

# Fast Gradient Computation for RoPE Attention in Almost Linear Time

Yifang Chen\*    Jiayan Huo†    Xiaoyu Li‡    Yingyu Liang§    Zhenmei Shi¶  
 Zhao Song||

## Abstract

The Rotary Position Embedding (RoPE) mechanism has become a powerful enhancement to the Transformer architecture, which enables models to capture token relationships when encoding positional information. However, the RoPE mechanisms make the computations of attention mechanisms more complicated, which makes efficient algorithms challenging. Earlier research introduced almost linear time, i.e.,  $n^{1+o(1)}$  where  $n$  is the number of input tokens, algorithms for the forward computation under specific parameter settings. However, achieving a subquadratic time algorithm for other parameter regimes remains impossible unless the widely accepted Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) is disproven. In this work, we develop the first almost linear time algorithm for backward computations in the RoPE-based attention under bounded entries. Our approach builds on recent advancements in fast RoPE attention computations, utilizing a novel combination of the polynomial method and the Fast Fourier Transform. Furthermore, we show that with lower bounds derived from the SETH, the bounded entry condition is necessary for subquadratic performance.

---

\* yifangc@uchicago.edu. The University of Chicago.

† jiayanh@arizona.edu. University of Arizona.

‡ 7.xiaoyu.li@gmail.com. Independent Researcher.

§ yingyul@hku.hk. The University of Hong Kong.    yliang@cs.wisc.edu. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

¶ zhmeishi@cs.wisc.edu. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

|| magic.linuxkde@gmail.com. The Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing at UC Berkeley.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Related Work</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Preliminaries on RoPE Attention</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Notation . . . . .	4
3.2	Problem Definition . . . . .	4
3.3	Polynomial Approximation of Exponential . . . . .	6
3.4	Time Complexity of Multiplications . . . . .	6
3.5	SETH Hypothesis . . . . .	7
3.6	Basic Facts . . . . .	7
3.7	Useful Definitions . . . . .	8
3.8	Reformulation of the Loss Function . . . . .	8
<b>4</b>	<b>RoPE Attention Gradient Calculation</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Exact Gradient Computation Time</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	Reformulate the Gradient into Its Closed Form . . . . .	12
5.2	Time to Get $s(x)$ and $v(y)$ Functions . . . . .	14
5.3	Time Complexity for Computing $\ell(x)$ Functions . . . . .	15
5.4	Time Complexity for Computing $\beta(x)$ and $\gamma(x)$ Functions . . . . .	15
5.5	Time Complexity for Computing the Gradient of RoPE Attention . . . . .	15
<b>6</b>	<b>Low Rank Approximation of Attention</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1	Approximate $s$ Using Low Rank Approximation . . . . .	16
6.2	Approximate $\ell$ Using Low Rank Approximation . . . . .	16
6.3	Approximate $\beta$ Using Low Rank Approximation . . . . .	17
6.4	Approximate $\gamma$ Using Low Rank Approximation . . . . .	17
6.5	Fast Computation in Almost Linear Time . . . . .	18
<b>7</b>	<b>Hardness</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>20</b>

# 1 Introduction

The GPT-o3 [Ope24], Llama 3.3 [LT24, AI24], Claude 3.5 [Ant24a] are transformed-based Large Language Models (LLMs), have become important tools in natural language processing, which enables applications from machine translation to sentiment analysis. In the Transformer architecture, attention mechanisms, computationally intensive operations, compute token correlations within the sequence [VSP<sup>+</sup>17]. The efficiency of attention computations, both in forward computations and backward gradient computations, directly influenced the scalability and feasibility of training LLMs, especially when the size and input context length of these LLMs continue to grow [AS24c, AS23]. In recent research, Rotating Position Embedding (RoPE) [SAL<sup>+</sup>24] has become a popular modification to the attention mechanism, and it has enabled models to capture positional relationships between tokens with better expressiveness. The RoPE mechanism has been adopted in state-of-the-art models, such as Llama [TLI<sup>+</sup>23, TMS<sup>+</sup>23, LT24], Claude [Ant24a], Apple’s LLMs [GWW<sup>+</sup>24, MGF<sup>+</sup>24], and many others, but the implementation of RoPE complicates attention computation due to the additional structure imposed by position-dependent rotations [SAL<sup>+</sup>24]. In recent work, [AS24a] has demonstrated an efficient algorithm for forward computation of RoPE attention in the bounded entry regime, but the backward computation, the process of calculating gradients for model optimization, is less explored.

Backward computation introduces additional complexity because it requires the evaluation of gradients that involve non-linear transformations of the attention matrix and positional embeddings. In [AS23], they present their algorithm to approximate forward computations of fast attention with bounded entries using the polynomial methods and low-rank approximation. In [AS24b], they propose almost linear time, i.e.,  $n^{1+o(1)}$  where  $n$  is the number of input tokens, an algorithm to compute backward gradients for fast attention with bounded entries. In recent work, [AS24a] proposes an efficient algorithm to perform the forward computation of RoPE-based attention using the polynomial methods and Fast Fourier Transform. Therefore, it is natural to raise the key question:

*Can backward computations for the RoPE attention match the efficiency of their forward computations in the bounded entry regime?*

In this work, we aim to address the question by presenting the first efficient algorithm for backward computation in RoPE attention under the bounded entry. Our main result shows that the backward gradient computations for the RoPE attention match their forward version’s efficiency. Therefore, by leveraging our algorithm in approximating backward computations in the RoPE attention with the forward algorithm from [AS24a], we will improve the overall time complexity of RoPE attention to almost linear time with bounded entries.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to characterize the fine-grained complexity of backward computations in RoPE attentions, extending prior results on forward computations in RoPE attention [AS24a].

**Roadmap.** In Section 2, we present some relevant papers. In Section 3, we show important components for the RoPE attention. In Section 4, we present the details of getting the gradients of RoPE-based attention mechanisms. Section 5 discusses the exact time complexity for computing RoPE attention gradients. Section 6 shows the fast computation of gradient using the polynomial method. Section 7 details the lower bounds of hardness. Finally, Section 8 provides conclusions and avenues for future work.

## 2 Related Work

**Rotary Position Embedding.** In this paper, we study a variant of attention called RoPE attention. At a high level, RoPE gives more expressive power to the model in exchange for making the computational problem more complicated. In particular, many prior algorithms, such as the algorithm of [AS23], no longer apply to RoPE for fundamental reasons we will discuss. RoPE was proposed by [SAL<sup>+</sup>24] and has been used extensively in large-scale industrial models. Examples which are known to use RoPE include the open-source models released by Meta such as Llama [TLI<sup>+</sup>23] (see page 3), Llama 2 [TMS<sup>+</sup>23] (see page 5), Llama 3 [LT24] (see page 7), and the close-source LLM Claude 3.5 [Ant24a] released by Anthropic. Apple also incorporates RoPE into their LLM architecture (see [MGF<sup>+</sup>24], and page 3 of [GWW<sup>+</sup>24]). The idea behind RoPE is to rotate the query and key vectors in the self-attention mechanism. The rotation is position-dependent and designed such that the inner product between two position-encoded vectors reflects their relative position in the input so that in the RoPE attention mechanism, pairs of tokens with a longer relative distance will have a smaller correlation.

**Fast Attention Computation.** The attention mechanism has often been criticized for its quadratic computational complexity concerning context length, a challenge that becomes more pronounced as the sequence length grows in today’s LLMs [AAA<sup>+</sup>23, Ope24, LT24, AI24, Ant24b, Ant24a]. However, this issue can be addressed using polynomial kernel approximation methods [AA22], which facilitate constructing the approximated attention matrix using low-rank approximations. Such methods enable substantial improvements in computation speed, allowing a single attention layer to perform both training and inference nearly as fast as linear time [AS23, AS24b]. Our research further extends this efficiency to support multi-layer transformer architectures for both training and inference. In addition, these techniques can generalize to advanced attention mechanisms, such as tensor attention, while preserving the almost linear time complexity in both training and evaluation phases [AS24c, LSSZ24]. Beyond this, alternative theoretical methods also exist. For example, the conv-basis approach introduced in [LLS<sup>+</sup>24c] offers another avenue for speeding up attention computation.

**Gradient Approximation.** Using low-rank approximation to approximate the gradient is a common approach for optimizing the training of transformers by reducing the complexity in the computations, such as [LSS<sup>+</sup>24b, LSSZ24, AS24b, HWSL24]. Specifically, [AS24b] extends the low-rank approximation technique developed in [AS23], which studies the forward computation of attention to approximate the gradient of the attention computation. In [LSS<sup>+</sup>24b], they further develop the low-rank approximation technique in [AS24b] to study multi-layer transformers, showing they can use nearly linear time to approximate the backward computations of multi-layer transformers. On the other hand, [LSSZ24] generalizes the gradient approximation of [AS24b] to another direction: they use it to study the training of the tensor version of attention computation that develops from the forward computation as in [AS24c]. Finally, [HWSL24] leverages the low-rank approximation technique to study the training of Diffusion Transformers (DiTs).

