

Scattered Mixture-of-Experts Implementation

Shawn Tan
tanjings@mila.quebec

Yikang Shen
yikang.shen@ibm.com

Rameswar Panda
rpanda@ibm.com

Aaron Courville
courvila@iro.umontreal.ca

Abstract

We present ScatterMoE, an implementation of Sparse Mixture-of-Experts (SMoE) on GPUs. ScatterMoE builds upon existing implementations, and overcoming some of the limitations to improve inference and training speed, and memory footprint. This implementation achieves this by avoiding padding and making excessive copies of the input.

We introduce ParallelLinear, the main component we use to build our implementation and the various kernels used to speed up the operation. We benchmark our implementation against Megablocks, and show that it enables a higher throughput and lower memory footprint. We also show how ParallelLinear enables extension of the Mixture-of-Experts concept by demonstrating with an implementation of Mixture of Attention.

 <https://github.com/shawntan/scattermoe>

1 Problem

Sparse Mixture of Experts (SMoEs; Shazeer et al. 2017) have become increasingly popular. While applications like Switch Transformer (Fedus et al., 2022) use SMoEs to scale ‘outrageously’ large models by distributed computing, it has proven useful in scaling up smaller models where device memory is an issue. Coupled with SMoE versions of the attention module (Zhang et al., 2022; Csordás et al., 2023), SMoEs have been used to scale up Universal Transformers (Dehghani et al., 2018; Tan et al., 2023), and also for applications to continual learning in a fully modularised Transformer (Shen et al., 2023). Computing SMoEs efficiently will bring huge benefits to the training and inference of these models.

SMoEs are challenging to implement efficiently. While a lot of deep learning research is implemented in PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019), the naive implementation of SMoEs are too slow, and do not take full advantage of the parallelism of GPUs. Further, initial implementations on TPUs require all tensor sizes to be known statically (at compilation time). This creates issues when experts are imbalanced: some experts are used a lot, exceeding the capacity decided at compilation time, requiring dropping of some tokens. On the other hand, underused experts are padded, which creates unnecessary memory allocation.

To combat this, Megablocks (Gale et al., 2023) and PIT (Zheng et al., 2023) frames the SMoE computation as a sparse matrix multiplication problem. This then allowed the problem to be broken down into a block sparse matrix multiplication problem, which could then be computed efficiently. In both these cases, the authors were able to create a more efficient GPU-based implementation of SMoEs. However, these existing implementations still leave room for possible improvement.

Firstly, existing implementations of SMoEs, performs a scatter-to-group initial copy of the input, creating a memory allocation and memory footprint overhead during training because of stored tensors used in the backward pass. Some implementations like Megablocks further pad the grouped copy so they are of equal sized blocks, which further increases the memory overhead.




Figure 1: Current implementations of SMOE Multi-layer Perceptrons (MLPs) require a copy of the embeddings when grouping (left), while ScatterMoE fuses the grouping and linear transformation step (right), reducing the memory footprint of our method. The various colours represent different experts, while the vertical rectangular boxes represent embeddings with their associated time steps labelled above or below them.

Secondly, Megablocks and PIT requires a translation of the SMOE problem into the sparse matrix format, requiring translating indices to sparse block matrix offsets. While this incurs only a small part of the computation overhead, the sparse matrix format makes things opaque and extension on top of Megablocks for modules other than an SMOE MLP difficult.

In this report, we present ScatterMoE, an SMOE implementation that minimises this memory footprint. This is made possible by `ParallelLinear`, a linear module that performs grouped matrix operations on scattered groups. This results in intermediate representations (*e.g.* hidden state of an SMOE MLP) that can be exposed as standard PyTorch tensors, allowing for easy extensions of present SMOE methods to other types of expert modules. We demonstrate the utility of this representation by implementing SMOE Attention, following the implementation in Tan et al. (2023). In the final section, we benchmark ScatterMoE against Megablocks¹, due to its usage in the Megatron-LM model (Shoeybi et al., 2019; Narayanan et al., 2021; Korthikanti et al., 2023). Megablocks is also implemented using the STK framework² which uses Triton³ (Tillet et al., 2019), a tile-based language for GPU programming in Python, making it the most accessible for modification and extension.

2 Method

In this report, we will maintain the notation convention of boldface, *i.e.* \mathbf{X} , for matrices, with the first dimension as the time or batch dimension, unless otherwise stated. Additionally, \mathbf{X}_i denotes the i -th row of \mathbf{X} . Unless otherwise stated, the first dimension is batch-time (batch and time dimensions flattened) for ease of understanding.

