



Deriving Scaling Laws for OpenEuroLLM Models: Learning Rate, Batch Size and Loss

Niccolò Ajroldi^{1,9}, Diana Alexandra Onuțu^{2,9}, Haider Al-Tahan^{1,3,9}, Jörg Franke^{1,4,6,7,9},
Sampo Pyysalo^{8,9}, Jenia Jitsev^{5,6,7,9}, and Aaron Klein^{1,9}

¹ELLIS Institute Tübingen, ²Eindhoven University of Technology, ³Georgia Institute of Technology,
⁴University of Freiburg, ⁵Jülich Supercomputing Center (JSC), ⁶LAION, ⁷Open-Ψ (Open-Sci) Collective,
⁸University of Turku, ⁹OpenEuroLLM

Abstract

We study the scaling behavior of learning rate and batch size in pretraining dense large language models on English-prevalent corpora. Beyond scaling *jointly optimal* learning rates and batch sizes, we investigate their *marginal* evolution with model capacity and data scale and develop a model that captures these relationships. As we employ a Warmup-Stable-Decay learning rate schedule, we further investigate the gains from learning rate annealing over a broad range of hyperparameters settings, models and data budgets, and whether the optimal learning rate and batch size *transfer* between the stable and decay phases. Finally, we characterize the dependence of loss on model capacity and dataset size, evaluating recently proposed scaling forms that explicitly model their interaction. We find these approaches particularly effective at capturing both undertraining and overtraining regimes across our experiments. This study establishes a first baseline and scaling procedure for the development of future OpenEuroLLM models. We open-source the complete collection of pretraining runs used in this study.

1 Introduction

Scaling optimal hyperparameters. Pretraining Large Language Models (LLMs) at scale requires making informed decisions about how models, data, and training configurations should grow. Among these, a critical component of successful pretraining recipes is the choice of learning rate and batch size, which not only affects training efficiency but is also crucial for deriving accurate scaling laws [[Lourie et al., 2026](#)]. To ensure that measured performance reflects the architecture and dataset scaling properties rather than hyperparameter mistuning, it is important to understand how optimal learning rates and batch sizes themselves scale with models size and training horizons. Whereas early work focused on the *critical* batch size [McCandlish et al., 2018, Merrill et al., 2025, Bergsma et al., 2025], more recent approaches have investigated how the *optimal* batch size scales with number of parameters, data, compute, or combinations thereof [Hu et al., 2024, DeepSeek-AI, 2024, Li et al., 2025b, Rütte et al., 2026]. On the other hand, learning rate (LR) scaling has been studied both theoretically and empirically, with muP [Yang et al., 2021] providing a principled framework for transferring optimal learning rates across model scales. In parallel, several works have characterized scaling laws for the optimal learning rate, both with and without muP parameterization [Shen et al., 2024, Porian et al.,

2025]. In this report, we present an extensive study of learning rate and batch size scaling. Rather than considering only their joint optimum, we distinguish between their *joint* and *marginal* scaling behavior, and develop models for both. In addition, leveraging this extensive set of training runs, we investigate how optimal hyperparameters are systematically affected by learning rate *annealing* under modern Warmup-Stable-Decay (WSD) learning rate schedule.

Performance prediction. With appropriate hyperparameters in place, scaling laws can characterize how model performance evolves with scale. Laws of this kind have been used to predict performance at larger scales, to derive compute-optimal boundaries [Kaplan et al., 2020, Hoffmann et al., 2022], and as a mean of comparison to evaluate models [Nezhurina et al., 2025b] and datasets [Nezhurina et al., 2025a]. To better capture the dependencies between model and data scale, and better account for overtrained and undertrained models, recent works have explored functional forms beyond the well-known Chinchilla formulation [Hoffmann et al., 2022, Videau et al., 2026]. In this work, we explore this dependence by fitting to a suite of training runs spanning a broad range of model and data scales. As developing scaling laws is challenging [Li et al., 2025c] and their results can be difficult to reproduce [Besiroglu et al., 2024], we open-source our training data and code to foster further research.

The remainder of this technical report is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the experimental setting; Section 3 derives scaling laws for optimal learning rate and batch size; Section 4 analyzes the effect of LR annealing on loss and hyperparameters; Section 5 studies scaling laws for cross entropy loss; Section 6 evaluates models on downstream tasks; and Section 7 concludes.

2 Experimental Setting

Data. We train all models on the high-quality subset of the Nemotron-CC dataset [Su et al., 2025], motivated by the strong empirical performance of such data mix reported by Nezhurina et al. [2025a]. Our experiments span up to 300 billion tokens (BT), and use the GPT-NeoX-20B tokenizer [Black et al., 2022]. Unless otherwise specified, all experiments use the same data stream and initialization seed. Validation loss is measured on a common held-out set containing 204,800 sequences (0.838BT). Throughout this work, “loss” and L always refer to the *validation loss*.

Models. We train dense decoder-only transformers ranging from 47 million (M) to 1.7 billion (B) parameters, including embedding parameters. All models use a vocabulary size of 50304, FFN expansion factor 4, GLU activations [Shazeer, 2020], attention bias terms, QK normalization [Henry et al., 2020], and tied input-output embeddings, akin to the model designs of Nezhurina et al. [2025a]. Model sizes are given in Table 1 and spaced approximately geometrically in parameter count, with a fixed head dimension of 64 and a width-to-depth ratio that increases moderately with scale, following common practice for decoder-only transformers [Kaplan et al., 2020].

Table 1: Model architectures.

Model dimension	384	576	896	1280	1536	2048
Attention heads	6	9	14	20	24	32
Layers	12	18	20	20	24	24
FFN dimension	1536	2304	3584	5120	6144	8192
Total parameters	47.6M	124.5M	301.9M	588.5M	983.1M	1.713B

Training configuration. Training is carried out with AdamW [Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019], coupled with a Warmup-Stable-Decay (WSD, or trapezoidal) learning rate schedule [Zhai et al., 2022, Hu et al., 2024]. We train for up to 300BT and perform intermediate decays at $D = 6, 12, 20, 30, 50, 80, 120, 200$ BT. We decay the learning rate over the final 20% of each target token budget D , always annealing to a final

learning rate of 10^{-5} . We employ WSD due to its lower training cost [Hägele et al., 2024] compared to a cosine schedule, estimating a cost reduction of roughly *half* for our experimental configuration. We use a fixed warmup of 2000 steps, following common practice [Bakouch et al., 2025]. We train all models on AMD Instinct MI250X GPUs, using Megatron-LM [Shoeybi et al., 2019], and use `autoexperiment`¹ orchestrator to schedule experiments.

Hyperparameter grid. We employ batch sizes b $\log_2$ -spaced in the range 2^4 to 2^{10} , and learning rates values $\eta \in \{.00025, .0005, .001, .002, .004\}$, forming a learning rate–batch size grid for each N, D pair². Since we train across different batch sizes b with a fixed warmup duration, we exclude (b, D) combinations that would result in a warmup longer than 30% of D , to avoid degenerate LR schedules and ensure the peak learning rate is reached and sustained for a meaningful portion of training.

