

# DALI: A Workload-Aware Offloading Framework for Efficient MoE Inference on Local PCs

Zeyu Zhu  
Institute of Automation, CAS  
School of Future Technology,  
University of Chinese Academy of  
Sciences  
Beijing, China  
zhuzeyu2021@ia.ac.cn

Gang Li  
Institute of Automation, CAS  
Beijing, China  
gang.li@ia.ac.cn

Peisong Wang  
Institute of Automation, CAS  
Beijing, China  
peisong.wang@nlpr.ia.ac.cn

Zitao Mo  
Institute of Automation, CAS  
Beijing, China  
mozitao2017@ia.ac.cn

Minnan Pei  
Institute of Automation, CAS  
Beijing, China  
peiminnan19@mails.ucas.ac.cn

Zhuoran Song  
Shanghai Jiao Tong University  
Shanghai, China  
songzhuoran@sjtu.edu.cn

Xiaoyao Liang  
Shanghai Jiao Tong University  
Shanghai, China  
liang-xy@cs.sjtu.edu.cn

Jian Cheng\*  
Institute of Automation, CAS  
AiRiA  
Maicro.ai  
Beijing, China  
jcheng@nlpr.ia.ac.cn

## Abstract

Mixture of Experts (MoE) architectures significantly enhance the capacity of LLMs without proportional increases in computation, but at the cost of a vast parameter size. Offloading MoE expert parameters to host memory and leveraging both CPU and GPU computation has recently emerged as a promising direction to support such models on resource-constrained local PC platforms. While promising, we notice that existing approaches mismatch the dynamic nature of expert workloads, which leads to three fundamental inefficiencies: (1) Static expert assignment causes severe CPU-GPU load imbalance, underutilizing CPU and GPU resources; (2) Existing prefetching techniques fail to accurately predict high-workload experts, leading to costly inaccurate prefetches; (3) GPU cache policies neglect workload dynamics, resulting in poor hit rates and limited effectiveness. To address these challenges, we propose **DALI**, a **workload-Aware offloadIng** framework for efficient MoE inference on local PCs. To fully utilize hardware resources, DALI first dynamically assigns experts to CPU or GPU by modeling assignment as a 0-1 integer optimization problem and solving it efficiently using a **Greedy Assignment** strategy at runtime. To improve prefetching accuracy, we develop a **Residual-Based Prefetching** method leveraging inter-layer residual information to accurately predict high-workload experts.


Additionally, we introduce a **Workload-Aware Cache Replacement** policy that exploits temporal correlation in expert activations to improve GPU cache efficiency. By evaluating across various MoE models and settings, DALI achieves significant speedups in the both prefill and decoding phases over the state-of-the-art offloading frameworks.

## 1 Introduction

Recently, **Mixture of Experts (MoE)** architectures have been widely adopted in Large Language Models (LLMs), including Switch Transformers [14], Mixtral [22], DeepSeek [10], and Qwen [6], for their ability to significantly enhance model capacity without proportionally increasing computation [29, 31]. In MoE, a gating function selects a small subset of experts for each token, allowing computation to be focused only on the activated experts. While this approach improves efficiency, it also substantially increases the total parameter count [1, 7], posing significant deployment challenges on resource-constrained platforms such as personal computers with memory-limited GPUs.

Table 1 highlights the gap between local PCs (e.g., RTX 3090/4090 setups) and high-end servers (e.g., NVIDIA H100). H100-based systems offer substantially more compute and memory resources, but are prohibitively expensive—a complete system can cost over \$200,000 and is inaccessible to most users. In contrast, local PCs are far more affordable and widely available, yet constrained by limited GPU memory and PCIe bandwidth. Therefore, enabling efficient MoE inference on local PCs is a critical research problem that can

\*Corresponding author.



**Figure 1.** Different MoE offloading frameworks.  $t_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th token. DALI dynamically schedules the experts based on the workloads, thus achieving better CPU and GPU balance.

**Table 1.** Comparison of Local PC and High-End Server Hardware

Feature	Local PC	H100 Server
GPU Model	RTX 3090/4090	H100 80GB
GPU Memory	24–32 GB	80 GB
GPU Bandwidth	~936–1000 GB/s	~3400 GB/s
PCIe Bandwidth	PCIe 4.0 $\times$ 16 32 GB/s	PCIe Gen5 / NVLink 128–900 GB/s
System RAM	32–128 GB	256–1024+ GB
System Cost	\$2k–\$5k	\$200k–\$400k+

democratize LLM deployment and reduce reliance on costly cloud infrastructure.

Offloading is a promising strategy to alleviate the memory demands of MoE models by storing expert parameters in secondary memory (e.g., DRAM, SSD, HDD), thereby reducing GPU memory usage without compromising model expressiveness. Conventional offloading frameworks transfer expert weights from CPU to GPU via PCIe after expert activation is determined [4, 12, 13, 19, 20, 34, 36, 38–40, 43, 44]. However, due to limited PCIe bandwidth of local PCs and the large size of MoE parameters, they incur considerable inference latency and restricts deployment in real-world scenarios. To reduce PCIe communication overhead, recent frameworks [17, 24, 25, 45] adopt hybrid CPU-GPU execution and offload expert computation to CPUs, thus mitigating data transfer costs and improving throughput. Nevertheless, expert activation is inherently input-dependent in MoE layers, causing the token count routed to each expert (i.e., the expert workload) to vary widely across inputs. This workload dynamism introduces three critical challenges for existing hybrid offloading frameworks:

**Underutilization of heterogeneous computational resources.** As shown in Figure 1a, llama.cpp [17] and Ktransformers [5] assign MoE layers to either the CPU or GPU, executing each layer on the device where the parameters reside (referred to as **layer-wise hybrid frameworks**). However, due to the sequential nature of model computations, such layer-wise partitioning prevents parallel execution between CPU and GPU. Furthermore, when workloads of an expert are large, computing on the CPU incurs significantly higher latency than transferring expert parameters to the GPU and processing. To address this, Fiddler [24] and HybriMoE [45] propose statically assigning individual experts to either CPU or GPU based on their workloads (referred to as **expert-wise hybrid frameworks**, Figure 1b). Experts exceeding a predefined workload threshold (high-workload experts) are executed on the GPU, while the rest (low-workload experts) are

handled by the CPU in parallel. However, this static assignment would lead to severe load imbalance between CPU and GPU, which results in poor utilization of system resources, thus severely hindering the inference performance.

**Low accuracy in prefetching high-workload experts.** Although expert-wise hybrid frameworks enhance inference performance, the experts assigned to the GPU are determined at runtime and must be transferred from CPU to GPU before computation, imposing significant communication overhead on local PCs with limited PCIe bandwidth. For instance, in HybriMoE using Mixtral-8 $\times$ 7B, PCIe transfers account for over 60% of inference time. Previous works [12, 39, 40, 44, 45] propose prefetching to mitigate the overhead of PCIe transfers. However, in expert-wise hybrid frameworks, since GPUs are typically responsible for computing high-workload experts, an accurate prediction of such experts is essential. Existing prefetching strategies neglect expert workload characteristics and thus exhibit poor prediction accuracy on high-workload experts, resulting in extremely low prefetch accuracy, which incurs substantial stall overhead.

**Inefficient expert-cache design.** To further reduce PCIe communication, existing methods [36, 44, 45] employ a portion of the GPU memory as a cache for expert parameters. When a cached expert is hit, the corresponding PCIe transfer can be avoided. For input-dependent and dynamic MoE inference, the expert usage varies across tokens. Therefore, how to design cache replacement strategies is particularly critical. In expert-wise hybrid frameworks, high-workload experts are executed on GPUs, necessitating efficient caching of these experts. Yet, replacement strategies in prior works [12, 45] neglect workload dynamics, resulting in poor cache hit rates. For example, HybriMoE achieves only 25.3% hit rate on Mixtral-8 $\times$ 7B, significantly limiting cache efficiency.

To tackle the above issues, we holistically redesign the scheduling, prefetching, and caching strategies to account for both heterogeneous hardware characteristics of local PCs and the dynamic nature of MoE workloads—design aspects overlooked by prior work. Specifically, we first formulate the CPU-GPU expert assignment problem as a 0-1 integer optimization model to capture heterogeneous execution and minimize inference latency. Due to the high overhead of solving this problem directly, we introduce a **Greedy Assignment** strategy that closely approximates the optimal solution with far lower computational cost. Second, to enhance prefetch accuracy, we propose a **Residual-Based Prefetching** method that leverages inter-layer residuals to refine features and accurately prefetch high-workload experts. Finally, observing




Figure 2. An illustration of the MoE architecture.

the strong temporal correlation of expert workloads across tokens, we design a **Workload-Aware Cache Replacement** strategy utilizing the temporal workload information, significantly improving cache hit rates and inference speed.

