

# Optimizing KV Cache Eviction in LLMs: Adaptive Allocation for Enhanced Budget Utilization

Yuan Feng<sup>1,3,†</sup>, Junlin Lv<sup>1,3,†</sup>, Yukun Cao<sup>1,3</sup>, Xike Xie<sup>2,3,\*</sup>, and S. Kevin Zhou<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science, University of Science and Technology of China (USTC), China

<sup>2</sup>School of Biomedical Engineering, USTC, China

<sup>3</sup>Data Darkness Lab, MIRACLE Center, Suzhou Institute for Advanced Research, USTC, China  
{yfung,junlinlv,ykcho}@mail.ustc.edu.cn, xkxie@ustc.edu.cn, s.kevin.zhou@gmail.com

## Abstract

Large Language Models have excelled in various fields but encounter efficiency limitations due to the extensive KV cache required for long sequences inference. Many efforts try to evict non-critical cache elements during runtime, thereby reducing cache size within a given memory budget while preserving generation quality. Our reexamination of their underlying principles discerns that prevailing strategies essentially aim to minimize an upper bound of eviction loss within a specific budget allocation. However, we observe that the current practice of uniformly allocating budgets across different attention heads during the eviction procedure tends to degrade the quality of generation post-eviction. In light of these findings, we propose a simple yet effective adaptive allocation algorithm that not only theoretically ensures its loss upper bound does not exceed that of previous uniform allocation methods, but also effectively aligns with the characteristics of the self-attention mechanism, thus practically reducing the upper bound. Further, integrating this algorithm with two of the most advanced methods yields Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid. Extensive experimental validation across 16 datasets and the Needle-in-a-Haystack test confirm that Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid achieve further enhancements, establishing new benchmarks in state-of-the-art performance.

## 1 Introduction

Autoregressive Large language models (LLMs) have achieved significant success and are widely utilized across diverse natural language processing applications, including dialogue systems (Yi et al. 2024), document summarization (Laban et al. 2023), and code generation (Gu 2023). Their deployment in real-world contexts has propelled the development of their capacity to process extended sequences. For instance, GPT-4 supports sequences up to 129K (Achiam et al. 2023), Claude3 up to 200K (Anthropic 2024), and Gemini-Pro-1.5 (Reid et al. 2024) up to 1M tokens. However, the computational cost and memory requirements for Transformer architecture increase quadratically with sequence length, posing significant challenges.

To mitigate these issues, a traditional optimization technique called caching has been applied to LLMs, referred to as Key-Value(KV) cache. The KV cache pairs store intermediate computation results of previous tokens, effectively

reducing the computational burden associated with autoregressive generation. It has become a prevalent approach in enhancing LLM efficiency. However, the expansion of the inference sequence necessitates a corresponding increase in KV cache size, which can easily exceed the total parameter size of the model itself in long-sequence inference (Sun et al. 2024). This not only leads to substantial memory overhead but also results in massive input/output (I/O) time during autoregressive generation (Sun et al. 2024).

In response, KV cache eviction methods (Zhang et al. 2024b; Xiao et al. 2023; Ge et al. 2023; Yang et al. 2024; Zhang et al. 2024a; Li et al. 2024) have been proposed to compress the cache size within specified budgets by discarding non-critical cache pairs while striving to minimize the loss of generation quality. These methods are valued for their plug-and-play capabilities, allowing for seamless integration into any LLM without fine-tuning. Typically, these algorithms employ various strategies to select and evict the majority of KV cache pairs, thus reducing memory demands. The latest leading algorithms use the Top-K base selection scheme, which effectively distinguishes between critical and non-critical cache pairs, retaining the former and evicting the latter. The recent leading algorithms have established the Top-K base selection scheme, which can effectively to distinguish the critical and non-critical cache pairs thus perserving and evicting. Despite these advancements, the challenge of minimizing quality loss in existing eviction schemes remains unresolved.

Our study begins by reexamining the underlying principles of eviction strategies from a theoretical perspective. We establish that Top-K based strategies aim to minimize an upper bound of eviction loss, quantified by the L1-distance between the outputs of the self-attention mechanism pre- and post-eviction under given budget allocation results. We also found the common practice of distributing budget uniformly across different attention heads leads to a misallocation of total budgets, thus diminishing the generation quality, as illustrated in Figure 1a. Base on these insights, we propose a simple yet effective adaptive allocation algorithm to optimize budget distribution to improve the generation quality, which utilizes the pronounced variations in attention concentration among the heads within the self-attention mechanism as illustrated in Figure 1b. In addition, we also theoretically prove that the upper bound of the loss under Top-K

<sup>†</sup>Equal Contribution \*Corresponding Author




Figure 1: An Illustrative Example. This example features a five KV cache pairs with associated attention weights across three heads. Adaptive allocation, through reallocating budgets from the concentrated Head2 to the dispersed Head1, increases the aggregated weights of retained KV cache pairs from 2.33 to 2.46, which correlates to a reduced upper bound of eviction loss in Section 3.5.

eviction with adaptive allocation consistently remains at or lower than that with uniform allocation, ensuring the robustness of algorithm performance in practice.

By integrating the adaptive budget allocation algorithm into two prominent methods (Li et al. 2024; Yang et al. 2024; Zhang et al. 2024a), we develop two adaptive eviction methods: Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid, respectively. Extensive evaluations across 16 datasets spanning various tasks in LongBench demonstrate that both Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid further improve the generation quality. Another widely used test, named "Needle-in-a-Haystack", also shows that adaptive allocation further enhances long-context retrieval capabilities. The main contributions are summarized as follow:

- **Reexamination of Cache Eviction Principle:** We formalize the principle of cache eviction as the minimization of the upper bound of eviction loss, quantified as changes in the L1 distance of attention outputs post-eviction.
- **Identifying and Addressing Limitations in Budget Allocations:** We pinpoint the inefficiency of existing uniform budget allocation across heads. To address this, we introduce an adaptive allocation algorithm that both theoretically and empirically reduces the upper bound of eviction loss.
- **Developments of Adaptive Eviction Methods:** Base on the proposed adaptive allocation algorithm, we develop two novel approaches, Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid. These methods demonstrably mitigate quality loss during compression in the extensive evaluations.
- **Innovative Direction to Enhance Cache Eviction:** Our research presents a method that adaptively allocates budgets based on unique characteristics among heads to optimize cache eviction, guided by our theoretical analysis of eviction loss upper bounds. We hope this direction achieves significant further development.

## 2 Related Works

In the context of long sequences, the vast scale of the KV caches leads to a memory-bound situation, causing significant memory and I/O latency costs (Wang and Chen 2023). Some studies, which are orthogonal to our work, employ efficient memory management strategies that reduce I/O time without altering the size of the KV Cache, such as Page Attention (Kwon et al. 2023) and Flash Attention (Dao et al. 2022). And in our experiments, we have incorporated the Flash Attention technique to achieve efficient computation. Other approaches (Tang et al. 2024) attempt to reduce I/O overhead by only recalling KV cache entries relevant to the current query for computation, while others remain stored for subsequent queries. However, these methods are constrained by substantial memory overheads, making it difficult to deploy on GPUs with lower storage capacities.

