



Truncate or Not? A Scaling Study of Looped Transformers with Truncated Backpropagation

Xuyuan Xiong^{1,*}, Siyu Chen^{2,*}, Zihan Shao², Yue Su¹, Weiyang Jin¹, Ping Luo¹,
Zhuoran Yang^{2,†}, Xihui Liu^{1,†}

¹MMLab, The University of Hong Kong ²Yale University

*Equal contribution: xiongxuyuan@connect.hku.hk, siyu.chen.sc3226@yale.edu

†Corresponding authors: zhuoran.yang@yale.edu, xihuiliu@eee.hku.hk

Looped transformers reuse a shared block of layers to increase computational depth without increasing the number of trainable parameters. They are trained with backpropagation through time (BPTT). To save training compute, BPTT is often truncated to the last few loops, but truncation yields biased gradients that may weaken the benefit of looping. In this work, we study the value of truncation in looped transformer training in a systematic way: we jointly vary model size, training tokens, and forward and backward loop counts across nearly 600 training runs and fit a unified scaling law that captures the effects of looping and truncation through *effective parameters*. Despite the training-compute savings of truncation, our fitted law favors **full BPTT** when forward and backward loop counts are jointly optimized. In matched-compute runs, full BPTT through fewer loops consistently outperforms truncated settings of the same compute. The law further shows that at fixed model size, the compute-optimal loop count and training-token budget both grow with compute. When model size is also free, the law identifies two fully trained loops as the best looped setting. Experimentally, this setting achieves lower validation loss than the compute-optimal non-looped model with about **27% fewer non-embedding parameters** and only 8% more training compute.

Date: October 15, 2026

Code: <https://github.com/xjxyys/Truncate-or-Not>




Figure 1 | Overview of looped transformer scaling with truncated BPTT. (a) Step for $(T, B) = (4, 2)$ (T forward loops, last B trained). (b) At $8D_0$ tokens, loops add effective parameters while truncation discounts them (§4; lines: law, markers: runs). (c) At fixed size (120M), optimal T grows with compute under full BPTT (§6.1). (d) (2, 2) (344M) beats (1, 1) (471M, 2.1×10^{19} FLOPs) in loss (2.36 vs. 2.37 nats) with 27% fewer parameters and 8% more compute (§6.3).

1 Introduction

Looped transformers have attracted attention for combining strong performance with efficient use of parameters and training memory. By repeatedly applying a shared block of layers, they increase computational depth without increasing the number of trainable parameters (Dehghani et al., 2019; Geiping et al., 2025). To reduce the cost of training these repeated blocks, several looped language models use truncated backpropagation through time (BPTT), propagating gradients only through the final loops while executing the earlier loops without tracking gradients (Geiping et al., 2025; Huang et al., 2026b; McLeish et al., 2025; Prairie et al., 2026; Wang et al., 2026a). Truncation introduces a new tradeoff: it saves backward computation and activation memory during training but can weaken the gains from looping (Schwethelm et al., 2026). To achieve the best performance under a fixed training compute budget, we must therefore decide how to divide compute among forward loops, backward loops, model size, and training tokens.

Existing scaling studies examine prescribed backpropagation recipes rather than jointly modeling forward and backward loop counts. Schwethelm et al. (2026) compare full BPTT with truncation to half the loops, fitting a separate scaling law to each recipe. Parcae (Prairie et al., 2026) varies backward-loop counts in small-model experiments but fixes them to half the forward-loop count in its scaling study, leaving their joint optimization to future work. These studies characterize specific recipes but do not provide a unified law for choosing both loop counts across model sizes and token budgets (Table 1). We thus ask the following question:

How do model size, training tokens, and forward and backward loops jointly affect loss, and should we truncate backpropagation under a fixed training compute budget?

To characterize how these quantities affect loss, we conduct nearly **600 training runs**, including a scaling suite spanning 58M–919M non-embedding parameters, over three orders of magnitude in training tokens per parameter, and up to 16 forward loops. We independently vary forward and backward loop counts across model sizes and token budgets and fit a **unified scaling law**. The scaling law expresses the benefit of looping through an *effective parameter count*—the size of a non-looped model that achieves the same loss at the same token budget. Fully trained loops increase the effective parameter count with diminishing returns, while truncation discounts this gain.

We then use the scaling law to decide whether to truncate, and the answer depends on whether the forward-loop count is prescribed. When it is, the law recovers the benefit of truncation reported in prior work (Schwethelm et al., 2026): the saved backward compute supports a larger model and more training tokens, which more than offset the discounted loop gain. When both loop counts can be chosen, however, the law favors full BPTT. Reducing the forward-loop count frees compute for additional backward loops until every remaining loop is trained, and under the fitted law this reallocation yields more effective parameters at the same compute than the original truncated setting. Separately fitted laws and matched-compute experiments support this advantage (§5).

Building on this preference for full BPTT, we additionally study how to allocate compute among loop count, training tokens, and model size. Consider first a setting where model size is predetermined, for example due to device memory constraints. At fixed model size, increasing the loop count is an effective way to increase the effective parameter count; however, additional loops offer diminishing gains while increasing the cost per token. The law precisely characterizes the optimal tradeoff between loop count and training tokens, allocating most additional compute to tokens and increasing the loop count only slowly. This result extends Parcae’s fixed-size allocation analysis (Prairie et al., 2026) beyond a prescribed truncation rule. When model size is also free, compute can instead support more unique parameters; under our leading-FLOP approximation, the law favors a




Figure 2 | No looping is computationally optimal; two fully trained loops saves most parameters with little extra compute. Each marker is a loop setting (T, B) , with T forward loops and the last B trained, at the parameter and token counts our scaling law finds compute-optimal. Compared with the model without looping at the same loss, the horizontal axis shows the training compute it needs and the vertical axis the fraction of non-embedding parameters it saves. Filled markers use full BPTT ($B = T$), and the dashed curve is the law’s prediction for full BPTT at any T from 2 to 16. Every truncated setting lies below this curve, so full BPTT forms the frontier and saves the most parameters at each compute. Dotted lines join the settings with the same T (§6.2).

non-looped model and identifies two fully trained loops as the best looped setting (Figure 2). In experiments, models with two fully trained loops nearly match compute-optimal non-looped models at equal training compute while having substantially fewer non-embedding parameters. With a little more training compute, such a smaller model surpasses the compute-optimal non-looped model (§6).

Our contributions are threefold:

- **A unified scaling law based on effective parameters.** We develop and validate a law that expresses loop gains and truncation discounts through an effective parameter count, jointly modeling model size, training tokens, and independent forward and backward loop counts (§4).
- **An explanation of when truncation pays.** We show why truncation can pay at a prescribed forward-loop count and why joint forward-backward allocation favors full BPTT under the fitted law, supported by matched-compute experiments (§5).
- **Compute-allocation rules and parameter-efficient training.** We derive allocation rules for fixed and free model size and demonstrate that two fully trained loops nearly match compute-optimal non-looped models while having substantially fewer trainable parameters (§6).

Figure 1 previews the three results: loops add effective parameters and truncation discounts them; at fixed model size the best loop count grows with compute; two fully trained loops match the loss of a non-looped model with fewer parameters for a little more compute.

2 Related work

Looped transformers. Depth-wise parameter sharing in Universal Transformers and ALBERT decouples computational depth from the number of trainable parameters (Dehghani et al., 2019; Lan et al., 2019). Theoretical and controlled studies show how recurrence supports iterative programs, in-context learning algorithms, and depth-sensitive reasoning (Giannou et al., 2023; Saunshi et al.,

2025; Yang et al., 2024). In language model pretraining, Huginn uses a prelude–recurrent–coda architecture (Geiping et al., 2025), while Ouro scales looped pretraining to 7.7T tokens (Zhu et al., 2025). Other work adds recurrence to pretrained models (Bae et al., 2025a; McLeish et al., 2025) or adapts depth at inference (Bae et al., 2025b; Jeddi et al., 2026). Recent architectures improve recurrence through residual and hyper-connections (Fu et al., 2026; Marchenko et al., 2026; Prairie et al., 2026; Zeitoun et al., 2026) or MoE routing (Chen et al., 2026a; Csordás et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2026; He et al., 2026). These studies show that looping improves parameter efficiency across architectures; we instead fix the architecture and ask how to train its loops and allocate compute.

Training through recurrent depth. Truncated BPTT limits gradient propagation to a subset of recurrent steps, saving activation memory and backward compute at the cost of biased gradients (Tallec and Ollivier, 2017; Williams and Peng, 1990). It is the common recipe for looped language models, which backpropagate through the last few loops or half of them (Geiping et al., 2025; McLeish et al., 2025; Prairie et al., 2026; Schwethelm et al., 2026), and recursive reasoning models often keep only the last step (Jolicoeur-Martineau, 2025; Wang et al., 2025). §A surveys these recipes in more detail. Implicit models likewise differentiate only a few steps at the fixed point (Bai et al., 2019; Geng et al., 2021b), and truncated BPTT in looped transformers can be read as a truncated Neumann series of the fixed-point gradient (Huang et al., 2026b; Movahedi et al., 2026). The few studies that measure what truncation costs compare training recipes at a fixed forward depth (Fein-Ashley and Rashidinejad, 2026; Huang et al., 2026a; Ren and Liu, 2026; Salvatori et al., 2026). We instead vary the backward depth independently of the forward depth, weighing the compute that truncation saves against the loop gain it costs.

Scaling laws for recurrence. Size–data scaling laws quantify how parameters and training tokens jointly determine loss (Hoffmann et al., 2022; Kaplan et al., 2020; Videau et al., 2026). For looped models, some laws fit each architecture separately (Chen et al., 2026c; Lee et al., 2026; Wang et al., 2026b), while others model the loop count explicitly (Table 1) through additive loss terms (Zhu et al., 2025) or effective parameters with linear, power-law, or bounded gains (Chen et al., 2026b; Prairie et al., 2026; Schwethelm et al., 2026). Closest to our work, Iso-Depth (Schwethelm et al., 2026) fits separate laws for full and half-length backpropagation and finds that truncation weakens the loop gain but lowers the loss at a fixed forward-loop count by freeing compute, while Parcae (Prairie et al., 2026) finds at fixed model size that loops and tokens should grow together with compute but ties the backward loops to half the forward loops and leaves their joint choice open. Our law instead treats the backward-loop count as a separate variable, combining coupled size–data scaling (Videau et al., 2026) with bounded loop gains (Chen et al., 2026b). It recovers the truncation benefit at a prescribed forward-loop count but favors full BPTT when both counts are free (§5). Looped MoE models commonly use two loops (Gao et al., 2026; He et al., 2026; Wang et al., 2026b). For dense models, our law ranks two fully trained loops first among looped settings, since they provide nearly the effective size of two untied copies (§6.2), and in our runs they nearly match compute-optimal models without looping with substantially fewer non-embedding parameters (§6.3).

3 Preliminaries

Looped transformers. We study the prelude–recurrent–coda architecture (Geiping et al., 2025; Schwethelm et al., 2026), illustrated in Figure 3 and detailed in §B. A prelude $\mathcal{P}$ of ℓ_p layers, including the input embedding, maps the input tokens to hidden states. A shared recurrent block $\mathcal{R}$ of ℓ_r layers then refines these states over T recurrent iterations, which we call *loops*, and a coda $\mathcal{C}$ of ℓ_c layers, including the output head, turns the result into next-token predictions. For an input

Table 1 | Scaling laws for looped language models. Earlier laws either fit a separate curve per architecture or model looping through a single loop count T , with backward loops B fixed or tied to T ; ours models T and B independently with a bounded effective-parameter gain. $/$: not discussed; † appendix scaling fit.

Study	Arch.	Scaling axes				Loop gain	BPTT	Regime
		N	D	T	B			
Schwethelm et al. (2026)	dense	✓	✓	✓	✗	power law (T^ϕ)	$T; \lceil T/2 \rceil$	fixed depth
Parcae (Prairie et al., 2026)	dense	✓	✓	✓	✗	linear (T)	$\lceil T/2 \rceil$	fixed N
Chen et al. (2026b)	dense, MoE	✓	✓	✓	✗	bounded exp. (T)	full (T)	free N , mem.
SMELT (Wang et al., 2026b)	MoE	✓	✓	✗	✗	per-arch. fit	/	matched N , KV
Lee et al. (2026)	dense, MoE	✓	✗	✗	✗	per-arch. fit	/	free N
Chen et al. (2026c)	dense	✓	✓	✗	✗	per-arch. fit	full (T)	free N
Ouro † (Zhu et al., 2025)	dense	✓	✓	✓	✗	additive (T)	/	/
Ours	dense	✓	✓	✓	✓	bounded (T, B)	$1 \leq B \leq T$	fixed & free N




Figure 3 | The looped transformer, drawn for $(T, B) = (4, 2)$. (a) One training step: a stop gradient on s_{T-B} , so the first $T - B$ loops (dashed) run forward only. (b) One loop, (3.1); all loops share its weights. (c) Training FLOPs per parameter and token of each part (5.1).

token sequence x and loops $t = 1, \dots, T$, the model computes

$$s_0 = \mathcal{P}(x), \quad s_t = \Phi_\theta(s_{t-1}; s_0) = \text{RMSNorm}(\mathcal{R}(W_{\text{inj}}[s_0; s_{t-1}])), \quad p = \mathcal{C}(s_T). \quad (3.1)$$

Here $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_T \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are the hidden states at each token position: the prelude output s_0 is the initial state, and s_t is the state after loop t . Each loop concatenates s_0 with the previous state into $[s_0; s_{t-1}]$, projects the result back to width d with $W_{\text{inj}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2d}$, and passes it through $\mathcal{R}$ and an RMSNorm to obtain s_t . This *input injection* feeds s_0 to every loop, and the RMSNorm at the end of each loop keeps the state passed to the next loop or the coda at a controlled scale, as in Schwethelm et al. (2026). We denote the loop map by Φ_θ , where θ collects the recurrent weights of $\mathcal{R}$ and W_{inj} . The coda maps the final state s_T to the next-token distribution p , and the cross-entropy loss applies only to p . We split the non-embedding parameters as $N = N_{\text{once}} + N_{\text{rec}}$, where N_{once} counts $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{C}$, which run once per token, and N_{rec} counts $\mathcal{R}$ and W_{inj} , which are reused in every loop; Table 2 gives the share N_{rec}/N for each model size.

Truncated BPTT. A *loop setting* (T, B) with $1 \leq B \leq T$ runs T loops forward and backpropagates through only the last B : the state s_{T-B} is detached (Figure 3a), so the first $T - B$ loops carry no gradient and store no activations. The setting $B = T$ is full BPTT, $B < T$ is truncated BPTT, and $(1, 1)$ is a standard transformer. The recurrent weights θ and, through the input injection, the prelude receive only the gradient of the last B loops. The coda’s gradient is exact. Evaluation always runs all T loops. A backward loop costs twice the FLOPs of a forward loop (§B), so truncation trades backward compute and activation memory for a biased gradient (Tallec and Ollivier, 2017; Williams and Peng, 1990). §B.2 writes out both gradients and discusses this bias.

Baseline scaling law. To relate validation loss to non-embedding parameter count N and training tokens D for a non-looped model, we adopt the coupled scaling law of Videau et al. (2026),

$$L(N, D) = E + \left[A \cdot \left(\frac{N}{N_0} \right)^{-\alpha} + H \cdot \left(\frac{D}{D_0} \right)^{-\beta} \right]^\kappa. \quad (3.2)$$

Here E is the irreducible loss, N_0 and D_0 are fixed reference scales (we give token budgets in units of $D_0 = 2^{30}$ tokens), $\alpha, \beta > 0$ are the size and token exponents, and the outer exponent κ couples the two terms ($\kappa = 1$ recovers the additive form of Hoffmann et al. (2022)); we denote the data coefficient by H to reserve B for backward loops. §4 extends (3.2) to looped models by replacing N with an effective parameter count in which (T, B) rescales N_{rec} by a *looping coefficient* $g(T, B)$.

4 A scaling law for forward and backward loops

Should a looped transformer truncate backpropagation? At a fixed model size and training compute, truncation saves backward computation that can be spent on more forward loops or more training data, but it also reduces the benefit of looping. We fit a scaling law that separates forward and backward loop counts to quantify this tradeoff. This section fits and validates the law and interprets it in terms of effective parameters. §5 then uses the law to decide whether to truncate, and §6 uses it to divide compute among loops, data, and model size.

4.1 Fitting and validating the scaling law

Experimental setup. We follow the architecture and training recipe of Schwethelm et al. (2026), using the prelude–recurrent–coda architecture introduced in §3. We train a grid of five model sizes from 58M to 919M non-embedding parameters (Table 2) on the 100B-token FineWeb-Edu corpus (Penedo et al., 2024). We use MuonH for transformer-block and input-injection matrices and AdamW for embedding, output, and normalization parameters (Jordan et al., 2024; Wen et al., 2025). We report validation cross-entropy in nats per token on deduplicated held-out shards; §B.3 gives the full training and evaluation setup, including the learning-rate and batch-size rules.

Table 2 | Model sizes.

Size	d	Layers	N	N_{rec}/N
60M	768	2/4/2	57.8M	0.510
120M	1024	2/5/2	115.4M	0.564
240M	1280	3/6/3	239.2M	0.507
480M	1664	3/7/4	470.8M	0.506
1B	2176	4/8/4	918.7M	0.505

d : width; layers: $\ell_p/\ell_r/\ell_c$; N : non-embedding parameters (§B.3).

Table 3 | Fit and prediction errors ($\times 10^{-3}$).

Evaluation	Fits	RMSE	MAE
In-sample	1	6.14	4.91
One configuration out	230	6.40	5.11
One model size N out	7	7.48	5.89
One token budget D out	11	6.42	5.12
One (T, B) setting out	15	8.67	6.74

Errors in $\times 10^{-3}$ nats/token over 230 configurations ($R^2 = 0.9992$; §C).




Figure 4 | Training curves of the scaling suite for no looping, (2, 1), and (2, 2). Each curve is one run, colored by model size, against training compute (§D.1); each token budget is a separate run. Training loss of every tenth step, averaged over at most ± 250 steps, not the validation loss we report. Highlighted line and dots: the frontier of run ends, the runs that end below every run with less compute. §H shows all fifteen loop settings.

