

From Observation to Intervention: A Causal Audit of Expert Importance in Mixture-of-Experts Models

Leonard Engmann¹ Christian Medeiros Adriano¹ Holger Giese¹

Abstract

Interpretability methods routinely use population-level summary statistics over observed model behaviour to license claims about the effects of targeted interventions on specific computations; in Pearl’s terms, they treat rung-1 associational evidence as if it supported rung-2 interventional conclusions, a move whose validity is rarely tested. We examine one concrete instance: the use of routing statistics in Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) pruning, where utilization rates, activation norms, and routing weight distributions are treated as predictors of which experts can be removed without functional cost. A token-level interventional audit across three high-redundancy MoE architectures (OLMoE-1B-7B-0924, Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B, DeepSeek-V2-Lite) finds no observational metric predicts causal expert importance in any model: across all 60 metric-layer combinations effect sizes stay below Cohen’s $d = 0.23$, and no metric is reliably positive under our corrected, dual-test criterion. A per-token routing weight control, run with identical n , rules out insufficient power, recovering a signal whose CI excludes zero at OLMoE’s final MoE layer ($d = +0.231$, 95% CI $[+0.09, +0.37]$, $p = 0.0013$). Existing pruning methods succeed in this regime not by identifying dispensable experts but because early-layer redundancy renders most selection criteria interchangeable. Our results provide an explicit counterexample to the common inferential step from population-level observational summaries to token-level interventional claims about expert importance, and illustrate how interventional audits can calibrate the evidential standards for interpretability claims.

¹Hasso Plattner Institute, University of Potsdam, Germany. Correspondence to: Leonard Engmann <engmann1@uni-potsdam.de>.

Accepted at the ICML 2026 Workshop on Philosophy of Science Meets Machine Learning (PhilML), Seoul, South Korea. Non-archival; not part of the ICML proceedings.

1. Introduction

Interpretability methods routinely treat statistics computed over observed model behaviour as predictors of what a targeted intervention would do. Attention weights are read as explanations of individual predictions. Gradient saliency is read as identifying input features whose removal should change a model’s output. Routing statistics in Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) models are read as identifying experts whose ablation should leave the model intact.

The move is from observation to intervention, and its validity is rarely tested. When it has been tested, it has often failed. Jain & Wallace (2019) showed that attention weights do not predict the effect of perturbing the corresponding inputs. Adebayo et al. (2020) showed that saliency maps survive randomisation of the very model weights they purport to explain. Joshi et al. (2026) argue more generally that interpretability claims that aim to generalise require interventional evidence, not associational evidence.

This paper examines a third case. It complements Jain & Wallace (2019) and Adebayo et al. (2020) with a new empirical instance, and makes Joshi et al. (2026)’s general argument concrete in the MoE pruning setting. The MoE pruning and compression literature uses observational routing statistics, such as expert utilization rates, activation norms, and routing weight distributions, as proxies for functional expert importance. The implicit assumption is that experts which are routed to more frequently, or more selectively, are doing more important work. That assumption supports a now-standard pipeline: rank experts by an observational criterion, remove the lowest-ranked, recover capability through fine-tuning (Chen et al., 2022; Muzio et al., 2024; Jaiswal et al., 2025). Recent extensions apply the same criteria to high-redundancy architectures including OLMoE (Xie et al., 2024). The interventional question, whether the observational ranking predicts which expert ablations actually change model behaviour at individual token positions, has not been tested in any of these architectures.

We test it. Using router-aware per-token ablation, we audit four canonical observational pruning metrics, namely utilization rate, activation norm, mean routing weight when active, and activation standard deviation, at five

representative layers in each of three high-redundancy MoE language models: OLMoE-1B-7B-0924 (Muenighoff et al., 2025), Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B, and DeepSeek-V2-Lite (DeepSeek-AI, 2024). The three models span the major design dimensions of the contemporary MoE literature: single- versus multi-objective auxiliary load-balancing, top- k activation ratios from 6.7% to 12.5%, scratch versus upcycled-from-dense training, and the presence or absence of shared experts. A parallel control experiment swaps the observational criterion for per-token routing weights. This is a token-conditioned quantity, distinct from the population-averaged routing weight metric, and bounds the predictive signal available to any routing-derived measure.