We integrate these components into **DALI**, a workload-Aware offLoading MoE framework that substantially accelerates expert-wise offloading inference on local PCs. Experiments across various models and settings demonstrate significant performance improvements. Specifically, DALI on average achieves speedups of 7.62 $\times$ , 3.80 $\times$ , 2.45 $\times$ , and 2.00 $\times$  during the prefill phase, and 3.97 $\times$ , 2.16 $\times$ , 1.48 $\times$ , and 1.32 $\times$  during decoding compared to the state-of-the-art llama.cpp, KTransformers, MoE-Lightning, and HybriMoE, respectively.


## 2 Background and Related Work

### 2.1 Mixture of Experts (MoE)


Mixture of Experts (MoE) architectures[21, 41] have recently gained widespread adoption in LLMs, such as DeepSeek[8–10], Mixtral[22], Snowflake[33], and Qwen[6]. Traditional LLMs consist of multiple stacked transformer blocks[37], whereas MoE architectures replace the Feed-Forward Network (FFN) layers within these transformer blocks with MoE layers, as illustrated in Figure 2. Each MoE layer includes multiple expert sub-networks, typically implemented as FFN, and a gate function, which dynamically determines which experts should be activated based on the input token. In the gate function, the input ( $x \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$ ) is first multiplied by the gate function’s weights ( $W_g \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times N}$ ), where  $d$  is the hidden dimension of the LLM model, and  $N$  denotes the total number of experts per layer. Then the resulting values undergo a softmax operation to obtain scores for each expert and the top- $k$  highest-scoring experts are selected, where  $k$  represents the number of activated experts, as the following equation:

$$G(x) = \text{TopK}(\text{Softmax}(x \cdot W_g)). \quad (1)$$

Then, each activated expert calculates the corresponding output using  $x$ . Finally, the outputs from these activated  $k$  experts are combined to generate the output of the MoE layer



(a) Layer-wise hybrid framework



(b) Expert-wise hybrid framework

Figure 3. The memory hierarchy and the data assignment in hybrid MoE offloading frameworks.

according to the following formula:

$$MoE_o = \sum_{i=1}^k G(x)_i \cdot E(x)_i, \quad (2)$$


where  $E(x)_i$  denotes the output of the  $i$ -th selected expert,  $G(x)_i$  is the activated score of the  $i$ -th selected expert.

### 2.2 MoE Offloading

Offloading frameworks alleviate the storage challenges posed by large-scale MoE models by offloading model parameters to secondary storage media such as DRAM, SSD, or HDD, thereby mitigating GPU memory pressure without sacrificing model expressiveness. Conventional offloading methods[2, 18, 23, 26, 30, 32, 35, 42], such as DeepSpeed[30] and FlexGen[32], are primarily designed for dense LLMs and must fetch all model parameters, incurring unnecessary communication overhead when applied to MoE architectures due to their inherently sparse activation patterns.

Recently, several offloading frameworks specifically tailored for MoE models have been proposed[4, 12, 17, 20, 24, 25, 36, 39, 40, 44, 45]. Although these frameworks introduce innovative prefetching techniques and caching strategies, they still require experts to be transferred to GPUs before execution. Due to PCIe bandwidth limitations and the substantial parameter counts of MoE, transferring expert parameters to GPUs introduces considerable latency overhead.

To mitigate this problem, recent studies[17, 24, 25, 45] propose hybrid MoE offloading systems, effectively leveraging CPU computational resources for offloaded expert-related computations, thereby significantly reducing PCIe transfers and enhancing inference speed. Nevertheless, these existing solutions exhibit several critical shortcomings. As shown in Figure 3a, layer-wise hybrid frameworks like Ktransformers[5] and llama.cpp[17] assign the first  $l$  layers to the CPU and layers  $l$  through  $L$  to the GPU, executing each MoE layer exclusively on one device. However, the layers on the CPU would incur significant inference latency when expert workloads become large, due to inherently slower CPU performance. Expert-wise hybrid frameworks such as



**Figure 4.** Comparison of execution time between CPU- and GPU-assigned experts under different batch sizes. The prefill and decoding length are both 32.


Fiddler[24] and HybriMoE[45] mitigate this problem by allocating experts based on workload size, as shown in Figure 3b. However, such static allocation strategies neglect real-time CPU-GPU load imbalances and result in inefficient utilization of heterogeneous computational resources, ultimately increasing inference latency. MoE-Lightning [4] adopts a performance-analysis model to offline-search deployment strategies, but it insufficiently models MoE characteristics and thus performs poorly.

### 3 Motivation

#### 3.1 The Necessity of Dynamic Expert Assignment

Due to PCIe bandwidth limitations and the large number of MoE expert parameters, an increasing number of MoE offloading frameworks adopt hybrid CPU-GPU execution to accelerate inference[17, 24, 25, 45]. Thanks to assign experts instead of layers to either CPU or GPU, *expert-wise hybrid frameworks*[24, 45] can perform high-workload expert computation on GPU and achieve better performance than *layer-wise hybrid frameworks*[17, 25]. However, existing expert-wise works[24, 45] assign experts purely based on workload, i.e., low-workload experts are executed on the CPU, while high-workload experts are transferred to the GPU for computation. This manner overlooks the parallel characteristics of heterogeneous systems and introduces serious CPU-GPU load imbalance. As shown in Figure 4, we measure the execution time of CPU- and GPU-assigned experts under the assignment policy of Fiddler[24] on DeepSeek-V2-Lite and Qwen-1.5 across different batch sizes. The significant gap between CPU and GPU execution time indicates severe imbalance. When the batch size is small, the experts’ workloads are often light, so the static assignment allocates most experts to the CPU, leading to much longer CPU execution time. The GPU idles waiting for the CPU, yielding low GPU utilization. As batch size grows, more high-workload experts emerge, and the imbalance reverses.

To address this, we propose a workload-aware **Greedy Assignment** strategy. We first formulate expert assignment as a 0-1 integer optimization problem that explicitly captures system parallelism to derive an optimal expert execution



**Figure 5.** Proportion of PCIe transfer time relative to total inference time under various batch sizes. The prefill and decoding length are both 32. ‘BS’ denotes the batch size. As shown in ‘Average’, with our proposed techniques, DALI significantly reduces PCIe traffic compared against HybriMoE.

schedule between CPU and GPU. To mitigate the high latency overhead of precise solving, we further introduce a heuristic greedy strategy that achieves near-optimal assignment with significantly lower solving latency.

#### 3.2 The Importance of Optimizing Prefetching

Although expert-wise hybrid frameworks significantly improve inference efficiency, especially with our Greedy Assignment strategy, PCIe transfer of the experts assigned to the GPU still remains a dominant performance bottleneck. As shown in Figure 5, PCIe transfer accounts for up to 78.1% of total execution time under hybrid execution, underscoring the urgency to reduce communication overhead.

Prefetching is a widely adopted technique to overlap computation and communication, effectively hiding PCIe latency in series of MoE offloading frameworks[3, 11–13, 20, 38, 40, 44, 45]. However, unlike prior frameworks that need all activated experts on the GPU, hybrid MoE framework only assigns high-workload experts to the GPU. This places stricter demands on prefetching: it must accurately prefetch experts with large workloads. As shown in Table 2, when adopting the prefetching method in statistical-based EdgeMoE[39] and feature-based HybriMoE[45] to prefetch high-workload experts, the prefetch mechanism shows poor accuracy. Much worse, as illustrated in Figure 6, low prediction accuracy results in minimal performance gains from prefetching due to the necessary re-fetch when prefetch misses, motivating the need for a more accurate strategy tailored to high-workload expert prediction in hybrid frameworks.


To this end, inspired by the residual between layers, we propose a **Residual-Based Prefetching** strategy. It uses the residual information between adjacent MoE layers to improve the precision of prefetching high-workload experts, thus unleashing acceleration benefits from prefetching.

#### 3.3 Challenge in Cache Utilization

To better utilize the limited GPU memory, many prior MoE offloading frameworks maintain an expert cache on the GPU to store a subset of experts[38, 44, 45]. Upon the expert cache

**Table 2.** Prefetch accuracy for predicting experts with different workload levels. Topk= $k$  indicates prediction of the top  $k$  most high-workload experts.