Our 592 training runs include a *scaling suite* of 347 distinct configurations spanning 1.1–1,291 tokens per parameter and fifteen (T, B) combinations with $T \in \{1, 2, 4, 8, 16\}$, keeping each model’s parameter count fixed (Prairie et al., 2026). Figure 4 shows the training curves of three of these settings: as compute grows, larger models take over the frontier of run ends, as in Hoffmann et al. (2022). We fit the law on 230 configurations and reserve 117 for separate tests. For configurations with multiple accepted runs, we use their mean validation loss. Each configuration receives the same weight in the fit, regardless of its number of runs. Other experiments cover compute allocation, comparisons with untied models, learning-rate sweeps, and batch-size sweeps; Appendices B.3, C.3, E and F give the full experimental design and fitting details.

Effective-parameter scaling law. Only the recurrent block runs in every loop, so looping can enlarge only this block. We therefore write the loss as the coupled law of Videau et al. (2026) with an effective parameter count. In it, the recurrent block, N_{rec} , counts several times, and the prelude and coda, N_{once} , count once (§3):

$$L = E + \left[A \cdot \left(\frac{N_{\text{eff}}}{N_0} \right)^{-\alpha} + H \cdot \left(\frac{D}{D_0} \right)^{-\beta} \right]^\kappa, \quad (4.1)$$

$$N_{\text{eff}} = N_{\text{once}} + g(T, B) \cdot N_{\text{rec}}, \quad g(T, B) = \exp[c \cdot (1 - T^{-p} \cdot B^{-q})].$$

Here $g(T, B)$ is the *looping coefficient*: it multiplies the recurrent block’s parameter count, while the prelude and coda count once. With full BPTT, the looping coefficient $g(T, T) = \exp[c \cdot (1 - T^{-(p+q)})]$ grows with T ; truncation multiplies it by $g(T, B)/g(T, T) \leq 1$.

Design of the looping coefficient. We choose $g(T, B)$ to satisfy four modeling requirements:

1 Normalization

$$g(T, B) \geq 0, \\ g(1, 1) = 1$$

The looping coefficient is nonnegative; a single loop recovers the non-looped model.

2 Monotonicity

$$\partial_T g > 0, \quad \partial_B g > 0$$

Increasing either loop count increases the looping coefficient.

3 Zero-backward limit

$$g(T, 0) = 0$$

With no trained loop, the recurrent block adds no effective size.

4 Saturation

$$\sup_{1 \leq B \leq T} g(T, B) < \infty$$

Finite parameters store finite information, motivating a bounded gain.

The finite-ceiling assumption is supported by prior observations of saturation: Chen et al. (2026b) model a bounded effective-parameter gain from looping, while Parcae finds that adding test-time

Table 4 | Fitted parameters on the 230-configuration fitting set. The reference scales are fixed at $N_0 = 2.4 \times 10^8$ parameters and $D_0 = 2^{30}$ tokens.

E	A	H	α	β	κ	c	p	q
0.29865	6.48695	7.63343	0.30568	0.39281	0.32510	1.11198	0.23677	1.02181




Figure 5 | The looping coefficient varies with $r = B/T$. Markers and bars: medians and ranges of the loss-matched empirical coefficient $\hat{g}$ over 150 configurations. Lines: least-squares fits of $\log_2 \hat{g}$ against $\log_2 r$ for each T (§C.2). The slope falls as T grows: truncating the same fraction of loops costs less at larger T , so g couples T and B .




Figure 6 | The looping coefficient and the runs. Surface and diamonds: the full-data fitted looping coefficient $g(T, B)$. Circles and gray bars: medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) of loss-matched empirical looping coefficients across 163 configurations with $T \leq 8$ (§C.2). Vertical segments join each median to the fitted value at the same loop setting. Three coefficients, c, p, q , suffice to capture how the runs depend on T and B .

loops to a trained model approaches a loss floor (Prairie et al., 2026). There is also an information-storage motivation. At a fixed parameter count and weight precision, the weights can store only a finite amount of information; additional loops provide more computation over those weights without increasing their storage capacity. We therefore treat saturation as an empirical modeling assumption and learn its ceiling from the data.

These requirements motivate the form in (4.1). Nonnegativity motivates an exponential parameterization, ensuring $g(T, B) > 0$ for $T, B > 0$. With $c, p, q > 0$, increasing either loop count decreases $T^{-p} \cdot B^{-q}$, so $g(T, B)$ grows toward the finite ceiling $\exp(c)$. The shared coefficient c enforces $g(1, 1) = 1$, and continuous extension as $B \rightarrow 0^+$ gives $g(T, 0) = 0$. At fixed model size and token budget, p governs the loss reduction from extra forward loops at fixed B , while q governs the loss reduction from extra backward loops at fixed T . These three loop coefficients, c, p, q , together with the six coefficients $E, A, H, \alpha, \beta, \kappa$ of the coupled size–data law (3.2), give nine fitted coefficients.

Empirical looping coefficients. Figure 5 motivates coupling T and B : the empirical looping coefficient has a smaller fitted log–log slope against $r = B/T$ at larger T . Figure 6 compares the shared looping-coefficient surface with empirical looping coefficients. For each looped run with loss ℓ , we first use shape-preserving piecewise cubic Hermite interpolation (PCHIP) (Fritsch and Butland, 1984) to interpolate the non-looped measurements at the same target token budget to obtain the effective size $\hat{N}_{\text{eff}}$ matching ℓ . We then use the effective-size relation in (4.1): subtracting N_{once}

and dividing by N_{rec} gives the empirical looping coefficient $\hat{g}$ (§C.2). Vertical segments join each empirical median to the fitted coefficient at the same loop setting. This agreement shows that $g(T, B)$ with just three parameters c, p, q captures the observed loop dependence; Table 3 quantifies the law’s in-sample fit and leave-one-out (LOO) prediction errors.

Fitting procedure. We fit all nine parameters jointly by minimizing the sum of squared differences between predicted and measured validation losses, giving each configuration equal weight. The reference scales $N_0 = 2.4 \times 10^8$ parameters and $D_0 = 2^{30}$ tokens are held fixed. Predictions use actual token counts D ; budget holdouts group target token budgets. To reduce sensitivity to the initial guess, we fit the law 64 times from different random starting values and retain the solution with the smallest fitting error. All fits converge. Table 4 gives the parameters fitted on the 230 configurations used for the validation below. Further fitting details are in §C.




Figure 7 | More loops with full BPTT lower the loss at every size and budget and one law tracks all of them. Validation loss against training tokens for the four loop settings with full BPTT. Dots: runs, open where outside the fitting set; lines: the full-data fitted law (§4).

Holdout validation. To test whether the law predicts measurements it has not been fitted to, we leave out selected configurations, fit all nine parameters again using the remaining measurements, and compare the predictions with the omitted measurements. For example, to test prediction at an unseen model size, we exclude every configuration at that size and fit the law using the other sizes. We repeat this for each size and for the other exclusions listed in Table 3.

Prediction accuracy. The law tracks the measured loss curves across sizes and token budgets (Figure 7), including the held-out configurations (marked with open circles). Figure 8 gives the complementary view across loop settings at a fixed model size and token budget: varying T with $B = T$, varying B at fixed T , and varying T at fixed B . Both figures use the law fitted on the 230-configuration fitting set; the curves are evaluated on both fitted and held-out configurations. §G overlays the law on the five-size grid of the scaling suite.

Holding out a model size or token budget increases prediction error only modestly (Table 3), whereas unseen loop settings are harder to predict (§C). Extrapolation back to the non-looped baseline is the weakest loop-count check; §C reports the boundary errors and alternative gains. The table separates fit quality from held-out prediction error. §4.2 examines the remaining discrepancies in effective-parameter units (Figure 9), and §6.1 checks their effect on compute allocation (Figure 13).




Figure 8 | Forward and backward loops at fixed size and budget (240M, $2D_0$). Markers show measured runs and solid lines show the fitted law. (a) $B = T$: the gain levels off; dashed, the power-law gain of prior work (Schwethelm et al., 2026) keeps growing. (b) Fixed T : training more of the loops lowers the loss. (c) Fixed B : more forward loops help little. Gains level off, and training more loops (B) lowers the loss more than running more loops (T).

4.2 Illustrating the scaling law with effective parameters

How many parameters is a loop setting worth? (4.1) allows us to decompose the answer into the gain from fully trained loops, $g(T, T)$, and the discount for truncation, $g(T, B)/g(T, T)$. We use the empirical looping coefficients introduced above to compare the law with the runs in Figure 9; their construction is detailed in §C.2.

The looping coefficient saturates for large T . With full BPTT, $B = T$, and the gain is $g(T, T) = \exp[c \cdot (1 - T^{-(p+q)})]$. The runs in Figure 8a vary both loop counts together at fixed model size and token budget. Each doubling of trained loops adds less than the one before (Figures 8a and 9a), as Chen et al. (2026b) also find with all loops trained. The power-law gain of prior work (Schwethelm et al., 2026) keeps growing, whereas ours approaches e^c . Our runs support the bounded form over the power law, predicting held-out forward-loop counts more accurately (§C.4).

Doubling B outweighs doubling T alone. At fixed T , truncation reduces B and hence $g(T, B)$, consistent with the smaller effective sizes in Figure 9b and higher losses in Figure 8b. Figure 9c clarifies the relative roles of T and B by grouping settings with the same B . The fitted bars and empirical estimates change relatively little as T increases within a group, but show larger gains as B increases across groups, including comparisons at the same T . The fitted exponents quantify this asymmetry: $q > p$ (Table 4) implies $g(T, 2B) > g(2T, B)$ for $2B \leq T$. From the same initial setting at fixed model size, doubling B thus adds more effective parameters than doubling T alone; the small loss gains from extra forward loops at fixed B support the same conclusion (Figure 8c).

Finding 1 Loops add effective parameters; truncation discounts them. Each fully trained loop adds effective parameters, with diminishing returns toward a finite ceiling. Truncation discounts this gain, and from the same setting, doubling B adds more effective parameters than doubling T (Figure 9c).

5 Truncate or not?

Truncation saves backward compute but reduces the effective parameter count (§4.2). Whether it lowers loss at a given compute depends on which quantities are held fixed. We first fix the




Figure 9 | What a loop setting is worth in effective size. (a) Full BPTT, the looping coefficient $g(T, T)$, approaches its fitted ceiling (dotted); dashed beyond the fitted loop counts. (b) The looping coefficient $g(T, B)$ against the trained fraction B/T . (c) Total effective size N_{eff}/N , grouped by B . Lines, bars and numbers: the law; markers and error bars: run estimates, median and interquartile range over sizes and budgets (§C.2). Effective size is set mainly by B : within each group of equal B , neither the law nor the runs gain much from more forward loops.

forward-loop count, as prior scaling studies do, and then let both loop counts vary at equal compute.

5.1 Fixed forward loops: truncation can be optimal

Suppose the forward-loop count T is prescribed, and the model size N , token count D , and backward-loop count B are chosen to minimize loss at a training compute C , with the recurrent block keeping a fixed share of the parameters as N varies. Truncation lowers the effective size $N_{\text{eff}} = N_{\text{once}} + g(T, B) \cdot N_{\text{rec}}$, but it also lowers the training cost, which we express through the *compute-equivalent size* N_{comp} :

$$C \simeq 6D \cdot N_{\text{comp}}, \quad N_{\text{comp}} = N_{\text{once}} + \frac{T + 2B}{3} \cdot N_{\text{rec}}. \quad (5.1)$$

We count two FLOPs per parameter and token for a forward pass and four for a backward pass, omitting attention products and the output projection. We also omit the optimizer update as its cost per step depends on the parameter count but not on T or B . Under this count, the prelude and coda run one forward and one backward pass, costing $6N_{\text{once}}$ FLOPs per token, and the recurrent block runs T forward and B backward passes, costing $(2T + 4B) \cdot N_{\text{rec}}$. Their sum is $6N_{\text{comp}}$. A looped model thus corresponds to two different non-looped sizes: trained on the same tokens, it reaches the loss of a non-looped model with N_{eff} parameters, and it costs the compute of a non-looped model with N_{comp} parameters. Their ratio $\chi = N_{\text{comp}}/N_{\text{eff}}$ is the compute paid per effective parameter. Therefore, our optimization at fixed compute reduces to choosing the backward-loop count that minimizes this ratio (see Lemma D.1 in §D.4 for a rigorous derivation):

$$B^* \in \arg \min_{B \in \{1, \dots, T\}} \chi(T, B), \quad \text{where} \quad \chi(T, B) = \frac{N_{\text{comp}}}{N_{\text{eff}}}.$$

Since χ does not involve C , neither does B^* . The stationary condition (D.7) gives continuous candidates for B^* ; integer choices are evaluated directly using χ (Table 5).

Truncation reduces effective size, but frees compute for a larger model and more tokens. At $T = 8$, the law selects $B^* = 2$ and predicts a 34% compute saving at equal optimized loss (Table 5).

Table 5 | With T prescribed, the law selects $B^* = 2$ and so truncates from $T = 4$ on. For each forward-loop count T , B^* is the backward-loop count that minimizes $\chi(T, B) = N_{\text{comp}}/N_{\text{eff}}$, the compute per effective parameter, over the integers $1 \leq B \leq T$, with $N_{\text{rec}}/N \simeq 0.507$ and N, D optimized under leading FLOPs. N^* and D^* are the optimal model size and token count at B^* relative to full BPTT at the same T and compute C . These ratios do not depend on C . The gap between $\chi(T, B^*)$ and $\chi(T, T)$, and hence the compute that truncation saves, grows with T .

T	B^*	$\chi(T, B^*)$	$\chi(T, T)$	N^*	D^*
1	1	1.000	1.000	1	1
2	2	1.031	1.031	1	1
4	2	1.204	1.430	1.27	1.08
8	2	1.580	2.376	1.51	1.20
16	2	2.343	4.339	1.70	1.31

Separately fitted laws at $T = 4, 8$ also favor $B = 2$ over $B = T$: at $T = 8$, their compute-optimal frontiers predict a 33–35% saving within the range of the runs (Figure 10; fitting details in §D.4).

This agrees with the fixed-compute truncation benefit reported by Schwethelm et al. (2026). Parcae uses truncated BPTT but leaves the compute-optimal choice of forward and backward loop counts to future work (Prairie et al., 2026, Appendix I). The benefit is conditional on prescribing T . We next ask whether it survives when both loop counts can be chosen.

5.2 Free forward-loop count: full BPTT is optimal

When T can also be chosen, we optimize the split between forward and backward loops at equal compute. Fix the model architecture and token count D . In our FLOP accounting, each forward pass through the recurrent block costs one unit and each backward pass costs two (§D.1). The recurrent block thus costs $T + 2B$ units per token; all other model components have the same cost across loop settings. Holding $T + 2B$ fixed therefore holds total compute fixed: for example, $(T, B) = (4, 4)$ and $(8, 2)$ both cost 12 recurrent units per token.

Fix such a loop-compute count $S = T + 2B$. With the architecture and D fixed, the law (4.1) depends on the loop setting only through $N_{\text{eff}} = N_{\text{once}} + g(T, B) \cdot N_{\text{rec}}$, and the loss decreases as N_{eff} grows. Since N_{once} and $N_{\text{rec}} > 0$ are fixed, minimizing the loss at this compute is equivalent to maximizing the looping coefficient $g(T, B)$, which we relax to continuous loop counts:

$$\underset{T, B \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{maximize}} \quad g(T, B) \quad \text{subject to} \quad T + 2B = S, \quad 1 \leq B \leq T. \quad (5.2)$$

The optimal split uses full BPTT. Recall that $g(T, B) = \exp[c \cdot (1 - T^{-p} \cdot B^{-q})]$ with $c > 0$. Thus (5.2) is equivalent to minimizing $T^{-p} \cdot B^{-q}$ under the same affine constraints. This is a standard convex optimization problem: whenever $q > 2p$, its unique solution is $T = B = S/3$ for every $S \geq 3$, giving full BPTT (Lemma D.2 in §D.4.2). The fitted exponents in Table 4, $p \simeq 0.237$ and $q \simeq 1.022$, satisfy $q > 2p \simeq 0.474$ by a wide margin. Therefore, the law predicts that full BPTT is optimal at every compute if both T and B can be chosen continuously.¹

¹The continuous optimum need not be an integer setting. At the loop compute of $(4, 3)$, $T + 2B = 10$, it is $(10/3, 10/3)$, which lies between the fully trained settings $(2, 2)$ and $(4, 4)$. Over a narrow compute range, the law therefore gives $(4, 3)$ a lead of at most 0.002 nats over both. Figure 2 shows the same effect: $(4, 3)$, $(8, 4)$ and $(16, 8)$ lie just below the full-BPTT frontier. Their fully trained counterparts at equal loop compute, with $(T + 2B)/3$ loops, are not integer settings, and each needs at most 2.2% more compute per effective parameter than its counterpart.




Figure 10 | Separately fitted laws confirm the predicted truncation. Iso-loss contours (labels: loss in nats) and compute-optimal frontiers of laws fitted separately to $B = T$ (dashed, grey) and to the predicted $B^* = 2$ (solid), at $T = 4$ (a) and $T = 8$ (b). Markers are measured runs; faded segments lie outside the runs of a setting. At every loss level, the $B^* = 2$ contour lies left of the $B = T$ contour (shaded gap), so truncation reaches the same loss with less compute: 5–11% less at $T = 4$ and 33–35% less at $T = 8$, where both compute-optimal points lie within the runs. The saving grows with T because further backpropagated loops add little effective size at full cost. The compute that truncation frees goes partly into a larger model.

Separately fitted laws confirm the benefit of full BPTT. The compute-optimal frontiers of the separately fitted laws predict that $(4, 4)$ reaches the same loss with less compute than $(8, 2)$ where both optimal allocations lie within the ranges of their runs (Figure 11). Matched-compute runs agree: at $D = 16D_0$, $(4, 4)$ achieves lower loss than $(8, 2)$ at every size (Table 6).

Finding 2 Truncation helps at a prescribed forward-loop count; with both forward and backward loop counts tunable, full BPTT is optimal. When T is prescribed, the law favors truncation, and separately fitted laws agree. When both loop counts can be chosen, full BPTT is optimal at every size and compute.

6 Allocating compute among loops, data, and model size

Given full BPTT, it remains to divide training compute among loops, tokens, and model size. Following Hoffmann et al. (2022), we summarize each allocation by how its optimum scales with compute, $X^* \propto C^a$. We first fix the model size (§6.1) and then let it vary (Sections 6.2 and 6.3).