2.1 Sparse Mixture-of-Experts

SMoE modules are made up of E experts which are typically sub-modules of a similar architecture. Each of the T tokens in the input is routed via a routing module, and then based on its output weights, assigned to k experts, where $k \leq E$. However, the naive method of computing the output of an SMOE (iterating over all tokens and evaluating the respective

¹ <https://github.com/stanford-futuredata/megablocks>

² <https://github.com/stanford-futuredata/stk>

³ <https://github.com/openai/triton>




Figure 2: ParallelLinear allows for performing different combinations of SMoE transformations allowing for the input and output to be either grouped or scattered. This basic functionality forms the basis of both forward and backward passes of ScatterMoE. Unlike existing implementations, these operations are performed without additional copying (or padding) of the input and output tensors.

expert output) is far too slow, and does not exploit the full parallelism of GPU computation. In sum, SMoE implementations often perform the following main steps:

1. **Routing** – Based on each token embedding \mathbf{X}_t , the router assigns the weights for each expert $g(\mathbf{X}_t)$, and only the top- k experts are selected.
2. **Grouping** – This step groups all tokens that are assigned to the same expert together. If $k > 1$, as is often the case, then this also results in a “fan out” of tokens, resulting in kN embeddings in total.
3. **Expert transform** – Now that the tokens are grouped by expert, each expert (a linear transform) can be efficiently computed by batched vector transformations (matrix-matrix multiplications).
4. **Scattering** – This step returns each token to be grouped by its original time-step. This still results in a kN embeddings in total.
5. **Weighted sum** – This step combines the k outputs per token by its original routing weight,

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \sum_{e \in \text{topk}(g(\mathbf{X}_t))} g_e(\mathbf{X}_t) \cdot f_e(\mathbf{X}_t)$$

Typically, each expert is an Multi-layer Perceptron (MLP) with one hidden layer of dimension d_{expert} .

In the Megablocks implementation, steps (1) and (4) result in a copy of the original input. They further pad the per-expert blocks of tokens so that they fit into equal count for convenient GPU computation (See Figure 1).

2.2 ParallelLinear operation

Our implementation of SMoE relies on ParallelLinear, which allows for different combinations of *grouped* General Matrix Multiplications (GeMMs). In order to achieve this, we wrote a Triton kernel, `scatter2scatter`, that enables all combinations of operations shown in Figure 2. This operation fuses grouped GeMMs and scattered read and write operations, which allows us to skip an intermediate group and copy step. ParallelLinear allows options for

grouped and scattered for both input and output, resulting in the four possible combinations seen in Figure 2. With combinations of these operations, we can implement both the forward and backward passes of ParallelLinear.

Algorithm 1 gives the pseudo-code of ParallelLinear. It is a thin wrapper around the actual scatter2scatter kernel, and uses no explicit grouping operations. The grouping operations are provided as arguments to scatter2scatter, which performs a fused transformation and grouping/scattering. This is the main workhorse of our SMOE implementation, and can be used for both implementing an MLP and an attention layer. To make this a self-contained module, we implement the backward pass of ParallelLinear independently of its downstream usage.

Algorithm 1 ParallelLinear FORWARD

```

Input:
 $\mathbf{X}$   $T \times d_{\text{in}}$  input matrix  $\mathbf{o}$   $T$  order indices
 $\mathbf{W}$   $E \times d_{\text{in}} \times d_{\text{out}}$  transform tensor  $k$  top- $k$ 
                                     default  $k = 1$ 

 $\mathbf{p}$   $S \times j$  routing weights
    where  $S_j = Tk$  default  $\mathbf{p} : (Tk \times 1) = \mathbf{1}$ 
*options
  grouped_in True, False grouped_out True, False
Output:
 $\mathbf{Y}$   $S \times d_{\text{out}}$  output matrix

 $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} \leftarrow \text{scatter2scatter}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{o}, k, \text{*options})$ 
if  $\mathbf{p} \neq \emptyset$  then
   $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} \leftarrow \text{view}(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}, S, j, -1)$  // reshape
   $\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \text{bmm}(\mathbf{p}, \hat{\mathbf{Y}})$  // weighted sum if  $\mathbf{p}$  is provided
else
   $\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ 
end if

```

2.2.1 Backward pass

In a typical batched linear transformation $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{XW}$, we need to compute the gradients $\nabla \mathbf{X}$ and $\nabla \mathbf{W}$.

$$\nabla \mathbf{X} = \nabla \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{W}^\top, \quad \nabla \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{X}^\top \nabla \mathbf{Y},$$

In ParallelLinear, we will need to compute the gradients for each of the E experts. While this could be computed in a way where \mathbf{X} and $\nabla \mathbf{Y}$ are both scattered, the implementation of this operation is fastest when both \mathbf{X} and $\nabla \mathbf{Y}$ are grouped⁴.

