

From Concentration to Differentiation and Back: Routing Effective Rank in MoE Reasoning Cohorts

Kang Chen¹, Sihan Zhao¹, Yixin Cao^{1,2†}, Yu-Gang Jiang¹

¹Fudan University, ²Shanghai Innovation Institute

Abstract

Test-time scaling produces cohorts of reasoning rollouts, yet there is no standard label-free account of how their internal computation reorganizes as inference unfolds. We introduce *routing effective rank* d_{eff} , the entropy-effective dimensionality of a cross-rollout graph built from MoE expert-routing similarity. Across ten MoE configurations and five math/science benchmarks, d_{eff} exhibits a reproducible low-high-low trajectory, with a prominent interior maximum in 98.5% of 3,105 model-question cohorts: routing similarity is concentrated early, maximally differentiated at intermediate budgets, and reconcentrated later, and the timing of this maximum varies systematically with architecture and reasoning effort. An exact decomposition separates cohort-wide common-mode mass from residual spectral dimensionality: common-mode reallocation accounts for about two thirds of the trajectory, while the residual spectrum contributes about one quarter and retains substantial variation beyond the common mode. The decomposition further localizes behavior: among non-unanimous cohorts, increases in common-mode concentration strongly predict same-answer recoverability, and higher reasoning effort delays the maximum by 2.59 octaves (doublings of the token budget) and consistently expands the high-rank period across all four tested architectures, locating the effort effect in timing and duration rather than peak amplitude. Correctness comparisons separate structural monitoring from answer selection, positioning routing effective rank as a decomposable, label-free diagnostic of cohort organization—a principled spectral lens on how MoE reasoning cohorts differentiate and reconcentrate over inference time.

Email: kchen24@m.fudan.edu.cn, yxcao@fudan.edu.cn[†]

Project: <https://cckfdu.com/deff/>

1 Introduction

Test-time scaling turns inference into a population process: instead of one answer, a model produces a *cohort* of candidate reasoning trajectories and combines them by majority vote, a verifier, or a learned reward [27, 36, 43]. As systems spend more compute at inference, the cohort itself becomes an object of study: it is what self-consistency aggregates and what group-based training treats as a unit.

Most existing analyses characterize a reasoning cohort through its final answers—votes, margins, or verifier scores. Before those answers are compared, the cohort already has an internal organization: some trajectories compute similarly, others route through different expert patterns. Sparse Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) models expose this organization through their routing traces. Routing is a by-product of decoding rather than an added probe: it arrives with every token and can be read online at any prefix, yet we find it carries a




Figure 1 Routing effective rank follows a reproducible low–high–low trajectory whose peak timing is architecture- and effort-dependent. One panel per architecture (fixed expert count E ; Qwen3-Next-80B, $E=512$, and the pooled curve are in Figure A1), one curve per reasoning-effort tier (medians). Triangles and whiskers mark the median and IQR of the peak budget, measured separately within each cohort (Section 4.2). The maximum moves later with effort in all four architectures, whereas peak height is architecture-dependent. Panels share one y -scale, but absolute d_{eff} levels depend on the routing representation and cohort size ($d_{\text{eff}} \leq N$): compare timing and shape within an architecture, not levels across panels.

reproducible signal about how the cohort organizes its reasoning. Comparing traces across same-question rollouts yields an activation-only similarity graph $\mathbf{W}$ (Section 3) whose spectrum compactly describes cohort geometry.

We study the *routing effective rank* d_{eff} , the entropy-effective dimensionality of that routing-similarity spectrum. Unlike ordinary rank, it discounts numerically tiny directions; unlike graph density, it summarizes the full eigenvalue distribution. Its interpretation, however, depends on how spectral mass is allocated: a rise in d_{eff} may reflect a weaker cohort-wide routing mode, a richer residual spectrum, or both. We therefore study d_{eff} as a decomposable trajectory rather than an isolated scalar (Figure 1), in three stages: its temporal regularity and architecture-dependent timing (RQ1), the spectral channels that account for it (RQ2), and how those channels relate to answer organization and reasoning effort (RQ3).

Across ten MoE configurations and five math/science benchmarks, d_{eff} traces a robust low–high–low trajectory over token budget, with a prominent interior maximum in 98.5% of 3,105 model–question cohorts (Figure 1). The shape is reproducible, while its timing is systematically architecture- and effort-dependent: the peak budget spans roughly $5\times$ across families and moves consistently later with reasoning effort. Permuting expert identities removes the prominent arc, indicating that it reflects cross-rollout routing organization rather than marginal expert usage, while difficulty-stratified and still-generating-rollout analyses preserve the qualitative shape. We therefore treat the trajectory as a reproducible spectral regularity of the cohort, and ask what produces it.

To explain this regularity, we derive the exact decomposition $\log d_{\text{eff}} = h(m) + (1 - m) \log d_{\perp}$, where m is the mass of the leading eigenmode and $d_{\perp}$ is the effective dimensionality of the residual spectrum. The leading mode aligns almost perfectly with the cohort-wide agreement direction (squared alignment 0.98). Reallocating mass into and out of this mode accounts for roughly two thirds of the trajectory, while the residual spectrum contributes about one quarter and retains substantial variation beyond the common mode (grouped-CV $R^2 = 0.37$). The arc therefore combines a dominant common-mode weakening-and-recovery process with a distinct residual reconfiguration.

The decomposition localizes distinct empirical roles: common-mode mass governs how easily same-answer rollout pairs are recovered from routing alone (*same-answer recoverability*), reasoning effort delays and widens the high-rank regime, and residual dimensionality retains complementary structural variation. Correctness comparisons position the metric as a label-free diagnostic of cohort organization and temporal routing geometry.

Contributions. This work makes three contributions.

- We establish a **robust routing differentiation–reconcentration trajectory** across ten MoE configurations, five math/science benchmarks, and 3,105 model–question cohorts, validated by expert-identity, difficulty-stratified, and still-generating controls (RQ1).
- We derive an **exact common-mode/residual decomposition** of routing effective rank and show that common-mode mass allocation accounts for most of its temporal motion, while residual dimensionality retains substantial independent variation (RQ2).
- We **behaviorally localize the two channels**: common-mode concentration predicts same-answer recoverability, and higher reasoning effort consistently delays and broadens the high-rank regime across four architectures (RQ3).

Together, these results turn d_{eff} from a visually suggestive curve into an interpretable, testable measurement framework for MoE cohort dynamics.

2 Related Work

Test-time cohorts, internal signals, and multi-run geometry. Sampling and aggregating many reasoning trajectories is standard, through majority vote [43, 44], outcome or process verifiers [9, 27, 39], compute allocation [2, 29, 36], group-based training [34], adaptive stopping [1, 26], and confidence or selective prediction [15, 22, 23]. A white-box line instead builds selectors and verifiers from internal computation: cross-rollout neuron agreement and novelty [5, 6], hidden-state probes and temporal signals [30, 40, 50]. Traces have also been mapped as landscapes, graphs, topological signatures, and representation-space trajectories [24, 37, 38, 46, 51]; closest in structure, SliceGraph links activation slices across sampled chains into mutual- k NN process families [7]. We instead treat the cohort as one unlabeled measurement object—a whole-rollout graph with routing-similarity edges, read as a budget-indexed spectrum—using answer-side signals to localize behavioral coupling and define the intended use.

MoE routing as an internal signal. Sparse MoE layers [12, 25, 35] underpin many current models [10, 21]. Prior work studies specialization, load balancing, and routing stability [52, 53], prefetching [11], test-time rollout selection [8], and what routes encode: probing finds fine-grained expert specialization [16], geometric accounts counter that routing mirrors hidden-state organization [42], counterfactual analyses probe route utility [48, 49]. Our question is complementary: how the cross-rollout routing graph reorganizes over budget.

Effective rank and spectral diversity. Effective rank is the exponential of spectral entropy [33], used statically to diagnose representation collapse [14]; the same functional underlies the Vendi score [13] and order-one Hill diversity [17]. We study its temporal behavior on routing similarity graphs, derive an exact common-mode/residual decomposition, and localize behavioral coupling to those channels; spectral clustering and Nyström completion appear only as structural controls [41, 45].

3 Method: Routing Effective Rank and Its Spectral Anatomy

3.1 Cohorts and the Routing Graph

For each question we sample a cohort of $N=64$ rollouts and evaluate along a logarithmic *budget axis* of token prefixes $b \in \{32, 48, \dots, 32768\}$ (16 points), plus a per-rollout *commit window* located at each boxed final answer. At budget b , each rollout i has a histogram $h_i(b)$ accumulating the router’s gate weight over each (layer, expert) slot in a short trailing window (16 tokens by default) (Figure 2). Edge weights are computed from router activations only; answer annotations never enter the similarity—they select the boxed-answer rollout subset, locate the commit window via a fixed answer-marker token anchor, and label same-answer




Figure 2 From routing traces to d_{eff} , on one real cohort (OSS-120B-High, AIME-24). (1–2) Each rollout’s routing trace ($K=4$ of $E=128$ experts per token per layer) is summarized, over a trailing 16-token window at budget b , by a gate-weight histogram h_i —from router activations alone; answer annotations only locate the commit window and label alignment. (3) Weighted-Jaccard similarities (Equation (1)) form the cohort graph over $N=64$ rollouts. (4) Its normalised spectrum gives d_{eff} (Equation (2)), from 1 to N . (5) Read at every budget, d_{eff} traces the low–high–low trajectory ($7.2 \rightarrow 33.6 \rightarrow 7.2$; the ends need 5–7 eigendirections for 80% of spectral mass, the peak 37): routing similarity is first concentrated, then distributed across more spectral directions, and finally reconcentrated—a direct geometric readout of cohort organization.

alignment. The symmetric cohort graph $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ holds their *weighted Jaccard* similarity,

$$\mathbf{W}_{ij}(b) = \frac{\sum_e \min(h_i^{(e)}(b), h_j^{(e)}(b))}{\sum_e \max(h_i^{(e)}(b), h_j^{(e)}(b))}, \quad (1)$$

indexed over expert slots e ; $\mathbf{W}_C$ denotes the commit-window graph. Two companion readouts recur: *density* dens, the off-diagonal mean of $\mathbf{W}$ (plain routing agreement), and *same-answer AP*, the average precision of ranking same-final-answer rollout pairs by edge weight. Two derived readouts recur in RQ3: the answer effective count $d_{\text{ans}} = \exp(-\sum_c \pi_c \log \pi_c)$ over the empirical answer-cluster distribution (the same Hill functional as d_{eff}), and the prevalence-corrected $\text{AP}_{\text{lft}} = (\text{AP} - \pi_{\text{same}})/(1 - \pi_{\text{same}})$, with π_{same} the same-answer pair prevalence.

