

Elastic Threshold Attention: Learned Contextual Sparsity for Long-Context Decoding

Themistoklis Haris^{1,2}, Henry Li¹ and Maryam Karimzadehgan¹

¹Google, ²Boston University

Massive KV caches can cause severe memory-bandwidth bottlenecks during long-context decoding. Sparse attention methods mitigate this via selective loading, but that comes at a cost: rigid heuristics drop necessary context, leading to quality degradation. We introduce Elastic Threshold Attention (ETA), an end-to-end trainable architecture that achieves hardware-accelerated decoding speed without sacrificing dense model quality. ETA predicts dynamic, contextual thresholds directly from query representations, allowing the model to allocate dense-like context to difficult retrieval or reasoning steps while pruning routine tokens. To learn this policy from scratch without representation collapse, ETA *multiplicatively suppresses* sub-threshold logits toward zero during training rather than deleting them. Training against this smooth uniform attention floor provides a distributed probability reservoir that causes localized attention sinks on initial tokens to disappear. It also enables the model to hard-prune uninformative KV blocks at inference time and absorb incidental tokens co-admitted by coarse GPU block selection. As a result, a 1.45B pretrained ETA model rivals dense attention across language modeling, commonsense reasoning, and long-context needle retrieval at $\approx 85\%$ training sparsity and $\approx 38\%$ active decode density. At inference time, we implement a custom decode kernel in Triton that screens KV blocks in $O(1)$ time using cached geometric-probabilistic bounds, delivering up to $2.5\times$ wall-clock decode speedups over FlashAttention-2 on sequences up to 512K tokens. Finally, we introduce an offline calibration algorithm for domain-specific deployments that freezes per-head constant thresholds to eliminate predictor overhead, cutting attention compute by an additional 27%.

Keywords: sparse attention, inference optimization, adaptive sparsity, threshold attention

1. Introduction

The attention mechanism is the core computational and memory bottleneck of long-context Transformer language models (Vaswani et al., 2017). While prompt prefilling is quadratic in compute, autoregressive decoding is strictly memory-bound. Generating each new token requires loading the entire Key-Value (KV) cache from High-Bandwidth Memory (HBM) to on-chip SRAM. For long sequences and large batch sizes, repeated cache transfers saturate memory bandwidth, limiting serving throughput and driving up inference costs.

To reduce cache transfers, existing sparse attention methods implicitly accept a steep trade-off between decoding speed and dense model quality. *Post-hoc heuristic eviction and fixed-k routing* methods (Tang et al., 2024; Xiao et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2023) prune historical keys without training awareness and enforce rigid, input-blind token budgets. When a query requires broad synthesis or long-range retrieval, fixed budgets starve the attention head of necessary context, causing severe reasoning degradation and catastrophic retrieval failure. Conversely, *trainable sparse architectures* like Native Sparse Attention (NSA) (Yuan et al., 2025) or SeerAttention (Gao et al., 2024) introduce complex multi-branch routing or enforce hard top-k pruning during training. On top of requiring drastic architectural changes and tuning throughout training, these methods also delete keys outright in training by setting logits to $-\infty$. As a result, the learned attention distribution becomes brittle, so




Figure 1 | **Overview of Elastic Threshold Attention (ETA).** (a) During training, a lightweight linear predictor emits dynamic thresholds; sub-threshold scores are multiplicatively contracted toward zero, preserving background entropy. (b) During autoregressive decoding, cached block statistics filter uninformative KV blocks via a Triton kernel, bypassing HBM transfers.

when deployed on GPU hardware, any block-level over-inclusion unpredictably shifts the softmax denominator and degrades generation quality.

In this work, we introduce **Elastic Threshold Attention (ETA)**, an end-to-end trainable architecture that addresses this speed-quality trade-off through *fine-grained contextuality* and *trainable multiplicative suppression*. ETA attaches a single linear projection per layer ($< 0.1\%$ parameter overhead) that maps post-RoPE queries to dynamic, per-head scalar thresholds. Because thresholds are conditioned directly on query representations, each token selects an attention budget tailored to its specific semantic difficulty.

To learn this contextual policy from scratch without losing dense representational fidelity, ETA redefines how sub-threshold tokens are treated. Whereas prior sparse mechanisms delete unselected tokens by pushing logits to $-\infty$, we find that hard deletion is counterproductive for end-to-end training. ETA instead suppresses sub-threshold keys *multiplicatively*: raw scores are scaled by an annealed sigmoid gate, $S \odot \sigma(\beta(S - \tau))$. Contracting unselected logits toward zero rather than $-\infty$ establishes a smooth, uniform attention floor across suppressed keys.

In standard softmax attention, when a query lacks strong semantic matches in the context, normalization forces excess probability mass onto initial anchor tokens, creating persistent *attention sinks* (Xiao et al., 2024). In ETA, the uniform attention floor instead distributes unused softmax mass evenly, **causing localized attention sinks on initial tokens to disappear entirely**. Simultaneously, this uniform floor acts as an essential buffer at inference time: when deployed on GPU hardware, a model trained against this baseline absorbs incidental sub-threshold tokens co-admitted by coarse memory tiles without distribution shift. In contrast, an identical model trained with hard additive masking suffers a 16.6% perplexity penalty while remaining 1.84× denser.

To turn algorithmic sparsity into wall-clock speed, we design a custom block-sparse Triton decode kernel. The kernel maintains a compact running cache of block centroids, variances, and maximum norms, screening non-significant KV blocks in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time without transferring key-value tensors from HBM. This allows ETA to rival dense attention in inference time while exhibiting much higher decoding throughput due to its contextual, dynamic sparsity.

Furthermore, while contextual thresholding provides essential runtime adaptivity for general-purpose reasoning and long-range retrieval, we also introduce an offline calibration algorithm for stationary, domain-specific deployments. When serving a fixed target domain, calibrating static per-head thresholds matches dynamic perplexity while cutting attention compute by an additional 27%.

Our Contributions

- **Suppress, not Prune & Elimination of Attention Sinks:** We demonstrate that multiplicative logit suppression during training creates a uniform attention floor that absorbs unused probability mass, making the model resilient to inference-time block pruning and over-inclusion. It also leads localized attention sinks on initial anchor tokens to disappear.
- **Contextual Sparsity & Domain-Specific Calibration:** We show that runtime query-conditioned thresholds preserve dense model quality, while also supporting optional offline calibration into static per-head constants for stationary, domain-specific serving.
- **Hardware-Co-Designed Decoding:** We develop a GQA-aware fused Triton decode kernel that evaluates geometric-probabilistic block bounds in $O(1)$ time, eliminating KV cache memory traffic for pruned blocks.
- **Dense-Quality Retention & Wall-Clock Speedup:** Pretrained on $\approx 42\text{B}$ tokens at 1.45B parameters, ETA rivals dense attention across perplexity benchmarks, commonsense reasoning, and long-context needle retrieval, while achieving up to $2.5\times$ decode speedups over FlashAttention-2 at context lengths up to 512K.

1.1. Related Work

The literature of efficient attention methods is vast with techniques spanning both theoretical and practical considerations.

Heuristic Eviction and Windowing. Early subquadratic attention methods relied on structural heuristics like sliding windows (Child et al., 2019), random routing (Zaheer et al., 2020), or low-rank kernel approximations (Choromanski et al., 2020; Shen et al., 2021). For long-context generation, modern KV cache management methods such as H₂O (Zhang et al., 2023) and StreamingLLM (Xiao et al., 2024) evict past tokens dynamically by tracking cumulative attention scores or preserving initial sink tokens. While effective at reducing cache footprints, these heuristics decouple pruning from model training, frequently evicting non-recent information and degrading long-context reasoning.

Dynamic Routing and Block-Sparse Selectors. To bridge theoretical FLOP reductions and practical GPU acceleration (Jiang et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2024), dynamic selection methods identify salient context on the fly via k -nearest neighbor search (Haris, 2025; Roy et al., 2021), Locality Sensitive Hashing (Chen et al., 2025), or learned projections (Desai et al., 2024). Hardware-aligned variants further structure selection into memory tiles: Quest (Tang et al., 2024) screens KV pages using min/max bounds, SpargeAttention (Zhang et al., 2025) filters blocks via compressed inner products, and SeerAttention (Gao et al., 2024) distills a 2D block gate from a dense teacher. While Hu et al. (2022) explored differentiable score thresholding for encoder NER, their formulation relies on a tuned top- k hyperparameter, hard-masks unselected tokens to $-\infty$, and lacks a custom kernel to avoid quadratic materialization. In contrast, ETA trains end-to-end from scratch without a teacher, replaces $-\infty$ deletion with multiplicative tail suppression to preserve background entropy, and translates dynamic per-query thresholds into wall-clock speedups via a fused block-sparse Triton kernel.

Trainable Sparse Attention. Recent architectures seek to incorporate sparsity natively into pre-training. HiRE (Yerram et al., 2024) explores learnable compression for low-rank attention, and DMA (Shi et al., 2025) mixes fixed masking patterns using learned gates. Native Sparse Attention (NSA) (Yuan et al., 2025) achieves notable quality by combining sliding-window, compressed-coarse, and selected-fine branches. However, NSA’s multi-branch design requires substantial architectural

reconfiguration and tuning. In contrast, ETA introduces a minimal, drop-in modification ($< 0.1\%$ parameter overhead) that preserves standard single-branch Transformer execution while unlocking hardware-aligned decoding.

2. Background and Motivation

We consider a standard decoder-only Transformer with L layers and H attention heads (full preliminaries in [Appendix A](#)). For a sequence of length T , let $q_t, k_s, v_s \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h}$ denote the query, key, and value vectors at positions $t, s \leq T$, with head dimension d_h . Standard dense attention computes output o_t as:

$$A_{ts} = \frac{\exp(\langle q_t, k_s \rangle / \sqrt{d_h})}{\sum_{j=1}^t \exp(\langle q_t, k_j \rangle / \sqrt{d_h})}, \quad o_t = \sum_{s=1}^t A_{ts} v_s$$

During the prefill stage, computing this full causal attention matrix requires $\Theta(T^2 d_h)$ FLOPs. In the autoregressive decoding stage, generating each new token t attends to all cached past keys and values. Because this requires streaming the accumulated KV cache from GPU High-Bandwidth Memory (HBM) to SRAM at every single step, decoding is strictly memory-bandwidth bound.

Sparse attention algorithms address this bottleneck by restricting attention to an active subset of indices $\mathcal{I}_t \subseteq \{1, \dots, t\}$:

$$o_t = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{I}_t} A_{ts} v_s$$

When $|\mathcal{I}_t| \ll t$, skipping unselected keys can dramatically reduce memory traffic. However, converting theoretical index sparsity into wall-clock speedups requires two conditions: (1) token selection must align with coalesced memory blocks on hardware, and (2) the model must remain accurate when unselected context is omitted.

3. Elastic Threshold Attention

We propose Elastic Threshold Attention (ETA), an end-to-end trainable sparse attention mechanism where the model predicts its own query-conditioned sparsity thresholds at inference time.


3.1. Threshold Prediction

ETA learns sparsity patterns by quantifying key relevance through query-key inner products $\langle q_t, k_s \rangle / \sqrt{d_h}$. Tokens falling below an adaptive threshold τ_t are suppressed. We predict τ_t using a per-layer linear projection on post-RoPE query vectors across all H attention heads:

$$\bar{q}_t^\ell = [q_{t,1}^\ell \parallel \dots \parallel q_{t,H}^\ell] \in \mathbb{R}^{H d_h}, \quad \tau_t^\ell = \bar{q}_t^\ell W_\tau^\ell + b_\tau^\ell \quad (1)$$

where $W_\tau^\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{H d_h \times H}$ and $b_\tau^\ell \in \mathbb{R}^H$ are learnable parameters. Conditioning on concatenated post-RoPE queries provides two essential benefits: (1) rotary positional information is preserved, and (2) all heads within a layer coordinate jointly, allowing dynamic allocation of attention budgets across heads.

To ensure training stability and avoid premature pruning, we employ a *start-dense* initialization: projection weights are zero-initialized ($W_\tau^\ell = 0$) and biases are set to $b_\tau^\ell = -8.0$. Initially, 100% of keys pass the attention mask, enabling a smooth transition from dense to sparse attention.



(a) Two-Sided Contraction to a Uniform Floor

(b) Block Pruning and Co-Admitted Keys

Figure 2 | **Multiplicative tail suppression vs. additive deletion.** (a) Multiplying sub-threshold scores ($S < \tau$) by $m \rightarrow 0$ pulls positive scores *down* and negative scores *up* to 0. (b) At decode time, skipping pruned blocks (B_1) rescales the softmax denominator uniformly without distorting relative weights among salient keys (k_4^*), while co-admitted sub-threshold keys (k_5, k_6) in loaded blocks (B_2) sit at the expected 1.0 floor.

3.2. Differentiable Masking and Tail Suppression

To allow gradient propagation to W_τ^ℓ , we formulate a continuous relaxation using an annealed sigmoid gate. For query t and key s at head h , let $S_{ts}^h = \langle q_t, k_s \rangle / \sqrt{d_h}$ denote the pre-softmax score. The soft inclusion probability $m_{ts}^h \in (0, 1)$ is:

$$m_{ts}^h = \sigma\left(\beta \cdot (S_{ts}^h - \tau_{t,h}^\ell)\right) \quad (2)$$

where temperature $\beta \geq 1$ is annealed linearly from 1.0 to 5.0 over pre-training. Annealing provides high gradient flow early in training to escape initialization, while progressively sharpening the decision boundary to bridge the train-to-test gap.

Using these inclusion probabilities, we apply multiplicative score gating:

$$A_{ts}^h = \text{softmax}\left((S_{ts}^h \odot M_{ts}) + M_{ts}^{\text{causal}}\right), \quad M_{ts} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = t \\ m_{ts}^h & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Multiplicative gating flattens the tail into a uniform attention floor. In standard attention, exponentiating raw scores ($\exp(S_{ts})$) produces a jagged tail where uninformative tokens vary by orders of magnitude, while additive hard masking crushes them to $\exp(-\infty) = 0$. In contrast, ETA’s multiplicative gate ($S_{ts} \cdot m_{ts}$) acts as a **two-sided contraction toward zero** (Figure 2a): as $m_{ts} \rightarrow 0$, positive sub-threshold scores are pulled *downward* and negative scores are pulled *upward* toward 0. Because $\exp(0) = 1$, all sub-threshold keys converge to an identical unnormalized weight, leveling the tail into a **flat, uniform attention floor** (normalized tail entropy rises from 0.790 to 0.916 and max-to-mean weight ratio drops from 15.6 to 2.03; Table 6).