The result is a clean three-model null. No observational metric reaches Bonferroni-corrected significance at any tested layer in any model. Effect sizes stay below Cohen’s $d = 0.23$ across all 60 metric-layer combinations, with signs inconsistent across layers and no cell reliably positive after correction. The routing weight control rules out insufficient power. Applied with identical machinery and identical n , it recovers one Bonferroni-significant effect. The signal is unique to OLMoE, at the final MoE layer ($d = +0.231$, $p = 0.0013$), where ablating an expert moves the residual stream by roughly $40\times$ what it does at early layers. Qwen and DeepSeek-V2-Lite show no comparable concentration. We treat the OLMoE late-layer effect as a within-model regularity that three architectures are not enough data to attribute to any single cause.

Two findings, two scopes. The observational null is general: three architectures spanning the major design dimensions of the contemporary literature, no metric-layer cell at corrected significance in any of them. Existing pruning methods that rely on these statistics do not succeed by identifying dispensable experts. They succeed because early-layer redundancy makes most selection criteria interchangeable, a regime we confirm through progressive ablation (Section 3). The OLMoE late-layer effect is narrow: one model, one layer, only under direct token-level conditioning. Both findings sit on the same side of one inferential boundary. Population-level routing statistics do not license token-level interventional predictions in this regime, regardless of which statistic is used.

All code and data are released.¹

2. Setup

MoE layer. A Mixture-of-Experts layer replaces a dense feedforward block with N experts $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and a router G .

¹Code: https://github.com/callmeloui/observational_metrics.

For hidden state $\mathbf{x}$ at token position t , the layer output is

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \sum_{i \in \text{top-}k} g_i(\mathbf{x}_t) \cdot E_i(\mathbf{x}_t), \quad (1)$$

where $g_i(\mathbf{x}_t) = \text{softmax}(W_g \mathbf{x}_t)_i$ is the routing weight. Three of our four metrics (utilization_rate, activation_norm, activation_std) are computed per-expert over the full corpus before any ablation. The fourth, mean routing weight when active, is the average of g_i over tokens for which expert i is selected. Our routing weight control uses $g_i(\mathbf{x}_t)$ directly, conditioned on the token under evaluation.

Functional importance. For expert i active at token t , we measure causal contribution through ablation. Let $\mathbf{y}_t^{(-i)}$ denote the layer output with E_i replaced by zero. The functional importance of i at t is the resulting loss change $\Delta \mathcal{L}_i^{(t)} = \mathcal{L}_t^{(-i)} - \mathcal{L}_t$, where $\mathcal{L}_t = -\log p_\theta(x_{t+1} \mid x_{\leq t})$. We also report the residual-stream displacement $\delta_i^{(t)} = \|\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{y}_t^{(-i)}\|_2$, which we call the gap norm. Functional importance asks whether ablating i at t changes the model’s prediction at t . The gap norm asks whether ablation changes the residual stream regardless of whether the change reaches the output.

Audit protocol. We test a precise version of the proxy assumption.

Definition 2.1 (Metric validity). An observational metric $m : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *causally valid at the token level* if, for token position t with active expert set $\mathcal{A}_t$, higher $m(e)$ among $e \in \mathcal{A}_t$ predicts larger functional importance $\Delta \mathcal{L}_e^{(t)}$.

Definition 2.1 is the condition that would justify using m to select experts for ablation: a strategy removing low- m experts should preferentially remove low-importance ones. For each metric-layer-model cell we sample $n = 200$ token positions. At each position we identify the active routed-expert set (shared experts in Qwen and DeepSeek are never modified), rank by the target metric, ablate the highest-ranked expert and record $\Delta \mathcal{L}_{\text{high}}$, then ablate the lowest-ranked and record $\Delta \mathcal{L}_{\text{low}}$. Validity in the sense of Definition 2.1 implies the paired difference $\Delta \mathcal{L}_{\text{high}} - \Delta \mathcal{L}_{\text{low}}$ is reliably positive. We test with a paired t -test (Cohen’s d as effect size, reported with a 95% confidence interval) and a Wilcoxon signed-rank test as a distribution-free check, and treat any cell where t and Wilcoxon disagree as noise. The routing weight control follows the same protocol with $g_i(\mathbf{x}_t)$ in place of the observational metric.

