

# Sliding Window Attention Adaptation

Yijiong Yu<sup>a</sup>, Jiale Liu<sup>b</sup>, Qingyun Wu<sup>b</sup>, Huazheng Wang<sup>a</sup>, and Ji Pei<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Oregon State University, {yuyiji, huazheng.wang}@oregonstate.edu

<sup>b</sup>Penn State University, {jiale.liu, qingyun.wu}@psu.edu

<sup>c</sup>DeepSolution, research@deepsolution.chat

## Abstract

The self-attention mechanism in Transformer-based Large Language Models (LLMs) scales quadratically with input length, making long-context inference expensive. Sliding window attention (SWA) reduces this cost to linear complexity, but naively enabling complete SWA at inference-time for models pretrained with full attention (FA) causes severe long-context performance degradation due to training–inference mismatch. This makes us wonder: *Can FA-pretrained LLMs be well adapted to SWA without pretraining?* We investigate this by proposing Sliding Window Attention Adaptation (SWAA), a set of practical recipes that combine five methods for better adaptation: (i) applying SWA only during prefilling; (ii) preserving “sink” tokens; (iii) interleaving FA/SWA layers; (iv) chain-of-thought (CoT); and (v) fine-tuning. Our experiments show that SWA adaptation is feasible while non-trivial: no single method suffices, yet specific synergistic combinations effectively recover the original long-context performance. We further analyze the performance-efficiency trade-offs of different SWAA configurations and provide recommended recipes for diverse scenarios. Our code is available at [github](#).

## 1 Introduction

Transformer-based Large Language Models (LLMs) (Vaswani et al., 2017) demonstrate remarkable capabilities, but their self-attention scales quadratically with the input sequence length, making long context processing inefficient. Sliding Window Attention (SWA), the most straightforward and widely adopted sparse attention pattern, which restricts each token’s attention to a fixed-size local window, reduces the computational complexity to linearity, along with some other benefits (see Appendix A).

To apply SWA to LLMs, typical solutions involve training a model with SWA from scratch, but

are prohibitively costly and cannot match the performance of state-of-the-art full-causal-attention models like Qwen3 (Team, 2025b), mainly due to the inability to reproduce pretraining data. Training-free methods like streaming attention (Xiao et al., 2024) can stabilize LLM outputs by retaining “sink tokens” while applying SWA, which greatly improve efficiency but inevitably suffer from severe long-context performance degradation possibly due to the inaccessibility of distant tokens’ information (Xiao, 2025). This motivates a critical, unexplored question: *Can a full-attention model be adapted to sliding window attention at low cost while maintaining long-context performance?*

We answer Yes to this question by proposing Sliding Window Attention Adaptation (SWAA), a set of recipes for adapting FA-pretrained models to SWA, which requires neither costly pretraining nor modifications to the standard Transformer architecture. Specifically, it systematically combines five practical and composable methods:

1. **Full Attention (FA) Decode:** applying SWA only during the prefilling stage while switching back to full attention for decoding.
2. **Keep First  $k$  Tokens:** explicitly preserving attention to the first  $k$  “sink” tokens.
3. **Interleaving FA/SWA layers:** mix full-attention and SWA layers (e.g., assigning SWA to half layers).
4. **Chain-of-Thought (CoT):** enforcing an explicit “thinking” process during decoding.
5. **Fine-tuning with SWA:** lightweight SWA-aware supervised fine-tuning on long-context data.

Among these, FA Decode is a novel method we introduce. Keep First  $k$  Tokens and FA/SWA Interleaving have been proven effective in prior work

(Xiao et al., 2024; Team, 2024a; Zhang et al., 2024), while CoT and fine-tuning are common LLM techniques. However, how these methods should be combined to be actually effective for SWA adaptation remains unexplored.

Therefore, in our experiments, we evaluate SWAA on Qwen3 (Team, 2025b) and Llama3.1 (Team, 2024b) across several long-context benchmarks, measuring both performance and efficiency under a wide range of SWAA recipes. First, we find that each method makes a distinct contribution, but no single ingredient suffices to make SWA competitive with full attention. Second, we show that specific synergistic combinations of methods can recover a large fraction of the original long-context performance. Third, we analyze the performance-efficiency trade-offs of different SWAA recipes and identify some recommended configurations suitable for different deployment scenarios.

Rather than proposing a single globally optimal configuration, we view SWAA as a flexible toolkit of practical recipes: practitioners can select SWAA recipes that match their accuracy and efficiency constraints, or compose their own SWA adaptation strategies by combining the available ingredients.

Our key contributions are:

1. We perform the first systematic study on adapting FA-pretrained LLMs to SWA without pre-training, revealing novel insights about how SWA impacts LLMs and providing a foundation for future research in efficient sparse attention.
2. We propose SWAA, a set of practical SWA adaptation recipes that offer a robust performance-efficiency balance for various use cases, accelerating LLM inference from the bottom level.
3. We implement our methods with FlashAttention (Dao, 2024) and vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023), making it plug-and-play and user-friendly for practical deployment.

## 2 Related Works

The  $O(N^2)$  complexity of self-attention in Transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017) has spurred a wide field of research about more efficient language model architectures. Among the two most popular technological routes are sparse attention and linear attention.

### 2.1 Sparse Attention

Our work falls in this category. Sliding Window Attention (SWA) represents the most basic form of local sparse attention, yet its performance is inherently limited. Therefore, model architectures such as Longformer (Beltagy et al., 2020), BigBird (Zaheer et al., 2020), and RATTENTION (Wang et al., 2025) combine local SWA on most tokens with special global attention on specific tokens to create a more powerful, albeit still sparse, pattern. Popular LLMs like Gemma2 (Team, 2024a) adopt SWA in half of their layers to balance the efficiency of SWA and performance of FA. Sliding Window Attention Training (SWAT) (Fu et al., 2025b) introduces architectural changes, such as sigmoid activation and balanced position embeddings, to stabilize SWA performance. More advanced methods like Deepseek-sparse-attention (Yuan et al., 2025; DeepSeek-AI, 2025b), although achieving excellent quality, involve more complicated implementation and optimization due to semantic-aware attention operations (e.g., selecting the most important tokens based on attention weights). Regardless, almost all of the above methods require pretraining with a specific sparse pattern, which is costly and fails to leverage the advantages of existing pre-trained models.