**Theoretical Foundation of LLMs.** The attention has become a cornerstone in AI, particularly in large language models (LLMs), which excel in NLP tasks such as machine translation, text generation, and sentiment analysis due to their ability to capture complex contextual relationships. However, understanding the attention mechanism from a theoretical perspective remains an ongoing challenge. Several works have explored the theoretical foundations and computational complexities of attention [TBY<sup>+</sup>19, ZHDK23, BSZ23, AS23, SYZ24, CLL<sup>+</sup>24a, CLL<sup>+</sup>24c, MOSW22,

SZZ24, AZLS19, DHS<sup>+</sup>22, BPSW20, SYZ21, ASZZ24], focusing on areas such as efficient attention [HJK<sup>+</sup>23, SMN<sup>+</sup>24, SZZ<sup>+</sup>21, LLL21, LLS<sup>+</sup>24c, LSSZ24, LSS<sup>+</sup>24b, LLSS24, LLS<sup>+</sup>24d, CLS<sup>+</sup>24, LLS<sup>+</sup>24b, HWSL24, HWL24, HCL<sup>+</sup>24, WHHL24, HLSL24, WHL<sup>+</sup>24, HYW<sup>+</sup>24, AS24b, GSWY23, SMN<sup>+</sup>24, LLL<sup>+</sup>24, LSSY24], optimization [DLS23, LSWY23, SWY23, GSY23b, LSXY24, GSY23a, GSX23], and the analysis of emergent abilities [BMR<sup>+</sup>20, WTB<sup>+</sup>22, AZL23, Jia23, XSW<sup>+</sup>24, LLS<sup>+</sup>24a, XSL24, CLL<sup>+</sup>24b, LSS<sup>+</sup>24a, HWG<sup>+</sup>24, WSH<sup>+</sup>24, SXY23, WMS<sup>+</sup>24, XSL24, KLS<sup>+</sup>24]. Notably, [ZHDK23] introduced an algorithm with provable guarantees for attention approximation, [KWH23] proved a lower bound for attention computation based on the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis, and [AS23] provided both an algorithm and hardness results for static attention computation using low-rank approximation [GSYZ24, SYYZ23].

### 3 Preliminaries on RoPE Attention

In Section 3.1, we talk about the notation and foundational concepts. In Section 3.2, we formalize our problems. In Section 3.3, we talk about polynomial approximation of the exponential function. In Section 3.4, we talk about the time complexity of matrix multiplications, setting up the framework for analyzing efficiency in attention computation. In Section 3.5, we talk about the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH). In Section 3.6, we talk about mathematical properties and tricks, such as the tensor trick and row-wise Kronecker products, which enable efficient matrix-vector operations. In Section 3.7, we give definitions of our key terms. In Section 3.8, we talk about the reformulation of the loss function using the tensor trick and analyze the computational complexity of the reformulated expressions.

#### 3.1 Notation

For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$ , for set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , we denote the set by using the notation  $[n]$ . Here, we define the concept of nearly linear time when the time is  $O(n \log n)$ . We introduce the concept of almost linear time when time is  $O(n^{1+o(1)})$ . Given  $a$  as any vector, we say the diagonal matrix of  $c$  is  $\text{diag}(c)$  where  $c_i$  means the  $i$ ,  $i$ -th entry in the matrix  $\text{diag}(c)$ . For any matrix, we denote the support of the matrix using the notation  $\text{supp}$ , that is, the set of entries where the matrix is nonzero.  $B^\top$  is defined as  $(B^\top)_{i,j} := B_{j,i}$ . Suppose there are two vectors  $c, d$  of the same length. We denote the entry-wise multiplication by using the notation  $c \circ d$ ; that is, the  $i$ -th entry in that vector is  $c_i d_i$ . To denote the Frobenius norm, for any matrix  $B$ , we denote it as  $\|B\|_F := \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} B_{i,j}^2}$ ; to denote the maximum norm of matrix  $B$ , we use  $\|B\|_\infty := \max_{i,j} |B_{i,j}|$ . Suppose there are two matrices  $C, D$  of the same dimensions. We represent the Hadamard product or the entry-wise multiplication by using the notation  $C \circ D$ , that is,  $(i, j)$ -th entry of the matrix is  $C_{i,j} \cdot D_{i,j}$ . Let  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times m_0}$  and  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times m_1}$ . We define  $C \otimes D$  is an  $n_0 n_1 \times m_0 m_1$  matrix, where  $(C \otimes D)_{(j_0-1)n_1+j_1, (i_0-1)m_2+i_1}$  is equal to  $C_{j_0, i_0} D_{j_1, i_1}$  for any  $j_0 \in [n_0], i_0 \in [m_0], j_1 \in [n_1], i_1 \in [m_1]$ .

#### 3.2 Problem Definition

Let  $n$  be the number of input tokens, and let  $d$  be the hidden/feature dimensions. We state the generalization of the standard RoPE attention from [AS24a].

**Definition 3.1** (A General Approximate RoPE Attention Computation, ARAttC, Definition 1.1 in [AS24a]). *Let  $B > 0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  denote two parameters. Given a set of matrices  $W_{-(n-1)}, \dots, W_{-1}, W_0, W_1, \dots, W_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  where  $\text{supp}(W_i) \subset S$  for all  $i \in \{-(n-1), \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ .*

Here  $S \subseteq [d] \times [d]$  where  $|S| = O(d)$ . Given three  $n \times d$  matrices  $Q, K, V$  with the guarantee that  $\|Q\|_\infty, \|K\|_\infty, \|V\|_\infty \leq B$  and  $\|W\|_\infty \leq 1$ . We define matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  as, for  $i, j \in [n]$ ,

$$A_{i,j} := \exp(Q_{i,*} W_{i-j} K_{j,*}^\top / d).$$

We define  $D := \text{diag}(A \mathbf{1}_n)$ . The goal of General Approximate RoPE Attention Computation is to output a matrix  $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  such that  $\|T - \text{ARAttC}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$  is small, where  $\text{ARAttC} := D^{-1} A V$ . For matrix  $M$ , we use  $\|M\|_\infty := \max_{i,j} |M_{i,j}|$ . Note that the  $1/d$  factor inside  $\exp$  in the definition of  $A$  is a normalization factor.

Our focus is to find weights to fit the attention to a desired output. Let  $Q := A_1 X_1$ ,  $K := A_2 X_2$ , and  $V := A_3 Y$ . We use  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ , and  $X_3$  to represent the weights  $W_Q$ ,  $W_K$  and  $W_V$ , respectively. We use  $A_1, A_2$ , and  $A_3$  to replace the input matrix to handle the more general settings such as cross attention. Then, the attention matrix is as follows.

$$A(X_1, X_2)_{i,j} := \exp((A_1 X_1)_{i,*} W_{i-j} (A_2 X_2)_{j,*}^\top / d) = \exp(A_{1,i,*} X_1 W_{i-j} X_2^\top A_{2,j,*}^\top / d).$$

We define  $w_{i-j} := \text{vec}(W_{i-j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$  and define  $W$  such that  $W_{j_0,*}$  is a  $1 \times d^2$  block and  $W_{i_+(j-1)n} := w_{i-j}^\top$ . Here, let  $A := A_1 \otimes A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$  and  $X := X_1 \otimes X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}$ . We can show that

$$A_{1,i,*} X_1 W_{i-j} X_2^\top A_{2,j,*}^\top = (A_{1,i,*} \otimes A_{2,j,*})(X_1 \otimes X_2) \text{vec}(W_{i-j}) = A_{i_+(j-1)n,*} X w_{i-j},$$

where the first step uses the tensor trick, and the second step uses the definitions of  $w_{i-j}$ ,  $A$ , and  $X$ . Thus we can reformulate the attention matrix  $A$  as, for  $i, j \in [n]$

$$A_{i,j}(X) = \exp(\underbrace{A_{i_+(j-1)n,*}}_{1 \times d^2} \underbrace{X}_{d^2 \times d^2} \underbrace{w_{i-j}/d}_{d^2 \times 1}).$$

Using the tensor trick again, we have

$$A_{i,j}(X) = \exp(\underbrace{(A_{i_+(j-1)n,*} \otimes w_{i-j}^\top)}_{1 \times d^4} \underbrace{\text{vec}(X)}_{d^4 \times 1} / d) = \exp(\underbrace{(A_{i_+(j-1)n,*} \otimes W_{i_+(j-1)n,*})}_{1 \times d^4} \underbrace{\text{vec}(X)}_{d^4 \times 1} / d).$$

Hence, by definition of row-wise Kronecker product, we have

$$\text{vec}(A(X)) = \exp(\underbrace{(A \otimes W)}_{n^2 \times d^4} \underbrace{\text{vec}(X)}_{d^4 \times 1} / d).$$

We define the matrix  $D(X) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  as

$$D(X) = \text{diag}(\underbrace{A(X)}_{n \times n} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}_n}_{n \times 1}).$$

Then, the optimization problem in the context of RoPE attention computation is described as:

**Definition 3.2** (Optimize RoPE Attention). *Let  $B > 0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  denote two parameters. Given a set of matrices  $W_{-(n-1)}, \dots, W_{-1}, W_0, W_1, \dots, W_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  where  $\text{supp}(W_i) \subset S$  for all  $i \in \{-(n-1), \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Here  $S \subseteq [d] \times [d]$  where  $|S| = O(d)$ . For  $i, j \in [n]$ , let  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$  such that  $W_{i_+(j-1)n,*} = \text{vec}(W_{i-j})$ . Here, we suppose four  $n \times d$  matrices  $A_1, A_2, A_3, E$ , and we have three  $d \times d$  matrices  $X_1, X_2, Y$ . Let  $X := X_1 \otimes X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}$ . We define the matrix*

$A(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  as the matrix representation of  $\exp(\underbrace{(\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{W})}_{n^2 \times d^4} \underbrace{\text{vec}(\mathbf{X})/d}_{d^4 \times 1})$  and the  $n \times n$  matrix  $D(\mathbf{X}) := \text{diag}(\underbrace{A(\mathbf{X})}_{n \times n} \mathbf{1}_n)_{n \times 1}$ . The RoPE attention optimization problem is formulated as:

$$\min_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}} \text{Loss}(\mathbf{X}) := \min_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}} 0.5 \|D(\mathbf{X})^{-1} A(\mathbf{X}) A_3 Y - E\|_F^2.$$

Note that we are able to get the gradient computation of Loss with respect to  $X_1$  or  $X_2$  based on the chain rule because

$$\frac{d\text{Loss}(X_1, X_2)}{dX_1} = \frac{d\text{Loss}(\mathbf{X})}{d\mathbf{X}} \frac{d\mathbf{X}}{dX_1} = \frac{d\text{Loss}(\mathbf{X})}{d\mathbf{X}} \frac{d(X_1 \otimes X_2)}{dX_1} = \frac{d\text{Loss}(\mathbf{X})}{d\mathbf{X}} (I_{d \times d} \otimes X_2).$$

Our approximation task can be formalized as follows.

