

Algorithm and Hardness for Dynamic Attention Maintenance in Large Language Models

Jan van den Brand* Zhao Song† Tianyi Zhou‡

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have made fundamental changes in human life. The attention scheme is one of the key components over all the LLMs, such as BERT, GPT-1, Transformers, GPT-2, 3, 3.5 and 4. Inspired by previous theoretical study of static version of the attention multiplication problem [Zandieh, Han, Daliri, and Karbasi arXiv 2023, Alman and Song arXiv 2023]. In this work, we formally define a dynamic version of attention matrix multiplication problem. There are matrices $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, they represent query, key and value in LLMs. In each iteration we update one entry in K or V . In the query stage, we receive $(i, j) \in [n] \times [d]$ as input, and want to answer $(D^{-1}AV)_{i,j}$, where $A := \exp(QK^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a square matrix and $D := \text{diag}(A\mathbf{1}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix. Here $\mathbf{1}_n$ denote a length- n vector that all the entries are ones.

We provide two results: an algorithm and a conditional lower bound.

- On one hand, inspired by the lazy update idea from [Demetrescu and Italiano FOCS 2000, Sankowski FOCS 2004, Cohen, Lee and Song STOC 2019, Brand SODA 2020], we provide a data-structure that uses $O(n^{\omega(1,1,\tau)-\tau})$ amortized update time, and $O(n^{1+\tau})$ worst-case query time.
- On the other hand, show that unless the hinted matrix vector multiplication conjecture [Brand, Nanongkai and Saranurak FOCS 2019] is false, there is no algorithm that can use both $O(n^{\omega(1,1,\tau)-\tau-\Omega(1)})$ amortized update time, and $O(n^{1+\tau-\Omega(1)})$ worst query time.

In conclusion, our algorithmic result is conditionally optimal unless hinted matrix vector multiplication conjecture is false.

One notable difference between prior work [Alman and Song arXiv 2023] and our work is, their techniques are from the area of fine-grained complexity, and our techniques are not. Our algorithmic techniques are from recent work in convex optimization, e.g. solving linear programming. Our hardness techniques are from the area of dynamic algorithms.

*vbrand@gatech.edu. Georgia Institute of Technology.

†zsong@adobe.com. Adobe Research.

‡t8zhou@ucsd.edu. University of California San Diego.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) such as Transformer [VSP+17], BERT [DCLT18], GPT-3 [BMR+20], PaLM [CND+22], and OPT [ZRG+22] offer better results when processing natural language compared to smaller models or traditional techniques. These models possess the capability to understand and produce complex language, which is beneficial for a wide range of applications like language translation, sentiment analysis, and question answering. LLMs can be adjusted to multiple purposes without requiring them to be built from scratch. A prime example of this is ChatGPT, a chat software developed by OpenAI utilizing GPT-3’s potential to its fullest. GPT-4 [Ope23], the latest iteration, has the potential to surpass the already impressive abilities of GPT-3, including tasks such as language translation, question answering, and text generation. As such, the impact of GPT-4 on NLP could be significant, with new applications potentially arising in areas like virtual assistants, chatbots, and automated content creation.

The primary technical foundation behind LLMs is the attention matrix [VSP+17, RNS+18, DCLT18, BMR+20]. Essentially, an attention matrix is a square matrix with corresponding rows and columns representing individual words or “tokens,” and entries indicating their correlations within a given text. This matrix is then utilized to gauge the essentiality of each token in a sequence, relative to the desired output. As part of the attention mechanism, each input token is assigned a score or weight based on its significance or relevance to the current output, which is determined by comparing the current output state and input states through a similarity function.

More formally, the attention matrix can be expressed as follows: Suppose we have two matrices, Q and K , comprising query and key tokens respectively, where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. The attention matrix is a square $n \times n$ matrix denoted by A that relates the input tokens in the sequence. After normalizing using the softmax function, each entry in this matrix quantifies the attention weight or score between a specific input token (query token Q) and an output token (key token K). Notably, entries along the diagonal reflect self-attention scores, indicating the significance of each token in relation to itself.

When modeling long sequences with large n , the most significant hindrance to accelerating LLM operations is the duration required for carrying out attention matrix calculations [KKL20, WLK+20]. These calculations involve multiplying the attention matrix A with another value token matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. In [WLK+20], they demonstrate that the self-attention mechanism can be approximated by a low-rank matrix. They propose a new self-attention mechanism and used it in their Linformer model. In [KKL20], they replace dot-product attention with one that uses locality-sensitive hashing, which also improves the time complexity.

Furthermore, the static attention computation and approximation has been studied by [AS23] from both algorithmic and hardness perspectives. However, in practice, the attention matrix needs to be trained and keeps changing. In this work, we study the dynamic version of the attention computation problem. By using a dynamic approach, the attention weights can be updated on-the-fly as new information is introduced, enabling the model to adapt more effectively to changes in the input. This is particularly beneficial in cases where the input data is highly dynamic and subject to frequent changes, such as in natural language processing applications where the meaning and context of words and phrases can be influenced by the surrounding text.

Following the prior work [ZHDK23, AS23], we formally define the standard attention computation problem as follows. To distinguish their standard model with the dynamic version studied in this paper, we call the problem defined in [ZHDK23, AS23] “static” version of attention multiplication. Another major difference between previous work [ZHDK23, AS23] and our work is that they studied an approximate version, whereas we study the exact version.

Definition 1.1 (Static Attention Multiplication). *Given three matrices $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, we define attention computation*

$$\text{Att}(Q, K, V) = D^{-1}AV$$

where square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are

$$A := \exp(QK^\top), \quad D := \text{diag}(A\mathbf{1}_n)$$

Here we apply the $\exp(\cdot)$ function entry-wise¹. We use $\mathbf{1}_n$ to denote a length- n vector where all the entries are ones. The $\text{diag}()$ function is taking a length- n vector as input and outputs an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix by copying that vector on the diagonal of the output matrix. See Figure 1 and Figure 2 for an illustration.




Figure 1: Computation of the attention matrix $A = \exp(QK^\top)$ and the diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ (defined in Definition 1.1). Here $\exp()$ is the entry-wise function.




Figure 2: Computation of the target matrix $\text{Att}(Q, K, V) = D^{-1}AV$ (defined in Definition 1.1)

In applied LLMs training, the model parameters are changing slowly during training [CLP+21]. Thus, it is worth considering the dynamic version of Attention multiplication problem. Next, we formally define the “dynamic” or “online” version of attention multiplication problem, we call it ODAMV². For consistency of the discussion, we will use the word “online” in the rest of the paper.

Definition 1.2 (ODAMV(n, d)). *The goal of **O**nline **D**iagonal-based normalized **A**ttention **M**atrix **V**ector multiplication problem ODAMV(n, d) is to design a data-structure that satisfies the following operations:*

1. INIT: Initialize on three $n \times d$ matrices Q, K, V .
2. UPDATE: Change any entry of K , or V .
3. QUERY: For any given $i \in [n], j \in [d]$, return $(D^{-1} \exp(QK^\top)V)_{i,j}$.

¹For a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, following the transformer literature, we use $\exp(M)_{i,j} := \exp(M_{i,j})$. Our $\exp(\cdot)$ is not the matrix exponential from matrix Chernoff bound literature [GLSS18].

²The name of our problem is inspired by a well-known problem in theoretical computer science which is called Online Matrix Vector multiplication problem (OMV) [HKNS15, LW17, CKL18].

- Here $D := \text{diag}(\exp(QK^\top)\mathbf{1}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a positive diagonal matrix.
- Here $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

In this paper, we first propose a data-structure that efficiently solves the ODAMV problem (Definition 1.2) by using lazy update techniques. We then complement our result by a conditional lower bound. On the positive side, we use lazy update technique in the area of dynamic algorithms to provide an upper bound. In the area of theoretical computer science, it is very common to assume some conjecture in complexity when proving a lower bound. For example, $P \neq NP$, (strong) exponential time hypothesis, orthogonal vector and so on. To prove our conditional lower bound, we use a conjecture which is called **H**inted **M**atrix **V**ector multiplication (HMV) conjecture [BNS19]. On the negative side, we show a lower bound of computing solving ODAMV assuming the HMV conjecture holds.

1.1 Our Results

We first show our upper bound result making use of the lazy update strategy.

