

# A Mathematical Theory of Top- $k$ Sparse Attention via Total Variation Distance

Georgios Tzachristas<sup>1,2</sup>, Lei Deng<sup>1</sup>, Ioannis Tzachristas<sup>3</sup>, Gong Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Renhai Chen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Theory Laboratory, Central Research Institute, 2012 Laboratory,  
Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., Shenzhen, China.  
{tzachristasgeorgios, deng.lei2, nicholas.zhang, chenrenhai}@huawei.com

<sup>2</sup>National Technical University of Athens, Greece  
el23102@mail.ntua.gr

<sup>3</sup>Trustworthy Technology and Engineering Laboratory, Heisenberg Research Center,  
2012 Laboratory, Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., Munich, Germany.  
ioannis.tzachristas@huawei.com

## Abstract

We develop a unified mathematical framework for certified Top- $k$  attention truncation that quantifies approximation error at both the distribution and output levels. For a single attention distribution  $P$  and its Top- $k$  truncation  $\hat{P}$ , we show that the total-variation distance coincides with the discarded softmax tail mass and satisfies the exact identity

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = 1 - e^{-\text{KL}(\hat{P}\|P)},$$

replacing generic inequalities by a sharp equality specific to Top- $k$  truncation. Building on this, we derive a hierarchy of non-asymptotic deterministic bounds—from a single boundary gap, through multi-gap and blockwise variants—that control  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P})$  using only the ordered logits.

We then turn to the attention outputs. Using an exact head–tail decomposition, we prove that the vector error factorizes as

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 = \tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2, \quad \tau = \text{TV}(P, \hat{P}),$$

yielding a new head–tail diameter bound

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq \tau \text{diam}_{H,T},$$

where  $\text{diam}_{H,T}$  is the cross-set diameter of the value vectors. This introduces the value matrix  $V$  as an explicit geometric parameter in the error bound, and we further obtain variance-based refinements that relate the output error to  $\text{Var}_P(V)$ .

Under an i.i.d. Gaussian score model  $s_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , we derive closed-form expressions for the softmax tail mass and show that the minimal  $k_\varepsilon$  ensuring  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$  obeys an asymptotic design rule  $k_\varepsilon/n \approx \Phi_c(\sigma + \Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon))$ . These analytical results motivate two certified selection algorithms,  $\Delta_k$ -Search and MC-Search, which adaptively score only a subset of keys and stop as soon as they can certify that a prescribed Top- $k$  truncation satisfies  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$ .

Empirical evaluations on **bert-base-uncased** attention maps and synthetic long-context logits confirm the predicted scaling of the certified sparsity ratio  $k_\varepsilon/n$ , reveal heavier-tailed logits than the Gaussian idealization, and demonstrate that certified Top- $k$  can reduce scored keys by a factor of 2–4 $\times$  on average—and by orders of magnitude on sharply peaked heads—while rigorously respecting the prescribed total-variation error.

**Keywords:** Top- $k$  attention, certified sparsification, total-variation bounds, softmax truncation, probabilistic analysis, efficient transformers

# 1 Introduction

The attention mechanism is the computational core of modern transformer architectures. For a sequence of  $n$  tokens with query, key, and value representations  $Q, K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_v}$ , the standard attention operator

$$\text{Attn}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^\top}{\sqrt{d}}\right)V$$

requires  $O(n^2d)$  time and  $O(n^2)$  memory to compute, dominated by the pairwise dot products between all queries and keys. As the context length  $n$  grows into the tens or hundreds of thousands, this quadratic scaling has become the primary bottleneck in large language models (LLMs).

A natural remedy is to exploit the observation that, for each query, only a small number of keys contribute significantly to the attention output. Top- $k$  sparse attention methods approximate the softmax weights by, for each query  $q_i$ , retaining only the  $k$  largest scores  $q_i^\top k_j$  over  $j$  and zeroing the rest. Such sparsity can lead to subquadratic complexity and aligns well with modern hardware, and numerous practical variants have been proposed, including block-based, hierarchical, and hash-based sparse attention. Several mainstream open-source systems now adopt Top- $k$  sparse attention in their inference stacks.

Despite impressive empirical performance, however, the mathematical foundations of these methods remain poorly understood. In this work we study Top- $k$  attention truncation through the lens of probability and optimization. Fundamental questions persist:

- How does truncating the softmax affect the output distribution and the resulting attention output?
- What deterministic or probabilistic guarantees can bound the error introduced by keeping only the top  $k$  keys?
- Can we design algorithms that certify in advance that a given truncation achieves a desired accuracy?

## 1.1 Contributions

This paper develops a unified mathematical theory of Top- $k$  attention that quantifies the effect of truncation at both the distribution and output levels, and connects these guarantees to certified sparse-attention algorithms. Our main contributions are:

1. **Distribution-level theory for Top- $k$  truncation.** For a softmax distribution  $P$  and its Top- $k$  truncation  $\hat{P}$ , we show that the total-variation distance coincides with the discarded softmax tail mass and satisfies the exact identity

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = 1 - e^{-\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P)}.$$

This replaces generic inequality-based bounds with a sharp equality specific to Top- $k$  truncation and serves as the foundation for all subsequent certificates.

2. **Deterministic certificates from score gaps and blocks.** Using only the ordered logits  $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_n$ , we derive non-asymptotic upper bounds on  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P})$  in terms of: (i) a single boundary gap  $s_k - s_{k+1}$ ; (ii) multi-gap (pigeonhole) refinements; and (iii) blockwise extensions that operate on groups of consecutive keys. These results yield a hierarchy of deterministic certificates, from fine-grained to coarse-grained, without any distributional assumptions.

3. **Output-level error bounds and geometry of the value matrix.** We establish an exact head–tail decomposition

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 = \tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2, \quad \tau = \text{TV}(P, \hat{P}),$$

and obtain a new head–tail diameter bound

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq \tau \text{diam}_{H,T},$$

where  $\text{diam}_{H,T}$  is the cross-set diameter of the value vectors. This introduces the value matrix  $V$  as an explicit geometric parameter in the error and is complemented by variance-based bounds that relate the output error to  $\text{Var}_P(V)$ . We further give a graph-theoretic characterization of the optimal head–tail partition: the "minimax" cross diameter is achieved by cutting the lightest edge of a maximum spanning tree.

4. **Probabilistic laws under a Gaussian score model.** Under an i.i.d. Gaussian model  $s_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , we derive closed-form expressions for the softmax tail mass and show that the minimal  $k_\varepsilon$  ensuring  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$  obeys an asymptotic design rule

$$k_\varepsilon/n \approx \Phi_c(\sigma + \Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon)).$$

This links error tolerance, logit variance, and expected sparsity, providing a principled guideline for choosing  $k$  in high-dimensional regimes.

5. **Certified selection algorithms and empirical validation.** We translate these analytical results into two certified Top- $k$  selection procedures:  $\Delta_k$ -Search, which uses a gap-based certificate, and MC-Search, which uses mass certificates and their blockwise extensions. Both algorithms adaptively score only as many keys as needed to certify  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$ , with  $\Delta_k$ -Search verifying a prescribed Top- $k$  and MC-Search additionally returning the minimal mass-certified size  $k_\varepsilon(q)$  for each query.

Experiments on **bert-base-uncased** attention maps and synthetic long-context logits confirm the predicted scaling of the certified sparsity ratio  $k_\varepsilon/n$ , reveal heavier-tailed logits than the Gaussian idealization, and demonstrate that certified Top- $k$  can reduce the number of scored keys by factors of 2–4 $\times$  on average, and by orders of magnitude for sharply peaked heads, while rigorously respecting the prescribed TV budget.

## 1.2 Applications to LLM-based systems

The theory developed here enables **provably efficient attention** in practical LLM deployments. By coupling the **exact tail-mass identity**

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = 1 - e^{-\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P)}$$

with our **certified selectors** ( $\Delta_k$ -Search and MC-Search), one can adaptively choose the minimal Top- $k$  per head and query that meets a prescribed tolerance  $\varepsilon$ , potentially yielding **subquadratic complexity** in the sequence length with explicit accuracy guarantees (Sections 4–7). The same certificates extend to structured, blockwise pruning across heads, windows, or tiles, supporting head/window selection under **verifiable error budgets** (Sections 4 and 7). Because the certification is orthogonal to implementation, it composes with fast attention kernels to reduce FLOPs without altering semantics, and it can inform serving-time trade-offs (latency/throughput vs. bounded deviation) as well as training-time objectives that encourage larger score gaps or target TV budgets. Empirically, certified sparsity scales predictably with context length while preserving the requested bound, making the approach suitable for **long-context inference** and resource-constrained deployment (Sections 7–8).

### 1.3 Scope and Structure

Our analysis focuses on single-head attention with fixed queries, but the results extend naturally to multi-head settings and to other exponential-family attention mechanisms. The paper is organized as follows. Section 3 introduces notation and basic definitions. Section 4 derives fundamental identities connecting total variation, KL divergence, and related quantities, and establishes deterministic gap and blockwise bounds. Section 5 converts these distribution-level guarantees into output-level error guarantees, including geometric and graph-theoretic characterizations of the value matrix. Section 6 develops probabilistic predictions under a Gaussian score model. Section 7 presents certified selection algorithms translating these bounds into practice. Section 8 empirically validates the theory on real attention maps and synthetic long-context logits. Section 9 concludes with a discussion of implications, limitations, and future directions.

In summary, this work provides a rigorous mathematical foundation for Top- $k$  attention, showing that its empirical robustness follows from the precise exponential decay of the discarded softmax mass and from structural properties of the value vectors, and that these insights enable the design of attention mechanisms with certified accuracy guarantees.

## 2 Related Work

The quadratic time and memory complexity of the standard attention operator has motivated extensive research into efficient and sparse alternatives. A full attention layer requires  $O(n^2d)$  computation, which becomes prohibitive for long sequences. Consequently, a wide variety of methods have sought to approximate or restrict the attention pattern while preserving model quality. Most of these approaches rely on heuristic sparsity or low-rank assumptions, and even when they come with theoretical guarantees, these are usually stated in terms of kernel or matrix approximation or model expressivity rather than per-query accuracy of the attention distribution. Our work differs in offering a unified mathematical analysis of Top- $k$  truncation with provable, certified error bounds on the resulting softmax distribution.

**Fixed and Learned Sparse Patterns.** Early efforts such as the **Sparse Transformer** [1] introduced fixed blockwise and strided attention masks that reduce complexity while maintaining global context. Subsequent models, including **Longformer** [2] and **BigBird** [3], combined local sliding windows with a small number of global tokens to extend attention to thousands of tokens. These methods improve scalability and can be trained effectively, but they impose hard-coded sparsity patterns rather than deriving them from the attention statistics themselves. They do not, however, provide explicit per-query deterministic or probabilistic bounds on the approximation error introduced by truncating a given attention distribution.

**Low-Rank and Kernel Approximations.** A second line of work compresses the attention matrix through low-rank or kernel-based approximations. **Linformer** [4] projects the key and value matrices into a lower-dimensional subspace, achieving linear complexity in sequence length. **Performer** [5] and **Random Feature Attention** [8] replace the softmax kernel by positive random feature maps, while **Nyströmformer** [6] approximates the attention matrix using Nyström sampling. These techniques provide substantial speedups and are accompanied by theoretical analyses in terms of kernel or matrix approximation error, or unbiasedness and concentration of the underlying estimators. However, their guarantees typically concern approximation of the attention kernel or matrix, rather than explicit per-query bounds on the deviation between the approximate and exact softmax distributions that can be turned into certification rules. In contrast, our analysis derives *closed-form deterministic* and *probabilistic* guarantees on the deviation between the truncated and exact softmax distributions.

**Memory-Efficient Implementations.** Complementary work has focused on optimizing the *exact* softmax computation for modern hardware. **FlashAttention** [7] reorganizes the computation to minimize GPU memory access, achieving large throughput gains without altering the mathematical definition of attention. While such systems-level improvements are orthogonal to sparsification, our certified truncation algorithms can be combined with such implementations to yield both theoretical and practical efficiency.

**Analytical and Theoretical Perspectives.** Several studies have examined the softmax function from a numerical or probabilistic viewpoint. Classical works on exponential families and on regular variation [9, 10] provide the probabilistic foundation for our Gaussian score model analysis. Despite these advances, prior work stops short of delivering *exact identities* or *certifiable algorithms* that bound, for a given finite score set, the total-variation error arising from truncating the attention distribution.

**Position of This Work.** Our contribution is orthogonal and complementary to these lines of research. We develop, to our knowledge, the first rigorous closed-form TV/KL-based mathematical theory of *Top-k* attention truncation, proving an exact identity between total-variation distance and KL divergence, deriving deterministic and Gaussian-model bounds, and translating them into  $\Delta_k$ -Search and MC-Search algorithms that certify a desired accuracy ( $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$ ) before computing all dot products. Whereas most existing methods trade accuracy for speed heuristically or provide only kernel-level approximation guarantees, our framework provides *verifiable per-query guarantees* linking sparsity, score variance, and approximation error—establishing a principled foundation for provably correct sparse attention.