3.2 Routing Effective Rank

With $p_i = \lambda_i / \sum_j \lambda_j$ over the eigenvalues of the symmetrized $\mathbf{W}$, the effective rank is the exponential of the spectral entropy [33],

$$d_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{W}) = \exp\left(-\sum_i p_i \log p_i\right), \quad (2)$$

the entropy-effective dimensionality of the routing-similarity spectrum—the same functional as the Vendi score on similarity matrices [13]. Under approximately block-structured geometry it approximates an effective number of balanced routing groups; more generally, it quantifies the spectral dimensionality of cohort

routing similarity rather than a literal count of clusters or solutions. These matrices are PSD to numerical precision (Section K); we symmetrize and clip negative eigenvalues before the entropy. The absolute scale is representation-specific, so we read d_{eff} by rank. In plain terms, low d_{eff} means that a few shared patterns explain most of the routing graph; high d_{eff} means that more independent directions are needed.

3.3 An Exact Spectral Decomposition

Effective rank can change because the leading eigenmode gains or loses mass, because the residual spectrum expands or contracts, or because mass mixes between the two. The grouping property of Shannon entropy separates these channels exactly. Let $m = p_1$ be the normalised mass of the leading eigenvalue, let $q_i = p_i/(1-m)$ for $i \geq 2$ renormalise the rest, and let $d_{\perp} = \exp(-\sum_{i \geq 2} q_i \log q_i)$ be the effective dimensionality of the residual spectrum. With $h(m) = -m \log m - (1-m) \log(1-m)$,

$$\log d_{\text{eff}} = h(m) + (1-m) \log d_{\perp} \quad (3)$$

holds to machine precision wherever $d_{\perp}$ is defined (numerical accounting in Section F). Writing $r = \log d_{\perp}$, any trajectory segment is attributed exactly to its three channels by the midpoint split $\Delta \log d_{\text{eff}} = \Delta h(m) - \bar{r} \Delta m + (1 - \bar{m}) \Delta r$. We call m the *common-mode mass*—RQ2 shows the leading eigenvector aligns almost perfectly with the cohort-wide agreement direction—and use $r = \log d_{\perp}$ for the residual dimensionality.

3.4 Statistical Protocol

The unit of analysis is one (model, question) cohort; budget steps within a cohort are never treated as independent samples. Headline intervals are two-way clustered bootstraps (question $\times$ configuration, $B=2000$ for the confirmatory families), and predictive comparisons use 5-fold cross-validation grouped by question, so the same question never straddles train and test. RQ3’s three confirmatory endpoints, decision rule, and verdict sentence were fixed before the analyses ran and are Bonferroni-corrected ($\alpha = 0.05/3$); its behavioral-localization layer carries secondary trajectory endpoints in the same confirmatory statistics, and null results are stated as effect-size bounds rather than proof of exact zero. Per-estimate bootstrap schemes, measurement conventions (peak definitions, prominence gates, grid endpoints), the full pre-registered plan, and the decision record are in Section A and Section G.

4 Experiments

RQ1 establishes the temporal phenomenon, RQ2 reveals its spectral anatomy, and RQ3 localizes its behavioral associations.

4.1 Experimental Setup

We use ten MoE configurations—OSS-{20B,120B} at High/Med/Low reasoning effort [31] ($E=32/128$, $K=4$; one base checkpoint per scale, effort set in the system prompt), Qwen3-30B-A3B-{Instruct,Thinking} ($E=128$, $K=8$), and Qwen3-Next-80B-A3B-{Instruct,Thinking} [47] ($E=512$, $K=10$)—on five math/science benchmarks (AIME’24/’25 [28], BRUMO’25 [3], HMMT’25 [18], GPQA [32]). This yields 3,105 model–question cohorts ($N=64$ rollouts each) over 50 model $\times$ dataset shards; per-analysis retention filters are accounted for in Table A13. Configurations group into three families—OSS, Qwen-Instruct, Qwen-Thinking—but family co-varies with routing architecture (expert count, top- K , depth, training recipe), so cross-family comparisons are reported descriptively, as rank-based trajectory contrasts. A sixth benchmark, LiveCodeBench-v5 [20], was held out from every analysis decision and used once, with all dials frozen (Section I).

4.2 RQ1: How Does Routing Effective Rank Evolve During Reasoning?

We first characterize the trajectory at the level of routing geometry. Pooled over five math and science benchmarks, d_{eff} rises from 5.21 at the earliest budget to 18.68 at $b=512$ and returns to 5.84 at the largest

budget (5.76 at commit; [Figure A1](#), inset). In spectral terms, routing similarity is concentrated early, spread over more directions at intermediate budgets, and concentrated again later ([Figure A5](#)).

The pattern appears within individual cohorts. A prominent interior maximum occurs in 98.5% of the 3,105 model-question cohorts (95% CI [96.7, 99.8], two-way clustered by question and configuration), with a median relative prominence of 0.68 of the peak height. The rate is 97.9–99.3% on every benchmark and $\geq 92.9\%$ on every configuration, and the same qualitative form appears in every difficulty stratum (98.3–98.7%), though peak height and location move with difficulty ([Section A](#)). The arc is therefore present at the individual-cohort level, beyond the pooled average.

Peak timing varies across models, datasets, and peak definitions. Where the maximum falls depends on the model and on how the maximum is measured. Locating the maximum after averaging a family’s curves gives earlier peaks than locating each cohort’s maximum and taking the median—the two definitions differ by up to 1.5–2 octaves (doublings of the token budget), because averaging first is pulled early by the spread of individual peak positions. Under the per-cohort definition, used throughout and declared per figure (the “caliper” of [Section A](#)), the median peak budgets are 768 tokens for OSS, 1024 for Qwen-Instruct, and 4096 for Qwen-Thinking. Under every definition, the pooled peak at $b=512$ summarizes a mixture of family-specific peak distributions; per-cohort medians provide the appropriate within-family timing statistic. Across datasets, by contrast, the ordering of peak timing is nearly fixed—almost identical in all ten configurations (Kendall $W=0.946$), with GPQA peaking 1.5–2 octaves before the math benchmarks ([Figure A2](#)).

The pattern depends on shared expert identities across rollouts. Permuting expert identities within each rollout and layer preserves per-rollout activation counts, per-layer load, and sparsity exactly, and destroys only the alignment of expert identities across rollouts. This control reduces the prominent-peak rate from 98.5% to 0.0% (10/10 configurations), cuts median prominence by a factor of 178, and flattens the spectrum to $d_{\text{eff}} \approx n$ (median ratio 0.94 to cohort size); a formally defined argmax survives on 73% of the near-flat curves, so the control removes the peak’s magnitude, not the existence of a maximum on a noisy curve. Restricting the graph to still-generating rollouts (the risk-set control of [Section D](#)) preserves an interior maximum in 99.8% of cells, with a peak location correlated at $\rho = 0.63$ with the full graph: completed traces refine the exact late-stage timing while leaving the trajectory intact. Together, these controls establish the arc as a property of aligned cross-rollout routing organization rather than of marginal activation volume.

Temporal context disambiguates equal-rank states. The same effective-rank value can occur on both the rising and the falling branch, and the mean spectra at the two endpoints are nearly identical (p_1 differs by 0.001; [Figure A5](#)). This branch symmetry makes d_{eff} most informative as a trajectory-valued diagnostic: budget context and local trend distinguish routing differentiation from reconcentration, so effective rank captures both cohort geometry and its temporal organization when read along the budget axis.

Takeaway 1. Routing effective rank reveals a robust differentiation–reconcentration trajectory whose maximum shifts systematically with architecture and reasoning effort, establishing temporal organization as an architecture-aware property of MoE reasoning cohorts.

4.3 RQ2: What Drives the Effective-Rank Trajectory?

RQ1 establishes a reproducible low–high–low trajectory. [Equation \(3\)](#) resolves its spectral source by separating leading-mode mass, residual dimensionality, and their interaction, and attributes every trajectory segment exactly to these channels. [Figure 3](#) summarizes the result.

The leading mode is a common mode. Its eigenvector is almost exactly the graph-wide agreement direction: $|\langle v_1, u \rangle|^2$ has median 0.9838 [0.9800, 0.9872], above 0.8 in 98.3% of frames and above 0.98 in every model family (intervals two-way clustered by question and configuration). Alignment is lowest precisely at the




Figure 3 Spectral anatomy of routing effective rank. The identity $\log d_{\text{eff}} = h(m) + (1 - m) \log d_{\perp}$ is exact, with $m = p_1$ the common-mode mass and $d_{\perp}$ the residual dimensionality (evaluated term by term on a real eigenspectrum in Figure A4). (A) Aligned per-family medians: as d_{eff} rises, spectral mass drains out of the common mode; as it falls, mass returns. The residual spectrum contributes complementary motion on a smaller scale. (B) Over the full budget path the common-mode term carries 0.67 of the absolute motion of $\log d_{\text{eff}}$, the residual term 0.24, and mixing 0.09 (two-way clustered 95% CIs); the remaining rows repeat the accounting on the early and late halves of the budget grid (details and controls in Section F). (C) Residual dimensionality retains substantial variation beyond the common mode: a grouped cross-validated fit of $\log d_{\perp}$ on m explains 37% of out-of-sample variance, leaving 63% as a distinct spectral axis for RQ3.

effective-rank maximum (0.970 vs. 0.991 at the ends), and m tracks plain graph density within a cohort ($\rho = +0.987$): the leading mode *is* routing agreement, in spectral form.

Common-mode mass allocation carries most of the motion. Over the 16-budget grid the absolute-value-normalised shares are 0.666 [0.645, 0.684] for the common-mode term, 0.243 [0.230, 0.260] for residual dimensionality and 0.092 for mixing, positive in 10/10 configurations and unchanged on a linear d_{eff} scale. Splitting the grid at its log-midpoint, the common-mode term takes 0.63 of the early half and 0.82 of the late half, and exceeds the residual term in both (Bonferroni-corrected over the three pre-registered hypotheses; Section F). These shares quantify each channel’s contribution to $\Delta \log d_{\text{eff}}$ under the exact identity: normalised by each component’s available range, the two channels move comparably fast in the early half, so the common mode’s larger share reflects its greater spectral leverage—the $5.9\times$ difference in the identity’s multipliers.

Channel attribution is stable across the budget axis. Permuting each problem’s peak position across problems reproduces most of the attribution, and every fixed cut point gives a similar split: the accounting is a property of the budget axis rather than of the estimated peak. The residual share is larger early than late (+0.158 [+0.080, +0.232]; matched-cell contrast), and restricting the late window to still-generating rollouts attenuates the contrast by 45% while leaving it positive. A matched permuted-peak placebo attributes most of the apparent near-peak residual enrichment to budget position, which sharpens the supported claim: attribution is stable along the budget axis rather than driven by a peak-localized burst (full numbers in Section F).

