

Scaling Laws for Multimodal Data Mixtures

Aditi Khandelwal^{1,*} Ayush K. Tarun^{2,*} Yixuan Xu³ Imanol Schlag³
Golnoosh Farnadi¹ Siva Reddy¹ Luke Zettlemoyer⁴ Antoine Bosselut²

¹MILA - Quebec AI Institute, McGill University ²EPFL ³ETH ⁴University of Washington

Abstract

Frontier AI systems are increasingly natively multimodal, jointly pretrained on multiple modalities, such as text, vision, and audio. However, the scientific understanding of the multimodal data mixtures used to pretrain these systems — how much of each modality to mix, and at what potential interference cost to the others — is largely absent or gatekept. In this work, we derive data mixing scaling laws for three modalities: text, vision, and audio. Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) increasingly adopt Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architectures, as MoEs scale efficiently and partially limit cross-modal interference. We therefore use MoEs to conduct 268 experiments ranging from 457M to 8.3B parameters, on up to 150 billion tokens. Our work leads to multiple actionable insights into multimodal data mixing for training MLLMs. First, compute optima are modality-specific: audio modality is model-heavy, favoring scaling parameters over tokens, while text and vision require balanced scaling of model size and data. Second, repeating vision or audio data beyond 2x yields negligible benefits. Finally, cross-modal interactions are highly asymmetric: vision strongly interferes with audio, whereas audio’s interference with learning text and vision is negligible. Overall, we provide a principled foundation for understanding the multimodal data mixtures needed to train frontier MLLMs.

1 Introduction

Frontier AI systems are increasingly natively multimodal [15, 47, 43, 39]. Yet details of how these systems are trained remain largely opaque, kept behind closed doors as trade secrets. Public scaling recipes [25, 19] are therefore often insufficient for practitioners training multimodal systems, where pretraining introduces additional design decisions: data mixtures, architectural choices, training strategies, and modality-specific algorithms. One trend that has stood out is the convergence toward **Mixture-of-Experts (MoE)** models for multimodality [9, 39, 15, 47, 43]. This convergence is natural for two reasons. First, MoEs scale capacity through sparse activation [72], decoupling parameter count from compute and making it tractable to grow models large enough to serve heterogeneous signals. Second, sparse routing permits modality-specific expert allocation, allowing parameters to specialize to distinct modalities and partially insulate them from one another [61, 32, 29]. Despite this architectural advantage, jointly training text, vision, and audio still introduces non-trivial optimization complexity [48, 14], as modalities have distinct feature representations, follow heterogeneous training dynamics [30], and compete for the same finite parameter capacity and routing budget, often interfering with one another.

Data imbalance further compounds this capacity competition. In realistic multimodal pretraining mixtures, modalities differ substantially in dataset availability, filtering quality, and target mixture proportions [73, 62, 60]. As a result, non-text modalities such as vision and audio are often trained in data-constrained regimes, where maintaining a desired mixture may require repeated passes over the

*Equal contribution. †Corresponding author (aditi.khandelwal@mila.quebec, ayush.tarun@epfl.ch).




Figure 1: Predicted loss curves and observed values for OOD training scales and regimes: (i) *Val Scratch*: a 12.6B-A3.8B MoE trained for 200B tokens (185B text, 7.5B vision, 7.5B audio); (ii) *Val non-text-heavy CPT*: continual pretraining (CPT) of a text-only 8.3B-A2.6B MoE on 50B tokens (10B text, 20B (unique 10B $\times$ 2) each vision and audio); and (iii) *Val text-heavy CPT*: CPT of text-only 8.3B-A2.6B MoE on 40B text, 5B each of vision and audio. Observed points are very close to the predicted curves. The only exception is the text loss in (ii), where CPT causes a significant spike in text loss (Appendix H) and does not stabilize, unlike (iii), which has a higher text proportion.

same examples. While the repetition tolerance of text is well characterized [40], the saturation point for repeated vision or audio data remains unknown. Prior work [1, 57, 53, 36, 60] has begun to address parts of this picture, including bimodal text–vision interactions and individual continuous-modality scaling laws. However, a *unified* framework that jointly handles text, vision, and audio under realistic, repetition-aware, data-imbalanced mixtures is still missing.

In this work, we introduce a unified scaling-law framework for native multimodal MoE pretraining that models a given target modality’s validation loss in the presence of other modalities. Starting from the standard Chinchilla form [19], our formulation accounts for three effects that arise in realistic multimodal mixtures. First, we model *directional cross-modal transfer*, capturing when a source modality helps or hurts a target modality. Second, we model *mixture-dependent capacity sharing*, capturing the loss of effective capacity when modalities compete for the same finite parameter and routing budget in MoE architectures. Third, we model *repetition saturation*, capturing the diminishing utility of repeated passes over scarce non-text data. The resulting law reduces to the standard Chinchilla form in the unimodal limit and generalizes prior bimodal interaction laws [1] to directional, unbalanced, and repetition-aware mixtures. We fit the law on a controlled suite of MoE pretraining runs spanning 457M to 8.3B total parameters and up to 150B tokens per run, totaling roughly 300k GH200-hours. Collectively, our experiments yield several insights for native multimodal pretraining:

- **Compute allocation is modality-specific.** Text and vision should be scaled by growing parameters and tokens in tandem. Audio follows a more model-heavy regime, where extra compute is better spent on increasing capacity than adding more audio tokens.
- **Cross-modal transfer is asymmetric.** Text and vision interfere with one another, whereas audio’s interference with both modalities is negligible, making it an effectively inert addition to the data mixture. Vision is the most disruptive source, especially for audio, making it the most expensive modality to mix in when audio is also an evaluation target.
- **Repeated non-text data saturates quickly.** The repetition tolerance observed for text [40] does not directly carry over to continuous modalities: vision and audio both show sharply diminishing returns after roughly two passes over the same data. Beyond this point, compute is better spent on additional unique data or larger models.

Finally, we show that the fitted law extrapolates beyond its training distribution (Figure 1) to larger compute budgets, out-of-distribution (OOD) mixture compositions, and continual pretraining. Across three held-out runs, 8 of 9 modality loss predictions match observed validation loss within 2.6%, and 6 of 9 within 1.1% with a correlation > 0.9 .




Figure 2: Validation loss as a function of model size for text+vision (left) and text+audio (right) training at 100B total tokens, averaged across modality-specific evaluation sets. Solid curves correspond to training with 5B–25B *unique* non-text tokens; dashed purple curves repeat 5B unique tokens 2–5 times. At every model scale, repeating data 5 $\times$ underperforms training on roughly 15B unique tokens, motivating the diminishing-returns form of $\phi_m(r_m)$ in Equation 4.

2 Method

To systematically study how modalities interact during their joint optimization, we introduce a unified multimodal scaling framework for text, vision, and audio. Standard neural scaling laws model the validation loss of a target modality as a predictable power-law function of model capacity and token count [25, 19] as follows:

$$L_m(N, D_m) = E_m + \frac{A_m}{N^{\alpha_m}} + \frac{B_m}{D_m^{\beta_m}} \quad (1)$$

Here, $m \in \mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{M} = \{\text{text, vision, audio}\}$. Let N denote the total parameter count of the model (including non-active parameters and embeddings [44]), D_m the number of sampled training tokens from modality m . The first term E_m captures the irreducible loss for modality m , while the second and third terms capture finite-capacity and finite-data effects, respectively [25, 19].

We extend this formulation to capture three factors: (1) data-based positive transfer or interference between modalities, (2) parametric capacity competition between modalities, and (3) the penalty incurred by oversampling scarce modality data. In this regard, we propose replacing N and D_m with $N_{\text{eff}}^m = N_{\text{eff}}(N, m, \hat{\mathcal{M}})$, and $D_{\text{eff}}^m = D_{\text{eff}}(D_m, \hat{\mathcal{M}})$ which denote the effective number of parameters and tokens, also taking into account the multimodal data mixture $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$. Intuitively, N_{eff} measures how much of the MoE’s parameters are effectively available to a target modality once it must be shared with other modalities, while D_{eff} measures how many of that modality’s tokens are effectively informative once we discount for the diminishing returns of data repetition and credit (or debit) it for cross-modal transfer from the co-trained modalities. Concretely, we make *one* modification to the N^{α_m} term (Section 2.1) and *two* modifications to the $D_m^{\beta_m}$ term (Section 2.2, covering data repetition and cross-modal transfer). The following sections describe the construction of both of these.

2.1 Mixture-dependent Capacity Sharing $N_{\text{eff}}^{(m)}$

Multimodal training changes how a finite model allocates its representational and optimization capacity: non-target modalities consume optimizer steps, gradients, routing bandwidth, and shared representation capacity. This forced sharing can hurt the target modality even when the source modality contains useful information [1], a phenomenon analogous to capacity competition in multi-task learning [11, 55]. To capture the cost of sharing finite MoE capacity, we replace N with a target-specific effective capacity parameterized by the **capacity-sharing coefficient** c_m :

$$N_{\text{eff}}^{(m)} = N \exp(c_m(1 - h_m)). \quad (2)$$

Here, $h_m = D_m / \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{M}} D_\ell$ is the mixture weight of modality m and therefore, $1 - h_m = \sum_{k \neq m} h_k$ denotes the total non-target mixture mass. The coefficient c_m is a signed log-capacity coefficient. If $c_m < 0$, then non-target data reduces the effective capacity available to modality m (we term this *capacity-dilution*); if $c_m > 0$, non-target data has a beneficial effect based on shared capacity.

The exponential form follows from a simple constant fractional change assumption on the log-capacity scale: $\partial \log N_{\text{eff}}^{(m)} / \partial (1 - h_m) = c_m$. Thus each additional unit of non-target mixture mass changes the effective target capacity by a fixed multiplicative factor. It also ensures $N_{\text{eff}}^{(m)} > 0$ and yields a simple first-order interaction term. Indeed,

$$\frac{A_m}{(N_{\text{eff}}^{(m)})^{\alpha_m}} = \frac{A_m}{N^{\alpha_m}} \exp[-\alpha_m c_m (1 - h_m)] \approx \frac{A_m}{N^{\alpha_m}} [1 - \alpha_m c_m (1 - h_m)], \quad (3)$$

where the approximation holds when $|c_m|$ is small. If $c_m < 0$, this adds a positive penalty $\alpha_m |c_m| (1 - h_m) A_m / N^{\alpha_m}$, **which vanishes as model capacity increases**. This is consistent with the intuition that increasing model capacity can attenuate negative transfer because of capacity [1].

We use the scalar $c_m (1 - h_m)$, instead of the directional capacity matrix $\sum_{k \neq m} u_{k \rightarrow m} h_k$, as the formulation with bidirectional capacity overfits on our limited-scale data (See Appendix G for comparison).

2.2 Effective Target-Modality Data $D_{\text{eff}}^{(m)}$

We hypothesize two factors that move $D_{\text{eff}}^{(m)}$ away from the raw unique-token count $D_{\text{uniq}}^{(m)}$: a within-modality *repetition* factor $\phi_m(r_m)$ capturing the diminishing returns of re-passing the same examples, and a between-modality *transfer* factor $\exp(\sum_{k \neq m} v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k)$ capturing help (or interference) from co-trained modalities.

Repetition-aware target data. In real-world mixtures, modalities like audio are seen multiple times while text is seen only once. To model the diminishing returns of data repetition, let $D_{\text{uniq}}^{(m)}$ be the number of unique tokens from modality m and $r_m = D_m / D_{\text{uniq}}^{(m)} \geq 1$ be the repetition ratio. We define the repetition-aware effective target-modality data, $D_m^r = D_{\text{uniq}}^{(m)} \phi_m(r_m)$, where $\phi_m(r_m)$ is a return-on-repetition function. $\phi_m(r_m)$ should ideally encode the following: the first pass over unique data is fully valuable ($\phi_m(1) = 1$), repeated passes still help ($\phi'_m(r) > 0$), but the marginal value of each additional repeat decays ($\phi''_m(r) < 0$). Our repetition ablations (Figure 2) also show that repeated non-text data quickly falls behind fresh data, motivating an exponentially decaying marginal-utility model for ϕ_m . We therefore use the following formulation, inspired by similar prior formulations [40, 34]:

$$\phi_m(r_m) = 1 + R_m^* \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{r_m - 1}{R_m^*}\right) \right), \quad (4)$$

where $R_m^* > 0$ is a modality-specific repetition scale. This form would imply that as $r_m \rightarrow \infty$, $\phi_m(r_m) \rightarrow 1 + R_m^*$. Thus, R_m^* can be interpreted as the maximum number of additional fresh-data-equivalent epochs available through repetition.