**Comparative Guarantees.** Most existing efficient-attention architectures—including Linformer [4], Performer [5], Reformer [11], and other kernelized or low-rank variants—reduce computational cost by projecting or approximating the attention kernel. Their analyses typically provide bounds on kernel or matrix approximation error, or characterize unbiasedness and concentration of random feature estimators, rather than giving explicit per-query bounds (for example, in total-variation distance) on the deviation between the approximate and true softmax distributions that can be used as certification rules for a particular score vector.

In contrast, our framework establishes *finite-sample, non-asymptotic guarantees* in total-variation distance. The exact identity

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = 1 - e^{-\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P)}$$

for the pair  $(P, \hat{P})$  arising from *Top-k* truncation links the truncation error directly to discarded softmax mass, yielding deterministic certificates that hold for any finite score set. Unlike prior methods, our certified algorithms ( $\Delta_k$ -Search and MC-Search) guarantee that the truncated attention achieves  $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$  before any approximation is accepted. Thus, the proposed theory replaces heuristic sparsity with **verifiable correctness**, complementing empirically efficient methods with provable accuracy control.

### 3 Preliminaries and Notation

We formalize the notation and definitions used throughout the paper and record several basic properties of the softmax and its *Top-k* truncation.

### 3.1 Attention Scores and Softmax Probabilities

For a single query vector  $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , keys  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and values  $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v}$ , define the (scaled) similarity scores

$$s_i = \frac{q^\top k_i}{\sqrt{d}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

**Indexing convention.** For each query  $q$ , let  $\pi$  be a permutation that sorts the scores in non-increasing order:  $s_{(1)} \geq \dots \geq s_{(n)}$  with  $s_{(i)} = s_{\pi(i)}$ . From now on we relabel indices by  $\pi$  and drop parentheses, so that  $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_n$ , and the associated pairs  $(k_i, v_i)$  are reindexed accordingly. Ties are broken by a fixed rule (e.g., smaller original index). All sums over indices  $1:k$  (e.g.,  $\sum_{i=1}^k$ ) use this convention.

The standard softmax probabilities are

$$p_i = \frac{e^{s_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^n e^{s_j}}, \quad P = (p_1, \dots, p_n),$$

which define a discrete distribution on  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .

We also collect the keys and values into matrices

$$K := \begin{bmatrix} k_1^\top \\ \vdots \\ k_n^\top \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \quad \text{and} \quad V := \begin{bmatrix} v_1^\top \\ \vdots \\ v_n^\top \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_v}.$$

For a single query corresponding to a row  $q^\top$  of  $Q$ , we view  $q$  as a column vector and specialize the matrix formula

$$\text{Attn}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^\top}{\sqrt{d}}\right) V$$

to

$$\text{Attn}(q, K, V) = V^\top \text{softmax}\left(\frac{Kq}{\sqrt{d}}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i.$$

This requires computing all  $n$  dot products  $q^\top k_i$ .

### 3.2 Top- $k$ Truncation

For a fixed integer  $k < n$ , let  $I_k = \{1, \dots, k\}$ . The *Top- $k$  truncated distribution* is

$$\hat{p}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{s_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^k e^{s_j}}, & \text{for } i \leq k, \\ 0, & \text{for } i > k, \end{cases} \quad \hat{P} = (\hat{p}_1, \dots, \hat{p}_n).$$

The corresponding truncated attention output is

$$\text{Attn}_k(q, K, V) := \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{p}_i v_i.$$

### 3.3 Error Measures and Basic Properties

We quantify the distance between the full distribution  $P$  and its truncated version  $\hat{P}$  using standard divergences and record several elementary properties that will be used throughout.

**Total variation.**

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n |p_i - \hat{p}_i|.$$

**Kullback–Leibler divergence.**

$$\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{p}_i \log \frac{\hat{p}_i}{p_i}.$$

We adopt the standard convention  $0 \log(0/q) = 0$  for  $q > 0$ , since  $\lim_{x \downarrow 0} x \log(x/q) = 0$ .

Because  $\hat{p}_i = 0$  for  $i > k$ , the divergence  $\text{KL}(P \| \hat{P})$  is infinite unless the truncation error is zero, whereas  $\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P)$  remains finite and is therefore used throughout.

**Basic properties.**

- **Shift invariance:** For any constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , replacing every score  $s_i$  by  $s_i + c$  leaves  $P$  and  $\hat{P}$  unchanged.
- **Normalization:**  $\sum_i p_i = \sum_i \hat{p}_i = 1$ .
- **Ordering convention:**  $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$  always refers to scores sorted in non-increasing order.

### 3.4 Notation Summary

Symbol	Description
$n$	Sequence length (number of keys)
$d, d_v$	Key/query and value dimensions
$q, k_i, v_i$	Query, key, and value vectors
$s_i = q^\top k_i / \sqrt{d}$	Scaled similarity scores, with $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_n$ by convention
$P = (p_i)$	Softmax distribution, $p_i = e^{s_i} / \sum_j e^{s_j}$
$\hat{P} = (\hat{p}_i)$	Top- $k$ truncated softmax distribution
$I_k$	Indices of the $k$ largest scores
$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P})$	Total variation distance between distributions
$\text{KL}(\hat{P} \  P)$	Kullback–Leibler divergence (finite direction)
$\Delta_k = s_k - s_{k+1}$	Boundary score gap
$\mu, \sigma$	Mean and standard deviation of Gaussian score model
$\Phi, \Phi_c$	Standard normal CDF and survival function
$t_\varepsilon$	Threshold achieving tail mass $\varepsilon$
$k_\varepsilon$	Expected Top- $k$ size ensuring error $\varepsilon$

Table 1: Summary of main notation used throughout the paper.

## 4 Distribution-Level Theory of Top- $k$ Truncation

In this section we study the effect of Top- $k$  truncation purely at the level of the softmax *distribution*. We first establish two fundamental identities relating the truncation error in total variation and KL divergence, and then derive deterministic upper bounds that depend only on simple score statistics (gaps and block masses).

### 4.1 Tail–Mass Identity for Total Variation

The most immediate consequence of truncation is that the total variation (TV) distance between  $P$  and  $\hat{P}$  equals the probability mass that is removed from the tail.

**Lemma 4.1** (Tail–mass identity). *For Top- $k$  truncation as above,*

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \sum_{i>k} p_i.$$

*Proof.* See Appendix A.1.

**Remark 4.2** (Shift invariance). For any constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , replacing every score  $s_i$  by  $s_i + c$  leaves both  $P$  and  $\hat{P}$  unchanged, since each is normalized by the same exponential factor  $e^c$ . Consequently, all subsequent results depend only on score *differences*, such as gaps  $s_i - s_j$ , and are invariant to global shifts of the score vector.

### 4.2 Exact Relationship Between TV and KL Divergence

Building on the tail–mass identity, we next show that the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence between the truncated and full distributions admits a closed-form expression, leading to an exact exponential relationship with the total-variation distance.

**Theorem 4.3** (Exact TV–KL identity). *For the distributions  $P$  and  $\hat{P}$  defined above,*

$$\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P) = \log \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n e^{s_j}}{\sum_{j=1}^k e^{s_j}}, \quad \text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = 1 - e^{-\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P)}.$$

*Proof.* See Appendix A.2. □

**Remark 4.4** (Asymmetry of the KL direction). The divergence  $\text{KL}(P \| \hat{P})$  is infinite unless the discarded tail mass is zero, because  $\hat{p}_i = 0$  for  $i > k$ . The finite quantity  $\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P)$  therefore provides the meaningful asymmetric comparison for truncated softmax distributions.

### 4.3 Consequences

Theorem A.2 reveals that the truncation error measured by total variation is exactly the complement of an exponential in the KL divergence. Thus the two measures are not merely related by an inequality (as in Pinsker’s bound), but by an identity specific to Top- $k$  truncation of a normalized exponential family.

Moreover, for small tail mass  $\tau = \text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \ll 1$ , the expansion

$$\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P) = -\log(1 - \tau) = \tau + O(\tau^2)$$

shows that KL and TV coincide to first order. Consequently, either quantity can serve as a mathematically precise proxy for truncation error, depending on analytical convenience.

### 4.4 Deterministic Bounds via Score Gaps and Blocks

The exact TV–KL identity of Theorem A.2 expresses the truncation error as a function of exponential sums over all  $n$  scores. While this form is precise, it still depends on the entire score vector. In this subsection we derive *deterministic bounds* that depend only on simple quantities—notably the boundary gap

$$\Delta_k = s_k - s_{k+1},$$

and, more generally, aggregated *block gaps*. These bounds provide computable and interpretable certificates of small truncation error.



#### 4.4.1 A Pointwise Gap Bound

**Theorem 4.5** (Deterministic gap bound). *Assume the scores are ordered  $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_n$ , and define  $\Delta_k := s_k - s_{k+1}$ . Then the total-variation error of Top- $k$  truncation satisfies*

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \frac{(n-k)e^{s_{k+1}}}{ke^{s_k} + (n-k)e^{s_{k+1}}} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{k}{n-k}e^{\Delta_k}}.$$

*Proof.* Write  $S_{\text{top}} = \sum_{j \leq k} e^{s_j}$  and  $S_{\text{tail}} = \sum_{j > k} e^{s_j}$ . Because  $s_j \geq s_k$  for  $j \leq k$  and  $s_j \leq s_{k+1}$  for  $j > k$ , we have

$$S_{\text{top}} \geq k e^{s_k}, \quad S_{\text{tail}} \leq (n-k) e^{s_{k+1}}.$$

Using Lemma A.1, the total-variation error is

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \frac{S_{\text{tail}}}{S_{\text{top}} + S_{\text{tail}}},$$

which gives

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \frac{(n-k)e^{s_{k+1}}}{ke^{s_k} + (n-k)e^{s_{k+1}}} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{k}{n-k}e^{\Delta_k}}.$$

□

*Remark 4.6.* The bound in Theorem 4.5 is tight in the extremal case where all Top- $k$  scores equal  $s_k$  and all remaining scores equal  $s_{k+1}$ .

**Interpretation.** A single large boundary gap  $\Delta_k$  exponentially suppresses the tail mass. For instance, with  $n = 10^4$  and  $k = 32$ , to ensure  $\text{TV} \leq 10^{-4}$  one needs  $\Delta_k \gtrsim 15$  (by Theorem 4.5). Such a  $\Delta_k$  ensures that the truncated attention output differs from the full one by less than 0.01% in total probability mass.

#### 4.4.2 A Pigeonhole Lemma for Multiple Gaps

For finer control one may use several adjacent score gaps of the ordered list  $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_n$ . Define the boundary gaps

$$\Delta_j := s_j - s_{j+1} \quad (1 \leq j < n),$$

and the local average of the next  $m+1$  gaps past the boundary  $k$ ,

$$\bar{\Delta}_{m+1} := \frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{r=k}^{k+m} \Delta_r = \frac{s_k - s_{k+m+1}}{m+1}.$$

**Lemma 4.7** (Multi-gap tail split). *Let  $1 \leq k < n$  and  $m \geq 0$  with  $k + m + 1 \leq n$ . Then the total-variation error of Top- $k$  truncation satisfies*

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \frac{1}{k} \left[ m e^{s_{k+1} - s_k} + (n - k - m) e^{s_{k+m+1} - s_k} \right]. \quad (4.1)$$

*Equivalently, in terms of gaps,*

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \frac{1}{k} \left[ m e^{-\Delta_k} + (n - k - m) e^{-(m+1)\bar{\Delta}_{m+1}} \right]. \quad (4.2)$$

*Proof.* Write  $S_{\text{top}} = \sum_{j \leq k} e^{s_j}$  and  $S_{\text{tail}} = \sum_{j > k} e^{s_j}$ . Since  $s_j \geq s_k$  for  $j \leq k$ , we have  $S_{\text{top}} \geq k e^{s_k}$ .

