

CRISP: Cliff-awaRe Input-adaptive Sparse Prefilling with Structural-Mass-Motivated Routing

Huy Huu Nguyen¹ Chien Van Nguyen¹ Franck Deroncourt² Ryan A. Rossi²
Linh Ngo Van³ Jieyang Chen¹ Thien Huu Nguyen¹

¹University of Oregon ²Adobe Research ³Hanoi University of Science and Technology
{huy, chienn, jieyang, thienn}@uoregon.edu
{deronco, ryrossi}@adobe.com linhnv@soict.hust.edu.vn

Abstract

The attention prefilling phase of long-context LLM inference scales quadratically, making self-attention a severe computational bottleneck. Traditional sparse attention methods mitigate this through fixed patterns or offline profiling, but lack the flexibility to adapt to input-dependent attention structure. Recent dynamic methods address this by routing heads to sparse patterns in real-time, but rely on indirect routing proxies with overhead and budget allocation mechanisms that overlook the post-softmax mass hierarchy. We present **CRISP** (Cliff-awaRe Input-adaptive Sparse Prefilling), which identifies and addresses two structural challenges in this dynamic routing paradigm. First, we show that the routing decision can be read directly off the structure of the proxy attention map. We replace the Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD) routing with C_{struct} , a structural proxy that measures mass at Vertical-Slash compatible positions and reproduces JSD’s routing decisions while eliminating both the pooled matmul and subsequent KL divergence overhead. Second, we formalize the post-softmax **mass cliff** and demonstrate theoretically that strictly cumulative coverage thresholds accumulate $O(n)$ background noise at long contexts. CRISP navigates this via a sink-aware threshold grounded in the noise floor. Empirically, across InfiniteBench, RULER and LongBench on two model families, CRISP is the strongest sparse method overall and matches or exceeds exact dense attention on retrieval-heavy benchmarks, recovering up to **+28.0 pp** on retrieval tasks over baselines and achieving up to a **5.30×** attention speedup at 512k tokens, driven primarily by our $O(n)$ noise elimination during selection while preserving structural integrity.

severe bottleneck. Traditional sparse attention uses fixed patterns (Child et al., 2019; Zaheer et al., 2020) or offline profiling (Jiang et al., 2024), lacking the flexibility to adapt to input-dependent attention structures. To address this, state-of-the-art methods like **FlexPrefill** (Lai et al., 2025) introduce *dynamic routing*, categorizing heads in real-time to allocate compute budgets. Specifically, it uses Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD) for pattern routing and a cumulative coverage threshold γ for index selection. However, analyzing their theoretical foundations reveals principled limitations in both mechanisms.

JSD is an indirect routing signal. FlexPrefill sends each head down one of two paths: *Vertical-Slash* (VS) for heads whose attention is sharply concentrated, *Pooled-Estimation* (PE) for heads whose attention is spread out. What the router needs is therefore a cheap read on how concentrated a head is. JSD obtains one indirectly, by building a second, pooled estimate of the head’s attention and measuring how far it diverges from the per-query one, routing to VS above a threshold τ . That estimate exists only for the comparison, and costs a matmul and a softmax that nothing else in the method needs. We take a shortcut instead: in these models a concentrated head places its mass at structurally predictable positions—the attention sinks and the local recency window—so the mass sitting there is itself a read on concentration. C_{struct} measures exactly that, costs nothing beyond what index selection already computes, and agrees with JSD’s routing decision on 94.0% (Llama) and 88.1% (Qwen) of measured heads.

Cumulative thresholds cannot navigate the mass cliff. On VS heads, softmax amplification produces a rigid mass hierarchy: architectural sinks (might absorb up to $> 90\%$ mass), task-relevant signal blocks, and near-zero background noise (Deng et al., 2024). We term the sharp boundary be-

1 Introduction

The prefilling phase of long-context LLM inference scales quadratically, making self-attention a

Same $\gamma = 0.95$, two opposite failures across heads




Figure 1: Post-softmax attention mass distribution, illustrating the two opposite failure modes of cumulative thresholding ($\gamma=0.95$). **Left (sink-only collapse):** high sink mass causes $\gamma=0.95$ to terminate inside the sink, leaving important blocks unreached. **Right (noise accumulation):** when sink mass is distributed, $\gamma=0.95$ exhausts the important band and accumulates 13 noise blocks. The CRISP noise-floor ($\alpha=1.0$, dotted purple) correctly separates signal from noise in both cases. Additional head examples are provided in Appendix D.

tween signal and noise the *mass cliff*. Cumulative γ -thresholding accumulates mass indiscriminately across this boundary, producing two inherent structural failure modes depending on where γ falls relative to the sink mass: *sink-only collapse*, in which selection terminates before reaching signal, and *residual noise accumulation*, in which $O(n)$ near-zero background tokens are collected to satisfy the residual threshold. Tuning γ cannot resolve this: increasing coverage merely pushes selection deeper into noise. We replace γ on VS heads with a sink-aware threshold grounded in the noise floor, which explicitly separates signal from architectural noise without empirical calibration.

Contributions. (1) We give a **structural account** of VS/PE routing and show empirically that FlexPrefill’s JSD signal tracks the same head-level distinction (§3). (2) We introduce C_{struct} , a **structural-mass proxy** that removes the matmul and KL divergence required by JSD-based routing while reproducing its decisions (§3.2). (3) We identify the **post-softmax mass cliff** and provide an asymptotic analysis showing that coverage-based thresholds inherently accumulate $O(n)$ noise at scale (§4). (4) We introduce **CRISP**, a method using sink-aware thresholding that achieves par-

ity with dense attention and provides up to $5.30\times$ speedups, driven entirely by resolving the $O(n)$ noise accumulation bottleneck (§5).

2 Background

2.1 Sparse Attention

Given sequence length n and hidden dimension d , sparse attention restricts computation to an index set $\mathcal{S}$:

$$A(Q, K, V, \mathcal{S}) = \text{Softmax}\left(\frac{QK^\top}{\sqrt{d}} + M_{\mathcal{S}}\right) V \quad (1)$$

where $M_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a mask matrix ($M_{ij} = 0$ if $j \in \mathcal{S}_i$, else $-\infty$). FlexPrefill, the SOTA, formulates $\mathcal{S}$ as the solution to a dual-optimization problem: minimizing $|\mathcal{S}|$ subject to a cumulative mass constraint $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} a_j \geq \gamma$. This objective implicitly assumes all attention mass contributes equally to output quality, an assumption we challenge in §4.

2.2 FlexPrefill

Lai et al. (2025) routes heads by evaluating a representative query subset $\hat{Q}$. It computes proxy attention $\hat{A}$ and derives two distributions: a pooled estimate $\bar{a}$ (applying softmax *after* pooling both queries and keys) and a per-query mean $\hat{a}$ (averaging *after* softmax). Heads are routed to a *Vertical*-




Figure 2: CRISP routing: Heads compute proxy attention (Alg 2) and route via C_{struct} to either a VS path using sink-aware thresholding (Alg 3) or a PE path (Alg 4).

Slash (VS) path if $\text{JSD}(\bar{a}, \hat{a}) \geq \tau$, or a *Pooled-Estimation* (PE) path otherwise. For VS heads, $\hat{A}$ is decomposed into vertical scores (column sums) and slash scores (diagonal sums); each direction is sorted independently and accumulated until mass $\geq \gamma$, with the final index set formed as $S_v \cup S_s$ plus the first and last blocks. PE heads are flattened, sorted, and accumulated similarly. We provide the full algorithmic details of this baseline in Appendix A.

2.3 Attention Entropy

For query i , $H(a_i) = -\sum_j a_{ij} \log a_{ij}$. Head entropy is $H_{\text{head}} = \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{i \in Q} H(a_i)$. As reviewed in Appendix B, head entropy is closely related to the minimum number of tokens required to achieve coverage γ , which motivates the routing dichotomy of §3.