Recently, KV cache eviction methods have gained attention and rapid development due to their flexible compression ratios given any storage budgets and the advantage of being plug-and-play without the need for fine-tuning. Earlier StreamingLLM (Xiao et al. 2023) simply maintains the cache of 4 initial and the recent tokens, discarding all others to adapt to long sequence inference. FastGen (Ge et al. 2023) searches and combines multiple strategies, like maintaining the cache of special tokens, punctuation tokens, and recent tokens, based on the characteristics of attention heads. H2O (2024b) has developed an eviction algorithm that utilizes query states of all tokens to identify important KV pairs based on the Heavy Hitter method. The most recent SnapKV (Li et al. 2024) identifies important KV cache pairs using query states of several tokens within a recent window, evicting the less important ones. This method effectively mitigates the quality degradation in cache eviction. The Pyramid (Yang et al. 2024; Zhang et al. 2024a) further adjusts the budget allocation across different layers in SnapKV, improving the generation quality in small-budget scenarios. However, to our best knowledge, current eviction methods have never tried to adaptively distribute the total budget across different heads. Building on theoretical analysis and observations of inherent attention patterns in LLM heads, we have identify and demonstrate the necessity for adaptive budget allocation in cache eviction. Based on these insights, we propose a simple yet effective budget allocation mechanism and integrate it into the two leading strategies, SnapKV and Pyramid, further reducing the accuracy drop associated with cache eviction.

## 3 Framework

### 3.1 Overview

In this section, we reexamine how the existing cache eviction strategies to retain essential information in the past KV cache from a theoretical perspective. Inspired by theoretical findings, we propose a simple yet effective algorithm for adaptive budget allocation, which is proved to better than the previous uniform allocation in cache eviction procedure both in theory and practice. Further integrating it into two current leading methods, we develop two adaptive cache

eviction methods: Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid. The key findings and insights are as below:

- **How the eviction strategies maintain generation quality despite discarding substantial KV cache?** Theorem 2 formalizes an upper bound of the eviction loss by using the L1-distance between the before and post-eviction outputs and Theorem 3 demonstrates that Top-K based eviction strategies actually minimize this upper bound.
- **Why is adaptive budget allocation better from the theoretical perspective?** Theorem 4 demonstrates that the upper bound of eviction loss under adaptive allocation maintains at or below that under previous uniform allocation in the cache eviction procedure. Thus it implies that the adaptive allocation is better in theory.
- **Why is adaptive budget allocation better from the empirical perspective?** As shown in Figure 2 and 3, we identify that the inherent disparities in attention concentration across different heads reliably translate theoretical advantages into practical results. This leads to consistent reductions of eviction loss upper bound across each layer in eviction procedure.

### 3.2 Preliminary

We begin by providing a formal description of the computational processes involving KV cache and Multi-head Attention in a single-layer of LLMs to alleviate the burden of notation. LLMs are characterized by their autoregressive generation mode, where each step involves using the current final token to predict the next token. Define  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  as the embedding matrix of all tokens in sequence, and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$  as the last token used as input at the current timestep. To clarify the subsequent theoretical exposition, we adopt the notation system from (Liu et al. 2023) under the assumption of  $h$  attention heads in one layer. The transformation matrices for each head  $i \in [h]$  map token embeddings to their respective Query, Key, and Value are denoted as  $W_i^Q$ ,  $W_i^K$ ,  $W_i^V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_h}$ , and the final output matrix  $W_i^O \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$  transform the intermediate result to the output hidden states. At each timestep, the states of the stored KV cache for head  $i$  has been initialized as:

$$K_i = XW_i^K, V_i = XW_i^V \quad (1)$$

Then, the input token  $x$  is mapped to its corresponding query, key, value for each head, and the previous KV cache is updated accordingly:

$$q_i = xW_i^Q, k_i = xW_i^K, v_i = xW_i^V \quad (2)$$

$$K_i = [K_i : k_i], V_i = [V_i : v_i] \quad (3)$$

Finally the final output  $o \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$  is computed as follow:

$$o = \sum_{i \in [h]} A_i V_i W_i^O \quad (4)$$

where  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$  is the attention weight calculated by:

$$A_i = \text{softmax}(q_i K_i^T) \quad (5)$$

### 3.3 Reexamining the Principle of Cache Eviction

Cache eviction is dedicated to reducing the size of KV cache to fit within a constrained budget by evicting certain cache pairs strategically. Eviction masks  $\{\mathcal{M}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}\}$  can be employed to simulate the post-eviction output  $o'$  in self-attention mechanism:

$$o' = \sum_{i \in [h]} A'_i V_i W_i^O \text{ where } A'_i = \text{softmax}(q_i K_i^T + \mathcal{M}_i) \quad (6)$$

where each element  $\mathcal{M}_i^j$  in mask  $\mathcal{M}_i$  indicates that whether evicting the  $j$ th  $\in [n]$  KV cache pair in  $K_i, V_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_h}$  on each head  $i$ :

$$\mathcal{M}_i^j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if the } j\text{th cache pair on head } i \text{ is retained} \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise the } j\text{th cache pair on head } i \text{ is evicted} \end{cases}$$

given budget allocation  $\{B_i\}$  s.t.  $\sum_{i \in [h]} B_i = B$

Thus, the budget  $B_i$  for head  $i$  corresponds to the number of zero elements in  $\mathcal{M}_i$ . Theorem 1 further simplify the output  $o'$  by eliminating the softmax function. A detailed proof is provided in Appendix A.1.

**Theorem 1.** *The post-eviction output  $o'$  can rewrite as:*

$$o' = \sum_{i \in [h]} \frac{A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i}{\|A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i\|_1} V_i W_i^O \quad (7)$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{N}_i^j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } K_i^j \text{ and } V_i^j \text{ are retained} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise, evict } K_i^j \text{ and } V_i^j \end{cases}$$

$$\text{given budget allocation } \{B_i\} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{i \in [h]} B_i = B$$

The reduction in generation quality due to cache eviction stems from alterations of the attention output. Thus, we model the eviction loss using the L1-distance between the post-eviction and original outputs of self-attention mechanism:

$$\text{Eviction Loss} = \|o' - o\|_1 \quad (8)$$

Utilizing the L1-norm of matrix, which can understand how the matrix transforms vectors, we derive an upper bound  $D$  for the Eviction Loss in Theorem 2. For a detailed proof, refer to Appendix A.2.

**Theorem 2.** *The eviction loss caused by cache eviction can be bounded by  $D$  as follows:*

$$\text{Eviction Loss} \leq D = 2hC - 2C \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{\text{retained } j} A_i^j \quad (9)$$

$$\text{given budget allocation } \{B_i\} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{i \in [h]} B_i = B$$

where  $C = \text{Max} \{\|V_i W_i^O\|_\infty\}$  is the max value in the row norms of Matrices  $\{V_i W_i^O\}$  among all heads.

<sup>1</sup>Given the first dimension of  $\mathcal{M}_i$  is 1,  $M_i^j$  is used to simplify the notation for  $\mathcal{M}_i(1, j)$ . Similarly,  $A_i^j$  is in the same manner.

