

---

# A Large-Scale Exploration of $\mu$ -Transfer

---

Lucas D. Lingle

Independent Researcher/EleutherAI  
lucasdaxlingle@gmail.com

## Abstract

Large artificial neural networks have become a mainstay of language, vision, and audio processing and synthesis, yet their initializations and learning rates are often set in an unsophisticated fashion, due to the high cost of hyperparameter sweeps at scale. The  $\mu$ -Parameterization ( $\mu$ P) offers a potential solution to this challenge, yielding scaling rules for model initialization and learning rates while reportedly enabling zero-shot hyperparameter transfer from small to large models. Despite its evident promise, the  $\mu$ P method is not yet widely adopted, perhaps due to higher implementation complexity, many variations, or complex theoretical background. This work investigates  $\mu$ P empirically, focusing on the ubiquitous transformer architecture, and aims to answer a simple question: does  $\mu$ -Transfer yield optimal learning rates in practice? Studying models of up to 10B parameters and training budgets of up to 190B tokens, we find  $\mu$ -Transfer works as intended for the majority of important cases, yet also identify a few cases where it may not.

## 1 Introduction

Despite the emergence of transformers as the primary architecture for language, vision, and audio [1–13], there is still no universal method for setting their initialization, learning rate, or other hyperparameters. Further, the hyperparameters selected for large models may be far from optimal due to the expense of conducting hyperparameter sweeps at scale.

The  $\mu$ -Parameterization ( $\mu$ P) [14–16] offers a general method for scaling initializations and learning rates, based on the Tensor Programs formalism of neural network training [17–19]. Empirically,  $\mu$ P is also reported to enable zero-shot hyperparameter transfer from small proxy models to large target models [14–16], using width or depth as the direction of scaling. This ‘ $\mu$ -transfer’ technique offers a promise of stable training and optimal hyperparameters at scale with low expense.

However, while the initial report on  $\mu$ -transfer demonstrated approximate preservation of hyperparameter optima, this was shown only at a relatively small scale [15], with the sole large-scale experiment being oriented as a benchmark. Thus, there is a lack of convincing empirical evidence that hyperparameter optima are preserved under  $\mu$ -transfer when target model is very large. In this absence, it seems possible the optimum could drift or jump due to emergent outlier features [15, 20].

A second open question is if  $\mu$ -transfer is compatible with the techniques used in practice, such as decoupled weight decay [21] or multiplicative nonlinearities [22, 23]. While the initial report aims to delineate the compatible techniques, there is a need for further exploration and empirical verification.

A few recent works appear to have adopted  $\mu$ P [24–26], but do not settle the open questions above; such an investigation would require extensive hyperparameter sweeps at scale. Inspired by the recent interest, this paper aims to shed further light on  $\mu$ -transfer, studying its reliability on transformer models through extensive ablations using up to 1.2B parameter models and 33B tokens, as well as a large-scale study using up to 10B parameter models and 190B tokens.

Table 1: Validation losses for  $\mu$ -transfer ablations. The best loss for each model size is shown in bold. Full experimental details and per-ablation analyses are given in Section 4.

Ablation	Width	Base LR					Transfer
		$2^{-10}$	$2^{-8}$	$2^{-6}$	$2^{-4}$	$2^{-2}$	
Baseline $\mu$ P	128	3.846	3.743	<b>3.695</b>	3.884	4.143	✓
	512	3.114	2.993	<b>2.953</b>	3.221	3.506	
	2048	2.711	2.553	<b>2.511</b>	2.563	3.244	
Projection Biases	128	3.838	3.735	<b>3.705</b>	3.911	4.269	✓
	512	3.108	2.986	<b>2.947</b>	2.970	3.557	
	2048	2.710	2.552	<b>2.529</b>	2.672	3.418	
RMSNorm Gains (Vector)	128	3.842	3.744	3.689	<b>3.670</b>	3.681	✗
	512	3.101	2.992	2.951	<b>2.950</b>	3.412	
	2048	2.692	<b>2.553</b>	2.609	2.605	3.169	
RMSNorm Gains (Scalar)	128	3.843	3.749	3.692	<b>3.670</b>	4.471	✗
	512	3.106	3.000	2.961	<b>2.959</b>	3.515	
	2048	2.704	2.570	<b>2.525</b>	2.542	3.334	
Zero Query Init	128	3.836	3.743	<b>3.694</b>	3.877	4.167	✓
	512	3.115	2.992	<b>2.949</b>	3.135	3.532	
	2048	2.711	2.553	<b>2.510</b>	2.551	3.272	
SP Attention Scale	128	3.836	<b>3.758</b>	3.905	4.140	4.597	✗
	512	3.104	2.993	<b>2.962</b>	3.449	4.184	
	2048	2.706	2.555	<b>2.525</b>	3.306	7.280	
SP Unembedding Init	128	3.861	3.765	<b>3.699</b>	3.896	4.161	✓
	512	3.119	2.990	<b>2.951</b>	3.265	3.582	
	2048	2.716	2.554	<b>2.509</b>	2.564	7.471	
Cosine Schedule	128	3.846	3.743	<b>3.695</b>	3.906	4.143	✓
	512	3.114	2.995	<b>2.955</b>	3.225	3.506	
	2048	2.712	2.558	<b>2.518</b>	2.572	3.244	
Decoupled Weight Decay	128	3.760	<b>3.679</b>	3.694	3.741	4.011	✗
	512	3.057	2.963	<b>2.957</b>	3.139	3.373	
	2048	2.686	2.535	<b>2.502</b>	3.123	6.594	
Embedding Normalization	128	3.834	3.743	<b>3.693</b>	4.012	4.120	✓
	512	3.115	2.993	<b>2.954</b>	3.028	3.506	
	2048	2.710	2.553	<b>2.512</b>	2.564	7.316	
SwiGLU Nonlinearity	128	3.800	3.740	<b>3.715</b>	4.090	7.024	✓
	512	3.070	2.975	<b>2.953</b>	3.175	6.863	
	2048	2.677	2.536	<b>2.505</b>	2.553	4.571	
Squared ReLU Nonlinearity	128	3.808	3.735	<b>3.686</b>	3.999	4.484	✓
	512	3.071	2.964	<b>2.929</b>	3.184	7.299	
	2048	2.666	2.516	<b>2.482</b>	2.532	3.259	
Lion Optimizer	128	<b>3.708</b>	3.736	4.057	4.344	10.380	✗
	512	2.952	<b>2.947</b>	3.416	3.961	10.285	
	2048	2.519	<b>2.511</b>	3.151	10.377	10.377	
Multi-Query Attention	128	3.811	3.708	<b>3.667</b>	3.881	4.121	✓
	512	3.101	2.979	<b>2.940</b>	3.187	3.518	
	2048	2.715	2.564	<b>2.521</b>	2.546	3.257	
4x Larger Batch	128	3.844	3.735	<b>3.697</b>	3.716	10.380	✓
	512	3.141	2.990	<b>2.965</b>	3.305	10.373	
	2048	2.745	2.556	<b>2.541</b>	2.697	7.197	
4x Smaller Batch	128	3.855	3.774	<b>3.736</b>	3.945	4.104	✓
	512	3.120	3.011	<b>2.977</b>	3.024	3.521	
	2048	2.714	2.568	<b>2.527</b>	2.549	3.223	