6.1 Fixed model size: loops versus data

Suppose a model must fit within a device’s memory budget, so adding parameters is not an option. With more training compute available, should we reuse those parameters through more loops per token, or train on more tokens? At fixed size, more loops raise effective size but leave fewer training tokens within the same compute budget; our law balances these two.

Asymptotic loop–token allocation under full BPTT. The allocation power laws below describe the large-compute limit of our fitted loss law, not a separate fit to measured optima. Fix the architecture

Table 6 | Reducing forward depth at equal training compute. Measured validation losses at $D = 16D_0$ (17.2 billion tokens). Within each row, $(T, B) = (8, 2)$ and $(4, 4)$ have identical model size, tokens, and training compute C , including optimizer updates. Losses and the reduction $\Delta L = L_{8,2} - L_{4,4}$ are in nats per token. Model sizes use nominal labels; C is the training compute in FLOPs.

Size	C (10^{19})	$L_{8,2}$	$L_{4,4}$	ΔL (10^{-2})
60M	2.41	2.5211	2.4933	2.78
120M	4.59	2.3843	2.3696	1.47
240M	8.28	2.2778	2.2642	1.36
480M	15.29	2.1845	2.1738	1.07
1B	28.38	2.1144	2.1057	0.87




Figure 11 | Fewer fully trained loops improve the compute-optimal frontier. Iso-loss contours of separately fitted laws for $(T, B) = (4, 4)$ (solid) and $(8, 2)$ (dashed), both with $T + 2B = 12$. Thick lines: compute-optimal frontiers; faded segments lie outside the runs of a setting. At equal loss, solid contours lie left of dashed ones: $(4, 4)$ uses 8–14% less compute, so once T can be chosen, full BPTT beats truncation.

and parameter counts ($N_{\text{rec}} > 0$); setting $B = T$ in (4.1) gives the full-BPTT loss

$$L_N(T, D) = E + \left[A \cdot \left(\frac{N_{\text{once}} + N_{\text{rec}} \cdot e^{c \cdot (1 - T^{-(p+q)})}}{N_0} \right)^{-\alpha} + H \cdot \left(\frac{D}{D_0} \right)^{-\beta} \right]^\kappa. \quad (6.1)$$

Because $\kappa > 0$, minimizing (6.1) is equivalent to minimizing its inner sum, $J_N = (L_N - E)^{1/\kappa}$. As $T \rightarrow \infty$, the effective size approaches $N_\infty = N_{\text{once}} + e^c \cdot N_{\text{rec}}$. Expanding around this limit gives

$$J_N(T, D) = J_\infty + K_N \cdot T^{-(p+q)} + H \cdot \left(\frac{D}{D_0} \right)^{-\beta} + O(T^{-2(p+q)}), \quad (6.2)$$

where $J_\infty = A \cdot (N_\infty/N_0)^{-\alpha}$ and $K_N = \alpha \cdot c \cdot (N_{\text{rec}} \cdot e^c/N_\infty) \cdot J_\infty > 0$ are fixed by the architecture and fitted coefficients; the leading loop term has exponent $p + q$ and the data term has exponent β .

Following the power-law allocation argument of Hoffmann et al. (2022), we balance these two terms under a compute constraint. At fixed size, compute per token grows linearly with T at large depth ($C \propto T \cdot D$). For continuous T, D , minimizing the leading terms in (6.2) gives the asymptotic scaling

$$T^* \propto C^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+p+q}}, \quad D^* \propto C^{\frac{p+q}{\beta+p+q}} \quad \text{at fixed } N. \quad (6.3)$$

These powers need not describe finite-compute optima, where overheads and integer loop counts remain consequential. §D.4.3 derives this limit from the exact stationary condition, including the compute overhead of the non-recurrent layers.




Figure 12 | How the compute-optimal allocation scales with training compute. **Top:** fixed model size (240M). (a) Loss against the loop count at five computes, with the optimum at each compute marked by a star. (b, c) The optimal loop count T^* and token count D^* of the stars, and the law’s optimum (line), whose exponents approach (6.4). **Bottom:** free model size. (d) Loss against model size at four computes for (1, 1) (dashed) and (2, 2) (solid), with their optima (stars) and the compute-optimal pairs of §6.3 (diamonds). (e, f) N^* and D^* of the stars and the law’s optimum (6.5), which places the optimum of (1, 1) at a larger model than its runs do. Colours mark compute within each row, and compute is $6N_{\text{comp}}D$ (5.1). At fixed size, added compute goes mostly to tokens while the loop count grows slowly. With free size, (2, 2) tracks (1, 1) at a smaller model.

Loops grow slowly; most added compute goes to data. Substituting the fitted $p + q \simeq 1.259$ and $\beta \simeq 0.393$ into (6.3) gives, with rounded exponents,

$$T^* \propto C^{0.24}, \quad D^* \propto C^{0.76}. \quad (6.4)$$

A tenfold increase in compute therefore raises the optimal loop count by about 1.7 times and the token count by about 5.8 times. These exponents are asymptotic: because loop counts are integers, the best setting changes in steps. Between steps, added compute goes to tokens; at each step, the model switches to a deeper setting with fewer tokens. The runs show the same trend: at each size, the loop count minimizing loss at equal compute grows with compute as predicted (Figure 12a–c).

Comparison with prior scaling laws. Parcae reports empirical exponents of approximately 0.40 for mean recurrence and 0.78 for training tokens (Prairie et al., 2026, Section 5.2). (6.4) agrees that tokens grow faster than loops, but predicts slower loop growth in the asymptotic regime. Parcae samples recurrence and uses truncated BPTT, so its reported optimum is conditional on that training recipe. Our full-BPTT result suggests that truncation may be suboptimal when both loop counts are free under our law and compute model; whether this also holds for Parcae requires a direct comparison. The law of Schwethelm et al. (2026) instead lets the looping coefficient grow unbounded as T^φ . Our gain saturates, and $p + q$ governs the approach to that ceiling, giving a different asymptotic allocation between loops and tokens.




Figure 13 | At a fixed model size, the best loop count grows with training compute: no looping, then two, then four trained loops. Loss minus that of the model without looping at the same compute, which spends it on more tokens; markers are runs, with a smooth curve through each setting; (4,2) trains half of its four loops. The bold curve is the best setting, named in the strip by its loop count T^* (faded where extrapolated). Within each stretch the best model spends added compute on tokens, and at each switch it trades tokens for loops.




Figure 14 | Loops versus untied copies. Fitted $g(T, T)$ (solid, with markers at integer T) against T untied copies (dashed). It stays below T for $T \geq 2$, so untied copies are worth more. The gap is smallest at $T = 2$, where two loops come close to the effective size of two untied copies.




Figure 15 | Two fully trained loops against no looping at 2.1×10^{19} FLOPs, as in Figure 1d. Parameters and compute of the (2,2) model relative to the compute-optimal model without looping. With 8% more compute, (2,2) reaches a lower loss with 27% fewer non-embedding parameters.

Finding 3 At fixed model size, optimal loops and tokens both grow with compute; tokens grow faster. Under the fitted law with full BPTT, the compute-optimal loop count grows asymptotically as $C^{0.24}$ and the token count as $C^{0.76}$. The runs at every size agree.

6.2 Free model size: the law favors no looping

When model size is free, the compute spent repeating a block can instead train more unique parameters. Start with a T -loop model using full BPTT, for integer $T \geq 2$, and replace its shared recurrent block with T untied copies. The resulting non-looped model has the same compute C and token budget D under (5.1), but greater effective size:

$$N_{\text{once}} + g(T, T) \cdot N_{\text{rec}} < N_{\text{once}} + T \cdot N_{\text{rec}}.$$

The left side is the effective size of the looped model; the right side is that of the model with T untied copies. The inequality follows from the fitted $g(T, T) < T$ (Figure 14; §D.4.4). The non-looped

model therefore has greater effective size and lower predicted loss at every token budget. Figure 14 also shows that $g(2, 2)$ is close to 2; we examine this two-loop case in §6.3.

The best loop setting does not change with compute. With parameter proportions fixed and positive, continuous N, D unrestricted, every loop setting shares the compute exponents of the model without looping. Optimizing the loop setting as well gives

$$N^* \propto C^{0.56}, \quad D^* \propto C^{0.44}, \quad T^* = B^* = 1. \quad (6.5)$$

The exponents are rounded predictions under the leading-FLOP count (§D.4.4). Under these assumptions, the ranking of loop settings is the same at every compute.

No looping is optimal, and two fully trained loops come closest. Among the fifteen settings, the law favors the model without looping at fixed compute (Figure 2), consistent with Schwethelm et al. (2026). The best looped setting is $(2, 2)$ (Table 5): $g(2, 2) \approx 2$, so two shared loops provide nearly the effective size of two untied copies. Because $N_{\text{eff}} > N$ for $(2, 2)$, the law predicts that it comes close to the model without looping with fewer trainable parameters. §6.3 tests this.

Finding 4 With free model size, no looping is optimal. At every compute, with model size and token count free, the law favors the model without looping (Figure 2).

6.3 Two fully trained loops are competitive with fewer parameters

Near parity at equal compute. At each of three training budgets, we train a model with two fully trained loops, $(2, 2)$, and a model without looping, each at the size and token count that minimize its loss for that budget, with three seeds per model (§E). At every budget, the looped model stays within 0.008 nats of the model without looping while having 27–32% fewer non-embedding parameters (Table 11). The gap shrinks as the budget grows, and at 2.1×10^{19} FLOPs² it is smaller than its standard error across seeds. Both models sit near the flat minima of their IsoFLOP profiles, the looped one at a smaller size (Figure 12d).

Ahead with a little more compute. Because the gap is so small, a little more compute lets the looped model pull ahead. We take the pair at 2.1×10^{19} FLOPs and train its $(2, 2)$ model on 8% more tokens, and so with 8% more compute. Its loss then falls 0.007 nats below that of the model without looping, well beyond the spread across seeds, while it still has 27% fewer non-embedding parameters (Figure 15; Table 11). Appendix E also compares the looped model with an untied model, which gives each loop its own block, at a fixed number of training tokens.

Finding 5 Two fully trained loops nearly match the model without looping with 27–32% fewer parameters. In the runs, the compute-optimal $(2, 2)$ model stays within 0.008 nats of the compute-optimal model without looping at equal training compute, with 27–32% fewer non-embedding parameters; with 8% more compute, its loss falls below.

7 Conclusion

Truncated BPTT saves compute, but whether it lowers the loss depends on which quantities are held fixed. We fit a scaling law that expresses every loop setting as effective parameters, with a gain that saturates and shrinks under truncation (§4). Under this law, truncation helps only when

²Including the optimizer update, as in Table 11; the forward and backward passes alone take 2.0×10^{19} FLOPs.

the forward-loop count is prescribed. When both loop counts are chosen, full BPTT is optimal at every model size and compute we analyze (§5).

The law also determines how to allocate compute. At fixed model size, most additional compute should go to data, and the number of fully trained loops grows only as about $C^{0.24}$ (§6.1). When model size is free, the law favors no looping, but two fully trained loops come close: with 27–32% fewer non-embedding parameters they nearly match the compute-optimal non-looped model at equal compute, and with 27% fewer parameters they achieve lower loss at 8% more compute (§6.3).

Limitations. Our main limitation is the focus on dense models: we do not study mixture-of-experts (MoE) architectures, so whether our conclusions on truncation and compute allocation extend to looped MoE models remains open. Second, we measure validation loss only and do not establish whether the observed gains translate to downstream task performance or reasoning ability. Third, our experiments are capped at $T \leq 16$, so the gain ceiling and later switches to more loops remain extrapolations. Related scaling sweeps reach eight loops in Schwethelm et al. (2026) and mean training loop counts of twelve in Parcae (Prairie et al., 2026). Much deeper recurrence can exacerbate training instability, including residual explosion and loss spikes (Fu et al., 2026; Prairie et al., 2026); developing stable training recipes for that regime is beyond our scope. Finally, we fix the ratio of non-embedding parameters in the combined prelude and coda to those in the recurrent block for each model size. Varying this ratio to study how parameter allocation affects the gains from looping and the compute-optimal loop counts is a direction for future work.

Acknowledgments

We thank Yuwei Niu, Yi Ge, and Tianyu Fu for valuable feedback and helpful discussions.

References

- Abnar, S., Shah, H., Busbridge, D., Ali, A. M. E., Susskind, J. and Thilak, V. (2025). Parameters vs FLOPs: Scaling Laws for Optimal Sparsity for Mixture-of-Experts Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12370*. 26
- Asadulaev, A., Banerjee, R., Karray, F. and Takac, M. (2025). Latent Reasoning in TRMs is Secretly a Policy Improvement Operator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.16886*. 26
- Bae, S., Fisch, A., Harutyunyan, H., Ji, Z., Kim, S. and Schuster, T. (2025a). Relaxed Recursive Transformers: Effective Parameter Sharing with Layer-wise LoRA. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 4, 43
- Bae, S., Kim, Y., Bayat, R., Kim, S., Ha, J., Schuster, T., Fisch, A., Harutyunyan, H., Ji, Z., Courville, A. and Yun, S.-Y. (2025b). Mixture-of-Recursions: Learning Dynamic Recursive Depths for Adaptive Token-Level Computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.10524*. 4
- Baek, J., Jo, M., Kim, M., Ren, M., Bengio, Y. and Ahn, S. (2026). Generative Recursive Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.19376*. 26
- Bai, S., Geng, Z., Savani, Y. and Kolter, J. Z. (2022). Deep Equilibrium Optical Flow Estimation. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 26
- Bai, S., Kolter, J. Z. and Koltun, V. (2019). Deep Equilibrium Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 4, 26, 27
- Bai, X. and Melas-Kyriazi, L. (2024). Fixed Point Diffusion Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08741*. 26
- Bansal, A., Schwarzschild, A., Borgnia, E., Emam, Z., Huang, F., Goldblum, M. and Goldstein, T. (2022). End-to-end Algorithm Synthesis with Recurrent Networks: Extrapolation without Overthinking. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 26
- Bergsma, S., Dey, N., Gosal, G., Gray, G., Soboleva, D. and Hestness, J. (2025). Power Lines: Scaling Laws for Weight Decay and Batch Size in LLM Pre-training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 29, 46
- Besiroglu, T., Erdil, E., Barnett, M. and You, J. (2024). Chinchilla Scaling: A replication attempt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10102*. 26
- Bordelon, B., Noci, L., Li, M. B., Hanin, B. and Pehlevan, C. (2023). Depthwise Hyperparameter Transfer in Residual Networks: Dynamics and Scaling Limit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16620*. 45
- Chen, W., Li, T., Huang, W., Yin, Y., Shang, L. and Qin, C. (2026a). LoopMoE: Unifying Iterative Computation with Mixture-of-Experts for Language Modeling. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.04438> 4
- Chen, Y., Goyal, A. and Krishnamoorthi, R. (2026b). Scaling Laws for Looped Mixture of Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.40316*. 4, 5, 7, 10, 26, 27
- Chen, Z., Vegesna, A., Dahal, S. and Wilson, A. G. (2026c). How Model Growth, Recursion, and Boundary Operators Influence Scaling Exponents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.19107*.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.19107> 4, 5, 26

- Choshen, L., Zhang, Y. and Andreas, J. (2025). A Hitchhiker’s Guide to Scaling Law Estimation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. 26
- Clark, A., de las Casas, D., Guy, A., Mensch, A., Paganini, M., Hoffmann, J., Damoc, B., Hechtman, B., Cai, T., Borgeaud, S., van den Driessche, G., Rutherford, E., Hennigan, T., Johnson, M., Millican, K. et al. (2022). Unified Scaling Laws for Routed Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01169*. 26
- Csordás, R., Irie, K., Schmidhuber, J., Potts, C. and Manning, C. D. (2024). MoEUT: Mixture-of-Experts Universal Transformers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 4
- Dehghani, M., Gouws, S., Vinyals, O., Uszkoreit, J. and Kaiser, Ł. (2019). Universal Transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 2, 3
- Dey, N., Zhang, B. C., Noci, L., Li, M., Bordelon, B., Bergsma, S., Pehlevan, C., Hanin, B. and Hestness, J. (2025). Don’t be lazy: CompleteP enables compute-efficient deep transformers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 45
- Fein-Ashley, J. and Rashidinejad, P. (2026). Solve the Loop: Attractor Models for Language and Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.12466*. 4, 26
- Filatov, O., Wang, J., Ebert, J. and Kesselheim, S. (2025). Optimal Scaling Needs Optimal Norm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.03871*. 29, 46
- Freinschlag, R., Bertram, T., Kobler, E., Mayr, A. and Klambauer, G. (2026). Symbol-Equivariant Recurrent Reasoning Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.02193*. 26
- Fritsch, F. N. and Butland, J. (1984). A method for constructing local monotone piecewise cubic interpolants. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 5 300–304. 8, 30
- Fu, R., Yang, Z., Zhang, J., Ma, J., Chen, H., Li, Y. and Chang, Y. (2026). Simply Stabilizing the Loop via Fully Looped Transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.18797*. 4, 18
- Gao, Z., Chen, L., Xiao, Y., Xing, H., Tao, R., Luo, H., Zhou, J. and Dai, B. (2025). Universal Reasoning Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.14693*. 26
- Gao, Z., Chen, Y., Xiao, Y., Yang, X., Tao, R., Zhou, J. and Dai, B. (2026). Loop the Loopies! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.16051*. 4, 27, 28
- Geiping, J., McLeish, S., Jain, N., Kirchenbauer, J., Singh, S., Bartoldson, B. R., Kailkhura, B., Bhatele, A. and Goldstein, T. (2025). Scaling up Test-Time Compute with Latent Reasoning: A Recurrent Depth Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05171*. 2, 4, 26, 28
- Geng, Z., Guo, M.-H., Chen, H., Li, X., Wei, K. and Lin, Z. (2021a). Is Attention Better Than Matrix Decomposition? In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 26
- Geng, Z., Zhang, X.-Y., Bai, S., Wang, Y. and Lin, Z. (2021b). On Training Implicit Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 4, 26
- Giannou, A., Rajput, S., Sohn, J.-y., Lee, K., Lee, J. D. and Papailiopoulos, D. (2023). Looped Transformers as Programmable Computers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13196*. 3

