

# Mixture of Lookup Key-Value Experts

Zongcheng Wang \*

## Abstract

Recent research has developed several LLM architectures suitable for inference on end-user devices, such as the Mixture of Lookup Experts (MoLE) [1]. A key feature of MoLE is that each token id is associated with a dedicated group of experts. For a given input, only the experts corresponding to the input token id will be activated. Since the communication overhead of loading this small number of activated experts into RAM during inference is negligible, expert parameters can be offloaded to storage, making MoLE suitable for resource-constrained devices. However, MoLE’s context-independent expert selection mechanism, based solely on input ids, may limit model performance. To address this, we propose the **Mixture of Lookup Key-Value Experts (MoLKV)** model. In MoLKV, each expert is structured as a key-value pair. For a given input, the input-derived query interacts with the cached key-value experts from the current sequence, generating a context-aware expert output. This context-aware mechanism alleviates the limitation of MoLE, and experimental results demonstrate that MoLKV achieves significantly lower validation loss in small-scale evaluations.

## 1 Introduction

Currently, AI inference is mainly performed in cloud data centers. This approach benefits from high-performance hardware capable of running cutting-edge models. It also achieves cost efficiency through economies of scale and batch processing. An alternative is on-device AI, where models run locally on end-user devices like laptops and smartphones. Although hardware constraints limit end-user devices from running the most advanced models, continuous improvements in hardware capabilities and model capability density [2] are expanding the scope of on-device AI. Furthermore, on-device AI has several unique advantages:

1. **Privacy Preservation.** By operating offline, it ensures that sensitive data remains on the device, thereby enhancing user privacy.
2. **Personalization.** On-device AI models can learn from user data to achieve personalization while protecting privacy. Personalization with limited data can be achieved through in-context learning or fine-tuning, but long-term personalization requires advancements in continual learning and memory techniques. There has been some recent exploration in these areas [3, 4].
3. **Proactive Intelligence.** On-device AI models can be deeply integrated with device systems, processing user activity information on the device in real time, and thus providing timely and proactive assistance [5, 6], overcoming the shortcomings of traditional LLM’s reactive response.

The biggest obstacle for end-user devices to run cutting-edge models is their limited Random Access Memory (RAM) capacity. Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) [7] are one of the most popular LLM architectures nowadays. For a given input, MoE activates only a subset of parameters, allowing the model to scale its parameter count while maintaining low computational cost. However, this parameter scaling leads to a

\*The School of Mathematics, Renmin University of China. Correspondence: 2021103675@ruc.edu.cn

massive memory footprint, with cutting-edge MoE models requiring between 200GB and 1TB of RAM in FP8 format [8, 9, 10]. This far exceeds the capacity of typical end-user devices, which usually have less than 32GB of RAM, making such models infeasible to run locally. In contrast, device storage is much larger, ranging from 256GB to over 1TB, allowing parameters to be offloaded to storage and selectively loaded during inference based on routing results [11]. However, the number of parameters activated by each input in MoE is still relatively large, and the storage bandwidth is much lower than that of RAM. These factors make communication a bottleneck, thus greatly increasing latency.

A promising solution is to use architectures with lower activation ratios, such as the Mixture of Lookup Experts (MoLE) [1]. In MoLE, each token id is associated with a dedicated group of experts. For a given input, only the experts corresponding to the input token id will be activated. The activation ratio can be as low as 1/100,000, far less than the 1/100 of MoE. Therefore, MoLE can minimize communication overhead, making it suitable for offloading parameters to storage to support on-device inference. However, MoLE underperforms comparably sized MoE models. This is partly because MoLE selects experts based solely on input ids, while MoE does so based on the routing results of the hidden state. The hidden state contains contextual information, while input ids do not. Therefore, MoLE’s context-independent expert selection mechanism may limit model performance.

To address this, we propose the Mixture of Lookup Key-Value Experts (MoLKV) model, which builds on MoLE. In MoLKV, experts are structured as key-value pairs rather than single values. In addition to selecting experts based on input ids, MoLKV also obtains context-aware expert outputs. Specifically, for a given input, the input-derived query interacts with the cached key-value experts from the current sequence, resulting in a dynamically weighted expert output. MoLKV has the following two advantages:

1. **Better model performance.** The context-aware expert output mechanism briefly introduced above alleviates the problem of context-independent expert selection in MoLE, thereby improving model performance.
2. **Efficient batch inference.** Although MoLKV selects more experts for computation per input than MoLE, the extra experts are cached in RAM, thus avoiding the consumption of valuable storage bandwidth. Since batch inference is constrained by storage bandwidth, MoLKV still maintains efficient batch inference capabilities.