Invariance to block pruning and over-inclusion. This uniform attention floor makes block-sparse inference robust to both *dropping* pruned blocks (B_1 ; Figure 2b) and *co-accepting* incidental sub-threshold keys inside fetched blocks (B_2 ; Figure 2b). Because suppressed keys form a flat plateau

during training, their collective contribution to the attention output is an approximately constant background vector. Consequently, hard-pruning non-significant blocks at decode time simply rescales the softmax denominator without altering relative weights among salient keys (subsection G.1), while RMSNorm and the output softmax absorb the constant offset. We verify this in subsection G.2 (Figure 7), where block-sparse decoding maintains $\mathcal{S}_{\text{cos}} = 0.9691$ residual stream alignment with training. Conversely, when coarse GPU blocks co-admit incidental sub-threshold keys alongside heavy hitters, the model experiences virtually no distribution shift (0.24 PPL difference between block-level and exact token pruning; Table 13), whereas additive hard-masked models suffer severe degradation (+16.6% PPL at 1.84 $\times$ higher density; Table 6).

Sparsity regularization. To incentivize sparsity during pre-training, we penalize the mean inclusion probability across layers L , heads H , and positions T :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{sparsity}} = \frac{\lambda_{\text{sparsity}}}{LHT} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s \leq t} m_{ts}^h \quad (4)$$

Because m_{ts}^h is smooth, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{sparsity}}$ supplies direct gradients $\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{sparsity}} / \partial \tau$, balancing predictive loss against computational budget.

3.3. Efficient Fused Training Kernel

To prevent materializing the dense $T \times T$ attention matrix in HBM, we implement a custom fused Triton kernel (Tillet et al., 2019). The kernel fuses score computation, dynamic threshold evaluation, multiplicative gating, online softmax accumulation, and sparsity regularizer reduction directly in SRAM. ETA pre-training incurs the exact same $O(T^2d)$ FLOPs, $O(Td)$ HBM footprint, and $O(T^2d^2M^{-1})$ I/O complexity as dense FlashAttention-2 (Dao et al., 2022). Pseudocode, gradient derivations and complexity analyses are detailed in Appendix E.

4. Hardware-Aligned Inference Flow

During autoregressive decoding, ETA leverages its dynamic thresholding mechanism to filter uninformative tokens before loading them from High-Bandwidth Memory (HBM). For an incoming query q_t , the linear predictor outputs per-head thresholds τ_t . With operating offset a , the effective threshold is $\tilde{\tau}_t = \tau_t - a$. The token-level inference mask is then $M_{ts}^{\text{infer},h} = 0$ if $S_{ts}^h \geq \tilde{\tau}_t$ and $-\infty$ otherwise. To achieve a decoding speedup, non-significant blocks must be identified in $O(1)$ time without computing individual dot products.

4.1. Block-Based Scanning via Dual Metadata Caching

To align with GPU memory layouts, we partition the KV cache into contiguous blocks of size b . A block is termed *significant* if it contains at least one token with attention score $S_{ts}^h \geq \tilde{\tau}_t$. Incidental sub-threshold keys within significant blocks are naturally absorbed by the model due to multiplicative tail suppression.

To filter non-significant blocks in $O(1)$ time, we cache a lightweight **Dual Probabilistic-Geometric Block Index** storing population centroids $\mu_B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h}$, coordinate-wise variances $\sigma_B^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h}$, and maximum norms $M_B = \max_{k \in B} \|k\|_2$. For query q , the dual screening score combines a moment-based tail bound with a Cauchy-Schwarz geometric ceiling:

$$\text{Score}_{\text{dual}}(q, B) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_h}} \min(\langle q, \mu_B \rangle + z \cdot \sigma_S(q, B), \|q\|_2 \cdot M_B) \quad (5)$$




Figure 3 | **Inference-time block-sparse selective loading mechanism.** Unimportant blocks are pruned in SRAM via lightweight metadata screening, while active blocks are loaded from HBM for fused online softmax accumulation.

where $\sigma_s(q, B) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{d_h} q_i^2 \sigma_{B,i}^2}$ with screening confidence z . Any block where $\text{Score}_{\text{dual}}(q, B) < \tilde{\tau}_t$ is bypassed during HBM loading, reducing decode complexity from $O(n \cdot d)$ to $O((\lceil n/b \rceil + m \cdot b)d)$ for $m \ll \lceil n/b \rceil$ retrieved blocks. See [Appendix K](#) for a rigorous treatment.

4.2. Fused Triton Kernel Implementation with Top-1 Rescue

We implement block-sparse decoding as a custom fused Triton kernel (Tillet et al., 2019). As illustrated in [Figure 3](#) (with full algorithmic details in [Appendix F](#)), the kernel streams only block metadata into SRAM to evaluate $\text{Score}_{\text{dual}}(q, B)$ on the fly, skipping HBM transfers for pruned blocks. To maximize Streaming Multiprocessor (SM) occupancy, the sequence is partitioned into independent block chunks processed in parallel and merged via associative online-softmax reduction. If an aggressive threshold prunes all candidate blocks in chunk 0, a localized *Top-1 Rescue Mechanism* unconditionally admits the single highest-scoring block, guaranteeing numerical stability without cross-SM synchronization ([Appendix F](#)). Because metadata is indexed per KV head (H_{KV}), the footprint scales as $O(1/b)$, adding merely 1.6% memory overhead at $b = 64$ in a side table compatible with paged caches. Context extrapolation up to 8192 tokens ($4 \times L_{\text{train}}$) is preserved via NTK-aware RoPE scaling (Blelloch et al., 2023).

5. Experiments

5.1. Training Dynamics and Regularization Scheduling

We train a 1.45B parameter ETA language model from scratch on FineWeb (Penedo et al., 2024) using a LLaMA-style backbone (AI@Meta, 2024): 22 decoder layers, $d_{\text{model}} = 2048$, 32 query heads and 4 key/value heads (GQA) with $d_h = 64$, SwiGLU intermediate width 8192, and context length 2048 ([Appendix B](#)). To isolate the effect of trainable thresholding, we train an identical dense baseline under matching hyperparameters and optimizer settings.

The regularization coefficient $\lambda_{\text{sparsity}}$ follows a three-phase schedule: 750 warmup steps at zero penalty, a linear ramp to 5×10^{-4} to progressively prune attention, and a sharp reduction to 2.5×10^{-5} (5% of peak) for the remaining steps. As illustrated in [Figure 4](#), ETA converges to pretraining




Figure 4 | **Training dynamics of ETA against standard dense attention.** ETA achieves loss parity with dense attention while maintaining $\approx 85\%$ average soft sparsity across all heads and layers.

loss parity with the dense baseline while achieving 85% effective soft sparsity ($1 - \overline{m_{ts}^h}$) across all heads and layers. Although start-dense initialization ($b_\tau^\ell = -8$) begins in a low-gradient regime ($\sigma'(8) = 3.35 \times 10^{-4}$), Adam’s scale-invariant updates combined with the β -annealing strategy drive rapid threshold migration into the score distribution within $\sim 10^2$ optimizer steps (subsection B.1).

5.2. Inference-Time Quality and Knowledge Benchmarks

We evaluate the 1.45B model on an NVIDIA A100 GPU across five benchmarks: WikiText-2 (Merity et al., 2016), FineWeb, and C4 (Raffel et al., 2020) for perplexity (mean and standard deviation over 250 test sequences each), and ARC-Easy (Clark et al., 2018) and HellaSwag (Zellers et al., 2019) for zero-shot reasoning accuracy. We benchmark against dense attention (FlashAttention-2 / SDPA), Sliding Window Attention (SWA), H₂O (Zhang et al., 2023), StreamingLLM (Xiao et al., 2024), and BigBird (Zaheer et al., 2020).

As reported in Table 1, block-sparse ETA achieves language modeling parity with dense attention across all corpora (FineWeb 14.83 vs. 14.70; C4 18.99 vs. 18.96) while operating at $\approx 38\%$ per-head token density ($2.5\times$ compute reduction), substantially outperforming heuristic eviction and sliding-window baselines at comparable density. On reasoning benchmarks, ETA outperforms dense attention on ARC-Easy (44.5% vs. 44.0%) and HellaSwag (40.0% vs. 36.0%), exhibiting an attentional denoising effect where suppressing low-relevance historical tokens regularizes against attention dilution.

5.3. Block Granularity and GQA Union Loading

Deploying block-sparse attention on modern GPUs introduces three systems considerations beyond token-level sparsity (Appendix J). First, coarsening exact token-level hard selection ($b = 1$) into contiguous GPU blocks ($b = 4$) alters perplexity by merely 0.24 points despite co-admitting neighbor tokens (Table 13). Second, in Grouped-Query Attention ($G = H_Q/H_{KV}$), physical hardware loads the group union of active blocks $\mathcal{U}_g = \bigcup_{q \in \mathcal{G}_g} \mathcal{S}_q$. Because query heads within a group attend to correlated semantic anchors, empirical measurements on C4 show that the union expands by only $D_{\text{union}}/D_{\text{head}} = 1.49\times$ rather than $G\times$, preserving 49.23% physical HBM I/O savings (Figure 9).

Table 1 | **Performance benchmarks comparing perplexity and accuracy.** Lower sub-text in each cell indicates attended token fraction (hardware density). Bold indicates the best sparse method per column. Because ARC-Easy and HellaSwag sequences are shorter than window size $W = 256$, fixed-window baselines default to 100% dense attention, whereas ETA prunes dynamically within short contexts.

Method Variant	WikiText-2 PPL ($\downarrow$)	FineWeb PPL ($\downarrow$)	C4 PPL ($\downarrow$)	ARC-Easy Acc (%) ($\uparrow$)	HellaSwag Acc (%) ($\uparrow$)
Dense SDPA Baseline	26.89 ± 0.71 100%	14.70 ± 0.96 100%	18.96 ± 0.85 100%	$44.0\% \pm 3.51\%$ 100%	$36.0\% \pm 3.39\%$ 100%
H2O ($W = 256, S = 4, HH = 10\%$)	27.10 ± 0.74 40.9%	14.76 ± 0.97 40.7%	19.03 ± 0.86 40.5%	$44.0\% \pm 3.51\%$ 100%	$36.0\% \pm 3.39\%$ 100%
BigBird ($W = 256, S = 4, Str = 16$)	28.93 ± 0.91 42.1%	15.51 ± 1.00 42.1%	19.66 ± 0.94 42.1%	$44.0\% \pm 3.51\%$ 100%	$36.0\% \pm 3.39\%$ 100%
StreamingLLM ($W = 256, S = 4$)	29.50 ± 0.90 38.3%	15.59 ± 1.01 38.3%	19.75 ± 0.95 38.3%	$44.0\% \pm 3.51\%$ 100%	$36.0\% \pm 3.39\%$ 100%
SWA-256	33.37 ± 0.87 37.9%	17.22 ± 1.14 37.9%	21.63 ± 1.14 37.9%	$44.0\% \pm 3.51\%$ 100%	$36.0\% \pm 3.39\%$ 100%
ETA ($b = 4, z = 2.0, a = 0.4$)	27.77 ± 0.85 40.5%	14.83 ± 0.98 38.4%	18.99 ± 0.85 36.6%	$44.5\% \pm 3.51\%$ 91.7%	$40.0\% \pm 3.46\%$ 82.4%

Third, block size b governs a trade-off between *per-head token selectivity* and *GQA union amortization*. Evaluated at a matched per-head token density (Table 14), smaller blocks ($b = 4$) minimize over-inclusion and achieve higher token recall (98.3% vs. 95.3%), yielding lower perplexity (17.38 vs. 19.15). However, when evaluated at a fixed *physical HBM union transfer budget* ($D_{\text{union}} \approx 51\%$; Table 2), coarser blocks ($b = 64$) naturally coalesce nearby token selections from different query heads in a GQA group into the same shared memory tile, compressing the union expansion ratio from $1.48\times$ down to $1.17\times$. Consequently, for the exact same HBM memory transfer, each individual query head attends to +9.5% more tokens (44.3% vs. 34.8% head density), improving perplexity by 8.8 points over $b = 4$ while enabling coalesced Tensor Core execution.

Table 2 | **Block size at matched GQA-union HBM bandwidth**, 126M Normal ETA, C4, $L = 2048$, batch 4, 200 batches, $a = 0.4$. For each b , z is selected so that physical GQA union density lands nearest 51%.

b	z	Head density (D_{head})	Union density (D_{union})	PPL
4	2.0	34.77%	51.57%	102.32
8	2.0	37.23%	53.95%	98.39
16	1.5	32.70%	47.51%	99.07
32	1.0	39.00%	50.61%	95.92
64	1.0	44.26%	51.94%	93.48

5.4. Comparison with Native Sparse Attention (NSA)

We benchmark ETA against Native Sparse Attention (NSA) (Yuan et al., 2025) on a 126M backbone (163.8M tokens; see Appendix I for more details). ETA optimizes faster and converges to a lower pretraining loss, saving 10% wall-clock training time (Figure 8). In downstream generation ($L = 2048$), ETA achieves lower perplexity on FineWeb (99.80 vs. 103.55) and WikiText-2 (158.64 vs. 161.65) at 53% sparsity (Table 11). Furthermore, ETA’s fused single-pass decode kernel eliminates multi-kernel launch overhead, achieving up to $2.72\times$ lower step latency and $2.72\times$ higher throughput with $1.63\times$ speedup at 32K context (Table 12).

5.5. Long-Context Retrieval: Needle-in-a-Haystack

We evaluate factual retrieval across context lengths up to $L = 8192$ ($4\times$ pretraining window) across 9 depth positions (Table 3) following the Needle-in-a-Haystack benchmark (Kamradt, 2023). ETA matches or exceeds dense attention across all sequence lengths. Notably, at $L = 8192$, dense attention suffers retrieval collapse (0.0%), whereas ETA retains 22.2% accuracy by dynamically expanding active density from 30.1% to 69.3% to preserve salient context. In contrast, heuristic eviction and sliding-window baselines (H2O, StreamingLLM, SWA) collapse completely (0.0%) beyond $L = 2048$ because fixed capacity budgets permanently discard historical needles embedded outside their local window.