Algorithm 2 groups the embeddings when they are not grouped in order to compute $\nabla \mathbf{W}$. groupXTY is the kernel that implements this grouped matrix multiplication. While this grouping incurs additional memory allocations for potentially very large matrices, these array allocations could be reused. Once the gradients $\nabla \mathbf{p}$ has been computed, the array for $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ can be used as the output for $\nabla \mathbf{Y}$. $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ can be reused for $\nabla \mathbf{X}$ as they are of the same dimensions. We can then further minimise the use of memory during the backward pass by re-using the arrays used for the grouping operations. We colour the reused arrays in blue and orange respectively in Algorithm 2.

2.2.2 SMOE Multi-layer Perceptron (SMoE MLP)

In the context of an SMOE MLP, we can reduce the memory footprint even further. The MLP requires two linear transformations, and could be naively implemented with two ParallelLinear operations set to perform scatter-to-scatter transformations. However, we can configure these two linear transforms to be scattered-to-grouped then grouped-to-scattered respectively. This means that for each ParallelLinear transform in the SMOE MLP, only one group operation would be required.

⁴We tested scatterXTY and found it to be slower than a grouping operation followed by groupXTY

Algorithm 2 ParallelLinear BACKWARD

Input:

$\nabla \mathbf{Y}$	$S \times d_{\text{out}}$	gradient matrix	$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$	$Tk \times d_{\text{out}}$	from forward pass
\mathbf{W}	$E \times d_{\text{in}} \times d_{\text{out}}$	transform tensor	\mathbf{X}	$T \times d_{\text{in}}$	from forward pass
k		top- k	\mathbf{o}	Tk	from forward pass
		default $k = 1$			

column \mathbf{p} $S \times j$ routing weights
 where $S_j = Tk$ default $\mathbf{p} : (T \times 1) = \mathbf{1}$

Output:

$\nabla \mathbf{X}$	same size as \mathbf{X}	$\nabla \mathbf{W}$	same size as \mathbf{W}
$\nabla \mathbf{p}$	same size as \mathbf{p}		

if $\mathbf{p} \neq \emptyset$ then
 $\nabla \mathbf{p} \leftarrow \text{bmm}(\nabla \mathbf{Y}, \hat{\mathbf{Y}})$
 $\nabla \mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \text{group}(\nabla \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{o}, \mathbf{p})$ *// weight and group*
else
 $\nabla \mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathbf{Y}$
end if
if \mathbf{X} is not grouped then
 $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \leftarrow \text{group}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{o}, \emptyset)$
else
 $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \leftarrow \mathbf{X}$
end if
 $\nabla \mathbf{W} \leftarrow \text{groupXTY}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \nabla \mathbf{Y})$
 $\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \leftarrow \text{scatter2scatter}(\nabla \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{W}^\top, \mathbf{o}, 1)$ *// grouped to scatter or group depending on original input*

Algorithm 3 SMOE MULTI-LAYER PERCEPTRON

Input:

\mathbf{X}	$T \times d_{\text{model}}$	input matrix	\mathbf{o}	T	vector of grouped ordering
\mathbf{W}_1	$E \times d_{\text{model}} \times d_{\text{expert}}$	transformation tensor			
\mathbf{W}_2	$E \times d_{\text{expert}} \times d_{\text{model}}$	transformation tensor			

Output:

\mathbf{Y}	$T \times d_{\text{model}}$	output matrix
--------------	-----------------------------	---------------

$\mathbf{H} \leftarrow \text{ParallelLinear}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{o}, \emptyset, \text{grouped_in}=\text{False}, \text{grouped_out}=\text{True})$
 $\mathbf{H} \leftarrow \sigma(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ *// where σ is any point-wise non-linearity*
 $\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \text{ParallelLinear}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{o}, \mathbf{p}, \text{grouped_in}=\text{True}, \text{grouped_out}=\text{False})$

2.3 Extensibility: Mixture-of-Attention (MoA)

There have been several proposals for applying SMOEs to the attention layer (Zhang et al., 2022; Csordás et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2023). Regardless of formulation, before the attention layer is applied, the embeddings should be in chronological order (scattered) to facilitate the application of positional embeddings and to compute the result of the attention weights and value embeddings. With existing SMOE implementations, there would be an additional pair of group-scatter operations, incurring additional memory costs.

