

# Improving the Throughput of Diffusion-based Large Language Models via a Training-Free Confidence-Aware Calibration\*

Jucheng Shen<sup>1</sup> Gaurav Sarkar<sup>2†</sup> Yeonju Ro<sup>3</sup> Sharath Nittur Sridhar<sup>2</sup>

Zhangyang Wang<sup>3</sup> Aditya Akella<sup>3</sup> Souvik Kundu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Rice University <sup>2</sup>Intel Labs <sup>3</sup>The University of Texas at Austin  
jack.shen@rice.edu

{gaurav.sarkar, sharath.nittur.sridhar, souvikk.kundu}@intel.com

{yro, akella}@cs.utexas.edu, atlaswang@utexas.edu

## Abstract

We present **CadLLM**, a *training-free* method to accelerate the inference throughput of diffusion-based LLMs (dLLMs). We first investigate on the dynamic nature of the token unmasking confidence across blocks and steps. Based on this observation, we then present a lightweight adaptive approach that can control the generation *block size*, *step size*, and *threshold* based on the average confidence score of the unmasked tokens. We further reduce the softmaxing overhead of token probability generation by dynamically leveraging a subset of *vocabulary size* to regulate sampling breadth. CadLLM is a plug-and-play model-agnostic with KV caching based dLLMs. Extensive experiments on four popular tasks demonstrate the efficacy of CadLLM to yield throughput improvement of up to **2.28×** over the state-of-the-art baseline with competitive accuracy.

## 1 Introduction

Masked diffusion language models (dLLMs) have advanced rapidly, with open-sourced models such as LLaDA (Nie et al., 2025) and DREAM (Ye et al., 2025) demonstrating strong generative capabilities (Austin et al., 2021; Campbell et al., 2022). However, unlike autoregressive language models that generate tokens sequentially in a single forward pass, diffusion-based models rely on a multi-step denoising Markov process that iteratively refines noisy latent states to generate clean text. This stochastic, multi-round refinement incurs substantial computational overhead during inference (Ye et al., 2025; Nie et al., 2025), often causing significant slowdown in token generation.

To improve inference throughput, recently fast-dLLM (Wu et al., 2025) proposed parallel decoding that unmask all positions above a *static* global confidence<sup>1</sup> threshold in parallel. While effective, this static thresholding has few key limitations. Firstly, fast-dLLM uses fixed block sizes with fixed step-size per block, essentially ignoring the change in confidence over the sequence. Secondly, it treats each block uniformly with a fixed sampling breadth (Fan et al., 2018; Holtzman et al., 2018), ignoring potential certainty differences. Thirdly, it employs a fixed token commit threshold, which also doesn’t account for the variation in confidence across inference steps.

**Our Contributions.** To address the above limitations, in this paper we present **CadLLM**, a *training-free adaptive method* that uses lightweight confidence signals to allocate compute where uncertainty persists and save it where predictions stabilize. Specifically, we first analyze the difference in confidence across different blocks and denoising steps. Interestingly, we find that the confidence varies significantly across these dimensions (refer to Section §3). To more optimally balance the compute for token denoising in dLLM, we then present CadLLM. Based on the average confidence of the unmasked tokens in a block, CadLLM dynamically allocates the *block size*, *step size* and unmasking *threshold* during the inference steps. To further reduce the token prediction softmax operation cost we present an *adaptive vocabulary subset* selection based on the prediction confidence.

Extensive experiments across multiple datasets at different generation lengths ( $g$ ) demonstrate the efficacy of CadLLM with a throughput gain of up to

\* Preprint under review.

† Work done when the author was affiliated with Intel.

<sup>1</sup>In this work we define confidence score as the model’s probability output score for its predicted tokens at each masked position.

**2.28×** over the state-of-the-art fast dLLM baseline (Wu et al., 2025) with competitive accuracy.

## 2 Preliminaries

Generation in masked diffusion language model (MDM) is modeled by a network  $p_\theta$  that predicts clean tokens for masked positions conditioned on the partially noised context and (optionally) the time  $t$  (Austin et al., 2021). At each step, given the current evidence  $E = (x_t, t)$ , the model computes  $p_\theta(X^i = v \mid E)$  for each position  $i$  and selects tokens with the highest confidence  $c^i(E) = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} p_\theta(X^i = v \mid E)$  to unmask, iteratively updating the sequence until reaching  $t = 0$  or a stopping condition. Fast-dLLM (Wu et al., 2025) accelerates MDM generation by decoding masked tokens in parallel according to confidence signals. It organizes the output into  $K$  blocks of size  $B$  and performs at most  $S$  refinement steps per block via MDM mechanism.