- Hakimi, N. (2026). Form Follows Function: Recursive Stem Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.15641*. 26
- Han, S.-I. (2026). Hierarchical vs. Flat Iteration in Shared-Weight Transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.14442*. 26
- He, D., Li, P., Chang, D., Meng, Q., Yin, L. and Liu, S. (2026). Looping Beyond Twice: A Scalable Recipe for Looped Mixture-of-Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.01153*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.01153> 4, 26, 27, 28
- Hoffmann, J., Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A., Buchatskaya, E., Cai, T., Rutherford, E., de Las Casas, D., Hendricks, L. A., Welbl, J., Clark, A., Hennigan, T., Noland, E., Millican, K., van den Driessche, G., Damoc, B. et al. (2022). Training Compute-Optimal Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*. 4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 26, 33, 43, 48
- Huang, B., Geng, Z. and Kolter, J. Z. (2026a). Equilibrium Reasoners: Learning Attractors Enables Scalable Reasoning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. 4, 26
- Huang, B., Shi, C., Chen, J., Wen, S., Liu, Z., Xing, E. and Ma, X. (2026b). Towards Looped Models Done Right, Part II: Rethinking at Fixed Points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.06833*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.06833> 2, 4, 26
- Jeddi, A., Ciccone, M. and Taati, B. (2026). LoopFormer: Elastic-Depth Looped Transformers for Latent Reasoning via Shortcut Modulation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 4
- Jolicoeur-Martineau, A. (2025). Less is More: Recursive Reasoning with Tiny Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.04871*. 4, 26
- Jordan, K., Jin, Y., Boza, V., You, J., Cesista, F., Newhouse, L. and Bernstein, J. (2024). Muon: An optimizer for hidden layers in neural networks. <https://kellerjordan.github.io/posts/muon/>. 6, 29, 33
- Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T. B., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J. and Amodei, D. (2020). Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*. 4, 26, 33
- Krajewski, J., Ludziejewski, J., Adamczewski, K., Pióro, M., Krutul, M., Antoniuk, S., Ciebia, K., Król, K., Odrzygóźdź, T., Sankowski, P., Cygan, M. and Jaszczur, S. (2024). Scaling Laws for Fine-Grained Mixture of Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07871*. 26
- Labovich, A. (2026). Stability and Generalization in Looped Transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.15259*. 26
- Lai, J. B., Quinn, J., Bao, A. and Gilpin, W. (2026). Test-Time Forecasting: Recurrent Depth Enables In-Context Dynamics Prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.19552*. 26
- Lan, Z., Chen, M., Goodman, S., Gimpel, K., Sharma, P. and Soricut, R. (2019). ALBERT: A Lite BERT for Self-supervised Learning of Language Representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11942*. 3, 43
- Lee, R., Biloki, J., Hu, E. J. and May, J. (2026). Sparse Layers are Critical to Scaling Looped Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.09165*. 4, 5, 26, 29

- Li, H., Zheng, W., Wang, Q., Ding, Z., Wang, H., Wang, Z., Xuyang, S., Ding, N., Zhou, S., Zhang, X. and Jiang, D. (2025a). Predictable Scale: Part II, Farseer: A Refined Scaling Law in Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.10972*. 26
- Li, H., Zheng, W., Wang, Q., Zhang, H., Wang, Z., Xuyang, S., Fan, Y., Ding, Z., Wang, H., Ding, N., Zhou, S., Zhang, X. and Jiang, D. (2025b). Predictable Scale: Part I, Step Law – Optimal Hyperparameter Scaling Law in Large Language Model Pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.04715*. 29, 46
- Loshchilov, I. and Hutter, F. (2019). Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 29
- Marchenko, A., Bezrukov, V., Kashurin, O., Fedorova, I., Bocharov, D., Shakhvalieva, Y., Tikhonova, M. and Ternovskii, V. (2026). Closing the Loop: Practical Training Recipes for Looped Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.00673*. 4
- McLeish, S., Li, A., Kirchenbauer, J., Kalra, D. S., Bartoldson, B. R., Kailkhura, B., Schwarzschild, A., Geiping, J., Goldstein, T. and Goldblum, M. (2025). Teaching Pre-trained Language Models to Think Deeper with Retrofitted Recurrence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.07384*. 2, 4, 26
- Movahedi, S., Milovanović, V., Libo Feigin, S., Theus, A., Hofmann, T., Boeva, V., Rusch, T. K. and Orvieto, A. (2026). Fixed-Point Reasoners: Stable and Adaptive Deep Looped Transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.18206*. 4, 26
- Nejati Manzari, O., Lajoie, G. and Rivaz, H. (2026). Recursive Vision Language Models for General Symbolic Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.01534*. 26
- Park, T., Lee, Y., Kim, D. and Bae, H. (2026). LoopUS: Recasting Pretrained LLMs into Looped Latent Refinement Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.11011*. 26
- Pearce, T. and Song, J. (2024). Reconciling Kaplan and Chinchilla Scaling Laws. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. 26
- Penedo, G., Kydlíček, H., Ben Allal, L., Lozhkov, A., Mitchell, M., Raffel, C., Von Werra, L. and Wolf, T. (2024). The FineWeb Datasets: Decanting the Web for the Finest Text Data at Scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17557*. 6, 29
- Pokle, A., Geng, Z. and Kolter, J. Z. (2022). Deep Equilibrium Approaches to Diffusion Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 26
- Porian, T., Wortsman, M., Jitsev, J., Schmidt, L. and Carmon, Y. (2024). Resolving Discrepancies in Compute-Optimal Scaling of Language Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 26
- Prairie, H., Novack, Z., Berg-Kirkpatrick, T. and Fu, D. Y. (2026). Parcae: Scaling Laws For Stable Looped Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.12946*. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 15, 18, 26, 28, 33
- Ren, L., Liu, Y., Shen, Y. and Chen, W. (2026). Rethinking Language Model Scaling under Transferable Hypersphere Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.28743*. 29, 45
- Ren, Z. and Liu, Z. (2026). Are Your Reasoning Models Reasoning or Guessing? A Mechanistic Analysis of Hierarchical Reasoning Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.10679*. 4, 26

- Salvatori, T., Forasassi, M., Toumi, A. and de Felice, G. (2026). Tiny Recursive Message Passing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.18649*. 4, 26
- Saunshi, N., Dikkala, N., Li, Z., Kumar, S. and Reddi, S. J. (2025). Reasoning with Latent Thoughts: On the Power of Looped Transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 3
- Schöne, M., Rahmani, B., Kremer, H., Falck, F., Ballani, H. and Gladrow, J. (2025). Implicit Language Models are RNNs: Balancing Parallelization and Expressivity. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. 26
- Schwethelm, K., Rueckert, D. and Kaissis, G. (2026). How Much Is One Recurrence Worth? Iso-Depth Scaling Laws for Looped Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.21106*. 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 43
- Sghaier, A., Parviz, A. and Jolicoeur-Martineau, A. (2026). Probabilistic Tiny Recursive Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.19943*. 26
- Sun, H., Qiang, R., Zheng, Y. and Dai, B. (2026). Forward-Free Diffusion Language Models with BPTT-Free Looped Refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.08357*. 26
- Talleg, C. and Ollivier, Y. (2017). Unbiasing Truncated Backpropagation Through Time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08209*. 4, 6, 26
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C. C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G. et al. (2023). Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*. 29
- Tur, Y., Naghiyev, J., Fang, H., Tsai, W.-C., Duan, J., Fox, D. and Krishna, R. (2026). Recurrent-Depth VLA: Implicit Test-Time Compute Scaling of Vision-Language-Action Models via Latent Iterative Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.07845*. 26
- Videau, M., Youbi-Idrissi, B., Lopez-Paz, D. and Ahuja, K. (2026). Skaling: Chinchilla’s Exponents Meet Kaplan’s Coupling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.07222*. 4, 6, 7, 26, 27
- Wang, G., Li, J., Sun, Y., Chen, X., Liu, C., Wu, Y., Lu, M., Song, S. and Yadkori, Y. A. (2025). Hierarchical Reasoning Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.21734*. 4, 26, 27, 28
- Wang, G., Liu, C., Wang, C., Zhou, C., Sun, Y., Wu, Y., Zhen, S., Scimeca, L. and Abbasi Yadkori, Y. (2026a). HRM-Text: Efficient Pretraining Beyond Scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.20613*.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.20613> 2, 26
- Wang, S., Zhang, G., Luo, K., Wu, Y., Liu, S., Liu, J., Huang, W., Yan, S. and Li, J. (2026b). SMELT: Scaling Laws for Compute-Matched MoE Looped Transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.01343*. 4, 5, 26, 27, 28
- Wen, K., Dang, X., Lyu, K., Ma, T. and Liang, P. (2025). Fantastic pretraining optimizers and where to find them 2.1: Hyperball optimization. <https://tinyurl.com/muonh>. 6, 29
- Williams, R. J. and Peng, J. (1990). An Efficient Gradient-Based Algorithm for On-Line Training of Recurrent Network Trajectories. *Neural Computation*, 2 490–501. 4, 6, 26

- Wu Fung, S., Heaton, H., Li, Q., McKenzie, D., Osher, S. and Yin, W. (2022). JFB: Jacobian-Free Backpropagation for Implicit Networks. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 26
- Yang, G., Hu, E. J., Babuschkin, I., Sidor, S., Liu, X., Farhi, D., Ryder, N., Pachocki, J., Chen, W. and Gao, J. (2021). Tensor Programs V: Tuning Large Neural Networks via Zero-Shot Hyperparameter Transfer. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 29
- Yang, G., Yu, D., Zhu, C. and Hayou, S. (2023). Tensor Programs VI: Feature Learning in Infinite-Depth Neural Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02244*. 45
- Yang, L., Lee, K., Nowak, R. and Papailiopoulos, D. (2024). Looped Transformers are Better at Learning Learning Algorithms. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 4, 26
- Zeitoun, A., Torroba-Hennigen, L. and Kim, Y. (2026). Hyperloop Transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.21254*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.21254> 4
- Zhu, R.-J., Wang, Z., Hua, K., Zhang, T., Li, Z., Que, H., Wei, B., Wen, Z., Yin, F., Xing, H., Li, L., Shi, J., Ma, K., Li, S., Kergan, T. et al. (2025). Scaling Latent Reasoning via Looped Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.25741*. 4, 5, 26, 32

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Related work	3
3	Preliminaries	4
4	A scaling law for forward and backward loops	6
4.1	Fitting and validating the scaling law	6
4.2	Illustrating the scaling law with effective parameters	10
5	Truncate or not?	10
5.1	Fixed forward loops: truncation can be optimal	11
5.2	Free forward-loop count: full BPTT is optimal	12
6	Allocating compute among loops, data, and model size	13
6.1	Fixed model size: loops versus data	13
6.2	Free model size: the law favors no looping	16
6.3	Two fully trained loops are competitive with fewer parameters	17
7	Conclusion	17
A	Extended related work	26
B	Model architecture and experimental setup	27
B.1	Model architecture	27
B.2	Full and truncated backpropagation through the loops	27
B.3	Experimental setup	28
C	The law in detail	29
C.1	What the runs show before any law is fitted	29
C.2	Empirical looping coefficient	30
C.3	Form and fit	31
C.4	Why a bounded gain	31
C.5	Runs at sixteen loops	32
D	Training compute and allocation	33
D.1	Training compute	33
D.2	Switch points	34
D.3	The runs at a fixed size	34
D.4	Allocation identities and their assumptions	34
D.4.1	Fixed forward-loop count: optimize size, data, and backward loops	35
D.4.2	Joint forward-backward allocation at equal compute	38
D.4.3	Fixed model size: allocate loops and data	38
D.4.4	Free model size: compare joint allocations	40
E	Compute-optimal pairs and the untied model	42
E.1	Compute-optimal pairs	42
E.2	The untied model	43
F	Learning rate and batch size	43
F.1	Learning-rate rule	43
F.2	Batch-size rule	46
G	The law across the five-size grid	46
H	Training curves	48

A Extended related work

Training through recurrent depth. Truncated BPTT limits gradient propagation to a subset of recurrent steps, saving activation memory and backward compute at the cost of biased gradients (Tallec and Ollivier, 2017; Williams and Peng, 1990). Looped language models often supervise the final output and backpropagate through only the last few loops. Huginn and retrofitted models use at most eight backward steps (Geiping et al., 2025; McLeish et al., 2025), Parcae and Iso-Depth backpropagate through half of the loops (Prairie et al., 2026; Schwethelm et al., 2026), URM runs the first loops without gradients (Gao et al., 2025), and looped MoE models supervise within recurrent segments (He et al., 2026). The same truncation trains looped models converted from pretrained language models (Park et al., 2026), recurrent-depth models for robot control and dynamics forecasting (Lai et al., 2026; Tur et al., 2026), and looped refinement in diffusion language models (Sun et al., 2026). Recursive reasoning models use even shorter backward horizons. Hierarchical recurrent models backpropagate through only the final steps (Han, 2026; Wang et al., 2025, 2026a), and TRM and its successors run all but the last recursion without gradients (Asadulaev et al., 2025; Baek et al., 2026; Freinschlag et al., 2026; Hakimi, 2026; Jolicoeur-Martineau, 2025; Nejati Manzari et al., 2026; Salvatori et al., 2026; Sghaier et al., 2026). For algorithmic extrapolation, recurrent networks and looped transformers run a random number of iterations without gradients before the supervised ones, or compute the loss over a window of the last loops (Bansal et al., 2022; Labovich, 2026; Yang et al., 2024). Implicit models replace backpropagation through the solver with implicit differentiation (Bai et al., 2019) or with one-step, Jacobian-free, and phantom gradients that differentiate only a few steps at the fixed point (Geng et al., 2021a,b; Wu Fung et al., 2022). Such approximations train implicit models for optical flow, diffusion, and language modeling (Bai et al., 2022; Bai and Melas-Kyriazi, 2024; Fein-Ashley and Rashidinejad, 2026; Pokle et al., 2022; Schöne et al., 2025), and truncated BPTT in looped transformers can be read as a truncated Neumann series of the fixed-point gradient (Huang et al., 2026b; Movahedi et al., 2026). Few studies measure what truncation costs. Fein-Ashley and Rashidinejad (2026) find that the one-step gradient nearly matches the perplexity of the exact implicit gradient at a fraction of its memory, Huang et al. (2026a) find that truncation lowers or raises Sudoku accuracy depending on the latent structure, Salvatori et al. (2026) find that the required gradient window grows with the propagation distance of the graph, and Ren and Liu (2026) argue that the one-step gradient delays the stabilization of hierarchical reasoning models. These studies compare training recipes at a fixed forward depth; we vary the backward depth independently of the forward depth, weighing the compute that truncation saves against the loop gain it costs.

Scaling laws for recurrence. Size–data scaling laws quantify how parameters and training tokens jointly determine loss (Hoffmann et al., 2022; Kaplan et al., 2020; Videau et al., 2026), and their compute-optimal predictions depend on how the laws are fitted and compute is counted (Besiroglu et al., 2024; Choshen et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025a; Pearce and Song, 2024; Porian et al., 2024). Extensions account for architectural choices such as MoE sparsity (Abnar et al., 2025; Clark et al., 2022; Krajewski et al., 2024). For looped models, some laws fit each architecture separately (Chen et al., 2026c; Lee et al., 2026; Wang et al., 2026b), while others model the loop count explicitly (Table 1) through additive loss terms (Zhu et al., 2025) or effective parameters with linear, power-law, or bounded gains (Chen et al., 2026b; Prairie et al., 2026; Schwethelm et al., 2026). Among these scaling-law studies of looped transformers, Iso-Depth (Schwethelm et al., 2026) and Parcae (Prairie et al., 2026) are particularly related to our work. Iso-Depth fits separate laws for full and half-length backpropagation and finds that truncation weakens the loop gain but lowers the loss at a fixed forward-loop count by freeing compute. At fixed model size, Parcae finds that loops and tokens should grow together with compute, but ties the backward loops to half the forward loops and leaves

their joint choice open. Our law instead treats the backward-loop count as a separate variable, combining coupled size–data scaling (Videau et al., 2026) with bounded loop gains (Chen et al., 2026b). It recovers the truncation benefit at a prescribed forward-loop count but favors full BPTT when both counts are free (§5). In looped MoE models, two loops are the common choice (He et al., 2026): SMELT finds them better than three or four under matched budgets (Wang et al., 2026b), and Loopie finds the marginal benefit of recurrence largest at two (Gao et al., 2026). For dense models, our law ranks two fully trained loops first among looped settings, since they provide nearly the effective size of two untied copies of the block while further loops add less (§6.2). In our runs, two-loop models nearly match compute-optimal models without looping at equal compute while having substantially fewer non-embedding parameters (§6.3).

B Model architecture and experimental setup

B.1 Model architecture

Figure 3 draws the model of §3 for the loop setting $(4, 2)$. In a training step (Figure 3a), the prelude maps the tokens to s_0 , every loop reads s_0 again through the input injection, and the state s_{T-B} entering the last B loops is treated as a constant. The gradient therefore reaches the coda, the last B loops and, through the injection, the prelude; the first $T - B$ loops run forward only, and evaluation runs all T loops. Each loop (Figure 3b) applies W_{inj} to $[s_0; s_{t-1}]$, the ℓ_r pre-norm transformer layers of $\mathcal{R}$ and an RMSNorm, with the same weights in every loop. At 2 FLOPs per parameter and token for a forward pass and 4 for a backward pass (Figure 3c), the prelude and coda cost 6, each forward loop 2 and each backward loop 4 more, giving $6N_{\text{once}} + (2T + 4B)N_{\text{rec}} = 6N_{\text{comp}}$ FLOPs per token (5.1), before attention and output (D.1); the optimizer adds a cost per step (D.3).

B.2 Full and truncated backpropagation through the loops

This appendix writes out the gradients that full and truncated BPTT compute for the recurrence of (3.1), and the fixed-point argument that motivates truncation (§3).