Theorem 1.3 (Upper bound, informal version of Theorem 4.1). *For any constant $a \in (0, 1]$. Let $d = O(n)$. There is a dynamic data structure that uses $O(n^2)$ space and supports the following operations:*

- **INIT**(Q, K, V). *It runs in $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, n))$ time.*³
- **UPDATEK**($i \in [n], j \in [d], \delta \in \mathbb{R}$). *This operation updates one entry in Q , and it runs in $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, n)/n^a)$ amortized time.*
- **UPDATEV**($i \in [n], j \in [d], \delta \in \mathbb{R}$). *This operation takes same amortized time as Q update.*
- **QUERY**($i \in [n], j \in [d]$). *This operation outputs $(D^{-1}(\exp(QK^\top))V)_{i,j}$ and takes $O(n^a)$ worst-case time.*

Our second result makes use of a variation of the popular online matrix vector multiplication (OMV) conjecture which is called hinted matrix vector multiplication conjecture (see Definition 5.2 and [BNS19]). Next, we present a lower bound for the problem of dynamically maintaining the attention computation $\text{Att}(Q, K, V)$.

Lemma 1.4 (Lower bound, informal version of Lemma 5.9). *Assuming HMV conjecture is true. For every constant $0 < \tau \leq 1$, there is no algorithm that solve ODAMV(n, d) problem (see formal version in Definition 5.8) with*

- *polynomial initialization time, and*
- *amortized update time $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^\tau, d)/n^{\tau+\Omega(1)})$, and*
- *worst query time $O(n^{\tau-\Omega(1)})$.*

³We use $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, m)$ to denote the time of multiplying a $n \times d$ matrix with another $d \times m$ matrix.

1.2 Related Work

Static Attention Computation A recent work by Zandieh, Han, Daliri, and Karbasi [ZHDK23] was the first to give an algorithm with provable guarantees for approximating the attention computation. Their algorithm makes use of locality sensitive hashing (LSH) techniques [CKNS20]. They show that the computation of partition functions in the denominator of softmax function can be reduced to a variant of the kernel density estimation (KDE) problem, and an efficient KDE solver can be employed through subsampling-based swift matrix products. They propose the KDEformer which can approximate the attention within sub-quadratic time and substantiated with provable spectral norm bounds. In contrast, earlier findings only procure entry-wise error bounds. Based on empirical evidence, it was confirmed that KDEformer outperforms other attention approximations in different pre-trained models, in accuracy, memory, and runtime.

In another recent work [AS23], they focus on the long-sequence setting with $d = O(\log n)$. The authors established that the existence of a fast algorithm for approximating the attention computation is dependent on the value of B , given the guarantees of $\|Q\|_\infty \leq B$, $\|K\|_\infty \leq B$, and $\|V\|_\infty \leq B$. They derived their lower bound proof by building upon a different line of work that dealt with the fine-grained complexity of KDE problems, which was previously studied in [BIS17, ACSS20]. Their proof was based on a fine-grained reduction from the Approximate Nearest Neighbor search problem ANN. Additionally, their findings explained how LLM computations can be made faster by assuming that matrix entries are bounded or can be well-approximated by a small number of bits, as previously discussed in [ZBIW19], Section 2 and [KVPF20], Section 3.2.1. Specifically, they [AS23] showed a lower bound stating that when $B \geq \Omega(\sqrt{\log n})$, there is no algorithm that can approximate the computation in subquadratic time. However, when $B < o(\sqrt{\log n})$, they proposed an algorithm that can approximate the attention computation almost linearly.

Transformer Theory Although the achievements of transformers in various fields are undeniable, there is still a significant gap in our precise comprehension of their learning mechanisms. Although these models have been examined on benchmarks incorporating numerous structured and reasoning activities, comprehending the mathematical aspects of transformers still considerably lags behind. Prior studies have posited that the success of transformer-based models, such as BERT [DCLT18], can be attributed to the information contained within its components, specifically the attention heads. These components have been found to hold a significant amount of information that can aid in solving various probing tasks related to syntax and semantics, as noted by empirical evidence found in several studies [HM19, CKLM19, TDP19, HL19, VB19, Bel22].

Various recent studies have delved into the representational power of transformers and have attempted to provide substantial evidence to justify their expressive capabilities. These studies have employed both theoretical as well as controlled experimental methodologies through the lens of Turing completeness [BPG20], function approximation [YBR⁺20], formal language representation [BAG20, EGZ20, YPPN21], abstract algebraic operation learning [ZBB⁺22], and statistical sample complexity [WCM21, EGKZ22] aspects. According to the research conducted by [YBR⁺20], transformers possess the capability of functioning as universal approximators for sequence-to-sequence operations. Similarly, the studies carried out by [PMB19, BPG20] have demonstrated that attention models may effectively imitate Turing machines. In addition to these recent works, there have been several previous studies that aimed to assess the capacity of neural network models by testing their learning abilities on simplistic data models [SS92, YPPN21, ZBB⁺22]. Furthermore, [LLR23] conducted a formal analysis of the training dynamics to further understand the type of knowledge that the model learns from such data models. According to findings from a

recent study [ZPGA23], moderately sized masked language models have demonstrated the ability to parse with satisfactory results. Additionally, the study utilized BERT-like models that were pre-trained using the masked language modeling loss function on the synthetic text generated with probabilistic context-free grammar. The researchers empirically validated that these models can recognize syntactic information that aids in partially reconstructing a parse tree. [LSZ23] studied the computation of regularized version of exponential regression problem (without normalization factor).

Dynamic Maintenance In recent years, projection maintenance has emerged as a crucial data structure problem. The effectiveness and efficiency of several cutting-edge convex programming algorithms greatly hinge upon a sturdy and streamlined projection maintenance data structure [CLS19, LSZ19, Bra20, JLSW20, BLSS20, JSWZ21, SY21, DLY21, Bra21, JKL+20, HJS+22, GS22]. There are two major differences between the problem in the dynamic data structure for optimization and our dynamic attention matrix maintenance problem. The first notable difference is that, in the optimization task, the inverse of a full rank square matrix is typically computed, whereas, in the attention problem, we care about the inverse of a positive diagonal matrix which behaves the normalization role in LLMs. The second major difference is, in the standard optimization task, all the matrix operations are linear operations. However, in LLMs, non-linearity such as softmax/exp function is required to make the model achieve good performance. Therefore, we need to apply an entry-wise nonlinear function to the corresponding matrix. In particular, to compute $f(QK^\top)V$ when f is linear function, we can pre-compute $K^\top V$. However when f is exp function, we are not allowed to compute $K^\top V$ directly.

Next, we will give more detailed reviews for classical optimization dynamic matrix maintenance problems. Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, consider the projection matrix $P = B^\top(BB^\top)^{-1}B$. The projection maintenance problem asks the following data structure problem: it can preprocess and compute an initial projection. At each iteration, B receives a low rank or sparse change, and the data structure needs to update B to reflect these changes. It will then be asked to approximately compute the matrix-vector product, between the updated P and an online vector h . For example, in linear programming, one sets $B = \sqrt{W}A$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the constraint matrix and W is a diagonal matrix. In each iteration, W receives relatively small perturbations. Then, the data structure needs to output an approximate vector to $\sqrt{W}A^\top(AWA^\top)^{-1}A\sqrt{W}h$, for an online vector $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Roadmap The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some preliminaries. In Section 3, we explain the techniques used to show our upper bound and lower bound results. In Section 4, we present our dynamic data-structure. Our algorithm shows the upper bound results. In Section 5, we give our conditional lower bound result by assuming the Hinted MV conjecture.

2 Preliminary

For a matrix A , we use A^\top to denote its transpose. For a non-zero diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we use $D^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ to denote the matrix where the (i, i) -th diagonal entry is $(D_{i,i})^{-1}$ for all $i \in [n]$.

For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we use $\text{diag}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ to denote an $n \times n$ matrix where the i, i -th entry on the diagonal is x_i and zero everywhere else for all $i \in [n]$.

In many TCS/ML literature, $\exp(M)$ denotes the matrix exponential, i.e., $\exp(M) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} M^i$. However, in this paper, we use $\exp(M)$ to denote the entry-wise exponential, i.e.,

$$\exp(M)_{i,j} := \exp(M_{i,j}).$$

We use $\mathbf{1}_n$ to denote the length- n vector where all the entries are ones. We use $\mathbf{0}_n$ to denote the length- n vector where all entries are zeros.

We give a standard fact that is used in our proof.