A sparsity-preserving expert-identity control. Permuting expert identities per rollout and layer—preserving sparsity, load and every marginal activation statistic—drives the residual spectrum toward its near-isotropic ceiling ($d_{\perp} = 62.9$ against a ceiling of 63) and leaves a prominent interior peak in 3.4% of cells against 97.5% for real cohorts (this experiment’s own pool and gate; Section A explains why peak rates are never compared across gates). The decomposition therefore measures *which* experts fire together rather than how much routing mass moves. Cross-problem pseudo-cohorts, by contrast, retain the coarse arc in 97.0% of 264 cells, revealing a generation-level temporal backbone; together, the two controls separate this shared backbone from the aligned routing organization measured within cohorts.

Residual dimensionality forms a complementary axis. Although m and $r = \log d_{\perp}$ are mathematically distinct, their empirical relationship is also far from one-dimensional: a grouped cross-validated fit of $\log d_{\perp}$ on m explains 37% of out-of-sample variance, leaving 63% beyond common-mode mass (25% explained on the descending branch of the OSS family). Residual dimensionality therefore provides a distinct coordinate of the routing graph, motivating the behavioral localization in RQ3.

Takeaway 2. *The trajectory is driven primarily by spectral mass leaving and later returning to a cohort-wide common mode. Residual dimensionality accounts for a complementary share of the motion and retains 63% of its out-of-sample variation beyond common-mode mass, providing a second, distinct coordinate of cohort routing geometry.*

4.4 RQ3: How Do Spectral Channels Relate to Answer Organization and Reasoning Effort?

RQ2 yields two mathematically distinct spectral channels; this section, the paper’s behavioral-localization layer (Section 3.4), localizes their empirical roles. Common-mode concentration is strongly associated with same-answer recoverability; reasoning effort consistently controls the timing and duration of the high-rank regime; and residual dimensionality provides a complementary structural axis. Together, these confirmatory analyses identify where the routing spectrum is most behaviorally informative.

Common-mode mass tracks same-answer recoverability. We measure *same-answer recoverability*—how well routing similarity alone recovers which rollouts share the same final answer—by the prevalence-corrected AP lift of Section 3.1, among non-unanimous cohorts. In a dynamic model $\Delta \text{AP}_{\text{lift}} \sim \Delta m + \Delta r + \text{budget-step fixed effects}$, increases in common-mode mass strongly predict recoverability gains (Figure 4, top). The residual partial is opposite-signed and about a quarter the size per standardized step, while a within-question temporal shuffle collapses both coefficients toward zero. The magnitude contrast identifies the shared spectral mode as the channel through which routing similarity becomes answer-aligned; its near-equivalence to graph density ($\rho=0.987$) gives that familiar signal a precise spectral interpretation.

Reasoning effort expands the high-rank regime. Pairing effort tiers within architecture yields four directionally consistent effects (Figure 4, bottom): higher effort delays the maximum by +2.59 octaves [+1.72, +3.83], raises peak-normalized occupancy—the time spent near high effective rank—by +0.102 [+0.045, +0.168], widens the $d_{\text{eff}} \geq 0.8d_{\text{max}}$ interval by +1.29 octaves [+0.55, +1.99], and reduces integrated common-mode mass by −0.087 [−0.154, −0.036], while residual-spectrum area remains comparatively stable. The registered peak-height contrast varies across architectures and its pooled interval spans zero (+0.104 [−0.079, +0.232]), whereas the timing and duration readouts agree directionally in all four (Table A10). This contrast localizes the robust effort effect to temporal extent rather than peak amplitude: higher effort sustains a less common-mode-concentrated, high-rank routing regime for longer, and peak-aligned curves retain architecture-specific shapes—broadening beyond a rigid temporal translation.

Behavioral localization and complementary use. Under the pre-registered decision tree (Section G), the tested answer-space associations concentrate primarily in the common-mode channel, while residual dimensionality remains the distinct structural coordinate established in RQ2. Correctness comparisons separate two roles: answer-side statistics remain stronger for answer selection (Table A11), while routing reaches up to 0.68 within a problem (Section L) and exposes label-free cohort geometry. We therefore position d_{eff} as a label-free monitor of cohort geometry and temporal organization, with common-mode mass as its most directly answer-aligned channel.

Takeaway 3. *Common-mode concentration is the behaviorally aligned spectral channel: it strongly predicts same-answer recoverability, while higher reasoning effort consistently delays and broadens the high-rank regime. Residual dimensionality contributes complementary structural variation, and the decomposition localizes the operational content of d_{eff} instead of treating it as an undifferentiated scalar.*




Figure 4 Common-mode concentration predicts same-answer recoverability; reasoning effort expands the high-rank regime. **Top:** across 28,622 adjacent-budget steps (clustered on 318 questions $\times$ 10 configurations), increases in common-mode mass make same-answer rollout pairs easier to recover from routing (the prevalence-corrected AP lift plotted here): $\beta_{\Delta m} = +0.522$ [+0.430, +0.609], while the corresponding residual coefficient is $\beta_{\Delta r} = -0.047$ [-0.092, -0.016]; a within-question time shuffle collapses both toward zero. **Bottom:** higher effort delays the maximum, increases high-rank occupancy, widens the $d_{\text{eff}} \geq 0.8d_{\text{max}}$ regime, and lowers integrated common-mode mass, with the same sign in all four architectures.

5 Robustness, Scope, and Limitations

Our claims concern within-architecture trajectory shape and timing, because the absolute value of d_{eff} depends on the routing representation, expert count, and cohort size. The core low-high-low trajectory is robust across complementary controls: restricting to still-generating rollouts preserves the interior maximum; masking the boxed answer leaves the trajectory statistically unchanged (Section D); a frozen transfer to 1,582 LiveCodeBench-v5 problems yields a 97.7% prominent-peak rate (Section I); and a binary expert-set Jaccard graph preserves the geometric results while slightly improving same-answer AP (Section J)—so the diagnostic can be computed from sparse expert-activation indicators alone, without router gate magnitudes.

These controls also identify where calibration matters. Risk-set restriction refines exact late-stage timing ($\rho = 0.63$ with the full graph), and peak-frame estimates require larger subcohorts than terminal ones (Section H). Lexical and formatting cues may remain partially entangled with same-answer recoverability, and sensitivity to sampling temperature remains to be characterized.

The confirmatory behavioral analysis rests on 318 unique questions under two-way clustering, so the reported intervals define the resolution of the present effect-size claims, and cross-family results are read as rank-based trajectory comparisons rather than capability claims.

6 Conclusion

We introduced routing effective rank as a label-free spectral view of how same-question MoE reasoning cohorts reorganize over inference time. Across ten configurations and five math/science benchmarks it traces a reproducible differentiation-reconcentration trajectory whose timing shifts with architecture and reasoning

effort.

An exact decomposition shows that common-mode mass allocation drives most of this motion, while residual dimensionality retains substantial independent structure. It also localizes behavior: common-mode concentration predicts same-answer recoverability among contested cohorts, and higher reasoning effort delays and broadens the high-rank regime across all four tested architectures.

The measurement is also practical: the trajectory and its readouts survive a frozen transfer to held-out code generation, and the diagnostic can be computed from sparse expert-activation indicators alone, so the framework applies during serving, before any answer is graded.

These results establish d_{eff} as an architecture-aware, label-free diagnostic of cohort routing geometry and temporal organization—turning a visually suggestive curve into a decomposable measurement framework for tracking when MoE reasoning cohorts differentiate, sustain distributed routing structure, and reconcentrate as inference compute unfolds.

References

- [1] Pranjal Aggarwal, Aman Madaan, Yiming Yang, and Mausam. Let’s sample step by step: Adaptive-consistency for efficient reasoning and coding with LLMs. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2023.
- [2] Bradley Brown, Jordan Juravsky, Ryan Ehrlich, Ronald Clark, Quoc V. Le, Christopher Ré, and Azalia Mirhoseini. Large language monkeys: Scaling inference compute with repeated sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21787*, 2024.
- [3] Brown University Math Olympiad Team. Brown university mock olympiad (BRUMO) 2025. Competition problem set, 2025.
- [4] A. Colin Cameron, Jonah B. Gelbach, and Douglas L. Miller. Robust inference with multiway clustering. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 29(2):238–249, 2011.
- [5] Kang Chen, Yaoning Wang, Kai Xiong, Zhuoka Feng, Wenhe Sun, Haotian Chen, and Yixin Cao. Do LLMs signal when they’re right? evidence from neuron agreement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.26277*, 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2510.26277. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2510.26277>.
- [6] Kang Chen, Zhuoka Feng, Sihan Zhao, Kai Xiong, Junjie Nian, Yaoning Wang, Changyi Xiao, and Yixin Cao. NEX: Neuron explore-exploit scoring for label-free chain-of-thought selection and model ranking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.05805*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2602.05805. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2602.05805>.
- [7] Kang Chen, Junjie Nian, Yixin Cao, and Yu-Gang Jiang. SliceGraph: Mapping process isomers in multi-run chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.14619*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2605.14619. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2605.14619>.
- [8] Kang Chen, Minshen Yu, Junjie Nian, Yaoning Wang, Yixin Cao, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Does the same token mean the same state? MoE routing as signal for reasoning control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.22798*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2606.22798. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2606.22798>.
- [9] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [10] Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Chenggang Zhao, R. X. Xu, Huazuo Gao, Deli Chen, Jiashi Li, Wangding Zeng, Xingkai Yu, Y. Wu, et al. DeepSeekMoE: Towards ultimate expert specialization in mixture-of-experts language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06066*, 2024.
- [11] Artyom Eliseev and Denis Mazur. Fast inference of mixture-of-experts language models with offloading. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17238*, 2023.
- [12] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, 23(120):1–39, 2022.