**Definition 3.3** (The Approx of the gradient of RoPE Attention Loss Function, ARAttLGC( $n, d, B, \epsilon$ )). Let  $B > 0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  denote two parameters. Given a set of matrices  $W_{-(n-1), \dots, -1}, W_0, W_1, \dots, W_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  where  $\text{supp}(W_i) \subset S$  for all  $i \in \{-(n-1), \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Here  $S \subseteq [d] \times [d]$  where  $|S| = O(d)$ . For  $i, j \in [n]$ , let  $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$  such that  $\mathbf{W}_{i+(j-1)n, *}$  =  $\text{vec}(W_{i-j})$ . Let  $X_1, X_2, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . Let  $\mathbf{X} := X_1 \otimes X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}$ . We have four  $n \times d$  matrices Let  $A_1, A_2, A_3, E$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$  such that  $\mathbf{A}$  equals to an  $n^2 \times d^2$  matrix from  $A_1 \otimes A_2$ . Assume  $\|A_1 X\|_\infty \leq B, \|A_2 X\|_\infty \leq B, \|A_3 Y\|_\infty \leq B, \|\mathbf{W}\|_\infty \leq 1$ . Assume that all the  $\log(n)$  bits model is applied throughout all numbers in matrices. We define Loss( $\mathbf{X}$ ) from Def. 3.2. Here, we define  $\frac{d\text{Loss}(\mathbf{X})}{d\mathbf{X}}$  as the loss function gradient. Then, our target is to output a vector  $\tilde{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{d^4}$  satisfying:

$$\|\tilde{g} - \frac{d\text{Loss}(\mathbf{X})}{d\mathbf{X}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon.$$

### 3.3 Polynomial Approximation of Exponential

Here, we will explain a technical tool for controlling the error dependence of our approximate algorithm. In particular, we will use the following optimal-degree polynomial approximation of the exponential function.

**Lemma 3.4** ([AA22]). Let  $B > 1$  and suppose  $\epsilon$  in  $(0, 0.1)$ . We can have  $P$ , which has input as a scalar and output as a scalar of degree  $g$ .  $g$  is defined as  $\Theta(\max\{\log(1/\epsilon)/(\log(\log(1/\epsilon)/B)), B\})$  such that for all  $x \in [0, B]$ , we can get

$$|P(x) - \exp(x)| < \epsilon.$$

Because  $P$ 's coefficients are rational values with numerators and denominators represented using integers of  $\text{poly}(g)$ -bit size and these coefficients can be determined in  $\text{poly}(g)$  time, we can calculate  $P$  in an efficient way.

### 3.4 Time Complexity of Multiplications

Here, we introduce the time complexity of multiplying matrices as follows:

**Definition 3.5.** We suppose  $n_1, n_2, n_3$ , denote any three positive integers. We define  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$  and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_3}$ . It costs  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n_1, n_2, n_3)$  time to perform  $AB$ .

Based on [BCS97, Blä13], we have the following fact.

**Fact 3.6.** We suppose  $n_1, n_2, n_3$ , denote any three positive integers.  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n_1, n_2, n_3) = O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n_1, n_3, n_2)) = O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n_2, n_1, n_3)) = O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n_2, n_3, n_1)) = O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n_3, n_1, n_2)) = O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n_3, n_2, n_1))$ .

### 3.5 SETH Hypothesis

Here, we introduce the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH):

**Hypothesis 3.7** (SETH).  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $k$  greater or equal to 3 such that, even when utilizing randomized algorithms, within the time of  $O(2^{(1-\epsilon)n})$ , we cannot solve  $k$ -SAT problems with  $n$  variables.

### 3.6 Basic Facts

In this section, we introduce some basic facts we will use.

**Fact 3.8.** We suppose there are three vectors of  $n$  dimension  $x, y, z$ . Thus, we get

- $\langle x \circ y, z \rangle = x^\top \text{diag}(y)z$ .
- $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle x \circ y, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle$ .

**Fact 3.9** (Folklore). Let  $U_1, V_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_1}$ . Let  $U_2, V_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_2}$ . Then we have

$$(U_1 V_1^\top) \circ (U_2 V_2^\top) = (U_1 \otimes U_2)(V_1 \otimes V_2)^\top$$

Here, given  $U_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_1}$  and  $U_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_2}$ , we define the row-wise Kronecker product as  $U_1 \otimes U_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_1 k_2}$ . That is,  $(U_1 \otimes U_2)_{i, l_1 + (l_2 - 1)k_1} := (U_1)_{i, l_1} U_{i, l_2}$  for all  $i \in [n]$ ,  $l_1 \in [k_1]$  and  $l_2 \in [k_2]$

**Fact 3.10.** We suppose  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , and we suppose the  $n$  dimension vectors  $a, b, c$  and a scalar  $d$ . Then, we have

- $\langle da, b \rangle = d \langle a, b \rangle = \langle a, db \rangle = d \langle b, a \rangle$ .
- $\langle a + c, b \rangle = \langle a, b \rangle + \langle c, b \rangle$ .
- $\langle a, b \rangle = a^\top b$ .
- $\langle a \circ c, b \rangle = \langle a, b \circ c \rangle$ .
- $\langle a \circ b, c \rangle = b^\top \text{diag}(a)c$

Here, we introduce a technique called the tensor trick.

**Fact 3.11** (Tensor trick). Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$  be the vectorization of  $X$ . Let there be two  $n \times d$  matrices  $A_1, A_2$ , and we define  $\mathbf{A} = A_1 \otimes A_2$ . Then, we can get  $\text{vec}(A_1 X A_2^\top) = \mathbf{A}x$ .

Now, we introduce the following properties.

**Fact 3.12.** Let there be two  $n \times d$  matrices  $A_1, A_2$ , and we define  $\mathbf{A} = A_1 \otimes A_2$ . Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . Let  $\mathbf{A}_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d^2}$  be a block of  $\mathbf{A}$ . We introduce  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$  as the vectorization of  $X$ . Thus, we get

- $(\exp(A_1 X A_2^\top)_{j_0, *})^\top = \exp(\mathbf{A}_{j_0} x)$
- $\text{vec}(\exp(A_1 X A_2^\top)) = \exp(\mathbf{A}x)$ ,

For the  $j_0$ -th row of  $\exp(A_1 X A_2^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , we use the notation  $\exp(A_1 X A_2^\top)_{j_0, *}$ .

*Proof.* From Lemma and Def. 3.11, we are able to prove this fact. □



### 3.7 Useful Definitions

Here, we denote  $d^4$ -dimensional vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d^4}$  as the vectorization of a  $d^2 \times d^2$  matrix  $X$ . We introduce some terms to simplify our notations in calculation.

**Definition 3.13.** We suppose there are two  $n^2 \times d^2$  matrices  $A, W$ . We define  $\tilde{A}$  as  $A \oslash W$ , which is an  $n^2 \times d^4$  matrix. We use  $\tilde{A}_{j_0}$  to denote the an  $n \times d^4$  subblock of  $\tilde{A}$ , given that the total counts of subblocks is  $n$ . The function is defined as  $u(x)_{j_0}$  maps a  $d^4$  dimensional vector to an  $n$ -dimensional vector with every  $j_0 \in [n]$  such that

$$u(x)_{j_0} := \exp(\tilde{A}_{j_0}x).$$

**Definition 3.14.** We suppose two  $n^2 \times d^2$  matrices  $A, W$ . Suppose that  $\tilde{A} := A \oslash W \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^4}$ . We use  $\tilde{A}_{j_0}$  to denote the an  $n \times d^4$  subblock of  $\tilde{A}$ , given the counts of total subblocks is  $n$ . The function is defined as  $\alpha(x)_{j_0}$  maps from a  $d^4$ -dimensional vector to a scalar with every  $j_0 \in [n]$  such that

$$\alpha(x)_{j_0} := \langle \exp(\tilde{A}_{j_0}x), \mathbf{1}_n \rangle.$$

**Definition 3.15.** From Def. 3.13, it defines  $u(\cdot)_{j_0}$ , and we have  $\alpha(\cdot)_{j_0}$  based on Def. 3.14. The function  $s(x)_{j_0}$  maps a  $d^4$ -dimensional vector to an  $n$ -dimensional vector given every  $j_0 \in [n]$  such that

$$s(x)_{j_0} := \alpha(x)_{j_0}^{-1} u(x)_{j_0}.$$

**Definition 3.16.** Let  $A_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be a matrix. We define  $v(y)_{i_0}$  as the  $i_0$ -th column of  $v(y)$ . We define the function  $v(y)_{i_0}$  maps a  $d^2$ -dimensional vector to an  $n$ -dimensional vector, given each  $i_0$  in the set  $[d]$ , such that

$$v(y)_{i_0} := A_3 Y_{*,i_0}$$

where  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$  is the vectorization of  $n \times n$  matrix  $Y$ .

**Definition 3.17.** From Def. 3.15, with every  $j_0$  in the set  $[n]$ , it gives  $s(x)_{j_0}$  as an  $n$ -dimensional normalized vector, and we define  $v(y)_{i_0}$  based on Def. 3.16 given that each  $i_0 \in [d]$ . Defining a function  $\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0}$  maps a  $d^4$ -dimensional vector to a scalar with each  $j_0 \in [n]$  and each  $i_0 \in [d]$  such that

$$\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} := \langle s(x)_{j_0}, v(y)_{i_0} \rangle - E_{j_0, i_0}.$$

Here  $E_{j_0, i_0}$  is the  $(j_0, i_0)$ -th coordinate of  $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  for each  $j_0$  in the set  $[n]$  and  $i_0$  in the set  $[d]$ , that is  $\ell(x) = s(x)v(y) - E$ .

**Definition 3.18.** Here we let  $\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0} := 0.5\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0}^2$  with every  $j_0$  in the set  $[n]$  and  $i_0$  in the set  $[d]$ .

