

OPTIMIZER MEMORY SCHEDULES FOR OUTSCALING THE OVERTRAINING AXIS

Katie Everett*
MIT CSAIL

Shikai Qiu
New York University

ABSTRACT

We investigate how optimizers scale across the overtraining axis and show that relative optimizer performance and optimal hyperparameters change substantially with training horizon. In particular, we study how matrix-preconditioned methods (Muon and SOAP) and a momentum-scheduled method (ADANA) scale relative to AdamW. We compare these four optimizers across models from 51M to 253M parameters and overtraining (OT) factors from $1\times$ to $256\times$, sweeping the base learning rate at every setting. The preferred learning rate schedule can reverse across the overtraining axis, the best weight decay coefficient scales approximately as $\sqrt{OT}$, and longer horizons generally favor longer fixed memory. ADANA’s scaling advantage over AdamW persists after tuning AdamW’s fixed memory separately at each horizon. Log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown provide substantial gains for ADANA that compound as training increases. With this treatment, ADANA outscals AdamW with an exponent advantage close to that predicted by DANA theory on power-law random features. Muon and SOAP instead provide roughly constant token-efficiency advantages over AdamW across most of the measured range, although SOAP may gain further at the highest overtraining factors. ADANA begins behind both matrix-preconditioned optimizers but closes the gaps as training increases, surpassing Muon and becoming competitive with SOAP at our highest OT factors. These results establish training horizon as an essential axis for optimizer evaluation and design.

1 INTRODUCTION

Language models exhibit empirical scaling laws relating loss to model size, training data, and compute (Kaplan et al., 2020). In particular, the Chinchilla scaling law finds that model size and training tokens should grow together to minimize loss at fixed pretraining compute, corresponding to approximately 20 training tokens per parameter (Hoffmann et al., 2022). This result motivated subsequent model and optimizer scaling studies to evaluate performance near the Chinchilla-optimal training horizon. However, for widely deployed language models, recurring inference costs far exceed the one-time cost of pretraining. This can favor training smaller models on far more tokens to achieve similar performance with lower inference costs, a practice known as *overtraining* (Sardana et al., 2024; Gadre et al., 2024; Bian et al., 2025). For a particular model size, the *overtraining factor* expresses the number of training tokens as a multiple of the compute-optimal value.

It is common for optimizer benchmarks to select hyperparameters and compare methods at a single training horizon or fixed token-to-parameter ratio. Optimizer rankings and optimal hyperparameter choices can change with training duration (Wen et al., 2025; Semenov et al., 2025; Wen et al., 2026), yet prior work covers a limited range of overtraining factors. We therefore study how optimizer performance and optimal hyperparameters scale across the overtraining axis.

The optimizers we study combine different forms of preconditioning with different treatments of memory. AdamW uses coordinatewise adaptive preconditioning, whereas Muon and SOAP apply matrix-level preconditioning (Jordan et al., 2024; Vyas et al., 2025); all three use scalar momentum coefficients that keep their memory horizons fixed throughout training. DANA instead derives

*Correspondence to everettk@csail.mit.edu.




Figure 1: **Optimizer rankings exhibit crossovers as training extends beyond the Chinchilla-optimal horizon.** We report the lowest final validation loss after independently sweeping the base learning rate for AdamW, ADANA, Muon, and SOAP on 51M, 124M, and 253M models under uniform weight decay. Muon and SOAP lead at short horizons, whereas ADANA closes its initial gap as the OT factor increases, and SOAP overtakes Muon at the longest measured horizons for the 51M and 124M models. Solid curves are fitted using our shared- m variant of the Scaling functional form (Videau et al., 2026); see Appendix G.

a momentum schedule whose memory grows throughout training, and ADANA incorporates this schedule into an Adam-style adaptive optimizer (Ferbach et al., 2025; 2026). We compare AdamW, ADANA, Muon, and SOAP to ask how fixed memory, matrix preconditioning, and scheduled memory affect optimizer scaling across the overtraining axis.

To study this question, we train models spanning 51M to 253M parameters with each optimizer across overtraining factors ranging from $1\times$ to $256\times$. For every optimizer, model size, and overtraining factor, we independently sweep the base learning rate and use the lowest final validation loss. Following prior work, we measure relative token efficiency at fixed model size using the ratio of the training tokens required by a baseline optimizer to those used by the indicated optimizer at the same loss (Qiu et al., 2025; Ferbach et al., 2026; Wen et al., 2026). We call this ratio the *token multiplier*; values above one mean that the baseline requires more training tokens and therefore favor the indicated optimizer.

Our experiments first show that optimizer treatments must themselves scale with the training horizon. The preferred learning rate schedule can reverse across the overtraining axis, and the best weight decay coefficient scales approximately as $\sqrt{f}$. For fixed-memory optimizers, longer horizons generally favor longer memory, while the optimal learning rate decreases as memory grows. Jointly tuning memory and learning rate at each horizon improves performance particularly at the lowest and highest OT factors. We also propose a momentum cooldown rule that bounds the optimizer’s memory timescale during terminal learning rate decay, yielding substantial gains for ADANA that compound with the benefits of log-time weight decay.

Finally, we find clear optimizer outscaling across the overtraining axis. With log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown, ADANA outscals AdamW with an equivalent-OT exponent close to the $2 - \kappa$ prediction from DANA theory on power-law random features (Ferbach et al., 2025). By contrast, Muon and SOAP provide roughly constant token-multiplier advantages over AdamW across most of the overtraining axis, although SOAP may gain further at our highest OT factors. ADANA begins substantially behind these matrix-preconditioned optimizers but gains on both as the training horizon increases, surpassing Muon and becoming competitive with SOAP. We use joint model–token loss fits and floor–decay likelihood profiles to examine whether this outscaling arises from an improved token-decay exponent, a lower finite-model high-token loss limit, or both.

2 RELATED WORK

Long and scheduled optimizer memory. Most optimizers use exponential averages with coefficients that keep their memory timescales fixed throughout training, but several recent methods instead combine or schedule multiple timescales. AdEMAMix combines separate fast and slow mo-




Figure 2: **Across model sizes under uniform weight decay, ADANA improves relative to AdamW as the OT factor increases, whereas Muon and SOAP already have an advantage at short horizons. Muon’s advantage remains roughly constant across OT factors, while SOAP may improve further at the highest OT factors.** Top: the vertical axis shows the OT factor AdamW requires to match the indicated optimizer’s loss at fixed model size; values above the equal-OT diagonal favor the indicated optimizer. Bottom: the AdamW-relative token multiplier is the equivalent AdamW OT factor divided by the optimizer’s OT factor, or equivalently the ratio of tokens required by AdamW to those used by the optimizer. Curves compare the fitted optimizer and AdamW losses, while markers invert measured optimizer losses through the fitted AdamW curve. Dotted curve segments and translucent marker fills identify target losses below AdamW’s best measured loss and therefore require extrapolating the AdamW fit.

momentum buffers, with distinct coefficients controlling their memory timescales (Pagliardini et al., 2024). Schedule-free methods use iterate averaging, which can be viewed as a form of memory in parameter space that preserves information from earlier optimizer updates (Defazio et al., 2024). ScheduleFree+ reports that the benefit of this parameter-averaging memory increases with training duration (Defazio, 2026). Morwani et al. (2025) connect schedule-free optimizers and AdEMAMix to accelerated SGD variants that decouple momentum decay from the weight assigned to the current gradient. Their experiments find larger gains at small batch sizes, consistent with these approaches being particularly effective in noise-dominated optimization. DANA derives a momentum timescale that grows throughout training and improves loss-scaling exponents in the power-law random features model, while ADANA incorporates this schedule into an Adam-style adaptive optimizer (Ferbach et al., 2025; 2026). Optimal hyperparameters also change with training horizon and batch size: Björck et al. (2025) show empirically that the optimal learning rate decreases predictably with token horizon, while Marek et al. (2025) find that Adam’s β_2 should scale with batch size to keep the second-moment half-life fixed in tokens rather than optimizer updates.

Weight decay controls a related form of memory: whereas momentum determines how long past gradient information influences the optimizer state, decoupled weight decay determines how long earlier optimizer updates remain influential in the parameters (Wang & Aitchison, 2025). Its optimal timescale depends on the data-to-model ratio (Bergsma et al., 2025a), and ADANA introduces a log-time weight decay schedule whose timescale grows throughout training (Ferbach et al., 2026).

Matrix-preconditioned optimizers. Muon, SOAP, and Shampoo can be viewed as matrix-preconditioned optimizers, in contrast to adaptive optimizers such as Adam, whose coordinatewise normalization acts as a diagonal preconditioner. In a high-dimensional least-squares model, Paquette et al. (2026) show that an idealized version of Muon provides a square-root spectral speedup for eigenmodes large enough to be resolved at the given batch size, whereas unresolved modes behave

like SGD. Empirically, Qiu et al. (2025) find that Muon, SOAP, and Shampoo achieve approximately constant $1.4\times$ compute-multiplier gains over AdamW across model widths from 190M to 1.4B when both the learning rate and weight decay are scaled appropriately.

Scaling-law functional forms. For scaling analyses that vary both model size and training horizon, Videau et al. (2026) propose a functional form that couples model size and training data through an interaction exponent. We use this functional form with a model exponent shared across optimizers, similar to Volkova et al. (2026), who show that sharing scaling-law parameters across optimizers improves identifiability.

Optimizer comparisons across training horizons. While many optimizer benchmarks compare methods at a single training horizon or fixed token-to-parameter ratio, recent studies have begun to investigate how relative optimizer performance changes across the overtraining axis. Wen et al. (2025) report that, relative to AdamW, the token multipliers for Muon and SOAP are approximately $1.2\times$ – $1.4\times$ on 130M–520M models from $1\times$ to $8\times$ Chinchilla. Muon performs better through $4\times$, while SOAP catches or overtakes it at $8\times$ and in their additional $16\times$ experiments. On the 1.2B model, both token multipliers decrease to approximately $1.1\times$. Semenov et al. (2025) find that AdamW narrows and eventually reverses SOAP’s short-horizon advantage as training extends. They also show that the long-horizon ordering between SOAP and AdEMAMix depends on retuning AdEMAMix’s slow-memory coefficient: SOAP overtakes AdEMAMix when its shorter-horizon coefficient is reused, whereas increasing β_3 restores AdEMAMix’s lead. Wen et al. (2026) report that, relative to AdamW, the token multiplier for standard Muon remains approximately $1.1\times$ across $1\times$ – $8\times$ Chinchilla, whereas the token multiplier for Muon Hyperball increases across the same range from approximately $1.2\times$ to $1.3\times$. These results show that optimizer advantages can change with training horizon and experimental treatment, while leaving their behavior under substantially greater overtraining unresolved.

3 SCALING OPTIMIZERS ACROSS TRAINING HORIZONS

3.1 MOMENTUM AND WEIGHT DECAY AS MEMORY

Throughout this paper, we use the term *memory* to refer to how long information from earlier optimizer updates remains influential.

For a momentum state with constant coefficient β ,

$$m_t = \beta m_{t-1} + (1 - \beta)g_t = (1 - \beta) \sum_{s=1}^t \beta^{t-s} g_s, \quad (1)$$

where $m_0 = 0$. The relative contribution of a gradient from a updates ago is therefore β^a . Its half-life and effective memory window are

$$H_{1/2} = \frac{\log(1/2)}{\log \beta}, \quad M = \frac{1}{1 - \beta}, \quad (2)$$

with $H_{1/2} \approx (\log 2)M$ near $\beta = 1$. Fixed-momentum optimizers use a coefficient that keeps this timescale constant across training steps, whereas scheduled-memory optimizers vary it throughout training. A similar interpretation applies to exponential moving averages of squared gradients.

Whereas momentum controls how long the optimizer state remembers past gradient information, weight decay controls how quickly the parameters forget it (Wang & Aitchison, 2025). Under decoupled weight decay (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2019), parameter decay is applied separately from the optimizer direction d_t :

$$\theta_{t+1} = (1 - \alpha_t)\theta_t - \eta_t d_t, \quad (3)$$

where η_t is the learning rate and α_t is the fraction of the existing parameter removed at update t . When $\alpha_t = \alpha > 0$ is constant, we can equivalently write

$$\theta_{t+1} = (1 - \alpha)\theta_t + \alpha \left(-\frac{\eta_t}{\alpha} d_t \right), \quad (4)$$

making the parameter iterate an exponential moving average of scaled optimizer updates. The influence of an update from a steps ago decays as $(1 - \alpha)^a$, giving an effective memory window of

approximately $1/\alpha$ updates. A time-varying weight decay schedule therefore changes how quickly the parameters forget updates from different parts of training.

In our study of the overtraining axis, this perspective lets us interpret the effects of momentum and weight decay through memory timescales measured in optimizer updates.

3.2 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

We compare AdamW, ADANA, Muon, and SOAP at fixed model size as we scale the overtraining factor. We define $f = T/(20P)$, where T is the number of training tokens and P is the nominal parameter count. For the 51M, 124M, and 253M models, we evaluate OT factors up to $256\times$, $32\times$, and $8\times$, respectively. All core comparisons use a sequence length of 2,048 and a global batch size of 256 sequences, so increasing the OT factor proportionally increases the number of optimizer updates. At every setting, we independently sweep the base learning rate and report the lowest final validation loss.

To determine the experimental setup for our core optimizer comparisons, we first studied learning rate schedule and weight decay choices across overtraining factors. We find that the preferred choices depend on the overtraining factor and that the ordering between candidates can reverse across the overtraining axis. After a shared linear warmup, we compared linear decay to zero with cosine decay to zero. For all four optimizers, linear decay performs better at $1\times$ OT, whereas cosine decay performs better at $8\times$ and $32\times$ OT. We also find that the benefit of log-time weight decay depends on the learning rate endpoint, with larger gains under cosine decay to 10% than under cosine decay to zero.

On the 51M model, we jointly sweep the base learning rate and weight decay coefficient for each optimizer, OT factor, and weight decay schedule. Consistent with the square-root scaling predicted for uniform AdamW by Bergsma et al. (2025a), the preferred coefficient scales approximately as $\sqrt{f}$ for both uniform and log-time weight decay. For most experiments, we therefore use $c_{\text{uniform}}(f) = 8\sqrt{f}$ or $c_{\log}(f) = 2\sqrt{f}$. For optimizers that benefit from log-time weight decay, its advantage over uniform weight decay increases with the overtraining factor.

At $1\times$ OT on the 253M model, we tune AdamW’s β_2 , Muon’s matrix momentum β , and SOAP’s β_2 ; each selects 0.98. We hold the remaining memory coefficients at standard values: $\beta_1 = 0.9$ for AdamW, $\beta_1 = \beta_{\text{Sh}} = 0.95$ for SOAP, and $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (0.9, 0.95)$ for Muon’s Adam-routed parameters. For ADANA, DANA theory relates κ to the power-law spectrum of the data (Ferbach et al., 2025), and the ADANA experiments find that $\kappa = 0.85$ performs well across model scales and architectures, consistent with κ being a transferable property of the data distribution (Ferbach et al., 2026). We therefore fix $\kappa = 0.85$ and $\delta = 8$ and tune g_3 at the same setting, selecting $g_3 = 8$. These fixed ADANA coefficients define a memory schedule that evolves throughout training. The supporting experiments appear in Appendices D, E, and F; Appendix B gives the complete treatment definitions.

3.3 OUTSCALING AND TOKEN MULTIPLIERS

We characterize outscaling through two closely related metrics that compare how many training tokens two optimizers require to reach the same loss at fixed model size. For an indicated optimizer and a specified baseline, the *equivalent OT factor* is the OT factor the baseline requires to match the indicated optimizer’s loss. The *token multiplier* is the ratio of the tokens required by the baseline to those used by the indicated optimizer; equivalently, it is the equivalent baseline OT factor divided by the indicated optimizer’s OT factor. Values above the equal-OT diagonal favor the indicated optimizer. At fixed model size, this ratio is the same quantity called the *compute multiplier* by Qiu et al. (2025); Ferbach et al. (2026) and *token-equivalent speedup* by Wen et al. (2026). We refer to it as the *token multiplier*: values above one mean that the baseline requires more training tokens and therefore favor the indicated optimizer.

We say that an optimizer *outscals a baseline optimizer across the overtraining axis* when its token multiplier increases with the OT factor, or equivalently when its equivalent-OT curve grows faster than the equal-OT reference. Because different optimizers or treatments may approach different high-token validation-loss limits, this increase may arise from an improved token-decay exponent, a lower high-token validation-loss limit, or both.




Figure 3: **Longer horizons favor longer optimizer memory, and longer memory requires a smaller learning rate.** All panels use the 51M model. Left: the optimal fixed effective memory for AdamW, Muon, and SOAP after independently sweeping the base learning rate at every memory and OT factor. Middle: at $8\times$ OT, the optimal base learning rate decreases as effective memory increases; Figure 17 shows the corresponding relationship at every measured OT factor. Right: the within-optimizer validation-loss improvement from replacing fixed $M = 50$ with the optimal (memory, base learning rate) pair at each horizon; positive values favor per-horizon tuning.

We calculate these metrics by inverting baseline loss curves. Unless otherwise stated, we fit these curves using the Skaling functional form (Videau et al., 2026), with the model exponent shared across optimizers. Appendix G gives the complete definition and compares alternative functional forms. When the target loss lies below the baseline optimizer’s best measured loss, this inversion requires extrapolation rather than interpolation. We denote these regions with dotted curves and translucent markers.

3.4 OPTIMIZER RANKINGS ACROSS TRAINING HORIZONS

Figures 1 and 2 show that optimizer rankings and relative token efficiency change with training horizon. Muon and SOAP perform best at most short and intermediate horizons, while ADANA improves relative to AdamW as the overtraining factor increases; at the longest measured horizons for the 51M and 124M models, SOAP also overtakes Muon. The token multipliers in Figure 2 show that Muon provides an approximately constant advantage over AdamW, ADANA’s advantage increases consistently across model sizes, and SOAP may gain further at the highest OT factors. In the following sections, we investigate how per-horizon fixed-memory tuning, log-time weight decay, and momentum cooldown improve optimizer performance across OT factors, and then ask whether the resulting optimizer treatments outscale one another across the overtraining axis.

4 HORIZON-TUNED FIXED MEMORY

Spectral analyses of learning dynamics suggest that optimization resolves progressively harder modes over the course of training; longer averaging windows may help accumulate the weak, persistent gradient signal needed to resolve modes learned later in training (Saxe et al., 2014; Bordelon et al., 2020). Longer windows also respond more slowly to changes in the gradient distribution and retain unusually large or stale gradients for more updates, creating a stability tradeoff. We therefore ask how the optimal fixed memory changes with overtraining factor and jointly tune memory and learning rate at every horizon on the 51M model. We note that the optimal momentum coefficient should depend on batch size (Marek et al., 2025), so these results are specific to our global batch size of 256.

4.1 LONGER HORIZONS FAVOR LONGER MEMORY

We sweep AdamW’s second-moment coefficient β_2 , Muon’s momentum coefficient β , and SOAP’s second-moment coefficient β_2 , reporting each through the effective memory window M defined in




Figure 4: **After tuning fixed memory separately at every horizon, ADANA still gains on AdamW across OT, while Muon and SOAP retain roughly constant token-efficiency advantages over AdamW.** On the 51M model under uniform weight decay, AdamW, Muon, and SOAP select the optimal (fixed memory, base learning rate) pair at every OT factor. ADANA uses the fixed scheduled-memory setting $(\kappa, \delta, g_3) = (0.85, 8, 8)$ and sweeps only the base learning rate. The vertical axis gives the horizon-tuned AdamW OT factor required to attain the same validation loss. Due to the small number of points, we compute equivalent OT by piecewise-linear interpolation of horizon-tuned AdamW loss in log-OT; translucent markers require extrapolation beyond the measured horizon-tuned AdamW loss range.

