
Compute-Optimal Scaling Laws for Spiking Language Models

Dan Saunders

Luma AI

danjsaund@gmail.com

Benjamin Ren

X School

ultraman1234502@gmail.com

Catherine He

X School

catherinezhanghe@gmail.com

Abstract

Spiking neural networks target energy-efficient language modeling through sparse, binary activations, but the efficiency–accuracy tradeoff of spiking language models is uncharacterized at scale. We present the first Chinchilla-style IsoFLOP scaling study of a spiking language model, sweeping SpikeGPT-family models [Zhu et al., 2023] (RWKV backbone [Peng et al., 2023]) from width 384 to 1536 across compute budgets from 3×10^{17} to 1×10^{19} FLOPs on FineWeb-EDU. We report two findings. First, the compute-optimal frontier is $N_{opt} \propto C^{0.56}$, close to the 0.50 that Hoffmann et al. [2022] report for dense Transformers, so spiking does not change how parameters and data should be traded off under a compute budget. Second, against non-spiking RWKV and Transformer baselines trained the same way, the loss gap splits into a backbone cost of about 0.16 nats that does not change with compute and a spiking cost that falls from 0.34 to about 0.23 nats and then levels off. These results give the first compute-optimal recipe for spiking language models and quantify the accuracy cost of their sparsity.

1 Introduction

Scaling laws address a basic allocation question: given a fixed compute budget C , how should it be split between model size N and data D to minimize loss? Kaplan et al. [2020] established power-law scaling for Transformers, and Hoffmann et al. [2022] (Chinchilla) introduced the IsoFLOP methodology and revised the optimal allocation toward roughly equal scaling of N and D . How these laws transfer to spiking neural networks is unknown. SpikeGPT [Zhu et al., 2023] binarizes activations into spikes on an RWKV backbone [Peng et al., 2023] for energy-efficient neuromorphic inference, but was trained far below the regime where compute-optimal behavior is characterized, leaving open both how a spiking model should be scaled and what accuracy its sparsity costs.

We conduct a Chinchilla-style IsoFLOP study across a grid of compute budgets, fitting parabolas to recover compute-optimal (N_{opt}, D_{opt}) at each budget. Our contributions are: (1) the first compute-optimal IsoFLOP scaling law for a spiking language model, $N_{opt} \propto C^{0.56}$, close to dense Transformers; (2) non-spiking RWKV and Transformer baselines at every budget, which separate a constant backbone cost (~ 0.16 nats) from a spiking cost that falls to about 0.23 nats and then levels off; and (3) evidence that the apparent departure from the Chinchilla exponent is largely a parameter-counting artifact.

2 Related Work

Scaling Laws. Kaplan et al. [2020] established power-law scaling of transformer loss with model size, data, and compute; Hoffmann et al. [2022] (Chinchilla) revised the compute-optimal allocation toward scaling N and D in roughly equal proportion, using three estimators including the IsoFLOP profiles (their Approach 2) we adopt. Pearce and Song [2024] show that much of the Kaplan–Chinchilla exponent discrepancy is a parameter-counting artifact (non-embedding versus total parameters), a point central to our analysis (Section 4.3). Shen et al. [2024] extend IsoFLOP fitting to linear-complexity, non-softmax sequence models from 70M to 7B parameters, finding scaling broadly similar to transformers; we apply the same methodology to spiking RWKV models.

Spiking Language Models. RWKV [Peng et al., 2023] replaces quadratic self-attention with a linear-time recurrence, removing the sequence-length term that complicates transformer FLOP accounting. Zhu et al. [2023] build SpikeGPT on this backbone, binarizing activations into discrete spikes for energy-efficient, event-driven inference on neuromorphic hardware. A separate line spikes large *pretrained* LLMs post hoc [Xing et al., 2024]. To our knowledge, no prior work characterizes compute-optimal scaling for spiking language models trained from scratch, which we address here.