We conducted experiments to validate that the performance of MoLKV outperforms that of MoLE. By controlling the activation parameters of both models at 197M and the total parameters at 1.65B, the results show that the validation loss of MoLKV is 0.03 lower than that of MoLE, verifying the effectiveness of MoLKV.

## 2 Related Work

**Sparse Mixture-of-Experts** The widely used Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architecture is more precisely termed Sparse Mixture-of-Experts (SMoE) [7]. For each input, SMoE activates only a subset of experts, maintaining low computational cost while scaling its parameters. Using fine-grained experts further improves performance [12], with corresponding scaling laws established [13, 14]. A key training challenge is expert load balancing, typically addressed through auxiliary loss functions [15, 16] or auxiliary-loss-free methods [17].

**Memory Layers** Memory Layers represent an extreme case of fine-grained SMoE, where each expert is a vector, the total number of experts can reach millions [18], and the activation rate can be less than 0.1%. For extremely large expert counts, product keys enable efficient routing [19]. Unlike SMoEs, Memory Layers inherently achieve balanced expert utilization [20]. Although no standardized architecture has

yet been established, recent studies have proposed diverse designs [20, 21, 22]. The low activation ratios of Memory Layers make them theoretically suitable for on-device inference.

**Lookup-based Models** Unlike SMOE and Memory Layers, which dynamically select experts via routing, Lookup-based models rely on direct lookups. Two main approaches have emerged: Mixture of Lookup Experts (MoLE) [1], which integrates per-layer experts retrieved by input ids, and methods that expand the input embedding layer using n-gram token embeddings [14, 23]. Lookup-based models achieve sparser activations than Memory Layers, making them especially suitable for on-device deployment and even batch inference. Furthermore, the expert routing in Lookup-based models is fixed, thus eliminating the need for auxiliary losses to achieve load balancing, making them easier to train than SMOE.

### 3 Model Architecture

#### 3.1 Preliminary

Since MoLKV is derived from MoLE [1], we will first introduce the architecture of MoLE. MoLE has different structures in training and inference modes. We will begin with the inference mode. Since the structure of each layer of MoLE is exactly the same, we will select one layer to explain in the following text and ignore the layer number.

**Inference Mode** The experts of MoLE in each layer can be represented as  $\{\{\mathbf{v}_{i,n}\}_{n=1}^N\}_{i=1}^{|V|}$ , where  $|V|$  is the vocabulary size,  $N$  is the number of experts for each id, and  $\mathbf{v}_{i,n} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the  $n$ -th expert corresponding to id  $i$ , with  $d$  being the hidden size. For a given input with id  $i$ , the experts selected via lookup operations are  $\{\mathbf{v}_{i,n}\}_{n=1}^N$ . Therefore, for each input,  $N$  experts are activated out of the total of  $N|V|$  experts, resulting in a sparsity of  $1/|V|$ . With vocabulary size around 100,000, the activation ratio can be as low as  $1/100,000$ , making MoLE suitable for on-device inference. Let  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denote the FFN input and  $i$  denote the input id, the FFN output  $\mathbf{y}$  during inference is computed as:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{h} + \text{FFN}(\mathbf{h}) + \sum_{n=1}^N s_n \mathbf{v}_{i,n} \quad (1)$$

$$s_n = \text{Softmax}_n(\mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{r}_n) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{r}_n)}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(\mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{r}_j)} \quad (2)$$

According to (1), the selected experts  $\{\mathbf{v}_{i,n}\}_{n=1}^N$  are aggregated according to the routing scores  $\{s_n\}_{n=1}^N$ , and the resulting expert output is added to the original FFN output to produce the final output  $\mathbf{y}$ . The routing scores are computed by (2), where  $\mathbf{r}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denotes the router vector for the  $n$ -th expert and is independent of input id.

**Training Mode** The modification to the training mode involves replacing  $\mathbf{v}_{i,n}$  with  $\text{FFN}_n(\mathbf{e}_i)$ , where  $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denotes the token embedding for id  $i$ , and  $\text{FFN}_n(\cdot)$  represents the  $n$ -th FFN expert, which is independent of the input id. The computation is as follows:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{h} + \text{FFN}(\mathbf{h}) + \sum_{n=1}^N (s_n \text{FFN}_n(\mathbf{e}_i)) \quad (3)$$

In training mode, each layer of MoLE has  $N$  FFN experts, denoted as  $\{\text{FFN}_n(\cdot)\}_{n=1}^N$ . For a given input with id  $i$ , the corresponding token embedding  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is used as the input to the FFN experts, and the resulting outputs for id  $i$  are  $\{\text{FFN}_n(\mathbf{e}_i)\}_{n=1}^N$ , as shown in (3). After training, the weights of  $\mathbf{e}_i$  and  $\text{FFN}_n(\cdot)$  are fixed, making  $\text{FFN}_n(\mathbf{e}_i)$  a static vector. This means we can pre-compute and store the results, denoted as  $\mathbf{v}_{i,n} := \text{FFN}_n(\mathbf{e}_i)$ . The above reparameterization transforms MoLE into inference mode.