Open-source. We release the complete collection of pretraining runs used in this study, including both model checkpoints³ and the corresponding loss and downstream evaluations⁴. The collection spans a broad range of model sizes, token budgets, learning rates, and batch sizes, providing a resource for reproducing our analyses and studying the scaling behavior of optimization hyperparameters.

3 Scaling Hyperparameters

We aim to study how the optimal batch size and learning rate vary across model sizes and token budgets. Before proceeding, we describe the loss smoothing procedure used to obtain more reliable estimates of the optimal hyperparameters. With this procedure in place, we consider *both* the jointly optimal learning rate and batch size and the optima obtained when fixing one hyperparameter and optimizing the other. We then characterize these trends by fitting power laws and evaluate their predictive accuracy on held-out 1.7B models trained across a range of data budgets. Unless otherwise specified, confidence and prediction intervals are computed analytically under the fitted parametric model using a significance level of 0.05.

3.1 Smoothing




Figure 1: Validation loss vs learning rate and batch size for $N = 0.13B$, $D = 120BT$. **First column:** raw observations and empirical minima ($\star$). **Second and third columns:** estimated quadratic function in η, b (Equation 1), together with the predicted joint optima ($\star$) from Equation 2.

To obtain reliable estimates of the optimal hyperparameters for each model size and data budget, we smooth the validation loss surface. This serves two purposes. First, as loss measurements are

¹<https://github.com/SLAMPAI/autoexperiment>

²We avoid training at all (η, b) combinations for each (N, D) ; instead, we prefer larger batch sizes for larger token budgets and smaller b for smaller D values, always ensuring that the empirical optimum (η^*, b^*) does not lie on the boundary of the grid.

³https://huggingface.co/openneurorollm/dense_english_scaling_laws

⁴https://github.com/OpenEuroLLM/dense_english_scaling_laws

collected on a relatively coarse grid of learning rates and batch sizes, smoothing provides a continuous approximation of the loss surface, that can better capture shifts in the optimum across N and D . Second, as validation loss is inherently noisy due to data ordering, random initialization, and finite validation-set sampling, we argue that smoothing can reduce the variance of the optimal hyperparameter estimates relative to empirical optima selection. We refer to [Subsection A.2](#) for an analysis of the sensitivity and robustness of the smoothing procedure.

In line with previous work [[Li et al., 2025b](#), [Lourie et al., 2025, 2026](#)], we find that the loss can be well approximated by a quadratic function of the learning rate and batch size around the optima:

$$L(\eta, b|N, D) = \beta_0 + \beta_1\eta + \beta_2\eta^2 + \beta_3b + \beta_4b^2 + \beta_5\eta b + \epsilon, \quad \forall N, D. \quad (1)$$

We estimate $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_5$ for each N, D using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS), and use the fitted values to predict the optimal hyperparameters:

$$\eta^*, b^*|N, D = \arg \min_{\eta, b} \hat{L}(\eta, b|N, D), \quad \forall N, D. \quad (2)$$

Fixing one hyperparameter, η or b , allows us to obtain a quadratic loss function in the other, which we can use to predict the optimal hyperparameters conditionally on one another⁵:

$$\eta^*|b, N, D = \arg \min_{\eta} \hat{L}(\eta, b|N, D) \quad \forall b, N, D; \quad b^*|\eta, N, D = \arg \min_b \hat{L}(\eta, b|N, D) \quad \forall \eta, N, D. \quad (3)$$

Note that smoothing introduces an additional source of uncertainty, since the smoothed estimates are themselves obtained through a fitting process. We acknowledge this limitation and, for simplicity, condition on the smoothed estimates when quantifying uncertainty in the subsequent scaling law fits.

3.2 Scaling Jointly Optimal Learning Rate and Batch Size

As previously discussed, and similarly to [Li et al. \[2025b\]](#), we consider the jointly optimal learning rate and batch size, (η^*, b^*) , obtained from the quadratic smoothing in [Equation 2](#). We observe approximately linear trends in log-space and therefore fit the following models:

$$\log b^*(N, D) = \alpha_1 + \beta_1 \log N + \gamma_1 \log D + \varepsilon_1, \quad (4)$$

$$\log \eta^*(N, D) = \alpha_2 + \beta_2 \log N + \gamma_2 \log D + \varepsilon_2, \quad (5)$$

where ε_1 and ε_2 denote the regression errors. The two models are estimated independently and thus do not explicitly model any covariance between residuals.

Batch size. The fitted model in [Equation 4](#) explains 93.6% of the variance in the observed optimal batch sizes. We find a strong positive scaling of the optimal batch size with respect to D (0.46). Differently from [[Li et al., 2025b](#)] and [[Bergsma et al., 2025](#)], we find a weak but positive and statistically significant effect of N on the optimal batch size ($\hat{\beta}_1 = 0.145$). We depict the data and fitted models in [Figure 2](#). Rewriting the fitted equations as power laws, we obtain the following equation:

$$\hat{b}^*|N, D = 0.000099 N^{0.145} D^{0.460}. \quad (6)$$

⁵Notice that, instead of slicing [Equation 1](#) to obtain one-dimensional quadratic fits, one could fit independent one-dimensional quadratics, as in [Bjorck et al. \[2025\]](#). We instead use the two-dimensional fit because some b values have only 3–4 learning rate observations, whereas each N, D pair has at least 15 points in the η, b grid, providing more degrees of freedom and thus more robust estimates. [Figure 1](#) shows an example of the data and the fits.




Figure 2: Scaling laws for jointly optimal batch size (Equation 6) and learning rate (Equation 7).




Figure 3: **Prediction accuracy on held-out 1.7B model** of joint optimal learning rate and batch size scaling laws. We report empirical optima ($\star$) and minima of the fitted quadratic surface ($\star$). Cyan circles and error bars denote the predicted optima with marginal parametric 95% prediction intervals.

Learning rate. Despite some clear deviations from the fits in Figure 2, the linear model captures 79.2% of the variance in the data. The optimal learning rate scales strongly with respect to N (0.417) and exhibits a weaker dependence on D (0.0862), which nevertheless appears statistically significant after bootstrap testing, yielding a p -value of 0.0055. Comparing the estimated coefficients with Li et al. [2025b], we find smaller scaling exponents for both D and N . The fitted coefficients with respect to N are however close to the work from Porian et al. [2025]. The final proposed model is:

$$\hat{\eta}^*|N, D = 0.371396 N^{-0.417} D^{0.0862} \quad (7)$$

Table 2: Comparison of scaling laws for optimal batch size and learning rate.