The truncated gradient. A loop setting (T, B) executes T forward loops and backpropagates through only the last B : the state s_{T-B} is detached from the computation graph, so the first $T - B$ loops run without gradients. To make this precise, we denote for loop t of (3.1) the Jacobian with respect to the incoming state and the derivative with respect to θ with the incoming state fixed by

$$\mathcal{J}_t = \frac{\partial \Phi_\theta(s_{t-1}; s_0)}{\partial s_{t-1}}, \quad \partial_\theta \Phi_t = \frac{\partial \Phi_\theta(s_{t-1}; s_0)}{\partial \theta}.$$

The loss $\mathcal{L}$ depends on θ only through s_T , so $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L} = (\partial \mathcal{L} / \partial s_T) \cdot (ds_T / d\theta)$, and it suffices to compare $ds_T / d\theta$ under full and truncated BPTT. The chain rule sums one contribution per loop, and detaching s_{T-B} keeps only the last B , giving the truncated gradient g_B :

$$\frac{ds_T}{d\theta} = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{J}_T \cdots \mathcal{J}_{t+1} \partial_\theta \Phi_t, \quad g_B = \sum_{t=T-B+1}^T \mathcal{J}_T \cdots \mathcal{J}_{t+1} \partial_\theta \Phi_t, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where the empty product for $t = T$ is the identity. Truncation keeps the B contributions with the fewest Jacobian products and drops the rest. The prelude gradient is truncated in the same way.

Truncation from a fixed point view. Whether the dropped contributions matter depends on the loop dynamics, and the deep-equilibrium view (Bai et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2025) gives an idealized answer. Suppose the loops approach a fixed point $s^* = \Phi_\theta(s^*; s_0)$, so that $\mathcal{J}_t \approx \mathcal{J}^*$ and $\partial_\theta \Phi_t \approx \partial_\theta \Phi^*$ for the loops that carry gradient. If the spectral radius of $\mathcal{J}^*$ is below one, the implicit function

theorem gives the gradient of the fixed point, and a Neumann series expands it into the same per-loop contributions:

$$\frac{\partial s^*}{\partial \theta} = (I - \mathcal{J}^*)^{-1} \partial_\theta \Phi^* = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{J}^*)^k \partial_\theta \Phi^*, \quad g_B \approx \sum_{k=0}^{B-1} (\mathcal{J}^*)^k \partial_\theta \Phi^*. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Truncating to B loops thus approximates the fixed-point gradient by the first B terms of its Neumann series, whereas full BPTT uses the first T . The extreme case $B = 1$ keeps only the leading term $\partial_\theta \Phi^*$; this is the one-step gradient used to train the Hierarchical Reasoning Model (Wang et al., 2025). When $\mathcal{J}^*$ is contractive, the dropped terms shrink geometrically, which makes truncation a plausible approximation at a fraction of the backward compute. This idealized argument, however, does not settle whether truncation pays off in practice, for two reasons. First, it assumes that the loops reach a fixed point, whereas looped language models are usually trained with only a few loops (Gao et al., 2026; He et al., 2026; Wang et al., 2026b). With so few iterations, the states need not come close to a fixed point, so the approximation $\mathcal{J}_t \approx \mathcal{J}^*$ behind (B.2) can fail and the contributions dropped in (B.1) need not be small. Second, even at a fixed point, the dropped terms are nonzero for $B < T$, so g_B is a biased estimate of the full gradient. The argument only bounds the error of a single gradient, whereas this bias enters every update, and how it accumulates over training and shapes the final model is not known. Prior measurements compare recipes at a fixed forward-loop count (§2) and so cannot separate the compute that truncation saves from the loop gain it costs. We therefore measure the net effect directly: the scaling law of §4 asks whether the saved compute outweighs this bias in the loss that training actually reaches.

B.3 Experimental setup

Models. We take the architecture and the training recipe of Schwethelm et al. (2026), the reference recipe below, which builds on the prelude–recurrent–coda layout of Huginn (Geiping et al., 2025) (§3). Its blocks use pre-norm attention with query–key normalization and rotary position embeddings, head dimension 128, a squared-ReLU feed-forward layer of width $4d$, no biases, and untied input and output embeddings. We change only what is held fixed. Schwethelm et al. (2026) hold the executed depth fixed, so that more loops mean fewer unique layers; we hold the unique parameters fixed, as Prairie et al. (2026) do, so that a loop setting changes the compute and not the model. The main grid spans five model sizes, from 58M to 919M non-embedding parameters (Table 2); width and depth grow together, and the recurrent block with the input injection holds 51% of the non-embedding parameters at four sizes and 56% at 120M. Short size names round N ; including the untied input and output embeddings, total parameter counts run from about 107M to about 1.06B. We quote budgets per parameter as D/N . The scaling suite supplements this grid with two compute-matched pairs, adding the 79M and 162M models at one configuration each (§E).

Loop settings and budgets. The scaling suite spans 1.1–1,291 training tokens per parameter and uses fifteen loop settings. Ten core settings, $(1, 1)$; $(2, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$; $(4, 1)$, $(4, 2)$, $(4, 3)$ and $(4, 4)$; and $(8, 2)$, $(8, 4)$ and $(8, 8)$, cover $T \in \{1, 2, 4, 8\}$ forward loops, full and truncated BPTT, and ratios B/T from $\frac{1}{4}$ to 1. Five more settings extend them: $(8, 1)$, and $T = 16$ with $B = 1, 4, 8$ and 16 at three sizes and short budgets (Appendices C.5 and G). The part of the training compute that depends on the loops grows with $T + 2B$, since a backward loop costs twice a forward loop (§D.1); $(4, 1)$ thus costs as much per token as $(2, 2)$, and $(8, 2)$ as much as $(4, 4)$. Token budgets D are given in units of $D_0 = 2^{30} \approx 1.07 \times 10^9$ tokens. We group runs by their target token budget; actual token counts may differ slightly because of batch rounding. Predictions use the actual token count D . An experimental configuration is a choice of (N, D, T, B) ; a run is one training execution of that configuration. Each configuration contributes one accepted validation loss to the analysis.

Data and evaluation. We train on the 100B-token sample of FineWeb-Edu (Penedo et al., 2024), the corpus of the looped scaling study of Lee et al. (2026), in a pre-shuffled release,³ tokenized with the Llama 2 tokenizer (Touvron et al., 2023) of the reference recipe (Schwethelm et al., 2026) into sequences of 2,048 tokens. We report cross-entropy in nats per token on the last two shards of the release, which no run trains on, after removing the documents whose exact text also appears in the training data (the same web page often occurs in several crawls).

Optimization. We use the optimizers of the reference recipe (Schwethelm et al., 2026). MuonH, a variant of Muon that keeps each weight matrix at a fixed Frobenius norm (Jordan et al., 2024; Wen et al., 2025), trains the hidden weight matrices (attention, feed-forward and input injection), and AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) trains the embedding, output and normalization parameters, both without weight decay. The MuonH update adds 0.06–5.7% to the compute of the forward and backward passes; the analysis leaves it out, and the measured compute we report includes it (§D.1). The peak learning rates follow the reference’s transfer rule (Ren et al., 2026; Schwethelm et al., 2026; Yang et al., 2021), a power law in the batch and training tokens with the token exponent re-estimated for our budgets, and the global batch grows as $64\sqrt{D/D_0}$ sequences, following the square-root scaling of the loss-optimal batch in prior work (Bergsma et al., 2025; Filatov et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025b) (§F). The learning rate warms up over the first 2% of steps and decays with a cosine to 10% of its peak; gradients are not clipped.

Runs and compute. The results in this paper come from 592 training runs with 2.7×10^{22} FLOPs of training compute, counted as in §D.1 with the optimizer update. The scaling suite contains 397 runs behind 347 configurations: 385 runs in the five-size grid (§G) and 12 runs in two compute-matched pairs (§E). Each configuration’s loss is the mean of its accepted runs. The remaining 195 distinct runs support the other experiments. These experiments comprise four more runs at 480M in Figure 13, nine further runs of the compute-optimal pairs and the 36 of the untied comparison (§E), and the 66 learning-rate and 124 batch-size runs of Figures 17 and 18; 44 runs belong to two of these groups and are counted once. Counting cancelled runs, runs replaced by reruns, pilot runs and earlier calibration sweeps that the paper does not report, the study trained more than 1,100 runs with about 4.8×10^{22} FLOPs.

C The law in detail

This appendix details the measured patterns behind the law, its fit and validation, the bounded gain, and the runs at sixteen loops.

C.1 What the runs show before any law is fitted

The measured losses separate the effects of forward and backward loops without a fitted law (§G). Forward loops that receive no gradient add almost nothing at first: at fixed B , doubling T from B to $2B$ changes the loss by less than 0.007 nats in all 24 size–budget combinations trained in all ten core settings, while doubling it again, from $2B$ to $4B$, lowers the loss in all 24. Spending the same compute per token on backward loops is better: (2, 2) beats (4, 1) and (4, 4) beats (8, 2) in all 24, by 0.023 nats on average for (2, 2) against (4, 1). Backward loops in turn have diminishing returns: with full BPTT, every doubling of $T = B$, from 1 to 8, lowers the loss, by less each time, in all 24 combinations where all four settings were trained.

³<https://huggingface.co/datasets/karpathy/fineweb-edu-100b-shuffle>

C.2 Empirical looping coefficient

The looping coefficient $g(T, B)$ in (4.1) rescales the recurrent block’s parameter count. To estimate it from the runs, we first find the non-looped model size that matches a looped run’s measured loss at the same token budget. This defines the empirical effective size, which we then convert to a looping coefficient using the run’s parameter counts.

Reference interpolation. Let $d = D_{\text{target}}/D_0$ denote a target budget level, where D_{target} is the target token count and $D_0 = 2^{30}$ tokens. At each d , we collect the accepted non-looped $(T, B) = (1, 1)$ configurations and order their actual parameter counts and measured losses as $(n_j, \ell_j)_{j=1}^{m_d}$, where $n_1 < \dots < n_{m_d}$. Each configuration contributes its accepted loss once, following the same aggregation rules as the fit. We require at least three distinct sizes and strictly decreasing losses, $\ell_1 > \dots > \ell_{m_d}$, as holds for the eligible reference groups. We interpolate log size as a function of loss:

$$\phi_d(\ell) := \text{PCHIP}[(\ell_j, \log n_j)_{j=m_d, \dots, 1}](\ell), \quad \ell \in [\ell_{m_d}, \ell_1]. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Here PCHIP denotes shape-preserving piecewise cubic Hermite interpolation (Fritsch and Butland, 1984), with reference points ordered by increasing loss. The interpolant in (C.1) passes through each measured point, $\phi_d(\ell_j) = \log n_j$, and preserves monotonicity between points. This loss-to-size conversion uses only the non-looped measurements, independent of the fitted coefficients of (4.1).

Coefficient of a looped configuration. For a looped configuration i , let L_i be its measured loss, d_i its target budget, and $N_{\text{once},i}, N_{\text{rec},i} > 0$ its once-run and recurrent counts; when its reference group is eligible and $L_i \in [\ell_{m_{d_i}}, \ell_1]$, define

$$\hat{N}_{\text{eff},i} := \exp[\phi_{d_i}(L_i)], \quad \hat{g}_i := \frac{\hat{N}_{\text{eff},i} - N_{\text{once},i}}{N_{\text{rec},i}}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

In (C.2), we subtract the once-run parameters and divide by the recurrent block’s size, as in (4.1). Each empirical coefficient depends on the run’s size and token budget; $g(T, B)$ is the law’s shared prediction. We report an estimate only when the reference group is eligible and the measured loss lies within its observed range, without extrapolation. Budget matching uses the target level d , keeping batch-rounded budgets in the same group. Actual consumed tokens differ from the target token budget by less than 0.2% in these runs; we leave these differences uncorrected.

For example, the 239.24M non-embedding-parameter run at $T = B = 2$ and $D = 4D_0$ has loss 2.4272 nats per token. The reference interpolation gives $\hat{N}_{\text{eff}} = 345.20\text{M}$, hence $\hat{g} = (345.20 - 117.98)/121.26 \simeq 1.874$, using its own once-run and recurrent counts in millions of parameters.

Summaries across configurations. For each setting (T, B) , let $\mathcal{I}_{T,B}$ be the set of eligible size–budget configurations. Figure 6 shows the median of $\{\hat{g}_i : i \in \mathcal{I}_{T,B}\}$, with the 25th and 75th percentiles as the interquartile range. Configurations have equal weight; for sorted estimates $x_{(1)}, \dots, x_{(n)}$, a percentile at probability u linearly interpolates adjacent order statistics at rank $1 + (n - 1)u$. Figure 9 uses the same loss-matched estimates, with total-size ratios shown where indicated. The surface figure includes 163 eligible configurations with $T \leq 8$: 121 from the fitting set and 42 from the separately held-out set. Reference configurations may also come from either set, and estimates that use the same references are dependent. These figures describe agreement with the runs rather than independent validation of the law. The interquartile ranges show variation across sizes and budgets, not confidence intervals. §C.3 reports the separate holdout evaluations in loss units.

Figure 5 uses the same estimator on the 150 eligible configurations with $T \in \{2, 4, 8\}$ and $1/4 \leq r = B/T \leq 1$. Markers show medians and bars show minima and maxima. For each T , we fit an intercept a_T and slope s_T by ordinary least squares with equal weight per cell:

$$(\hat{a}_T, \hat{s}_T) = \arg \min_{a,s} \sum_{i:T_i=T} [a + s \log_2 r_i - \log_2 \hat{g}_i]^2. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

In (C.3), the fitted slopes are 0.823, 0.446 and 0.173 for $T = 2, 4, 8$, respectively; these lines summarize the empirical trend across the 150 configurations rather than a separate scaling law.

C.3 Form and fit

Functional form. The looping coefficient is

$$g(T, B) = \exp[c(1 - T^{-p}B^{-q})], \quad N_{\text{eff}} = N_{\text{once}} + g(T, B)N_{\text{rec}}.$$

The normalization is exact: $g(1, 1) = 1$, so $(T, B) = (1, 1)$ gives $N_{\text{eff}} = N$. For $c, p, q > 0$, $g(T, B)$ increases in T and in B toward e^c . The fitted ceiling of the looping coefficient is $e^c \simeq 3.04$; it is an extrapolation, not an observed asymptotic limit. With full BPTT the looping coefficient is $g(T, T) = \exp[c(1 - T^{-(p+q)})]$; for $B < T$ it is smaller by the factor $\exp[-cT^{-(p+q)}(r^{-q} - 1)]$, $r = B/T$, which approaches one as T grows.

Data split. We split the 347 scaling-suite configurations into 230 for fitting and 117 for testing. The fitting set spans fifteen loop settings and includes 226 configurations from the five-size grid, covering five model sizes at approximately 9, 18, 37, or 74 training tokens per parameter, giving the sizes a common budget range. Of these 226 configurations, 194 use the eleven settings with at most eight loops (a few at the largest budgets were not run) and 32 use $T = 16$. The other four fitting configurations are also used to compare a looped model with a non-looped model at each of two training-compute budgets (§E), adding sizes 79M and 162M to the grid’s five sizes. Each configuration enters once through the mean loss of its accepted runs, aggregating repeated runs and seeds and removing duplicate exports. The other 117 configurations of the scaling suite, mostly at shorter or longer budgets, enter no fit and serve as separate tests. Predictions use actual consumed tokens and exact parameter counts. The fixed normalizations are $N_0 = 2.4 \times 10^8$ and $D_0 = 2^{30}$.

Solver. We minimize equally weighted squared residuals in nats per token. All nine coefficients are refitted on every training fold using 64 independent uniform random starts, retaining the lowest-cost converged solution. The trust-region reflective solver uses an analytic Jacobian, Jacobian scaling, at most 4000 evaluations, and tolerances $\text{ftol} = \text{xtol} = \text{gtol} = 10^{-12}$. Seeds are 20261010 plus the deterministic fold index. No full-data coefficients initialize a held-out fold, and no learned preprocessing, weighting or hyperparameter tuning is used.

In optimization coordinates, $E \in [0, 3]$, $\log A, \log H \in [-10, 15]$, $\alpha, \beta, \kappa \in [0.01, 3]$, $p, q \in [0.001, 10]$, and $\log c \in [\log 0.001, \log 10]$. Initial ranges are $E \in [0.3, 1.2]$, $\log A, \log H \in [0.5, 2.5]$, $\alpha, \beta \in [0.25, 0.65]$, $\kappa \in [0.15, 0.45]$, $p, q \in [0.1, 2]$, and $\log c \in [\log 0.2, \log 2]$. The power-law gain of §C.4 uses the same ranges for the first six coefficients and $\phi_T, \phi_B \in [-5, 5]$, initialized in $[0.05, 0.8]$. All 264 fits of each law converge with full-rank Jacobians (the largest-size holdout reaches $E = 0$).

Validation and aggregation. Residuals are prediction minus measurement. Point LOO holds out one entire accepted configuration. Size folds hold out all combinations at the selected model size. Budget folds group the target level D_{target}/D_0 , retaining batch-rounded versions together. Setting folds hold out an entire (T, B) pair. Each family covers all 230 configurations. Point LOO trains on 229 configurations and tests on the remaining one, repeating this for all 230. Table 7 reports pooled errors, which weight held-out configurations equally. Every fold converges and none is dropped. §G overlays the law on the 226 fitted grid configurations; the four fitted configurations from the compute-matched pairs are not shown there.

C.4 Why a bounded gain

Prior scaling laws for looped models let the looping gain grow as a power of the loop count, T^ϕ (Schwethelm et al., 2026). We extend this form to $T^{\phi_T}B^{\phi_B}$ in place of $g(T, B)$, keeping the rest of

Table 7 | Pooled errors in nats/token over all 230 configurations; all 264 fits converge (one at a bound).

Evaluation	Fits	RMSE	MAE	Bias	Max. error
In-sample	1	6.14×10^{-3}	4.91×10^{-3}	-3.73×10^{-16}	2.04×10^{-2}
One configuration out	230	6.40×10^{-3}	5.11×10^{-3}	-3.30×10^{-6}	2.10×10^{-2}
One model size N out	7	7.48×10^{-3}	5.89×10^{-3}	-2.16×10^{-4}	2.58×10^{-2}
One token budget D out	11	6.42×10^{-3}	5.12×10^{-3}	-3.42×10^{-5}	2.08×10^{-2}
One (T, B) setting out	15	8.67×10^{-3}	6.74×10^{-3}	8.86×10^{-4}	2.63×10^{-2}

Table 8 | The law against the power-law gain of prior work (Schwethelm et al., 2026): $g(T, B) = T^{\phi_T} B^{\phi_B}$ in place of the bounded gain, which reduces to T^ϕ with full BPTT, everything else of (4.1) unchanged, fitted on the same configurations with the same folds and solver. Pooled RMSE in nats per token.

