

Separating Stream Stability from Long-Term Recall in Language Models

Peipei Cao¹, Xin Zhang², Jie Tang³, Xiao Li³, Siying Li², Qing Pei³

¹School of Computer and Electronic Information, Guangxi University

²School of Information Science and Engineering, Chongqing Jiaotong University

³School of Computer Science and Technology, Guangdong University of Technology

Abstract

Methods for streaming language models are often discussed alongside long-context and memory systems, although they solve different problems. An attention sink can stabilize autoregressive generation over an indefinitely long stream while the model remains unable to use content that has left its recent-token cache. We argue that this distinction should be explicit in system claims and evaluation. We introduce three horizons: the *stability horizon*, over which predictive behavior remains well behaved; the *access horizon*, over which past content can still causally affect the output; and the *utility horizon*, over which a task retains acceptable performance. We show constructively that the stability horizon can be infinite while the access and utility horizons are finite. We then propose THREEH, an evaluation contract that measures all three horizons under a common state and compute budget. Applying the framework to attention-sink streaming clarifies its strength, constant-memory, stable generation, without treating anchor tokens as semantic memory. The framework exposes roles for cache policies, recurrent state, retrieval, and external memory. Experiments on 128K-token streams, delayed binding recall, and delayed decisions show that attention sinks preserve local modeling but not content beyond the active cache; recurrent and retrieval state extend the semantic horizon.

1 Introduction

Language models are increasingly expected to run continuously: a dialogue may last for days, an agent may process an unbounded event stream, and a service may generate tokens long after its original prompt. Ordinary dense attention is a poor fit for this setting because its key–value (KV) cache grows with the stream. A fixed recent-token window bounds memory, but naively evicting the oldest states can cause generation quality to collapse.

StreamingLLM identified a striking remedy: retain a few initial KV states as *attention sinks* to-

gether with the recent window (Xiao et al., 2024b). This small change preserves stable language modeling over millions of tokens without fine-tuning. The result is important, simple, and widely useful. It is also easy to over-interpret. The retained sink states stabilize attention normalization; they do not absorb the semantics of all subsequently evicted tokens. StreamingLLM itself makes this boundary clear: it enables continuous generation but does not enlarge the amount of historical content the model can attend to.

That boundary becomes blurred when “infinite context,” “streaming,” and “long-term memory” are used interchangeably. A system may generate fluent text forever while forgetting a fact from ten minutes ago. Conversely, a system may retrieve an old fact accurately but have poor token-level throughput. Perplexity, needle retrieval, and downstream task accuracy therefore answer different questions.

We propose separating three properties:

1. the **stability horizon**: how long the model can run before its predictive behavior degrades;
2. the **access horizon**: how far back information can still causally influence the output; and
3. the **utility horizon**: how far back task-relevant information can be placed while maintaining a specified level of task performance.

These horizons need not move together. This paper contributes (i) a formal separation showing that unbounded stream stability does not imply unbounded memory, (ii) THREEH, a budget-matched evaluation protocol for reporting all three properties, and (iii) design implications for systems that combine attention sinks with recurrent state or retrieval. Our goal is not to diminish streaming methods, but to make their achievement precise and

to prevent the wrong benchmark from becoming evidence for the wrong capability.

2 Three Horizons for Long-Running Models

2.1 Setup

Let $x_{1:t}$ be a token stream and let M_t be the model state retained after token t . A bounded-state streaming system updates

$$M_t = U(M_{t-1}, x_t), \quad |M_t| \leq B,$$

and predicts x_{t+1} from M_t . The state may contain KV vectors, recurrent activations, compressed summaries, retrieved passages, or mixtures of these. The budget B should count all persistent state, not only the visible prompt.

Stability horizon. For a degradation tolerance ϵ , define

$$H_{\text{stab}}(\epsilon) = \sup\{T : \Delta\mathcal{L}(t) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } t \leq T\},$$

where $\Delta\mathcal{L}(t)$ is the excess predictive loss relative to a declared reference at stream position t . One can replace loss with a distributional divergence or another local generation criterion. Stability is about whether the model continues to operate normally.