**Threshold-Based Rule.** For a working sequence  $x$ , it compute confidences  $\{c^i(E)\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}(x)}$  and unmask all positions whose confidence exceeds a fixed global threshold  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  (Wu et al., 2025):

$$\mathcal{U}_\tau(E) = \{i \in \mathcal{M}(x) : c^i(E) \geq \tau\} \quad (1)$$

**Factor-Based Rule.** Factor-based rule controls the degree of parallelism via a *factor* parameter  $\phi > 0$ . For a sorted confidence order  $c^{(1)} \geq \dots \geq c^{(m)}$  for the  $m$  masked positions in the current block and choose the largest  $r$  satisfying:

$$(r + 1) \left(1 - c^{(r)}\right) < \phi,$$

It then unmask the top- $r$  positions. Intuitively, this decodes more tokens when individual confidences are uniformly high and fewer when they are borderline.

## 3 Motivational Case Study

**Confidence is Not Uniform.** Figure 1a shows per-block, per-step confidence for three datasets. Within each block, confidence rises quickly then plateaus; across blocks, difficulty varies—some stabilize immediately, others remain uncertain. A fixed schedule thus over-refines easy blocks while under-serving harder ones. When confidence is high, large block size can exploit parallel decoding since more tokens exceed the threshold; when low, smaller blocks help stabilize outputs faster.

Similarly, the step size should be large under low confidence and small once predictions are stable. Finally, the confidence threshold itself must adapt—should be high at situations to prevent premature commitments, and should be low at situations to accelerate decoding.

**Sampling Breadth has Latency Overhead.** Figure 1b evaluates the softmax latency for different vocabulary sizes. It shows that the latency grows sharply with vocabulary size: evaluating all  $\sim 50K$  tokens is nearly an order of magnitude slower than using a small subset. Since softmax is called at every step, this may become a major bottleneck. This necessitates the adaptive vocabulary size selection to perform the softmax computation on only a subset of total vocabulary.

## 4 CadLLM Methodology

As illustrated in Figure 2, we utilize diffusion LLM’s internal confidence for each token after each forward pass as the key signal to form a *feedback loop*. The feedback loop allocates computing resources where uncertainty persists (low recent mean confidence) and saves resources where predictions have stabilized (high recent mean confidence). We leverage this confidence signal to adaptively select the block size, step size, vocabulary size, and threshold. More importantly its *training-free* nature makes CadLLM easily integrable to improve throughput for any off-the-shelf model.

### 4.1 Adaptive block sizes ( $B_t$ )


Figure 1a shows that (i) confidence typically rises then plateaus within few refinements and (ii) unmasking difficulty varies across blocks. As demonstrated in the following Eq. 2, we set  $B_t$  proportional to the current average confidence  $\bar{c}$ : high-confidence blocks expand in size to amortize computing cost of forward passes, whereas low-confidence blocks shrink so the model can focus refinement where uncertainty concentrates.

$$B_t = \text{clip}\left(B_{\min} + (B_{\max} - B_{\min}) \cdot \bar{c}, B_{\min}, B_{\max}\right) \quad (2)$$

Here  $B_{\max}$  and  $B_{\min}$  represents the maximum and minimum allowable blocks sizes, respectively.

### 4.2 Adaptive steps ( $S_t$ )

We design the step size  $S_t$  to be complementarily related to  $\bar{c}$  and use it to pace the inner loop



(a) Per-block, per-step confidence heatmaps. Lighter the color the higher the confidence.

(b) Softmax latency.

