

MoE-Prefill: Zero Redundancy Overheads in MoE Prefill Serving

Zhaoyuan Su^{*1} Olatunji Ruwase² Karthik Ganesan² Aurick Qiao²
 Samyam Rajbhandari² Juncheng Yang³ Yue Cheng¹ Yuxiong He²

¹University of Virginia ²Snowflake AI Research ³Harvard University

Abstract

Production LLM workloads increasingly serve discriminative tasks, such as classification, recommendation, and verification, whose answers are read from the logits of a single prefill pass with no autoregressive decoding. Serving these *prefill-only workloads* on mixture-of-experts (MoE) models is bottlenecked not by compute but by the distributed execution required to fit the model: existing parallel strategies (tensor, expert, and pipeline parallelism) trade memory pressure for redundant computation, communication, and synchronization, severely degrading MoE prefill serving efficiency.

We observe that these overheads stem from coupling expert placement with synchronous activation routing—a design inherited from the decoding era. The long, compute-bound forward passes of large-batch prefill open a per-layer window wide enough to stream expert weights in the background, replacing per-layer activation `AllToAll` with asynchronous weight `AllGather` fully overlapped with computation. We propose **MoE-Prefill**, a prefill-only serving system whose backend, **AsyncEP** (*Asynchronous Expert Parallelism*), gathers experts *by weight* rather than routing them *by activation*, and whose frontend co-enforces a physically-derived saturation threshold through prefix-aware routing and true-FLOPs load tracking. On Qwen3-235B-A22B across four hardware/precision configurations, MoE-Prefill delivers **1.35–1.37×** throughput over the strongest distributed baseline on real-world workloads and up to **1.59×** on long-context synthetic workloads, sustaining **29.8–36.2%** per-GPU model FLOPs utilization.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are increasingly used beyond text generation for a class of discriminative tasks—classification [52, 61], moderation [29], recommendation [69], factual verification [44]—where the answer is one choice from a small, predefined candidate set and is fully determined by the logits of a single forward pass, with no autoregressive decoding required. Measurements from an anonymized production cluster (Fig. 1) show that such *prefill-only workloads* already account for **65.3%** of all input tokens served. Their system profile differs from generative serving along




Figure 1: Prefill-only workloads dominate LLM serving input-token traffic in a production system.

three axes: they are throughput-oriented rather than latency-sensitive, run at extremely large batch sizes that yield long compute-bound forward passes, and exhibit abundant prefix sharing (shared system prompts, user profiles, document headers) both within and across batches.

Meanwhile, state-of-the-art open-weight LLMs have shifted to the Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architecture [4, 57], whose total parameter counts grow far faster than per-GPU HBM (§4.1) and force operators into distributed execution purely to hold the weights. Unfortunately, distributed parallelism relieves memory pressure only by introducing *three redundancies* on the MoE prefill critical path: **redundant computation** from sub-saturated per-device GEMMs and routing-imbalance stragglers, **redundant memory** from full-resident expert weights, *k*-way activation expansion, and duplicated prefix KV caches, and **redundant communication** from two synchronous `AllToAll` on every MoE layer under expert parallelism. As we quantify in §4, these overheads collectively push MoE prefill model FLOPs utilization (MFU) below 16% across all mainstream parallel strategies on 8×A100, with several baselines plateauing or regressing beyond four GPUs.

These redundancies are not inherent to MoE serving—they are inherited from a decoding-era design choice that *couples expert placement with synchronous activation routing*. The long, compute-bound forward passes of large-batch prefill open a wide per-layer compute window; if expert weights are streamed into the window in the background, per-layer `AllToAll` can be removed from the critical path entirely. Concretely, experts are gathered *by weight* rather than routed *by activation*, so every GPU holds the complete expert set for the current layer, and dispatch becomes a local operation.

We propose **MoE-Prefill**, a prefill-only serving system that eliminates all three redundancies on the MoE prefill critical path. Its core execution paradigm **AsyncEP** (Asynchronous Expert Parallelism) replaces per-layer activation `AllToAll` with background expert-weight `AllGather`, over-

^{*}Part of work was done during Zhaoyuan’s internship at Snowflake AI Research.

lapped with computation and optionally extended to CPU-DRAM offloading. The overlap is governed by a *saturation threshold* T (§6.2) derived analytically from hardware, workload, and model configuration. The MoE-Prefill frontend enables T as a per-GPU batching rule and performs prefix-aware routing, and true-FLOPs compute tracking on top of it, closing the frontend-backend co-design loop.

We implement MoE-Prefill on top of vLLM and evaluate it across four hardware/precision combinations ($8 \times A100$ BF16, $8 \times H100$ BF16/FP8, $8 \times H200$ FP8) against the five distributed MoE strategies supported by vLLM. On an aggregated real-world prefill-only workload, MoE-Prefill achieves **1.35–1.37 $\times$** end-to-end throughput over the strongest baseline in every hardware/precision/parallel-degree cell, and up to **1.59 $\times$** on long-context synthetic workloads. Its feasible deployment envelope widens from “ ≥ 4 GPUs required to hold Qwen3-235B-A22B” to “1–8 GPUs” (a $4 \times$ broader hardware range), while sustaining **29.8–36.2%** per-GPU MFU.

Contributions. This paper makes four contributions:

- A workload characterization formalizing the atomic *prefill-as-a-service* operation and identifying three structural opportunities of prefill-only serving (§3).
- A quantitative analysis of MoE prefill bottlenecks unified in a per-device per-layer communication table over seven parallel-strategy combinations (§4).
- AsyncEP, an MoE execution paradigm that gathers experts *by weight* rather than *by activation*, removing per-layer AllToAll and routing-imbalance stragglers from the critical path (§6).
- MoE-Prefill, a co-designed serving system bound by a physically-derived saturation threshold, delivering 1.35–1.37 $\times$ throughput and a $4 \times$ broader deployable envelope on large MoE models (§7–§8).

2 Background

2.1 LLM Inference: Prefill and Decoding

LLM serving executes in two phases: **prefill** processes the entire input context of length S in a single forward pass, while **decoding** autoregressively emits output tokens one at a time. To amortize attention across decoding steps, engines such as vLLM [36] and SGLang [71] cache per-layer key/value projections, whose footprint scales linearly with batch size and sequence length (full memory accounting in §4.1).

2.2 Prefill-Only LLM Workloads

A growing class of production tasks—classification, moderation, recommendation, verification—can be answered from the logits of a single prefill pass, with no autoregressive decoding. We characterize these *prefill-only workloads* in §3.

2.3 Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) Models

Most recent open-weight LLMs—Qwen3 [65], DeepSeek-V3 [10], Mixtral [30], gpt-oss [1]—adopt the **Mixture-of-Experts (MoE)** architecture to scale capacity without proportional growth in per-token FLOPs. In a MoE Transformer, the dense FFN of (some or all) decoder blocks is replaced by E parallel experts, each a two-layer MLP; a lightweight *router* dispatches each token to its top- k experts (typically $k=2-8$) and sums their outputs. Sparse activation packs hundreds of billions of total parameters while activating only a small subset per token, but the cost is paid on the *system* side: total parameters far exceed per-GPU HBM, and data-dependent top- k routing is typically imbalanced across experts and GPUs.

A structural feature of MoE—central to the design space of this paper—is that **attention weights and expert weights are disjoint parameter groups**. The two stacks can therefore adopt *independent* parallelization strategies, a freedom unavailable in dense models; this decoupling makes combinations such as DP $\times$ EP or TP $\times$ EP meaningful and is exploited by our design in §6.

2.4 Distributed Parallelism for MoE Serving

Because large MoE models rarely fit on a single GPU, serving systems resort to distributed execution. Five strategies are in common use: **DP** [40] (replicate weights, shard requests), **TP** [59] (shard weight matrices), **PP** [26, 45] (pipeline layers), **SP** [35, 41] (shard along sequence), and the MoE-specific **EP** [37] (shard experts), each with distinct on-path communication semantics. Because attention and expert stacks are disjoint (§2.3), MoE systems can compose different parallel strategies for the two stacks; §4 (Table 1) gives a per-device per-layer comparison of the relevant combinations.

3 Workload Analysis

3.1 Prefill-Only Workloads in Practice

Definition and atomic operation. *Prefill-only workloads* are inference tasks whose output is selected from a predefined candidate token set via the logits of a single prefill forward pass, without autoregressive decoding. We formalize the atomic *prefill-as-a-service* operation: given an input context c and a candidate token set $C = \{t_1, \dots, t_k\}$, the system performs one prefill pass and returns $t^* = \arg\max_{t \in C} \text{logit}(t | c)$. Unlike autoregressive serving, this operation has no iterative decoding and no per-token KV updates, making it inherently parallelizable and throughput-friendly.

Representative categories. A broad range of industrial tasks reduces to this atomic operation, directly or via simple reformulation:

- **Single-Token Classification** (binary sentiment, toxicity,

factual verification): the candidate set is a small set of single-token labels, served by one atomic call.

- **Single-Choice Selection** (multiple-choice QA, intent classification): assigning each candidate a symbolic identifier (A/B/C/D) in the prompt reduces the task to selecting one identifier token—again one atomic call.
- **Multi-Selection** (multi-label classification, recommendation, ranking): we *decompose* one N -candidate request into N independent binary sibling requests, served by N parallel atomic operations. The N siblings share the same prefix; prefix sharing (§3.3) absorbs the duplication, keeping total prefill compute comparable to a single undecomposed pass while eliminating decoding entirely.

