

MISA: Mixture of Indexer Sparse Attention for Long-Context LLM Inference

Ruijie Zhou, Fanxu Meng*, Yufei Xu, Tongxuan Liu, Guangming Lu, Muhan Zhang, Wenjie Pei*
<https://github.com/MuLabPKU/TransArch>

Abstract

DeepSeek Sparse Attention (DSA) sets the state of the art for fine-grained inference-time sparse attention by introducing a learned token-wise indexer that scores every prefix token and selects the top- k for the main attention. To remain expressive, the indexer uses H^I query heads (e.g. 64 on DeepSeek-V3.2) that share the same selected token set; this multi-head design is precisely what makes the indexer the dominant cost on long contexts. We propose **MISA** (Mixture of Indexer Sparse Attention), a drop-in replacement for the DSA indexer that treats its H^I heads as a pool of mixture-of-experts: a lightweight router uses cheap block-level statistics to pick a query-dependent subset of $h \ll H^I$ active heads, and only those heads run the heavy token-level scoring. This preserves the diversity of the original indexer pool while reducing the per-query cost from $\mathcal{O}(H^I L)$ to $\mathcal{O}(hL + H^I M)$ with $M = \lceil L/B \rceil \ll L$ pooled keys. Following HISA, we further introduce a hierarchical variant, MISA[†], that uses the MoE-routed pass to keep an enlarged candidate set and then re-ranks it with the original DSA indexer to recover the final top- k almost exactly. With $h = 8$ active heads and *no additional training*, MISA matches the dense DSA indexer on LongBench across DeepSeek-V3.2 and GLM-5 while running with $8\times$ and $4\times$ fewer indexer heads, respectively, and outperforms HISA on average; it preserves fully green Needle-in-a-Haystack heatmaps up to 128K context and recovers more than 92% of the tokens selected by the DSA indexer per layer. Our TileLang kernel delivers roughly a $3.82\times$ speedup over DSA’s original indexer kernel on a single NVIDIA H200 GPU. These results show that indexer-head-axis routing is a practical and complementary axis of efficiency for fine-grained sparse attention, on top of the existing token-axis hierarchies.

1 Introduction

Frontier large language models such as Qwen3 [25], Kimi K2 [18], GLM-5 [28], and DeepSeek-V3.2 [7] now routinely process prefixes of hundreds of thousands of tokens in a single forward pass, and the latest releases—GPT-5.5 [19], Claude Opus 4.7 [1], Gemini 3 [11], MiniMax-01 [15], and DeepSeek-V4 [8]—push this to the million-token regime. At these lengths, dense attention becomes the dominant cost of both prefill and decode, motivating a wave of *sparse attention* techniques that select only a small subset $\mathcal{T}_t$ of past tokens for each query position [3–5, 10, 16, 17, 21–24, 26, 27, 30]. Among them, DeepSeek Sparse Attention (DSA) [7] stands out as the best-performing fine-grained variant in production: rather than selecting whole blocks of tokens with handcrafted patterns, DSA introduces a lightweight learned *indexer* that scores every prefix token and feeds the top- k tokens into the main attention. Its dominance carries into the next generation: DeepSeek-V4’s Compressed Sparse Attention (CSA) [8] is, at its core, DSA applied on top of a $4\times$ compressed (block-level) KV stream, confirming that learned token-wise indexing remains the strongest building block even when the underlying KV is itself compressed. By contrast, block-level inference-time alternatives such

*Corresponding author: fxmeng@stu.pku.edu.cn, wenjiecoder@outlook.com.




Figure 1: Comparison of the DSA and MISA indexers. **(a) DSA** scores every prefix token with all H^I indexer heads in parallel before the Top- k Selector picks the final tokens. **(b) MISA** introduces a lightweight Router that uses block-pooled indexing keys $\tilde{k}_b^I$ (cf. Eq. 4) to choose a query-dependent subset of $h \ll H^I$ active heads, and only those heads compute the per-token score. Both designs feed the same Sparse Multi-Head Latent Attention operator and produce a top- k token set of identical size, so MISA is a drop-in replacement for the DSA indexer.

as MoBA [17] consistently lag behind DSA on retrieval-style benchmarks because their per-block scores cannot localise the relevant content within a block.

A central design choice of DSA is that the indexer itself is multi-head: although the main attention in DeepSeek-V3.2 has $H = 128$ query heads, all of them share the *same* selected token set $\mathcal{T}_t$ (the sparse MLA operates in MQA mode with a single key/value entry per token), so a single indexer is sufficient—yet DSA still uses $H^I = 64$ indexer heads. The reason is expressiveness: each head specialises in a different relevance pattern (recency, syntactic role, lexical or semantic similarity, ...), and the aggregated score $I_{t,s} = \sum_j w_{t,j}^I \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{q}_{t,j}^I \cdot \mathbf{k}_s^I)$ benefits from this diversity, with measurable retrieval degradation as H^I shrinks. The unfortunate consequence is that scoring each of the L prefix tokens with all H^I heads is precisely what makes the indexer the dominant cost on long contexts. Two recent improvements try to reduce this indexer cost without touching the head axis. IndexCache [2] retains only a small set of layers as *full* indexer layers and lets the remaining *shared* layers reuse their top- k , amortising the cost *across layers*; HISA [24] attacks the cost from the *token axis* with a hierarchical block-to-token search. Both still keep every one of the H^I heads active inside the kernel, and both step away from DSA’s strict per-token, per-layer scoring—tokens outside HISA’s selected blocks and entire shared layers in IndexCache no longer receive a fresh fine-grained score, sacrificing part of the granularity that makes DSA strong.

This paper takes the orthogonal view that the bottleneck is the *head* axis. Our key observation is that, while diversity across heads is essential when aggregated over a large pool, only a few heads are actually informative for any given query: the relevant set changes slowly along the prefix and can be identified from cheap block-level statistics. We turn this observation into MISA (Mixture of Indexer Sparse Attention), an indexer that treats the H^I heads as a pool of MoE experts, routes a query-dependent subset of $h \ll H^I$ active heads via a block-pooled scorer, and runs the heavy token-level scan with only those heads. The router itself operates on $M = \lceil L/B \rceil \ll L$ pooled keys, so its overhead is negligible, and the per-query indexer cost is reduced from $\mathcal{O}(H^I L)$ to $\mathcal{O}(hL + H^I M)$. MISA preserves the full diversity of the indexer pool because every head remains available; routing simply chooses *which* ones to consult on each token. We further show that MISA can be plugged into a coarse-to-fine pipeline (MISA[†]) that uses an enlarged routed candidate set followed by a token-level DSA refinement, recovering the dense indexer’s selections almost exactly.