LightTransfer (Zhang et al., 2024) is a promising attempt at adapting existing models to SWA without pretraining, which has the same motivation as ours. But it may generalize poorly across model families (see Appendix G).

### 2.2 Linear Attention

An alternative approach involves reformulating the attention mechanism entirely to achieve linear,  $O(N)$ , complexity. This includes methods such as RNN-like linear attention transformers (Katharopoulos et al., 2020; Peng et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2023) and structured state-space models (SSMs) like Mamba (Gu and Dao, 2023). Many works such as Jamba and Nemotron-Flash (Lieber et al., 2024; Linsong Chu et al., 2024; Team et al., 2025; Fu et al., 2025a) interleave linear attention layers with traditional attention layers to create hybrid model structures. While promising, they represent a fundamental architectural departure from the standard Transformer, and their performance is generally weaker than traditional Transformer-based LLMs.

### 3 Candidate Methods for SWA Adaptation

As established, a naive application of SWA leads to severe long-context performance degradation. Therefore, we investigate five methods that can potentially facilitate SWA adaptation from distinct perspectives. However, every method except fine-tuning has some drawbacks to LLM inference efficiency, as discussed in Appendix A. Therefore, although these methods are not mutually exclusive, we should not indiscriminately adopt all of them. Instead, we must evaluate various combinations to identify the optimal trade-off between performance and efficiency.

#### 3.1 Full Attention Decode

This method applies SWA **only** to the prefilling stage. During the decoding (auto-regressive generation) stage, each token still employs full attention, allowing access to all previous tokens in the context. The resulting attention mask is depicted in Figure 1a.

This novel approach, first proposed in our study, is inspired by human reading comprehension: humans typically scan a passage casually (prefilling) before thinking deeply to formulate an answer (decoding) for a specific problem. We term this strategy "reading casually, thinking carefully." In our design, the SWA-constrained prefilling stage corresponds to casual reading, while the full-attention decoding stage enables careful thinking. This analogy also suggests that Chain-of-Thought (CoT) during decoding may be particularly beneficial, as extended generation (i.e. "thinking") could compensate for the insufficient contextual information gathered during the prefilling stage.




Figure 1: (a) Attention mask for FA Decode. SWA is used for prompt tokens (prefill), and full attention is used for generated tokens (decode). (b) Attention mask for SWA combined with Keep First  $k$  Tokens.

#### 3.1.1 Keep First $k$ Tokens

Xiao et al. demonstrate that models pretrained with full attention allocate a disproportionate amount of attention to the initial tokens ("attention sink"), and removing the visibility of these tokens causes performance collapse. Their solution, streaming attention, involves permanently retaining the attention to these "sink" tokens while using SWA, which successfully maintains the stability of the attention distribution and the model's output. Our method is basically the same: as shown in Figure 1b, any subsequent token can attend to its local window **and** the initial  $k$  tokens.

Notably, however, our method extends beyond its original version. Streaming attention operates only at the KV cache level; specifically, the KV cache of the sink tokens is retained during decoding, while the prefilling stage is not modified or accelerated at all. In contrast, we directly customize the Flash-Attention-2 (Dao, 2024) kernel to implement such attention mask, thereby accelerating prefilling via SWA as well, and eliminating the need to modify KV cache.

#### 3.2 Interleaving Layers

This method retains full attention on a subset of layers while applying SWA to the remainder, providing a simple hybrid mechanism to balance the performance of full attention with the efficiency of pure SWA. A common strategy involves designating one in every  $n$  layers to use full attention (e.g., layers 0, 2, 4, ... retain full attention, while all others use SWA). For example, Gemma-2 (Team, 2024a) uses SWA only for layers [1, 3, 5, ...], and Gemma-3 (Team, 2025a) uses SWA only for layers [5, 11, 17, ...].

However, for an FA-pretrained model, layers may exhibit distinct behaviors, suggesting it may not be optimal to simply assign SWA to layers [1, 3, 5, ...]. Instead, it might be preferable to use statistical features to select "lazy" (mostly focusing on just recent tokens) layers, as adopted by LightTransfer (Zhang et al., 2024). However, we find that LightTransfer is not consistently superior in practice (see Appendix G). Therefore, for simplicity, we still choose the simplest fixed-interval layer selections in our experiments, such as [0, 2, 4, ...] and [1, 3, 5, ...].

#### 3.3 Chain-of-Thought

Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022) is a widely used technique for improving model ac-

curacy via reasoning. With the advent of "thinking" models, such as DeepSeek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI, 2025a), CoT has evolved from a prompting strategy to an intrinsic LLM capability. However, whether CoT has a specific impact in SWA scenarios remains uninvestigated. We explore this by comparing a thinking model with its non-thinking variant, e.g., Qwen3-4B-Thinking and Qwen3-4B-Instruct, to verify the effect of CoT on SWA adaptation, which can produce more notable differences compared to simply adding CoT prompting to the same model.

### 3.4 Fine-tuning

This is the most natural way to mitigate training-inference mismatch. Apparently, the model should be fine-tuned while SWA is applied, so that the model's parameters can be trained to better adapt to SWA. Meanwhile, the training data must be long-context tasks, where SWA actually works.

However, most available long-context datasets only contain brief ground-truth answers, lacking the reasoning steps required for fine-tuning a "thinking" model. Since our goal is to *restore* the model's original capabilities under SWA rather than teach it new ones, instead of directly using the original dataset, we adopt an approach similar to self-distillation (Yang et al., 2024). Specifically, we utilize the original full-attention model to generate new answers for the dataset's questions, and these generated answers are then filtered for correctness using GPT-5-Mini (OpenAI, 2025), to make up our training dataset. For each question, we sample 4 answers with temperature 1, because we find this strategy is slightly better than generating only one answer with temperature 0.

## 4 Experiment Setup

We organize our experiments around three research questions:

**RQ1: Is SWA adaptation feasible without any additional training?** We evaluate whether an FA LLM can be adapted to SWA using only inference-time modifications, and which combinations of techniques are necessary.

**RQ2: How much does fine-tuning with SWA improve performance?** We study the effect of SWA-aware fine-tuning on long-context performance and identify which components of SWAA are still required.