---

**Algorithm 1: Eviction Based on Top-K Selection**

---

**Input:** Allocation  $\{B_i\}$ , KV Cache  $\{K_i, V_i\}$ , Weights  $\{A_i\}$ **Output:** Compressed cache  $\{\hat{K}_i, \hat{V}_i\}$ 

```
1: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $h$  do
2:   initialize empty cache  $\hat{K}_i, \hat{V}_i$  for head  $i$ 
3:   for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
4:     if  $A_i^j \in \text{Top-K}(A_i, B_i)$  then
5:       retain and append cache pair  $K_i^j, V_i^j$  to  $\hat{K}_i, \hat{V}_i$ 
6:     else
7:       evict cache pair  $K_i^j, V_i^j$ 
8:     end if
9:   end for
10: end for
11: return compressed cache  $\{\hat{K}_i, \hat{V}_i\}$ 
```

---

As shown in Algorithm 1, the core idea of current leading eviction strategies based on Top-K selections is to retain part of cache pairs corresponding to  $B_i$  highest weights  $A_i^j \in \text{Top-K}(A_i, B_i)$ , while evicting those considered non-essential. Obviously, given the budget allocation  $\{B_i\}$  the Top-K based eviction strategies maximize the aggregated weights as follow:

$$\text{Top-K Eviction} = \arg \max_{\text{strategy}} \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{\text{retained } j} A_i^j. \quad (10)$$

$$\text{given } \{B_i\} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{i \in [h]} B_i = B$$

Therefore, we have established the following Theorem 3.

**Theorem 3.** *Given a budget allocation  $\{B_i\}$ , the principle of eviction strategies based on Top-K selections is to minimize the upper bound  $D$  of the eviction loss.*

$$\text{Top-K Eviction} = \arg \min_{\text{strategy}} D \quad (11)$$

$$\text{given } \{B_i\} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{i \in [h]} B_i = B$$

### 3.4 Adaptive vs. Uniform: Theoretical Insights.

In existing studies on cache eviction, the budget  $B$  is uniformly distributed across each head within a layer: specifically,  $B_i = B/h$ . Consequently, the upper bound of eviction loss  $D$  under any given allocation, is modified to  $D'$  under uniform allocation:

$$D' = 2hC - 2C \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{A_i^j \in \text{Top-K}(A_i, B_i)} A_i^j \quad (12)$$

$$\text{given uniform allocation } \{B_i = B/h\}$$

In contrast, we suggest adaptive distribution of the total budget among different heads and introduce a simple yet

---

**Algorithm 2: Adaptive Budget Allocation**

---

**Input:** Total Budget  $B$ , Attention Weights in  $h$  heads  $\{A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}\}$ ;**Output:** Allocated Budgets of  $h$  heads  $\{B_i^*\}$ ;

```
1: Concatenate across heads  $A = \text{Cat}(\{A_i\}, \text{dim}=1)$ 
2: Create head indicator  $I = [1 \dots 1 : \dots : h \dots h]$  with each index  $\{i\}$  repeat  $n$  times
3: Identify top indices  $T = \text{Top-K}(A, B)$ .indices
4: Select the corresponding head indicator  $I^* = I[T]$ 
5: Count frequencies of each  $i$  in  $I^*$  to determine  $\{B_i^*\}$ 
6: Return Allocated Results of  $h$  heads  $\{B_i^*\}$ 
```

---

effective budget allocation algorithm that dynamically distributes the total budget  $B$  based on the attention weights  $A_i$  across  $h$  heads, with the allocated results defined as  $\{B_1^*, B_2^*, \dots, B_h^*\}$  subject to  $\sum_{i \in [h]} B_i^* = B$ . As shown in Algorithm 2, it firstly selects the  $B$  largest attention weights from all heads within one layer. Based on the times of each head is selected in the above procedure, different budgets  $B_i^*$  are allocated to each head. Under this adaptive allocation, the upper bound of eviction loss is denoted as  $D''$ :

$$D'' = 2hC - 2C \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{\substack{j \in [n] \\ A_i^j \in \text{Top-K}(A_i, B_i^*)}} A_i^j \quad (13)$$

given adaptive allocation  $\{B_i^*\}$

**Theorem 4.** *The upper bound  $D''$  of eviction loss with adaptive budget allocation consistently remains at or below the upper bound  $D'$  associated with uniform allocation.*

$$D'' \leq D' \quad (14)$$

According to Theorem 4, our adaptive allocation algorithm achieves equal or smaller eviction loss than the previous uniform allocation approach, thereby enhancing the post-eviction generation quality. The detailed proof can be found in Appendix A.3.

### 3.5 Adaptive vs. Uniform: Empirical Insights

According to Theorem 4, the upper bound of eviction loss of adaptive allocation is equal or less than to that of the current uniform allocation. We further demonstrate different attention heads within each layers of LLMs exhibit significant disparities in attention concentration, resulting in the necessity of adaptive budget allocation in practice. For visualization in Figure 2 (a), most concentrated heads in Layer 8 like head 1 require only 1% of the original cache budget to effectively retain the aggregated weights  $\sum_{\text{retained } j} A_i^j$  of 0.95. Conversely, other heads like heads 18 requires nearly 50% proportion to near 0.95. This characteristic is closely related to the upper bound  $D$  of eviction loss, as detailed in Theorem 3. Under such circumstances, the previous uniform budget allocation faces a dilemma, as an illustrative example in Figure 1: either neglect the loss in dispersed heads, or allocate excessive and unnecessary budgets to heads with concentrated attention. This significantly undermines the trade-off performance between the total budget and generation




Figure 2: Disparities in Attention Concentration Across Heads. (Mistral-instruct-v0.2 on the first sample of Qasper, a single-doc QA dataset in LongBench) We aggregate different proportions of the top attention weights,  $\sum_{\text{retained } j} A_i^j$ , to analyze attention concentration in different head  $i$ . Most concentrated heads require a small cache proportion, e.g., 5%, to aggregate weights close to 1, whereas other dispersed heads need significantly larger proportions, such as 20%.




Figure 3: Comparison of Upper bounds. (In the instance of Mistral-instruct-v0.2 on the first sample of Qasper, a single-document QA dataset in LongBench, adaptive allocation consistently reduced eviction loss upper bound.)

quality in previous cache eviction. In contrast, the adaptive allocation algorithm assigns large budgets to dispersed heads, while controlling the budget sizes for other heads, effectively maintaining the overall budget size and mitigating the decline in generation quality. In Figure 3, we also visualize the gap between the upper bounds of eviction loss,  $D'$  and  $D''$ , under previous uniform budget allocation and proposed adaptive allocation of an average budget size of 128 for each head. Results show that adaptive allocation consistently reduces eviction loss upper bound, especially in layers 8 to 30.