Section 3.1. For every (optimizer, M , OT factor) setting, we independently sweep the base learning rate; at each horizon, we select the $(M, \text{base learning rate})$ pair with the lowest final validation loss. For experimental details and complete results, see Appendix F.

We see in Figure 3 that longer horizons generally favor longer fixed memory. From $1\times$ to $128\times$ OT, the optimal memory increases from $M = 20$ to $M = 1280$ for AdamW, from $M = 20$ to $M = 640$ for Muon, and from $M = 40$ to $M = 1280$ for SOAP. We do not expect this trend to continue indefinitely: extremely long windows may become unstable, particularly early in training when the optimization dynamics change rapidly. Many horizons also have broad low-regret memory ranges, with several neighboring values performing similarly. We find that the optimal base learning rate decreases as memory grows, suggesting that using longer memory requires smaller steps for stability.

4.2 PER-HORIZON TUNING IMPROVES FIXED-MEMORY OPTIMIZERS

Per-horizon memory tuning produces its largest gains at the low and high ends of our overtraining range; at moderate horizons, our $M = 50$ setting is already near-optimal. At $128\times$ OT, it improves final validation loss by 3.3 mpt for AdamW, 3.6 mpt for Muon, and 1.3 mpt for SOAP. Thus, $\beta = 0.98$ is a strong choice at moderate OT factors but does not transfer uniformly across the full overtraining range.

Figure 4a compares ADANA against AdamW with horizon-tuned memory. ADANA continues to gain on this stronger AdamW baseline as the overtraining factor increases, showing that its empirical advantage is not explained by holding AdamW’s β_2 fixed across horizons and is consistent with a benefit from adapting memory within the run. Figures 4b–c show that horizon-tuned Muon and SOAP retain roughly constant advantages over horizon-tuned AdamW.

5 LOG-TIME WEIGHT DECAY ACROSS TRAINING HORIZONS

Under the memory interpretation in Section 3.1, the weight decay schedule determines how quickly the parameters forget past updates during training. In our implementation, the per-update decay fraction is

$$\alpha_t = s_t \lambda_t, \quad (5)$$




Figure 5: **Log-time weight decay increasingly benefits ADANA, modestly benefits SOAP, has little consistent effect on AdamW, and harms Muon at high OT factors.** On the 51M-parameter model, we compare uniform weight decay, $c(f) = 8\sqrt{f}$, with log-time weight decay, $a(f) = 2\sqrt{f}$, independently sweeping the base learning rate at every optimizer, weight decay schedule, and OT factor. Left: the token multiplier of log-time weight decay relative to the same optimizer under uniform weight decay. Right: AdamW-relative token multipliers for both weight decay schedules, using AdamW with uniform weight decay as the common baseline.

where $s_t \in [0, 1]$ is the normalized learning rate schedule. Uniform weight decay keeps λ_t constant across optimizer updates:

$$\lambda_t^{\text{uniform}} = \frac{c(f)}{S}. \quad (6)$$

Log-time weight decay instead decreases the coefficient over training (Ferbach et al., 2026):

$$\lambda_t^{\text{log}} = \frac{a(f)}{\tau + t} \quad (7)$$

Here, S is the total number of optimizer updates and $\tau = 0.1S_{1\times}$. We use the coefficient rules $c(f) = 8\sqrt{f}$ and $a(f) = 2\sqrt{f}$, fitted from our joint weight decay coefficient and learning rate sweeps. Their $\sqrt{f}$ dependence agrees with the scaling predicted by Bergsma et al. (2025a). These rules approximate the trend across optimizers rather than selecting the optimal weight decay coefficient separately at every optimizer and overtraining factor. We independently sweep the base learning rate for every optimizer, weight decay schedule, and overtraining factor. See Appendix E for additional details.

Figure 5 shows that, under these coefficient rules, the preferred weight decay schedule depends on both the optimizer and training horizon. Log-time weight decay increasingly benefits ADANA as the overtraining factor grows, modestly benefits SOAP, has little consistent effect on AdamW, and harms Muon at high OT. The Muon result may reflect a poorly matched log-time weight decay coefficient rather than the schedule itself. Figures 1 and 2 use uniform weight decay for all optimizers. In Section 7, we instead use the better-performing weight decay schedule for each optimizer when comparing their strongest treatments.

6 MOMENTUM COOLDOWN FOR GROWING MEMORY

In this section, we propose a formulation of momentum cooldown, motivated by the idea that ADANA’s log-time momentum schedule makes its memory longest near the end of training, when the learning rate approaches zero and responsiveness may become more important. Our momentum cooldown bounds the optimizer’s memory timescale during terminal learning rate decay. Applied to ADANA, it preserves the growing memory window through most of training but shortens it near the end of the run. A similar idea to reduce momentum at the end of training has been used for Muon in nanochat (Karpathy, 2025).

We define the current learning rate decay timescale as

$$\tau_{\eta,t} = \frac{\eta_t}{|\eta_{t+1} - \eta_t|}, \quad (8)$$




Figure 6: **Momentum cooldown selectively benefits ADANA’s log-time memory and combines with log-time weight decay to amplify ADANA’s advantage as the overtraining factor increases, consistently across model sizes.** All panels use AdamW with uniform weight decay at the same model size as the token-multiplier baseline. Left: on the 51M model under uniform weight decay, momentum cooldown has little consistent effect on fixed-memory AdamW but substantially improves ADANA at long horizons. Middle: log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown each improve ADANA; combined, they yield the largest gains at long horizons. Right: across all three model sizes, the combined treatment outperforms ADANA with uniform weight decay. The resulting ADANA token multiplier follows an approximately straight line on log–log axes. We therefore use ADANA with log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown in the subsequent comparisons of the strongest treatments.

taking $\tau_{\eta,t} = \infty$ when the learning rate is constant or increasing. For any momentum state with coefficient β_t , we define its original memory timescale as

$$\tau_{\text{mom},t} = \frac{1}{1 - \beta_t}. \quad (9)$$

In momentum cooldown, we replace this timescale with

$$\tau_{\text{CD},t} = \max(1, \min\{\tau_{\text{mom},t}, \tau_{\eta,t}\}), \quad \beta_{\text{CD},t} = 1 - \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{CD},t}}. \quad (10)$$

See Appendix K for the complete definitions and ablations.

Figure 6 shows that momentum cooldown has little consistent effect on fixed-memory AdamW but substantially improves ADANA at long horizons. Log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown each improve ADANA alone, and the gains compound when the two interventions are combined. Across all three model sizes, the combined treatment outperforms ADANA with uniform weight decay. In particular, its AdamW-relative token multiplier appears approximately straight when plotted on log–log axes, motivating the outscaling analysis in Section 7. We therefore use ADANA with log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown in the subsequent strongest-treatment comparisons. Our experiments measure improvements in final validation loss; we leave additional analysis of the mechanism behind this benefit and comparison of alternative momentum cooldown rules to future work.

7 OUTSCALING ACROSS THE OVERTRAINING AXIS

Using the treatment choices identified in the preceding sections, we now compare how the resulting optimizer treatments scale relative to one another across the overtraining axis.

7.1 ADANA OUTSCALES ADAMW

The DANA momentum schedule was originally derived to improve loss-scaling exponents relative to SGD in the power-law random features model (Ferbach et al., 2025). In this analysis, DANA




Figure 7: **With log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown, ADANA outperforms AdamW with an equivalent OT slope close to the DANA PLRF prediction $2 - \kappa$.** Left and middle: the AdamW OT factor required to match ADANA’s loss at fixed model size, using AdamW with uniform weight decay and log-time weight decay as baselines, respectively. Across model sizes and both baselines, the fitted log-log slopes range from 1.15 to 1.20, close to the PLRF prediction $2 - \kappa = 1.15$ for $\kappa = 0.85$. Dotted segments and translucent markers require extrapolating the AdamW fit. Right: relative to AdamW with log-time weight decay, we plot the ADANA token-decay exponent difference implied by each fixed high-token-limit difference under the shared- m Scaling fit. The exponent difference remains above zero even where the high-token limit favors AdamW, providing evidence for an improved ADANA token-decay exponent while leaving the high-token-limit difference less well identified.

accelerates an effective optimization clock, which reparameterizes training time according to the rate at which spectral modes are learned. When the momentum damping schedule scales as $t^{-\kappa}$, the momentum contribution to this clock grows as

$$\left(\int_0^t s^{-\kappa/2} ds \right)^2 \propto t^{2-\kappa},$$

whereas the SGD clock grows linearly with t . Consequently, matching DANA after t updates requires SGD to train for a horizon proportional to $t^{2-\kappa}$. In terms of our equivalent-OT metric, this would give DANA an equivalent-OT exponent of $2 - \kappa$ relative to SGD.

The PLRF model provides a tractable setting for high-dimensional optimization theory, but whether this outscaling behavior transfers to the adaptive versions, ADANA and AdamW, and to transformers is an open empirical question. We therefore ask how ADANA’s token efficiency relative to AdamW evolves across the overtraining axis and how its equivalent-OT scaling compares with the $2 - \kappa$ prediction.

Figure 7 compares ADANA with log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown against AdamW with either uniform or log-time weight decay. Across all three model sizes and both AdamW baselines, the fitted equivalent-OT exponents range from 1.15 to 1.20, close to $2 - \kappa = 1.15$ for the $\kappa = 0.85$ treatment used throughout our experiments. The floor-decay tradeoff analysis also shows that ADANA’s fitted token-decay exponent advantage remains positive throughout the range of high-token-limit differences consistent with the data. Appendix H gives the complete equivalent-OT and floor-decay analyses.

7.2 MATRIX-PRECONDITIONED OPTIMIZERS PROVIDE APPROXIMATELY CONSTANT GAINS OVER ADAMW

Figure 8 compares Muon and SOAP with AdamW. Across most overtraining factors, Muon provides a $1.4\times$ – $1.7\times$ token multiplier over AdamW, while SOAP provides a $1.3\times$ – $1.7\times$ multiplier. These results are consistent with the matrix-preconditioned optimizers providing roughly constant token multipliers over AdamW across OT factors. Whether this behavior persists at still higher OT factors is unclear: SOAP’s token multiplier rises to approximately $1.9\times$ at $128\times$ OT on the 51M model, suggesting that it may gain further with additional overtraining.




Figure 8: **ADANA versus matrix-preconditioned optimizers under their strongest treatments: ADANA closes the gap to Muon and SOAP as the overtraining factor increases.** AdamW and Muon use uniform weight decay, SOAP uses log-time weight decay, and ADANA uses log-time weight decay with momentum cooldown. Left: Muon and SOAP provide roughly constant token-multiplier advantages over AdamW across most of the overtraining axis, although SOAP may gain further at the highest OT factors. This suggests that matrix preconditioning may provide an approximately constant efficiency multiplier over AdamW. ADANA begins behind both matrix-preconditioned optimizers, but has a larger fitted token-decay exponent and closes the gap as the training horizon increases, catching Muon and becoming competitive with SOAP. Dotted segments and translucent markers indicate baseline extrapolation.

7.3 ADANA OUTSCALES THE MATRIX-PRECONDITIONED OPTIMIZERS

Finally, we compare ADANA’s horizon-dependent gains with the matrix-preconditioned optimizers. ADANA starts substantially behind: at $2\times$ OT, its token multiplier is $0.59\times$ – $0.63\times$ relative to Muon and $0.63\times$ – $0.69\times$ relative to SOAP across the three model sizes. As the training horizon increases, ADANA closes these gaps, surpassing Muon and becoming competitive with SOAP at the highest OT factors we test. It appears that ADANA outscals Muon and may outscale SOAP, but these trends rely heavily on the highest OT factors we test; it remains uncertain whether they continue at even higher OT factors.

8 DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

Optimizer evaluation should treat training horizon as part of the experimental design. An optimizer selected near the compute-optimal horizon may not remain strongest when the same model is trained substantially longer, and its preferred learning rate schedule, weight decay treatment, and memory can also change across the overtraining axis. Long-horizon comparisons therefore require scaling rules for hyperparameters that are often selected using experiments at only one horizon.

Our results suggest complementary roles for preconditioning and scheduled memory. In our experiments, Muon and SOAP provide large advantages over AdamW across most horizons, while ADANA’s relative efficiency increases with training horizon. Tuning fixed memory separately at every horizon improves the fixed-memory optimizers but does not explain ADANA’s scaling advantage, suggesting that adapting memory within a training run provides an additional benefit.

Future work should establish how these conclusions transfer across larger models, architectures, datasets, and training horizons. Preliminary experiments in Appendix J show that reversing the order of adaptive preconditioning and scheduled momentum retains most of ADANA’s performance, indicating that scheduled memory can remain effective under another preconditioner ordering. Future work could extend these experiments to larger models and longer training horizons.

Our main optimizer comparisons use a global sequence batch of 256. Appendix I reports a fixed-token experiment at $8\times$ OT in which ADANA begins losing efficiency at smaller batch sizes than

AdamW, despite jointly optimizing the learning rate with β_2 for AdamW and g_3 for ADANA. Because increasing batch size simultaneously reduces the number of optimizer updates and gradient noise, and because other optimizer hyperparameters remain fixed, this experiment does not identify the mechanism or establish a general batch scaling law for ADANA. We therefore treat batch dependence as an important limitation and leave a fully controlled study across batch size, update count, and effective batch size to future work.

9 CONCLUSION

Optimizer rankings and optimal treatments change as models are trained beyond their compute-optimal token budgets. ADANA’s scaling advantage over AdamW persists after tuning AdamW’s fixed memory separately at each training horizon. Log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown further amplify this advantage, producing equivalent-OT scaling close to the $2 - \kappa$ prediction from DANA theory on power-law random features. Matrix-preconditioned optimizers provide large but approximately constant gains over AdamW across most of the measured range, while ADANA begins behind them and closes the gap as training increases. Treating training horizon as an essential experimental axis reveals optimizer behavior hidden by single-horizon comparisons and suggests that scheduling optimizer memory is a promising route to methods whose relative efficiency improves with additional training.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to the Google TPU Research Cloud program, MIT CSAIL, and Kaiming He for providing the compute that made this work possible. We thank Elliot Paquette and Ziyin Liu for technical discussions. We thank an anonymous reviewer of a prior paper for suggesting that we investigate the interaction between the learning rate schedule endpoint and the advantage of log-time weight decay. SQ thanks the support of the Two Sigma Fellowship.

REFERENCES

- Rohan Anil, Vineet Gupta, Tomer Koren, Kevin Regan, and Yoram Singer. Scalable second order optimization for deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09018*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.09018>.
- Jacob Austin, Sholto Douglas, Roy Frostig, Anselm Levskaya, Charlie Chen, Sharad Vikram, Federico Lebron, Peter Choy, Vinay Ramasesh, Albert Webson, and Reiner Pope. How to scale your model: A systems view of LLMs on TPUs. <https://jax-ml.github.io/scaling-book/>, 2025. Online book.
- Shane Bergsma, Nolan Dey, Gurpreet Gosal, Gavia Gray, Daria Soboleva, and Joel Hestness. Power lines: Scaling laws for weight decay and batch size in LLM pre-training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 38, 2025a. doi: 10.52202/085713-4171. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2025/hash/b5f78a17a94da3e34c935515d1b6adae-Abstract-Conference.html.
- Shane Bergsma, Nolan Dey, Gurpreet Gosal, Gavia Gray, Daria Soboleva, and Joel Hestness. Straight to zero: Why linearly decaying the learning rate to zero works best for LLMs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.15938>.
- Shane Bergsma, Nolan Dey, and Joel Hestness. Predicting training re-evaluation curves enables effective data curriculums for LLMs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.25380>.
- Shane Bergsma, Bin Claire Zhang, Nolan Dey, Shaheer Muhammad, Gurpreet Gosal, and Joel Hestness. Scaling with collapse: Efficient and predictable training of LLM families. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.25087>.

-
- Song Bian, Minghao Yan, and Shivaram Venkataraman. Scaling inference-efficient language models. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.18107>.
- Johan Björck, Alon Benhaim, Vishrav Chaudhary, Furu Wei, and Xia Song. Scaling optimal LR across token horizons. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=WYL4eFLcxG>.
- Blake Bordelon, Abdulkadir Canatar, and Cengiz Pehlevan. Spectrum dependent learning curves in kernel regression and wide neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1024–1034. PMLR, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/bordelon20a.html>.
- James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Yash Katariya, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, George Necula, Adam Paszke, Jake VanderPlas, Skye Wanderman-Milne, and Qiao Zhang. JAX: Composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs. <https://github.com/google/jax>, 2018. Version 0.6.2.
- Zachary Charles, Gabriel Teston, Lucio Dery, Keith Rush, Nova Fallen, Zachary Garrett, Arthur Szlam, and Arthur Douillard. Communication-efficient language model training scales reliably and robustly: Scaling laws for DiLoCo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.09799*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.09799>.
- Tianqi Chen, Bing Xu, Chiyuan Zhang, and Carlos Guestrin. Training deep nets with sublinear memory cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06174*, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.06174>.
- Aaron Defazio. Schedulefree+: Scaling learning-rate-free and schedule-free learning to large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.19095*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.19095>.
- Aaron Defazio, Xingyu Yang, Harsh Mehta, Konstantin Mishchenko, Ahmed Khaled, and Ashok Cutkosky. The road less scheduled. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.15682>.
- Nolan Dey, Bin Claire Zhang, Lorenzo Noci, Mufan Li, Blake Bordelon, Shane Bergsma, Cengiz Pehlevan, Boris Hanin, and Joel Hestness. Don’t be lazy: CompleteP enables compute-efficient deep transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.01618*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.01618>.
- Katie E. Everett, Lechao Xiao, Mitchell Wortsman, Alexander A. Alemi, Roman Novak, Peter J. Liu, Izzeddin Gur, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Leslie Pack Kaelbling, Jaehoon Lee, and Jeffrey Pennington. Scaling exponents across parameterizations and optimizers. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 12666–12700. PMLR, 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/everett24a.html>.
- Damien Ferbach, Katie Everett, Gauthier Gidel, Elliot Paquette, and Courtney Paquette. Dimension-adapted momentum outpaces sgd. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16098*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.16098>.
- Damien Ferbach, Courtney Paquette, Gauthier Gidel, Katie Everett, and Elliot Paquette. Logarithmic-time schedules for scaling language models with momentum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.05298*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.05298>.
- Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Georgios Smyrnis, Vaishaal Shankar, Suchin Gururangan, Mitchell Wortsman, Rulin Shao, Jean Mercat, Alex Fang, Jeffrey Li, Sedrick Keh, Rui Xin, Marianna Nezhurina, Igor Vasiljevic, Jenia Jitsev, Luca Soldaini, Alexandros G. Dimakis, Gabriel Ilharco, Pang Wei Koh, Shuran Song, Thomas Kollar, Yair Carmon, Achal Dave, Reinhard Heckel, Niklas Muenighoff, and Ludwig Schmidt. Language models scale reliably with over-training and on downstream tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08540*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08540>.