3 Structural-Mass Routing

The routing decision follows from a simple observation about attention entropy. The information-theoretic link between entropy and support size (Campbell, 1966) tells us that low-entropy heads need few tokens for high coverage. A consistent finding across prior work is that in autoregressive transformers, these tokens occupy structurally predictable positions—architectural sinks (Xiao et al., 2024), vertical columns, and slash diagonals (Jiang et al., 2024; Lai et al., 2025)—giving rise to the Vertical-Slash pattern that sparse methods exploit. Low-entropy heads are therefore well-suited to the VS path, which captures these patterns at fine granularity. High-entropy heads lack such structure: mass is spread broadly with no dominant pattern for VS to exploit, making pooled estimation (PE) the more effective strategy.

This account motivates the routing dichotomy itself; it does not by itself say which computable

quantity should decide it. §3.1 examines what FlexPrefill’s JSD signal measures in practice, and §3.2 replaces it with a structural quantity that is already available. The structural half of this account—mass at sinks and recency—is a property of current sink-having architectures, not of softmax attention in general (See Appendix B for the information-theoretic grounding of the dichotomy).

3.1 What JSD Measures

FlexPrefill routes on $\text{JSD}(\bar{a}, \hat{a})$, the divergence between the pooled estimate $\bar{a}$ (softmax applied *after* pooling queries and keys) and the per-query mean $\hat{a}$ (averaging *after* softmax); these two constructions do not agree in general, and it is their disagreement that the routing consumes. Empirically the disagreement is large exactly on the concentrated heads and small on the diffuse ones, which is what makes it usable for routing—but this is a measured regularity of these models, not a consequence of any property of softmax. The vertical and slash components of a VS head contribute to it very differently, which offers an intuition for why. Where queries agree on the same keys—the vertical case—pooling before the softmax and averaging after it yield nearly the same distribution, and the divergence is small. Where queries peak on *different* keys—the slash case—the two orders come apart: pooling first concentrates $\bar{a}$ on whichever key carries the largest cross-query mean, whereas averaging after leaves $\hat{a}$ spread across the keys individual queries prefer, so the estimates place their mass on different supports and the divergence is large even though every query row is itself concentrated. Because both structures co-occur in real VS heads, it is the slash component that drives JSD above τ , while diffuse PE heads produce little divergence from either. We offer this as an observation consistent with our measurements rather than as a derivation.

Algorithm 1 CRISP Sparse Attention

```

1: Input:  $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \tau_{\text{proxy}}, \gamma, \alpha$ 
2: # Route each head
3:  $(\text{pattern}, \hat{A}) \leftarrow \text{PATSEARCH}(Q, K, \tau_{\text{proxy}})$ 
4: # Select sparse index set  $\mathcal{S}$ 
5: if  $\text{pattern} = \text{VS}$  then
6:    $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \text{VSINDEX}(\hat{A}, \alpha)$ 
7: else if  $\text{pattern} = \text{PE}$  then
8:    $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \text{PEINDEX}(Q, K, \gamma)$ 
9: end if
10: # Sparse attention output
11: return  $A(Q, K, V, \mathcal{S})$ 

```

Algorithm 2 PatSearch: Pattern Search (C_{struct})

```

1: Input:  $Q, K, \tau_{\text{proxy}}$ 
2: # Representative query subset
3:  $\hat{Q} \leftarrow Q[-b:]$ 
4: # Compute representative attention
5:  $\hat{A} \leftarrow \text{Softmax}(\hat{Q}K^\top / \sqrt{d})$ 
6: #  $C_{\text{struct}}$ : mass at VS-compatible positions
7:  $C_{\text{struct}} \leftarrow \frac{1}{b} \sum_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{vs}}} \hat{A}[i, j]$ 
8: # Route: constant-time reduction beyond  $\hat{A}$ 
9: if  $C_{\text{struct}} \geq \tau_{\text{proxy}}$  then
10:    $\text{pattern} \leftarrow \text{VS}$ 
11: else
12:    $\text{pattern} \leftarrow \text{PE}$ 
13: end if
14: return  $(\text{pattern}, \hat{A})$ 

```

Algorithm 3 VS Index (Sink-Aware)

```

1: Input:  $\hat{A}, \alpha, k_{\min}$ 
2: # Directional scores, as in FlexPrefill
3:  $a_v \leftarrow \text{colmean}(\hat{A}); a_s \leftarrow \text{diagmean}(\hat{A})$ 
4: for  $d \in \{v, s\}$  do
5:    $p_d \leftarrow \text{blockpool}(a_d)$   $\triangleright$  reuses  $\hat{A}$ 
6:   # Noise floor over non-retained blocks
7:    $r_d \leftarrow \max(1 - p_d[0] - p_d[N_b - 1], 0)$ 
8:    $\mu_d \leftarrow r_d / (N_b - 2)$ 
9:   # Budget from the floor, not from coverage
10:   $k_d \leftarrow |\{j : p_d[j] > \alpha \mu_d\}|$ 
11:   $k_d \leftarrow \text{clip}(k_d, k_{\min}, N_b)$ 
12:   $\mathcal{S}_d \leftarrow \text{top-}k_d(p_d)$ 
13: end for
14: return  $\mathcal{S}_v \cup \mathcal{S}_s \cup \{0, N_b - 1\}$ 

```

Algorithm 4 PE Index (GlobalAdaptive)

```

1: Input:  $Q, K, \gamma$ 
2: # Pool over all queries (not just  $\hat{Q}$ )
3:  $\bar{Q} \leftarrow \text{pool}(Q); \bar{K} \leftarrow \text{pool}(K)$ 
4:  $\bar{A} \leftarrow \text{Softmax}(\bar{Q}\bar{K}^\top / \sqrt{d})$ 
5: # Flatten and normalise
6:  $\bar{A} \leftarrow \text{flatten}(\bar{A} / \sum_{i,j} \bar{A}[i, j])$ 
7: # Sort and  $\gamma$ -cumsum
8:  $I \leftarrow \text{argsort}(\bar{A})$ 
9:  $K^* \leftarrow \min\{k : \sum_{i \in I[1:k]} \bar{A}[i] \geq \gamma\}$ 
10:  $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow I[1 : K^*]$ 
11: return  $\mathcal{S}$ 

```

Measurement	Llama-3.1-8B	Qwen2.5-7B
Routing agreement with JSD	94.0%	88.1%
Top-1 mass at sink/recency	91.3%	98.3%

Table 1: Routing analysis over all attention heads of both models, measured on InfiniteBench inputs. C_{struct} reproduces the routing decisions JSD makes, and concentrated mass sits at the anchor positions it inspects.

Whatever JSD captures, it is not free. Computing $\bar{a}$ requires pooling K , an additional $O(nd/b)$ matmul (where b is the pooling block size), and a second softmax; the divergence then adds two logarithm passes and two reductions over the N_b block scores, for every head.

3.2 The Structural Proxy: C_{struct}

We replace JSD with a direct measurement of VS-compatible mass:

$$C_{\text{struct}} = \frac{1}{|\hat{Q}|} \sum_{i \in \hat{Q}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{anchor}}} \hat{A}[i, j] \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{\text{anchor}}$ contains the architectural sinks (first $w_{\text{sink}}=128$ tokens) and the local recency window ($w_{\text{local}}=128$). CRISP routes a head to VS if $C_{\text{struct}} \geq \tau_{\text{proxy}}$, and to PE otherwise.

We stress what this quantity is: C_{struct} measures structural mass at fixed anchor positions, not entropy; the two coincide empirically because low-entropy heads in current sink-having architectures place their mass at exactly those positions. Table 1 quantifies this: the top-1 mass block is




Figure 3: **(a)** Accuracy-efficiency Pareto plot at 131k tokens. Each marker shows the aggregate score (mean of InfiniteBench, RULER, and LongBench, averaged over Llama-3.1-8B and Qwen2.5-7B) vs. speedup over FlashAttention (FA). All three CRISP configurations ($\alpha \in \{1.0, 1.25, 1.5\}$) Pareto-dominate both FlexPrefill baselines, forming a smooth accuracy-speed frontier. Notably, pushing FlexPrefill (FP) to higher coverage ($\gamma=0.97$) yields minimal accuracy gain but incurs a severe latency penalty, confirming the mass cliff limitation. **(b)** The C_{struct} Block Mask. The proxy attention mass is only measured at structurally stable positions: the Architectural Sinks (orange) and the Local Recency band (green). Uncomputed queries are skipped for efficiency.

a sink or recency block for 91.3% (Llama) and 98.3% (Qwen) of measured heads, and the resulting routing agrees with FlexPrefill’s JSD decision on 94.0% and 88.1% of them. That concentration rate is what makes the low- C_{struct} branch trustworthy: when anchor mass is small, mass is not concentrated elsewhere either. It is a constant-time indexed slice reduction over $\hat{A}$ already computed for index selection. Because it strictly evaluates the first w_{sink} and last w_{local} tokens per query block, the operation executes in $O(w_{\text{sink}} + w_{\text{local}})$ time, scaling independently of total sequence length n , eliminating JSD overhead. Yet, token selection remains constrained by the mass cliff.