Split the tail into the first  $m$  discarded entries and the remainder:

$$S_{\text{tail}} = \sum_{j=k+1}^{k+m} e^{s_j} + \sum_{j=k+m+1}^n e^{s_j}.$$

By monotonicity, for  $k+1 \leq j \leq k+m$  we have  $s_j \leq s_{k+1}$ , hence  $\sum_{j=k+1}^{k+m} e^{s_j} \leq m e^{s_{k+1}}$ ; and for  $j \geq k+m+1$ ,  $s_j \leq s_{k+m+1}$ , hence  $\sum_{j=k+m+1}^n e^{s_j} \leq (n-k-m) e^{s_{k+m+1}}$ . Therefore

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \frac{S_{\text{tail}}}{S_{\text{top}} + S_{\text{tail}}} \leq \frac{S_{\text{tail}}}{S_{\text{top}}} \leq \frac{m e^{s_{k+1}} + (n-k-m) e^{s_{k+m+1}}}{k e^{s_k}},$$

which gives (4.1). Using  $s_{k+1} - s_k = -\Delta_k$  and  $s_{k+m+1} - s_k = -\sum_{r=k}^{k+m} \Delta_r = -(m+1)\bar{\Delta}_{m+1}$ , we obtain (4.2).  $\square$

#### 4.5 Blockwise Deterministic Bounds

When attention is computed in structured partitions—such as heads, local windows, or tiles—it is natural to consider truncation at the block level. Let  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_M\}$  be a disjoint partition of indices, and let each block contribute total unnormalized mass

$$Z_j = \sum_{i \in B_j} e^{s_i}, \quad w_j = \log Z_j.$$

We order the block masses in non-increasing order

$$Z_{(1)} \geq Z_{(2)} \geq \dots \geq Z_{(M)},$$

and denote by the Top- $\alpha$  blocks  $\{B_{(1)}, \dots, B_{(\alpha)}\}$  the kept set after truncation. Let

$$Z_{\text{head}} := \sum_{j \leq \alpha} Z_{(j)}, \quad Z_{\text{tail}} := \sum_{j > \alpha} Z_{(j)}.$$

The overall total variation error equals the normalized tail mass,

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \frac{Z_{\text{tail}}}{Z_{\text{head}} + Z_{\text{tail}}} = \sum_{i \notin \cup_{j \leq \alpha} B_{(j)}} p_i, \quad p_i = \frac{e^{s_i}}{\sum_k e^{s_k}}.$$

**Gap-based bound (sharper form).** For an integer  $1 \leq \alpha < M$ , let the inter-block gap be

$$\Delta_{\text{blk}} = w_{(\alpha)} - w_{(\alpha+1)} = \log \frac{Z_{(\alpha)}}{Z_{(\alpha+1)}}.$$

Then

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\alpha}{M-\alpha} e^{\Delta_{\text{blk}}}} \leq \frac{M-\alpha}{\alpha} e^{-\Delta_{\text{blk}}}. \quad (4.3)$$

*Proof.* Using  $Z_{\text{head}} \geq \alpha Z_{(\alpha)}$  and  $Z_{\text{tail}} \leq (M-\alpha) Z_{(\alpha+1)}$ ,

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \frac{Z_{\text{tail}}}{Z_{\text{head}} + Z_{\text{tail}}} = \frac{1}{1 + Z_{\text{head}}/Z_{\text{tail}}} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\alpha}{M-\alpha} \frac{Z_{(\alpha)}}{Z_{(\alpha+1)}}} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\alpha}{M-\alpha} e^{\Delta_{\text{blk}}}}.$$

**Existence of a sufficient gap.** Among the  $M$  ordered block masses, there always exists at least one pair of adjacent blocks satisfying

$$w_{(j)} - w_{(j+1)} \geq \frac{w_{(1)} - w_{(M)}}{M-1},$$

since  $\sum_{j=1}^{M-1} (w_{(j)} - w_{(j+1)}) = w_{(1)} - w_{(M)}$ . Thus, in practice even modest variations in block mass typically produce a nontrivial certified gap.

**Discussion.** Equation (4.3) provides a simple, fully verifiable certificate for structured sparsification: keeping the top- $\alpha$  blocks guarantees that the total variation error is bounded by  $1/(1 + \frac{\alpha}{M-\alpha}e^{\Delta_{\text{blk}}})$  (and hence by  $(M - \alpha)/\alpha \cdot e^{-\Delta_{\text{blk}}}$ ). This bound depends only on observable block statistics and requires no probabilistic assumptions. In implementation,  $\Delta_{\text{blk}}$  can be estimated from a small subset of scores using inexpensive upper bounds, enabling efficient certified pruning across heads or local windows.

#### 4.6 Blockwise Mass-Certificate Bounds

While the gap-based bound of Section 4.5 relies on a single inter-block gap  $\Delta_{\text{blk}}$ , it may be conservative when several near-top blocks share similar mass. A more adaptive approach is to certify directly on *blockwise sums*, in analogy to the Mass-Certificate Search (MC-Search) of Section 7.2. Here, the goal is to verify that the retained set of  $\alpha$  blocks captures a sufficient fraction of the total mass, even when block gaps are small.

**Setup.** Let  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_M\}$  be a disjoint block partition with block masses  $Z_b = \sum_{i \in B_b} e^{s_i}$  and block probabilities  $p_b = Z_b / \sum_{r=1}^M Z_r$ . For any candidate kept set  $K \subseteq \{1, \dots, M\}$  with  $|K| = \alpha$ , the total-variation error equals the normalized *tail mass*,

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \frac{S_{\text{tail}}}{S_{\text{head}} + S_{\text{tail}}}, \quad S_{\text{head}} = \sum_{b \in K} Z_b, \quad S_{\text{tail}} = \sum_{b \notin K} Z_b.$$

In practice, the exact  $Z_b$  may be unavailable, but can be bounded via partial scoring or block-level upper/lower estimates.

**Mass-certificate bound.** Suppose each block  $b$  has known lower and upper bounds  $L_b \leq Z_b \leq U_b$ . Let  $K_\alpha(L)$  denote the  $\alpha$  blocks with the largest lower bounds  $L_b$  (this choice maximizes the kept-mass lower bound). Then an upper bound on the total-variation error for the *specific* kept set  $K_\alpha(L)$ , consistent with these bounds, is

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \frac{S^+(U)}{S^-(L) + S^+(U)}, \quad S^-(L) = \sum_{b \in K_\alpha(L)} L_b, \quad S^+(U) = \sum_{b \notin K_\alpha(L)} U_b. \quad (4.4)$$

This bound is deterministic and verifiable: if the right-hand side is below  $\varepsilon$ , the corresponding block set  $K_\alpha(L)$  is guaranteed to satisfy  $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$  for all realizations of the true block masses.

**Interpretation.** Equation (4.4) is the blockwise analogue of the tokenwise MC-certificate of Section 7. The quantity  $S^-(L)$  is a conservative underestimate of the kept-block mass, while  $S^+(U)$  is a conservative overestimate of the discarded-block mass. Their ratio yields a provable upper bound on the tail probability fraction,

$$\text{TV} \leq \frac{S^+(U)}{S^-(L) + S^+(U)} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{S^-(L)}{S^+(U)}}.$$

Because both  $L_b$  and  $U_b$  tighten monotonically as more tokens are scored, the bound improves adaptively and converges to equality once all blocks are fully evaluated.

**Transition to Output Bounds.** The results in this section provide a hierarchy of *distribution-level* certificates: exact identities in TV and KL, pointwise and multi-gap bounds, and blockwise gap- and mass-based bounds. In the next section we show how these certified deviations in  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P})$  translate into guarantees on the actual attention *outputs*, yielding tight  $\ell_2$  error bounds that explicitly incorporate the geometry of the value matrix  $V$ .

## 5 Output-Level Error Bounds and Geometry of the Value Matrix

Having established distribution-level control via total variation and KL, we now quantify how Top- $k$  truncation affects the actual *attention outputs*. We first convert TV bounds into basic  $\ell_2$  guarantees, then refine them using an exact head–tail decomposition, geometric (diameter) and variance-based bounds, and finally formulate a graph-theoretic problem that characterizes the optimal head–tail partition.

### 5.1 Basic $\ell_2$ Bounds via Total Variation

The TV distance bounds derived in the previous section directly translate into Euclidean errors on the resulting attention outputs.

**Proposition 5.1** (Output error). *Let  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_v}$  and assume  $\|v_j\|_2 \leq C$  for all rows  $v_j$ . Then*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq 2C \text{TV}(P, \hat{P}).$$

*Proof.* See Appendix A.4. □

This provides a certified  $\ell_2$  guarantee on the attention outputs: once a sufficient score gap is observed, the truncation error on the resulting value vector is bounded by  $2C$  times the small total-variation mass.

### 5.2 Exact Head–Tail Decomposition

We next refine this crude bound by expressing the output error *exactly* in terms of conditional means over the retained and discarded sets.

**Theorem 5.2** (Exact head–tail identity). *Let  $P = (p_i)_{i=1}^n$  be the attention weights and  $\hat{P} = (\hat{p}_i)$  their Top- $k$  truncation. Let  $\tau := \sum_{i>k} p_i$  denote the tail mass and define the conditional means*

$$\mu_{\text{head}} := \frac{\sum_{i \leq k} p_i v_i}{1 - \tau}, \quad \mu_{\text{tail}} := \frac{\sum_{i > k} p_i v_i}{\tau} \quad (\mu_{\text{tail}} = 0 \text{ if } \tau = 0).$$

*Then the exact identity*

$$\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V) = \tau (\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}})$$

*holds, so that*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 = \tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2.$$

*(Proof in Appendix A.4.)*

### 5.3 Head–Tail Diameter Bound

The exact decomposition suggests a geometric control of the error via the spread of the value vectors across the head–tail cut.

**Proposition 5.3** (Head–tail diameter bound). *Define the cross-set diameter*

$$\text{diam}_{H,T} := \max_{\substack{i > k \\ j \leq k}} \|v_i - v_j\|_2.$$

*Then*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq \tau \text{diam}_{H,T}.$$

*If  $\|v_i\| \leq C$  for all  $i$ , then  $\text{diam}_{H,T} \leq 2C$ , recovering the classical  $2C\tau$  bound as a special case. (Proof in Appendix A.5.)*

## 5.4 Variance-Based Bounds

We now complement the diameter bound with variance-based control that explicitly involves the value variance under the full attention distribution.

**Proposition 5.4** (Centered  $\chi^2$ -variance bound). *Let  $\mu_P := \sum_i p_i v_i$  and define the value variance under  $P$  by*

$$\text{Var}_P(V) := \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \|v_i - \mu_P\|_2^2.$$

*Then*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P}\|P)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V)},$$

*and for Top- $k$  truncation  $D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P}\|P) = \tau/(1 - \tau)$ . (Proof in Appendix A.6.)*

**Corollary 5.5** (Centered KL-variance bound). *Since  $\text{KL}(\hat{P}\|P) = -\log(1 - \tau)$  for Top- $k$ ,*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{e^{\text{KL}(\hat{P}\|P)} - 1} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V)}.$$

*(Proof in Appendix A.6.)*

## 5.5 Combined “Best Available” Certificate

Finally, we collect the preceding bounds into a single inequality that automatically chooses the sharpest available guarantee for a given configuration of  $P$  and  $V$ .

**Theorem 5.6** (Best available certificate). *Let  $C \geq \max_i \|v_i\|_2$ . For Top- $k$  truncation,*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq \min\left\{\tau \text{diam}_{H,T}, \sqrt{D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P}\|P)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V)}, 2C\tau\right\}.$$

*This bound never exceeds  $2C\tau$ , and it is strictly smaller whenever at least one of the diameter or variance terms is less than  $2C\tau$  (for example, whenever  $\text{diam}_{H,T} < 2C$  or when  $\text{Var}_P(V)$  is substantially smaller than  $C^2$ ). (Proof in A.10)*

Proposition 5.3 introduces a new combinatorial optimization problem: given the value vectors  $\{v_i\}$ , how should we choose the head set to minimize the cross-set diameter?

## 5.6 Graph-Theoretic Optimization of the Head–Tail Diameter

We now rephrase the problem of minimizing the head–tail diameter as a classical graph partition problem and describe its solution via a maximum spanning tree.

### 5.6.1 Problem statement

Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$  be  $n$  items (points), and let  $w_{ij} = w_{ji} \geq 0$  be the weight of edge  $\{i, j\}$  (e.g. the Euclidean distance  $\|v_i - v_j\|_2$ ). For any non-empty proper subset  $H \subset \mathcal{V}$  (i.e.,  $1 \leq |H| \leq n - 1$ ), define the *cut value*

$$\phi(H) := \max\{w_{ij} : i \in H, j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus H\}.$$

Our goal is the “minimax” problem

$$\phi^* = \min_{H \subset \mathcal{V}, 1 \leq |H| \leq n-1} \phi(H)$$

and an optimal partition achieving it.

**One-line summary (what we will prove).** Compute a maximum spanning tree (MaxST) and delete its lightest edge; the two components form an optimal cut and the weight of that deleted edge equals  $\phi^*$ .

### 5.6.2 A threshold view of the problem

For a real number  $\tau$ , let  $G_{>\tau}$  be the graph on  $\mathcal{V}$  that keeps exactly those edges whose weight is *strictly greater* than  $\tau$ .

**Lemma 5.7** (Feasibility via disconnection). *There exists a non-trivial  $H$  with  $\phi(H) \leq \tau$  if and only if  $G_{>\tau}$  is disconnected.*

*Proof.* If  $G_{>\tau}$  is disconnected, take  $H$  to be a union of its connected components; then every edge crossing the cut has weight  $\leq \tau$ . Conversely, if  $G_{>\tau}$  is connected, any bipartition must cut some edge of  $G_{>\tau}$ , so its largest cross edge  $> \tau$ .  $\square$

By Lemma 5.7,  $\phi^*$  is the *smallest*  $\tau$  for which  $G_{>\tau}$  becomes disconnected.

### 5.6.3 Maximum spanning tree characterization

A *maximum spanning tree* (MaxST) is a spanning tree whose total weight is maximal. Let  $T^*$  be any MaxST, and let

$$\alpha := \min\{w_e : e \in T^*\}$$

be the weight of its lightest edge.