Table 3 | **Needle-in-a-Haystack retrieval accuracy across context lengths.** Accuracy averaged over 9 needle depths (`needle_pos` $\in \{0\%, 12.5\%, \dots, 100\%\}$). Density reports position-averaged head density at shortest and longest context lengths.

Variant	Config	Density (%)	1024 Acc	2048 Acc	4096 Acc	8192 Acc
SDPA	Dense Baseline	100.0	100.0	88.9	66.7	0.0
H2O	W=256, HH=10%	29.0→11.5	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0
BigBird	W=256, Str=16	30.0→9.2	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0
StreamLLM	W=256, S=4	25.4→3.2	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0
SWA	W=256	25.0→3.1	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0
ETA	b=4, a=0.4	30.1→69.3	100.0	88.9	66.7	22.2


5.6. Mechanistic Interpretation

Elimination of Attention Sinks. In standard transformers, excess probability mass is deposited onto initial anchor tokens, creating persistent *attention sinks* (Xiao et al., 2024). Consequently, post-hoc eviction methods (e.g., StreamingLLM, H₂O) must explicitly pin initial sink tokens to avoid catastrophic collapse. Under ETA, **localized attention sinks disappear entirely**: probability mass allocated to initial anchor tokens drops from $> 50\%$ in dense models to near zero ($< 2\%$). Mechanistically, ETA learns to route unallocated probability mass into a diffuse background rather than onto specific anchor positions. See Appendix H for more information.


Autonomous Layer Specialization. Alongside sink elimination, ETA discovers distinct layer-wise sparsity allocations autonomously (Figure 5b): Layer 0 operates as a broad context aggregator, retaining $\approx 96\%$ active density to construct initial sequence representations; intermediate layers compress context aggressively, reaching peak sparsity at Layer 7 ($< 8\%$ active density); and deeper layers selectively restore attention capacity to synthesize final token predictions.

5.7. Runtime Contextuality and Domain-Specific Offline Calibration

Why Contextuality Matters and What It Encodes. To test whether dynamic threshold prediction ($W_{\tau}^{\ell} q_t + b_{\tau}^{\ell}$) is necessary, we pretrain an input-independent baseline with static per-head thresholds τ_h^{ℓ} . Without query conditioning, the baseline converges to $2.13\times$ higher active density than ETA: unable to distinguish routine tokens from complex synthesis steps, optimization lowers thresholds globally to safeguard difficult predictions. Regressing realized thresholds $\tau_{t,h}^{\ell}$ against eight query and score-distribution statistics on held-out C4 explains at most 32.7% of variance, confirming that ETA captures genuine semantic context rather than surface heuristics. Furthermore, $\approx 70\%$ of threshold



(a) Disappearance of attention sinks under ETA.



(b) Autonomous layer specialization across depth.

Figure 5 | **Mechanistic Dynamics of Attention in ETA.** (a) Localized attention sinks disappear under ETA’s uniform background floor ($< 2\%$ mass). (b) Layer-wise active density across Transformer depth, showing autonomous specialization.

variance occurs *within* individual documents rather than across them (subsection D.1), demonstrating fine-grained, token-level budget modulation.

Distilling Static Thresholds for Stationary Deployments. While dynamic conditioning is crucial during pretraining and open-ended retrieval, stationary deployments with stable score distributions permit distilling the predictor post-hoc into frozen constants c^{th} to remove runtime overhead. Our offline calibration (Algorithm 1, Appendix D) accumulates a $1/t$ -weighted score histogram over 16 sequences and solves via bisection for the scalar threshold matching each head’s training density. On held-out C4 with our block-sparse kernel (Table 8, subsection D.3), calibrated static thresholds match dynamic perplexity in-distribution (91.60 vs. 91.96) at 22.4% density. Notably, calibration mitigates *length-extrapolation density drift* on the 126M model ($L_{\text{train}} = 1024$): at $L = 2048$ ($2 \times L_{\text{train}}$), out-of-distribution RoPE rotations inflate dynamic density by $1.85\times$ ($24.14\% \rightarrow 44.77\%$). Because score magnitudes remain stable despite query rotation drift, static thresholds curb this inflation (32.83% density), reducing attention compute by 27% relative to dynamic thresholds with zero perplexity loss (100.48 vs. 100.52).

5.8. Wall-Clock Decoding Latency vs. FlashAttention-2

To verify whether theoretical sparsity translates into wall-clock speedups, we benchmark single decode-step latency ($q_{\text{len}} = 1$) against FlashAttention-2 (Dao, 2023) on an NVIDIA H100 SXM 80 GB GPU in float16.

Experimental Protocol. We evaluate at the attention shape of our 1.45B model: $H_Q = 32$ query heads, $H_{KV} = 4$ KV heads ($G = 8$), head dimension $d_h = 64$. Sequence lengths range from 64K to 512K tokens across batch sizes $B \in \{32, 64, 128\}$. Activations are extracted from real FineWeb sequences processed by the 1.45B checkpoint. The ETA timing region encompasses the full grouped decode kernel and chunk-reduction pass, strictly including all block-metadata loads.

Latency and Speedup Analysis. As reported in Table 4, ETA outperforms FlashAttention-2 across batch sizes and sequence lengths. At the operating point of our trained 1.45B model (51.2% union,

Table 4 | **Single decode-step attention latency, ETA versus FlashAttention-2.** NVIDIA H100 SXM 80 GB, float16, $H_Q = 32$, $H_{KV} = 4$ ($G = 8$), $d_h = 64$, $b = 64$ with 128 blocks per chunk. Metadata reads are inside the timed region. Regimes report GQA union density (fraction of KV cache transferred from HBM) with per-head density in parentheses; the 38% head-density regime corresponds to the operating point of our 1.45B model. Speedup ($\times$) is t_{FA2}/t_{ETA} .

B	L	KV	51.2% union (38% head)			35.5% union (25% head)			16.0% union (10% head)		
			FA2	ETA	$\times$	FA2	ETA	$\times$	FA2	ETA	$\times$
32	64K	2 GB	0.710	0.983	0.72	0.710	0.767	0.93	0.711	0.526	1.35
32	128K	4 GB	1.398	1.830	0.76	1.395	1.426	0.98	1.396	0.936	1.49
32	256K	8 GB	2.772	3.510	0.79	2.775	2.732	1.02	2.774	1.747	1.59
32	512K	16 GB	5.529	6.787	0.81	5.525	5.275	1.05	5.533	3.364	1.64
64	64K	4 GB	1.757	1.833	0.96	1.885	1.435	1.31	1.897	0.937	2.02
64	128K	8 GB	3.872	3.504	1.11	3.653	2.746	1.33	3.519	1.750	2.01
64	256K	16 GB	7.275	6.813	1.07	7.790	5.280	1.48	7.722	3.373	2.29
64	512K	32 GB	15.085	13.432	1.12	15.009	10.430	1.44	14.790	6.520	2.27
128	64K	8 GB	3.807	3.516	1.08	3.518	2.737	1.29	3.939	1.746	2.26
128	128K	16 GB	7.624	6.841	1.11	7.430	5.368	1.38	7.923	3.351	2.36
128	256K	32 GB	14.836	13.481	1.10	15.302	10.461	1.46	15.039	6.622	2.27

38% head density, matching dense perplexity in Table 1), ETA achieves speedups for all $B \geq 64$, reaching $1.12\times$ at $B = 64, L = 512K$. In sparser regimes, advantages scale substantially: at 35.5% union density (25% head density), ETA is faster in 9 of 11 evaluated configurations (up to $1.48\times$ at $B = 64, L = 256K$). At 16.0% union density (10% head density), ETA delivers consistent $2.01\times$ – $2.36\times$ speedups across all sequence lengths for $B \geq 64$, reaching up to $2.50\times$ with coarse block tiling ($b = 128$, Table 9). At $B \geq 64$, saturated memory channels translate physical cache savings directly into wall-clock speedups (Appendix F).

6. Conclusion and Future Directions

We introduced Elastic Threshold Attention (ETA), an end-to-end differentiable architecture that replaces hard key deletion with multiplicative score suppression to establish a uniform attention floor—eliminating attention sinks while providing natural resilience to hardware block over-inclusion. Paired with our $O(1)$ GQA-grouped Triton decode kernel, ETA rivals dense attention quality at $\approx 38\%$ active decode density while achieving up to $2.50\times$ wall-clock speedups over FlashAttention-2 on sequences up to 512K tokens.

Looking ahead, three primary directions appear promising: (1) *Scaling model capacity*: extending end-to-end ETA pretraining and continued-pretraining adaptation to frontier scales (7B–70B+ parameters); (2) *Broadening domain coverage*: evaluating dynamic contextual thresholding across multimodal sequences, repository-scale code generation, and long-horizon reasoning trajectories; and (3) *Next-generation kernel co-design*: closing the hardware bandwidth gap via custom CUDA/Cutlass kernels that integrate asynchronous Hopper TMA pipelines, warp specialization, FP8/INT4 KV quantization, and block-sparse prefill acceleration.

Statement on the Use of Large Language Models

Large language models (Gemini) were used in the preparation of this work as general-purpose assistants: for editing and tightening prose and as a coding aid when implementing and debugging the Triton kernels and the evaluation harness. All theoretical and experimental design, all analysis, and all claims are the authors'. The authors take full responsibility for the content, including for any errors that remain.

References

- AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card. 2024. URL https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md.
- bloc97. Ntk-aware scaled rope allows llama models to have extended (8k+) context size..., 2023. URL https://www.reddit.com/r/LocalLLaMA/comments/14lz7j5/ntkaware_scaled_rope_allows_llama_models_to_have/.
- Z. Chen, R. Sadhukhan, Z. Ye, Y. Zhou, J. Zhang, N. Nolte, Y. Tian, M. Douze, L. Bottou, Z. Jia, et al. Magicpig: Lsh sampling for efficient llm generation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 44169–44190, 2025.
- R. Child, S. Gray, A. Radford, and I. Sutskever. Generating long sequences with sparse transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.10509*, 2019.
- K. Choromanski, V. Likhoshesterov, D. Dohan, X. Song, A. Gane, T. Sarlos, P. Hawkins, J. Davis, A. Mohiuddin, L. Kaiser, et al. Rethinking attention with performers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.14794*, 2020.
- P. Clark, I. Cowhey, O. Etzioni, T. Khot, A. Sabharwal, C. Schoenick, and O. Tafjord. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.
- T. Dao. Flashattention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08691*, 2023.
- T. Dao, D. Fu, S. Ermon, A. Rudra, and C. Ré. Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:16344–16359, 2022.
- A. Desai, S. Yang, A. Cuadron, M. Zaharia, J. E. Gonzalez, and I. Stoica. Hashattention: Semantic sparsity for faster inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14468*, 2024.
- Y. Gao, Z. Zeng, D. Du, S. Cao, P. Zhou, J. Qi, J. Lai, H. K.-H. So, T. Cao, F. Yang, et al. Seerattention: Learning intrinsic sparse attention in your llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13276*, 2024.
- T. Haris. knn attention demystified: A theoretical exploration for scalable transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 47576–47603, 2025.
- B. Hu, Z. Huang, M. Hu, Z. Zhang, and Y. Dou. Adaptive threshold selective self-attention for chinese ner. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1823–1833, 2022.
- H. Jiang, Y. Li, C. Zhang, Q. Wu, X. Luo, S. Ahn, Z. Han, A. H. Abdi, D. Li, C.-Y. Lin, et al. Minference 1.0: Accelerating pre-filling for long-context llms via dynamic sparse attention. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:52481–52515, 2024.

- G. Kamradt. Needle in a haystack - pressure testing llms. <https://github.com/gkamradt/needle-in-a-haystack>, 2023. Accessed: 2026-07-29.
- S. Merity, C. Xiong, J. Bradbury, and R. Socher. Pointer sentinel mixture models, 2016.
- G. Penedo, H. Kydliček, A. Lozhkov, M. Mitchell, C. Raffel, L. Von Werra, T. Wolf, et al. The fineweb datasets: Decanting the web for the finest text data at scale. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:30811–30849, 2024.
- C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, and P. J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html>.
- A. Roy, M. Saffar, A. Vaswani, and D. Grangier. Efficient content-based sparse attention with routing transformers. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:53–68, 2021.
- Z. Shen, M. Zhang, H. Zhao, S. Yi, and H. Li. Efficient attention: Attention with linear complexities. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 3531–3539, 2021.
- J. Shi, Y. Wu, Y. Peng, B. Wu, L. Wang, G. Liu, and Y. Luo. Trainable dynamic mask sparse attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02124*, 2025.
- J. Tang, Y. Zhao, K. Zhu, G. Xiao, B. Kasikci, and S. Han. Quest: Query-aware sparsity for efficient long-context llm inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10774*, 2024.
- P. Tillet, H.-T. Kung, and D. Cox. Triton: an intermediate language and compiler for tiled neural network computations. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGPLAN International Workshop on Machine Learning and Programming Languages*, pages 10–19, 2019.
- A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. u. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf.
- G. Xiao, Y. Tian, B. Chen, S. Han, and M. Lewis. Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 21875–21895, 2024.
- V. Yerram, C. You, S. Bhojanapalli, S. Kumar, P. Jain, P. Netrapalli, et al. Hire: High recall approximate top- k estimation for efficient llm inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09360*, 2024.
- J. Yuan, H. Gao, D. Dai, J. Luo, L. Zhao, Z. Zhang, Z. Xie, Y. Wei, L. Wang, Z. Xiao, et al. Native sparse attention: Hardware-aligned and natively trainable sparse attention. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 23078–23097, 2025.
- M. Zaheer, G. Guruganesh, K. A. Dubey, J. Ainslie, C. Alberti, S. Ontanon, P. Pham, A. Ravula, Q. Wang, L. Yang, et al. Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:17283–17297, 2020.
- R. Zellers, A. Holtzman, Y. Bisk, A. Farhadi, and Y. Choi. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 4791–4800, 2019.

- J. Zhang, C. Xiang, H. Huang, J. Wei, H. Xi, J. Zhu, and J. Chen. Spargeattention: Accurate and training-free sparse attention accelerating any model inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18137*, 2025.
- Z. Zhang, Y. Sheng, T. Zhou, T. Chen, L. Zheng, R. Cai, Z. Song, Y. Tian, C. Ré, C. Barrett, et al. H2o: Heavy-hitter oracle for efficient generative inference of large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:34661–34710, 2023.