Figure 1: (a) Confidence dynamics for three difference datasets. (b) Latency vs. vocabulary size.

within the active block and also schedule the threshold  $\tau_t$ , as described in Eq. 3. This allows low-confidence mask locations to trigger more refinement steps, while high-confidence locations to have fewer steps.

$$S_t = \text{clip}(S_{\text{base}} + (S_{\text{max}} - S_{\text{base}})(1 - \bar{c}), S_{\text{base}}, S_{\text{max}}) \quad (3)$$

### 4.3 Adaptive vocabulary size ( $V_t$ )

To amortize the cost of sampling from vocabulary, we adapt a sampling size  $V_t$  based on few key metric: phase, confidence, and token repetition. In specific, we use a larger vocabulary subset at the early generation stage or during the phase of uncertainty in token generation. We also allow larger vocab size when repetitive tokens generate ( $r_t$ ). On the contrary we reduce its size for higher confidence situation to reduce compute cost. Eq. 4 defines the  $V_t$  allocation mechanism.

$$V_t = \text{clip}(V_{\text{phase}}(g_t) \cdot f_{\text{conf}}(\bar{c}) \cdot f_{\text{rep}}(r_t), V_{\text{min}}, V_{\text{max}}) \quad (4)$$

Here,  $V_{\text{phase}}$  widens early and narrows late based on the generation progress (% of tokens generated within a sequence)  $g_t$ ;  $f_{\text{conf}}$  expands under low confidence; and  $f_{\text{rep}}$  widens briefly under repetitions.

**Same Token Repetition Detection.** A naive controller may over-narrow  $V_t$  once confidence is high, causing short loops (e.g., “the the the”). To avoid this, we introduce a lightweight *repetition detector* that scans recent outputs and returns  $r_t \in [0, 1]$ . When repetition spikes,  $f_{\text{rep}}(r_t) > 1$  briefly widens  $V_t$  to restore diversity, then reverts as  $r_t$  drops. This preserves fast decoding in stable regions while preventing local degeneracy.

### 4.4 Adaptive threshold ( $\tau_t$ )

Adaptive confidence threshold *controls the token unmasking*. Early in a block or for low confidence, committing too many tokens in parallel by having a low threshold lead to poor quality output. Also, having a high threshold late in a block gates already




Figure 2: Overview of CadLLM’s adaptive controller. The controller dynamically updates various parameters based on a lightweight confidence and progress signals, replacing the static ones.

stable tokens from being unmasked. As described in Eq. 5, we define a progress-aware threshold  $\tau_t$  that is initially strict (when confidence is low) and relaxes eventually (as confidence rises and remains high), as more and more tokens are unmasked and uses it to gate unmasking within the selected  $V_t$  candidates.

$$\tau_t = \tau_{\text{base}}(1 - g_t) + \tau_{\text{min}}g_t \quad (5)$$

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental Setup

All experiments are run on a single NVIDIA H100 GPU. We evaluate on GSM8K (5-shot), MATH (4-shot), MBPP (3-shot, pass@1), and HumanEval (0-shot, pass@1) with generation lengths  $g=256$  and  $g=512$ . We compare three decoding strategies: CadLLM (ours), and fast-dLLM with factor and threshold based approaches. Further hyperparameter details are provided in the Appendix.

### 5.2 Analysis of Main Results

Table 1 reports throughput (tokens/s), accuracy, and latency across benchmarks. CadLLM achieves

Benchmark	CadLLM (ours)	Fast-dLLM (factor)	Fast-dLLM (threshold)
GSM8K	78.01%	76.19%	79.00%
	120.07 (1.33 $\times$ )	119.18 (1.32 $\times$ )	90.40 (1.00 $\times$ )
	75.44%	74.45%	75.28%
	107.79 (1.37 $\times$ )	100.66 (1.27 $\times$ )	78.77 (1.00 $\times$ )
MATH	32.06%	32.22%	32.40%
	106.84 (1.34 $\times$ )	109.97 (1.38 $\times$ )	79.58 (1.00 $\times$ )
	34.94%	35.40%	32.06%
	117.21 (1.14 $\times$ )	111.86 (1.08 $\times$ )	103.18 (1.00 $\times$ )
MBPP	24.00%	21.20%	25.60%
	99.86 (1.37 $\times$ )	96.01 (1.31 $\times$ )	73.15 (1.00 $\times$ )
	13.00%	13.20%	14.20%
	104.62 (1.35 $\times$ )	100.73 (1.30 $\times$ )	77.71 (1.00 $\times$ )
HEval	35.97%	32.92%	37.19%
	220.81 (2.28 $\times$ )	132.28 (1.37 $\times$ )	96.84 (1.00 $\times$ )
	43.29%	41.46%	45.12%
	163.72 (1.74 $\times$ )	131.14 (1.38 $\times$ )	94.41 (1.00 $\times$ )