- [13] Dan Friedman and Adji Bousso Dieng. The vendi score: A diversity evaluation metric for machine learning. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [14] Quentin Garrido, Randall Balestriero, Laurent Najman, and Yann LeCun. RankMe: Assessing the downstream performance of pretrained self-supervised representations by their rank. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023.
- [15] Yonatan Geifman and Ran El-Yaniv. Selective classification for deep neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- [16] Jeremy Herbst, Stefan Wermter, and Jae Hee Lee. The expert strikes back: Interpreting mixture-of-experts language models at expert level. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.02178*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2604.02178. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2604.02178>. Accepted at ICML 2026.
- [17] M. O. Hill. Diversity and evenness: A unifying notation and its consequences. *Ecology*, 54(2):427–432, 1973.
- [18] HMMT. HMMT: Harvard–MIT mathematics tournament. Competition problem set, 2025.
- [19] Lawrence Hubert and Phipps Arabie. Comparing partitions. *Journal of Classification*, 2:193–218, 1985.
- [20] Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. LiveCodeBench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025.
- [21] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [22] Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models (mostly) know what they know. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221*, 2022.
- [23] Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- [24] Jinu Lee, Shivam Agarwal, Amruta Parulekar, Siddarth Madala, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, and Julia Hockenmaier. ReasoningFlow: Discourse structures for understanding LLM reasoning traces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.05402*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2606.05402. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2606.05402>.
- [25] Dmitry Lepikhin, Hyoungho Lee, Yuanzhong Xu, Dehao Chen, Orhan Firat, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Noam Shazeer, and Zhifeng Chen. GShard: Scaling giant models with conditional computation and automatic sharding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [26] Yiwei Li, Peiwen Yuan, Shaoxiong Feng, et al. Escape sky-high cost: Early-stopping self-consistency for multi-step reasoning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- [27] Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- [28] Mathematical Association of America. AIME: American invitational mathematics examination. Competition problem set, 2025.
- [29] Niklas Muennighoff, Zitong Yang, Weijia Shi, Xiang Lisa Li, Li Fei-Fei, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, Percy Liang, Emmanuel Candès, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. s1: Simple test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.19393*, 2025.
- [30] Jingwei Ni, Ekaterina Fadeeva, Tianyi Wu, Mubashara Akhtar, Jiaheng Zhang, Elliott Ash, Markus Leippold, Timothy Baldwin, See-Kiong Ng, Artem Shelmanov, and Mrinmaya Sachan. ReProbe: Efficient test-time scaling of multi-step reasoning by probing internal states of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11667–11689, San Diego, California, United States, July 2026. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.acl-long.536. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2026.acl-long.536/>.
- [31] OpenAI. gpt-oss-120b & gpt-oss-20b model card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.10925*, 2025.

- [32] David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R. Bowman. GPQA: A graduate-level google-proof Q&A benchmark. In *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*, 2024.
- [33] Olivier Roy and Martin Vetterli. The effective rank: A measure of effective dimensionality. In *European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pages 606–610, 2007.
- [34] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- [35] Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2017.
- [36] Charlie Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. Scaling LLM test-time compute optimally can be more effective than scaling model parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03314*, 2024.
- [37] Lihao Sun, Hang Dong, Bo Qiao, Qingwei Lin, Dongmei Zhang, and Saravan Rajmohan. LLM reasoning as trajectories: Step-specific representation geometry and correctness signals. In *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 26872–26887, San Diego, California, United States, July 2026. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.acl-long.1237. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2026.acl-long.1237/>.
- [38] Xue Wen Tan, Nathaniel Tan, Galen Lee, and Stanley Kok. The shape of reasoning: Topological analysis of reasoning traces in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.20665*, 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2510.20665. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2510.20665>. Accepted at the ICML 2026 Workshop on Epistemic Intelligence in Machine Learning.
- [39] Jonathan Uesato, Nate Kushman, Ramana Kumar, Francis Song, Noah Siegel, Lisa Wang, Antonia Creswell, Geoffrey Irving, and Irina Higgins. Solving math word problems with process- and outcome-based feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.14275*, 2022.
- [40] Martina G. Vilas, Safoora Yousefi, Besmira Nushi, Eric Horvitz, and Vidhisha Balachandran. Tracing the traces: Latent temporal signals for efficient and accurate reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.10494*, 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2510.10494. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2510.10494>.
- [41] Ulrike von Luxburg. A tutorial on spectral clustering. In *Statistics and Computing*, 2007.
- [42] Xi Wang, Soufiane Hayou, and Eric Nalisnick. The myth of expert specialization in MoEs: Why routing reflects geometry, not necessarily domain expertise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.09780*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2604.09780. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2604.09780>.
- [43] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- [44] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [45] Christopher K. I. Williams and Matthias Seeger. Using the Nyström method to speed up kernel machines. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2001.
- [46] Zhen Xiong, Yujun Cai, Zhecheng Li, and Yiwei Wang. Mapping the minds of LLMs: A graph-based analysis of reasoning LLMs. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 17751–17763, Suzhou, China, November 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-main.896. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.emnlp-main.896/>.
- [47] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025.

- [48] Jiahao Ying, Mingbao Lin, Qianru Sun, and Yixin Cao. Beyond benchmarks: Understanding mixture-of-experts models through internal mechanisms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.23933*, 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2509.23933. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2509.23933>.
- [49] Youngsik Yoon, Siwei Wang, Wei Chen, and Jungseul Ok. When are experts misrouted? counterfactual routing analysis in mixture-of-experts language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.07260*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2605.07260. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2605.07260>.
- [50] Jinyang Zhang, Hongxin Ding, Yue Fang, Weibin Liao, Muyang Ye, Junfeng Zhao, and Yasha Wang. The tell-tale norm: ℓ_2 magnitude as a signal for reasoning dynamics in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.06188*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2606.06188. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2606.06188>.
- [51] Zhanke Zhou, Zhaocheng Zhu, Xuan Li, Mikhail Galkin, Xiao Feng, Sanmi Koyejo, Jian Tang, and Bo Han. Landscape of thoughts: Visualizing the reasoning process of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.22165*, 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2503.22165. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.22165>. Accepted as an ICLR 2026 poster.
- [52] Barret Zoph, Irwan Bello, Sameer Kumar, Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Jeff Dean, Noam Shazeer, and William Fedus. ST-MoE: Designing stable and transferable sparse expert models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08906*, 2022.
- [53] Barret Zoph, Irwan Bello, Sameer Kumar, et al. Designing effective sparse expert models. In *IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops*, 2022.

Technical Appendix

This appendix collects the protocol declarations, tables, controls, sensitivity analyses, and supplementary results referenced from the paper. Its sections are lettered A, B, . . . and its figures, tables, and equations are numbered A1, A2, . . . , so a pointer from the paper reading “Section K” or “Table A2” identifies them unambiguously. Citations here refer to the reference list of the paper.

A Statistical Protocol, Calipers, and Gates

This section specifies the measurement conventions behind every headline number, making the analysis fully reproducible.

Unit and clustering. The unit of analysis is one (model, question) cohort (3,105 in total), where “model” ranges over the ten served configurations; budget steps within a cohort are never treated as independent samples. Headline intervals are two-way clustered bootstraps over questions and configurations ($B=2000$) [4], because this design has at most one cohort per (question, configuration) pair. Two-way clustering materially affects the uncertainty estimate: for the prominent-peak rate (0.9852), the iid interval is [0.9807, 0.9894] (width 0.0087), one-way by question [0.9803, 0.9897] (0.0094), and two-way [0.9671, 0.9984] (0.0313)—3.6× wider than iid, with the configuration dimension doing the work. We always report the two-way interval, and each headline carries the per-configuration sign count ($k/10$: how many of the ten configurations share the pooled sign). Two estimator families deviate from this default and are labelled where they appear: the pooled effort contrasts of Table A10 cluster on question × architecture (four architecture clusters; per-architecture rows cluster on question only), and the dynamic recoverability supplement and the correctness-boundary AUCs use $B=500$, the latter uncorrected by design. The configuration dimension’s bootstrap clusters are the ten served configurations; the OSS tiers within a scale share base weights and differ only in the prompt-set effort level (Section 4.1), so this dimension has six distinct checkpoints behind its ten clusters.

Peak calipers. “Where the trajectory peaks” depends on how the maximum is measured, and the calipers differ by up to two octaves (Table A1): the argmax of a family’s *mean* curve, of its *median* curve, and the median of *per-cohort* argmax positions are all defensible and all different, because aggregating curves before locating the maximum is pulled early by the spread of individual peak positions. The paper reports the per-cohort median throughout, and every figure states its caliper.

Prominence gates. A cohort counts as having a *prominent* interior maximum when its peak clears a fixed relative-prominence threshold (1.2×), frozen before these analyses and not itself pre-registered; an *interior* maximum requires only that the argmax is not an endpoint (99.3% of cohorts). With $d_{\text{ends}} = \max(d_{b_1}, d_{b_{16}})$ the two grid endpoints’ larger value, we report *absolute* prominence $d_{\text{max}} - d_{\text{ends}}$ (in d_{eff} units) and *relative* prominence $(d_{\text{max}} - d_{\text{ends}})/d_{\text{max}}$; the 1.2× gate requires an interior argmax with $d_{\text{max}} \geq 1.2 d_{\text{ends}}$. The spectral-anatomy experiment of Section F uses its own, more permissive gate on its own 6-shard pool. Because the same null data can read 0.0% under one gate and a few percent under another, **peak rates are never compared across experiments with different gates or grids**; each is reported against its own real-data arm.

Grid left edge. Peak rates are also sensitive to where the budget grid starts, because the prominence gate compares against the larger of the two grid endpoints, so the left edge is part of the measurement convention. On the 16-budget grid ($b \geq 32$) the pooled prominent rate is 98.5%; on a 14-budget grid ($b \geq 64$) it is 95.3%, with the loss concentrated in configurations already differentiated by $b=64$ (GPQA 98.4% → 93.5%; OSS-20B-Low 95.3% → 78.9%; OSS-120B-Low 97.2% → 88.7%). Peak-rate numbers are comparable only at matched grids.

Difficulty strata. With the fixed majority-share cutpoints [0.60, 0.875], the prominent-peak rate is 98.3% [94.0, 100] (hard, $n=638$), 98.7% [96.1, 100] (mid, $n=622$), and 98.6% [96.4, 99.9] (easy, $n=1,844$); the three

Table A1 Three peak-budget calipers: argmax of the family *mean* curve, of the family *median* curve, and the median of *per-cohort* argmax positions [IQR]. The paper’s primary caliper is the per-cohort median (rightmost); the family-mean caliper is shown because aggregated curves are what a reader sees in a plot.

Family	n	mean	median	per-cohort [IQR]
OSS	1863	256	192	768 [256, 2048]
Qwen-Instruct	636	768	768	1024 [768, 4096]
Qwen-Thinking	606	2048	2048	4096 [2560, 8192]
pooled	3105	512	—	1024

strata total 3,104 because one cohort produced no gradeable answer and therefore has no defined majority share. The peak’s height and location both move (median peak d_{eff} 21.63/23.10/24.70; median peak budget 2048/2048/1024). The qualitative shape persists across difficulty strata, while peak height and timing vary systematically with difficulty.

B Per-Configuration Levels and Trajectory-Aligned Readouts

Table A2 gives per-configuration d_{eff} levels at a fixed mid-range budget. Effective rank rises monotonically with reasoning effort inside every architecture (fixed expert count E), isolating effort from model width; absolute levels are representation- and cohort-size-dependent ($d_{\text{eff}} \leq N$) and are not compared across architectures. Figure A1 completes the trajectory figure of the paper with the fourth architecture, Qwen3-Next-80B. Figure A2 adds the dataset axis: the ordering of peak timing across datasets is nearly invariant across configurations.