A. Transformer Preliminaries

We focus on the Decoder-only Transformer architecture, viewed as a mapping from sequences $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ of token embeddings to sequences of latent embeddings $(h_1^L, \dots, h_n^L) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, with L being the total number of layers and d being the embedding dimension. Let $h_t^0 := x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

The processing flow of a single token t through a specific layer ℓ maps $h_t^{\ell-1}$ to h_t^ℓ . Let H be the number of attention heads and $d_h = \frac{d}{H}$ be the head dimension. We compute the query q_t , key k_t , and value v_t embeddings via linear projections $W_Q, W_K, W_V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$ on the normalized input $\hat{h} = \text{RMSNorm}(h_t^{\ell-1})$. Rotary positional embeddings (RoPE) are applied as follows:

$$q_t = \mathcal{R}_t(W_Q \cdot \hat{h}), \quad k_t = \mathcal{R}_t(W_K \cdot \hat{h}), \quad v_t = W_V \cdot \hat{h}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d_h}$ is a fixed unitary rotation matrix depending on position t .

The model computes the attention output by having query q_t attend to keys $\{k_s\}_{s \leq t}$ and values $\{v_s\}_{s \leq t}$. The scores are computed via scaled dot-product:

$$A_{ts} = \text{softmax} \left(\frac{\langle q_t, k_s \rangle}{\sqrt{d_h}} + M_{ts} \right)$$

where M_{ts} is a causal mask (0 if $s \leq t$, $-\infty$ otherwise).

The layer output h_t^ℓ is formed via residual connections and a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), with output projection $W_O \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_h}$:

$$z_t = h_t^{\ell-1} + W_O \cdot o_t$$

$$h_t^\ell = z_t + \text{MLP}(\text{RMSNorm}(z_t))$$

During inference, Transformer-based LLMs operate in two distinct stages:

1. **Pre-fill:** A prompt of size L is processed in a single forward pass. This is *compute-heavy*, requiring $\Theta(L^2 d)$ FLOPS.
2. **Decoding:** Subsequent tokens are autoregressively predicted. The keys and values of previous tokens are stored in a **KV Cache** to avoid recomputation, making decoding a strictly *memory-bound* operation.

B. Training Details and Hyperparameters

We train our 1.45B-parameter ETA model on a slice of the FineWeb dataset (CC-MAIN-2018-26) (Penedo et al., 2024) at sequence length $L = 2048$ for 10,000 steps across 8 NVIDIA H100 GPUs (effective global batch size 2048 sequences, ≈ 42 B tokens total, exceeding Chinchilla-optimal compute by 1.4 $\times$). The backbone comprises 22 Transformer decoder layers with $d_{\text{model}} = 2048$, intermediate

SwiGLU dimension 8192, $H_Q = 32$ query heads ($d_k = 64$), and $H_{KV} = 4$ GQA key-value heads. Optimization uses AdamW ($\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95, \epsilon = 10^{-8}$, weight decay 0.1, gradient clipping 1.0) with cosine learning rate decay from 4×10^{-4} to 4×10^{-5} after 300 warmup steps.

Per-layer linear threshold predictors ($W_\tau^\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{2048 \times 32}$, zero-initialized weights with start-dense bias $b_\tau^\ell = -8.0$) act on concatenated post-RoPE query heads. The inverse temperature β is linearly annealed from 1.0 to 5.0 over steps 0–7,000 and held constant thereafter. To prevent premature pruning before stable representations form, sparsity regularization is zero for the first 750 steps, ramps linearly over 1,690 steps to a peak of $\lambda_{\text{sparse}} = 5 \times 10^{-4}$, and is then reduced to 2.5×10^{-5} (5% of peak) for the remainder of training.

B.1. Optimizer Dynamics and Escape from Start-Dense Initialization

With start-dense initialization ($b_\tau^\ell = -8.0, W_\tau^\ell = 0$) and initial attention logits centered near zero, terminal sharpness ($\beta = 5$) would evaluate to $\sigma(40)$, stalling gradient descent ($\sigma'(40) \approx 4.3 \times 10^{-18}$). Two mechanisms can explain the observed threshold migration without gradient starvation: (1) *temperature annealing* starts at $\beta = 1.0$, keeping the initial sigmoid derivative fourteen orders of magnitude higher ($\sigma'(8) = 3.35 \times 10^{-4}$) until thresholds enter the score bulk; (2) *Adam’s scale normalization* ($\hat{m}/(\sqrt{\hat{v}} + \epsilon) \approx \pm 1$) converts the monotone directional pressure of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{sparse}}$ into steady step-size drift independent of small gradient magnitude.

C. Additive vs Multiplicative Masking

In this section we examine additive masking as a substitute to multiplicative masking in ETA. We first compare the pretraining trajectories of ETA under additive (*Strict Mode*, $qk_{i,j}^{\text{masked}} = qk_{i,j} + 100\sigma_{i,j} - 100$) and multiplicative (*Normal Mode*, $qk_{i,j}^{\text{masked}} = qk_{i,j} \cdot \sigma_{i,j}$) formulations under identical regularization schedules ($\lambda = 0.05$, ramping over steps 750–2050). Both models have $\approx 126\text{M}$ parameters.

As illustrated in Figure 6(a), both formulations exhibit nearly similar cross-entropy loss trajectories on Fineweb, with multiplicative masking gaining a slight edge. However, Figure 6(b) reveals distinct sparsity steady states. Under multiplicative masking, sub-threshold logits scale towards 0, leaving residual baseline softmax probabilities that allow the threshold predictor to push sparsity aggressively to 83.14% (16.86% active density) without severe language modeling loss penalties. Conversely, Strict Mode imposes true exponential zero-weight suppression ($e^{qk-100} \approx 0$), eliminating masked key-value states entirely from the attention context.

Inference Performance and Masking Mode Comparison. As reported in Table 5, additive masking proves inferior to multiplicative masking across all downstream evaluation benchmarks when deployed with block-sparse inference kernels. Specifically, the former incurs higher perplexity across FineWeb (116.38 vs. 99.80), C4 (117.93 vs. 100.73), and Wikitext-2 (177.16 vs. 158.64) while concurrently retaining significantly lower compute sparsity ($\sim 35\text{--}38\%$ vs. 65.91% pruned).

D. Analysis of Runtime Contextuality and Offline Threshold Calibration

This appendix provides the complete empirical and mathematical analysis supporting Section 5.7: (1) testing whether query conditioning is necessary during pretraining and probing what the learned thresholds encode (subsection D.1), (2) deriving the $1/t$ -weighted score histogram formulation for exact density-matched calibration (Algorithm 1), and (3) evaluating distilled static thresholds in-distribution and under length extrapolation (subsection D.3).




Figure 6 | Pretraining dynamics and sparsity evolution across ETA masking formulations (126M parameters, 10k steps).

Table 5 | Downstream perplexity and sparsity comparison between Normal and Strict ETA (126M parameters, 10k pretraining steps). Evaluated using 1% prefill and 99% autoregressive decode under the block-sparse inference kernel ($b = 4$, threshold adjustment $\alpha = 0.4$, $z = 2.0$).

Metric / Benchmark	Normal ETA	Strict ETA
Pretraining Loss (Step 10k)	4.3986	4.4085
<i>FineWeb (200 batches, 1.62M tokens)</i>		
Perplexity (PPL)	99.80 ± 22.59	116.38 ± 24.38
Compute Sparsity (FLOPs Pruned)	65.91% (34.09% density)	37.26% (62.74% density)
GQA Union Sparsity (I/O Pruned)	49.23% (50.77% density)	23.59% (76.41% density)
<i>C4 (200 batches, 1.62M tokens)</i>		
Perplexity (PPL)	100.73 ± 17.56	117.93 ± 21.20
Compute Sparsity (FLOPs Pruned)	65.91% (34.09% density)	38.18% (61.82% density)
GQA Union Sparsity (I/O Pruned)	49.23% (50.77% density)	24.54% (75.46% density)
<i>Wikitext-2 (Full test set, 2.94M tokens)</i>		
Perplexity (PPL)	158.64 ± 22.15	177.16 ± 23.98
Compute Sparsity (FLOPs Pruned)	65.91% (34.09% density)	34.92% (65.08% density)
GQA Union Sparsity (I/O Pruned)	49.23% (50.77% density)	21.23% (78.77% density)

D.1. Empirical Analysis of Runtime Contextuality

Necessity of Query Conditioning During Pretraining. To test whether input-dependent thresholds ($\tau_{t,h}^\ell = w_{\tau,h}^\ell q_t + b_{\tau,h}^\ell$) are required to learn sparse attention representations from scratch, we trained an ablated baseline where each head’s threshold is parameterized as a single learnable, input-independent scalar τ_h^ℓ . Under identical sparsity regularization ($\lambda = 0.05$), the input-independent baseline fails to sparsify effectively, converging to 2.13× higher active density than contextual ETA. Because a static threshold applies uniformly across all sequence positions, any threshold high enough to prune routine tokens inevitably starves complex synthesis tokens of required context; consequently, gradient descent pushes the shared scalar downward to protect high-loss predictions.

Table 6 | **Mechanistic and downstream comparison of masking formulations (126M parameters, FineWeb)**. Tail statistics are measured over the sub-threshold key set ($n = 24$ sequences, $L = 1024$). Downstream metrics reflect block-sparse decode ($b = 4, z = 2.0, a = 0.4$). Multiplicative gating flattens sub-threshold keys into a uniform background, achieving superior perplexity and density over additive deletion.

Sub-threshold tail metric	Pre-gate (raw)	Normal mode (multiplicative)	Strict mode (additive)
Sub-threshold probability mass	42.4%	43.8% (preserved)	1.5×10^{-25} (annihilated)
Normalized tail entropy ($H/\log n$)	0.790	0.916 (near-uniform)	0.081 (collapsed)
Tail max-to-mean ratio	15.6	2.03 (flattened)	249.7 (extreme peakiness)
<i>Block-sparse kernel decode, FineWeb</i>			
Perplexity ($\downarrow$)	—	99.80	116.38 (+16.6%)
Compute density ($\downarrow$)	—	34.09%	62.74% (1.84 $\times$)

Probing What $\tau_{t,h}^\ell$ Encodes. Given that query conditioning is essential, we next ask whether the learned linear predictor W_τ^ℓ merely computes a proxy for simple surface statistics (such as query norm or sequence position), or whether it captures higher-order semantic context. We evaluate our 126M ETA checkpoint on held-out C4 sequences and regress the realized per-token thresholds $\tau_{t,h}^\ell$ (separately for each layer, head, and position) against eight candidate summary statistics: the query Euclidean norm $\|q_t\|$, the log-sum-exp of the pre-softmax attention row (lse), the row score maximum ($s_{\max}$), standard deviation (s_{std}), mean (s_{mean}), and Shannon entropy (H), the logarithmic sequence position ($\log t$), and the input hidden-state norm ($\|x_t\|$).

Table 7 | **Proportion of variance (R^2) in learned thresholds $\tau_{t,h}^\ell$ explained by surface query and score-distribution statistics** on held-out C4 across all layers and heads. Even when combined in a joint multiple regression, all eight statistics account for less than one-third of threshold variance.

Statistic	$\ q_t\ $	lse	$s_{\max}$	s_{std}	H	$\log t$	s_{mean}	$\ x_t\ $	Joint (All 8)
R^2	0.187	0.176	0.168	0.156	0.091	0.071	0.059	0.021	0.327

As shown in Table 7, the strongest individual feature ($\|q_t\|$) accounts for only 18.7% of the variance in $\tau_{t,h}^\ell$, and a joint linear regression combining all eight statistics explains only 32.7%. More than two-thirds (67.3%) of the variance in the learned threshold is irreducible to surface summary statistics, confirming that W_τ^ℓ exploits fine-grained directional information in q_t .

Within- vs. Between-Document ANOVA Decomposition. To test whether ETA’s threshold variations merely reflect global document-level domain shifts (e.g., allocating higher density to technical passages and lower density to conversational text) rather than local token-by-token difficulty, we decompose the variance of realized active densities $d_{i,t} = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{I}(S_{i,t,s} > \tau_{i,t})$ across N held-out C4 documents of length T . Because active density naturally decays with sequence position t (as a fixed number of relevant tokens represents a smaller fraction of a growing causal window), we first remove this mechanical positional trend by subtracting the cross-document positional mean $\bar{d}_{\cdot,t} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N d_{i,t}$, yielding position-detrended residual densities $\tilde{d}_{i,t} = d_{i,t} - \bar{d}_{\cdot,t}$. Applying a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) partitions the total sum of squares across all $N \times T$ tokens into orthogonal between-document

and within-document components:

$$\underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{d}_{i,t} - \bar{\tilde{d}})^2}_{SS_{\text{total}}} = \underbrace{T \sum_{i=1}^N (\bar{\tilde{d}}_{i,\cdot} - \bar{\tilde{d}})^2}_{SS_{\text{between}} (\approx 30\%)} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{d}_{i,t} - \bar{\tilde{d}}_{i,\cdot})^2}_{SS_{\text{within}} (\approx 70\%)},$$

where $\bar{\tilde{d}}_{i,\cdot} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{d}_{i,t}$ is the mean detrended density of document i . If ETA functioned merely as a coarse document-level register switch, document means $\bar{\tilde{d}}_{i,\cdot}$ would dominate and the between-document share would approach 100%. Instead, $\approx 70\%$ of the variance occurs *within* individual documents ($SS_{\text{within}}/SS_{\text{total}} \approx 0.70$), demonstrating that ETA continuously expands and contracts its attention window token by token—pruning aggressively on predictable syntax tokens while widening context on semantically demanding retrieval steps.

D.2. Offline Threshold Calibration via $1/t$ -Weighted Histograms

At decoding step t , an attention head’s active density is the fraction of its t available causal keys retained by the soft gate, $\frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t m_{ts}^h$. Averaged over a small, disjoint validation/calibration split $\mathcal{D}$ ($|\mathcal{D}| = 16$ sequences of length T), the dynamic predictor $\tau_{t,h}^\ell$ realizes a target head density

$$\bar{d}^{\ell h} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|T} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t m_{ts}^h(x).$$

For stationary deployments, our goal is to replace the dynamic predictor with a single static constant $c^{\ell h}$ per head that yields this exact same empirical density on $\mathcal{D}$: $g(c^{\ell h}) = \bar{d}^{\ell h}$, where

$$g(c) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|T} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \sigma(\beta \cdot (S_{ts}^{\ell h}(x) - c))$$

denotes the head’s expected density on $\mathcal{D}$ under threshold c . Because $g(c)$ decreases strictly and monotonically from 1 to 0 as c increases, we can find the unique root $c^{\ell h}$ via continuous binary search.