Table 1: Comprehensive results on LLaDA-Instruct (single NVIDIA H100). For each benchmark, the *upper row* is generation length 256 and the *lower row* is 512. Shot settings: GSM8K (5-shot), MATH (4-shot), MBPP (3-shot, pass@1), HumanEval (0-shot, pass@1). Each cell shows accuracy (top, in %) and throughput improvement (bottom: *tokens/s* / *improvement*). Improvement is relative to the Fast-dLLM threshold baseline at the same generation length.

up to **2.28 $\times$**  higher throughput than Fast-dLLM baselines while maintaining accuracy on par with the strongest models, including on MATH. Adaptive control over blocks, steps, and vocabulary size reduces number of forward passes and compute cost without retraining. These gains persist at larger scales ( $g = 512$ ), demonstrating that CadLLM maintains both efficiency and accuracy across longer generations.

### 5.3 Ablations and Analysis

We conduct ablation studies to understand how each policy of CadLLM contribute to performance (Table 2). Additionally, we also investigate the effects of using different cache modes (Table 3), confidence calculation methods (Table 6), as well as enabling an optional early stopping via Prophet method that is proposed in recent literature (Table 7). We include the latter two in the Appendix.

**Adaptive Policy Ablations.** As shown in Table 2, disabling adaptive block size ( $B_t$ ) reduces throughput by 8.6%, while accuracy changes only slightly. This shows that block sizing mainly affects computation instead of accuracy. Larger blocks amortize computation cost when confidence is high, while smaller blocks localize refinement with some extra computation cost when confidence is low. Without

Mode	Token/s $\uparrow$	Time (s) $\downarrow$	Accuracy $\uparrow$	NFE $\downarrow$
ON	121.72	2501.10	78.01%	86,816
No $V_t$	119.67	2547.25	74.41%	86,666
No $S_t$	136.76	2235.68	76.12%	76,955
No $B_t$	111.19	2751.77	78.32%	92,344
No $\tau_t$	34.57	8841.89	78.17%	337,664
OFF	34.32	8908.60	78.01%	337,664

Table 2: GSM8K ablations at generation length 256. “ON” enables all four adaptive policies (adaptive block size, steps, vocabulary size, and threshold). Each subsequent row disables only the named policy. “OFF” disables all four adaptive policies.

adaptive steps ( $S_t$ ), throughput increases by 12.3% however, the accuracy drops by 1.9 percentage points. This indicates that steps alone balance inference speed and accuracy: fewer steps accelerate decoding with accuracy drop, and more steps preserve accuracy but incur higher computation cost. Removing adaptive vocabulary size ( $V_t$ ) lowers throughput by 1.7% and sharply reduces accuracy by 4.6 percentage points, while NFE remains nearly unchanged. This confirms that adaptive vocabulary size acts as an exploration–exploitation lever: widening early or under uncertainty improves robustness, while narrowing later saves softmax cost without harming accuracy.

Eliminating the progress-aware threshold ( $\tau_t$ ) collapses efficiency. Throughput falls by 71.6%, latency increases by 254%, and NFE jumps by 289%, while accuracy remains nearly unchanged. This demonstrates that a dynamic commit gate is essential for practical runtime. The fully static **OFF** configuration shows nearly identical degradations, confirming that thresholding dominates the contribution to efficiency gains in the absence of other adaptive policies.

**Cache Modes (Prefix vs. Dual).** Additionally, as shown in Table 3, our method is *KV-cache agnostic*: it plugs into either prefix-only caching or dual (prefix+suffix) caching without any modification except for the few lines that replace the underlying cache methods.

Cache	Token/s $\uparrow$	Time (s) $\downarrow$	Accuracy $\uparrow$	NFE $\downarrow$
Prefix	145.20	2116.64	75.89%	82,677
	113.09	3155.55	76.72%	97,865
Dual	121.72	2501.10	78.01%	86,816
	107.79	3261.45	75.44%	104,215

Table 3: GSM8K (5-shot). CadLLM with prefix-only and dual KV caching. For each cache mode, the *upper row* is generation length 256 and the *lower row* is 512.



## 6 Conclusions

We present CadLLM, a *training-free* adaptive decoding method for masked dLLMs that replaces fixed schedules with four confidence-driven policies: adaptive block size, step size, vocabulary size (with repetition guard), and commitment threshold. These policies focus compute on uncertain regions and skip stable ones while remaining model-agnostic and KV-cache compatible. Evaluations in multiple datasets demonstrate that CadLLM can retain the accuracy similar to SoTA while improving throughput by up to **2.28 $\times$** .