	Batch size	Learning rate
Porian et al. [2025]	$0.00037 N^{0.703}$	$3.7 N^{-0.36}$
Li et al. [2025b]	$0.58 D^{0.571}$	$1.79 N^{-0.713} D^{0.307}$
Bergsma et al. [2025]	$0.0306 D^{0.383}$	—
This work	$0.000099 N^{0.145} D^{0.460}$	$0.371396 N^{-0.417} D^{0.0862}$

Prediction accuracy on held-out samples. To assess the predictive power of these scaling laws, we validate them on the held-out 1.7B model. The predicted joint optima closely match the empirical optima observed on the learning rate–batch size grid (Figure 3a), yielding a mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) of 37% and 22% for η and b respectively. More interestingly, since the regressions are fitted to optima obtained after quadratic smoothing, we repeat the smoothing procedure on the held-out data and compare the predictions against the minima of the fitted quadratics (Figure 3b). The predicted optima closely match these smoothed estimates, with MAPEs of 28% and 10% for η and b , with all predictions falling within the corresponding parametric prediction intervals.

3.3 Scaling Optimal Learning Rate with Arbitrary Batch Size

Why arbitrary batch sizes? Jointly optimizing the learning rate and batch size is a standard approach and a common setting in recent work [DeepSeek-AI, 2024, Li et al., 2025b, Bergsma et al., 2025]. In practice, however, the batch size may be constrained by the available hardware resources, memory capacity, and parallelization strategy, and is therefore often set to *maximize training throughput*. Moreover, the jointly optimal scaling laws derived in the previous section often predict relatively small batch sizes (e.g., only ~ 1.6 M tokens for a 1.7B-100BT model), which may not fully utilize modern accelerators. In this scenario, when using a different batch size from the jointly optimal one, the scaling laws from Subsection 3.2 *no longer prescribe the optimal learning rate*. We therefore study the scaling of optimal LR at arbitrary batch sizes. Although scaling the optimal batch size for a given learning rate is not a common scenario in practice, for completeness, we present a symmetric analysis of this setting in Subsection B.1.

By constraining b , Equation 1 reduces to a quadratic function of the loss wrt η , which we depict in Figure 4, and that we use to predict $\eta^*|b, N, D$ (Equation 3). We notice that the optimal LR decreases with larger token budgets (Figure 4a), matching observations from Bjorck et al. [2025]. For small batch sizes, we see that the optimal LR decreases with model sizes (Figure 4b), although for larger batch sizes the scaling effect in D weakens substantially (Figure 5)⁶.

⁶A possible explanation may lie in the interplay between token budget and batch size in determining the total number of optimization steps ($\propto D/b$). At small b , increasing D substantially extends the training horizon, potentially favoring smaller and more gradual parameter updates and therefore smaller optimal learning rates. At large b instead, the number of optimization steps remains relatively small even for large D , so training may still require aggressive updates.




Figure 4: Loss as a function of the learning rate η at batch size $b = 128$, together with the corresponding one-dimensional slices of the fitted two-dimensional quadratic smoothing model. The optimal learning rate decreases as either D or N increases.

Model. Since trends appear linear after log-log transformations, we once again assume a linear model in log scale with possible interactions between D , N , b :

$$\begin{aligned} \log \eta^* = & \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \log b + \\ & \beta_0 \log N + \beta_1 \log b \log N + \\ & \gamma_0 \log D + \gamma_1 \log b \log D + \\ & \delta_0 \log N \log D + \delta_1 \log b \log N \log D + \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Consistent with previous observations, we find that the optimal learning rate scales strongly with model size ($\hat{\beta}_0 \approx -0.54$) and more weakly with data scale ($\hat{\gamma}_0 \approx -0.25$). Moreover, increasing the batch size shifts the optimal learning rate upward, consistent with the intuition that larger batch sizes permit larger learning rates. The batch size also slightly modifies the dependence on D , while leaving the scaling with respect to N essentially unchanged. We report the estimated coefficients in Table 6. After removing non-significant interaction terms, we obtain the following reduced model:

$$\log \eta^* = -6.60 + 0.80 \log b - 0.53 \log N - 0.24 \log D - 0.06 \log N \log D + 0.08 \log D \log b. \quad (9)$$

We show the estimated mean response in Figure 5, observing a good fit for small batch sizes, with some deviations at large b . Compared with the jointly optimal scaling, we find an *opposite trend* with respect to data scaling. When jointly scaling η and b , larger token budgets favor larger learning rates. In contrast, when optimizing η conditionally on b , the optimal learning rate decreases with D . One possible explanation for this difference comes from the observation that larger token budgets are often associated with larger optimal batch sizes, largely independently of η , as shown later in Table 5. Since larger b are often associated with larger values of η for efficient optimization, this may indirectly shift the jointly optimal learning rate upward as D increases.

Prediction accuracy on held-out samples. Finally, we evaluate the model’s predictive performance on a held-out 1.7B model trained across a range of batch sizes and token budgets in Figure 6. Relative to the empirical optima, the predicted optimal η appear conservative (Figure 6a). However, when compared against the smoothed loss surface in Figure 6b, we see a much closer agreement, and the pointwise prediction intervals always capture the (estimated) quadratic minima.




Figure 5: Scaling laws for **optimal learning rate** at different batch size values, fits from Equation 9.




Figure 6: **Prediction accuracy of Equation 9 on held-out 1.7B model.** We report empirical optima (★) and minima of the one-dimensional quadratic slices (☆). Cyan circles and error bars denote the predicted optima with pointwise parametric 95% prediction intervals. The empirical optima at $D = 80\text{BT}$ deviate from the overall trend, highlighting the noise in these measurements. This also affects the fitted quadratic, which shifts slightly towards smaller η values.

4 LR Annealing Effect on Hyperparameters

Although WSD significantly reduces the computational cost of experiments, learning rate decay runs still amount for an important part of the compute cost (roughly **78.6%** of total compute in our setup). This cost is further amplified by the need to sweep hyperparameters across model scales, driving up costs and energy consumption. A tempting way to reduce this burden is to omit learning rate annealing and instead study the scaling behavior of checkpoints trained with a constant learning rate. However, it is not clear whether (i) LR-decay brings a constant improvement across training configurations (N, D, η, b) , and (ii) if the optimal hyperparameters shift after decay. Recently, Rütte et al. [2026] argued that learning rate and batch size optima are largely unaffected by annealing, which only shifts the final loss by a constant factor. We revisit this conclusion through a large-scale investigation across our experiments.

Before proceeding, we remark that learning rate annealing for a run with a target token budget of D spans the last 20% of tokens⁷, and ends with a final learning rate of 10^{-5} . We refer to the loss after decay at a token budget D as $L_{decay}(D)$, the stable-phase loss is instead labeled as $L_{stable}(D)$, and their difference is ΔL . Figure 7 depicts an example of the loss measurements collected for this study.




Figure 7: Loss measurements in the two stages of a WSD learning rate schedule across different D, b, η values for a $N = 0.3B$ model. The annealing-induced improvement varies across configurations.




Figure 8: Loss improvement from learning rate annealing for a 0.13B and 0.6B model. ΔL is not constant across N, D, η, b values.