		Method	Batch size			
			8	16	32	64
DeepSeek-V2-Lite	Topk=1	EdgeMoE	35.3%	24.5%	14.6%	11.8%
		HybriMoE	36.7%	32.7%	35.8%	40.6%
	Topk=2	EdgeMoE	34.7%	25.0%	20.1%	15.4%
		HybriMoE	45.0%	40.1%	39.3%	38.9%
Mixtral-8x7B	Topk=1	EdgeMoE	25.7%	25.4%	28.6%	30.9%
		HybriMoE	51.1%	53.4%	48.4%	46.8%
	Topk=2	EdgeMoE	40.3%	40.1%	44.7%	48.5%
		HybriMoE	65.2%	63.7%	58.9%	56.4%




**Figure 6.** Speedup achieved by HybriMoE’s prefetching strategy compared to no prefetching under different batch sizes on DeepSeek-V2-Lite and Mixtral-8x7B.

hit, the data traffic between CPU and GPU can be avoided. However, due to the input-dependent expert activation, the set of experts used during inference varies dynamically. As a result, cache replacement policies are crucial to maintaining high cache hit rates. Existing methods, such as FastMoE[12] adopts traditional LRU policies, while HybriMoE[45] uses activation scores of experts to update the cache. However, in expert-wise MoE offloading frameworks, GPUs primarily compute high-workload experts, which implies that cached experts should preferentially be high-workload ones. Unfortunately, as shown in Figure 7, neither LRU nor score-based strategies (e.g., HybriMoE) consider expert workload, resulting in poor cache hit rates, which severely limits the benefits from caching.

MoE experts are typically responsible for different knowledge domains, and adjacent tokens within a sequence often share similar semantics[15, 46, 47]. Motivated by this, we investigate the temporal locality of high-workload expert usage—specifically, whether experts with high workload at token  $i$  tend to remain high-workload at token  $i + 1$ . Figure 8 presents a heatmap where each cell at position  $(m, n)$  records the frequency with which expert  $m$  is a high-workload expert at token  $i$  and expert  $n$  is high-workload at token  $i + 1$ . The pronounced diagonal pattern in the heatmap indicates that if an expert is high-workload for token  $i$ , it is highly likely to remain so for token  $i + 1$ .



**Figure 7.** Cache hit rates of LRU and HybriMoE’s replacement strategies under different cache sizes on DeepSeek-V2-Lite and Mixtral-8x7B. Cache size is measured in the number of cached experts in each MoE layer.



**Figure 8.** Correlation of high-workload expert activation between adjacent tokens in layers 1, 4, 8, and 16 of Mixtral-8x7B. The x- and y-axes represent high-workload experts (top 3 by workload) activated for adjacent tokens.

Based on this observation, we design a **Workload-Aware Cache Replacement** strategy, which updates the expert cache according to the workload history of previous tokens, significantly improving cache hit rates and leading to further acceleration of MoE offloading inference.

## 4 Design

Figure 9 illustrates the overview of our DALI framework. During deployment, all expert weights are stored in CPU DRAM. Additionally, for each MoE layer, we randomly select a fixed number of experts (defined as *cache\_size*) to be cached in GPU memory as an expert cache. When performing the MoE layer computation, DALI first determines the expert assignment across CPU and GPU using our proposed Greedy Assignment strategy at runtime, based on the current layer’s expert activation pattern. The activated experts are then processed in parallel by CPU and GPU. Meanwhile, a separate work stream is launched to execute our Residual-Based Prefetching strategy, which predicts and prefetches high-workload experts required for the next MoE layer. If an




Figure 9. The overview of our DALI framework.

expert assigned to the GPU is already cached in GPU memory, its parameters are directly used for computation ( $E_1$ ). Otherwise, the expert weights are loaded from DRAM to GPU ( $E_3, E_7$ ). DALI updates the expert cache using our Workload-Aware Cache Replacement policy to maintain high cache hit rates. The above process is repeated iteratively until the inference is complete.

#### 4.1 Greedy Assignment Strategy

To achieve load balance between the CPU and GPU, and identify the optimal expert assignment schedule for reducing the inference latency, we propose a Greedy Assignment strategy exploiting the heterogeneous hardware characteristics and workload properties.

To minimize the execution time of the MoE layer, we first formulate the following optimization objective:

$$\min \max(T_{\text{gpu}}, T_{\text{cpu}}), \quad (3)$$

where  $T_{\text{gpu}}$  and  $T_{\text{cpu}}$  represent the total execution times of experts assigned to the GPU and CPU, respectively. Due to the parallelism of heterogeneous systems, the MoE layer's latency is determined by the slower of the two devices.

To obtain the optimal assignment schedule, We use two binary vectors,  $C, G \in \{0, 1\}^N$ , to denote the assignment of  $N$  routed experts:  $C_i = 1$  indicates that expert  $i$  is assigned to the CPU, while  $G_i = 1$  denotes assignment to the GPU. The CPU execution time is calculated as:

$$T_{\text{cpu}} = \sum_{i=1}^N t_{\text{cpu}}(w_i) \cdot C_i, \quad (4)$$

where  $w_i$  is the workload of expert  $i$ , and  $t_{\text{cpu}}(w_i)$  gets the execution time of expert  $i$  on the CPU for the given workload. The GPU execution time is calculated as:

$$T_{\text{gpu}} = \sum_{i=1}^N t_{\text{gpu}}(w_i) \cdot G_i, \quad (5)$$

where  $t_{\text{gpu}}(w_i) = \max(\text{Trans}_{\text{expert}}(w_i), \text{compute}_{\text{expert}}(w_i))$ ,  $\text{Trans}_{\text{expert}}(w_i)$  denotes the time for PCIe transmission of expert  $i$ , and  $\text{compute}_{\text{expert}}(w_i)$  denotes the GPU execution time of expert  $i$ . Due to pipeline parallelism, the GPU execution time for an expert is the maximum of these two. The  $\text{Trans}_{\text{expert}}(w_i)$  is defined as:

$$\text{Trans}_{\text{expert}}(w_i) = \begin{cases} 0, & w_i = 0 \\ \text{trans\_time}, & w_i > 0 \end{cases}, \quad (6)$$

#### Algorithm 1 Greedy Assignment Strategy

```

1:  $C = [0, \dots, 0]_N, G = [0, \dots, 0]_N$ 
2:  $T_{\text{cpu}} = 0, T_{\text{gpu}} = 0$ 
3:  $t_{\text{gpu}} = [t_{\text{gpu}}(w_1), \dots, t_{\text{gpu}}(w_N)]$ 
4:  $t_{\text{cpu}} = [t_{\text{cpu}}(w_1), \dots, t_{\text{cpu}}(w_N)]$ 
5:  $\text{sorted\_indices} = \text{argsort}(|t_{\text{gpu}} - t_{\text{cpu}}|, \text{descending} = \text{True})$ 
6: for all  $\text{idx} \in \text{sorted\_indices}$  do
7:    $\text{gpu\_time} = t_{\text{gpu}}[\text{idx}]$ 
8:    $\text{cpu\_time} = t_{\text{cpu}}[\text{idx}]$ 
9:   if  $\text{gpu\_time} == 0 \ \&\& \ \text{cpu\_time} == 0$  then
10:    continue
11:   end if
12:   if  $T_{\text{gpu}} + \text{gpu\_time} \leq T_{\text{cpu}} + \text{cpu\_time}$  then
13:      $G[\text{idx}] = 1$ 
14:      $T_{\text{gpu}} = T_{\text{gpu}} + \text{gpu\_time}$ 
15:   else
16:      $C[\text{idx}] = 1$ 
17:      $T_{\text{cpu}} = T_{\text{cpu}} + \text{cpu\_time}$ 
18:   end if
19: end for
20: return  $C, G$ 

```

where  $\text{trans\_time}$  represents the time required to transfer the weights of a single expert from DRAM to GPU via PCIe. All hardware-specific timing values (e.g.,  $\text{trans\_time}$ ,  $t_{\text{cpu}}(w_i)$ ) can be obtained through warm-up profiling before execution and can be reused for later inference.

In addition to timing considerations, the optimization of Equation (3) is subject to the following constraints:

##### 1. Expert activation constraint:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (C_i + G_i) = \text{expert\_num}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\text{expert\_num}$  is the total number of activated experts in the MoE layer for given inputs.

##### 2. Mutual exclusion constraint:

$$0 \leq C_i + G_i \leq 1, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (8)$$

This constraint indicates that each expert can only be assigned to either the CPU or the GPU, not both. When  $C_i = G_i = 0$ , it means expert  $i$  is not activated.

##### 3. GPU memory constraint:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N G_i \cdot \text{size}(E_i) \leq M_{\text{gpu}}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\text{size}(E_i)$  denotes the memory required by expert  $i$ , and this constraint ensures that the total memory consumption on the GPU does not exceed its memory capacity  $M_{\text{gpu}}$ .