**Analysis of the Two Modes** Why does MoLE use different structures for training and inference? Suppose we use the inference-mode structure for training, as shown in (1). The experts  $\{v_{i,n}\}_{n=1}^N$  for id  $i$  do not contain contextual information, only representing certain meanings of the token corresponding to id  $i$ . This implies that each  $v_{i,n}$  has a strong correlation with the corresponding token embedding  $e_i$  during training. Switching to training mode, which means representing  $v_{i,n}$  as  $\text{FFN}_n(e_i)$ , can introduce beneficial inductive biases without losing expressive power, thereby improving training dynamics. Our ablation studies further confirmed that replacing  $v_{i,n}$  with  $\text{FFN}_n(e_i)$  during training leads to lower validation loss. However, since all FFN experts are activated in training mode, the number of activated parameters is very large, which leads to inefficient inference and makes parameter offloading impossible. Therefore, MoLE needs to be switched to inference mode after training to achieve efficient inference.

**Gated MoLE** Inspired by Gated Attention [24], we enhance MoLE by adding a gating mechanism to the expert outputs, resulting in a stronger baseline termed Gated MoLE. The inference-mode computation for Gated MoLE is:

$$y = h + \text{FFN}(h) + g \sum_{n=1}^N s_n v_{i,n} \quad (4)$$

$$g = \text{Sigmoid}(h^\top u) \quad (5)$$

The gating score  $g$  is multiplied by the expert output, as shown in (4).  $g$  is computed by (5), where  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the gate parameter. Gated MoLE introduces only  $d$  additional parameters per layer, minimally increasing parameter count and computational cost, while improving performance through dynamic gating of the expert contributions.

### 3.2 MoLKV

The following text introduces our proposed MoLKV model. We will start from the motivation, explore step by step, and finally derive the architecture of MoLKV.

**Key-Value Experts** The previous section detailed the architecture of MoLE. One limitation of MoLE is that its expert selection relies solely on input ids. Although the routing scores shown in (2) yield dynamically weighted expert outputs, the context awareness is limited because only a small number of experts are selected per input. A potential improvement is to expand expert selection beyond input token lookups, thereby engaging more experts. A natural approach is to associate each expert with a key, allowing experts to be selected based on similarity computations between these keys and input-derived queries. Therefore, MoLKV extends MoLE by associating each expert  $v_{i,n} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with a key  $k_{i,n} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$  (where  $d'$  denotes the key dimension), forming a key-value paired expert, or KV expert for short. Here,  $k_{i,n}$  and  $v_{i,n}$  are referred to as the expert key and expert value, respectively.

**Subset-of-Experts Problem** After adding the expert keys, we can calculate the similarity scores between the query and the whole expert keys  $\{\{k_{i,n}\}_{n=1}^N\}_{i=1}^{|V|}$ , and select the expert values corresponding to the top- $k$  highest scores, which is similar to the way experts are selected in MoE. However, the number of expert keys per layer is as high as  $N|V|$ , where  $|V|$  is around 100,000. Since the cost of computing with all expert keys is prohibitively high, we can only perform computations on a small subset of experts. This raises a problem: how can we effectively identify a suitable subset-of-experts for computation? If we randomly select some experts as the subset, it will obviously lead to suboptimal performance. A more reasonable approach is to use approximate nearest neighbor (ANN) search algorithms, such as HNSW [25], which can retrieve expert keys that are highly similar to the query at a lower cost. However, this would introduce considerable training complexity and is not explored in this work. Moreover, under MoLE’s inference mode, all experts are offloaded to storage. The methods described above would load much more experts from storage, consuming valuable storage bandwidth and potentially

increasing significant latency, especially in batch inference scenarios. Therefore, these approaches represent suboptimal solutions.