### 3.8 Reformulation of the Loss Function

Based on the notation in Section 3.7, we can reformulate and simplify our loss function.

**Lemma 3.19.** With the following conditions

- Given three  $n \times d$  input sequence matrices  $A_1, A_2$ , and  $A_3$ ,

- Let  $\mathbf{A} = A_1 \otimes A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$  and  $\mathbf{X} = X_1 \otimes X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}$ , where  $\otimes$  denotes Kronecker product.
- Given  $W$  is a  $n^2 \times d^2$  matrix, we define  $\tilde{A} = A \otimes W$ . Let  $j_0 \in [n]$ , and we define  $\tilde{A}_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d^2}$  be a block of size  $n \times d^2$  from  $\tilde{A}$ .
- $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be a matrix. For  $j_0 \in [n]$  and  $i_0 \in [d]$ , we define  $E_{j_0, i_0}$  as the  $(j_0, i_0)$ -th position or entry the  $n \times d$  matrix  $E$ .
- Here are three squared matrices  $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , let  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$
- Based on Def. 3.2, we have  $\text{Loss}(\mathbf{X})$ .
- Based on Def. 3.18, For  $j_0$  in the set  $[n]$  and  $i_0$  in the set  $[d]$ , we get  $\text{Loss}(\mathbf{X})_{j_0, i_0}$

Then, we have

$$\text{Loss}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{j_0 \in [n]} \sum_{i_0 \in [d]} \text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}.$$

*Proof.* We present the reformulation of the Loss Function using the tensor trick as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Loss}(\mathbf{X}) &= 0.5 \|D(\mathbf{X})^{-1} A(\mathbf{X}) A_3 Y - E\|_F^2 \\ &= \sum_{j_0=1}^n \sum_{i_0=1}^d 0.5 \cdot (\langle \exp(\tilde{A}_{j_0} x), \mathbf{1}_n \rangle^{-1} \exp(\tilde{A}_{j_0} x), A_3 Y_{*, i_0} \rangle - E_{j_0, i_0})^2 \\ &= \sum_{j_0=1}^n \sum_{i_0=1}^d 0.5 (\langle s(x)_{j_0}, v(y)_{i_0} \rangle - E_{j_0, i_0})^2 \\ &= \sum_{j_0=1}^n \sum_{i_0=1}^d \text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0} \end{aligned}$$

where the 1st equality is based on Def. 3.2, the definition of Frobenius norm derives the 2nd equality, the 3rd equality is due to Def. 3.15 and Def. 3.16, and the 4th step is based on Def. 3.18.  $\square$

## 4 RoPE Attention Gradient Calculation

In this section, we compute the gradient of RoPE attention.

**Lemma 4.1.** *If we have for every  $i \in [d^4]$ ,*

- The column function  $u(x)_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  (Definitions 3.13),
- $\alpha(x)_{j_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.14),
- $s(x)_{j_0}$  is an arbitrary element in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (Def. 3.15),
- $\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.17), and
- $\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.18).

Then, we have  $\forall j_0 \in [n], \forall i_0 \in [d]$ ,

- **Part 1.**

$$\frac{d\tilde{A}_{j_0}x}{dx_i} = \underbrace{(\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}}_{n \times 1}.$$

- **Part 2.**

$$\frac{du(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i} = u(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}.$$

- **Part 3.**

$$\frac{d\alpha(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i} = \langle (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}, u(x)_{j_0} \rangle.$$

- **Part 4.**

$$\frac{ds(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i} = -s(x)_{j_0} \langle (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle + s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}$$

- **Part 5.**

$$\frac{d\langle s(x)_{j_0}, v(y)_{i_0} \rangle}{dx_i} = \langle -s(x)_{j_0} \langle (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle + s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}, A_3 Y_{*,i_0} \rangle.$$

- **Part 6.**

$$\frac{d\ell(x)_{j_0,i_0}}{dx_i} = \langle -s(x)_{j_0} \langle (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle + s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}, A_3 Y_{*,i_0} \rangle.$$

- **Part 7.**

$$\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0,i_0}}{dx_i} = \ell(x)_{j_0,i_0} \langle -s(x)_{j_0} \langle (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle + s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}, A_3 Y_{*,i_0} \rangle.$$

*Proof.* To show **Part 1**,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{A}_{j_0}x}{dx_i} &= \tilde{A}_{j_0} \frac{dx}{dx_i} \\ &= \underbrace{\tilde{A}_{j_0}}_{n \times d^4} \underbrace{e_i}_{d^4 \times 1} \\ &= (\tilde{A}_{j_0})_{*,i}, \end{aligned}$$

and we note that the 1st and 2nd equalities are by the basic derivative rule and the 3rd equality is due to the basis vector definition.

To show **Part 2**,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i} &= \frac{d \exp(\tilde{A}_{j_0}x)}{dx_i} \\ &= \exp(\tilde{A}_{j_0}x) \circ \frac{d\tilde{A}_{j_0}x}{dx_i} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \exp(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0} x) \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i} \\
&= u(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i},
\end{aligned}$$

and we note that the 1st equality is by Def. 3.13, the 2nd equality is by chain rule, the 3rd equality is due to **Part 1**, and the 4th equality is because of Def. 3.13.

To show **Part 3**,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\alpha(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i} &= \frac{d\langle \exp(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0} x), \mathbf{1}_n \rangle}{dx_i} \\
&= \left\langle \frac{d \exp(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0} x)}{dx_i}, \mathbf{1}_n \right\rangle + \left\langle \exp(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0} x), \frac{d\mathbf{1}_n}{dx_i} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \frac{d \exp(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0} x)}{dx_i}, \mathbf{1}_n \right\rangle \\
&= \langle u(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i}, \mathbf{1}_n \rangle \\
&= \langle (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i}, u(x)_{j_0} \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

and we note that the 1st equality is by Def. 3.14, the 2nd equality is by product rule, the 3rd equality is due to  $\frac{d\mathbf{1}_n}{dx_i} = \mathbf{0}_n$ , the 4th equality is because of Def. 3.13, and 5th equality derives from basic algebra.

To show **Part 4**,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{ds(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i} &= \frac{d(\alpha(x)_{j_0}^{-1} u(x)_{j_0})}{dx_i} \\
&= \frac{d\alpha(x)_{j_0}^{-1}}{dx_i} u(x)_{j_0} + \alpha(x)_{j_0}^{-1} \frac{du(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i} \\
&= -\alpha(x)_{j_0}^{-2} \frac{d\alpha(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i} u(x)_{j_0} + \alpha(x)_{j_0}^{-1} \frac{du(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i} \\
&= -\alpha(x)_{j_0}^{-2} \underbrace{\langle (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i}, u(x)_{j_0} \rangle}_{n \times 1} u(x)_{j_0} + \alpha(x)_{j_0}^{-1} \underbrace{(u(x)_{j_0}) \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i}}_{n \times 1} \\
&= -\alpha(x)_{j_0}^{-1} s(x)_{j_0} \underbrace{\langle (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i}, u(x)_{j_0} \rangle}_{n \times 1} + s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i} \\
&= -s(x)_{j_0} \underbrace{\langle (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle}_{n \times 1} + s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i},
\end{aligned}$$

and we note that the 1st equality is by Def. 3.15, the 2nd equality is by product rule, the 3rd equality is due to chain rule, the 4th equality is because of previous parts, the 5th and 6th equalities derive from Def. 3.15.

To show **Part 5**,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\langle s(x)_{j_0}, v(y)_{i_0} \rangle}{dx_i} &= \left\langle \frac{ds(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i}, v(y)_{i_0} \right\rangle + \left\langle s(x)_{j_0}, \frac{dv(y)_{i_0}}{dx_i} \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \frac{ds(x)_{j_0}}{dx_i}, v(y)_{i_0} \right\rangle \\
&= \langle -s(x)_{j_0} \langle (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle + s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*,i}, A_3 Y_{*,i_0} \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

and we note that the 1st equality is due to the product rule, the 2nd equality is by  $\frac{dv(y)_{i_0}}{dx_i} = \mathbf{0}_n$ , and the 3rd equality is due to the previous part.

To show **Part 6**,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0}}{dx_i} &= \frac{d(\langle s(x)_{j_0}, v(y)_{i_0} \rangle - E_{j_0, i_0})}{dx_i} \\ &= \frac{d\langle s(x)_{j_0}, v(y)_{i_0} \rangle}{dx_i} \\ &= \langle -s(x)_{j_0} \underbrace{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^{*, i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle}_{n \times 1} + s(x)_{j_0} \circ \underbrace{(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^{*, i}, A_3 Y_{*, i_0})}_{n \times 1} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and we note that the 1st equality is by Def. 3.17, the 2nd equality is by  $\frac{dE_{j_0, i_0}}{dx_i} = \mathbf{0}_n$ , and the 3rd equality is due to the previous part.

To show **Part 7**,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}}{dx_i} &= 0.5 \frac{d(\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0})^2}{dx_i} \\ &= \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} \cdot \frac{d\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0}}{dx_i} \\ &= \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} \langle -s(x)_{j_0} \underbrace{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^{*, i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle}_{n \times 1} + s(x)_{j_0} \circ \underbrace{(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^{*, i}, A_3 Y_{*, i_0})}_{n \times 1} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and we note that the 1st equality is by Def. 3.18, the 2nd equality is by chain rule, and the 3rd equality is due to the previous part.  $\square$

## 5 Exact Gradient Computation Time

In this section, we analyze the time complexity of exact gradient computation. In Section 5.1, we reformulate the closed form of the gradient. In Section 5.2, we show the time complexity for  $s(x)$  and  $v(y)$ . In Section 5.3, we show the time complexity for  $\ell(x)$ . In Section 5.4, we show the time complexity for  $\beta(x)$  and  $\gamma(x)$ . In Section 5.5, we show the total time complexity for computing the gradient of RoPE attention.