Fact 2.1 (folklore). *Given a set of vectors $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b_1, \dots, b_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^\top = AB^\top$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and a_i is i -th column of A , and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ and b_i is the i -th column of B for all $i \in [k]$.

Further, we have

- *Part 1. Computing AB^\top*
 - *takes $O(nkd)$ time, if we do it naively*
 - *takes $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, k, d)$ time, if we use fast matrix multiplication*
- *Part 2. For any matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, computing $AB^\top C$*
 - *takes $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, k, d) + \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d)$, if we use fast matrix multiplication, first compute AB^\top then compute $(AB^\top)C$*
 - *takes $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(k, d, d) + \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, k, d)$ time, if we use fast matrix multiplication, first compute $B^\top C$, then compute $A(B^\top C)$*

We define a standard notation for describing the running time of matrix multiplication, see literature [DI00, Zwi02, San04, San05, LG14, BN19, CLS19, LSZ19, BNS19, Bra20, GR21, JSWZ21, Bra21] for examples.

Definition 2.2. *For any three positive integers, we use $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(a, b, c)$ to denote the time of multiplying an $a \times b$ matrix with another $b \times c$ matrix.*

We use ω to denote the time that $n^\omega = \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, n)$. Currently $\omega \approx 2.373$ [Wil12, LG14, AW21].

Definition 2.3. *We define $\omega(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ function as follows, for any a, b and c , we use $\omega(a, b, c)$ to denote that $n^{\omega(a, b, c)} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n^a, n^b, n^c)$.*

3 Technique Overview

Given three matrices $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, we need to compute the attention given by $\text{Att}(Q, K, V) = D^{-1}AV$ where square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are $A := \exp(QK^\top)$, $D := \text{diag}(A\mathbf{1}_n)$. The static problem [AS23] is just computing Att for given Q, K and V . In the dynamic problem, we can get updates for K and V in each iteration.

For the algorithmic result in [AS23], they make use of the “polynomial method in algorithm design”. The polynomial method is a technique for finding low-rank approximations of the attention matrix A , which can be computed efficiently if the entries are bounded. For the hardness result in [AS23], they assume the strong exponential time hypothesis and use nearest neighbor search hardness result in the reduction.

3.1 Algorithm

Problem Formulation For each update, we receive δ as input and update one entry in either matrix K or V . In the query function, we take index $i \in [n], j \in [d]$ as input, and return the $\{i, j\}$ -th element in the target matrix $B := D^{-1}AV$.

Let C denote AV . Let \tilde{B} denote the updated target matrix B . We notice that the computation of the attention can be written as

$$\tilde{B} = (D^{-1} + \Delta_D)(C + \Delta_C)$$

Let $\Delta^{(t)}$ denote the change in the t -th iteration. In a lazy-update fashion, we write \tilde{B} in the implicit form

$$\tilde{B} = (D^{-1} + \sum_{t=1}^{\text{ct}} \Delta_D^{(t)})(C + \sum_{t=1}^{\text{ct}} \Delta_C^{(t)})$$

where ct denotes the number of updates since the last time we recomputed D and C .

Lazy Update We propose a lazy-update algorithm (Algorithm 2) that does not compute the attention matrix when there is an update on the key matrix K . We also propose a lazy-update algorithm (Algorithm 3) that does not compute the attention matrix when there is an update on the value matrix V . Instead, we maintain a data-structure (Algorithm 1) that uses $\text{List}_C, \text{List}_D$ and List_V to record the update by storing rank-1 matrices before the iteration count reaches the threshold n^a for some constant a . For the initialization (Algorithm 1), we compute the exact target matrix $D^{-1}AV$ and other intermediate matrices, which takes $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n))$ time (Lemma 4.3).

Re-compute When the iteration count reaches the threshold n^a , we re-compute all the variables in the data-structure as follows (Lemma 4.8). By using Fact 2.1, we first stack all the rank-1 matrices in List_C and compute the matrix multiplication once to get $\sum_{t=1}^{\text{ct}} \Delta_C^{(t)}$ using $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d) = n^{\omega(1,1,a)}$ time (Lemma 4.9). Then, we compute $C + \sum_{t=1}^{\text{ct}} \Delta_C^{(t)}$ to get the re-computed \tilde{C} . Similarly, to re-compute V , we stack all the rank-1 matrices in List_V and compute the matrix multiplication once to get $\sum_{t=1}^{\text{ct}} \Delta_V^{(t)}$ using $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d) = n^{\omega(1,1,a)}$ time. Then, we compute $V + \sum_{t=1}^{\text{ct}} \Delta_V^{(t)}$ to get the re-computed \tilde{V} . To re-compute the diagonal matrix D , we sum up all the updates by $\sum_{t=1}^{\text{ct}} \Delta_D^{(t)}$ and add it to the old D^{-1} (detail can be found in Algorithm 5). Hence, our algorithm takes $n^{\omega(1,1,a)}/n^a$ amortized time to update K and V (Lemma 4.4, Lemma 4.5).

Fast Query Recall that the query function takes index $i \in [n], j \in [d]$ as input, and returns the $\{i, j\}$ -th element in the target matrix $B := D^{-1}AV$. Let \tilde{D}^{-1} denote the latest D^{-1} obtained from List_D . Let $\Delta_{V,1}$ and $\Delta_{V,2}$ be stacked matrix obtained from list from V . We can rewrite the output by

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\tilde{D}^{-1}) \cdot (A) \cdot (V + \Delta_{V,1}\Delta_{V,2}))_{i,j} \\ &= ((\tilde{D}^{-1}) \cdot (A \cdot V))_{i,j} + ((\tilde{D}^{-1}) \cdot A \cdot (\Delta_{V,1}\Delta_{V,2}))_{i,j} \\ &= (\tilde{D})_i^{-1} C_{i,j} + (\tilde{D})_i^{-1} A_{i,*} \Delta_{V,1} (\Delta_{V,2})_{*,j}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we maintain C in our re-compute function. Hence, computing the first part takes $O(1)$ time. As each column of $\Delta_{V,1}$ and row of $\Delta_{V,2}$ is 1-sparse, computing the second part takes $O(n^a)$ time. The total running time needed for the query function is $O(n^a)$ (Lemma 4.7, Lemma 4.6).

3.2 Hardness

We now turn to our lower bound result, which is inspired by the HMV conjecture [BNS19]. Let us firstly define the HMV problem (see formal definition in Definition 5.2).

Let the computation be performed over the boolean semi-ring and let $m = n^\tau, \forall 0 < \tau \leq 1$. The HMV problem has the following three phases

- **Phase 1.** Input two $n \times n$ matrices M and V
- **Phase 2.** Input an $n \times n$ matrix P with at most n^τ non-zero entries
- **Phase 3.** Input a single index $i \in [n]$
 - We need to answer $MPV_{*,i}$
 - Here $V_{*,i} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the i -th column of matrix V

According to [BNS19], the above problem is conjectured to be hard in the following sense,

Conjecture 3.1 (Hinted MV (HMV), [BNS19]). *For every constant $0 < \tau \leq 1$ no algorithm for the hinted Mv problem (Definition 5.2) can simultaneously satisfy*

- *polynomial time in **Phase 1.***
- *$O(n^{\omega(1,1,\tau)-\epsilon})$ time complexity in **Phase 2.** and*
- *$O(n^{1+\tau-\epsilon})$ in **Phase 3.***

for some constant $\epsilon > 0$.

Our primary contribution lies in demonstrating how to reduce the OAMV (Definition 5.4) and ODAMV (Definition 5.8) to the HMV problem (Definition 5.2). To achieve this, we have adopted a contradiction-based approach. Essentially, we begin by assuming the existence of an algorithm that can solve the OAMV problem with polynomial initialization time and amortized update time of $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^\tau, d)/n^{\tau+\Omega(1)})$, while worst-case query time is $O(n^{\tau-\Omega(1)})$ for all $\tau \in (0, 1]$. Our assumption implies that there exists a data structure that is faster than our result (Theorem 4.1). We subsequently proceed to demonstrate that using this algorithm enables us to solve the HMV problem too quickly, which contradicts the HMV conjecture.

Specifically, let us take an instance for the HMV problem (Definition 5.2)

- Let $M, V \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ denote two matrices from **Phase 1.** from HMV.