Models and data. We run the protocol on three high-redundancy MoE language models: OLMoE-1B-7B-0924 (16 layers, 64 experts, top-8,

no shared expert), Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B (24 layers, 60 routed experts plus one shared, top-4), and DeepSeek-V2-Lite (27 layers with layer 0 dense, 64 routed experts plus 2 shared, top-6). The auxiliary load-balancing coefficient ranges over an order of magnitude across the three ($\alpha = 0.01$ for OLMoE, 0.001 for Qwen, multi-objective for DeepSeek). For each model we audit four metrics at five representative layers proportional to network depth (OLMoE: L0, L4, L7, L11, L15; Qwen: L0, L6, L12, L18, L23; DeepSeek: L1, L7, L13, L20, L26), yielding 20 metric-layer cells per model and 60 cells in total. Bonferroni correction is applied per model: $\alpha_{\text{adj}} = 0.05/20 = 0.0025$ for the audit and $\alpha_{\text{adj}} = 0.05/5 = 0.01$ for the routing weight control. The evaluation corpus is the WikiText-2 test split (Merity et al., 2016). Full architectural details, precision settings, verification procedures, and per-cell numbers are in Appendix A and B.

3. Results

Each metric-layer cell is a direct token-level test of whether an observational summary licenses an interventional prediction.

The observational null replicates in all three models.

Across the 60 metric-layer cells (20 per model), no observational metric is significant under our corrected, dual-test criterion (the Bonferroni threshold of $p < 0.0025$ together with Wilcoxon agreement). Effect sizes stay below Cohen’s $d = 0.23$ throughout. In OLMoE, 19 of 20 cells are non-significant at $p < 0.05$ uncorrected, and the one cell at $p_t = 0.048$ (activation std at Layer 11, $d = +0.141$) reverses sign at Layer 15 ($d = -0.020$). In Qwen, one cell reaches uncorrected $p_t < 0.0025$ but fails the Wilcoxon check ($p_W = 0.036$); under our t -and-Wilcoxon agreement rule it is noise. In DeepSeek, three cells reach uncorrected $p_t < 0.05$ and only one survives Wilcoxon, with $d = +0.163$ at Layer 20 of utilization rate, well below the magnitudes the pruning literature treats as actionable. Activation norm, which Jaiswal et al. (2025) identify as the strongest of 16 expert-dropping criteria they benchmark, shows $|d| \leq 0.157$ at every tested layer in every model and does not reach Bonferroni significance anywhere. Signs are inconsistent across layers within each metric, the pattern produced by null distributions rather than weak true effects. Estimating effect sizes with 95% CIs rather than testing against zero gives the same conclusion. The intervals that exclude zero are exactly the cells reaching uncorrected $p_t < 0.05$ (bold in Appendix A); none survives our corrected, dual-test criterion. The one cell crossing the corrected t -threshold, activation std at Qwen Layer 23 ($[+0.08, +0.36]$), is rejected by Wilcoxon ($p_W = 0.036$) and already classed as noise. No observational metric yields the reliably positive effect

that Definition 2.1 requires of a valid selection criterion. Full per-cell tables, with intervals, are in Appendix A.

The routing weight control isolates one signal, in one model, at one layer.

Applied with identical machinery, the per-token routing weight ranking yields the pattern in Figure 1. In OLMoE, effect size grows monotonically with depth and reaches $d = +0.231$ at Layer 15 ($p = 0.0013$, the one result in the entire experiment to survive Bonferroni correction). Its 95% CI, $[+0.09, +0.37]$, excludes zero under identical n ; the contrast with the observational cells is therefore one of where effects are centred, not of statistical power. Qwen and DeepSeek show no comparable depth concentration: Qwen stays within $|d| \leq 0.124$ across all five tested layers, DeepSeek within $|d| \leq 0.098$. The shaded band in Figure 1 shows the range covered by all 60 observational-metric cells across the three models; only the OLMoE Layer 15 routing weight result lies outside it.




Figure 1. Per-token routing weight ablation across layers in three models ($n = 200$ per layer, paired t -test, Cohen’s d on paired differences). Shaded bands per model are 95% CIs. Grey band is the full range of observational-metric effect sizes across all four metrics, five layers, and three models. Only OLMoE Layer 15 ($d = +0.231$, $p = 0.0013$) survives Bonferroni correction ($\alpha_{\text{adj}} = 0.01$ over five layers).

Progressive ablation confirms the redundancy regime.