### 5.1 Reformulate the Gradient into Its Closed Form

**Lemma 5.1** (Gradient Reformulation,  $\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}}{dx}$ ). *If we have for every  $i \in [d^4]$ ,*

- *The column function  $u(x)_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  (Definitions 3.13),*
- *$\alpha(x)_{j_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.14),*
- *$s(x)_{j_0}$  is an arbitrary element in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (Def. 3.15),*
- *$\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.17), and*
- *$\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.18).*

*Then, we have*

$$\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}}{dx} = \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top (\text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0}) A_3 Y_{*, i_0} - s(x)_{j_0} s(x)_{j_0}^\top A_3 Y_{*, i_0}).$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}}{dx_i} &= \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} \langle -s(x)_{j_0} \langle (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*, i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle + s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*, i}, A_3 Y_{*, i_0} \rangle \\
&= \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} \langle s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*, i}, A_3 Y_{*, i_0} \rangle - \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} \langle s(x)_{j_0} \langle (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*, i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle, A_3 Y_{*, i_0} \rangle \\
&= \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} \langle s(x)_{j_0} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*, i}, A_3 Y_{*, i_0} \rangle - \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} \langle (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0})_{*, i}, s(x)_{j_0} \rangle \langle s(x)_{j_0}, A_3 Y_{*, i_0} \rangle \\
&= \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top)_{*, i} \text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0}) A_3 Y_{*, i_0} - \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top)_{*, i} s(x)_{j_0} s(x)_{j_0}^\top A_3 Y_{*, i_0} \\
&= \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top)_{*, i} (\text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0}) - s(x)_{j_0} s(x)_{j_0}^\top) A_3 Y_{*, i_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

where the 1st step follows from Lemma 4.1, and all other steps follow from Fact 3.10.

Then, the gradient can be reformulated as follows.

$$\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}}{dx} = \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top (\text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0}) A_3 Y_{*, i_0} - s(x)_{j_0} s(x)_{j_0}^\top A_3 Y_{*, i_0}).$$

Thus, we complete the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2** (Gradient Reformulation,  $\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0}}{dx}$ ). *If we have for every  $i \in [d^4]$ ,*

- *The column function  $u(x)_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  (Definitions 3.13),*
- *$\alpha(x)_{j_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.14),*
- *$s(x)_{j_0}$  is an arbitrary element in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (Def. 3.15),*
- *$\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.17),*
- *$\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.18), and*
- *$\beta(x)_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $\underbrace{A_3 Y}_{n \times d} \underbrace{\ell(x)_{j_0, *}}_{d \times 1}$ .*

*Then, we get*

$$\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0}}{dx} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top (s(x)_{j_0} \circ A_3 \beta(x)_{j_0}) - \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top s(x)_{j_0} \langle s(x)_{j_0}, A_3 \beta(x)_{j_0} \rangle.$$

*Proof.* We can get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0}}{dx} &= \sum_{i_0 \in [d]} \frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}}{dx} \\
&= \sum_{i_0 \in [d]} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top (\text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0}) - s(x)_{j_0} s(x)_{j_0}^\top) \ell(x)_{j_0, i_0} A_3 Y_{*, i_0} \\
&= \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top (\text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0}) - s(x)_{j_0} s(x)_{j_0}^\top) \beta(x)_{j_0},
\end{aligned}$$

and we note that the first equality is because Lemma 3.19, the 2nd equality is due to basic algebra, and the 3rd equality comes from the lemma statement.

Thus, we complete this proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3** (Gradient Reformulation,  $\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)}{dx}$ ). *If we have for every  $i \in [d^4]$ ,*

- *The column function  $u(x)_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  (Definitions 3.13),*

- $\alpha(x)_{j_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.14),
- $s(x)_{j_0}$  is an arbitrary element in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (Def. 3.15),
- $\ell(x)_{j_0, i_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.17),
- $\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0, i_0}$  is a real number (Def. 3.18),
- $\beta(x)_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $\underbrace{A_3 Y}_{n \times d} \underbrace{\ell(x)_{j_0, *}}_{d \times 1}$ , and
- $\gamma(x)_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $(\text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0}) - s(x)_{j_0} s(x)_{j_0}^\top) \beta(x)_{j_0}$

Then, we get

$$\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)}{dx} = \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\top}_{d^4 \times n^2} \text{vec}(\underbrace{\gamma(x)}_{n \times n})$$

*Proof.* We show that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\text{Loss}(x)}{dx} &= \sum_{j_0 \in [n]} \frac{d\text{Loss}(x)_{j_0}}{dx} \\ &= \sum_{j_0 \in [n]} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{j_0}^\top \gamma(x)_{j_0} \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\top \text{vec}(\gamma(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where we note that the 1st equality is because of Lemma 3.19, the 2nd equality is based on the lemma statement, and the 3rd equality derives from basic concepts of vectorization.

Thus, we complete the proof.  $\square$

## 5.2 Time to Get $s(x)$ and $v(y)$ Functions

**Lemma 5.4.** *Pick  $s(x)$  and  $v(y)$  from Def. 3.15 and Def. 3.16, then it costs  $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d) + \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n))$  time to get  $s(x)$ , and it costs  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d)$  time to get  $v(y)$ .*

*Proof.* We first show the time complexity of  $s(x)$ .

Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be the RoPE attention matrix. Let  $D = A \mathbf{1}_n$ . Then

$$s(x) = D^{-1} A.$$

Then, we need  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d) + \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n)$  time to get  $A$ .

Next, we need  $O(n^2)$  time to get  $D$ .

Now, we need  $O(n^2)$  time to get  $D^{-1} A$ .

Therefore, they cost time  $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d) + \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n))$  time .

We show the time complexity of  $v(y)$ .

To get  $v(y) = A_3 Y$ , it costs time  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d)$ .

Thus, we complete the proof.  $\square$

### 5.3 Time Complexity for Computing $\ell(x)$ Functions

**Lemma 5.5.** *We have  $\ell(x)$  from Def. 3.17, then it costs  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, d) + O(nd)$  to calculate  $\ell(x)$ .*

*Proof.* We show the time complexity of  $\ell(x)$ , where  $\ell(x) = s(x)v(y) - E$ .

It costs  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, d)$  time to get  $s(x)v(y)$ .

Then, it requires  $O(nd)$  time to get  $s(x)v(y) - E$ .

Therefore, they cost time  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, d) + O(nd)$ .

Thus, we complete the proof.  $\square$

### 5.4 Time Complexity for Computing $\beta(x)$ and $\gamma(x)$ Functions

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $\beta(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be defined as  $\beta(x) := \ell(x)v(y)^\top$  and  $\gamma(x)$  be defined as  $\gamma(x)_{j_0} := (\text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0} - s(x)_{j_0}s(x)_{j_0}^\top)\beta(x)_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , given that  $s(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  then  $\beta(x)$  can be computed in time of  $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, d))$  and  $\gamma(x)$  can be computed in time of  $O(n^2)$ .*

*Proof.* Here we present  $\beta(x)$  as follows:  $\beta(x) = \ell(x)v(y)^\top$ .

It costs  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n)$  time to get  $\ell(x)v(y)^\top$ , which equals to  $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, d))$ .

Next, we show the time complexity for  $\gamma(x)_{j_0} = (\text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0} - s(x)_{j_0}s(x)_{j_0}^\top)\beta(x)_{j_0}$ . It costs  $O(n)$  time to get  $\gamma(x)_{j_0}$ . The reason is that  $s(x)_{j_0}s(x)_{j_0}^\top$  is a rank one matrix and  $\text{diag}(s(x)_{j_0})$  is a diagonal matrix

Given  $j_0 \in [n]$ , the time for  $\gamma(x)$  is  $O(n^2)$  and we finish the proof.  $\square$

### 5.5 Time Complexity for Computing the Gradient of RoPE Attention

**Lemma 5.7** (RoPE attention gradient computation time complexity). *We define three  $n \times d$  input sequence matrices as  $A_1, A_2, A_3$ , and the  $n \times d$  approximated attention computation matrix as  $E$ . We define several input fixed matrices as  $X_1, X_2, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . We define  $\mathbf{X} = X_1 \otimes X_2, \mathbf{A} = A_1 \otimes A_2$ . We define  $x := \text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$  and try to get the Loss function gradient. Let  $g := \frac{d\text{Loss}(X_1, X_2)}{dx}$  where  $\text{Loss}(X_1, X_2)$  from Def. 3.3. Then, it costs  $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d) + \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n))$  time to get the gradient  $g \in \mathbb{R}^{d^4}$ .*

*Proof.* We show the time complexity of  $g$  as follows.

1. We need time  $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d) + \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n))$  for  $s(x), v(y)$  from Lemma 5.2.
2. We need time  $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, d) + \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d))$  for  $\ell(x)$  from Lemma 5.3.
3. We need time  $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, n, d))$  for  $\beta(x)$  from Lemma 5.6.
4. We need time  $O(n^2)$  for  $\gamma(x)$  from Lemma 5.6.

Therefore, it costs  $O(\mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, d) + \mathcal{T}_{\text{mat}}(n, d, n))$  time overall for the gradient computation.

Thus, we complete the proof.  $\square$

## 6 Low Rank Approximation of Attention

This section presents the fast running time using the polynomial method and Fast Fourier transform.

**Lemma 6.1** (Theorem 1.3 from [AS24a]). *Suppose  $d = O(\log n)$  and  $B = o(\sqrt{\log n})$ . There is an  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time algorithm to approximate ArAttC up to  $\epsilon = 1/\text{poly}(n)$  additive error.*



## 6.1 Approximate $s$ Using Low Rank Approximation

**Lemma 6.2.** For any  $B = o(\sqrt{\log n})$ , let  $k_1$  equals to  $n^{o(1)}$  such that: Suppose we have two  $n \times d$  matrices  $A_1, A_2, X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{X} = X_1 \otimes X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}$ . Assume we can use  $O(\log n)$  bits to write every entry from  $s(x)$ . It holds that  $\max\{\|A_1 X_1\|_\infty, \|A_2 X_2\|_\infty\} \leq B$ , then there are three matrices  $U_1, V_1, W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_1}$  such that  $\|U_1 V_1^\top - s(x)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon / \text{poly}(n)$ . Here  $s(x) = D^{-1} A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  where  $A$  is defined as the matrix representation of  $\exp((A \otimes W) \text{vec}(X))$ , and  $D = \text{diag}(A/d) \mathbf{1}_n$ . Moreover, these matrices  $U_1, V_1$  can be created explicitly in  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time.