Family means depend on the cohort-size cutoff. The family fingerprint at $b=4096$ uses the *matched* cohorts (boxed ≥ 17): 9.2/18.8/25.0 for OSS/Instruct/Thinking. Pooling the full cache (boxed ≥ 10) gives 9.1/18.8/24.6, and a binary-Jaccard graph gives 7.5/14.9/19.6; the ordering is invariant, only the absolute scale shifts. The behavioral counterpart is median commit length (1537/3133/9690 tokens).

C Difficulty Correlations

Table A4 gives the descriptive difficulty associations referenced from Section 4.4. We correlate each problem’s commit-graph d_{eff} with *consensus* difficulty (1–majority share) and *correctness* difficulty (1–accuracy), aggregated two ways: pooling all problems, and averaging over model×dataset shards (which controls for the cross-model capability axis; 2000× bootstrap CIs). The pooled-all value is diluted by the capability axis; the per-shard mean is the interpretable figure.

The association is terminal, and window-aligned. At $b \leq 1024$ every two-way clustered interval covers zero, so we make no early-triage claim. For the long-reasoning family the readout must be taken at the commit window: at $b=4096$ it flips negative (≈ -0.34) because the median Thinking commit length is 9,690 tokens, so $b=4096$ still lies on the rising branch there. OSS and Instruct, whose commits arrive earlier, are already positive at $b=4096$.

Difficulty coupling is likewise concentrated in the common-mode channel. Under the pre-registered ladder protocol of Section G, difficulty as a regression target behaves like the primaries: adding residual dimensionality after common-mode mass yields $\Delta R^2_{r|m} = +0.022 [-0.001, +0.050]$, with the interval spanning zero, and the split (m, r) state performs comparably to the scalar. We therefore interpret the descriptive Spearman rows above as difficulty associations rather than evidence for an additional residual-specific mechanism.




Figure A1 Full four-architecture version of [Figure 1](#), including Qwen3-Next-80B ($E=512$). Same data, calipers, and conventions: triangles give the per-cohort argmax median with IQR whiskers; the inset is the pooled mixture curve. Qwen3-Next-80B repeats the low-high-low shape with a later clock and is the one architecture whose peak height inverts with effort (per-cohort median peak d_{eff} : Instruct 37.2 vs. Thinking 36.7), while its fixed-budget levels remain effort-monotone ([Table A2](#)).

Table A2 Mean/median d_{eff} at $b=4096$ per configuration (weighted Jaccard). Monotone in reasoning effort within each architecture.

Configuration	E	mean d_{eff}	median d_{eff} (n)
OSS-20B-Low	32	3.62	3.19 (318)
OSS-20B-Med	32	8.27	5.99 (318)
OSS-20B-High	32	10.57	11.41 (282)
OSS-120B-Low	128	4.25	4.08 (318)
OSS-120B-Med	128	10.62	5.09 (318)
OSS-120B-High	128	17.85	19.13 (309)
Qwen3-30B-Instruct	128	15.57	16.43 (318)
Qwen3-30B-Thinking	128	19.64	20.96 (310)
Qwen3-Next-80B-Instruct	512	22.04	15.72 (318)
Qwen3-Next-80B-Thinking	512	29.72	32.18 (296)

D Trajectory Controls

The low-high-low trajectory could in principle be produced by marginal activation statistics, by a mixture of finished and running rollouts, or by aggregation. This section expands the controls summarized in [Section 4.2](#); [Figure A3](#) shows the per-cohort picture directly.

Expert identity carries the trajectory. Permuting expert identities per rollout and per layer—preserving per-rollout activation counts, per-layer load, and sparsity exactly—reduces the prominent-peak rate from 98.5% to 0.0% (the null rate is exactly 0.0% in each of the ten configurations), cuts median *absolute* prominence from 15.92 to 0.09 (a factor of 178; median relative prominence falls $0.68 \rightarrow 0.00$), and drives the spectrum to $d_{\text{eff}} \approx n$ (median ratio 0.94 to cohort size). An interior argmax formally remains on 73.1% of the resulting near-flat curves, so the permutation destroys the peak’s magnitude, not the existence of a maximum on a noisy curve. The trajectory is therefore carried by cross-rollout expert co-activation identities rather than




Figure A2 The dataset sets the ordering of the effective-rank clock, nearly deterministically across configurations. Left: median peak-normalized d_{eff} trajectories per dataset for one representative configuration per architecture (High/Thinking tier). Right: each configuration’s median peak budget per dataset (dots; all ten configurations) with cross-configuration medians (diamonds). The dataset ordering of peak timing is almost identical in every configuration (Kendall $W=0.946$, within-configuration permutation $p < 10^{-4}$): GPQA peaks 1.5–2 octaves earlier than the math benchmarks (pooled median $\log_2 t_{\text{max}}$ 9.79 vs. 12.00 for HMMT’25), and HMMT’25 is latest with the widest high-rank period ($w_{0.8}$, octaves at $d_{\text{eff}} \geq 0.8 d_{\text{max}}$: median 3.64 vs. 2.38)—consistent with the peak tracking each dataset’s length scale rather than a universal token count.

Table A3 Family mean d_{eff} at a fixed budget, at each family’s own trajectory peak, and at commit (family-mean caliper; Section A). The OSS-vs-reasoning separation holds at all three readouts, and the OSS effort tiers stay ordered at commit (3.55/3.65/3.86 at 20B, 4.19/5.26/5.48 at 120B). The Instruct-vs-Thinking ordering, by contrast, is specific to the fixed mid-budget reading: it narrows at the peak-aligned readout (Thinking peaks later) and *reverses* at commit (9.2 vs. 6.6), so fixed-budget readings conflate level with timing.

Family	at $b=4096$	at own peak	at commit
OSS	9.1	15.7	4.3
Qwen-Instruct	18.8	25.1	9.2
Qwen-Thinking	24.6	26.1	6.6

Table A4 Spearman(commit-graph d_{eff} , difficulty). The consensus–correctness gap is clear for OSS, ≈ 0 for Instruct, and reverses for Thinking. Pooled-all is a single Spearman over the 3,104 cohorts with a defined majority share (one cohort produced no gradeable answer); per-shard mean averages the within-shard Spearman over the 50 model×dataset shards (2000× bootstrap CIs).

Aggregation	consensus	correctness
pooled-all	+0.15	+0.14
per-shard mean	+0.46 [+0.40, +0.51]	+0.40 [+0.34, +0.47]
per-family: OSS	+0.23	+0.12
per-family: Instruct	+0.47	+0.44
per-family: Thinking	+0.27	+0.31

aggregate routing mass.

Risk-set analysis preserves the arc and refines late-stage timing. The risk-set analysis isolates the contribution of still-generating rollouts at large budgets, where the full graph otherwise combines running and completed traces. Restricting the graph to the *risk set*—only rollouts still generating at b —leaves an interior maximum in




Figure A3 The trajectory is a per-cohort fact, not an aggregation effect. Each of the 3,105 rows is one (model, question) cohort, standardised within the row and sorted by the budget at which it peaks; the left stripe gives the architecture. The bright band runs diagonally—the sort constructs the diagonal; the band’s contrast, not its diagonality, carries the information—and the architecture stripe shows how the pooled peak combines architecture-specific clocks: OSS-20B cohorts concentrate at early peaks and Qwen3-Next-80B cohorts at late ones.

99.8% of cells, so frozen windows are not the sole source of the non-monotonicity; but risk-set peak positions correlate only moderately with full-graph peaks ($\rho = +0.632$), so late-budget peak *locations* partly reflect freezing. Once every rollout has finished, d_{eff} is constant by construction (coefficient of variation 0.0000 at both the median and the 90th percentile); post-completion readings carry no dynamical content and are not interpreted.

Answer-token masking. Capping the trailing window at the boxed-answer anchor—so the formatted answer characters never enter the histogram—leaves the trajectory statistically unchanged: the prominent-peak rate is 98.7% vs. 98.5% ($\Delta +0.002$ [−0.005, +0.015], n.s.), and the peak frame is unmoved for 88.2% of questions (97.4% within one frame); only the post-peak reconcentration becomes shallower (collapse ratio $0.26 \rightarrow 0.40$), attributing roughly a fifth of the collapse depth to the answer characters themselves. Masking the last 32 pre-answer tokens instead removes the arc ($98.5\% \rightarrow 34.4\%$; per-configuration range 4.6%–70.6%), locating the signal in the commit region rather than in the answer string. Mask distance is collinear with window staleness, so “no answer tokens” and “stale window” are not fully separated.

The shape is temporal. Shuffling the order of each cohort’s per-budget frames—preserving the marginal set of graphs while destroying their sequence—drops the prominent-peak rate from 98.5% to 56.2%: the trajectory is a property of the time course, not of the collection of frames.

Peak location is set by generation length. The peak’s location tracks the model’s own generation-length scale (rank correlation +0.94 with the cohort’s median completion budget), so a fixed token budget lands at different trajectory positions in different models. Cross-model readings are therefore taken in per-cohort peak units (Section A; Table A3).

E Difficulty-Stratified Same-Answer Recoverability

Same-answer AP is defined only for cohorts with ≥ 2 distinct answers; 38% of cohorts are unanimous and are excluded, leaving 1,912 (the confirmatory P2 audit additionally applies the audit family’s ≥ 10 -graded-rollout gate, retaining 1,906; Section G). Table A5 gives the stratified recoverability curves, using the fixed majority-share cutpoints [0.60, 0.875] plus the most-contested slice; the dynamic coupling of AP *changes* to the spectral increments Δm and Δr is analyzed in Section 4.4.

Table A5 Same-answer AP by budget and difficulty stratum (defined-AP cohorts). The column grid omits $b=4096$ for space; the pooled defined-AP there is 0.673 (between $b=2048$ ’s 0.657 and $b=8192$ ’s 0.688). The last column is the same-answer AP of the commit-window graph $\mathbf{W}_C$ itself (0.719 pooled); b32768 is the largest prefix budget. Absolute levels are not comparable across strata (each stratum has its own same-answer prevalence, hence its own random-AP baseline).

Stratum	b32	b128	b512	b2048	b8192	b32768	$\mathbf{W}_C$
easy (≥ 0.875)	0.901	0.902	0.909	0.917	0.930	0.940	0.940
mid ($[0.60, 0.875)$)	0.605	0.612	0.625	0.653	0.692	0.725	0.726
hard (< 0.60)	0.317	0.321	0.337	0.394	0.433	0.480	0.484
contested (< 0.5)	0.237	0.239	0.247	0.315	0.357	0.413	0.418
all defined-AP	0.611	0.614	0.627	0.657	0.688	0.717	0.719

F Spectral Anatomy: Details, Controls, and Attribution Tests

This section backs [Section 4.3](#). The identity of [Equation \(3\)](#) is evaluable wherever $d_\perp$ is defined ($m < 1$): 49,549 of the 49,680 frames (16 budgets $\times$ 3,105 cohorts; the 131 frames at $m \approx 1$ have undefined $d_\perp$, and 2,999 cells have all 16 frames defined). Its maximum per-frame residual is 5.7×10^{-14} ; per-segment attribution residuals are $\leq 1.3 \times 10^{-15}$. [Figure A4](#) evaluates the identity term by term on one real eigenspectrum; [Figure A5](#) shows the underlying spectra directly; [Table A6](#) attributes each trajectory segment’s motion to the three channels; [Table A7](#) fits the residual axis on the common mode by subset; [Table A8](#) reports the experiment’s nulls.