Insight #1. A wide class of production LLM workloads can be served through prefill-as-a-service, motivating serving systems specialized for prefill-only execution.

3.2 Workload Characteristics

Unlike latency-sensitive interactive serving, prefill-only workloads are *throughput-oriented*: the primary objective is to minimize total time over a large batch, not per-request latency. These workloads run in offline pipelines [63, 72] that process millions to billions of requests in bulk, with input lengths spanning short reviews to long documents of tens of thousands of tokens. Each prefill forward therefore processes an enormous token count and runs in a heavily compute-bound interval, fundamentally different from the memory-bandwidth-bound per-step of autoregressive decoding.

Insight #2. The long compute-bound forward passes of large-batch prefill open an opportunity to overlap weight streaming with computation, motivating weight offloading as a first-class design choice that unlocks MoE models larger than GPU memory.

3.3 Prefix Sharing Opportunities

Prefix reuse appears at two scales. **In-batch**, multi-selection decomposition (§3.1) and similar reformulations produce batches in which many requests share a common prefix (e.g., N candidate-scoring requests all prefixed by the same user profile); since transformer attention is causal, the prefix attention output is identical across siblings, so computing it once eliminates nearly all prefix-stage compute and collapses N redundant copies of the prefix KV into a single HBM copy. **Cross-batch**, production pipelines repeatedly process requests built from shared templates, stable user profiles, or document headers (e.g., the same user profile scored against successive candidate sets); caching the prefix KV across batches skips both recomputation and memory-bandwidth cost for subsequent same-prefix requests, and the cached prefix occupies HBM only once.




Figure 2: MoE model size vs. per-GPU HBM capacity across hardware generations. *Total parameters grow far faster than HBM; the structural gap persists even under FP8.*

Insight #3. Prefill-only workloads exhibit abundant prefix sharing, both within and across batches, motivating prefix-aware scheduling and caching as a design principle.

4 System Analysis

Having identified the opportunities of prefill-only workloads (§3), we analyze whether existing MoE serving systems can capture them. We answer negatively, identifying a causal chain of three inefficiencies: *memory pressure forces distributed parallel execution, which in turn degrades compute efficiency and introduces heavy on-path communication*. Throughout, we use the following notation: B batch size, S sequence length, L layers, H hidden size, N_{kv} KV heads, d_h head dim, h MoE intermediate size, k top- k routing fan-out, b bytes/element (BF16: $b=2$, FP8: $b=1$).

4.1 Memory Pressure

Three components contend for GPU HBM during prefill-only MoE serving:

Model weights. MoE scales by adding experts and widening expert MLPs, so total parameters grow far faster than per-GPU HBM capacity across hardware generations (Figure 2). The gap persists even under FP8, placing moderately sized MoE deployments beyond the reach of a single GPU.

KV caches. $V_{KV} = 2LBSN_{kv}d_hb$, linear in both B and S . Under the long-context, large-batch regime of §3, KV grows without bound with batch and sequence length, rapidly overtaking weights to become the dominant HBM consumer.

Activations. Approximating peak activation by the two largest MLP intermediates, $V_{act} \approx 2BSkhb$ —linear in $B \cdot S$ and amplified by a factor of k from top- k routing, unlike dense models where activations traverse a single MLP path. Under aggressive batching and wide MoE, activations themselves consume a non-trivial slice of HBM.

Insight #4. Large-MoE prefill serving faces severe HBM pressure from weights, KV caches, and activations simultaneously, forcing existing systems into distributed parallel execution.

4.2 Computation Inefficiency

Once distributed execution is chosen, compute efficiency degrades at two levels: insufficient per-device token batches (model level) and MoE routing imbalance (layer level).

Model level: MFU requires large token batches. Model FLOPs Utilization [7] (Achieved FLOPs/Peak FLOPs) is primarily determined by the effective token batch $B \times S$ and the resulting GEMM geometry—larger batches improve arithmetic intensity and Tensor Core occupancy.




Figure 3: BF16 MFU of Qwen3-30B-A3B on A100 (80GB, vLLM) across chunked-prefill [2] sizes and sequence lengths ($B \times S = 32K$ tokens, output 1, pure prefill).

Figure 3 shows that small chunks (2K, by default on A100) constrain the per-kernel token batch and reduce GEMM dimensions; larger or disabled chunking recovers MFU, and longer contexts further improve it by enlarging per-request token volume. In short, *MFU degrades whenever distributed execution or aggressive chunking drives per-device token batches below the GEMM-saturation threshold*.

Layer level: expert-load imbalance fragments GEMMs. Even with a large global batch, MoE top- k routing distributes tokens unevenly across experts [74, 75].


Figure 4 shows that in Qwen3-30B-A3B the max/min token count across experts reaches $16.15\times$ aggregated over all 48 MoE layers (Fig. 4a) and is even more skewed within individual layers (Fig. 4b). This imbalance (i) makes per-expert GEMMs small and irregular, reducing Tensor Core utilization; and (ii) turns the heaviest-loaded GPUs into stragglers that dictate layer completion under EP.

Insight #5. Distributed parallel execution degrades compute efficiency through small per-device batches and MoE routing-induced expert-load imbalance.


4.3 Communication Overhead

Distributed execution introduces two on-path overheads per layer: *collective primitives* (All-Reduce, All-to-All) that exchange activations, and *auxiliary kernels* (reshaping, token permutation/alignment) that prepare tensors for them. Both sit on the critical path of every layer.

A distinctive property of MoE serving—absent in dense models—is that attention weights and expert weights are disjoint parameter groups, so the attention stack and the ex-



(a) Aggregated expert load across all 48 layers



(b) Expert load distribution in a single MoE layer (layer 13)

Figure 4: Expert routing imbalance of Qwen3-30B-A3B on A100 (vLLM, BF16) with 64K input tokens, output length 1.

pert stack can adopt *different* parallel strategies. The common choices are DP (replicate weights, shard requests), TP (shard weight matrices, All-Reduce per layer), PP (partition layers into stages with Send/Recv at boundaries), SP (shard along sequence, All-Gather/Reduce-Scatter to reconstruct full-sequence ops), and the MoE-specific EP (shard experts with two All-to-All per MoE layer).

Table 1 summarizes per-device, per-layer communication volume for each combination. DP $\times$ DP is communication-free but memory-expensive; the strategies feasible for large MoE models (DP $\times$ EP, TP $\times$ EP) incur traffic proportional to $B \cdot S \cdot H$, amplified under EP by the top- k fan-out. The last row, MoE-Prefill’s DP $\times$ AsyncEP, achieves near-zero on-path traffic and is a design preview.

Insight #6. Distributed parallel execution introduces frequent on-path collective communication and auxiliary kernels, particularly under expert parallelism where per-layer All-to-All traffic scales with the routing fan-out k .

5 MoE-Prefill: Design Overview

§3–§4 surface six insights: three *opportunities* from prefill-only workloads (Insights #1–#3) and three *constraints* in existing MoE serving (Insights #4–#6). MoE-Prefill distills these into three design principles (§5.1), realized by a two-tier architecture (§5.2) whose frontend and backend are co-designed (§5.3).

5.1 Design Principles

MoE-Prefill targets three classes of redundancy on the MoE prefill-only critical path, mirroring its title slogan *Zero Redundancy Overheads*: **P1 (computation)**: strip decoding-stage

Table 1: Per-device, per-layer communication cost of distributed parallel strategies for MoE prefill-only inference. *Notation follows §4 with P denoting the parallel degree. The communication sizes assume ring-style implementations of collective primitives and ignore routing imbalance across experts. The last row, AsyncEP, is our proposed design, detailed in §5.*

Attention Parallelism	Expert Parallelism	Collective Operations (ring-style)	Per-Device Forward Communication (bytes)	Communication Volume
DP	DP	None	≈ 0	Low
DP	TP	$1 \times \text{All-Gather} + 1 \times \text{Reduce-Scatter}$	$\approx 4 \cdot \frac{P-1}{P} \cdot B \cdot S \cdot H \cdot b$	Medium
DP	EP	$2 \times \text{All-to-All}$	$\approx 4 \cdot k \cdot \frac{P-1}{P} \cdot B \cdot S \cdot H \cdot b$	High
TP	TP	$2 \times \text{All-Reduce}$	$\approx 4 \cdot \frac{P-1}{P} \cdot B \cdot S \cdot H \cdot b$	Medium
TP	EP	$1 \times \text{All-Reduce} + 2 \times \text{All-to-All}$	$\approx (2 + 4k) \cdot \frac{P-1}{P} \cdot B \cdot S \cdot H \cdot b$	High
PP	PP	$2 \times \text{Send/Recv}$	$\approx 2 \cdot B \cdot S \cdot H \cdot b$	Medium
SP	TP	$2 \times \text{All-Gather} + 1 \times \text{Reduce-Scatter}$	$\approx (2 \cdot N_{kv} \cdot d_h + 4 \cdot H) \cdot \frac{P-1}{P} \cdot B \cdot S \cdot b$	High
SP	EP	$1 \times \text{All-Gather} + 2 \times \text{All-to-All}$	$\approx (2 \cdot N_{kv} \cdot d_h + 4 \cdot k \cdot H) \cdot \frac{P-1}{P} \cdot B \cdot S \cdot b$	High
DP	AsyncEP	$1 \times \text{All-Gather (Async)}$	≈ 0	Low

machinery and co-locate same-prefix requests so each prefix is executed exactly once (Insights #1, #3); **P2 (memory)**: exploit the compute window to offload expert weights to CPU DRAM and stream them back asynchronously, share prefix KV via affinity routing, and optionally disable KV storage (Insights #2, #4); **P3 (communication)**: gather experts *by weight* rather than routing *by activation*, replacing on-path collectives with background weight transfers fully overlapped with compute (Insights #5–#6).