3 Methods

3.1 Experimental Settings

All models are trained with the AdamW optimizer ($\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$) using a batch size of 16 and a context length of 1024 tokens. Text is tokenized using the EleutherAI/gpt-neox-20b tokenizer [Black et al., 2022], and training data is drawn from the FineWeb-EDU sample-100BT split [Penedo et al., 2024]. Spiking neuron dynamics follow the standard leaky integrate-and-fire (LIF) model [Gerstner and Kistler, 2002, Maass, 1997], with the arctangent ($\arctan$) surrogate gradient [Nefci et al., 2019] used to enable backpropagation through the non-differentiable spiking threshold. The peak learning rate at each width comes from a power law $\text{LR}_{\text{opt}}(d) = k d^{-p}$ fit to a pilot sweep (Appendix D), with cosine decay to one-tenth, so loss differences across the grid reflect the N/D allocation rather than learning-rate tuning. We estimate training compute as $C \approx 6ND$ [Kaplan et al., 2020]; RWKV has no attention term, so matrix multiplies dominate.

3.2 Parameter Counting

With a 50,257-token vocabulary the embedding is 11–50% of all parameters, so how N is counted matters. We distinguish the strict non-embedding count ($13ld^2$, Kaplan), the FLOP-matmul count entering $C = 6ND$ ($N_{\setminus E} = 13ld^2 + vd$, retaining the output projection), and the total count ($N_T = 13ld^2 + 2vd$), with v the vocabulary size. Following Pearce and Song [2024], total is our primary convention; Section 4.3 reports all three. Inverting a parameter budget to a width d requires solving a cubic (Appendix E).

4 Results

4.1 IsoFLOP profiles

Figure 1 shows the validation loss L profiles across the grid; each model is trained single-epoch to the token budget its compute tier and width imply, and the full loss grid is tabulated in Appendix B.

Every tier produces the U-shaped profile in $\log N$ that the IsoFLOP method assumes, with an interior optimum well inside the sampled widths at all four compute budgets. The parabolas flatten as compute grows (leading quadratic coefficient $0.148 \rightarrow 0.057$ from 3×10^{17} to 1×10^{19}), so the vertex is less tightly determined at high compute; this dominates our exponent uncertainty (Section 4.4).

4.2 Compute-Optimal Frontier

Taking each parabola vertex as $(N_{\text{opt}}, L_{\text{opt}})$ with N_{opt} the total parameter count (our primary convention, Section 4.3) and $D_{\text{opt}} = C/(6N_{\text{opt}})$, log-log regression over the four compute budgets




Figure 1: **(a)** IsoFLOP profiles: validation loss L versus model size N at each compute budget C , with an interior compute-optimal minimum per tier. **(b)** The same runs as learning curves (loss versus compute $C = 6N_{\text{E}}D$, colored by budget); their lower envelope is the compute-optimal frontier $L_{\text{opt}}(C)$, which extrapolates a decade beyond the fit grid to the out-of-sample hero run at $C = 10^{20}$ (measured 2.76 vs. predicted 2.78 nats).

Table 1: Compute-optimal exponent α ($N_{\text{opt}} \propto C^\alpha$) under three parameter-counting conventions, estimated in two ways: the IsoFLOP vertex fit (Sec. 4.1) and a Chinchilla Approach 3 parametric fit $L = E + A/N^\alpha + B/D^\beta$ (Appendix G). The two estimators agree within each convention. D/N is the compute-optimal token-to-parameter ratio at the smallest and largest budget using IsoFLOP fit.

Convention	N	α (IsoFLOP)	α (Approach 3)	D/N ($3 \times 10^{17} \rightarrow 10^{19}$)
Strict non-embedding (Kaplan)	$13ld^2$	0.748	0.745	$25.1 \rightarrow 4.7$
FLOP-matmul (grid build)	$13ld^2 + vd$	0.624	0.644	$9.2 \rightarrow 4.1$
Total (Chinchilla, primary)	$13ld^2 + 2vd$	0.556	0.595	$4.9 \rightarrow 3.5$

($R^2 = 0.996$; per-tier vertices in Appendix C) yields

$$N_{T,\text{opt}}(C) = 1.82 \times 10^{-2} C^{0.556}, \quad D_{\text{opt}}(C) \propto C^{0.444}.$$

So $\alpha \approx 0.56$, close to the 0.5 that Hoffmann et al. [2022] report for dense Transformers. Because the grid is defined by $C \equiv 6ND$, $\beta = 1 - \alpha$ is not estimated separately.

Out-of-sample extrapolation. We train one compute-optimal model a decade beyond the grid, at $C = 10^{20}$ FLOPs ($N_T \approx 2.44\text{B}$, width 2048/depth 41; $D \approx 7.1\text{B}$ tokens single-epoch, same $\text{LR}_{\text{opt}}(d)$ rule). Extrapolating $L_{\text{opt}}(C)$ from the grid vertices predicts $L^* \approx 2.78$ nats; the run reaches $L \approx 2.76$ nats, so the frontier holds out of sample.