Pre-registered hypotheses. Three hypotheses formed the Bonferroni family ($\alpha = 0.05/3$, 98.33% intervals). $H1$ (common-mode share exceeds residual share): early +0.289, 95% [+0.110, +0.444], 98.33% [+0.044, +0.478], 9/10; late +0.666 [+0.612, +0.731], 98.33% [+0.599, +0.756], 10/10—both supported. $H2$ (residual share larger early than late; matched-cell contrast, $n = 2,604$): +0.158 [+0.080, +0.232], 98.33% [+0.060, +0.251], 10/10—supported; with the late half restricted to live rollouts ($n = 2,256$) the contrast attenuates 45% to +0.087 [+0.011, +0.158], 8/10, and across seven bootstrap seeds the lower bound ranges +0.009 to +0.016: the contrast remains positive but attenuated under the live-rollout restriction, with a modestly seed-sensitive lower confidence bound. $H3$ (residual share enriched near the peak): rise $-0.020 [-0.133, +0.075]$, n.s. (MDE₈₀ 0.146); fall +0.269 [+0.213, +0.318], nominally positive—but a matched permuted-peak placebo reproduces 94% of it (excess +0.016; +0.006 to +0.021 across estimators) and cross-problem pseudo-cohorts reproduce roughly two thirds, so under the pre-registered placebo rule we interpret the contrast as a budget-position effect rather than peak-specific enrichment.

Placebos and cut points. Permuting each problem’s peak position across problems reproduces the attribution split almost exactly (placebo common-mode share 0.611 rise / 0.831 fall against true 0.691/0.853, i.e. 88%/97%), and a fixed-cut-point sweep with no peak anywhere gives a similar split at every cut: the decomposition describes the budget axis, not the peak.

Headroom normalization. Normalised by each factor’s available headroom, early-half motion is indistinguishable between the two factors (m +0.282 [+0.214, +0.359], r +0.226 [+0.139, +0.333]; difference +0.056 [−0.014, +0.116], n.s., MDE₈₀ 0.093); in the late half the common mode does move faster (+0.140 [+0.112, +0.167]). The nats-scale dominance of the common-mode term thus reflects a 5.89 $\times$ multiplier ratio in [Equation \(3\)](#), not uniformly faster motion of m .

Architecture-aware family contrasts. Because family co-varies with routing architecture, these contrasts are interpreted descriptively rather than causally. Significant residual-share differences concentrate on the descending branch (rise Instruct–OSS +0.154 [+0.065, +0.273]; fall Thinking–OSS +0.097 [+0.043, +0.156]; late Thinking–OSS +0.088 [+0.045, +0.155]; fall and late Instruct–Thinking -0.051 and -0.075 , both negative). The present sample does not resolve early-segment family differences (MDE₈₀ 0.24–1.77), so these contrasts are




Figure A4 The exact identity on one real, typical eigenspectrum. A normalised eigenspectrum (log scale) with the common-mode mass $m = p_1$ highlighted; the annotation evaluates $\log d_{\text{eff}} = h(m) + (1 - m) \log d_{\perp}$ term by term on this frame, and the two sides agree to the printed precision. The example is the committed per-shard spectrum whose m is closest to the median of those examples—typical rather than cherry-picked.




Figure A5 The trajectory is a redistribution of spectral mass. Mean normalised eigenspectrum over 2,999 cohorts (band: IQR), at the first budget, at each cohort's *own* peak (peak-aligned, since family peak budgets differ several-fold; Table A1), and at the last budget. The leading direction holds $p_1=0.689$ early, 0.334 at the peak and 0.688 late, while the tail beyond rank 8 moves the opposite way (0.084/0.238/0.096). The low–high–low form in d_{eff} is exactly this shift of mass out of and back into the leading eigendirections. Note that the two ends are spectrally alike, not merely equal in d_{eff} : p_1 differs by 0.001 between them. Cohorts with fewer than 32 graded rollouts are excluded so that every curve is averaged over the same eigenvalue ranks.

left uninterpreted. Shoelace tests do not detect family-level hysteresis in the (m, r) plane under the tested variants (e.g. closed loop $-0.011 [-0.070, +0.039]$, 5/10).

G Behavioral Localization: Preregistered Plan and Predictive Ladders

The frozen plan. The audit's endpoints, decision rule, and verdict sentences were fixed before the analyses ran. For each target Y the predictive specification ladder is $Y \sim \text{controls}; + f(\text{dens}); + f(m); + f(m) + g(r); + f(\log d_{\text{eff}})$, with f, g cubic B-spline bases (5 knots, fit on train folds) and controls = model×dataset fixed effects + log cohort size + two cohort-accuracy covariates (an indicator for majority-incorrect cohorts and terminal cohort accuracy; answer-derived, which if anything makes the residual null conservative), evaluated by 5-fold GroupKFold with groups = question. The two headline quantities are $\Delta R^2_{r|m} = R^2_{m+r} - R^2_m$ (residual-spectrum value) and $\Delta R^2_{\text{split}} = R^2_{m+r} - R^2_{d_{\text{eff}}}$ (the split-spectrum-vs-scalar out-of-fold difference). These are

Table A6 Attribution of trajectory motion by the midpoint split of Equation (3): share of $|\Delta \log d_{\text{eff}}|$ carried by the mixing term $h(m)$, the common-mode term, and the residual term, per segment (two-way clustered 95% CIs; all common-mode and residual shares are positive in $\geq 9/10$ configurations; mixing shares are n.s. with MDE₈₀ 0.04–0.08). “Live” restricts the segment to still-generating rollouts. Shares are pooled ratio-of-sums over each arm’s full cell set; the pre-registered H2 contrast of Section F is the same functional on the 2,604 cells matched across both halves (excluding 395 late-half segments whose $\Delta \log d_{\text{eff}}$ is exactly zero under frozen windows), where the early share is 0.317—so the contrast is +0.158, not the difference of the displayed rows.

Segment	n	$\Delta \log d_{\text{eff}}$	mixing h	common mode	residual
early half (32 → 1024)	2999	+1.136	+0.026	+0.631 [+537, +.719]	+0.342 [+271, +.429]
late half (1024 → 32768)	2999	−0.920	+0.017	+0.824 [+784, +.868]	+0.158 [+117, +.189]
late half, live only	2256	−0.717	+0.005	+0.776 [+707, +.845]	+0.219 [+170, +.267]
rise (peak-aligned)	2931	+1.605	+0.020	+0.691 [+611, +.772]	+0.289 [+212, +.354]
fall (peak-aligned)	2931	−1.400	+0.012	+0.853 [+822, +.885]	+0.135 [+092, +.174]
fall, live only	2663	−1.075	−0.002	+0.836 [+799, +.874]	+0.166 [+112, +.216]

Table A7 Grouped cross-validated fit of $r = \log d_{\perp}$ on m (folds grouped by question; 47,984 frames from the 2,999 complete cells). The residual axis is only partially predictable from the common mode.

Subset	frames	CV R^2	Spearman
all	47984	0.369	−0.639
OSS	29808	0.295	−0.530
Qwen-Instruct	9824	0.533	−0.764
Qwen-Thinking	8352	0.579	−0.767
all, rising branch	31109	0.545	−0.724
all, falling branch	18718	0.303	−0.345
OSS, falling	13067	0.251	−0.125

Table A8 Nulls for the anatomy experiment, on its own 6-shard pool and prominence gate (not comparable to the full-corpus gate; Section A). The expert-identity permutation drives the residual spectrum toward its near-isotropic ceiling ($d_{\perp} \rightarrow N-1$); cross-problem pseudo-cohorts of unrelated rollouts retain the coarse arc.

Variant	n	med. m	med. $d_{\perp}$	med. d_{eff}	prom.
real ($N=64$)	204	0.450	38.9	14.4	97.5%
id. permutation	204	0.082	62.9	59.5	3.4%
pseudo-cohorts ($N=32$)	264	0.321	25.1	16.8	97.0%

out-of-fold predictive comparisons rather than formally nested models (only $m \rightarrow (m, r)$ is nested). Primaries (Bonferroni family of three, $\alpha = 0.0167$): $P1$ answer effective count $\log d_{\text{ans}}$ against commit-graph state; $P2$ terminal AP lift on defined-AP cohorts; $P3$ the paired effort contrast on peak height. Correctness was pre-registered as an uncorrected *boundary* endpoint. The decision tree committed three verdict sentences verbatim, and the frozen rule selected Outcome C; for neutral presentation the branches are labelled A/B/C, with the verbatim verdicts and the selection rule unchanged. **Outcome A:** “Effective rank is common-mode dominated, but its residual spectrum carries independent information about semantic multiplicity and routing–answer organization—not correctness.” **Outcome B:** “Residual spectral dimensionality reflects computation style rather than output semantics.” **Outcome C (selected):** “In these cohorts, routing effective rank is primarily a smooth full-spectrum reparameterization of global routing agreement; the residual axis varies, but we find no independent operational semantics for it.” Outcome C constrains claims about incremental residual semantics on the tested answer-space targets; it does not alter the exact spectral decomposition, the residual axis’s structural independence, or the effort–timing effects.

Behavioral-localization layer. The confirmatory verdict above is unchanged, and $P3$ ’s registered primary—the paired effort contrast on peak height—varies across architectures with a pooled interval spanning zero (+0.104

$[-0.079, +0.232]$; [Table A10](#)). On top of it we report secondary trajectory endpoints that localize the positive effects rather than alter the primary family: peak time, peak-normalized occupancy Occ_d , width above $0.8d_{\max}$, and integrated common-mode/residual mass. Peak time, occupancy, and the integrated masses are passthroughs of the confirmatory statistics; the width and alignment readouts were computed under decision rules fixed before this layer ran. The width rule licensed “broadens” only if all four architectures agreed and the pooled interval excluded zero; both conditions were met. The pooled rows are descriptive aggregates over four architecture clusters. A separate peak-alignment analysis reveals architecture-specific shape changes beyond a rigid temporal translation.

[Table A9](#) gives the full ladders ([Figure A6](#) renders them as a heatmap); per-architecture effort contrasts are in [Table A10](#), and the correctness boundary in [Table A11](#) and [Figure A9](#).