*Proof.* By definition of  $A(\mathbf{X})$ , we have

$$\text{vec}(A(\mathbf{X})) = \exp(A \otimes W) \text{vec}(X).$$

Hence, using the tensor trick, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A(\mathbf{X})_{i,j} &= \exp((A_{i+(j-1)n} \otimes W_{i+(j-1)n}) \text{vec}(X)/d) \\ &= \exp((A_{i+(j-1)n} \otimes w_{i-j}^\top) \text{vec}(X)/d). \end{aligned}$$

We define  $w_{i-j} := \text{vec}(W_{i-j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$  and define  $W$  such that  $W_{j_0}$  is an  $1 \times d^2$  block and  $W_{i+(j-1)n} := w_{i-j}^\top$ . We also define  $A := A_1 \otimes A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$  and  $\mathbf{X} := X_1 \otimes X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}$ . We use  $A_{j_0}$  to denote the a  $1 \times d^2$  subblock of  $A$ .

We can reformulate the attention matrix  $A$  as, for  $i, j \in [n]$

$$A(\mathbf{X})_{i,j} = \exp(\underbrace{A_{i+(j-1)n}}_{1 \times d^2} \underbrace{\mathbf{X}}_{d^2 \times d^2} \underbrace{w_{i-j}/d}_{d^2 \times 1}).$$

Thus, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{i+(j-1)n} \mathbf{X} w_{i-j}, \\ &= (A_{1,i,*} \otimes A_{2,j,*})(X_1 \otimes X_2) \text{vec}(W_{i-j}) \\ &= A_{1,i,*} X_1 W_{i-j} X_2^\top A_{2,j,*}^\top \end{aligned}$$

where 1st equality uses definitions of  $w_{i-j}, A$ , and  $\mathbf{X}$ , and the second step uses the tensor trick. We complete our proof after applying Lemma 6.1.  $\square$

## 6.2 Approximate $\ell$ Using Low Rank Approximation

**Lemma 6.3.** Let  $d$  equal  $O(\log n)$ . Suppose we can use  $O(\log n)$  bits to write every entry in  $E, v(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ . Define the  $\ell(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  as specified in Def. 3.17. Then, we have  $U_1, V_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_1}$  such that  $\|U_1 V_1^\top v(y) - E - \ell(x)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon / \text{poly}(n)$ .

*Proof.* Here, we present the bound as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_1 V_1^\top v(y) - E - \ell(x)\|_\infty &= \|U_1 V_1^\top v(y) - s(x)v(y)\|_\infty \\ &= \|v(y)\|_\infty \cdot \|U_1 V_1^\top - s(x)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \epsilon / \text{poly}(n), \end{aligned}$$

where the 1st is because of Def. 3.17, 2nd step is based on the distributive law, and 3rd step is due to Lemma 6.2.  $\square$

### 6.3 Approximate $\beta$ Using Low Rank Approximation

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $k_2 = n^{o(1)}$ . We define  $\ell(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  based on Def. 3.17, and  $v(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  based on Def. 3.16. We suppose  $\beta(x)$  is equal to  $v(y)\ell(x)^\top$ , which is an  $n \times n$  matrix. Let  $U_2, V_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_2}$  such that  $\|U_2 V_2^\top - \beta(x)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon / \text{poly}(n)$ . In  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time, we can get  $U_2, V_2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{\beta}(x) \approx \beta(x)$

By Lemma 6.3,  $U_1 V_1^\top v(y) - E$  approximately equals to  $\ell(x)$ .

Then we define  $\tilde{\beta}(x) = v(y)(U_1 V_1^\top v(y) - E)^\top$ .

We can use the low-rank technique to represent  $\tilde{\beta}(x) = v(y)v(y)^\top V_1 U_1^\top - v(y)E^\top$ .

Also,  $v(y)^\top V_1$  can be computed at first because it takes  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time.

Given that all low rank matrices, we have  $U_2, V_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_2}$  where  $k_2 = \max\{d, k\} + d = n^{o(1)}$ .

Here, we present the proof for obtaining the bound.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\beta}(x) - \beta(x)\|_\infty &= \|v(y)(U_1 V_1^\top v(y)) - E)^\top - v(y)\ell(x)^\top\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|U_1 V_1^\top v(y) - E - \ell(x)\|_\infty \cdot \|v(y)\|_\infty \cdot d \\ &\leq \epsilon / \text{poly}(n) \end{aligned}$$

where the first step is based on the definition of  $\beta(x)$  and  $\tilde{\beta}(x)$ , the second step is due to the distributive law, and the third step derives from Lemma 6.3.

Thus, we complete the proof.  $\square$

### 6.4 Approximate $\gamma$ Using Low Rank Approximation

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let  $k_1 = n^{o(1)}$ . Let  $k_2 = n^{o(1)}$ . We suppose  $\gamma_1(x)$  is  $\text{diag}(s(x))\beta(x)$ , and  $U_1, V_1$  be two  $n \times k_1$  matrices, in which  $\|U_1 V_1^\top - f(x)\|_\infty \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\text{poly}(n)}$ . We suppose two  $n \times k_2$  matrices  $U_2, V_2$  in which  $\|U_2 V_2^\top - \beta(x)\|_\infty \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\text{poly}(n)}$ . Then we have two  $n \times k_3$  matrices in which  $\|U_3 V_3^\top - \gamma_1(x)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon / \text{poly}(n)$ . We can construct  $U_3, V_3$  in  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time.*

*Proof.* Let  $U_3 = U_1 \otimes U_2$  and  $V_3 = V_1 \otimes V_2$ , and we can use  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time to get them.

Let  $\tilde{s}(x) = U_1 V_1^\top$  and  $\tilde{\beta}(x) = U_2 V_2^\top$ .

Then, we have the following by Fact 3.9.

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_3 V_3^\top - \gamma_1(x)\|_\infty &\leq \|U_3 V_3^\top - \text{diag}(s(x))\beta(x)\|_\infty \\ &= \|(U_1 \otimes U_2)(V_1 \otimes V_2)^\top - \text{diag}(s(x))\beta(x)\|_\infty \\ &= \|\text{diag}(U_1 V_1^\top)(U_2 V_2^\top) - \text{diag}(s(x))\beta(x)\|_\infty \\ &= \|\text{diag}(\tilde{s}(x))\tilde{\beta}(x) - \text{diag}(s(x))\beta(x)\|_\infty \\ &= \|\text{diag}(\tilde{s}(x))\tilde{\beta}(x) - \text{diag}(\tilde{s}(x))\beta(x) + \text{diag}(\tilde{s}(x))\beta(x) - \text{diag}(s(x))\beta(x)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|\text{diag}(\tilde{s}(x))\tilde{\beta}(x) - \text{diag}(\tilde{s}(x))\beta(x)\|_\infty + \|\text{diag}(\tilde{s}(x))\beta(x) - \text{diag}(s(x))\beta(x)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{\text{poly}(n)} \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is because of the def. of  $\gamma_1(x)$ , the second equality is due to the def. of  $U_3, V_3$ , the third equality is based on Fact 3.9, the fourth equality is due to the def. of  $\tilde{s}(x)$  and  $\tilde{\beta}(x)$ , the fifth equality is due to simple arithmetic, the sixth inequality is because of the triangle inequality, and the seventh inequality derives from Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 6.4.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.6.** Let  $k_1 = n^{o(1)}$ . Let  $k_2 = n^{o(1)}$ . Let  $k_4 = n^{o(1)}$ . Let  $\gamma_2(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  where for  $j_0$  in set  $[n]$ ,  $j_0$  represents  $j_0$ -th column,  $\gamma_2(x)_{j_0} = s(x)_{j_0} s(x)_{j_0}^\top \beta(x)_{j_0}$ . We suppose  $U_1, V_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_1}$  in which  $\|U_1 V_1^\top - s(x)\|_\infty \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\text{poly}(n)}$ . We suppose two  $n \times k_2$  matrices  $U_2, V_2$  in which  $\|U_2 V_2^\top - \beta(x)\|_\infty \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\text{poly}(n)}$ . Then, we have  $U_4, V_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_4}$  such that  $\|U_4 V_4^\top - \gamma_2(x)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon / \text{poly}(n)$ . We can get  $U_4, V_4$  in  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time.

*Proof.* Let  $\rho(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be  $\rho(x)_{j_0} := s(x)_{j_0} \beta(x)_{j_0}$ .

We define  $\tilde{\rho}(x) \approx \rho(x)$ .

Let  $(U_1 V_1)_{j_0, *}^\top \approx s(x)_{j_0}$  and  $(U_2 V_2)_{j_0, *}^\top \approx \beta(x)_{j_0}$ .

Then, we define  $\tilde{\rho}(x)_{j_0}$  as the inner product of  $\tilde{s}(x)_{j_0}$  and  $\tilde{\beta}(x)_{j_0}$ , and by Fact 3.10, we have  $\tilde{\rho}(x)_{j_0} = (U_1 V_1)_{j_0, *}^\top \cdot (U_2 V_2)_{j_0, *}^\top$ .

Then, it costs  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time if we compute  $V_1 V_2^\top$  first.

Now, we show

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}(x)_{j_0} &= (U_1 V_1)_{j_0, *}^\top \cdot (U_2 V_2)_{j_0, *}^\top \\ &= \underbrace{(U_1)_{j_0, *}}_{1 \times k_1} \underbrace{V_1 V_2^\top}_{k_1 \times k_2} \underbrace{(U_2)_{j_0, *}^\top}_{k_2 \times 1} \end{aligned}$$

Once the  $V_1 V_2^\top$  are pre-computed, the above step only takes  $O(k_1 k_2)$  time. Given that  $j_0 \in [n]$ , we can have the total time  $O(n k_1 k_2) = n^{1+o(1)}$ .