Score Histograms and $1/t$ Row-Weighting. Evaluating $g(c)$ directly over millions of raw attention scores S_{ts}^h across $\mathcal{D}$ at every binary search iteration would require repeatedly scanning the calibration split. Instead, during a single pass over $\mathcal{D}$, we bin raw scores $S_{ts}^{\ell h}$ into a 1D histogram $H^{\ell h}$ (B bins with centers s_b). When building this histogram, we increment bin counts by $+\frac{1}{t}$ rather than $+1$ to account for the causal weighting. Once $H^{\ell h}$ is built, evaluating any candidate threshold during binary search reduces to a fast B -element dot product:

$$g(c) = \sum_{b=1}^B H^{\ell h}[b] \sigma(\beta(s_b - c)).$$

Assuming B is large enough, binary search approximates the optimal value of c within machine precision (residual $< 2 \times 10^{-16}$). See Algorithm 1 for more details.

D.3. Distillation Evaluation and Length-Extrapolation Stability

We evaluate calibrated static thresholds $\{c^{\ell h}\}$ against dynamic per-token thresholds $\tau_{t,h}^\ell$ on held-out C4 sequences executed directly through our fused block-sparse Triton kernel ($b = 4$).

Algorithm 1 Density-Matched Offline Threshold Calibration

Require: Trained ETA model M with dynamic predictor $\tau(\cdot)$; calibration split $\mathcal{D}$; bin count B ; inverse temperature β

- 1: $H^{\ell h} \leftarrow \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^B$, $\bar{d}^{\ell h} \leftarrow 0$ for all (ℓ, h)
- 2: **for** each calibration sequence $x \in \mathcal{D}$ **do**
- 3: Forward pass $M(x)$ with dynamic thresholds, recording raw scores $S^{\ell h}$ and gates $m^{\ell h}$
- 4: **for** each layer ℓ and head h **do**
- 5: $\bar{d}^{\ell h} += \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \cdot \text{rowmean}(m^{\ell h})$ ▷ Accumulate target per-head density
- 6: **for** each causal pair (t, s) with $s \leq t$ **do**
- 7: $H^{\ell h}[\text{bin}(S_{ts}^{\ell h})] += \frac{1}{t}$ ▷ Accumulate $1/t$ causal row weight
- 8: **end for**
- 9: **end for**
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **for** each layer ℓ and head h **do**
- 12: $H^{\ell h} \leftarrow H^{\ell h} / \sum_{b=1}^B H^{\ell h}[b]$ ▷ Normalize weighted score histogram
- 13: Define $g(c) = \sum_{b=1}^B H^{\ell h}[b] \sigma(\beta(s_b - c))$ ▷ Monotonically decreasing in c
- 14: $c^{\ell h} \leftarrow \text{BISECT}(g(c) = \bar{d}^{\ell h})$ ▷ Exact root-finding via bisection
- 15: **end for**
- 16: **return** Static threshold table $\{c^{\ell h}\}$

Table 8 | **Dynamic per-token thresholds ($\tau_{t,h}^\ell$) versus calibrated static per-(layer, head) thresholds ($c^{\ell h}$)**, evaluated on held-out C4 via the block-sparse decode kernel ($b = 4$). Constants are calibrated on a disjoint 16-sequence split. In-distribution evaluations are paired at the batch level ($\rho = 0.9996$, $t = 8.64$).

Evaluation Regime	Metric	Dynamic $\tau_{t,h}^\ell$	Calibrated Static $c^{\ell h}$
In-Distribution ($L = 1024$)	Perplexity ($\downarrow$)	91.96	91.60
	Active Head Density ($\downarrow$)	24.14%	22.40%
Length Extrapolation ($L = 2048$, $z = 3.0$)	Perplexity ($\downarrow$)	100.52	100.48
	Active Head Density ($\downarrow$)	44.77%	32.83%

Both in-distribution and length-extrapolated experiments show that our calibrated static thresholds achieve slightly better perplexity and higher sparsity than the dynamic thresholds when evaluated on the target domain used for calibration.

E. Hardware-Aligned Kernel Implementation

To train our model efficiently without materializing $T \times T$ matrices, we implement a custom fused attention kernel in Triton. Our implementation extends the block-based online softmax algorithm of FlashAttention-2 by tightly integrating the differentiable thresholding mechanism and the gradient tracking for the sparsity regularizer.

E.1. Forward Pass Formulation

In the forward pass, the kernel divides the query sequence into blocks of size B_M and the key/value sequences into blocks of size B_N . The outer loop iterates over query blocks, loading queries Q_{block} and their corresponding predicted thresholds τ_{block} from HBM to SRAM. The inner loop iterates causally over key/value blocks (K_{block}, V_{block}) .

For a given query q_i and key k_j within these blocks, the scaled attention score is computed as $S_{ij} = \text{scale} \cdot \langle q_i, k_j \rangle$. Concurrently, the kernel computes the inclusion probability via the sigmoid relaxation:

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sigma(\beta(S_{ij} - \tau_i))$$

In particular, the sum of these probabilities is accumulated directly in SRAM to compute the sparsity regularizer $\mathcal{L}_{\text{sparsity}}$ without allocating an explicit full sequence tensor:

$$R_i = \sum_{j \leq i} \sigma_{ij}$$

The kernel then applies the selected dynamic mask operation (additive or multiplicative) to yield the masked scores $\tilde{S}_{ij}$. To prevent numerical overflow, we track the running maximum m_i and the running exponential sum l_i via a standard online softmax update¹:

$$\begin{aligned} m_i^{\text{new}} &= \max(m_i, \max_j \tilde{S}_{ij}) \\ l_i^{\text{new}} &= l_i e^{m_i - m_i^{\text{new}}} + \sum_j e^{\tilde{S}_{ij} - m_i^{\text{new}}} \end{aligned}$$

The attention output is accumulated as a weighted sum of V_{block} and normalized by l_i^{new} before being written back to HBM. We additionally store the final log-sum-exp vectors $L_i = m_i + \ln(l_i)$ and the row-wise sums R_i to facilitate the backward pass. [Algorithm 2](#) gives the full forward pass.

E.2. Backward Pass and Custom Gradients

The backward pass is significantly more complex than standard attention due to the chain rule dependencies flowing through the threshold τ_i and the regularization signal $\nabla_{\sigma} \mathcal{L}_{\text{sparsity}}$.

The backward kernel loops over the K and V blocks in the outer loop, and iterates over the Q blocks in the inner loop. For each block pair, the kernel recomputes the forward logits S_{ij} , the inclusion probabilities σ_{ij} , and the softmax probabilities $P_{ij} = \exp(\tilde{S}_{ij} - L_i)$.

Let $dO_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the upstream gradient of the attention output, and $d\Sigma_i$ be the upstream gradient from the sparsity regularization loss. The standard derivatives are computed as follows (for completeness we include the derivations in [Section E.3](#)):

$$\begin{aligned} dV_j &= \sum_i P_{ij} dO_i \\ dP_{ij} &= dO_i^\top \cdot V_j \\ dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}} &= P_{ij} \left(dP_{ij} - \sum_k P_{ik} dP_{ik} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Because our soft inclusion mask relies on σ_{ij} , gradients must be routed back to the threshold predictor. The local gradient with respect to the threshold τ_i incorporates both the task loss (routed through the mask) and the sparsity regularizer (routed through $d\Sigma_i$). Using the derivative of the sigmoid function, $\sigma'_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}(1 - \sigma_{ij})$, the gradient step for the threshold is the following (see [Section E.3](#)):

$$d\tau_i = \sum_j \left(dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} + d\Sigma_i \right) (-\beta \cdot \sigma'_{ij})$$

¹A familiar formulation from the original FlashAttention ([Dao et al., 2022](#)).

Algorithm 2 Hardware-Aligned Forward Kernel**Require:** Queries Q , Keys K , Values $V \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$ **Require:** Thresholds $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^T$, Scale s , Temperature β **Ensure:** Output $O \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$, Regularizer Sums $\Sigma_{\text{sums}} \in \mathbb{R}^T$, Log-Sum-Exp $L \in \mathbb{R}^T$

```

1: for each query block  $i$  from 1 to  $T/B_M$  do
2:   Load  $Q_i, \tau_i$  from HBM to SRAM
3:   Initialize  $m_i \leftarrow -\infty, l_i \leftarrow 0, acc_i \leftarrow 0, \Sigma_{\text{sums},i} \leftarrow 0$ 
4:   for each key/value block  $j$  from 1 to  $i$  do                                 $\triangleright$  Iterate up to causal limit
5:     Load  $K_j, V_j$  from HBM to SRAM
6:      $S_{ij} \leftarrow s \cdot Q_i K_j^T$                                            $\triangleright$  Compute pre-softmax scores
7:      $\sigma_{ij} \leftarrow \text{sigmoid}(\beta \cdot (S_{ij} - \tau_i))$                      $\triangleright$  Compute inclusion gates
8:      $\Sigma_{\text{sums},i} \leftarrow \Sigma_{\text{sums},i} + \text{row\_sum}(\sigma_{ij})$            $\triangleright$  Accumulate regularizer
9:     if additive then
10:       $\tilde{S}_{ij} \leftarrow S_{ij} + C \cdot \sigma_{ij} - C$                          $\triangleright$  Additive masking
11:     else
12:       $\tilde{S}_{ij} \leftarrow S_{ij} \odot \sigma_{ij}$                                  $\triangleright$  Multiplicative masking
13:     end if
14:     Apply causal mask to  $\tilde{S}_{ij}$ ; for diagonal blocks ( $j = i$ ), restore token diagonal  $\text{diag}(\tilde{S}_{ii}) \leftarrow$ 
        $\text{diag}(S_{ii})$                                                              $\triangleright$  Bypass threshold on diagonal
15:      $m_{\text{new}} \leftarrow \max(m_i, \max(\tilde{S}_{ij}))$                                  $\triangleright$  Online softmax update
16:      $\alpha \leftarrow \exp(m_i - m_{\text{new}})$ 
17:      $P_{ij} \leftarrow \exp(\tilde{S}_{ij} - m_{\text{new}})$ 
18:      $l_{\text{new}} \leftarrow l_i \cdot \alpha + \text{row\_sum}(P_{ij})$ 
19:      $acc_i \leftarrow acc_i \cdot \alpha + P_{ij} V_j$ 
20:      $m_i \leftarrow m_{\text{new}}, l_i \leftarrow l_{\text{new}}$ 
21:   end for
22:    $O_i \leftarrow acc_i / l_i$                                                  $\triangleright$  Normalize output
23:    $L_i \leftarrow m_i + \ln(l_i)$                                              $\triangleright$  Store log-sum-exp for backward pass
24:   Store  $O_i, \Sigma_{\text{sums},i}, L_i$  from SRAM to HBM
25: end for

```

Similarly, the gradient with respect to the raw pre-softmax attention score S_{ij} receives an additional term from the thresholding mechanism, yielding the final dS_{ij}^{raw} used to compute dK and dQ .

Because the backward pass's inner loop iterates over queries while holding keys constant, gradients for Q and τ are accumulated atomically across multiple inner iterations (`tl.atomic_add`), ensuring thread-safe gradient reductions across the sequence length without necessitating massive workspace buffers. [Algorithm 3](#) gives the full backward pass.

E.3. Derivation of the Attention Gradients

To formulate the backward pass, we differentiate the scalar loss $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to the intermediate variables in reverse. We denote the upstream gradient of the loss with respect to any variable X as $dX = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial X}$. Recall the forward attention operations for a query i and key j :

$$S_{ij} = s \langle Q_i, K_j \rangle, \quad P_{ij} = \frac{\exp(\tilde{S}_{ij})}{\sum_k \exp(\tilde{S}_{ik})}, \quad O_i = \sum_k P_{ik} V_k \quad (6)$$

where s is the scaling factor and $\tilde{S}_{ij}$ is the dynamically masked pre-softmax logit.

Algorithm 3 Hardware-Aligned Backward Kernel**Require:** Forward tensors Q, K, V, τ, O, L , upstream gradients $dO, d\Sigma$ **Require:** Scale s , Temperature β **Ensure:** Gradients $dQ, dK, dV \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$, $d\tau \in \mathbb{R}^T$

```

1: Initialize  $dQ, d\tau \leftarrow 0$  in HBM
2: for each key block  $j$  from 1 to  $T/B_N$  do
3:   Load  $K_j, V_j$  from HBM to SRAM
4:   Initialize  $dK_j \leftarrow 0, dV_j \leftarrow 0$  in SRAM
5:   for each query block  $i$  from  $j$  to  $T/B_M$  do ▷ Respect causal bounds
6:     Load  $Q_i, \tau_i, O_i, L_i, dO_i, d\Sigma_i$  from HBM to SRAM
7:     Recompute  $S_{ij} \leftarrow s \cdot Q_i K_j^\top$ 
8:     Recompute  $\sigma_{ij} \leftarrow \text{sigmoid}(\beta \cdot (S_{ij} - \tau_i))$ 
9:     Recompute masked scores  $\tilde{S}_{ij}$  ▷ Using strict or soft mask
10:    Apply causal/diagonal mask to  $\tilde{S}_{ij}$ 
11:     $P_{ij} \leftarrow \exp(\tilde{S}_{ij} - L_i)$  ▷ Recompute attention probabilities
12:     $dV_j \leftarrow dV_j + P_{ij}^\top dO_i$  ▷ Accumulate value gradients
13:     $dP_{ij} \leftarrow dO_i V_j^\top$ 
14:     $D_i \leftarrow \text{row\_sum}(dO_i \odot O_i)$  ▷ Softmax scaling factor
15:     $dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}} \leftarrow P_{ij} \odot (dP_{ij} - D_i)$  ▷ Gradient through softmax
16:    Compute threshold gradient  $d\tau_{\text{local}}$  using  $dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}}, d\Sigma_i$ , and  $\sigma'_{ij}$ 
17:    Compute raw pre-softmax gradient  $dS_{ij}^{\text{raw}}$ 
18:     $dK_j \leftarrow dK_j + s(dS_{ij}^{\text{raw}})^\top Q_i$  ▷ Accumulate key gradients
19:    atomic_add( $dQ_i, dS_{ij}^{\text{raw}} K_j$ ) ▷ Accumulate to HBM safely
20:    atomic_add( $d\tau_i, \text{row\_sum}(d\tau_{\text{local}})$ )
21:  end for
22:  Store  $dK_j, dV_j$  from SRAM to HBM
23: end for

```

We first compute the gradients with respect to the value vectors V_j and the scalar attention probabilities P_{ij} . Applying the chain rule to the forward output sum yields:

$$dV_j = \sum_i P_{ij} dO_i, \quad \text{and} \quad dP_{ij} = dO_i \cdot V_j \quad (7)$$

Next, we route the gradient through the softmax normalization to find the derivative with respect to the masked logits, $\tilde{S}_{ij}$. Because $\tilde{S}_{ij}$ affects all probabilities P_{ik} for query i , we sum over k using the standard softmax Jacobian, $\frac{\partial P_{ik}}{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}} = P_{ij}(\delta_{jk} - P_{ik})$, where δ_{jk} is the Kronecker delta:

$$dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}} = \sum_k dP_{ik} \frac{\partial P_{ik}}{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}} = P_{ij} \left(dP_{ij} - \sum_k P_{ik} dP_{ik} \right) \quad (8)$$

The threshold τ_i and the raw pre-softmax logit S_{ij} interact through the inclusion probability $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma(\beta(S_{ij} - \tau_i))$. This probability branches into two computational pathways: the task loss (acting as a dynamic mask to produce $\tilde{S}_{ij}$) and the sparsity regularization loss (accumulating into the row-wise sum $R_i = \sum_j \sigma_{ij}$).