Access horizon. Let $x_i \rightsquigarrow y_t$ mean that changing x_i , while holding an appropriate counterfactual continuation fixed, can change the distribution of output y_t . The access horizon at time t is

$$H_{\text{access}}(t) = \max\{t - i : x_i \rightsquigarrow y_t\}.$$

This is a causal property of the state update and read mechanism. For a pure sliding KV window of size W , non-initial content older than W tokens cannot affect the output after eviction. Retained initial sink tokens are exceptions at fixed positions, not a general historical channel.

Utility horizon. For task family $\mathcal{T}$, score threshold α , and lag d , let $S_{\mathcal{T}}(d)$ be expected task performance when decisive information is placed d tokens before the query. Then

$$H_{\text{util}}(\mathcal{T}, \alpha) = \sup\{d : S_{\mathcal{T}}(d) \geq \alpha\}.$$

Utility depends on the task, interference, prompting, and decision rule. It can be much smaller than the architectural access horizon because accessible information may still be ignored, a phenomenon documented in long-context evaluation (Liu et al., 2024a; Hsieh et al., 2024).

2.2 Stability does not imply memory

Proposition 1 (Horizon separation). *There exists a bounded-state autoregressive model with $H_{\text{stab}}(\epsilon) = \infty$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, while $H_{\text{access}}(t) \leq W$ for all non-initial tokens and $H_{\text{util}}(\mathcal{T}, \alpha) \leq W$ for a delayed-recall task.*

Proof. Consider a stationary order- W token process and a model that exactly represents its next-token conditionals using only the latest W tokens. Its predictive loss does not increase with stream length, so its stability horizon is infinite. Now define a delayed-recall task whose answer at time t is a uniformly random symbol presented only at $t - W - 1$, independent of the intervening stream. The retained state contains no function of that symbol. Consequently, changing it cannot affect the output, and no policy reading only the state can outperform chance. Thus access and above-chance utility are bounded even though stream prediction remains stable. $\square$

Token-level language modeling can be dominated by local statistics, whereas memory tasks deliberately depend on remote variables. An infinite stability horizon is therefore compatible with a short semantic horizon.

3 What Attention Sinks Do

In causal self-attention, early tokens are visible to nearly every later position. Several pretrained model families allocate substantial attention to these positions even when they are not semantically important (Xiao et al., 2024b). Removing them changes the normalization geometry seen during training and can destabilize a windowed KV cache. Retaining a few initial states keeps that geometry closer to the pretrained regime.

This mechanism supports two claims. First, sink retention can make the computational process *stationary enough* for long-running inference. Second, it can do so with constant KV memory and without rebuilding the recent window. The mechanism does not support a third claim: that the initial states encode arbitrary later events. In an ordinary Transformer forward pass, the KV vectors of a fixed initial token are computed before those events arrive and are not retroactively updated. Once a later token is evicted, there is no content path from it to future outputs unless the system provides another state-update or retrieval mechanism.

Stream position	1 ... $t - W$... t
Sink-window state: retain a few fixed initial anchors + the latest W token states. Generation can remain stable as $t \rightarrow \infty$, but ordinary content between the anchors and recent window has no path to the output after eviction.	
Memory-augmented state: update a recurrent summary or query an external store. Remote content may affect the output, but access, selection, and task use must be measured separately from stream stability.	

Figure 1: Stable streaming and long-term memory are different system properties. Attention sinks anchor computation; a separate update or access path is needed for evicted content to remain semantically available.

The distinction resembles earlier separations in long-context research. Positional methods such as ALiBi and RoPE, and extensions such as YaRN and LongRoPE, address how attention behaves at different distances (Press et al., 2022; Su et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2024; Ding et al., 2024); they do not guarantee that models use all available evidence. Exact and sparse attention systems reduce the cost of processing long prompts (Dao et al., 2022; Zaheer et al., 2020; Jiang et al., 2024; Xiong et al.). KV-cache methods instead retain or load selected states (Zhang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2023; Ge et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2024; Xiao et al., 2025); selection quality and semantic retention remain empirical questions. Long-context benchmarks repeatedly show that fitting text into a context window is not the same as using it reliably (Liu et al., 2024a; Bai et al., 2024; Hsieh et al., 2024).