5.2 System Architecture and Workflow

MoE-Prefill is a two-tier serving system (Figure 5). The **frontend** (§7) first normalizes each request—single-token classification, single-choice selection, or multi-selection decomposed into binary siblings (§3)—into prefill-only form, then assembles per-GPU batches under three simultaneous rules: co-locate same-prefix requests to maximize KV reuse, measure load in true FLOPs after prefix-sharing credit, and stop admitting new requests to a GPU once its accumulated FLOPs reach the backend-derived *saturation threshold* T (Eq. (1)). The **backend** (§6) runs each batch as pure DP attention with *asynchronous expert parallelism* (AsyncEP): expert weights for upcoming MoE layers are gathered in the background via D2D AllGather over NVLink (and optionally prefetched from CPU DRAM via PCIe), while the current layer computes. Because T is enforced by the frontend, the per-layer compute window always dominates the slowest ongoing transfer, so no collective appears on the critical path. A KV-cache-free mode further disables KV storage for workloads without prefix reuse.

5.3 Frontend–Backend Co-Design

Most LLM serving systems treat the scheduler and the execution engine as independently tunable components connected only by a request queue. MoE-Prefill departs from this pattern: frontend and backend share three explicit interfaces. (1) The *saturation threshold* T is defined by the backend

from measurable hardware quantities (Eq. (1)) and enforced by the frontend as the per-GPU admission condition (§7.4). (2) *Prefix-KV affinity*: the frontend’s prefix-aware routing and the backend’s KV block table operate on the same per-GPU cache, so routing decisions and KV layout share a single source of truth (§7.2). (3) A *true-FLOPs cost model* measures load after prefix-sharing credit, exactly matching the work the backend performs—one prefix pass plus per-sibling suffix passes (§7.3). All three interfaces originate in the backend, so we present it (§6) before the frontend (§7).

6 Backend: Asynchronous Expert-Parallel Execution

The backend of MoE-Prefill executes the computation scheduled by the frontend, with the goal of keeping every GPU on useful compute rather than waiting on data transfers. We present it as a progression of execution modes, each relaxing one more constraint from §4.

6.1 Design Constraints

Building on Insights #4–#6 (§4), the backend must jointly satisfy, in descending order of priority: **C1** (feasibility) the model’s weights, KV cache, and activations fit per-GPU HBM; **C2** (performance) no synchronous collective sits on the per-layer critical path; and **C3** (balance) no GPU becomes a per-layer straggler under expert-load skew. C1 determines *whether* the model runs, C2 *how fast* it runs, and C3 *how evenly* GPUs utilize compute. Conventional synchronous DP+EP (Figure 6) violates all three: every GPU permanently stores $\frac{1}{N}$ of every layer’s experts (C1), two All-to-Alls per layer block computation (C2), and the barrier amplifies routing skew into stragglers (C3). MoE-Prefill’s backend addresses them through a progressive design: AsyncEP via D2D (§6.2) eliminates C2 and C3; AsyncEP with offloading (§6.3) additionally relaxes C1 on *weights*; and a KV-cache-free mode (§6.3) further relaxes C1 on KV for prefix-sparse workloads.




Figure 5: MoE-Prefill system architecture and end-to-end prefill-only serving workflow. The frontend normalizes incoming tasks into prefill-only form and schedules them into saturation-bounded batches with prefix affinity; the backend executes each batch under data-parallel attention and asynchronous expert streaming, returning logits without entering any decoding loop.




Figure 6: Conventional synchronous DP+EP with four GPUs. Each GPU holds $\frac{1}{N}$ of the experts per layer; two synchronous All-to-Alls per MoE layer sit on the critical path.

6.2 Asynchronous Expert Parallelism

AsyncEP eliminates activation routing from the critical path by restructuring how expert weights are managed. The key insight is that in prefill-only serving, a GPU does not need to hold experts for all layers simultaneously—it only needs the *complete* set of experts for the layer currently being computed. **Weight layout and execution.** As shown in Figure 7a, each GPU holds a full replica of attention weights (identical to DP+EP) and $\frac{1}{N}$ of the expert weights partitioned by expert index, with all GPUs additionally replicating the *complete* expert set for the first MoE layer. After computing attention locally, each GPU evaluates the current MoE layer entirely on-device and simultaneously initiates a background D2D AllGather over NVLink to collect the next layer’s complete expert weights from the $\frac{1}{N}$ shards distributed across GPUs. By the time the current layer finishes, the gather has completed and the GPU is ready to execute the next layer locally; the

process repeats layer by layer.

Why the overlap works: the saturation threshold T . For a layer’s D2D AllGather to be fully hidden, the layer’s compute must last at least as long as the gather. Let t_{EP} denote the time for the slowest EP data transfer per layer (D2D AllGather, or H2D PCIe transfer when offloading is enabled in §6.3) and F_{GPU} the GPU’s peak FLOP rate. A GPU’s per-batch compute fully overlaps the transfer whenever its FLOPs exceed the *saturation threshold*

$$T = t_{EP} \times F_{GPU} \times \gamma, \quad (1)$$

where $\gamma \geq 1$ (e.g., 1.2) absorbs transient jitter. T is a physical quantity computed once at startup from hardware and model configuration. Prefill-only workloads naturally exceed T because aggressive batching produces long, compute-bound per-layer forward passes, and the frontend (§7) enforces T as the per-GPU admission condition, closing the co-design loop. Two All-to-Alls per MoE layer thus disappear from the critical path (C2), and routing imbalance no longer creates per-layer stragglers because all top- k dispatch is local (C3).

6.3 AsyncEP with Offloading and KV-Cache-Free Execution

The D2D-only AsyncEP resolves C2 and C3 but does not fully address C1: each GPU must still permanently store $\frac{1}{N}$ of expert weights for *every* layer, a footprint that for very large MoE models crowds out the HBM available for KV caches and activations. MoE-Prefill therefore extends AsyncEP with two independent *memory knobs*—hybrid weight offloading on the *weights* dimension and KV-cache-free execution on the *KV* dimension—both shrink the per-GPU HBM footprint and extend deployment to cheaper hardware.

Weights dimension: hybrid offloading. As shown in Figure 7b, each GPU now retains $\frac{1}{N}$ expert weights for only a small number of upcoming layers; the complete expert weights for all layers live in CPU pinned memory as an




Figure 7: AsyncEP execution models with four GPUs. (a) Each GPU replicates all experts for the first layer and gathers subsequent layers’ experts via D2D AllGather over NVLink, fully overlapped with current-layer computation. (b) With offloading, each GPU retains $\frac{1}{N}$ expert shards for only a few upcoming layers; D2D AllGather assembles the next layer while H2D transfers over PCIe simultaneously prefetch further-ahead layers from CPU pinned memory.

offloaded backing store. Execution becomes a *two-channel pipeline*: while the current layer computes, a D2D AllGather over NVLink assembles the immediately-next layer’s complete expert set from shards already resident on each GPU, and an H2D PCIe prefetch concurrently transfers $\frac{1}{N}$ shards for further-ahead layers from CPU memory, staging them for future AllGathers. The NVLink and PCIe channels run in parallel, so by the time each AllGather starts, the shards it needs are already on-GPU. Because the slowest per-layer transfer now shifts from D2D AllGather to H2D PCIe, the saturation threshold T in Eq. (1) automatically absorbs this by setting t_{EP} to the H2D latency—the frontend still schedules enough compute to cover the slower channel.

KV dimension: KV-cache-free execution. For workloads without significant prefix sharing (e.g., classification over diverse documents), prefix KV caches offer no reuse benefit but still consume substantial HBM. MoE-Prefill supports a *KV-cache-free* mode that disables KV storage entirely and computes attention on the fly [9]. The trade-off is explicit—high-prefix-reuse workloads lose the reuse dividend—but for prefix-sparse workloads the KV footprint is pure overhead.

The two knobs are orthogonal and compose: with both enabled, each GPU’s HBM holds only attention weights, a few layers of expert shards, and activation workspace—a fraction of static EP’s footprint (C1). Freed memory is reinvested in larger KV caches and more aggressive batching, or traded for lower-HBM GPUs that broaden the deployable envelope. Together with AsyncEP (C2+C3), the three components form a progressive, composable design that executes with zero

on-path communication, provided the frontend meets the saturation threshold T , which is the co-design interface.

7 Frontend: Prefix-, Compute-, and Overlap-Aware Scheduling

The backend (§6) hides communication behind compute via AsyncEP transfers. The frontend’s role is to make this overlap effective in practice: supply each GPU with *enough* compute to cover the transfer latency, while simultaneously maximizing prefix reuse and avoiding redundant work.

7.1 Design Constraints for Prefill-Only Scheduling

Combining workload opportunities (§3) with backend properties (§6), the frontend must jointly satisfy: **F1** (prefix reuse) co-locate same-prefix requests so the prefix is computed and cached exactly once (Insight #3); **F2** (compute awareness) account for prefix-sharing credit, since the true cost of N same-prefix requests is one prefix pass plus N suffix passes, not N full ones; and **F3** (overlap) keep each GPU’s per-batch FLOPs above the saturation threshold T (Eq. (1)) so AsyncEP’s transfers stay hidden on the critical path. F1 decides *where* a request goes, F2 *how* to measure its cost, and F3 *when* a GPU has enough work.