A progressive ablation experiment on OLMoE removes the k highest-weight active experts at a target layer and records the cumulative loss change ($n = 500$ token positions per layer- k cell, layers $\{0, 1, 7, 8, 9, 15\}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, 7\}$). At layers 0 through 9, mean loss change stays below $+0.083$ nats at $k = 7$, meaning removing seven of eight active experts is functionally tolerable in the average case. Layer 15 breaks at $k = 2$ with mean $\Delta\mathcal{L} = +0.155$ nats and reaches $+0.431$ at $k = 7$. The early- and mid-layer redundancy buffer is the structural condition that makes the choice of observational metric immaterial: any selection criterion that

removes experts at these layers will look approximately harmless because nearly all selections at these layers are approximately harmless.

Mechanism underlying the OLMoE late-layer effect.

The OLMoE Layer 15 signal coincides with a sharp scaling of the gap norm: mean residual-stream displacement under single-expert ablation grows from 0.0041 at Layer 0 to 0.1697 at Layer 15, a $41\times$ increase. The Qwen redistribution analysis (Appendix A.3) shows comparable gap-norm scaling without OLMoE’s late-layer functional concentration, which rules out gap-norm growth alone as sufficient. Three architectures are not enough data to attribute the OLMoE-specific pattern to any single training or architectural factor. We treat it as an empirical regularity requiring controlled within-architecture follow-up.

4. Discussion

What the audit shows and what it does not. The three-model null is the empirical headline: no observational metric reaches corrected significance at any tested layer in any model. The audit does not show that metric-guided pruning fails as a deployment pipeline. It shows that when it succeeds, the success is not attributable to the metric identifying experts that matter at the level of individual tokens. Progressive ablation explains why this is consistent with the literature’s reported gains: removing seven of eight active experts at layers 0 through 9 leaves OLMoE’s mean loss almost unchanged. Any selection rule applied at these layers will look approximately harmless because nearly all selections at these layers are approximately harmless. The metric and the random baseline are doing the same thing. We read these cells as estimates, not as accept/reject decisions: the interpretive weight rests on the contrast between observational effects that cluster near zero with no reliable sign and a control effect, estimated identically, whose interval excludes zero. That contrast is what licenses reading the null as evidence about where effects lie rather than as a mere absence of evidence.

The OLMoE late-layer effect. One signal does survive. At OLMoE Layer 15, per-token routing weight predicts functional importance ($d = +0.231$, $p = 0.0013$). The signal is conditioned on the individual token rather than the corpus distribution, which is the structural move the rest of the paper shows to be missing. The signal is also not a counterexample to the broader null: pruning methods need a predictor that can be computed before inference, and $g_i(\mathbf{x}_t)$ requires the forward pass to that layer at that token. The OLMoE result is an existence proof of a per-token predictor, not evidence that any deployable metric works. It is also unique to OLMoE: comparable gap-norm scaling in Qwen does not produce comparable functional

concentration, which rules out residual-stream growth as a sufficient explanation. Three architectures are not enough data to attribute the pattern to any single training or design choice. We treat it as an empirical regularity worth following up within OLMoE through controlled checkpoint variation, not as a general property of high-redundancy MoE.

Scope. The audit is at the token level and tests one-expert ablation at one position. Deployed pruning makes one-shot global decisions and recovers through fine-tuning. The token-level null does not directly falsify the deployed pipeline, but it removes the per-token mechanism that pipeline assumes. At $n = 200$ per cell the intervals are wide, with half-widths near 0.14; we therefore claim only that no observational metric produces a reliably positive token-level effect, not that the underlying effects are exactly zero, and the reading rests on the contrast with the identically powered control rather than on any single non-significant cell. All three audited models are high-redundancy, with top- k activation rates between 6.7% and 12.5%. Whether observational metrics regain validity in low-redundancy architectures such as Switch-style and Mixtral-8x7B remains open, and we read the literature’s reported pruning successes on those architectures as partly attributable to the regime in which the metrics were originally developed.

The inferential move. Pearl’s causal hierarchy (Bareinboim et al., 2022) distinguishes what kinds of claims an interpretability study is entitled to make. At the associational level, observational data can justify statements about correlations between a model’s behaviour and its internal components. At the interventional level, experiments such as ablations or activation patching can support claims about how deliberately editing those components changes behavioural quantities. The pruning literature treats $\mathbb{E}_t[m_t(e)]$, a summary over observed routing behaviour, as a predictor of $\Delta\mathcal{L}_e^{(t)}$, the loss change under intervention at a specific token. In the framing of Joshi et al. (2026), this is a move from rung 1 to rung 2 of the hierarchy: observational evidence used to license an interventional claim. Joshi et al.’s primary concern is the boundary between rung 2 (interventions over a set of prompts) and rung 3 (counterfactual claims about individual instances). Our case shows the analogous failure one boundary lower: observational summaries do not license interventional predictions at the token level. Each of the 60 metric-layer cells in our audit is an instance of this rung-1-to-rung-2 inference. None survives the corrected threshold in any of the three models. The failure is uniform across metric families, layers, and architectures. The closest precedents are Jain & Wallace (2019) on attention and Adibayo et al. (2020) on saliency. In both, a quantity computed from observed model behaviour was treated as a predictor of intervention outcomes, and in both the proxy was not invariant to the perturbations it was meant to track. Routing