Conditioning audit. Every subset gate reports kept and dropped counts to make the conditioning step explicit. P1 keeps 3,096/3,105 (kept mean m 0.688 vs. dropped 0.628). P2 keeps 1,906/3,105: 1,193 unanimous cohorts have undefined AP (leaving 1,912), and a further 6 are removed by the audit family’s shared ≥ 10 -graded-rollout gate (all OSS-20B-High $\times$ GPQA cohorts with 5–9 gradeable answers); the dropped set has majority share 0.998 vs. 0.715 kept—so the alignment verdict speaks only for contested, sufficiently graded cohorts.

Dynamic recoverability localization. Regressing per-step changes in AP lift on the spectral increments with budget-step fixed effects (28,622 steps from 318 questions $\times$ 10 configurations) gives $\text{coef}(\Delta m) = +0.522$ $[+0.430, +0.609]$ and $\text{coef}(\Delta r) = -0.047$ $[-0.092, -0.016]$ (two-way question $\times$ configuration clustered, $B=500$; a supplementary analysis outside the Bonferroni family); a within-question time shuffle sits at $\approx +0.002/-0.000$. Thus the positive recoverability association is localized to increasing common-mode mass; the residual partial is small and opposite-signed. Standardized, a 1-SD step in common-mode mass moves recoverability roughly four times as much as a 1-SD step in residual dimensionality ($+0.048$ $[+0.040, +0.057]$ vs. -0.011 $[-0.023, -0.004]$ per SD); re-clustering on question $\times$ base architecture (four clusters) widens both intervals by 15–40% without changing either sign ($\beta_{\Delta r}$ $[-0.111, -0.015]$).

Peak alignment does not collapse the effort contrast. After aligning each cohort by its own maximum, the lower/higher-effort trajectory gap shrinks by at least half only for OSS-20B; the aligned/raw gap ratios are 0.32/0.74/2.24/1.62 across the four architectures. The effort effect is therefore not a rigid time translation of one shared curve ([Figure A7](#) shows the unaligned trajectories). Edge censoring is negligible (1.8%); excluding censored pairs leaves the width contrast unchanged ($+1.26$ $[+0.57, +1.97]$ octaves).

H Subcohort Fidelity and Absolute Scale

Small-cohort estimates of d_{eff} order cohorts usably at the terminal frame from $n \approx 8$, but the peak frame—where the spectrum is most spread—requires far larger subcohorts ([Table A12](#), [Figure A10](#)).

Absolute scale. An effective rank computed on n rollouts is bounded by n , so small-cohort readings are compressed by construction and can only be compared across cohort sizes after an inversion; for rank-based uses the compression is close to a monotone rescaling. Where an absolute value is wanted, a closed form is available for the *order-two* effective rank, which depends on the graph only through its mean squared off-diagonal entry; because that quantity is a pairwise mean, a subsample estimates it without bias and the full-cohort value follows with no fitted calibration: median error 4.4% at $n=8$, versus 7.5% for a per-family fitted inversion. Within the Hill family [17] the order-two member is the one that admits this; the order-one member underlying d_{eff} does not. The same construction removes the cohort-size dependence that otherwise contaminates size-varying readouts.

Table A9 Semantic-audit ladders: out-of-fold R^2 under GroupKFold by question. $\Delta R^2_{r|m}$ carries two-way clustered 95% CIs; the Bonferroni 98.33% intervals for the two regression primaries are P1 $[-0.011, +0.052]$ and P2 $[-0.102, +0.036]$ —both span zero. Density and common-mode mass provide nearly identical predictive value on these endpoints (ΔR^2 : -0.0005 on P1, $+0.0036$ on P2), localizing the observable association to the global agreement channel; the spectral formulation contributes exact channel attribution and an independent residual coordinate rather than scalar predictive lift.

Target	n	controls	+dens	+ m	+ (m, r)	+log d_{eff}	$\Delta R^2_{r m}$ [95%]	$\Delta R^2_{\text{split}}$
log d_{ans} (commit, P1)	3,096	0.610	0.631	0.631	0.648	0.641	+0.018 $[-.004, +.041]$	+0.007
log d_{ans} (terminal, sens.)	3,096	0.610	0.632	0.632	0.649	0.642	+0.017 $[-.018, +.039]$	+0.007
AP lift (terminal, P2)	1,906	0.216	0.260	0.264	0.267	0.268	+0.003 $[-.051, +.023]$	-0.002
difficulty (secondary)	3096	0.564	0.586	0.586	0.607	0.595	+0.022 $[-.001, +.050]$	+0.012

Table A10 Effort localization, paired within architecture (higher minus lower tier, matched by question; question-clustered 95% CIs; pooled row clustered by question $\times$ architecture, 4 architecture clusters). $\Delta \log d_{\text{max}}$ (peak height) is the registered primary endpoint of this contrast—it varies by architecture, with a pooled interval spanning zero; the remaining columns are secondary endpoints. $\text{Occ}_d = \int d_{\text{eff}}(\tau)/d_{\text{max}} d\tau$ with τ the normalized budget-grid index; $w_{0.8}$ is the octave width of the contiguous $d_{\text{eff}} \geq 0.8d_{\text{max}}$ regime. The consistent effects are later maxima, greater peak-normalized occupancy, a wider high-rank interval, and weaker integrated common-mode mass. Residual-spectrum area has no common shift.

Architecture	n	$\Delta \log_2 t_{\text{max}}$	$\Delta \log d_{\text{max}}$	ΔOcc_d	$\Delta w_{0.8}$	ΔAUC_m	ΔAUC_r
OSS-20B	282	+3.86 [3.66, 4.03]	+1.81 [.141, .217]	+1.07 [.097, .117]	+1.47 [1.28, 1.63]	-.113 [-.119, -.106]	-.144 [-.195, -.093]
OSS-120B	309	+2.97 [2.80, 3.14]	+2.34 [.189, .285]	+1.72 [.161, .183]	+2.02 [1.84, 2.20]	-.156 [-.163, -.150]	+1.04 [.064, .146]
Qwen3-30B	310	+1.70 [1.56, 1.83]	+0.93 [.058, .124]	+0.40 [.030, .052]	+.47 [.29, .65]	-.038 [-.045, -.031]	+0.079 [.040, .117]
Qwen3-Next-80B	296	+1.90 [1.82, 2.00]	-.093 [-.130, -.052]	+0.87 [.078, .096]	+1.22 [1.07, 1.36]	-.041 [-.048, -.033]	-.039 [-.080, .006]
Pooled	—	+2.59 [1.72, 3.83]	+1.04 [-.079, .232]	+1.02 [.045, .168]	+1.29 [.55, 1.99]	-.087 [-.154, -.036]	+0.004 [-.127, .111]

Table A11 Correctness comparison: fit-free single-feature AUCs (cohorts with ≥ 10 graded rollouts). We retain the pre-registered one-sided reading and do not reinterpret the coefficient sign post hoc; answer-side baselines remain stronger than standalone routing features for correctness selection.

Feature	cohort AUC [95%]	rollout AUC
vote margin	0.833 [.790, .869]	0.860
d_{ans} (neg.)	0.821 [.777, .859]	0.856
question prior (LOMO)	0.909 [.872, .953]	0.856
m (terminal)	0.542 [.472, .658]	0.548
density (terminal)	0.539 [.469, .660]	0.545
d_{eff} (terminal)	0.440 [.324, .509]	0.432
r (terminal)	0.381 [.321, .478]	0.380

I Frozen-Coordinate Transfer to LiveCodeBench-v5

Every quantity in the paper was developed on math and science benchmarks. To test whether the trajectory readouts are properties of that domain or of the process, we froze every dial—window length, subcohort size $n=8$, peak-detector thresholds, all family constants—and ran the readouts once on LiveCodeBench-v5, which had been excluded from every analysis decision (1,582 problems, the same ten configurations). The gross trajectory statistics transfer within noise of their math anchors: the share of cohorts with a prominent interior maximum is 97.7% (math: 98.5%), a frozen running-maximum peak detector fires on 98.3% of cohorts at precision 0.972 (math: 0.92–0.95), and the recoverability gain transfers with the same sign at smaller magnitude. Thinking transfers best (peak share 100%).

Transfer sharpens two scope conditions. Cross-problem rank fidelity at $n=8$ ($b=4096$) is 0.881, against a matched within-configuration math value of 0.866; the corpus-pooled variant of the same statistic reads ≈ 0.98 only because between-configuration level differences dominate its ranking, and is not a valid anchor

$\log d_{\text{ans}}$ (commit graph)	0.610 baseline	0.631 +0.022	0.631 +0.021	0.648 +0.039 vs. +m: +0.018 n.s.	0.641 +0.032
AP lift (terminal)	0.216 baseline	0.260 +0.045	0.264 +0.048	0.267 +0.051 vs. +m: +0.003 n.s.	0.268 +0.052
difficulty (1 – maj. share)	0.564 baseline	0.586 +0.021	0.586 +0.021	0.607 +0.043 vs. +m: +0.022 n.s.	0.595 +0.031
	controls (baseline)	+density	+m	+(m, r)	+log d_{eff}

Figure A6 Out-of-sample model ladders for the semantic endpoints. Grouped-CV R^2 (upper number) and its increment over controls (lower number). The predictive ladder localizes answer-space coupling to the global agreement channel: density and common-mode mass provide nearly identical predictive value on these targets, while the residual axis remains the distinct structural coordinate of RQ2 (increments bounded in Figure A8). The scalar $\log d_{\text{eff}}$ lies between the agreement-only and split-spectrum models.




Figure A7 Higher effort moves the effective-rank maximum later in every architecture. Peak-normalized trajectories for paired lower- and higher-effort configurations, with paired peak-delay intervals on the right. The timing effect is uniform; peak height is architecture-dependent.

Table A12 Rank fidelity of subsampled d_{eff} : median over 50 (model, dataset) shards of the Spearman correlation, across a shard’s cohorts, between d_{eff} on a random n -rollout subcohort (20 draws) and the full 64-rollout graph; two-way (dataset $\times$ model) clustered 95% CIs.

n	terminal frame	peak frame
2	0.517 [.430, .588]	0.200 [.158, .265]
4	0.738 [.654, .763]	0.411 [.315, .485]
8	0.850 [.788, .880]	0.611 [.493, .692]
16	0.926 [.889, .942]	0.791 [.721, .838]
32	0.971 [.957, .976]	0.916 [.890, .945]

here (this readout is also distinct from the terminal/peak fidelities of Table A12, which use the full 64-rollout graph and single draws). The domain-sensitive readout is the *text* channel: string-match vote margins do not transfer to code, reading contested cohorts at AUC 0.433 against ≈ 0.83 on math, because functionally similar programs rarely share identical strings; the routing-side correctness readout is unchanged (0.407, inside its null band). The division of labour—text statistics for answer selection—presumes an answer space in which




Figure A8 Residual *terminal incremental* associations are bounded on the tested targets. Incremental out-of-fold R^2 from adding residual dimensionality after common-mode mass. Thick whiskers are 95% and thin whiskers Bonferroni 98.33% two-way clustered intervals. The intervals constrain independent residual contributions on the tested targets (95% upper bounds: +0.04 for answer effective count, +0.02 for AP lift) while remaining compatible with small effects.