By solving the optimization problem in Equation (3) under these constraints, we obtain the optimal assignment of activated experts, which greatly improves the computation efficiency. However, the precise solving process introduces significant latency overhead and diminishes the performance

gain. Therefore, we propose a heuristic Greedy Assignment strategy that approximates the optimal solution with minimal solving cost, thereby further accelerating MoE inference.

Algorithm 1 illustrates our Greedy Assignment strategy. The key idea of the greedy strategy is to prioritize assigning experts whose CPU and GPU execution times differ most significantly to reduce overall inference latency. First, we initialize the assignment variables  $C$  and  $G$ , as well as the total execution times  $T_{\text{gpu}}$  and  $T_{\text{cpu}}$ . Next, based on the expert activation of each token, we obtain the workload of each expert and compute its expected execution time on both CPU and GPU using  $t_{\text{cpu}}(w_i)$  and  $t_{\text{gpu}}(w_i)$ , as shown in lines 1-4. In line 5, we sort the experts in descending order based on the absolute difference between their CPU and GPU execution times. The algorithm then iterates over this list: for each expert, if assigning it to the GPU results in a lower cumulative latency than assigning it to the CPU, it is allocated to the GPU (lines 12-14); otherwise, it is assigned to the CPU (lines 15-17). Moreover, if an expert is not activated, we do not assign it (lines 9-10).

After all experts have been processed, the Greedy Assignment strategy yields the final assignment vectors  $C$  and  $G$ , which will be used in the subsequent expert computation. Experiments demonstrate that the assignment schedule produced by the greedy strategy achieves up to 92% of the performance of the optimal solution, while incurring only 5% (v.s. 55% of the optimal solution) end-to-end latency overhead. This enhances the acceleration benefit brought by dynamic assignment and further improves the inference performance.

## 4.2 Residual-Based Prefetching

As analyzed in Section 3.2, previous approaches suffer from extremely low accuracy in prefetching high-workload experts, which severely limits the potential acceleration benefit from prefetching. To address this, we propose a Residual-Based Prefetching method that leverages the residual between adjacent MoE layer features to adjust the features used for prefetching. This significantly improves the accuracy of the high-workload expert prefetching, thereby improving the inference speedup.

Figure 10 presents our Residual-Based Prefetching method. Firstly, our approach adopts the feature-based prefetching scheme: it uses the input features of the current MoE layer’s gate function and the gate function of the next MoE layer to predict which experts will be activated in the next layer. However, as our analyses indicate, naïvely using only the raw input features results in very low accuracy when predicting high-workload experts. Therefore, inspired by the similarity between inputs of adjacent MoE gate functions due to residual connections, our Residual-Based Prefetching strategy further applies a residual correction to the current input features. This makes them better approximate the next MoE layer’s gating input (measured by the cosine similarity analyzed in Appendix A.5) and thus improves the accuracy of expert




Figure 10. Illustration of our Residual-Based Prefetching method.

activation prediction. The transformation is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}^{(l)} &= \text{hidden\_states}^{(l)} + \text{res\_vec}^{(l)}, \\ \text{predict\_expert}^{(l+1)} &= \text{gate\_func}^{(l+1)}(\tilde{h}^{(l)}), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $\text{hidden\_states}^{(l)}$  is the input to the  $l$ -th MoE gate,  $\text{res\_vec}^{(l)}$  is the layer-specific residual vector of layer  $l$ , and  $\text{gate\_func}^{(l+1)}$  is the gate function for layer  $l+1$ . The  $\text{res\_vec}^{(l)}$  has the same dimension with the  $\text{hidden\_states}^{(l)}$  along the feature axis, and is shared across all tokens. Once the predicted activated experts of the next layer obtained, we count the number of tokens routed to each expert, and the top- $k$  high-workload experts are selected for prefetching.


Note that obtaining the residual vector requires no fine-tuning or retraining. It can be constructed offline by running inference on a small calibration dataset (described in Section 6.1) and can be reused on various downstream tasks. The residual vector for layer  $l$  is computed as:

$$\text{res\_vec}^{(l)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \text{hidden\_states}_i^{(l+1)} - \text{hidden\_states}_i^{(l)} \right), \quad (11)$$

where  $N$  is the number of tokens in the calibration dataset. Each MoE layer maintains its own residual vector, except for the last one, which does not require prefetching for any subsequent layer.

## 4.3 Workload-Aware Cache Replacement

As analyzed in Section 3.3, prior works ignore the influence of dynamic workloads when designing cache replacement strategies for the expert cache on the GPU, resulting in low cache hit rates. Fortunately, our analysis reveals a strong correlation in high-workload expert activations between adjacent tokens. Motivated by this observation, we propose a Workload-Aware Cache Replacement strategy that updates the expert cache based on dynamic workload patterns. This approach significantly improves the cache hit rate and, in turn, accelerates the inference performance of our DALI framework.



**Figure 11.** Workload-Aware Cache Replacement Strategy. Here,  $cache\_size = 4$ ,  $w_{size} = 4$ ,  $u_{size} = 2$ , each layer totally has 8 experts, and  $S_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th sequence in a batch of size  $b$ .

Figure 11 and Algorithm 2 illustrate the cache workflow within a single MoE layer with our proposed Workload-Aware Cache Replacement strategy. Each MoE layer maintains  $n$  experts ( $cache\_size$ ) in GPU memory and performs cache replacement independently following this procedure. All experts also reside in CPU memory. Initially, we set the workload score of each expert to zero and track expert IDs using two sets:  $expert\_on\_gpu$  for those experts currently cached on GPU, and  $expert\_on\_cpu$  for those not on GPU, as shown in lines 1-3. We then define a sliding token window of size  $w_{size}$ . Within each window, the strategy obtains the workloads of experts for each token (line 5) and updates workload scores accordingly (line 6). Specifically, the accumulated workload score  $s_k$  for expert  $k$  is calculated as:

$$s_k = \sum_{i=1}^{w_{size}} workload_i^k, \quad (12)$$

where  $workload_i$  is an  $N$ -dimensional vector representing the workload distribution of  $N$  experts when processing the  $i$ -th token in the current window and  $workload_i^k$  denotes the workload of expert  $k$ . After processing a window of  $w_{size}$  tokens (line 9), we perform the cache replacement: we select the  $u_{size}$  experts with the highest scores from the CPU (line 10) and the  $u_{size}$  experts with the lowest scores from the GPU (line 11). Selected experts on GPU are replaced by the selected experts on CPU to maximize cache utility. After the replacement, we update the  $expert\_on\_gpu$  and  $expert\_on\_cpu$ , and the scores ( $s$ ) are reset to zero. Then, the strategy continues performing the above process using newly generated tokens until the inference process is complete.

Moreover, the expert cache can cooperate with our Greedy Assignment strategy: if an expert is already resident on the

## Algorithm 2 Workload-Aware Cache Replacement

```

1:  $s = [0, 0, \dots, 0]^N$ 
2:  $expert\_on\_gpu = \{e_1^{gpu}, e_2^{gpu}, \dots, e_n^{gpu}\}$ 
3:  $expert\_on\_cpu = \{e_1^{cpu}, e_2^{cpu}, \dots, e_m^{cpu}\}$ 
4: for  $i = 0$  to  $max\_length - 1$  do
5:    $workload_i = get\_workload(x_i)$ 
6:    $s = s + workload_i$ 
7:   if  $token_i == EOS$  then
8:     break
9:   else if  $i \bmod w_{size} == 0$  then
10:     $cpu\_trans\_ind = TopK(s[expert\_on\_cpu])$ 
11:     $gpu\_evict\_ind = TopK(s[expert\_on\_gpu])$ 
12:    Evict experts on GPU with indices in  $gpu\_evict\_ind$ 
13:    Transfer experts from CPU to GPU with indices in  $cpu\_trans\_ind$ 
14:    Update  $expert\_on\_gpu$  and  $expert\_on\_cpu$ 
15:     $s = [0, 0, \dots, 0]^N$ 
16:   end if
17: end for

```

GPU, its PCIe transfer cost is treated as zero, and only its GPU compute time is counted during scheduling.

## 5 Implementation

We implement our proposed DALI framework based on the open-source KTransformers framework[25]. To support expert-wise hybrid execution, we first extend it with over 1,000 lines of C++ and 2,000 lines of Python code. In addition, we develop three key modules: `plan_solver`, `prefetch_tool`, and `cache_tool` to support our Greedy Assignment, Residual-Based Prefetching, and Workload-Aware Cache Replacement techniques, respectively. All modules are encapsulated into user-friendly APIs.