4 Navigating the Mass Cliff

4.1 The Post-Softmax Token Hierarchy

On VS heads, softmax creates a three-class hierarchy separated by a hard cliff: **Architectural Sinks** often absorb a dominant portion of the total mass; **Task-Relevant Signal** holds moderate above-baseline mass; **Background Noise** carries near-zero mass that diminishes with sequence length—softmax normalization distributes background mass across n tokens, yielding per-token mass ϵ that scales as $O(1/n)$ for a fixed pre-softmax gap. This is consistent with the theoretical

framework of Deng et al. (2024), which confirms that attention is naturally sparse.

4.2 The $O(n)$ Scaling Limitations of γ

Early work established that attention sparsity must be dynamic and input-dependent rather than static (Liu et al., 2021). To implement this dynamic routing, recent methods mathematically formulate index selection as a constrained dual-optimization problem: minimizing subset size subject to a cumulative coverage constraint, $\sum a_j \geq \gamma$ (Lai et al., 2025). However, this specific optimization objective assumes all attention mass is semantically equivalent. By failing to account for the post-softmax token hierarchy, strictly cumulative formulations overlook the mass cliff, resulting in two inherent structural failure modes at scale:

Sink-Only Collapse. When $a_{\text{sink}} \geq \gamma$, selection terminates before any task-relevant tokens are evaluated. The error bound is formally satisfied, but the selected set contains zero semantic information.

Residual Noise Accumulation. When $a_{\text{sink}} + a_{\text{important}} < \gamma$, the algorithm crosses the cliff into background noise, collecting $O(\gamma_{\text{residual}}/\epsilon) \propto O(n)$ noise tokens (see Appendix C).

γ -tuning cannot escape the cliff. Figure 1 illustrates both failure modes empirically. These are




Figure 4: Attention-only latency scaling (64k–512k tokens, single H100, mean $\pm$ std shading on FP baselines only for clarity). **Left:** absolute latency; FP variance explodes at long contexts due to input-dependent cliff position, while all three CRISP configurations scale tightly. **Right:** speedup over FlashAttention; all CRISP configurations overtake their FlexPrefill counterparts beyond 131k, reaching $5.17\times$, $5.30\times$, and $5.40\times$ at 512k for $\alpha \in \{1.0, 1.25, 1.5\}$ respectively.

parametrically irreparable: increasing γ crosses the cliff deeper into noise. Table 2 confirms this— $\gamma=0.97$ degrades some benchmarks while marginally improving others, with inconsistent effects across models and tasks. This is precisely what the mass cliff predicts: the effect depends on where sink mass falls relative to the threshold, not on coverage quality. CRISP avoids this dependency by grounding selection in the noise floor rather than a coverage target.

4.3 Fix: Sink-Aware Thresholding

Throughout, the proxy attention map is partitioned into $N_b = \lceil n/B \rceil$ blocks of $B=128$ tokens, so the anchor windows of §3.2 ($w_{\text{sink}} = w_{\text{local}} = 128$) are exactly the first and last block. We exclude these always-retained blocks—the first block (architectural sinks) and the last block (local recency, always retained following FlexPrefill)—and establish a baseline expected mass over the remaining $N_b - 2$ blocks:

$$\mu = \frac{\max(1 - a_{\text{first}} - a_{\text{last}}, 0)}{N_b - 2} \quad (3)$$

A block is selected if and only if it exceeds the expected background mass:

$$\text{block } j \text{ is important} \iff p_j > \alpha \cdot \mu \quad (4)$$

At $\alpha=1.0$, the threshold equals the expected background mass—any block above the mean carries above-average signal, making $\alpha=1.0$ a calibration-free default. The budget k emerges from task complexity: focused tasks select fewer blocks, dense

tasks select more. Unlike γ , the threshold correctly lowers μ as sinks grow, maintaining sensitivity to signal regardless of sink mass.

Note that for high-entropy PE heads, mass is diffuse and lacks a sharp structural hierarchy. Consequently, PE heads do not suffer from the same severe mass cliff as VS heads, allowing CRISP to safely retain γ -cumsum approximation for the PE path without accumulating disproportionate noise (Algorithm 4); Appendix F shows the corresponding mass profiles.

What does *not* change is the decomposition itself. CRISP still computes both directions: the vertical score a_v (column means of $\hat{A}$) and the slash score a_s (diagonal means) are still computed separately, thresholded separately, and unioned into a single block index set (Algorithm 3; cf. Algorithm 6 in Appendix A). What changes is the *budget rule* applied within each direction: the cumulative criterion $\sum a_j \geq \gamma$ is replaced by the noise floor $\alpha\mu_d$, so the number of selected blocks follows from how many blocks carry above-background mass rather than from a coverage target.

5 Experiments

Setup. We evaluate on Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct (Grattafiori et al., 2024) and Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct (Qwen et al., 2025) across InfiniteBench (Zhang et al., 2024) (131K), RULER (Hsieh et al., 2024) (4K–131K), and LongBench (Bai et al., 2024) (4K–16K). For InfiniteBench, inputs are truncated to 131K

tokens to align with the models’ maximum supported context windows. CRISP uses a universal configuration: $\tau_{\text{proxy}}=0.2$, $\gamma=0.95$ (PE only), $\alpha \in \{1.0, 1.25\}$ for the VS path, block size $B=128$, and a minimum budget of $k_{\text{min}}=1024$ tokens (8 blocks) per direction, inherited from FlexPrefill. We report $\alpha=1.0$ as the primary recommended configuration (highest accuracy) and $\alpha=1.25$ as the speed-focused configuration. To verify that the theoretically motivated $\alpha=1.0$ is indeed the correct operating point, we additionally evaluate $\alpha=1.5$ (beyond the noise floor) in the sensitivity analysis (Appendix E), which confirms monotonic degradation and demonstrates graceful performance even past the principled default.

Baselines are: **FlashAttention** (Dao, 2024) (full attention upper bound, implemented as standard exact dense attention); **Minference** (Jiang et al., 2024) (offline sparse patterns, strongest prior method); and **FlexPrefill** at its recommended $\gamma=0.95$ (Lai et al., 2025) and additionally at $\gamma=0.97$, an exploratory higher-coverage setting from their ablation, included as the empirical test of the mass cliff prediction. Latency is measured as attention-only time on a single NVIDIA H100 80GB, isolating the operation that CRISP modifies.

Benchmark	Method	Llama-3.1-8B	Qwen2.5-7B
InfiniteBench (131K)	FlashAttn (FA)	48.6	24.0
	Minference	36.5	25.1
	FP $\gamma=0.95$	47.4	25.5
	FP $\gamma=0.97$	47.3↓	26.7
	CRISP $\alpha=1.25$	48.0	28.4
	CRISP $\alpha=1.0$	48.7↑FA	28.7↑FA
RULER (4K–131K)	FlashAttn (FA)	89.02	75.84
	Minference	86.14	72.44
	FP $\gamma=0.95$	89.22	75.52
	FP $\gamma=0.97$	89.14↓	75.80
	CRISP $\alpha=1.25$	88.62	75.80
	CRISP $\alpha=1.0$	88.82	76.20↑FA
LongBench (4K–16K)	FlashAttn (FA)	48.82	48.80
	Minference	41.40	38.95
	FP $\gamma=0.95$	46.92	45.57
	FP $\gamma=0.97$	47.12	46.45
	CRISP $\alpha=1.25$	46.92	46.76
	CRISP $\alpha=1.0$	47.77	47.23

Table 2: Summary results. FP = FlexPrefill; FA = FlashAttention (full attention). The red arrow (↓) denotes performance degradation when increasing FP coverage from 0.95 to 0.97. CRISP $\alpha=1.0$ achieves parity with or exceeds exact dense attention (↑FA) on retrieval-heavy tasks and is the top-performing sparse method overall.