statistics in MoE pruning are the same case. The pattern is not about attention, saliency, or routing. It is about what kind of evidence licenses what kind of claim. We do not develop a general theory of when observational-to-interventional inferences hold or fail. We provide one empirical instance and identify two structurally similar cases.

5. Conclusion

Mixture-of-Experts pruning relies on an unstated inference from population-level routing statistics to token-level interventional predictions. A three-model audit finds no observational metric predicts causal expert importance at the token level after correction, with one signal surviving only under direct per-token conditioning at OLMoE Layer 15. Null-hypothesis testing here measures evidence against a metric’s validity, not evidence in favour of any competing account; we therefore report an interval estimate for every cell, and a Bayesian comparison of metric models, in the spirit of Bayes factors or information-criterion model selection, would let future work quantify the relative support each criterion receives from token-level interventional data. The pattern of summary statistics standing in for interventional evidence has appeared elsewhere in interpretability methodology, and the present null is one more case where the inferential move does not hold up to its own test.

References

- Adebayo, J., Gilmer, J., Muelly, M., Goodfellow, I., Hardt, M., and Kim, B. Sanity checks for saliency maps, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.03292>.
- Bareinboim, E., Correa, J. D., Ibeling, D., and Icard, T. On pearl’s hierarchy and the foundations of causal inference. In *Probabilistic and causal inference: the works of Judea Pearl*, pp. 507–556. ACM Books, 2022.
- Chen, T., Huang, S., Xie, Y., Jiao, B., Jiang, D., Zhou, H., Li, J., and Wei, F. Task-specific expert pruning for sparse mixture-of-experts, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.00277>.
- DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.04434>.
- Jain, S. and Wallace, B. C. Attention is not explanation, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.10186>.
- Jaiswal, A., Wang, J., Li, Y., Li, P., Chen, T., Wang, Z., Wang, C., Pang, R., and Du, X. Finding fantastic experts in moes: A unified study for expert dropping strategies and observations, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.05586>.
- Joshi, S., Mueller, A., Klindt, D., Brendel, W., Reizinger, P., and Sridhar, D. Causality is key for interpretability claims to generalise, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.16698>.
- Merity, S., Xiong, C., Bradbury, J., and Socher, R. Pointer sentinel mixture models, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.07843>.
- Muennighoff, N., Soldaini, L., Groeneveld, D., Lo, K., Morrison, J., Min, S., Shi, W., Walsh, P., Tafjord, O., Lambert, N., Gu, Y., Arora, S., Bhagia, A., Schwenk, D., Wadden, D., Wettig, A., Hui, B., Dettmers, T., Kiela, D., Farhadi, A., Smith, N. A., Koh, P. W., Singh, A., and Hajishirzi, H. Olmoe: Open mixture-of-experts language models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.02060>.
- Muzio, A., Sun, A., and He, C. Seer-moe: Sparse expert efficiency through regularization for mixture-of-experts, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.05089>.
- Xie, Y., Zhang, Z., Zhou, D., Xie, C., Song, Z., Liu, X., Wang, Y., Lin, X., and Xu, A. Moe-pruner: Pruning mixture-of-experts large language model using the hints from its router, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.12013>.

A. Detailed Cross-Architecture Replication Results

This appendix reports per-cell results for the cross-architecture replications summarized in Section 3. Section A.1 gives full per-token metric ablation tables for all three models. Section A.2 gives full routing weight control tables. Section A.3 gives the redistribution analysis.

A.1. Observational Metrics Per-Cell Results

For each model, we report Cohen’s d , its 95% confidence interval, the paired t -test p -value (p_t), and the Wilcoxon signed-rank p -value (p_W). Intervals are exact noncentral- t confidence intervals on the paired d , confirmed by a 20,000-sample bootstrap of the per-token paired differences (the two agree to within 0.02 in every cell). Bonferroni-corrected significance threshold per model: $\alpha_{\text{adj}} = 0.05/20 = 0.0025$. Cells in **bold** reach uncorrected $p_t < 0.05$; equivalently, these are the cells whose 95% interval excludes zero. No cell is significant under our corrected, dual-test criterion in any of the three models: the only cell crossing the corrected t -threshold (Qwen activation std, L23) is rejected by Wilcoxon.