Evaluation	Bounded gain	Power-law gain
In-sample	6.14×10^{-3}	1.31×10^{-2}
One configuration out	6.40×10^{-3}	1.36×10^{-2}
One model size N out	7.48×10^{-3}	1.40×10^{-2}
One token budget D out	6.42×10^{-3}	1.35×10^{-2}
One (T, B) setting out	8.67×10^{-3}	1.65×10^{-2}

Table 9 | Looping coefficient and total effective size; total size uses recurrent share $f = 0.507$.

Setting	$g(T, B)$	N_{eff}/N
(1, 1)	1.00000	1.00000
(2, 1)	1.18330	1.09294
(2, 2)	1.91023	1.46150
(4, 1)	1.36498	1.18505
(4, 2)	2.04945	1.53209
(4, 4)	2.50361	1.76236
(8, 2)	2.17552	1.59601
(8, 4)	2.57832	1.80024
(8, 8)	2.80330	1.91431
(16, 16)	2.93895	1.98308

(4.1) unchanged. This form is the limit of our gain as $c \rightarrow \infty$ with $cp \rightarrow \phi_T$ and $cq \rightarrow \phi_B$; under full BPTT it reduces to T^ϕ with $\phi = \phi_T + \phi_B$. We fit both laws on the same configurations, folds and solver. The power-law gain is less accurate in every evaluation in Table 8, with nearly twice the error on a held-out (T, B) setting (1.65×10^{-2} vs. 8.67×10^{-3} nats); it keeps growing where the runs level off, and held out at sixteen loops its error is three times that of the bounded gain (§C.5). Our gain rises from $g(1, 1) = 1$ toward e^c ; with full BPTT and $p + q = 1$ it is the reciprocal exponential gain $\exp[c(1 - 1/T)]$, and free exponents separate the ceiling from the rate of approach.

The derivatives distinguish the empirical assumption from its algebraic consequences. At fixed coefficients, with $s = p + q$, the total derivatives below follow the full-BPTT path $B = T$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \log g}{\partial T} &= cpT^{-p-1}B^{-q} > 0, & \frac{\partial \log g}{\partial B} &= cqT^{-p}B^{-q-1} > 0, \\
\frac{d}{dT}g(T, T) &= csT^{-s-1}g(T, T) > 0, \\
\frac{d^2}{dT^2}g(T, T) &= csT^{-s-2}g(T, T) [csT^{-s} - (s + 1)].
\end{aligned}$$

For the fitted coefficients, $cs < s + 1$, so the full-BPTT gain is concave for $T \geq 1$. Concavity is not automatic for every positive parameter choice. The effective size is an equivalence in validation loss, not in stored knowledge (Zhu et al., 2025).

C.5 Runs at sixteen loops

The fit contains 32 configurations at $T = 16$, across 120M, 240M and 480M, with backward counts 1, 4, 8 and 16 and target token budgets from $2D_0$ to $8D_0$. Holding out this whole row leaves 198 training configurations and gives RMSE 0.0115 nats, against 0.0340 for the power-law gain of prior

work, which keeps growing beyond the loop counts it is fitted on. The harder extrapolation is the row without looping, $T = 1$: RMSE 0.0172 (0.0207 for the power-law gain), the largest forward-row error. The four sixteen-loop configurations of 480M at $2D_0$ lie outside the fitting set.

D Training compute and allocation

We first define the training-compute cost, then discuss the fixed-size switch points and their experimental checks. §D.4 gives the allocation derivations for prescribed forward loops, joint loop counts, and fixed or free model size.

D.1 Training compute

Training compute counts the FLOPs of the forward and backward passes. We use the usual convention of 2 FLOPs per parameter and token for the forward pass and 4 for the backward pass (Hoffmann et al., 2022; Kaplan et al., 2020). The prelude and coda run forward and backward once per token. Each forward loop runs the recurrent block forward once, and each backward loop adds a backward pass through it, which costs twice as much. The compute of the passes per token is

$$F(T, B) \approx 6N_{\text{once}} + (2T + 4B)N_{\text{rec}} + F_{\text{attn}}(T, B) + F_{\text{out}} = 6N_{\text{comp}} + F_{\text{attn}}(T, B) + F_{\text{out}}, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where F_{attn} counts the attention products of every executed layer and F_{out} the output projection.⁴ The attention products of the recurrent block follow the same count, one unit per forward loop and two more per backward loop, so every loop-dependent term grows with $T + 2B$, as in the accounting of truncated BPTT by Prairie et al. (2026) and Schwethelm et al. (2026); for a given model, (2, 2) and (4, 1) therefore cost the same per token, as do (4, 4) and (8, 2).

For a model of size N we write this compute per token as $F_N(T, B) = u_N + v_N(T + 2B)$, where u_N collects the prelude, coda and output and $v_N > 0$ one forward pass through the recurrent block with its attention, so that D training tokens cost

$$C \simeq F_N(T, B) D. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

At fixed N and D , the compute depends on the loop counts only through $T + 2B$. (5.1) is its leading term, without the attention and output costs.

The optimizer update is negligible. MuonH also spends FLOPs on each update: five Newton–Schulz iterations per weight matrix (Jordan et al., 2024), a cost F_{opt} per step that depends on the model but not on T or B , so that a run of n_{step} steps costs

$$C = F(T, B) D + F_{\text{opt}} n_{\text{step}}. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Across our runs the update adds 0.06–5.7% to the compute of the passes. It cannot change the split between forward and backward loops, since it does not depend on either; leaving it out moves the fixed-size switch points of §6.1 by less than 0.5%, and it gives the models with more trainable parameters, the untied model and the model without looping at its compute-optimal size, 0.5–0.75% more compute, or about 0.001 nats in loss (§E). Like prior scaling studies (Prairie et al., 2026; Schwethelm et al., 2026), our analysis therefore omits it and uses (D.2); the measured compute in figures, tables and §B.3 includes it unless stated otherwise.

⁴We use actual layer counts for numerical compute accounting. Each transformer layer has $12d^2$ matrix parameters and input injection has $2d^2$, so the exact matrix contribution under our counting convention is $72d^2(\ell_p + \ell_c) + 4d^2(T + 2B)(6\ell_r + 1)$. With width d , sequence length S and vocabulary size V (32,064 with padding): $F_{\text{attn}} = 4Sd[3(\ell_p + \ell_c) + (T + 2B)\ell_r]$ and $F_{\text{out}} = 6Vd$. Embedding lookup, normalization, and activations are omitted.

Table 10 | Model size fixed: the training compute at which the best loop setting changes, given as the tokens per parameter that the model without looping trains on at that compute. Among all fifteen trained settings, four of them with $T = 16$, only full BPTT reaches the frontier, apart from (4, 3), which leads briefly between (2, 2) and (4, 4) by at most 0.002 nats. [†]Beyond the compute of the runs of that size. [‡]Involves $T = 16$, trained at three sizes and short budgets only.

Best setting changes	60M	120M	240M	480M	1B
(1, 1) $\rightarrow$ (2, 2)	16	17	16	15	14
(2, 2) $\rightarrow$ (4, 4)	400	413	374 [†]	345 [†]	312 [†]
(4, 4) $\rightarrow$ (8, 8)	9,622 [†]	9,648 [†]	8,605 [†]	7,833 [†]	7,025 [†]
(8, 8) $\rightarrow$ (16, 16)	210,087 [‡]	204,851 [‡]	182,247 [‡]	164,533 [‡]	146,710 [‡]

D.2 Switch points

At a fixed size, each setting traces a loss curve in C , and the best setting at each compute lies on their lower envelope (Table 10). Full BPTT reaches the envelope almost everywhere: among all fifteen trained settings, four of them with $T = 16$, the best setting at every compute is (1, 1), (2, 2), (4, 4), (8, 8) or (16, 16), apart from a narrow compute range between (2, 2) and (4, 4) where (4, 3) leads by at most 0.002 nats on our integer menu (§6.1). Truncation lowers the compute per token but gives up the gain of the loops it does not train, and at equal compute per token a setting that trains all of its fewer loops is the better buy, as the runs show directly (§C.1). Measured in the tokens per parameter that the model without looping trains on at the same compute, two loops become the best choice at about 14–17, four overtake two at about 312–413, and eight overtake four at about 7,000–9,600 (sixteen pay only beyond 147,000–210,000).

D.3 The runs at a fixed size

The runs confirm the first switch and the role of the trained loops (Figure 13; Figure 1c previews the 120M slice). Beyond about 30 tokens per parameter, (2, 2) ends below the model without looping at every point we measured, by about 0.01 nats at 50 tokens per parameter and by 0.025 at 200. Loops without gradient do not win: (4, 1), which costs as much per token as (2, 2) but trains only one of its four loops, stays above the model without looping up to 200 tokens per parameter. At 60M, 120M and 240M, where the runs reach several hundred tokens per parameter, (4, 4) overtakes (2, 2), as the law predicts, but already at about 200 tokens per parameter rather than at the law’s 374–413. At one compute per size far into this range, that of (4, 4) at $32D_0$ for 60M and 240M and at $24D_0$ for 120M (1,291, 533 and 335 tokens per parameter of the model without looping), the runs read 2.514, 2.389 and 2.247 for the model without looping, 2.479, 2.358 and 2.223 for (2, 2), and 2.460, 2.345 and 2.218 for (4, 4): (4, 4) is the lowest, 0.019, 0.012 and 0.006 nats below (2, 2), while (4, 3) at the same compute trails (4, 4) by 0.010, 0.008 and 0.006 and (8, 8) lies above it at all three sizes. At 480M the same compute is reached at 174 tokens per parameter, before the switch: the model without looping reads 2.141, (2, 2) 2.121 and (4, 4) 2.124, so (2, 2) and (4, 4) are level and both stay below the model without looping. The runs with $T = 16$, trained at $2D_0$ – $8D_0$ (§C.5), lie well below the compute where eight or sixteen loops pay and stay above (4, 4) at equal compute.

D.4 Allocation identities and their assumptions

We follow the allocation regimes of Sections 5.1 to 6.2: first prescribe T , then optimize the split between T , B , and finally allocate loops, data, and model size. The prescribed- T and free-size results use the leading matrix-FLOP approximation (5.1); the joint-loop and fixed-size calculations use (D.2), with the attention and output costs. All omit the optimizer update (§D.1).

D.4.1 Fixed forward-loop count: optimize size, data, and backward loops

Lemma D.1 (Optimal backward-loop allocation). *Fix the integer forward-loop count $T \geq 1$ and training-compute budget $C > 0$. Suppose the loss follows (4.1), with positive fitted coefficients $E, A, H, \alpha, \beta, \kappa, c, p, q$ and normalization scales $N_0, D_0 > 0$. Let $N = N_{\text{once}} + N_{\text{rec}}$ be the parameter count. Assume the recurrent block holds a fixed fraction $\rho \in [0, 1]$ of parameters as N varies ($N_{\text{rec}} = \rho N$, $N_{\text{once}} = (1 - \rho)N$). Under the leading-FLOP approximation $C = 6DN_{\text{comp}}$, for each $B \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ let $L_{T,B}^*(C)$ be the minimum loss over $N, D > 0$ at budget C ; then*

$$\arg \min_{B \in \{1, \dots, T\}} L_{T,B}^*(C) = \arg \min_{B \in \{1, \dots, T\}} \chi(T, B), \quad \chi(T, B) = \frac{N_{\text{comp}}}{N_{\text{eff}}}. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

The minimizing backward counts are independent of C .

Proof. The proof reduces the looped allocation problem to a non-looped one. With a fixed recurrent fraction, the effective and compute-equivalent parameter counts are both constant multiples of N , so the loop setting enters the budget only through the factor $\chi(T, B)$. We first fix B and solve the size–data allocation in closed form. The optimized loss then depends on B only through a positive power of $\chi(T, B)$, multiplied by a factor in C that is common to all backward counts, so comparing backward counts reduces to comparing χ .

Step 1: the price of an effective parameter. Let us first fix the backward loop count B . Substituting $N_{\text{rec}} = \rho N$ and $N_{\text{once}} = (1 - \rho)N$ into the effective parameter count of (4.1) and the compute-equivalent count of (5.1) makes both proportional to N :

$$\frac{N_{\text{eff}}}{N} = 1 - \rho + \rho g(T, B), \quad \frac{N_{\text{comp}}}{N} = 1 - \rho + \rho \frac{T + 2B}{3}, \quad \chi(T, B) = \frac{1 - \rho + \rho(T + 2B)/3}{1 - \rho + \rho g(T, B)} > 0.$$

The factor N cancels in the ratio, so χ depends on the loop setting and the recurrent share ρ but not on model size. Intuitively, N_{eff} measures what the model is worth in loss and N_{comp} what it costs in compute, so χ is the number of compute-equivalent parameters paid for each effective parameter. Because this price is the same at every size, choosing $N > 0$ is equivalent to choosing $N_{\text{eff}} > 0$, and we optimize over the normalized effective size $x = N_{\text{eff}}/N_0 > 0$ directly.

Step 2: the budget as a non-looped budget. Define $y = D/D_0$ and $\bar{C} = C/(6N_0D_0)$. Since $N_{\text{comp}} = \chi N_{\text{eff}}$, the budget $C = 6DN_{\text{comp}}$ becomes

$$\bar{C} = \chi xy, \quad \text{equivalently} \quad xy = \frac{\bar{C}}{\chi}.$$

A non-looped model has $\chi = 1$ and buys effective size and tokens with $xy = \bar{C}$. A loop setting therefore acts like a non-looped model whose budget is divided by χ : settings with $\chi < 1$ stretch the budget and settings with $\chi > 1$ shrink it. Once the size x is chosen, the budget fixes the token count $y = \bar{C}/(\chi x)$, so a single free variable remains.

Step 3: a one-variable objective. Write $J = Ax^{-\alpha} + Hy^{-\beta}$ for the bracket in (4.1), so that $L = E + J^\kappa$. Since $z \mapsto E + z^\kappa$ is strictly increasing for $z > 0$ when $\kappa > 0$, minimizing L and minimizing J have the same minimizers. Eliminating y with the budget gives

$$J(x) = Ax^{-\alpha} + H \left(\frac{\chi x}{\bar{C}} \right)^\beta.$$

The first term is the size penalty and falls as the model grows. The second is the data penalty and rises with x , because a larger model leaves fewer tokens within the same budget. The optimum balances these two effects, which pull the model size in opposite directions.

Step 4: the balance condition and the optimal allocation. Both terms are power laws in x , so $\log x$ is the natural variable: in it, each term is an exponential. Holding T, B, C fixed, write $X = Ax^{-\alpha}$ and $Y = H(\chi x/\bar{C})^\beta$. Then

$$\frac{dJ}{d \log x} = -\alpha X + \beta Y, \quad \frac{d^2 J}{d(\log x)^2} = \alpha^2 X + \beta^2 Y > 0.$$

The objective is strictly convex in $\log x$. It also diverges at both ends, since $X \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow 0$ and $Y \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. A strictly convex function that diverges at both ends has exactly one stationary point, and that point is its global minimum. The stationarity condition $\alpha X = \beta Y$ states that, at the optimum, a one-percent increase in model size lowers the size penalty by exactly as much as the resulting loss of tokens raises the data penalty. Writing it out,

$$\alpha A x^{-\alpha} = \beta H \left(\frac{\chi}{\bar{C}} \right)^\beta x^\beta \implies x^{\alpha+\beta} = \frac{\alpha A}{\beta H} \left(\frac{\bar{C}}{\chi} \right)^\beta.$$

Taking the positive root and substituting it into $y = \bar{C}/(\chi x)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} x^* &= \left(\frac{\alpha A}{\beta H} \right)^{1/(\alpha+\beta)} \left(\frac{\bar{C}}{\chi} \right)^{\beta/(\alpha+\beta)}, \\ y^* &= \left(\frac{\beta H}{\alpha A} \right)^{1/(\alpha+\beta)} \left(\frac{\bar{C}}{\chi} \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+\beta)}. \end{aligned} \tag{D.5}$$

As Step 2 anticipated, the loop setting enters only through the reduced budget $\bar{C}/\chi$: the optimal effective size and token count are those of a compute-optimal non-looped model trained with $\bar{C}/\chi$. The optimal size and token count are recovered as $N^* = N_0 x^*/[1 - \rho + \rho g(T, B)]$ and $D^* = D_0 y^*$.

Step 5: the optimal loss. At the stationary point $Y^* = (\alpha/\beta)X^*$, so the two penalties stay in a fixed proportion and $J^* = X^* + Y^* = [(\alpha + \beta)/\beta]X^*$. Substituting x^* into $X^* = A(x^*)^{-\alpha}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} J^* &= \frac{\alpha + \beta}{\beta} A (x^*)^{-\alpha} \\ &= \frac{\alpha + \beta}{\beta} A^{\beta/(\alpha+\beta)} \left(\frac{\beta H}{\alpha} \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+\beta)} \left(\frac{\bar{C}}{\chi} \right)^{-\alpha\beta/(\alpha+\beta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Define the positive constants

$$\eta = \frac{\kappa \alpha \beta}{\alpha + \beta}, \quad K = \left[\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\beta} A^{\beta/(\alpha+\beta)} \left(\frac{\beta H}{\alpha} \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+\beta)} \right]^\kappa.$$

Raising J^* to the power κ restores the loss:

$$L_{T,B}^*(C) - E = K \bar{C}^{-\eta} \chi(T, B)^\eta. \tag{D.6}$$

This is the compute-optimal loss of a non-looped model at budget $\bar{C}/\chi$.

Step 6: comparing backward counts. In (D.6), K and η depend only on the fitted coefficients and $\bar{C}^{-\eta}$ only on the budget; none of them depends on B . The backward count enters only through $\chi(T, B)^\eta$, which is strictly increasing in χ because $\eta > 0$. The optimized losses over $B \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ are therefore ordered exactly as the values of χ , so the two have the same minimizers, including any ties. This proves (D.4). Changing the budget multiplies every optimized excess loss by the same factor $\bar{C}^{-\eta}$, which leaves their ranking, and hence the minimizing backward counts, unchanged whenever the admissible set of B is fixed. In the limit $\rho = 0$ the model has no recurrent block, so $\chi = 1$ for every B and all backward counts tie, as expected with nothing to truncate. $\square$




Figure 16 | Truncation can be favored at a prescribed T , but not when T and B are chosen jointly. The law's $\chi = N_{\text{comp}}/N_{\text{eff}}$; lower χ means lower compute-optimal loss. (a) Stars: the best B at each T . (b) Percentages: compute saved by the best B over $B = T$ at equal loss.