Contributions. (i) We identify the indexer’s per-token head–token products as the dominant cost of DSA on long contexts and introduce head-axis routing as an axis of efficiency that is *complementary* to the token-axis hierarchies explored by HISA [24] and block-level methods [17, 21, 22]. (ii) We propose MISA, a drop-in MoE-routed indexer that activates only $h \ll H^I$ heads per query through a lightweight block-pooled router, and a hierarchical extension MISA[†] that re-ranks a routed candidate

set with the original DSA indexer to recover the dense top- k almost exactly. (iii) Without any additional training, MISA matches the dense DSA indexer on LongBench within 0.5 average points across DeepSeek-V3.2 and GLM-5 while running with $h = 8$ active heads ($8\times$ and $4\times$ fewer indexer heads, respectively), preserves full Needle-in-a-Haystack accuracy up to 128K context, and recovers more than 92% of the tokens selected by the DSA indexer per layer on LSHT. (iv) Our TileLang kernel implementation delivers roughly a $3.82\times$ speedup over DSA’s original indexer kernel on a single NVIDIA H200 GPU. Together, these results show that head-level routing is a practical efficiency axis for fine-grained sparse attention, on top of any existing token-level scheme.

2 Related work

Sparse attention. A long line of work attacks the quadratic cost of attention on long contexts by selecting a subset of past tokens for each query. *Static-pattern* methods such as Sparse Transformer [5], Longformer [3], and BigBird [27] use predefined window, stride, and global tokens that are decoupled from the actual content. *Cache-eviction* methods drop tokens at decode time using attention-statistics heuristics: StreamingLLM [23] keeps a few attention sinks plus a recent window, H2O [30] retains heavy hitters in past attention, and SnapKV [16] clusters and compresses the KV cache. These methods avoid retrieval entirely and can therefore lose information that becomes relevant later in the generation.

A more recent class of methods uses *content-based dynamic retrieval* at the block level. Quest [21] and InfLLM [22] score blocks of tokens by their pooled key against the query and select the top- m blocks at decode time. MoBA [17] extends this idea to a trained inference-time selector with the same block-level granularity. MagicPIG [4] replaces top- k retrieval with LSH-based importance sampling. SeerAttention [10] learns a sparse gate jointly with the model. Native Sparse Attention [26] is the first work to train a transformer with a hardware-aligned sparsity pattern from scratch. Among inference-time methods, DeepSeek Sparse Attention [7] is currently the strongest: a learned token-wise indexer scores every prefix token (rather than every block), and the resulting top- k matches dense attention quality at production scale. HISA [24] accelerates the DSA indexer with a coarse-to-fine block-to-token search, and IndexCache [2] amortises the same indexer across consecutive layers by retaining only a few *full* indexer layers and reusing their top- k in the rest; both still keep every indexer head active inside the kernel and depart from per-token, per-layer scoring. MISA is complementary to all of these works: instead of acting along the token axis, we route along the head axis of the indexer itself, which can be combined orthogonally with any token-level scheme.

Mixture of experts in language models. Conditional computation via mixture of experts (MoE) was introduced by Shazeer et al. [20] and scaled up in GShard [14] and Switch Transformer [9], where a learned router activates a sparse subset of expert FFNs per token. Modern open-weight LLMs such as Mixtral [12] and DeepSeek-MoE [6] make their FFN layers MoE-based while leaving the attention layers dense. *Attention-side* MoE has also been explored: Mixture-of-Attention-Heads [29] treats whole multi-head attention modules as experts and routes one module per token; MoH [13] treats each individual attention head as an expert and selects a sparse subset of heads to compute the attention output. MISA adopts the same head-as-expert philosophy as MoH but applies it to a fundamentally different module. MoH and prior attention MoEs route the heads that produce the attention *output*, so changing the routed subset directly changes the values written back into the residual stream. MISA instead routes the heads that produce the indexer *score*: the routed subset only decides which similarity patterns are consulted when picking the top- k tokens, while the downstream attention itself remains dense over the chosen set. This decoupling is what makes it possible to use a very small number of experts ($h \ll H^I$) without harming model quality.

3 Preliminaries

We briefly review DeepSeek Sparse Attention (DSA) as used in DeepSeek-V3.2 [7] and a follow-up indexer-side improvement, HISA [24]; both serve as baselines and as the starting points for the design of MISA. DSA consists of two components: a **token-wise indexer** that selects a small set of relevant tokens for each query, and **Sparse MLA** that performs attention only over the selected tokens. HISA introduces a **hierarchical indexing** mechanism that improves indexer efficiency while keeping Sparse MLA identical to DSA. The notation introduced below is used throughout the rest of the paper.

Indexer in DSA. Let L denote the causal prefix length for a query position t . The indexer maintains lightweight indexing keys $\mathbf{k}_s^I$, indexing queries $\mathbf{q}_{t,j}^I$ for H^I indexing heads, and per-head gating weights $w_{t,j}^I$. The relevance score between query t and key s is

$$I_{t,s} = \sum_{j=1}^{H^I} w_{t,j}^I \cdot \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{q}_{t,j}^I \cdot \mathbf{k}_s^I). \quad (1)$$

The indexer then selects the top- k token indices,

$$\mathcal{T}_t = \text{TopK}(I_{t,:}, k), \quad (2)$$

which are passed to the downstream Sparse MLA operator. The per-query indexer cost is therefore $\mathcal{O}(H^I L)$, dominated by the H^I head-token products in Eq. 1; aggregated over a full prefill it grows as $\mathcal{O}(H^I L^2)$ per layer.

Sparse MLA in DSA. Sparse MLA adopts the MQA mode of MLA, in which each token stores a single latent key-value entry $\mathbf{c}_s$ shared across all query heads. Given the selected token set $\mathcal{T}_t$, attention is computed only over the selected entries:

$$\mathbf{u}_t = \text{Attn}(\mathbf{h}_t, \{\mathbf{c}_s \mid s \in \mathcal{T}_t\}). \quad (3)$$

This reduces the dominant attention cost from $\mathcal{O}(L^2)$ to $\mathcal{O}(Lk)$. The interface between the two components is exactly the selected token set $\mathcal{T}_t$, which makes the indexer the natural target for further acceleration without touching Sparse MLA.