We suppose  $\tilde{s}(x)$  approximates  $s(x)$  and set is equal to  $U_1 V_1^\top$ . Then, we are able to approximate  $\gamma_2(x)$  using  $\tilde{s}(x)$  and  $\tilde{\rho}(x)$  as follows.

We suppose  $\tilde{\gamma}_2(x)$  equals to  $\tilde{s}(x) \text{diag}(\tilde{\rho}(x))$ .  $U_4$  and  $V_4$  can be obtained since we can use the low-rank approximation technique to represent  $\tilde{s}(x)$  and  $\text{diag}(\tilde{\rho}(x))$  is a diagonal matrix. Basically  $U_4 = U_1$  and  $V_4 = \text{diag}(\tilde{\rho}(x)) V_1$ .

Now, we need to control the error. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_4 V_4^\top - \gamma_2(x)\|_\infty &= \|\tilde{\gamma}_2(x) - \gamma_2(x)\|_\infty \\ &= \max_{j_0 \in [n]} \|\tilde{s}(x)_{j_0} \tilde{\rho}(x)_{j_0} - s(x)_{j_0} \rho(x)_{j_0}\|_\infty \\ &= \max_{j_0 \in [n]} \|\tilde{s}(x)_{j_0} \tilde{\rho}(x)_{j_0} - \tilde{s}(x)_{j_0} \rho(x)_{j_0} + \tilde{s}(x)_{j_0} \rho(x)_{j_0} - s(x)_{j_0} \rho(x)_{j_0}\|_\infty \\ &\leq \max_{j_0 \in [n]} \|\tilde{s}(x)_{j_0} \tilde{\rho}(x)_{j_0} - \tilde{s}(x)_{j_0} \rho(x)_{j_0}\|_\infty + \|\tilde{s}(x)_{j_0} \rho(x)_{j_0} - s(x)_{j_0} \rho(x)_{j_0}\|_\infty \\ &\leq \max_{j_0 \in [n]} \|\tilde{s}(x)_{j_0}\|_\infty \cdot \|\tilde{\rho}(x)_{j_0} - \rho(x)_{j_0}\|_\infty + \|\tilde{s}(x)_{j_0} - s(x)_{j_0}\|_\infty \cdot \|\rho(x)_{j_0}\|_\infty \\ &\leq \epsilon / \text{poly}(n) \end{aligned}$$

where the 1st equality is based on the def. of  $\tilde{\gamma}_2(x)$ , the 2nd equality is due to def. of  $\tilde{\gamma}_2(x)$  and  $\gamma_2(x)$ , the 3rd equality is due to simple mathematical properties, the 4th step is due to the triangle inequalities, and the 5th step is due to the distributive law.

Thus, we complete the proof.  $\square$

## 6.5 Fast Computation in Almost Linear Time

**Theorem 6.7** (Main result). Assuming the entries of  $A_1, A_2, X_1, X_2, Y, E$  are represented using  $O(\log n)$  bits, there is an  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time algorithm to solve  $\mathbf{AAttLGC}(n, d = O(\log n), B = o(\sqrt{\log n}))$ , from Def. 3.3, with the accuracy upper bounded by  $\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}$ . To be more specific, a gradient vector  $\tilde{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{d^4}$  comes out of our algorithm where  $\|\frac{d\text{Loss}}{dx} - \tilde{g}\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.6 and Lemma 6.5, There are matrices  $\gamma(x), \gamma_1(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $\gamma_2(x)$ , we have

$$\gamma(x) = \gamma_1(x) - \gamma_2(x).$$

We assume Lemma 6.5 and Lemma 6.6 are true from Lemma 6.2 to Lemma 6.4. Thus, we can have the following based on Lemma 6.5 Lemma 6.6.

We can use low rank approximation technique to represent  $\tilde{\gamma}_1(x) = U_3 V_3^\top$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_2(x) = U_3 V_3^\top$  as the approximation to  $\gamma_1(x)$  and  $\gamma_2(x)$  respectively.

The cost is  $n^{1+o(1)}$  time for every Lemma in Lemmas 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6.

We have the reformulated gradient from Lemma 4.1 as follows.

$$\frac{d\text{Loss}(x)}{dx} = \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\top}_{d^4 \times n^2} \underbrace{\text{vec}(\gamma(x))}_{n \times n}$$

Therefore,  $n^{1+o(1)}$  is the total running time.

We show that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d\text{Loss}(X)}{dx} - \tilde{g} \right\|_\infty &= \left\| \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\top}_{d^4 \times n^2} \underbrace{\text{vec}(\gamma(x))}_{n \times n} - \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\top}_{d^4 \times n^2} \underbrace{\text{vec}(\tilde{\gamma}(x))}_{n \times n} \right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\top}_{d^4 \times n^2} \left( \underbrace{\text{vec}(\gamma(x))}_{n \times n} - \underbrace{\text{vec}(\tilde{\gamma}(x))}_{n \times n} \right) \right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\top}_{d^4 \times n^2} \right\|_\infty \left\| \underbrace{\text{vec}(\gamma(x))}_{n \times n} - \underbrace{\text{vec}(\tilde{\gamma}(x))}_{n \times n} \right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\top}_{d^4 \times n^2} \right\|_\infty \|\gamma(x) - \tilde{\gamma}(x)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \epsilon / \text{poly}(n). \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is based on Lemma 4.1, the second equality is due to the distributive law, the third equality derives from the definition of  $\ell_\infty$  norm, the fourth equality is due to the def. of vectorization, and the fifth inequality derives from the Lemmas in Lemma 6.5 and Lemma 6.6.

We choose  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}$ .

Thus, we have finished our proof.  $\square$

## 7 Hardness

In this section, we introduce our hardness results.

**Theorem 7.1** (Lower bound). *Assuming SETH, for any  $q > 0$ , for the ARAttLGC( $n, d = O(\log n), B = \omega(\sqrt{\log n})$ ), there does not exist an algorithm which can be executed in time  $O(n^{2-q})$  based on Def. 3.3.*

*Proof.* We pick all of the  $W_{-(n-1)}, \dots, W_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  as an identity matrix  $I_d$ . Therefore, the gradient computation of RoPE attention can be treated as the gradient computation of classic attention. Thus, our lower bound result can derive from [AS24b].  $\square$

## 8 Conclusion

This paper presents the first practical and efficient backward gradient algorithm under the assumption of bounded entries for the RoPE-based attention mechanism. By leveraging polynomial methods and the Fast Fourier Transform, we achieve almost linear time complexity, making the forward and backward computations comparably efficient. Additionally, we demonstrate that conditions exist under which performance better than quadratic can be realized, consistent with the lower bounds suggested by the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH). These findings not only improve the computational efficiency of RoPE-based attention mechanisms but also provide a foundation for exploring sub-gradient computations in other advanced attention variants of neural networks. This work highlights the connection between algorithm design and computational complexity theory, unveiling new possibilities for the development of large transformer models. Future research could extend these results to cases involving unbounded entries and assess the real-world implications of these theoretical advancements for large language models. Furthermore, applying this approach to other positional encoding mechanisms could further enhance the scalability of state-of-the-art transformer models.

## References

- [AA22] Amol Aggarwal and Josh Alman. Optimal-degree polynomial approximations for exponentials and gaussian kernel density estimation. In *Proceedings of the 37th Computational Complexity Conference*, pages 1–23, 2022.
- [AAA<sup>+</sup>23] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [AI24] Meta AI. Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date, 2024. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>.
- [Ant24a] Anthropic. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku, 2024. [https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model\\_Card\\_C3](https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model_Card_C3)
- [Ant24b] Anthropic. Claude 3.5 sonnet, 2024.
- [AS23] Josh Alman and Zhao Song. Fast attention requires bounded entries. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- [AS24a] Josh Alman and Zhao Song. Fast rope attention: Combining the polynomial method and fast fourier transform. *manuscript*, 2024.
- [AS24b] Josh Alman and Zhao Song. The fine-grained complexity of gradient computation for training large language models. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [AS24c] Josh Alman and Zhao Song. How to capture higher-order correlations? generalizing matrix softmax attention to kronecker computation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [ASZZ24] Josh Alman, Zhao Song, Ruizhe Zhang, and Danyang Zhuo. Bypass exponential time preprocessing: Fast neural network training via weight-data correlation preprocessing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

- [AZL23] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Physics of language models: Part 1, context-free grammar. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13673*, 2023.
- [AZLS19] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 242–252. PMLR, 2019.
- [BCS97] Peter Bürgisser, Michael Clausen, and Mohammad Amin Shokrollahi. Algebraic complexity theory. *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 1997.
- [Blä13] Markus Bläser. Fast matrix multiplication. *Theory of Computing*, pages 1–60, 2013.
- [BMR<sup>+</sup>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.
- [BPSW20] Jan van den Brand, Binghui Peng, Zhao Song, and Omri Weinstein. Training (over-parametrized) neural networks in near-linear time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11648*, 2020.
- [BSZ23] Jan van den Brand, Zhao Song, and Tianyi Zhou. Algorithm and hardness for dynamic attention maintenance in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02207*, 2023.
- [CLL<sup>+</sup>24a] Bo Chen, Xiaoyu Li, Yingyu Liang, Jiangxuan Long, Zhenmei Shi, and Zhao Song. Circuit complexity bounds for rope-based transformer architecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07602*, 2024.
- [CLL<sup>+</sup>24b] Bo Chen, Xiaoyu Li, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, and Zhao Song. Bypassing the exponential dependency: Looped transformers efficiently learn in-context by multi-step gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11268*, 2024.
- [CLL<sup>+</sup>24c] Yifang Chen, Xiaoyu Li, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, and Zhao Song. The computational limits of state-space models and mamba via the lens of circuit complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.06148*, 2024.
- [CLS<sup>+</sup>24] Bo Chen, Yingyu Liang, Zhizhou Sha, Zhenmei Shi, and Zhao Song. Hsr-enhanced sparse attention acceleration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10165*, 2024.
- [DHS<sup>+</sup>22] Yichuan Deng, Hang Hu, Zhao Song, Omri Weinstein, and Danyang Zhuo. Training overparametrized neural networks in sublinear time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.04508*, 2022.
- [DLS23] Yichuan Deng, Zhihang Li, and Zhao Song. Attention scheme inspired softmax regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10411*, 2023.
- [GSWY23] Yeqi Gao, Zhao Song, Weixin Wang, and Junze Yin. A fast optimization view: Reformulating single layer attention in llm based on tensor and svm trick, and solving it in matrix multiplication time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07418*, 2023.
- [GSX23] Yeqi Gao, Zhao Song, and Shenghao Xie. In-context learning for attention scheme: from single softmax regression to multiple softmax regression via a tensor trick. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02419*, 2023.