For a restricted menu, minimize over its available backward counts. Figure 16 evaluates χ for every integer B at $T = 2, 4, 8, 16$ (Table 5 lists the optima).

Separate laws for the contour comparison. To check the shared looping coefficient $g(T, B)$, we fit $L = E_s + [A_s(N/N_0)^{-\alpha_s} + H_s(D/D_0)^{-\beta_s}]^{\kappa_s}$ separately to each setting s at $T = 4, 8$ in Figure 10. The contours use compute from (5.1) with $N_{\text{rec}}/N \simeq 0.507$; their minimum-compute points trace the compute-optimal frontiers. These are in-sample predictions of the separate laws.

Choosing the backward-loop count. For a continuous relaxation, an interior optimum balances the relative increase in compute-equivalent size against that in loss-equivalent size. The ratio is independent of model size, so we can differentiate it at fixed $N_{\text{once}}, N_{\text{rec}}$. By definition,

$$\frac{\partial N_{\text{comp}}}{\partial B} = \frac{2}{3}N_{\text{rec}}, \quad \frac{\partial N_{\text{eff}}}{\partial B} = cqT^{-p}B^{-q-1}g(T, B)N_{\text{rec}}.$$

Differentiating $\log \chi = \log N_{\text{comp}} - \log N_{\text{eff}}$ and setting the derivative to zero yields

$$\frac{2BN_{\text{rec}}}{3N_{\text{comp}}} = cqT^{-p}B^{-q}\frac{g(T, B)N_{\text{rec}}}{N_{\text{eff}}}. \quad (\text{D.7})$$

This is an implicit equation for a continuous candidate, as both parameter counts depend on B ; boundary values $B = 1, T$ are also checked, and the discrete optimum evaluates χ at each integer.

The equation also gives an explicit asymptotic form when $N_{\text{rec}} > 0$. Suppose $0 < p < 1$ and $q > 0$, as in the fitted law, and consider large T with $B \ll T$. Then $g(T, B) \rightarrow e^c$, $N_{\text{comp}} \sim TN_{\text{rec}}/3$, and $N_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow N_{\text{once}} + e^cN_{\text{rec}}$. Substituting these limits into (D.7) and rearranging gives

$$B^*(T) \sim \left[\frac{cq}{2} \frac{e^c N_{\text{rec}}}{N_{\text{once}} + e^c N_{\text{rec}}} \right]^{1/(1+q)} T^{(1-p)/(1+q)}.$$

The exponent lies between zero and one, so this solution grows while $B^*/T \rightarrow 0$, matching the assumed limit. This is a large- T prediction; finite loop counts require discrete optimization.

D.4.2 Joint forward–backward allocation at equal compute

Lemma D.2 (Optimal joint forward–backward allocation). *Fix an architecture with $N_{\text{rec}} > 0$ and a token count $D > 0$. Suppose the loss follows (4.1), with positive fitted coefficients $E, A, H, \alpha, \beta, \kappa, c, p, q$ and positive normalization scales N_0, D_0 . Let T and B be continuous variables. For any $S \geq 3$, consider the equal-compute problem under (D.2):*

$$\underset{T, B \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimize}} \quad L(N, D, T, B) \quad \text{subject to} \quad T + 2B = S, \quad 1 \leq B \leq T.$$

If $q \geq 2p$, its unique solution is $T^* = B^* = S/3$, corresponding to full BPTT.

Proof. With the token count and architecture fixed, every split on the line $T + 2B = S$ has the same compute, so only the looping coefficient $g(T, B)$ varies across feasible splits. We therefore maximize g along this line, reduce the problem to a strictly convex function of B alone, and show that its derivative is negative on the whole feasible interval when $q \geq 2p$. The minimum then lies at the boundary $B = T$, which is full BPTT.

At fixed architecture and token count, (D.2) depends on the loop counts only through $S = T + 2B$, including the attention products. Thus every feasible split has the same compute. Since the loss is strictly decreasing in N_{eff} and $N_{\text{rec}} > 0$, minimizing it is equivalent to maximizing $g(T, B)$. Using $g(T, B) = \exp[c(1 - T^{-p}B^{-q})]$ with $c > 0$, this is equivalent to minimizing $T^{-p}B^{-q}$, or its logarithm. Substituting $T = S - 2B$ gives $1 \leq B \leq S/3$ and the strictly convex objective

$$h(B) = -p \log(S - 2B) - q \log B, \quad h''(B) = \frac{4p}{(S - 2B)^2} + \frac{q}{B^2} > 0.$$

When $q \geq 2p$, the constraint $B \leq T$ gives

$$h'(B) = \frac{2p}{T} - \frac{q}{B} \leq \frac{2p - q}{T} \leq 0.$$

The derivative is strictly negative whenever $B < T$, including when $q = 2p$. Hence the unique minimum is at $B = S/3$, where $T = B$. For $S = 3$, this is also the only feasible split. $\square$

The replacement preserves N, D and strictly improves any truncated setting, so the conclusion also holds when either or both are optimized, provided the replacement is admissible. It does not require fixed parameter proportions across model sizes. Including the optimizer update does not change the result, since its cost is independent of T, B .

The condition is stronger than $q > p$: a backward loop costs twice a forward loop, so the comparison is q versus $2p$. Our adopted fit satisfies $q > 2p$. For integer or restricted loop menus, $S/3$ may be unavailable, so the continuous dominance argument does not replace the discrete check (D.8).

D.4.3 Fixed model size: allocate loops and data

With N fixed, size cannot rebalance against data, and the loop setting determines how many tokens the compute buys: $D_N(C; T, B) = C/F_N(T, B)$ by (D.2). §6.1 compares the fifteen observed settings $\mathcal{S}$ at their respective token budgets:

$$(T^*, B^*) \in \arg \min_{(T, B) \in \mathcal{S}} L(N, D_N(C; T, B), T, B), \quad D^* = D_N(C; T^*, B^*). \quad (\text{D.8})$$

The switch points quoted in §6.1 are computed with the measured compute, optimizer update included; leaving it out moves them by less than 0.5% (§D.1).

For continuous loop counts, Lemma D.2 establishes the preference for full BPTT when $q \geq 2p$, as in our adopted fit. We therefore set $B = T$ and first characterize the interior balance between loops and tokens, then derive its large-compute limit.

Lemma D.3 (Optimal loop–token balance at fixed model size). *Fix an architecture with $N_{\text{once}} \geq 0$ and $N_{\text{rec}} > 0$, and a compute budget $C > 0$. Suppose the loss follows (4.1), with positive fitted coefficients $E, A, H, \alpha, \beta, \kappa, c, p, q$ and positive normalization scales N_0, D_0 . Let $B = T \geq 1$ be continuous and use (D.2), so that $F_N(T, T) = u_N + 3v_N T$ with fixed $u_N, v_N > 0$ and $D = C/F_N(T, T)$. Write $s = p + q$ and define*

$$N_{\text{eff}}(T) = N_{\text{once}} + N_{\text{rec}} \exp[c(1 - T^{-s})],$$

$$X(T) = A \left(\frac{N_{\text{eff}}(T)}{N_0} \right)^{-\alpha}, \quad Y(T) = H \left(\frac{D}{D_0} \right)^{-\beta}.$$

Throughout this derivation, a prime denotes a total derivative with respect to T along $B = T$, holding the architecture and C fixed. In particular,

$$N'_{\text{eff}}(T) \equiv \frac{dN_{\text{eff}}(T)}{dT} = N_{\text{rec}} c s g(T, T) T^{-s-1},$$

$$F'_N(T, T) \equiv \frac{d}{dT} F_N(T, T) = 3v_N.$$

Thus N'_{eff} measures how effective size changes with loop count (N is fixed), and $F'_N(T, T)$ includes both loop counts as $B = T$ grows. Every interior optimum satisfies

$$\alpha X \frac{N'_{\text{eff}}}{N_{\text{eff}}} = \beta Y \frac{F'_N(T, T)}{F_N(T, T)}. \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Equivalently, the stationary points are parameterized by

$$C(T) = D_0 \left[\frac{3\beta H v_N}{\alpha A} F_N(T, T)^{\beta-1} \left(\frac{N_{\text{eff}}}{N_0} \right)^\alpha \frac{N_{\text{eff}}}{N'_{\text{eff}}} \right]^{1/\beta}, \quad D(T) = \frac{C(T)}{F_N(T, T)}. \quad (\text{D.10})$$

Proof. At fixed model size and compute, the loop count trades effective size against tokens: raising $T = B$ increases N_{eff} but, through the budget, reduces D . We write the loss as a function of T alone by substituting $D = C/F_N(T, T)$, differentiate its size and data terms, and set the total derivative to zero, which gives (D.9). This first-order condition involves C only through the factor $C^{-\beta}$, so it can be solved explicitly for the compute at which each T is stationary, which gives (D.10).

Since $\kappa > 0$, minimizing loss is equivalent to minimizing J ; substituting the budget gives

$$J(T; N, C) = X(T) + Y(T) = A \left(\frac{N_{\text{eff}}}{N_0} \right)^{-\alpha} + H \left(\frac{D_0 F_N(T, T)}{C} \right)^\beta.$$

Increasing T raises the effective size and lowers X , but reduces the token budget and raises Y . At fixed N, C , differentiating the token budget gives

$$D' \equiv \frac{d}{dT} \left(\frac{C}{F_N(T, T)} \right) = -\frac{C F'_N(T, T)}{F_N(T, T)^2}, \quad \frac{D'}{D} = -\frac{F'_N(T, T)}{F_N(T, T)}.$$

Consequently, the derivatives of the two loss terms are

$$X' \equiv \frac{dX}{dT} = -\alpha X \frac{N'_{\text{eff}}}{N_{\text{eff}}}, \quad Y' \equiv \frac{dY}{dT} = \beta Y \frac{F'_N(T, T)}{F_N(T, T)}.$$

Setting $J' = X' + Y' = 0$ gives (D.9), and $N'_{\text{eff}} = N_{\text{rec}} c s g(T, T) T^{-s-1} > 0$ with $F'_N = 3v_N$ yields

$$\alpha A \left(\frac{N_{\text{eff}}}{N_0} \right)^{-\alpha} \frac{N'_{\text{eff}}}{N_{\text{eff}}} = 3\beta H v_N \left(\frac{D_0}{C} \right)^\beta F_N(T, T)^{\beta-1}.$$

All factors are positive, so solving for C gives (D.10). $\square$

This is a necessary condition for an interior optimum; boundary values and all allowed integer settings must also be compared. On the finite menu, added compute goes to tokens until a deeper setting reaches a lower predicted loss, at which point the token budget drops.

Lemma D.4 (Asymptotic loop–token allocation). *Suppose the loss follows (4.1), with positive fitted coefficients $E, A, H, \alpha, \beta, \kappa, c, p, q$ and positive normalization scales N_0, D_0 . Use the fixed architecture and compute model of Lemma D.3, and allow all continuous $T \geq 1$ with no upper bound. Let $T^*(C)$ be any global minimizer along $B = T$, and let $D^*(C) = C/F_N(T^*, T^*)$. As $C \rightarrow \infty$, there are constants $K_T, K_D > 0$, independent of C , such that*

$$T^*(C) \sim K_T C^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+p+q}}, \quad D^*(C) \sim K_D C^{\frac{p+q}{\beta+p+q}}. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

Proof. The proof has two steps. First, we show that a global minimizer exists for every budget and grows without bound as compute increases, so at large compute it is interior and satisfies the stationarity relation (D.10) of Lemma D.3. Second, we take the large- T limit of that relation, where $C(T)$ is asymptotically a power of T ; inverting it gives $T^*(C)$, and the budget gives $D^*(C)$.

For each finite C , the continuous objective J tends to infinity as $T \rightarrow \infty$, since its data term grows without bound, so a global minimizer exists. Moreover, $T^*(C) \rightarrow \infty$ as $C \rightarrow \infty$: for any fixed $M \geq 1$, every $T \leq M$ has $J(T; N, C) \geq X(M)$, whereas $J(2M; N, C) \rightarrow X(2M) < X(M)$. No minimizer stays in $[1, M]$ at large compute; it is eventually interior and satisfies (D.10).

Writing $s = p + q$, the large- T limits are

$$N_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow N_{\text{once}} + e^c N_{\text{rec}}, \\ N'_{\text{eff}} \sim N_{\text{rec}} c s e^c T^{-s-1}, \quad F_N(T, T) \sim 3v_N T.$$

The bracket in (D.10) is thus asymptotic to a positive constant times $T^{\beta-1}T^{s+1} = T^{\beta+s}$, so $C(T)$ is asymptotic to a positive constant times $T^{(\beta+s)/\beta}$. Evaluating this relation at $T^*(C)$ and inverting gives the first part of (D.11), and $D^*(C) \sim C/(3v_N T^*(C))$ gives the second, recovering (6.3). $\square$

The current coefficients give exponents approximately 0.238 and 0.762 ((6.4) rounds them to 0.24 and 0.76). These are asymptotic consequences of the fitted law along $B = T$, not a refit to measured optima. The dominance argument above applies within this law and compute model; its extrapolation to unbounded depth is not empirically established. Finite-depth overheads and allowed loop counts determine the practical switches.

D.4.4 Free model size: compare joint allocations

This subsection supports the comparisons of §6.2 in two steps. Lemma D.5 compares a fully trained looped model with the non-looped model that unties its loops at the same leading compute. Corollary D.6 then lets the model size adapt to the budget and compares the compute-optimal frontiers of all loop settings.

Lemma D.5 (Untied copies outweigh full-BPTT loops). *Suppose the looping coefficient is $g(T, B) = \exp[c(1 - T^{-p}B^{-q})]$ with $c, p, q > 0$, and write $s = p + q$. If*

$$g(2, 2) < 2 \quad \text{and} \quad cs 2^{-s} < 1, \quad (\text{D.12})$$

then $g(T, T) < T$ for every real $T \geq 2$. Consequently, for an architecture with $N_{\text{rec}} > 0$ and a fixed token count, replacing a fully trained T -loop model, $T \geq 2$, with a non-looped model of size $N_{\text{once}} + TN_{\text{rec}}$ preserves the leading compute (5.1) and increases the effective size by $[T - g(T, T)]N_{\text{rec}} > 0$.

Proof. Each untied copy of the recurrent block adds one full block of effective parameters, whereas each additional trained loop adds less than one once the gain begins to saturate. We make this precise by following the ratio $g(T, T)/T$, the effective size contributed per executed copy of the block. The first condition in (D.12) places this ratio below one at $T = 2$, and the second makes it decrease for all $T \geq 2$, so it stays below one. The statement about effective size then follows by comparing the two parameter counts term by term.

Along full BPTT, $\log g(T, T) = c(1 - T^{-s})$, so

$$\frac{d}{dT} \log \frac{g(T, T)}{T} = csT^{-s-1} - \frac{1}{T} = \frac{csT^{-s} - 1}{T}.$$

Because $s > 0$, the factor T^{-s} decreases in T , so for every $T \geq 2$ we have $csT^{-s} \leq cs2^{-s} < 1$ and the derivative is negative. The ratio $g(T, T)/T$ is therefore strictly decreasing on $[2, \infty)$, and

$$\frac{g(T, T)}{T} \leq \frac{g(2, 2)}{2} < 1 \quad (T \geq 2).$$

For the second statement, the leading compute-equivalent size of the looped model is $N_{\text{once}} + (T + 2T)N_{\text{rec}}/3 = N_{\text{once}} + TN_{\text{rec}}$ by (5.1), which equals the parameter count, and hence the leading compute, of the non-looped replacement. Their effective sizes are $N_{\text{once}} + g(T, T)N_{\text{rec}}$ and $N_{\text{once}} + TN_{\text{rec}}$, which differ by $[T - g(T, T)]N_{\text{rec}}$, positive by the first statement and $N_{\text{rec}} > 0$. $\square$

The adopted coefficients satisfy both conditions: $g(2, 2) \simeq 1.910 < 2$ and $cs2^{-s} \simeq 0.585 < 1$. The restriction to $T \geq 2$ is needed, because the continuous extension has $g(T, T) > T$ just above $T = 1$, where the derivative above is positive ($cs \simeq 1.400 > 1$).

Corollary D.6 (Free-size frontiers). *Adopt the assumptions of Lemma D.1: the loss law (4.1), a fixed recurrent fraction ρ , and the leading-FLOP budget $C = 6DN_{\text{comp}}$. For each loop setting (T, B) and budget $C > 0$, let $L_{T,B}^*(C)$ be the minimum loss over continuous $N, D > 0$, with minimizers $N_{T,B}^*(C)$ and $D_{T,B}^*(C)$, and let $\eta = \kappa\alpha\beta/(\alpha + \beta)$. Then:*

(i) Frontier identity. *Every loop setting behaves like a non-looped model with budget $C/\chi(T, B)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} L_{T,B}^*(C) &= L_{1,1}^*\left(\frac{C}{\chi(T, B)}\right), \\ N_{T,B}^*(C) &= \left(\frac{N}{N_{\text{eff}}}\right)_{T,B} N_{1,1}^*\left(\frac{C}{\chi(T, B)}\right), \\ D_{T,B}^*(C) &= D_{1,1}^*\left(\frac{C}{\chi(T, B)}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{D.13}$$

where the ratio $(N/N_{\text{eff}})_{T,B} = 1/[1 - \rho + \rho g(T, B)]$ is evaluated at the indicated loop setting and does not depend on N .

(ii) Compute premium. *If the loop setting receives λC , with $\lambda > 0$, while the non-looped model receives C , then*

$$\frac{L_{T,B}^*(\lambda C) - E}{L_{1,1}^*(C) - E} = \left(\frac{\lambda}{\chi(T, B)}\right)^{-\eta}, \quad \frac{N_{T,B}^*(\lambda C)}{N_{1,1}^*(C)} = \left(\frac{N}{N_{\text{eff}}}\right)_{T,B} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\chi(T, B)}\right)^{\beta/(\alpha+\beta)}. \tag{D.14}$$

In particular, the loop setting reaches a lower loss exactly when $\lambda > \chi(T, B)$.

(iii) Equal-compute gap. *At $\lambda = 1$,*

$$L_{T,B}^*(C) - L_{1,1}^*(C) = [L_{1,1}^*(C) - E][\chi(T, B)^\eta - 1]. \tag{D.15}$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma D.1 already contains the key fact: for a fixed loop setting, the budget constraint reads $C/\chi = 6N_{\text{eff}}D$, so optimizing a looped model over its size and tokens is the non-looped problem with a reduced budget. Part (i) restates it for the non-looped optimum, and parts (ii) and (iii) follow by comparing the optimal losses and sizes, (D.6) and (D.5), at two budgets.