**RQ3: Which SWAA configurations achieves the optimal performance-efficiency trade-offs?**

We evaluate how different SWAA configurations trade off accuracy against inference latency.

### 4.1 Models

Our primary experiments use Qwen3-4B-Thinking and Qwen3-4B-Instruct (Team, 2025b). The Thinking variant enforces chain-of-thought (CoT) style reasoning, whereas the Instruct variant usually just answers briefly. To ensure generality, we additionally evaluate Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking, Qwen3-30B-A3B-Instruct (Team, 2025b), and Llama3.1-8B-Instruct (Touvron et al., 2023).

All models are served with vLLM in float16 precision using a batch size of 64. We use greedy decoding (temperature = 0) for all evaluations. In preliminary experiments, we observed that vLLM yields slightly lower (about 1% to 5%) scores than HuggingFace Transformers due to precision-related discrepancies.

### 4.2 Evaluation Dataset

SWA is identical to full attention when the context length is within the window size. Even if the model is fine-tuned, we can pre-calculate the prompt length and simply disable the LoRA adapters for short prompts to get completely the same response as the original model. Therefore, our experiments focus exclusively on long-context benchmarks with inputs exceeding 16k tokens, as re-evaluating models on standard short-context benchmarks (e.g., MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021), GPQA (Rein et al., 2023)) is completely unnecessary.

Since we find other long-context benchmarks are either too easy or too difficult for 4B-level models (see Appendix B), we ultimately select LongMemEval (Wu et al., 2024), a benchmark consisting of various types of long-context QA tasks with moderate difficulty, although it is originally designed for agent memory system evaluation. Its context length is controllable by selecting a specific number of chat sessions to concatenate as the context from a pool of hundreds of sessions (a session contains the chat history between user and assistant within a day). To create a moderately difficult and discriminative evaluation, we construct **LongMemEval\_24k** by sampling 10 sessions, resulting in 500 samples ranging from 16k to 32k with an average context length of 24k.



For additional validation of generalizability, as shown in Appendix D, we also experiment on LongBench-V2 (Bai et al., 2024b), a more modern and challenging benchmark that requires deep reasoning across various real-world tasks.

### 4.3 Training Details

For the fine-tuning dataset, we initially considered LongAlign (Bai et al., 2024a), a widely used long-context fine-tuning dataset for adapt a regular-length model to long-context tasks. However, since its sample count ( $\sim 10,000$ ) is insufficient, we incorporate an additional 6,000 samples from Fusang-v1-long (Pan, 2024), a more comprehensive corpus of over 40,000 long-context samples that includes LongAlign as a subset.

We perform SWA-aware fine-tuning using LoRA (Hu et al., 2022). Unless otherwise noted, we use rank  $r = 16$  and  $\alpha = 128$ , and apply LoRA only to the query, key, and value projection modules. We adopt this parameter-efficient setting because full-parameter fine-tuning often leads to overfitting and degradation of the model’s original capabilities in our preliminary experiments. We use a learning rate of  $1e-4$  with a cosine decay schedule. Models are fine-tuned for a single epoch on the sampled long-context dataset since we observe no meaningful gains from additional epochs (see Appendix F). Once training takes approximately 12 hours on an 8\*H20 GPU server for Qwen3-4B and 30 hours for Qwen3-30B-A3B.

## 5 Experiment Results

### 5.1 SWA Adaptation Without Fine-tuning

We first study SWA adaptation without any additional training. Table 1 reports LongMemEval\_24k accuracy for Qwen3-4B-Thinking ("think") and Qwen3-4B-Instruct ("non-think") under different combinations of SWAA components. In most settings, we use an aggressive 2k window to amplify the impact of SWA. The configurations are ranked by the number of methods applied (0, 1, 2, or 3 of Interleaving Layers, Keep First and FA Decode). Rows 1 (original model) and 2 (naive SWA) serve as upper and lower baselines, respectively. In the column "FA layers", the value records which layers use full attention, and [] means all the layers use SWA, i.e., this method is not enabled. In the column "keep first", the value is  $k$  in Keep First  $k$  Tokens. When comparing results, an accuracy difference of less than 5% is usually considered

statistically insignificant. From the results, we find that:

**Naive SWA is not viable.** Naively replacing FA with a 2k sliding window attention (row 1) drops accuracy significantly to 3.2 and 11.0, respectively. Even with an 8k window (row 2), accuracy only recovers to 13.2 and 19.8, far below the FA baseline.

**Single method helps, but cannot close the gap.** Each method—Keep First, FA Decode, or Interleaving Layers—improves over naive SWA (rows 3–6), yet each alone recovers only a small fraction of the FA gap and remains well below the baseline. In short, no single method is sufficient.

**Combinations exhibit strong synergy.** Recipes that combine multiple methods deliver large gains:

- **FA Decode + Keep First  $k$**  substantially improves over naive SWA (rows 7–9), recovering roughly half to two-thirds of the gap on the thinking model as  $k$  increases. However, increasing  $k$  from 100 to 1000 yields almost no improvement, indicating that  $k$  does not need to be exceedingly large.
- **Interleaving Layers + FA Decode** is markedly stronger (row 13), recovering most of the gap for the thinking model.
- **FA Decode + Interleaving Layers + Keep First  $k$**  perform best (rows 18). The thinking model recovers close to 90% of the FA gap even at 2k window.

**CoT synergizes with FA Decode.** Under recipes that include FA Decode, the thinking model consistently benefits more than the non-thinking model (rows 13 and 18), suggesting that CoT synergizes with FA Decode: preserving global attention at decoding time enables longer reasoning traces to capitalize on context processed by SWA, confirming our hypothesis in Section 3.1.

**Sliding window size affects, but is not the decisive role.** With FA Decode + Keep First  $k$ , accuracy improves as the window increases (rows 7, 14, 15), though benefits are modest until 8k. When added with interleaving FA layers, moving from a 2k to a 4k window is enough to close the remaining gap on the thinking model (row 22 matches the FA baseline), indicating that FA Decode and Interleaving are the dominant drivers, and larger windows mainly smooth residual error.