ScatterMoE provides an advantage. Since we can retain the scattered ordering through a ParallelLinear transform, we can implement MoAs without allocating the extra arrays for grouping and scattering. Figure 3 shows the operations used for SMOE Attention.

In this report, we specifically implement and benchmark the Mixture of Multi-head Attention variant found in Tan et al. (2023). This bears close resemblance to Grouped-query Attention (GQA; Ainslie et al. 2023), where each key head




Figure 3: ParallelLinear allows for scattered to scattered transformations which retains the chronological order.

has multiple possible query heads, while in the SMOE setting, there would be h_{expert} key heads, with $k \cdot h_{\text{expert}}$ query heads selected from a possible $E \cdot h_{\text{expert}}$, where h_{expert} is the number of heads per expert. Following the standard attention implementation conventions, we set $d_{\text{out}} = d_{\text{expert}} \cdot d_{\text{head}}$, where d_{head} is the number of dimensions for each head. We then reshape when we perform the attention operation so that the separate heads interact independently.

In Algorithm 4, we need to consider the time dimension, so we express the inputs and intermediate arrays as 3-dimensional tensors with the dimensions for batch, time, and embedding dimensions ($B \times T \times d$). In practice, we assume that the input is contiguous and is batch-time ordered, allowing us to flatten the tensor and proceed as we did in the case of the MLP. Note that for the SMOE attention, a key distinction is that we require ParallelLinear to give an ungrouped output after the first transformation, and it takes an ungrouped input for the output transform, which means both ParallelLinear transformation use a scattered to scattered configuration (Figure 2c).

Algorithm 4 SMOE MULTI-HEAD ATTENTION

Input:

\mathbf{X}	$B \times T \times d_{\text{model}}$	input matrix	k		top- k
\mathbf{o}	$B \times T \times k$	grouped indices	\mathbf{p}	$B \times T \times k$	router weights
\mathbf{W}_K	$d_{\text{model}} \times d_{\text{out}}$	key transform	\mathbf{W}_V	$d_{\text{model}} \times d_{\text{out}}$	value transform
\mathbf{W}_Q	$E \times d_{\text{model}} \times d_{\text{out}}$	query transform	\mathbf{W}_O	$E \times d_{\text{out}} \times d_{\text{model}}$	output transform

Output:

\mathbf{O}	$B \times T \times d_{\text{model}}$	output matrix			
$\mathbf{V} \leftarrow \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{W}_V$					
$\mathbf{K} \leftarrow \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{W}_K$					
$\mathbf{Q} \leftarrow \text{ParallelLinear}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{W}_Q, \mathbf{o}, \emptyset, \text{grouped_in}=\text{False}, \text{grouped_out}=\text{False})$					
$\hat{\mathbf{O}} \leftarrow \text{Attention}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V})$					
$\mathbf{O} \leftarrow \text{ParallelLinear}(\hat{\mathbf{O}}, \mathbf{W}_O, \mathbf{o}, \mathbf{p}, \text{grouped_in}=\text{False}, \text{grouped_out}=\text{False})$					

3 Performance

In this section, we cover the performance of our implementation for both training and inference.


As an overall integrated test, we benchmark our method within Mixtral (Jiang et al., 2024), using a $\sim 1.5\text{B}$ parameter configuration,

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_{\text{model}} &= 1024, & d_{\text{expert}} &= 3584, & L &= 16, \\
 k &= 2, & E &= 8, & &
 \end{aligned}$$

We compare against the naive implementation from HuggingFace (Naive HF impl.), then swapping out the SMOE layer with Megablocks sparse (MB (Sparse)) and grouped memory efficient (MB (Mem. eff.)), and finally ScatterMoE (Ours). Our goal is to measure the overall throughput in a training setting.

We ran the training for 100 training updates, with an effective batch size of 256 and 2048 tokens per instance, across 8 A100 GPUs on the same compute node. For both the naive and ScatterMoE, this resulted in an actual batch size of 128 and 2 accumulation steps, while the Megablocks benchmarks required a batch size of 64 and 4 accumulation steps. We ran the training for a 100 steps and computed the overall throughput. Our method outperforms both the Sparse Megablocks implementation by **38.1%** in this setting.

The rest of this section covers the other benchmarking experiments we performed in more detail, testing for the effects of decreasing sparsity, and increasing granularity of experts, and benchmarking of our Mixture of Attention implementation.