**Subset-of-Experts Solution: Cached KV Experts** This paper employs an alternative method: instead of choosing subset-of-experts from storage, we use the experts cached in RAM from the current sequence as the subset-of-experts. Specifically, during the inference phase, each token activates the experts corresponding to its input id, loading them from storage into RAM. We can cache the KV experts corresponding to the tokens in the current sequence, treating them as the subset-of-experts. In this way, for a new input in the sequence, it can interact with the cached KV experts to obtain new expert outputs, instead of interacting with all experts. It is worth mentioning that the cached KV experts are quite similar to the KV cache in attention, but the former are trainable parameters, while the latter consists of activations. The above method has two advantages:

1. The cached KV experts are in RAM and do not need to be loaded from storage, thus avoiding the consumption of storage bandwidth. Therefore, it does not increase latency significantly and enables efficient batch inference.
2. Similar to the KV cache, the cached KV experts contain contextual information, enabling the generation of effective, context-aware expert outputs.

**Cached KV Experts in Detail** The previous text introduced the concept of cached KV experts. Here we will detail its mathematical form. Similar to the sliding window attention, we only retain the experts corresponding to the most recent  $M$  tokens preceding the current token (assuming the sequence is sufficiently long), resulting in preliminary cached KV experts  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N \times d'}$  and  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N \times d}$ . Similar to positional encoding in attention, we apply RoPE [26] to  $\mathbf{K}$  along the sequence dimension to obtain  $\mathbf{K}^R$ . An optional step is to normalize the cached KV experts; additionally, we flatten  $\mathbf{V}$  along the first two dimensions to obtain  $\mathbf{V}'$ . We obtain the final cached KV experts as  $\mathbf{K}^R \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N \times d'}$  and  $\mathbf{V}' \in \mathbb{R}^{MN \times d}$ .

**MoLKV Architecture** In the MoLKV model, let  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denote the FFN input, and  $i$  denote the input id corresponding to  $\mathbf{h}$ . The FFN output  $\mathbf{y}$  during inference is computed as:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{h} + \text{FFN}(\mathbf{h}) + g \sum_{n=1}^N s_n \mathbf{v}_{i,n} + g' \mathbf{S}'_I \mathbf{V}'_I \quad (6)$$

where  $g' \mathbf{S}'_I \mathbf{V}'_I$  is the new gated expert output introduced by MoLKV compared to Gated MoLE formulation in (4). The new gating score  $g'$  is calculated using  $g' = \text{Sigmoid}(\mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{u}')$ , with  $\mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$  as the new gate parameter. The steps for obtaining the new expert output  $\mathbf{S}'_I \mathbf{V}'_I$  are detailed below:

▷ 1. The query  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$  is derived from  $\mathbf{h}$  via a projection matrix  $\mathbf{W}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{d' \times d}$ . Then we can obtain the RoPE-encoded query  $\mathbf{q}^R$ :

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{W}_q \mathbf{h}, \quad \mathbf{q}^R = \text{RoPE}(\mathbf{q}) \quad (7)$$

▷ 2. The new scores  $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{MN}$  are obtained by summing the query-key scores  $\mathbf{S}_{\text{qk}}$  and the new routing scores  $\mathbf{S}_{\text{router}}$ , then flattening:

$$\mathbf{S} = \text{Flatten}(\mathbf{S}_{\text{qk}} + \mathbf{S}_{\text{router}}), \quad \mathbf{S}_{\text{qk}} = \frac{\mathbf{K}^R \mathbf{q}^R}{\sqrt{d'}}, \quad \mathbf{S}_{\text{router}} = \mathbf{W}_r \mathbf{h} \quad (8)$$

similar to the multi-head attention scores, the qk scores  $\mathbf{S}_{\text{qk}} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$  are obtained by multiplying the cached expert keys  $\mathbf{K}^R$  by the RoPE-encoded query  $\mathbf{q}^R$  and scaling by  $1/\sqrt{d'}$ . The route scores  $\mathbf{S}_{\text{router}} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times N}$  are obtained via a new router  $\mathbf{W}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times N \times d}$ .

▷ 3. Following sparse attention methods [27, 28], we apply a top- $k$  selection to reduce computation:

$$I = \text{SelectTopkIndices}(\mathcal{S}, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_I \in \mathbb{R}^k, \mathcal{V}'_I \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d} \quad (9)$$

where  $I$  denote the indices of the top- $k$  values in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Using indices  $I$ , we obtain the top- $k$  scores  $\mathcal{S}_I$  and corresponding cached expert keys  $\mathcal{V}'_I$ . After obtaining the normalized top- $k$  scores  $\mathcal{S}'_I \in \mathbb{R}^k$  via  $\mathcal{S}'_I = \text{Softmax}(\mathcal{S}_I)$ , the new gated expert output is computed as  $g' \mathcal{S}'_I \mathcal{V}'_I \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , as shown in (6). The attention-like interaction between the query and the cached KV experts enables the resulting expert output to be context-aware.