Indexer in HISA. HISA replaces the flat prefix scan with a two-stage coarse-to-fine search. The prefix is partitioned into $M = \lceil L/B \rceil$ contiguous blocks $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_M$ of size B , and each block is summarized by a representative key obtained via mean pooling:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_b^I = \text{Pool}(\{\mathbf{k}_s^I \mid s \in \mathcal{B}_b\}). \quad (4)$$

In the first stage, the same indexing queries $\mathbf{q}_{t,j}^I$ and gating weights $w_{t,j}^I$ as in DSA are reused to score the pooled keys, and the top- m blocks are selected:

$$J_{t,b} = \sum_{j=1}^{H^I} w_{t,j}^I \cdot \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{q}_{t,j}^I \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_b^I), \quad \mathcal{C}_t = \text{TopK}(J_{t,:}, m). \quad (5)$$

Following [17], the first and last blocks are always included in $\mathcal{C}_t$ to retain the attention sink and local context. The candidate token set is then $\Omega_t = \bigcup_{b \in \mathcal{C}_t} \mathcal{B}_b$.

In the second stage, the original DSA scoring (Eq. 1) is applied within Ω_t , and the final top- k tokens

$$\mathcal{T}_t = \text{TopK}(\{I_{t,s} \mid s \in \Omega_t\}, k) \quad (6)$$

are passed to the unmodified Sparse MLA operator.

4 Method

As established in Section 3, the DSA indexer scores every prefix token with all H^I heads, giving a per-query cost of $\mathcal{O}(H^I L)$ that already dominates the indexer kernel even after FP8 quantisation, the ReLU non-linearity, and the small indexer dimension used by DeepSeek-V3.2 [7]. The H^I heads cannot simply be collapsed into one: each specialises in a different relevance pattern, so reducing H^I measurably degrades retrieval. Our starting point is the observation that this expressiveness is needed only *in aggregate*—across all queries and across the prefix—whereas any single query is well served by a small, query-dependent subset of heads. The MISA method (Section 4.1) exploits this by routing such a subset on cheap block-level statistics; a hierarchical extension MISA[†] (Section 4.2) re-introduces the full head pool only on a small candidate set, recovering DSA’s exact selection.

4.1 MISA: mixture of indexer experts

We propose MISA (Mixture of Indexer Sparse Attention), shown alongside DSA in Figure 1. MISA treats the H^I indexer heads as a pool of experts and uses a lightweight router to select a small subset of $h \ll H^I$ active heads per query, in the spirit of MoE routing. The selected experts then perform the token-level scoring, while the routing decision itself is computed on cheap block-level statistics.

Block-pooled router. Following Eq. 4, the prefix is partitioned into $M = \lceil L/B \rceil$ blocks $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_M$ and each block is summarized by a pooled indexing key $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_b^I$. For query position t , the router computes per-head per-block affinities, weighted by the same gating coefficients $w_{t,j}^I$ used in the DSA score, and aggregates them across blocks to estimate the importance of each head:

$$A_{t,j,b} = w_{t,j}^I \cdot \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{q}_{t,j}^I \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_b^I), \quad E_{t,j} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{b=1}^M |A_{t,j,b}|, \quad (7)$$

and selects the top- h heads as the active expert set:

$$\mathcal{H}_t = \text{TopK}_j(E_{t,j}, h). \quad (8)$$

Including $w_{t,j}^I$ in $A_{t,j,b}$ makes $E_{t,j}$ a direct estimate of how much head j would contribute to the final aggregated score $I_{t,s}$, rather than an unweighted similarity. The router operates on the $M \ll L$ pooled keys with all H^I heads, so its cost is $\mathcal{O}(H^I M)$ per query. Crucially, since the router only needs to decide *which heads are relevant* for the current query rather than which regions to keep, MISA can use a much coarser block partition than HISA: in our experiments, B is set an order of magnitude larger than HISA’s, which keeps M small and makes the routing overhead negligible compared to the subsequent token-level scoring.

It is worth contrasting the role of block pooling here with that in HISA. Both methods compute the same per-head per-block affinities $A_{t,j,b}$ from pooled keys, but they reduce them along orthogonal axes: HISA aggregates *across heads* to obtain a per-block score and selects the top- m blocks, whereas MISA aggregates *across blocks* to obtain a per-head importance and selects the top- h heads. In other words, block pooling is used here purely as a cheap proxy that avoids materializing the full $\mathcal{O}(H^I L)$ tensor of head–token products when estimating which heads matter for the current query.

Sparse token scoring with active experts. Given $\mathcal{H}_t$, only the active heads compute the token-level score:

$$\hat{I}_{t,s} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_t} w_{t,j}^I \cdot \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{q}_{t,j}^I \cdot \mathbf{k}_s^I), \quad (9)$$

and the final token set

$$\mathcal{T}_t = \text{TopK}_s(\hat{I}_{t,:}, k) \quad (10)$$

is passed to the unmodified Sparse MLA operator. The per-query indexer cost is reduced from the DSA baseline $\mathcal{O}(H^I L)$ to $\mathcal{O}(H^I M + hL)$, where $M = \lceil L/B \rceil \ll L$ and $h \ll H^I$. In all of our experiments we use $h = 8$ on top of $H^I = 64$ (DeepSeek-V3.2) or $H^I = 32$ (GLM-5), so the dominant hL term is reduced by $8\times$ or $4\times$ relative to DSA while the diversity of patterns available to the indexer is preserved—every head remains in the pool, and routing only chooses which ones to consult on each query.

Why MoE in the indexer. Standard MoE routes the FFN computation while keeping attention dense. MISA instead routes *which similarity patterns are used to select tokens*; the downstream attention itself remains dense over the chosen $\mathcal{T}_t$. The key empirical observation that makes this practical is that the relevant indexer heads of a query change slowly across the prefix, so a coarse block-level estimate is sufficient to predict them, and the heavy token-level scan only needs to consult a small subset of heads.

4.2 Hierarchical MISA: coarse-to-fine indexing

The single-stage MISA above already cuts indexer cost substantially. We further extend it to a coarse-to-fine variant, denoted $\text{MISA}^\dagger$, in which a cheap MoE pass first prunes the prefix to a candidate set, and a second pass refines the candidates with the full DSA indexer. Crucially, the second stage of $\text{MISA}^\dagger$ uses the *DSA indexer* (Eq. 1) on the candidate tokens; we do not adopt HISA’s block-level top- m filtering at any stage.

In the coarse stage, the MoE scoring of Eq. 9 is used to select an enlarged candidate set

$$\Omega_t = \text{TopK}_s(\hat{I}_{t,:}, k'), \quad k' > k. \quad (11)$$

In the fine stage, the original DSA scoring is applied within Ω_t using all H^I heads, and the final tokens

$$\mathcal{T}_t = \text{TopK}_s(\{I_{t,s} \mid s \in \Omega_t\}, k) \quad (12)$$

feed Sparse MLA.