-
- Vineet Gupta, Tomer Koren, and Yoram Singer. Shampoo: Preconditioned stochastic tensor optimization. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/gupta18a.html>.
- Alexander Hägele, Elie Bakouch, Atli Kosson, Loubna Ben Allal, Leandro von Werra, and Martin Jaggi. Scaling laws and compute-optimal training beyond fixed training durations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18392*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.18392>.
- Jonathan Heek, Anselm Levskaya, Avital Oliver, Marvin Ritter, Bertrand Rondepierre, Andreas Steiner, and Marc van Zee. Flax: A neural network library and ecosystem for JAX. <https://github.com/google/flax>, 2024. Version 0.10.6.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Thomas Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katherine Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karén Simonyan, Erich Elsen, Oriol Vinyals, Jack Rae, and Laurent Sifre. An empirical analysis of compute-optimal large language model training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 30016–30030, 2022. URL https://papers.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/c1e2faff6f588870935f114ebe04a3e5-Abstract-Conference.html.
- Shengding Hu, Yuge Tu, Xu Han, Chaoqun He, Ganqu Cui, Xiang Long, Zhi Zheng, Yewei Fang, Yuxiang Huang, Weilin Zhao, Xinrong Zhang, Zheng Leng Thai, Kaihuo Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Yuan Yao, Chenyang Zhao, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Zhongwu Zhai, Ning Ding, Chao Jia, Guoyang Zeng, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. MiniCPM: Unveiling the potential of small language models with scalable training strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06395*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.06395>.
- Keller Jordan, Yuchen Jin, Vlado Boza, Jiacheng You, Franz Cecista, Laker Newhouse, and Jeremy Bernstein. Muon: An optimizer for hidden layers in neural networks, 2024. URL <https://kellerjordan.github.io/posts/muon/>.
- Norman P. Jouppi et al. In-datacenter performance analysis of a tensor processing unit. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, pp. 1–12, 2017. doi: 10.1145/3079856.3080246.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08361>.
- Andrej Karpathy. nanochat: The best ChatGPT that \$100 can buy. <https://github.com/karpathy/nanochat>, 2025. Software repository.
- Mikhail Khona, Aditya Vavre, Boxiang Wang, Deyu Fu, Hao Wu, Mike Chrzanowski, Bryan Catanzaro, Dheevatsa Mudigere, Jeff Pool, Michael Lightstone, Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostafa Patwary, Nima Tajbakhsh, and Tijmen Blankevoort. SOAP, Muon, and beyond: Pushing LLM pretraining scales. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.20548*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.20548>.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>.
- Jingyuan Liu, Jianlin Su, Xingcheng Yao, Zhejun Jiang, Guokun Lai, Yulun Du, Yidao Qin, Weixin Xu, Enzhe Lu, Junjie Yan, Yanru Chen, Huabin Zheng, Yibo Liu, Shaowei Liu, Bohong Yin, Weiran He, Han Zhu, Yuzhi Wang, Jianzhou Wang, Mengnan Dong, Zheng Zhang, Yongsheng Kang, Hao Zhang, Xinran Xu, Yutao Zhang, Yuxin Wu, Xinyu Zhou, and Zhilin Yang. Muon is scalable for LLM training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.16982*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.16982>.

-
- Ziyin Liu, Zhikang T. Wang, and Masahito Ueda. LaProp: Separating momentum and adaptivity in Adam. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04839*, 2020. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2002.04839. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.04839>.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. SGDR: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Skq89Scxx>.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7>.
- Martin Marek, Sanae Lotfi, Aditya Somasundaram, Andrew Gordon Wilson, and Micah Goldblum. Small batch size training for language models: When vanilla SGD works, and why gradient accumulation is wasteful, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.07101>.
- Bruno Mlodozieniec, Pierre Ablin, Louis Béthune, Dan Busbridge, Michal Klein, Jason Ramapuram, and Marco Cuturi. Completed hyperparameter transfer across modules, width, depth, batch and duration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.22382*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.22382>.
- Depen Morwani, Itai Shapira, Nikhil Vyas, Eran Malach, Sham Kakade, and Lucas Janson. A new perspective on shampoo’s preconditioner. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17748*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.17748>.
- Depen Morwani, Nikhil Vyas, Hanlin Zhang, and Sham Kakade. Connections between schedule-free optimizers, AdEMAMix, and accelerated SGD variants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02431*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.02431>.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Alexander M. Rush, Boaz Barak, Teven Le Scao, Aleksandra Piktus, Nouamane Tazi, Sampo Pyysalo, Thomas Wolf, and Colin Raffel. Scaling data-constrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16264*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.16264>.
- Matteo Pagliardini, Pierre Ablin, and David Grangier. The ademamix optimizer: Better, faster, older. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.03137*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.03137>.
- Elliot Paquette, Courtney Paquette, Lechao Xiao, and Jeffrey Pennington. 4+3 phases of compute-optimal neural scaling laws. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pp. 16459–16537, 2024. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/hash/1dccfc3ee01871d05e33457c61037d59-Abstract-Conference.html.
- Elliot Paquette, Noah Marshall, Lucas Benigni, Guangyuan Wang, Atish Agarwala, and Courtney Paquette. Phases of Muon: When Muon eclipses SignSGD. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.09552*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.09552>.
- Guilherme Penedo, Hynek Kydlíček, Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Margaret Mitchell, Colin Raffel, Leandro von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. The FineWeb datasets: Decanting the web for the finest text data at scale. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.17557>.
- Project Apertus et al. Apertus: Democratizing open and compliant LLMs for global language environments, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.14233>.
- Shikai Qiu, Zixi Chen, Hoang Phan, Qi Lei, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Hyperparameter transfer enables consistent gains of matrix-preconditioned optimizers across scales. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.05620*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.05620>.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. Technical report, OpenAI, 2019. URL <https://cdn.openai.com/better-language-models/language-models.pdf>.

-
- Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. ZeRO: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, 2020. doi: 10.1109/SC41405.2020.00024.
- Nikhil Sardana, Jacob Portes, Sasha Dobov, and Jonathan Frankle. Beyond chinchilla-optimal: Accounting for inference in language model scaling laws. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.00448>.
- Andrew M. Saxe, James L. McClelland, and Surya Ganguli. Exact solutions to the nonlinear dynamics of learning in deep linear neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6120>.
- Andrei Semenov, Matteo Pagliardini, and Martin Jaggi. Benchmarking optimizers for large language model pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.01440*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.01440>.
- Ishaan Shah, Anthony M. Polloreno, Karl Stratos, Philip Monk, Adarsh Chaluvareja, Andrew Hojel, Andrew Ma, Anil Thomas, Ashish Tanwer, Darsh J. Shah, Khoi Nguyen, Kurt Smith, Michael Callahan, Michael Pust, Mohit Parmar, Peter Rushton, Platon Mazarakis, Ritvik Kapila, Saurabh Srivastava, Somanshu Singla, Tim Romanski, Yash Vanjani, and Ashish Vaswani. Practical efficiency of Muon for pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.02222*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.02222>.
- Hao-Jun Michael Shi, Tsung-Hsien Lee, Shintaro Iwasaki, Jose Gallego-Posada, Zhijing Li, Kaushik Rangadurai, Dheevatsa Mudigere, and Michael Rabbat. A distributed data-parallel PyTorch implementation of the distributed shampoo optimizer for training neural networks at-scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06497*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.06497>.
- Egor Shulgin, Dimitri von R’utte, Tianyue H. Zhang, Niccolò Ajroldi, Bernhard Sch’olkopf, and Antonio Orvieto. Deriving hyperparameter scaling laws via modern optimization theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.15958*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.15958>.
- The JAX Authors. Splash attention: Sparse flash attention for TPU. <https://github.com/jax-ml/jax>, 2023. JAX Pallas Splash Attention implementation.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288>.
- Mathurin Videau, Badr Youbi-Idrissi, David Lopez-Paz, and Kartik Ahuja. Scaling: Chinchilla’s exponents meet kaplan’s coupling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.07222*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2608.07222. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.07222>.
- Alexandra Volkova, Mher Safaryan, Christoph H. Lampert, and Dan Alistarh. Towards robust scaling laws for optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.07712*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.07712>.
- Nikhil Vyas, Depen Morwani, Rosie Zhao, Mujin Kwun, Itai Shapira, David Brandfonbrener, Lucas Janson, and Sham Kakade. SOAP: Improving and stabilizing shampoo using adam. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=IDxZhXrpNf>.
- Xi Wang and Laurence Aitchison. How to set AdamW’s weight decay as you scale model and dataset size. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.13698>.
- Kaiyue Wen, David Hall, Tengyu Ma, and Percy Liang. Fantastic pretraining optimizers and where to find them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.02046*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.02046>.
- Kaiyue Wen, Xingyu Dang, Kaifeng Lyu, Tengyu Ma, and Percy Liang. Fantastic pretraining optimizers and where to find them II: Hyperball optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.16899*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.16899>.

Greg Yang, Edward J. Hu, Igor Babuschkin, Szymon Sidor, Xiaodong Liu, David Farhi, Nick Ryder, Jakub Pachocki, Weizhu Chen, and Jianfeng Gao. Tensor programs V: Tuning large neural networks via zero-shot hyperparameter transfer. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.03466>.

A EXTENDED RELATED WORK

Training beyond compute-optimal horizons. Data-constrained scaling studies characterize how repeated data changes the benefit of continued training when the available unique data are limited (Muennighoff et al., 2023). Warmup-Stable-Decay schedules separate an extensible stable-training phase from terminal learning rate decay (Hu et al., 2024), while reusable training trajectories allow scaling behavior to be evaluated across multiple training durations without restarting each run from initialization (Hägele et al., 2024). Together, these works treat training horizon as an experimental axis distinct from model size.

Hyperparameter transfer across scale. The maximal-update parameterization and μ Transfer enable zero-shot hyperparameter transfer across model width by prescribing how initialization and learning rates should scale (Yang et al., 2021). Subsequent work derives optimizer-dependent width exponents, develops depth-aware parameterizations, and extends hyperparameter transfer across modules, width, depth, batch size, and training duration (Everett et al., 2024; Dey et al., 2025; Mlodozieniec et al., 2025). For matrix-preconditioned optimizers, preserving gains across model scale requires optimizer-appropriate learning rate and weight decay transfer (Qiu et al., 2025). Complementary theoretical work derives coupled scaling rules for learning rate, momentum, and batch size from the iteration or token budget (Shulgin et al., 2026).

Optimizer memory and weight decay timescales. Recent work uses normalized optimizer timescales to align training curves across model scales and characterize how information from different portions of training remains influential (Bergsma et al., 2026b;a). In particular, Bergsma et al. (2025a) fit a normalized AdamW weight decay timescale proportional to $(D/N)^{-0.527}$, where D is the token horizon and N is model size. At fixed model size, this implies that the corresponding memory window measured in tokens grows approximately as $D^{0.473}$. This provides additional context for studying momentum and weight decay as horizon-dependent memory timescales.

Preconditioner order and scalable matrix optimizers. Adam accumulates momentum before applying coordinatewise adaptive normalization, whereas LaProp applies normalization before momentum accumulation (Kingma & Ba, 2015; Liu et al., 2020). This distinction motivates our experiments on preconditioner order. Shampoo introduced structured matrix-valued preconditioning, with subsequent work developing scalable and distributed implementations (Gupta et al., 2018; Anil et al., 2020; Shi et al., 2023; Morwani et al., 2024). SOAP applies Adam-like updates in Shampoo’s evolving eigenbasis, while Muon approximately orthogonalizes matrix-valued updates (Vyas et al., 2025; Jordan et al., 2024). Recent studies further examine the practical implementation and large-scale behavior of these optimizers (Liu et al., 2025; Shah et al., 2025; Khona et al., 2026).

B EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

Unless explicitly stated otherwise, all experiments use the model family, initialization, data, training, and evaluation protocols defined in this section.

B.1 NOTATION, ARCHITECTURE, AND MODEL SIZES

Table 1 defines the notation used for the model family and for nominal compute accounting.

Symbol	Definition
H	Number of attention heads
D	Model dimension
D_{head}	Dimension of each attention head
N	Number of Transformer blocks
F	Feed-forward intermediate dimension
L	Sequence length in tokens
V	Padded vocabulary size
B	Global batch size in sequences
S	Number of optimizer updates
$T = SBL$	Number of training tokens
P	Nominal parameter count used for scaling and compute accounting
P_{nonemb}	Number of non-embedding parameters
P_{train}	Exact trainable parameter count, including both vocabulary matrices and learned normalization scales
$C = 6PT$	Nominal training compute in FLOPs
$\text{TPP} = T/P$	Training tokens per nominal parameter
$f = T/(20P) = \text{TPP}/20$	OT factor: training-token horizon in multiples of 20 tokens per nominal parameter

Table 1: Notation used for the architecture, training budget, and nominal compute.

We use decoder-only causal Transformers. The architecture, initialization, and width, depth, and attention co-scaling setup broadly follow the Enoki ladder in Ferbach et al. (2026). Relative to that setup, we replace GeLU with SwiGLU, LayerNorm with RMSNorm, and QK-LayerNorm with QK-RMSNorm, and use a constant token embedding initialization. The resulting Transformer blocks are architecturally similar to the Llama 2 style architecture (Touvron et al., 2023) used in Qiu et al. (2025).

The co-scaling rule, introduced in Charles et al. (2025) and used in Ferbach et al. (2026), is

$$D_{\text{head}} = 64, \quad D = 64H, \quad N = \lfloor 3H/4 \rfloor, \quad F = 4D,$$

The nominal count includes the readout matrix but omits the input embedding matrix, although the two are untied. Kaplan et al. (2020) found that excluding embedding parameters produced cleaner scaling trends across model depths. We nevertheless include the readout because it is applied as a dense vocabulary projection, whereas the input embedding is accessed by lookup.

Throughout the paper, model size labels such as 51M and 253M refer to rounded nominal parameter counts P , not exact trainable parameter counts.

We use overtraining (OT) factor as a concise convention for reporting training horizons: $1\times$ OT denotes 20 training tokens per nominal parameter, $2\times$ denotes 40, and so forth. The 20-tokens-per-parameter heuristic is motivated by Hoffmann et al. (2022), but we do not assume that this horizon is compute-optimal for every optimizer, model family or dataset. For each model, the $1\times$ horizon uses $S_{1\times} = \lfloor 20P/(BL) \rfloor$ optimizer updates. We report the realized token count after this integer rounding.

Following Hoffmann et al. (2022) and Austin et al. (2025), we approximate training compute as

$$C = 6PT,$$

Component	Choice
Block normalization	Pre-RMSNorm; learned scale, no bias; $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$
Attention	Multi-head attention with $D_{\text{head}} = 64$
Q/K normalization	QK-RMSNorm before RoPE; learned scale, no bias; $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$
Positional encoding	RoPE with base 10,000
Activation	SwiGLU
Tokenizer	GPT-2 with vocabulary padded to $V = 50,304$
Embedding / readout tying	Untied
Biases	None
Dropout	None
Nominal parameter count	$P = 16ND^2 + DV$

Table 2: Model architecture.

where P is the nominal parameter count and T is the number of training tokens. This first-order estimate counts approximately $2PT$ FLOPs for the forward pass and $4PT$ FLOPs for the backward pass through the parameterized matrix multiplications.

B.2 INITIALIZATION

Following the ScaledGPT initialization used in Ferbach et al. (2026), ordinary projections use fan-in scaling, while attention and feed-forward residual-output projections receive an additional $1/\sqrt{2N}$ depth factor. This depth correction follows the initialization used in GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019). Because residual-output projections are initialized independently with zero-mean weights, distinct residual increments have zero cross-covariance in expectation over initialization. Scaling each of the $2N$ residual-output projections by $1/\sqrt{2N}$ therefore keeps the expected aggregate variance contributed by the residual branches of order one as depth changes. We initialize token embeddings separately with the width-independent constant standard deviation 0.02. Residual branches are added to the residual stream with coefficient one; no additional residual multiplier is applied.

All matrix entries are drawn independently from untruncated, zero-mean Gaussian distributions. Table 4 reports their standard deviations; learned normalization scales are initialized to one.

B.3 COMMON TRAINING CONTROLS

Table 5 lists the training controls shared across the primary experiments unless explicitly stated otherwise. For an experiment with S optimizer updates and tuned peak learning rate η , every candidate learning rate schedule uses the same linear warmup.

The learning rate schedule after warmup and the weight decay treatment are selected experimentally in Appendices D and E, respectively.

B.4 DATASET, TRAINING ORDER, SEEDS, AND EVALUATION

We use the `sample/350BT` subset of FineWeb (Penedo et al., 2024) at revision `9bb295ddab0e05d785b879661af7260fed5140fc`. We encode each document with the GPT-2 tokenizer (Radford et al., 2019) and append one GPT-2 end-of-text token. We use source files 0–507 for training and reserve source files 508–509 for validation. The resulting training set contains 360.5 billion tokens. Training and validation are drawn from disjoint FineWeb source files; we do not perform additional deduplication across the two partitions.

Training follows a fixed sequential order through the tokenized corpus. End-of-text tokens separate documents, and training sequences may span document boundaries. We do not shuffle the training data. All experiments begin at the start of the corpus and use this same ordering. Consequently, experiments with the same global batch size and training horizon process the same tokens in the same optimizer updates.

Model	D	N	F	P_{nonemb}	P	P_{train}	$S_{1\times}$
51M	512	6	2,048	25,173,248	50,921,472	76,684,544	1,942
124M	768	9	3,072	84,950,400	123,568,128	162,217,344	4,713
253M	1,024	12	4,096	201,353,728	252,837,888	304,376,320	9,645
458M	1,280	15	5,120	393,257,600	457,605,120	522,035,840	17,456
757M	1,536	18	6,144	679,536,384	756,744,192	834,070,272	28,867
1.17B	1,792	21	7,168	1,079,064,448	1,169,129,472	1,259,353,984	44,598

Table 3: Model sizes. Model names use rounded nominal parameter counts $P = 16ND^2 + DV$. Non-embedding and exact trainable parameter counts include learned normalization scales.

Unless explicitly stated otherwise, every hyperparameter configuration starts from a fresh initialization with random seed 42. The training order is fixed independently of the seed, so configurations at the same model and training coordinate share both their initialization and their ordered training data. We use one seed per configuration for the hyperparameter sweeps in this paper. These matched comparisons reduce nuisance variation between nearby configurations, but they do not estimate variation across random initializations.

From the two held-out source files, we construct one fixed validation set containing 1,920 sequences and 3,932,160 scored next-token targets. Every model is evaluated on the same targets in the same order. We report mean per-token next-token cross-entropy over the complete validation set. This full-set loss is used for both hyperparameter selection and reported loss comparisons.

B.5 HYPERPARAMETER SWEEP INTERIORITY

Throughout the paper, we assess hyperparameter sweeps using the same boundary-interiority criterion. We regard a one-dimensional sweep as interior only when its minimum and the complete set of points within one millipoint of that minimum lie away from both tested boundaries. For nested sweeps, we assess the inner learning rate sweep independently at every value of the outer hyperparameter before interpreting regret or selecting a minimum along the outer axis. We then apply the same one-millipoint interiority criterion to the outer axis.

B.6 HARDWARE, NUMERICAL PRECISION, AND PARALLEL EXECUTION

We implement the models in JAX (Bradbury et al., 2018) and Flax (Heek et al., 2024) and train on TPU v4-8 and v6e-4 accelerators (Jouppi et al., 2017) using causal Splash attention with 512-token kernel tiles and a fused backward pass.