Directional cross-modal transfer. Next, we model how the presence of a source modality k 's data alters the learning efficiency of a target modality m . A natural starting point is an additive effective-data model (assuming no repetition) [34],

$$D_m^t = D_m + \sum_{k \neq m} \tau_{k \rightarrow m} D_k, \quad (5)$$

where $\tau_{k \rightarrow m} > 0$ indicates positive transfer and $\tau_{k \rightarrow m} < 0$ indicates interference. However, for negative $\tau_{k \rightarrow m}$, additive effective data can become non-positive in highly skewed mixtures ($|D_k| \gg |D_m|$), making the power-law term ill-defined. This is especially problematic when a scarce target modality is trained with a large amount of non-target modality data.

To preserve the interpretation of transfer while guaranteeing positivity, we model transfer on the log-effective-data scale:

$$\log D_m^t = \log D_m + \sum_{k \neq m} v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k. \quad \Rightarrow \quad D_m^t = D_m \exp\left(\sum_{k \neq m} v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k\right). \quad (6)$$

Here, the variable $v_{k \rightarrow m}$ is the **directional transfer coefficient**. Using an exponential function ensures that our effective data count always remains strictly positive, even in the event of severe cross-modal interference (a highly negative $v_{k \rightarrow m}$) or a highly skewed data mixture. Positive $v_{k \rightarrow m}$ means that increasing the mixture weight of modality k increases the effective data for target modality m ; negative $v_{k \rightarrow m}$ means that modality k interferes with the learning of modality m .

This exponential form can also be viewed as a locally additive transfer model. Let $g_m = \sum_{k \neq m} v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k$, then for small transfer magnitudes, a first-order Taylor expansion gives:

$$D_m^t = D_m \exp(g_m) \approx D_m (1 + g_m + O(g_m^2)) = D_m + \sum_{k \neq m} v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k D_m + O(g_m^2) D_m. \quad (7)$$

Thus, to first order, the log-linear model behaves like an additive effective-data model with local additive coefficient $\tau_{k \rightarrow m}^{\text{local}} = v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k D_m / D_k$. When data are unrepeated, and total tokens are fixed, $D_k / D_m = h_k / h_m$, so $\tau_{k \rightarrow m}^{\text{local}} = v_{k \rightarrow m} h_m$. Hence the proposed parameterization is a first-order log-linear analogue of additive transfer, but it remains positive for all finite $v_{k \rightarrow m}$ and all mixture weights. Substituting Equation 6 into the data term gives

$$\frac{B_m}{(D_m^t)^{\beta_m}} = \frac{B_m}{D_m^{\beta_m}} \exp\left(-\beta_m \sum_{k \neq m} v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k\right) \approx \frac{B_m}{D_m^{\beta_m}} \left[1 - \beta_m \sum_{k \neq m} v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k\right], \quad (8)$$

where the approximation stands for small $|v_{k \rightarrow m}|$. Therefore, positive transfer reduces the finite-data loss term, while interference increases it.

Combining the repetition correction $\phi_m(r_m)$ from the previous paragraph with this directional transfer factor gives the full effective target-modality data,

$$D_{\text{eff}}^{(m)} = D_{\text{unq}}^{(m)} \phi_m(r_m) \exp\left(\sum_{k \neq m} v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k\right), \quad (9)$$

the data-side analogue of the capacity-sharing $N_{\text{eff}}^{(m)}$ from Section 2.1.

2.3 Unified Multimodal Scaling Law

Plugging $N_{\text{eff}}^{(m)}$ (Section 2.1) and $D_{\text{eff}}^{(m)}$ (Section 2.2) into Equation 1 yields the final law:

$$L_m = E_m + \frac{A_m}{[N \exp(c_m(1 - h_m))]^{\alpha_m}} + \frac{B_m}{\left[D_{\text{unq}}^{(m)} \phi_m(r_m) \exp\left(\sum_{k \neq m} v_{k \rightarrow m} h_k\right)\right]^{\beta_m}}. \quad (10)$$

This equation reduces to the standard unimodal law when $h_m = 1$, $h_k = 0$ for $k \neq m$, and $r_m = 1$. Our unified formulation also generalizes prior bimodal interaction laws [1] to directional, unbalanced, and repetition-aware mixtures. In Appendix B, we elaborate on how our log-linear capacity and transfer terms recover existing additive bimodal formulations under small-interaction approximations. We also ablate scaling law formulations without each of our proposed components and show that our formulation generalizes the best. The analysis can be found in Appendix G.

3 Experimental Setup

To empirically fit the variables in our unified scaling framework, we design a highly controlled suite of pretraining experiments across six Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) parameter scales (457M to 8.3B total parameters) on curated multimodal mixtures.

Models. Wan et al. [63] show in MoEs, the hidden dimension (d_{model}) is rank-preserving, meaning the relative performance ordering of models remains stable across compute and parameter scales for different d_{model} values. This allows us to vary model capacity via the hidden dimension and attribute downstream performance changes to multimodal data mixtures rather than architectural confounds. All models in our experiments utilize 32 layers, Grouped Query Attention [3] with 16 attention heads

and 4 key-value heads, 1 shared expert, 16 routable experts (of which 2 are chosen for each token), an expert hidden dimension of d_{model} , and untied embeddings. d_{model} varies from 384 to 2048, and SwiGLU activation is used along with QK-Norm for training stability [58]. More training details and exact model sizes can be found in Appendix D.

Tokenizers. For text, we use the tokenizer from Mistral-Nemo [2] (vocabulary size 131K), Emu3.5 tokenizer [10] for images (vocabulary size 131K) and WavTokenizer (vocabulary size 4K) [23] with a token rate of 40 tokens/second for audio.

Datasets and Evaluations. We use high-quality, permissive¹ datasets for each modality to maximize signal in our limited-scale experiments and ensure training stability. Our data composition deliberately mimics the distribution mixtures used in real-world MLLM pretraining, following the methodologies of Apertus for text [18], Chameleon for vision [58], and Voxtral for audio [33]. Briefly, the text corpus balances general knowledge, reasoning, and coding; the vision corpus employs both standard and reversed image-caption pairs to encourage bidirectional alignment; and the audio corpus mixes speech-only datasets with synthetic interleaved audio-text sequences. Our validation sets consist of 100 million token subsets drawn from these same distributions. Moreover, note that the vision and audio losses include the loss on text tokens from their respective validation sets. Full dataset breakdowns, sourcing details, and license filtering protocols are provided in Appendix E.

Hyperparameters. Following the Step Law [28], we perform a hyperparameter sweep over learning rates and batch sizes (detailed in Appendix C). Across all model scales and modalities, we find that applying a **1× Step Law learning rate** and a **2× Step Law batch size** consistently achieves the lowest or close to the lowest loss, and we use this configuration for all subsequent experiments. To check seed sensitivity, we ran the smallest and largest models for 30B tokens with three different seeds and observed $< 0.3\%$ variance in validation loss; we therefore conduct the rest of our experiments with a single seed.

Experiment Grid. For each model scale, we run a controlled grid of pretraining experiments designed to isolate the main factors in our scaling law: unimodal scaling, repetition saturation, pairwise cross-modal transfer, and three-way modality interference. All runs are trained in an autoregressive fashion and evaluated on the held-out modality-specific validation sets described above, and the resulting losses are used to jointly fit the scaling law in Section 2.3. Our grid consists of the following:

- **Unimodal scaling.** (1) Text-only baselines: 10B, 20B, 40B, and 100B tokens; (2) vision and audio baselines: 5B, 10B, 15B, 20B, and 25B tokens.
- **Text–vision and text–audio mixtures.** Text-skewed: (1) $D_{\text{text}} + D_{\text{vision}} = 100\text{B}$ with $D_{\text{vision}} \in \{5, 10, 15, 20, 25\}\text{B}$, and (2) $D_{\text{text}} + D_{\text{audio}} = 100\text{B}$ with $D_{\text{audio}} \in \{5, 10, 15, 20, 25\}\text{B}$. Balanced: (3) 25B+25B text–vision and (4) 25B+25B text–audio.
- **Repetition ablations.** (1) $D_{\text{text}} + D_{\text{vision}} = 100\text{B}$ with $D_{\text{unq}}^{\text{vision}} = 5\text{B}$ and $r_m \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$; (2) $D_{\text{text}} + D_{\text{audio}} = 100\text{B}$ with $D_{\text{unq}}^{\text{audio}} = 5\text{B}$ and $r_m \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$.
- **Vision–audio and three-way mixtures.** (1) 25B vision + 25B audio; (2) $D_{\text{text}} + D_{\text{vision}} + D_{\text{audio}} = 150\text{B}$ with $D_{\text{text}} = 100\text{B}$ and $(D_{\text{vision}}, D_{\text{audio}}) \in \{(45, 5), (41.5, 8.5), (37.5, 12.5), (33, 17), (25, 25)\}\text{B}$.

In the three-way mixtures, we allocate more vision than audio tokens because open-source vision datasets are typically much larger than audio ones (e.g., Mint-1T [5] vs. USP [13]), so realistic multimodal mixtures are likely vision-skewed.

Joint Scaling Law Fitting. To robustly fit the coefficients in Equation 10, we jointly optimize all modality-specific scaling exponents (α_m, β_m) , cross-modal transfer coefficients $v_{k \rightarrow m}$, and repetition penalties. We minimize the Huber loss [20] on log validation loss with the L-BFGS algorithm [42].

4 Unimodal Scaling Laws

We first examine the per-modality scaling behaviors, which lets us ask a basic resource-allocation question: for text, vision, and audio, should additional compute be spent on parameters, on tokens, or on scaling both in tandem?

¹CC BY 4.0 and similarly licensed

Different modalities reward different compute allocations: text and vision benefit roughly equally from extra parameters and tokens, whereas audio benefits more from parameters. Table 1 reports the irreducible loss E_m , the fitted scaling exponents (α_m, β_m) , and the induced compute-optimal exponents ($a = \beta_m/(\alpha_m + \beta_m)$, $b = \alpha_m/(\alpha_m + \beta_m)$), assuming $C \propto N \times D$, $N_{\text{opt}} \propto C^a$ and $D_{\text{opt}} \propto C^b$. Vision has the highest scaling exponents in our setup, with $\alpha_{\text{vis}} = 0.50$ and $\beta_{\text{vis}} = 0.51$ — both about 50% above the corresponding text values ($\alpha_{\text{text}} = \beta_{\text{text}} = 0.34$) and the audio model exponent ($\alpha_{\text{aud}} = 0.32$). In other words, increasing either model size or training tokens reduces vision loss faster than for the other two modalities. Moreover, as α_{vis} and β_{vis} are close, vision’s compute-optimal split is balanced ($a = 0.50$, $b = 0.50$). Audio has a more asymmetric profile ($\alpha_{\text{aud}} = 0.32$, $\beta_{\text{aud}} = 0.52$): the data term shrinks faster than the model term, and the induced compute-optimal split tilts toward model size ($N_{\text{opt}} \propto C^{0.62}$, $D_{\text{opt}} \propto C^{0.38}$). Text has $\alpha = \beta = 0.34$, giving a balanced compute-optimal split ($a = b = 0.50$) close to the original Chinchilla finding [19]; therefore, standard text-only recipes remain reasonable for the text portion of a multimodal mixture. Relative to existing scaling laws, while text and vision compute-optimality exponents look very similar, our audio exponents sit in a more model-heavy regime, plausibly reflecting (i) the architectural shift from dense to sparse MoE (compared to SODA [36]) and (ii) higher per-token information density in our high-quality, filtered corpora compared to web-scale data [21, 56].