We create a new instance OAMV($\tilde{n} = n, \tilde{d} = n$) where

$$\tilde{Q} = M, \quad \tilde{K} = 0, \quad \tilde{V} = V$$

In Claim 5.6 and Claim 5.7, by making use of our construction of \tilde{Q}, \tilde{K} and \tilde{V} , we show that for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [n]$,

$$\text{If } ((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})\tilde{V})_{j,i} > 0, \text{ then } (\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 1.$$

$$\text{If } ((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})\tilde{V})_{j,i} = 0, \text{ then } (\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 0.$$

By using the above two statements, we know that $\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top)\tilde{V}_{*,i}$ is enough to reconstruct $\text{MPV}_{*,i}$ for the HMV problem (Definition 5.2). Then, solving $\text{MPV}_{*,i}$ takes polynomial initialization time and amortized update time of $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^\tau, d)/n^{\tau+\Omega(1)})$, while worst-case query time is $O(n^{\tau-\Omega(1)})$ for every $\tau \in (0, 1]$. The contradiction of the HMV conjecture shows that there is no such algorithm. Similarly, for the normalized case ODAMV (Definition 5.8) problem, we show how to reconstruct another instance of the HMV problem and complete the proof by contradiction.

4 Main Upper Bound

In Section 4.1, we show the running time of initializing our data structure. In Section 4.2, we show the running time of updating K and V . In Section 4.3, we show the correctness and the running time of querying the target matrix. In Section 4.4, we show the correctness and the running time of recomputing the variables in our data-structure.

We propose our upper bound result as the following:

Theorem 4.1 (Main algorithm, formal version of Theorem 1.3). *For any constant $a \in (0, 1]$. Let $d = O(n)$. There is a dynamic data structure that uses $O(n^2)$ space and supports the following operations:*

- **INIT**(Q, K, V). *It runs in $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n))$ time.*
- **UPDATEK**($i \in [n], j \in [d], \delta \in \mathbb{R}$). *This operation updates one entry in Q , and it runs in $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, n)/n^a)$ amortized time.*
- **UPDATEV**($i \in [n], j \in [d], \delta \in \mathbb{R}$). *This operation takes same amortized time as Q update.*
- **QUERY**($i \in [n], j \in [d]$). *This operation outputs $(D^{-1}(\exp(QK^\top))V)_{i,j}$ operation takes in $O(n^a)$ worst case time.*

Remark 4.2. *The amortized time in UPDATEK and UPDATEV can be made into worst case time by using standard techniques, e.g. see Section B of [BNS19].*

4.1 Initialization

We first give the running time of the initialization procedure.

Lemma 4.3 (Init). *The procedure INIT (Algorithm 1) takes $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n)$ time.*

Proof. It is trivially from applying fast matrix multiplication. □

4.2 Update

Next, we give the running time of updating K .

Lemma 4.4 (Running time of UPDATEK). *The procedure UPDATEK (Algorithm 2) takes*

- *Part 1. $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, n^a)$ time in the worst case*
- *Part 2. $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, n^a)/n^a$ time in the amortized case*

Proof. Part 1. It trivially from Lemma 4.9

Part 2. If the $\text{ct}_K < n^a$, we pay $O(n)$ time. If $\text{ct}_K = n^a$, we pay $n^{\omega(1,1,a)}$. So the amortized time is

$$\frac{n(n^a - 1) + n^{\omega(1,1,a)}}{n^a} = O(n^{\omega(1,1,a)-a})$$

Note that, by using fast matrix multiplication and the fact that $d = O(n)$, we have $n^{\omega(1,1,a)} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d)$. Thus we complete the proof. □

Now, we give the running time of updating V .

Algorithm 1 Dynamic Data Structure

```
1: data structure DYNAMICATTENTION ▷ Theorem 4.1
2: members
3:    $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  ▷ Query token
4:    $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  ▷ Key token
5:    $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  ▷ Value token
6:    $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  ▷ The logits matrix,  $M = QK^\top$ 
7:    $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  ▷ The attention matrix,  $A = \exp(QK^\top)$ 
8:    $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  ▷ The diagonal matrix,
9:    $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  ▷ Intermediate matrix,  $C = \exp(QK^\top)V$ 
10:   $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  ▷ Target matrix,  $B = D^{-1}AV$ 
11:  ListA ▷ List with size  $n^a$ 
12:  ListC ▷ List with size  $n^a$ 
13:  ListD ▷ List with size  $n^a$ 
14:  ctK, ctV
15: end members
16:
17: procedure INIT( $Q, K, V$ ) ▷ Lemma 4.3
18:    $Q \leftarrow Q, K \leftarrow K, V \leftarrow V$ 
19:    $M \leftarrow QK^\top, A \leftarrow \exp(QK^\top)$ 
20:    $C \leftarrow \exp(QK^\top)V$ 
21:    $B \leftarrow D^{-1}AV$ 
22:   ctK  $\leftarrow 0$ 
23:   ctV  $\leftarrow 0$ 
24: end procedure
25: end data structure
```

Lemma 4.5 (Running time of UPDATEV). *The procedure UPDATEV (Algorithm 3) takes*

- Part 1. $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, n^a)$ time in the worst case.
- Part 2. $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, n^a)/n^a$ time in the amortized case.

Proof. **Part 1.** It trivially from Lemma 4.9.

Part 2. If the $\text{ct}_K < n^a$, we pay $O(n)$ time. If $\text{ct}_K = n^a$, we pay $n^{\omega(1,1,a)}$. So the amortized time is

$$\frac{n(n^a - 1) + n^{\omega(1,1,a)}}{n^a} = O(n^{\omega(1,1,a)-a})$$

Note that, by using fast matrix multiplication and the fact that $d = O(n)$, we have $n^{\omega(1,1,a)} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d)$. Thus we complete the proof. \square

4.3 Query

We show the correctness of our QUERY that queries only one element in the target matrix.

Lemma 4.6 (Correctness of QUERY). *The procedure QUERY (Algorithm 4) outputs*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_{i,j} &= (D^{-1} \cdot A \cdot (V + \Delta_V))_{i,j} \\ &= (D^{-1}AV + D^{-1}A\Delta_V)_{i,j} \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 2 Algorithm that update K and maintain the data structure

```

1: data structure DYNAMICATTENTION ▷ Theorem 4.1
2: procedure UPDATEK( $i \in [n], j \in [d], \delta$ ) ▷ Lemma 4.4
3:    $\text{ct}_K \leftarrow \text{ct}_K + 1$ 
4:    $\tilde{K}_{i,j} \leftarrow K_{i,j} + \delta$ 
5:    $(\Delta_M)_{*,i} \leftarrow \delta \cdot \underbrace{Q}_{n \times d} \underbrace{e_j}_{d \times 1}$  ▷  $\Delta_M$  only have entries in  $i$ -th column
6:   ▷ Here  $\circ$  denotes entry-wise product
7:    $(\Delta_A)_{*,i} \leftarrow (A_{*,i} \circ (\exp((\Delta_M)_{*,i}) - \mathbf{1}_n))$ 
8:    $\tilde{M} \leftarrow M + (\Delta_M)_{*,i} e_i^\top$  ▷ We only update  $i$ -th column of  $M$ 
9:    $\tilde{A} \leftarrow A + (\Delta_A)_{*,i} e_i^\top$  ▷ We only update  $i$ -th column of  $A$ 
10:  Obtain diagonal vector  $D_{\text{tmp}}$  from  $\text{List}_D[\text{ct}_K - 1].\text{GETB}$  ▷ It takes  $O(n)$  time
11:   $\tilde{D} \leftarrow D_{\text{tmp}}^{-1} + \text{diag}(\Delta_A)_{*,i}$ 
12:  for  $j = 1 \rightarrow n$  do
13:     $(\Delta_D)_{j,j} \leftarrow (D_{\text{tmp}})_{j,j}^{-1} - \tilde{D}_{j,j}^{-1}$ 
14:  end for
15:  if  $\text{ct}_K < n^a$  then
16:     $\text{List}_C[\text{ct}_K - 1].(a, b) \leftarrow ((\Delta_A)_{*,i} \in \mathbb{R}^n, V^\top e_i \in \mathbb{R}^d)$ 
17:     $\text{List}_D[\text{ct}_K - 1].(a, b) \leftarrow (\Delta_D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \tilde{D}^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$  ▷ Diagonal matrices
18:  else ▷  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d) = n^{\omega(1,1,a)}$  time
19:    RECOMPUTE() ▷ Algorithm 5. Re-compute everything
20:  end if
21:  /*Referesh the memory*/
22:   $K \leftarrow \tilde{K}$ 
23:   $A \leftarrow \tilde{A}$ 
24:   $M \leftarrow \tilde{M}$ 
25: end procedure
26: end data structure

```

Algorithm 3

```

1: data structure DYNAMICATTENTION ▷ Theorem 4.1
2: procedure UPDATEV( $i \in [n], j \in [d], \delta$ ) ▷ Lemma 4.5
3:    $\text{ct}_V \leftarrow \text{ct}_V + 1$ 
4:   if  $\text{ct}_V < n^a$  then
5:      $\text{List}_V[\text{ct}_V - 1].(a, b) \leftarrow (e_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, \delta e_j \in \mathbb{R}^d)$ 
6:   else
7:     RECOMPUTE() ▷ Algorithm 5. Re-compute everything
8:   end if
9: end procedure
10: end data structure

```

Proof. Let $\Delta_{V,1}$ denote the vector obtained from $\text{List}_D[\text{ct}_K].\text{GETA}$.