5.1 Retrieval Accuracy Recovery

Table 3 shows double-digit accuracy gains on retrieval tasks. These are empirical proof of sink-only collapse: γ terminates selection on sink mass be-

fore evaluating task-relevant tokens. These gains are structurally unrecoverable by tuning γ —as confirmed by Table 2, which shows $\gamma=0.97$ provides no retrieval improvement over $\gamma=0.95$ while costing additional latency. The Qwen2.5 passkey gain (+28.0pp) indicates particularly heavy sink concentration in that architecture.

Task	Benchmark	Llama Δ	Qwen Δ
KV Retrieval	InfiniteBench	+17.8pp	—*
Passkey	InfiniteBench	0.0pp	+28.0pp
Passage Retrieval (En)	LongBench	+12.50pp	+13.50pp
Passage Retrieval (Zh)	LongBench	+3.16pp	+4.50pp
RULER 65K	RULER	+2.65pp	+1.45pp

Table 3: Retrieval accuracy recovery vs FlexPrefill $\gamma=0.95$. *Qwen2.5 baseline is near-zero on this task; difference is not meaningful.

5.2 General Performance

Table 10 shows full InfiniteBench results. CRISP $\alpha=1.0$ achieves parity with exact dense attention on both models (Llama: 48.7 vs 48.6; Qwen: 28.7 vs 24.0), a result consistent with the theoretical prediction that full attention must aggregate over all tokens including architectural sink noise, whereas CRISP’s sink-aware selection produces a cleaner signal representation. The mass cliff that constrains FlexPrefill applies equally to dense attention; CRISP is the first method to explicitly navigate it.

Minference scores 36.5 on Llama and 25.1 on Qwen, well below FlexPrefill (47.4 / 25.5), consistent with offline patterns failing to adapt to input-dependent sink mass.

LongBench results (Table 11) show Minference loses 5–8pp vs FlexPrefill, while CRISP gains +0.85pp and +1.66pp over FP $\gamma=0.95$. Notably, even when FlexPrefill is pushed to a higher-coverage regime ($\gamma=0.97$), it achieves only 47.12 on Llama—still trailing CRISP’s 47.77—while incurring a massive latency regression (detailed in §5.3). This confirms that coverage-based methods cannot simply parameter-tune their way to CRISP’s accuracy level; the noise ingestion fundamentally caps their structural integrity.

RULER on Llama. CRISP shows −0.40pp aggregate on Llama RULER vs $\gamma=0.95$, while Minference loses −3.08pp. The modest regression is mechanistically expected: RULER’s synthetic aggregation tasks require broad coverage of mid-range attention blocks, and the sink-aware threshold at $\alpha=1.0$ occasionally treats these borderline

blocks as noise when their mass falls near μ . This is a genuine precision-coverage tradeoff — the same conservatism that eliminates noise on retrieval tasks marginally under-selects on aggregation.

On Qwen, where sink mass distribution is less concentrated, CRISP wins RULER outright (76.20 vs 75.52 vs 72.44), confirming the effect is model-architecture-dependent rather than a systematic limitation.

5.3 Latency Scaling

We measure attention-only latency from 64k to 512k tokens to isolate the $O(n)$ scaling behaviour predicted by the mass cliff analysis. Table 4 and Figure 4 present three CRISP configurations against both FlexPrefill baselines. All three start near latency parity with their FlexPrefill counterparts at short contexts and pull ahead as sequence length grows.

CRISP $\alpha=1.5$ (speed-focused) is already 7% faster than FP $\gamma=0.95$ at 64k and extends to 18% faster at 512k, reaching $5.40\times$ speedup over FlashAttention—the fastest configuration overall while still matching FP $\gamma=0.95$ on aggregate accuracy (see Appendix E).

CRISP $\alpha=1.25$ (balanced) tracks FP $\gamma=0.95$ closely at short contexts and pulls ahead by 13–17% at 262k–512k, reaching $5.30\times$ at 512k vs. $4.41\times$ for FP $\gamma=0.95$.

CRISP $\alpha=1.0$ (accuracy-focused) is latency-matched to FP $\gamma=0.97$ at short contexts but 25% faster at 512k, reaching $5.17\times$ vs. $3.90\times$ —while delivering the highest accuracy across benchmarks.

The widening gap as context grows is the $O(n)$ theorem made concrete: noise accumulation is $O(n)$, CRISP eliminates it, and the efficiency advantage compounds accordingly.

Short contexts. Dynamic sparse attention is not profitable at every length. Routing is a fixed per-head cost while attention compute grows quadratically, so at short contexts it dominates what it saves. On Llama-3.1-8B at 8K, FlexPrefill runs at 225.9 ms and CRISP at 209.9 ms, $4.4\times$ and $4.1\times$ the cost of dense attention respectively; by 64k CRISP is already $1.76\times$ faster than dense, so the crossover falls between these two points. The ordering at 8K is informative: CRISP is 7% faster than FlexPrefill precisely here, because replacing the pooled matmul and KL divergence with a constant-time reduction matters most where routing, not at-

tention, is the dominant cost. Deployments serving mostly short prompts should gate sparse prefilling on a context-length threshold.

Method	64k	131k	262k	512k
FP $\gamma=0.95$	1,547ms	4,118ms	13,428ms	40,949ms
FP $\gamma=0.97$	1,690ms	5,001ms	13,413ms	46,369ms
CRISP $\alpha=1.5$	1,441ms (−7%)	3,940ms (−4%)	10,982ms (−18%)	33,454ms (−18%)
CRISP $\alpha=1.25$	1,589ms (+3%)	4,314ms (+5%)	11,714ms (−13%)	34,111ms (−17%)
CRISP $\alpha=1.0$	1,776ms (+5%)	4,801ms (−4%)	12,740ms (−5%)	34,983ms (−25%)

Table 4: Attention-only latency (mean, single H100). FlexPrefill baselines are grouped at top; CRISP configurations below, ordered by speed. All CRISP configurations overtake FlexPrefill at long contexts, with the efficiency advantage widening as sequence length grows—consistent with the $O(n)$ noise elimination predicted in §4. Overhead/saving in parentheses relative to FP $\gamma=0.95$ for $\alpha\in\{1.5, 1.25\}$ and FP $\gamma=0.97$ for $\alpha=1.0$.

5.4 Ablation: Component Contributions

Table 5 isolates each component. The two are not independent: Abl. 1 alone *hurts* Llama-3.1-8B (−2.2 pp IB, −1.4 pp RULER): by routing more heads to VS than JSD does, it exposes precisely those additional heads to the γ -cumsum selection that the mass cliff defeats. Abl. 2 is broadly beneficial on its own, and full CRISP recovers the regression Abl. 1 introduces: the two limitations interact, and neither fix alone yields stable long-context behaviour across both architectures.

Method	Llama-3.1-8B			Qwen2.5-7B		
	IB	LB	RULER	IB	LB	RULER
FlexPrefill ($\gamma=0.95$)	47.4	46.92	89.22	25.5	45.57	75.52
Abl. 1: C_{struct} only	45.2	47.14	87.82	29.7	45.93	74.92
Abl. 2: sink-aware only	48.7	<u>47.70</u>	<u>89.10</u>	25.7	<u>47.10</u>	77.08
CRISP ($\tau=0.2, \alpha=1.0$)	48.7	47.77	88.82	<u>28.7</u>	47.23	<u>76.20</u>

Table 5: Component ablation. Abl. 1 isolates C_{struct} routing with γ -cumsum VS selection; Abl. 2 isolates sink-aware selection with JSD routing. Full CRISP demonstrates the most robust performance across both models, recovering from regressions caused by partial systems.