**Theorem 5.8** (Main theorem).  $\phi^* = \alpha$ . *Moreover, deleting from  $T^*$  any lightest edge splits  $\mathcal{V}$  into two parts  $(H, \mathcal{V} \setminus H)$  with  $\phi(H) = \alpha$ , hence  $(H, \mathcal{V} \setminus H)$  is an optimal cut. Conversely, every optimal cut is a union of connected components of  $G_{>\alpha}$ .*

*Proof.* Run Kruskal in *descending* order (or negate weights and run standard Kruskal). Let  $e_{\min}$  be the last edge Kruskal adds to complete a spanning tree; its weight is  $\alpha$ . Right before adding  $e_{\min}$ , Kruskal has examined all edges  $> \alpha$  and the graph is still *disconnected*, so  $G_{>\alpha}$  is disconnected. For any  $\tau < \alpha$  Kruskal already has a spanning tree using only edges  $> \tau$ , hence  $G_{>\tau}$  is connected. Therefore the first threshold where connectivity breaks is exactly  $\alpha$ , i.e.,  $\phi^* = \alpha$  by Lemma 5.7. Removing  $e_{\min}$  gives a cut whose cross edges are all  $\leq \alpha$ , and since  $e_{\min}$  itself crosses this cut with weight  $\alpha$ , we have  $\phi(H) = \alpha$ ; optimality follows since no cut can get below  $\alpha$ .  $\square$

**Tie handling.** If multiple edges have weight  $\alpha$ ,  $G_{>\alpha}$  may have more than two components. Any non-empty union of these components is optimal and attains value  $\alpha$ .

### 5.6.4 Algorithms (easy to implement)

**Kruskal (descending order).**

1. Build the edge list  $(i, j, w_{ij})$  and sort it by  $w_{ij}$  in *descending* order (breaking ties arbitrarily).
2. Maintain a disjoint-set union (union–find) structure. Scan edges in order and add  $(i, j)$  if and only if it connects two different components.
3. Stop when a single connected component remains (equivalently, after adding  $n - 1$  edges in a complete graph). The resulting tree is a MaxST. The lightest selected edge has weight  $\alpha$  and is the one to cut.

**Cost.** Sorting dominates:  $O(m \log m)$  time for  $m$  edges (plus near-linear union–find time). For a complete graph,  $m = \binom{n}{2}$ , so the total cost is  $O(n^2 \log n)$ .

## 6 Probabilistic Analysis under a Gaussian Score Model

The deterministic results of Section 4 apply to any finite set of scores. To understand how large the Top- $k$  set must be, on average, to ensure a given error tolerance  $\varepsilon$ , we now adopt a simple but analytically tractable probabilistic model for the scores. Throughout this section we treat the attention logits as random variables drawn from a Gaussian distribution, an assumption that provides accurate approximations for normalized dot products in high dimensions.

### 6.1 Setup and Notation

Let the normalized scores be i.i.d.

$$s_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Define the exponential weights  $w_i = e^{s_i}$  and note that  $\mathbb{E}[w_i] = e^{\mu + \sigma^2/2}$ . The softmax normalization for one query is

$$Z_n = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i, \quad p_i = \frac{w_i}{Z_n}.$$

For a threshold  $t$ , denote the *tail mass* (fraction of the softmax weight above  $t$ ) by

$$\tau_n(t) = \frac{\sum_{i: s_i > t} w_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}. \quad (6.1)$$

Truncating at the  $k$ -th largest score corresponds to choosing a random threshold  $T_k$  satisfying  $\#\{i : s_i > T_k\} = k$ , and the resulting total variation error equals  $\tau_n(T_k)$ .

All Gaussian-moment formulas used in this subsection (e.g.,  $\mathbb{E}[w_i] = e^{\mu + \sigma^2/2}$ ) are derived in Appendix B.

### 6.2 Law of Large Numbers for Exponential Weights

By the strong law of large numbers,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}[w_i] = e^{\mu + \sigma^2/2}, \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{1}_{\{s_i > t\}} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}[w_i \mathbf{1}_{\{s_i > t\}}].$$

Using the log-normal moment identity, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[w_i \mathbf{1}_{\{s_i > t\}}] = e^{\mu + \sigma^2/2} \Phi_c\left(\frac{t - \mu - \sigma^2}{\sigma}\right),$$

where  $\Phi_c(x) = 1 - \Phi(x)$  is the Gaussian survival function. Therefore, by the continuous mapping theorem,

$$\tau_n(t) = \frac{\sum_{i: s_i > t} w_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \Phi_c\left(\frac{t - \mu - \sigma^2}{\sigma}\right). \quad (6.2)$$

Equation (6.2) states that the softmax tail mass converges almost surely to a deterministic function of  $t$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\sigma$ . A detailed derivation of the log-normal moment identity and the limit (6.2) is given in Appendix B.

### 6.3 Asymptotic Threshold for a Target Error

Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  be a desired bound on the total-variation error. Define the asymptotic threshold  $t_\varepsilon$  by

$$\Phi_c\left(\frac{t_\varepsilon - \mu - \sigma^2}{\sigma}\right) = 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Solving for  $t_\varepsilon$  gives

$$t_\varepsilon = \mu + \sigma^2 + \sigma \Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon), \quad (6.3)$$

where  $\Phi^{-1}$  is the quantile function of the standard normal. This threshold separates the top  $\varepsilon$  fraction of exponential weight from the remainder in expectation.

The expected Top- $k$  size achieving error  $\varepsilon$  is therefore

$$k_\varepsilon \approx n \Phi_c(\sigma + \Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon)). \quad (6.4)$$

### 6.4 Implications

Equations (6.3)–(6.4) provide a closed-form mapping between the desired truncation error  $\varepsilon$ , the score variance  $\sigma^2$ , and the expected fraction  $k/n$  of keys to keep. For moderate  $\sigma$ , the relation is nearly linear on a log-probability scale, consistent with empirical fits observed in simulation. Combined with the deterministic bounds from Section 4, these results allow one to design Top- $k$  attention mechanisms that achieve provable accuracy guarantees with predictable sparsity.

### 6.5 Empirical Verification of the Gaussian Law

In Section 6.3 we derived the asymptotic law that the expected Top- $k$  size achieving error  $\varepsilon$  under the Gaussian score model satisfies

$$k_\varepsilon \approx n \Phi_c(\sigma + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon)).$$

For convenience, we denote this prediction by

$$\alpha_{\text{Gauss}}(\varepsilon, \sigma) := n \Phi_c(\sigma + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon)),$$

which predicts the expected Top- $k$  size (or equivalently, the effective sparsity level) required to ensure a prescribed total-variation error  $\varepsilon$  under a Gaussian score model.

**Experimental question.** We now test the quantitative accuracy of this law in practice. Specifically, we ask:

*For which values of the score variance  $\sigma$  does our Gaussian approximation remain accurate?*

**Setup.** We generated independent Gaussian scores  $s_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$  for  $n = 10,000$  and computed the empirical value of  $\alpha_{\text{emp}}$ , the minimal number of retained keys ensuring  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$ , over 1000 Monte Carlo repetitions. We then compared  $\alpha_{\text{emp}}$  with the theoretical prediction  $\alpha_{\text{Gauss}}(\varepsilon, \sigma)$  for  $\varepsilon \in \{10^{-3}, 5 \times 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}\}$  and  $\sigma$  spanning  $[0.1, 3.0]$ .

**Results.** Table 2 reports both theoretical and empirical values. Across all regimes tested, the two agree to within numerical precision: for  $\sigma \leq 3$ , the relative deviation  $|\alpha_{\text{emp}} - \alpha_{\text{Gauss}}|/\alpha_{\text{Gauss}}$  remains below 0.1%. Figure 1 visualizes this near-perfect alignment. *Surprisingly, the Gaussian formula remains extremely accurate even for moderate  $\sigma$  where the log-normal tail approximation could have broken down.*



$n$	$\varepsilon$	$\sigma$	$\alpha_{\text{Gauss}}$ (ceil)	Avg. $\alpha_{\text{emp}}$	Attempts
10000	0.01	0.1	9871	9870.542	1000
10000	0.01	0.2	9833	9833.207	1000
10000	0.01	0.3	9787	9786.906	1000
10000	0.01	0.4	9730	9730.330	1000
10000	0.01	0.5	9662	9661.310	1000
10000	0.01	0.6	9579	9579.279	1000
10000	0.01	0.7	9481	9481.306	1000
10000	0.01	0.8	9366	9365.916	1000
10000	0.01	0.9	9232	9232.125	1000
10000	0.01	1.0	9077	9077.160	1000
10000	0.01	1.1	8900	8899.953	1000
10000	0.01	1.2	8700	8701.500	1000
10000	0.01	1.3	8477	8476.689	1000
10000	0.01	1.4	8229	8230.120	1000
10000	0.01	1.5	7957	7957.835	1000
10000	0.01	1.6	7662	7663.143	1000
10000	0.01	1.7	7345	7345.123	1000
10000	0.01	1.8	7007	7009.203	1000
10000	0.01	1.9	6651	6651.748	1000
10000	0.01	2.0	6280	6279.964	1000
10000	0.01	2.1	5896	5897.901	1000
10000	0.01	2.2	5503	5507.407	1000
10000	0.01	2.3	5106	5113.053	1000
10000	0.01	2.4	4707	4715.916	1000
10000	0.01	2.5	4311	4339.901	1000
10000	0.01	2.6	3922	3960.727	1000
10000	0.01	2.7	3544	3592.462	1000
10000	0.01	2.8	3179	3220.476	1000
10000	0.01	2.9	2832	2915.051	1000
10000	0.01	3.0	2503	2585.113	1000

Table 2: Compressed table for  $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$ . Others omitted for space.

**Takeaway.** The empirical agreement confirms that the probabilistic law derived in Section 6 provides a quantitatively precise description of the softmax tail mass. For all practical regimes of interest ( $\sigma \lesssim 3$ ), the Gaussian prediction can be used as a direct design rule linking sparsity, variance, and target accuracy.




Figure 1: Empirical validation of the Gaussian prediction. The theoretical curve  $\alpha_{\text{Gauss}}(\sigma)$  (solid) matches the measured averages  $\alpha_{\text{emp}}$  (dots) for  $\varepsilon \in \{10^{-3}, 5 \times 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}\}$ . Accuracy remains remarkably high up to  $\sigma = 3$ .

## 7 Certifying Selection Algorithms for Top- $k$ Truncation

The deterministic and probabilistic results derived above yield explicit conditions under which a Top- $k$  approximation achieves a prescribed total-variation error  $\varepsilon$ . In this section we translate those conditions into concrete *certifying algorithms* that identify the required subset of keys without exhaustively computing all  $n$  scores.

We assume that the keys are organized into an index structure partitioned into cells (e.g., tiles or clusters) with precomputed centers  $c_j$  and radii  $r_j$ , so that each cell admits an upper bound  $U_j(q)$  on the dot products  $q \cdot k$  for keys it contains. Any such structure can be used; the algorithms below are agnostic to the specific choice.

### 7.1 $\Delta_k$ -Search: Gap-Based Certification

**Intuition.** From Theorem 4.5, the truncation error obeys the sharp inequality

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{k}{n-k} e^{\Delta_k}}, \quad \Delta_k = s_k - s_{k+1}.$$

Thus, to guarantee  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$ , it suffices that

$$\Delta_k \geq \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}.$$

The idea of  $\Delta_k$ -Search is to explore the key space progressively until this inequality is *certified* without scoring all items.

**Theorem 7.1** (Correctness of  $\Delta_k$ -Search). *Whenever Algorithm 1 terminates, the returned set  $\mathcal{I}_k$  satisfies  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$ .*

*Sketch.* If  $L_k - U_{\text{out}} \geq \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$ , then for all unscored keys  $j$ ,

$$s_j \leq U_{\text{out}} \leq s_k - \left[ \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \right],$$

---

**Algorithm 1**  $\Delta_k$ -Search: Certified Top- $k$  Selection

---

**Input:** Query vector  $q$ ; key vectors  $\{k_i\}_{i=1}^n$  partitioned into cells with centers  $c_j$  and radii  $r_j$ ; target error  $\varepsilon$

- 1: Score an initial batch of at least  $k$  keys and compute scores  $s_i = q^\top k_i$ ; initialize candidate heap  $\mathcal{I}_k$  with the current Top- $k$
- 2: **repeat**
- 3:    $L_k \leftarrow$  current  $k$ -th largest observed score  $\triangleright$  smallest score in  $\mathcal{I}_k$
- 4:    $U_{\text{scored}} \leftarrow \max\{s_i : i \text{ scored and } i \notin \mathcal{I}_k\}$   $\triangleright$  take  $-\infty$  if none
- 5:    $U_{\text{unscored}} \leftarrow \max_{j \in \mathcal{U}}\{q \cdot c_j + \|q\|_2 r_j\}$   $\triangleright \mathcal{U}$ : cells with unscored keys; take  $-\infty$  if  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$
- 6:    $U_{\text{out}} \leftarrow \max\{U_{\text{scored}}, U_{\text{unscored}}\}$
- 7:   **if**  $L_k - U_{\text{out}} \geq \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$  **then**
- 8:     **return** Certified Top- $k$  indices  $\mathcal{I}_k$  with  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$
- 9:   **else**
- 10:     Refine the cell  $j$  with maximal  $U_j(q)$ , score its keys, and update  $\mathcal{I}_k$  and  $\mathcal{U}$
- 11:   **end if**
- 12: **until** certification achieved or all keys are scored

---

so that  $\Delta_k \geq \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$ . Applying Theorem 4.5 yields  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

**Complexity.**  $\Delta_k$ -Search terminates after scoring only keys contained in cells whose upper bounds exceed

$$L_k - \left\lceil \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil.$$

In practice this is a small fraction of all keys, yielding large reductions in dot-product evaluations.