Table 1: Fitted scaling-law exponents for each modality in comparison to prior art: Chinchilla [19] and TGL [59] for text, NMM [53] for vision, and SODA [36] for audio. We report the irreducible loss E_m , the scaling exponents α_m, β_m , and the induced compute-optimal exponents a, b .

Modality / Reference	E_m	α_m	β_m	$N_{\text{opt}} \propto C^a$	$D_{\text{opt}} \propto C^b$
Text	1.91	0.34	0.34	0.50	0.50
Vision	5.67	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.50
Audio	4.36	0.32	0.52	0.62	0.38
Chinchilla [19] (text-dense)	1.69	0.34	0.28	0.46	0.54
TGL [59] (text-MoE)	—	—	—	0.51	0.49
NMM [53] (vision-dense)	1.90	0.30	0.34	0.53	0.47
SODA [36] (audio-dense)	—	—	—	0.37	0.58

5 Modality Data Mixing: Transfer, Interference, and Repetition

After examining how each modality scales with parameters and data, we subsequently investigate the effects of the presence of non-target modalities. We primarily seek to answer the following three practical mixture-design questions: (1) *Which modalities help or hurt one another?* (2) *How quickly repeated non-text data saturates?* (3) *Which modalities are most sensitive to sharing model capacity?*

Cross-modal transfer is asymmetric: audio yields no significant transfer to text and vision, while vision is the most disruptive source, particularly for audio. Figure 3 (Left) presents the transfer coefficients $v_{k \rightarrow m}$ from our unified scaling law. The joint fit assigns audio a small positive transfer to both text ($v_{\text{audio} \rightarrow \text{text}} = 0.146$) and vision ($v_{\text{audio} \rightarrow \text{vision}} = 0.130$), but neither coefficient is stable across leave-one-scale-out folds as their standard deviations exceed their means ($v_{\text{audio} \rightarrow \text{text}} = 0.009 \pm 0.37$, $v_{\text{audio} \rightarrow \text{vision}} = 0.104 \pm 0.23$; Table 4). We therefore view audio as an inert modality for the other two modalities. In contrast, text and vision exhibit mutual negative interference, with $v_{\text{vision} \rightarrow \text{text}} = -0.558$ and $v_{\text{text} \rightarrow \text{vision}} = -0.583$.² This means, for a mixture containing 1T text tokens and 100B vision tokens, the 100B vision tokens effectively cancel the effect of 50.72B text tokens ($= -0.558 \times (1T/(1T + 100B)) \times 100B$, Section 2.2). Vision tokens induce an even more pronounced penalty on audio performance ($v_{\text{vision} \rightarrow \text{audio}} = -0.795$), whereas the interference by text tokens is relatively mild ($v_{\text{text} \rightarrow \text{audio}} = -0.102$). Practically, this makes vision the most expensive modality to mix in when audio and text are also evaluation targets.

Repeating non-text data beyond two epochs is rarely worth the compute. Our scaling laws give $R_{\text{vision}}^* = 1.00$ and $R_{\text{audio}}^* = 1.76$. Since $\phi_m(r_m) \rightarrow 1 + R_m^*$ as $r_m \rightarrow \infty$, this caps the value

²Interestingly, refitting the vision-side terms ($A, B, E, v_{\text{text} \rightarrow \text{vision}}, v_{\text{audio} \rightarrow \text{vision}}$) separately to image understanding (text-token loss on image-caption pairs) and image generation (image-token loss on caption-image pairs) yields $v_{\text{text} \rightarrow \text{vision}} = +0.400 / -0.716$ and $v_{\text{audio} \rightarrow \text{vision}} = +0.346 / +0.052$ (understanding/generation). Thus, both text and audio transfer positively to image understanding, and the negative joint text $\rightarrow$ vision transfer is driven primarily by image generation.




Figure 3: **(Left)** Cross-Modal Transfer Matrix of directional log-transfer coefficients $v_{k \rightarrow m}$; positive values (blue) indicate synergistic transfer and negative values (red) indicate interference. **(Middle, Right)** Marginal worth of each successive epoch for audio and vision, expressed as a fraction of one unique-data epoch. Repetition beyond two epochs yields steeply diminishing returns: by the third epoch, each new pass is worth $\leq 43.2\%$ unique data for audio and $\leq 23.2\%$ unique data for vision.

of repetition at about 2.0 fresh-data-equivalent epochs for vision and 2.76 for audio, which means repeating cannot substitute for more than roughly one extra epoch’s worth of fresh vision tokens or two of fresh audio tokens. Figure 3 (middle, right) makes this concrete by showing the worth of each successive epoch as a fraction of one unique-data epoch. For vision, the second epoch contributes 63% of a fresh epoch, the third 23%, and the fifth only 3%; audio decays more gradually, with the third epoch worth 43% and the fifth 14%. The same pattern is visible in Figure 2: the $5B \times 5$ (25B tokens seen) curves track below or at most match the 15B unique-token curves across the entire model-scale range, despite consuming 67% more sampled tokens. While these findings may seem in contrast to text, where up to four repetitions of data has previously been shown to suffer minimal degradation [40], recent work [22] finds that MoEs overfit more rapidly than dense models even when repeating text data, suggesting that the low repetition utility we observe may partly reflect model sparsity rather than being inherent to vision and audio. *Overall, beyond two epochs, the freed compute is therefore better spent on additional unique tokens or on a larger model.*

Audio is the modality most affected by capacity dilution, reinforcing the case for spending its compute budget on parameters rather than tokens. Beyond the data-side transfer captured by $v_{k \rightarrow m}$, modalities also compete for finite MoE parameter capacity through the capacity-sharing term in Eq. 2. Our joint fit gives $c_{\text{text}} = -0.46$, $c_{\text{vision}} = -0.85$, and $c_{\text{audio}} = -1.87$. All three are negative, so non-target modality data always shrinks the effective parameter budget available to a target modality.³ The magnitudes, however, differ markedly. To make these numbers concrete, consider a mixture in which the target accounts for 10% of training tokens ($1 - h_m = 0.9$). The effective parameter count for the target modality is $N_{\text{eff}}^{(m)} = N \exp(c_m \cdot 0.9)$, giving $\approx 0.66 N$ for text, $\approx 0.47 N$ for vision, and only $\approx 0.19 N$ for audio. With $|c_{\text{audio}}|$ roughly $4\times$ larger than text and $2\times$ larger than vision, *audio’s effective capacity is eroded most by the presence of other modalities* — consistent with its model-heavy, compute-optimal frontier in Table 1 ($a_{\text{audio}} = 0.62$). Both observations point in the same direction: audio benefits more than the other two modalities from additional parameters, whether they are added by scaling the model or recovered by reducing the share of non-audio data in the mixture. Vision sits between the two, while *text is the least capacity-sensitive, retaining most of its nominal capacity even in heavily skewed multimodal mixtures*. This might be another explanation for the modality-bias dynamics towards text described in prior work [70].

6 Validation at Scale and Practical Implications

Validation. We evaluate the fitted law on three held-out runs not used for fitting. The first is a 12.6B-A3.8B MoE trained for 200B tokens with a heavily text-skewed mixture of 185B text, 7.5B vision, and 7.5B audio tokens. This tests the fit of our law by extrapolating along three axes: model size, dataset size, and modality proportions. Our next two runs are continual pretraining (CPT) runs — a regime our fit has not seen — at the 8.3B-A2.6B scale, both starting from a text-only checkpoint

³We analyze the expert-routing patterns of our models in Appendix I to provide a mechanistic perspective on this observation. We find no modality-wise expert segregation, suggesting that the dilution arises from modalities sharing the same experts.

trained on 100B text tokens. The first CPT run trains 10B text + 20B ($10\text{B} \times 2$) vision + 20B ($10\text{B} \times 2$) audio. The second CPT run trains on 40B text + 5B vision + 5B audio. We use the total (100B + CPT) text tokens when using our law to predict losses for the CPT runs.

Across the nine modality-level predictions, predicted and observed validation losses are highly correlated (Pearson $r = 0.999$). Eight of nine predictions are within 2.6% of the observed loss, and six are within 1.1% (Appendix Table 10). These error rates and high correlation suggest that the fitted law extrapolates well beyond its training distribution across the three held-out settings we test.

Example usage. Let’s assume a practitioner wants to train a 120B-A29B MoE model on 15T tokens and $D_{\text{uniq}}^{\text{text}} = 15\text{T}$, $D_{\text{uniq}}^{\text{vision}} = 1\text{T}$, and $D_{\text{uniq}}^{\text{audio}} = 500\text{B}$. Given that all the modalities are equally important to the practitioner, we minimize $(1/|\mathcal{M}|) \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} (L_m - E_m)$, i.e., the sum of residuals for all modalities using SLSQP [27] and multistart [49, 50]. The results suggest using only 9.7T of the text tokens, repeating 1T unique vision tokens 2.6 times, and repeating 500B audio tokens 5.3 times for the optimal MLLM. The example illustrates how scaling laws fitted using our framework can be used to derive context-specific optimal training mixtures. In Section 9, we discuss why these fitted coefficients should not be treated as universal.

7 Related Works

Scaling Laws from Text to Multimodal. Foundational work in scaling establishes predictable power-law relationships between model capacity, compute, and dataset size for language models [25, 19]. Henighan et al. [17] show that such scaling behavior extends beyond text to autoregressive image, video, and image-text modeling. Recent work extends these laws to sparse architectures: Wan et al. [63] derive holistic MoE scaling laws to map compute budgets to optimal MoE configurations, Tian et al. [59] introduce an “Efficiency Leverage” metric linking expert activation and compute via power laws. Scaling laws have also been proposed for individual modalities: vision [53] and audio [36]. Beyond empirical fits, Caballero et al. [8] propose Broken Neural Scaling Laws capturing diverse tasks and modalities. Recent works have also presented scaling behaviors in mixed-modal systems, for example, Aghajanyan et al. [1] explored mixed-modal scaling laws unifying the contributions of modalities, deriving a bi-modal scaling law, while Tian et al. [60] and Shukor et al. [53] studied the scaling properties of native, early-fusion multimodal models under various data constraints. Sun et al. [57] propose extending decoder-based scaling laws to multimodal models via modality-specific tokenization efficiency. Zhang et al. [69] introduce MiCo, demonstrating emergent abilities across 10 modalities. Under data constraints, Muennighoff et al. [40] find that up to 4× repetition remains beneficial for text. However, similar systematic studies to identify the limits of repetition and saturation are lacking for non-text modalities.

Multimodal Interference and Sparse Architectures. Joint training across modalities often induces modality bias, with dense models over-relying on text [70, 64]. In architectures like Chameleon [58], this requires disproportionately large text token budgets to maintain performance. Sparse approaches mitigate this: Mixture-of-Transformers [31], MoMa [32], and Uni-MoE [29] route tokens to modality-aware experts, reducing negative transfer and compute. Zhang et al. [68] exploit modality asymmetry via specialized expert groups (AsyMoE), while Tong et al. [61] highlight vision–language scaling asymmetries in MoEs. MM1 [37] shows strong sensitivity to data mixtures and tokenization, but lacks a scaling formulation.