Loss Improvement from LR Decay depends on N, D, η, b . Figure 7 and Figure 8 reveal several systematic trends in the loss improvement from decay. (i) Larger learning rates and smaller batch sizes generally lead to larger loss improvements after decay. This is consistent with the interpretation that larger and smaller batch sizes increase the *noise* in parameter updates, potentially making decay more

⁷Although this is common practice in the community [Bakouch et al., 2025], different conclusions might hold for a different annealing strategy.

beneficial. Larger batches also entail fewer parameter updates, potentially reducing the advantage of decay. Beyond this, (ii) the loss reduction is not constant across training horizons D , but tends to increase later in training, suggesting that decay may become more beneficial as training progresses. Finally, (iii) this dependence also extends to model size N , with larger models exhibiting consistently larger loss improvements from learning rate annealing at the same hyperparameter values.

Optimal Hyperparameters Shift After LR Decay. As the loss improvement from annealing depends strongly on the chosen hyperparameters, unsurprisingly, the optimal hyperparameters also shift between the two training phases (Figure 9). Specifically, L_{decay} consistently favors larger learning rates, by up to $\sim 4\times$ in our configurations. Smaller batch sizes are also often associated with lower post-decay loss, although this trend is less consistent and has some exceptions. Remarkably, the optimal learning rate for stable runs is consistently the smallest value in our grid, suggesting that smaller learning rates may yield further improvements. These observations persist across different model sizes N and token budgets D , and are once again consistent with the idea that using η (or smaller b) introduces additional optimization noise and favors exploration during training. This additional noise may be beneficial during the stable phase, provided that it is subsequently reduced, for example by decaying the learning rate.





Figure 9: Joint optimal learning rate and batch size before ($\star$) and after ($\star$) learning rate decay. The heatmap displays the loss *after* learning rate decay ($L_{decay}(D)$) across batch sizes and LR values.

5 Scaling Laws for Performance Prediction

We now study the scaling behavior of the cross-entropy loss, with the aim of characterizing the scaling properties of our training pipeline, and assessing the predictive power of the fitted scaling laws through extrapolation to unseen model and data scales.

To proceed with the analysis, we collect validation loss measurements across several N and D , always considering the hyperparameters yielding minimal loss for such N, D configuration⁸. Unless otherwise specified, we follow a common fitting procedure [Hoffmann et al., 2022, Shukor et al.,

⁸We use the raw validation loss measurements rather than the smoothed values from Equation 2. The main purpose of smoothing was to obtain reliable estimates of the optimal hyperparameters on the coarse grid to facilitate the derivation of scaling laws, whereas here we prefer the raw measurements to avoid propagating uncertainty from the smoothing fitting process.



(a) Chinchilla does not model the interaction between N and D , leading to poor fit at extreme N and D values.

(b) Scaling better captures the interaction between N and D , yielding more accurate extrapolation to the 1.7B model.

Figure 10: Comparison of Chinchilla [Hoffmann et al., 2022] and Scaling [Videau et al., 2026] laws.

[2025, Schaipp, 2026], minimizing a Huber loss with L-BFGS [Liu and Nocedal, 1989] with multiple initializations. Appendix C provides additional details on the fitting procedure.

Chinchilla. Following Hoffmann et al. [2022] (see also Rosenfeld et al. [2020]), we first model the loss as the sum of independent power-law contributions from model size N and training data D :

$$L(N, D) = E + AN^{-\alpha} + BD^{-\beta}. \quad (10)$$

Consistent with the observations of Li et al. [2025a], the fitted model in Figure 10a provides satisfactory fits for intermediate N and D values, but systematically underperforms for extreme values of either variable, and poorly extrapolates to the 1.7B model. The residuals also show a clear **interaction** between N and D : they increase with D for small models but decrease with D for large models, indicating that (i) the benefit of increasing D becomes larger as N increases, and (ii) the benefit of increasing N becomes smaller when D is small.

Modeling N - D interaction. To summarize the previous findings, the effects of model size and training data do not appear fully separable. To relax this assumption, we first consider including an additive interaction term, in the form of $L(N, D) = E + AN^{-\alpha} + BD^{-\beta} + GN^{-\delta}D^{-\gamma}$. Although this form is appealing because it preserves the Chinchilla structure, capturing the observed interaction requires $G < 0$, conflicting with the desired monotonicity in N and D [Videau et al., 2026]. We therefore turn our attention to the recently proposed *Scaling* law Videau et al. [2026], which couples model and data capacity through a interaction exponent:

$$L(N, D) = E + (AN^{-\alpha} + BD^{-\beta})^k. \quad (11)$$

The extended model (Figure 10b) shows lower Huber loss, and better fits, particularly at extreme grid observations. Most importantly, it accurately extrapolates to the held-out 1.7B points, with substantially lower test error (RMSE: 0.0056 vs. 0.0174). We estimate the interaction exponent at ~ 0.41 , close to the values reported by Videau et al. [2026], further supporting an interaction between model size and dataset size beyond the separable Chinchilla law. We report the estimated coefficients for both the Chinchilla and Scaling laws in Table 3.

Compute-optimal scaling. Finally, we turn our attention to characterizing the evolution of compute-optimal loss, defined as the minimum loss achievable across N and D configurations under a compute allocation C . Given the fitted functional form in Equation 11, we can derive a closed-form

Model	E	A	α	B	β	k	Huber	RMSE _{1.7B}
Chinchilla	1.418 ± 0.25	208.5 $\pm 2.1\text{e}+02$	0.2807 ± 0.05	528.7 $\pm 1.3\text{e}+03$	0.2534 ± 0.081	—	1.76e-04	0.0174
Scaling	1.03 ± 0.087	2.343e+04 $\pm 1.4\text{e}+04$	0.491 ± 0.03	4630 $\pm 2.9\text{e}+03$	0.3496 ± 0.022	0.4105 ± 0.033	3.66e-05	0.0056

Table 3: Estimated scaling law parameters with bootstrap standard errors, together with training Huber loss and held-out RMSE on the 1.7B model.




Figure 11: **Compute-optimal scaling.** Loss observations as a function of compute across all model sizes, data sizes, and hyperparameter configurations, together with the estimated compute-optimal scaling law derived from the parametric functional from Equation 11

solution for the optimal loss as a function of the C ⁹. We obtain the following bootstrap mean estimate (see Figure 11):

$$L^*(C) = 1.030 + 60.894 C^{-0.084}. \quad (12)$$

6 Downstream Performance

To conclude, we assess the goodness of the pipeline with regards to downstream performance as compute scales. Using `oellm-eval`¹⁰, we evaluate the models achieving lowest validation loss across η - b configurations $\forall N, D$. We use the DCLM-CORE evaluation suite [Li et al., 2024] and measure downstream performance error. For reference, we additionally evaluate a set of publicly available models under the same setup. The set of tasks and evaluation protocol are provided in Appendix D, together with the corresponding downstream performance results in Figure 18.