Table 1: Qwen3-4B-Thinking and Qwen3-4B-Instruct results on LongMemEval without SFT

No.	window size	FA layers	keep first	FA decode	Acc think	Acc non-think
0	Full	[]	0	False	<b>73.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>
1	2k	[]	0	False	3.2	11.0
2	8k	[]	0	False	13.2	19.8
3	2k	[]	10	False	16.0	15.6
4	2k	[]	0	True	11.8	14.2
5	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	0	False	13.4	18.4
6	8k	[]	0	True	26.2	25.0
7	2k	[]	10	True	38.2	20.6
8	2k	[]	100	True	50.0	17.8
9	2k	[]	1000	True	50.0	20.2
10	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	10	False	17.0	14.8
11	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	True	32.2	26.0
12	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	10	False	25.8	36.4
13	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	0	True	59.2	34.8
14	4k	[]	10	True	38.0	24.4
15	8k	[]	10	True	49.2	35.2
16	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	10	True	36.0	17.2
17	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	10	True	65.0	<b>53.6</b>
18	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	100	True	<b>68.8</b>	50.6
19	2k	[1, 5, 9, ...]	10	True	53.2	31.4
20	2k	[1, 9, 17, ...]	10	True	36.4	18.8
21	2k	[3, 7, 11, ...]	10	True	54.2	34.6
22	4k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	100	True	<b>73.0</b>	<b>54.2</b>
23	8k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	100	True	<b>71.6</b>	<b>56.6</b>

**SWA/FA layer selection has large impacts.** Selecting less layers for FA, e.g. only one fourth or eighth (row 19, 20), though more efficient, will significantly decrease the improvement brought by Interleaving Layers. More importantly, for Qwen3-4B, configuring *odd-numbered* layers with full attention is significantly better than *even-numbered* layers (row 11, 13, 16, 17). However, surprisingly, this result is reversed for Qwen3-30B-A3B and Llama3.1-8B-Instruct (row 10 and 11 in Table 4 and 5). This suggests that layer functionalities differ across model families and sizes, necessitating model-specific layer selection strategies, as discussed in Section 3.2.

Therefore, we answer RQ1: adapting an FA LLM to SWA is feasible even without any training. But it requires specific combinations of at least 2 methods, which could be less efficient for inference.

## 5.2 SWA Adaptation With Fine-tuning

We next evaluate SWA-aware supervised fine-tuning, which is expected to provide higher improvement. Table 2 reports LongMemEval\_24k accuracy after SFT under various SWAA configurations. The original full-attention model is also fine-tuned as a baseline (row 0). Since training is relatively time-consuming, we only test a representative subset of configurations. Our findings are as follows:

**Fine-tuning substantially lifts all SWA configurations.** Comparing all the fine-tuning results with non-training ones, it is clear that fine-tuning consistently provides great improvement. However, simply fine-tuning with naive SWA remains insufficient, only achieving 18.8% and 23.8% accuracy (row 1).

**FA Decode and Interleaving Layers emerge as dominant components.** After SFT, FA Decode and Interleaving Layers provide the largest gains.

Table 2: Qwen3-4B-Thinking and Qwen3-4B-Instruct results on LongMemEval with SFT

No.	window size	FA layers	keep first	FA decode	Acc think	Acc non-think
0	Full	[]	0	True	<b>74.6</b>	<b>63.4</b>
1	2k	[]	0	False	18.8	23.8
2	2k	[]	10	False	15.6	/
3	2k	[]	0	True	57.9	42.0
4	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	0	False	63.6	54.6
5	4k	[]	0	True	62.6	/
6	2k	[]	10	True	56.7	/
7	2k	[]	100	True	62.2	42.6
8	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	0	True	<b>73.2</b>	<b>58.8</b>
9	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	True	<b>66.0</b>	/
10	2k	[1, 5, 9, ...]	0	True	<b>68.8</b>	47.0
11	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	100	True	<b>73.2</b>	<b>61.4</b>

Table 3: Recommended SWA adaptation recipes for different needs and scenarios.  $\square$  means optional.

Training?	Thinking Model?	Prefer?	FA Decode	Interleaving Layers	Keep First
No	No	Any	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	Yes	Efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	Yes	Accuracy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Yes	Any	Efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	Any	Accuracy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Using FA Decode alone (row 3) or using Interleaving Layers alone (row 4) both get high accuracy. And combining both (row 8) further boosts performance to 73.2 (think) and 58.8 (non-think), nearly matching the full-attention SFT baseline in row 0.

**Keep First becomes optional rather than essential.** Before fine-tuning, Keep First is crucial for stability under SWA. But after SFT, it only provides minor additional improvement. With FA Decode, adding  $k = 100$  (row 7) improves over  $k = 0$  (row 3) only 4.5%, and if further combining FA layers, it almost offers no improvements (row 11 and row 8).

**Effect of sliding window size.** Row 3 and 5 shows that increasing the window from 2k to 4k with FA Decode improves thinking-model accuracy from 57.9 to 62.6. This mirrors the non-SFT trend that larger windows help, but the dominant improvements still come from FA Decode and Interleaving Layers.

So, we answer RQ2: fine-tuning brings remarkably high performance restoration, provided we ap-

ply **FA Decode**, **Interleaving Layers**, or a combination thereof, while **Keep First** becomes optional. And the improvement brought by SFT under each configuration varies significantly, meaning a near-optimal training-free configuration need not remain optimal after SFT, and vice versa.

### 5.3 Performance–efficiency Trade-offs and Recommended Recipes

Although integrating more methods can typically achieve higher accuracy, it introduces more overhead, indicating that the efficiency of each recipe must also be evaluated. To assess the performance–efficiency trade-off of different SWAA configurations, we evaluate time-to-first-token (TTFT), time-per-output-token (TPOT), total throughput, and average running time per request. Concretely, we benchmark Qwen3-4B-Thinking on a single H100 GPU using vLLM’s bench\_serve utility (Kwon et al., 2023) with random input data and 100 total requests. The prompt length and output length are set to 128k and 512 tokens, respectively, representing a typical long-context QA setting.