8 Conclusion

We introduce a unified scaling-law framework for native multimodal MoE pretraining that captures how the amount of data, model capacity, data repetition, and cross-modal interactions shape per-modality loss. Our work shows that multimodal scaling is a resource-allocation problem as well, in which modalities differ in how they benefit from data, compete for capacity, tolerate repetition, and affect one another. Our results lead to several broader takeaways. First, compute-optimal allocation is modality-specific: text and vision favor a uniform Chinchilla-style recipe, while audio benefits more from extra parameters than extra tokens. Second, cross-modal transfer is asymmetric: audio is inert with respect to text and vision, whereas text and vision interfere negatively with audio and each other. Third, both vision and audio saturate near two fresh-data-equivalent epochs, after which compute is better spent on more unique tokens or a larger model. Finally, audio is roughly 4× more sensitive

than text and $2\times$ more sensitive than vision to capacity sharing, consistent with its model-heavy compute-optimal frontier. More broadly, our work has practical implications for frontier MLLM development, where training recipes are often opaque and compute is too expensive for exhaustive trial-and-error search. Our work can also serve as a planning tool by estimating the cost of adding a modality, revealing when scarce data should be repeated versus replaced with model scaling, and exposing which modalities are likely to dominate or degrade the learned representations. Extending this framework to more modalities, tasks, architectures, and data distributions is a step toward more predictable and transparent multimodal training.

9 Limitations and Future Work

In Section 6, we show that our derived scaling law extrapolates to a larger from-scratch model and to a continual-pretraining setup. However, we leave validation at substantially larger scales ($\gg 10\text{B}$ active parameters, $> 1\text{T}$ tokens), extension to additional modalities such as long-form video, and a mechanistic analysis of why audio interferes so little with the other modalities to future work.

More broadly, because many design choices were held fixed in the experiments we ran to fit the coefficients of our scaling law, our contribution is best viewed as a framework for fitting context-specific multimodal scaling laws, rather than a universal law for prescribing exact training mixtures. For example, the fitted coefficients likely depend on our choice of tokenizers (i.e., Mistral-Nemo text tokens [2], Emu3.5 image tokens [10], WavTokenizer at 40 tokens/s for audio tokens [23]) and loss objective (next token prediction), and different choices could shift the absolute values of the exponents and coefficients. Moreover, different MoE architectural hyperparameters and degrees of dataset quality could influence the fitted coefficients. However, we expect the qualitative ordering between models or data mixtures to be robust to these variations [56]. Finally, although modeling bidirectional capacity sharing did not consistently improve extrapolation in our experiments (Table 9), additional training runs could improve the identifiability of these coefficients and, more generally, reduce the coefficient variance observed in Table 5.

Acknowledgements

We thank the members of the EPFL NLP Lab for their helpful discussions and feedback on our manuscript. We also gratefully acknowledge the support of the Swiss National Science Foundation (No. 215390), the AI2050 program at Schmidt Sciences (Grant #G-25-69783), Sony Group Corporation, and the Swiss National Supercomputing Center (CSCS) in the form of an infrastructure engineering and development project. This work was also supported as part of the Swiss AI Initiative by a grant from the Swiss National Supercomputing Centre (CSCS) under project IDs a139 and a145 on Alps. Furthermore, this research is with support from Google.org and the Google Cloud Research Credits program for the Gemini Academic Program. This project is also funded by the European Union (ERC, RESPECT-LM, 101222478). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. Finally, Ayush acknowledges support from the EPFL AI Center PhD Fellowship Program 2026.

References

- [1] Armen Aghajanyan, Lili Yu, Alexis Conneau, Wei-Ning Hsu, Karen Hambardzumyan, Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Omer Levy, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Scaling laws for generative mixed-modal language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 265–279. PMLR, 2023.
- [2] Mistral AI. Mistral NeMo, July 2024. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-nemo>.
- [3] Joshua Ainslie, James Lee-Thorp, Michiel De Jong, Yury Zemlyanskiy, Federico Lebrón, and Sumit Sanghai. GQA: Training generalized multi-query transformer models from multi-head checkpoints. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4895–4901, 2023.
- [4] Xiang An, Yin Xie, Kaicheng Yang, Wenkang Zhang, Xiuwei Zhao, Zheng Cheng, Yirui Wang, Songcen Xu, Changrui Chen, Chunsheng Wu, Huajie Tan, Chunyuan Li, Jing Yang, Jie Yu,

- Xiyao Wang, Bin Qin, Yumeng Wang, Zizhen Yan, Ziyong Feng, Ziwei Liu, Bo Li, and Jiankang Deng. LLaVA-OneVision-1.5: Fully Open Framework for Democratized Multimodal Training, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.23661>.
- [5] Anas Awadalla, Le Xue, Oscar Lo, Manli Shu, Hannah Lee, Etash Guha, Matt Jordan, Sheng Shen, Mohamed Awadalla, Silvio Savarese, et al. Mint-1t: Scaling open-source multimodal data by 10x: A multimodal dataset with one trillion tokens. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:36805–36828, 2024.
 - [6] Lucas Bandarkar, Chenyuan Yang, Mohsen Fayyaz, Junlin Hu, and Nanyun Peng. Multilingual routing in mixture-of-experts, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.04694>.
 - [7] Hui Bu, Jiayu Du, Xingyu Na, Bengu Wu, and Hao Zheng. AISHELL-1: An open-source Mandarin speech corpus and a speech recognition baseline. In *2017 20th Conference of the Oriental Chapter of the International Coordinating Committee on Speech Databases and Speech I/O Systems and Assessment (O-COCOSDA)*, pages 1–5, 2017. doi: 10.1109/ICSDA.2017.8384449.
 - [8] Ethan Caballero, Kshitij Gupta, Irina Rish, and David Krueger. Broken Neural Scaling Laws, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.14891>.
 - [9] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, and Ice Pasupat et al. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the Frontier with Advanced Reasoning, Multimodality, Long Context, and Next Generation Agentic Capabilities, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.06261>.
 - [10] Yufeng Cui, Honghao Chen, Haoge Deng, Xu Huang, Xinghang Li, Jirong Liu, Yang Liu, Zhuoyan Luo, Jinsheng Wang, Wenxuan Wang, Yueze Wang, Chengyuan Wang, Fan Zhang, Yingli Zhao, Ting Pan, Xianduo Li, Zecheng Hao, Wenxuan Ma, Zhuo Chen, Yulong Ao, Tiejun Huang, Zhongyuan Wang, and Xinlong Wang. Emu3.5: Native Multimodal Models are World Learners, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.26583>.
 - [11] Chris Fifty, Ehsan Amid, Zhe Zhao, Tianhe Yu, Rohan Anil, and Chelsea Finn. Efficiently identifying task groupings for multi-task learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:27503–27516, 2021.
 - [12] Daniel Galvez, Greg Diamos, Juan Ciro, Juan Felipe Cerón, Keith Achorn, Anjali Gopi, David Kanter, Maximilian Lam, Mark Mazumder, and Vijay Janapa Reddi. The People’s Speech: A Large-Scale Diverse English Speech Recognition Dataset for Commercial Usage. *CoRR*, abs/2111.09344, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.09344>.
 - [13] Daniel Galvez, Ryan Hileman, Rafael Mosquera, Juan Ciro, Kurt Bollacker, Peter Mattson, and David Kanter. Unsupervised People’s Speech (The Million Hour Audio Dataset). 2023. URL https://huggingface.co/datasets/MLCommons/peoples_speech.
 - [14] Itai Gat, Idan Schwartz, Alexander Schwing, and Tamir Hazan. Removing bias in multi-modal classifiers: Regularization by maximizing functional entropies. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3197–3208, 2020.
 - [15] Google. A new era of intelligence with Gemini 3, November 2025. URL <https://blog.google/products/gemini/gemini-3/>.
 - [16] Haorui He, Zengqiang Shang, Chaoren Wang, Xuyuan Li, Yicheng Gu, Hua Hua, Liwei Liu, Chen Yang, Jiaqi Li, Peiyang Shi, Yuancheng Wang, Kai Chen, Pengyuan Zhang, and Zhizheng Wu. Emilia: A Large-Scale, Extensive, Multilingual, and Diverse Dataset for Speech Generation. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, 33:4044–4054, 2025. ISSN 2998-4173. doi: 10.1109/taslp.2025.3612835. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TASLPRO.2025.3612835>.
 - [17] Tom Henighan, Jared Kaplan, Mor Katz, Mark Chen, Christopher Hesse, Jacob Jackson, Heewoo Jun, Tom B. Brown, Prafulla Dhariwal, Scott Gray, Chris Hallacy, Benjamin Mann, Alec Radford, Aditya Ramesh, Nick Ryder, Daniel M. Ziegler, John Schulman, Dario Amodei, and Sam McCandlish. Scaling Laws for Autoregressive Generative Modeling, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.14701>.

- [18] Alejandro Hernández-Cano, Alexander Hägele, Allen Hao Huang, Angelika Romanou, Antoni-Joan Solergibert, Barna Pasztor, Bettina Messmer, Dhia Garbaya, Eduard Frank Ďurech, Ido Hakimi, et al. Apertus: Democratizing open and compliant llms for global language environments. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2509, 2025.
- [19] Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Tom Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Erich Elsen, Jack W. Rae, Oriol Vinyals, and Laurent Sifre. Training Compute-Optimal Large Language Models, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.15556>.
- [20] Peter J Huber. Robust estimation of a location parameter. In *Breakthroughs in statistics: Methodology and distribution*, pages 492–518. Springer, 1992.
- [21] Maximilian Idahl, Benedikt Droste, Björn Plüster, and Jan Philipp Harries. propella-1: Multi-Property Document Annotation for LLM Data Curation at Scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.12414*, 2026.
- [22] Atindra Jha, Margaret Li, Jure Leskovec, Percy Liang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Data scarcity and model sparsity: Mixtures-of-experts overfit more to repeated data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.11917*, 2026.
- [23] Shengpeng Ji, Ziyue Jiang, Wen Wang, Yifu Chen, Minghui Fang, Jialong Zuo, Qian Yang, Xize Cheng, Zehan Wang, Ruiqi Li, et al. Wavtokenizer: an efficient acoustic discrete codec tokenizer for audio language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16532*, 2024.
- [24] Nikhil Kandpal, Brian Lester, Colin Raffel, Sebastian Majstorovic, Stella Biderman, Baber Abbasi, Luca Soldaini, Enrico Shippole, A. Feder Cooper, Aviya Skowron, Shayne Longpre, Lintang Sutawika, Alon Albalak, Zhenlin Xu, Guilherme Penedo, Loubna Ben, Elie Bakouch, John David, Honglu Fan, Dashiell Stander, Guangyu Song, Aaron Gokaslan, John Kirchenbauer, Tom Goldstein, Brian R, Bhavya Kailkhura, and Tyler Murray. The Common Pile v0.1: An 8TB Dataset of Public Domain and Openly Licensed Text. *arXiv preprint*, 2025.
- [25] 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, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08361>.
- [26] Aditi Khandelwal, Marius Mosbach, Verna Dankers, Siva Reddy, and Golnoosh Farnadi. Leveraging routing dynamics in mixture-of-experts models for efficient language adaptation, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.29714>.
- [27] Dieter Kraft. A software package for sequential quadratic programming. *Forschungsbericht-Deutsche Forschungs- und Versuchsanstalt für Luft- und Raumfahrt*, 1988.
- [28] Houyi Li, Wenzhen Zheng, Qiufeng Wang, Hanshan Zhang, Zili Wang, Shijie Xuyang, Yuantao Fan, Zhenyu Ding, Haoying Wang, Ning Ding, Shuigeng Zhou, Xiangyu Zhang, and Daxin Jiang. Predictable Scale: Part I, Step Law – Optimal Hyperparameter Scaling Law in Large Language Model Pretraining, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.04715>.
- [29] Yunxin Li, Shenyuan Jiang, Baotian Hu, Longyue Wang, Wanqi Zhong, Wenhan Luo, Lin Ma, and Min Zhang. Uni-MoE: Scaling Unified Multimodal LLMs with Mixture of Experts, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.11273>.
- [30] Weixin Liang, Lili Yu, Liang Luo, Srinivasan Iyer, Ning Dong, Chunting Zhou, Gargi Ghosh, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, et al. Mixture-of-transformers: A sparse and scalable architecture for multi-modal foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04996*, 2024.
- [31] Weixin Liang, Lili Yu, Liang Luo, Srinivasan Iyer, Ning Dong, Chunting Zhou, Gargi Ghosh, Mike Lewis, Wen tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Xi Victoria Lin. Mixture-of-Transformers: A Sparse and Scalable Architecture for Multi-Modal Foundation Models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.04996>.