We use mixed-precision training. Model parameters and floating-point optimizer states are stored in `float32`; parameter gradients and RMSNorm statistics are computed in `float32`; and model activations and the operands of dense and attention matrix multiplications generally use `bfloat16`. The JAX Splash implementation uses `float32` for selected attention accumulations (The JAX Authors, 2023). The training loss materializes the vocabulary logits and computes full-vocabulary cross-entropy. For validation, logits are promoted from `bfloat16` to `float32` before computing cross-entropy and device-local loss sums; the ordered batch sums are then combined on the host using `float64` summation.

For gradient accumulation, we divide the global batch contiguously into equal microbatches. We average the resulting gradients, apply global-norm clipping to the accumulated batch-mean gradient, and then perform one optimizer update. Gradient accumulation therefore preserves the global batch size, data ordering, and number of optimizer updates. It produces the same batch-mean gradient in exact arithmetic, although the different reduction order can introduce small finite-precision differences.

When activation rematerialization is enabled, we apply it independently to each Transformer block (Chen et al., 2016). Intermediate activations within the block are discarded after the forward pass and recomputed during the backward pass, reducing activation memory at the cost of additional computation.

Parameter	Standard deviation
Token embedding	0.02
Query, key, and value projections	$D^{-1/2}$
Attention output projection	$(2ND)^{-1/2}$
Feed-forward input projection	$D^{-1/2}$
SwiGLU gate projection	$D^{-1/2}$
Feed-forward output projection	$(2NF)^{-1/2}$
Readout matrix	$D^{-1/2}$
Learned normalization scales	1

Table 4: Initialization standard deviations.

For configurations requiring parameter sharding, we use ZeRO Stage 3 fully sharded data parallelism over a one-dimensional TPU mesh (Rajbhandari et al., 2020). Model parameters, gradients, and optimizer states are partitioned across devices rather than replicated.

C OPTIMIZER DEFINITIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

C.1 COMMON UPDATE WRAPPER

Let g_t denote the gradient averaged over the global batch after combining any accumulated micro-batch gradients. The optimizer receives the globally clipped gradient

$$\tilde{g}_t = \frac{g_t}{\max(1, \|g_t\|_2/G)}, \quad G = 1. \quad (11)$$

We write the scheduled base learning rate as $\eta_t = \eta s_t$, where η is the tuned peak learning rate and $s_t \in [0, 1]$ is a dimensionless schedule multiplier that includes warmup and decay. To express layerwise learning rate tuning without carrying separate multipliers through every optimizer definition, we define the groupwise peak learning rate

$$\eta_i = \eta r_i \gamma_i, \quad \eta_{t,i} = s_t \eta_i, \quad (12)$$

where r_i is an optimizer-native route multiplier and γ_i is the tunable layerwise multiplier, each constant within its parameter group. For optimizers without distinct native routes, $r_i = 1$. The $\gamma = 1$ setting fixes $\gamma_i = 1$ for every group but does not remove optimizer-native route multipliers.

Following decoupled weight decay (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2019), we implement weight decay as a separate parameter update term rather than as an L_2 penalty in the training objective. Given an optimizer-specific direction $d_{t,i}$, the common parameter update is

$$\theta_{t+1,i} = \theta_{t,i} - s_t \eta_i d_{t,i} - s_t \lambda_{t,i} \theta_{t,i}. \quad (13)$$

The data and decay terms are computed from $\theta_{t,i}$ and applied in the same update. Decay is therefore not added to the gradient, accumulated in the optimizer moments, or transformed by an optimizer preconditioner. It follows the normalized schedule s_t , but is independent of the peak learning rate, the native route multiplier, and the layerwise multiplier.

For the uniform WD schedule,

$$\lambda_{t,i} = m_i^{\text{WD}} \frac{c}{S}, \quad (14)$$

where S is the number of optimizer updates, c is the weight decay coefficient, and $m_i^{\text{WD}} \in \{0, 1\}$ is the decay mask. In the absence of a data update, a decayed parameter is therefore multiplied at update t by $1 - s_t c/S$.

C.2 ADAMW

We use AdamW (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2019; Kingma & Ba, 2015). Adam maintains exponential moving averages of the first and second elementwise moments of the clipped gradient,

$$m_t = \beta_1 m_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_1) \tilde{g}_t, \quad (15)$$

$$v_t = \beta_2 v_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_2) \tilde{g}_t^{\odot 2}, \quad (16)$$

Control	Default
Sequence length	$L = 2,048$ tokens
Global batch size	$B = 256$ sequences
Gradient clipping	Global ℓ_2 norm of 1.0, applied after gradient accumulation
Learning rate warmup	Linear from 0.01η to η over $W = \max\{100, \min\{\lfloor S/50 \rfloor, 5,000\}\}$ updates

Table 5: Common training controls.

with $m_0 = v_0 = 0$. We apply the standard bias corrections

$$\hat{m}_t = \frac{m_t}{1 - \beta_1^t}, \quad \hat{v}_t = \frac{v_t}{1 - \beta_2^t}, \quad (17)$$

and define the Adam direction elementwise as

$$d_t = \frac{\hat{m}_t}{\sqrt{\hat{v}_t} + \epsilon}. \quad (18)$$

We use $\epsilon = 10^{-15}$. Substituting this direction into Equation 13 gives

$$\theta_{t+1,i} = \theta_{t,i} - s_t \eta_i \frac{\hat{m}_{t,i}}{\sqrt{\hat{v}_{t,i}} + \epsilon} - s_t \lambda_{t,i} \theta_{t,i}. \quad (19)$$

The groupwise learning rate therefore affects the Adam data update, while independent weight decay remains independent of the peak learning rate and the layerwise multiplier.

C.3 MUON

We apply Muon (Jordan et al., 2024) to the hidden-layer attention and feed-forward matrices. Muon applies Nesterov momentum followed by Newton–Schulz matrix orthogonalization. Following Qiu et al. (2025), we use Adam for token embeddings, the readout matrix, learned normalization scales, and biases. The Adam route has native learning rate multiplier $r_i = 1.6$, while the Muon route has $r_i = 1$.

For an eligible hidden weight matrix, let $G_{t,i}$ denote the effective matrix obtained from its clipped gradient. Rank-three attention kernels are reshaped to matrices before the Muon transformation and restored to their original shapes afterward. Muon updates its momentum buffer and forms the Nesterov lookahead as

$$B_{t,i} = \beta B_{t-1,i} + (1 - \beta) G_{t,i}, \quad (20)$$

$$H_{t,i} = \beta B_{t,i} + (1 - \beta) G_{t,i}, \quad (21)$$

with $B_{0,i} = 0$. Starting from

$$X_0 = \frac{H_{t,i}}{\|H_{t,i}\|_F + \epsilon_{\text{NS}}}, \quad \epsilon_{\text{NS}} = 10^{-8}, \quad (22)$$

we transpose X_0 when necessary so that its shorter dimension comes first, then apply five Newton–Schulz iterations,

$$A_j = X_j X_j^\top, \quad (23)$$

$$X_{j+1} = c_0 X_j + (c_1 A_j + c_2 A_j^2) X_j, \quad (24)$$

where

$$(c_0, c_1, c_2) = (3.4445, -4.7750, 2.0315). \quad (25)$$

After restoring the original orientation and tensor shape, we apply no additional shape-dependent multiplier, and the Muon direction is

$$d_{t,i} = X_5. \quad (26)$$

Parameters assigned to the Adam route use the Adam direction from the preceding subsection.

C.4 SOAP

We use SOAP (Vyas et al., 2025), which applies Adam in the eigenbasis of a Shampoo preconditioner. Following Wen et al. (2025), we apply SOAP to every learned matrix, including the token embedding, attention and feed-forward kernels, and readout matrix. Rank-three attention kernels are reshaped to their effective matrix representations and restored afterward. Learned normalization scales and biases use the Adam direction defined above. Both routes use $r_i = 1$.

For each matrix, we partition every eligible axis into blocks of at most 512 coordinates, zero-padding and subsequently cropping ragged boundary blocks. An axis longer than 10,000 coordinates is left unpreconditioned. Consequently, the embedding and readout receive one-sided SOAP, with an identity basis on the vocabulary axis. For gradient block $G_{t,b}$, SOAP updates the left and right Gram matrices as

$$L_{t,b} = \beta_{\text{Sh}} L_{t-1,b} + (1 - \beta_{\text{Sh}}) G_{t,b} G_{t,b}^\top, \quad (27)$$

$$R_{t,b} = \beta_{\text{Sh}} R_{t-1,b} + (1 - \beta_{\text{Sh}}) G_{t,b}^\top G_{t,b}. \quad (28)$$

Let $Q_{t,b}^L$ and $Q_{t,b}^R$ denote the bases used for the current update. After an initialization-only optimizer call that constructs these bases by eigendecomposition, index $t = 1, 2, \dots$ counts applied SOAP updates. SOAP maintains its first moment in the original coordinates and its second moment in the rotated coordinates:

$$M_{t,b} = \beta_1 M_{t-1,b} + (1 - \beta_1) G_{t,b}, \quad (29)$$

$$\overline{G}_{t,b} = (Q_{t,b}^L)^\top G_{t,b} Q_{t,b}^R, \quad (30)$$

$$\overline{M}_{t,b} = (Q_{t,b}^L)^\top M_{t,b} Q_{t,b}^R, \quad (31)$$

$$V_{t,b} = \beta_2 V_{t-1,b} + (1 - \beta_2) \overline{G}_{t,b}^{\odot 2}. \quad (32)$$

The blockwise SOAP direction is

$$\overline{D}_{t,b} = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \beta_2^t}}{1 - \beta_1^t} \frac{\overline{M}_{t,b}}{\sqrt{V_{t,b}} + \epsilon}, \quad (33)$$

$$D_{t,b} = Q_{t,b}^L \overline{D}_{t,b} (Q_{t,b}^R)^\top. \quad (34)$$

We use $\epsilon = 10^{-15}$ in the denominator of the blockwise SOAP direction in Equation 33 and add no diagonal regularization to the Gram matrices ($\epsilon_{\text{matrix}} = 0$).

We refresh the left and right bases after every $K = 10$ applied updates. Before each refresh, we compute the Rayleigh quotient of every current basis vector. For example, for a left-basis column q_j ,

$$\hat{\lambda}_{t,b,j}^L = q_j^\top L_{t,b} q_j, \quad (35)$$

which estimates the gradient variance along that direction. We sort the basis vectors in decreasing order of these estimates and apply the same permutation to the corresponding rows or columns of $V_{t,b}$. We then obtain the refreshed basis from a QR decomposition of the Gram matrix applied to the sorted basis,

$$Q_{t+1,b}^L = \text{qr}\left(L_{t,b} Q_{t,b}^{L,\text{sorted}}\right), \quad (36)$$

with the analogous operation on the right. Thus the second-moment slots are reordered by approximate spectral rank but are not otherwise transported through the change of basis.

Finally, we merge and crop the blocks, restore the original tensor shape, and set $d_{t,i} = D_{t,i}$. We apply no additional spectral normalization or shape-dependent multiplier.

C.5 ADANA

We use ADANA (Ferbach et al., 2025; 2026), following the released PyTorch implementation used for the language-model experiments. Let $t = 1, 2, \dots$ count applied optimizer updates; gradient-accumulation microbatches do not advance this clock. ADANA uses the same log-time weight for its first and second moments,

$$\Delta_t = \frac{\delta}{\delta + t}, \quad (37)$$

Parameter class	AdamW	Muon	SOAP	ADANA	Learning rate group	Weight decay
Token embedding	Adam	Adam	SOAP	ADANA	γ_e	Yes
Attention and feed-forward matrices	Adam	Muon	SOAP	ADANA	γ_h	Yes
Readout matrix	Adam	Adam	SOAP	ADANA	γ_r	Yes
Learned normalization scales	Adam	Adam	Adam	ADANA	γ_e	No

Table 6: Parameter routing for the four primary optimizers. The weight decay column gives the common independent weight decay mask.

and updates

$$m_t = (1 - \Delta_t)m_{t-1} + \Delta_t \tilde{g}_t, \quad (38)$$

$$v_t = (1 - \Delta_t)v_{t-1} + \Delta_t \tilde{g}_t^{\odot 2}, \quad (39)$$

with $m_0 = v_0 = 0$. We apply no additional bias correction.

Define the time-dependent momentum amplification

$$\chi_t = (t + 1)^{1-\kappa} + 1. \quad (40)$$

The ADANA direction is

$$d_t = \frac{g_2 \tilde{g}_t + g_3 \chi_t m_t}{\sqrt{v_t} + \epsilon}, \quad (41)$$

where all operations involving v_t are elementwise. We use $\epsilon = 10^{-15}$. We fix $g_2 = 1$ and $\delta = 8$, while g_3 and κ control the strength and growth rate of the momentum contribution and are treated as momentum hyperparameters. The additional $+1$ in χ_t and the first-update clock follow the released implementation rather than the displayed ADANA pseudocode.

Our implementation exposes the optional ADANA–MK4 coordinatewise cap through `clipsnr`, but every ADANA experiment reported in this paper disables this option and uses no MK4 clipping.

C.6 PARAMETER ROUTING

Table 6 summarizes the optimizer direction, layerwise learning rate group, and weight decay mask for each parameter class. The three layerwise factors are γ_e for the token embedding and other vector-like parameters, γ_h for hidden matrices, and γ_r for the readout matrix.

All native route multipliers are $r_i = 1$, except for Muon’s Adam route, which uses $r_i = 1.6$. Models in the primary architecture contain no bias parameters. When adapting our methods to architectures with biases, we recommend treating them like learned normalization scales: use the same optimizer route and the γ_e embedding-group learning rate, and exclude them from weight decay.

D LEARNING RATE SCHEDULE SELECTION

We next investigate how the learning rate decay schedule interacts with training horizon and find a crossover between linear and cosine decay across OT factors. For each schedule, we jointly tune the base learning rate and weight decay coefficient at each OT factor. Linear decay performs better at $1\times$ OT for all four optimizers, whereas cosine decay performs better at $8\times$ and $32\times$ OT. A learning rate schedule selected at a conventional training horizon therefore need not transfer to a substantially overtrained regime. Since our experiments focus primarily on high overtraining factors, we use cosine-decay-to-zero for the remainder of the paper.

Both schedules begin with a linear warmup from 0.01η to the peak learning rate η over $W = \max\{100, \min\{\lfloor S/50 \rfloor, 5,000\}\}$ optimizer updates, where S is the total number of optimizer updates. For the remaining $S - W$ updates, let $u_t \in [0, 1]$ denote the fraction of post-warmup training completed, and write the learning rate as $\eta_t = \eta s_t$. We compare linear decay to zero with cosine decay to zero (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2017),

$$s_t^{\text{linear}} = 1 - u_t, \quad s_t^{\text{cosine}} = \frac{1 + \cos(\pi u_t)}{2}. \quad (42)$$




Figure 9: **Linear and cosine learning rate decay schedules after warmup.** Both schedules use the same linear warmup before decaying from the peak learning rate to zero.

We compare linear and cosine decay on the 51M model at $1\times$, $8\times$, and $32\times$ OT for AdamW, ADANA, Muon, and SOAP. We hold the optimizer-specific momentum hyperparameters fixed throughout this comparison: $\beta_1 = 0.9$ and $\beta_2 = 0.95$ for AdamW; $g_3 = 8$ and $\kappa = 0.85$ for ADANA; $\beta = 0.95$ for Muon; and $\beta_1 = 0.95$, $\beta_2 = 0.99$, and $\beta_{Sh} = 0.95$ for SOAP.

To account for possible interactions between the learning rate schedule and weight decay coefficient, we sweep the base learning rate η and weight decay coefficient c separately for each optimizer, OT factor, and schedule. We use the uniform WD schedule, defined here by a per-update coefficient c/S before multiplication by the learning rate schedule s_t . In particular, s_t multiplies both the optimizer’s data-dependent update and the independent weight decay update, making an interaction between the learning rate schedule shape and the weight decay coefficient plausible. For each schedule, we extend the learning rate sweep at every weight decay coefficient, OT factor, and optimizer setting until the minimum is attained in the interior of the sweep. We likewise extend the weight decay range whenever the best pair lies on its boundary. We then report the lowest final validation loss over the resulting (learning rate, weight decay) grid for each optimizer and OT factor.

Let L_s^* denote the lowest final validation loss over the resulting (learning rate, weight decay) grid for schedule $s \in \{\text{linear, cosine}\}$. We summarize the schedule advantage as

$$10^3 (L_{\text{linear}}^* - L_{\text{cosine}}^*)$$

in millipoints, so positive values indicate that cosine decay achieves the lower final validation loss. Appendix E separately selects the weight decay schedule and its WD coefficient scaling rule. The exact fixed momentum treatments, tested WD coefficients, and complete learning rate sweeps appear in Appendix L.

Figure 11 summarizes the horizon-dependent crossover. After selecting the best learning rate and weight decay coefficient pair for each schedule, linear decay achieves the lower loss at $1\times$ OT for all four optimizers, whereas cosine decay achieves the lower loss at $8\times$ and $32\times$ OT for all four. Thus, a schedule selected at $1\times$ OT does not transfer unchanged to the more overtrained regimes studied here.

Figure 10 shows that the crossover is not produced by a single favorable weight decay coefficient: the high-OT advantage of cosine decay appears across multiple coefficients. The same crossover remains in the row labeled “best,” where the weight decay coefficient is selected separately for each schedule and OT factor.

Because the remaining experiments in this paper focus primarily on high OT factors, we use cosine decay to zero after warmup as the primary learning rate schedule. This is a protocol choice for the regimes studied here, rather than a claim that cosine decay is universally optimal.

This comparison is restricted to the 51M model, the two schedule families considered here, fixed optimizer-specific momentum settings, and the uniform WD schedule. Appendix E next studies weight decay schedules and coefficient scaling, while Appendix L reports the complete learning rate sweeps underlying this comparison.




Figure 10: **Cosine decay vs linear decay learning rate schedule advantage across OT factor and coefficient of the uniform WD schedule on the 51M parameter model.** Each cell reports $10^3(L_{\text{linear}} - L_{\text{cosine}})$ after selecting the best base learning rate separately for each schedule at the indicated weight decay coefficient; positive values favor cosine decay to zero. The row labeled “best” selects the best weight decay coefficient for each OT factor separately for each schedule. Momentum hyperparameters are fixed to AdamW ($\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95$), ADANA ($g_3 = 8, \kappa = 0.85$), Muon ($\beta = 0.95$), and SOAP ($\beta_1 = 0.95, \beta_2 = 0.99, \beta_{\text{Sh}} = 0.95$).

E WEIGHT DECAY SCHEDULES AND COEFFICIENT SCALING

After selecting cosine decay to zero as the learning rate schedule, we next study two decisions governing weight decay within and across training horizons. The WD schedule specifies how the per-update decay coefficient changes across optimizer updates, whereas the WD coefficient scaling rule specifies how its overall coefficient changes with OT factor. Such a scaling rule is needed when we do not retune weight decay at every training horizon, because the best WD coefficient at one OT factor does not generally remain best at another. We first define the two WD schedules and fix the log-time offset convention, then compare the schedules under cosine decay to zero and derive coefficient scaling rules for experiments where full per-horizon tuning is infeasible. Appendix L reports the complete learning rate-by-coefficient grids underlying these analyses.

Following decoupled weight decay (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2019), we implement weight decay as a separate parameter update term rather than as an L_2 penalty in the training objective. We apply weight decay to all learned parameters except learned normalization scales, including both the token embedding and readout matrices. Our models do not contain biases, but for architectures with learned biases, we recommend excluding them from weight decay. For parameters included in the weight decay mask, the independent decay contribution at update t is $-s_t \lambda_t \theta_t$, where $s_t \in [0, 1]$ denotes the normalized learning rate schedule.