## 7 Limitations

One limitation of CadLLM is that the accuracy and throughput improvements can potentially remain sensitive to a few hyperparameters that may often require careful tuning. Automated search of the calibration hyperparameters is an interesting future research. Further evaluations on multimodal generative tasks with dLLMs remains another interesting exploration direction.

## References

- Jacob Austin, Daniel D. Johnson, Jonathan Ho, Daniel Tarlow, and Rianne van den Berg. 2021. [Structured denoising diffusion models in discrete state-spaces](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2107.03006.
- Andrew Campbell, Joe Benton, Valentin De Bortoli, Tom Rainforth, George Deligiannidis, and Arnaud Doucet. 2022. [A continuous time framework for discrete denoising models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2205.14987.
- Angela Fan, Mike Lewis, and Yann Dauphin. 2018. Hierarchical neural story generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.04833*.
- Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Maxwell Forbes, Antoine Bosselut, David Golub, and Yejin Choi. 2018. Learning to write with cooperative discriminators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.06087*.
- Pengxiang Li, Yefan Zhou, Dilxat Muhtar, Lu Yin, Shilin Yan, Li Shen, Yi Liang, Soroush Vosoughi, and Shiwei Liu. 2025. [Diffusion language models know the answer before decoding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2508.19982.
- Shen Nie, Fengqi Zhu, Zebin You, Xiaolu Zhang, Jingyang Ou, Jun Hu, Jun Zhou, Yankai Lin, Ji-Rong Wen, and Chongxuan Li. 2025. [Large language diffusion models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.09992.
- Chengyue Wu, Hao Zhang, Shuchen Xue, Zhijian Liu, Shizhe Diao, Ligeng Zhu, Ping Luo, Song Han, and

Enze Xie. 2025. [Fast-dllm: Training-free acceleration of diffusion llm by enabling kv cache and parallel decoding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2505.22618.

Jiacheng Ye, Zhihui Xie, Lin Zheng, Jiahui Gao, Zirui Wu, Xin Jiang, Zhenguo Li, and Lingpeng Kong. 2025. [Dream 7b: Diffusion large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2508.15487.

## Appendix

### A. Related Work

**Fast-dLLM.** Fast-dLLM accelerates masked diffusion language models via confidence-aware parallel decoding with (i) a fixed-threshold rule that unmask all positions with  $c^i \geq \tau$  and (ii) a factor-based rule selecting the largest  $r$  with  $(r+1)(1 - c^{(r)}) < \phi$ , executed in fixed-size blocks with a preset number of refinement steps (Wu et al., 2025). Our **CadLLM** departs from this static design by turning these knobs into policies: *adaptive block size* (compute allocation to easy vs. hard blocks), *adaptive steps* (precision–speed dial), *adaptive vocabulary size* (confidence-aware search breadth), and *adaptive threshold* (phase-aware commit threshold). This training-free controller closes the loop between signals and compute, improving throughput while preserving accuracy.

**Early exiting in diffusion LMs.** Concurrent work observes early answer convergence and proposes *Prophet*, which triggers an “all-in” decode using the top-2 confidence gap as a stop criterion (Li et al., 2025). Our focus is orthogonal: we target training-free compute allocation (adaptive blocks, steps, vocabulary size, and threshold). In our implementation, early exit via *Prophet* is available as an optional confidence-based, block-level stop; we leave *Prophet* disabled in main results because it overlaps with adaptive steps and reduces accuracy (see Appendix for a detailed comparison). The controller remains compatible with *Prophet* should deployments prioritize additional speed over accuracy.

### B. Algorithm

<sup>2</sup>For all initial variables and hyperparameters not specified here, see Table 4.