4.3 The Parameter-Counting Convention

Refitting under all three conventions (Table 1), α moves from 0.75 (strict non-embedding, near Kaplan’s reported 0.73) through 0.62 (FLOP-matmul) to 0.56 (total, near Chinchilla’s 0.5), spanning essentially the entire Kaplan–Chinchilla gap on a single dataset and architecture, at matched fit quality ($R^2 \approx 0.996$).

This has two consequences. First, small-scale IsoFLOP exponents should not be compared across studies without matching the counting convention. Second, our apparent departure from $\alpha = 0.5$ is largely a counting artifact: the larger non-embedding exponents reflect the small-scale bias Pearce and Song [2024] predict, not an architectural difference.

4.4 Sensitivity and Cross-Check

Details are in Appendix F. A leave-one-group-out jackknife gives $\alpha_{\text{total}} = 0.556$ with range $[0.532, 0.615]$ (mean 0.565 ± 0.053), so the estimate does not depend on any single tier. Repeating




Figure 2: Spiking RWKV compared with non-spiking baselines. **(a)** Compute-optimal loss $L_{\text{opt}}(C)$ for each architecture. **(b)** Backbone cost (dense RWKV minus Transformer) and spiking cost (spiking minus dense RWKV) at each budget.

four compute-optimal configurations across additional seeds gives run-to-run variance ≤ 0.003 nats, which shifts the exponent by < 0.01 , so the estimate is not seed-limited. It is far more sensitive to *how many* tiers are fit: two, three, and four tiers give 0.454, 0.537, and 0.556, so more tiers are the main way to tighten it. As an independent check, a Chinchilla Approach 3 parametric fit ($L = E + A/N^a + B/D^b$, which does not impose $C = 6ND$) reproduces the per-convention exponents to within 0.04 (Table 1) and estimates an irreducible loss $E \approx 2.7$ nats (Appendix G).

4.5 Comparison to Non-Spiking Baselines

To measure what spiking costs in loss, we repeat the IsoFLOP grid for two non-spiking baselines, a continuous-valued RWKV and a standard softmax-attention Transformer, using the same data, batch size, learning-rate schedule, and evaluation as the spiking runs and tuning only the learning rate per architecture. Comparing compute-optimal losses at each budget separates two effects (Figure 2): the backbone cost, the gap between dense RWKV and the Transformer, and the spiking cost, the gap between spiking and dense RWKV.

The backbone cost stays between 0.15 and 0.17 nats at every budget (Table 2, Appendix A). The spiking cost falls from 0.338 to 0.263 to 0.227 nats between 3×10^{17} and 3×10^{18} FLOPs, then holds at 0.225 at 10^{19} . With four budgets we cannot tell whether it has stopped falling or is only falling more slowly. At 10^{19} we add a width-2048 dense RWKV run above the compute-optimal size, so its minimum is not at the edge of the sampled widths.

Finally, spike rates depend on training progress rather than model size, rising toward a ~ 0.36 firing fraction as tokens-per-parameter grows (Appendix H).

5 Conclusion and Limitations

Under total-parameter counting, the compute-optimal frontier of a spiking language model is $N_{T,\text{opt}} \propto C^{0.556}$, close to dense Transformers’ 0.5; larger non-embedding exponents come from parameter counting, not the architecture. About 0.16 nats of the gap to a Transformer comes from the RWKV backbone and does not change with compute, while the cost of spiking falls to about 0.23 nats by 10^{19} FLOPs. These results come from four tiers between 3×10^{17} and 10^{19} FLOPs, far below Chinchilla’s 10^{21} – 10^{24} , on FineWeb-EDU only, with the aspect ratio d/l drifting from 38 to 53 across widths. The baselines use one seed per configuration, so whether the spiking cost stays near 0.23 nats at larger scale is untested; more tiers beyond the 10^{20} -FLOP point (Section 4.2) would test both this and the power law.

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

We would like to thank Lambda for their generous computational grant through the Lambda Research Grant Program. We also thank Cooper Sigrist and Charlie Guo from X School for their support.