- [32] Xi Victoria Lin, Akshat Shrivastava, Liang Luo, Srinivasan Iyer, Mike Lewis, Gargi Ghosh, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Armen Aghajanyan. MoMa: Efficient Early-Fusion Pre-training with Mixture of Modality-Aware Experts, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21770>.
- [33] Alexander H. Liu, Andy Ehrenberg, Andy Lo, Clément Denoix, Corentin Barreau, Guillaume Lample, Jean-Malo Delignon, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Patrick von Platen, Pavankumar Reddy Muddireddy, Sanchit Gandhi, Soham Ghosh, Srijan Mishra, Thomas Foubert, Abhinav Rastogi, Adam Yang, Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Amélie Héliou, Amélie Martin, Anmol Agarwal, Antoine Roux, Arthur Darcet, Arthur Mensch, Baptiste Bout, Baptiste Rozière, Baudouin De Monicault, Chris Bamford, Christian Wallenwein, Christophe Renaudin, Clémence Lanfranchi, Darius Dabert, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Devon Mizelle, Diego de las Casas, Elliot Chane-Sane, Emilien Fugier, Emma Bou Hanna, Gabrielle Berrada, Gauthier Delerce, Gauthier Guinet, Georgii Novikov, Guillaume Martin, Himanshu Jaju, Jan Ludziejewski, Jason Rute, Jean-Hadrien Chabran, Jessica Chudnovsky, Joachim Studnia, Joep Barmentlo, Jonas Amar, Josselin Somerville Roberts, Julien Denize, Karan Saxena, Karmesh Yadav, Kartik Khandelwal, Kush Jain, Léo Renard Lavaud, Léonard Blier, Lingxiao Zhao, Louis Martin, Lucile Saulnier, Luyu Gao, Marie Pellat, Mathilde Guillaumin, Mathis Felardos, Matthieu Dinot, Maxime Darrin, Maximilian Augustin, Mickaël Seznec, Neha Gupta, Nikhil Raghuraman, Olivier Duchenne, Patricia Wang, Patryk Saffer, Paul Jacob, Paul Wambergue, Paula Kurylowicz, Philomène Chagniot, Pierre Stock, Pravesh Agrawal, Rémi Delacourt, Romain Sauvestre, Roman Soletskyi, Sagar Vaze, Sandeep Subramanian, Saurabh Garg, Shashwat Dalal, Siddharth Gandhi, Sumukh Aithal, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Thibault Schueller, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Robert, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, Tom Bewley, Valeriia Nemychnikova, Victor Paltz, Virgile Richard, Wen-Ding Li, William Marshall, Xuanyu Zhang, Yihan Wan, and Yunhao Tang. Voxtral, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.13264>.
- [34] Shayne Longpre, Sneha Kudugunta, Niklas Muennighoff, I Hsu, Isaac Caswell, Alex Pentland, Sercan Arik, Chen-Yu Lee, Sayna Ebrahimi, et al. ATLAS: Adaptive Transfer Scaling Laws for Multilingual Pretraining, Finetuning, and Decoding the Curse of Multilinguality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.22037*, 2025.
- [35] Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Federico Cassano, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Nouamane Tazi, Ao Tang, Dmytro Pykhtar, Jiawei Liu, Yuxiang Wei, Tianyang Liu, Max Tian, Denis Kocetkov, Arthur Zucker, Younes Belkada, Zijian Wang, Qian Liu, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Indraneil Paul, Zhuang Li, Wen-Ding Li, Megan Risdal, Jia Li, Jian Zhu, Terry Yue Zhuo, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Nii Osae Osae Dade, Wenhao Yu, Lucas Krauß, Naman Jain, Yixuan Su, Xuanli He, Manan Dey, Edoardo Abati, Yekun Chai, Niklas Muennighoff, Xiangru Tang, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Christopher Akiki, Marc Marone, Chenghao Mou, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Binyuan Hui, Tri Dao, Armel Zebaze, Olivier Dehaene, Nicolas Patry, Canwen Xu, Julian McAuley, Han Hu, Torsten Scholak, Sebastien Paquet, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Nicolas Chapados, Mostofa Patwary, Nima Tajbakhsh, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Lingming Zhang, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. StarCoder 2 and The Stack v2: The Next Generation, 2024.
- [36] Potsawee Manakul, Woody Haosheng Gan, Martijn Bartelds, Guangzhi Sun, William Held, and Diyi Yang. Scaling Open Discrete Audio Foundation Models with Interleaved Semantic, Acoustic, and Text Tokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.16687*, 2026.
- [37] Brandon McKinzie, Zhe Gan, Jean-Philippe Fauconnier, Sam Dodge, Bowen Zhang, Philipp Dufter, Dhruvi Shah, Xianzhi Du, Futang Peng, Floris Weers, Anton Belyi, Haotian Zhang, Karanjeet Singh, Doug Kang, Ankur Jain, Hongyu Hè, Max Schwarzer, Tom Gunter, Xiang Kong, Aonan Zhang, Jianyu Wang, Chong Wang, Nan Du, Tao Lei, Sam Wiseman, Guoli Yin, Mark Lee, Zirui Wang, Ruoming Pang, Peter Grasch, Alexander Toshev, and Yinfei Yang. MM1: Methods, Analysis & Insights from Multimodal LLM Pre-training, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.09611>.
- [38] Bettina Messmer, Vinko Sabolčec, and Martin Jaggi. Enhancing Multilingual LLM Pretraining with Model-Based Data Selection. *arXiv*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.10361>.
- [39] Meta AI. The Llama 4 herd: The beginning of a new era of natively multimodal AI innovation, April 2025. URL <https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-4-multimodal-intelligence/>.

- [40] 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, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.16264>.
- [41] Tu Anh Nguyen, Benjamin Muller, Bokai Yu, Marta R. Costa-jussa, Maha Elbayad, Sravya Popuri, Christophe Ropers, Paul-Ambroise Duquenne, Robin Algayres, Ruslan Mavlyutov, Itai Gat, Mary Williamson, Gabriel Synnaeve, Juan Pino, Benoît Sagot, and Emmanuel Dupoux. SpiRit-LM: Interleaved spoken and written language model. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 13:30–52, 2025. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a_00728. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.tacl-1.2/>.
- [42] Jorge Nocedal. Updating quasi-Newton matrices with limited storage. *Mathematics of computation*, 35(151):773–782, 1980.
- [43] OpenAI, :, Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P. Goucher, and Adam Perelman et al. GPT-4o System Card, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.21276>.
- [44] Tim Pearce and Jinyeop Song. Reconciling kaplan and chinchilla scaling laws. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12907*, 2024.
- [45] Vineel Pratap, Qiantong Xu, Anuroop Sriram, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Ronan Collobert. MLS: A Large-Scale Multilingual Dataset for Speech Research. In *Interspeech 2020*, pages 2757–2761, 2020. doi: 10.21437/Interspeech.2020-2826.
- [46] Pascal Puchtler, Johannes Wirth, and René Peinl. HUI-Audio-Corpus-German: A High Quality TTS Dataset. In *KI 2021: Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 44th German Conference on AI, Virtual Event, September 27 – October 1, 2021, Proceedings*, page 204–216, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2021. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 978-3-030-87625-8. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-87626-5_15. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-87626-5_15.
- [47] Team Qwen. Qwen3. 5-Omni Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.15804*, 2026.
- [48] Sainandan Ramakrishnan, Aishwarya Agrawal, and Stefan Lee. Overcoming language priors in visual question answering with adversarial regularization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [49] AHG Rinnooy Kan and Gerrit T Timmer. Stochastic global optimization methods part I: Clustering methods. *Mathematical programming*, 39(1):27–56, 1987.
- [50] AHG Rinnooy Kan and GT Timmer. Stochastic global optimization methods part II: Multi level methods. *Mathematical Programming*, 39(1):57–78, 1987.
- [51] Yao Shi, Hui Bu, Xin Xu, Shaoji Zhang, and Ming Li. AISHELL-3: A Multi-Speaker Mandarin TTS Corpus. In *Interspeech 2021*, pages 2756–2760, 2021. doi: 10.21437/Interspeech.2021-755.
- [52] Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053*, 2019.
- [53] Mustafa Shukor, Enrico Fini, Victor Guilherme Turrissi da Costa, Matthieu Cord, Joshua Susskind, and Alaaeldin El-Nouby. Scaling laws for native multimodal models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 12–23, 2025.
- [54] Dan Saattrup Smart, Sif Bernstorff Lehmann, Simon Rands Leminen, Anders Jess Pedersen, Anna Katrine van Zee, and Torben Blach. CoRal: A Diverse Danish ASR Dataset Covering Dialects, Accents, Genders, and Age Groups, 2024. URL <https://hf.co/datasets/alexandrainst/coral>.
- [55] Trevor Standley, Amir Zamir, Dawn Chen, Leonidas Guibas, Jitendra Malik, and Silvio Savarese. Which tasks should be learned together in multi-task learning? In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 9120–9132. PMLR, 2020.

- [56] Anirudh Subramanyam, Yuxin Chen, and Robert L Grossman. Scaling laws revisited: modeling the role of data quality in language model pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.03313*, 2025.
- [57] Qingyun Sun, Zhen Guo, and PIN AI Team. Scaling Law Hypothesis for Multimodal Model, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.06754>.
- [58] Chameleon Team. Chameleon: Mixed-Modal Early-Fusion Foundation Models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.09818>.
- [59] Changxin Tian, Kunlong Chen, Jia Liu, Ziqi Liu, Zhiqiang Zhang, and Jun Zhou. Towards greater leverage: Scaling laws for efficient mixture-of-experts language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.17702*, 2025.
- [60] Changyao Tian, Hao Li, Gen Luo, Xizhou Zhu, Weijie Su, Hanming Deng, Jinguo Zhu, Jie Shao, Ziran Zhu, Yunpeng Liu, et al. NaViL: Rethinking Scaling Properties of Native Multimodal Large Language Models under Data Constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.08565*, 2025.
- [61] Shengbang Tong, David Fan, John Nguyen, Ellis Brown, Gaoyue Zhou, Shengyi Qian, Boyang Zheng, Théophane Vallaes, Junlin Han, Rob Fergus, et al. Beyond language modeling: An exploration of multimodal pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.03276*, 2026.
- [62] Wei-Cheng Tseng, Xuanru Zhou, Mingyue Huo, Yiwen Shao, Hao Zhang, and Dong Yu. Revisiting Audio-language Pretraining for Learning General-purpose Audio Representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.16757*, 2025.
- [63] Weilin Wan, Jingtao Han, Weizhong Zhang, and Cheng Jin. Holistic Scaling Laws for Optimal Mixture-of-Experts Architecture Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.21862*, 2026.
- [64] Huyu Wu, Meng Tang, Xinhan Zheng, and Haiyun Jiang. When Language Overrides: Revealing Text Dominance in Multimodal Large Language Models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.10552>.
- [65] Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Chi Chen, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, et al. Efficient GPT-4V level multimodal large language model for deployment on edge devices. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):5509, 2025.
- [66] Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Mingdao Liu, Lei Zhang, shengmin jiang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Scaling Speech-Text Pre-training with Synthetic Interleaved Data. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3tukjsVyrE>.
- [67] Binbin Zhang, Hang Lv, Pengcheng Guo, Qijie Shao, Chao Yang, Lei Xie, Xin Xu, Hui Bu, Xiaoyu Chen, Chencheng Zeng, Di Wu, and Zhendong Peng. WENETSPEECH: A 10000+ Hours Multi-Domain Mandarin Corpus for Speech Recognition. In *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6182–6186, 2022. doi: 10.1109/ICASSP43922.2022.9746682.
- [68] Heng Zhang, Haichuan Hu, Yaomin Shen, Weihao Yu, Yilei Yuan, Haochen You, Guo Cheng, Zijian Zhang, Lubin Gan, Huihui Wei, Hao Zhang, and Jin Huang. AsyMoE: Leveraging Modal Asymmetry for Enhanced Expert Specialization in Large Vision-Language Models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.12715>.
- [69] Yiyuan Zhang, Handong Li, Jing Liu, and Xiangyu Yue. Explore the Limits of Omni-modal Pretraining at Scale, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.09412>.
- [70] Xu Zheng, Chenfei Liao, Yuqian Fu, Kaiyu Lei, Yuanhuiyi Lyu, Lutao Jiang, Bin Ren, Jialei Chen, Jiawen Wang, Chengxin Li, Linfeng Zhang, Danda Pani Paudel, Xuanjing Huang, Yungang Jiang, Nicu Sebe, Dacheng Tao, Luc Van Gool, and Xuming Hu. MLLMs are Deeply Affected by Modality Bias, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.18657>.
- [71] Fan Zhou, Zengzhi Wang, Nikhil Ranjan, Zhoujun Cheng, Liping Tang, Guowei He, Zhengzhong Liu, and Eric P Xing. Megamath: Pushing the limits of open math corpora. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.02807*, 2025.