Both gradient derivations rely on the shared upstream gradient flowing through σ_{ij} . Using

$dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}$ and $d\Sigma_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_i}$, we apply the chain rule to find:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} = dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} + d\Sigma_i$$

Threshold Gradient ($d\tau_i$): The threshold τ_i only affects the loss via σ_{ij} . Because it influences all keys j up to the causal limit, we sum the chain rule across the sequence. Evaluating the inner derivative $\frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial \tau_i} = -\beta \sigma'_{ij}$ (where $\sigma'_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}(1 - \sigma_{ij})$), we obtain:

$$d\tau_i = \sum_j \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial \tau_i} = \sum_j \left(dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} + d\Sigma_i \right) (-\beta \cdot \sigma'_{ij})$$

Raw Score Gradient (dS_{ij}^{raw}): Unlike the threshold, the raw score S_{ij} affects the loss through both the indirect sigmoid path (σ_{ij}) and the direct dynamic mask path ($\tilde{S}_{ij}$). Applying the multivariate chain rule:

$$dS_{ij}^{\text{raw}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial S_{ij}} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial S_{ij}}$$

Notice the mathematical symmetry in the sigmoid's argument: the inner derivative with respect to the score is $\frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial S_{ij}} = +\beta \sigma'_{ij}$. Substituting this and the shared intermediate term yields the final local gradient:

$$dS_{ij}^{\text{raw}} = dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial S_{ij}} + \left(dS_{ij}^{\text{masked}} \frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} + d\Sigma_i \right) (\beta \cdot \sigma'_{ij})$$

Masking Derivatives: To implement these equations natively, the exact values of the local mask derivatives are determined by the chosen dynamic masking strategy:

- **Additive Masking** ($\tilde{S}_{ij} = S_{ij} + C \cdot \sigma_{ij} - C$): The direct derivative is $\frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial S_{ij}} = 1$, and the sigmoid interaction is $\frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} = C$.
- **Multiplicative Masking** ($\tilde{S}_{ij} = S_{ij} \odot \sigma_{ij}$): The direct derivative is $\frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial S_{ij}} = \sigma_{ij}$, and the sigmoid interaction is $\frac{\partial \tilde{S}_{ij}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} = S_{ij}$.

Query and Key Gradients As we saw, dS_{ij}^{masked} is combined with the sparsity regularization gradient to form the total upstream gradient for the raw score, denoted as dS_{ij}^{raw} . We distribute this raw gradient back to the query and key vectors. Differentiating the scaled dot-product $S_{ij} = s Q_i K_j^T$ yields symmetric accumulations:

$$dQ_i = \sum_j s \cdot dS_{ij}^{\text{raw}} K_j, \quad \text{and} \quad dK_j = \sum_i s \cdot dS_{ij}^{\text{raw}} Q_i \quad (9)$$

From a hardware implementation perspective, the scalar s is absorbed into dS_{ij}^{raw} immediately prior to these matrix multiplications. Because our backward kernel holds keys in the outer loop and iterates over queries in the inner loop, dK_j is accumulated safely in on-chip SRAM, whereas dQ_i requires atomic additions to prevent race conditions in global High Bandwidth Memory (HBM).

E.4. Complexity Analysis

To formally evaluate the hardware efficiency of our Threshold Attention mechanism, we analyze its space, time (FLOPs), and memory access (I/O) complexities. We follow the analytical framework of FlashAttention (Dao et al., 2022).

Let T be the sequence length and d be the head dimension. Let M denote the capacity of the fast on-chip SRAM. To maximize SRAM utilization without overflowing, our block sizes are constrained such that $B_M, B_N = \Theta(M/d)$. For this analysis, we assume a causal masking paradigm, meaning the inner loops traverse approximately $T^2/2$ total element interactions.

Forward Pass Complexity In standard attention, materializing the dense $T \times T$ attention matrix requires $O(T^2)$ space and $O(T^2)$ High Bandwidth Memory (HBM) accesses. Our hardware-aligned forward pass avoids this.

- **Space:** We only store the inputs $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$, the threshold parameters $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^T$, the final output $O \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$, and the vectors required for the backward pass ($L, \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^T$). The dynamic mask σ_{ij} is computed locally in SRAM and never explicitly materialized. Thus, the total space complexity is $O(Td)$, identical to standard FlashAttention.
- **Time:** The inner loop computes the dot product, the sigmoid inclusion probability, and the softmax accumulator updates. While the sigmoid and masking operations introduce a constant factor overhead compared to raw FlashAttention, they are element-wise $O(1)$ operations. Across all block pairs, the dominant operation remains the matrix multiplications ($Q_i K_j^T$ and $P_{ij} V_j$), yielding a time complexity of $O(T^2 d)$.
- **I/O (HBM Accesses):** The outer loop iterates over T/B_M query blocks. For each query block, it loads Q_i and τ_i from HBM ($\Theta(B_M d)$ elements). The inner loop iterates over T/B_N key/value blocks, loading K_j and V_j ($\Theta(B_N d)$ elements). The total number of HBM accesses is given by:

$$\text{HBM Accesses} = \sum_{i=1}^{T/B_M} \left[\Theta(B_M d) + \sum_{j=1}^{T/B_N} \Theta(B_N d) \right] = O\left(\frac{T^2 d}{B_M}\right) \quad (10)$$

Substituting $B_M = \Theta(M/d)$, the overall I/O complexity is $O(T^2 d^2 M^{-1})$.

Backward Pass Complexity The backward pass reconstructs the forward pass intermediate states to avoid saving the massive $T \times T$ matrices, trading additional FLOPs for substantially reduced memory reads.

- **Space:** The backward pass requires storing the gradients $dQ, dK, dV \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$ and $d\tau \in \mathbb{R}^T$, requiring $O(Td)$ space.
- **Time:** Recomputing S_{ij} and σ_{ij} requires the same $O(T^2 d)$ FLOPs as the forward pass. Computing the standard attention gradients ($dS_{ij}, dP_{ij}, dV_j, dK_j, dQ_i$) and the threshold gradient $d\tau_i$ involves purely linear matrix multiplications and element-wise derivatives. Thus, the total time complexity remains $O(T^2 d)$.
- **I/O (HBM Accesses):** The outer loop iterates over T/B_N key blocks, holding K_j and V_j in SRAM while accumulating dK_j and dV_j . The inner loop streams the query blocks Q_i, dO_i and vectors $L, \tau, D, d\Sigma$ from HBM ($\Theta(B_M d)$ elements). The gradients dQ_i and $d\tau_i$ are accumulated to HBM using atomic additions. The total HBM access cost is:

$$\text{HBM Accesses} = \sum_{j=1}^{T/B_N} \left[\Theta(B_N d) + \sum_{i=j}^{T/B_M} \Theta(B_M d) \right] = O\left(\frac{T^2 d}{B_N}\right) \quad (11)$$

Substituting $B_N = \Theta(M/d)$, the backward I/O complexity is $O(T^2 d^2 M^{-1})$.

F. Inference-Time Block-Sparse Fused Kernel

Here we detail the algorithmic design and systems optimizations of our custom Triton (Tillet et al., 2019) fused kernel for block-sparse attention decoding.

F.1. GQA-Grouped Execution and Compact Metadata Layout

In Grouped-Query Attention ($G = H_Q/H_{KV}$), launching an independent thread block per query head replicates KV cache reads up to G times. Instead, our kernel launches a two-dimensional grid over KV heads ($\lceil N_{\text{blocks}}/C \rceil \times (B \cdot H_{KV})$), maintaining leading accumulator dimensions of size G . All C block metadata records for a chunk are fetched in bulk coalesced tiles to evaluate the $C \times G$ screening bounds simultaneously via Tensor Core matrix multiplications (`tl.dot`). A KV block is loaded from HBM into SRAM once if *any* query head within the group selects it, with per-head online-softmax updates masked individually. This reduces byte traffic from $H_Q \cdot D_{\text{head}}$ to $H_{KV} \cdot D_{\text{union}}$ fractions of the cache.

To minimize metadata I/O, each per-block record stores only the 64-dimensional centroid μ_B (float16), 64-dimensional coordinate standard deviation σ_B (float16), and scalar maximum norm M_B (float32), totaling 258 bytes per block per KV head (1.6% overhead at $b = 64$). Caching σ_B rather than variance σ_B^2 prevents half-precision underflow below 6×10^{-5} in low-variance blocks.

F.2. Mixed Precision and Numerical Stability

While Tensor Core matrix multiplications ($qK_B^\top$ and PV_B) execute in float16, squaring coordinates in half precision during proxy bound evaluation can induce overflow or cancellation. Consequently, all coordinate-wise square accumulations, dot-product bounding terms ($\langle q, \mu_B \rangle$), scaling factors, and online softmax accumulators (m_c, l_c) are strictly promoted to float32.

F.3. Chunked Decoding and Two-Stage Reduction

To maximize Streaming Multiprocessor (SM) occupancy during long-context decoding, the block sequence is partitioned into independent *chunks* of C contiguous blocks. The primary scan kernel evaluates block thresholds and updates local online softmax accumulators ($m_{\text{mid}}^{(c)}, l_{\text{mid}}^{(c)}, O_{\text{mid}}^{(c)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$) independently for each chunk c . When $N_{\text{chunks}} > 1$, a secondary reduction kernel aggregates chunk statistics via associative online softmax reduction:

$$o = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^{N_{\text{chunks}}} O_{\text{mid}}^{(c)} \exp\left(m_{\text{mid}}^{(c)} - m_{\text{global}}\right)}{\sum_{c=1}^{N_{\text{chunks}}} l_{\text{mid}}^{(c)} \exp\left(m_{\text{mid}}^{(c)} - m_{\text{global}}\right)}, \quad \text{where } m_{\text{global}} = \max_c m_{\text{mid}}^{(c)}.$$

When $N_{\text{chunks}} = 1$, a fast path normalizes and writes $o = \text{acc}_1/l_1$ directly to HBM without staging intermediate buffers. Larger chunk sizes C reduce intermediate buffer traffic and reduction trip counts at the cost of grid parallelism; as shown in Table 9, $b = 64, c = 128$ achieves optimal throughput at 51.2% union density, whereas coarser blocks ($b = 128, c = 64$) reach 2.50 $\times$ speedup in sparse regimes (16.0% union).

Table 9 | **Effect of block size and chunk size** at $B = 64$, $L = 512K$ (32.8 GB KV cache), NVIDIA H100 SXM 80 GB, float16. c denotes blocks per chunk. Coarser blocks reduce metadata overhead in sparse regimes (16%), while $b = 64$ achieves the best balance at 51.2% union density.

Arm	51.2% union		35.5% union		16.0% union	
	ms	×	ms	×	ms	×
FlashAttention-2	15.085	—	15.009	—	14.790	—
ETA $b = 32, c = 64$	16.617	0.91	13.498	1.11	9.207	1.61
ETA $b = 64, c = 64$	13.797	1.09	10.566	1.42	6.429	2.30
ETA $b = 64, c = 128$	13.432	1.12	10.430	1.44	6.520	2.27
ETA $b = 128, c = 64$	16.733	0.90	11.472	1.31	5.921	2.50

F.4. Top-1 Rescue, Tail Handling, and Kernel Validation

If an aggressive threshold prunes all candidate blocks in chunk 0, leaving an empty softmax denominator ($l_c = 0$), the kernel executes a localized *Top-1 Rescue Phase*: it tracks the maximum proxy bound index during scanning and unconditionally loads $K_{\max_idx}, V_{\max_idx}$ into SRAM. Furthermore, whenever sequence length T is not an exact multiple of block size B , the final chunk ($c = N_{\text{chunks}}$) executes a predicated tail phase (IS_TAIL=True) to process remaining tokens with out-of-bounds positions masked to $-\infty$.

We validate the grouped decode kernel across 31 test configurations against an independent PyTorch reference implementation modeling greedy block selection and top-1 rescue. Integer selection counts (per-head density, attended token fraction, and GQA union blocks) match with zero discrepancy across all cases, while attention outputs match within 10^{-6} in float32 and 10^{-3} in float16. The complete decode procedure is summarized in [Algorithm 4](#).