**Algorithm 1** CadLLM.<sup>2</sup>

**Require:** model  $p_\theta$ , prompt  $x_{\text{prompt}}$ , length  $g$   
**Require:**  $(B_{\min}, B_{\max}), (S_{\min}, S_{\max})$   
**Require:**  $(V_{\min}, V_{\max}), (\tau_0, \tau_{\min})$   
**Require:** window  $\Delta$

- 1:  $x \leftarrow [x_{\text{prompt}}; [\text{MASK}]^g]$
- 2:  $\text{pos} \leftarrow |x_{\text{prompt}}|$
- 3:  $\text{remain} \leftarrow g$
- 4:  $C \leftarrow []$
- 5: **while**  $\text{remain} > 0$  **do**
- 6:    $g_t \leftarrow (g - \text{remain})/g$
- 7:    $\bar{c} \leftarrow \text{MEANCONF}(C, \Delta)$
- 8:    $f_{\text{conf}}(\bar{c}) \in \{1.5, 1.2, 0.8, 1.0\}$  by  $\bar{c}$
- 9:    $r_t \leftarrow \text{repeat-score}$
- 10:    $f_{\text{rep}}(r_t) \leftarrow 1 + 2r_t$  if  $r_t > 0.5$ , else 1
- 11:    $B_t \leftarrow \text{clip}(B_{\min} + (B_{\max} - B_{\min})\bar{c})$
- 12:    $S_t \leftarrow \text{clip}(S_{\min} + (S_{\max} - S_{\min})(1 - \bar{c}))$
- 13:    $V_t \leftarrow \text{clip}(V_{\text{phase}}(g_t) f_{\text{conf}}(\bar{c}) f_{\text{rep}}(r_t))$
- 14:    $\tau_t \leftarrow \tau_0(1 - g_t) + \tau_{\min}g_t$
- 15:    $M \leftarrow \text{mask in } [\text{pos} : \text{pos} + B_t]$
- 16:   **for**  $t' = 1$  **to**  $S_t$  **do**
- 17:      $\ell \leftarrow \text{LOGITS}(x)$
- 18:      $x_{\text{pred}} \leftarrow \arg \max(\ell)$
- 19:      $p[i] \leftarrow \text{conf. of } x_{\text{pred}}[i] \text{ in } V_t, i \in M$
- 20:      $\text{commit} \leftarrow \{i \in M : p[i] \geq \tau_t\}$
- 21:      $x[\text{commit}] \leftarrow x_{\text{pred}}[\text{commit}]$
- 22:     append  $\text{MEAN}(p[i] | i \in M)$  to  $C$
- 23:     **if** no  $[\text{MASK}]$  in  $M$  **then break**
- 24:     **end if**
- 25:   **end for**
- 26:    $\text{pos} \leftarrow \text{pos} + B_t$
- 27:    $\text{remain} \leftarrow \text{remain} - B_t$
- 28: **end while**
- 29: **return**  $x$

**C. Hyperparameter Settings****C1. CadLLM (ours)**

Parameter	Value
Model	LLaDA-8B-Instruct
Generation length $g$	(256, 512)
Temperature $T$	0
Remasking	low confidence
Confidence method	softmax
Mean confidence sliding window	$\Delta = 5$
Initial block size $B_0$	24
Block size range $(B_{\min}, B_{\max})$	(4, 64)
Initial step $S_0$	24
Step range $(S_{\min}, S_{\max})$	(24, 90)
Initial vocabulary size $V_0$	100
Vocabulary size range $(V_{\min}, V_{\max})$	(35, 1000)
Initial threshold $\tau_0$	0.85
Threshold minimum $\tau_{\min}$	0.4
Early stopping via Prophet	False
Repetition detector	window $w = 8$
Repetition detector	min length = 2
Caching	Dual Cache

Table 4: Hyperparameters for CadLLM used in Table 1.

**C2. Baselines (Fast-dLLM)**

Parameter	Value
Model	LLaDA-8B-Instruct
Generation length $g$	256
Temperature $T$	0
Caching	DualCache
Selection rule	factor (f); threshold (t)
Factor / Threshold	$\phi = 1.0$ (f); $\tau = 0.9$ (t)
Confidence method	softmax

Table 5: Hyperparameters for Fast-dLLM baselines used in Table 1. Rows annotated with (f) indicate the factor variant, and rows annotated with (t) indicate the threshold variant.

**B. Further Experiments****Confidence Method (Softmax vs. Entropy)**

We compare two confidence computations for our controller: maximum softmax probability (“Softmax”) and entropy-based confidence (“Entropy”). Results on GSM8K at  $g=256$  (single H100) show that softmax is both faster and slightly more accurate, with substantially fewer function evaluations.