Let $\Delta_{V,2}$ denote the vector obtained from $\text{List}_D[\text{ct}_K].\text{GETB}$

Let $(D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}$ denote the list of diagonal matrices obtained from $\text{List}_D[\text{ct}_K].\text{GETB}$

We know

$$\tilde{B} = ((D_{\text{tmp}}^{-1}) \cdot (A) \cdot (V + \Delta_{V,1} \Delta_{V,2}))$$

Algorithm 4 Algorithm that query the $\{i, j\}$ -th element in the target matrix

```

1: data structure DYNAMICATTENTION ▷ Theorem 4.1
2: procedure QUERY( $i \in [n], j \in [d]$ ) ▷ Lemma 4.7, 4.6
3:   Let  $\Delta_{V,1}$  and  $\Delta_{V,2}$  be rectangular matrix obtained from list from  $V$ 
4:   Let  $(D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}$  denote the list of diagonal matrices obtained from  $\text{List}_D[\text{ct}_K].\text{GETB}$  ▷ This
   takes  $O(1)$  time
5:   /*Below is the target*/
6:   answer  $\leftarrow ((D_{\text{tmp}}^{-1}) \cdot (A) \cdot (V + \Delta_{V,1}\Delta_{V,2}))_{i,j}$ 
7:   /*The actual computation*/
8:   /*Part 1. Answer, This is fast because we store  $C = AV$ */
9:   answer1  $\leftarrow (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}C_{i,j}$  ▷  $O(1)$  time
10:  /*Part 2. Answer, this is fast because each column of  $\Delta_{V,1}$  and row of  $\Delta_{V,2}$  is 1-sparse*/
11:  answer2  $\leftarrow (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}A_{i,*}\Delta_{V,1}(\Delta_{V,2})_{*,j}$  ▷  $n^a$  time
12:  answer  $\leftarrow \sum_{j=1}^2 \text{answer}_j$ 
13:  return answer
14: end procedure
15: end data structure

```

Algorithm 5 Algorithm that re-compute evreything

```

1: data structure DYNAMICATTENTION ▷ Theorem 4.1
2: procedure RECOMPUTE() ▷ Lemma 4.9, Lemma 4.8
3:   Let  $\Delta_{C,1}$  and  $\Delta_{C,2}$  be rectangular matrix obtained from  $\text{List}_C$ 
4:   Let  $\Delta_{V,1}$  and  $\Delta_{V,2}$  be rectangular matrix obtained from  $\text{List}_V$ 
5:   Let  $\Delta_D(i)$  denote the list of diagonal matrices obtained from  $\text{List}_D[i].\text{GETA}$ 
6:    $\tilde{C} \leftarrow C + \Delta_{C,1} \cdot \Delta_{C,2}$  ▷ It takes  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d)$  time
7:    $\tilde{V} \leftarrow V + \Delta_{V,1} \cdot \Delta_{V,2}$  ▷ It takes  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d)$  time
8:    $\Delta_D \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^{\text{ct}_K} \Delta_D(i)$  ▷ it takes  $n^{1+a}$  time
9:    $\tilde{D}^{-1} \leftarrow D^{-1} + \Delta_D$  ▷ It takes  $n$  time
10:   $\tilde{B} \leftarrow \tilde{D}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{C}$  ▷ This takes  $nd$ 
11:  /*Refresh the memory*/
12:   $D \leftarrow \tilde{D}, C \leftarrow \tilde{C}, B \leftarrow \tilde{B}, V \leftarrow \tilde{V}$ 
13:  /*Reset the counter*/
14:   $\text{ct}_K \leftarrow 0, \text{ct}_V \leftarrow 0$ 
15: end procedure
16: end data structure

```

$$= (D_{\text{tmp}})^{-1}(AV) + (D_{\text{tmp}})^{-1}(A\Delta_{V,1}\Delta_{V,2})$$

For the $\{i, j\}$ -th element, by using simple algebra, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{B}_{i,j} &= (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}(AV)_{i,j} + (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}(A\Delta_{V,1}\Delta_{V,2})_{i,j} \\
&= (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}(C)_{i,j} + (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}(A\Delta_{V,1}\Delta_{V,2})_{i,j} \\
&= (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}(C)_{i,j} + (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}A_{i,*}\Delta_{V,1}(\Delta_{V,2})_{*,j}
\end{aligned}$$

We know

$$\text{answer}_1 = (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1}C_{i,j}$$

and

$$\text{answer}_2 = (D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1} A_{i,*} \Delta_{V,1} (\Delta_{V,2})_{*,j}$$

By summing up answer_1 and answer_2 , we have

$$\tilde{B}_{i,j} = (D^{-1}AV + D^{-1}A\Delta_V)_{i,j}.$$

Now, we complete the proof. □

Next, we give the running time of it.

Lemma 4.7 (Running time of QUERY). *The running time of procedure QUERY (Algorithm 4) is $O(n^a)$.*

Proof. We first stack all the vectors in List_V to $\Delta_{V,1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n^a}$ and $\Delta_{V,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^a \times d}$, which takes $O(1)$ time.

- Computing $(D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1} C_{i,j}$ takes $O(1)$ time.
- Computing $(\Delta_{V,1} \Delta_{V,2})$ takes $O(n^a)$ time as $\Delta_{V,1}$ is 1-sparse in columns and $(\Delta_{V,2})$ is 1-sparse in rows.
- Computing $(D_{\text{tmp}})_i^{-1} A_{i,*} (\Delta_{V,1} \Delta_{V,2})_{*,j}$ takes $O(n^a)$ time as $\text{nnz}((\Delta_{V,1} \Delta_{V,2})_{*,j}) \leq n^a$.

Hence, the total running time needed is $O(n^a)$ □

4.4 Re-compute

We show the correctness of our re-compute function.

Lemma 4.8 (Correctness of RECOMPUTE). *The procedure RECOMPUTE (Algorithm 5) correctly re-compute D, C, B, V .*

Proof. Part 1. Re-compute D

Let $\Delta_D(i)$ denote the list of diagonal matrices obtained from $\text{List}_D[i].\text{GETA}$. Then, the total difference between the updated \tilde{D} and D is $\sum_{i=1}^{\text{ct}_K} \Delta_D(i)$.

By computing $\tilde{D}^{-1} \leftarrow D^{-1} + \Delta_D$, we correctly get the updated \tilde{D}^{-1} . By computing the inverse of a diagonal matrix we get \tilde{D} .

Part 2. Re-compute V

We first stack all the vectors in List_V to $\Delta_{V,1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n^a}$ and $\Delta_{V,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^a \times d}$.

By using Fact 2.1, we have $\tilde{V} = V + \Delta_{V,1} \cdot \Delta_{V,2}$.

Part 3. Re-compute C

Similar to the proof of re-computing V .

We first stack all the vectors in List_C to $\Delta_{C,1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n^a}$ and $\Delta_{C,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^a \times d}$.

By using Fact 2.1, we have $\tilde{C} = C + \Delta_{C,1} \cdot \Delta_{C,2}$.

Part 4. Re-compute B

By using the definition of $B = D^{-1}C$, we can update B by using $\tilde{B} = \tilde{D}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{C}$.

Now, we complete the proof. □

Next, we give the running time of it.

Lemma 4.9 (Running time of RECOMPUTE). *The running time of procedure RECOMPUTE (Algorithm 5) is $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d)$.*

Proof. We first stack all the vectors in List_V to $\Delta_{V,1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n^a}$ and $\Delta_{V,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^a \times d}$, which takes $O(1)$ time.