(a) 1.5B model training throughput (b) SMoE MLP unit throughput (c) SMoE MLP unit memory use

Figure 4

3.1 Unit Benchmarking on the SMoE MLP

Unless otherwise stated, we use the following model hyperparameters,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{model}} &= 4096, & d_{\text{ff}} &= 2d_{\text{model}} \\ d_{\text{expert}} &= d_{\text{ff}}/k, & E &= 8k \end{aligned}$$

For example, the active hidden units for an MLP is $2 \cdot 4096 = 8192$. If $k = 4$, then $E = 4 \cdot 8 = 32$, with each expert being $8192/k = 2048$ dimensions. Each datapoint on the plot is the median and 5-th and 95-th percentiles of 100 runs of the module.

Figure 4a summarises the overall performance for an SMoE MLP where $E = 32, k = 4$, and $T = 30 \cdot 2048$. All benchmark times are measured on an Nvidia A100 GPU. Generally, we find that ScatterMoE has slightly higher throughput during training, for the same input sizes. Our method shows a larger margin of improvement for inference.

On memory consumption, our implementation for the SMoE MLP uses **66.2%** of the memory Megablocks uses during training, while using only **53.6%** of the memory of Megablocks if we consider only inference.

3.2 Granularity and Throughput

Krajewski et al. (2024) defines the concept of granularity. Given a SMoE MLP with the equivalent active parameters as an MLP with intermediate dimension layer of dimension d_{ff} , and with each expert of dimension d_{expert} , then granularity is defined as,

$$G = \frac{d_{\text{ff}}}{d_{\text{expert}}}$$

Here, we measure the effect of throughput as we vary G while fixing d_{ff} . Accordingly, with higher values of G , we need to increase values of k and E — more granularity requires more experts to achieve the same active parameters.

We test values of $k \in \{1, 2, 4, 8, 16\}$, and $E = 8k$ for divisibility of dimension sizes. Figure 5 shows how throughput of both methods vary relative to a model with equivalent active parameters. Since we maintain constant active and total parameters for these runs, these results are also constant for all G .

We find that ScatterMoE scales with G with better throughput. This may be related to the increase in zero-padding required for higher number of E in the case of Megablocks — as the number of experts grows and the embeddings assigned to each expert decreases, there will be more padding introduced. If we consider only the forward pass, the relative gap between our method and Megablocks is also much higher than in the case of training. This makes our method favourable for batched inference, especially with high granularity settings.

Krajewski et al. (2024) prescribes higher G for SMoE models, and our implementation seems suited for this application. Our padding-free implementation also reduces the amount of additional memory allocated, which can potentially improve throughput.




Figure 5: Increasing k and E while fixing the number of active parameters and total parameters. We find that our implementation scales better with higher k . Inference granularity scaling performance. The difference in relative throughput is higher if we consider only the forward pass.

3.3 Decreasing sparsity

We can view the SMoE as an interpolation between a model with the size of just the active parameters $k \cdot d_{\text{expert}}$ and a large fully dense model with $E \cdot d_{\text{expert}}$. However, SMoE comes with additional overhead to compute, and we want to measure how much reducing sparsity will affect throughput, in comparison to a fully dense model.

In this experiment, we tested on increasing values of $k \leq 30$. Further increasing k reaches the limit of device memory for Megablocks. We maintain $E = 64$ for all runs, and compare the performance of both Megablocks and ScatterMoE to a dense model with a $d_{\text{ff}} = E \cdot d_{\text{expert}}$.

Generally, we find that while our implementation performs with slightly better throughput overall, both Megablocks and our implementations are still more efficient than a large dense MLP with equivalent parameters. However, note that in this case, the throughput for $k = 30, E = 64$ is already reaching the throughput for an equivalent dense model with the same parameters. Further increasing k exceeds the memory of the device we ran the benchmarks on for Megablocks.




Figure 6: Relative throughput curves as we decrease sparsity (increasing k)

3.4 Mixture of Attention

As previously mentioned, we implement the Mixture of Multi-head Attention (MoMHA) variant of Attention SMoEs as described in Tan et al. (2023). This implementation allows for multiple attention heads per expert, and shares the key and value embeddings across the attention experts. This formulation is similar to Grouped-query Attention (GQA; Ainslie et al. 2023), where each head of the key has several query heads, each of these forming a group. MoMHA experts are the equivalent of groups in GQA, where each group is of size k .