We use uniform WD to denote the standard schedule in which the per-update coefficient, before multiplication by s_t , is constant across optimizer updates. Following Wang & Aitchison (2025), we divide the WD coefficient by the total number of optimizer updates S :

$$\lambda_t^{\text{uniform}} = \frac{c_{\text{uniform}}}{S}. \quad (43)$$

For a fixed learning rate schedule shape, this approximately prevents cumulative decay from increasing with the number of updates.

We use log-time WD to denote the schedule proposed in Ferbach et al. (2026), in which the per-update coefficient decreases inversely with the shifted update index:

$$\lambda_t^{\text{log}} = \frac{c_{\text{log}}}{\tau + t}. \quad (44)$$

We use c for the WD coefficient throughout and add a schedule subscript only when multiple WD schedules appear in the same expression. The coefficient values are not directly comparable across schedules because they parameterize different decay shapes.




Figure 11: **High overtraining factors favor cosine decay over linear decay on the 51M parameter model for all optimizers.** Each point reports $10^3(L_{\text{linear}} - L_{\text{cosine}})$ after selecting the best base learning rate and weight decay coefficient pair for each schedule; positive values favor cosine decay to zero. Momentum hyperparameters are fixed as in Figure 10.

E.1 PROTOCOL CHOICE FOR THE LOG-TIME WD OFFSET

Applying log-time WD across training horizons requires specifying how its offset changes when the number of optimizer updates changes. Let S denote the total number of optimizer updates in the current experiment and $S_{1\times}$ the number at $1\times$ OT. The schedule in Ferbach et al. (2026) uses an offset proportional to the current training horizon. We instead anchor the offset to the $1\times$ OT horizon:

$$\underbrace{\lambda_{t,\text{horizon}}^{\log} = \frac{c}{0.1S + t}}_{\text{horizon-normalized}} \quad \underbrace{\lambda_{t,1\times}^{\log} = \frac{c}{0.1S_{1\times} + t}}_{1\times\text{-anchored, used here}}. \quad (45)$$

The two definitions coincide at $1\times$ OT. At longer horizons, the horizon-normalized definition stretches the initial phase of the WD schedule with the full training horizon, whereas the $1\times$ -anchored definition preserves the initial timescale used at $1\times$ OT. We adopt $\tau = 0.1S_{1\times}$ as our protocol convention for extending log-time WD across the OT axis. This choice is not intended as a claim that the anchored offset is universally optimal. Unless otherwise stated, all log-time WD experiments in this paper use this convention.

E.2 INTERACTION WITH THE LEARNING RATE ENDPOINT

The language model experiments in Ferbach et al. (2026) use cosine decay to 10% of the peak learning rate. Comparing log-time WD with uniform WD for AdamW and AdEMAMix, they report approximately 10% compute-efficiency gains that appear to increase with model scale. The literature generally finds that decaying the learning rate to zero outperforms schedules with higher endpoints. For example, Bergsma et al. (2025b) find that linear decay to zero consistently outperforms cosine decay to 10% across a range of language model pretraining settings. We therefore test whether the magnitude of the log-time WD advantage depends on the learning rate endpoint.

To isolate this interaction, we hold the base learning rate fixed at $\log_2 \eta = -8$ for AdamW and -12.5 for ADANA and match the total parameter shrinkage produced by the two WD schedules in the absence of gradient updates. Within each optimizer and learning rate endpoint pair, all other training coordinates are identical. Under weight decay alone, a parameter evolves according to

$$\theta_{t+1} = (1 - s_t \lambda_t) \theta_t. \quad (46)$$

The fraction of its initial value retained after S updates is therefore

$$R(\lambda) = \prod_{t=0}^{S-1} (1 - s_t \lambda_t), \quad \theta_S = R(\lambda) \theta_0. \quad (47)$$

For a log-time WD coefficient $c_{\log} = 2$, we choose the uniform WD coefficient c_{uniform} by solving

$$\prod_{t=0}^{S-1} \left(1 - s_t \frac{c_{\text{uniform}}}{S}\right) = \prod_{t=0}^{S-1} \left(1 - s_t \frac{c_{\log}}{\tau + t}\right). \quad (48)$$




Figure 12: **The apparent advantage of the log-time WD schedule is substantially diminished when the learning rate decays to zero rather than to 10% of its peak.** We compare the uniform and log-time WD schedules with the same base learning rate and matched total parameter shrinkage from weight decay alone on the 51M parameter model at $8\times$ OT. Markers show validation evaluations at selected training steps, and lines linearly interpolate between them. With a 10% endpoint, the log-time WD schedule reduces final validation loss by 32.3 millipoints for AdamW and 16.9 millipoints for ADANA; with a zero endpoint, the corresponding differences are 1.3 and 0.3 millipoints.

We solve Equation 48 numerically in log space using the exact discrete learning rate schedule, including warmup. This gives $c_{\text{uniform}} = 11.500447$ for cosine decay to 10% and $c_{\text{uniform}} = 12.319252$ for cosine decay to zero. The matching depends only on the learning rate schedule and training horizon, so we use the same coefficients for AdamW and ADANA. This comparison therefore isolates the effect of when weight decay is applied while holding its cumulative parameter shrinkage fixed. Because the coefficients are determined by retention matching rather than tuned separately, it does not compare the best achievable loss under the two WD schedules.

Under both learning rate endpoints, log-time WD develops an advantage during training; with decay to zero, however, most of this advantage disappears during the final learning rate cooldown. The results in Ferbach et al. (2026) therefore do not by themselves determine which WD schedule is preferable under our cosine-decay-to-zero protocol.

E.3 COMPARING UNIFORM AND LOG-TIME WD SCHEDULES ACROSS OT FACTORS

Because our primary learning rate schedule decays to zero, we next compare uniform and log-time WD under this endpoint. For each optimizer, WD schedule, and OT factor, we evaluate a two-dimensional grid over base learning rate and WD coefficient. At each WD coefficient, we sweep the base learning rate independently and then compare the resulting minimum losses across coefficients, following the sweep-interiority criteria in Section B.5. The summary figures report quantities minimized over base learning rate, while Section L reports the coefficient grids in Table 13 and shows every evaluated point in Figures 32 and 33. This comparison therefore makes no assumption about how the WD coefficient should scale across training horizons.

Uniform WD performs better at $1\times$ OT for AdamW, ADANA, and Muon. At higher OT factors, log-time WD becomes competitive or better for some optimizers, including ADANA and SOAP at the longest measured horizons, but it is not uniformly superior across optimizers or horizons.




Figure 13: **The relative performance of the uniform and log-time WD schedules depends on both the optimizer and OT factor.** On the 51M parameter model with cosine decay to zero and fixed optimizer-specific momentum, each point shows $10^3(L_{\log} - L_{\text{uniform}})$ after selecting the best (base learning rate, WD coefficient) pair for each WD schedule. Positive values favor the uniform WD schedule, while negative values favor the log-time WD schedule.

This comparison allows the WD coefficient to vary independently at every OT factor. It therefore compares the two WD schedules under per-horizon tuning rather than providing a coefficient scaling rule that transfers across training horizons.

E.4 WD COEFFICIENT SCALING RULES ACROSS OT FACTORS

When computationally feasible, the best way to set weight decay is to jointly tune the base learning rate and WD coefficient at every training horizon. However, this joint sweep is often computationally impractical. We therefore investigate how the WD coefficient should scale with training horizon to determine a scaling rule that can be used in place of per-horizon WD tuning.

An equivalent view of AdamW treats the parameter iterate itself as an exponential moving average of preconditioned updates: in conventional notation with constant learning rate η and weight decay λ , the averaging coefficient is $\eta\lambda$ and the resulting memory timescale is $1/(\eta\lambda)$ updates (Wang & Aitchison, 2025). This view has recently been used to explain other horizon-dependent phenomena. Bergsma et al. (2026b) show that the normalized AdamW timescale controls training-loss-curve shape and must be matched, together with tokens per parameter, for curves to collapse across model scales. Bergsma et al. (2026a) predict when training data are retained from AdamW’s implicit EMA coefficients and use the resulting re-evaluation curves to design data curricula. We therefore interpret WD coefficient scaling as controlling a normalized optimizer memory, rather than only the strength of regularization.

Prior work in Bergsma et al. (2025a) asks the same question for AdamW under a uniform WD schedule: how should the WD coefficient scale with model size, training horizon, and batch size? They define the normalized AdamW timescale

$$\tau = \frac{B}{\eta\lambda D} = \frac{1}{\eta\lambda S}, \quad (49)$$

and find that the optimal timescale scales approximately as

$$\tau_{\text{opt}} \propto \left(\frac{D}{N}\right)^{-0.527}. \quad (50)$$

They also find that, at fixed model size and training horizon, the optimal raw AdamW coefficient λ scales approximately linearly with batch size below the critical batch size. In our uniform WD parameterization, c/S corresponds to the peak effective decay coefficient $\eta\lambda$, and hence $c = 1/\tau$. Thus, at fixed token horizon, their batch-scaling prescription corresponds to holding c fixed as batch size varies: the factor of B is already absorbed through $S = D/B$. Their horizon-scaling result then implies

$$\frac{c(f)}{c(1)} = f^{0.527} \approx \sqrt{f}. \quad (51)$$




Figure 14: **The best WD coefficient changes with OT factor.** Each curve shows coefficient regret at one OT factor for a fixed optimizer and WD schedule on the 51M parameter model. The regret of coefficient c is $10^3[L(c) - \min_{c'} L(c')]$, where $L(c)$ is the best final validation loss over the base learning rate sweep at coefficient c . The movement of the minima across curves shows that a coefficient selected at one training horizon need not transfer to another. The learning rate schedule uses cosine decay to zero and optimizer-specific momentum is held fixed. Upward triangles at the upper boundary represent regrets greater than 25 millipoints.

Power Lines studies uniform WD with AdamW; we extend this analysis to log-time WD and the broader set of optimizers considered here.

Using the per-horizon joint sweeps described above, Figure 14 shows the resulting regret for each WD coefficient after minimizing over the base learning rate,

$$\mathcal{R}(c; f) = 10^3 \left[L_f(c) - \min_{c'} L_f(c') \right], \quad (52)$$

where $L_f(c)$ is the best final validation loss over the learning rate sweep at coefficient c .

The best WD coefficient generally increases with OT factor for both WD schedules, although its precise value and the width of the low-regret region differ across optimizers. Consequently, fixing the coefficient selected at $1 \times$ OT can incur increasing regret at longer training horizons.

To quantify this trend, let $c_{o,s}^*(f)$ denote the best coefficient for optimizer o , WD schedule s , and OT factor f after minimizing over the base learning rate. We anchor the uniform and log-time WD schedules at their $1 \times$ OT coefficients, $c_{\text{uniform}}(1) = 8$ and $c_{\text{log}}(1) = 2$, and fit a separate power-law exponent for each WD schedule across optimizers by least squares in log space:

$$\log_2 c_{o,s}^*(f) = \log_2 c_s(1) + \alpha_s \log_2 f + \epsilon_{o,s,f}. \quad (53)$$

The independently fitted exponents are 0.527 for uniform WD and 0.473 for log-time WD.

Both fitted exponents are close to $1/2$. We therefore use the square-root exponent for both schedules, with schedule-specific $1 \times$ OT coefficients determined by our sweeps:

$$c_{\text{uniform}}(f) = 8\sqrt{f}, \quad c_{\text{log}}(f) = 2\sqrt{f}. \quad (54)$$

We use these prescriptions when repeating the complete learning rate and WD coefficient grid is computationally impractical, but do not claim that either rule is universally optimal. When direct joint tuning is feasible, we instead use the best measured (base learning rate, WD coefficient) pair.




Figure 15: **The best WD coefficients are consistent with square-root scaling across OT factor.** For each optimizer, WD schedule, and OT factor on the 51M parameter model, points show the WD coefficient from the best (base learning rate, WD coefficient) pair in the two-dimensional grid. The solid black curves show the separate power-law fits in Equation 53, while the dashed curves show the adopted square-root rules. The learning rate schedule uses cosine decay to zero and optimizer-specific momentum is held fixed.

F FIXED-MEMORY TUNING ACROSS TRAINING HORIZONS

Spectral analyses of deep linear and kernel learning show that higher-eigenvalue modes are learned earlier, whereas lower-eigenvalue modes require longer training (Saxe et al., 2014; Bordelon et al., 2020). This progression suggests that averaging gradients over longer windows may become increasingly useful at extended training horizons: longer windows can accumulate weak but persistent directional signal needed to resolve harder modes. This motivation is consistent with the long-memory benefits observed for AdEMAMix, the growing-memory construction of DANA, and the use of AdEMAMix in the long-duration Apertus pretraining runs (Pagliardini et al., 2024; Ferbach et al., 2025; Project Apertus et al., 2025). However, longer memory also responds more slowly to changes in the gradient distribution and can retain stale or unusually large gradients for longer, creating a competing stability consideration. For fixed-memory optimizers—which use scalar coefficients such as β to maintain a constant effective memory throughout a run—we therefore ask how the memory coefficient should vary across training horizons.

F.1 PER-HORIZON MEMORY TUNING

We conduct this analysis on the 51M-parameter model, where it is computationally feasible to jointly sweep one optimizer-specific memory coefficient and the base learning rate at every overtraining factor. For AdamW, we vary the second-moment coefficient β_2 and fix $\beta_1 = 0.9$. For Muon, we vary its native momentum coefficient β and fix its non-matrix AdamW path at $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (0.9, 0.95)$. For SOAP, we vary the rotated-basis second-moment coefficient β_2 and fix $\beta_1 = \beta_{Sh} = 0.95$ with preconditioner refresh interval $K = 10$. Our choice to tune AdamW’s β_2 is supported by Marek et al. (2025), who find that preserving the second-moment half-life transfers better across batch sizes while $\beta_1 = 0.9$ remains effective.

We report each momentum coefficient using the effective memory window M defined in Section 3.1. The $M = 50$ setting used in our uniform-weight-decay comparison corresponds to $\beta = 0.98$ and a half-life of approximately 34 optimizer updates. At fixed batch size, holding β constant as the overtraining factor increases makes this window a progressively smaller fraction of training.

For every optimizer, overtraining factor, and value of M , we independently sweep the base learning rate. For all experiments, we sweep over the memory grid $M \in \{20, 40, 80, 160, 320, 640, 1280\}$. We additionally test $M = 10$ at six short-horizon settings whose minima initially reached the lower boundary, and extend AdamW and SOAP to $M = 2560$ at $128 \times OT$. We evaluate these sweeps using the interiority criteria in Appendix B.5. Within each (optimizer, M , OT factor) setting, we first require the optimal learning rate to be interior in the learning rate sweep. After minimizing over learning rate, we require the optimal memory to be interior in the memory sweep




Figure 16: **The low-regret region shifts toward longer fixed memory as the training horizon increases.** For each optimizer, effective memory, and OT factor, we independently sweep the base learning rate and report regret relative to the best memory for that optimizer and horizon. Black outlines mark the minimizing memory. Diagonal slashes indicate points whose learning rate sweeps were incomplete.

at every (optimizer, OT factor) setting. At each horizon, the per-horizon treatment selects the $(M, \text{base learning rate})$ pair with the lowest final validation loss.

F.2 HORIZON-TUNED MEMORY RESULTS

Longer horizons favor longer memory. Figure 3 shows that longer training horizons generally favor longer fixed memory. From $1 \times$ to $128 \times$ OT, the optimal memory increases from $M = 20$ to $M = 640$ for Muon, from $M = 20$ to $M = 1280$ for AdamW, and from $M = 40$ to $M = 1280$ for SOAP, although the trajectories are not always monotonic.

We do not infer a memory scaling rule from these optima. Figure 16 shows that many horizons have broad low-regret regions, so small loss differences can substantially change the minimizing M . We instead use the optimal memory at each horizon as a per-horizon tuned comparison and leave a transferable memory prescription to future work.

Memory and learning rate must be tuned jointly. Figure 17 shows that the loss-minimizing base learning rate generally decreases as effective memory grows, although the relationship depends on optimizer and horizon. This coupling creates a tradeoff: longer memory becomes useful at long horizons but is typically paired with a smaller learning rate, which can slow learning throughout the run. A fixed-memory optimizer must accept one compromise between memory and learning rate throughout training, whereas scheduled memory can use shorter memory early and lengthen it as training proceeds. This provides one plausible explanation for why per-horizon tuned constant memory does not fully match scheduled memory.

Per-horizon tuning improves fixed-memory optimizers. The fixed-memory comparison uses $\beta_2 = 0.98$ for AdamW and SOAP and $\beta = 0.98$ for Muon, corresponding to $M = 50$. The per-horizon sweeps show that $M = 50$ is near-optimal at moderate horizons, but tends to provide too much memory at the shortest horizons and too little at the longest. The gains therefore appear at both ends of our overtraining range and are largest at $128 \times$ OT. At $128 \times$ OT, per-horizon tuning improves validation loss by 3.3 mpt for AdamW, 3.6 mpt for Muon, and 1.3 mpt for SOAP. Figure 18 expresses the resulting performance as token multipliers relative to fixed- $M = 50$ AdamW.

Interpretation and limitations. These experiments act as an oracle for constant-memory optimizers: at each training horizon, they select the best combination of memory and learning rate under




Figure 17: **The best base learning rate generally decreases as fixed memory grows, with optimizer- and horizon-dependent deviations.** Each panel fixes the OT factor and compares AdamW, Muon, and SOAP across effective memory. At each memory, the plotted value is the base learning rate attaining the lowest final validation loss in an independent learning rate sweep. Open circles indicate points whose learning rate sweeps were incomplete.




Figure 18: **Per-horizon memory tuning improves fixed-memory optimizers.** For the 51M model, circles show each optimizer with fixed effective memory $M = 50$, after independently sweeping the base learning rate at every OT factor. Triangles show the lowest measured loss after jointly sweeping fixed memory and base learning rate at each horizon. We convert these loss values to token multipliers relative to AdamW with $M = 50$, corresponding to $\beta_2 = 0.98$, by inverting the fixed- $M = 50$ AdamW curve from the shared- m Scaling fit. Because scaling fits are not well identified from this small set of horizon-tuned points, we connect adjacent points with piecewise-linear segments rather than fitted curves. Per-horizon memory tuning provides modest gains for AdamW but substantially strengthens Muon and SOAP at the longest measured horizons.

Optimizer	Prescribed optimizer-specific settings
AdamW	$\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.98$
Muon	$\beta = 0.98$; Adam route $\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95$
SOAP	$\beta_1 = 0.95, \beta_2 = 0.98, \beta_{Sh} = 0.95, K = 10$
ADANA	$g_2 = 1, g_3 = 8, \kappa = 0.85, \delta = 8$

Table 7: Optimizer-specific settings used in the primary comparison. The settings are held fixed across model sizes and OT factors; ADANA’s memory changes within training according to its prescribed log-time rule. The base learning rate is swept independently at every coordinate.

the setting where the memory remains fixed throughout training. The results are limited to the 51M model and one memory coefficient per optimizer.

Complete learning rate sweeps for this section are included in Figures 36 and 37 of Appendix L.