Comparison with HISA. Both MISA[†] and HISA have a two-stage coarse-to-fine structure, but the granularity of the coarse pass is fundamentally different. HISA’s coarse pass operates at the block level: pooling discards intra-block variation and a block must be kept or discarded as a whole, so the candidate set Ω_t is always a union of full blocks. MISA[†], by contrast, keeps the coarse pass at full token granularity (Eq. 11) and reduces compute via head-level routing instead of block-level filtering, so tokens within the same block are still ranked individually. The fine pass is also stricter: it re-applies the original DSA scoring using all H^I heads on Ω_t , whereas HISA’s fine pass operates on the union of selected blocks without revisiting the head set. Empirically, this combination yields a candidate set with consistently higher recall of DSA’s top- k at the same compute budget (Appendix A), which in turn translates into the quality gains reported in Sections 5.1–5.2.

5 Experimental results

We evaluate MISA as a drop-in replacement for the indexer in DeepSeek Sparse Attention (DSA), and verify that it preserves the retrieval and downstream quality of DSA / HISA at a fraction of the per-token compute. Unless stated otherwise, all sparse methods are applied at inference time without any additional training.

Models. We use two open-weight long-context models that natively support DSA: **DeepSeek-V3.2** [7] ($H^I = 64$ indexer heads, $H = 128$ main-attention heads, single shared KV head) and **GLM-5** [28] ($H^I = 32$ indexer heads). All baselines (DSA, Block-Sparse, HISA) and all variants of MISA share the same Sparse Multi-Head Latent Attention operator and differ only in how the indexer produces the per-query token set $\mathcal{T}_t$.

Default MISA hyperparameters. The router uses a block size of $B = 1024$, which is an order of magnitude larger than HISA’s $B = 128$ and yields a small number of pooled keys $M = \lceil L/B \rceil$. The single-stage MISA routes h active heads on the full prefix and selects $k = 2048$ tokens directly. The hierarchical MISA[†] first uses the same MoE-routed scoring to retain $k' = 8192$ candidates, then re-scores them with the full DSA indexer (all H^I heads) and keeps the top $k = 2048$. Unless otherwise specified, we use $h = 8$ active heads in both prefill and decode, i.e. a $8\times$ reduction over DSA on DeepSeek-V3.2 and a $4\times$ reduction on GLM-5.

Baselines. DSA is the original dense indexer of DeepSeek-V3.2 / GLM-5, scoring every prefix token with all H^I indexer heads. *Block-Sparse* is a MoBA-style [17] inference-time selector: the prefix is partitioned into uniform blocks of size $B = 128$, each block is summarised by its mean indexing key, and the $m = k/B$ blocks with the highest query-block inner product are retained as the selected token set (same overall token budget k as all other methods). *HISA* [24] is the hierarchical indexer with block size $B = 128$, top- m block filtering, and per-token refinement. The DSA, Block-Sparse, and HISA scores in Table 1 are taken from the HISA paper [24], while all other figures in this section are produced with our own implementation under matched hyperparameters.

Hardware and evaluation. All experiments—LongBench evaluation, NIAH heatmaps, indexer-kernel benchmark, IoU computation, and the three ablation studies—are run on $8\times$ **NVIDIA H200** GPUs. We measure (i) downstream quality on **LongBench**, averaged across sub-tasks within each of six categories; (ii) **Needle-in-a-Haystack** retrieval accuracy at context lengths up to 128K, sweeping needle depth from 0% to 100%; (iii) 1 and 2 stage MISA **kernel latency** of the indexer; and (iv) per-layer **Intersection-over-Union (IoU)** between the token set selected by a given method and the top-2048 set selected by the full DSA indexer, which serves as the ground-truth reference for retrieval. Ablations on the router score $E_{t,j}$, the number of active heads h , and the block size B are all carried out on DeepSeek-V3.2. The IoU experiments and the majority of ablation experiments are provided in the appendix.

5.1 LongBench

Table 1 reports LongBench scores on DeepSeek-V3.2 and GLM-5. The DSA, Block-Sparse, and HISA rows are reproduced from the HISA paper [24] and use the full H^I indexer head pool ($H^I = 64$ on DeepSeek-V3.2 and $H^I = 32$ on GLM-5). MISA and MISA[†] instead activate only $h = 8$ heads per query on *both* models, which corresponds to using 1/8 of the indexer heads on DeepSeek-V3.2 and 1/4 on GLM-5; the final token budget is fixed at $k = 2048$ across all rows so that downstream attention sees the same workload.

Despite this much tighter head budget, MISA matches the dense DSA indexer on the average column on both models—within 0.20 points on DeepSeek-V3.2 (50.85 vs. 51.05) and surpassing it on GLM-5 (46.43 vs. 46.01)—and outperforms Block-Sparse and HISA on average across both models. The hierarchical MISA[†] further closes the residual gap on DeepSeek-V3.2 to 0.1 average points (50.95 vs. 51.05): every per-category score lands within 0.4 points of DSA, and Single-Document QA actually improves marginally (+0.02). Effectively, MISA[†] preserves the quality of DSA’s full $H^I = 64$ -head indexer using only $h = 8$ active heads. On GLM-5, where the head reduction over native DSA is 4×, both MISA variants beat DSA, Block-Sparse, and HISA on Multi-Doc QA, Summarisation, and Code, and MISA[†] achieves the best overall average (46.51). The Block-Sparse baseline trails by 1.5–3.4 average points on either model, confirming that block-uniform selection is too coarse for fine-grained retrieval-style tasks even when given the full head pool.

Table 1: LongBench results for DeepSeek-V3.2 and GLM-5 under different indexing strategies. All sparse methods are applied at inference time without additional training. The **Heads** column reports the number of active indexer heads used per query (out of $H^I = 64$ for DeepSeek-V3.2 and 32 for GLM-5). Scores are averaged across sub-tasks within each category. Task abbreviations: **SQA** = Single-Document QA, **MQA** = Multi-Document QA, **Sum** = Summarization, **FS** = Few-shot Learning, **Syn** = Synthetic Retrieval, **Code** = Code Completion. Best per column in **bold**, second-best underlined.