References

- Sid Black, Stella Biderman, Eric Hallahan, Quentin Anthony, Leo Gao, Laurence Golding, Horace He, Connor Leahy, Kyle McDonell, Jason Phang, Michael Pieler, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Shivanshu Purohit, Laria Reynolds, Jonathan Tow, Ben Wang, and Samuel Weinbach. GPT-NeoX-20B: An open-source autoregressive language model, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.06745>.
- Wulfram Gerstner and Werner M. Kistler. *Spiking Neuron Models: Single Neurons, Populations, Plasticity*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- 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>.
- 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>.
- Wolfgang Maass. Networks of spiking neurons: The third generation of neural network models. *Neural Networks*, 10(9):1659–1671, 1997.
- Emre O. Neftci, Hesham Mostafa, and Friedemann Zenke. Surrogate gradient learning in spiking neural networks, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.09948>.
- Tim Pearce and Jinyeop Song. Reconciling Kaplan and Chinchilla scaling laws, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12907>.
- Guilherme Penedo, Hynek Kydlíček, Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Margaret Mitchell, Colin Raffel, Leandro von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. The FineWeb datasets: Decanting the web for the finest text data at scale, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.17557>.
- Bo Peng, Eric Alcaide, Quentin Anthony, Alon Albalak, Samuel Arcadinho, Stella Biderman, Huanqi Cao, Xin Cheng, Michael Chung, Matteo Grella, Kranthi Kiran GV, Xuzheng He, Haowen Hou, Jiaju Lin, Przemyslaw Kazienko, Jan Kocon, Jiaming Kong, Bartłomiej Koptyra, Hayden Lau, Krishna Sri Ipsit Mantri, Ferdinand Mom, Atsushi Saito, Guangyu Song, Xiangru Tang, Bolun Wang, Johan S. Wind, Stanislaw Wozniak, Ruichong Zhang, Zhenyuan Zhang, Qihang Zhao, Peng Zhou, Qinghua Zhou, Jian Zhu, and Rui-Jie Zhu. RWKV: Reinventing RNNs for the Transformer era, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.13048>.
- Xuyang Shen, Dong Li, Ruitao Leng, Zhen Qin, Weigao Sun, and Yiran Zhong. Scaling laws for linear complexity language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.16690>.
- Xingrun Xing, Boyan Gao, Zheng Zhang, David A. Clifton, Shitao Xiao, Li Du, Guoqi Li, and Jiajun Zhang. SpikeLLM: Scaling up spiking neural network to large language models via saliency-based spiking, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.04752>.
- Greg Yang and Edward J. Hu. Feature learning in infinite-width neural networks, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.14522>.
- Greg Yang, Edward J. Hu, Igor Babuschkin, Szymon Sidor, Xiaodong Liu, David Farhi, Nick Ryder, Jakub Pachocki, Weizhu Chen, and Jianfeng Gao. Tensor programs V: Tuning large neural networks via zero-shot hyperparameter transfer, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.03466>.
- Rui-Jie Zhu, Qihang Zhao, Guoqi Li, and Jason K. Eshraghian. SpikeGPT: Generative pre-trained language model with spiking neural networks, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13939>.

Table 2: Compute-optimal loss L_{opt} (nats) for spiking RWKV and the two non-spiking baselines (Section 4.5), with backbone cost (dense RWKV minus Transformer) and spiking cost (spiking minus dense RWKV). All runs share data, batch size, schedule, and evaluation; the learning rate is tuned per architecture. The 10^{19} dense RWKV fit includes a width-2048 run above the compute-optimal size.

C (FLOPs)	Transformer	Dense RWKV	Spiking RWKV	backbone cost	spiking cost
3×10^{17}	3.195	3.363	3.701	0.168	0.338
1×10^{18}	3.012	3.177	3.441	0.166	0.263
3×10^{18}	2.878	3.030	3.256	0.151	0.227
1×10^{19}	2.671	2.835	3.061	0.164	0.225

Table 3: Final validation loss across the IsoFLOP grid. N is the total parameter count. d is the embedding dimension. l is the number of layers. Bold marks the per-tier minimum; dashes indicate configurations outside the grid at that budget.

d/l	N	Compute budget C (FLOPs)			
		3×10^{17}	1×10^{18}	3×10^{18}	1×10^{19}
384/10	57.8M	3.8049	3.7049	–	–
512/12	92.4M	3.7002	3.5283	3.4866	–
640/14	138.9M	3.7384	3.4413	3.3480	3.3141
768/18	215.2M	3.8867	3.4621	3.2978	3.2030
1024/20	375.6M	–	3.5627	3.2558	3.1041
1280/24	639.8M	–	–	3.3020	3.0506
1536/29	1043.8M	–	–	–	3.0838

A Baseline Compute-Optimal Losses

B Full Loss Grid

C Compute-Optimal Frontier Vertices

Table 4 gives the per-tier compute-optimal allocation (total-parameter convention) recovered from the IsoFLOP parabola vertices, with $D_{\text{opt}} = C/(6N_{\text{opt}})$.