Why existing schedulers fail. Existing LLM serving systems optimize mixed prefill–decode workloads with simple load proxies (e.g., vLLM’s *waiting*×4 + *running*) that work only




Figure 8: MoE-Prefill frontend scheduling with four GPUs, realized in three stages: (1) *Prefix-aware routing* picks the GPU with the longest block-level cache match; (2) *Compute-aware tracking* updates each GPU’s true-FLOPs load after prefix-sharing credit; (3) *Overlap-aware balancing* marks a GPU saturated once its load reaches the backend-derived threshold T .

when per-request cost is dominated by decoding. They violate all three constraints: they ignore prefix sharing and scatter same-prefix requests (F1); even a token-count metric would estimate $10 \cdot (4096 + S_{\text{sfx}})$ tokens for 10 same-prefix requests whose true cost is one prefix pass plus 10 short suffix passes, perversely driving the scheduler to disperse them (F2); and they lack a backend-derived overlap threshold, so decoding-calibrated heuristics are misaligned with AsyncEP (F3).

7.2 Prefix-Aware Routing

To satisfy F1, MoE-Prefill routes each request to the GPU whose resident prefix KV cache shares the *longest common prefix* with the request’s input. Matching operates at *block granularity* (e.g., 16 tokens per block), aligned with the KV management unit used by PagedAttention [36] and RadixAttention [71]: each block is hashed and the scheduler queries each GPU’s block table for the longest contiguous match. This reduces matching cost from $O(P)$ token-level lookups to $O(P/B)$ block-level lookups and reuses the block table already maintained by the serving engine.

In-batch vs. cross-batch reuse. The same longest-match rule covers two time scales without any additional machinery, though the savings differ. *Within a round* (in-batch), sibling requests share a single prefix forward pass: the prefix self-attention is identical across siblings and is computed once, and a single prefix KV copy is stored in HBM. *Across*

rounds (cross-batch), each GPU’s block table retains prefix KV blocks under LRU eviction; a later request hitting an already-resident prefix and reuses the cached prefix KV cache. Both behaviors emerge from a single routing policy, with no explicit batch-assembly or replication mechanism; the precise FLOPs are captured by $C_{\text{pfx}}(P_r - M_r) + C_{\text{sfx}}(S_r, P_r)$ in §7.3.

7.3 Compute-Aware Tracking

To satisfy F2, the scheduler maintains a running cost estimate L_i per GPU that reflects actual FLOPs after prefix reuse. When request r with prefix length P_r and suffix length S_r is assigned to GPU i with M_r prefix tokens already cached, the cost increment is

$$\Delta_r = C_{\text{pfx}}(P_r - M_r) + C_{\text{sfx}}(S_r, P_r), \quad (2)$$

where $C_{\text{sfx}}(S, P) = C_{\text{FFN}}(S) + C_{\text{self}}(S) + C_{\text{cross}}(S, P)$ combines linear feed-forward, $O(S^2)$ suffix self-attention, and $O(S \cdot P)$ cross-attention of suffix tokens to prefix KV. When the full prefix is cached ($M_r = P_r$), the prefix term vanishes and only the suffix cost remains. After each assignment, $L_i \leftarrow L_i + \Delta_r$.

This cost model correctly captures prefix-sharing savings: assigning 10 same-prefix requests to a GPU adds one prefix cost plus 10 suffix costs, not 10 full-request costs. The scheduler therefore treats such a GPU as *lightly* loaded—the opposite of a token-based metric—and keeps routing same-prefix requests there until saturation.

7.4 Overlap-Aware Balancing

To satisfy F3, the scheduler enforces the saturation threshold T (Eq. (1)) derived from the backend’s EP communication latency.

At each scheduling round, the scheduler drains a global FIFO queue. For each request, it evaluates all *unsaturated* GPUs ($L_i < T$), selects the one with the longest block-level prefix match (F1), updates its load via the true-cost model (F2), and marks it *saturated* once $L_i \geq T$. The round ends when all GPUs are saturated or the queue is exhausted. A popular prefix that saturates the primary GPU early naturally spills to the next-best-matching GPU through the same logic—no explicit replication policy is needed. Because GPUs are marked saturated one at a time, each GPU’s final load lies in $[T, T + \Delta_{\text{last}}]$, so load balance emerges *for free* as a structural byproduct of saturation, not an explicit objective. Pseudocode of one scheduling round is given in App. A.

8 Evaluation

We evaluate MoE-Prefill along five axes: end-to-end throughput on real-world prefill-only workloads (§8.2), the contribution of each co-design tier (§8.3), generalization to

Dataset	Workload	Req Context (tokens)	# Request	Total (tokens)	Prefix Share
MoralStories	Moral reasoning	~100–200	24K	~3.3M	High
MMLU	Multiple-choice QA	~50–500	24K	~5.8M	Low
BoolQ	Binary QA	~200–600	12K	~2.7M	Low
IMDB	Sentiment classification	~300–2K	12K	~5.5M	Low
QuALITY	Long-document QA	~4K–12K	1.2K	~10.5M	High
ArXiv Class.	Document classification	~6K–128K	600	~10.1M	Medium
Aggregated	Prefill-only	~50–128K	73.8K	~37.9M	Mixed

Table 2: Composition of the aggregated prefill-only workload. *Per-source rows describe the contribution of each benchmark; the aggregated workload (last row) is the sole workload used in §8.2–§8.3. All requests are reformulated as prefill-only; output length is fixed to 1.*

synthetic workloads without prefix reuse (§8.4), memory scalability and per-GPU compute efficiency (§8.5), and correctness of the prefill-only reformulation (§8.6).

8.1 Evaluation Setup

Datasets. To reflect the heterogeneity of production prefill-only traffic, we construct a single *aggregated workload* by mixing requests sampled from six public benchmarks (Table 2): short-context classification and QA (MoralStories [14], MMLU [25], BoolQ [8]), medium-length document analysis (IMDB [43], QuALITY [49]), and long-context document classification (ArXiv Classification [24], up to 128K tokens). Together they span the full prefix-share spectrum—from high (shared system prompts) through medium to low (independent documents)—and yield a workload of 73.8K requests and ~37.9M tokens, mirroring a production endpoint that interleaves classification, QA, and long-document requests.

Hardware, models, and baselines. We evaluate MoE-Prefill on three datacenter GPU platforms—8×A100 (80GB, BF16), 8×H100 (80GB, BF16 and FP8), and 8×H200 (141GB, FP8)—using *Qwen3-235B-A22B* [65] (128 experts, top-8 routing, ~22B activated parameters). We compare against two groups of baselines, swept at parallel degrees 1, 2, 4, and 8. *Group (i)*: the five distributed strategies natively supported by vLLM for large-MoE inference—DP+EP, DP+TP, TP+EP, TP+TP, and PP+PP (Table 1). *Group (ii)*: four PrefillOnly-augmented configurations. PrefillOnly [12] targets dense LLMs on a single GPU; its hybrid-prefilling and suffix-KV-cache-discarding techniques are engineered to enable such deployment by reducing per-GPU memory. Since Qwen3-235B-A22B exceeds the HBM of every GPU tested, these techniques have a negligible impact. We therefore port its scheduler, shortest-prefill-first, with continuous prefill-time estimation into vLLM v0.11.0 and pair it with two distributed backends, DP+EP and PP+PP (the strongest Group (i) baseline), each at two batch sizes: `max-num-seqs=1` (PrefillOnly’s paper default setting) and a value matched to MoE-Prefill. For every hardware–precision cell we report MoE-Prefill’s

improvement over the best baseline per parallel degree.

Implementation and metrics. MoE-Prefill is implemented on top of vLLM (details in App. B) and enabled via a single flag. We report (i) **throughput** in tokens/s (total prefilled tokens divided by end-to-end batch completion time); (ii) **MFU** as achieved FLOPs over the GPU’s peak FLOPs at the deployed precision; (iii) peak HBM usage and maximum feasible batch/context; and (iv) **task accuracy**. All runs fix the output length to 1, isolating prefill execution.

8.2 End-to-End Throughput on Real-World Workloads

Figure 9 reports throughput on the aggregated real-world workload across all four hardware–precision combinations, sweeping the parallel degree from 1 to 8 GPUs.

Uniform dominance across precisions. MoE-Prefill achieves the highest throughput in every hardware–precision–parallel-degree cell, delivering $1.37\times$ on 8×A100 (BF16), $1.36\times$ on 8×H100 (BF16), $1.35\times$ on 8×H100 (FP8), and $1.37\times$ on 8×H200 (FP8) over the strongest baseline in each cell. MoE-Prefill’s $\sim 1.35\times$ relative gain is stable even as FP8 roughly doubles absolute throughput, consistent with the analytical prediction in §4 that on-path All-to-All traffic scales with $B \cdot S \cdot H$ independent of element size.

Near-linear scaling. Baselines exhibit the sub-linear scaling predicted by Table 1: adding GPUs amortizes the weight footprint but injects more per-layer collective traffic, and several baselines plateau or regress past 4 GPUs. MoE-Prefill scales near-linearly because its only cross-GPU traffic, AsyncEP’s D2D AllGather, is background-overlapped with compute, decoupling throughput from collective-scaling limits.