Additionally, the original routing score  $s_n$  in (6) is by augmenting the result from (2) with the score obtained from the query and the current expert key  $\mathbf{k}_{i,n}$ :

$$s_n = \text{Softmax}_n \left( \mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{r}_n + \frac{\mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{k}_{i,n}}{\sqrt{d'}} \right), s_n \in \mathbb{R} \quad (10)$$

### 3.3 Complexity Analysis

Table 1: Complexities of Different Models. We report the statistics of a single FFN layer during the inference phase, and we only count the MACs of large matrix operations in these models.

Models	MACs	# Param in RAM	# Param Offloaded	# Param Loaded per Input
	Computational Cost	RAM Usage	Storage Usage	Storage Bandwidth Usage
Dense	$3dD$	$3dD$	0	0
MoLE	$3dD$	$3dD$	$N V d$	$Nd$
MoLKV	$3dD + dd' + MNd' + kd$	$3dD + MN(d + d')$	$N V (d + d')$	$N(d + d')$

During the inference phase, the complexity of a single FFN layer in the Dense, MoLE, and MoLKV models is summarized in Table 1. We report four important metrics. The meaning of each metric is explained in gray below its name. Here,  $d$  is the hidden size,  $D$  is the intermediate size of FFN,  $d'$  is the size of the expert key,  $N$  is the number of experts for each id,  $|V|$  is the vocabulary size, and  $M$  is the length of the cached experts. We used the SwishGLU form [29] of FFN, so the number of parameters for each FFN is  $3dD$ .

For the Dense model, which is the standard Transformer model, all its parameters are in RAM, so there is no storage usage or loading overhead. For MoLE, all experts are offloaded to storage, the total offloaded parameter count is  $N|V|d$ , and the experts loaded per input has a size of  $Nd$ .

For MoLKV, since each expert is a key-value pair, its size is  $d + d'$ , making the total offloaded parameter count  $N|V|(d + d')$ . Since it selects additional experts in RAM rather than storage, the number of experts loaded per input remains  $N$ , and the parameter count is  $N(d + d')$ . MoLKV needs to cache experts of length  $M$  in RAM, so the number of parameters in RAM increases by  $MN(d + d')$ . The computational cost of MoLKV represented in MACs is  $3dD + dd' + MNd' + kd$ , where  $dd'$  corresponds to the query projection,  $MNd'$  corresponds to the similarity calculation between the query and the expert keys, and  $kd$  corresponds to the output projection of top- $k$  expert values. Due to the addition of the expert keys, MoLKV has a larger overhead compared to MoLE, but this issue can be mitigated by selecting a smaller  $d'$  and  $M$ .

## 4 Experiments

**Model Configurations** We implement Dense, MoLE, and MoLKV models for experiments, and their configurations are shown in Table 2. The Dense model adopts the modern Transformer [30] architecture,



Table 2: Model Configurations

Models	$L$	$d$	$D$	$N$	# Activated Param	# Total Param
Dense	16	1024	2644	0	197M	197M
MoLE	16	1024	2644	2	197M	1.65B
MoLKV	16	1024	2548	2	197M	1.65B

Table 3: Model Performances

Models	Validation Loss
Dense	3.1083
MoLE	3.0297
Gated MoLE	3.0180
MoLKV	<b>2.9985</b>

including RoPE [26], SwishGLU [29], RMSNorm [31], and Pre-LN [32]. MoLE and MoLKV are built upon the Dense model by adding new modules. All three models consist of 16 layers with a hidden size of 1024. Both MoLE and MoLKV have 2 experts per token id at each layer. For MoLKV, the expert key size  $d'$  is 146, the cached expert length  $M$  is 512, the  $k$  (used for selecting top- $k$  expert values) is set to 32, and only the first 14 layers contain experts. The FFN intermediate size  $D$  of MoLKV is set to 2548, which is smaller than the 2644 of the other two. Under the above configuration, the three models share the same activation parameter count of 197M, and MoLE and MoLKV have the same total parameter count of 1.65B. This ensures a fair comparison in the experiments.

**Training Configurations** All models are trained on a 10B-token subset of FineWeb dataset [33] using the tiktoken tokenizer with a vocabulary size of 50304. We use AdamW [34] as the optimizer for all models, with a learning rate of  $3e-4$ . The sequence length is 2048, the batch size is 240, and the training consists of 20,000 steps. Additional training hyperparameters are provided in Table B.

**Main Results** As shown in Table 3, we report validation loss as the metric for evaluating model performance. Due to the introduction of the lookup experts, the validation loss of MoLE decreased by nearly 0.08 compared to that of Dense. MoLKV further reduced the loss by 0.03 relative to MoLE. To eliminate the effect of the gating mechanism in MoLKV, we also included Gated MoLE for comparison. MoLKV achieved a 0.02 lower validation loss than Gated MoLE, confirming the effectiveness of its core design. The experimental results demonstrate that the context-aware expert output mechanism introduced in MoLKV can effectively improve model performance.