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental setup

We evaluate a pretrained causal decoder with a $W = 2,048$ -token active cache. We compare five conceptual systems:

- **Window:** retain only the latest W KV states;
- **StreamingLLM:** retain four initial sinks and $W - 4$ recent states;
- **Window recomputation:** rebuild a fresh W -token cache before each prediction;
- **Recurrent:** update a fixed-size learned memory at window boundaries; and
- **Sink + retrieval:** use attention sinks locally and retrieve old records from an external store.

The stability track streams 128K tokens and normalizes perplexity to each method’s value at 2K. The retention track inserts four-way random bindings at lags from $0.25W$ to $8W$. The utility track delays evidence for a three-action decision task

Method	PPL@128K	State	Lat.	Recall@8W
Window	5.40	W	1.00	25
StreamingLLM	1.04	W	1.03	25
Recompute	1.02	W	7.80	25
Recurrent	1.08	$W + M$	1.12	46
Sink + retrieval	1.05	$W + D$	1.35	78
Dense oracle	1.00	$64W$	38.0	96

Table 1: System results. PPL is normalized to the 2K value; latency is relative per-token latency; recall is percent on a four-way task. M is recurrent state and D is an external store.

over the same lags. Targets never occupy the fixed sink positions. Each lag contains 500 test examples.

4.2 Attention sinks stabilize the stream

Figure 2a replicates the attention-sink phenomenon. At 128K tokens, plain window attention reaches an $5.40\times$ its short-stream perplexity. StreamingLLM remains at $1.04\times$, close to window recomputation at $1.02\times$. Adding retrieval leaves stream stability nearly unchanged at $1.05\times$, because the store is queried only by evaluation prompts. Thus, attention sinks solve the stability problem without paying the recomputation baseline’s $7.8\times$ latency.

4.3 Stability and retention separate

Inside the cache, Window and StreamingLLM reach 97–98% recall. At $2W$, both fall to approximately chance: 26% for Window and 26% for StreamingLLM. Their curves overlap because sink states are fixed before the random binding appears. The recurrent system retains 70% at $2W$ and 46% at $8W$, while retrieval reaches 89% and 78%. The dense oracle remains above 96%.

The key comparison is therefore not Window versus StreamingLLM on retention; both lack a path from an evicted non-initial token. It is StreamingLLM’s $1.04\times$ perplexity paired with 25% remote recall. The system looks indefinitely stable under local language modeling while carrying only a one-window general semantic access horizon.




Figure 2: Three-horizon results. Window attention becomes unstable after eviction, whereas attention sinks and recomputation maintain local language modeling. StreamingLLM nevertheless falls to chance on remote bindings and delayed decisions once evidence leaves the recent cache. Recurrent state degrades gradually; retrieval preserves a longer, imperfect tail.

Method	H_{stab}	H_{access}	H_{util}	Dominant bottleneck
Window	$2W$	$1W$	$0.5W$	normalization
StreamingLLM	$> 64W$	$1W$	$0.5W$	eviction
Recurrent	$> 64W$	$2W$	$1W$	interference
Sink + retrieval	$> 64W$	$8W$	$4W$	selection/use

Table 2: Measured horizons under the following thresholds: stability $\leq 1.1 \times$ normalized perplexity, retention $\geq 75\%$, and utility $\geq 75\%$.




Figure 3: Measured horizon profiles. StreamingLLM has a long stability horizon but the same one-window access profile as ordinary window attention; recurrent and retrieval mechanisms trade additional state for a longer semantic horizon.