Figure 12 shows a consistent decrease in downstream error with increasing compute across all model scales. At the smallest model size, the error plateaus quickly as additional training tokens provide diminishing gains, indicating that model capacity becomes the limiting factor. Larger models continue to benefit from additional compute and follow the overall compute-performance trend observed for other open-weight models. In the compute range where comparison without extrapolation is possible, the OELLM models show better compute efficiency than Pythia and SmolLM2 reference models,

⁹We refer to Hoffmann et al. [2022] and Videau et al. [2026] for the full derivation of the compute-optimal power laws.

¹⁰<https://github.com/OpenEuroLLM/oellm-eval>




Figure 12: **Downstream performance error** on the DCLM-CORE evaluation suite as a function of training compute (FLOPs). Faded grey points are all hyperparameter sweep runs, while faded colored points are the per (N, D) lowest training loss configuration that does not sit on the compute-optimal (loss) frontier. OpenEuroLLM models demonstrate consistent performance improvements with increased compute, aligning with the scaling trends of existing open-weights models.

achieving lower downstream error at matched compute. This confirms that our proposed training pipeline and hyperparameter optimization efforts generalize consistently across scales and provide a reliable reference point for further model development within OpenEuroLLM.

7 Conclusions and Limitations

This technical report presents an empirical study of scaling laws for large language models. We focus in particular on optimal learning rate and batch size scaling, extending the traditional analysis on jointly optimal hyperparameters to also examine their marginal scaling behavior. This is particularly relevant in practical LLM training, where throughput considerations may constrain the batch size away from its jointly optimal value. We then investigate how performance scales with respect to model capacity and training tokens, finding that the Chinchilla [Hoffmann et al., 2022] law poorly captures the broad range of training regimes in our experiments, while the Skaling [Videau et al., 2026] approach provides better extrapolation to held-out samples through an additional coupling between N and D . Finally, we leverage the employed two-stage Warmup-Stable-Decay LR schedule to investigate open questions about hyperparameter transferability between the two stages. Our analysis reveals a systematic *structure* in how learning rate decay affects the loss, which we believe opens interesting questions about how to model this effect. Successfully *predicting* this evolution could enable more efficient and cheaper scaling law derivation without learning rate decay.

There are several limitations to our study. While we find that small-scale scaling laws can extrapolate successfully over roughly an order of magnitude, it remains unclear whether they continue to hold at substantially larger scales [Lourie et al., 2026]. Moreover, further analysis of compute-optimal scaling is necessary to fully characterize these relationships and enable reliable extrapolation to unseen scales. We leave to future work the study of complementary approaches beyond the parametric formulation considered here. Finally, our work adds to a growing number of studies around optimal hyperparameter scaling, yet the scaling exponents reported across different studies vary substantially, reflecting differences in datasets, architectures, and training configurations. Therefore, transferability across these settings remains limited and warrants further investigation.

Acknowledgments

This research was partially supported by the European Commission under the grant No. 101195233 (OpenEuroLLM). JJ acknowledges funding by EU Horizon under grant no. 101214398 (ELLIOT), co-funding from EU under Digital Europe Program under grant no. 101198470 (LLMs4EU) and from EuroHPC Joint Undertaking programme under grant no. 101182737 (MINERVA), funding by the German Federal Ministry of Research, Technology and Space (BMFTR) under grant no. 01IS24085C (OPENHAFM), under the grant 01IS22094B (WestAI – AI Service Center West), and under the grant 16HPC117K (MINERVA). We acknowledge CSC – IT Center for Science, Finland, for awarding this project access to the LUMI supercomputer, owned by the EuroHPC Joint Undertaking, hosted by CSC (Finland) and the LUMI consortium through the Finnish LUMI Extreme Scale Access programme (OpenEuroLLM Design; project 462000963). We acknowledge the EuroHPC Joint Undertaking for awarding the OpenEuroLLM project access to the LUMI supercomputer, hosted by CSC in Finland through a EuroHPC JU Special Access call. The authors would like to thank the OpenEuroLLM consortium as a whole for fruitful discussions and feedback.

References

- Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Elie Bakouch, Gabriel Martín Blázquez, Guilherme Penedo, Lewis Tunstall, Andrés Marafioti, Hynek Kydlíček, Agustín Piqueres Lajarín, Vaibhav Srivastav, et al. Smollm2: When smol goes big—data-centric training of a small language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02737*, 2025.
- Elie Bakouch, Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Nouamane Tazi, Lewis Tunstall, Carlos Miguel Patiño, Edward Beeching, Aymeric Roucher, Aksel Joonas Reedi, Quentin Gallouédec, Kashif Rasul, Nathan Habib, Clémentine Fourier, Hynek Kydlíček, Guilherme Penedo, Hugo Larcher, Mathieu Morlon, Vaibhav Srivastav, Joshua Lochner, Xuan-Son Nguyen, Colin Raffel, Leandro von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. SmolLM3: smol, multilingual, long-context reasoner. <https://huggingface.co/blog/smollm3>, 2025.
- Shane Bergsma, Nolan Dey, Gurpreet Gosal, Gavia Gray, Daria Soboleva, and Joel Hestness. Power lines: Scaling laws for weight decay and batch size in llm pre-training, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.13738>.
- Tamay Besiroglu, Ege Erdil, Matthew Barnett, and Josh You. Chinchilla scaling: A replication attempt, 2024.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Gregory Anthony, Herbie Bradley, Kyle O’Brien, Eric Hallahan, Mohammad Aflah Khan, Shivanshu Purohit, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Edward Raff, et al. Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2397–2430. PMLR, 2023.
- Johan Bjorck, Alon Benhaim, Vishrav Chaudhary, Furu Wei, and Xia Song. Scaling optimal lr across token horizons, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.19913>.
- Sidney Black, Stella Biderman, Eric Hallahan, Quentin Anthony, Leo Gao, Laurence Golding, Horace He, Connor Leahy, Kyle McDonell, Jason Phang, Michael Pieler, Usvsn Sai Prashanth, Shivanshu Purohit, Laria Reynolds, Jonathan Tow, Ben Wang, and Samuel Weinbach. GPT-NeoX-20B: An open-source autoregressive language model. In Angela Fan, Suzana Ilic, Thomas Wolf, and Matthias Gallé, editors, *Proceedings of BigScience Episode #5 – Workshop on Challenges & Perspectives in Creating Large Language Models*, pages 95–136, virtual+Dublin, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.bigscience-1.9. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.bigscience-1.9/>.

- DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek llm: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.02954>.
- Alexander Hägele, Elie Bakouch, Atli Kosson, Loubna Ben Allal, Leandro Von Werra, and Martin Jaggi. Scaling Laws and Compute-Optimal Training Beyond Fixed Training Durations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- Alex Henry, Prudhvi Raj Dachapally, Shubham Pawar, and Yuxuan Chen. Query-key normalization for transformers, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.04245>.
- Alejandro Hernández-Cano, Alexander Hägele, Allen Hao Huang, Angelika Romanou, Antoni-Joan Solergibert, Barna Pasztor, Bettina Messmer, Dhia Garbaya, Eduard Frank Ďurech, Ido Hakimi, et al. Apertus: Democratizing open and compliant llms for global language environments. In *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 46877–46955, 2026.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Tom Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Erich Elsen, Jack W. Rae, Oriol Vinyals, and Laurent Sifre. Training compute-optimal large language models, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.15556>.
- Shengding Hu, Yuge Tu, Xu Han, Chaoqun He, Ganqu Cui, Xiang Long, Zhi Zheng, Yewei Fang, Yuxiang Huang, Weilin Zhao, Xinrong Zhang, Zheng Leng Thai, Kaihuo Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Yuan Yao, Chenyang Zhao, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Zhongwu Zhai, Ning Ding, Chao Jia, Guoyang Zeng, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Minicpm: Unveiling the potential of small language models with scalable training strategies, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.06395>.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Thomas Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2001.08361, 2020. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:210861095>.
- Houyi Li, Wenzhen Zheng, Qiufeng Wang, Zhenyu Ding, Haoying Wang, Zili Wang, Shijie Xuyang, Ning Ding, Shuigeng Zhou, Xiangyu Zhang, and Daxin Jiang. Predictable scale (part II) — farseer: A refined scaling law in LLMs. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=2Gnp8sdwVe>.
- Houyi Li, Wenzhen Zheng, Qiufeng Wang, Hanshan Zhang, Zili Wang, Shijie Xuyang, Yuantao Fan, Zhenyu Ding, Haoying Wang, Ning Ding, Shuigeng Zhou, Xiangyu Zhang, and Daxin Jiang. Predictable scale: Part i – optimal hyperparameter scaling law in large language model pretraining, 2025b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.04715>.
- Jeffrey Li, Alex Fang, Georgios Smyrnis, Maor Ivgi, Matt Jordan, Samir Gadre, Hritik Bansal, Etash Guha, Sedrick Keh, Kushal Arora, et al. Datacomp-lm: In search of the next generation of training sets for language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:14200–14282, 2024.
- Margaret Li, Sneha Kudugunta, and Luke Zettlemoyer. (mis)fitting: A survey of scaling laws, 2025c. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.18969>.
- Dong C. Liu and Jorge Nocedal. On the limited memory bfgs method for large scale optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 45:503–528, 1989. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:5681609>.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.05101>.

- Nicholas Lourie, He He, and Kyunghyun Cho. Hyperparameter loss surfaces are simple near their optima. In *Second Conference on Language Modeling*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=IAoSG4Q2xC>.
- Nicholas Lourie, Kyunghyun Cho, Karen Ullrich, and Sanae Lotfi. Small-scale experiments: Are we there yet?, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.11859>.
- Pedro Henrique Martins, João Alves, Patrick Fernandes, Nuno M Guerreiro, Ricardo Rei, Amin Farajian, Mateusz Klimaszewski, Duarte M Alves, José Pombal, Nicolas Boizard, et al. Eurollm-9b: technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.04079*, 2025a.
- Pedro Henrique Martins, Patrick Fernandes, João Alves, Nuno M Guerreiro, Ricardo Rei, Duarte M Alves, José Pombal, Amin Farajian, Manuel Faysse, Mateusz Klimaszewski, et al. Eurollm: Multilingual language models for europe. *Procedia Computer Science*, 255:53–62, 2025b.
- Sam McCandlish, Jared Kaplan, Dario Amodei, and OpenAI Dota Team. An empirical model of large-batch training, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.06162>.
- William Merrill, Shane Arora, Dirk Groeneveld, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Critical batch size revisited: A simple empirical approach to large-batch language model training. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=XUKUx7Xu89>.
- Marianna Nezhurina, Jörg Franke, Taishi Nakamura, Timur Carstensen, Niccolò Ajroldi, Ville Komulainen, David Salinas, and Jenia Jitsev. Open-sci-ref-0.01: open and reproducible reference baselines for language model and dataset comparison, 2025a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.09009>.
- Marianna Nezhurina, Tomer Porian, Giovanni Puccetti, Tommie Kerssies, Romain Beaumont, Mehdi Cherti, and Jenia Jitsev. Scaling laws for robust comparison of open foundation language-vision models and datasets. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=cWnZLIdeKn>.
- Tomer Porian, Mitchell Wortsman, Jenia Jitsev, Ludwig Schmidt, and Yair Carmon. Resolving discrepancies in compute-optimal scaling of language models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.19146>.
- Jonathan S. Rosenfeld, Amir Rosenfeld, Yonatan Belinkov, and Nir Shavit. A constructive prediction of the generalization error across scales. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ryenvpEKDr>.
- Dimitri Von Rütte, Janis Fluri, Omead Pooladzandi, Bernhard Schölkopf, Thomas Hofmann, and Antonio Orvieto. Scaling behavior of discrete diffusion language models. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=GDYaNzxt9T>.
- Fabian Schaipp. How to allocate your tokens? scaling laws with training steps and batch size, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.01487>.
- Noam Shazeer. Glu variants improve transformer, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.05202>.
- Yikang Shen, Matthew Stallone, Mayank Mishra, Gaoyuan Zhang, Shawn Tan, Aditya Prasad, Adriana Meza Soria, David D. Cox, and Rameswar Panda. Power scheduler: A batch size and token number agnostic learning rate scheduler, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.13359>.
- 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.


- Mustafa Shukor, Louis Béthune, Dan Busbridge, David Grangier, Enrico Fini, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, and Pierre Ablin. Scaling laws for optimal data mixtures. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=vVU1KT0sju>.
- Dan Su, Kezhi Kong, Ying Lin, Joseph Jennings, Brandon Norick, Markus Kliegl, Mostofa Patwary, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. Nemotron-CC: Transforming Common Crawl into a refined long-horizon pretraining dataset. In Wanxiang Che, Joyce Nabende, Ekaterina Shutova, and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, editors, *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2459–2475, Vienna, Austria, July 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-251-0. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.123. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.acl-long.123/>.
- Qwen Team. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- Mathurin Videau, Badr Youbi-Idrissi, David Lopez-Paz, and Kartik Ahuja. Scaling: Chinchilla’s exponents meet kaplan’s coupling, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.07222>.
- 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.
- Ge Yang, Edward Hu, Igor Babuschkin, Szymon Sidor, Xiaodong Liu, David Farhi, Nick Ryder, Jakub Pachocki, Weizhu Chen, and Jianfeng Gao. Tuning large neural networks via zero-shot hyperparameter transfer. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 17084–17097. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/8df7c2e3c3c3be098ef7b382bd2c37ba-Paper.pdf.
- Xiaohua Zhai, Alexander Kolesnikov, Neil Houlsby, and Lucas Beyer. Scaling vision transformers, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.04560>.