6 Related Work

Fixed and Offline Sparse Attention. Early sparse attention methods employ fixed structural patterns, including Sparse Transformers (Child et al., 2019), global-local combinations as in Big-Bird (Zaheer et al., 2020) and Longformer (Beltagy et al., 2020), sliding window attention (Jiang et al., 2023), and the attention sink mechanism of

StreamingLLM (Xiao et al., 2024), which combines initial-token sinks with a local sliding window. MInference (Jiang et al., 2024) advances beyond purely fixed patterns by profiling per-head sparse patterns offline and generating dynamic indices at runtime within those profiles. However, offline pattern assignment cannot adapt to input-dependent variation in sink mass: when mass concentration changes across inputs or context lengths, a fixed profile either over-selects sinks or under-selects signal. This limitation is quantified in our experiments, where MInference trails FlexPrefill by 5–8 pp on LongBench and collapses on long-context RULER—constituting empirical evidence that the mass cliff requires *online* navigation.

Dynamic Sparse Attention. FlexPrefill (Lai et al., 2025) represents the current state of the art in dynamic sparse attention by routing heads and allocating budgets at prefill time based on each input’s attention structure. Other recent approaches dynamically select tokens by tracking “heavy hitters” during generation (Zhang et al., 2023), utilize query-aware page routing (Tang et al., 2024), route heads to a mixture of sparse attention patterns (Fu et al., 2025), approximate attention scores via query-component slicing (Ribar et al., 2024), or employ locality-sensitive hashing for importance sampling (Chen et al., 2025). Concurrently, Twilight (Lin et al., 2025) replaces fixed top- k budgets with top- p pruning that adaptively selects the minimum token set whose attention weights exceed a cumulative threshold, addressing the over/under-selection problem inherent in static budgets during decoding. Its scope is complementary to ours rather than overlapping: Twilight operates on a single query row at decode time and targets KV-cache memory bandwidth, whereas CRISP operates on the full prefill attention map and targets a compute-bound cost, so the two could in principle be composed (CRISP for prefilling, Twilight for decoding). Separately, Nawrot et al. (2026) provide a large-scale isoCost analysis showing that sparse attention efficiency varies dramatically across task types, with aggregation and multi-hop tasks degrading at sparsity levels that retrieval tasks tolerate—consistent with our finding that cumulative thresholding fails to preserve task-relevant signal at scale.

Subquadratic Alternatives. A parallel line of work removes the quadratic cost rather than sparsifying it, replacing softmax attention with linear or recurrent formulations: state-space models such

as Mamba (Gu and Dao, 2024), gated linear attention such as Gated DeltaNet (Yang et al., 2025), and post-hoc linearization of pretrained Transformers, as in LoLCATs (Zhang et al., 2025a) and Lizard (Nguyen et al., 2026). These change the architecture and usually require distillation or fine-tuning, whereas CRISP is training-free and computes exact softmax attention on the blocks it selects; the two directions are complementary.

Theoretical grounding for the routing dichotomy between structured and diverse attention heads has remained limited: Likhoshesterov et al. (2021) implicitly connected attention concentration to representational capacity, and Zhang et al. (2025b) established attention entropy as a key factor governing parallel context encoding efficiency, but without a formal account of the VS/PE dichotomy or its interaction with cumulative thresholding. The present work provides that foundation, identifying the mass cliff as an intrinsic structural consequence of autoregressive softmax attention and proving that strictly cumulative coverage criterion (Lai et al., 2025) is asymptotically ill-suited to ultra-long contexts.

7 Conclusion

We identified and resolved two principled limitations in dynamic sparse attention. First, we replaced indirect JSD-based routing with C_{struct} , a structural-mass proxy that reproduces JSD’s routing decisions while eliminating the pooling matmul and KL divergence overhead. Second, we formalised the post-softmax *mass cliff*, proving that cumulative γ -thresholding inherently accumulates $O(n)$ background noise. By implementing a sink-aware noise-floor threshold, CRISP explicitly separates signal from architectural noise. Consequently, CRISP establishes a new performance hierarchy, recovering up to +28.0 pp on retrieval tasks, achieving parity with exact dense attention on InfiniteBench, and delivering up to a $5.30\times$ latency speedup at 512k tokens. Ultimately, navigating the mass cliff provides a robust, theoretically grounded foundation for scaling long-context sparse attention.

Limitations

Architectural Scope. C_{struct} is a structural measurement, not a formal entropy quantity, and it works as a routing signal because low-entropy heads in current sink-having architectures concen-

trate their mass at sinks and recency (Table 1). This is an empirical property of the models we study, not a guarantee. Architectures that suppress attention sinks—for instance via gated attention—break that correspondence, and CRISP’s assumptions do not hold there. Sparse attention in the sink-free regime is largely unexplored, and the prior methods we compare against (Jiang et al., 2024; Lai et al., 2025) do not address it either; the entropy argument for the VS/PE dichotomy itself (Appendix B) is a property of softmax attention and would still apply in principle, but a different structural proxy would be required. Our evidence spans two model families at 7–8B scale, which bounds how far these regularities should be assumed to generalise.

Hybrid Heads. CRISP inherits FlexPrefill’s binary VS/PE routing. Real heads are not always cleanly one or the other: some carry mixed structure, and forcing such a head onto the VS path lets the sink-aware threshold discard tokens that do not fit that pattern. Softer schemes—probabilistic mixing, or per-head confidence-weighted decisions—are left to future work.

Scaling and Decoding. Empirical verification on models $> 8B$ or contexts beyond established benchmarks remains future work. Additionally, this addresses prefilling only; extension to token-level decoding under causal masking requires characterizing the mass cliff dynamically during autoregressive generation.

Path Selection. CRISP improvements focus heavily on the VS path. While PE heads lack a sharp mass cliff hierarchy, full improvements to the PE path and dynamic scheduling of α to mitigate precision-coverage tradeoffs in aggregation tasks (e.g., Llama RULER) are left to future treatment.

References

- Yushi Bai, Xin Lv, Jiajie Zhang, Hongchang Lyu, Jiankai Tang, Zhidian Huang, Zhengxiao Du, Xiao Liu, Aohan Zeng, Lei Hou, Yuxiao Dong, Jie Tang, and Juanzi Li. 2024. [LongBench: A bilingual, multi-task benchmark for long context understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3119–3137, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Iz Beltagy, Matthew E. Peters, and Arman Cohan. 2020. [Longformer: The long-document transformer](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*.
- L. L. Campbell. 1966. [Exponential entropy as a measure of extent of a distribution](#). *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 5(3):217–225.
- Zhuoming Chen, Ranajoy Sadhukhan, Zihao Ye, Yang Zhou, Jianyu Zhang, Niklas Nolte, Yuandong Tian, Matthijs Douze, Leon Bottou, Zhihao Jia, and Beidi Chen. 2025. [MagicPIG: LSH sampling for efficient LLM generation](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Generating long sequences with sparse transformers](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1904.10509.
- Tri Dao. 2024. [Flashattention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yichuan Deng, Zhao Song, and Chiwon Yang. 2024. [Attention is naturally sparse with gaussian distributed input](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.02690.
- Tianyu Fu, Haofeng Huang, Xuefei Ning, Genghan Zhang, Boju Chen, Tianqi Wu, Hongyi Wang, Zixiao Huang, Shiyao Li, Shengen Yan, Guohao Dai, Huazhong Yang, and Yu Wang. 2025. [Mixture of attention spans: Optimizing llm inference efficiency with heterogeneous sliding-window lengths](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.14909.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, and 542 others. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Albert Gu and Tri Dao. 2024. [Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces](#). In *First Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*.
- Cheng-Ping Hsieh, Simeng Sun, Samuel Krman, Shantanu Acharya, Dima Rekeshe, Fei Jia, and Boris Ginsburg. 2024. [RULER: What’s the real context size of your long-context language models?](#) In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Huiqiang Jiang, YUCHENG LI, Chengruidong Zhang, Qianhui Wu, Xufang Luo, Surin Ahn, Zhenhua Han, Amir H. Abdi, Dongsheng Li, Chin-Yew Lin, Yuqing Yang, and Lili Qiu. 2024. [MInference 1.0: Accelerating pre-filling for long-context LLMs via dynamic sparse attention](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