Table 1. Per-token metric ablation per-cell results, OLMoE-1B-7B-0924. $n = 200$ per cell.

Metric	L0	L4	L7	L11	L15
Utilization rate	−0.071 $p_t=0.319$ [−0.21, +0.07]	−0.027 $p_t=0.702$ [−0.17, +0.11]	+0.029 $p_t=0.687$ [−0.11, +0.17]	+0.066 $p_t=0.351$ [−0.07, +0.21]	+0.051 $p_t=0.476$ [−0.09, +0.19]
Activation norm	−0.095 $p_t=0.182$ [−0.23, +0.04]	+0.119 $p_t=0.094$ [−0.02, +0.26]	+0.075 $p_t=0.293$ [−0.06, +0.21]	+0.136 $p_t=0.057$ [−0.00, +0.27]	+0.033 $p_t=0.640$ [−0.11, +0.17]
Mean routing weight	+0.048 $p_t=0.500$ [−0.09, +0.19]	−0.093 $p_t=0.189$ [−0.23, +0.05]	+0.072 $p_t=0.312$ [−0.07, +0.21]	−0.036 $p_t=0.611$ [−0.18, +0.10]	−0.095 $p_t=0.179$ [−0.23, +0.04]
Activation std	−0.034 $p_t=0.634$ [−0.17, +0.11]	+0.030 $p_t=0.669$ [−0.11, +0.17]	−0.098 $p_t=0.169$ [−0.24, +0.04]	+0.141 $p_t=0.048$ [+0.00, +0.28]	−0.020 $p_t=0.777$ [−0.16, +0.12]

Table 2. Per-token metric ablation per-cell results, Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B. $n = 200$ per cell.

Metric	L0	L6	L12	L18	L23
Utilization rate	−0.131 $p_t=0.065$ [−0.27, +0.01]	+0.012 $p_t=0.861$ [−0.13, +0.15]	+0.111 $p_t=0.118$ [−0.03, +0.25]	+0.009 $p_t=0.903$ [−0.13, +0.15]	−0.001 $p_t=0.993$ [−0.14, +0.14]
Activation norm	+0.019 $p_t=0.786$ [−0.12, +0.16]	+0.053 $p_t=0.454$ [−0.09, +0.19]	+0.110 $p_t=0.120$ [−0.03, +0.25]	+0.045 $p_t=0.526$ [−0.09, +0.18]	+0.092 $p_t=0.194$ [−0.05, +0.23]
Mean routing weight	+0.021 $p_t=0.772$ [−0.12, +0.16]	+0.018 $p_t=0.798$ [−0.12, +0.16]	−0.006 $p_t=0.934$ [−0.14, +0.13]	+0.129 $p_t=0.070$ [−0.01, +0.27]	+0.035 $p_t=0.620$ [−0.10, +0.17]
Activation std	+0.067 $p_t=0.343$ [−0.07, +0.21]	+0.046 $p_t=0.515$ [−0.09, +0.19]	+0.081 $p_t=0.252$ [−0.06, +0.22]	+0.149 $p_t=0.036$ [+0.01, +0.29]	+0.222 $p_t=0.002$ [+0.08, +0.36]

A.2. Routing Weight Control Per-Cell Results

For the per-token routing weight control experiment, we report Cohen’s d , its 95% confidence interval, paired t -test p -value, Wilcoxon p -value, and Spearman ρ between the routing weight ratio ($w_{\text{high}}/w_{\text{low}}$) and the loss difference ($\Delta_{\text{high}} - \Delta_{\text{low}}$). Bonferroni-corrected threshold per model: $\alpha_{\text{adj}} = 0.05/5 = 0.01$. Cells in **bold** reach Bonferroni significance. At the uncorrected 95% level both OLMoE Layer 11 and Layer 15 exclude zero; only Layer 15 survives the corrected threshold.

Table 3. Per-token metric ablation per-cell results, DeepSeek-V2-Lite. $n = 200$ per cell.