G SCALING FITS AND TOKEN MULTIPLIERS

G.1 PRIMARY COMPARISON AND MEASURED SUPPORT

We fit the 76 uniform weight decay loss values used in Figures 1 and 2. These experiments contain nine OT factors from $1\times$ through $256\times$ for the 51M model, six from $1\times$ through $32\times$ for the 124M model, and four from $1\times$ through $8\times$ for the 253M model, for each of AdamW, ADANA, Muon, and SOAP. At every (optimizer, model size, OT factor) setting, we independently sweep the base learning rate and use the lowest final validation loss.

In this section, we fit validation loss jointly as a function of model size and training tokens. We use these fits to estimate scaling exponents and high-token loss limits and to define the smooth AdamW reference curve used to calculate token multipliers. These quantities therefore depend on the chosen functional form.

G.2 JOINT MODEL–TOKEN FUNCTIONAL FORM

Let P denote nominal model size and T denote the number of training tokens, and define the dimensionless coordinates $p = P/P_0$ and $t = T/T_0$, with $P_0 = 10^8$ parameters and $T_0 = 2 \times 10^9$ tokens. Throughout the main text, we model the loss values with the joint model–token functional form proposed by Videau et al. (2026), with the residual loss floor E and high-token model exponent m shared across optimizers:

$$\mathcal{L}_o(P, T) = E + \left[A_o p^{-m/k_o} + B_o t^{-\beta_o} \right]^{k_o},$$

where o indexes the optimizer. We refer to this specification as the shared- m Scaling fit. The parameters A_o , B_o , β_o , and k_o are optimizer specific, so the four-optimizer fit contains 18 free parameters.

At fixed model size, the high-token limit is

$$\mathcal{L}_{o,\infty}(P) = E + A_o^{k_o} p^{-m},$$

and the excess above this limit decays asymptotically as $T^{-\beta_o}$. Accordingly, we refer to β_o as the fixed-model token-decay exponent under this functional form. In the infinite-model limit, the token exponent is $k_o\beta_o$. At fixed model size, however, high-token excess loss decays with exponent β_o .

Because we have only three model sizes, we cannot reliably estimate a separate model exponent for each optimizer. We therefore share m across optimizers and report optimizer-specific model exponents as a sensitivity analysis; this modeling choice does not imply that their true exponents are equal.

G.3 ALTERNATIVE FUNCTIONAL FORMS AND MODEL SELECTION

Before selecting the shared- m Scaling fit, we considered six alternative functional forms.

Functional form	Parameters	RMSE (mpt)	AICc	BIC
Chinchilla additive	17	14.349	-600.54	-571.47
Parameter–token interaction	21	14.850	-580.77	-548.94
Additive OT, shared model exponent	18	3.272	-821.82	-791.86
Additive OT, optimizer-specific model exponents	21	3.113	-818.24	-786.41
Scaling, optimizer-specific model exponents	21	3.079	-819.90	-788.07
Shared-m Scaling	18	3.251	-822.78	-792.83
Scaling, shared inner exponent	18	3.290	-820.96	-791.01

Table 8: In-sample fit and information criteria for the candidate scaling forms on the 76 uniform weight decay loss values.

Our first alternative is the Chinchilla functional form, which uses separate additive terms for model size and training tokens (Hoffmann et al., 2022),

$$\mathcal{L}_o(P, T) = E + A_o p^{-\alpha_o} + B_o t^{-\beta_o}.$$

We use a shared residual floor E and optimizer-specific values of A_o , α_o , B_o , and β_o .

Our second alternative is a parameter–token interaction model motivated by the loss decompositions on power-law random features models in Paquette et al. (2024),

$$\mathcal{L}_o(P, T) = E + A_o p^{-\alpha_o} + C_o p^{-\gamma_o} t^{-\delta_o},$$

where the interaction amplitude C_o and exponents γ_o and δ_o are positive. This form allows the marginal effect of training tokens to depend on model size while preserving monotonic improvement in either coordinate.

We next compare two additive forms using the overtraining factor f ,

$$\mathcal{L}_o(P, f) = E + A_o p^{-\alpha_o} + C_o p^{-u_o} f^{-\delta_o},$$

with one version sharing α across optimizers and one using optimizer-specific α_o .

Finally, we compare two additional variants within the Scaling family: a version with optimizer-specific high-token model exponents $m_o = k_o \alpha_o$, and a version that shares the inner exponent α while retaining optimizer-specific k_o , so that $m_o = k_o \alpha$ remains optimizer specific.

We compare the models using root mean squared error (RMSE), small-sample corrected Akaike information criterion (AICc), Bayesian information criterion (BIC), residual structure, and structured holdout tests. Lower AICc and BIC indicate a better tradeoff between fit error and model complexity.

In each structured holdout test, we remove a scientifically meaningful group of loss values, refit the model, and evaluate its predictions on that omitted group. We consider five tests: holding out an entire OT factor; holding out one complete model size; holding out each model size’s longest horizon; holding out each model size’s two longest horizons; and holding out the longest horizon from all three model sizes simultaneously. These tests evaluate prediction across horizon or model-size boundaries. Ordinary leave-one-loss-value-out prediction is less informative because neighboring optimizers and horizons remain in the fit.

The Chinchilla and parameter–token interaction forms are not competitive on these experiments. Their RMSEs exceed 14 millipoints, compared with 3.08–3.29 millipoints for the remaining five candidates. As Figure 19 shows, both also leave a pronounced U-shaped residual pattern: they overpredict the lowest and highest losses while underpredicting intermediate losses. We therefore restrict the structured-holdout comparison below to the remaining five candidates, which fit the observed loss values substantially better.

For the five better-fitting models, Table 9 reports pooled RMSE in millipoints for the structured holdout tests. We additionally report every fold’s training count, held-out count, and RMSE in Table 10.

We select the shared- m Scaling fit as our primary scaling fit and use it throughout the main text. Among the candidate functional forms that also have 18 parameters, it has the lowest observed AICc and BIC, and its errors when predicting held-out long horizons are comparable to those of the best-performing alternative. Allowing optimizer-specific model exponents reduces the in-sample RMSE




Figure 19: **The separable Chinchilla model and the parameter–token interaction model leave systematic residuals.** Residuals are fitted minus observed validation loss in millipoints. The Chinchilla-additive and parameter–token interaction models retain a pronounced U-shaped structure, whereas the five additive-OT and Scaling candidates remain substantially closer to zero across the observed loss range.

by 0.171 mpt, but adds three parameters. The paired-coordinate bootstrap does not consistently rank the candidate models, so this selection is not evidence that the shared- m form is uniquely correct.

Predictions for a completely held-out model size are substantially less accurate than predictions across the OT axis for every candidate. Because only three model sizes are available, we share m across optimizers to reduce overfitting along the model-size axis; we do not interpret the current experiments as identifying optimizer-specific model-scaling laws. In Appendix H.1, we check whether the qualitative conclusions persist across both the Scaling and additive OT families rather than relying on a single parameterization.

G.4 TOKEN MULTIPLIERS

Following prior work, we compare optimizers using the ratio of the training tokens required by a baseline optimizer to those used by an indicated optimizer at the same loss. At fixed model size, this is the same quantity called the *compute multiplier* by Qiu et al. (2025); Ferbach et al. (2026) and *token-equivalent speedup* by Wen et al. (2026). We refer to it as the *token multiplier*. A value above one means that the baseline requires more tokens to attain the same loss and therefore favors the indicated optimizer.

At fixed model size p , let $t_b(\ell; p)$ denote the normalized number of training tokens required by a baseline optimizer b to reach loss ℓ . If optimizer o achieves loss ℓ_o after normalized token count t , its token multiplier relative to b is

$$M_{T,o|b}(p, t) = \frac{t_b(\ell_o; p)}{t}.$$

Functional form	Hold out OT	Hold out longest	Hold out two longest	Joint frontier	Hold out model
Additive OT, shared model exponent	5.36	5.89	6.00	6.92	36.30
Additive OT, optimizer-specific model exponents	5.64	6.06	5.99	7.65	13.98
Scaling, optimizer-specific model exponents	5.94	5.99	5.49	7.70	184.49
Shared-m Scaling	5.73	5.86	5.53	6.95	59.45
Scaling, shared inner exponent	5.97	6.11	5.61	7.32	59.68

Table 9: Pooled RMSE in millipoints for the structured holdout tests for the five better-fitting models.

Test	Held-out group	Train n	Held-out n	Additive OT		Scaling		
				Shared α	Optimizer-specific α_o	Optimizer-specific m_o	Shared m	Shared α
Hold out OT	1 $\times$	64	12	9.49	10.35	11.37	10.75	11.32
	2 $\times$	64	12	3.51	3.69	4.12	3.97	4.21
	4 $\times$	64	12	5.37	5.46	5.09	5.02	4.99
	8 $\times$	64	12	3.80	3.51	3.45	3.82	4.03
	16 $\times$	68	8	2.99	2.76	2.60	2.80	2.96
	32 $\times$	68	8	5.42	5.80	5.34	4.86	4.93
	64 $\times$	72	4	2.68	2.76	3.23	3.17	2.91
	128 $\times$	72	4	2.18	2.26	1.24	1.13	1.48
	256 $\times$	72	4	4.58	4.43	5.98	6.10	6.26
Hold out model	51M	40	36	46.19	19.74	256.43	35.72	15.75
	124M	52	24	18.73	4.58	64.19	61.61	76.52
	253M	60	16	30.58	4.50	86.77	90.69	87.04
Hold out longest horizon	51M, 256 $\times$	72	4	4.58	4.43	5.98	6.10	6.26
	124M, 32 $\times$	72	4	7.42	8.11	7.15	6.31	6.50
	253M, 8 $\times$	72	4	5.29	4.98	4.55	5.08	5.53
Hold out two longest	51M, 128–256 $\times$	68	8	4.81	4.76	5.53	5.63	5.60
	124M, 16–32 $\times$	68	8	7.31	7.73	6.23	5.73	6.04
	253M, 4–8 $\times$	68	8	5.60	5.04	4.58	5.22	5.15
Joint frontier	All longest horizons	64	12	6.92	7.65	7.70	6.95	7.32

Table 10: Per-fold support and RMSE in millipoints for each structured holdout test for the five better-fitting models.




Figure 20: **Residuals of the selected shared- m Scaling fit remain small across model sizes and OT values.** Residuals are fitted minus observed validation loss in millipoints, shown separately for the 51M, 124M, and 253M models. Lines connect adjacent OT factors for the same optimizer. The overall RMSE is 3.251 millipoints.

A value above one means that the baseline optimizer requires more training tokens to reach optimizer o 's loss, while a value below one favors the baseline. For most optimizer comparisons in this paper, we use AdamW as the baseline.

Under the shared- m Scaling fit, the fitted token count required by a baseline optimizer b to reach loss ℓ is

$$\hat{t}_b(\ell; p) = \left[\frac{B_b}{(\ell - E)^{1/k_b} - A_b p^{-m/k_b}} \right]^{1/\beta_b}.$$

This inverse is finite when ℓ lies above the baseline's fitted finite-model high-token limit,

$$\mathcal{L}_{b,\infty}(p) = E + A_b^{k_b} p^{-m}.$$

As ℓ approaches this limit from above, the required token count diverges. If ℓ falls below the fitted limit, the baseline cannot match it with any finite token count under the fitted model.

For the smooth curves in the main text, we evaluate optimizer o 's fitted loss and invert the fitted baseline curve; we refer to these as *fit-to-fit token multipliers*. At each experimental (optimizer, model size, OT factor) setting, we instead compute a *measured-to-fit token multiplier* by inverting the observed validation loss through the fitted baseline curve. A measured-to-fit multiplier therefore depends on the baseline fit but not on a fitted curve for optimizer o .

When the inferred baseline token count exceeds the largest token budget measured for that baseline at the same model size, the multiplier depends on extrapolating rather than interpolating the baseline fit. We denote extrapolated token multiplier points using translucent marker fills with opaque outlines. For fit-to-fit curves, the line becomes dotted starting at the OT factor where the equivalent baseline token count exceeds the largest token budget measured for that baseline at the same model size.

H OUTSCALING ACROSS TRAINING HORIZONS

As in the main text, we use outscaling to describe an improvement in an optimizer's relative efficiency as OT increases. Here we use the scaling fits from Appendix G to examine whether that improvement is better described by an improved token-decay exponent, a lower finite-model high-token loss limit, or both.

H.1 DEFINITION AND FLOOR-DECAY TRADEOFF

Outscaling can arise through an improved token-decay exponent, a lower high-token validation-loss limit, or both. Optimizer treatments may approach different finite-model limits because they can select different solutions or retain different residual optimization and noise floors. Under our experiments, we typically cannot identify these two effects separately, so we propose a profile-fit analysis that traces their tradeoff and determines whether the observed outscaling requires an advantage in at least one.

At fixed model size P , let $\mathcal{L}_{o,\infty}(P)$ denote optimizer o 's finite-model high-token loss limit, and let β_o denote its token-decay exponent under the shared- m Scaling fit. For optimizer o and baseline b , define

$$\Delta_\infty(P) = \mathcal{L}_{b,\infty}(P) - \mathcal{L}_{o,\infty}(P), \quad \Delta_\beta = \beta_o - \beta_b.$$

Positive Δ_∞ means that optimizer o approaches a lower finite-model loss limit, while positive Δ_β means that its excess loss decays faster with additional training tokens. Outscaling across the over-training axis may therefore arise from either advantage or from both simultaneously.

To expose this tradeoff, we fix a candidate value of Δ_∞ , refit the remaining scaling parameters, and record the corresponding best-fitting value of Δ_β . Each profile therefore shows the token-decay exponent difference implied by a particular assumption about the high-token-limit difference.

We plot the portion of each profile curve that contains the unconstrained optimum and satisfies a 95% profile-likelihood threshold. Let $R(d)$ be the minimum residual sum of squares after fixing $\Delta_\infty = d$, and let $R_{\min}$ be the unconstrained minimum. We estimate a common residual variance as $\hat{\sigma}^2 = R_{\min}/(n - p)$, where n is the number of fitted loss values and p is the number of free

parameters in the unconstrained fit, and display the contiguous segment containing the optimum for which

$$\frac{R(d) - R_{\min}}{\hat{\sigma}^2} \leq \chi_{1,0.95}^2 \simeq 3.84.$$

The value 3.84 is the 95th percentile of a chi-squared distribution with one degree of freedom, corresponding to the 95% one-parameter profile-likelihood threshold under independent Gaussian residuals with common variance. Our loss values are selected experimental measurements rather than independent noisy replicates, so we use this threshold only as a common display criterion across functional forms, not as a calibrated confidence interval.

We repeat this procedure for four of the alternative functional forms: the additive-OT and Scaling families each with either a model exponent shared across optimizers or optimizer-specific model exponents. This separates sensitivity to the model–token coupling from sensitivity to the model–exponent constraint.

We interpret the profiles as sets of compatible floor–decay decompositions rather than precise independent estimates of either quantity. We use them to determine whether the observed outscaling requires the compared optimizer to have an advantage in its token-decay exponent, its high-token loss limit, or both.

H.2 PAIRWISE COMPARISONS UNDER UNIFORM WEIGHT DECAY

We first compare all optimizers under uniform weight decay, since this provides a fair comparison under the most standard weight decay setting.

Relative to AdamW. The three non-Adam optimizers exhibit different horizon dependence (Figure 21). ADANA begins slightly behind AdamW, but its AdamW-relative token multiplier increases with overtraining factor. Muon is strongest over most short and intermediate horizons, although its advantage over AdamW remains comparatively flat. SOAP’s advantage decreases through intermediate OT factors and rises at the longest horizons. The floor–decay profiles show that these trends need not have the same asymptotic explanation: ADANA must improve upon AdamW in its token-decay exponent, its high-token loss limit, or both, whereas SOAP’s late gain is more compatible with a lower fitted high-token limit despite a worse token-decay exponent.

Muon versus SOAP. We see that the two matrix-preconditioned optimizers have different scaling behavior and in fact reverse their ordering as the OT factor increases. Muon is stronger through most short and intermediate horizons, while SOAP overtakes it at the longest measured horizons for the 51M and 124M models (Figure 22). Across the profiled functional forms, this crossover is consistently associated with a tradeoff: SOAP approaches a lower fitted high-token limit, while Muon retains the better token-decay exponent.

ADANA versus matrix-preconditioned optimizers. ADANA begins behind both Muon and SOAP but becomes increasingly competitive as the overtraining factor grows. It is the strongest primary treatment for the 51M model at $128\times$ OT, while SOAP is strongest at $256\times$ OT and for the 124M model at $32\times$ OT. Thus, scheduled memory catches the matrix-preconditioned treatments over the measured overtraining axis without uniformly dominating them. The profile comparisons leave open whether ADANA would ultimately win through a better token-decay exponent, a lower high-token limit, or both.

H.3 STRONGEST TREATMENT COMPARISONS

The uniform weight decay comparisons above provide a controlled comparison in which all optimizers use the same weight decay treatment. We next ask how the optimizers compare when each uses the strongest treatment among those we studied with sufficient coverage across model sizes and training horizons.

For ADANA, we use log-time weight decay with momentum cooldown. For AdamW and SOAP, we use log-time weight decay because it improves performance relative to uniform weight decay. For Muon, we retain uniform weight decay because log-time weight decay does not improve its performance at high overtraining factors.




Figure 21: **Uniform-WD optimizers exhibit distinct outscaling behavior relative to AdamW.** Columns compare ADANA, Muon, and SOAP with AdamW. The top row plots the AdamW OT factor required to match each optimizer at the OT factor on the horizontal axis; values above the equal-OT diagonal favor the optimizer named first. The middle row reports the corresponding AdamW-relative token multiplier. Curves are fit-to-fit comparisons under the shared- m Skaling fit, while markers invert measured loss values through the fitted AdamW curve. Dotted curve segments and translucent marker fills require extrapolating AdamW beyond its largest measured token budget at that model size. The bottom row profiles the tradeoff between the 51M high-token limit difference and token-decay exponent difference under four functional forms; symbols mark the unconstrained optima and the displayed curves satisfy the 95% profile threshold. Positive values on either profile axis favor the optimizer named first. ADANA’s token multiplier rises strongly with OT, Muon’s is comparatively flat, and SOAP’s turns upward at the longest horizons.




Figure 22: **Rankings among the non-Adam uniform-WD treatments also change with training horizon.** Columns compare SOAP with Muon, ADANA with Muon, and ADANA with SOAP. The top, middle, and bottom rows respectively show equivalent OT, baseline-relative token multipliers, and floor-decay profiles using the conventions of Figure 21. SOAP overtakes Muon only at the longest measured horizons, while ADANA gains on both matrix-preconditioned treatments and reaches or exceeds them at some of the highest measured model-horizon settings. The profiles show that these ranking changes need not have the same asymptotic explanation: SOAP’s late advantage over Muon is compatible with a lower fitted high-token limit despite a worse token-decay exponent, whereas ADANA’s comparisons retain a tradeoff between the two quantities.

Our horizon-tuned momentum experiments show that fixed-memory optimizers can benefit from tuning momentum separately at each overtraining factor. However, these experiments are available only for the 51M model, so we cannot perform the full comparison using horizon-tuned momentum across all three model sizes.

With each optimizer using its strongest available treatment, Figure 23 shows that ADANA’s relative token efficiency increases with overtraining factor against each of the other three optimizers. ADANA begins behind at short horizons, then catches or overtakes log-time-WD AdamW, uniform-WD Muon, and log-time-WD SOAP as the training horizon increases.