Figure 2: Accuracy and inference time of each configuration of Qwen3-4B on LongMemEval

To visualize the performance-efficiency trade-off, Figure 2 plots each configuration’s accuracy on LongMemEval\_24k (Wu et al., 2024) against its average running time, while detailed TTFT, TPOT, and throughput statistics for each configuration are provided in Appendix E. We draw a line between the full-attention point and the naive-SWA point as a baseline curve: configurations above this line offer a better accuracy-latency balance intuitively. For configurations with nearly identical time costs, we display only the one with the highest accuracy. Since **Keep First**  $k$  has negligible impact on runtime (Appendix E), all plotted configurations fix  $k = 10$ .

From Figure 2, we observe that many configurations in Figure 2 achieve a clearly better performance-efficiency ratio than baselines. And for the thinking model, more points lie above the baseline curve compared to non-thinking, indicating that **CoT** generally has a positive effect on improving the performance-efficiency ratio of SWAA.

Thus, we finally answer RQ3: many SWAA configurations all reach excellent performance-efficiency trade-off, but there is no single metric to quantify such trade-off to decide the globally optimal one. We therefore summarize **recommended SWA adaptation recipes** tailored to various deployment scenarios in Table 3. And we must note that specific parameters should be flexibly set to meet application-specific requirements, without the need to follow our experimental parameters (e.g.,

a 2k window,  $k = 10$ ). For example, you can increase the window size to 4k or  $k$  to 128 for higher accuracy and acceptable additional overhead.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we validate the feasibility of adapting full-attention pretrained LLMs to Sliding Window Attention (SWA) for better efficiency, offering a cost-effective alternative that avoids training sparse-attention models from scratch. By systematically deconstructing the adaptation process, we identify that the catastrophic degradation observed in naive implementations can be effectively mitigated through synergistic combinations of auxiliary methods. Our extensive experiments across the Qwen and Llama families demonstrate that while trade-offs between computational overhead and model performance are inevitable, optimized configurations can get an excellent performance-efficiency balance.

## 7 Limitations

We speculate that the ideal reasoning trajectory of the model adapted to SWA should be longer than the original model, to compensate for the information loss caused by SWA. That means, using the answers generated by the original model as fine-tuning data may not be the optimal training method. Rather, RL methods like GRPO (Shao et al., 2024) might further help the model adapted to SWA learn a better reasoning trajectory. How-



ever, we did not experiment with them since they are too time-consuming and unstable.

We have not yet implemented the KV cache eviction (or overwriting) mechanism when using SWA; that is, although the speed is improved, memory usage is not effectively reduced.

Further experiments may be needed to confirm whether our conclusions generalize to larger model sizes, such as 70B.

## References

- Yushi Bai, Xin Lv, Jiajie Zhang, Yuze He, Ji Qi, Lei Hou, Jie Tang, Yuxiao Dong, and Juanzi Li. 2024a. [Longalign: A recipe for long context alignment of large language models](#).
- Yushi Bai, Xin Lv, Jiajie Zhang, Hongchang Lyu, Jiankai Tang, Zhidian Huang, Zhengxiao Du, Xiao Liu, Aohan Zeng, Lei Hou, Yuxiao Dong, Jie Tang, and Juanzi Li. 2023. [Longbench: A bilingual, multi-task benchmark for long context understanding](#).
- Yushi Bai, Shangqing Tu, Jiajie Zhang, Hao Peng, Xiaozhi Wang, Xin Lv, Shulin Cao, Jiazheng Xu, Lei Hou, Yuxiao Dong, Jie Tang, and Juanzi Li. 2024b. [Longbench v2: Towards deeper understanding and reasoning on realistic long-context multitasks](#).
- Iz Beltagy, Matthew E. Peters, and Arman Cohan. 2020. [Longformer: The long-document transformer](#).
- Tri Dao. 2024. [Flashattention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- DeepSeek-AI. 2025a. [Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning](#).
- DeepSeek-AI. 2025b. [Deepseek-v3.2: Pushing the frontier of open large language models](#).
- Yonggan Fu, Xin Dong, Shizhe Diao, Hanrong Ye, Wonmin Byeon, Yashaswi Karnati, Lucas Liebenwein, Maksim Khadkevich, Alexander Keller, Jan Kautz, et al. 2025a. [Nemotron-flash: Towards latency-optimal hybrid small language models](#). In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Zichuan Fu, Wentao Song, Yejing Wang, Xian Wu, Yefeng Zheng, Yingying Zhang, Derong Xu, Xuetao Wei, Tong Xu, and Xiangyu Zhao. 2025b. [Sliding window attention training for efficient large language models](#).
- Albert Gu and Tri Dao. 2023. [Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces](#).
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Cheng-Ping Hsieh, Simeng Sun, Samuel Kriman, Shantanu Acharya, Dima Rekesh, Fei Jia, Yang Zhang, and Boris Ginsburg. 2024. [Ruler: What’s the real context size of your long-context language models?](#)
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Angelos Katharopoulos, Apoorv Vyas, Nikolaos Pappas, and François Fleuret. 2020. [Transformers are rns: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5156–5165. PMLR.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention](#).
- Opher Lieber, Barak Lenz, Hofit Bata, Gal Cohen, Jhonathan Osin, Itay Dalmedigos, Erez Safahi, Shaked Meirom, Yonatan Belinkov, Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Omri Abend, Raz Alon, Tomer Asida, Amir Bergman, Roman Glozman, Michael Gokhman, Avashalom Manevich, Nir Ratner, Noam Rozen, Erez Shwartz, Mor Zusman, and Yoav Shoham. 2024. [Jamba: A hybrid transformer-mamba language model](#).
- Tri Dao Linsong Chu, Divya Kumari et al. 2024. [Bamba: Inference-efficient hybrid mamba2 model](#).
- OpenAI. 2025. [ChatGPT](#).
- Wenbo Pan. 2024. [Fusang-v1: A large curation of instruction-tuning datasets for better bilingual and long-range llms](#).
- Bo Peng, Eric Alcaide, Quentin Anthony, Alon Albalak, Samuel Arcadinho, Stella Biderman, Huanqi Cao, Xin Cheng, Michael Chung, Leon Derczynski, Xingjian Du, Matteo Grella, Kranthi Gv, Xuzheng He, Haowen Hou, Przemyslaw Kazienko, Jan Kocon, Jiaming Kong, Bartłomiej Koptyra, Hayden Lau, Jiaju Lin, Krishna Sri Ipsit Mantri, Ferdinand Mom, Atsushi Saito, Guangyu Song, Xiangru Tang, Johan Wind, Stanisław Woźniak, Zhenyuan Zhang, Qinghua Zhou, Jian Zhu, and Rui-Jie Zhu. 2023. [RWKV: Reinventing RNNs for the transformer era](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 14048–14077, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2023. [Gpqa: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark](#).
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. 2024. [Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models](#).
- Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, Yuqing Xia, Jilong Xue, Jianyong Wang, and Furu Wei. 2023. [Retentive network: A successor to transformer for large language models](#).
- Gemma Team. 2024a. [Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size](#).
- Gemma Team. 2025a. [Gemma 3 technical report](#).
- Ling Team, Bin Han, Caizhi Tang, Chen Liang, Donghao Zhang, Fan Yuan, Feng Zhu, Jie Gao, Jingyu Hu, Longfei Li, Meng Li, Mingyang Zhang, Peijie Jiang, Peng Jiao, Qian Zhao, Qingyuan Yang, Wenbo Shen, Xinxing Yang, Yalin Zhang, Yankun Ren, Yao Zhao, Yibo Cao, Yixuan Sun, Yue Zhang, Yuchen Fang, Zibin Lin, Zixuan Cheng, and Jun Zhou. 2025. [Every attention matters: An efficient hybrid architecture for long-context reasoning](#).
- Llama Team. 2024b. [The llama 3 herd of models](#).
- Qwen3 Team. 2025b. [Qwen3 technical report](#).
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. [Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models](#).
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 5998–6008.
- Bailin Wang, Chang Lan, Chong Wang, and Ruoming Pang. 2025. [Rattention: Towards the minimal sliding window size in local-global attention models](#).
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Di Wu, Hongwei Wang, Wenhao Yu, Yuwei Zhang, Kai-Wei Chang, and Dong Yu. 2024. [Longmemeval: Benchmarking chat assistants on long-term interactive memory](#).
- Guangxuan Xiao. 2025. Why stacking sliding windows can’t see very far. <https://guangxuanx.com/blog/stacking-swa.html>.
- Guangxuan Xiao, Yuandong Tian, Beidi Chen, Song Han, and Mike Lewis. 2024. [Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Zhaorui Yang, Tianyu Pang, Haozhe Feng, Han Wang, Wei Chen, Minfeng Zhu, and Qian Liu. 2024. [Self-distillation bridges distribution gap in language model fine-tuning](#).
- Jingyang Yuan, Huazuo Gao, Damai Dai, Junyu Luo, Liang Zhao, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Yuxing Wei, Lean Wang, Zhiping Xiao, Yuqing Wang, Chong Ruan, Ming Zhang, Wenfeng Liang, and Wangding Zeng. 2025. [Native sparse attention: Hardware-aligned and natively trainable sparse attention](#). In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 23078–23097, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Manzil Zaheer, Guru Guruganesh, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontañón, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Qifan Wang, Li Yang, and Amr Ahmed. 2020. [Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- Xuan Zhang, Fengzhuo Zhang, Cunxiao Du, Chao Du, Tianyu Pang, Wei Gao, and Min Lin. 2024. [Light-transfer: Your long-context llm is secretly a hybrid model with effortless adaptation](#).