**Upcoming Work** Due to time and resource constraints, we have only conducted preliminary experiments as described. In the future, we will also conduct the following experiments: (1) Training on a larger dataset to enhance the persuasiveness of the experiments; (2) Evaluating on more benchmarks; (3) Ablation studies on the effectiveness of specific elements in MoLKV; (4) Testing the efficiency of MoLKV in inference, such as single-step decoding latency and throughput; (5) Conducting in-depth experimental analysis of MoLKV. After completing the above experiments, we will update this paper.

## 5 Conclusion

This paper addresses the potential limitations of MoLE’s context-independent expert selection and proposes an improved architecture named MoLKV. Building upon MoLE, MoLKV enhances model performance by enabling queries to interact with cached key-value experts, thereby generating context-aware expert outputs while retaining MoLE’s advantage of efficient batch inference. This work advances the design of architectures suitable for on-device inference, contributing to the development of edge AI.

## References

- [1] Shibo Jie et al. “Mixture of Lookup Experts”. In: *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*. ISSN: 2640-3498. 2025, pp. 27929–27940. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v267/jie25b.html>.
- [2] Chaojun Xiao et al. “Densing law of LLMs”. In: *Nature Machine Intelligence* 7.11 (2025), pp. 1823–1833. ISSN: 2522-5839. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s42256-025-01137-0>.
- [3] Sabri Eyuboglu et al. *Cartridges: Lightweight and general-purpose long context representations via self-study*. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2506.06266>.
- [4] Zhiyu Li et al. *MemOS: An Operating System for Memory-Augmented Generation (MAG) in Large Language Models*. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2505.22101>.
- [5] Yaxi Lu et al. “Proactive Agent: Shifting LLM Agents from Reactive Responses to Active Assistance”. In: *International Conference on Representation Learning 2025* (2025), pp. 47431–47457. URL: [https://proceedings.iclr.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2025/hash/75c37811e830bf029584b1c6fac17726-Abstract-Conference.html](https://proceedings.iclr.cc/paper_files/paper/2025/hash/75c37811e830bf029584b1c6fac17726-Abstract-Conference.html).
- [6] Bufang Yang et al. *ContextAgent: Context-Aware Proactive LLM Agents with Open-World Sensory Perceptions*. Oct. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2505.14668>.
- [7] Noam Shazeer et al. “Outrageously Large Neural Networks: The Sparsely-Gated Mixture-of-Experts Layer”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations 2017*. 2017. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=B1ckMDqlg>.
- [8] An Yang et al. *Qwen3 Technical Report*. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388>.
- [9] DeepSeek-AI et al. *DeepSeek-V3 Technical Report*. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2412.19437>.
- [10] Kimi Team et al. *Kimi K2: Open Agentic Intelligence*. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2507.20534>.
- [11] Zhenliang Xue et al. *PowerInfer-2: Fast Large Language Model Inference on a Smartphone*. 2024. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.06282>.
- [12] Damai Dai et al. “DeepSeekMoE: Towards Ultimate Expert Specialization in Mixture-of-Experts Language Models”. In: *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 2024, pp. 1280–1297. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.70/>.
- [13] Jan Ludziewski et al. “Scaling Laws for Fine-Grained Mixture of Experts”. In: *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2024, pp. 33270–33288. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/ludziewski24a.html>.
- [14] Da Yu et al. *Scaling Embedding Layers in Language Models*. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.01637>.
- [15] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. “Switch Transformers: Scaling to Trillion Parameter Models with Simple and Efficient Sparsity”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23.120 (2022), pp. 1–39. ISSN: 1533-7928. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/21-0998.html>.
- [16] Zihan Qiu et al. “Demons in the Detail: On Implementing Load Balancing Loss for Training Specialized Mixture-of-Expert Models”. In: *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 2025, pp. 5005–5018. ISBN: 979-8-89176-251-0. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2025.acl-long.249/>.
- [17] Lean Wang et al. *Auxiliary-Loss-Free Load Balancing Strategy for Mixture-of-Experts*. 2024. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2408.15664>.
- [18] Xu Owen He. *Mixture of A Million Experts*. 2024. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.04153>.
- [19] Guillaume Lample et al. “Large Memory Layers with Product Keys”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 32. 2019. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/9d8df73a3cfbf3c5b47bc9b50f214aff-Abstract.html>.
- [20] Vincent-Pierre Berges et al. “Memory Layers at Scale”. In: *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*. ISSN: 2640-3498. 2025, pp. 3831–3842. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v267/berges25a.html>.
- [21] Zihao Huang et al. “Ultra-Sparse Memory Network”. In: *International Conference on Representation Learning 2025* (2025), pp. 86557–86575. URL: [https://proceedings.iclr.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2025/hash/d78d68cae595fabadd187b583ee8708e-Abstract-Conference.html](https://proceedings.iclr.cc/paper_files/paper/2025/hash/d78d68cae595fabadd187b583ee8708e-Abstract-Conference.html).