- [72] Barret Zoph, Irwan Bello, Sameer Kumar, Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Jeff Dean, Noam Shazeer, and William Fedus. ST-MoE: Designing Stable and Transferable Sparse Expert Models, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.08906>.
- [73] Hongjian Zou, Yue Ge, Qi Ding, Yixuan Liao, and Xiaoxin Chen. Caption First, VQA Second: Knowledge Density, Not Task Format, Drives Multimodal Scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.13054*, 2026.

Appendix

A Impact Statement

This work aims to guide the development of future Multimodal LLMs by providing principled scaling laws for data mixing across text, vision, and audio. Its primary positive impact is a potential substantial reduction in redundant compute (and the associated environmental cost) as practitioners can rely on our insights rather than running expensive ablation runs.

At the same time, we acknowledge potential negative impacts, such as the possibility that improvements to joint vision–audio training could contribute to higher-quality deepfakes and voice clones, with downstream implications for misinformation and fraud. Our contribution is nonetheless foundational rather than directly capability-unlocking, and we believe the value of openly sharing these insights outweighs the risks of concentrating such knowledge within a handful of frontier labs.

B Relation to Additive Bimodal Scaling Laws

We now show that Equation 10 recovers the structure of prior bimodal interaction laws under a small-interaction approximation, while generalizing them to directional, unbalanced, and repetition-aware mixtures.

Consider two modalities i and j , no repetition, and $h_i + h_j = 1$. For target modality i ,

$$L_i = E_i + A_i N^{-\alpha_i} \exp[-\alpha_i c_i h_j] + B_i D_i^{-\beta_i} \exp[-\beta_i v_{j \rightarrow i} h_j].$$

For small $|c_i|$ and $|v_{j \rightarrow i}|$,

$$L_i \approx L_i^{(0)} - \alpha_i c_i h_j \frac{A_i}{N^{\alpha_i}} - \beta_i v_{j \rightarrow i} h_j \frac{B_i}{D_i^{\beta_i}},$$

where

$$L_i^{(0)} = E_i + \frac{A_i}{N^{\alpha_i}} + \frac{B_i}{D_i^{\beta_i}}$$

is the unimodal scaling law for modality i . The same expansion holds for target modality j . If we evaluate the mixture loss

$$L_{ij} = h_i L_i + h_j L_j,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} L_{ij} &\approx h_i L_i^{(0)} + h_j L_j^{(0)} \\ &\quad - h_i h_j \left[\alpha_i c_i \frac{A_i}{N^{\alpha_i}} + \alpha_j c_j \frac{A_j}{N^{\alpha_j}} \right] \\ &\quad - h_i h_j \left[\beta_i v_{j \rightarrow i} \frac{B_i}{D_i^{\beta_i}} + \beta_j v_{i \rightarrow j} \frac{B_j}{D_j^{\beta_j}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For balanced mixtures $h_i = h_j = 1/2$, $D_i = D_j = D/2$, and approximately matched exponents, this becomes

$$L_{ij} \approx \frac{L_i^{(0)} + L_j^{(0)}}{2} + \frac{A_{ij}^{\text{cap}}}{N^{\bar{\alpha}}} + \frac{B_{ij}^{\text{tr}}}{D^{\bar{\beta}}}, \quad (11)$$

where A_{ij}^{cap} and B_{ij}^{tr} are induced interaction coefficients determined by $(c_i, c_j, v_{i \rightarrow j}, v_{j \rightarrow i})$ and the unimodal constants. Equation 11 has the same “average unimodal law plus additive interaction powers” structure as the bimodal scaling law of Aghajanyan et al. [1].

The present formulation is more general along four axes. First, transfer is directional: $v_{i \rightarrow j}$ and $v_{j \rightarrow i}$ need not be equal. Second, the law applies to arbitrary mixture weights h_i, h_j , not only balanced bimodal mixtures. Third, it accounts for repeated data through $\phi_m(r_m)$. Fourth, the exponential parameterization guarantees positive effective data even under negative transfer. The only component not included in Equation 10 is a constant asymptotic synergy term analogous to $-C_{ij}$ in some joint bimodal laws. We omit this term because our validation losses are target-modality losses: with unlimited target-modality data and capacity, auxiliary modalities should not change the irreducible target loss E_m . If the evaluation objective is instead the joint likelihood of paired modalities, a constant mutual-information offset can be added as an additional term.




Figure 4: Validation loss as a function of (left) training tokens D at fixed model sizes and (right) total parameter count N at fixed dataset sizes. Text has the lowest irreducible loss E_m , while vision has the highest. Vision also exhibits large fitted scaling exponents for both data and model scale, indicating steep improvements with both additional data (β_{vision}) and model parameters (α_{vision}).

C Learning Rate and Batch Size

We follow the Step Law [28] to compute the learning rate (LR) and batch size (BS), and treat these computed values as the $1\times$ setting. We then ablate around this point using $LR \in \{0.3\times, 1\times, 3\times\}$ and $BS \in \{0.5\times, 1\times, 2\times\}$ (with $1\times BS = 4M$ tokens). We train our smallest ($d_{\text{model}} = 384$) and our biggest model ($d_{\text{model}} = 2048$) for 30B tokens under each configuration; results are shown in Figure 5.

Across both models and all three modalities (text, audio, vision), the combination of $1\times$ LR with $2\times$ BS consistently achieves the lowest or close to the lowest loss. Smaller batch sizes ($0.5\times$) degrade performance, while increasing to $2\times$ yields stable improvements, suggesting benefits from reduced gradient noise at this scale. The $1\times$ BS setting remains competitive but is generally slightly worse than $2\times$.

We also observe that big models are less sensitive to LR and BS variations than smaller ones, though the same optimal region ($1\times$ LR, $2\times$ BS) holds across both model sizes. Overall, these results support using the Step LR-derived learning rate and moderately increasing the batch size to $2\times$.

D Training Configurations

Table 2 shows the exact sizes of the models. Each of our experiments is run on 64 Nvidia-GH200 GPUs with 96GB VRAM each, and the full sweep of 268 runs amounts to $\sim 300k$ GH200-hours of compute. We use the Megatron-LM [52] framework to train our models. In our preliminary experiments, we saw that micro batch sizes (MBS) greater than 1 lead to a non-trivial speedup, and therefore we use expert-parallelism (EP) to achieve $MBS > 1$ for all the models. Global batch sizes (GBS) are chosen to be divisible by $EP \times EDP$ (Expert Data Parallelism), while being close to discovered optimal batch sizes from Appendix C. Table 3 contains the training hyperparameters in detail.

E Datasets

We use high-quality permissive datasets for each modality to maximize signal in our limited-scale experiments and to ensure training stability, as lower-quality multimodal data is known to exhibit unstable training dynamics [65]. The data composition for each modality is deliberately aligned with the distribution mixtures used in real-world multimodal large language model (MLLM) pretraining,




Figure 5: Training losses across different multipliers of optimum learning rates (LR) and batch sizes (BS) obtained using Step Law [28]. $d_{\text{model}} = 384$ and $d_{\text{model}} = 2048$ denote the smallest and largest models studied in our work, respectively. The predicted learning rate by Step Law is the best for our case as well, but the optimal batch size is twice the predicted value. It is very close to the best, if not the best, for all three modalities: text, vision, and audio.

following the methodologies of Apertus [18] for text, Chameleon [58] for vision, and Voxtral [33] for audio. Specifically, our text corpus is constructed to balance general knowledge, reasoning, and coding capabilities; it comprises 50% FineWeb-HQ and 32.5% FineWeb2-HQ [38] for general text, supplemented by 7.5% MegaMath-Web-Pro [71] and 10% Stack v2-Edu [24, 35]. For the vision modality, we sample from the LLaVA-OneVision-1.5 Mid-Training dataset [4], employing an even split of 50% standard image-caption pairs and 50% reversed caption-image pairs to encourage bidirectional cross-modal alignment. Finally, our audio training mixture consists of 50% audio-only samples from the Unsupervised People Speech dataset [13]. The remaining 50% uses paired speech-text data in two formats: interleaved audio-text sequences (also inspired by [41] and [66]) when the underlying data supports segment- or turn-level composition, and direct ASR-style audio-text pairs otherwise. The interleaved subset includes People’s Speech [12], WenetSpeech [67], LegCo Speech⁴, CoRal V3 conversation data [54], and Emilia-YODAS [16]. The direct ASR-style subset includes AISHELL-1&3 [7, 51], Multilingual LibriSpeech [45], HUI-Audio-Corpus-German [46], Common Voice 24⁵, and CoRal V3 read-aloud data [54]. Together, these datasets provide coverage across English, Mandarin, Cantonese, German, other European languages, and broader multilingual speech.

⁴LegCo Speech

⁵Common Voice 24

Table 2: Hidden size and parameter counts (millions) for all the models used in this study. The active and total parameter count only consists of the non-embedding parameters. Model hyperparameters other than the hidden dimension (d_{model}) are mentioned in Section 3.

d_{model}	Active (M)	Total (M)	Embedding (M)
384	54.5	252.7	204.7
576	122.4	568.3	307.0
768	217.5	1010.2	409.3
1152	489.0	2272.7	614.0
1536	869.1	4040.0	818.7
2048	1544.7	7181.8	1091.6

Table 3: Training hyperparameters for different models. Model labels follow the (TOTAL PARAMS)-A(ACTIVE PARAMS) convention with both counts including untied embeddings. EP, MBS, and GBS denote the size of the expert parallel group, micro batch size, and the global batch size, respectively. Model hyperparameters other than the hidden dimension (d_{model}) are mentioned in Section 3.

Model name	Model	d_{model}	EP	MBS	GBS	Learning Rate	Tokens (B)
M1	457M-A259M	384	1	4	256	1.73×10^{-3}	5
					256	2.15×10^{-3}	10
					256	2.43×10^{-3}	15
					256	2.65×10^{-3}	20
					256	2.84×10^{-3}	25
					256	3.28×10^{-3}	40
					512	4.35×10^{-3}	100
					768	4.93×10^{-3}	150
M2	875M-A429M	576	2	2	256	9.74×10^{-4}	5
					256	1.21×10^{-3}	10
					256	1.36×10^{-3}	15
					256	1.49×10^{-3}	20
					256	1.60×10^{-3}	25
					384	1.84×10^{-3}	40
					512	2.44×10^{-3}	100
					768	2.77×10^{-3}	150
M3	1.4B-A0.6B	768	2	4	256	6.51×10^{-4}	5
					256	8.05×10^{-4}	10
					256	9.12×10^{-4}	15
					256	9.96×10^{-4}	20
					256	1.07×10^{-3}	25
					256	1.23×10^{-3}	40
					512	1.63×10^{-3}	100
					768	1.85×10^{-3}	150
M4	2.9B-A1.1B	1152	2	4	256	3.63×10^{-4}	5
					256	4.49×10^{-4}	10
					256	5.08×10^{-4}	15
					256	5.55×10^{-4}	20
					256	5.95×10^{-4}	25
					256	6.87×10^{-4}	40
					512	9.10×10^{-4}	100
					768	1.03×10^{-3}	150
M5	4.9B-A1.7B	1536	2	3	192	2.40×10^{-4}	5
					192	2.98×10^{-4}	10
					192	3.37×10^{-4}	15
					192	3.68×10^{-4}	20
					192	3.94×10^{-4}	25
					384	4.55×10^{-4}	40
					576	6.03×10^{-4}	100
					768	6.83×10^{-4}	150
M6	8.3B-A2.6B	2048	2	2	256	1.60×10^{-4}	5
					256	1.97×10^{-4}	10
					256	2.24×10^{-4}	15
					256	2.44×10^{-4}	20
					256	2.62×10^{-4}	25
					384	3.02×10^{-4}	40
					512	4.00×10^{-4}	100
					768	4.53×10^{-4}	150

F Effect of Data Repetition

F.1 Effect of repeating vision data




Figure 6: Validation loss as a function of model size for the text+vision repetition experiments at 100B total training tokens, on the text-only evaluation set (left) and averaged across the two vision evaluation sets (right). Solid green curves vary the unique-vision-token budget from 5B to 25B; dashed purple curves repeat a fixed 5B unique-vision budget 2–5 times. Text loss is essentially independent of the vision repetition factor, while on the averaged vision panel the gap between repeated and unique-data curves widens with model scale, with $5B \times 5$ (25B sampled) falling below the 15B unique-token curve at the largest scales.