4.4 Task utility has its own horizon

Delayed decision accuracy follows retention but is not identical to it (Figure 2c). StreamingLLM reaches 93% for evidence at $0.5W$, 83% at the boundary, and 36% at $2W$, near the 33.3% chance rate. Retrieval reaches 85% at $2W$ and 73% at $8W$, below its binding recall because retrieved evidence must still be interpreted. Recurrent memory shows a smoother but lower tail.

4.5 Ablations and robustness checks

We test whether the separation survives changes in cache size, target placement, interference, and number of sink tokens. Table 3 shows that more sinks improve stability up to a small saturation point but do not extend random-position recall. Doubling

Condition	PPL@128K	Recall@ $2W$	Utility@ $2W$
0 sinks	5.40	25	34
1 sink	1.31	25	34
4 sinks	1.04	26	36
8 sinks	1.03	26	35
4 sinks, cache $2W$	1.03	91	84
4 sinks + retrieval $k = 1$	1.04	73	68
4 sinks + retrieval $k = 4$	1.05	89	85

Table 3: Ablation results. Sink count changes stability but not remote semantic access; cache and retrieval interventions move the access horizon.

W shifts the recall cliff from $1W$ to $2W$ in absolute tokens, while leaving the cliff at approximately one normalized cache window. Retrieval depth improves the remote tail at additional query cost.

Takeaway. The experiments establish a two-part result: attention sinks recover stable and efficient streaming, replicating their intended benefit, while counterfactual delayed tests show that stability should not be read as long-term memory. Recurrent and retrieval mechanisms extend access differently, and their utility remains below raw access because they introduce interference or selection errors.

5 THREEH: A Three-Horizon Evaluation Contract

We propose that any system described as streaming, infinite-context, or long-term memory report the following three tracks under one declared resource budget. The protocol is deliberately compatible with sink-window, recurrent, compressed, and retrieval-augmented systems.

5.1 Track A: stream stability

Feed a continuous natural-text stream substantially longer than the training window. Report predictive loss in fixed position buckets, the worst

bucket degradation, per-token latency, peak accelerator memory, and persistent state size. The reference must be explicit: dense attention within its supported range, window recomputation, or a fixed-context oracle answer different questions. Boundary effects between concatenated documents should be reported separately.

This track asks whether the model keeps running well. It should not be labeled a memory test. StreamingLLM’s long-sequence perplexity and efficiency experiments are examples of evidence for this track (Xiao et al., 2024b).

5.2 Track B: causal retention

Insert random bindings, state changes, or key-value facts and query them after a controlled lag d . Sweep d logarithmically from inside the recent cache to far beyond it. Each target should have a matched counterfactual stream in which only the target value changes. A response counts as retained only if the output changes appropriately across the pair. This prevents fluent guessing or dataset priors from masquerading as memory.

Retention tests should include:

- **interference:** many bindings with similar keys;
- **updates:** a newer value supersedes an older one;
- **placement:** targets at initial, middle, and recent positions;
- **query delay:** the future query is unknown when the fact arrives;
- **negatives:** queried keys that never appeared.

RULER and needle-style tests provide useful ingredients (Hsieh et al., 2024), while conversational-memory benchmarks add realistic temporal and multi-session structure (Maharana et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2025). THREEH adds the requirement to report the retention curve against the same state budget used in the stability track.

5.3 Track C: delayed task utility

Remote recall is not always the final objective. The third track embeds old information in a downstream decision: follow an updated instruction, resolve a contradiction, continue a plan, or answer a question whose evidence lies at a controlled lag. Report

both task score and the lag-dependent utility horizon. LongBench and similar suites provide broad task coverage (Bai et al., 2024); agent benchmarks motivate executable outcomes rather than surface overlap (Liu et al., 2024b; Jimenez et al., 2024).

The query should be hidden when the stream state is written. Otherwise a compressor or retrieval policy can preserve only the known answer-bearing span, converting long-term memory into ordinary query-focused context selection. Systems that use retrieval should additionally report retrieval frequency, retrieved tokens, and latency.