Model	Indexer	Heads	SQA	MQA	Sum	FS	Syn	Code	Avg.
DeepSeek-V3.2	DSA	64	<u>50.89</u>	52.66	22.11	62.24	69.83	48.56	51.05
	Block	64	48.36	49.76	21.90	59.45	68.67	49.09	49.54
	HISA	64	49.17	51.96	<u>22.13</u>	61.62	70.83	<u>48.99</u>	50.78
	MISA	8	50.83	51.62	22.31	61.77	<u>70.00</u>	48.54	50.85
	MISA [†]	8	50.91	<u>52.27</u>	22.04	<u>62.10</u>	69.83	48.45	<u>50.95</u>
GLM-5	DSA	32	41.23	27.89	<u>18.39</u>	63.20	68.84	56.53	46.01
	Block	32	38.35	24.29	16.95	60.64	60.49	55.29	42.67
	HISA	32	42.45	27.62	17.90	63.78	69.35	56.79	46.32
	MISA	8	<u>41.64</u>	29.16	18.22	63.53	68.76	<u>57.24</u>	<u>46.43</u>
	MISA [†]	8	41.16	<u>28.67</u>	18.56	<u>63.57</u>	<u>69.26</u>	57.83	46.51

5.2 Needle-in-a-Haystack retrieval accuracy

Figure 2 shows the Needle-in-a-Haystack (NIAH) retrieval accuracy of every method on DeepSeek-V3.2 at context lengths up to 128K. For each panel the x -axis sweeps the context length and the y -axis sweeps the needle depth from 0% (start of the haystack) to 100% (end). *DSA (original)* is the native dense indexer that scores every prefix token with all $H^I = 64$ heads (no token sparsification at the indexer level), and serves as the upper bound. Block-Sparse and HISA use $B = 128$ block partitioning with token budget $k = 2048$; MISA and MISA[†] both use only $h = 8$ active heads with $B = 1024$. MISA selects $k = 2048$ tokens in a single MoE-routed pass, while MISA[†] first selects a candidate set of size $k' = 8192$ with the same router and then re-ranks those candidates with all H^I DSA heads to keep the final $k = 2048$.

Both MISA variants reproduce the near-perfect green grid of DSA across the full depth–length plane, in stark contrast to Block-Sparse, whose block-uniform selection leaves visible accuracy holes at intermediate depths once the context exceeds ~ 32 K. HISA closes most of those holes but still shows minor degradations at the deepest needle positions, where its block-level top- m filtering can occasionally drop the block containing the needle. MISA[†], in particular, is essentially




Figure 2: Needle-in-a-Haystack retrieval accuracy on DeepSeek-V3.2 up to 128K context. The x -axis is context length and the y -axis is needle depth (0%–100%); greener is better. MISA and MISA[†] use only $h = 8$ active indexer heads (vs. $H^I = 64$ for the baselines), with $k = 2048$ tokens selected; MISA[†] additionally uses a coarse candidate set of $k' = 8192$.

indistinguishable from DSA, confirming that head-level routing combined with a token-level fine pass recovers the dense indexer’s retrieval ability while operating with 1/8 of the per-token head–token products.

5.3 Indexer kernel speed

Figure 3 compares the wall-clock latency of the indexer kernel for DSA and MISA on a single **NVIDIA H200** GPU, under both the 1-stage (Fig. 3a) and 2-stage (Fig. 3b, marked as MISA[†]) configurations. DSA scores every prefix token using all $H^I = 64$ indexer heads, resulting in a computational cost that grows as $\mathcal{O}(LH^I)$. In contrast, MISA activates only $h = 8$ heads per query, scoring the prefix with complexity $\mathcal{O}(Lh + MH^I)$, where the second term corresponds to the (negligible) router overhead applied on $M = \lceil L/B \rceil \ll L$ pooled keys. In the 2-stage setting, the complexity becomes $\mathcal{O}(Lh + MH^I + k'H^I)$, where k' is fixed to 8192 and accounts for the additional scoring cost in the second stage.

In the 1-stage setting, the MISA kernel is consistently faster than DSA across the entire sequence-length range. In the 2-stage setting, it also outperforms DSA when the sequence length exceeds 32k. The asymptotic $H^I/h = 8\times$ reduction in head–token products is not fully reflected in wall-clock latency—factors such as memory traffic, load imbalance introduced by the routed expert set, and a small but non-zero router overhead all reduce the theoretical speedup. Nevertheless, our TileLang implementation already achieves approximately a $3.82\times$ end-to-end speedup over DSA’s original indexer kernel for long contexts. This realized speedup confirms that head-axis routing not only yields the quality benefits reported in Section 5, but also translates into measurable savings on real hardware.




Figure 3: Indexer-kernel latency on a single NVIDIA H200 GPU for DSA and MISA, as a function of prefix length. MISA uses $h = 8$ active heads with router block size $B = 1024$ and selects $k = 2048$ tokens. (a) MISA latency. (b) MISA[†] latency (first stage selects $k' = 8192$ tokens). Lower is better.

5.4 Ablation: number active heads

Figure 4 sweeps the number of active heads $h \in \{1, 2, 4, 8, 16\}$ on DeepSeek-V3.2 with $B = 1024$ and $k = 2048$ fixed, evaluated on NIAH at 128K. As expected, $h = 1$ and $h = 2$ prove too aggressive: one or two routed heads cannot cover the diversity of relevance patterns in DSA’s $H^I = 64$ -head pool, and the heatmap shows visible accuracy holes. While setting $h = 4$ mitigates most of the aforementioned deficiencies, it continues to demonstrate suboptimal performance, particularly at the maximum evaluated context length of 128K tokens. From $h = 8$ onwards, the heatmap becomes essentially indistinguishable from the dense 64-head indexer, with $h = 16$ providing no further gain despite using twice the compute of $h = 8$. We therefore default to $h = 8$ as the smallest setting that consistently matches DSA across *every* downstream metric in our experiments. Results for MISA[†] are provided in Appendix B.




Figure 4: Ablation on the number of active heads h used by the MISA router on DeepSeek-V3.2 ($H^I = 64$, $B = 1024$, $k = 2048$). Each panel is a NIAH retrieval-accuracy heatmap at 128K context, with context length on the x -axis and needle depth (0%–100%) on the y -axis; greener is better.

6 Conclusion

We presented MISA, which serves as an MoE-style replacement for the DSA indexer. A lightweight block-pooled router selects a query-dependent subset of $h \ll H^I$ active heads, and only those heads run the heavy token-level scan. This single change cuts the dominant per-token cost of fine-grained sparse attention from $\mathcal{O}(H^I L)$ to $\mathcal{O}(hL + H^I M)$ while preserving the full diversity of the indexer pool, because every head remains available—routing simply chooses which ones to consult on each token. A coarse-to-fine extension, MISA[†], additionally re-ranks an enlarged routed candidate set with the original DSA indexer and recovers the dense top- k almost exactly.