### 3.6 Implementation

The current two leading eviction strategies, SnapKV and Pyramid, both utilize the several tokens  $X^{rec} \in \mathbb{R}^{win*d}$  from a recent window (typically window size is 32) to identify and evict the less important cache pairs. SnapKV excels at managing evictions under scenarios with large budgets, while Pyramid is more effective in environments with

### Algorithm 3: Ada-SnapKV in One Layer

**Input:** Total budget  $B$ , Past cache  $\{K_i, V_i\}$ , Tokens in the recent window  $X^{rec} \in \mathbb{R}^{win*d}$   
**Output:** Compressed cache  $\{\hat{K}_i, \hat{V}_i\}$

- 1: **for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $h$  **do**
- 2:  $Q_i^{rec} = X^{rec} W_i^Q$
- 3:  $\bar{A}_i = \text{softmax}(Q_i^{rec} K_i^T)$
- 4:  $\bar{A}_i = \bar{A}_i.\text{maxpooling}(\text{dim} = 1).\text{mean}(\text{dim} = 0)$
- 5: **end for**
- 6: get  $\{B_i^*\}$  by invoking Algorithm 2( $B, \{\bar{A}_i\}$ )
- 7:  $\{B_i^*\} = \alpha \times \{B_i^*\} + (1 - \alpha) \times \frac{B}{h}$
- 8:  $\{\hat{K}_i, \hat{V}_i\} = \text{Algorithm 1}(\{B_i^*\}, \{K_i, V_i\}, \{\bar{A}_i\})$
- 9: **return** compressed cache  $\{\hat{K}_i, \hat{V}_i\}$

smaller budgets. The key distinction lies in how Pyramid and SnapKV allocate budgets within different layers in LLMs. Pyramid suggests that information aggregation among layers takes a pyramidal form, thereby allocating a larger budget to shallower layers and progressively reducing it in deeper layers through pre-set hyper-parameters. In contrast, SnapKV distributes the budget uniformly across all layers. Nonetheless, same as other eviction methods, they both allocate the budget uniformly among all heads within a single layer. We incorporate the adaptive allocation algorithm into both of them, resulting in the creation of two novel adaptive strategies Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid, respectively.

Take the Ada-SnapKV in algorithm 3 as an example<sup>2</sup>, the adaptive budget allocation can be seamlessly integrated into any eviction strategy by invoking Algorithm 2 before eviction process in each layer to distribute adaptively the total budget among all heads. In line 6, a hyper-parameter  $\alpha$ , set by default to 0.5, prevent from assigning tiny budgets to highly concentrated heads, enhances fault tolerance in the post-eviction generation.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Settings

**Datasets** Firstly, we carry out an comprehensive evaluation using 16 datasets, covering domains of single-document QA (Kočíský et al. 2018; Dasigi et al. 2021), multi-document QA (Yang et al. 2018; Ho et al. 2020; Trivedi et al. 2022), summarization (Huang et al. 2021; Zhong et al. 2021; Fabbri et al. 2019), few-shot learning (Joshi et al. 2017; Gliwa et al. 2019; Li and Roth 2002), Synthetic (Bai et al. 2023), and code generation (Guo et al. 2023; Liu, Xu, and McAuley 2023), within LongBench (Bai et al. 2023), a benchmark for evaluating multi-task performance with long-sequence inputs. These datasets feature varying average input lengths from 1,235 to 18,409 tokens, necessitating substantial KV cache size during generation, thereby rendering them suitable for evaluating KV cache eviction strategies.

<sup>2</sup>Algorithm 3 describes the process serially for simplicity, but eviction operations can be parallelized easily in practice.

	Single-Doc. QA			Multi-Doc. QA			Summarization			Few-shot Learning			Synthetic		Code		Ave. Score
	NrtvQA	Qasper	MF-en	HotpotQA	2WikiMQA	Musique	GovReport	QMSum	MultiNews	TREC	TriviaQA	SAMSum	PCount	PRE	Lcc	RB-P	
Full Cache	26.63	32.99	49.34	42.77	27.35	18.77	32.87	24.24	27.10	71.00	86.23	42.96	2.75	86.98	55.33	52.87	42.51
B=128h																	
H2O	<b>21.19</b>	21.66	38.60	30.63	20.65	12.19	<b>20.65</b>	<b>22.42</b>	21.81	39.00	82.52	<b>40.68</b>	2.98	<b>79.56</b>	49.13	46.76	34.40
StreamingLLM	16.61	14.74	31.40	28.05	21.36	12.08	18.44	18.91	19.26	43.50	74.22	29.00	2.75	31.65	41.27	38.84	27.63
SnapKV	19.17	21.40	42.93	36.76	22.44	15.86	19.16	21.84	21.55	47.50	84.15	40.24	2.30	68.26	50.69	47.13	35.09
Pyramid	20.16	21.77	43.55	36.78	23.12	14.39	19.53	22.03	21.47	51.00	84.62	40.24	2.79	70.77	50.57	46.53	35.58
Ada-SnapKV	20.63	<b>22.58</b>	<b>45.68</b>	<b>37.90</b>	23.49	<b>16.55</b>	19.99	22.28	21.55	59.50	<b>85.00</b>	40.62	3.09	69.36	50.98	<b>48.17</b>	36.71
Ada-Pyramid	20.50	21.71	45.61	36.81	<b>23.57</b>	15.84	19.75	22.13	<b>22.00</b>	<b>60.50</b>	84.04	40.51	<b>3.21</b>	73.60	<b>51.24</b>	48.02	<b>36.81</b>
B=256h																	
H2O	21.54	22.92	42.56	31.07	22.53	13.76	<b>22.52</b>	22.40	23.09	40.50	84.20	40.77	3.41	86.10	50.98	48.17	36.03
StreamingLLM	17.93	16.01	33.36	30.71	21.30	10.08	20.66	19.47	22.89	53.50	73.59	29.22	3.00	27.77	42.30	39.87	28.85
SnapKV	22.37	23.74	48.13	38.56	22.43	15.66	21.91	23.13	23.15	61.50	85.45	41.42	3.09	84.54	53.22	50.24	38.66
Pyramid	20.09	24.00	47.33	38.24	22.48	16.02	21.40	22.45	22.63	63.00	84.93	40.98	3.40	82.48	52.78	49.36	38.22
Ada-SnapKV	22.55	<b>25.78</b>	<b>48.33</b>	<b>40.30</b>	<b>24.24</b>	16.64	21.63	23.03	<b>23.19</b>	<b>67.00</b>	<b>85.78</b>	<b>41.53</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>87.07</b>	<b>53.86</b>	<b>51.13</b>	<b>39.72</b>
Ada-Pyramid	<b>22.64</b>	24.64	47.40	40.25	23.62	<b>16.83</b>	21.82	<b>23.34</b>	22.70	66.50	84.99	41.34	2.78	86.90	53.17	49.52	39.28
B=512h																	
H2O	21.72	26.03	44.81	32.33	23.16	14.86	23.65	22.84	24.70	42.00	85.22	41.57	<b>3.40</b>	86.45	53.04	49.68	37.22
StreamingLLM	18.76	17.17	37.09	30.21	21.64	9.93	<b>24.44</b>	20.00	<b>25.57</b>	62.00	72.36	29.95	2.48	18.17	43.70	40.13	29.60
SnapKV	<b>24.60</b>	27.81	<b>48.98</b>	39.46	<b>25.25</b>	16.98	23.70	22.96	24.37	67.00	85.88	41.26	2.78	86.56	<b>54.81</b>	<b>51.71</b>	40.26
Pyramid	23.23	27.94	48.87	40.50	24.36	16.74	23.22	23.16	24.37	67.00	85.73	41.74	3.16	85.67	54.16	50.34	40.01
Ada-SnapKV	23.39	28.72	48.96	<b>40.60</b>	25.20	17.25	23.15	23.48	24.41	<b>68.00</b>	<b>86.39</b>	41.69	2.73	<b>88.92</b>	54.69	51.51	<b>40.57</b>
Ada-Pyramid	24.03	<b>28.98</b>	48.39	39.25	24.50	<b>18.38</b>	23.13	<b>23.90</b>	24.30	<b>68.00</b>	85.89	<b>41.89</b>	2.98	87.71	54.46	51.39	40.45
B=1024h																	
H2O	23.90	28.62	46.46	37.03	24.74	15.04	25.30	23.11	25.92	46.00	85.93	41.80	<b>3.24</b>	86.57	54.46	51.01	38.70
StreamingLLM	19.42	21.69	41.75	32.40	22.18	11.18	<b>27.13</b>	21.09	<b>26.59</b>	67.00	71.79	30.11	2.88	16.57	44.82	39.76	31.02
SnapKV	<b>25.47</b>	29.57	<b>49.33</b>	<b>40.90</b>	25.53	19.01	25.94	23.89	26.21	69.50	<b>86.48</b>	42.10	2.98	<b>88.56</b>	<b>55.57</b>	51.92	41.44
Pyramid	24.21	29.86	48.93	40.75	25.05	18.77	25.73	<b>24.06</b>	25.65	68.50	86.31	42.25	2.97	87.17	54.75	52.10	41.07
Ada-SnapKV	24.79	<b>31.94</b>	48.45	40.73	26.22	<b>19.11</b>	25.61	23.92	26.03	<b>70.00</b>	86.32	42.35	2.91	88.31	55.44	<b>52.55</b>	<b>41.54</b>
Ada-Pyramid	25.09	30.94	48.18	40.00	<b>26.52</b>	19.10	24.93	23.71	25.86	<b>70.00</b>	86.34	<b>42.64</b>	2.56	86.92	54.93	51.90	41.23