## 7.2 MC-Search: Sum-Wise Mass Certification

**Intuition.** While  $\Delta_k$ -Search relies on a single boundary gap, it may be conservative when several near-top keys have similar scores. *Mass-Certificate Search (MC-Search)* exploits the exact tail-mass identity

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \frac{S_{\text{tail}}}{S_{\text{head}} + S_{\text{tail}}},$$

and certifies  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$  by upper-bounding the *unscored* exponential tail mass.

Let  $S$  be the set of evaluated keys and let  $\mathcal{I}_k \subseteq S$  be the current candidate Top- $k$  among the evaluated keys. Define

$$S_{\text{head}}^{\text{known}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} e^{s_i}, \quad S_{\text{tail}}^{\text{known}} = \sum_{i \in S \setminus \mathcal{I}_k} e^{s_i}.$$

For each unexplored cell  $j$ , let  $U_j(q)$  be an upper bound on  $q \cdot k$  over that cell, and let  $\mathcal{U}$  denote the set of unexplored cells. The algorithm maintains the running *upper* estimate

$$\hat{\tau}_k = \frac{S_{\text{tail}}^{\text{known}} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} e^{U_j(q)}}{S_{\text{head}}^{\text{known}} + S_{\text{tail}}^{\text{known}}}.$$

If  $\hat{\tau}_k \leq \varepsilon$ , the certificate  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$  is proven.

**Theorem 7.2** (Correctness of MC-Search). *If Algorithm 2 terminates, then the resulting set  $\mathcal{I}_k$  satisfies  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$ .*

*Sketch.* By construction, for all unscored keys  $j$  we have  $s_j \leq U_j(q)$ ; hence the true tail mass is at most  $S_{\text{tail}}^{\text{known}} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} e^{U_j(q)}$ , while the total mass is at least  $S_{\text{head}}^{\text{known}} + S_{\text{tail}}^{\text{known}}$ . Therefore  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \hat{\tau}_k$ , and if  $\hat{\tau}_k \leq \varepsilon$  upon termination, then  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$  (by the tail-mass identity, Lemma A.1).  $\square$

---

**Algorithm 2** MC-Search: Sum-Wise Certified Top- $k$  Selection

---

**Input:** Query vector  $q$ , key partitions  $\{c_j, r_j\}$ , target error  $\varepsilon$

- 1: Initialize  $S \leftarrow \emptyset$ ; compute cell bounds  $U_j(q)$  for all cells and set  $\mathcal{U}$  to all cells
- 2: **repeat**
- 3:   Evaluate a batch of keys from the cell with largest  $U_j(q)$
- 4:   Update  $S$ , the candidate heap  $\mathcal{I}_k \subseteq S$ , and the unexplored set  $\mathcal{U}$
- 5:   Recompute

$$\hat{\tau}_k \leftarrow \frac{\sum_{i \in S \setminus \mathcal{I}_k} e^{s_i} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} e^{U_j(q)}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} e^{s_i} + \sum_{i \in S \setminus \mathcal{I}_k} e^{s_i}}$$

6: **until**  $\hat{\tau}_k \leq \varepsilon$

7: **return** Certified top- $k$  indices  $\mathcal{I}_k$  with  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) \leq \varepsilon$ 

---

**Complexity.** MC-Search can adaptively focus on high-probability cells and may terminate earlier than  $\Delta_k$ -Search when the tail distribution is flat, at the cost of slightly more bookkeeping. Both algorithms share  $O(k \log n)$  memory and sublinear scoring behavior in typical regimes.

### 7.3 Comparative Discussion

The two certified algorithms instantiate distinct philosophies:

- **$\Delta_k$ -Search** uses a *local* certificate (a single gap) and excels when score distributions exhibit clear separations between relevant and irrelevant keys.
- **MC-Search** relies on a *global* mass certificate, advantageous when many keys have similar scores or when hierarchical index structures provide tight cell bounds.

In practice they can be combined: a fast  $\Delta_k$ -Search pass first certifies most queries, while difficult cases fall back to MC-Search. Both algorithms translate the mathematical conditions of Sections 4–6 into implementable selection procedures with provable accuracy guarantees.

## 8 Empirical Validation on Real Attention Maps

We now test the theory and certified algorithms on both real attention maps from **bert-base-uncased** and controlled synthetic settings. This section focuses on how often Top- $k$  truncation meets a target TV tolerance, how aggressive certified sparsity can be in practice, and how these behaviors scale with sequence length and tolerance.

**Setup.** We evaluate the proposed certificates on **bert-base-uncased** using real attention probabilities returned by the model (`output_attentions=True`). Inputs are longer paragraphs (tokenized to average length  $\bar{n} \approx 15$  in this run). Unless otherwise stated, we target an error tolerance  $\varepsilon = 0.01$  and request a nominal  $k = 16$ , but enforce query-wise  $k_{\text{adj}} = \min(k, n - 1)$  so that truncation is non-trivial for  $n \leq k$ . We collect per-query (layer, head, position) statistics over 6,048 attention distributions.

### 8.1 Results on BERT Attention

**Aggregate behavior.** Across 6,048 queries (mean length  $\bar{n} = 15.0$ ), the requested  $k = 16$  becomes  $\bar{k}_{\text{adj}} = 13.10$ . The *observed* truncation error (exact tail mass) has

$$\text{TV}_{\text{mean}} = 0.00782 < \varepsilon, \quad \text{TV}_{\text{median}} = 0.00330, \quad \text{TV}_{95\%} = 0.0301.$$

Thus, while the *average* query is within tolerance, about 5% of queries exceed  $\varepsilon$  under a fixed- $k$  policy.

**Gap certificate (local  $\Delta$ ).** The deterministic  $\Delta$ -certificate passes on only 1.79% of queries overall. This is consistent with the threshold

$$\Delta \geq \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \approx \log \left( \frac{2}{13} \cdot \frac{0.99}{0.01} \right) \approx 2.73,$$

(using representative  $(n, k) = (15, 13)$ ), whereas the empirical boundary gaps are smaller (overall  $\Delta_{\text{mean}} = 0.489$ , median 0.297). In words: many heads are relatively flat around the  $k$ -boundary, so a single-gap certificate is conservative.

**Mass certificate (MC-Search style).** For each query we compute the minimal  $k_{\text{mc}}$  such that the discarded mass is  $\leq \varepsilon$ . We obtain

$$\bar{k}_{\text{mc}} = 10.95, \quad \text{mean speedup } \mathbb{E}[n/k_{\text{mc}}] = 1.75 \times .$$

Hence an adaptive, mass-certified policy attains guaranteed accuracy with materially fewer keys than dense attention on average, and fewer than the fixed  $k_{\text{adj}}$ .

**Head-wise heterogeneity.** There is substantial variation across heads. Several mid-layer heads are highly peaked and certify aggressively (large speedups), whereas early-layer heads are flatter.

Head (L-H)	rows	cert% $_{\Delta}$	TV $_{\text{mean}}$	$\Delta_{\text{mean}}$	$\bar{k}_{\text{mc}}$	$\mathbb{E}[n/k_{\text{mc}}]$
0-0	42	0.0%	0.0550	0.198	14.98	1.00×
1-6	42	2.38%	$9.8 \cdot 10^{-5}$	0.595	4.33	4.79×
2-0	42	35.71%	$9.0 \cdot 10^{-6}$	2.60	1.14	14.0×
2-9	42	33.33%	$6.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$	2.64	1.55	13.9×
3-5	42	7.14%	$6.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$	0.724	5.93	3.93×
5-9	42	9.52%	$3.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$	0.962	4.95	4.29×

Table 3: Representative heads illustrating the spectrum from flat (0-0) to strongly peaked (2-0, 2-9). cert% $_{\Delta}$  is the fraction of queries certified by the deterministic gap bound;  $k_{\text{mc}}$  is the minimal mass-certified Top- $k$ .

**Takeaways.** (i) A *fixed- $k$*  setting with  $k \approx 13$  achieves  $\text{TV}_{\text{mean}} < \varepsilon$  but leaves a non-negligible tail risk ( $\text{TV}_{95\%} > \varepsilon$ ). (ii) The *mass certificate* removes this tail risk by adapting  $k$  per query; it yields  $\sim 1.75\times$  mean reduction in scored keys overall and up to  $\sim 14\times$  in peaked heads. (iii) The  $\Delta$  *certificate* is highly effective in peaked regimes (where a single boundary gap is informative) and conservative in flat regimes; it is therefore best used as a fast first-line check.

## 8.2 Operating Policies and Certified Efficiency

We now discuss how the certified bounds and algorithms can be turned into practical inference-time policies.

**Hybrid ( $\Delta$ +MC) policy.** A practical strategy is: (1) attempt  $\Delta$ -Search; if

$$\Delta \geq \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon},$$

*stop* (certificate passes). (2) Otherwise, invoke MC-Search to raise  $k$  minimally until the empirical tail mass is  $\leq \varepsilon$ . This preserves the simplicity of a local gap certificate where it works, while guaranteeing accuracy everywhere.

**Quantile-based fixed- $k$ .** If per-query adaptivity is undesirable at inference time, compute the empirical distribution of  $k_{\text{mc}}$  per layer/head and choose  $k$  as a high quantile (e.g., 95th) to reduce tail risk while retaining most of the efficiency. Table 3 suggests that per-head quantiles could substantially shrink compute in mid layers without hurting certification.

**Scaling with sequence length.** For heads whose distributions remain peaked as  $n$  grows, the expected certified complexity follows  $O(k_{\text{mc}} d)$  with empirical speedups  $\propto n/k_{\text{mc}}$ . The observed cases with  $k_{\text{mc}} \approx 1-2$  indicate large potential gains at longer  $n$ .

### 8.3 Discussion

These findings mirror the theoretical picture:

- The *deterministic* gap bound  $\text{TV} \leq \frac{n-k}{k} e^{-\Delta}$  is sharp when a clear boundary separation exists (large  $\Delta$ ), hence the strong certification in L2-H0/H9.
- The *mass identity*  $\text{TV} = \text{tail mass}$  directly enables certified minimal- $k$  selection (MC-Search), eliminating violations by construction.
- Empirically, early heads tend to be flatter (small  $\Delta$ ; larger  $k_{\text{mc}}$ ), while certain mid-layer heads concentrate mass sharply (small  $k_{\text{mc}}$ ).

Overall, certified Top- $k$  on real attention maps is both *accurate* (no bound violations with MC) and *efficient* (material key reductions), and the hybrid policy operationalizes the theory with minimal overhead.

### 8.4 Reporting Summary for This Run

For completeness, we summarize the main statistics from the paragraph-length BERT run:

- Queries analyzed: 6,048; mean sequence length  $\bar{n} = 15.0$ .
- Requested  $k = 16$ ; applied  $k_{\text{adj}} = \min(k, n-1)$ ; resulting  $\bar{k}_{\text{adj}} = 13.10$ .
- Error metrics at  $k_{\text{adj}}$ :  $\text{TV}_{\text{mean}} = 0.00782$ ,  $\text{TV}_{\text{median}} = 0.00330$ ,  $\text{TV}_{95\%} = 0.0301$ .
- Gap certificate pass rate: 1.79% overall; peaked heads up to 35.7%.
- Mass certificate:  $\bar{k}_{\text{mc}} = 10.95$ ; mean speedup  $\mathbb{E}[n/k_{\text{mc}}] = 1.75\times$ ; selected heads up to  $\sim 14\times$ .

### 8.5 Scaling with Sequence Length

We next move from short paragraphs to longer fixed-length windows to examine the effect of sequence length on certified Top- $k$ .

**Setup.** To examine asymptotic behavior, we varied the sequence length of BERT attention from  $n = 128$  to 512 while fixing the requested Top- $k = 16$  and target tolerance  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ . For each length, we evaluated both the deterministic  $\Delta$ -certificate and the mass certificate (MC-Search) on all query distributions of `bert-base-uncased`. The experiment produced between  $5.5 \times 10^4$  and  $2.2 \times 10^5$  query instances per setting.

**Observed trends.** As shown in Table 4, the average total-variation error under a fixed- $k$  truncation increases monotonically with context size:

$$\text{TV}_{\text{mean}} = 0.160 \rightarrow 0.208 \rightarrow 0.263 \quad \text{for } n = 128, 256, 512.$$

The 95th-percentile error rises above 0.5, indicating that fixed- $k$  policies violate the target bound  $\varepsilon = 0.01$  for a non-negligible fraction of queries. This confirms the theoretically predicted growth of the discarded tail mass with  $n$  when  $k$  is held constant.

**Gap vs. Mass certificates.** The deterministic  $\Delta$ -certificate required gaps of

$$\Delta \geq \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \approx 6.5\text{--}8.0$$

for these lengths, whereas empirical gaps were small ( $\bar{\Delta} \approx 0.07\text{--}0.09$ ). Consequently, no query satisfied the  $\Delta$  criterion (0% pass rate), illustrating its conservative nature for flat attention distributions. In contrast, the MC-Search certificate—which adaptively increases  $k$  until  $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$ —identified the minimal certified sizes

$$\bar{k}_{\text{mc}} = 59.6, 108.2, 206.2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\bar{k}_{\text{mc}}}{n} \approx 0.47, 0.42, 0.40.$$

Thus the certified fraction of retained keys decreases slowly with  $n$ , yielding mean theoretical speedups of roughly 2.1–2.5 $\times$  while maintaining the target accuracy.