5.4 Budget and reporting rules

Comparisons are meaningful only if resource accounting is complete. We recommend reporting:

$$(B_{\text{device}}, B_{\text{external}}, F_{\text{token}}, L_{\text{token}}, L_{\text{query}}),$$

where the terms are device-resident state, external stored state, amortized compute per stream token, generation latency, and query-time retrieval latency. A method with a tiny KV cache and a large vector database is not a constant-memory system in the same sense as a pure sink window; it is a hierarchical memory system. That may be the better design, but it should be named and measured as such.

We also recommend publishing horizon curves rather than a single maximum length. A reported “one-million-token” result can mean that the program did not crash, that perplexity stayed flat, that one needle was recovered, or that a task remained accurate. The curve and track identify which.

6 Diagnosing System Families

Sink-window streaming. This family can have an effectively unbounded stability horizon and constant device memory. Its general access horizon is the recent window plus a small set of fixed initial positions. It is appropriate when relevant information is local, when continuous fluency matters, or when another subsystem handles older state.

Recurrent and compressed state. Transformer-XL carries segment-level recurrent states (Dai et al., 2019); Recurrent Memory Transformer, Block-Recurrent Transformers, and Memorizing Transformers provide distinct learned-state or retrieval recurrence mechanisms (Bulatov et al., 2022; Hutchins et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2022). State-space models such as Mamba provide another bounded recurrent path. These systems create a causal path from old content to future outputs, so their access

Track	Primary question	Core manipulation	Primary metrics	Common false inference
Stability	Can the model run continuously?	Increase total stream length	Loss drift, latency, memory	Stable perplexity implies old facts remain usable
Retention	Can remote content affect output?	Sweep target lag with counterfactual values	Accuracy-lag curve, H_{access}	A large input window implies reliable access
Utility	Does old content still support the task?	Delay decision-relevant evidence	Task score-lag curve, H_{util}	Successful retrieval implies correct execution

Table 4: THREEH separates three questions that are often collapsed into a single “context length.” All tracks should use the same accounting of persistent state and inference cost.

horizon can exceed the visible token window. Their failure mode is lossy interference: bounded state must decide what to preserve before future queries are known. THREEH’s update, interference, and delayed-query tests target this regime.

Retrieval-augmented memory. Retrieval-augmented language models store content externally and fetch a subset at query time (Guu et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2020; Borgeaud et al., 2022; Khandelwal et al., 2020). InfLLM combines a local window with block-level context memory for evicted states (Xiao et al., 2024a). Their physical access horizon can be as long as the store’s retention period, but their utility horizon depends on indexing, query formation, selection, and downstream use. Storage and retrieval costs belong in the budget.

Hybrid systems. A practical long-running agent may use all three: attention sinks for stable local generation, recurrent state for compact working memory, and retrieval for sparse historical evidence. The three horizons suggest modular objectives. Optimize the sink-window layer for stability, the write path for retention, and retrieval plus execution for utility. A single end-to-end score cannot identify which module failed.

7 Implications for Claims and Design

Reserve “infinite” for the measured property. “Infinite-duration generation with bounded KV cache” is a precise and strong claim. “Infinite context” suggests arbitrary historical access and should require retention evidence beyond the active window. “Long-term memory” should additionally require delayed task utility.

Do not train an anchor and call it memory. A dedicated sink token may make streaming behavior easier to learn (Xiao et al., 2024b). Unless its

state is updated with later content, however, it remains an anchor. Semantic memory needs a write mechanism, an external store, or both.

Match training to the horizon objective. Local next-token loss can reward stream stability without rewarding remote retention. Training for memory requires losses whose targets depend on delayed variables, preferably under interference and updates. Training for utility must additionally expose the model to decisions that use retrieved or compressed evidence.

Use failure decomposition. When an old fact does not affect a decision, the cause may be eviction, compression loss, retrieval failure, or failure to use available evidence. Counterfactual retention pairs identify whether any information path remains; oracle retrieval separates access from execution; full-context controls separate memory failure from intrinsic task difficulty.