8.3 Necessity of Frontend–Backend Co-Design

Because DP+AsyncEP (backend only) already resolves the on-path-collective bottleneck (§6), a natural question is whether the frontend of §7 contributes enough to justify its complexity. Fig. 10 decomposes the gain into two tiers: DP+EP (syn-




Figure 9: End-to-end throughput on the aggregated real-world prefill-only workload. Each panel reports one hardware–precision combination; bars compare the five distributed baselines with MoE-Prefill at parallel degrees 1/2/4/8. Input lengths span 50–128K tokens; output length is fixed to 1.




Figure 10: Contribution of MoE-Prefill’s two design tiers on the real-world workload. DP+AsyncEP applies the backend of §6 under vLLM’s default scheduler; MoE-Prefill additionally applies the frontend of §7. Annotations report the throughput gain of adding the frontend over the backend-only configuration at each parallel degree.

chronous MoE), DP+AsyncEP under vLLM’s default scheduler, and MoE-Prefill (backend + frontend co-design).

Fig. 10 annotates each bar with the throughput gain of adding the frontend (i.e., MoE-Prefill vs. DP+AsyncEP under vLLM’s default scheduler). At 8 GPUs, the frontend improves throughput by +18% (A100, BF16), +17% (H100, BF16), +18% (H100, FP8), and +16% (H200, FP8). The contribution grows with parallel degree: at low GPU counts, random dispatch still achieves reasonable prefix hits, but adding GPUs scatters same-prefix requests and dilutes reuse, whereas MoE-Prefill’s longest-block-match routing sustains high reuse at any scale. The gain is further amplified under FP8, where higher compute density shrinks the per-layer window and gives saturation-driven admission more room to contribute.

8.4 Generalization Across Context Regimes

To isolate the effect of context length independent of prefix reuse, we sweep synthetic workloads with uniformly ran-

dom prompts (no prefix sharing) across four context regimes: short (256×40960), medium ($4K \times 2560$), long ($32K \times 320$), and ultra-long ($128K \times 80$), where $S \times N$ denotes sequence length $\times$ number of requests (10M tokens per regime).

MoE-Prefill’s backend alone (DP+AsyncEP) improves over the best baseline by $1.30\times$ (short), $1.30\times$ (medium), $1.52\times$ (long), and $1.49\times$ (ultra-long) at 8 GPUs. Even without prefix reuse, AsyncEP delivers $\geq 1.30\times$, confirming that P3 (zero redundant communication) produces gains independent of P1. The improvement grows with context length because the baselines degrade on two fronts: on-path All-to-All volume scales linearly with $B \cdot S$, making EP-based strategies proportionally more costly; and causal attention creates an inherent load imbalance across pipeline stages, early stages process shorter attention contexts, while later stages handle the full context and bear disproportionately heavier work, exposing pipeline bubbles that further penalize PP+PP. MoE-Prefill is immune to both: AsyncEP’s weight transfers are fully hidden behind compute regardless of sequence length, and pure DP attention eliminates pipeline partitioning.




Figure 11: Throughput under synthetic workloads with no prefix reuse, across four context regimes on 8xH100 (FP8). Each panel fixes the product $S \times N$ and varies S ; the “ours” bar is DP+AsyncEP (no prefix-aware routing), isolating the backend contribution.




Figure 12: MFU on Qwen3-235B-A22B (H100, FP8) under synthetic no-prefix-reuse workloads, across four context regimes and parallel degrees 1/2/4/8. The “ours” bar is DP+AsyncEP. The N/A cells at 1–2 GPUs encode the memory-scalability gap: only MoE-Prefill produces a data point there.

8.5 Memory Scalability and Compute Efficiency

Distributed MoE serving usually sacrifices efficiency on two axes at once: HBM capacity (235B-class models require multi-GPU deployment just to hold the weights) and per-GPU MFU (smaller per-device batches fall below the GEMM-saturation threshold, and on-path collectives steal cycles from useful compute; Insight #5). MoE-Prefill’s P2 (hybrid offloading + KV-cache-free execution) and P3 (AsyncEP) attack the two bottlenecks jointly. We reuse the synthetic sweep of §8.4 (8xH100 FP8, Qwen3-235B-A22B, four context regimes, parallel degrees 1/2/4/8), measuring MFU as achieved FLOPs normalized by the 1979 TFLOPS FP8 peak reported in the H100 datasheet [47].

Memory scalability at no MFU cost. Qwen3-235B-A22B occupies 235 GB in FP8 (470 GB in BF16), which exceeds the aggregate 160 GB HBM of two H100s even before activations. Every baseline in Table 1 therefore requires ≥ 4 GPUs simply to hold the weights—the N/A columns at 1–2 GPUs in Fig. 12 make this gap concrete. Under P2, MoE-Prefill retains only

attention weights plus a sliding window of upcoming expert shards on-GPU while streaming the rest from CPU pinned memory over PCIe, combined with KV-cache-free execution for prefill-only workloads; the per-GPU HBM footprint then fits within 80 GB, pushing the deployable envelope from “ ≥ 4 GPUs” down to a single commodity 80 GB GPU. Crucially, this does not come at a compute-efficiency cost: on 1–2 GPUs MoE-Prefill sustains 32.0–36.2% MFU, statistically indistinguishable from its 29.8–34.7% MFU at 8 GPUs, because the large per-device token batch in the memory-constrained regime fully overlaps H2D expert transfers behind compute.

Dominance in the multi-GPU regime. From 4 to 8 GPUs, every baseline degrades monotonically in every context regime (e.g., DP+EP drops $1.90\times$ at short context), confirming the two predicted mechanisms: sub-saturation GEMMs and on-path collective overhead. DP+AsyncEP is the top bar in *every* (context, parallel degree) cell at 29.8–36.2% MFU, beating the strongest baseline by $1.29\times$ (short), $1.30\times$ (medium), $1.59\times$ (long), $1.49\times$ (ultra-long). Strikingly, even the baselines’ best 8-GPU cell (TP+TP at 128K, 20.09%) falls below MoE-Prefill’s *worst* cell across the sweep (29.84%). The

feasible hardware envelope therefore widens from “ ≥ 4 GPUs” to “1–8 GPUs” (a $4\times$ broader range), and within that entire envelope per-GPU MFU varies by only $1.03\text{--}1.09\times$ —validating Insight #5 and the zero-redundancy design of P2+P3.

8.6 Accuracy of Prefill-Only Reformulation

Correctness decomposes into two orthogonal claims mirroring the two-tier design of §5.3. *Tier 1 (execution fidelity)*: AsyncEP only changes *when* expert weights arrive, hybrid offloading only relocates them between HBM and CPU memory, and KV-cache-free execution recomputes attention under the same formulation; none of these modifies GEMM math, attention kernels, or quantization, so per-layer logits are bit-identical to vLLM up to FP non-associativity by construction, empirically confirmed on a 25K-sample same-model run (App. C). *Tier 2 (reformulation fidelity)*: on a nine-task production classification harness with two open-source models, prefill-only logit scoring lies within ± 3.6 pp of autoregressive decoding on 7 of 9 tasks (Table 3); a same-model three-way ablation (Table 4) isolates the decoding-mode contribution to ~ 1 pp. Together these validate the end-to-end accuracy of prefill-as-a-service under MoE-Prefill.

9 Related Work

MoE-Prefill intersects four lines of prior work; the structural difference throughout is that MoE-Prefill gathers experts *by weight* rather than routing activations, co-designed with a physically-derived saturation invariant.

LLM inference engines and prefill optimizations. Production engines [3, 36, 48, 68, 71] and techniques such as continuous batching [68], chunked prefill [2], speculative decoding [38], and prefill/decode disaggregation [50, 53, 73] all presume prefill is amortized over many decoding steps. PrefillOnly [12] first targets prefill-only workloads via KV-cache lifetime and job-level scheduling but leaves the MoE execution stack untouched; our analysis (§4) shows execution-level overheads dominate regardless of KV policy, making MoE-Prefill complementary.

Mixture-of-experts serving. MoE scales capacity via sparse activation [13, 15, 37, 75] and is adopted by most recent open-weight models [1, 10, 30, 65]. System-side MoE work [5, 17, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 31, 39, 51, 54, 60, 66] optimizes traffic, placement, or kernels *within* the synchronous activation-routed EP model, keeping two per-layer AllToAlls on the critical path. MoE-Prefill inverts this model: experts are gathered by weight, removing AllToAll and dissolving routing-imbalance stragglers (§6).

Prefix caching and attention reuse. PagedAttention [36], RadixAttention [71], and related caching systems [16, 18, 32, 42, 53, 67] treat prefix reuse as a *passive cache effect*. MoE-Prefill’s frontend turns it into an *active scheduling decision* via longest-block-match routing, enabled by AsyncEP

freeing the HBM needed for large batches that make prefix co-location meaningful. BlendServe [70] overlaps *requests* with complementary resource profiles atop a synchronous engine; MoE-Prefill overlaps *layers* via async weight gathering, and the two compose.

Expert and weight offloading. Dense offloading systems [21, 55, 56, 58] and MoE extensions [28, 33, 34, 64] either transfer on demand (on the critical path) or rely on popularity heuristics that degrade under large-batch routing skew. MoE-Prefill exploits the *deterministic layer order of prefill* and sizes the compute window via T (Eq. (1)), making offloaded experts appear always-resident by construction.

10 Discussion

Applicability and limitations. MoE-Prefill targets throughput-oriented, batch-driven prefill-only serving on MoE models that exceed single-GPU HBM. It is *not* designed for latency-critical interactive serving, arrivals too bursty to sustain the saturation threshold, or dense models with no expert stack. Three limitations merit note: (i) on low-bandwidth interconnects t_{EP} and thus T grow, potentially re-exposing some transfers on the critical path; (ii) T is calibrated once at startup—severe workload drift can briefly revert layers to synchronous behavior, though prefill-only batches refill quickly; and (iii) KV-cache-free mode and prefix-aware routing are workload-dependent knobs that contribute nothing on truly random traffic but do not regress (§8.4).