## A SWA’s Benefits and Each Method’s Drawbacks

SWA reduces the computational complexity to  $O(N \cdot W)$ , where  $W$  is the window size. The benefits are threefold: (1) SWA reduces the computational load, (2) conserves GPU memory by limiting the required Key-Value (KV) cache, and (3) enhances KV cache reusability beyond traditional prefix caching, since a token’s state is independent of tokens outside its local window. However, there is no free lunch—each method of SWAA has some drawbacks, impairing the benefits brought by SWA to varying degrees.

**FA Decode** presents two primary drawbacks: (1) the benefits apply only to prefilling, while decoding speed is not accelerated as it utilizes full attention, and (2) the GPU memory required for the KV cache is not reduced, as the KV cache for the full context must be retained for decoding. In

practice, however, many distributed LLM services have to recompute the KV cache of the entire chat history because storing and loading the KV cache complicates engineering systems, making prefilling occurs more frequently than expected, thereby amplifying the advantage of this method.

**Keep First** introduces very minor computational overhead, but it complicates efficient KV cache reuse. Due to positional encoding, a token’s KV state depends on its position relative to the initial  $k$  tokens, hindering simple cache reuse across different requests. A position encoding separation or offsetting mechanism may be needed.

**Interleaving Layers** introduces the most significant overhead, as only a subset of layers benefits from the computational savings of SWA. Furthermore, the GPU memory required for the KV cache is not reduced for the full-attention layers. Additionally, this method negates the KV cache reusability advantage of SWA, as the existence of full-attention layers violates the independence of the KV cache beyond the local window.

**CoT** will greatly increase the generation length, especially for difficult tasks. So the decoding time will be much longer.

## B Other Long-context Benchmarks

We find existing long-context benchmarks problematic for our specific needs. For example:

1. LongBench (Bai et al., 2023) is classic and widely used, but its average context length (most are under 16k) is relatively short for modern models, i.e., it is already too easy. And its data source is too old, leading to a risk of test data leakage.
2. Ruler(Hsieh et al., 2024) has controllable context length, but its tasks are almost all synthetic and most of them are needle-retrieval tasks, failing to reflect the model’s overall long-context capability in real-world scenarios.
3. LongBench-V2 (Bai et al., 2024b) is well-designed to necessitate deep understanding and reasoning over very long context. But it is too challenging for 4B-level models (e.g., Qwen3-4B-Thinking only gets 35% accuracy, which is too close to the random guessing baseline of 25%), making the improvement of different methods less distinguishable. Moreover, since it is in a multiple-choice question

format, the results may not be sufficiently reliable because the model has a 25% chance of guessing the correct option.

However, despite the extreme difficulty of LongBench-V2 (Bai et al., 2024b), it remains a high-quality long-context benchmark after all. Thus we still elect to conduct our experiments on it to verify the generalizability of our conclusions, as shown in Appendix D.