## 6 Evaluation

### 6.1 Experimental Setup

**1) Models.** We evaluate DALI on three widely-used, open-sourced MoE models: DeepSeek-V2-Lite-Chat (DeepSeek), Qwen3-30B-A3B (Qwen), and Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct (Mixtral). The details of the used MoEs are summarized in Table 3.

**2) Datasets.** We evaluate on two standard LLM datasets: C4[28] and Wikitext[27]. To construct the residual vector used in Residual-Based Prefetching, we sample 1K sequences from Wikitext to form a calibration dataset and perform inference to collect token-level features. Then we can obtain the residual vector as Equation 11. For speed benchmarking, we sample input sequences from the C4 dataset.

**3) Baselines.** We compare with four state-of-the-art MoE offloading frameworks: llama.cpp [17], KTransformers [5], MoE-Lightning [4], and HybriMoE [45]. Ktransformers and llama.cpp are layer-wise hybrid frameworks and assign MoE layers to either the CPU or GPU. MoE-Lightning searches the



**Figure 12.** Comparison of decoding speed across different models and batch sizes. For all models, the cache ratio is 50% and  $w_{size} = 4$ . For Mixtral,  $u_{size} = 1$  and the prefetch size is 1. For DeepSeek and Qwen,  $u_{size}=8$  and the prefetch size is 4.

**Table 3.** The configuration of the used MoE architectures.

	DeepSeek	Qwen	Mixtral
Layers	27	48	32
Hidden size	2048	2048	4096
Shared Experts per Layer	2	0	0
Routed Experts per Layer	64	128	8
Activated Experts	6	8	2


optimal model deployment strategy before inference based on its proposed performance analysis model. HybriMoE is an expert-wise hybrid framework and incorporates both expert prefetching and caching techniques. To ensure a fair comparison, we set the number of CPU cores to 16 and threads to 32 for all frameworks. We also ensure that all frameworks use comparable GPU memory. For HybriMoE and DALI, we cache the same number of experts on GPU. For MoE-Lightning, llama.cpp and KTransformers, which do not support expert caching on GPU, we control the number of MoE layers stored and executed on the GPU in these frameworks to maintain a comparable memory usage with that of DALI and HybriMoE.

**4) Metrics.** The inference of MoE models is divided into the prefill and decoding phases. We evaluate the two phases separately (*prefill speed* and *decoding speed*), using tokens per second (tokens/s) as the performance metric. The average speed across all sequences in a batch is reported as the speed metric of this batch. If not specific, for prefill benchmarks, the prompt length is set to 64, and for decoding benchmarks, we set the prompt length and generated lengths both to 64.

**5) Hardware Platform.** All experiments are conducted on a platform equipped with an AMD EPYC 7532 CPU with 64 cores, 256GB DDR4 DRAM, an NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU (24GB memory), and PCIe 4.0  $\times 16$  interface.

## 6.2 Overall Results


As shown in Figure 12, we compare decoding speed under various batch sizes. Since Fiddler is much slower than DALI




**Figure 13.** Prefill speed on DeepSeek under varying batch sizes.

(on average 14.3 $\times$ ), we omit its detailed comparisons. Compared with llama.cpp, KTransformers, MoE-Lightning, and HybriMoE, DALI achieves average speedups of 3.97 $\times$ , 2.16 $\times$ , 1.48 $\times$ , and 1.32 $\times$ , respectively. The speedup over KTransformers and llama.cpp is particularly significant, mainly because our Greedy Assignment strategy enables effective utilization of both CPU and GPU resources for MoE computation. In contrast, KTransformers and llama.cpp uses a static layer-wise mapping that prevents parallel execution, failing to leverage heterogeneous hardware effectively, especially when processing high-workload experts. Compared with MoE-Lightning, DALI avoids numerous asynchronous transfers and frequent stream switches by combining accurate prefetching and caching, and MoE-Lightning’s fixed CPU/GPU placement before inference makes it poorly suited to MoE’s dynamic workload patterns. Compared with HybriMoE, DALI further improves performance through dynamic expert planning to better utilize CPU-GPU parallelism, while our Residual-Based Prefetching and Workload-Aware Cache Replacement strategies significantly reduce PCIe communication overhead, providing additional speedup.

Figure 13 presents the prefill speed under different batch sizes for DeepSeek. On average, DALI achieves speedups of 7.62 $\times$ , 3.80 $\times$ , 2.45 $\times$  and 2.00 $\times$  over llama.cpp, KTransformers, MoE-Lightning, and HybriMoE, respectively. The performance gain over KTransformers and llama.cpp is substantial, largely due to their limited use of GPU resources. Since the CPU is not well-suited for high-workload tasks, especially at large batch sizes, their performance deteriorates quickly.



**Figure 14.** Comparison of decoding speed between HybriMoE and DALI using their respective assignment strategies.



**Figure 15.** Decoding speed comparison between greedy assignment and optimal assignment strategies.

**Table 4.** MoE spent time (s) comparison between different expert assignment strategies. Decoding length = 32.

Batch Size	Opt_plan	Greedy
DeepSeek		
16	12.4	14.4 (↓14%)
32	19.7	22.4 (↓12%)
Mixtral		
16	22.6	26.7 (↓15%)
32	28.0	30.4 (↓7.8%)


Compared to HybriMoE, our framework also obtains significant performance improvements thanks to our dynamic expert assignment strategy and the optimization on prefetching and caching.

### 6.3 Breakdown Analysis


To analyze where our gains come from and demonstrate the effectiveness of our three proposed techniques separately, we conduct more detailed breakdown analyses.

**1) Benefit of Greedy Assignment Strategy.** Figure 14 shows the speedup achieved by our Greedy Assignment strategy. To isolate the impact of assignment policies, both HybriMoE and DALI are configured to use only their assignment strategies (i.e., without prefetching and caching techniques). Compared to “Naive”, which computes all experts on the CPU without any scheduling strategy, HybriMoE and our greedy strategy achieve average speedups of 3.58× and 4.42×, respectively. Furthermore, our greedy strategy outperforms HybriMoE’s by 23% because our greedy assignment achieves better load balance between the CPU and GPU and fully exploits the heterogeneous hardware resources.

Although solving the 0-1 optimization problem yields the optimal expert assignment, its runtime solving cost is prohibitively high. To balance efficiency and quality, we develop a heuristic Greedy Assignment. As shown in Figure 15, our greedy strategy achieves a 1.70× speedup over the “Opt\_plan” method, which first solves the 0-1 optimization problem and performs the MoE computation according to the optimal expert assignment. While “Opt\_plan” provides a theoretically optimal assignment, its solving overhead largely diminishes



**Figure 16.** (a) Speedup comparison of different prefetching methods. Each method prefetches two experts. (b) Prefetch accuracy comparison using different methods on Mixtral. *Top-k* indicates prefetching the top-k highest-workload experts.




**Figure 17.** (a) Decoding speed comparison between HybriMoE’s update strategy and our workload-aware strategy under different cache ratios. Batch size is 4. (b) Cache hit rate comparison across different update strategies on Mixtral. Batch size is 4.


its acceleration benefit. In contrast, the greedy strategy delivers near-optimal assignments with negligible cost: the latency overhead introduced by the greedy strategy is only 4.5% (v.s. 55%) of the total inference time. Moreover, as shown in Table 4, when comparing only the MoE execution time (excluding solving costs), the greedy schedule attains up to 92% of the performance of the optimal solution.

To further illustrate the effect of our Greedy Assignment on balancing workload, we compare CPU and GPU execution times of HybriMoE and DALI in Appendix A.1. Moreover, we provide a more detailed analyses on the latency overhead introduced by our greedy strategy in Appendix A.4. DALI develops a Greedy Assignment strategy to obtain a near-optimal assignment while significantly reducing the solving cost. In addition, we also explore the effects of other approximate solving methods, such as beam search, in Appendix A.2.

**2) Benefit of Prefetching.** Figure 16a evaluates various prefetching strategies on Mixtral. “Naive” denotes the baseline using only Greedy Assignment (built on KTransformers), “Random” performs random prefetching, and “HybriMoE” adopts its own prefetching method. “Random” performs worse than “Naive” due to frequent stalls caused by incorrect prefetches. HybriMoE provides modest improvement but suffers from low accuracy in identifying high-workload experts. In contrast, our Residual-Based Prefetching significantly improves prediction accuracy, resulting in larger



**Figure 18.** (a) Decoding speed on Mixtral with varying numbers of prefetched experts (‘PS’ denotes the prefetch size). (b) Decoding speed on Mixtral with varying numbers of cached experts on GPU. (c) Cache hit rate of the Workload-Aware Cache Replacement strategy on DeepSeek under different  $w_{size}$  and  $u_{size}$  configurations. Batch size is 4. (d) Cache hit rate changes across layers during token generation on Mixtral, when caching 4 experts per layer. Batch size = 4, decoding length = 64,  $w_{size} = 8$ ,  $u_{size} = 1$ . We report the average hit rate of every 8 tokens as a group.