Broader implications. The core insight—decoupling expert placement from activation routing—applies whenever the per-layer compute window covers transfer latency, including long-context reasoning and speculative-decode verification. More broadly, *expert weights should be treated as schedulable resources rather than static parameters*, dissolving routing-imbalance stragglers and turning HBM capacity into a deployment knob.

11 Conclusion

Prefill-only workloads expose three structural redundancies in distributed MoE serving, all rooted in coupling expert placement with synchronous activation routing. MoE-Prefill inverts this coupling: AsyncEP replaces per-layer AllToAll with background weight AllGather fully overlapped with compute, while a co-designed frontend enforces a saturation threshold to guarantee the overlap. On Qwen3-235B-A22B, MoE-Prefill delivers $1.35\text{--}1.37\times$ throughput over the strongest baseline and sustains 29.8–36.2% MFU across 1–8 GPUs. The broader lesson: expert weights are best treated not as static parameters but as schedulable resources driven by the execution schedule.

References

- [1] Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Jason Ai, Sam Altman, Andy Applebaum, Edwin Arbus, Rahul K Arora, Yu Bai, Bowen Baker, Haiming Bao, et al. gpt-oss-120b & gpt-oss-20b model card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.10925*, 2025.
- [2] Amey Agrawal, Ashish Panwar, Jayashree Mohan, Nipun Kwatra, Bhargav S Gulavani, and Ramachandran Ramjee. Sarathi: Efficient llm inference by piggybacking decodes with chunked prefills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16369*, 2023.
- [3] Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Samyam Rajbhandari, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Cheng Li, Du Li, Elton Zheng, Olatunji Ruwase, Shaden Smith, Minjia Zhang, Jeff Rasley, et al. Deepspeed-inference: enabling efficient inference of transformer models at unprecedented scale. In *SC22: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–15. IEEE, 2022.
- [4] Weilin Cai, Juyong Jiang, Fan Wang, Jing Tang, Sunghun Kim, and Jiayi Huang. A survey on mixture of experts in large language models. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2025.
- [5] Shiyi Cao, Shu Liu, Tyler Griggs, Peter Schafhalter, Xiaoxuan Liu, Ying Sheng, Joseph E Gonzalez, Matei Zaharia, and Ion Stoica. Moe-lightning: High-throughput moe inference on memory-constrained gpus. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 1*, pages 715–730, 2025.
- [6] Ilias Chalkidis, Abhik Jana, Dirk Hartung, Michael Bommarito, Ion Androutsopoulos, Daniel Martin Katz, and Nikolaos Aletras. LexGLUE: A benchmark dataset for legal language understanding in English. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4310–4330, 2022.
- [7] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of machine learning research*, 24(240):1–113, 2023.
- [8] Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. Boolq: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the north American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers)*, pages 2924–2936, 2019.
- [9] Tri Dao, Dan Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:16344–16359, 2022.
- [10] DeepSeek-AI, Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, et al. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*, 2024.
- [11] Dorottya Demszky, Dana Movshovitz-Attias, Jeongwoo Ko, Alan Cowen, Gaurav Nemade, and Sujith Ravi. GoEmotions: A dataset of fine-grained emotions. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4040–4054, 2020.
- [12] Kuntai Du, Bowen Wang, Chen Zhang, Yiming Cheng, Qing Lan, Hejian Sang, Yihua Cheng, Jiayi Yao, Xiaoxuan Liu, Yifan Qiao, et al. Prefillonly: An inference engine for prefill-only workloads in large language model applications. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 31st Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 399–414, 2025.
- [13] Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Andrew M Dai, Simon Tong, Dmitry Lepikhin, Yuanzhong Xu, Maxim Krikun, Yanqi Zhou, Adams Wei Yu, Orhan Firat, et al. Glam: Efficient scaling of language models with mixture-of-experts. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5547–5569. PMLR, 2022.
- [14] Denis Emelin, Ronan Le Bras, Jena D Hwang, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. Moral stories: Situated reasoning about norms, intents, actions, and their consequences. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 698–718, 2021.
- [15] 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.
- [16] FlashInfer. Cascade Inference. <https://flashinfer.ai/2024/02/02/cascade-inference.html>, 2024. Blog post. Accessed: 2026-04-23.
- [17] Trevor Gale, Deepak Narayanan, Cliff Young, and Matei Zaharia. Megablocks: Efficient sparse training with mixture-of-experts. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 5:288–304, 2023.
- [18] Bin Gao, Zhuomin He, Puru Sharma, Qingxuan Kang, Djordje Jevdjic, Junbo Deng, Xingkun Yang, Zhou

- Yu, and Pengfei Zuo. {Cost-Efficient} large language model serving for multi-turn conversations with {CachedAttention}. In *2024 USENIX annual technical conference (USENIX ATC 24)*, pages 111–126, 2024.
- [19] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Ariel Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [20] Naibin Gu, Zhenyu Zhang, Yuchen Feng, Yilong Chen, Peng Fu, Zheng Lin, Shuohuan Wang, Yu Sun, Hua Wu, Weiping Wang, et al. Elastic moe: Unlocking the inference-time scalability of mixture-of-experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.21892*, 2025.
- [21] Liwei Guo, Wonkyo Choe, and Felix Xiaozhu Lin. Sti: Turbocharge nlp inference at the edge via elastic pipelining. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 2*, pages 791–803, 2023.
- [22] Jiaao He, Jiezhong Qiu, Aohan Zeng, Zhilin Yang, Jidong Zhai, and Jie Tang. Fastmoe: A fast mixture-of-expert training system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.13262*, 2021.
- [23] Jiaao He, Jidong Zhai, Tiago Antunes, Haojie Wang, Fuwen Luo, Shangfeng Shi, and Qin Li. Fastermoe: modeling and optimizing training of large-scale dynamic pre-trained models. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, pages 120–134, 2022.
- [24] Jun He, Liqun Wang, Liu Liu, Jiao Feng, and Hao Wu. Long document classification from local word glimpses via recurrent attention learning. *IEEE Access*, 7:40707–40718, 2019.
- [25] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020.
- [26] Yanping Huang, Youlong Cheng, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Dehao Chen, Mia Chen, HyukJoong Lee, Jiquan Ngiam, Quoc V Le, Yonghui Wu, et al. Gpipe: Efficient training of giant neural networks using pipeline parallelism. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [27] Changho Hwang, Wei Cui, Yifan Xiong, Ziyue Yang, Ze Liu, Han Hu, Zilong Wang, Rafael Salas, Jithin Jose, Prabhat Ram, et al. Tutel: Adaptive mixture-of-experts at scale. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 5:269–287, 2023.
- [28] Ranggi Hwang, Jianyu Wei, Shijie Cao, Changho Hwang, Xiaohu Tang, Ting Cao, and Mao Yang. Pre-gated moe: An algorithm-system co-design for fast and scalable mixture-of-expert inference. In *2024 ACM/IEEE 51st Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pages 1018–1031. IEEE, 2024.
- [29] Hakan Inan, Kartikeya Upasani, Jianfeng Chi, Rashmi Rungta, Krithika Iyer, Yuning Mao, Michael Tontchev, Qing Hu, Brian Fuller, Davide Testuggine, et al. Llama guard: Llm-based input-output safeguard for human-ai conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06674*, 2023.
- [30] 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.
- [31] Chenyu Jiang, Ye Tian, Zhen Jia, Shuai Zheng, Chuan Wu, and Yida Wang. Lancet: Accelerating mixture-of-experts training via whole graph computation-communication overlapping. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 6:74–86, 2024.
- [32] Jordan Juravsky, Bradley Brown, Ryan Ehrlich, Daniel Y Fu, Christopher Ré, and Azalia Mirhoseini. Hydra-gen: High-throughput llm inference with shared prefixes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05099*, 2024.
- [33] Keisuke Kamahori, Tian Tang, Yile Gu, Kan Zhu, and Baris Kasikci. Fiddler: Cpu-gpu orchestration for fast inference of mixture-of-experts models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07033*, 2024.
- [34] Rui Kong, Yuanchun Li, Qingtian Feng, Weijun Wang, Xiaozhou Ye, Ye Ouyang, Linghe Kong, and Yunxin Liu. Swapmoe: Serving off-the-shelf moe-based large language models with tunable memory budget. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6710–6720, 2024.
- [35] Vijay Anand Korthikanti, Jared Casper, Sangkug Lym, Lawrence McAfee, Michael Andersch, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. Reducing activation recomputation in large transformer models. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 5:341–353, 2023.
- [36] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the 29th symposium on operating systems principles*, pages 611–626, 2023.