Table 1: Comparison Based on Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 Among 16 Datasets

Each dataset is assessed using LongBench-recommended metrics, with the quality scores up to 100. Detailed dataset information is provided in Appendix A.5. We also utilize the widely-used ‘Needle-in-a-Haystack’ test, where key information is randomly inserted into long texts to create prompts. This test evaluates whether LLMs can extract this key information from extensive texts, specifically examining the impact of proposed adaptive allocation on the models’ fundamental long context retrieval abilities.

**Baselines** We conduct a comparative analysis between our newly proposed methods, *Ada-SnapKV* and *Ada-Pyramid*, and the previously established *SnapKV* and *Pyramid*, acknowledged as two leading approaches under varying scenarios. Additionally, we assess these methods against other earlier eviction strategies, including *StreamingLLM* and *H2O*. *StreamingLLM* is designed to handle long-sequence inputs by retaining caches of several initial tokens and others in a recent window. And *H2O* compresses cache size by employing attention weight-based detection of Heavy Hitters based on all query and key states. In all experiments, the hyper-parameter  $\alpha$  in Algorithm 2 is set to 0.5. Both *Ada-SnapKV* and *Ada-Pyramid*, as well as *SnapKV* and *Pyramid*, utilize the same configuration settings as described in (Li et al. 2024), ensuring comparability with a recent window size of 32 and a maximum pooling kernel size of 7.

Parameters for *StreamingLLM* and *H2O* conform to the default settings reported in the literatures (Zhang et al. 2024b; Xiao et al. 2023).

**Base Models** In the experiments, we employ two open-source base models: Mistral-7B-instruct-v0.2 (Jiang et al. 2023) and LWM-Text-Chat-1M (Liu et al. 2024). The Mistral 7B model features a context length of 32K and has been adopted as the primary model in related studies (Li et al. 2024; Zhang et al. 2024a) due to its moderate parameter size and remarkable capability for long text tasks. Meanwhile, LWM stands as the state of the art with its 1M context length, facilitating performance evaluations for Needle-in-a-Haystack test under extreme context lengths.

## 4.2 Evaluations Among 16 Datasets

We assess all eviction strategies using cache budget  $B \in \{128 \times h, 256 \times h, 512 \times h, 1024 \times h\}$  for each layer. Detailed results for each dataset on the Mistral model are provided in Table 1, while other results for the LWM model are placed in Appendix A.4 due to space constraints. To demonstrate the efficacy of adaptive allocation, we take a budget  $B = 128h$  as an example presented in Table 1. After integrating the adaptive allocation algorithm, *Ada-SnapKV* enhances the quality scores in 15 out of 16 datasets compared to the original *SnapKV*, increasing the average score from




Figure 4: Needle-in-a-Haystack Test. This test inserts a critical sentence (the 'needle') within a document (the 'haystack') with extensive context, then evaluates a model's ability to retrieve the needle from the document. The x-axis indicates the context length of the document, and the y-axis shows the insertion depth of the needle. The Average Score is determined by averaging the aggregated scores at various context lengths. Higher scores indicate an improved capacity of the model for contextual retrieval.




Figure 5: Average Score Among 16 Datasets

35.09 to 36.71. Similarly, Ada-Pyramid surpasses the original Pyramid in 14 of 16 datasets, boosting the average score from 35.58 to 36.81.

Figure 5 summarizes performance based Mistral and LWM across 16 datasets. Overall, SnapKV and Pyramid, as the current two leading methods, exhibit closely matched performance, surpassing previous approaches such as H2O and StreamingLLM. Furthermore, our Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid strategies consistently improve the generated quality under varying budgets, especially in small budgets. The two adaptive eviction strategies with alternatingly leading and surpassing previous versions to become the new state-of-the-art methods. This consistent improvement validates the necessity and effectiveness of adaptive budget allocation, as demonstrated in both theoretical derivations and empirical findings.

### 4.3 Evaluations on Needle-in-a-Haystack Test

As shown in Figure 4, we employ a Needle-in-a-Haystack test to demonstrate how adaptive budget allocation can enhance long-context retrieval capabilities. All configurations maintains a recent window size of 32 and a pooling kernel size of 7 which consistent with former experiments, where the maximum inference length is limited to 33K in the full cache case on A100-80G. With a cache budget of  $B = 128h$ , all four strategies—Ada-SnapKV, Ada-Pyramid, SnapKV, and Pyramid—successfully extend inference length up to 217K. Notably, Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid both effectively improve long-text retrieval capabilities. In particular, Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid achieve near-lossless retrieval within the original 33K length, a feat not replicated by the standard SnapKV and Pyramid. In terms of average score, Ada-SnapKV improves from 95.40 to 96.56, while Ada-Pyramid increases from 96.62 to 97.02.

## 5 Conclusion

In this study, we reexamine prevailing cache eviction strategies employed in LLMs, discerning their goal to minimize an upper bound of eviction loss. This loss is quantified as the L1 distance between outputs before and after eviction. By introducing an adaptive budget allocation among various attention heads, we theoretically reduce the upper bound compared to previous practices. Our empirical findings suggest that this adaptive approach significantly benefits from the varied concentration levels inherent among multiple heads within the self-attention mechanism. We develop two novel adaptive eviction methods, Ada-SnapKV and Ada-Pyramid, which incorporate this adaptive allocation into two advanced

existing strategies. Comprehensive evaluation confirms that both methods yield substantial improvements, especially in small budgets. A comprehensive evaluation verifies that both methods significantly enhance performance, particularly in scenarios with small budgets. Furthermore, this research emphasizes the significant potential for advancing cache eviction strategies through our theoretical framework and adaptive budgeting, which are specifically designed to exploit the unique characteristics of different attention heads in LLMs.