Overall, these comparisons provide evidence that the strongest ADANA treatment outscals AdamW and Muon and gains substantially on SOAP across the measured overtraining axis. We state the SOAP comparison more cautiously because SOAP performs particularly well for the 51M model at $256\times$ OT. Across all four profiled functional forms, the data favor an improved ADANA token-




Figure 23: **Log-time WD and momentum cooldown make ADANA increasingly competitive with the strongest measured versions of the three other optimizers.** Columns compare ADANA using log-time WD and momentum cooldown with AdamW using log-time WD, Muon using uniform WD, and SOAP using log-time WD. The top, middle, and bottom rows respectively show equivalent OT, baseline-relative token multipliers, and floor-decay profiles using the same conventions as Figure 21. Strong ADANA’s relative token efficiency increases with OT in all three comparisons. Across the profiled functional forms, the comparisons favor an improved ADANA token-decay exponent, while the corresponding high-token limit differences remain less well identified. Open circles indicate points whose learning rate sweeps were incomplete; the fits use only the filled points.

decay exponent, while the precise division between token-decay and high-token-limit advantages remains less well identified.

H.4 EQUIVALENT OT SCALING AND THE DANA PLRF PREDICTION

Effective optimization time. An effective optimization clock is a reparameterization of training time that measures how much progress the optimizer has made through the problem’s spectrum, rather than simply counting updates. As an example, consider gradient descent on a quadratic with a time-dependent learning rate η_t . Along an eigendirection with curvature λ , the residual evolves approximately as

$$r_{t,\lambda} \approx \exp\left(-\lambda \sum_{s < t} \eta_s\right) r_{0,\lambda}.$$

The accumulated learning rate $\sum_{s < t} \eta_s$, rather than the update count alone, therefore acts as an effective optimization clock. Two learning rate schedules that reach the same accumulated value make approximately the same progress along that eigendirection.

The PLRF analysis of DANA derives an analogous clock for its coupled gradient and momentum dynamics (Ferbach et al., 2025). In the notation of that analysis,

$$\vartheta(t) = 1 + 2\gamma_2 Bt + \left(\int_0^t \sqrt{B\gamma_3(s)} \, ds \right)^2,$$

where B is the batch size, γ_2 is the direct-gradient step size, and $\gamma_3(t)$ is the time-dependent step size for the momentum channel. Note that $\gamma_3(t)$ in the DANA notation is distinct from the constant ADANA coefficient g_3 used elsewhere in this paper. The term linear in t is the direct-gradient contribution to the effective clock, while the squared-integral term arises from the coupled momentum dynamics. For the DANA schedule

$$\gamma_3(t) \propto t^{-\kappa},$$

the latter term grows as

$$\left(\int_0^t s^{-\kappa/2} \, ds \right)^2 \propto t^{2-\kappa}.$$

ADANA retains this time exponent through its equivalent EMA formulation, in which the momentum direction is multiplied by $(1+t)^{1-\kappa}$ (Ferbach et al., 2026).

From optimizer updates to equivalent OT. In our experiments, batch size and sequence length are fixed, so the number of optimizer updates is proportional to the number of training tokens and hence to the overtraining factor at fixed model size. If the baseline follows a clock linear in update count while ADANA follows the DANA clock above, the corresponding equivalent-OT relation is

$$f_{\text{baseline}} \propto f_{\text{ADANA}}^{2-\kappa}.$$

For our choice $\kappa = 0.85$, this gives a predicted log-log slope

$$2 - \kappa = 1.15.$$

Equivalently, DANA’s effective clock grows relative to the linear baseline with exponent $1 - \kappa = 0.15$.

This prediction has a specific theoretical scope. In PLRF, DANA-decaying outscals SGD above the high-dimensional line across the signal- and noise-controlled phases before the model-capacity floor is reached. The exact loss exponent depends on the data and target spectra and on whether population bias, embedding bias, or variance controls the loss. Thus, $2 - \kappa$ is the exponent of DANA’s effective optimization clock, not a universal loss exponent shared by every PLRF phase.

Comparison with the transformer experiments. Figure 24 compares this prediction with the equivalent AdamW OT required to match ADANA. With log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown, the fitted equivalent-OT slopes are 1.20, 1.16, and 1.15 for the 51M, 124M, and 253M models. These values are close to the PLRF prediction $2 - \kappa = 1.15$ across all three model sizes. Under uniform weight decay, the corresponding slopes are 1.15, 1.06, and 1.03, indicating that the agreement is strongest for the ADANA treatment combining log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown.

We treat $2 - \kappa$ as a theoretically motivated reference rather than a direct prediction for these transformer experiments. DANA theory compares DANA with SGD on PLRF, whereas our experiments compare adaptively preconditioned ADANA with AdamW; the strongest ADANA treatment also includes log-time weight decay and momentum cooldown. Moreover, the floor-decay profiles above show that a fitted token-decay exponent remains coupled to the assumed high-token loss limit. Our conclusion is therefore that ADANA’s measured equivalent-OT scaling is quantitatively close to the effective-clock prediction from DANA theory, not that these experiments identify a particular PLRF phase or establish that the complete PLRF theory transfers unchanged to transformers.




Figure 24: **With log-time WD and momentum cooldown, ADANA outscaling is close to the PLRF prediction $2 - \kappa$ across model sizes.** We plot equivalent OT scaling across model sizes: for each ADANA OT factor, the vertical axis gives the AdamW OT factor required to attain the same fitted validation loss. Lines compare uniform-WD ADANA with ADANA using log-time WD and momentum cooldown; markers instead invert measured ADANA loss values through the fitted AdamW curve. Translucent markers and dotted curve segments require extrapolating AdamW beyond its largest measured token budget. The displayed fit values are log-log slopes over each curve’s plotted range. The dashed reference has slope 1, while the dotted reference has the PLRF-predicted slope $2 - \kappa = 1.15$; both pass through $(1, 1)$. The combined-treatment slopes are 1.20, 1.16, and 1.15 for the 51M, 124M, and 253M models, respectively, whereas the uniform-WD slopes are 1.15, 1.06, and 1.03.

I BATCH SIZE AND OPTIMIZER UPDATE COUNT

At fixed token count, changing the batch size also changes the number of sequential optimizer updates. If T is the token budget, B is the batch size in sequences, and L is the sequence length, then the number of updates is approximately

$$S = \frac{T}{B \times L}.$$

Increasing B therefore simultaneously reduces the number of optimizer updates and the stochastic variation between updates. This creates a fixed-token identifiability problem: an optimizer can appear to scale poorly with batch either because it benefits less from larger batches or because it benefits more from the additional updates available at smaller batches. The fixed-token batch comparisons in Ferbach et al. (2026) and Marek et al. (2025) have the same limitation.

Figure 25 shows our initial batch scaling experiment at $8 \times \text{OT}$. ADANA achieves a lower loss at $B = 32$, but its loss begins to increase at $B = 64$ and continues to rise with batch size. AdamW remains close to its $B = 32$ performance through approximately $B = 256$ before its loss increases at larger batch sizes. Both optimizers lose efficiency at the largest measured batch sizes.

The optimal memory hyperparameters for both optimizers follow clear batch scaling trends. For AdamW, the optimal second-moment memory $M_2 = 1/(1 - \beta_2)$ decreases approximately as $1/B$, keeping BM_2 approximately constant and replicating the batch-transfer behavior observed by Marek et al. (2025). For ADANA, the optimal g_3 increases approximately linearly with B , while its jointly optimized base learning rate decreases.

We obtain these curves by jointly optimizing the base learning rate and β_2 for AdamW, with $\beta_1 = 0.9$ fixed, and the base learning rate and g_3 for ADANA, with $\kappa = 0.85$ and $\delta = 8$ fixed. For both optimizers, we use uniform weight decay with $c(f) = 8\sqrt{f}$. Because the per-update decay is c/S and the number of updates S decreases inversely with batch size at fixed token count, holding c fixed implements the batch scaling prescription of Bergsma et al. (2025a).

We propose three possible explanations for the observed differences in how the optimizers perform across batch sizes. First, ADANA’s advantage may depend on the number of sequential optimizer updates. In the PLRF derivation of DANA, when $\gamma_3(t) \propto t^{-\kappa}$, the momentum contribution to the effective optimization clock grows as $BS^{2-\kappa}$, compared with a baseline contribution proportional to BS . Its relative contribution therefore grows as $S^{1-\kappa}$. This suggests that ADANA’s advantage




Figure 25: **At fixed token count, ADANA loses efficiency at smaller batch sizes than AdamW in the measured $8\times$ -OT slice.** We train the 51M parameter model for $8\times$ OT while holding the total number of training tokens fixed and varying the global batch size from 32 to 1,024. At each batch size, we jointly sweep the base learning rate and either AdamW β_2 or ADANA g_3 ; AdamW $\beta_1 = 0.9$ and ADANA $\kappa = 0.85$, $\delta = 8$ remain fixed. Left: the best final validation loss relative to $B = 32$. Middle: the selected AdamW second-moment memory $M_2 = 1/(1 - \beta_2)$; the $M_2 \propto 1/B$ guide corresponds to approximately constant token memory BM_2 , consistent with Marek et al. (2025). Right: the selected ADANA g_3 . The lower panels show the base learning rate selected jointly with each optimizer hyperparameter. This fixed-token slice does not by itself establish a general batch scaling law for ADANA.

should become more visible over longer training horizons at a fixed batch size. At fixed tokens, however, increasing B reduces S and may obscure this advantage.

Second, ADANA may be particularly effective in the high-noise regime. Analyses of accelerated-SGD-style methods suggest that some multi-timescale methods derive their largest advantage from noisy, small-batch gradients (Morwani et al., 2025). Increasing the effective batch size could then reduce ADANA’s advantage independently of the accompanying reduction in optimizer updates.

Third, we leave open whether broader joint hyperparameter optimization would change the relative batch scaling. Although the optimal g_3 follows a clear batch-dependent trend, g_3 , κ , and δ jointly determine ADANA’s evolving first-moment timescale. Similarly, optimizing AdamW’s β_2 at fixed β_1 does not test whether its first- and second-moment timescales should be transferred together. We have separately studied how ADANA’s optimal weight-decay coefficient scales with training horizon at a fixed batch size, but not how it changes across batch sizes. Additional batch-conditioned weight-decay sweeps could therefore test whether weight-decay transfer contributes to the observed performance differences.

Finally, in language model training, each batch element is a sequence rather than an independent token, making the appropriate notion of effective batch size ambiguous. One natural measure is the total number of tokens processed per update, $B \times L$. However, tokens within the same sequence share context and are likely more correlated than tokens drawn from different batch elements. Two configurations with the same $B \times L$ may therefore have different gradient noise: increasing B while shortening L may provide more independent information than decreasing B while lengthening L . Comparing different (B, L) factorizations at matched tokens per update would help identify which notion of batch size governs optimizer performance.

Disentangling these mechanisms requires complementary experimental slices: varying the training horizon at fixed batch isolates dependence on sequential updates; varying batch at fixed update count probes the effect of batch and gradient noise; and varying batch at fixed tokens measures the operational efficiency tradeoff. Comparing different (B, L) factorizations at matched tokens per update would further test whether the relevant quantity is tokens per update or the effective number of independent sequences. The present experiment should therefore be interpreted as an observation about this fixed-token, fixed-sequence-length slice rather than as a general batch scaling law for ADANA.




Figure 26: **AdamW and LaProp remain close at matched β_1 .** We compare $\beta_1 \in \{.90, .95\}$ at fixed $\beta_2 = .98$, independently sweeping the base learning rate for every optimizer- β_1 -OT coordinate. Left: best validation loss. Right: token multiplier relative to AdamW with $\beta_1 = .90$ and $\beta_2 = .98$.

J PRECONDITIONER ORDER IN FIXED- AND SCHEDULED-MEMORY OPTIMIZERS

In this section, we propose the LADANA optimizer, which first applies adaptive preconditioning to each gradient and then applies the DANA log-time momentum rule. LADANA can therefore be viewed as an RMSProp-style preconditioner followed by DANA, reversing the order of preconditioning and momentum accumulation used by ADANA.

The first scientific question is whether ADANA requires unpreconditioned gradient-scale information to outscale across the overtraining axis. ADANA accumulates raw gradients in a memory whose duration grows throughout training and applies the current adaptive preconditioner only after this accumulation. Changes in gradient magnitude across coordinates and training time therefore remain represented in its long-memory state. LADANA instead normalizes each gradient before it enters that state. If ADANA’s advantage comes primarily from the growing memory clock, LADANA should preserve its improving token efficiency at longer horizons. If raw gradient magnitudes contain information that the mechanism relies on, preconditioning before accumulation may weaken the advantage. Comparing ADANA and LADANA therefore tests whether log-time momentum can produce outscaling when applied to preconditioned gradients.

The second scientific question is how preconditioner ordering affects stability—in particular, whether LADANA has stability advantages over ADANA. LaProp motivates normalization-first ordering by identifying a potentially destabilizing interaction in Adam: Adam accumulates raw gradients in its momentum buffer and then preconditions the entire buffer using the current second-moment estimate. Past gradients are therefore rescaled using statistics from a later point in training, which can be problematic when the gradient distribution changes. LaProp instead normalizes each gradient using its contemporaneous second-moment estimate before storing it in momentum, decoupling the momentum and adaptivity time scales and remaining stable in hyperparameter regimes where Adam can diverge (Liu et al., 2020). This concern may be especially important for log-time momentum. Because DANA’s effective memory grows during training, a gradient spike or a mismatch between past gradients and the current preconditioner can remain influential for much longer than under conventional fixed-memory momentum. LADANA may therefore offer a stability advantage by normalizing unusual gradients before they enter the growing-memory state. Our present experiments compare final validation loss but do not yet directly establish this stability advantage.

J.1 ADAMW AND LAPROP ISOLATE PRECONDITIONER ORDER

AdamW and LaProp provide a fixed-memory comparison of the two possible preconditioner orderings. Let

$$v_t = \beta_2 v_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_2) \tilde{g}_t^{\odot 2}, \quad \hat{v}_t = \frac{v_t}{1 - \beta_2^t}. \quad (55)$$

AdamW first accumulates the raw gradient,

$$m_t = \beta_1 m_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_1) \tilde{g}_t, \quad d_t^{\text{AdamW}} = \frac{\hat{m}_t}{\sqrt{\hat{v}_t} + \epsilon}, \quad (56)$$

and therefore applies the current preconditioner to the complete momentum buffer.

LaProp reverses these operations (Liu et al., 2020). It first normalizes the current gradient,

$$z_t = \frac{\tilde{g}_t}{\sqrt{\hat{v}_t} + \epsilon}, \quad (57)$$

and then accumulates the normalized direction. We follow the official LaProp implementation, which places the scheduled learning rate inside the momentum state:

$$\mu_t = \beta_1 \mu_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_1) \eta_t z_t, \quad (58)$$

$$c_t = \beta_1 c_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_1) \eta_t, \quad d_t^{\text{LaProp}} = \frac{\mu_t}{c_t}. \quad (59)$$

For both optimizers, the outer update is

$$\theta_t = \theta_{t-1} - \eta_t \Gamma d_t - \omega_t \theta_{t-1}, \quad (60)$$

where Γ denotes the parameter-group learning rate scale and ω_t is the matched decoupled weight-decay transition. Thus, AdamW averages gradients and then normalizes, whereas LaProp normalizes each gradient using the second-moment estimate available when it is observed and then averages the resulting directions.

Figure 26 compares the two optimizers at matched $\beta_1 \in \{0.90, 0.95\}$, fixed $\beta_2 = 0.98$, and the same uniform-WD prescription. We independently sweep the base learning rate for every optimizer, momentum, and OT coordinate. AdamW and LaProp remain close across the measured horizons. LaProp with $\beta_1 = 0.95$ has a modest advantage at the shorter horizons, but reversing the preconditioner order does not produce a separation that grows systematically with OT.

This comparison establishes the fixed-memory control for the experiments below: changing preconditioner order alone has only a modest effect on final validation loss performance under these treatments. It does not determine whether preconditioned gradients can support outscaling from log-time momentum, because both AdamW and LaProp retain a horizon-independent first-moment window. The corresponding scheduled-memory comparison is therefore between ADANA and LADANA.

J.2 LADANA APPLIES DANA AFTER PRECONDITIONING

We now consider normalization-first ordering for log-time momentum. For the log- v variant of LADANA, the second-moment state follows the same log-time update as ADANA,

$$v_t = (1 - \Delta_t) v_{t-1} + \Delta_t \tilde{g}_t^{\odot 2}, \quad \Delta_t = \frac{\delta}{\delta + t}. \quad (61)$$

Let P_t denote the elementwise linear operator

$$P_t x = \frac{x}{\sqrt{v_t} + \epsilon}, \quad (62)$$

and define the gradient normalized at the time it is observed as $z_t = P_t \tilde{g}_t$. LADANA applies the DANA memory update to these preconditioned gradients,

$$n_t = (1 - \Delta_t) n_{t-1} + \Delta_t z_t, \quad (63)$$

$$d_t^{\text{LADANA}} = g_2 z_t + g_3 \chi_t n_t, \quad \chi_t = (t + 1)^{1-\kappa} + 1, \quad (64)$$

with $n_0 = v_0 = 0$. The scalar learning rate remains outside this state recursion.

This notation makes the reversal relative to ADANA explicit. If m_t is ADANA’s raw-gradient memory, its direction can be written as

$$d_t^{\text{ADANA}} = g_2 P_t \tilde{g}_t + g_3 \chi_t P_t m_t. \quad (65)$$

The two optimizers therefore share the same direct-gradient channel. Their long-memory channels differ: ADANA stores each unpreconditioned gradient and applies the current preconditioner P_t to the complete memory, whereas LADANA stores $P_s \tilde{g}_s$ using the preconditioner available when the gradient was observed. More precisely, define

$$w_{t,s} = \Delta_s \prod_{r=s+1}^t (1 - \Delta_r). \quad (66)$$

Then

$$d_t^{\text{LADANA}} - d_t^{\text{ADANA}} = g_3 \chi_t \sum_{s=1}^t w_{t,s} (P_s - P_t) \tilde{g}_s. \quad (67)$$

Thus the two rules coincide when the adaptive preconditioner is constant over the effective memory window, and remain close when it changes little over that window. Equation 67 isolates preconditioner order rather than introducing a different direct-gradient update.

We also consider a fixed- v ablation. In this variant,

$$r_t = \beta_2 r_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_2) \tilde{g}_t^{\odot 2}, \quad (68)$$

$$\hat{r}_t = \frac{r_t}{1 - \beta_2^t}, \quad z_t = \frac{\tilde{g}_t}{\sqrt{\hat{r}_t} + \epsilon}, \quad (69)$$

while n_t retains the log-time update above. This separates the effect of preconditioner order from the effect of scheduling the denominator memory. Unless otherwise stated, our LADANA experiments use log-time memory for both n_t and v_t , with $g_2 = 1$, $g_3 = 8$, $\kappa = 0.85$, $\delta = 8$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-15}$; fixed- v LADANA instead uses $\beta_2 = 0.98$ for the denominator memory.

J.3 LADANA RESULTS AND LIMITATIONS

Under uniform weight decay, LADANA with log-time second-moment memory performs similarly to ADANA through $128\times$ OT on the 51M model and slightly underperforms it at $256\times$. The two optimizers also remain close across the shorter horizons measured for the 124M and 253M models. By contrast, fixed- v LADANA falls behind at long horizons on the 51M model. These results give a qualified positive answer to our first question: outscaling from log-time momentum can occur on preconditioned gradients, although scheduling the denominator memory appears important at long horizons.