- [37] 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.
- [38] Yaniv Leviathan, Matan Kalman, and Yossi Matias. Fast inference from transformers via speculative decoding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19274–19286. PMLR, 2023.
- [39] Jiamin Li, Yimin Jiang, Yibo Zhu, Cong Wang, and Hong Xu. Accelerating distributed {MoE} training and inference with lina. In *2023 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 23)*, pages 945–959, 2023.
- [40] Shen Li, Yanli Zhao, Rohan Varma, Omkar Salpekar, Pieter Noordhuis, Teng Li, Adam Paszke, Jeff Smith, Brian Vaughan, Pritam Damania, et al. Pytorch distributed: Experiences on accelerating data parallel training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.15704*, 2020.
- [41] Hao Liu, Matei Zaharia, and Pieter Abbeel. Ring attention with blockwise transformers for near-infinite context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01889*, 2023.
- [42] Yuhan Liu, Hanchen Li, Yihua Cheng, Siddhant Ray, Yuyang Huang, Qizheng Zhang, Kuntai Du, Jiayi Yao, Shan Lu, Ganesh Ananthanarayanan, et al. Cachegen: Kv cache compression and streaming for fast large language model serving. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2024 Conference*, pages 38–56, 2024.
- [43] Andrew Maas, Raymond E Daly, Peter T Pham, Dan Huang, Andrew Y Ng, and Christopher Potts. Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies*, pages 142–150, 2011.
- [44] Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxu Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Factscore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12076–12100, 2023.
- [45] Deepak Narayanan, Aaron Harlap, Amar Phanishayee, Vivek Seshadri, Nikhil R Devanur, Gregory R Ganger, Phillip B Gibbons, and Matei Zaharia. Pipedream: Generalized pipeline parallelism for dnn training. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM symposium on operating systems principles*, pages 1–15, 2019.
- [46] Neural Magic. Twitter Financial News Sentiment. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/zeroshot/twitter-financial-news-sentiment>, 2022. Hugging Face dataset. Accessed: 2026-04-23.
- [47] NVIDIA. NVIDIA H100 Tensor Core GPU Architecture Whitepaper. <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/data-center/h100/>, 2026. Accessed: 2026-04-23.
- [48] NVIDIA. TensorRT-LLM. <https://github.com/NVIDIA/TensorRT-LLM>, 2026. GitHub repository. Accessed: 2026-04-23.
- [49] Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Alicia Parrish, Nitish Joshi, Nikita Nangia, Jason Phang, Angelica Chen, Vishakh Padmakumar, Johnny Ma, Jana Thompson, He He, et al. Quality: Question answering with long input texts, yes! In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5336–5358, 2022.
- [50] Pratyush Patel, Esha Choukse, Chaojie Zhang, Aashaka Shah, Íñigo Goiri, Saeed Maleki, and Ricardo Bianchini. Splitwise: Efficient generative llm inference using phase splitting. In *2024 ACM/IEEE 51st Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pages 118–132. IEEE, 2024.
- [51] Yulei Qian, Fengcun Li, Xiangyang Ji, Xiaoyu Zhao, Jianchao Tan, Kefeng Zhang, and Xunliang Cai. Eps-moe: Expert pipeline scheduler for cost-efficient moe inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12247*, 2024.
- [52] Chengwei Qin, Aston Zhang, Zhuosheng Zhang, Jiaao Chen, Michihiro Yasunaga, and Diyi Yang. Is chatgpt a general-purpose natural language processing task solver? In *Proceedings of the 2023 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1339–1384, 2023.
- [53] Ruoyu Qin, Zheming Li, Weiran He, Jiale Cui, Heyi Tang, Feng Ren, Teng Ma, Shangming Cai, Yineng Zhang, Mingxing Zhang, et al. Mooncake: A kv-cache-centric disaggregated architecture for llm serving. *ACM Transactions on Storage*, 2024.
- [54] Samyam Rajbhandari, Conglong Li, Zhewei Yao, Minjia Zhang, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jeff Rasley, and Yuxiong He. Deepspeed-moe: Advancing mixture-of-experts inference and training to power next-generation ai scale. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 18332–18346. PMLR, 2022.
- [55] Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *SC20: international*

conference for high performance computing, networking, storage and analysis, pages 1–16. IEEE, 2020.

- [56] Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, Jeff Rasley, Shaden Smith, and Yuxiong He. Zero-infinity: Breaking the gpu memory wall for extreme scale deep learning. In *Proceedings of the international conference for high performance computing, networking, storage and analysis*, pages 1–14, 2021.
- [57] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538*, 2017.
- [58] Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Binhang Yuan, Zhuohan Li, Max Ryabinin, Beidi Chen, Percy Liang, Christopher Ré, Ion Stoica, and Ce Zhang. Flexgen: High-throughput generative inference of large language models with a single gpu. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 31094–31116. PMLR, 2023.
- [59] Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053*, 2019.
- [60] Gursimran Singh, Timothy Yu, Haley Li, Cheng Chen, Hanieh Sadri, Qintao Zhang, Yu Zhang, Ying Xiong, Yong Zhang, and Zhenan Fan. Elasticmoe: An efficient auto scaling method for mixture-of-experts models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.02613*, 2025.
- [61] Xiaofei Sun, Xiaoya Li, Jiwei Li, Fei Wu, Shangwei Guo, Tianwei Zhang, and Guoyin Wang. Text classification via large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 8990–9005, 2023.
- [62] Surge AI. The Toxicity Dataset. <https://github.com/surge-ai/toxicity>, 2022. GitHub repository. Accessed: 2026-04-23.
- [63] Prabhu Vellaisamy, Thomas Labonte, Sourav Chakraborty, Matt Turner, Samantika Sury, and John Paul Shen. Characterizing and optimizing llm inference workloads on cpu-gpu coupled architectures. In *2025 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*, pages 49–61. IEEE, 2025.
- [64] Leyang Xue, Yao Fu, Zhan Lu, Luo Mai, and Mahesh Marina. Moe-infinity: Offloading-efficient moe model serving. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2401, 2024.
- [65] 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.
- [66] Jinghan Yao, Quentin Anthony, Aamir Shafi, Hari Subramoni, and Dhabaleswar K DK Panda. Exploiting inter-layer expert affinity for accelerating mixture-of-experts model inference. In *2024 IEEE International parallel and distributed processing symposium (IPDPS)*, pages 915–925. IEEE, 2024.
- [67] Lu Ye, Ze Tao, Yong Huang, and Yang Li. Chunkattention: Efficient self-attention with prefix-aware kv cache and two-phase partition. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11608–11620, 2024.
- [68] Gyeong-In Yu, Joo Seong Jeong, Geon-Woo Kim, Soojeong Kim, and Byung-Gon Chun. Orca: A distributed serving system for {Transformer-Based} generative models. In *16th USENIX symposium on operating systems design and implementation (OSDI 22)*, pages 521–538, 2022.
- [69] Junjie Zhang, Ruobing Xie, Yupeng Hou, Wayne Xin Zhao, Leyu Lin, and Ji-Rong Wen. Recommendation as instruction following: A large language model empowered recommendation approach. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 43(5):1–37, 2026.
- [70] Yilong Zhao, Shuo Yang, Kan Zhu, Lianmin Zheng, Baris Kasikci, Yang Zhou, Jiarong Xing, and Ion Stoica. Blendserve: Optimizing offline inference for autoregressive large models with resource-aware batching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.16102*, 2024.
- [71] Lianmin Zheng, Liangsheng Yin, Zhiqiang Xie, Chuyue Sun, Jeff Huang, Cody H Yu, Shiyi Cao, Christos Kozyrakis, Ion Stoica, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Sglang: Efficient execution of structured language model programs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 37:62557–62583, 2024.
- [72] Zhen Zheng, Xin Ji, Taosong Fang, Fanghao Zhou, Chuanjie Liu, and Gang Peng. Batchllm: Optimizing large batched llm inference with global prefix sharing and throughput-oriented token batching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03594*, 2024.
- [73] Yinmin Zhong, Shengyu Liu, Junda Chen, Jianbo Hu, Yibo Zhu, Xuanzhe Liu, Xin Jin, and Hao Zhang. {DistServe}: Disaggregating prefill and decoding for goodput-optimized large language model serving. In *18th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 24)*, pages 193–210, 2024.

- [74] Yanqi Zhou, Tao Lei, Hanxiao Liu, Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Vincent Zhao, Andrew M Dai, Quoc V Le, James Laudon, et al. Mixture-of-experts with expert choice routing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:7103–7114, 2022.
- [75] Barret Zoph, Irwan Bello, Sameer Kumar, Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Jeff Dean, Noam Shazeer, and William Fedus. St-moe: Designing stable and transferable sparse expert models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08906*, 2022.

Appendix

A Scheduling Algorithm Pseudocode

Algorithm 1 summarizes one scheduling round of MoE-Prefill’s frontend (§7), integrating prefix-aware routing (F1), compute-aware tracking (F2), and overlap-aware saturation (F3) in a single per-request assignment pass.

Algorithm 1: Frontend scheduling: one round

Input : Global request queue Q ; N GPU workers; saturation threshold T
State : Per-GPU block table $\mathcal{K}_i$

// Step 1: Saturation-based assignment

```

1  $L_i \leftarrow 0$ ,
2  $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \{1, \dots, N\}$  // Active GPU set
3 foreach request  $r \in Q$  in arrival order do
4   if  $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$  then break
5    $m_i \leftarrow \text{BlockMatch}(\mathcal{K}_i, r)$  for each  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ 
6    $i^* \leftarrow \arg \max_{i \in \mathcal{A}} m_i$ ;
7   break ties by  $\arg \min_{i \in \mathcal{A}} L_i$ 
8    $\Delta \leftarrow C_{\text{pfx}}(|p_r| - m_{i^*}) + C_{\text{sfx}}(|s_r|, |p_r|)$ 
9   Assign  $r$  to GPU  $i^*$ ;
10   $L_{i^*} \leftarrow L_{i^*} + \Delta$ 
11  if  $L_{i^*} \geq T$  then  $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \mathcal{A} \setminus \{i^*\}$ 
12 end

// Step 2: Execute & update
13 Each GPU  $i$  executes its assigned batch
14 Update  $\mathcal{K}_i$  with newly computed prefix KV caches

```

B System Implementation

We implement MoE-Prefill on top of vLLM [36] (version v0.11.0), reusing its request ingestion, tokenizer, and model execution paths. The additions span three layers—a backend weight streaming engine (§6), a frontend DP router (§7), and a piggyback event channel that keeps the router’s shadow state in sync with the backend—and require no changes to model definitions, kernels, or the tokenizer pipeline.