- [22] Zihao Huang et al. *UltraMemV2: Memory Networks Scaling to 120B Parameters with Superior Long-Context Learning*. Aug. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2508.18756>.
- [23] Hongzhi Huang et al. “Over-Tokenized Transformer: Vocabulary is Generally Worth Scaling”. In: *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*. ISSN: 2640-3498. 2025, pp. 26261–26282. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v267/huang25bb.html>.
- [24] Zihan Qiu et al. *Gated Attention for Large Language Models: Non-linearity, Sparsity, and Attention-Sink-Free*. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2505.06708>.
- [25] Yu A. Malkov and D. A. Yashunin. “Efficient and Robust Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search Using Hierarchical Navigable Small World Graphs”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 42.4 (2020), pp. 824–836. ISSN: 1939-3539. URL: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8594636>.
- [26] Jianlin Su et al. “RoFormer: Enhanced transformer with Rotary Position Embedding”. In: *Neurocomputing* 568 (2024), p. 127063. ISSN: 0925-2312. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0925231223011864>.
- [27] Enzhe Lu et al. *MoBA: Mixture of Block Attention for Long-Context LLMs*. 2025. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.13189>.
- [28] DeepSeek-AI. *DeepSeek-V3.2: Pushing the Frontier of Open Large Language Models*. 2025. URL: <https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-V3.2/blob/main/assets/paper.pdf>.
- [29] Noam Shazeer. *GLU Variants Improve Transformer*. 2020. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2002.05202>.
- [30] Ashish Vaswani et al. “Attention is All you Need”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 30. 2017. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Abstract.html>.
- [31] Biao Zhang and Rico Sennrich. “Root Mean Square Layer Normalization”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 32. 2019. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/1e8a19426224ca89e83cef47f1e7f53b-Abstract.html>.
- [32] Ruibin Xiong et al. “On Layer Normalization in the Transformer Architecture”. In: *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2020, pp. 10524–10533. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/xiong20b.html>.
- [33] Guilherme Penedo et al. “The FineWeb Datasets: Decanting the Web for the Finest Text Data at Scale”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), pp. 30811–30849. URL: [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2024/hash/370df50ccfd8bde18f8f9c2d9151bda-Abstract-Datasets\\_and\\_Benchmarks\\_Track.html](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/hash/370df50ccfd8bde18f8f9c2d9151bda-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks_Track.html).
- [34] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. “Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization”. In: *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019*, 2019. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7>.

## A Pseudocode

The pseudocode for MoKLV in training mode is given below. The definitions of some modules that are not the focus of this article, such as Attention, RotaryEmb, and Config, are omitted here.