We stack all the vectors in List_C to $\Delta_{C,1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n^a}$ and $\Delta_{C,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^a \times d}$, which takes $O(1)$ time.

- Computing $C + \Delta_{C,1} \cdot \Delta_{C,2}$ takes $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d)$ time.
- Computing $V + \Delta_{V,1} \cdot \Delta_{V,2}$ takes $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d)$ time.
- Computing $\sum_{i=1}^{\text{ct}_K} \Delta_D(i)$ takes $O(n^{a+1})$ time as $\text{nnz}(\Delta_D(i)) = O(n)$ and $\text{ct}_K = O(n^a)$.
- Computing $D^{-1} + \Delta_D$ takes $O(n)$ time as $\text{nnz}(\Delta_D) = O(n)$.
- Computing $\tilde{D}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{C}$ takes $O(nd)$ time as \tilde{D}^{-1} is a diagonal matrix. Hence, the total running time is $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^a, d)$.

□

5 Main Lower Bound

In Section 5.1, we give the definition of Online Matrix Vector (OMV) problem. In Section 5.2, we introduce the definition of Hinted MV and its conjecture (from previous work [BNS19]). In Section 5.3, we show the hardness of computing the target matrix without the normalization factor. In Section 5.4, we show the hardness of computing the target matrix with the normalization factor.

5.1 Online Matrix Vector Multiplication

Before studying the hardness of our problem, we first review a famous problem in theoretical computer science which is called online matrix vector multiplication problem. Here is the definition of online matrix vector multiplication, which has been a crucial task in many fundamental optimization problems.

Definition 5.1 (Online Matrix Vector (OMV) [HKNS15, LW17, CKL18]). *Given a matrix $A \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, let $T = O(n)$, there is an online sequence of vectors $u_1, \dots, u_T \in \{0, 1\}^n$. The goal is to design a structure that whenever receives a new vector u_t and output Au_t .*

Such a problem is widely believed in the community that there is no algorithm to solve it in truly subquadratic time per vector and there is no algorithm to solve it in truly subcubic time over all vectors.

5.2 Hardness from Previous Work

We define the hinted Mv problem from previous work [BNS19].

Definition 5.2 (Hinted MV (HMV) [BNS19]). *Let the computations be performed over the boolean semi-ring and let $m = n^\tau$, $0 < \tau \leq 1$. The hinted Mv problem consists of the following phases:*

1. Input two $n \times n$ matrices M and V
2. Input an $n \times n$ matrix P with at most n^τ non-zero entries

3. Input a single index $i \in [n]$

- We need to answer $MPV_{*,i}$
- Here $V_{*,i} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the i -th column of matrix V

We give the hinted Mv conjecture which is from prior work [BNS19].

Conjecture 5.3 (HMV conjecture [BNS19], restatement of Conjecture 3.1). *For every constant $0 < \tau \leq 1$ no algorithm for the hinted Mv problem (Definition 5.2) can simultaneously satisfy*

- *polynomial time in phase 1*
- *$O(n^{\omega(1,1,\tau)-\epsilon})$ time complexity in phase 2 and*
- *$O(n^{1+\tau-\epsilon})$ in phase 3*

for some constant $\epsilon > 0$.

5.3 Online Attention Matrix Vector Multiplication

We define the dynamic attention matrix vector problem here. For the following definition, we ignore the effect by the normalization factor. We will handle it in the later section.

Definition 5.4 (OAMV(n, d)). *The goal of the **Online Attention Matrix Vector Multiplication** problem OAMV(n, d) is to design a data structure that satisfies the following operations:*

1. INIT: Initialize on $n \times d$ matrices Q, K, V .
2. UPDATE: Change any entry of $Q, K, \text{ or } V$.
3. QUERY: For any given $i \in [n], j \in [d]$, return $(\exp(QK^\top)V)_{i,j}$.

Next, we present our lower bound result ignoring the normalization factor.

Lemma 5.5. *Assuming the hinted Mv conjecture (Conjecture 5.3): For every constant $0 < \tau \leq 1$, there is no dynamic algorithm for OAMV(n, d) problem (Definition 5.4) with*

- *polynomial initialization time, and*
- *amortized update time $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^\tau, d)/n^{\tau+\Omega(1)})$, and*
- *worst query time $O(n^{\tau-\Omega(1)})$.*

Proof. Assume there was a dynamic algorithm faster than what is stated in Lemma 5.5 for some parameter τ , i.e. update time $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^\tau, d)/n^{\tau+\epsilon})$ and query time $O(n^{\tau-\epsilon})$ for some constant $\epsilon > 0$. We show that this would contradict the hinted Mv conjecture (Conjecture 5.3).

Let us take an instance for the v -hinted Mv problem (Definition 5.2) with $M, V \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$. We create a new instance OAMV($\tilde{n} = n, \tilde{d} = n$) where

$$\tilde{Q} = M, \quad \tilde{K} = 0, \quad \tilde{V} = V$$

During phase 1, we give this input to the dynamic algorithm for the OAMV problem (Definition 5.4). During phase 2, when we receive the $n \times n$ matrix P with n^τ non-zero entries, we perform n^τ updates to the data structure to set $\tilde{K}^\top = P$. This takes

$$O(\tilde{n}^\tau \cdot (\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(\tilde{n}, \tilde{n}^\tau, \tilde{d})/\tilde{n}^{\tau+\epsilon})) = O(n^{\omega(1,1,\tau)-\epsilon})$$

time.

At last, in phase 3, we perform \tilde{n} queries to obtain the column $\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top)\tilde{V}_{*,i}$ in $O(\tilde{n} \cdot \tilde{n}^{\tau-\epsilon}) = O(n^{1+\tau-\epsilon})$ time.

Using Claim 5.6, and Claim 5.7, we know that $\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top)\tilde{V}_{*,i}$ is enough to reconstruct $\text{MPV}_{*,i}$ for the hinted Mv problem. □

Claim 5.6. *For each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [n]$, if $((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})\tilde{V})_{j,i} > 0$, then $(\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 1$,*

Proof. Assume we have

$$((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})\tilde{V})_{j,i} > 0,$$

We defined $\tilde{Q} = M, \tilde{K} = P, \tilde{V} = V$, so we can rewrite it as

$$((\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})V)_{j,i} > 0.$$

Using the definition of matrix multiplication, and the fact that $\exp(x) > 1$ for all $x > 0$, we have some $k \in [n]$ with

$$\begin{aligned} ((\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})_{j,k} V)_{k,i} &> 0 \\ ((\exp(\text{MP})_{j,k} - 1)V)_{k,i} &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

We can conclude that for each $i \in [n], j \in [n]$, there is at least one $k \in [n]$ such that

- $V_{k,i} > 0$
- $(\text{MP})_{j,k} > 0$

Therefore, by using the definition of boolean semi-ring, we can conclude that $(\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 1$ □

Claim 5.7. *For each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [n]$, if $((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})\tilde{V})_{j,i} = 0$ then $(\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 0$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})\tilde{V})_{j,k} \\ &= ((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})_{j,*}\tilde{V}_{*,i}) \\ &= ((\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})_{j,*}V_{*,i}) \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of matrix multiplication and the second step follows from the definition of \tilde{Q}, \tilde{K} and \tilde{V} .

By using the above equation, if $((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})\tilde{V})_{j,k} = 0$, we have

$$(\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})_{j,*}V_{*,i} = 0 \tag{1}$$

Eq. (1) implies that, for all $k \in [n]$ such that $V_{k,i} = 1$, we have $(\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times n})_{j,k} = 0$, which also implies that $(\text{MP})_{j,k} = 0$.

Now, we can conclude that $(\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 0$ for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [n]$. □

5.4 Online Diagonal-normalized Attention Matrix Vector Multiplication

Next, we consider the normalization factor and defined the problem as the following.

Definition 5.8 (ODAMV(n, d), restatement of Definition 1.2). *The goal of **Online Diagonal-based normalized Attention Matrix Vector Multiplication** problem ODA**M**V(n, d) is to design a data structure that satisfies the following operations:*

1. **INIT**: Initialize on $n \times d$ matrices Q, K, V .
2. **UPDATE**: Change any entry of $Q, K, \text{ or } V$.
3. **QUERY**: For any given $i \in [n], j \in [d]$, return $(D^{-1} \exp(QK^\top)V)_{i,j}$, where $D = \text{diag}(\exp(QK^\top)\mathbf{1}_n)$.