The following are our observations from repetition experiments on vision (Figure 6):

- Text-only performance remains relatively stable regardless of the composition of the vision data. The variance in text loss across all unique and repeated vision configurations across all modal configurations is close to 4×10^{-4} , confirming that repeating vision data, rather than having unique vision tokens, does not induce negative transfer or catastrophic forgetting in the text modality within this MoE architecture.
- For cross-modal evaluation experiments (Text-to-Vision and Vision-to-Text), increasing unique vision tokens strictly improves performance. However, repetition imposes a severe penalty at larger model scales. For models with parameters more than half a billion, repeating 5B tokens 5 times (25B total) performs worse than training using just 60% of that token volume (15B) in unique data.
- At the smallest model scales (e.g., 457M and 875M total parameters), the performance gap between repeated data (e.g., 5B repeated 2x) and unique data (10B unique) is nearly indistinguishable. This suggests that smaller models are capacity-bound and saturate their representational limits before the penalty of data repetition takes full effect, whereas larger models are strictly data-bound and penalize repetition heavily.

F.2 Effect of repeating audio data

Repeating audio data has similar effects to repeating vision data (Figure 7). Across all audio evaluations (Audio-only, Audio-Text, and Text-Audio), repeating data yields steeply diminishing returns. Repeating a 5B token dataset 5 times (25B total tokens) achieves an evaluation loss roughly equivalent to training using just 40% of that token volume (10B) in unique data. This indicates that 60% of the compute spent on this repetition provides almost zero marginal value. By the same token, the repetition penalty observed in audio perfectly mirrors the behavior observed in vision. In both continuous modalities, repetition beyond 2 epochs simply wastes compute.

F.3 Interference between modalities

Consistent with our repetition experiments, text evaluation remains entirely flat across the varying mixture ratios (Figure 8), proving that text modality seems agnostic to the changing proportions of vision and audio tokens in the remaining budget. For both vision and audio evaluations, performance




Figure 7: Validation loss as a function of model size for the text+audio repetition experiments at 100B total training tokens, on the text-only evaluation set (left) and averaged across the audio evaluation sets (right). Solid red curves vary the unique-audio-token budget from 5B to 25B; dashed purple curves repeat a fixed 5B unique-audio budget 2–5 times. As with vision, text loss is essentially unaffected by the audio repetition factor, while on the averaged audio panel repeated data underperforms unique data more strongly at larger model scales: $5B \times 5$ tracks roughly the 10B unique-token curve, indicating that $\sim 60\%$ of the additional compute spent on repetition produces little marginal value.




Figure 8: Validation loss as a function of model size for the vision-audio interference experiments under a fixed 150B-token budget with text held constant at 100B. The remaining 50B tokens are traded between vision and audio in five splits (45B/5B, 41.5B/8.5B, 37.5B/12.5B, 33B/17B, 25B/25B), running from vision-dominant (green) to audio-dominant (red). Panels show loss on the text-only evaluation set (left), averaged across the audio evaluation sets (middle), and averaged across the vision evaluation sets (right).

curves follow a trivial downward trend corresponding directly to the absolute volume of data provided for that modality. The curve is so predictable and linear, suggesting that MoE routing effectively isolates the modalities, mitigating the potential gradient conflicts seen in dense models [30].

G Goodness-of-Fit Results and Scaling Law Variants

We test the goodness of the fit through (i) leave-one-out cross-validation across model scales (Table 4), (ii) random-subset resampling of the configuration grid (Table 5), (iii) training extrapolation to the largest scale (Table 6), (iv) ablations of each modeling component (Table 7), and (v) a directional-capacity variant of the law (Tables 8 and 9). Together these establish that the fit is stable across folds, extrapolates to scales beyond its training range, and that each of the three modeling components — cross-modal transfer, capacity dilution, and repetition saturation — contributes to predictive accuracy.

We report two goodness-of-fit metrics throughout this section. $\text{RMSE}_{\log}$ is the root-mean-squared error between predicted and observed log loss, $\text{RMSE}_{\log} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\log \hat{L}_i - \log L_i)^2 \right)^{1/2}$, and summarises the fit over all n evaluated runs. The maximum relative error, $\max_i |\hat{L}_i - L_i| / L_i$, instead reports the single worst-predicted run in the evaluated set, and is the metric we use when we quote a worst-case error in the main text.

Table 4: Refits across four interpolation leave-one-out holdouts (M2, M3, M4, M5, with the extremes M1 (smallest) and M6 (largest) always included in training). The **Joint-fit** column in (a) reports coefficients from the fit on all configurations (M1-M6), while **Leave-one-scale-out** coefficient estimates are averaged over the four leave-one-out folds and reported as mean $\pm$ standard deviation. The metrics in (b) are computed on runs at the scale held out in each fold.

(a) Fitted coefficients.

Coefficient	Joint-fit	Leave-one-scale-out
<i>Base law (per modality)</i>		
E_{Text}	1.910	1.920 ± 0.127
α_{Text}	0.337	0.359 ± 0.012
β_{Text}	0.337	0.323 ± 0.083
E_{Vision}	5.670	5.727 ± 0.051
α_{Vision}	0.568	0.598 ± 0.037
β_{Vision}	0.508	0.574 ± 0.047
E_{Audio}	4.365	4.295 ± 0.171
α_{Audio}	0.324	0.359 ± 0.058
β_{Audio}	0.519	0.467 ± 0.169
<i>Cross-modal transfer</i>		
$v_{V \rightarrow T}$	-0.558	-0.635 ± 0.245
$v_{T \rightarrow V}$	-0.583	-0.651 ± 0.088
$v_{A \rightarrow T}$	+0.146	0.009 ± 0.366
$v_{T \rightarrow A}$	-0.102	-0.411 ± 0.327
$v_{A \rightarrow V}$	+0.130	0.104 ± 0.231
$v_{V \rightarrow A}$	-0.795	-0.798 ± 0.093
<i>Repetition saturation</i>		
R_V^*	0.998	1.138 ± 0.142
R_A^*	1.758	1.745 ± 0.132
<i>Capacity dilution</i>		
c_{Text}	-0.457	-0.439 ± 0.109
c_{Vision}	-0.846	-0.767 ± 0.079
c_{Audio}	-1.873	-1.471 ± 0.456

(b) Metrics on the held-out scale.

Holdout	RMSE _{log}	Maximum relative error (%)			
		Overall	Text	Vision	Audio
M2	0.0060	2.31	1.25	1.41	2.31
M3	0.0066	1.25	1.25	1.23	1.11
M4	0.0073	2.06	1.45	1.19	2.06
M5	0.0068	1.95	1.77	1.04	1.95

Cross-validation (Interpolation) across model scales. We perform a four-fold leave-one-out cross-validation over the four middle scales (M2, M3, M4, M5), keeping the smallest (M1) and largest (M6) in the training set in every fold so the held-out scale is always interpolated. Table 4 reports the fitted coefficients (mean $\pm$ std across folds) and per-fold validation metrics on the held-out scale. The base-law and capacity-dilution coefficients are stable across folds (e.g., $\alpha_{\text{Text}} = 0.359 \pm 0.012$, $E_{\text{Text}} = 1.92 \pm 0.13$, $c_{\text{Text}} = -0.439 \pm 0.11$), and the held-out validation loss is matched to within 2.31% in every fold. The fit therefore does not depend on any single intermediate scale and is stable to interpolation.

Random-subset resampling of the configuration grid. We also test the stability of the law by refitting it on five independent random subsets containing 90% of the fitted points, drawn without regard to scale, mixture, or repetition setting. Table 5 compares the coefficients estimated from the joint fit across all runs against the average coefficient values estimated from these five subsets. The base-law exponents, capacity-dilution coefficients, and repetition-saturation points are recovered consistently, and the text-vision transfer coefficients retain both their sign and approximate magni-

Table 5: Coefficients under random-subset resampling: five independent refits, each on a random 90% subset of the fitted configurations. The **Joint-fit** column reports coefficients fit on the full data. **Random-subset Refit** estimates are averaged over five 90% subsamples of runs and reported as mean $\pm$ standard deviation. Coefficients that contain zero within one standard deviation of the average value are marked[†].

Coefficient	Joint-fit	Random-subset Refits
<i>Base law (per modality)</i>		
E_{Text}	1.910	2.010 ± 0.085
α_{Text}	0.337	0.360 ± 0.048
β_{Text}	0.337	0.401 ± 0.062
E_{Vision}	5.670	5.675 ± 0.068
α_{Vision}	0.568	0.535 ± 0.067
β_{Vision}	0.508	0.561 ± 0.049
E_{Audio}	4.365	4.331 ± 0.203
α_{Audio}	0.324	0.332 ± 0.066
β_{Audio}	0.519	0.524 ± 0.173
<i>Cross-modal transfer</i>		
$v_{V \rightarrow T}$	-0.558	-0.595 ± 0.104
$v_{T \rightarrow V}$	-0.583	-0.605 ± 0.088
$v_{A \rightarrow T}$	+0.146	$+0.043 \pm 0.292^\dagger$
$v_{T \rightarrow A}$	-0.102	-0.240 ± 0.118
$v_{A \rightarrow V}$	+0.130	$-0.014 \pm 0.206^\dagger$
$v_{V \rightarrow A}$	-0.795	-0.825 ± 0.174
<i>Repetition saturation</i>		
R_V^*	0.998	1.086 ± 0.164
R_A^*	1.758	1.589 ± 0.174
<i>Capacity dilution</i>		
c_{Text}	-0.457	-0.479 ± 0.125
c_{Vision}	-0.846	-0.839 ± 0.117
c_{Audio}	-1.873	-1.737 ± 0.187

tude. The two audio-source transfer coefficients behave differently: $v_{A \rightarrow T}$ and $v_{A \rightarrow V}$ have standard deviations that exceed their means, and $v_{A \rightarrow V}$ changes sign relative to the joint fit.

Extrapolation to the largest scale. We test how far the law extrapolates beyond its fitting range by training on prefixes of the model-size axis and predicting the largest scale (M6). Four regimes (R1–R4 in Table 6) progressively grow the training prefix from M1–M2 (R1, 80 runs) up to M1–M5 (R4, 200 runs); validation is always on M6 so the four regimes are directly comparable. The maximum relative error on M6 decreases monotonically with the training span: 8.27% in R1, 6.91% in R2, 4.06% in R3, and 2.46% in R4.