Algorithm 4 Hardware-Aligned Block-Sparse Decoding (Inference)

Require: Query $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$, KV Cache $K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$

Require: Block Size B , Blocks per Chunk C , Total Full Blocks $N_{\text{full}} \leftarrow \lfloor T/B \rfloor$

Require: Metadata: Centroids $\mu_b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, Variances $\sigma_b^2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, Max Norms $M_b \in \mathbb{R}$ for $b \in [1, N_{\text{full}}]$

Require: Dynamic Threshold τ , Softmax Scale s , Operating Offset a , Z-score z

Ensure: Output $o \in \mathbb{R}^d$

- 1: Calculate $N_{\text{chunks}} \leftarrow \lceil N_{\text{full}}/C \rceil$
- 2: **if** $N_{\text{chunks}} > 1$ **then**
- 3: Allocate intermediate buffers $M_{\text{mid}}, L_{\text{mid}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\text{chunks}}}, O_{\text{mid}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\text{chunks}} \times d}$ in HBM
- 4: **end if**
- 5: $\tau_{\text{eff}} \leftarrow \tau - a$ ▷ Effective threshold with operating offset
- 6: **for** each chunk c from 1 to N_{chunks} **do** ▷ Processed in parallel across GPU SMs
- 7: $m_c \leftarrow -\infty, l_c \leftarrow 0, acc_c \leftarrow \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \text{tokens_attended} \leftarrow 0$
- 8: $\max_bound \leftarrow -\infty, \max_idx \leftarrow -1$
- 9: **for** each full block $b \in [(c-1)C + 1, \min(cC, N_{\text{full}})]$ **do**
- 10: Load μ_b, σ_b^2, M_b from HBM into SRAM
- 11: $\text{bound}_{\text{gauss}} \leftarrow s \cdot \left(\langle q, \mu_b \rangle + z \cdot \sqrt{\sum_i q_i^2 (\sigma_b^2)_i} \right)$
- 12: $\text{bound}_{\text{spher}} \leftarrow s \cdot \|q\| \cdot M_b$
- 13: $\text{bound} \leftarrow \min(\text{bound}_{\text{gauss}}, \text{bound}_{\text{spher}})$
- 14: **if** $\text{bound} \geq \tau_{\text{eff}}$ **then**

```

15:         Load  $K_b, V_b$  from HBM into SRAM                                ▶ Significant block
16:         Update  $m_c, l_c, acc_c$  via online softmax using  $q, K_b, V_b$ 
17:         tokens_attended  $\leftarrow$  tokens_attended +  $B$ 
18:     end if
19:     if  $c == 1$  and bound > max_bound then                                ▶ Track max only for Chunk 1 rescue
20:         max_bound  $\leftarrow$  bound, max_idx  $\leftarrow$   $b$ 
21:     end if
22: end for
23: if  $c == 1$  and tokens_attended == 0 then                                ▶ Top-1 Rescue Phase (Chunk 1 only)
24:     Load  $K_{\max\_idx}, V_{\max\_idx}$  from HBM into SRAM
25:     Update  $m_c, l_c, acc_c$  via online softmax using  $q, K_{\max\_idx}, V_{\max\_idx}$ 
26: end if
27: if  $c == N_{\text{chunks}}$  and  $T > N_{\text{full}} \cdot B$  then                                ▶ Tail-Block Phase (partial remaining tokens)
28:     Load remaining tail tokens  $K_{\text{tail}}, V_{\text{tail}}$  from HBM into SRAM
29:     Update  $m_c, l_c, acc_c$  via online softmax with partial masking
30: end if
31: if  $N_{\text{chunks}} == 1$  then
32:     return  $acc_c / l_c$                                 ▶ Single-chunk fast path: return normalized output directly
33: else
34:     Store unnormalized accumulators:  $m_c \rightarrow M_{\text{mid}}[c], l_c \rightarrow L_{\text{mid}}[c], acc_c \rightarrow O_{\text{mid}}[c]$ 
35: end if
36: end for

37: Global Reduction Kernel:                                ▶ Executed when  $N_{\text{chunks}} > 1$ 
38:  $m_{\text{global}} \leftarrow -\infty, l_{\text{global}} \leftarrow 0, o \leftarrow \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ 
39: for each chunk  $c$  from 1 to  $N_{\text{chunks}}$  do
40:      $m_{\text{new}} \leftarrow \max(m_{\text{global}}, M_{\text{mid}}[c])$ 
41:      $\alpha_{\text{global}} \leftarrow \exp(m_{\text{global}} - m_{\text{new}}), \alpha_{\text{chunk}} \leftarrow \exp(M_{\text{mid}}[c] - m_{\text{new}})$ 
42:      $l_{\text{global}} \leftarrow l_{\text{global}} \cdot \alpha_{\text{global}} + L_{\text{mid}}[c] \cdot \alpha_{\text{chunk}}$ 
43:      $o \leftarrow o \cdot \alpha_{\text{global}} + O_{\text{mid}}[c] \cdot \alpha_{\text{chunk}}$ 
44:      $m_{\text{global}} \leftarrow m_{\text{new}}$ 
45: end for
46: return  $o / l_{\text{global}}$                                 ▶ Final normalization across all chunks
    
```

G. Train-to-Inference Representational Consistency

To formally characterize the relationship between training-time multiplicative relaxation and inference-time block-sparse execution, we analyze their induced attention distributions over the shared causal support $\mathcal{S}_t = \{1, \dots, t\}$ at decoding step t .

Let $S_s = \frac{q_t k_s^\top}{\sqrt{d_k}}$ denote the raw pre-softmax attention logit for past key $s \leq t$, and let τ_t be the predicted head threshold. Let $\mathcal{K}_t \subset \mathcal{S}_t$ denote the set of active keys retained by the kernel threshold test, and let $\mathcal{P}_t = \mathcal{S}_t \setminus \mathcal{K}_t$ be the set of pruned background keys.

Definition 1 (Training and Inference Attention Distributions). *The training-time attention distribution*

p^{train} and inference-time distribution p^{infer} over the full support $\mathcal{S}_t$ are defined as:

$$p_s^{\text{train}} = \frac{\exp(S_s \cdot \sigma_s)}{\sum_{j=1}^t \exp(S_j \cdot \sigma_j)}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_t, \quad (12)$$

$$p_s^{\text{infer}} = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(S_s)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_t} \exp(S_j)}, & \text{if } s \in \mathcal{K}_t, \\ 0, & \text{if } s \in \mathcal{P}_t, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where $\sigma_s = \text{sigmoid}(\beta(S_s - \tau_t)) \in (0, 1)$ is the gating surrogate with sharpness parameter $\beta > 0$.

G.1. Relative Log-Odds Invariance

A central question for any sparse attention surrogate is whether omitting pruned keys from the softmax denominator at inference—the transition from Equation 12 to Equation 13—distorts the relative weighting among retained tokens. Here we show that ETA’s multiplicative gating preserves relative log-odds among salient tokens up to an exponentially vanishing residual.

For any two retained tokens $a, b \in \mathcal{K}_t$, the training attention ratio satisfies:

$$\frac{p_a^{\text{train}}}{p_b^{\text{train}}} = \frac{\exp(S_a \sigma_a)}{\exp(S_b \sigma_b)} = \exp(S_a \sigma_a - S_b \sigma_b). \quad (14)$$

Because $S_a, S_b \geq \tau_t$, the sigmoid gates saturate exponentially close to unity ($\sigma_s = 1 - \epsilon_s$, where $\epsilon_s = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(S_s - \tau_t)}) \ll 1$). Taking logarithms yields:

$$\log\left(\frac{p_a^{\text{train}}}{p_b^{\text{train}}}\right) = (S_a - S_b) - (S_a \epsilon_a - S_b \epsilon_b) = \log\left(\frac{p_a^{\text{infer}}}{p_b^{\text{infer}}}\right) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(S - \tau_t)}). \quad (15)$$

Thus, hard-pruning sub-threshold blocks at decode time rescales the softmax denominator uniformly without altering the relative attention hierarchy, ranking, or selective focus among retained salient keys.

G.2. Empirical Verification of Residual Stream Alignment

To empirically verify that dropping background keys during block-sparse decoding preserves internal representations, we compare layer-by-layer state trajectories across parallel forward passes on held-out C4 sequences ($L = 1024$) using the 126M ETA checkpoint under block-sparse decoding ($b = 4$, $z = 2.0$, $a = 0.4$).

Let $\mathbf{x}_{\text{train}}^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{\text{infer}}^{(l)}$ denote the residual stream hidden states at layer $l \in \{0, \dots, 11\}$ produced by training-time multiplicative gating and discrete block-sparse decoding, respectively. At each decoding step t , we evaluate directional cosine similarity and relative Euclidean deviation:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{cos}}(l) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_{\text{train}}^{(l)}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{infer}}^{(l)} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x}_{\text{train}}^{(l)}\| \|\mathbf{x}_{\text{infer}}^{(l)}\|}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{\ell_2}(l) = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_{\text{train}}^{(l)} - \mathbf{x}_{\text{infer}}^{(l)}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_{\text{train}}^{(l)}\|}.$$

As shown in Figure 7(a), internal representations remain tightly aligned across network depth, maintaining a mean directional cosine similarity of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{cos}} = 0.9691$ (0.9997 at Layer 0) alongside a stable 22.77% relative ℓ_2 shift. At the final language modeling head (Figure 7(b)), next-token logit vectors achieve 0.9959 cosine similarity, a KL divergence of only 0.0631 nats, and an 80.29% exact top-1 argmax match.




Figure 7 | **Internal representation and output distribution alignment between training-time multiplicative relaxation and inference-time block-sparse execution.** (a) Layer-by-layer residual stream trajectory alignment across network depth (L_0 – L_{11}). (b) Final language modeling head calibration metrics.

H. Mechanistic Analysis: Elimination of Attention Sinks and Layer Specialization

To investigate the mechanistic behavior of ETA across network depth and sequence positions, we conducted evaluation sweeps on held-out FineWeb sequences up to length $L = 2048$. Across all 22 layers and 32 query heads ($22 \times 32 = 704$ attention heads), we recorded the active token density matrix and the softmax probability mass allocated to initial anchor positions ($t \in [0, 3]$).

Mathematical Mechanism of Attention Sink Elimination. In standard dense softmax attention—as well as sparse attention architectures trained with additive hard masks ($S_{ts} \rightarrow -\infty$ for $s \notin I_t$)—attention probabilities are constrained to sum to unity over active tokens:

$$P_{ts} = \frac{\exp(S_{ts})}{\sum_{j \in I_t} \exp(S_{tj})}, \quad \sum_{s \in I_t} P_{ts} = 1.$$

When a query token q_t has low semantic affinity for all available keys in the preceding context, the softmax normalization still forces 100% of the probability mass to be distributed among the active set. To avoid corrupting the residual stream with random context combinations during these “no-op” steps, standard Transformers learn to project initial sequence tokens ($t \in [0, 3]$, which are causally visible to all subsequent tokens) into a dedicated subspace with large positive key bias and near-zero value impact. As shown in Figure 5a (Section 5.6), these *attention sinks* (Xiao et al., 2024) absorb over 50% of total attention mass in standard dense models as sequence length increases. Because standard models depend on token 0 as their sole probability sink, post-hoc eviction methods (e.g., StreamingLLM, H₂O) suffer catastrophic perplexity degradation if initial anchor tokens are evicted, requiring explicit heuristic pinning of the first 4 tokens.

Under ETA’s multiplicative gating during training ($\tilde{S}_{ts} = S_{ts} \cdot \sigma(\beta(S_{ts} - \tau_t))$), sub-threshold logits are contracted toward 0 rather than $-\infty$. Since $\exp(0) = 1$, the training-time softmax partition function

Z_t decomposes into:

$$Z_t = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{I}_t} \exp(\tilde{S}_{ts}) + \sum_{s \notin \mathcal{I}_t} \exp(0) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{I}_t} \exp(\tilde{S}_{ts}) + (t - |\mathcal{I}_t|).$$

The suppressed tail of size $(t - |\mathcal{I}_t|)$ acts as a natural, distributed probability reservoir with total weight $(t - |\mathcal{I}_t|) \cdot 1$. Whenever a query q_t lacks strong semantic matches in the context, raising τ_t contracts all logits toward zero, causing the uniform background floor to absorb nearly all softmax mass equally across the t historical positions ($\tilde{P}_{ts} \approx 1/t$). Because this uniform background floor provides a built-in “no-op” reservoir throughout training, gradient descent experiences zero pressure to create localized sink projections on initial tokens. Consequently, as demonstrated in Figure 5a, **localized attention sinks disappear under ETA**: average probability mass on tokens $t \in [0, 3]$ drops from $> 50\%$ in dense attention to $< 2\%$ across all sequence lengths, eliminating the need for heuristic sink-token pinning during block-sparse inference.

Autonomous Layer Specialization Across Depth. Examining the 22×32 layer-head density profile in Figure 5b (Section 5.6) reveals that ETA autonomously organizes its attention budget into three distinct functional stages without layer-specific hyperparameter tuning:

1. **Broad Surface Aggregation (Layer 0):** The initial transformer layer retains $\approx 96\%$ active token density across heads, functioning as a dense-like feature extractor that mixes local and global surface tokens before higher-level representations are formed.
2. **Aggressive Mid-Network Compression (Layers 3–14):** Intermediate layers compress context aggressively, reaching a global minimum at Layer 7 where mean active density drops below 8%. In these layers, heads specialize into targeted retrieval and syntactic routing heads that attend exclusively to high-affinity semantic spans.
3. **Deep Predictive Synthesis (Layers 15–21):** Deeper layers progressively restore attention density (recovering to 35%–48%) to aggregate distributed representations across the context window before final next-token prediction.

I. NSA vs ETA: Experimental Details

Both models were pretrained from scratch on the FineWeb 10BT corpus (5 parquet shards) on a single NVIDIA H100 SXM 80GB GPU. Training was executed for exactly 10,000 gradient steps with sequence length $L = 1024$, batch size $B = 4$ per device with 4 gradient accumulation steps (effective global batch size = 16, representing 163.8M tokens total). Optimization was governed by AdamW ($\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.95$, $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$, weight decay 0.1) with a cosine learning rate decay schedule (peak lr = 3×10^{-4} , 500 warmup steps). ETA incorporated a sparsity regularization penalty ($\lambda = 0.05$), while NSA trained purely with standard cross-entropy.