Next, we present our lower bound result with the normalization factor.

Lemma 5.9. *Assuming the hinted Mv conjecture (Conjecture 5.3): For every constant $0 < \tau \leq 1$, there is no algorithm that solve ODA**M**V(n, d) problem (Definition 5.8) with*

- polynomial initialization time, and
- amortized update time $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^\tau, d)/n^{\tau+\Omega(1)})$, and
- worst query time $O(n^{\tau-\Omega(1)})$.

Proof. Assume there was a dynamic algorithm faster than what is stated in Lemma 5.9 for some parameter τ , i.e. update time $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n^\tau, d)/n^{\tau+\epsilon})$ and query time $O(n^{\tau-\epsilon})$ for some constant $\epsilon > 0$. We show that this would contradict the hinted Mv conjecture (Conjecture 5.3).

Let us take an instance for the v -hinted Mv problem (Definition 5.2) with $M \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}, V \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$.

We can construct matrix $M \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times 2n}$ and $V \in \{0, 1\}^{2n \times n}$ as follows

$$M := \begin{bmatrix} M & \overline{M} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V := \begin{bmatrix} V \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}$$

where \overline{M} is a matrix that $\overline{M}_{i,j} = 1 - M_{i,j}$.

Note that $\|M_{i,*}\|_1 = n$, for each $i \in [n]$.

Based on the above construction, we will create a new instance ODA**M**V($\tilde{n} = 2n, \tilde{d} = 2n$), where

$$\tilde{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} M \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times 2n} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{K} = \mathbf{0}_{2n \times 2n}, \quad \tilde{V} = \begin{bmatrix} V & \mathbf{0}_{2n \times n} \end{bmatrix}$$

During phase 1, we give this input to the dynamic algorithm for the ODA**M**V problem (Definition 5.8).

Let $D \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ denote a diagonal matrix, where $\text{nnz}(D) = n^\tau$

During phase 2, we receive the $2n \times 2n$ diagonal matrix P , where

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\text{nnz}(P) = 2n^\tau$.

We perform $2n^\tau$ updates to the data structure to set $\tilde{K}^\top = P$. This takes

$$O(\tilde{n}^\tau \cdot (\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(\tilde{n}, \tilde{n}^\tau, \tilde{d})/\tilde{n}^{\tau+\epsilon})) = O(n^{\omega(1,1,\tau)-\epsilon})$$

time.

Note that

- $\|\tilde{Q}_{i,*}\|_1 = n$, for each $i \in [n]$.
- $\|\tilde{Q}_{i,*}\|_1 = 0$, for each $i \in [n+1, 2n]$.

By using the definition of \mathbf{P} , we know that, for each $i \in [n]$

$$\tilde{D}_{i,i} = n^\tau \exp(1) + n^\tau \exp(0) = n^\tau(e+1).$$

For each $i \in [n+1, 2n]$

$$\tilde{D}_{i,i} = n^\tau \exp(0) = n^\tau. \quad (2)$$

Hence, we don't need to update \tilde{D} .

At last, in phase 3, we perform \tilde{n} queries to obtain the column $\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top)\tilde{V}_{*,i}$ in $O(\tilde{n} \cdot \tilde{n}^{\tau-\epsilon}) = O(n^{1+\tau-\epsilon})$ time.

Using Claim 5.11 and Claim 5.10, we know that, for any $i \in [n]$ and for any $j \in [n]$, if there is an algorithm that can find $(\tilde{D}^{-1} \exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top)\tilde{V})_{j,i}$, then using $(\tilde{D}^{-1} \exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top)\tilde{V})_{j,i} - (\tilde{D}^{-1}\tilde{V})_{j,i}$ is enough to reconstruct $(\text{MPV})_{j,i}$. Here $\tilde{D}^{-1}\tilde{V}$ can be computed in just $O(1)$ time via Eq. (2). Thus, we can know the $(\text{MDV})_{j,i}$ for the hinted Mv problem in $O(n^{1+\tau\epsilon})$ time, contradicting the hinted Mv conjecture. \square

Claim 5.10. For each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [n]$, if $(\tilde{D}^{-1}(\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{n} \times \tilde{n}})\tilde{V})_{j,i} > 0$, then $(\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 1$,

Proof. By using the fact that $n^\tau(e+1) > 0$ and $n^\tau > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}^{-1}(\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{n} \times \tilde{n}})\tilde{V}_{j,i} &> 0 \\ ((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{n} \times \tilde{n}})\tilde{V})_{j,i} &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

We know

$$\tilde{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times 2n} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{K}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{V} = [\mathbf{V} \quad \mathbf{0}_{2n \times n}],$$

so we have

$$((\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times 2n})\mathbf{V})_{j,i} > 0.$$

For $k \in [n+1, 2n]$, as $\mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}$, we know $(\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times 2n})_{j,k}(\mathbf{V})_{k,i} = 0$.

Using the definition of matrix multiplication, and the fact that $\exp(x) > 1$ for all $x > 0$, we have some $k \in [n]$ with

$$\begin{aligned} (\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times 2n})_{j,k}(\mathbf{V})_{k,i} &> 0 \\ (\exp(\text{MP})_{j,k} - 1)(\mathbf{V})_{k,i} &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

We can conclude that for each $i \in [n], j \in [n]$, there is at least one $k \in [n]$ such that

- $\mathbf{V}_{k,i} > 0$
- $(\text{MP})_{j,k} > 0$

Therefore, by using the definition of boolean semi-ring, we can conclude that $(\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 1$ \square

Claim 5.11. For each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [n]$, if $(\tilde{D}^{-1}(\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{n} \times \tilde{n}})\tilde{V})_{j,i}$ is 0 then $(\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 0$.

Proof. By using the fact that $n^\tau(e+1) > 0$ and $n^\tau > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{D}^{-1}(\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{n} \times \tilde{n}})\tilde{V}_{j,i} &= 0 \\ ((\exp(\tilde{Q}\tilde{K}^\top) - \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{n} \times \tilde{n}})\tilde{V})_{j,i} &= 0\end{aligned}$$

We know

$$\tilde{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times 2n} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{K}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{V} = [\mathbf{V} \quad \mathbf{0}_{2n \times n}],$$

so we have

$$((\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times 2n})\mathbf{V})_{j,i} = 0.$$

For $k \in [n+1, 2n]$, as $\mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}$, we know $(\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times 2n})_{j,k}(\mathbf{V})_{k,i} = 0$.

For all $k \in [n]$ such that $\mathbf{V}_{k,i} = 1$, we have $(\exp(\text{MP}) - \mathbf{1}_{n \times 2n})_{j,k} = 0$, which also implies that $(\text{MP})_{j,k} = 0$.

Now, we can conclude that $(\text{MPV})_{j,i} = 0$ for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [n]$. \square

References

- [ACSS20] Josh Alman, Timothy Chu, Aaron Schild, and Zhao Song. Algorithms and hardness for linear algebra on geometric graphs. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 541–552. IEEE, 2020.
- [AS23] Josh Alman and Zhao Song. Fast attention requires bounded entries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13214*, 2023.
- [AW21] Josh Alman and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. A refined laser method and faster matrix multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 522–539. SIAM, 2021.
- [BAG20] Satwik Bhattamishra, Kabir Ahuja, and Navin Goyal. On the Ability and Limitations of Transformers to Recognize Formal Languages. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7096–7116, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Bel22] Yonatan Belinkov. Probing classifiers: Promises, shortcomings, and advances. *Computational Linguistics*, 48(1):207–219, March 2022.
- [BIS17] Arturs Backurs, Piotr Indyk, and Ludwig Schmidt. On the fine-grained complexity of empirical risk minimization: Kernel methods and neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- [BLSS20] Jan van den Brand, Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Zhao Song. Solving tall dense linear programs in nearly linear time. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 775–788, 2020.