Component ablations. Table 7 ablates each of the three modeling components — cross-modal transfer, capacity dilution, and repetition saturation — by refitting the law with that component removed on the full training set. Removing repetition saturation increases the overall $\text{RMSE}_{\log}$ by 49.4% and capacity dilution by 38.4%; removing cross-modal transfer has little effect on average $\text{RMSE}_{\log}$ but worsens Huber loss and worst-case error from 2.16% to 2.61%. Repetition saturation and capacity dilution are therefore critical for fit quality, while cross-modal transfer reduces worst-case error further, though not as much as capacity dilution and repetition saturation.

Table 9 also compares the above law variants across extrapolation regimes (along with a directional-capacity variant discussed in the next section). Leaving out any component performs comparably across regimes R2, R3, and R4, but the full law is much better (8.27% vs 10.55%, 9.96%, 9.30%) in R1 when only M1 and M2 runs are used to fit the laws.

Directional-capacity variant. Our default formulation models capacity dilution with one coefficient per target modality, c_m (3 coefficients in total for the three modalities). A natural generalization is to allow the dilution to depend on which source modality is competing: $N_{\text{eff}}^{(m)} = N \exp\left(\sum_{k \neq m} c_{k \rightarrow m} h_k\right)$, with one coefficient per ordered (source, target) pair (6 coefficients in

Table 6: Refits under training extrapolation regimes. Columns **R{x-1}** (**train M1-x**) denote the regime where runs corresponding to models M1, M2, ... Mx are used for fitting, whereas the **Joint-fit** column reports coefficients from the fit on all configurations (M1-M6). The metrics in (b) are validated using M6 runs only (the most distant out-of-sample scale), so the four regimes are directly comparable. Both $\text{RMSE}_{\log}$ and Overall Maximum Relative Error decrease monotonically as more model scales are included in the fit.

(a) Fitted coefficients.

	Joint-fit	R1 (train M1-2)	R2 (train M1-3)	R3 (train M1-4)	R4 (train M1-5)
<i>Base law (per modality)</i>					
E_{Text}	1.910	2.197	2.179	2.162	1.930
α_{Text}	0.337	0.438	0.383	0.450	0.317
β_{Text}	0.337	0.305	0.398	0.324	0.367
E_{Vision}	5.670	5.502	6.066	5.997	5.732
α_{Vision}	0.568	0.334	1.100	0.830	0.557
β_{Vision}	0.508	0.741	0.668	0.828	0.585
E_{Audio}	4.365	5.055	5.037	4.862	4.255
α_{Audio}	0.324	4.252	1.415	0.570	0.281
β_{Audio}	0.519	0.594	0.839	0.936	0.455
<i>Cross-modal transfer</i>					
$v_{V \rightarrow T}$	-0.558	-0.037	-0.568	-0.584	-0.277
$v_{T \rightarrow V}$	-0.583	-0.291	-0.899	-0.966	-0.686
$v_{A \rightarrow T}$	0.146	0.750	0.307	0.173	0.457
$v_{T \rightarrow A}$	-0.102	-1.576	-1.086	-0.334	-0.298
$v_{A \rightarrow V}$	0.130	0.017	0.102	0.167	0.051
$v_{V \rightarrow A}$	-0.795	-0.992	-0.728	-0.534	-0.527
<i>Repetition saturation</i>					
R_V^*	0.998	1.233	1.197	1.180	1.265
R_A^*	1.758	1.643	1.505	1.274	1.640
<i>Capacity dilution</i>					
c_{Text}	-0.457	-0.662	-0.538	-0.418	-0.706
c_{Vision}	-0.846	-1.165	-0.844	-0.634	-0.847
c_{Audio}	-1.873	-0.806	-1.337	-2.113	-1.724

(b) Metrics on the held-out M6 scale. n_{train} denotes the number of training points in the respective regime.

Estimation Regime	n_{train}	$\text{RMSE}_{\log}$	Maximum Relative Error (%)			
			Overall	Text	Vision	Audio
R1 (train M1-2)	80	0.0430	8.27	4.87	1.19	8.27
R2 (train M1-3)	120	0.0349	6.91	3.70	4.03	6.91
R3 (train M1-4)	160	0.0217	4.06	3.49	3.96	4.06
R4 (train M1-5)	200	0.0094	2.46	2.46	1.78	2.04

total). Tables 8 and 9 compare this directional variant against the default and the three component-ablations across the same four extrapolation regimes. The directional variant performs comparably to the default on R1–R3, but slightly worse on R4 (2.54% vs 2.46% maximum relative error on M6), so the additional three coefficients do not improve extrapolation. Moreover, the vision errors are strictly worse than the non-directional version (Table 6b). We therefore retain the simpler 3-coefficient form throughout the paper.

H Scaling Law Validation Results

Table 10 shows the results on out-of-domain datapoints. All the obtained loss values are very close ($< 2.6\%$ error) to their predicted values, barring the test loss in non-text-heavy CPT (6.73% error). As visible in Figure 9, the text loss increases sharply for the CPT runs, but the non-text-heavy run does not get enough text tokens for the loss to stabilize, unlike the text-heavy CPT run. We hypothesize that longer training would stabilize the text loss and bring it closer to our law’s prediction.

Table 7: Component ablations of the joint fit on the full training set. The “ Δ vs Full” column shows the relative increase in overall $\text{RMSE}_{\log}$ when the corresponding component is removed. k denotes the parameters to fit in the resulting scaling law. Per-modality $\text{RMSE}_{\log}$ and the overall maximum relative error, both computed on the fitted set, are shown for context. The full law achieves the minimum in the Maximum Relative Error (**Max. rel. err.**) column.

Variant	k	$\text{RMSE}_{\log}$	Δ vs Full	$\text{RMSE}_{\text{Text}}$	$\text{RMSE}_{\text{Vision}}$	$\text{RMSE}_{\text{Audio}}$	Max rel. err. (%)
Full law	26	0.0064	–	0.0066	0.0053	0.0073	2.16
No repetition	24	0.0096	+49.4%	0.0062	0.0112	0.0107	3.62
No transfer	20	0.0064	–0.7%	0.0061	0.0061	0.0070	2.61
No capacity	23	0.0089	+38.4%	0.0077	0.0074	0.0111	5.24

Table 8: $\text{RMSE}_{\log}$ and maximum relative errors (%) for the directional-capacity variant of our scaling law: a separate $c_{k \rightarrow m}$ for each (source, target) pair instead of one c_m per target in Eq. 2. We use the same training extrapolation regimes as Table 6 where **R{x-1}** (**train M1-x**) denote the regime where runs corresponding to models M1, M2, ... Mx are used for fitting, and the metrics are computed on M6 only. n_{train} denotes the number of training points in the respective regime. Even though the $\text{RMSE}_{\log}$ and overall maximum relative errors are comparable, the vision errors are strictly worse than the non-directional version (Table 6b).

Regime	n_{train}	$\text{RMSE}_{\log}$	Maximum relative error (%)			
			Overall	Text	Vision	Audio
R1 (train M1-2)	80	0.0441	7.91	5.41	3.88	7.91
R2 (train M1-3)	120	0.0358	6.54	3.89	5.60	6.54
R3 (train M1-4)	160	0.0208	4.84	3.35	4.84	3.62
R4 (train M1-5)	200	0.0101	2.54	2.54	2.21	2.13

I Routing Analysis

In Section 5, we observed that the capacity dilution coefficients, $c_{\text{text}} = -0.46$, $c_{\text{vision}} = -0.85$, and $c_{\text{audio}} = -1.87$ were all negative, meaning non-target modality data always shrinks the effective parameter budget available to a target modality. To mechanistically investigate capacity dilution, we look at the routing patterns of the models. Following prior work on analysing MoE routing [6, 26], we accumulate per-expert assignment counts over each modality-specific validation set, giving a per-layer distribution over experts for every modality, and compare these distributions across modalities using the Jensen–Shannon divergence (JSD), normalised to $[0, 1]$.

We observe that routing is diffuse rather than modality-specific. At the M6 scale, the per-layer expert-assignment distributions of the modalities present in the training mixture are nearly indistinguishable: $\text{JSD}(\text{text}, \text{vision}) = 0.003$ and $\text{JSD}(\text{text}, \text{audio}) = 0.003\text{--}0.004$. Table 11 reports this divergence across model scales, where it stays below 0.03 everywhere and decreases with model size. We see the following observations hold across the model sizes: (i) every trained modality uses the full

Table 9: Metrics on the held-out M6 scale across the four training extrapolation regimes (R1: train M1-2, R2: train M1-3, R3: train M1-4, R4: train M1-5). Five variants of our law are compared: the full law, three variants with each modeling component individually removed, and the directional-capacity variant. *Lower is better in every column.* Under these extrapolation regimes, we observe that the full law and the directional capacity variant perform consistently well across the regimes.

Variant	$\text{RMSE}_{\log}$				Maximum relative error (%)			
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R1	R2	R3	R4
Full law	0.0430	0.0349	0.0217	0.0094	8.27	6.91	4.06	2.46
No transfer	0.0469	0.0379	0.0138	0.0095	10.55	7.94	3.71	2.22
No capacity	0.0436	0.0355	0.0212	0.0139	9.96	7.76	5.58	5.38
No repetition	0.0456	0.0362	0.0218	0.0127	9.30	6.74	4.28	2.70
Directional capacity	0.0441	0.0358	0.0208	0.0101	7.91	6.54	4.84	2.54




Figure 9: The overall training loss and the text-only loss for (i) *Continual run 1*: Continual pretraining (CPT) on a text-only checkpoint trained with 100B tokens. The continual training mixture consists of 10B text, 20B vision (10B repeated twice), and 20B audio (10B repeated twice), (ii) *Continual Run 2*: Continual pretraining on the same checkpoint as (i) with 40B text, 5B vision, and 5B audio.

Table 10: Predicted vs. observed validation loss on three held-out runs. Predictions use the fitted coefficients from Table 1 and Section 5. No parameters are re-tuned on these runs, and 8/9 losses are predicted to within 2.51%.

Modality	Observed	Predicted	Δ	Relative error
<i>12.6B-A3.8B, from scratch on 200B tokens (185B text / 7.5B vision / 7.5B audio)</i>				
Text	2.4264	2.4874	+0.0610	+2.51%
Vision	6.4240	6.4185	-0.0055	-0.09%
Audio	5.2589	5.1470	-0.1119	-2.13%
<i>8.3B-A2.6B, non-text-heavy continual pretraining: 10B text + 20B vision ($r=2$) + 20B audio ($r=2$)</i>				
Text	2.7840	2.5967	-0.1872	-6.73%
Vision	6.2183	6.2249	+0.0067	+0.11%
Audio	5.0230	5.0178	-0.0053	-0.10%
<i>8.3B-A2.6B, text-heavy continual pretraining: 40B text + 5B vision + 5B audio</i>				
Text	2.5897	2.5627	-0.0271	-1.04%
Vision	6.4872	6.5974	+0.1101	+1.70%
Audio	5.3068	5.3016	-0.0052	-0.10%

set of experts, with the routing distribution remaining close to uniform; and (ii) expert loads are balanced across modalities, with no modality-level imbalance. What little modality separation exists is concentrated in the layers closest to the output and shrinks as model size grows. We hypothesize that the diffuse routing may partly reflect the load-balancing loss. Thus, in our setting, capacity dilution does not appear to arise from modalities partitioning the expert pool, but rather from their sharing of the same experts.

Table 11: Mean per-layer Jensen–Shannon divergence between the expert-assignment distributions of two modalities, for every model scale. Mixture labels give the token split between the two modalities present in training. Values near zero indicate that the two modalities route to the same experts in the same proportions; the scale is normalized to $[0, 1]$. Barring the smallest model M1, all the divergences are ≤ 0.01 , indicating negligible modality-wise expert segregation. This hints that modalities compete for representational capacity within the same experts leading to $c_m < 0$.

Model	Text vs. vision		Text vs. audio	
	95/5	75/25	95/5	75/25
M1	0.026	0.010	0.014	0.011
M2	0.007	0.005	0.005	0.005
M3	0.010	0.008	0.006	0.009
M4	0.006	0.006	0.007	0.007
M5	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.004
M6	0.003	0.004	0.004	0.003