## C Results of Other Models

We show the results of Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking and Qwen3-30B-A3B-Instruct on LongMemEval\_24k in Table 4, and the results of Llama3.1-8B-Instruct in Table 5. The scores of Qwen3-30B-A3B are generally higher and those of Llama3.1 are generally lower, but all results are consistent with our previous conclusions, demonstrating their generalizability.

Due to the time-intensive nature of training, we only test a small set of configurations with fine-tuning.

## D Results of LongBench V2

We present the results of LongBench V2 (Bai et al., 2024b) in Tables 6, 7 and 8. We retain only the samples whose context length is under 128k due to GPU memory limitations; thus, 384 of 500 samples are kept. However, due to the high difficulty, the performance is generally poor. Some scores are even below the random guessing baseline (25%).

For Qwen3-4B and Qwen3-30B-A3B models, the results show less noticeable differences between various methods. But fortunately, the trend of accuracy changes is generally consistent with that of other datasets, so they do not conflict with all of our previous conclusions. For Llama3.1, due to its weaker long-context capability, accuracy consistently hovers around 30%.

## E Inference Efficiency

The TTFT, TPOT and total throughput when using vLLM are shown in Table 9. Since inference speed is highly dependent on hardware, implementation details, and workload characteristics, these numbers should be interpreted as reference values. However, from the results, we can still conclude that:

1. Interleaving Layers and FA Decode significantly slow down the speed compared to pure

SWA.

2. Keep First  $k$  Tokens has a negligible impact on efficiency.
3. Increasing the window size slightly increases inference time. For example, increasing from 2k to 4k decreases throughput by only 10%, but a 4k window generally achieves higher accuracy based on previous experiments. Therefore, in practice, a 4k window is a more common choice.

In theory, FA Decode should yield a decoding speed identical to that of full attention. Yet, in this table, we observe acceleration on TPOT. This is because vLLM-v1 typically mixes different requests' prefilling and decoding tokens in one sequence to improve GPU utilization. Thus, the speeds of prefilling and decoding may affect each other. If processing only a single request, the situation differs. For example, when the generation length is set to 2000, we find decoding takes over 95% of the total time, rendering the acceleration of the prefilling stage negligible—i.e., SWA with FA Decode is almost unable to improve efficiency in such cases.

## F Influence of Training Epochs

As shown in Table 10, training for more than 1 epoch yields no improvement. Therefore, we choose to train for only 1 epoch.

## G Results of LightTransfer

LightTransfer (Zhang et al., 2024) represents a promising attempt at SWA adaptation on full-attention models without pretraining. It proposes a layer selection method for SWA adaptation that calculates a "lazy ratio," represented by the ratio of attention from tokens at the end of the sequence (from a calibration dataset) to recent tokens versus global tokens. Layers with a higher "lazy ratio" are selected to apply SWA, while the rest retain full attention. This method is intuitive and theoretically sound, but our experiments reveal some negative results.

Since the complete code of LightTransfer is not open-source, we reproduce this method using LongAlign (Bai et al., 2024a) as the calibration dataset for lazy layer detection, where the number of last tokens is set to 64, and the recent token window is set to 1024. From our experimental results shown in Table 11, we find that:

1. For Qwen3-4B, LightTransfer even has a counterproductive effect; allowing lazy layers to use FA yields higher scores, while following the original method (letting non-lazy layers use FA) results in significantly lower scores.
2. For Qwen3-30B, it provides nearly no improvement over fixed-interval selection.
3. Only for Llama3.1-8B does LightTransfer show advantages.

Therefore, we conclude that LightTransfer does not yield stable performance across various models. Although fine-grained layer selection methods are theoretically superior, we believe they require further investigation before integration into our SWAA recipes.



Table 4: Results of Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking and Qwen3-30B-A3B-Instruct on LongMemEval

No.	SFT	window size	FA layers	keep first	FA decode	Acc think	Acc non-think
0	False	Full	[]	0	False	<b>79.2</b>	<b>71.6</b>
1	False	2k	[]	0	False	0.0	0.4
2	False	8k	[]	0	False	0.0	0.2
3	False	2k	[]	10	False	0.0	2.8
4	False	2k	[]	0	True	0.2	0.2
5	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	False	21.0	28.4
6	False	2k	[]	10	True	43.8	23.6
7	False	2k	[]	100	True	58.6	22.2
8	False	2k	[]	1000	True	59.0	25.4
9	False	4k	[]	10	True	49.8	26.6
10	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	10	True	<b>74.8</b>	<b>63.0</b>
11	False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	10	True	51.6	24.0
12	False	2k	[0, 4, 8, ...]	10	True	48.8	23.8
13	False	2k	[2, 6, 10, ...]	10	True	64.8	44.2
14	False	4k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	100	True	<b>74.6</b>	<b>64.4</b>
15	True	\	[]	0	False	<b>79.6</b>	\
16	True	2k	[]	0	True	62.2	51.0
17	True	2k	[]	100	True	65.6	50.8
18	True	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	True	<b>72.6</b>	\
19	True	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	100	True	<b>77.8</b>	<b>68.0</b>

Table 5: Results of Llama3.1-8B-Instruct on LongMemEval

No.	SFT	window size	FA layers	keep first	FA decode	Acc non-think
0	False	Full	[]	0	False	<b>61.0</b>
1	False	2k	[]	0	False	0.6
2	False	8k	[]	0	False	1.2
3	False	2k	[]	10	False	1.8
4	False	2k	[]	0	True	0.0
5	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	False	3.0
6	False	2k	[]	10	True	16.8
7	False	2k	[]	100	True	20.0
8	False	2k	[]	1k	True	24.2
9	False	4k	[]	10	True	23.8
10	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	10	True	<b>42.6</b>
11	False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	10	True	21.0
12	False	2k	[0, 4, 8, ...]	10	True	17.8
13	False	2k	[2, 6, 10, ...]	10	True	24.4
14	False	4k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	100	True	<b>44.0</b>