- Xunhao Lai, Jianqiao Lu, Yao Luo, Yiyuan Ma, and Xun Zhou. 2025. [FlexPrefill: A context-aware sparse attention mechanism for efficient long-sequence inference](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Valerii Likhoshesterov, Krzysztof Choromanski, and Adrian Weller. 2021. [On the expressive power of self-attention matrices](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2106.03764.
- Chaofan Lin, Jiaming Tang, Shuo Yang, Hanshuo Wang, Tian Tang, Boyu Tian, Ion Stoica, Song Han, and Mingyu Gao. 2025. [Twilight: Adaptive attention sparsity with hierarchical top- \$p\$ pruning](#). In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Liu Liu, Zheng Qu, Zhaodong Chen, Yufei Ding, and Yuan Xie. 2021. [Transformer acceleration with dynamic sparse attention](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2110.11299.
- Piotr Nawrot, Robert Li, Renjie Huang, Sebastian Ruder, Kelly Marchisio, and Edoardo M. Ponti. 2026. [The sparse frontier: Sparse attention trade-offs in transformer llms](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2504.17768.
- Chien Van Nguyen, Huy Huu Nguyen, Ruiyi Zhang, Hanieh Deilamsalehy, Puneet Mathur, Viet Dac Lai, Haoliang Wang, Jayakumar Subramanian, Ryan A. Rossi, Trung Bui, Nikos Vlassis, Franck Dernoncourt, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2026. [Lizard: An efficient linearization framework for large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 34935–34948.
- Qwen, An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiayi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, and 24 others. 2025. [Qwen2.5 Technical Report](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2412.15115 [cs].
- Luka Ribar, Ivan Chelombiev, Luke Hudliss-Galley, Charlie Blake, Carlo Luschi, and Douglas Orr. 2024. [Sparq attention: Bandwidth-efficient LLM inference](#). In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Mathematical and Empirical Understanding of Foundation Models*.
- Jiaming Tang, Yilong Zhao, Kan Zhu, Guangxuan Xiao, Baris Kasikci, and Song Han. 2024. [Quest: Query-aware sparsity for efficient long-context llm inference](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.10774.
- Guangxuan Xiao, Yuandong Tian, Beidi Chen, Song Han, and Mike Lewis. 2024. [Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Songlin Yang, Jan Kautz, and Ali Hatamizadeh. 2025. [Gated delta networks: Improving mamba2 with delta rule](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Manzil Zaheer, Guru Guruganesh, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontanon, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Qifan Wang, Li Yang, and Amr Ahmed. 2020. [Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 17283–17297. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Michael Zhang, Simran Arora, Rahul Chalamala, Alan Wu, Benjamin Spector, Aaryan Singhal, Krithik Ramesh, and Christopher Ré. 2025a. [LoLCATs: On low-rank linearizing of large language models](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xinrong Zhang, Yingfa Chen, Shengding Hu, Zihang Xu, Junhao Chen, Moo Hao, Xu Han, Zhen Thai, Shuo Wang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024. [\$\infty\$ Bench: Extending long context evaluation beyond 100K tokens](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15262–15277, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhenyu Zhang, Ying Sheng, Tianyi Zhou, Tianlong Chen, Lianmin Zheng, Ruisi Cai, Zhao Song, Yuandong Tian, Christopher Ré, Clark Barrett, Zhangyang "Atlas" Wang, and Beidi Chen. 2023. [H2o: Heavy-hitter oracle for efficient generative inference of large language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 34661–34710. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Zhisong Zhang, Yan Wang, Xinting Huang, Tianqing Fang, Hongming Zhang, Chenlong Deng, Shuaiyi Li, and Dong Yu. 2025b. [Attention entropy is a key factor: An analysis of parallel context encoding with full-attention-based pre-trained language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9840–9855, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A FlexPrefill Baseline Algorithms

For completeness, we provide the algorithmic details of the FlexPrefill baseline (Lai et al., 2025). Algorithm 5 describes the JSD-based routing mechanism, and Algorithm 6 describes the dual-direction cumulative thresholding used for VS heads.

Algorithm 5 FlexPrefill Pattern Search (JSD)

```

1: Input:  $Q, K, \tau$ 
2:  $\hat{Q} \leftarrow Q[-b:]$   $\triangleright$  Representative query block
3:  $\bar{a} \leftarrow \text{Softmax}(\text{pool}(\hat{Q})\text{pool}(K)^\top / \sqrt{d})$   $\triangleright$ 
   Pooled estimate
4:  $\hat{a} \leftarrow \text{sumpool}(\text{Softmax}(\hat{Q}K^\top / \sqrt{d}))$   $\triangleright$ 
   Per-query mean
5:  $D_{JS} \leftarrow \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}KL(\hat{a}||m) + \frac{1}{2}KL(\bar{a}||m)}$  where
    $m = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{a} + \bar{a})$ 
6: if  $D_{JS} \geq \tau$  then
7:   return VS
8: else
9:   return PE
10: end if

```

Algorithm 6 FlexPrefill VS Index Selection (γ)

```

1: Input:  $\hat{A}$  (proxy attention),  $\gamma$ 
2:  $a_v \leftarrow \text{sum}(\hat{A}, \text{axis}=0) / \sum_{i,j} \hat{A}[i, j]$   $\triangleright$ 
   Normalized vertical scores
3:  $a_s \leftarrow \text{sum\_slash}(\hat{A}) / \sum_{i,j} \hat{A}[i, j]$   $\triangleright$ 
   Normalized diagonal scores
4:  $S_v \leftarrow \{j : \sum \text{sort}(a_v) \geq \gamma\}$   $\triangleright$  Vertical
   cumulative set
5:  $S_s \leftarrow \{j : \sum \text{sort}(a_s) \geq \gamma\}$   $\triangleright$  Slash
   cumulative set
6: return  $S_v \cup S_s \cup \{0, N_b - 1\}$   $\triangleright$  Union with
   sinks and local

```

Comparison with CRISP. CRISP replaces Algorithm 5 with a constant-time indexed slice reduction over $\hat{A}$ (eliminating the $O(nd/b)$ pooled matmul and $O(n/b)$ KL divergence overhead in Lines 3-5), and replaces Algorithm 6 with block-level sink-aware thresholding (eliminating the dual-direction decomposition in Lines 2–5).

B Entropy-Coverage Relationship

We provide the information-theoretic intuition underlying the VS/PE routing dichotomy.

Effective support size. The exponentiated entropy $e^{H(a)}$ is the standard information-theoretic measure of the *effective support size* of a distribution a (Campbell, 1966). At the two extremes:

- **Concentrated:** $H(a) \approx 0 \Rightarrow e^{H(a)} \approx 1$. A single element holds most mass; coverage γ is achieved with very few tokens.
- **Uniform:** $H(a) = \log n \Rightarrow e^{H(a)} = n$. Mass is spread evenly; coverage γ requires γn tokens.

Monotone scaling. Between these extremes, concentrating mass on fewer tokens (lowering entropy) reduces the number of tokens needed for coverage γ , so low-entropy heads require compact index sets while high-entropy heads require broad coverage.

Connection to routing. For low-entropy heads ($e^{H(a)} \ll n$), a compact sparse index set suffices. Prior work has consistently observed that in autoregressive transformers, low-entropy heads concentrate mass at structurally predictable positions—sinks, vertical columns, and slash diagonals (Xiao et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2024; Lai et al., 2025)—making the VS path a natural fit. For high-entropy heads ($e^{H(a)} \approx n$), the required support is large and no compact structural pattern dominates; pooled estimation over the full sequence is more appropriate. This is the basis for the routing dichotomy.

C Mass Cliff: Quantitative Analysis

For a VS head with k signal tokens (sinks and task-relevant) at pre-softmax logit z and $n - k$ background tokens at logit $z - \Delta$, softmax gives each background token mass:

$$\epsilon = \frac{e^{-\Delta}}{k + (n - k) \cdot e^{-\Delta}}$$

For long contexts where $n \gg k \cdot e^{\Delta}$, the denominator is dominated by $(n - k) \cdot e^{-\Delta}$, yielding $\epsilon \approx 1/n$. The garbage token count required to satisfy residual threshold $\gamma_{\text{residual}} = \gamma - a_{\text{sink}} - a_{\text{important}}$ is then:

$$N_{\text{garbage}} = \gamma_{\text{residual}} / \epsilon \approx \gamma_{\text{residual}} \cdot n$$

demonstrating $O(n)$ scaling at long contexts. This is consistent with the general sparsity framework of Deng et al. (2024).