$n$	$k_{\text{req}}$	$\bar{k}_{\text{mc}}$	$\text{TV}_{\text{mean}}$	$\text{TV}_{95\%}$	$\bar{\Delta}$	Gap pass (%)	Speedup ( $n/\bar{k}_{\text{mc}}$ )
128	16	59.63	0.160	0.568	0.093	0.0	2.15 $\times$
256	16	108.24	0.208	0.700	0.082	0.0	2.36 $\times$
512	16	206.22	0.263	0.797	0.074	0.0	2.48 $\times$

Table 4: Scaling of certified Top- $k$  truncation with sequence length ( $\varepsilon = 0.01$ ). A fixed  $k = 16$  rapidly violates the target bound as  $n$  grows. Adaptive MC-Search increases  $k$  roughly linearly with  $n$ , maintaining  $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$  and yielding 2–2.5 $\times$  average reductions in scored keys.

**Discussion.** The experiment empirically validates the theoretical asymptotics: for a fixed tolerance  $\varepsilon$ , the expected certified fraction  $k_\varepsilon/n$  remains nearly constant, confirming that the required sparsity grows linearly with sequence length. Although  $\Delta$ -Search is too strict for flat early-layer distributions, MC-Search provides a tight, guaranteed bound and achieves predictable speedups. At longer contexts or higher  $\varepsilon$ , the ratio  $k_\varepsilon/n$  is expected to decrease further, demonstrating substantial constant-factor reductions in effective quadratic attention cost in practice.

## 8.6 Accuracy–Efficiency Tradeoff ( $\varepsilon$ -Sweep)

Complementing the length scaling study, we now vary the TV tolerance  $\varepsilon$  to understand how certified sparsity responds to accuracy requirements.

**Setup.** To quantify the empirical tradeoff between certified accuracy and sparsity, we fixed the requested Top- $k = 16$  and varied the error tolerance  $\varepsilon \in \{10^{-3}, 5 \times 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 2 \times 10^{-2}, 5 \times 10^{-2}\}$  across sequence lengths  $n \in \{128, 256, 512\}$ . For each  $(n, \varepsilon)$ , we measured the minimal mass-certified  $k_{\text{mc}}$  such that  $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$ , and the resulting mean speedup  $n/k_{\text{mc}}$ .




Figure 2: Certified accuracy–efficiency tradeoff.

**Results.** Table 5 summarizes the mean certified truncation size and speedup. As  $\varepsilon$  relaxes,  $k_{mc}$  decreases roughly log-linearly, producing rapidly increasing speedups. At  $\varepsilon=0.01$ , the certified fraction  $k_{mc}/n$  is nearly constant ( $\approx 0.4$ ) across all lengths, confirming the predicted linear scaling  $k_\varepsilon \propto n$  and a substantially reduced effective quadratic attention cost. The deterministic  $\Delta$ -certificate again proves too strict (0% pass rate), whereas the mass certificate achieves tight control of total variation.

$n$	$\varepsilon$	$\bar{k}_{mc}$	$TV_{\text{mean}@k=16}$	Gap pass (%)	Speedup $n/\bar{k}_{mc}$
128	0.001	87.7	0.160	0.0	$1.46\times$
128	0.005	69.1	0.160	0.0	$1.85\times$
128	0.010	59.6	0.160	0.0	$2.15\times$
128	0.020	49.4	0.160	0.0	$2.59\times$
128	0.050	35.4	0.160	0.0	$3.62\times$
256	0.001	159.3	0.208	0.0	$1.62\times$
256	0.005	125.3	0.208	0.0	$2.04\times$
256	0.010	108.2	0.208	0.0	$2.37\times$
256	0.020	89.9	0.208	0.0	$2.85\times$
256	0.050	64.4	0.208	0.0	$3.98\times$
512	0.001	300.2	0.263	0.0	$1.70\times$
512	0.005	237.6	0.263	0.0	$2.16\times$
512	0.010	206.2	0.263	0.0	$2.48\times$
512	0.020	172.3	0.263	0.0	$2.97\times$
512	0.050	124.3	0.263	0.0	$4.12\times$

Table 5: Empirical  $\varepsilon$ -sweep for certified Top- $k$  on **bert-base-uncased**. For a fixed  $k=16$ , truncation error rises with  $n$ , but adaptive MC-Search maintains  $TV \leq \varepsilon$  by increasing  $k_{mc}$  roughly linearly with  $n$ . Speedup increases steadily with  $\varepsilon$  while preserving accuracy.

**Discussion.** The  $\varepsilon$ -sweep confirms the theoretical accuracy–efficiency curve: the certified fraction  $k_\varepsilon/n$  decreases smoothly with tolerance, approximately following a Gaussian-tail law. For moderate tolerances ( $\varepsilon \approx 0.01$ – $0.02$ ), attention can be truncated to 30–40% of keys with 2–3 $\times$  fewer dot products, while preserving total variation within bound. At relaxed tolerances ( $\varepsilon \geq 0.05$ ), average speedups in these runs reach about 3–4 $\times$ , revealing substantial headroom for certified Top- $k$  in long-context transformers. The empirical curves in Figure 2 illustrate this smooth tradeoff: the left panel shows mean speedup  $n/\bar{k}_{mc}$  versus  $\varepsilon$ , while the right panel reports the certified fraction  $\bar{k}_{mc}/n$ . Both are consistent with the Gaussian-tail law predicted in Section 6. Overall, the  $\varepsilon$ -sweep supports the asymptotic law  $k_\varepsilon/n \approx \Phi_c(\sigma + \Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon))$  derived under the Gaussian model, indicating good alignment between theoretical and empirical trends.






Figure 3: Diagnostic: mean TV at fixed  $k = 16$ .

$\varepsilon$	$k_\varepsilon/n$ (empirical)			theory (Gaussian)
	$n=4096$	$n=8192$	$n=16384$	$\Phi_c(\sigma + \Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon))$
0.001	0.9818	0.9818	0.9818	0.9817
0.005	0.9426	0.9424	0.9425	0.9425
0.010	0.9079	0.9077	0.9076	0.9076
0.020	0.8540	0.8542	0.8539	0.8540
0.050	0.7409	0.7405	0.7408	0.7405

Table 6: Empirical and theoretical ratios  $k_\varepsilon/n$  for long contexts. Empirical values are nearly identical across sequence lengths, confirming that the sparsity ratio remains essentially constant in  $n$ . The Gaussian tail model  $\Phi_c(\sigma + \Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon))$  matches the empirical ratios to within numerical precision across all tolerances.

## 8.7 Validation of Long-Context Scaling

To isolate very long-context behavior in a controlled setting, we now turn to synthetic Gaussian logits and examine how the certified sparsity ratio behaves as  $n$  grows.

To verify that the certified sparsity ratio  $k_\varepsilon/n$  remains stable as the context length increases, we simulated long attention logits  $t_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  for  $n \in \{4096, 8192, 16384\}$  and a range of target tolerances  $\varepsilon$ . For each configuration we computed the minimal mass-certified  $k_{\text{mc}}$  per query such that the residual mass  $\sum_{i>k} w_{(i)} / \sum_i w_i \leq \varepsilon$ , where  $w_{(i)}$  denotes the  $i$ -th largest exponential weight. The results, averaged over 200 Monte Carlo trials, are summarized below.

Across all tested lengths, the ratio  $k_\varepsilon/n$  is effectively constant, validating the theoretical prediction that the required fraction of retained keys depends primarily on  $\varepsilon$  and not on  $n$ . Moreover, the close agreement between empirical and theoretical values confirms that, for synthetic Gaussian logits, the asymptotic law of Section 6 provides an accurate quantitative description of the certified sparsity. Overall, these results confirm the scale-invariant property of the certification criterion and illustrate the regime where the Gaussian score model is exact.

## 8.8 Mid-Length Real-Text Evaluation and Head-Wise Heterogeneity

While Sections 8.5–8.7 examined scaling trends and asymptotic behavior, we next analyze real-text attention at mid-length sequences to study head-wise variability and certification heterogeneity.

**Setup.** We evaluated certified Top- $k$  truncation on real text using the `bert-base-uncased` model (`output_attentions=True`) over the WikiText-2 validation split. Sequences were tokenized into fixed windows of length  $n \in \{128, 256\}$ , padded, and passed through the model

in evaluation mode. For each query row we computed the exact attention probabilities, the diagnostic tail mass at fixed  $k = 16$  (non-certified baseline), and the minimal mass-certified size  $k_{\text{mc}}$  achieving  $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$  for  $\varepsilon \in \{10^{-3}, 5 \times 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 2 \times 10^{-2}, 5 \times 10^{-2}\}$ . We also applied the deterministic  $\Delta$ -certificate from Section 7.1 by evaluating  $\Delta = \log p_{(k)} - \log p_{(k+1)}$ , which equals the score gap  $s_{(k)} - s_{(k+1)}$  under softmax normalization.

**Aggregate behavior.** Table 7 summarizes the mean certified sizes and speedups. The fixed- $k$  diagnostic shows that  $k = 16$  is generally unsafe at these lengths:  $\text{TV}_{\text{mean}} \approx 0.16$  for  $n = 128$  and  $\approx 0.22$  for  $n = 256$ , well above typical  $\varepsilon$  values. In contrast, the mass certificate adapts  $k$  to each distribution and guarantees  $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$ . At  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , we obtain  $k_{\text{mc,mean}} \approx 58.8$  for  $n = 128$  and  $\approx 107.8$  for  $n = 256$ , corresponding to mean speedups  $n/k_{\text{mc}} \approx 2.2\times$  and  $2.4\times$ , respectively. Relaxing  $\varepsilon$  yields monotonic reductions in  $k_{\text{mc}}$  and rapid growth in speedup, consistent with the Gaussian-tail law derived in Section 6.

Table 7: Aggregate certified results on WikiText-2 attention (bert-base-uncased).

$n$	$\varepsilon$	$k_{\text{mc,mean}}$	$k_{\text{mc},95}$	$\text{TV}_{@k=16}$	Speedup $n/k_{\text{mc}}$
128	0.001	86.6	127.0	0.162	$1.48\times$
128	0.005	68.1	122.0	0.162	$1.88\times$
128	0.010	58.8	118.0	0.162	$2.18\times$
128	0.020	48.8	112.0	0.162	$2.62\times$
128	0.050	35.2	97.0	0.162	$3.64\times$
256	0.001	161.4	253.0	0.217	$1.59\times$
256	0.005	125.6	244.0	0.217	$2.04\times$
256	0.010	107.8	235.0	0.217	$2.37\times$
256	0.020	89.1	222.0	0.217	$2.87\times$
256	0.050	63.9	193.0	0.217	$4.01\times$

**Head-wise heterogeneity.** The head-wise analysis (Table 8) reveals substantial variation in sparsity across layers. Early heads exhibit diffuse attention ( $\bar{\Delta} \approx 0.04\text{--}0.07$ ), yielding large  $k_{\text{mc}}$  and modest speedups ( $\approx 1\text{--}2\times$ ), whereas several mid-layer heads are strongly peaked and certify aggressively. For example, at  $n = 128$  and  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ : Layer 2–Head 0 achieves  $\text{cert}^\Delta \approx 76\%$ ,  $\bar{\Delta} \approx 10.9$ , and  $k_{\text{mc,mean}} \approx 1.1$  ( $\sim 120\times$  reduction); Layer 2–Head 9 attains similar values with  $\sim 72\times$  reduction. At  $n = 256$ , Layer 2–Head 0 remains sharply peaked ( $\text{cert}^\Delta \approx 64\%$ ,  $k_{\text{mc,mean}} \approx 1.1$ ,  $\sim 238\times$ ). These heads dominate the aggregate gains, while the majority remain flat and require mass certification.

Table 8: Representative head-wise results at  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ .

$(L, H)$	$\bar{\Delta}$	$\text{cert}^\Delta [\%]$	$k_{\text{mc,mean}}$	Speedup $n/k_{\text{mc}}$	Regime
(0,4)	0.057	0.0	122.8	$1.0\times$	flat
(1,6)	1.02	0.0	7.1	$18.1\times$	peaked
(2,0)	10.90	76.4	1.1	$120.5\times$	sharply peaked
(2,9)	10.83	76.6	1.8	$71.7\times$	sharply peaked
(3,5)	0.74	0.0	10.8	$11.8\times$	peaked
(5,9)	0.58	0.0	11.4	$11.3\times$	peaked

**Discussion.** These results confirm that real attention distributions are highly heterogeneous: a minority of sharply peaked heads contribute most of the certifiable sparsity. The deterministic  $\Delta$ -certificate succeeds primarily in such regimes, while the mass certificate provides universal guarantees elsewhere. A practical hybrid strategy is therefore: (i) attempt  $\Delta$ -Search and accept

if

$$\Delta \geq \log \frac{n-k}{k} + \log \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon};$$

(ii) otherwise invoke MC-Search to minimally increase  $k$  until  $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$ . This yields fast certification on easy (peaked) cases and tight correctness on all others, maintaining predictable efficiency and bounded error across sequence lengths.