Table 6: Qwen3-4B-Thinking and Qwen3-4B-Instruct results on LongBench-V2

No.	SFT	window size	FA layers	keep first	FA decode	Acc think	Acc non-think
0	False	Full	[]	0	False	<b>34.6</b>	<b>35.2</b>
1	False	2k	[]	0	False	9.4	25.8
2	False	8k	[]	0	False	15.1	22.1
3	False	2k	[]	10	False	7.7	25.8
4	False	2k	[]	0	True	<b>26.2</b>	25.2
5	False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	0	False	12.1	23.5
6	False	8k	[]	0	True	22.8	25.5
7	False	2k	[]	10	True	25.8	25.2
8	False	2k	[]	100	True	24.2	26.5
9	False	2k	[]	1000	True	23.8	25.2
10	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	10	False	19.8	<b>29.2</b>
11	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	True	23.8	<b>29.9</b>
12	False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	10	False	21.1	<b>29.9</b>
13	False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	0	True	<b>28.5</b>	26.8
14	False	4k	[]	10	True	<b>27.9</b>	27.5
15	True	Full	[]	0	False	<b>37.9</b>	<b>34.9</b>
16	True	2k	[]	0	False	7.4	30.9
17	True	2k	[]	100	False	6.0	\
18	True	2k	[]	0	True	29.2	30.2
19	True	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	0	False	29.5	31.9
20	True	4k	[]	0	True	<b>32.9</b>	\
21	True	2k	[]	10	True	28.9	29.2
22	True	2k	[]	100	True	29.2	30.5
23	True	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	True	31.5	\
24	True	2k	[0, 4, 8, ...]	0	True	30.9	\
25	True	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	0	True	<b>38.3</b>	<b>34.6</b>
26	True	2k	[1, 5, 9, ...]	0	True	32.0	32.2
27	True	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	100	True	<b>37.2</b>	<b>33.9</b>

Table 7: Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking and Qwen3-30B-A3B-Instruct results on LongBench-V2

No.	SFT	window size	FA layers	keep first	FA decode	Acc think	Acc non-think
0	False	Full	[]	0	False	<b>49.7</b>	<b>42.6</b>
1	False	2k	[]	0	False	0.0	0.0
2	False	8k	[]	0	False	0.0	0.0
3	False	2k	[]	10	False	9.1	32.2
4	False	2k	[]	0	True	0.0	0.0
5	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	False	20.1	25.8
6	False	2k	[]	10	True	9.1	32.2
7	False	2k	[]	100	True	10.4	28.2
8	False	2k	[]	1k	True	11.7	29.5
9	False	4k	[]	10	True	26.8	30.9
10	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	10	True	22.1	<b>33.6</b>
11	False	2k	[0, 4, 8, ...]	10	True	12.4	29.5
12	False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	10	True	<b>30.2</b>	28.9
13	False	2k	[2, 6, 10, ...]	10	True	21.1	35.6
14	False	4k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	100	True	<b>29.5</b>	<b>35.9</b>
15	True	Full	[]	0	False	<b>43.6</b>	\
16	True	2k	[]	0	True	35.9	33.9
17	True	2k	[]	100	True	<b>36.6</b>	32.9
18	True	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	True	<b>41.3</b>	\
19	True	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	100	True	<b>48.0</b>	<b>37.9</b>

Table 8: Llama3.1-8B-Instruct results on LongBench-V2

No.	SFT	window size	FA layers	keep first	FA decode	Acc non-think
0	False	Full	[]	0	False	<b>33.2</b>
1	False	2k	[]	0	False	0.0
2	False	8k	[]	0	False	0.0
3	False	2k	[]	10	False	28.9
4	False	2k	[]	0	True	0.0
5	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	0	False	0.0
6	False	2k	[]	10	True	28.9
7	False	2k	[]	100	True	<b>30.2</b>
8	False	2k	[]	1000	True	<b>30.2</b>
9	False	4k	[]	10	True	27.5
10	False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	10	True	28.2
11	False	2k	[0, 4, 8, ...]	10	True	<b>32.6</b>
12	False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	10	True	26.5
13	False	2k	[2, 6, 10, ...]	10	True	26.8
14	False	4k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	100	True	<b>30.9</b>

Table 9: Efficiency metrics of different SWAA configurations on vLLM. "FA layers = 1/4" means one fourth of total layers use full attention while the others use SWA.

window	keep first	FA decode	FA layers	TTFT (s)	TPOT (s)	Throughput (k tks/s)
Full	0	False	None	1681.44	0.16	3.74
2k	0	False	None	203.20	0.02	30.72
2k	100	False	None	207.74	0.02	30.65
2k	0	False	1/2	938.00	0.09	6.70
2k	0	True	None	963.39	0.11	6.39
2k	0	True	1/2	1321.39	0.14	4.72
2k	0	True	1/4	1141.66	0.12	5.43
4k	0	False	None	233.07	0.02	27.03
4k	100	False	None	237.87	0.02	26.74
4k	0	False	1/2	949.02	0.09	6.64
4k	0	True	None	990.00	0.11	6.23
4k	0	True	1/2	1340.91	0.14	4.64
4k	0	True	1/4	1166.69	0.13	5.32

Table 10: Results of different training epochs of Qwen3-4B-Thinking on LongMemEval

SFT (epochs)	window size	FA layers	keep first	FA decode	Acc
1	2k	[]	0	True	58.0
2	2k	[]	0	True	57.6
3	2k	[]	0	True	56.0

Table 11: Results of LightTransfer on LongMemEval. "lazy" represents the half layers with higher lazy ratio, i.e. those which should apply SWA in theory. "non-lazy" represents the other part, i.e. those which should keep full attention.

SFT	window size	FA layers	keep first	FA decode	Acc think	Acc non-think
<b>Model Group: Qwen3-4B</b>						
False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	100	True	48.8	18.4
False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	100	True	<b>70.8</b>	<b>50.4</b>
False	2k	lazy	100	True	70.2	47.8
False	2k	non-lazy	100	True	54.0	19.6
<b>Model Group: Qwen3-30B-A3B</b>						
False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	100	True	<b>75.8</b>	<b>64.2</b>
False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	100	True	60.2	25.8
False	2k	lazy	100	True	61.8	25.2
False	2k	non-lazy	100	True	74.8	59.2
<b>Model Group: Llama3.1-8B-Instruct</b>						
False	2k	[0, 2, 4, ...]	100	True	\	39.8
False	2k	[1, 3, 5, ...]	100	True	\	24.2
False	2k	lazy	100	True	\	20.2
False	2k	non-lazy	100	True	\	<b>49.8</b>