- [GSY23a] Yeqi Gao, Zhao Song, and Junze Yin. Gradientcoin: A peer-to-peer decentralized large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10502*, 2023.
- [GSY23b] Yeqi Gao, Zhao Song, and Junze Yin. An iterative algorithm for rescaled hyperbolic functions regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00660*, 2023.
- [GSYZ24] Yuzhou Gu, Zhao Song, Junze Yin, and Lichen Zhang. Low rank matrix completion via robust alternating minimization in nearly linear time. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [GWW<sup>+</sup>24] Tom Gunter, Zirui Wang, Chong Wang, Ruoming Pang, Andy Narayanan, Aonan Zhang, Bowen Zhang, Chen Chen, Chung-Cheng Chiu, David Qiu, et al. Apple intelligence foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21075*, 2024.
- [HCL<sup>+</sup>24] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Pei-Hsuan Chang, Robin Luo, Hong-Yu Chen, Weijian Li, Wei-Po Wang, and Han Liu. Outlier-efficient hopfield layers for large transformer-based models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03828*, 2024.
- [HJK<sup>+</sup>23] Insu Han, Rajesh Jayaram, Amin Karbasi, Vahab Mirrokni, David P Woodruff, and Amir Zandieh. Hyperattention: Long-context attention in near-linear time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05869*, 2023.
- [HLSL24] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Thomas Lin, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. On computational limits of modern hopfield models: A fine-grained complexity analysis. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024.
- [HWG<sup>+</sup>24] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Wei-Po Wang, Ammar Gilani, Chenyang Li, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. Fundamental limits of prompt tuning transformers: Universality, capacity and efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.16525*, 2024.
- [HWL24] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Dennis Wu, and Han Liu. Provably optimal memory capacity for modern hopfield models: Transformer-compatible dense associative memories as spherical codes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23126*, 2024.
- [HWSL24] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Weimin Wu, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. On statistical rates and provably efficient criteria of latent diffusion transformers (dits). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01079*, 2024.
- [HYW<sup>+</sup>24] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Donglin Yang, Dennis Wu, Chenwei Xu, Bo-Yu Chen, and Han Liu. On sparse modern hopfield model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [Jia23] Hui Jiang. A latent space theory for emergent abilities in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09960*, 2023.
- [KLS<sup>+</sup>24] Yekun Ke, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Chiwun Yang. Curse of attention: A kernel-based perspective for why transformers fail to generalize on time series forecasting and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.06061*, 2024.
- [KWH23] Feyza Duman Keles, Pruthuvi Mahesakya Wijewardena, and Chinmay Hegde. On the computational complexity of self-attention. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 597–619. PMLR, 2023.

- [LLL21] Jian-wei LIU, Jun-wen LIU, and Xiong-lin LUO. Research progress in attention mechanism in deep learning. *Chinese Journal of Engineering*, 43(11):1499–1511, 2021.
- [LLL+24] Xiaoyu Li, Yuanpeng Li, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, and Zhao Song. On the expressive power of modern hopfield networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05562*, 2024.
- [LLS+24a] Chenyang Li, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Tianyi Zhou. Fourier circuits in neural networks and transformers: A case study of modular arithmetic with multiple inputs. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2402, 2024.
- [LLS+24b] Xiaoyu Li, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Yufa Zhou. Fine-grained attention i/o complexity: Comprehensive analysis for backward passes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09397*, 2024.
- [LLS+24c] Yingyu Liang, Heshan Liu, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Junze Yin. Conv-basis: A new paradigm for efficient attention inference and gradient computation in transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05219*, 2024.
- [LLS+24d] Yingyu Liang, Jiangxuan Long, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Yufa Zhou. Beyond linear approximations: A novel pruning approach for attention matrix. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11261*, 2024.
- [LLSS24] Xiaoyu Li, Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, and Zhao Song. A tighter complexity analysis of sparsegpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12151*, 2024.
- [LSS+24a] Yingyu Liang, Zhizhou Sha, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Yufa Zhou. Looped relu mlps may be all you need as practical programmable computers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09375*, 2024.
- [LSS+24b] Yingyu Liang, Zhizhou Sha, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Yufa Zhou. Multi-layer transformers gradient can be approximated in almost linear time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13233*, 2024.
- [LSSY24] Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Chiwun Yang. Toward infinite-long prefix in transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14036*, 2024.
- [LSSZ24] Yingyu Liang, Zhenmei Shi, Zhao Song, and Yufa Zhou. Tensor attention training: Provably efficient learning of higher-order transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16411*, 2024.
- [LSWY23] Zhihang Li, Zhao Song, Zifan Wang, and Junze Yin. Local convergence of approximate newton method for two layer nonlinear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15390*, 2023.
- [LSXY24] Chenyang Li, Zhao Song, Zhaoxing Xu, and Junze Yin. Inverting the leverage score gradient: An efficient approximate newton method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11267*, 2024.
- [LT24] AI @ Meta Llama Team. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.



- [MGF<sup>+</sup>24] Brandon McKinzie, Zhe Gan, Jean-Philippe Fauconnier, Sam Dodge, Bowen Zhang, Philipp Dufter, Dhruvi Shah, Xianzhi Du, Futang Peng, Floris Weers, et al. Mm1: Methods, analysis & insights from multimodal llm pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09611*, 2024.
- [MOSW22] Alexander Munteanu, Simon Omlor, Zhao Song, and David Woodruff. Bounding the width of neural networks via coupled initialization a worst case analysis. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 16083–16122. PMLR, 2022.
- [Ope24] OpenAI. Introducing openai o1-preview. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-openai-o1-preview>, 2024. Accessed: September 12.
- [SAL<sup>+</sup>24] Jianlin Su, Murtadha Ahmed, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Wen Bo, and Yunfeng Liu. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063, 2024.
- [SMN<sup>+</sup>24] Zhenmei Shi, Yifei Ming, Xuan-Phi Nguyen, Yingyu Liang, and Shafiq Joty. Discovering the gems in early layers: Accelerating long-context llms with 1000x input token reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.17422*, 2024.
- [SWY23] Zhao Song, Weixin Wang, and Junze Yin. A unified scheme of resnet and softmax. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13482*, 2023.
- [SXY23] Zhao Song, Guangyi Xu, and Junze Yin. The expressibility of polynomial based attention scheme. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20051*, 2023.
- [SYYZ23] Zhao Song, Mingquan Ye, Junze Yin, and Lichen Zhang. Efficient alternating minimization with applications to weighted low rank approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04169*, 2023.
- [SYZ21] Zhao Song, Shuo Yang, and Ruizhe Zhang. Does preprocessing help training over-parameterized neural networks? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:22890–22904, 2021.
- [SYZ24] Zhao Song, Junze Yin, and Lichen Zhang. Solving attention kernel regression problem via pre-conditioner. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 208–216. PMLR, 2024.
- [SZZ<sup>+</sup>21] Zhuoran Shen, Mingyuan Zhang, Haiyu Zhao, Shuai Yi, and Hongsheng Li. Efficient attention: Attention with linear complexities. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 3531–3539, 2021.
- [SZZ24] Zhao Song, Lichen Zhang, and Ruizhe Zhang. Training multi-layer over-parametrized neural network in subquadratic time. In *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, 2024.
- [TBY<sup>+</sup>19] Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Shaojie Bai, Makoto Yamada, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Transformer dissection: a unified understanding of transformer’s attention via the lens of kernel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.11775*, 2019.
- [TLI<sup>+</sup>23] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal

- Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [TMS<sup>+</sup>23] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [VSP<sup>+</sup>17] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [WHHL24] Dennis Wu, Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Teng-Yun Hsiao, and Han Liu. Uniform memory retrieval with larger capacity for modern hopfield models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03827*, 2024.
- [WHL<sup>+</sup>24] Dennis Wu, Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Weijian Li, Bo-Yu Chen, and Han Liu. STanhop: Sparse tandem hopfield model for memory-enhanced time series prediction. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- [WMS<sup>+</sup>24] Jiayu Wang, Yifei Ming, Zhenmei Shi, Vibhav Vineet, Xin Wang, Yixuan Li, and Neel Joshi. Is a picture worth a thousand words? delving into spatial reasoning for vision language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [WSH<sup>+</sup>24] Weimin Wu, Maojiang Su, Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. Transformers are deep optimizers: Provable in-context learning for deep model training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.16549*, 2024.
- [WTB<sup>+</sup>22] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*, 2022.
- [XSL24] Zhuoyan Xu, Zhenmei Shi, and Yingyu Liang. Do large language models have compositional ability? an investigation into limitations and scalability. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Mathematical and Empirical Understanding of Foundation Models*, 2024.
- [XSW<sup>+</sup>24] Zhuoyan Xu, Zhenmei Shi, Junyi Wei, Fangzhou Mu, Yin Li, and Yingyu Liang. Towards few-shot adaptation of foundation models via multitask finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15017*, 2024.
- [ZHDK23] Amir Zandieh, Insu Han, Majid Daliri, and Amin Karbasi. Kdeformer: Accelerating transformers via kernel density estimation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 40605–40623. PMLR, 2023.