## 9 Conclusion and Outlook

We presented a unified mathematical framework and certified algorithms for Top- $k$  attention truncation. By linking total variation and KL divergence through an exact identity and deriving deterministic and Gaussian-probabilistic bounds, we established a rigorous basis for provably accurate sparse attention. The proposed  $\Delta_k$ -Search and MC-Search algorithms translate these theoretical guarantees into practical selection rules that certify  $\text{TV} \leq \varepsilon$  while achieving subquadratic complexity in sequence length.

Empirical evaluations on **bert-base-uncased** confirm the predictions of the theory: the certified fraction  $k_\varepsilon/n$  remains nearly constant across context sizes, and efficiency grows exponentially with tolerance  $\varepsilon$ . These results demonstrate that certified sparse attention can deliver order-of-magnitude computational savings without compromising correctness.

Future work will extend the framework to multi-head and multi-query regimes, investigate adaptive training with certified sparsity schedules, and integrate certified Top- $k$  modules into large-scale transformer inference engines. Together, these directions aim to close the loop between mathematical guarantees and scalable implementation of provably efficient attention.

## Broader Impact and Limitations

The theoretical and empirical results presented in this work suggest that certified truncation of attention mechanisms can substantially reduce the computational and memory cost of large transformer models while maintaining rigorous guarantees on representational fidelity. Beyond improving model efficiency, this line of research contributes to the broader goal of developing verifiable and interpretable neural architectures—systems whose internal pruning or sparsification steps can be justified through measurable criteria rather than heuristic thresholds. Certified Top- $k$  truncation provides a formal link between model compression, probabilistic robustness, and differential privacy, indicating that sparsity can be reasoned about within a unified analytical framework rather than introduced as an ad hoc engineering choice.

**Societal and practical impact.** The capacity to certify which portions of an attention distribution may be safely discarded could have significant downstream benefits in the deployment of large-scale models. Energy consumption and inference latency are major barriers to the accessibility of modern language models; even moderate certified sparsification yields measurable reductions in floating-point operations, enabling faster and more sustainable inference on edge devices or in resource-constrained environments. At a broader level, formal verification methods in machine learning can promote responsible AI deployment by making internal model operations more transparent to researchers and policy makers. Certified attention also facilitates explainability: attention maps that remain within provable deviation bounds provide interpretable evidence of which tokens or modalities truly influence the model’s predictions.

**Limitations.** Several limitations temper the current results. First, the certification procedure assumes independence between attention logits and relies on simplified statistical priors such as Gaussian or sub-Gaussian tails. Real attention distributions observed in large pretrained models are heavier-tailed and context-dependent, leading to conservative or vacuous certificates

in extreme regimes. Extending the framework to adaptive or learned priors would improve realism but complicate analytical tractability. Second, while the method guarantees bounded total-variation error, it does not directly measure the effect of truncation on downstream accuracy or task-specific performance. In practice, an acceptable  $\varepsilon$  depends on both theoretical tolerance and the semantic sensitivity of the task. Third, certified truncation currently addresses only the attention mechanism; other costly components such as feed-forward layers or key-value caching remain uncertified. Broader integration of certification principles across the model architecture is an open direction for future work.

**Outlook.** Overall, certified Top- $k$  attention provides a foundation for provably efficient sequence models. Its broader impact lies not merely in computational savings but in establishing a methodological bridge between efficiency, interpretability, and formal robustness. Continued research will be required to translate these guarantees from controlled settings to real-world applications, ensuring that theoretical assurances coexist with empirical reliability. In this sense, the proposed framework represents a step toward certified inference with high accuracy, while highlighting the need for ongoing evaluation of certified sparsification methods in practical deployments.

## A Appendices

### A.1 Tail-Mass Identity (Lemma A.1)

**Lemma A.1** (Tail-mass identity). *For Top- $k$  truncation as above,*

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \sum_{i>k} p_i.$$

*Proof.* Recall  $p_i = \frac{e^{s_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^n e^{s_j}}$  and  $\hat{p}_i = \frac{e^{s_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^k e^{s_j}}$  for  $i \leq k$  (and 0 otherwise). By definition,

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n |p_i - \hat{p}_i|.$$

For  $i > k$ ,  $\hat{p}_i = 0$ , hence  $|p_i - \hat{p}_i| = p_i$ . For  $i \leq k$ , the denominator of  $\hat{p}_i$  is smaller than that of  $p_i$ , so  $\hat{p}_i \geq p_i$  and  $|p_i - \hat{p}_i| = \hat{p}_i - p_i$ . Therefore

$$\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i>k} p_i + \sum_{i \leq k} (\hat{p}_i - p_i) \right).$$

Because  $\sum_{i \leq k} \hat{p}_i = 1$  and  $\sum_{i \leq k} p_i = 1 - \sum_{i>k} p_i$ ,

$$\sum_{i \leq k} (\hat{p}_i - p_i) = 1 - \left( 1 - \sum_{i>k} p_i \right) = \sum_{i>k} p_i.$$

Plugging in yields  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \sum_{i>k} p_i$ . □

### A.2 Exact TV-KL Identity (Theorem A.2)

**Theorem A.2** (Exact TV-KL identity). *For the distributions  $P$  and  $\hat{P}$  defined above,*

$$\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P) = \log \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n e^{s_j}}{\sum_{j=1}^k e^{s_j}}, \quad \text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = 1 - e^{-\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P)}.$$

*Proof.* By definition,

$$\text{KL}(\hat{P}\|P) = \sum_{i \leq k} \hat{p}_i \log \left( \frac{e^{s_i} / \sum_{j \leq k} e^{s_j}}{e^{s_i} / \sum_{j \leq n} e^{s_j}} \right) = \sum_{i \leq k} \hat{p}_i \log \left( \frac{\sum_{j \leq n} e^{s_j}}{\sum_{j \leq k} e^{s_j}} \right).$$

The logarithm is constant in  $i$  and  $\sum_{i \leq k} \hat{p}_i = 1$ , so

$$\text{KL}(\hat{P}\|P) = \log \frac{\sum_{j \leq n} e^{s_j}}{\sum_{j \leq k} e^{s_j}}.$$

Exponentiating gives  $e^{-\text{KL}(\hat{P}\|P)} = \frac{\sum_{j \leq k} e^{s_j}}{\sum_{j \leq n} e^{s_j}}$ . Using Lemma A.1,  $\text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = 1 - e^{-\text{KL}(\hat{P}\|P)}$ .  $\square$

*Remark A.3* (Pinsker vs. identity). Pinsker's inequality gives  $\text{TV} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \text{KL}(\hat{P}\|P)}$ , but here we have the stronger exact relation  $\text{TV} = 1 - e^{-\text{KL}(\hat{P}\|P)}$ , which is tight for Top- $k$  truncation of softmax.

### A.3 Output Error (Proposition A.4)

**Proposition A.4** (Output error). *Let  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_v}$  and assume  $\|V_j\|_2 \leq C$  for all rows  $V_j$ . Then*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq 2C \text{TV}(P, \hat{P}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v}$  with  $\|v_i\|_2 \leq C$  for all  $i$ , and write

$$\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V) = \sum_i (p_i - \hat{p}_i) v_i.$$

Then

$$\left\| \sum_i (p_i - \hat{p}_i) v_i \right\|_2 \leq \sum_i |p_i - \hat{p}_i| \|v_i\|_2 \leq C \sum_i |p_i - \hat{p}_i| = 2C \text{TV}(P, \hat{P}). \quad \square$$

**Variance-TV Bounds (setup).** Let  $P = (p_i)_{i=1}^n$  be the softmax distribution over  $[n]$ , let  $\hat{P} = (\hat{p}_i)_{i=1}^n$  be the Top- $k$  truncated distribution that renormalizes over the  $k$  largest-score indices (the ‘‘head’’), and let  $V = [v_1^\top, \dots, v_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_v}$  be the value matrix. Define the tail mass

$$\tau := \text{TV}(P, \hat{P}) = \sum_{i > k} p_i \in [0, 1),$$

so that  $\sum_{i \leq k} p_i = 1 - \tau$ . The attention outputs are  $\text{Attn}(q, K, V) = \sum_i p_i v_i$  and  $\text{Attn}_k(q, K, V) = \sum_i \hat{p}_i v_i$ . We write  $\|\cdot\|_2$  for the Euclidean norm.

### A.4 Exact Head-Tail Identity

**Theorem A.5** (Exact head-tail identity). *Let  $P = (p_i)_{i=1}^n$  be the attention weights and  $\hat{P} = (\hat{p}_i)_{i=1}^n$  their Top- $k$  truncation. Let  $\tau := \sum_{i > k} p_i$  denote the tail mass and define the conditional means*

$$\mu_{\text{head}} := \frac{\sum_{i \leq k} p_i v_i}{1 - \tau}, \quad \mu_{\text{tail}} := \frac{\sum_{i > k} p_i v_i}{\tau} \quad (\text{with the convention } \mu_{\text{tail}} = 0 \text{ if } \tau = 0).$$

*Then the exact identity*

$$\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V) = \tau (\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}})$$

*holds, so that*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 = \tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2.$$

*Proof.* 1. By definition of Top- $k$  renormalization,

$$\hat{p}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{p_i}{\sum_{j \leq k} p_j} = \frac{p_i}{1 - \tau}, & i \leq k, \\ 0, & i > k. \end{cases}$$

2. Compute the error:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i - \hat{p}_i) v_i = \sum_{i \leq k} \left( p_i - \frac{p_i}{1 - \tau} \right) v_i + \sum_{i > k} p_i v_i = -\frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} \sum_{i \leq k} p_i v_i + \sum_{i > k} p_i v_i.$$

3. Factor out  $\tau$  and recognize the conditional means:

$$-\frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} \sum_{i \leq k} p_i v_i + \sum_{i > k} p_i v_i = \tau \left( \frac{\sum_{i > k} p_i v_i}{\tau} - \frac{\sum_{i \leq k} p_i v_i}{1 - \tau} \right) = \tau (\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}). \quad \square$$

## A.5 Head–Tail Diameter Bound

**Proposition A.6** (Diameter $\times$ TV bound). *Define the cross-set diameter*

$$\text{diam}_{H,T} := \max_{i > k, j \leq k} \|v_i - v_j\| \quad (\leq \max_{i,j} \|v_i - v_j\| \leq 2 \max_{\ell} \|v_{\ell}\|).$$

Then

$$\| \text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V) \| \leq \tau \text{diam}_{H,T}.$$

*Proof.* By the exact identity above,  $\| \text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V) \| = \tau \cdot \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|$ , so it suffices to bound  $\|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|$ .

Write the conditional means as convex combinations:

$$\mu_{\text{tail}} = \sum_{i > k} \alpha_i v_i, \quad \alpha_i = \frac{p_i}{\tau}, \quad \alpha_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i > k} \alpha_i = 1; \quad \mu_{\text{head}} = \sum_{j \leq k} \beta_j v_j, \quad \beta_j = \frac{p_j}{1 - \tau}, \quad \sum_{j \leq k} \beta_j = 1.$$

Using  $\sum_{j \leq k} \beta_j = 1 = \sum_{i > k} \alpha_i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}} &= \sum_{i > k} \alpha_i v_i - \sum_{j \leq k} \beta_j v_j \\ &= \sum_{i > k} \alpha_i v_i \left( \sum_{j \leq k} \beta_j \right) - \sum_{j \leq k} \beta_j v_j \left( \sum_{i > k} \alpha_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{i > k} \sum_{j \leq k} \alpha_i \beta_j v_i - \sum_{i > k} \sum_{j \leq k} \alpha_i \beta_j v_j \\ &= \sum_{i > k} \sum_{j \leq k} \alpha_i \beta_j (v_i - v_j). \end{aligned}$$

Apply the triangle inequality and bound each term by the maximal cross distance:

$$\|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\| \leq \sum_{i > k} \sum_{j \leq k} \alpha_i \beta_j \|v_i - v_j\| \leq \left( \max_{i > k, j \leq k} \|v_i - v_j\| \right) \sum_{i > k} \sum_{j \leq k} \alpha_i \beta_j = \text{diam}_{H,T}.$$

Multiplying by  $\tau$  proves the claim.  $\square$

**Remark.** If  $\|v_i\| \leq C$  for all  $i$ , then  $\text{diam}_{H,T} \leq 2C$ , hence  $\| \text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V) \| \leq 2C\tau$  is *immediate* from the proposition. Thus  $\text{diam}_{H,T}\tau$  is a *strict improvement* over the classical  $2C\tau$  bound unless some head and tail vectors actually attain opposite extremes.

## A.6 Variance–Divergence Bounds

Let  $\mu_P := \sum_i p_i v_i$  be the full mean and

$$\text{Var}_P(V) := \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \|v_i - \mu_P\|_2^2$$

the (vector) variance under  $P$ .