Figure 8: The curves for increasing granularity for the MoMHA implementation. In this case, the Active params baseline varies in throughput because of the shared key and value vectors across the experts.

For the following benchmarks, we adhere to the following parameters:

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_{\text{model}} &= 4096, & d_{\text{head}} &= 128, & T &= 16 \cdot 2048 \\
 h &= 32, & h_{\text{expert}} &= h/k, & E &= 8k
 \end{aligned}$$

where d_{head} is the dimension of each attention head and h is the number of *active* attention heads.

We implemented an equivalent baseline in Megablocks using the ‘dense’ configuration in the library. This version still suffers from the issue with having to perform redundant grouping and scattering steps.

For $k = 8$, we find that our implementation outperforms Megablocks yet again, by **24.0%** of throughput for inference. We also note from Figure 8, that as we increase granularity (fewer heads per expert / smaller h_{expert}), the gap between our implementation and Megablocks grows as well. Again, our method is favourable for use in high granularity settings.

4 Conclusion

ScatterMoE is an implementation of SMOEs in Triton that reduces the memory footprint and offers slightly higher throughput compared to existing solutions. We have also engineered ScatterMoE to be made up the ParallelLinear primitive, which we envision to be a module that can be extended upon to build other MoE-style modules that require grouped or scattered linear transformations.

We have also provided an implementation of an MLP and Attention layer based on ScatterMoE, that we hope will benefit any future implementations of Mixture-of-Expert based models, and serve as worked examples for extending the concept of SMOEs to other variants of linear transformation based experts.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Songlin Yang for their advice and suggestions during the development of ScatterMoE.

References

- Joshua Ainslie, James Lee-Thorp, Michiel de Jong, Yury Zemlyanskiy, Federico Lebrón, and Sumit Sanghai. Gqa: Training generalized multi-query transformer models from multi-head checkpoints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13245*, 2023.
- Róbert Csordás, Piotr Piekos, and Kazuki Irie. Switchhead: Accelerating transformers with mixture-of-experts attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.07987*, 2023.
- Mostafa Dehghani, Stephan Gouws, Oriol Vinyals, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Łukasz Kaiser. Universal transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03819*, 2018.
- William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1):5232–5270, 2022.
- Trevor Gale, Deepak Narayanan, Cliff Young, and Matei Zaharia. MegaBlocks: Efficient Sparse Training with Mixture-of-Experts. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 5, 2023.
- 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, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- Vijay Anand Korthikanti, Jared Casper, Sangkug Lym, Lawrence McAfee, Michael Andersch, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. Reducing activation recomputation in large transformer models. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 5, 2023.
- Jakub Krajewski, Jan Ludziejewski, Kamil Adamczewski, Maciej Pióro, Michał Krutul, Szymon Antoniak, Kamil Ciebiera, Krystian Król, Tomasz Odrzygóźdź, Piotr Sankowski, et al. Scaling laws for fine-grained mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07871*, 2024.
- Deepak Narayanan, Mohammad Shoeybi, Jared Casper, Patrick LeGresley, Mostofa Patwary, Vijay Korthikanti, Dmitri Vainbrand, Prethvi Kashinkunti, Julie Bernauer, Bryan Catanzaro, et al. Efficient large-scale language model training on gpu clusters using megatron-lm. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pp. 1–15, 2021.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538*, 2017.
- Yikang Shen, Zheyu Zhang, Tianyou Cao, Shawn Tan, Zhenfang Chen, and Chuang Gan. Moduleformer: Learning modular large language models from uncurated data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04640*, 2023.
- Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053*, 2019.
- Shawn Tan, Yikang Shen, Zhenfang Chen, Aaron Courville, and Chuang Gan. Sparse universal transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07096*, 2023.
- Philippe Tillet, Hsiang-Tsung Kung, and David Cox. Triton: an intermediate language and compiler for tiled neural network computations. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGPLAN International Workshop on Machine Learning and Programming Languages*, pp. 10–19, 2019.

Xiaofeng Zhang, Yikang Shen, Zeyu Huang, Jie Zhou, Wenge Rong, and Zhang Xiong. Mixture of attention heads: Selecting attention heads per token. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05144*, 2022.

Ningxin Zheng, Huiqiang Jiang, Quanlu Zhang, Zhenhua Han, Lingxiao Ma, Yuqing Yang, Fan Yang, Chengruidong Zhang, Lili Qiu, Mao Yang, et al. Pit: Optimization of dynamic sparse deep learning models via permutation invariant transformation. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pp. 331–347, 2023.