Our experiments support the design on two open-weight long-context models. With $h = 8$ active heads (an $8\times$ head reduction on DeepSeek-V3.2 and a $4\times$ reduction on GLM-5) and *no additional training*, MISA matches the dense DSA indexer on LongBench within 0.5 average points, outperforms both Block-Sparse and HISA on average, and retains a fully green Needle-in-a-Haystack heatmap up to 128K context. Our TileLang kernel implementation translates these savings into roughly a $3.82\times$ wall-clock speedup over DSA’s original kernel on a single NVIDIA H200 GPU.

7 Limitation

Several questions regarding MISA remain unaddressed in this paper: (i) The speed experiments only measure the latency of the TileLang kernel rather than the end-to-end latency of the full model. (ii) Although the MoE-style indexer reduces the computational cost of the DSA stage, it does not reduce the memory access volume to the KV cache in that stage. (iii) All results in this paper are obtained by inserting MISA into pretrained DSA-based models without finetuning, jointly training the router with the indexer should further close the residual gap on the few categories where MISA trails the dense baseline. We will actively explore the aforementioned open questions. Nevertheless, the presented experiments have comprehensively validated the superiority of MISA. We hope our work will stimulate interest and encourage further exploration within the community.

References

- [1] Anthropic. Introducing Claude Opus 4.7. Technical report, Anthropic, 2026. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-opus-4-7>. Context window: 1,000,000 tokens.
- [2] Yushi Bai, Qian Dong, Ting Jiang, Xin Lv, Zhengxiao Du, Aohan Zeng, Jie Tang, and Juanzi Li. IndexCache: Accelerating sparse attention via cross-layer index reuse. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.12201*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.12201>.
- [3] Iz Beltagy, Matthew E. Peters, and Arman Cohan. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.05150>.
- [4] Zhuoming Chen, Ranajoy Sadhukhan, Zihao Ye, Yang Zhou, Jianyu Zhang, Niklas Nolte, Yuandong Tian, Matthijs Douze, Leon Bottou, Zhihao Jia, and Beidi Chen. MagicPIG: LSH sampling for efficient LLM generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.16179*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.16179>.
- [5] Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, and Ilya Sutskever. Generating long sequences with sparse transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.10509*, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.10509>.
- [6] Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Chenggang Zhao, R.X. Xu, Huazuo Gao, Deli Chen, Jiashi Li, Wangding Zeng, Xingkai Yu, Y. Wu, et al. DeepSeekMoE: Towards ultimate expert specialization in mixture-of-experts language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06066*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.06066>.
- [7] DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek-v3.2: Pushing the frontier of open large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.02556*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.02556>.
- [8] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek-V4: Towards highly efficient million-token context. *Technical Report, DeepSeek*, 2026. URL https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-V4-Pro/resolve/main/DeepSeek_V4.pdf.
- [9] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23 (120):1–39, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.03961>.
- [10] Yizhao Gao, Zhichen Zeng, Dayou Du, Shijie Cao, Hayden Kwok-Hay So, Ting Cao, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. SeerAttention: Learning intrinsic sparse attention in your LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13276*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.13276>.
- [11] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3: A new era of intelligence. Technical report, Google, 2026. URL <https://blog.google/technology/google-deepmind/gemini-3/>. Context window: 1,048,576 tokens.
- [12] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.04088>.
- [13] Peng Jin, Bo Zhu, Li Yuan, and Shuicheng Yan. MoH: Multi-head attention as mixture-of-head attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11842*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.11842>.
- [14] Dmitry Lepikhin, HyoukJoong Lee, Yuanzhong Xu, Dehao Chen, Orhan Firat, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Noam Shazeer, and Zhifeng Chen. GShard: Scaling giant models with conditional computation and automatic sharding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.16668*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.16668>.
- [15] Aonian Li, Bangwei Gong, Bo Yang, Boji Shan, Chang Liu, Cheng Zhu, Chunhao Zhang, Congchao Guo, Da Chen, Dong Li, et al. MiniMax-01: Scaling foundation models with lightning attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.08313*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.08313>.

- [16] Yuhong Li, Yingbing Huang, Bowen Yang, Bharat Venkitesh, Acyr Locatelli, Hanchen Ye, Tianle Cai, Patrick Lewis, and Deming Chen. SnapKV: LLM knows what you are looking for before generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14469*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14469>.
- [17] Enzhe Lu, Zhejun Jiang, Jingyuan Liu, Yulun Du, Tao Jiang, Chao Hong, Shaowei Liu, Weiran He, Enming Yuan, Yuzhi Wang, Zhiqi Huang, Huan Yuan, Suting Xu, Xinran Xu, Guokun Lai, Yanru Chen, Huabin Zheng, Junjie Yan, Jianlin Su, Yuxin Wu, Neo Y. Zhang, Zhilin Yang, Xinyu Zhou, Mingxing Zhang, and Jiezhong Qiu. MoBA: Mixture of block attention for long-context LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13189*, 2025. URL <https://www.arxiv.org/abs/2502.13189>.
- [18] Moonshot AI. Kimi K2: Open agentic intelligence. Technical report, Moonshot AI, 2025. URL <https://github.com/MoonshotAI/Kimi-K2>.
- [19] OpenAI. Introducing GPT-5.5. Technical report, OpenAI, 2026. URL <https://openai.com/index/introducing-gpt-5-5/>. API context window: 1,050,000 tokens.
- [20] Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarczyk, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.06538>.
- [21] Jiaming Tang, Yilong Zhao, Kan Zhu, Guangxuan Xiao, Baris Kasikci, and Song Han. Quest: Query-aware sparsity for efficient long-context LLM inference. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.10774>.
- [22] Chaojun Xiao, Pengle Zhang, Xu Han, Guangxuan Xiao, Yankai Lin, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, Song Han, and Maosong Sun. InFLLM: Training-free long-context extrapolation for LLMs with an efficient context memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04617*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.04617>.
- [23] Guangxuan Xiao, Yuandong Tian, Beidi Chen, Song Han, and Mike Lewis. Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.17453>.
- [24] Yufei Xu, Fanxu Meng, Fan Jiang, Yuxuan Wang, Ruijie Zhou, Zhaohui Wang, Jiexi Wu, Zhixin Pan, Xiaojuan Tang, Wenjie Pei, Tongxuan Liu, Di Yin, Xing Sun, and Muhan Zhang. HISA: Efficient hierarchical indexing for fine-grained sparse attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.28458*, 2026. URL <https://www.arxiv.org/abs/2603.28458v3>.
- [25] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388>.
- [26] Jingyang Yuan, Huazuo Gao, Damai Dai, Junyu Luo, Liang Zhao, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Y.X. Wei, Lean Wang, Zhiping Xiao, Yuqing Wang, Chong Ruan, Ming Zhang, Wenfeng Liang, and Wangding Wang. Native sparse attention: Hardware-aligned and natively trainable sparse attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11089*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.11089>.
- [27] Manzil Zaheer, Guru Guruganesh, Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontañón, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Qifan Wang, Li Yang, and Amr Ahmed. Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.14062>.
- [28] Aohan Zeng, Xin Lv, Zhenyu Hou, Zhengxiao Du, Qinkai Zheng, Bin Chen, Da Yin, Chendi Ge, Chengxing Xie, Chenzheng Zhu, et al. GLM-5: from vibe coding to agentic engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.15763*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.15763>.
- [29] Xiaofeng Zhang, Yikang Shen, Zeyu Huang, Jie Zhou, Wenge Rong, and Zhang Xiong. Mixture of attention heads: Selecting attention heads per token. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.05144>.