Mode	Token/s $\uparrow$	Time (s) $\downarrow$	Accuracy $\uparrow$	NFE $\downarrow$
Softmax	121.72	2501.10	78.01%	86,816
Entropy	76.69	3981.49	77.03%	135,963

Table 6: Comparison of two confidence calculation modes (softmax vs. entropy) on GSM8K (5-shot),  $g=256$ .**Prophet Early Commit**

We evaluate integrating *Prophet* early-commit (Li et al., 2025) into **CadLLM**. On GSM8K at  $g=256$  (single H100), enabling Prophet increases throughput and reduces function evaluations, but it also lowers accuracy, overlapping with the role of our adaptive-steps policy. As a result, we keep Prophet *disabled by default*; it remains an optional speed knob for deployments that can trade a few accuracy points for lower latency.

Mode	Token/s $\uparrow$	Time (s) $\downarrow$	Accuracy $\uparrow$	NFE $\downarrow$
Prophet	144.50	2113.72	75.28%	70,335
Default	121.72	2501.10	78.01%	86,816

Table 7: Comparison of enabling early stopping via Prophet vs. default mode on GSM8K (5-shot),  $g=256$ .**D. Case Study**

We compare answers produced by our controller in three settings: *ON* (all four adaptive policies

enabled), an *ablated* variant with exactly one policy disabled, and *OFF* (all four adaptive policies disabled). Each table uses the same prompt shown below and shows the full reasoning text side by side.

**Prompt:** *Janet’s ducks lay 16 eggs per day. She eats three for breakfast every morning and bakes muffins for her friends every day with four. She sells the remainder at the farmers’ market daily for \$2 per fresh duck egg. How much in dollars does she make every day at the farmers’ market?*

<b>ON</b>	To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers’ market, we need to follow these steps: 1) Calculate the total number of eggs laid per day. 2) Subtract eggs eaten and baked. 3) Compute revenue. Total eggs = 16. Breakfast = 3; baking = 4. Eggs left to sell = $16 - 3 - 4 = 9$ . She sells each egg for \$2, so revenue = $9 \times 2 = 18$ . Therefore, Janet makes \$18 per day.
<b>No <math>V_t</math></b>	To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers’ market, we need to follow these steps: 1) Calculate the total number of eggs laid per day. 2) Subtract eggs eaten and baked. 3) Compute revenue. Total eggs = 16. Breakfast = 3; baking = 4. Eggs left to sell = $16 - 3 - 4 = 9$ . Price = \$2/egg. Revenue = $9 \times 2 = 18$ . Therefore, Janet makes \$18 per day.
<b>OFF</b>	To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers’ market, we need to follow these steps: 1) Total eggs laid per day: 16. 2) Eggs eaten for breakfast and baked for friends: $3 + 4 = 7$ . 3) Eggs left to sell: $16 - 7 = 9$ . 4) Revenue: $9 \times 2 = 18$ . Therefore, Janet makes \$18 every day.

Table 8: Case study (adaptive vocabulary size ablation). Each variant is a single, full-width row.

**Adaptive vocabulary size (case study).** In Table 8, all three variants (ON, No adaptive vocabulary size, OFF) compute the correct answer (18). The qualitative difference is that *ON* presents a concise, single-pass derivation with no redundant enumeration, whereas *No adaptive vocabulary size* and *OFF* tend to include extra scaffolding. This reflects the role of vocabulary size: keep breadth wide only when uncertainty is high, then narrow once scores concentrate. On harder prompts, this setting reduces token/phrase repetition by briefly widening the candidate set when the model hesitates, and then tightening it as confidence stabilizes.

**Adaptive steps (case study).** In Table 9, all rows again reach 18, but *ON* keeps the reasoning suc-

<b>ON</b>	To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers’ market, we need to follow these steps: 1) Calculate the total number of eggs laid per day. 2) Subtract eggs eaten and baked. 3) Compute revenue. Total eggs = 16. Breakfast = 3; baking = 4. Eggs left to sell = $16 - 3 - 4 = 9$ . Price = \$2. Revenue = $9 \times 2 = 18$ . Therefore, \$18 per day.
<b>No <math>S_t</math></b>	To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers’ market, we need to follow these steps: 1) Calculate the total number of eggs laid per day. 2) Subtract eggs eaten and baked. 3) Compute revenue. Total eggs = 16. Breakfast = 3; baking = 4. Eggs left for sale = $16 - 3 - 4 = 9$ . Price = \$2/egg. Revenue = $9 \times 2 = 18$ . Therefore, \$18 per day.
<b>OFF</b>	To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers’ market, we need to follow these steps: 1) Total eggs laid per day: 16. 2) Eggs eaten for breakfast and baked for friends: $3 + 4 = 7$ . 3) Eggs left to sell: $16 - 7 = 9$ . 4) Revenue: $9 \times \$2 = \$18$ . Therefore, Janet makes \$18 every day.