Table 4: Compute-optimal allocation from the IsoFLOP parabola vertices (total parameters).

C (FLOPs)	N_{opt}	D_{opt}	D/N	L_{opt}
3×10^{17}	101M	0.49B	4.9	3.7014
1×10^{18}	175M	0.95B	5.5	3.4406
3×10^{18}	349M	1.43B	4.1	3.2564
1×10^{19}	693M	2.40B	3.5	3.0619

D Learning Rate Pilot

The optimal learning rate typically decreases with model width, with common rules $\text{LR}_{\text{opt}} \propto d^{-1}$ or $d^{-1/2}$ [Yang and Hu, 2022], [Yang et al., 2022]. We sweep the learning rate over embedding dimensions and fit $\text{LR}_{\text{opt}}(d) = k d^{-p}$ by log-log regression (nesting both rules as $p = 1, \frac{1}{2}$), then set the peak learning rate at each width in the main sweep, with cosine decay to one-tenth. Figure 3 shows the fit.




Figure 3: Fitted learning-rate power law for SpikeGPT.

E Parameter-Count Inversion (Cardano)

With aspect ratio $A = d/l$ where d is the embedding dimension and l is the number of layers, each block contributes $13d^2$ matmul parameters from its time-mix and channel-mix components, so $N_{\setminus E} = 13d^3/A + vd$ and $N_T = N_{\setminus E} + vd$ where v is the vocabulary size. Inverting a target $N_{\setminus E}$ to a width d requires solving the cubic

$$13d^3 + Avd - AN_{\setminus E} = 0,$$

which has a closed form via Cardano’s formula. Because $N_{\setminus E}$ and d are related by this cubic rather than a monomial, $d_{\text{opt}}(C)$ is not itself a power law except in the large- d limit where $13d^3$ dominates Avd ; we therefore sample target values $N_{\setminus E}$ along the fitted frontier and invert numerically at each, rounding to architecture-compatible widths.

F Sensitivity Detail

Table 5 reports the leave-one-group-out jackknife for both the FLOP-matmul exponent α and the total-parameter exponent α_{total} . Dropping c3e17 (the lowest-compute tier) produces the largest excursion; jackknife means sit close to the full-data estimates, so no single tier dominates the fit. Replacing the parabola vertex with the discrete per-tier argmin gives $\alpha_{\text{total}} = 0.584$ but is markedly less stable under leave-one-out, since the argmin moves only in the discrete jumps the width grid allows; we report the vertex fit as primary.

Table 5: Leave-one-group-out jackknife on the IsoFLOP tiers.

Dropped tier	α	α_{total}
c3e17	0.674	0.615
c1e18	0.616	0.553
c3e18	0.625	0.560
c1e19	0.605	0.532
Full-data	0.624	0.556
Jackknife mean	0.630 ± 0.046	0.565 ± 0.053

G Approach 3 Parametric Fit

We fit $L(N, D) = E + A/N^a + B/D^b$ jointly across all runs; the frontier exponent follows as $\alpha = b/(a + b)$ and does not impose $C' = 6ND$. Per convention it gives 0.745 (strict non-embedding

Kaplan et al. [2020]), 0.644 (FLOP-matmul), and 0.595 (total), matching the IsoFLOP estimates to within 0.04, and an irreducible loss $E \approx 2.6$ –2.8 nats. A five-parameter surface on 19 points is degenerate, so we rely on the agreement of the two estimators rather than either point estimate.

H Activation Sparsity

Figure 4 plots the mean block spike rate against training tokens per parameter where block spike rate is the fraction of neurons firing in a specific layer. The per-width curves collapse onto a single rising, saturating trend approaching a ~ 0.36 firing fraction, indicating that sparsity is set by training progress rather than model size.




Figure 4: Mean block spike rate versus tokens per parameter; width curves collapse onto one trend.