**Figure 19.** Breakdown analysis of performance gains. In each group, from the second bar, the right bar includes one more optimization than the adjacent left bar. ‘Naive’ refers to the case without any optimization and offload all experts on CPU using Ktransformers. Cache ratio is 25%, prefetch size is 1 (Mixtral) and 8 (Qwen).

speedups. Figure 16b further compares prefetch accuracy on Mixtral. Our method consistently achieves the highest accuracy on high-workload experts. To explain why our Residual-Based Prefetching is effective, we provide a further analyses from the perspective of the cosine similarity in Appendix A.5.

**3) Benefit of Cache Replacement Strategy.** Figure 17a compares the inference speed when employing different GPU cache replacement strategies. The cache ratio denotes the proportion of experts cached on the GPU. Compared to HybriMoE, which replaces cache based on expert activation score, our Workload-Aware Cache Strategy achieves a 1.23 $\times$  speedup. This is because our strategy more effectively captures the expert utilization in dynamic workload scenarios, resulting in higher cache hit rates and reduced PCIe traffic. Figure 17b shows the comparisons on cache hit rates under different cache ratios when applying various replacement strategies. Our workload-aware method consistently outperforms both LRU and HybriMoE’s score-based approach.

**4) Overall Breakdown.** Figure 19 presents the individual performance gains from each technique. Compared to ‘Naive’, the Greedy Assignment Strategy delivers a 4.1 $\times$  speedup—the most significant among the three. This is because it maximizes heterogeneous resource utilization by

intelligently assigning experts across CPU and GPU. Prefetching yields a marginal 9% gain, mainly due to two reasons: (1) prefetching requires additional gating computations for prediction, and (2) it incurs CUDA stream switching overhead, which both partially diminish the benefits. Finally, our cache technique contributes a further 38% speedup, as our Workload-Aware Cache Replacement strategy improves cache hit rate, thereby reducing PCIe communication overhead and accelerating overall inference.

#### 6.4 Sensitivity Analysis

In this section, we explore how the inference speed of our DALI varies with key parameters such as prefetch size, cache ratio,  $w_{size}$ , and  $u_{size}$ .

**1) Effect of Prefetch Size on Inference Speed.** Figure 18a shows the inference speed on Mixtral as we vary the number of experts being prefetched. We observe that prefetching only one expert—the one with the highest predicted workload—yields the best performance. The reasons are twofold: (1) the expert with the highest workload predicted by residual-based prefetching is often actually used on the GPU, thus reducing the prediction error rate, and (2) as more experts are prefetched, the computation time becomes insufficient to overlap the communication cost, resulting in reduced speed.

**2) Effect of Cached Expert Count on Inference Speed.** Figure 18b shows decoding speed as we increase the number of experts cached per layer on Mixtral. The decoding speed improves with the increased cache size, demonstrating the scalability of our Workload-Aware Cache Replacement strategy with respect to cache capacity.

**3) Impact of  $w_{size}$  and  $u_{size}$  on Cache Hit Rate.** Figure 18c presents cache hit rates under different configurations of  $w_{size}$  and  $u_{size}$ . We observe that smaller  $w_{size}$  values lead to higher hit rates, indicating that more frequent cache replacement helps improve cache utility. Similarly, larger  $u_{size}$  values (i.e., more experts replaced per update) also improve the hit rate. However, frequent or large-scale replacement incurs substantial latency overhead, which may diminish

the performance gains from higher cache efficiency. Thus, a trade-off must be maintained when tuning these parameters. Therefore, we explore how  $w_{\text{size}}$  and  $u_{\text{size}}$  affect inference speed, as shown in Appendix A.6. Finally, to maximize the inference speed, we select (4, 8) for Qwen and DeepSeek, and (4, 1) for Mixtral.

**4) Cache Hit Rate Varies as Token Generation.** Our Workload-Aware Cache Replacement strategy updates experts based on their historical workload in processing previous tokens. In Figure 18d, we analyze how the cache hit rate varies as a sequence is progressively generated. We find that the hit rate consistently increases and eventually reaches up to 100%. This indicates that our strategy exhibits strong domain adaptability, progressively updating the cached experts to better match the current sequence, thereby improving reuse and reducing PCIe communication.

## 6.5 Discussion

**1) Performance under Varying Decoding Lengths.** To evaluate the generality of DALI across different sequence lengths, we set the batch size to 16 and the prompt length to 32, and measure decoding performance on Mixtral with decoding lengths of 128, 256, 512, and 1024. Experimental results show that DALI achieves average speedups of 2.78 $\times$ , 1.96 $\times$ , and 1.47 $\times$  over llama.cpp, KTransformers, and HybriMoE, respectively. This demonstrates that DALI consistently outperforms existing MoE offloading systems across a range of decoding scenarios. The more detailed experimental results are shown in Appendix A.7.


**2) Applicability to Multi-GPU Platform.** While DALI targets MoE inference on personal computers equipped with a single CPU and GPU, we further evaluate its generalizability in a multi-GPU setup (1 CPU + 2 GPUs, as described in Section 6.1). During the decoding phase, DALI achieves average speedups of 3.43 $\times$ , 1.87 $\times$ , and 1.32 $\times$  over llama.cpp, KTransformers, and HybriMoE, respectively, demonstrating strong scalability. As DALI is designed for single-CPU/GPU edge environments, further exploration of distributed environments and high CPU-GPU bandwidth server systems (e.g., GH200) will be pursued as future work.

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we propose DALI, an MoE offloading inference framework tailored to heterogeneous hardware and the characteristics of MoE models. First, we introduce a Greedy Assignment strategy that dynamically allocates experts across CPU and GPU to fully leverage their respective hardware resources. Second, to reduce PCIe transfer overhead, we propose a Residual-Based Prefetching method that improves prefetch accuracy by correcting features with cross-layer residuals. Third, we develop a Workload-Aware Cache Replacement strategy that updates the cached expert based on the workload history, obtaining significantly higher cache

hit rates. Extensive experiments compared with the prior arts demonstrate the superiority of our DALI.

## A Appendix



**Figure 20.** Comparison of MoE execution time on CPU/GPU in HybriMoE and DALI.

**Table 5.** The prefetch accuracy on different downstream tasks.


	Method	Arc-e	Arc-c	OBQA	RTE	Average
DeepSeek	HybriMoE	75.7%	75.5%	69.8%	69.6%	72.6%
	DALI	<b>81.1%</b>	<b>79.4%</b>	<b>77.4%</b>	<b>80.1%</b>	<b>79.5%</b>
Qwen	HybriMoE	63.2%	79.0%	84.7%	83.6%	77.6%
	DALI	<b>93.0%</b>	<b>94.0%</b>	<b>92.2%</b>	<b>93.9%</b>	<b>93.3%</b>

### A.1 Further Analysis on Greedy Assignment

To illustrate the effect of our Greedy Assignment, we compare CPU and GPU execution times of HybriMoE and DALI in Figure 20. We can observe that DALI achieves a better load balance between CPU and GPU with the Greedy Assignment, and, moreover, lowers the inference latency of the MoE layer. Further analysis of the experimental results shows that, after applying the Greedy Assignment strategy, the increase in the CPU-side MoE execution time is often smaller than the reduction in the GPU-side MoE execution time. For example, on the DeepSeek model with batch size = 64, enabling Greedy Assignment increases the CPU execution time by 6.66 s, while reducing the GPU execution time by 20 s. This indicates that, through dynamic assignment, DALI offloads a portion of experts that would otherwise be executed on the GPU to the CPU, substantially reducing PCIe transfers and consequently decreasing the GPU-side MoE latency.

### A.2 Try Other Scheduling Algorithms

DALI develops a Greedy Assignment strategy to obtain a near-optimal assignment while significantly reducing the solving cost. In addition, we also explore the effects of other approximate solving methods, such as beam search. We set the beam size to 2 and score each beam by its execution time. In Figure 21, we compare the optimal plan, Greedy Assignment, and beam search in terms of MoE execution time and planning overhead. We observe that, although beam search can be slightly better than Greedy Assignment in some cases,



**Figure 21.** The MoE execution time and plan overhead comparison. The black number in each bar denotes the MoE execution time (without planning time) and the red number denotes the planning overhead.