Under log-time weight decay, LADANA performs similarly to ADANA through $64\times$ OT but deteriorates sharply at $128\times$. We cannot yet determine whether this reflects a mismatched weight-decay coefficient, an interaction between preconditioner order and log-time weight decay, or genuine instability of the combined treatment. In particular, we used the log-time weight-decay coefficient rule determined from experiments on the other optimizers (Appendix E.4) without performing a LADANA-specific weight-decay coefficient sweep. We therefore treat the $128\times$ result as an unresolved interaction rather than evidence that LADANA is inherently unstable.

We leave our second question about stability as future work, as final loss and learning rate sensitivity cannot establish whether LADANA is more robust to gradient spikes or changing gradient distributions. For the current results, our conclusion is narrower: preconditioning before accumulation preserves most of ADANA’s uniform-WD outscaling, while its stability properties and compatibility with log-time weight decay remain open.

The complete learning rate sweep evidence for the retained preconditioner-order comparisons appears in Figures 38, 39, and 40. Dashed curves and hollow markers are retained wherever the full ≤ 1 millipoint set reaches a tested learning rate boundary.




Figure 27: **Preconditioner order under uniform weight decay across model sizes.** The top row reports final validation loss for ADANA and LADANA with log-time denominator memory. The bottom row converts the same loss values to token multipliers relative to uniform-WD AdamW at each model size. The 51M panels additionally show the fixed- v LADANA ablation. Open circles indicate points whose learning rate sweeps were incomplete.




Figure 28: **Preconditioner order under log-time weight decay.** Final validation loss (left) and token multipliers relative to uniform-WD AdamW (right) for ADANA and LADANA with log-time denominator memory on the 51M model. Both treatments use the log-time weight-decay coefficient rule from Appendix E.4.

K MOMENTUM COOLDOWN FOR LOG-TIME MEMORY

K.1 MOTIVATION: LONG MEMORY CAN BECOME STALE DURING TERMINAL DECAY

Long memory improves gradient averaging, but reduces responsiveness to changes in the optimization trajectory. Under ADANA’s log-time rule, the momentum timescale grows approximately linearly with the number of optimizer updates. While the training dynamics change slowly, the optimizer can average over an increasingly long history without fixing one memory length for the entire run.

The same persistence may become undesirable during terminal learning rate decay. Although the learning rate is not stored in the momentum state, the buffer retains gradients evaluated at earlier parameter values reached using larger step sizes. When the learning rate changes faster than the momentum state can respond, substantial kernel mass remains on directions from an earlier optimization regime. We refer to this mismatch as stale memory: the stored gradients are not intrinsically invalid, but are old relative to the timescale on which the current update rule is changing.

This suggests a schedule-aware compromise: retain ADANA’s growing memory while the learning rate changes slowly, but shorten it once terminal decay becomes faster than the momentum response. Momentum cooldown implements this principle directly. We treat stale memory as its motivation rather than as an empirically established explanation of its gains.

K.2 DEFINITION OF MOMENTUM COOLDOWN

Let

$$\tau_{\text{mom},t} = \frac{1}{\Delta_t} = \frac{\delta + t}{\delta} \quad (70)$$

denote the momentum timescale of ADANA’s original log-time update. We define the local learning rate decay timescale as

$$\tau_{\eta,t} = \frac{\eta_t}{\eta_t - \eta_{t+1}} \quad (71)$$

whenever $\eta_{t+1} < \eta_t$, and set $\tau_{\eta,t} = \infty$ during constant or increasing portions of the schedule. Momentum cooldown replaces the original timescale with

$$\tau_{\text{CD},t} = \max(1, \min\{\tau_{\text{mom},t}, \tau_{\eta,t}\}), \quad \Delta_t^{\text{CD}} = \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{CD},t}}. \quad (72)$$

The cooled memory state therefore follows

$$m_t^{\text{CD}} = (1 - \Delta_t^{\text{CD}}) m_{t-1}^{\text{CD}} + \Delta_t^{\text{CD}} \tilde{g}_t. \quad (73)$$

Before the two timescales cross, $\tau_{\eta,t} \geq \tau_{\text{mom},t}$, so cooldown leaves the original log-time memory rule unchanged. During sufficiently rapid learning rate decay, it increases the weight placed on the current gradient and concentrates the momentum kernel on more recent updates. The construction depends only on relative changes in the learning rate and is therefore invariant to its overall scalar scale.

Because the standard ADANA implementation uses the same log-time coefficient for its first- and second-moment states, our principal ADANA treatment applies Δ_t^{CD} to both states. We separately examine which states should be cooled in the treatment-selection experiments below. Figure 29 shows how this rule changes the momentum timescale and the age distribution of the resulting kernel.

K.3 MOMENTUM COOLDOWN TREATMENT SELECTION

We distinguish two interventions on ADANA’s long-memory channel. *Memory-window cooldown* shortens the kernel used to update the long-memory state. *Long-memory contribution cooldown* leaves that kernel unchanged and instead multiplies the long-memory contribution $g_3 \chi_t m_t$ by $\min(1, \tau_{\eta}/\tau_{\text{mom}})$ during learning rate decay. The combined treatment applies both changes. For AdamW, we analogously apply the memory-window rule to the first moment, the second moment, or both moments.




Figure 29: **Mechanics of momentum cooldown.** We illustrate the exact responsive-memory rule used in our experiments for a representative $h8$ ADANA run at $128\times$ OT with cosine learning rate decay. Left: log-time momentum normally uses an increasingly long timescale. We define the learning rate decay timescale as $\eta_t/|\eta_{t+1} - \eta_t|$ and set the cooled momentum timescale to the minimum of this quantity and the original log-time momentum timescale. Right: the resulting median and 90th-percentile ages of the momentum kernel, defined as the shortest recent history containing 50% and 90% of its mass. Cooldown leaves the kernel unchanged earlier in training but makes it increasingly concentrated on recent gradients during terminal decay.

Cooling AdamW’s first moment improves validation loss by 2.30 millipoints at $8\times$ OT. Cooling both moments gives essentially the same improvement. By contrast, cooling only the second moment is unstable at every tested learning rate, producing validation losses from 15.2 to 42.9. This behavior is consistent with a response-time mismatch: the second-moment denominator becomes rapidly responsive during learning rate decay while the first-moment numerator continues to retain older gradients. Cooling both moments removes this mismatch and restores stable training, but provides no additional gain beyond cooling the first moment alone. We treat this explanation as a mechanistic interpretation rather than a demonstrated causal result.

For ADANA, memory-window cooldown improves validation loss by 11.47 millipoints. Tapering only the long-memory contribution improves loss by 0.92 millipoints, while combining that taper with memory-window cooldown improves loss by 6.13 millipoints. All three selected minima come from learning rate sweeps satisfying the interiority criterion. Thus shortening the memory window is the most effective tested intervention; tapering the long-memory contribution alone helps only modestly, and combining the two interventions does not improve on memory-window cooldown alone.

K.4 WHERE MOMENTUM COOLDOWN HELPS AND WHAT REMAINS OPEN

We show in Figure 6 that momentum cooldown provides a small benefit to AdamW but a substantial improvement to ADANA, consistent with our motivation that growing log-time memory can become stale during terminal learning rate decay. The ADANA benefit is consistent across all three model sizes.

Moreover, in our experiments on the 51M parameter model, momentum cooldown and log-time weight decay provide complementary gains. Each intervention improves long-horizon ADANA, and combining them produces the lowest validation losses at the longest measured horizons. Figure 6 reports these final-loss comparisons; Figures 41 and 43 provide the underlying learning rate sweeps.

Several questions remain open. We have not tested analogous cooldown rules for Muon or SOAP, and the present rule has only been evaluated with cosine decay to zero. We set the crossover at the unit timescale ratio, but have not established that this threshold is optimal. Final validation losses also cannot determine whether downweighting older gradient history is the causal mechanism behind the improvement. Our present conclusion is therefore narrower: shortening ADANA’s memory

Optimizer	Cooldown target	Best base LR	Validation loss	Gain vs. standard (mpt)
AdamW	None	$2^{-7.0}$	3.430405	0.00
AdamW	First moment	$2^{-7.0}$	3.428106	+2.30
AdamW	Second moment	—	Unstable	—
AdamW	First and second moments	$2^{-7.0}$	3.428112	+2.29
ADANA	None	$2^{-12.5}$	3.432476	0.00
ADANA	Memory window	$2^{-12.5}$	3.421004	+11.47
ADANA	Long-memory contribution	$2^{-12.5}$	3.431558	+0.92
ADANA	Window and contribution	$2^{-12.5}$	3.426349	+6.13

Table 11: **Momentum cooldown treatment selection at $8 \times \text{OT}$.** Each reported minimum comes from an independent base learning rate sweep, and gains are measured relative to the same optimizer without cooldown.

during terminal decay produces a substantial empirical gain, while the optimal rule and its mechanism remain unresolved.

L COMPLETE HYPERPARAMETER SWEEPS

This section collects the complete learning rate and nested-hyperparameter sweeps that support figures elsewhere in the paper. Solid curves with filled markers indicate sweeps that satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion in Section B.5; dashed curves with hollow markers indicate sweeps whose within-one-millipoint set reaches a tested boundary.

L.1 LEARNING RATE SCHEDULE SELECTION

Optimizer	Fixed momentum treatment	c at $1\times$	c at $8\times$	c at $32\times$
AdamW	$\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95$	$\{2, 4, 8, 16\}$	$\{4, 8, 16, 32\}$	$\{16, 32, 64, 128\}$
ADANA	$g_3 = 8, \kappa = 0.85$	$\{4, 8, 16\}$	$\{8, 16, 32, 64\}$	$\{16, 32, 64, 128\}$
Muon	$\beta = 0.95$	$\{2, 4, 8, 16\}$	$\{8, 16, 32, 64\}$	$\{16, 32, 64, 128\}$
SOAP	$\beta_1 = 0.95, \beta_2 = 0.99, \beta_{Sh} = 0.95$	$\{2, 4, 8, 16\}$	$\{4, 8, 16, 32, 64\}$	$\{16, 32, 64, 128\}$

Table 12: Fixed momentum treatments and coefficients of the uniform WD schedule for the linear-to-zero and cosine-to-zero comparison on the 51M parameter model. At every listed coefficient, each schedule receives a separate base learning rate sweep.




Figure 30: **Base learning rate sweeps at each uniform WD coefficient on the 51M parameter model with linear decay to zero.** Each colored curve holds the WD coefficient fixed while varying the base learning rate; stars mark the minimum final validation loss within each sweep. Momentum hyperparameters are AdamW ($\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95$), ADANA ($g_3 = 8, \kappa = 0.85$), Muon ($\beta = 0.95$), and SOAP ($\beta_1 = 0.95, \beta_2 = 0.99, \beta_{Sh} = 0.95$). All 48 displayed sweeps satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion.




Figure 31: **Base learning rate sweeps at each uniform WD coefficient on the 51M parameter model with cosine decay to zero.** Each colored curve holds the WD coefficient fixed while varying the base learning rate; stars mark the minimum final validation loss within each sweep. Solid lines with filled markers denote sweeps that satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion. Momentum hyperparameters are AdamW ($\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95$), ADANA ($g_3 = 8, \kappa = 0.85$), Muon ($\beta = 0.95$), and SOAP ($\beta_1 = 0.95, \beta_2 = 0.99, \beta_{Sh} = 0.95$). These sweeps provide the uniform WD grid used in the learning rate schedule comparison. All 48 displayed sweeps satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion.

L.2 WEIGHT DECAY SWEEPS

The WD schedule comparison and coefficient scaling analysis in Appendix E use nested sweeps. At every WD coefficient, we first select the minimum of an independently extended base learning rate sweep; only after each contributing learning rate sweep satisfies the interiority criterion in Section B.5 do we compare coefficients. The summary figures in Appendix E collapse this pointwise evidence by minimizing over the learning rate. Here we report the complete underlying grids.

Table 13 gives the fixed momentum treatment and tested coefficients for every optimizer, WD schedule, and OT factor.

Optimizer	Fixed momentum treatment	WD coefficient c			
		$1\times$ OT	$8\times$ OT	$32\times$ OT	$64\times$ OT
<i>Uniform WD</i>					
AdamW	$\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.98$	4, 8, 16	8, 16, 32	16, 32, 64, 128	16, 32, 64, 128
ADANA	$g_3 = 8, \kappa = 0.85$	4, 8, 16	8, 16, 32, 64	16, 32, 64, 128	16, 64, 128, 256
Muon	$\beta = 0.98$	4, 8, 16	8, 16, 32, 64	16, 32, 64, 128	16, 32, 64, 128, 256
SOAP	$\beta_1 = 0.95, \beta_2 = 0.98, \beta_{\text{Sh}} = 0.95$	4, 8, 16	$8, 16, 16\sqrt{2}, 32$	$16, 32, 32\sqrt{2}, 64$	8, 32, 64, 128
<i>Log-time WD</i>					
AdamW	$\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.98$	1, 2, 4, 8	$1, 2, 4, 4\sqrt{2}, 8$	1, 2, 4, 8, 16	2, 8, 16, 32, 64
ADANA	$g_3 = 8, \kappa = 0.85$	1, 2, 4, 8	1, 2, 4, 8, 16	1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32	2, 8, 16, 32, 64
Muon	$\beta = 0.98$	1, 2, 4, 8	1, 2, 4, 8	1, 2, 4, 8, 16	2, 4, 8, 16, 32
SOAP	$\beta_1 = 0.95, \beta_2 = 0.98, \beta_{\text{Sh}} = 0.95$	1, 2, 4, 8	$2, 4, 4\sqrt{2}, 8$	1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32	1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32

Table 13: WD coefficient grids for the uniform and log-time WD sweep figures. Each OT cell lists the coefficients c included in the corresponding base learning rate sweeps.

Log-time WD coefficient sweeps. Figure 33 reports the corresponding $1 \times$ -anchored log-time WD coefficient sweeps.




Figure 32: **Base learning rate sweeps at each uniform WD coefficient on the 51M parameter model with cosine decay to zero.** Columns are optimizers and rows are OT factors. Each colored curve holds c fixed; circles are measured learning rates and black-edged stars mark the minimum within each sweep. All 60 sweeps satisfy the interiority criterion in Section B.5. Facets use independent vertical ranges to expose the local learning rate basin; upward triangles retain observed losses above a facet’s displayed range.




Figure 33: **Base learning rate sweeps at each log-time WD coefficient on the 51M parameter model with cosine decay to zero.** Columns are optimizers and rows are OT factors. Each colored curve holds c fixed; circles are measured learning rates and black-edged stars mark the minimum within each sweep. We use the $1\times$ -anchored offset $\tau = 0.1S_{1\times}$. All 77 sweeps satisfy the interi-
 ority criterion in Section B.5. Facets use independent vertical ranges, and upward triangles retain
 observed losses above a facet’s displayed range.

L.3 UNIFORM-WD AND LOG-TIME-WD SCALING SWEEPS

Figures 34 and 35 show every independently tuned learning rate sweep used in the uniform-WD and log-time-WD scaling comparisons.




Figure 34: **Complete uniform-WD learning rate sweeps across model sizes and OT factors.** Columns are optimizers and rows are model sizes; colors identify OT factor. The treatment uses cosine decay to zero and uniform WD with $c(f) = 8\sqrt{f}$. Circles are measured learning rates and black-edged stars mark the selected minimum within each sweep. All 76 displayed sweeps satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion.




Figure 35: **Complete log-time-WD learning rate sweeps across model sizes and OT factors.** Columns are optimizers and rows are model sizes; colors identify OT factor. The treatment uses cosine decay to zero and the $1\times$ -anchored log-time WD coefficient $a(f) = 2\sqrt{f}$. Circles are measured learning rates and black-edged stars mark the selected minimum within each sweep. All 72 displayed sweeps satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion.

L.4 FIXED-MEMORY SWEEPS

Figures 36 and 37 report the complete learning rate sweeps underlying the memory-tuning results in Appendix F and Figure 3.




Figure 36: **Complete fixed-memory learning rate sweeps from $1\times$ through $8\times$ OT.** Columns are optimizers, rows are OT factors, and colors identify effective memory. Black-edged stars mark the minimum of each learning rate sweep. Solid curves with filled markers denote sweeps satisfying the one-millipoint interiority criterion; dashed curves with hollow markers denote sweeps whose within-one-millipoint set reaches a tested boundary.




Figure 37: **Complete fixed-memory learning rate sweeps from $16\times$ through $128\times$ OT.** The layout and visual encoding match Figure 36. Open circles indicate points whose learning-rate sweeps were incomplete. The sweep for SOAP at $128\times$ OT with $M = 2560$ is incomplete.

L.5 PRECONDITIONER-ORDER SWEEPS

Figures 38–40 report the learning rate sweep evidence underlying the retained preconditioner-order comparisons in Appendix J. Momentum cooldown treatments are kept in the separate sweeps below.




Figure 38: **Complete learning rate sweeps for the fixed-memory preconditioner-order comparison.** Panels compare AdamW and LaProp at $\beta_1 \in \{.90, .95\}$, fixed $\beta_2 = .98$, and OT factors 1 through 64. Each curve is an independent base learning rate sweep. All 28 displayed sweeps satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion.




Figure 39: **Uniform-WD learning rate sweeps for preconditioner order across model sizes.** Rows are the 51M, 124M, and 253M models; columns are ADANA, LADANA with log-time denominator memory, and the fixed- v LADANA ablation (available only for the 51M model). Thirty-seven of 39 displayed sweeps satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion. Open circles indicate points whose learning-rate sweeps were incomplete. The incomplete sweeps are log- v LADANA at 51M/128 $\times$ and 124M/32 $\times$. ADANA is retained once as the visual reference for the two preconditioner-order treatments.




Figure 40: **Log-time-WD learning rate sweeps for h8 preconditioner order.** Panels compare ADANA and LADANA with log-time denominator memory across OT factors 1 through 128. Open circles indicate points whose learning rate sweeps were incomplete.

L.6 MOMENTUM COOLDOWN SWEEPS

Figures 41– 42 report the learning rate sweep evidence underlying the retained momentum-cooldown comparison in Figure 6.




Figure 41: **Complete uniform-WD learning rate sweeps for the momentum cooldown interventions.** Panels show the momentum-cooldown variants of AdamW and ADANA across OT factors 1 through 128. Corresponding standard-treatment sweeps appear in the primary-treatment and preconditioner-order sweeps and are not repeated here. All 16 displayed sweeps satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion.

Momentum cooldown treatment-selection sweeps. Figure 44 exposes the component-wise learning rate sweeps underlying Table 11.




Figure 42: **Large-model uniform-WD learning rate sweeps for ADANA with and without momentum cooldown.** Rows are the 124M and 253M parameter models, columns are the standard and momentum-cooldown treatments, and colors identify OT factor.




Figure 43: **Complete log-time-WD learning rate sweeps for the momentum cooldown intervention.** The panel shows ADANA with momentum cooldown across OT factors 1 through 128; the corresponding standard ADANA sweeps appear in the log-time-WD preconditioner sweep grid and are not repeated here. All eight displayed sweeps satisfy the one-millipoint interiority criterion.




Figure 44: **Learning rate sweeps for cooldown-component selection at $8\times$ OT.** Each panel overlays the independently swept component treatments for one optimizer. AdamW first-moment and both-moment cooldown are nearly coincident. The three second-moment-only AdamW observations have losses from 15.2 to 42.9 and are shown as capped upward triangles; they are instability outcomes rather than ordinary open minima. All other displayed selected minima satisfy the one-millipoint learning rate interiority rule.