Metric	L1	L7	L13	L20	L26
Utilization rate	-0.039 $p_t=0.581$ [$-0.18, +0.10$]	$+0.044$ $p_t=0.533$ [$-0.10, +0.18$]	$+0.115$ $p_t=0.105$ [$-0.02, +0.25$]	$+0.163$ $p_t=0.023$ [$+0.02, +0.30$]	$+0.143$ $p_t=0.045$ [$+0.00, +0.28$]
Activation norm	$+0.157$ $p_t=0.028$ [$+0.02, +0.30$]	$+0.040$ $p_t=0.576$ [$-0.10, +0.18$]	$+0.097$ $p_t=0.172$ [$-0.04, +0.24$]	$+0.006$ $p_t=0.937$ [$-0.13, +0.14$]	$+0.084$ $p_t=0.235$ [$-0.06, +0.22$]
Mean routing weight	-0.007 $p_t=0.926$ [$-0.15, +0.13$]	-0.070 $p_t=0.327$ [$-0.21, +0.07$]	$+0.097$ $p_t=0.174$ [$-0.04, +0.24$]	-0.014 $p_t=0.849$ [$-0.15, +0.13$]	$+0.035$ $p_t=0.621$ [$-0.10, +0.17$]
Activation std	$+0.101$ $p_t=0.156$ [$-0.04, +0.24$]	$+0.064$ $p_t=0.369$ [$-0.08, +0.20$]	$+0.043$ $p_t=0.545$ [$-0.10, +0.18$]	$+0.050$ $p_t=0.483$ [$-0.09, +0.19$]	$+0.064$ $p_t=0.370$ [$-0.08, +0.20$]

 Table 4. Routing weight control, OLMoE-1B-7B-0924. $n = 200$ per layer.

	L0	L4	L7	L11	L15
Cohen’s d	-0.114	$+0.095$	$+0.085$	$+0.164$	$+0.231$
95% CI	[$-0.25, +0.03$]	[$-0.04, +0.23$]	[$-0.05, +0.22$]	[$+0.02, +0.30$]	[$+0.09, +0.37$]
p_t	0.107	0.180	0.233	0.022	0.0013
p_w	0.217	0.799	0.227	0.015	0.019
Spearman ρ	-0.058	$+0.019$	$+0.196$	$+0.084$	$+0.199$

 Table 5. Routing weight control, Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B. $n = 200$ per layer.

	L0	L6	L12	L18	L23
Cohen’s d	$+0.014$	-0.031	$+0.114$	$+0.124$	$+0.112$
95% CI	[$-0.12, +0.15$]	[$-0.17, +0.11$]	[$-0.03, +0.25$]	[$-0.02, +0.26$]	[$-0.03, +0.25$]
p_t	0.840	0.659	0.110	0.081	0.116
p_w	0.385	0.589	0.308	0.922	0.199
Spearman ρ	-0.084	$+0.043$	-0.036	$+0.082$	-0.011

 Table 6. Routing weight control, DeepSeek-V2-Lite. $n = 200$ per layer.

	L1	L7	L13	L20	L26
Cohen’s d	$+0.075$	$+0.078$	$+0.068$	$+0.068$	$+0.098$
95% CI	[$-0.06, +0.21$]	[$-0.06, +0.22$]	[$-0.07, +0.21$]	[$-0.07, +0.21$]	[$-0.04, +0.24$]
p_t	0.293	0.273	0.336	0.335	0.169
p_w	0.390	0.508	0.460	0.085	0.466
Spearman ρ	$+0.090$	-0.070	$+0.051$	-0.001	-0.018

A.3. Redistribution Analysis

The redistribution analysis decomposes the signal chain from router to logits into two correlations across depth: routing weight to gap norm (whether the router tracks expert contribution magnitude), and gap norm to relative compensation (whether that contribution propagates to logit-level importance). Figure 2 shows both correlation chains across depth in OLMoE-1B-7B-0924 and Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B. In both models, routing weight predicts gap norm at every layer. The two models diverge on the second chain: in Qwen, gap norm predicts relative compensation from Layer 6 onwards; in OLMoE, this correlation strengthens only at Layer 15. The router tracks hidden-state contribution magnitude in both architectures, but in OLMoE those contributions reach logit space only at the final layer.

For Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B, we ran the redistribution analysis at layers 0, 6, 12, 18, and 23, computing per-expert statistics over the WikiText-2 test corpus ($n = 34,016$ token-level expert activations per layer). Table 7 reports mean gap norm across the 60 routed experts, Spearman ρ between routing weight and gap norm, and Spearman ρ between gap norm and relative compensation.