Table 9: Case study (adaptive steps ablation).

cinct while *No-adaptive steps* uses comparable logic with slightly more intermediate narration. Adaptive steps mainly protect quality on trickier questions: they allocate just enough refinement to ambiguous spans before committing, which avoids under-refinement errors (e.g., off-by-one arithmetic or prematurely truncated derivations) without forcing needless extra passes when the solution is already settled.

**Adaptive block size (case study).** Table 10 shows that all settings deliver the same correct outcome, indicating the policy does not harm content fidelity on short arithmetic. Its qualitative value appears as sequences grow: *ON* focuses work on the uncertain span only, preventing spillover from already-stable text and preserving step-by-step clarity. The ablated and all-off rows remain correct here, but on longer chains the adaptive span reduces cross-span interference and keeps explanations tighter.

**Adaptive threshold (case study).** In Table 11, each variant still returns 18 with coherent steps. The adaptive threshold’s contribution is pacing: it raises the bar early (to avoid premature commitment when context is thin) and relaxes it late (to avoid redundant re-checking once the answer is evident). The *No-adaptive threshold* row looks similar on this easy prompt, but on more ambiguous ones the adaptive gate prevents vacillation and unnec-

---

<b>ON</b>	<p>To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers' market, we need to follow these steps:</p> <p>1) Calculate the total number of eggs laid per day.  2) Subtract eggs eaten and baked. 3) Compute revenue.</p> <p>Total eggs = 16. Breakfast = 3; baking = 4. Eggs left to sell = <math>16 - 3 - 4 = 9</math>. Price = \$2. Revenue = <math>9 \times 2 = 18</math>. Therefore, \$18 per day.</p>
<b>No <math>B_t</math></b>	<p>To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers' market, we need to follow these steps:</p> <p>1) Total eggs laid per day: 16. 2) Eggs eaten for breakfast and baked for friends: <math>3 + 4 = 7</math>. 3) Eggs left to sell: <math>16 - 7 = 9</math>. 4) Revenue: <math>9 \times \\$2 = \\$18</math>.  Therefore, Janet makes \$18 every day.</p>
<b>OFF</b>	<p>To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers' market, we need to follow these steps:</p> <p>1) Total eggs laid per day: 16. 2) Eggs eaten for breakfast and baked for friends: <math>3 + 4 = 7</math>. 3) Eggs left to sell: <math>16 - 7 = 9</math>. 4) Revenue: <math>9 \times \\$2 = \\$18</math>.  Therefore, Janet makes \$18 every day.</p>

---

Table 10: Case study (adaptive block size ablation).

---

<b>ON</b>	<p>To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers' market, we need to follow these steps:</p> <p>1) Calculate the total number of eggs laid per day.  2) Subtract eggs eaten and baked. 3) Compute revenue.</p> <p>Total eggs = 16. Breakfast = 3; baking = 4. Eggs left to sell = <math>16 - 3 - 4 = 9</math>. Price = \$2. Revenue = <math>9 \times 2 = 18</math>. Therefore, \$18 per day.</p>
<b>No <math>\tau_t</math></b>	<p>To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers' market, we need to follow these steps:</p> <p>1) Total eggs laid per day: 16. 2) Eggs eaten for breakfast: 3. 3) Eggs baked for muffins: 4. 4) Eggs left to sell: <math>16 - 3 - 4 = 9</math>. 5) Revenue: <math>9 \times \\$2 = \\$18</math>.  Therefore, Janet makes \$18 at the farmers' market.</p>
<b>OFF</b>	<p>To determine how much Janet makes every day at the farmers' market, we need to follow these steps:</p> <p>1) Total eggs laid per day: 16. 2) Eggs eaten for breakfast and baked for friends: <math>3 + 4 = 7</math>. 3) Eggs left to sell: <math>16 - 7 = 9</math>. 4) Revenue: <math>9 \times \\$2 = \\$18</math>.  Therefore, Janet makes \$18 every day.</p>

---

Table 11: Case study (adaptive threshold ablation).

essary edits, yielding consistent derivations while preserving efficiency.