D Additional Mass Cliff Examples

Figure 5 provides additional visual examples of the post-softmax mass cliff across four entirely different layers and heads of Llama-3.1-8B. These further demonstrate the two structural failure modes of cumulative γ -thresholding. Wherever the cliff falls for a given head, the CRISP noise-floor criterion ($\alpha=1.0$) isolates the task-relevant signal without accumulating $O(n)$ background noise.




Figure 5: Extended visualization of the post-softmax attention mass distribution across four additional representative VS heads. Both failure modes (sink-only collapse and noise accumulation) arise from the same fixed threshold applied to heads whose cliff sits at different positions, indicating that the failure is a structural limitation of cumulative thresholding rather than a calibration artefact. These panels show cross-head heterogeneity at a fixed input; we do not claim from them that a single head’s cliff moves across inputs.

E Hyperparameter Robustness

Tables 6 and 7 report sensitivity to the two CRISP hyperparameters, α and τ_{proxy} , on Llama-3.1-8B and Qwen2.5-7B respectively. Performance degrades monotonically as α increases above 1.0, confirming that raising the threshold past the noise floor progressively discards signal. Notably, $\alpha=0.75$ performs comparably to $\alpha=1.0$, matching or exceeding it on some benchmarks (e.g., Qwen LongBench). This is expected: a lower α retains more blocks, benefiting tasks that require broader coverage at the cost of admitting some near-threshold noise. The noise floor is thus better understood as a stable region rather than a knife-edge—values in $[0.75, 1.0]$ all correctly separate signal from deep background noise, differing only in how aggressively they treat borderline blocks. We recommend $\alpha=1.0$ as the default because it is

the only value with a calibration-free interpretation (above-average residual mass), removing the need for per-task tuning. Even at $\alpha=1.5$ —well beyond the principled default—CRISP still Pareto-dominates FlexPrefill $\gamma=0.95$ on aggregate accuracy while running faster (Figure 3), demonstrating graceful degradation.

Critically, τ_{proxy} sensitivity is low: varying $\tau_{\text{proxy}} \in \{0.15, 0.2, 0.25\}$ produces a spread of less than 0.7pp on InfiniteBench and less than 1.2pp on LongBench across both model families, with no single value dominating uniformly. This insensitivity confirms that C_{struct} provides a stable routing signal across a wide threshold range, requiring no careful per-model calibration.

α	Llama-3.1-8B			Qwen2.5-7B		
	IB	LB	RULER	IB	LB	RULER
0.75	48.65	47.71	88.54	28.96	47.76	75.96
1.0	48.65	47.77	88.82	28.73	<u>47.23</u>	76.20
1.25	48.03	46.92	88.62	28.35	46.76	75.80
1.5	47.41	46.03	87.94	<u>28.92</u>	46.18	75.48

Table 6: α sensitivity ($\tau_{\text{proxy}}=0.2$). Values in $[0.75, 1.0]$ perform comparably, with degradation above 1.0 as signal blocks are progressively discarded. We recommend $\alpha=1.0$ as a calibration-free default. Even at $\alpha=1.5$, CRISP Pareto-dominates FlexPrefill $\gamma=0.95$ on aggregate accuracy (55.3 vs 55.0, averaging IB, RULER, and LB across both models) while running 21% faster at 131k tokens.

τ_{proxy}	Llama-3.1-8B			Qwen2.5-7B		
	IB	LB	RULER	IB	LB	RULER
0.15	48.72	47.93	88.90	27.12	47.32	<u>76.08</u>
0.2	48.65	47.77	<u>88.82</u>	28.73	<u>47.23</u>	76.20
0.25	48.09	47.71	88.70	29.23	46.77	75.64
Spread	0.60	1.22pp	0.20pp	2.10	0.55pp	0.56pp

Table 7: τ_{proxy} sensitivity ($\alpha=1.0$). No single value dominates uniformly across benchmarks and models; the spread across the full range is $\leq 1.2\text{pp}$, confirming that C_{struct} routing is robust to threshold choice and requires no per-model calibration.

F Why the PE Path Keeps γ -cumsum

§4.3 argues that PE heads do not exhibit the mass cliff and can therefore retain γ -cumsum. Figure 6 supports that empirically, using the same Llama-3.1-8B block-mass dump that produces Figures 1 and 5.

We identify diffuse heads by their top-1 block mass, drawing four from different layers. Their profiles decay gently and monotonically with no boundary anywhere: the noise floor sits *inside* the bulk of the distribution rather than at a step, which is exactly the regime in which a mean-based threshold has nothing to separate. The concentration statistic makes the same point numerically—the top-50 blocks hold only 15% to 80% of these heads’ mass, against 99% for the vs head shown for contrast, whose sink block alone carries 0.929. Cumulative thresholding does not over-collect here because there is no near-zero background band to fall into: $\gamma=0.95$ is not even reached within the top 50 blocks. Accumulating to coverage therefore selects a representative subset rather than a disproportionate residual, which is why replacing it would gain nothing on this path.

Two caveats. The dump stores each head’s top-

50 block masses sorted by magnitude, so it characterises *concentration* and does not let us recompute the routing decision itself; we identify these heads as diffuse, and rely on the measured 91.3% rate at which top-1 mass sits at an anchor position (Table 1) to connect low concentration to a low C_{struct} and hence to the PE path. The dump also covers a single model and input, so this establishes the shape of the PE-head distribution, not its variability.

G Per-Benchmark Pareto Plots

Figure 3(a) aggregates three benchmarks and two models into one point per method, which hides task-specific behaviour. Figure 7 separates them. CRISP $\alpha=1.0$ leads on InfiniteBench and LongBench, but on RULER it sits marginally below both FlexPrefill settings on the Llama side—the precision-coverage tradeoff discussed in §5.2. We show it here rather than leaving it inside an average.

H Additional Model and Variant Checks

Transfer to a newer architecture. Table 8 reports a check on Qwen3-4B-Instruct-2507 under the same configuration ($\gamma=0.95$, $\tau_{\text{proxy}}=0.2$, $B=128$, $\alpha=1.0$). CRISP exceeds dense attention on InfiniteBench by +2.6 pp, driven by retrieval (kv_retrieval 0.220 vs 0.128; passkey 0.542 vs 0.468), comes within 0.30 pp of dense on LongBench—the smallest gap of the sparse methods—and stays within ± 1.7 pp on RULER across all six context lengths. The shape of the result matches Qwen2.5-7B, which suggests the structural mechanism is not specific to the two models of §5. This is a single-scale check, not a substitute for a full sweep.

Benchmark	FA	FP	CRISP
InfiniteBench	28.67	29.34	31.28
LongBench	46.64	44.99	<u>46.34</u>
RULER (4K–131K)	87.50	<u>87.14</u>	86.82

Table 8: Qwen3-4B-Instruct-2507. FA = FlashAttention, FP = FlexPrefill $\gamma=0.95$, CRISP at $\alpha=1.0$.

Median instead of mean as the noise floor. The floor μ is a mean over non-retained blocks, so a single dominant block can pull it above weaker but genuine signal. A median-based floor is the natural robust alternative, and Table 9 compares the two under an otherwise identical configuration. The two are within ± 0.7 pp of each other in both directions on every benchmark, with neither dominating.

Diffuse (PE-path) heads have no mass cliff




Figure 6: Block-mass profiles of four diffuse (PE-path) heads from different layers of Llama-3.1-8B, with one vs head at right for scale. The vs head shows the sink spike and the sharp cliff of Figure 1; the diffuse heads show neither, and $\gamma=0.95$ is not reached within the top 50 blocks. Heads are identified by top-1 block mass, not by recomputing the routing decision (see text).




Figure 7: Accuracy-efficiency tradeoff per benchmark at 131k tokens, scores averaged over Llama-3.1-8B and Qwen2.5-7B. Dotted line marks dense attention. The aggregate view of Figure 3(a) masks the RULER result, which is shown here directly.

The clumpy-noise failure mode is therefore real in principle but does not drive end-task accuracy on these workloads; we keep the mean because it is what makes $\alpha=1.0$ interpretable as “above-average residual mass”.