---

```
1 import torch
2 from torch import nn
3 from torch.nn import functional as F
4
5
6 class MLP(nn.Module):
7     def __init__(self, config: Config, key_expert: bool = False):
8         super().__init__()
9         h_size = config.hidden_size
10        i_size = config.intermediate_size
11        o_size = config.key_size if key_expert else h_size
12
13        self.ffn_gate = nn.Linear(h_size, i_size, bias=False)
14        self.ffn_up = nn.Linear(h_size, i_size, bias=False)
15        self.ffn_down = nn.Linear(i_size, o_size, bias=False)
16
17    def forward(self, x: torch.Tensor):
18        x1 = self.ffn_gate(x)
19        x2 = self.ffn_up(x)
20        x3 = F.silu(x1) * x2
21        y = self.ffn_down(x3)
22        return y
23
24
25 class Layer(nn.Module):
26     def __init__(self, config: Config, has_experts: bool):
27         super().__init__()
28         d = config.hidden_size
29         dk = config.key_size
30         n = config.num_experts
31
32         self.rotary_emb = RotaryEmb(config)
33         self.attention = Attention(config, self.rotary_emb)
34         self.ffn = MLP(config)
35         self.attn_layer_norm = nn.RMSNorm(d)
36         self.ffn_layer_norm = nn.RMSNorm(d)
37         self.has_experts = has_experts
38         self.qk_scale_factor = config.qk_scale_factor
39         self.expert_topk = config.expert_topk
40
41     if has_experts:
42         self.query_proj = nn.Linear(d, dk, bias=False)
43         self.key_experts = nn.ModuleList([MLP(config, True) for _ in range(n)])
44         self.value_experts = nn.ModuleList([MLP(config) for _ in range(n)])
45         self.vocab_emb_layer_norm = nn.RMSNorm(d)
46         self.expert_key_norm = nn.RMSNorm(dk)
47         self.expert_value_norm = nn.RMSNorm(d)
48         self.router = nn.Parameter(torch.randn(d, n))
49         self.new_router = nn.Parameter(torch.randn(d, n))
```

```

50         self.gate = nn.Parameter(torch.randn(d, 1))
51         self.new_gate = nn.Parameter(torch.randn(d, 1))
52
53     def forward(
54         self,
55         x_input: torch.Tensor,
56         vocab_emb: torch.Tensor,
57         sliding_window_mask: torch.Tensor,
58     ):
59         x = self.attn_layer_norm(x_input)
60         x_ffn_input = self.attention(x) + x_input
61         x_ffn = self.ffn_layer_norm(x_ffn_input)
62         y = self.ffn(x_ffn) + x_ffn_input
63
64         if self.has_experts:
65             expert_query = self.query_proj(x_ffn).unsqueeze(2) # (b, s, 1, dk)
66             vocab_emb = self.vocab_emb_layer_norm(vocab_emb)
67             expert_key = torch.stack(
68                 [f(vocab_emb) for f in self.key_experts], 2
69             ) # (b, s, n, dk)
70             expert_key = self.expert_key_norm(expert_key)
71             expert_value = torch.stack(
72                 [f(vocab_emb) for f in self.value_experts], 2
73             ) # (b, s, n, d)
74
75             """The original expert output in MoLE"""
76             router_score = x_ffn @ self.router # (b, s, n)
77             qk_score = (
78                 expert_query @ expert_key.transpose(-2, -1) * self.qk_scale_factor
79             ) # (b, s, 1, dk) @ (b, s, dk, n) -> (b, s, 1, n)
80             score = router_score + qk_score.squeeze(2) # (b, s, n)
81             score = score.softmax(-1).unsqueeze(-1) # (b, s, n, 1)
82             gate = torch.sigmoid(x_ffn @ self.gate) # (b, s, 1)
83             expert_output = (expert_value * score).sum(2) * gate # (b, s, d)
84
85             """The New expert output added in MoLKV"""
86             new_router_score = x_ffn @ self.new_router # (b, s, n)
87             expert_query_r = self.rotary_emb(expert_query)
88             expert_key_r = self.rotary_emb(expert_key)
89             new_qk_score = (
90                 expert_query_r.transpose(1, 2)
91                 @ expert_key_r.permute(0, 2, 3, 1)
92                 * self.qk_scale_factor
93             ) # (b, 1, s, dk) @ (b, n, dk, s) -> (b, n, s, s)
94             new_score = (
95                 new_router_score.transpose(1, 2).unsqueeze(-1) + new_qk_score
96             ) # (b, n, s, s)
97
98             new_score = new_score.masked_fill(~sliding_window_mask, float("-inf"))
99             new_score = new_score.permute(0, 2, 3, 1).flatten(2) # (b, s, s * n)
100             indices = new_score.topk(self.expert_topk, -1, sorted=False).indices
101             topk_mask = torch.zeros_like(new_score, dtype=bool)
102             topk_mask.scatter_(-1, indices, True)
103             new_score = new_score.masked_fill(~topk_mask, float("-inf"))
104             new_score = new_score.softmax(-1)

```

```

105     new_gate = torch.sigmoid(x_ffn @ self.new_gate) # (b, s, 1)
106     new_expert_output = (
107         new_score
108         @ self.expert_value_norm(expert_value).flatten(1, 2)
109         * new_gate
110     ) # (b, s, s * n) @ (b, s * n, d) -> (b, s, d)
111
112     y = y + expert_output + new_expert_output
113
114     return y

```

---

## B Training Hyperparameters

Configuration Key	Value
seq_length	2048
batch_size	8
gradient_accumulation_steps	30
effective_batch_size	240
training_steps	20000
warmup_steps	200
learning_rate	3e-4
lr_decay_scheduler	cosine
min_lr	3e-6
weight_decay	0.1
adam_betas	[0.9, 0.95]
grad_clip	1.0
layer_norm_type	RMSNorm
layer_norm_eps	1e-8
optimizer_type	AdamW
optimizer_eps	1e-8
mixed_precision	True
pos_emb	RoPE
pos_emb_theta	10000
weight_tying	False
init_dist	trunc normal
init_std	0.02