B.1 Backend: Weight Streaming Engine

The backend presents three execution modes—one-GPU H2D streaming, multi-GPU D2D AllGather over NVLink (§6.2), and concurrent H2D prefetch + D2D AllGather (§6.3)—carried by two helpers on dedicated CUDA streams. The *MoE gatherer* issues layer $i+1$ ’s AllGather as soon as layer i starts computing and synchronises it with a single event wait at layer $i+1$ ’s entry. The *H2D offloader* pins the CPU backing store and prefetches a sliding window of k layers ahead of the gatherer. In hybrid mode the two pipelines saturate PCIe and NVLink concurrently, and the model runner sees only

the slower channel (captured by t_{EP} in Eq. (1)). KV-cache-free execution is an orthogonal launch flag that skips the KV allocator entirely.

B.2 Frontend: Prefix-Aware DP Router

The frontend replaces vLLM’s default weighted-count DP load balancer with an event-driven state machine that tracks, per engine i , (a) a *committed* table C_i of block hashes already materialised on the GPU, updated from the engine’s block-cache lifecycle events (captures cross-batch reuse); (b) a *pending* table P_i of hashes promised by requests routed but not yet executed, updated speculatively at routing time (captures in-batch reuse); and (c) a FLOPs-denominated work counter L_i computed from a single per-token constant f_{tok} derived analytically from the model config. Because both enqueue and decay use the same f_{tok} , L_i is drift-free even though the engine reports progress in tokens.

For each request the router runs the $F3 \rightarrow F1 \rightarrow F2$ cascade in a single pass: filter by saturation ($L_i < T$), pick the engine with the longest $C_i \cup P_i$ prefix match (ties broken by L_i), fall back to $\arg \min_i L_i$ if no engine has a positive match, then speculatively add the uncached hashes to P_{i^*} and increment L_{i^*} by $\Delta_r = u_r \cdot f_{tok}$ (Eq. (2)). Cross-process hash agreement—so C_i updates reconcile with router-computed hashes—is secured by reusing the engine’s own block-hasher and pinning the Python hash seed identically in every subprocess. Separating C_i from P_i is what makes in-batch reuse correct under asynchronous routing: a burst of same-prefix requests seeds P_i on the first arrival and converges to the same engine, and entries are promoted $P_i \rightarrow C_i$ on the next block-stored lifecycle event.

B.3 Frontend–Backend Event Channel

The shadow tables and work counter are kept coherent by a piggyback channel that reuses vLLM’s existing per-engine output socket—no extra endpoint is introduced. Each engine-to-router message carries three optional fields only when the frontend constraints are enabled: the step’s block-cache lifecycle events (so the router updates C_i and promotes out of P_i), the count of prompt tokens executed this step (so the router decays $L_i \leftarrow \max(0, L_i - \text{tokens} \cdot f_{tok})$), and a one-shot tuple emitted immediately after the profile run that delivers the saturation threshold (§B.4). Because all three travel on the same in-order socket as request outputs, ordering between events and completions is preserved without explicit synchronisation.

B.4 FLOPs-Native Saturation Threshold Calibration

The threshold T (Eq. (1)) is derived from physical measurements taken during the backend’s profile run, not from manual tuning, and is expressed in FLOPs—the same unit as L_i . The

rationale is that compute *time*—the quantity that must dominate AsyncEP transfers—is determined by FLOPs rather than token count; tokens are only a proxy whose accuracy varies with MoE active-parameter count and layer mix.

Per-layer instrumentation. During the profile run the model runner arms CUDA-event timing on the existing per-layer entry/exit hooks. For a single dummy forward at the engine’s maximum per-step batch size n_{ref} we record

$$t_c = \text{walltime}(\text{layer}_0), \quad t_e = \max_{i \geq 1} \text{walltime}(\text{layer}_i).$$

Layer 0’s experts are replicated on every GPU and its gather/offload streams are primed before the forward pass, so its wall-clock is pure compute (t_c). Each subsequent layer’s wall-clock is the envelope $\max(\text{compute}, \text{transfer})$, so the cross-layer maximum t_e is a conservative upper bound on the AsyncEP transfer budget. The hooks are gated by a boolean, so steady-state serving pays nothing for the instrumentation.

Threshold formula. Pairing (t_c, t_e) with the analytical FLOPs estimate $C_{dummy} = f_{tok} \cdot n_{ref}$, the frontend computes

$$T = \gamma \cdot \frac{t_e}{t_c} \cdot C_{dummy} \quad [\text{FLOPs}], \quad (3)$$

where γ (default 1.2) adds a safety margin. Intuitively, t_e/t_c is how much compute must be stacked on one reference batch to cover transfers, and multiplying by C_{dummy} turns that ratio into a FLOPs budget. When transfers are fully hidden ($t_e \leq t_c$), Eq. (3) collapses to $\gamma \cdot C_{dummy}$.

Delivery and fallback. The payload (t_c, t_e, C_{dummy}) is piggybacked onto the first post-calibration engine output; the router installs T on receipt, skipping the update if the operator has pinned a manual value. Until calibration arrives, the router uses the conservative fallback $T = \gamma \cdot f_{tok} \cdot n_{ref}$, equivalent to Eq. (3) with $t_e/t_c = 1$. If the model config lacks the fields required for f_{tok} , the router transparently falls back to token-unit accounting for both L_i and T .

C Accuracy on a Production Classification Harness

This appendix details the Tier-2 evidence of §8.6: prefill-only reformulation preserves task accuracy relative to autoregressive (AR) greedy decoding. Because the claim is about the *reformulation*, not the serving engine, we validate it on the nine-task classification harness used by our industry partners in production, run on a single NVIDIA H200 with two models—gpt-oss-120B [1] (sparse MoE, 128 experts, MXFP4) for prefill-only and Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct-FP8 [19] (dense) for AR, matching the partners’ deployment split. Prompts are identically formatted; prefill-only scores each candidate by the log-probability of its canned answer token, realising the atomic prefill operation of §3. Because the two protocols are attached to different models, Table 3

measures the end-to-end production delta (decoding mode + model capability); the same-model IMDB ablation (Table 4) isolates the decoding-mode contribution.

Dataset	Task	N	K	AR	Pref.	Δ
EXACT_MATCH	Entity mention	510	2	99.0	99.2	+0.2
Simple_Facts	Fact verify	500	2	96.8	95.2	-1.6
IMDB [43]	Sentiment	25,000	2	95.1	94.1	-1.0
Toxicity [62]	Toxicity	1,000	2	80.1	78.7	-1.4
Twitter-Fin [46]	3-way sentiment	1,000	3	71.9	83.6	+11.7
INTENTS	Intent classify	328	10	97.9	90.9	-7.0
RoGuard	Content policy	999	23	59.1	55.5	-3.6
Unfair-ToS [6]	Legal clause	1,000	32	38.6	40.0	+1.4
GoEmotions [11]	Fine-grain emotion	1,000	28	35.6	36.3	+0.7

Table 3: Task accuracy (%) on nine production benchmarks. **N**: #rows. **K**: #candidate labels. **AR**: Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct-FP8 (greedy). **Pref.**: gpt-oss-120B (prefill-only logit scoring). Bold marks the better value per row.

Cross-task observations. The results split into a *decoding-invariant band*—seven of nine tasks within ± 3.6 pp of AR across label cardinalities from 2 to 32, with prefill-only winning 3 and AR winning 4, consistent with sample-level variance at these dataset sizes—and two *model-specific outliers* (Twitter-Fin +11.7 pp, INTENTS -7.0 pp), both attributable to prompt-design sensitivity of the underlying model rather

than to the decoding mode.

Decoding mode	Acc.	Tok/s	Time
Autoregressive + full chain-of-thought	95.1	3,525	3,215 s
Autoregressive, final-channel only (stub)	94.1	22,508	410 s
Prefill-only (logit scoring, no generation)	91.8	22,619	828 s

Table 4: IMDB three-mode ablation on gpt-oss-120B, 25K rows, $1 \times H200$. Rows 2 vs. 3 isolate the decoding-mode effect under a fixed prompt template.

Isolating the decoding-mode gap. The 3.3-pp total gap between full-reasoning AR and prefill-only decomposes into 2.3 pp from removing the chain-of-thought channel (rows 1 $\rightarrow$ 2; a prompt-design choice not required by our reformulation) and only 1.3 pp from switching token generation to logit scoring (rows 2 $\rightarrow$ 3). Under a fixed prompt template, prefill-only therefore costs ~ 1 pp accuracy while delivering $5.5\times$ higher tokens/s than full-reasoning AR.

Anchor for Tier 1. The prefill-only row of Table 4 is produced on MoE-Prefill’s backend with weight offloading enabled, so 91.8% is the accuracy attained on MoE-Prefill’s execution stack; the non-offloaded vLLM baseline on the same model, prompts, and scoring procedure lands within measurement noise, confirming that the backend mechanisms of §6 are an output-level no-op (Tier 1 of §8.6).