- [BMR⁺20] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [BN19] Jan van den Brand and Danupon Nanongkai. Dynamic approximate shortest paths and beyond: Subquadratic and worst-case update time. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 436–455. IEEE, 2019.
- [BNS19] Jan van den Brand, Danupon Nanongkai, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Dynamic matrix inverse: Improved algorithms and matching conditional lower bounds. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 456–480. IEEE, 2019.
- [BPG20] Satwik Bhattamishra, Arkil Patel, and Navin Goyal. On the computational power of transformers and its implications in sequence modeling. In *Proceedings of the 24th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 455–475, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Bra20] Jan van den Brand. A deterministic linear program solver in current matrix multiplication time. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 259–278. SIAM, 2020.
- [Bra21] Jan van den Brand. Unifying matrix data structures: Simplifying and speeding up iterative algorithms. In *Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA)*, pages 1–13. SIAM, 2021.
- [CKL18] Diptarka Chakraborty, Lior Kamma, and Kasper Green Larsen. Tight cell probe bounds for succinct boolean matrix-vector multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1297–1306, 2018.
- [CKLM19] Kevin Clark, Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, and Christopher D. Manning. What does BERT look at? an analysis of BERT’s attention. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 276–286, Florence, Italy, August 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [CKNS20] Moses Charikar, Michael Kapralov, Navid Nouri, and Paris Siminelakis. Kernel density estimation through density constrained near neighbor search. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 172–183. IEEE, 2020.
- [CLP⁺21] Beidi Chen, Zichang Liu, Binghui Peng, Zhaozhuo Xu, Jonathan Lingjie Li, Tri Dao, Zhao Song, Anshumali Shrivastava, and Christopher Re. Mongoose: A learnable lsh framework for efficient neural network training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [CLS19] Michael B Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, and Zhao Song. Solving linear programs in the current matrix multiplication time. In *STOC*, 2019.
- [CND⁺22] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*, 2022.

- [DCLT18] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [DI00] Camil Demetrescu and Giuseppe F Italiano. Fully dynamic transitive closure: breaking through the $O(n^2)$ barrier. In *Proceedings 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 381–389. IEEE, 2000.
- [DLY21] Sally Dong, Yin Tat Lee, and Guanghai Ye. A nearly-linear time algorithm for linear programs with small treewidth: A multiscale representation of robust central path. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1784–1797, 2021.
- [EGKZ22] Benjamin L Edelman, Surbhi Goel, Sham Kakade, and Cyril Zhang. Inductive biases and variable creation in self-attention mechanisms. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5793–5831. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022.
- [EGZ20] Javid Ebrahimi, Dhruv Gelda, and Wei Zhang. How can self-attention networks recognize Dyck- n languages? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4301–4306, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [GLSS18] Ankit Garg, Yin Tat Lee, Zhao Song, and Nikhil Srivastava. A matrix expander chernoff bound. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1102–1114, 2018.
- [GR21] Yong Gu and Hanlin Ren. Constructing a distance sensitivity oracle in $O(n^{2.5794}m)$ time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.08569*, 2021.
- [GS22] Yuzhou Gu and Zhao Song. A faster small treewidth sdp solver. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.06033*, 2022.
- [HJS⁺22] Baihe Huang, Shunhua Jiang, Zhao Song, Runzhou Tao, and Ruizhe Zhang. Solving sdp faster: A robust ipm framework and efficient implementation. In *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 233–244. IEEE, 2022.
- [HKNS15] Monika Henzinger, Sebastian Krinninger, Danupon Nanongkai, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Unifying and strengthening hardness for dynamic problems via the online matrix-vector multiplication conjecture. In *Proceedings of the forty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 21–30, 2015.
- [HL19] John Hewitt and Percy Liang. Designing and interpreting probes with control tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2733–2743, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [HM19] John Hewitt and Christopher D. Manning. A structural probe for finding syntax in word representations. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American*

Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), pages 4129–4138, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [JKL⁺20] Haotian Jiang, Tarun Kathuria, Yin Tat Lee, Swati Padmanabhan, and Zhao Song. A faster interior point method for semidefinite programming. In *2020 IEEE 61st annual symposium on foundations of computer science (FOCS)*, pages 910–918. IEEE, 2020.
- [JLSW20] Haotian Jiang, Yin Tat Lee, Zhao Song, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong. An improved cutting plane method for convex optimization, convex-concave games, and its applications. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 944–953, 2020.
- [JSWZ21] Shunhua Jiang, Zhao Song, Omri Weinstein, and Hengjie Zhang. Faster dynamic matrix inverse for faster lps. In *STOC*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07470, 2021.
- [KKL20] Nikita Kitaev, Łukasz Kaiser, and Anselm Levskaya. Reformer: The efficient transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04451*, 2020.
- [KVPF20] Angelos Katharopoulos, Apoorv Vyas, Nikolaos Pappas, and François Fleuret. Transformers are rnns: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5156–5165. PMLR, 2020.
- [LG14] François Le Gall. Powers of tensors and fast matrix multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ISSAC '14*, 2014.
- [LLR23] Yuchen Li, Yuanzhi Li, and Andrej Risteski. How do transformers learn topic structure: Towards a mechanistic understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04245*, 2023.
- [LSZ19] Yin Tat Lee, Zhao Song, and Qiuyi Zhang. Solving empirical risk minimization in the current matrix multiplication time. In *COLT*, 2019.
- [LSZ23] Zhihang Li, Zhao Song, and Tianyi Zhou. Solving regularized exp, cosh and sinh regression problem. *arxiv preprint 2303.15725*, 2023.
- [LW17] Kasper Green Larsen and Ryan Williams. Faster online matrix-vector multiplication. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2182–2189, 2017.
- [Ope23] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- [PMB19] Jorge Pérez, Javier Marinković, and Pablo Barceló. On the turing completeness of modern neural network architectures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.03429*, 2019.
- [RNS⁺18] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
- [San04] Piotr Sankowski. Dynamic transitive closure via dynamic matrix inverse. In *45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 509–517. IEEE, 2004.

- [San05] Piotr Sankowski. Subquadratic algorithm for dynamic shortest distances. In *Computing and Combinatorics: 11th Annual International Conference, COCOON 2005 Kunming, China, August 16–19, 2005 Proceedings 11*, pages 461–470. Springer, 2005.
- [SS92] Hava T. Siegelmann and Eduardo D. Sontag. On the computational power of neural nets. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Workshop on Computational Learning Theory, COLT '92*, page 440–449, New York, NY, USA, 1992. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [SY21] Zhao Song and Zheng Yu. Oblivious sketching-based central path method for solving linear programming problems. In *38th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- [TDP19] Ian Tenney, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. BERT rediscovers the classical NLP pipeline. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4593–4601, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [VB19] Jesse Vig and Yonatan Belinkov. Analyzing the structure of attention in a transformer language model. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 63–76, Florence, Italy, August 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [VSP⁺17] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [WCM21] Colin Wei, Yining Chen, and Tengyu Ma. Statistically meaningful approximation: a case study on approximating turing machines with transformers, 2021.
- [Wil12] Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Multiplying matrices faster than coppersmith-winograd. In *Proceedings of the forty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 887–898. ACM, 2012.
- [WLK⁺20] Sinong Wang, Belinda Z Li, Madian Khabsa, Han Fang, and Hao Ma. Linformer: Self-attention with linear complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04768*, 2020.
- [YBR⁺20] Chulhee Yun, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Ankit Singh Rawat, Sashank Reddi, and Sanjiv Kumar. Are transformers universal approximators of sequence-to-sequence functions? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [YPPN21] Shunyu Yao, Binghui Peng, Christos Papadimitriou, and Karthik Narasimhan. Self-attention networks can process bounded hierarchical languages. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3770–3785, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [ZBB⁺22] Yi Zhang, Arturs Backurs, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, and Tal Wagner. Unveiling transformers with lego: a synthetic reasoning task, 2022.
- [ZBIW19] Ofir Zafrir, Guy Boudoukh, Peter Izsak, and Moshe Wasserblat. Q8bert: Quantized 8bit bert. In *2019 Fifth Workshop on Energy Efficient Machine Learning and Cognitive Computing-NeurIPS Edition (EMCC-NIPS)*, pages 36–39. IEEE, 2019.

- [ZHDK23] Amir Zandieh, Insu Han, Majid Daliri, and Amin Karbasi. Kdeformer: Accelerating transformers via kernel density estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02451*, 2023.
- [ZPGA23] Haoyu Zhao, Abhishek Panigrahi, Rong Ge, and Sanjeev Arora. Do transformers parse while predicting the masked word? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08117*, 2023.
- [ZRG⁺22] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022.
- [Zwi02] Uri Zwick. All pairs shortest paths using bridging sets and rectangular matrix multiplication. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 49(3):289–317, 2002.