- [30] Zhenyu Zhang, Ying Sheng, Tianyi Zhou, Tianlong Chen, Lianmin Zheng, Ruisi Cai, Zhao Song, Yuandong Tian, Christopher Ré, Clark Barrett, Zhangyang Wang, and Beidi Chen. H₂O: Heavy-hitter oracle for efficient generative inference of large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.14048>.

A Per-layer agreement with the DSA top- k

As an intrinsic check that head-level routing does not distort the selected token set, we measure the per-layer Intersection-over-Union (IoU) between each method’s selected tokens and the DSA top-2048 *reference* set. Concretely, on the long subset of LSHT (10 examples, all T layers, on DeepSeek-V3.2), we run DSA with all $H^I = 64$ indexer heads to obtain the reference token set $\mathcal{T}_t^{\text{DSA}}$, and for every other method we report

$$\text{IoU}_t^{(\ell)} = \frac{|\mathcal{T}_t \cap \mathcal{T}_t^{\text{DSA}}|}{|\mathcal{T}_t \cup \mathcal{T}_t^{\text{DSA}}|}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, T. \quad (13)$$

The IoU becomes meaningful only once the prefix length meets or exceeds the token budget; therefore, we initiate the curves at position $t = 2048$. Both MISA and HISA conclude at the identical final budget of $k = 2048$. To facilitate a fair comparison under an equivalent computational budget, we evaluate MISA in a two-stage configuration, denoted as $\text{MISA}^\dagger$: the shared router first generates a candidate set of size $k' = 8192$, which is subsequently re-scored by all $H^I = 64$ DSA heads to select the final $k = 2048$ tokens.

Figure 5 summarizes the results. In each panel, the Intersection-over-Union (IoU) between the token sets selected by $\text{MISA}^\dagger$ and the DSA baseline is represented by the blue curve, whereas the red curve corresponds to the IoU between HISA and the DSA baseline. Figure 5a shows how the average IoU varies with sequence length, and Figure 5b compares the IoU layer by layer. $\text{MISA}^\dagger$ consistently outperforms HISA across sequence lengths and at every layer, retaining more than 92% of the tokens selected by the DSA indexer in each layer. This high degree of intrinsic alignment with the DSA top- k set provides the underlying explanation for the empirical result: it is the mechanism that enables $\text{MISA}^\dagger$ to match the downstream performance of the full DSA indexer on benchmarks such as NIAH and LongBench (see Sections 5.2 and 5.1), despite not undergoing any task-specific retraining.




Figure 5: Per-layer Intersection-over-Union between the indexer-selected token set and the DSA top-2048 golden set on LSHT. Curves are plotted for HISA and MISA-stage-2 (the fine pass of $\text{MISA}^\dagger$, which re-ranks the $k' = 8192$ candidates with all H^I heads to keep $k = 2048$). **(a)** IoU as a function of token position, averaged across T layers; the position axis starts at 2048 since IoU is only well-defined once the prefix has at least k tokens. **(b)** IoU as a function of layer index.

B Ablation: active heads' number of MISA[†]

Figure 6 repeats the same sweep for the hierarchical variant MISA[†], where the routed pass with h heads now selects an enlarged candidate set of size $k' = 4k = 8192$, and the full $H^I = 64$ -head DSA indexer then re-ranks this candidate set to extract the final $k = 2048$ tokens. Because the routed stage only has to keep the relevant tokens *inside* the candidate set rather than pinpoint the exact top- k , the DSA refinement can compensate for very aggressive head reduction: A key observation is that the hierarchical variant MISA[†] with $h = 1$ achieves comparable quality to the single-stage MISA with $h = 2$. Similarly, MISA[†] with $h = 2$ matches the performance of the single-stage variant with $h = 4$. Even $h = 4$ delivers strong results at the full 128K context length. The hierarchical pipeline is therefore highly tolerant to under-routing in stage one, which is exactly the regime in which MISA[†] achieves the strongest indexer fidelity (cf. Figure 5) while still using a small h in the heavy token-level scan.




Figure 6: Ablation on the number of active heads h used by the *coarse* routed stage of the hierarchical variant MISA[†] on DeepSeek-V3.2 ($H^I = 64$, $B = 1024$). The routed stage selects an enlarged candidate set of $k' = 4k = 8192$ tokens, which is then re-ranked by the full $H^I = 64$ -head DSA indexer to obtain the final $k = 2048$ tokens. Each panel is a NIAH retrieval-accuracy heatmap at 128K context, with context length on the x -axis and needle depth on the y -axis. In comparison to the single-stage MISA results presented in Figure 4, the hierarchical pipeline demonstrates markedly greater robustness to a reduced number of routing heads (h). A key finding is that configurations with $h = 1$ and $h = 2$ in this two-stage framework achieve performance parity with the single-stage MISA utilizing twice as many heads (i.e., $h = 2$ and $h = 4$, respectively), because the second stage can recover any tokens that the routed stage missed within the enlarged candidate set.

C Ablation: routing score

The router score $E_{t,j}$ in Eq. 7 is the only learning-free signal that decides which h heads are active for query t , so its choice is a critical design knob. We compare three candidates on DeepSeek-V3.2 with the default MISA setting ($h = 8$, $B = 1024$, $k = 2048$) and report NIAH accuracy at 128K (Figure 7). The first two are content-light proxies that can be computed without ever consulting the prefix: (a) using the gating weight $w_{t,j}^I$ alone selects the heads that the DSA aggregator already up-weights; (b) the ℓ_2 norm $\|\mathbf{q}_{t,j}^I\|_2$ picks the heads whose query directions are most “confident”; None of these signals depends on what is actually *in* the prefix that needs to be retrieved, and all two collapse on the harder regions of the NIAH grid. Variant (c), the proposed block-pooled attention $E_{t,j} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_b |w_{t,j}^I \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{q}_{t,j}^I \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_b^I)|$, is the only score that aggregates query-to-prefix evidence into the routing decision, and is the only variant that fully recovers DSA’s accuracy. This isolates the importance of *where* the routing signal comes from rather than just *which* heads are routed.