## References

- Achiam, J.; Adler, S.; Agarwal, S.; Ahmad, L.; Akkaya, I.; Aleman, F. L.; Almeida, D.; Altschmidt, J.; Altman, S.; Anadkat, S.; et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Anthropic. 2024. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku. Accessed: 2024-07-09.
- Bai, Y.; Lv, X.; Zhang, J.; Lyu, H.; Tang, J.; Huang, Z.; Du, Z.; Liu, X.; Zeng, A.; Hou, L.; et al. 2023. Longbench: A bilingual, multitask benchmark for long context understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14508*.
- Dao, T.; Fu, D.; Ermon, S.; Rudra, A.; and Ré, C. 2022. Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 16344–16359.
- Dasigi, P.; Lo, K.; Beltagy, I.; Cohan, A.; Smith, N. A.; and Gardner, M. 2021. A dataset of information-seeking questions and answers anchored in research papers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03011*.
- Fabbri, A. R.; Li, I.; She, T.; Li, S.; and Radev, D. R. 2019. Multi-news: A large-scale multi-document summarization dataset and abstractive hierarchical model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01749*.
- Ge, S.; Zhang, Y.; Liu, L.; Zhang, M.; Han, J.; and Gao, J. 2023. Model tells you what to discard: Adaptive kv cache compression for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01801*.
- Gliwa, B.; Mochol, I.; Biesek, M.; and Wawer, A. 2019. SAMSum corpus: A human-annotated dialogue dataset for abstractive summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.12237*.
- Gu, Q. 2023. Llm-based code generation method for golang compiler testing. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2201–2203.
- Guo, D.; Xu, C.; Duan, N.; Yin, J.; and McAuley, J. 2023. LongCoder: A Long-Range Pre-trained Language Model for Code Completion. *arXiv:2306.14893*.
- Ho, X.; Duong Nguyen, A.-K.; Sugawara, S.; and Aizawa, A. 2020. Constructing A Multi-hop QA Dataset for Comprehensive Evaluation of Reasoning Steps. In Scott, D.; Bel, N.; and Zong, C., eds., *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 6609–6625. Barcelona, Spain (Online): International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Huang, L.; Cao, S.; Parulian, N.; Ji, H.; and Wang, L. 2021. Efficient attentions for long document summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.02112*.
- Jiang, A. Q.; Sablayrolles, A.; Mensch, A.; Bamford, C.; Chaplot, D. S.; Casas, D. d. I.; Bressand, F.; Lengyel, G.; Lample, G.; Saulnier, L.; et al. 2023. Mistral 7B. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Joshi, M.; Choi, E.; Weld, D. S.; and Zettlemoyer, L. 2017. TriviaQA: A Large Scale Distantly Supervised Challenge Dataset for Reading Comprehension. *arXiv:1705.03551*.
- Kočiský, T.; Schwarz, J.; Blunsom, P.; Dyer, C.; Hermann, K. M.; Melis, G.; and Grefenstette, E. 2018. The narrativeqa reading comprehension challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6: 317–328.
- Kwon, W.; Li, Z.; Zhuang, S.; Sheng, Y.; Zheng, L.; Yu, C. H.; Gonzalez, J.; Zhang, H.; and Stoica, I. 2023. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, 611–626.
- Laban, P.; Kryściński, W.; Agarwal, D.; Fabbri, A. R.; Xiong, C.; Joty, S.; and Wu, C.-S. 2023. SUMMEDITs: measuring LLM ability at factual reasoning through the lens of summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 9662–9676.
- Li, X.; and Roth, D. 2002. Learning question classifiers. In *COLING 2002: The 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.
- Li, Y.; Huang, Y.; Yang, B.; Venkitesh, B.; Locatelli, A.; Ye, H.; Cai, T.; Lewis, P.; and Chen, D. 2024. Snapkv: Llm knows what you are looking for before generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14469*.
- Liu, H.; Yan, W.; Zaharia, M.; and Abbeel, P. 2024. World model on million-length video and language with ringattention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08268*.
- Liu, T.; Xu, C.; and McAuley, J. 2023. RepoBench: Benchmarking Repository-Level Code Auto-Completion Systems. *arXiv:2306.03091*.
- Liu, Z.; Wang, J.; Dao, T.; Zhou, T.; Yuan, B.; Song, Z.; Shrivastava, A.; Zhang, C.; Tian, Y.; Re, C.; and Chen, B. 2023. DeJa Vu: Contextual Sparsity for Efficient LLMs at Inference Time. *arXiv:2310.17157*.
- Reid, M.; Savinov, N.; Tepyashin, D.; Lepikhin, D.; Lillcrap, T.; Alayrac, J.-b.; Soriccut, R.; Lazaridou, A.; Firat, O.; Schrittwieser, J.; et al. 2024. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*.
- Sun, H.; Chen, Z.; Yang, X.; Tian, Y.; and Chen, B. 2024. Triforce: Lossless acceleration of long sequence generation with hierarchical speculative decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11912*.
- Tang, J.; Zhao, Y.; Zhu, K.; Xiao, G.; Kasikci, B.; and Han, S. 2024. Quest: Query-Aware Sparsity for Efficient Long-Context LLM Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10774*.
- Trivedi, H.; Balasubramanian, N.; Khot, T.; and Sabharwal, A. 2022. MuSiQue: Multihop Questions via Single-hop Question Composition. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10: 539–554.



Wang, K.; and Chen, F. 2023. Catalyst: Optimizing Cache Management for Large In-memory Key-value Systems. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 16(13): 4339–4352.

Xiao, G.; Tian, Y.; Chen, B.; Han, S.; and Lewis, M. 2023. Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17453*.

Yang, D.; Han, X.; Gao, Y.; Hu, Y.; Zhang, S.; and Zhao, H. 2024. PyramidInfer: Pyramid KV Cache Compression for High-throughput LLM Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12532*.

Yang, Z.; Qi, P.; Zhang, S.; Bengio, Y.; Cohen, W. W.; Salakhutdinov, R.; and Manning, C. D. 2018. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09600*.

Yi, Z.; Ouyang, J.; Liu, Y.; Liao, T.; Xu, Z.; and Shen, Y. 2024. A Survey on Recent Advances in LLM-Based Multi-turn Dialogue Systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18013*.

Zhang, Y.; Gao, B.; Liu, T.; Lu, K.; Xiong, W.; Dong, Y.; Chang, B.; Hu, J.; Xiao, W.; et al. 2024a. PyramidKV: Dynamic KV Cache Compression based on Pyramidal Information Funneling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02069*.