Figure A9 Correctness selection favors answer-side statistics. Fit-free single-feature AUCs for cohort majority correctness (circles) and rollout-level correctness (diamonds); dotted line: chance; two-way clustered 95% CIs ($B=500$, uncorrected). Text-side baselines sit at 0.82–0.91 (the 0.91 question prior uses the other nine configurations’ outcomes), while the best routing feature reaches 0.542, separating answer selection from the structural-monitoring role studied in the main paper.

string equality is meaningful; execution-based verification is the right substitute where it is not.

J Representation Robustness: Binary Expert-Set Jaccard

All main results use the weighted-Jaccard (gate-weight) graph. Replacing it with a *binary* expert-set Jaccard—which experts fired, ignoring gate weights—leaves every soft/geometric result unchanged or slightly better, on the same 3,105 cohorts (the two pipelines retain identical problem sets, so the comparison is matched by construction). The family ordering is preserved (d_{eff} 7.5/14.9/19.6 vs. weighted 9.2/18.8/25.0; only the absolute scale compresses); same-answer AP improves by +0.006 to +0.008. The partition and correctness-selection conclusions are weight-independent and unchanged. More importantly, binary expert-activation sets preserve the routing fingerprint and slightly improve same-answer AP: the method operates from sparse expert-activation indicators alone, without router gate magnitudes.

K Spectral Validity of the Routing Graph

Empirically, the symmetrized weighted-Jaccard (Ruzicka) matrices are positive semi-definite to numerical precision here. Across all 52,785 cohort graphs ($17 \times 3,105$: every model, dataset, and budget, plus the




Figure A10 Rank fidelity of subsampled d_{eff} (Table A12): terminal-frame ordering is reliable from $n \approx 8$ ($\rho = 0.85$), while peak-frame fidelity improves steadily from 0.20 at $n=2$ to 0.92 at $n=32$, reflecting the greater spectral spread near the trajectory maximum. The dotted line at 0.91 is the fidelity of per-rollout *density* against a different (same-answer recoverability) target; it does not describe d_{eff} .

commit window) the minimum eigenvalue of the symmetrized $\mathbf{W}$ is $\geq -5.8 \times 10^{-14}$ ($\geq -4.6 \times 10^{-14}$ on the boxed-rollout submatrices the spectra are computed on); the fraction of graphs with a minimum eigenvalue below -10^{-12} is 0.00%. The clip to zero used before the spectral entropy (Equation (2)) therefore removes only floating-point noise.

L Operational Scope: Structural Monitoring versus Answer Selection

We additionally tested whether the global spectral summaries that diagnose cohort organization can support answer selection. Across fit-free correctness AUCs, partition tests, vote reweighting, and token-accuracy frontier analyses, answer-side signals remain stronger for selection. These results separate two complementary roles: routing spectra provide a label-free view of internal cohort geometry, while margins, execution signals, and verifiers remain the appropriate tools for answer selection.

L.1 Structural Analysis: Routing Geometry Is Diffuse Rather than Partition-Like

Answer-side statistics remain stronger for correctness selection. Given a same-question cohort, d_{eff} predicts majority-vote correctness at AUC 0.506 versus 0.832 for a vote margin, and same-answer-support coherence is near-identical for correct and incorrect answers (0.698 vs. 0.697; AUC 0.483). (These are different estimands, not two conventions for one number: Table A11 scores the *signed* terminal-frame ($b=32768$) $\log d_{\text{eff}}$ of the full boxed cohort graph on the 3,096 cohorts with ≥ 10 answer-assigned rollouts, while this paragraph scores a *direction-folded* d_{eff} recomputed on the answer-bearing subgraph at the $b=4096$ prefix over 3,055 cohorts with ≥ 16 answer-bearing rollouts—folding is why this value cannot fall below 0.5. Neither analysis finds any routing feature competitive with the answer-side baselines, and r ’s resolved below-chance value is not inverted into an error signal.) The pooled 0.506 should not be read as “the signal is absent”: resolved by granularity, routing reaches 0.65 across problems and 0.68 within a problem, while each remains below a matched text statistic on its own terms (problem prior 0.95, answer agreement 0.75, vote margin 0.83), and the single-rollout null is powered (AUC 0.51, power 1.00 against a 5-point effect) rather than data-limited. The comparison holds at every granularity, separating answer selection from structural monitoring. This is structural: the routing graph encodes graded, diffuse cohort organization rather than a *label-free* answer-separating partition—even the oracle commit graph has no hard clusters (eigengap $\hat{k} \approx 1$, spectral clustering [41] reaching an adjusted Rand index [19] of only ≈ 0.07).

Table A13 Sample accounting. All analyses draw from the same fixed activation cache; the retained count differs only by an explicit per-analysis filter.

Analysis	Retained	Unit	Filter
Pooled trajectory (Figure 1)	3,105	cohorts/cell	none (frozen windows retained; all 16 frames finite)
Cohort corpus (Section 4.1)	3,105	cohorts	5 math/sci, 50 shards
Binary-Jaccard ablation (Section J)	3,105	cohorts	same corpus, binary graph
Spectral anatomy (Section F)	49,549 / 2,999	frames / cells	$d_{\perp}$ defined ($m < 1$) / all 16 frames
Audit P1 / difficulty (Table A9)	3,096	cohorts	≥ 10 graded rollouts
Audit P2, AP lift (Table A9)	1,906	cohorts	defined AP (≥ 2 answers) and ≥ 10 graded rollouts
Dynamic AP regression (Section G)	28,622	budget steps	defined-AP increments
Subcohort fidelity (Table A12)	3,105	cohorts	50 shards $\times$ 20 draws
Defined-AP recoverability (Table A5)	1,912	cohorts	≥ 2 distinct answers (no audit gate)
Token $\times$ acc Pareto (Section L.2)	2,996	problems	exact rollout lengths
Spectral validity (Section K)	52,785	graphs	every model $\times$ data $\times$ budget + commit

Prefix state is descriptive rather than prognostic. Prefix routing state does not predict whether a cohort will ultimately reach unanimity (a GRPO zero-advantage proxy): pooled AUC is only 0.45–0.56. The state describes present organization, not destination.

Hard answer labels subsume the tested soft-geometry weighting. With m hard labels in hand, the tested soft-geometry weightings are subsumed: graph-weighted distribution extrapolation matches a plain estimate (TV 0.0980 vs. 0.0983), and density-weighted voting performs comparably to equal-weight voting (majority-vote accuracy 0.9496 vs. 0.9512 on this control’s evaluation base, which differs from the frontier base of Section L.2). The graph’s value is concentrated *before* labels are available—in geometric calibration.

Oracle-seeded propagation remains limited by diffuse membership. Factorizing a seed-and-propagate pipeline for majority-vs-rest separation shows that the limiting factor is membership assignment rather than seed coverage: selectors cover minority members (0.30–0.45 minority share), but 16-seed subgraph purity is only 0.55–0.68, and even *ground-truth* seed labels cap propagation at 0.616 (prefix) / 0.692 (commit). The full feasible pipeline sits at chance (0.48–0.51).

d_{eff} is better suited to observation than vote reweighting. We evaluated six ways of incorporating d_{eff} into voting—re-weighting, stop trigger, vote count, subset selection, confidence, and efficiency—and none improves on the corresponding answer-side baseline under the tested protocols. Diversity/effective-count re-weighting (using $d_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{W})$ as an effective vote count) slightly *hurts* majority vote at commit (-0.0072 , significant): the re-weighting quantity carries no correctness signal (the coherence null above). An out-of-fold logistic over vote margin and gap (on the same 3,055-cohort pool, 0.833) gains nothing from adding d_{eff} and dens (0.830).

L.2 Answer/Compute Frontier Analysis

We also tested directly whether these routing summaries extend the answer/compute frontier; under the tested protocols the strongest frontier points come from answer-side signals, cleanly separating the structural-monitoring role of routing spectra from answer-side selection and stopping.

Token $\times$ accuracy Pareto. On 2,996 problems with exact per-rollout lengths, the strongest frontier points are provided by the number of votes and text-margin early-stopping: plain self-consistency peaks at $N \approx 24$ (0.7613 at 40.9% cost, above full $N=64$ ’s 0.7570—over-provisioning hurts), consistency early-stop is an on-frontier saver, and the tested routing-based levers (redundancy kill, -0.3 to -0.6 pp; d_{eff} -based cross-problem N allocation) do not reach the frontier.

Early-stop discrimination. When consistency early-stop fires (62% of problems, premature-stop rate 0.001), predicting whether a stop is correct is AUC 0.660 for the vote margin versus 0.521 for d_{eff} ; routing adds -0.034

$[-0.076, +0.025]$ over the margin (CI includes zero).

Vote confidence and efficiency. Confidence and efficiency are likewise the margin’s doing: 92.4% of problems are settled by $N=8$, and truncating the most-confident 70% at $N=8$ reaches full-64 accuracy at 24.8 votes. Routing provides no measurable incremental gain in these answer-side decisions.

M Reproducibility and Sample Accounting

All cohort statistics derive from one fixed activation cache of MoE routing histograms, with d_{eff} computed by the same symmetrize-and-clip implementation throughout; the commit graph uses the boxed-answer subwindow. The corpus is 3,105 cohorts across 50 model×dataset shards, identical under the weighted and the indicator (binary) graph; trajectory statistics, including the 98.5% prominent-peak rate, are computed on the weighted graph over all 3,105 cohorts, and 3,096 is the audit family’s retention (≥ 10 graded rollouts), not a pipeline difference. The spectral-anatomy analyses (Section F) evaluate Equation (3) on the 49,549 frames with defined $d_{\perp}$ (of 49,680 total); the 2,999 complete cells supply the attribution segments and the 47,984 CV-fit frames. The audit ladders (Section G) are anchored to the corpus tables to deviation $< 10^{-13}$. Every analysis draws from this one cache; the retained count differs only by an explicit per-analysis filter (Table A13), never by a dataset swap.

Infrastructure and availability. All rollouts were generated with vLLM on a single node with eight NVIDIA H20 GPUs and 2 TB of system memory; the routing histograms were captured during serving, and all downstream spectral and statistical analyses ran on the fixed activation cache described above. The activation caches, cohort-level tables, and the complete analysis code will be released under a license permitting free research use, with exact software versions pinned in the release.