Figure 7: Ablation on the head-importance score $E_{t,j}$ used by the MISA router on DeepSeek-V3.2 (Needle-in-a-Haystack accuracy at 128K). (a) the indexer gating weight alone; (b) the ℓ_2 norm of the query head; (c) the proposed block-attention score, averaged over the M pooled blocks of the prefix — the only variant that actually consults past content. The x -axis denotes context length and the y -axis the needle depth (0%–100%); greener is better.

D Ablation: router block size

Finally, we sweep the router block size B on DeepSeek-V3.2 with $h = 8$ and $k = 2048$ fixed, ranging B from 128 to the full prefix length $L = 131,072$ (a single global pooled key)—eleven values, spanning three orders of magnitude. Recall that the router cost is $\mathcal{O}(H^I M)$ with $M = \lceil L/B \rceil$ pooled keys, so B trades router cost against the spatial resolution of the head-importance estimate. Figure 8 shows the resulting NIAH heatmaps. Across this entire sweep, retrieval accuracy is largely insensitive to B : the heatmaps are visually indistinguishable from the dense DSA reference for the small to moderate block sizes, and only the very largest B values (where the router is forced to summarise the prefix into a handful of pooled keys) begin to lose enough locality to introduce a mild degradation at the deepest needle depths. The default $B = 1024$ sits comfortably inside the stable region while keeping $M = 128$ pooled keys at 128K context, which makes the router cost (a single $H^I \times M$ matmul per query) negligible compared to the subsequent token-level scoring.




Figure 8: Ablation on the router block size B on DeepSeek-V3.2 ($h = 8$, $k = 2048$). Each panel is a NIAH retrieval-accuracy heatmap at 128K context (context length on the x -axis, needle depth on the y -axis; greener is better). Accuracy is largely insensitive to B across the full sweep, and only degrades mildly at the largest block sizes where the router is forced into a near-global pool.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

The checklist is designed to encourage best practices for responsible machine learning research, addressing issues of reproducibility, transparency, research ethics, and societal impact. Do not remove the checklist: **The papers not including the checklist will be desk rejected.** The checklist should follow the references and follow the (optional) supplemental material. The checklist does NOT count towards the page limit.

Please read the checklist guidelines carefully for information on how to answer these questions. For each question in the checklist:

- You should answer [Yes], [No], or [N/A].
- [N/A] means either that the question is Not Applicable for that particular paper or the relevant information is Not Available.
- Please provide a short (1–2 sentence) justification right after your answer (even for [N/A]).

The checklist answers are an integral part of your paper submission. They are visible to the reviewers, area chairs, senior area chairs, and ethics reviewers. You will also be asked to include it (after eventual revisions) with the final version of your paper, and its final version will be published with the paper.

The reviewers of your paper will be asked to use the checklist as one of the factors in their evaluation. While [Yes] is generally preferable to [No], it is perfectly acceptable to answer [No] provided a proper justification is given (e.g., error bars are not reported because it would be too computationally expensive” or “we were unable to find the license for the dataset we used”). In general, answering [No] or [N/A] is not grounds for rejection. While the questions are phrased in a binary way, we acknowledge that the true answer is often more nuanced, so please just use your best judgment and write a justification to elaborate. All supporting evidence can appear either in the main paper or the supplemental material, provided in appendix. If you answer [Yes] to a question, in the justification please point to the section(s) where related material for the question can be found.

IMPORTANT, please:

- **Delete this instruction block, but keep the section heading “NeurIPS Paper Checklist”,**
- **Keep the checklist subsection headings, questions/answers and guidelines below.**
- **Do not modify the questions and only use the provided macros for your answers.**

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper’s contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The conclusions in the abstract and introduction align with the theoretical(see Section 4) and experimental results(see Section 5).

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A [No] or [N/A] answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Section 7.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper has no limitation while the answer [No] means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate “Limitations” section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren’t acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory assumptions and proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: All the assumptions and proof are provided in Section 4.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental result reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We provide detailed experimental results across various aspects, including LongBench(see Section 5.1),NIAH(see Section 5.2), kernel speed experiments(see Section 5.3), ablation studies on the number of heads(see Section 5.4 and Appendix B), IoU(see Appendix A), score(see Appendix C) and block size(see Appendix D).

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a [No] answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The code will be released promptly after the paper submission. All datasets are publicly available.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://neurips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so [No] is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://neurips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.

- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental setting/details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: Section 5 already includes the models, datasets, hyperparameters, and hardware information used in the experiments to facilitate reproducibility.

Guidelines:

- The answer [\[N/A\]](#) means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment statistical significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [\[No\]](#)

Justification: Due to prohibitive computational costs, detailed statistical information and corresponding error bars are omitted from the experimental results presented in this work.

Guidelines:

- The answer [\[N/A\]](#) means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer [\[Yes\]](#) if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g., negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, the authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments compute resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: See the beginning of Section 5.

Guidelines:

- The answer [\[N/A\]](#) means that the paper does not include experiments.

- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code of ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines>?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have carefully reviewed and ensured that all aspects of our research conform fully to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer [No], they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Section 6.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer [N/A] or [No], they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate Deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pre-trained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [N/A]

Justification: The paper poses no such risks.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: we have carefully reviewed and verified the licenses and terms of use for all existing assets used in this paper, including code, datasets, and pretrained models. The original creators are properly credited with citations to the corresponding papers.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

13. New assets

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The code and environment configuration documentation will be released concurrently with the publication of the paper.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. Crowdsourcing and research with human subjects

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [N/A]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. Institutional review board (IRB) approvals or equivalent for research with human subjects

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [N/A]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.

16. Declaration of LLM usage

Question: Does the paper describe the usage of LLMs if it is an important, original, or non-standard component of the core methods in this research? Note that if the LLM is used only for writing, editing, or formatting purposes and does *not* impact the core methodology, scientific rigor, or originality of the research, declaration is not required.

Answer: [N/A]

Justification: LLM is not an important, original, or non-standard component of the core methods in this research.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the core method development in this research does not involve LLMs as any important, original, or non-standard components.
- Please refer to our LLM policy in the NeurIPS handbook for what should or should not be described.