Hyperparameter Control. To isolate the fundamental efficiency and quality characteristics of the attention mechanisms, both models were trained with identical 126M-parameter LLaMA-style transformer backbones: 12 hidden layers, model hidden dimension $d_{\text{model}} = 768$, intermediate SwiGLU dimension $d_{\text{ffn}} = 2048$, 12 query heads ($H_Q = 12$), 4 key/value heads ($H_{KV} = 4$, GQA ratio = 3), head dimension $d_k = 64$, RMSNorm ($\epsilon = 10^{-6}$), and a vocabulary size of 32,768 tokens. Both models share identical Rotary Position Embedding (RoPE) parameters: base frequency $\theta = 500,000.0$ and LLaMA-3 wavelength-dependent frequency scaling (factor = 8.0, high_freq_factor = 4.0, low_freq_factor = 1.0, and original_max_positions = 8192).

Table 10 | **Backbone Architectural Hyperparameters.** All backbone dimensions and positional encodings are identical between the two models. ETA adds $12 \times (768 \times 12 + 12) = 0.11\text{M}$ threshold-predictor parameters on top, under 0.1% of the total.

Hyperparameter	NSA 126M	ETA 126M
Layers (L)	12	12
Hidden Size (d_{model})	768	768
FFN Intermediate (d_{ffn})	2048	2048
Query Heads (H_Q)	12	12
KV Heads (H_{KV})	4	4
Head Dimension (d_k)	64	64
Parameters excl. output embedding	100.66M	100.66M
Total parameters	125.85M	125.85M
Vocabulary Size	32,768	32,768
RoPE Base Theta (θ)	500,000.0	500,000.0
RoPE Scaling	LLaMA-3 (8 $\times$)	LLaMA-3 (8 $\times$)

I.1. Training Convergence and Wall-Clock Dynamics

We first compare the training dynamics between the two models. As shown in Figure 8, ETA exhibits faster and more effective optimization than NSA across all 10,000 steps. ETA reaches a final step loss of **4.370**, whereas NSA stabilizes at **4.508**. Total training wall-clock time was 4,796s for ETA versus 5,310s for NSA.




Figure 8 | **Pretraining Loss Convergence.** ETA demonstrates consistently steeper loss convergence throughout pretraining, finishing $\Delta\text{Loss} = -0.138$ below NSA.

I.2. Autoregressive Downstream Perplexity

We evaluated both models in an identical autoregressive split-mode protocol at context length $L = 2048$ ($2\times$ pretraining sequence length): 1% context prefill and 99% autoregressive decoding with KV caching. Evaluations were conducted across three benchmark corpora: FineWeb, C4, and the entire test partition of Wikitext-v2. For ETA, the probabilistic threshold index operated with $a = 0.4$ and $z = 2.0$.

As presented in Table 11, ETA outperforms NSA in downstream perplexity on FineWeb (99.80 vs. 103.55) and WikiText-2 (158.64 vs. 161.65) while maintaining $\approx 53\%$ sparsity during autoregressive generation, and matches NSA on C4 (100.73 vs. 100.18). Across an identical 126M parameter backbone and training budget, ETA’s single unified thresholding mechanism learns more efficiently than NSA’s tri-branch architecture without requiring multi-scale heuristic branches.

Table 11 | **Perplexity (PPL) and Sparsity Comparison.** 126M models, evaluated under 1% prompt prefill + 99% autoregressive decode (batch size 4, $L = 2048$).

Dataset	NSA PPL	ETA PPL	Δ PPL	ETA Sparsity
FineWeb (10BT)	103.55 $\pm$ 26.51 [± 1.87]	99.80 $\pm$ 21.71 [± 1.54]	-3.75	53.60%
C4	100.18 $\pm$ 16.08 [± 1.14]	100.73 $\pm$ 17.96 [± 1.27]	+0.55	53.89%
Wikitext-2	161.65 $\pm$ 22.50 [± 1.24]	158.64 $\pm$ 22.30 [± 1.17]	-3.01	51.17%

I.3. Autoregressive Decoding Latency and Throughput

We benchmark autoregressive decoding latency and generation throughput across batch sizes $B \in \{16, 32\}$ and sequence lengths up to $L = 32,768$ (32K) under a 10% prefill / 90% decode partition. As reported in Table 12, ETA significantly lowers per-step decode latency across every measured configuration. At $B = 32, L = 8K$, ETA reduces step latency from 69.07 ms to 25.35 ms (2.72 $\times$ speedup), increasing generation throughput from 463 to 1,262 tok/s. At long sequence lengths ($L = 32K$), ETA achieves a 1.63 $\times$ speedup at $B = 16$ (37.36 ms vs. 60.93 ms). ETA’s fused single-pass decode kernel eliminates the multi-kernel launch overhead inherent to tri-branch architectures, demonstrating practical systems-level gains for long-context generation.

Table 12 | **Decoding Efficiency & Throughput Sweep.** Evaluated under 10% prompt prefill + 90% autoregressive decode across sequence lengths up to 32,768 tokens.

Batch (B)	Context (L)	Model	Prefill (TTFT)	Step Latency (ms)	Throughput (tok/s)
16	16,384 (16K)	NSA	0.992 s	61.319 $\pm$ 2.248	260.93
16	16,384 (16K)	ETA	0.319 s	24.254 $\pm$ 6.086	659.68
16	32,768 (32K)	NSA	1.724 s	60.932 $\pm$ 2.927	262.59
16	32,768 (32K)	ETA	0.649 s	37.356 $\pm$ 12.475	428.31
32	8,192 (8K)	NSA	0.174 s	69.069 $\pm$ 1.573	463.31
32	8,192 (8K)	ETA	0.294 s	25.353 $\pm$ 5.808	1,262.16
32	16,384 (16K)	NSA	0.407 s	69.102 $\pm$ 1.359	463.09
32	16,384 (16K)	ETA	0.502 s	37.737 $\pm$ 12.720	847.98
32	32,768 (32K)	NSA	0.465 s	66.193 $\pm$ 4.728	483.44
32	32,768 (32K)	ETA	1.149 s	61.291 $\pm$ 23.937	522.10

J. Block Size Mechanics, Index Screening, and Granularity Analysis

This appendix provides extended empirical evaluations of block granularity, GQA union memory transfers, and the dual screening index, supplementing subsection 5.3. Together, these experiments isolate four distinct mechanisms governing hardware-aligned block-sparse decoding.

J.1. Isolating Block Over-Inclusion from Exact Token Selection

Block-sparse decoding groups contiguous keys into memory tiles of size b , co-admitting sub-threshold neighbor tokens whenever a block contains at least one salient key. While our parallel trajectory analysis (subsection G.2; Figure 7) establishes that hardening continuous soft training gates into discrete selection masks preserves residual representations (0.9959 logit cosine similarity, 0.0631 nats KL), Table 13 isolates the specific impact of block coarseness by comparing block-sparse hard

selection ($b = 4$) against exact token-level hard selection ($b = 1$) under identical checkpoints and thresholds.

Table 13 | **Isolating the cost of block granularity.** Evaluated under identical checkpoints, thresholds, data, and protocols ($L = 2048, a = 0.4$).

Model / corpus	Selection	PPL	Head	Union
1.45B FineWeb	block kernel, $b = 4, z = 2.0$	17.99	37.8%	69.4%
1.45B FineWeb	exact token-level hard	18.23	18.6%	42.6%
1.45B C4	block kernel, $b = 4, z = 2.0$	17.97	36.5%	66.7%
1.45B C4	exact token-level hard	18.16	18.3%	41.2%
126M C4	block kernel, $b = 4, z = 1.0$	105.14	26.2%	40.1%
126M C4	exact token-level hard	112.14	24.6%	38.5%

On the 1.45B model, exact token-level hard selection ($b = 1$) alters perplexity by merely 0.24 points on FineWeb (18.23 vs. 17.99) and 0.19 points on C4 (18.16 vs. 17.97) while operating at roughly half the head density (18.6% vs. 37.8%). This confirms that co-admitting sub-threshold neighbor tokens inside GPU blocks does not distort model predictions—a direct consequence of ETA’s uniform background floor—and that the higher density observed under block execution is not required for model quality, but rather an intentional systems trade-off to enable coalesced HBM block transfers.

J.2. GQA Union Loading Across Heads and Groups

In Grouped-Query Attention (GQA), each key-value head is shared by a group $\mathcal{G}_g$ of $G = H_Q/H_{KV}$ query heads. Because each query head $q \in \mathcal{G}_g$ computes an independent threshold $\tau_{t,q}$ and selects an active block subset $\mathcal{S}_q \subseteq \{1, \dots, N_{\text{blocks}}\}$, physical GPU hardware must transfer the **group union** of blocks from HBM into SRAM:

$$\mathcal{U}_g = \bigcup_{q \in \mathcal{G}_g} \mathcal{S}_q. \quad (16)$$

While per-head compute density (D_{head}) governs Tensor Core FLOPs, the group union density (D_{union}) governs HBM memory traffic and dominates decoding latency. If query heads within a group selected uncorrelated, disjoint blocks, the union would expand additively up to $\min(1, G \cdot D_{\text{head}})$, erasing memory bandwidth savings.

To measure this empirically, we tracked head-level active masks $\mathcal{S}_q$ and group-level union masks $\mathcal{U}_g$ across all 12 layers on C4 during full autoregressive decoding on the 126M model ($H_Q = 12, H_{KV} = 4, G = 3$).

As shown in Figure 9, the empirical group union expands by only **1.49×** (50.8% union vs. 34.1% head density), preserving a **49.23%** physical memory I/O reduction. Query heads sharing a KV head naturally attend to overlapping semantic anchors and entity spans, preventing additive union blowup.

J.3. Screening Index Precision and Per-Head Selectivity

The dual index of Equation 5 acts as an $O(1)$ probabilistic-geometric filter. To evaluate its retrieval accuracy at the individual head level, Table 14 tracks block-level accept decisions against exact per-token attention scores across 20 batches of FineWeb on the 1.45B model under fixed screening parameters ($z = 2.0, a = 0.4$).




Figure 9 | **GQA Union Loading vs. Compute Sparsity across KV Groups.** Head compute density vs. physical group union density across all four KV groups on C4 decoding.

Table 14 | **The screening index as a retrieval system at fixed $z = 2.0$.** 1.45B, FineWeb, $L = 2048$, $a = 0.4$. Rates are measured against true per-token scores at the kernel’s effective threshold across all (layer, head, block) cells of 20 batches. Missed mass represents the fraction of softmax mass in rejected blocks.

b	False neg.	False pos.	Token recall	Missed mass	PPL
4	3.4%	30.8%	98.3%	10.2%	17.38
16	11.7%	16.8%	96.9%	21.5%	18.47
64	27.5%	5.6%	95.3%	36.3%	19.15

Across all block sizes, the index maintains high token recall (95.3%–98.3%). When evaluated at fixed z , finer blocks ($b = 4$) provide tighter spatial selectivity and higher token recall, achieving lower perplexity.

J.4. The Granularity Trade-Off: Per-Head Selectivity vs. Matched HBM Union Bandwidth

A critical systems insight arises when comparing block sizes at a fixed **physical HBM union transfer budget** (D_{union}) rather than fixed per-head parameters. While smaller blocks ($b = 4$) are superior at a fixed *per-head* token budget (Table 14), physical hardware latency is governed by D_{union} —the total volume of KV blocks moved across the HBM bus.

In Table 2 (subsection 5.3), we sweep $b \in \{4, 8, 16, 32, 64\}$ on C4 (126M ETA model) and tune the screening parameter z so that every block size transfers an identical HBM union volume of $D_{\text{union}} \approx 51\%$. When physical HBM transfer is held constant at $\approx 51\%$, increasing block size from $b = 4$ to $b = 64$ improves perplexity by 8.8 points (93.48 vs. 102.32). The mechanism is explained directly by the **Head density** column in Table 2:

- At $b = 4$, small blocks suffer from higher inter-head GQA divergence: different query heads in the same group select distinct 4-token blocks, resulting in a union expansion ratio of $D_{\text{union}}/D_{\text{head}} = 51.57\%/34.77\% = 1.48\times$. Thus, at a 51.6% HBM transfer budget, each individual query head only gets to attend to 34.77% of the sequence.
- At $b = 64$, coarser blocks naturally coalesce nearby token selections from different query heads sharing a KV head into the same 64-token memory tile, compressing the union expansion ratio to $D_{\text{union}}/D_{\text{head}} = 51.94\%/44.26\% = 1.17\times$. Consequently, for the *exact same* 51.9% *physical HBM memory transfer*, each query head gets to attend to 44.26% of the sequence—an extra +9.5% of attended context per head at zero additional memory I/O cost.

This +9.5% increase in per-head attended context far outweighs the slight reduction in spatial boundary precision, explaining why hardware-aligned blocks ($b = 64$) simultaneously maximize Tensor Core throughput and achieve superior language modeling quality per byte transferred from HBM.

K. Dual Probabilistic-Geometric Screening Index: Mathematical Analysis

This section details the theoretical properties and bounds governing the Dual Screening Index introduced in [section 4](#).

K.1. Cantelli Bound and Finite-Population Maximums

For key block $B = \{k_1, \dots, k_b\}$ with centroid μ_B and empirical covariance Σ_B , treating $k \sim \text{Unif}(B)$ yields empirical mean $\langle q, \mu_B \rangle$ and empirical variance $q^\top \Sigma_B q$. Cantelli’s one-sided inequality establishes:

$$\Pr_{k \sim \text{Unif}(B)} \left[\langle q, k \rangle \geq \langle q, \mu_B \rangle + z \sqrt{q^\top \Sigma_B q} \right] \leq \frac{1}{1 + z^2}. \quad (17)$$

Because the population is finite with cardinality b , the number of keys exceeding this threshold is at most $\lfloor b/(1 + z^2) \rfloor$. Whenever $z > \sqrt{b - 1}$, this integer bound is identically zero. Thus, for small blocks ($b = 4, z \geq 2$), Cantelli’s bound provides a certified upper bound on the maximum score in the block.

K.2. Diagonal Variance Surrogate and Per-Head Pareto Frontier

To avoid materializing $d \times d$ covariance matrices Σ_B , our kernel caches only the diagonal variance $\sigma_B^2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and evaluates:

$$\sigma_S(q, B)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d q_i^2 \sigma_{B,i}^2. \quad (18)$$

This surrogate serves as an efficient quantile estimator. By Cauchy-Schwarz, an exact bound could be restored via $\sum_i |q_i| \sigma_{B,i}$, but the diagonal surrogate is substantially tighter in practice and achieves empirical false-negative rates under 3.4% at $b = 4$ ([Table 14](#)).