Part (i). By Step 1 of the proof of Lemma D.1, N_{eff} is the fixed multiple $1 - \rho + \rho g(T, B)$ of N , so optimizing over N is equivalent to optimizing over N_{eff} , and $N_{\text{comp}} = \chi N_{\text{eff}}$ turns the budget into $C/\chi = 6N_{\text{eff}}D$. In the variables (N_{eff}, D) , the loss (4.1) is the non-looped law, since $(1, 1)$ has $g(1, 1) = 1$ and $N_{\text{eff}} = N$, and the constraint is the non-looped budget C/χ , since $\chi(1, 1) = 1$. The two problems therefore have the same minimum and the same unique minimizers (Step 4 of that proof), namely $L_{1,1}^*(C/\chi)$, with effective size $N_{1,1}^*(C/\chi)$ and token count $D_{1,1}^*(C/\chi)$. Dividing the effective size by $1 - \rho + \rho g(T, B)$ recovers $N_{T,B}^*(C)$, which gives (D.13).

Part (ii). By (D.6), the excess loss of (T, B) at budget λC is $K\bar{C}^{-\eta}\lambda^{-\eta}\chi^\eta$, and that of $(1, 1)$ at budget C is $K\bar{C}^{-\eta}$, because $\chi(1, 1) = 1$. Their ratio is $(\lambda/\chi)^{-\eta}$. Since $\eta > 0$, it is below one exactly when $\lambda > \chi$. For the sizes, part (i) gives $N_{T,B}^*(\lambda C) = (N/N_{\text{eff}})_{T,B} N_{1,1}^*(\lambda C/\chi)$, and (D.5) with $\chi = 1$ shows that $N_{1,1}^*$ scales as the power $\beta/(\alpha + \beta)$ of the budget, so $N_{1,1}^*(\lambda C/\chi)/N_{1,1}^*(C) = (\lambda/\chi)^{\beta/(\alpha + \beta)}$.

Part (iii). Setting $\lambda = 1$ in the loss ratio of part (ii) gives $L_{T,B}^*(C) - E = [L_{1,1}^*(C) - E]\chi^\eta$. Subtracting $L_{1,1}^*(C) - E$ from both sides yields (D.15). $\square$

The identities are exact within the stated approximation and have two consequences. First, by (D.5) every loop setting has $N^* \propto C^{\beta/(\alpha + \beta)}$ and $D^* \propto C^{\alpha/(\alpha + \beta)}$ (exponents 0.562 and 0.438 with the fitted coefficients), so the optimal pair minimizes $\chi(T, B)$ at every compute. Second, among the fifteen settings $(1, 1)$ minimizes χ and $(2, 2)$ is the best looped setting (Table 5; Figure 16b). For $(2, 2)$, $N_{\text{eff}} \simeq 1.462N$, $N_{\text{comp}} \simeq 1.507N$ and $\chi \simeq 1.031$, so (D.13) predicts equal loss at 3.1% more compute and 31.6% fewer parameters than $(1, 1)$. By (D.14), 10% more compute predicts lower loss with about 29.0% fewer non-embedding parameters. At equal compute, with $\eta \simeq 0.0559$, the bracketed multiplier in (D.15) is about 1.72×10^{-3} , or 0.172% of the non-looped model’s excess loss above E , rather than a constant gap in nats, making the compute convention consequential.

Limits of the scale-independent ratios. The identities describe an empirical loss law under a specified compute approximation; they do not establish a universal property of looped models. Size or data bounds can put an optimum on a boundary. A size-dependent recurrent share or the attention, output, and optimizer terms breaks the simple $6\chi N_{\text{eff}}D$ factorization. Full-compute optimization therefore requires an explicit architectural scaling family and a fresh numerical envelope. Its results should be reported separately from the analytic ratios, using the same adopted fit.

E Compute-optimal pairs and the untied model

The main text (§6.3) compares $(2, 2)$ with a compute-optimal model without looping while allowing model size and token count to vary. Below we give the full table for that comparison, followed by a controlled comparison at fixed tokens against an untied model with a separate block per loop.

E.1 Compute-optimal pairs

We trained $(1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ each at the size and token count that minimize its loss for the same training compute, with three seeds each (Table 11). The first two pairs also belong to the scaling suite and its fitting set. At all three budgets, the looped model has 27–32% fewer non-embedding parameters and comes within $(1-8) \times 10^{-3}$ nats of the model without looping. At 2.1×10^{19} FLOPs (2.0×10^{19} for the forward and backward passes alone), training the 344M $(2, 2)$ model on 8% more

tokens, and so with 8% more compute, lowers its loss to 2.3590, $(7.3 \pm 1.8) \times 10^{-3}$ nats below the 471M model without looping (Figure 1d).

Table 11 | Compute-optimal pairs. Each model at the size that minimizes its loss for the compute; loss: mean of three seeds; gap: (2, 2) minus (1, 1), $\pm$ standard error; parameters: non-embedding counts (the models without looping are the 120M, 240M and 480M models of Table 2). Compute includes attention, output, and optimizer updates (D.3); the first three rows are matched in the compute of the forward and backward passes (1.5×10^{18} , 5.9×10^{18} , and 2.0×10^{19} FLOPs, or 9.6×10^{17} , 4.1×10^{18} , and 1.5×10^{19} under the leading-FLOP count $6N_{\text{comp}}D$ of Figure 12d; counting the optimizer update, (1, 1) spends 0.7% more, which corresponds to about 10^{-3} nats); the last row trains the 344M (2, 2) model on 8% more tokens (+8% compute) against the 2.1×10^{19} FLOP (1, 1) reference.

Compute (FLOPs)	(1, 1)		(2, 2)		Gap
	Parameters	Loss	Parameters	Loss	
1.6×10^{18}	115M	2.7098	79M	2.7177	$(7.9 \pm 1.9) \times 10^{-3}$
6.0×10^{18}	239M	2.5215	162M	2.5253	$(3.8 \pm 1.8) \times 10^{-3}$
2.1×10^{19}	471M	2.3663	344M	2.3677	$(1.4 \pm 1.7) \times 10^{-3}$
2.2×10^{19} (+8%)	471M	2.3663	344M	2.3590	$(-7.3 \pm 1.8) \times 10^{-3}$

E.2 The untied model

The untied model of a looped model is the same network in which each loop has its own copy of the recurrent block, input injection and normalization. For two loops it holds $N_{\text{once}} + 2N_{\text{rec}}$ parameters, about 1.5 times as many, at the same compute per token. Tying layers to save parameters goes back to ALBERT (Lan et al., 2019), and Bae et al. (2025a) relax the tie of looped models converted from pretrained ones. Each copy is initialized like the looped model; with all copies set equal, the untied model reproduces the looped model’s loss and logits exactly.

Design and results. Each size trains at about 18 tokens per parameter of the looped model, close to the compute-optimal ratio of Hoffmann et al. (2022): 60M at D_0 , 120M at $2D_0$, 240M at $4D_0$ and 480M at $8D_0$, with the recipe of its (2, 2) run and three seeds per model. Alongside the untied model, we train (2, 2) at the same width and (2, 2) widened to about 80% of the untied model’s non-embedding parameters, on the same tokens (Table 12). At the untied model’s width the looped model trails by 9×10^{-3} – 1.7×10^{-2} nats (1.3×10^{-2} averaged over the four sizes), against $(3\text{--}4) \times 10^{-3}$ by the law, whose error at these (2, 2) runs is at most 4×10^{-3} nats. The wider looped model uses 15–22% more forward-and-backward compute per token than the untied model and reaches a lower loss by 5×10^{-3} – 1.7×10^{-2} nats, in all twelve seed pairs.

F Learning rate and batch size

Our runs follow one learning-rate rule and one batch-size rule, both set by the token budget D (Table 13). We test each rule against sweeps that vary only the learning rate or only the batch; a learning-rate sweep scales the MuonH and AdamW learning rates by one common factor. We call a value acceptable when its loss is within 0.25% of the optimum of its sweep, about a tenth of what (4, 4) gains over (1, 1) at the same model size and budget.

F.1 Learning-rate rule

We take the transfer rule of the reference recipe (Schwethelm et al., 2026) for the peak MuonH learning rate of the hidden weight matrices,

$$\eta = 0.014 \left(\frac{b}{128} \right)^{0.558} \left(\frac{D}{D_{\text{ref}}} \right)^{-\gamma}, \quad D_{\text{ref}} = 9.83 \times 10^8, \quad (\text{F.1})$$




Figure 17 | Learning-rate rule ((F.1), $\gamma = 0.40$) against the measured optimum. Colors give the model size; filled markers: (4,4), open markers: (4,1). Solid gray lines: the rule; dashed lines: the alternative it is tested against; shading: the tolerance (0.25%). (a) Loss above the fitted optimum, in percent of the optimum loss, against the learning rate relative to the rule, for the ten token-exponent sweeps, with one quadratic in $\log \eta$ per sweep. (b) Fitted optima relative to (F.1) at $\gamma = 0.32$, with the learning rates within the tolerance (bars); dashed: $\gamma = 0.32$. (c) As (a), at D_0 , for four sizes with (4,4) and for 60M with (2,2) and (8,8). (d) Optima of these sweeps against the number of executed layers; dashed: the trend HyperP measures without residual scaling (the optimum halves from 8 to 24 layers), drawn through the rule at 20 layers.

Table 12 | Comparison with the untied model. At each size: the untied model, (2, 2) at its width, and (2, 2) widened to about 80% of its non-embedding parameters. Width with heads $\times$ head dimension; parameters: non-embedding; compute: compute per token of the forward and backward passes relative to the untied model, the same ratio as the training compute since all models of a size train on the same tokens; loss: mean of three seeds; – untied: paired by seed, mean $\pm$ standard error.

Size	Model	Width	Parameters	Compute	Loss	– untied
60M	untied	768 (6 $\times$ 128)	87M	1.00	2.7843	
	(2, 2)	768 (6 $\times$ 128)	58M	1.00	2.7931	$(+8.8 \pm 3.0) \times 10^{-3}$
	(2, 2), wider	840 (7 $\times$ 120)	69M	1.15	2.7668	$(-1.75 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-2}$
120M	untied	1024 (8 $\times$ 128)	180M	1.00	2.5809	
	(2, 2)	1024 (8 $\times$ 128)	115M	1.00	2.5982	$(+1.73 \pm 0.14) \times 10^{-2}$
	(2, 2), wider	1152 (9 $\times$ 128)	146M	1.22	2.5681	$(-1.28 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-2}$
240M	untied	1280 (10 $\times$ 128)	360M	1.00	2.4147	
	(2, 2)	1280 (10 $\times$ 128)	239M	1.00	2.4272	$(+1.25 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-2}$
	(2, 2), wider	1408 (11 $\times$ 128)	289M	1.18	2.4044	$(-1.03 \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-2}$
480M	untied	1664 (13 $\times$ 128)	709M	1.00	2.2565	
	(2, 2)	1664 (13 $\times$ 128)	471M	1.00	2.2700	$(+1.35 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-2}$
	(2, 2), wider	1824 (12 $\times$ 152)	566M	1.18	2.2511	$(-5.4 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-3}$

Table 13 | Batch size, number of steps and peak MuonH learning rate of the hidden weight matrices at each budget. The learning rate is (F.1) with $\gamma = 0.40$, with its ratio to the $\gamma = 0.32$ value rounded to a power of $2^{1/8}$; the AdamW learning rates are multiplied by the same ratio. Warmup takes 2% of the steps.

Budget D/D_0	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	4	8	16	32
Batch (sequences of 2,048 tokens)	48	64	88	128	176	256	352
Steps	5,464	8,192	11,920	16,384	23,832	32,768	47,664
Peak learning rate ($\times 10^{-3}$)	10.7	9.25	8.11	8.01	7.03	6.36	6.09

where b is the global batch in sequences of 2,048 tokens; the AdamW learning rates scale with width, and those of the embedding and output also with batch. The reference recipe uses the token exponent $\gamma = 0.32$ of HyperP (Ren et al., 2026), a transfer rule for MuonH. On our models this exponent is too small: relative to (F.1) with $\gamma = 0.32$, the optimal learning rate keeps falling as D grows (Figure 17b). We thus re-estimate γ and, as our models vary in depth, test for a depth term.

Token exponent: $\gamma = 0.40$. We swept the learning rate at the smallest and the largest model size, 60M at D_0 , $4D_0$ and $16D_0$ and 1B at $4D_0$ and $16D_0$, each with (4, 4) and (4, 1), and fit a quadratic in $\log \eta$ to each sweep to locate its optimum (Figure 17a). The exponent that minimizes the rule’s largest loss above the optimum is $\gamma = 0.406$ (95% interval 0.400–0.412), and we use $\gamma = 0.40$. The rule is then within 0.06% of the optimum in every sweep, the largest gap being 60M with (4, 1) at $16D_0$, whereas $\gamma = 0.32$ ends up 0.45% above the optimum at 1B and $16D_0$.

No depth correction. Depth-wise transfer rules lower the learning rate as networks get deeper (Bordelon et al., 2023; Dey et al., 2025; Ren et al., 2026; Yang et al., 2023). For updates normalized as in MuonH, keeping the change of the network per step fixed requires $\eta \propto \ell^{-1/2}$ with residual branches scaled by $\ell^{-1/2}$, or $\eta \propto \ell^{-1}$ without that scaling, where ℓ is the number of executed layers (Ren et al., 2026, Theorem 3). Our recipe scales neither the residual branches nor the learning rate with depth, although our models get deeper both with size (20 to 40 executed layers from 60M to 1B at $T = 4$) and with the number of forward loops (12 to 36 at 60M). Yet the optimum does not follow the depth (Figure 17c–d): at D_0 , the rule’s learning rate is the best of $1/\sqrt{2}$, 1 and $\sqrt{2}$




Figure 18 | Batch rule (F.2) against the measured optimum. Colors give the model size. (a) Loss-optimal batch for (4, 4), the vertex of a quadratic in log batch fitted to each sweep, with the batches within the tolerance (bars). Lines: the rule (solid) and one ladder step lower (dashed). (b) Loss above the best batch, in percent of the best loss, at up to two ladder steps from the rule, over the 33 sweeps with at least three batch sizes (filled: $B = T$; open: $B < T$; n : sweeps run at that batch). Thick line: worst sweep; thin line: mean; shading: the tolerance.

times itself in all six sweeps, and the fitted optima stay within about 7% of the rule, where the trend HyperP measures without residual scaling would lower them by more than half. The optimal learning rate follows the training tokens, not the depth, so the rule needs no depth term.

F.2 Batch-size rule

We set the global batch to

$$b(D) = 64\sqrt{D/D_0} \text{ sequences}, \quad (\text{F.2})$$

rounded to a ladder whose neighboring steps differ by about $\sqrt{2}$ ($\dots, 32, 48, 64, 88, 128, 176, 256, 352$). The loss-optimal batch grows about as $\sqrt{D}$, as in prior work (Bergsma et al., 2025; Filatov et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025b), and in eleven batch sweeps with (4, 4) (60M at five budgets, 240M and 1B at three) the rule’s batch is acceptable in every one (Figure 18a).

Prefactor. The loss is flat over about a factor of two in batch, so the prefactor is a choice between neighboring ladder steps. One step lower, $45\sqrt{D/D_0}$, suits 1B with full BPTT as well as 64 suits 60M, but truncated BPTT prefers larger batches: at 1B and $16D_0$, the best batch is 176 for (4, 4) and 352 for (4, 1). Over all 33 sweeps with at least three batch sizes, which cover all ten core settings, only the rule is acceptable everywhere: it stays within 0.17% of the best batch, while one step lower reaches 0.30% and one step higher 0.42% (Figure 18b). The rule therefore changes comparisons between loop settings by less than 0.004 nats.

G The law across the five-size grid

Figure 19 shows the validation loss of the 343 configurations in the suite’s five-size grid, one panel per loop setting. Filled markers denote the 226 configurations used to fit the law of §4; open markers denote the rest. The suite’s four fitted configurations from the compute-matched pairs (120M, 79M, 240M and 162M) are listed in Table 11 and are not drawn here. The figure contains 290




Figure 19 | The law across the scaling suite. Validation loss of every configuration in the five-size grid against training tokens ($D_0 = 2^{30}$), one panel per loop setting (T, B) with a row per forward-loop count, colored by model size. Filled dots: configurations the law is fitted on; open dots: the other configurations; lines: the law (§4) over each size’s measured budgets.

configurations in the ten core settings, 17 with (8, 1) and 36 with $T = 16$. Each configuration shows the mean loss of its accepted runs (385 in all; §B.3); the law is drawn over each size’s measured budgets. The configurations span 1.1 to 1,291 tokens per parameter, while the fitted ones span 9 to 74. Per loop setting, the law’s RMSE on the fitted configurations is 0.0031 to 0.0093 nats; on the rest it is 0.0200, as most lie below 5 or above 125 tokens per parameter (§7). Figure 7 shows the four

full-BPTT settings at the 26 size–budget pairs where all four were trained: one set of coefficients tracks all four, with RMSE 0.0053 nats over the 68 fitted configurations (0.0148 over the 36 others).

H Training curves

Figure 20 shows the training curves of the 385 runs behind the 343 configurations of §G, one panel per loop setting; Figure 4 in §4.1 repeats its first row. Each curve is the training loss of every tenth step, the cross-entropy of that step’s batch, against the training compute spent so far, counted as in §D.1 with the optimizer update; it is not the validation loss on held-out documents that we report (§B.3). Each token budget is a separate run whose cosine schedule ends at that budget, so a run reaches its final loss only at its end. The highlighted line therefore joins run ends only (dots), those that end below every run with less compute, and needs no fit. As in the training-curve envelopes of Hoffmann et al. (2022, Figure A5), larger models take over this frontier as compute grows; at the highest compute of each panel it follows the largest model of that setting, 1B, or 480M for $T = 16$.




Figure 20 | Training curves of every run in the five-size grid. Training loss against compute (§D.1), one panel per loop setting, with a row per forward-loop count and backward loops increasing to the right, colored by model size; every tenth step, averaged over at most ± 250 steps. Highlighted line and dots: the frontier of run ends, the runs that end below every run with less compute.