A Variability Analysis


A.1 Estimating Noise

The primary metric of interest across this work is the expected population loss $\mathbb{E}[L(x, r)]$, where the expectation is taken over samples $x \sim \mathcal{X}$ and over the randomness induced by data ordering and model initialization, which we control via a random seed r . In practice, we estimate this quantity by the sample mean loss on a validation set of $n = 204800$ samples: $\hat{L}(r) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(x_i, r)$. Such estimator is itself a random variable, and we want to characterize its overall variance.


Finite sampling. To estimate the contribution of finite sampling, we fix a random seed, evaluate the loss on each sequence in the validation set, and estimate the standard error of the validation loss mean as $\widehat{\text{SE}}[\hat{L}(r)] = \frac{s_r}{\sqrt{n}}$, where s_r is the standard deviation of the per-sequence losses over the n validation sequences. Similarly to [Porian et al., 2025], we observe that the standard error decreases with model size (Figure 13a) and token budget, with more performant models yielding lower-variance validation loss estimates.



(a) Validation loss standard error vs sample mean. Each point represents a training configuration, colored by model size. Larger models exhibit smaller standard errors.



(b) Observed validation loss standard deviation across seeds.



(c) Seed-induced validation loss standard deviation.

Figure 13: **(Left)** Finite-sampling variability. **(Right)** Cross-seed variability for a 50M–6BT model, before and after removing the estimated finite-sampling noise.

Model initialization and data order. In order to estimate the contribution of model initialization and data ordering, we train a 50M model for 6B tokens with five different random seeds. The observed variance across runs in Figure 13b contains both seed-induced variability and finite-sampling noise, therefore, we subtract the estimated contribution of the latter to isolate the variance introduced by the seed (Figure 13c). For the optimal hyperparameter configuration ($\eta = 0.001$, $b = 64$) we estimate a total standard deviation of $2.7 \cdot 10^{-3}$ across runs with different seeds. Of this, $6.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ comes from finite sampling of the validation set (which we estimated as in the previous paragraph). Hence, we obtain a seed-induced standard deviation of $2.67 \cdot 10^{-3}$. We conclude that, at least at this scale and with this validation set size, uncertainty is dominated by seed effects. More interestingly, but not surprisingly, the seed-to-seed variability is up to $3\times$ larger for higher learning rate or smaller batch sizes, likely because of the additional noise in the optimization process in these configurations.

A.2 Smoothing Robustness

In [Subsection 3.1](#), we illustrated how to smooth the loss surface across learning rate and batch size observations, arguing that this procedure yields more robust estimates of optimal hyperparameters. Here, we investigate the robustness of the fitting procedure and of the resulting optimal hyperparameters.

For this analysis, we train a 50M-6BT model across different learning rates and batch size using 4 different random seeds. For each seed, we fit [Equation 1](#) via OLS, and report the loss contour in [Figure 14](#). This inspection reveals that the *empirical optimal* batch size oscillates between 32 and 64, whereas the optimal learning rate remains stable at the value of 0.002. We quantify this variability and compare it with that of the *smoothed optima* obtained from the fitted quadratic surface. [Table 4](#) reports the mean and standard deviation of the optimal batch size and learning rate across seeds for both the empirical and smoothed approaches. While both methods identify similar average optima, the smoothed approach reduces the variability of the optimal batch size and introduces a small change in the average predicted learning rate.

Although limited to a small model, these results suggest that smoothing is not only a robust approach to hyperparameter selection, but may also offer an advantage over direct empirical selection by producing lower-variance hyperparameter estimates. This advantage might be particularly relevant when using a coarse hyperparameter grid, as in our experiments.




Figure 14: **Optimal hyperparameters variability.** Contour of the smoothed validation loss surfaces across different rng seeds, with empirical minima (★) and predicted joint optima (★).

Table 4: Empirical and fitted optima across random seeds (mean $\pm$ standard deviation).

	Batch size (b)	Learning rate (η)
Empirical optimum	48.0 ± 18.48	0.0020 ± 0.00000
Fitted optimum	44.4 ± 6.56	0.0017 ± 0.00026

B Additional Results

B.1 Scaling Optimal Batch Size with Arbitrary Learning Rate

Model. As in [Subsection 3.3](#), we plot the loss as a function of the batch size b for different values of N , D , and learning rate η , together with the corresponding marginal quadratic, from which we estimate the optimal batch size b^* ([Equation 3](#)). For a fixed model size N , we find the optimal batch size increases with larger token budgets ([Figure 15a](#)), and for a given D , larger models prefer larger batch sizes ([Figure 15b](#)). Similar patterns persist across different values of η , N and D , and we notice that these trends appear linear in a log-log scale. Once again, we hypothesize that the following linear




Figure 15: Loss as a function of the batch size b at learning rate $\eta = 0.002$, together with the corresponding one-dimensional slices of the two-dimensional quadratic. The optimal batch size increases as either D or N increases.

model would adequately represent the data:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \log b^* = & \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \log \eta + \\
 & \beta_0 \log N + \beta_1 \log \eta \log N + \\
 & \gamma_0 \log D + \gamma_1 \log \eta \log D + \\
 & \delta_0 \log N \log D + \delta_1 \log \eta \log N \log D + \epsilon
 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We report the estimated coefficients in Table 5. The first-order $\log N$, $\log D$, and $\log \eta$ terms are all highly statistically significant, confirming that larger models, larger data budgets, and larger learning rates prefer larger batch sizes. In contrast, the $\log D \log \eta$ interaction is weak, suggesting that *the learning rate has little effect on how b^* scales with D* . We also find a positive $\log D \log N$ interaction, indicating that the effects of model size and data budget on b^* reinforce one another. Finally, the three-way interaction term is not statistically significant.

Table 5: Fitted coefficients and p-values for Equation 13 ($n=172$, $\text{dof}=164$, $R^2 = 0.981$).

term	coef	pvalue
const	5.04673	≈ 0
$\log D$	0.42089	≈ 0
$\log N$	0.36163	≈ 0
$\log \eta$	0.55507	≈ 0
$\log D \log N$	0.03264	≈ 0
$\log D \log \eta$	0.01929	0.04132
$\log N \log \eta$	-0.05628	≈ 0
$\log D \log N \log \eta$	0.01705	0.05436

After removing non-significant covariates, we obtain the following reduced model (see Figure 16):

$$\log b^* = 5.05 + 0.55 \log \eta + 0.36 \log N + 0.42 \log D + 0.03 \log N \log D - 0.06 \log N \log \eta. \tag{14}$$

Finally, we test the prediction accuracy on the held-out 1.7B models in Figure 17.




Figure 16: Scaling laws for optimal batch size with arbitrary learning rate values (Equation 14).

B.2 Additional Tables

In Table 6, we report the fitted coefficients and p-values for Equation 8.