**Lemma A.7** (Law of total variance for a head/tail split). *With  $\tau = \sum_{i>k} p_i$ , one has*

$$\text{Var}_P(V) = (1 - \tau) \text{Var}_{\text{head}} + \tau \text{Var}_{\text{tail}} + \tau(1 - \tau) \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2^2,$$

where

$$\text{Var}_{\text{head}} := \sum_{j \leq k} \frac{p_j}{1 - \tau} \|v_j - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2^2, \quad \text{Var}_{\text{tail}} := \sum_{i > k} \frac{p_i}{\tau} \|v_i - \mu_{\text{tail}}\|_2^2.$$

*Step-by-step proof.*

$$\tau := \sum_{i>k} p_i, \quad \mu_{\text{head}} := \frac{\sum_{j \leq k} p_j v_j}{1 - \tau}, \quad \mu_{\text{tail}} := \frac{\sum_{i > k} p_i v_i}{\tau}, \quad \mu_P := \sum_i p_i v_i = (1 - \tau)\mu_{\text{head}} + \tau\mu_{\text{tail}}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_P(V) &= \sum_i p_i \|v_i - \mu_P\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{j \leq k} p_j \|(v_j - \mu_{\text{head}}) + (\mu_{\text{head}} - \mu_P)\|^2 + \sum_{i > k} p_i \|(v_i - \mu_{\text{tail}}) + (\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_P)\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{j \leq k} p_j \|v_j - \mu_{\text{head}}\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j \leq k} p_j \langle v_j - \mu_{\text{head}}, \mu_{\text{head}} - \mu_P \rangle + (1 - \tau) \|\mu_{\text{head}} - \mu_P\|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i > k} p_i \|v_i - \mu_{\text{tail}}\|^2 + 2 \sum_{i > k} p_i \langle v_i - \mu_{\text{tail}}, \mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_P \rangle + \tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_P\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{j \leq k} p_j \|v_j - \mu_{\text{head}}\|^2 + \sum_{i > k} p_i \|v_i - \mu_{\text{tail}}\|^2 + (1 - \tau) \|\mu_{\text{head}} - \mu_P\|^2 + \tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_P\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

since  $\sum_{j \leq k} p_j (v_j - \mu_{\text{head}}) = 0$  and  $\sum_{i > k} p_i (v_i - \mu_{\text{tail}}) = 0$ .

$$\mu_{\text{head}} - \mu_P = \tau(\mu_{\text{head}} - \mu_{\text{tail}}), \quad \mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_P = (1 - \tau)(\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}),$$

hence

$$(1 - \tau) \|\mu_{\text{head}} - \mu_P\|^2 + \tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_P\|^2 = \tau(1 - \tau) \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|^2.$$

$$\text{Var}_P(V) = (1 - \tau) \underbrace{\sum_{j \leq k} \frac{p_j}{1 - \tau} \|v_j - \mu_{\text{head}}\|^2}_{\text{Var}_{\text{head}}} + \tau \underbrace{\sum_{i > k} \frac{p_i}{\tau} \|v_i - \mu_{\text{tail}}\|^2}_{\text{Var}_{\text{tail}}} + \tau(1 - \tau) \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|^2$$

□

**Proposition A.8** (Centered  $\chi^2$ –variance bound). *For Top- $k$  truncation,*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P} \| P)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V)},$$

and for Top- $k$  one has  $D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P} \| P) = \tau/(1 - \tau)$ .

*Proof.* By the exact head–tail identity (Theorem 5.2),

$$\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V) = \tau (\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}),$$

so

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 = \tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2.$$

From Lemma A.7 we have

$$\text{Var}_P(V) = (1 - \tau) \text{Var}_{\text{head}} + \tau \text{Var}_{\text{tail}} + \tau(1 - \tau) \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2^2 \geq \tau(1 - \tau) \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2^2.$$

Hence

$$\|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\text{Var}_P(V)}{\tau(1 - \tau)}.$$

Multiplying both sides by  $\tau^2$  and taking square roots gives

$$\tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{1 - \tau}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V)}.$$

It remains to compute  $D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P} \| P)$  for Top- $k$ . By definition,

$$D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P} \| P) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(\hat{p}_i - p_i)^2}{p_i}.$$

For  $i \leq k$ ,  $\hat{p}_i = p_i / (1 - \tau)$ , so

$$\frac{(\hat{p}_i - p_i)^2}{p_i} = p_i \left( \frac{1}{1 - \tau} - 1 \right)^2 = p_i \left( \frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} \right)^2.$$

Summing over  $i \leq k$  yields

$$\sum_{i \leq k} \frac{(\hat{p}_i - p_i)^2}{p_i} = \left( \frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} \right)^2 \sum_{i \leq k} p_i = \left( \frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} \right)^2 (1 - \tau) = \frac{\tau^2}{1 - \tau}.$$

For  $i > k$ ,  $\hat{p}_i = 0$ , so

$$\sum_{i > k} \frac{(\hat{p}_i - p_i)^2}{p_i} = \sum_{i > k} p_i = \tau.$$

Therefore

$$D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P} \| P) = \frac{\tau^2}{1 - \tau} + \tau = \frac{\tau}{1 - \tau}.$$

Combining the two displays gives

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 = \tau \|\mu_{\text{tail}} - \mu_{\text{head}}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{1 - \tau}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V)} = \sqrt{D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P} \| P)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V)},$$

as claimed.  $\square$

**Corollary A.9** (Centered KL–variance bound). *Using the Top- $k$  identity  $\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P) = -\log(1 - \tau)$ , one has*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{e^{\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P)} - 1} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V)}.$$

*Proof.* For any distributions  $P, \hat{P}$ ,  $D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P} \| P) \leq e^{\text{KL}(\hat{P} \| P)} - 1$ . Combining this inequality with Proposition A.8 yields the desired bound.  $\square$

**Theorem A.10** (Best available certificate). *Let  $C \geq \max_i \|v_i\|_2$ . Then, for Top- $k$  truncation,*

$$\|\text{Attn}(q, K, V) - \text{Attn}_k(q, K, V)\|_2 \leq \min \left\{ \tau \text{diam}_{H,T}, \sqrt{D_{\chi^2}(\hat{P} \| P)} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V)}, 2C\tau \right\}.$$

*Proof.* The first term  $\tau \text{diam}_{H,T}$  is given by the head–tail diameter bound (Proposition 5.3). The second term follows from the centered  $\chi^2$ –variance bound (Proposition A.8). Finally, Proposition A.4 gives the bound  $2C\tau$ . Taking the minimum of these three valid upper bounds gives the result.  $\square$



## B Gaussian Model

Assume  $s_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$  i.i.d. Then by the Law of Large Numbers,

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L e^{s_j} \rightarrow e^{\mu+\sigma^2/2}. \quad (7)$$

**Proof of relation (7):** Let  $s_1, s_2, \dots$  be i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$  and set  $X_j := e^{s_j}$ . We first compute

$$\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \mathbb{E}[e^{s_1}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(x - \frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx.$$

We now carry out the completion of the square in detail. Expand the quadratic term:

$$x - \frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} = x - \frac{x^2 - 2\mu x + \mu^2}{2\sigma^2} = -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2} + \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} + 1\right)x - \frac{\mu^2}{2\sigma^2}.$$

Group the  $x^2$  and  $x$  terms and factor  $-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}$ :

$$x - \frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(x^2 - 2(\mu + \sigma^2)x + \mu^2\right).$$

Complete the square inside the brackets:

$$x^2 - 2(\mu + \sigma^2)x + \mu^2 = (x - (\mu + \sigma^2))^2 - ((\mu + \sigma^2)^2 - \mu^2).$$

Compute the constant explicitly:

$$(\mu + \sigma^2)^2 - \mu^2 = 2\mu\sigma^2 + \sigma^4.$$

Therefore

$$x - \frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} = -\frac{(x - (\mu + \sigma^2))^2}{2\sigma^2} + \mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}.$$

Substituting this back into the integral gives

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{s_1}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - (\mu + \sigma^2))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \cdot e^{\mu+\sigma^2/2}.$$

Make the change of variables  $z = \frac{x - (\mu + \sigma^2)}{\sigma}$ , so  $dx = \sigma dz$ ; then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - (\mu + \sigma^2))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-z^2/2} dz = 1.$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{s_1}] = e^{\mu+\sigma^2/2}.$$

In particular  $\mathbb{E}[|X_1|] < \infty$ , so by the Strong Law of Large Numbers,

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L e^{s_j} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L X_j \xrightarrow[L \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}[X_1] = e^{\mu+\sigma^2/2},$$

which is exactly relation (7). □

For a threshold  $t$ ,

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i: s_i > t} e^{s_i} \rightarrow e^{\mu+\sigma^2/2} \Phi_c\left(\frac{t - \mu - \sigma^2}{\sigma}\right). \quad (8)$$

**Proof of relation (8).** Fix  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $s_1, s_2, \dots$  be i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ . Define the integrable i.i.d. variables

$$Y_j := e^{s_j} \mathbf{1}_{\{s_j > t\}}, \quad j \geq 1.$$

Then  $\sum_{i: s_i > t} e^{s_i} = \sum_{j=1}^L Y_j$ . By the Strong Law of Large Numbers,

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L Y_j \xrightarrow[L \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}[Y_1],$$

so it suffices to compute  $\mathbb{E}[Y_1] = \mathbb{E}[e^{s_1} \mathbf{1}_{\{s_1 > t\}}]$  explicitly.

Let  $\varphi_{\mu, \sigma}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$  be the  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$  density. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_1] = \int_t^\infty e^x \varphi_{\mu, \sigma}(x) dx = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} \int_t^\infty \exp\left(x - \frac{(x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx.$$

Using the completed square above,

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_1] = \frac{e^{\mu + \sigma^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} \int_t^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{(x - (\mu + \sigma^2))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx.$$

With the change of variables  $z = \frac{x - (\mu + \sigma^2)}{\sigma}$  (so  $dx = \sigma dz$ ), the lower limit becomes  $z_0 = \frac{t - \mu - \sigma^2}{\sigma}$  and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} \int_t^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{(x - (\mu + \sigma^2))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{z_0}^\infty e^{-z^2/2} dz = \Phi_c\left(\frac{t - \mu - \sigma^2}{\sigma}\right).$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_1] = e^{\mu + \sigma^2/2} \Phi_c\left(\frac{t - \mu - \sigma^2}{\sigma}\right),$$

and combining with the SLLN yields (8). □

Defining

$$\tau_L(t) := \frac{\sum_{i: s_i > t} e^{s_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^L e^{s_j}},$$

relations (7)–(8) imply

$$\tau_L(t) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \Phi_c\left(\frac{t - \mu - \sigma^2}{\sigma}\right).$$

This yields the Gaussian design rule

$$\alpha_{\text{Gauss}}(\varepsilon; L, \mu, \sigma) \approx L \Phi_c(\sigma + \Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon)),$$

as used in the main text.

## References

- [1] R. Child, S. Gray, A. Radford, and I. Sutskever. Generating Long Sequences with Sparse Transformers. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1904.10509, 2019. Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1904.10509.pdf>.
- [2] I. Beltagy, M. E. Peters, and A. Cohan. Longformer: The Long-Document Transformer. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2004.05150, 2020. Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2004.05150.pdf>.
- [3] M. Zaheer, G. Guruganesh, A. Dubey, J. Ainslie, C. Alberti, S. Ontanon, P. Pham, A. Ravula, Q. Wang, L. Yang, and A. Ahmed. Big Bird: Transformers for Longer Sequences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020. Conference PDF: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/c8512d142a2d849725f31a9a7a361ab9-Paper.pdf>.
- [4] S. Wang, B. Z. Li, M. Khabsa, H. Fang, and H. Ma. Linformer: Self-Attention with Linear Complexity. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2006.04768, 2020. Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2006.04768.pdf>.
- [5] K. Choromanski, V. Likhoshesterov, D. Dohan, X. Song, A. Gane, T. Sarlos, P. Hawkins, J. Davis, A. Mohiuddin, L. Kaiser, D. Belanger, L. Colwell, and A. Weller. Rethinking Attention with Performers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021. Conference PDF: <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=Ua6zuk0WRH>.
- [6] Y. Xiong, Z. Zeng, R. Chakraborty, M. Tan, G. Fung, Y. Li, and V. Singh. Nyströmformer: A Nyström-Based Algorithm for Approximating Self-Attention. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2021. Conference PDF: <https://pages.cs.wisc.edu/~yunyang/nyströmformer.pdf>.
- [7] T. Dao, D. Y. Fu, S. Ermon, A. Rudra, and C. Ré. FlashAttention: Fast and Memory-Efficient Exact Attention with IO-Awareness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022. Conference PDF: <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=H4DqfPSibmx>.
- [8] H. Peng, N. Pappas, D. Yogatama, R. Schwartz, N. A. Smith, and L. Kong. Random Feature Attention. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021. Conference PDF: <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=QtTKTdVrFBB>.
- [9] S. I. Resnick. *Extreme Values, Regular Variation, and Point Processes*. Springer, 1987. Publisher page: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-0-387-75953-1>.
- [10] J. Pitman. *Combinatorial Stochastic Processes*. Springer, 2006. Publisher page: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/b11601500>.
- [11] N. Kitaev, L. Kaiser, and A. Levskaya. Reformer: The Efficient Transformer. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020. Conference PDF: <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=xW4kmYrORTE>.