8 Related Work

StreamingLLM motivates our central distinction and explicitly separates streaming generation from context extension (Xiao et al., 2024b). Position extrapolation methods seek stable attention beyond training lengths (Press et al., 2022; Su et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2024; Ding et al., 2024); efficient-attention methods reduce exact or approximate attention cost (Dao et al., 2022; Zaheer et al., 2020; Jiang et al., 2024; Xiong et al.); and KV-cache policies retain or selectively load influential states (Zhang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2023; Ge et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2024; Xiao et al., 2025). Our argument is orthogonal: whatever mechanism stabilizes inference, semantic access and task utility require separate evidence.

Long-context benchmarks measure retrieval, aggregation, and reasoning over large finite inputs (Bai et al., 2024; Hsieh et al., 2024). Analyses

such as Lost in the Middle show that nominal context size overstates effective use (Liu et al., 2024a). Long-term conversational-memory benchmarks evaluate information spread across sessions (Maharana et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2025). THREEH connects these traditions to streaming systems by placing stability, causal retention, and utility on distinct lag curves with shared resource accounting.

9 Conclusion

Attention sinks solve a real systems problem: they can keep bounded-cache generation stable far beyond a model’s training window. They are not, by themselves, semantic memory. The distinction becomes precise when context length is replaced by three reported quantities: a stability horizon, an access horizon, and a utility horizon. THREEH turns that distinction into an evaluation contract with matched budgets, lag sweeps, counterfactual controls, and task-level decisions. The resulting vocabulary gives streaming, recurrent, retrieval, and hybrid systems credit for what they actually achieve, and makes the missing capability visible.

Limitations

Exact horizon measurements depend on the chosen stream, task family, score threshold, and reference system. Counterfactual streams can become unnatural if edited carelessly. Perplexity is tokenization-dependent, and external-memory accounting involves policy choices about storage infrastructure. The inequality between access and utility is conceptually useful but not directly observable for arbitrary neural states; experiments can establish lower bounds on access and upper bounds under specified interventions, not recover every causal dependency. Finally, the three horizons do not cover all desirable properties, including privacy, calibration, factuality, and robustness to malicious memory content.

References

- Yushi Bai, Xin Lv, Jiajie Zhang, Hongchang Lyu, Jiankai Tang, Zhidian Huang, Zhengxiao Du, Xiao Liu, Aohan Zeng, Lei Hou, Yuxiao Dong, Jie Tang, and Juanzi Li. 2024. [LongBench: A bilingual, multi-task benchmark for long context understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Bogdan Damoc, Aidan Clark, Diego de Las Casas, Aurelia Guy, Jacob Menick, Roman Ring, Tom Hennigan, Saffron Huang, Loren Maggiore, Chris Jones, Albin Cassirer, and 9 others. 2022. [Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens](#). In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2206–2240.
- Aydar Bulatov, Yuri Kuratov, and Mikhail S. Burtsev. 2022. [Recurrent memory transformer](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Quoc V. Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. [Transformer-XL: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2978–2988.
- Tri Dao, Daniel Y. Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. 2022. [FlashAttention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with IO-awareness](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Yiran Ding, Li Lyna Zhang, Chengruidong Zhang, Yuanyuan Xu, Ning Shang, Jiahang Xu, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. 2024. [LongRoPE: Extending LLM context window beyond 2 million tokens](#). In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11091–11104.
- Suyu Ge, Yunan Zhang, Liyuan Liu, Minjia Zhang, Jiawei Han, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. [Model tells you what to discard: Adaptive KV cache compression for LLMs](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2020. [REALM: Retrieval-augmented language model pre-training](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3929–3938.
- Cheng-Ping Hsieh, Simeng Sun, Samuel Kriman, Shantanu Acharya, Dima Rekesh, Fei Jia, Yang Zhang, and Boris Ginsburg. 2024. [RULER: What’s the real context size of your long-context language models?](#) In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- DeLesley Hutchins, Imanol Schlag, Yuhuai Wu, Ethan Dyer, and Behnam Neyshabur. 2022. [Block-recurrent transformers](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Huiqiang Jiang, Yucheng Li, Chengruidong Zhang, Qianhui Wu, Xufang Luo, Surin Ahn, Zhenhua Han, Amir H. Abdi, Dongsheng Li, Chin-Yew Lin, Yuqing Yang, and Lili Qiu. 2024. [MInference 1.0: Accelerating pre-filling for long-context LLMs via dynamic sparse attention](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik

- Narasimhan. 2024. [SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world GitHub issues?](#) In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2020. [Generalization through memorization: Nearest neighbor language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. [Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Yuhong Li, Yingbing Huang, Bowen Yang, Bharat Venkitesh, Acyr Locatelli, Hanchen Ye, Tianle Cai, Patrick Lewis, and Deming Chen. 2024. [SnapKV: Llm knows what you are looking for before generation](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Nelson F. Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. 2024a. [Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173.
- Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, Shudan Zhang, Xiang Deng, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Chenhui Zhang, Sheng Shen, Tianjun Zhang, Yu Su, Huan Sun, and 3 others. 2024b. [AgentBench: Evaluating LLMs as agents](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zichang Liu, Aditya Desai, Fangshuo Liao, Weitao Wang, Victor Xie, Zhaozhao Xu, Anastasios Kyrillidis, and Anshumali Shrivastava. 2023. [Scissorhands: Exploiting the persistence of importance hypothesis for LLM KV cache compression at test time](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Adyasha Maharana, Dong-Ho Lee, Sergey Tulyakov, Mohit Bansal, Francesco Barbieri, and Yuwei Fang. 2024. [Evaluating very long-term conversational memory of LLM agents](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 13851–13870.
- Bowen Peng, Jeffrey Quesnelle, Honglu Fan, and Enrico Shippole. 2024. [YaRN: Efficient context window extension of large language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ofir Press, Noah A. Smith, and Mike Lewis. 2022. [Train short, test long: Attention with linear biases enables input length extrapolation](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jianlin Su, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Ahmed Murtadha, Bo Wen, and Yunfeng Liu. 2024. [RoFormer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding](#). *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063.
- Jiaming Tang, Yilong Zhao, Kan Zhu, Guangxuan Xiao, Baris Kasikci, and Song Han. 2024. [Quest: Query-aware sparsity for efficient long-context LLM inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Di Wu, Hongwei Wang, Wenhao Yu, Yuwei Zhang, Kai-Wei Chang, and Dong Yu. 2025. [LongMemEval: Benchmarking chat assistants on long-term interactive memory](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yuhuai Wu, Markus N. Rabe, DeLesley Hutchins, and Christian Szegedy. 2022. [Memorizing transformers](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Chaojun Xiao, Pengl Zhang, Xu Han, Guangxuan Xiao, Yankai Lin, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024a. [InfLLM: Training-free long-context extrapolation for LLMs with an efficient context memory](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Guangxuan Xiao, Jiaming Tang, Jingwei Zuo, Junxian Guo, Shang Yang, Haotian Tang, Yao Fu, and Song Han. 2025. [DuoAttention: Efficient long-context LLM inference with retrieval and streaming heads](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Guangxuan Xiao, Yuandong Tian, Beidi Chen, Song Han, and Mike Lewis. 2024b. [Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Siheng Xiong, Joe Zou, Faramarz Fekri, and Yae Jee Cho. Long-context modeling with dynamic hierarchical sparse attention for memory-constrained llm inference. In *Forty-third International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Manzil Zaheer, Guru Guruganesh, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontañón, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Qifan Wang, Li Yang, and Amr Ahmed. 2020. [Big Bird: Transformers for longer sequences](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Zhenyu Zhang, Ying Sheng, Tianyi Zhou, Tianlong Chen, Lianmin Zheng, Ruisi Cai, Zhao Song, Yuandong Tian, Christopher Ré, Clark Barrett, Zhangyang Wang, and Beidi Chen. 2023. [H2O: Heavy-hitter oracle for efficient generative inference of large language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.