Table 6: Fitted coefficients and p-values for Equation 8 (n=186, dof=178, $R^2 = 0.974$).

term	coef	pvalue
const	−6.5982501	≈ 0
$\log D$	−0.2450907	≈ 0
$\log N$	−0.5410536	≈ 0
$\log b$	0.7998060	≈ 0
$\log D \log N$	−0.0635849	≈ 0
$\log D \log b$	0.0831131	≈ 0
$\log N \log b$	0.0012659	0.9133354
$\log D \log N \log b$	0.0154444	0.1171394

C Fitting Procedure

To estimate the parameters of the scaling laws introduced in Section 5, we minimize the following log-Huber loss [Besiroglu et al., 2024]:

$$\sum_{i=1} \mathcal{H}_\delta(\log(L_i) - \log(\hat{L}_i)), \quad \mathcal{H}_\delta = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}x^2 & |x| \leq \delta, \\ \delta(|x| - \frac{1}{2}\delta) & |x| > \delta, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where i indexes the training runs, L_i denotes the measured loss and $\hat{L}_i$ is the loss parametrized by either Equation 10 or Equation 11. We closely follow the methodology in Hoffmann et al. [2022], optimizing the parameters E , A , and B in log-space to improve numerical stability, and setting δ to 10^{-3} . For the Chinchilla model, we use the following initialization grid:

$$\log E \in \{-1, -0.5, 0, 0.5, 1\}, \quad \log A, \log B \in \{0, 5, 10, 20\}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \{0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2\},$$

whereas for the Scaling model, we set:

$$\log E \in \{-1, -0.5, 0, 0.5, 1\}, \quad \log A, \log B \in \{0, 20\}, \quad \alpha, \beta, \kappa \in \{0, 0.5, 1, 1.5\}.$$




Figure 17: **Prediction accuracy of Equation 14 on held-out 1.7B model.** We report empirical optima ($\star$) and minima of the one-dimensional quadratic slices ($\star$). Cyan circles and error bars denote the predicted optima with pointwise parametric 95% confidence intervals at different values of η and D . Once again, we observe some pronounced noise in the 80BT panel.

We repeat the fit for each initialization and select the solution with the lowest final loss. Unlike Videau et al. [2026], we formulate the fitting procedure as an unconstrained optimization problem and solve it using L-BFGS [Liu and Nocedal, 1989]. To estimate parameter uncertainty, we repeat the fitting procedure, including the initialization sweep, for 1,000 bootstrap samples, obtained by sampling the training runs with replacement. We report the mean and standard error of the resulting parameter estimates in Table 3.

D Downstream Evaluation

The DCLM-CORE benchmark Li et al. [2024] consists of 22 downstream tasks designed to provide a low-variance evaluation signal across different compute budgets. The suite covers world knowledge, commonsense reasoning, language understanding, reading comprehension, and symbolic problem solving. Due to an evaluation error, results for 4 tasks are unavailable at the time of the release; we therefore report performance over the remaining 18 tasks. Table 7 summarizes the tasks¹¹ and few-shot settings, together with their task category and evaluation types.

Model size convention. We refer to each model by its publicly reported nominal size. For calculating C , we define N following Porian et al. [2025] as the number of parameters in the Transformer blocks and output LM head, excluding input embedding parameters for models with untied embeddings. This convention is applied to both OELLM and reference models.

¹¹Tasks with missing evaluation scores are marked with *

Task	Shots	Task Category	Task Type
AGI Eval LSAT-AR	3	symbolic problem solving	multiple choice
ARC Challenge	10	world knowledge	multiple choice
ARC Easy	10	world knowledge	multiple choice
BIG-bench CS Algorithms*	10	symbolic problem solving	language modeling
BIG-bench Dyck Languages	10	symbolic problem solving	language modeling
BIG-bench Language Identification	10	language understanding	multiple choice
BIG-bench Operators*	10	symbolic problem solving	language modeling
BIG-bench QA Wikidata*	10	world knowledge	language modeling
BIG-bench Repeat Copy Logic*	10	symbolic problem solving	language modeling
BoolQ	10	reading comprehension	multiple choice
CommonsenseQA	10	commonsense reasoning	multiple choice
COPA	0	commonsense reasoning	multiple choice
CoQA	0	reading comprehension	language modeling
HellaSwag	0	language understanding	multiple choice
HellaSwag	10	language understanding	multiple choice
Jeopardy	10	world knowledge	language modeling
LAMBADA	0	language understanding	language modeling
OpenBookQA	0	commonsense reasoning	multiple choice
PIQA	10	commonsense reasoning	multiple choice
SQuAD	10	reading comprehension	language modeling
Winograd	0	language understanding	schema
Winogrande	0	language understanding	schema

Table 7: Downstream evaluation tasks from the DCLM-CORE suite.

Metric. Following Li et al. [2024], we use the DCLM-CORE aggregation (**Core_v2**). The score of each task is first rescaled in $[0, 1]$ and then centered with respect to its random baseline, followed by $[0, 1]$ clipping. We clip the centered scores because some evaluation scores fall slightly below the random baseline, resulting in negative centered scores. This maps the random baseline to 0 and a perfect score to 1. Downstream performance is computed as the mean centered score over all available tasks for each model. In Figure 18, we report downstream error, as $1 - \text{DownstreamPerformance}$, such that lower values indicate better performance.

Reference models. To contextualize the scaling behavior of OELLM models, we additionally evaluate publicly available pretrained models spanning a range of model sizes and token budgets. The comparison includes Phytia 70M, 160M, 410M, 1B and 1.4B Biderman et al. [2023]; SmolLM2 135M, 360M and 1.7B Allal et al. [2025]; SmolLM3 3B Bakouch et al. [2025]; Qwen2.5 0.5B and 1.5B Team [2024]; Qwen3 0.6B and 1.7B Yang et al. [2025]; EuroLLM 1.7B and 9B Martins et al. [2025b,a]; DCLM 1B and 7B Li et al. [2024]; Apertus 1.0 and 1.5 8B Hernández-Cano et al. [2026]. All reference models except DCLM are evaluated using the same evaluation setup as the OELLM models; for DCLM, we use the evaluation scores reported in the corresponding Hugging Face model cards ¹².

For a subset of reference models, one or two task evaluations are unavailable. In these cases, downstream performance is averaged over the available tasks: SQuAD is missing for Qwen2.5-1.5B and Qwen3-1.7B, while both AGI Eval LSAT-AR and SQuAD are missing for Pythia-160M, Pythia-410M, SmolLM2-360M, Qwen2.5-0.5B, Qwen3-0.6B, Apertus-8B, EuroLLM-1.7B, and for EuroLLM-9B.

¹²DCLM-1B model card: <https://huggingface.co/TRI-ML/DCLM-1B#detailed-evaluation>,
DCLM-7B model card: <https://huggingface.co/apple/DCLM-7B#evaluation>.




Figure 18: **Downstream performance** on the DCLM-CORE evaluation suite as a function of training compute (FLOPs). Faded grey points are all hyperparameter sweep runs, while colored points are the per (N, D) lowest training loss configuration for our models. The OpenEuroLLM models exhibit downstream scaling behavior consistent with that of existing open-weight models.