Zhang, Z.; Sheng, Y.; Zhou, T.; Chen, T.; Zheng, L.; Cai, R.; Song, Z.; Tian, Y.; Ré, C.; Barrett, C.; et al. 2024b. H2o: Heavy-hitter oracle for efficient generative inference of large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

Zhong, M.; Yin, D.; Yu, T.; Zaidi, A.; Mutuma, M.; Jha, R.; Awadallah, A. H.; Celikyilmaz, A.; Liu, Y.; Qiu, X.; et al. 2021. QMSum: A new benchmark for query-based multi-domain meeting summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.05938*.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

**Theorem.** The post-eviction output  $o'$  can rewrite as:

$$o' = \sum_{i \in [h]} \frac{A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i}{\|A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i\|_1} V_i W_i^O \quad (15)$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{N}_i^j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } K_i^j \text{ and } V_i^j \text{ are retained} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise, evict } K_i^j \text{ and } V_i^j \end{cases}$$

$$\text{given budget allocation } \{B_i\} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{i \in [h]} B_i = B$$

*Proof.* Consider the softmax function as:

$$\text{softmax}(x) = \frac{\exp(x^j)}{\sum^j \exp(x^j)} \quad (16)$$

Thus, the attention weight after eviction procedure is:

$$A'_i = \text{softmax}(s_i + \mathcal{M}_i) \text{ where } s_i = q_i K_i^T \quad (17)$$

$$A'_i = \frac{\exp(s_i^j + \mathcal{M}_i^j)}{\sum^j \exp(s_i^j + \mathcal{M}_i^j)} = \frac{\exp(s_i^j) \odot \mathcal{N}_i^j}{\sum^j \exp(s_i^j) \odot \mathcal{N}_i^j} \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{\exp(s_i^j) \odot \mathcal{N}_i^j}{\sum^j \exp(s_i^j)} \frac{\sum^j \exp(s_i^j)}{\sum^j \exp(s_i^j) \odot \mathcal{N}_i^j} \quad (19)$$

$$= \frac{A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i}{\|A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i\|_1} \quad (20)$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{N}_i^j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } K_i^j \text{ and } V_i^j \text{ are retained} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise, evict } K_i^j \text{ and } V_i^j \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Thus:

$$o' = \sum_{i \in [h]} A'_i V_i W_i^O = \sum_{i \in [h]} \frac{A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i}{\|A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i\|_1} V_i W_i^O \quad (22)$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{N}_i^j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } K_i^j \text{ and } V_i^j \text{ are retained} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise, evict } K_i^j \text{ and } V_i^j \end{cases}$$

$$\text{given budget allocation } \{B_i\} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{i \in [h]} B_i = B$$

□

### A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

**Theorem.** The eviction loss caused by cache eviction can be bounded by  $D$  as follows:

$$\text{Eviction Loss} \leq D = 2hC - 2C \sum_{i \in [h] \text{ retained } j} \sum A_i^j \quad (23)$$

$$\text{given budget allocation } \{B_i\} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{i \in [h]} B_i = B$$

where  $C = \text{Max} \{\|V_i W_i^O\|_1\}$  is the max value in the L1-norm of Matrices  $\{V_i W_i^O\}$  among all head.

*Proof.* By calculating the L1 distance between their outputs, we can obtain

$$\|o' - o\|_1 = \left\| \sum_{i \in [h]} \left( \mathbf{1} - \frac{\mathcal{N}_i}{\|A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i\|_1} \right) \odot A_i V_i W_i^O \right\|_1 \quad (24)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in [h]} \left\| \left( \mathbf{1} - \frac{\mathcal{N}_i}{\|A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i\|_1} \right) \odot A_i V_i W_i^O \right\|_1 \quad (25)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in [h]} \left\| \left( \mathbf{1} - \frac{\mathcal{N}_i}{\|A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i\|_1} \right) \odot A_i \right\|_1 \|V_i W_i^O\|_\infty \quad (26)$$

$$\leq C \sum_{i \in [h]} \left\| \left( \mathbf{1} - \frac{\mathcal{N}_i}{\|A_i \odot \mathcal{N}_i\|_1} \right) \odot A_i \right\|_1 \quad (27)$$

$$\text{where } C = \text{Max} \left\{ \|V_i W_i^O\|_\infty \right\}$$

By expanding  $A_i$ , we can further simplify the expression.

$$\|o' - o\|_1 \leq C \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{\text{retained } j} \left( \frac{A_i^j}{\sum_{\text{retained } j} A_i^j} - A_i^j \right) + \sum_{\text{evicted } j} A_i^j \quad (28)$$

$$= C \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{\text{retained } j} \left( \frac{A_i^j}{\sum_{\text{retained } j} A_i^j} \right) - \sum_{\text{retained } j} A_i^j + \sum_{\text{evicted } j} A_i^j \quad (29)$$

$$= C \sum_{i \in [h]} \left( 2 - 2 \sum_{\text{retained } j} A_i^j \right) \quad (30)$$

$$= 2hC - 2C \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{\text{retained } j} A_i^j \quad (31)$$

□

### A.3 Proof of Theorem 4

**Theorem.** *The upper bound  $D''$  of eviction loss with adaptive budget allocation consistently remains at or below the upper bound  $D'$  associated with uniform allocation.*

$$D'' \leq D' \quad (32)$$

*Proof.*

$$D' = 2hC - 2C \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{\substack{j \in [n] \\ A_i^j \in \text{Top-K}(A_i, B_i)}} A_i^j \quad (33)$$

given uniform allocation  $\{B_i = B/h\}$

$$D'' = 2hC - 2C \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{\substack{j \in [n] \\ A_i^j \in \text{Top-K}(A_i, B_i^*)}} A_i^j \quad (34)$$

given adaptive allocation  $\{B_i^*\}$

Based on the operations of concatenation and Top-K in the first and second lines of Algorithm 2, we can flatten the second  $\sum$  in  $D''$  as follow:

$$D'' = 2hC - 2C \sum_{\substack{i \in [h], j \in [n] \\ A_i^j \in \text{Top-K}(A, B)}} A_i^j \quad (35)$$

$$\text{where } B = \sum_i B_i^* = \sum_i B_i$$

Considering that  $B = \sum B_i = \sum B_i^*$ , it is evident that  $\sum_{\substack{i \in [h], j \in [n] \\ A_i^j \in \text{Top-K}(A, B)}} A_i^j \geq \sum_{i \in [h]} \sum_{\substack{j \in [n] \\ A_i^j \in \text{Top-K}(A_i, B_i)}} A_i^j$ . This is because under the premise of identical total budget, the global Top-K sum is greater than or equal to the sum of local Top-K sums of each head. Thus:

$$D'' \leq D' \quad (36)$$

□

	Single-Doc. QA			Multi-Doc. QA			Summarization			Few-shot Learning			Synthetic		Code		Ave. Score
	NrtvQA	Qasper	MF-en	HotpotQA	2WikiMQA	Musique	GovReport	QMSum	MultiNews	TREC	TriviaQA	SAMSum	PCount	PRE	Lcc	RB-P	
Full Cache	18.00	25.80	43.10	23.40	16.70	9.70	27.20	25.00	24.70	70.50	61.60	39.60	3.00	6.50	42.20	41.60	29.91
B=128h																	
H2O	17.90	17.73	36.10	21.52	<b>17.51</b>	<b>9.26</b>	16.13	22.99	<b>19.64</b>	43.50	60.64	36.36	<b>3.00</b>	<b>5.50</b>	34.93	36.74	24.97
StreamingLLM	12.81	11.32	29.04	17.24	13.67	6.91	<b>16.34</b>	20.25	17.35	41.00	52.74	25.77	0.50	3.00	28.38	30.98	20.46
SnapKV	17.51	17.57	38.89	22.15	17.28	9.13	15.01	21.96	17.94	46.00	61.05	35.97	0.00	4.00	36.92	37.83	24.95
Pyramid	18.17	17.58	39.08	22.05	16.78	8.13	14.74	22.24	17.88	47.50	60.11	37.02	0.50	3.50	<b>36.96</b>	38.73	25.06
Ada-SnapKV	<b>18.64</b>	18.61	<b>39.59</b>	22.51	17.05	9.19	15.28	22.88	18.98	52.50	<b>61.69</b>	36.76	0.00	3.00	36.82	39.63	25.82
Ada-Pyramid	18.35	<b>18.93</b>	39.49	<b>22.57</b>	16.83	8.61	15.05	<b>23.22</b>	18.85	<b>55.50</b>	60.93	<b>37.39</b>	0.50	3.50	36.55	<b>39.79</b>	<b>26.00</b>
B=256h																	
H2O	18.99	19.18	38.78	21.88	17.33	9.16	16.88	23.29	20.51	48.00	60.36	38.07	<b>3.00</b>	<b>5.50</b>	37.18	37.94	26.00
StreamingLLM	13.59	11.81	29.73	18.59	14.37	6.72	<b>21.06</b>	20.78	<b>21.29</b>	51.50	51.92	26.51	0.50	3.00	28.97	31.09	21.96
SnapKV	<b>19.27</b>	20.61	40.78	22.81	16.83	<b>9.89</b>	16.23	23.17	20.07	53.50	<b>61.75</b>	38.41	0.00	4.00	38.25	40.57	26.63
Pyramid	18.81	19.83	40.71	22.34	17.10	9.08	16.10	22.93	19.50	60.00	61.01	38.65	0.50	5.00	38.23	39.13	26.81
Ada-SnapKV	18.99	<b>21.08</b>	<b>41.18</b>	<b>22.89</b>	<b>17.64</b>	9.52	16.71	23.05	20.48	67.00	61.27	38.74	0.00	3.50	<b>39.60</b>	<b>40.96</b>	27.66
Ada-Pyramid	18.78	20.32	40.50	22.73	17.01	9.37	16.05	<b>23.60</b>	19.93	<b>69.00</b>	61.43	<b>39.07</b>	2.00	5.00	38.40	40.08	<b>27.70</b>
B=512h																	
H2O	18.61	20.07	39.82	22.08	17.21	<b>10.13</b>	17.62	23.65	21.41	54.50	<b>61.84</b>	38.74	<b>3.00</b>	5.50	39.23	40.08	27.09
StreamingLLM	13.94	13.13	33.06	18.26	14.44	7.41	<b>25.24</b>	21.00	<b>23.78</b>	60.50	52.04	26.31	1.00	3.00	30.10	31.76	23.44
SnapKV	18.45	21.96	42.01	23.25	17.42	9.88	17.68	23.62	21.30	68.00	61.77	39.02	1.00	4.50	40.09	40.79	28.17
Pyramid	18.46	22.85	<b>42.24</b>	23.27	16.75	9.45	17.41	<b>24.62</b>	21.20	<b>70.00</b>	60.61	39.32	<b>3.00</b>	<b>6.50</b>	39.63	40.78	<b>28.51</b>
Ada-SnapKV	<b>18.83</b>	22.39	42.15	23.52	<b>18.27</b>	9.63	17.66	23.99	21.23	<b>70.00</b>	61.72	38.93	2.00	4.50	<b>40.11</b>	<b>41.28</b>	<b>28.51</b>
Ada-Pyramid	18.64	<b>22.86</b>	41.81	<b>23.61</b>	16.67	9.45	17.35	23.75	20.79	<b>70.00</b>	60.66	<b>39.61</b>	<b>3.00</b>	5.50	39.87	40.99	28.41
B=1024h																	
H2O	17.11	22.34	41.26	22.09	<b>17.47</b>	9.60	18.82	23.94	22.49	61.00	<b>62.33</b>	38.68	<b>3.00</b>	5.50	41.23	41.18	28.00
StreamingLLM	14.78	16.77	37.64	18.77	14.63	7.39	<b>26.43</b>	21.47	<b>24.21</b>	67.00	53.00	25.99	0.50	3.00	31.51	32.31	24.71
SnapKV	18.45	24.18	42.50	<b>23.53</b>	17.32	<b>10.23</b>	19.00	24.26	23.04	69.50	62.22	<b>39.88</b>	<b>3.00</b>	5.50	41.15	41.91	<b>29.10</b>
Pyramid	18.48	<b>24.87</b>	42.11	23.45	16.97	9.84	18.93	<b>24.50</b>	22.77	69.50	61.65	39.73	2.50	5.00	41.07	41.27	28.91
Ada-SnapKV	18.94	23.68	43.27	23.28	17.15	9.89	18.58	23.46	22.65	<b>70.00</b>	62.24	39.83	2.50	5.50	<b>41.68</b>	<b>42.88</b>	<b>29.10</b>
Ada-Pyramid	<b>19.00</b>	23.83	<b>43.36</b>	23.48	17.03	9.32	18.70	24.11	22.61	69.50	61.83	39.75	2.50	<b>6.00</b>	40.85	41.80	28.98

Table 2: Comparison Based on LWM-Text-Chat-1M Among 16 Datasets

#### A.4 Detailed results for LWM model Among 16 Datasets

The table 2 presents quality scores of different eviction strategies based on the LWM model across 16 datasets. Overall, the results are consistent with those of Mistral, and the adaptive allocation also leads to quality improvements after cache eviction.

#### A.5 Detailed Information of Datasets

Table 3 provides a comprehensive description of information pertaining to 16 datasets.

#### A.6 Detailed Concentration Visualization of Heads

Figure 6 supplements Figure 2 in the main paper by presenting the visualization results across all layers. It can be observed that in all layers, different heads exhibit significant variations in attention concentration. This indicates that the adaptive allocation algorithm has great potential to reduce the upper bound of eviction loss empirically.

#### A.7 Code

The source code for this paper is intended for public release following the publication. It will be accessible at <https://github.com/FFY0/AdaKV> once it is made available.

Label	Task	Task Type	Eval metric	Avg len	Language	Sample Num
NrtvQA	NarrativeQA	Single-Doc. QA	F1	18,409	EN	200
Qaspe	Qasper	Single-Doc. QA	F1	3,619	EN	200
MF-en	MultiFieldQA-en	Single-Doc. QA	F1	4,559	EN	150
HotpotQA	HotpotQA	Multi-Doc. QA	F1	9,151	EN	200
2WikiMQA	2WikiMultihopQA	Multi-Doc. QA	F1	4,887	EN	200
Musique	MuSiQue	Multi-Doc. QA	F1	11,214	EN	200
GovReport	GovReport	Summarization	Rouge-L	8,734	EN	200
QMSum	QMSum	Summarization	Rouge-L	10,614	EN	200
MultiNews	MultiNews	Summarization	Rouge-L	2,113	EN	200
TREC	TREC	Few-shotLearning	Accuracy	5,177	EN	200
TriviaQA	TriviaQA	Few-shotLearning	F1	8,209	EN	200
SAMSum	SAMSum	Few-shotLearning	Rouge-L	6,258	EN	200
PCount	PassageCount	Synthetic	Accuracy	11,141	EN	200
Pre	PassageRetrieval-en	Synthetic	Accuracy	9,289	EN	200
Lcc	LCC	Code	Edit Sim	1,235	Python/C#/Java	500
RB-P	RepoBench-P	Code	Edit Sim	4,206	Python/Java	500

Table 3: Information of 16 Datasets




Figure 6: Visualization of Heads' Concentrations