Figure 2. Two-level dissociation in redistribution: Spearman ρ across depth for OLMoE-1B-7B-0924 and Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B. Left: routing weight versus gap norm; the router tracks expert contribution magnitude at every layer in both models. Right: gap norm versus relative compensation; in Qwen the second chain closes from Layer 6, in OLMoE only at Layer 15. Significance markers: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 7. Qwen1.5-MoE redistribution analysis. Correlations computed across $N = 60$ routed experts at each layer. Significance markers: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

	L0	L6	L12	L18	L23
Mean gap norm	0.011	0.122	0.090	0.239	0.440
$\rho(\text{rw}, \text{gap norm})$	+0.558***	+0.638***	+0.632***	+0.596***	+0.744***
$\rho(\text{gap norm}, \text{rel. comp.})$	+0.076	+0.394**	+0.388**	+0.349**	+0.282*

The gap-norm-to-relative-compensation correlation is non-significant at Layer 0 ($\rho = +0.076$, $p = 0.563$) but significant ($p < 0.05$) from Layer 6 onwards, in contrast to OLMoE where this correlation strengthens only at Layer 15. The mean gap norm scales $\approx 38\times$ from Layer 0 (0.011) to Layer 23 (0.440), comparable to OLMoE’s $41\times$ scaling.

B. Architecture Verification Procedures

For each cross-architecture replication, we ran a four-test verification suite before collecting per-token metric ablation and routing weight control data:

1. **Per-token CE matches HuggingFace reference loss.** For one corpus sample, mean per-token cross-entropy over non-padding positions is compared to HuggingFace’s `labels=input_ids` loss. Tolerance: 10^{-2} for half-precision runs, 10^{-4} for fp32.
2. **No stale state after clearing ablation hooks.** For one position, baseline loss, ablated loss, and post-clear loss are computed; baseline and post-clear must agree to within 10^{-3} .
3. **Position diversity.** Across 100 positions in one sample, distinct losses must exceed 50% of positions.
4. **Position-specific ablation effect.** Ablating expert e at a position where e is active must produce larger loss change than at a position where e is inactive.

All three models passed all four verification tests. For DeepSeek-V2-Lite verification was repeated independently at each of the 5 tested layers; Qwen and OLMoE verifications were performed once at the most-tested middle layer.

C. Progressive Ablation Per-Layer Trajectories

For the progressive ablation experiment summarised in Section 3, Table 8 reports mean cumulative $\Delta\mathcal{L}$ (in nats) on OLMoE-1B-7B-0924 for each tested layer at each removal depth k , computed over $n = 500$ WikiText-2 token positions per (layer, k) cell. Table 9 reports the corresponding median and P95 values, which clarify that the mean increase at Layer 15 is driven by a heavy upper tail rather than a uniform shift. Median $\Delta\mathcal{L}$ at $k = 7$ remains below $+0.02$ nats at every tested layer including Layer 15, while P95 reaches $+2.633$ nats at Layer 15 versus $\leq +0.709$ elsewhere. The redundancy cliff at Layer 15 is concentrated on a minority of positions where the ensemble does not absorb removal.

Table 8. Mean cumulative $\Delta\mathcal{L}$ (nats) under progressive ablation of the k highest-routing-weight active experts at each layer in OLMoE-1B-7B-0924. $n = 500$ token positions per cell.

k	L0	L1	L7	L8	L9	L15
1	+0.009	+0.018	+0.009	+0.015	+0.029	+0.082
2	+0.013	+0.031	+0.016	+0.028	+0.060	+0.155
3	+0.016	+0.035	+0.010	+0.045	+0.061	+0.214
4	+0.019	+0.051	+0.022	+0.054	+0.073	+0.290
5	+0.029	+0.058	+0.022	+0.061	+0.080	+0.354
6	+0.021	+0.058	+0.025	+0.062	+0.078	+0.403
7	+0.028	+0.068	+0.020	+0.070	+0.083	+0.431

Table 9. Median and P95 cumulative $\Delta\mathcal{L}$ (nats) at $k = 7$ for each tested layer. Median values near zero throughout indicate the mean increase at Layer 15 is concentrated in an upper tail rather than a uniform shift.

	L0	L1	L7	L8	L9	L15
Median	+0.000	+0.003	+0.001	+0.008	+0.012	+0.018
P95	+0.433	+0.398	+0.473	+0.641	+0.709	+2.633