**Table 6.** The comparisons of scheduling overhead relative to end-to-end inference between HybriMoE and DALI across various sequence lengths on DeepSeek model. Batch size is 8.

Sequence Length	32	64	256	1024	2048	Average
HybriMoE	2.87%	2.94%	3.02%	3.12%	3.08%	3.01%
DALI	4.84%	4.54%	4.51%	4.24%	4.36%	4.50%

**Table 7.** The memory usage comparisons between HybriMoE and DALI across various batch sizes. Sequence length is 64.

	Method	8	16	32	64	128
Mixtral	HybriMoE	13.4GB	13.7GB	14.1GB	15.3GB	17.8GB
	DALI	12.6GB	12.8GB	13.0GB	13.6GB	15.1GB
Qwen	HybriMoE	4.79GB	5.02GB	5.35GB	6.16GB	7.42GB
	DALI	4.79GB	4.98GB	5.28GB	5.85GB	7.02GB

it introduces substantial solving overhead (multi-beam evaluation, frequent top-k operations), which makes end-to-end inference significantly slower than DALI with Greedy Assignment.

### A.3 The Generality of Residual-Based Prefetching

Our Residual-Based Prefetching strategy pre-computes the residual vector offline on the Wikitext calibration set and reuses it for unseen tasks without fine-tuning. Since Wikitext covers various types of corpora, this residual vector remains effective on downstream tasks without fine-tuning. Using the residual vector derived from the Wikitext calibration set, we compare prefetch accuracy with HybriMoE on various downstream tasks from the EleutherAI Language Model Evaluation Harness [16]. Compared with HybriMoE, DALI significantly improves prefetch accuracy by 6.9% and 15.7% on DeepSeek and Qwen on average, respectively, demonstrating the generalization of our Residual-Based Prefetching strategy.

### A.4 Overhead Analysis

In this section, we analyze DALI’s potential overheads.

**Table 8.** In different layers, the comparisons on cosine similarity between the inputs used to predict expert activations and the ground-truth inputs for HybriMoE and DALI. Batch size is 8.

	Layer ID	1	4	8	12	16	20	23	Average
Qwen	HybriMoE	0.44	0.86	0.89	0.79	0.87	0.85	0.83	0.79
	DALI	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.93</b>
Mixtral	HybriMoE	0.47	0.81	0.81	0.84	0.84	0.87	0.88	0.79
	DALI	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.89</b>

**Table 9.** The inference speed (Tokens/s) under different ( $w_{\text{size}}$ ,  $u_{\text{size}}$ ) settings. Sequence length is 64 and batch size is 32.

	HybriMoE (2, 8)	(2, 16)	(4, 8)	(4, 16)	(8, 8)
DeepSeek	1.25	1.84	1.76	<b>1.89</b>	1.83
Qwen	1.75	1.88	1.82	<b>1.96</b>	1.92
	HybriMoE (2,1)	(2,2)	(4,1)	(4,2)	(8,1)
Mixtral	1.65	1.92	1.89	<b>2.02</b>	1.87

**1) Greedy Assignment Overhead.** DALI performs Greedy Assignment to decide expert placement dynamically at run-time. As shown in Table 6, we report the scheduling overhead relative to end-to-end inference latency across different sequence lengths and compare it with HybriMoE’s static assignment overhead. On average, HybriMoE incurs 3.01% overhead, whereas our dynamic strategy incurs 4.50%. However, as discussed in Section 6.3-1, our Greedy Assignment delivers a 4.42× end-to-end speedup, making the 4.50% overhead well justified. Moreover, we observe that, because generating each token triggers a fixed number of scheduling decisions (equal to the number of MoE layers), the fraction of latency attributable to scheduling remains essentially constant.


**2) Memory Overhead.** Table 7 compares GPU memory usage between DALI and HybriMoE. We can observe that DALI introduces no additional memory overhead; in fact, due to timely disposal of unused tensors in our implementation, DALI uses less GPU memory than HybriMoE.

### A.5 Residual-Based Prefetching Analysis

Moreover, to explain why our Residual-Based Prefetching is effective, we analyze the cosine similarity between the ground-truth input and the input used to predict in HybriMoE and DALI, as presented in Table 8. Compared to HybriMoE, our residual-corrected inputs exhibit higher cosine similarity to the ground-truth inputs, indicating that the correction brings the inputs used to predict closer to the true ones. This yields higher prediction accuracy and improves prefetch correctness.

### A.6 Explore the Setting of $w_{\text{size}}$ and $u_{\text{size}}$

In Table 9, we explore how  $w_{\text{size}}$  and  $u_{\text{size}}$  affect inference speed. Compared with (2, 8), the (2, 16) setting increases  $u_{\text{size}}$ ,



**Figure 22.** Decoding speed on DeepSeek under varying decoding lengths.

i.e., the number of experts updated per cache refresh; although it raises the cache hit rate by 4.2%, the extra PCIe cost outweighs the benefit, slowing the performance. In contrast, (4, 8) versus (8, 8) updates the cache more frequently, but its hit-rate gain (7.1%) dominates, improving overall speed. Notably, even with the slowest setting, DALI remains superior to HybriMoE (e.g., 1.76 v.s. 1.25 Tokens/s on DeepSeek). Finally, we select (4, 8) for Qwen and DeepSeek, and (4, 1) for Mixtral. Notably, even with the slowest setting, DALI remains superior to HybriMoE (e.g., 1.76 v.s. 1.25 Tokens/s on DeepSeek).

### A.7 Performance under Varying Decoding Lengths

As shown in Figure 22, we report the decoding speed under different decoding lengths. The experimental results demonstrate that DALI consistently outperforms prior methods across all decoding lengths.

## References

- [1] Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Harkirat Behl, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, Michael Harrison, Russell J. Hewett, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Weishung Liu, Caio C. T. Mendes, Anh Nguyen, Eric Price, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Xin Wang, Rachel Ward, Yue Wu, Dingli Yu, Cyril Zhang, and Yi Zhang. 2024. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219* (2024).
- [2] Keivan Alizadeh, Iman Mirzadeh, Dmitry Belenko, Karen Khatamifard, Minsik Cho, Carlo C Del Mundo, Mohammad Rastegari, and Mehrdad Farajtabar. 2023. Llm in a flash: Efficient large language model inference with limited memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11514* (2023).
- [3] Ruisi Cai, Yeonju Ro, Geon-Woo Kim, Peihao Wang, Babak Ehteshami Bejnordi, Aditya Akella, and Zhangyang Wang. 2024. Read-ME: Refactorizing LLMs as Router-Decoupled Mixture of Experts with System Co-Design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.19123* (2024).
- [4] Shiyi Cao, Shu Liu, Tyler Griggs, Peter Schafhalter, Xiaoxuan Liu, Ying Sheng, Joseph E Gonzalez, Matei Zaharia, and Ion Stoica. 2025. MoE-lightning: High-throughput moe inference on memory-constrained gpus. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 1*. 715–730.
- [5] Hongtao Chen, Weiye Xie, Boxin Zhang, Jingqi Tang, Jiahao Wang, Jianwei Dong, Shaoyuan Chen, Ziwei Yuan, Chen Lin, Chengyu Qiu, et al. 2025. KTransformers: Unleashing the Full Potential of CPU/GPU Hybrid Inference for MoE Models. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 31st Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 1014–1029.
- [6] Yunfei Chu, Jin Xu, Qian Yang, Haojie Wei, Xipin Wei, Zhifang Guo, Yichong Leng, Yuanjun Lv, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2024. Qwen2-audio technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10759* (2024).
- [7] Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Chenggang Zhao, R.X. Xu, Huazuo Gao, Deli Chen, Jiashi Li, Wangding Zeng, Xingkai Yu, Y. Wu, Zhenda Xie, Y.K. Li, Panpan Huang, Fuli Luo, Chong Ruan, Zhifang Sui, and Wenfeng Liang. 2024. Deepseekmoe: Towards ultimate expert specialization in mixture-of-experts language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06066* (2024).
- [8] DeepSeek-AI. 2024. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437* (2024).
- [9] DeepSeek-AI. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948* (2025).
- [10] Aixin Liu DeepSeek-AI, Bei Feng, Bin Wang, Bingxuan Wang, Bo Liu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Hanwei Xu, Hao Yang, Haowei Zhang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Li, Hui Qu, J.L. Cai, Jian Liang, Jianzhong Guo, Jiaqi Ni, Jiashi Li, Jin Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junxiao Song, Kai Dong, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Liang Zhao, Liyue Zhang, Meng Li, Miaojuan Wang, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peiyi Wang, Peng Zhang, Qihao Zhu, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, R.J. Chen, R.L. Jin, Ruiqi Ge, Ruizhe Pan, Runxin Xu, Ruyi Chen, S.S. Li, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Shirong Ma, Shiyu Wang, Shuang Zhou, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Size Zheng, T. Wang, Tian Pei, Tian Yuan, Tianyu Sun, W.L. Xiao, Wangding Zeng, Wei An, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wentao Zhang, X.Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xianzu Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xing kai Yu, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Xuan Lu, Xuecheng Su, Y. Wu, Y.K. Li, Y.X. Wei, Y.X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Li, Yaohui Wang, Yi Zheng, Yichao Zhang, Yiliang Xiong, Yilong Zhao, Ying He, Ying Tang, Yishi Piao, Yixin Dong, Yixuan Tan, Yiyuan Liu, Yongji Wang, Yongqiang Guo, Yuchen Zhu, Yuduan Wang, Yuheng Zou, Yukun Zha, Yunxian Ma, Yuting Yan, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Z.Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhen Huang, Zhen Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Zhewen Hao, Zhihong Shao, Zhiniu Wen, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, Zhuoshu Li, Zihan Wang, Zihui Gu, Zilin Li, and Ziwei Xie. 2024. DeepSeek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04434* (2024).
- [11] Zhixu Du, Shiyu Li, Yuhao Wu, Xiangyu Jiang, Jingwei Sun, Qilin Zheng, Yongkai Wu, Ang Li, Hai Li, and Yiran Chen. 2024. Sida: Sparsity-inspired data-aware serving for efficient and scalable large mixture-of-experts models. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* 6 (2024), 224–238.
- [12] Artyom Eliseev and Denis Mazur. 2023. Fast inference of mixture-of-experts language models with offloading. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17238* (2023).
- [13] Zhiyuan Fang, Zicong Hong, Yuegui Huang, Yufeng Lyu, Wuhui Chen, Yue Yu, Fan Yu, and Zibin Zheng. 2025. Accurate Expert Predictions in MoE Inference via Cross-Layer Gate. *arXiv e-prints* (2025), arXiv:2502.
- [14] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2022. Switch transformers: scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 23, 1, Article 120 (Jan. 2022), 39 pages.
- [15] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2022. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient

- sparsity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23, 120 (2022), 1–39.
- [16] Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Stella Biderman, Shawn Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jasmine Hsu, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, et al. 2021. A framework for few-shot language model evaluation. *Version v0. 0.1. Sept 10* (2021), 8–9.
- [17] Georgi Gerganov. 2023. ggerganov/llama.cpp: Port of Facebook’s LLaMA model in C/C++. <https://github.com/ggerganov/llama.cpp>.
- [18] Jiaao He and Jidong Zhai. 2024. Fastdecode: High-throughput gpu-efficient llm serving using heterogeneous pipelines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11421* (2024).
- [19] Xin He, Shunkang Zhang, Yuxin Wang, Haiyan Yin, Zihao Zeng, Shao-huai Shi, Zhenheng Tang, Xiaowen Chu, Ivor Tsang, and Ong Yew Soon. 2024. Expertflow: Optimized expert activation and token allocation for efficient mixture-of-experts inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17954* (2024).
- [20] Ranggi Hwang, Jianyu Wei, Shijie Cao, Changho Hwang, Xiaohu Tang, Ting Cao, and Mao Yang. 2024. Pre-gated moe: An algorithm-system co-design for fast and scalable mixture-of-expert inference. In *2024 ACM/IEEE 51st Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. IEEE, 1018–1031.
- [21] Robert A Jacobs, Michael I Jordan, Steven J Nowlan, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 1991. Adaptive mixtures of local experts. *Neural computation* 3, 1 (1991), 79–87.
- [22] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th  ophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088* (2024).
- [23] Xuanlin Jiang, Yang Zhou, Shiyi Cao, Ion Stoica, and Minlan Yu. 2024. Neo: Saving gpu memory crisis with cpu offloading for online llm inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.01142* (2024).
- [24] Keisuke Kamahori, Tian Tang, Yile Gu, Kan Zhu, and Baris Kasikci. 2024. Fiddler: Cpu-gpu orchestration for fast inference of mixture-of-experts models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07033* (2024).
- [25] KVCACHE-AI. 2024. Ktransformers: A Flexible Framework for Experiencing Cutting-edge LLM Inference Optimizations. <https://github.com/kvcache-ai/ktransformers>.
- [26] Wonbeom Lee, Jungi Lee, Junghwan Seo, and Jaewoong Sim. 2024. {InfiniGen}: Efficient generative inference of large language models with dynamic {KV} cache management. In *18th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 24)*. 155–172.
- [27] Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. 2016. Pointer sentinel mixture models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07843* (2016).
- [28] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research* 21, 140 (2020), 1–67.
- [29] Samyam Rajbhandari, Conglong Li, Zhewei Yao, Minjia Zhang, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jeff Rasley, and Yuxiong He. 2022. Deepspeed-moe: Advancing mixture-of-experts inference and training to power next-generation ai scale. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 18332–18346.
- [30] Jeff Rasley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. Deepspeed: System optimizations enable training deep learning models with over 100 billion parameters. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 3505–3506.
- [31] Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Mazi  r, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. 2017. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538* (2017).
- [32] Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Binhang Yuan, Zhuohan Li, Max Ryabinin, Beidi Chen, Percy Liang, Christopher R  , Ion Stoica, and Ce Zhang. 2023. Flexgen: High-throughput generative inference of large language models with a single gpu. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 31094–31116.
- [33] Snowflake. 2024. Snowflake Arctic: The Best LLM for Enterprise AI. <https://www.snowflake.com/en/data-cloud/arctic/>.
- [34] Xiaoniu Song, Zihang Zhong, Rong Chen, and Haibo Chen. 2024. Promoe: Fast moe-based llm serving using proactive caching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.22134* (2024).
- [35] Yixin Song, Zeyu Mi, Haotong Xie, and Haibo Chen. 2024. Powerinfer: Fast large language model serving with a consumer-grade gpu. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 30th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 590–606.
- [36] Peng Tang, Jiacheng Liu, Xiaofeng Hou, Yifei Pu, Jing Wang, Pheng-Ann Heng, Chao Li, and Minyi Guo. 2024. Hobbit: A mixed precision expert offloading system for fast moe inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.01433* (2024).
- [37] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [38] Leyang Xue, Yao Fu, Zhan Lu, Luo Mai, and Mahesh Marina. 2024. MoE-Infinity: Offloading-Efficient MoE Model Serving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14361* (2024).
- [39] Rongjie Yi, Liwei Guo, Shiyun Wei, Ao Zhou, Shangguang Wang, and Mengwei Xu. 2023. Edgemoe: Fast on-device inference of moe-based large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14352* (2023).
- [40] Hanfei Yu, Xingqi Cui, Hong Zhang, and Hao Wang. 2025. fMoE: Fine-Grained Expert Offloading for Large Mixture-of-Experts Serving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05370* (2025).
- [41] Seniha Esen Yuksel, Joseph N Wilson, and Paul D Gader. 2012. Twenty years of mixture of experts. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 23, 8 (2012), 1177–1193.
- [42] Mingjin Zhang, Xiaoming Shen, Jiannong Cao, Zeyang Cui, and Shan Jiang. 2024. Edgeshard: Efficient llm inference via collaborative edge computing. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* (2024).
- [43] Yujie Zhang, Shivam Aggarwal, and Tulika Mitra. 2025. DAOP: Data-Aware Offloading and Predictive Pre-Calculation for Efficient MoE Inference. In *2025 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference (DATE)*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [44] Shuzhang Zhong, Ling Liang, Yuan Wang, Runsheng Wang, Ru Huang, and Meng Li. 2024. AdapMoE: Adaptive sensitivity-based expert gating and management for efficient moe inference. In *Proceedings of the 43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design*. 1–9.
- [45] Shuzhang Zhong, Yanfan Sun, Ling Liang, Runsheng Wang, Ru Huang, and Meng Li. 2025. HybriMoE: Hybrid CPU-GPU Scheduling and Cache Management for Efficient MoE Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.05897* (2025).
- [46] Yanqi Zhou, Tao Lei, Hanxiao Liu, Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Vincent Zhao, Andrew M. Dai, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V. Le, and James Laudon. 2022. Mixture-of-experts with expert choice routing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 7103–7114.
- [47] Zeyu Zhu, Gang Li, Tielong Liu, Zitao Mo, Xiaoyao Liang, and Jian Cheng. 2025. MATA: A Memory-Efficient Attention Accelerator for LLMs Exploiting Look-Back KV Cache Pruning. *IEEE Trans. Comput.* (2025).