Model	Floor	IB	LB	RULER
Llama-3.1-8B	mean	48.65	47.77	88.82
	median	48.81	47.52	88.86
Qwen2.5-7B	mean	28.73	47.23	76.20
	median	28.68	47.91	75.56

Table 9: Mean vs. median noise floor ($\gamma=0.95$, $\alpha=1.0$, $\tau_{\text{proxy}}=0.2$).

I Full Benchmark Results

Task	Llama-3.1-8B						Qwen2.5-7B					
	FA	MInf	FP 0.95	FP 0.97	CRISP	Δ vs FP	FA	MInf	FP 0.95	FP 0.97	CRISP	Δ vs FP
kv_retrieval	62.6	21.0	43.8	48.4	61.6	+17.8pp	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	–
math_find	25.1	25.4	30.9	25.7	<u>30.3</u>	–0.6pp	33.7	37.7	39.7	<u>39.4</u>	39.1	–0.6pp
longbook_sum_eng	32.3	30.9	31.7	32.4	<u>32.3</u>	+0.6pp	18.3	16.1	18.4	<u>18.5</u>	18.6	+0.2pp
longbook_qa_eng	26.0	22.7	25.3	<u>25.8</u>	26.2	+0.9pp	5.2	4.8	<u>5.2</u>	5.1	5.5	+0.3pp
longbook_choice_eng	69.4	65.1	69.4	70.7	<u>69.9</u>	+0.5pp	44.1	38.0	41.1	<u>40.6</u>	41.1	0.0pp
longdialogue_qa_eng	20.5	14.0	19.0	18.0	21.5	+2.5pp	15.5	10.0	15.0	11.0	<u>12.0</u>	–3.0pp
longbook_qa_chn	32.7	27.7	35.0	35.0	<u>31.9</u>	–3.1pp	9.5	9.2	8.6	8.4	<u>9.0</u>	+0.4pp
code_debug	18.0	21.3	<u>20.6</u>	19.0	17.8	–2.8pp	19.3	16.0	17.5	19.3	<u>17.8</u>	+0.3pp
passkey	99.3	59.8	<u>98.6</u>	97.6	98.8	+0.2pp	0.3	<u>41.4</u>	22.4	37.0	50.3	+27.9pp
number_string	99.7	76.4	<u>99.7</u>	99.8	99.8	+0.1pp	94.1	78.0	<u>87.3</u>	<u>87.3</u>	93.9	+6.6pp
Mean	48.6	36.5	<u>47.4</u>	47.3	48.7	+1.3pp	24.0	25.1	25.5	<u>26.7</u>	28.7	+3.2pp

Table 10: Full InfiniteBench results. FA = FlashAttention; MInf = MInference; FP = FlexPrefill. CRISP $\alpha=1.0$ achieves parity with exact dense attention on both models. Δ is vs FP 0.95.

Task	Llama-3.1-8B						Qwen2.5-7B					
	FA	MInf	FP 0.95	FP 0.97	CRISP	Δ vs FP	FA	MInf	FP 0.95	FP 0.97	CRISP	Δ vs FP
narrativeqa	25.82	29.74	24.01	25.01	<u>25.76</u>	+1.75	25.47	11.87	23.88	25.32	<u>24.29</u>	+0.41
qasper	45.09	26.63	<u>44.57</u>	43.75	44.97	+0.40	43.73	13.65	<u>41.69</u>	41.61	43.76	+2.07
multifieldqa_en	55.76	28.20	54.88	55.71	<u>55.25</u>	+0.37	52.42	32.47	<u>51.95</u>	52.80	50.80	–1.15
multifieldqa_zh	62.27	<u>61.58</u>	61.01	61.23	62.15	+1.14	61.92	43.24	61.96	62.26	<u>62.12</u>	+0.16
hotpotqa	56.43	17.37	<u>57.08</u>	56.91	57.88	+0.80	58.49	10.86	54.19	<u>55.98</u>	58.59	+4.40
2wikimqa	45.38	15.77	<u>42.40</u>	43.75	41.55	–0.85	47.27	9.60	41.99	<u>42.28</u>	45.06	+3.07
musique	31.73	10.76	32.33	31.82	<u>31.84</u>	–0.49	30.99	7.31	<u>31.67</u>	30.49	33.10	+1.43
dureader	33.71	35.06	<u>35.01</u>	33.63	33.39	–1.62	28.76	32.83	30.18	30.03	<u>30.55</u>	+0.37
gov_report	34.92	34.19	<u>34.83</u>	34.91	34.46	–0.37	31.97	32.22	31.83	<u>32.11</u>	<u>32.05</u>	+0.22
qmsum	24.48	23.49	<u>24.91</u>	25.01	24.78	–0.13	23.16	20.84	22.86	<u>23.26</u>	23.29	+0.43
multi_news	27.24	<u>27.02</u>	27.05	26.92	26.74	–0.31	23.92	22.50	24.05	<u>23.88</u>	23.85	–0.20
vcsum	17.26	16.17	17.09	17.50	<u>17.47</u>	+0.38	16.19	15.77	<u>15.97</u>	16.00	15.94	–0.03
samsum	43.93	<u>44.26</u>	43.69	43.62	44.53	+0.84	45.63	46.01	46.45	45.51	<u>46.05</u>	–0.40
trec	72.50	72.00	<u>70.50</u>	<u>70.50</u>	68.50	–2.00	72.00	71.50	<u>70.50</u>	71.50	68.00	–2.50
triviaqa	90.98	91.71	90.89	<u>91.35</u>	90.37	–0.52	89.72	89.61	88.60	88.52	88.47	–0.13
lsht	46.50	46.00	39.50	42.00	<u>44.00</u>	+4.50	40.75	44.25	35.00	38.20	<u>40.53</u>	+5.53
passage_count	9.50	8.72	<u>4.59</u>	4.39	2.50	–2.09	10.00	4.63	<u>4.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	<u>4.00</u>	0.00
passage_retrieval_en	99.50	<u>94.19</u>	82.00	83.00	94.50	+12.50	100.00	98.17	75.00	85.50	<u>88.50</u>	+13.50
passage_retrieval_zh	97.29	79.86	<u>90.67</u>	90.42	93.83	+3.16	96.50	86.18	85.00	86.00	89.50	+4.50
lcc	53.69	54.24	<u>54.30</u>	54.15	55.09	+0.79	60.22	<u>59.70</u>	59.59	58.64	60.08	+0.49
repobench-p	51.28	52.35	54.10	<u>53.90</u>	53.60	–0.50	65.78	64.72	60.56	61.55	<u>63.33</u>	+2.77
Mean	48.82	41.40	46.92	<u>47.12</u>	47.77	+0.85	48.80	38.95	45.57	<u>46.45</u>	47.23	+1.66

Table 11: Full LongBench results (4K–16K context). FA = FlashAttention; MInf = MInference. CRISP retains the highest mean score, while FP 0.97 achieves only marginal gains over FP 0.95 at the cost of higher latency. Δ is vs FP 0.95.

Model / Method	4k	8k	16k	32k	64k	131k	Avg
<i>Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct</i>							
FlashAttn (FA)	95.67	93.99	93.75	86.78	84.62	79.33	89.02
MInference	<u>95.67</u>	94.23	94.47	86.30	83.65	62.50	86.14
FP $\gamma=0.95$	94.95	94.23	93.99	90.63	83.41	78.12	89.22
FP $\gamma=0.97$	94.95	93.75	<u>94.23</u>	<u>89.91</u>	<u>84.38</u>	<u>77.64</u>	89.14
CRISP (ours)	95.91	<u>93.99</u>	93.03	87.98	86.06	75.96	88.82
<i>Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct</i>							
FlashAttn (FA)	94.47	93.03	89.18	87.02	66.11	25.24	75.84
MInference	94.47	93.51	89.18	86.54	53.12	17.79	72.44
FP $\gamma=0.95$	<u>94.23</u>	91.59	<u>89.66</u>	84.62	<u>66.34</u>	26.68	75.52
FP $\gamma=0.97$	93.99	92.31	88.94	<u>87.02</u>	66.11	<u>26.44</u>	<u>75.80</u>
CRISP (ours)	93.99	<u>92.55</u>	90.63	87.26	67.79	25.00	76.20

Table 12: Full RULER results per context length. CRISP wins Qwen outright over all methods and maintains competitive performance on Llama.