## 2 Background and Notation

This paper focuses on decoder-only transformer models [27, 28], which process sequences of tokens  $\mathbf{z} \in \{0, \dots, V-1\}^C$ , where  $V$  is called the vocabulary size and  $C$  the context length. This architecture has three components: the embedding layer, transformer layers, and unembedding layer. We describe a pre-norm transformer decoder [29] of depth  $L$ .

### 2.1 Embedding Layer

The token sequence  $\mathbf{z} \in \{0, \dots, V-1\}^C$  is used to index into an embedding matrix  $\mathbf{W}^E \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times M}$ , where  $M$  is called the model width. The resulting real-valued vectors are written as rows to an activation matrix  $\mathbf{X}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times M}$  according to the formula  $\mathbf{X}_i^0 = \mathbf{W}_{z_i}^E$ .

### 2.2 Transformer Layers

A transformer layer consists of two residual blocks [30], denoted MHA and MLP, which are added to a ‘residual stream’ according to the formula

$$\mathbf{X}^\ell = \mathbf{X}^{\ell-1} + \text{MHA}(\mathbf{X}^{\ell-1}) + \text{MLP}(\mathbf{X}^{\ell-1} + \text{MHA}(\mathbf{X}^{\ell-1})). \quad (1)$$

The MHA residual block performs multi-head self-attention, defined by a head width  $D \in \mathbb{N}$  and number of heads  $H \in \mathbb{N}$ . For each head, MHA uses a distinct set of projections  $\mathbf{W}^{AQ}, \mathbf{W}^{AK}, \mathbf{W}^{AV} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times D}$  to perform the following computations given input  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times M}$ :

$$\mathbf{Y} = \text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{X}) \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{W}^{AQ} \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{W}^{AK} \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{W}^{AV} \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{S} = \tau^{-1}\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^\top + \mathbf{M} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{P} = \text{Softmax}(\mathbf{S}) \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{O} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{V} \quad (8)$$

where the LayerNorm and Softmax functions are applied row-wise,  $\tau^{-1} > 0$  is a constant typically set to  $1/\sqrt{D}$ , and  $\mathbf{M}$  is a causal mask given by  $\mathbf{M}_{i,j} = -\infty$  if  $j > i$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{i,j} = 0$  otherwise. The heads’ outputs  $\mathbf{O}$  are concatenated together, and then projected using one additional matrix  $\mathbf{W}^{AO} \in \mathbb{R}^{HD \times M}$  to form the residual  $\text{MHA}(\mathbf{X})$ . This residual is summed onto the residual stream as in Equation 1, and the sum is processed by the MLP residual block.

The MLP residual block applies a multi-layer perceptron to each sequence position independently. It is defined via hidden width  $F$  and element-wise activation  $\phi$ . It uses two trainable projections  $\mathbf{W}^{FI} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times F}$  and  $\mathbf{W}^{FO} \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times M}$ . Given an input tensor  $\mathbf{X}$ , it defines the residual:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{X}) \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{O} = \phi(\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{W}^{FI})\mathbf{W}^{FO} \quad (10)$$

This residual is likewise summed onto the residual stream, following Equation 1.

### 2.3 Unembedding Layer

The unembedding layer uses a matrix  $\mathbf{W}^U \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times V}$  to produce the probabilities for next-token prediction. The layer’s input is the residual stream output  $\mathbf{X}^L$ , and its output is

$$\mathbf{Y} = \text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{X}^L) \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{U} = \text{Softmax}(\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{W}^U) \quad (12)$$

Due to the softmax, each row of  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times V}$  defines a probability mass function over tokens in the vocabulary. The model is trained on the cross-entropy loss  $-\frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=0}^{C-1} \log \mathbf{U}_{i, \mathbf{z}_{i+1}}$ .

### 3 $\mu$ -Transfer

The  $\mu$ -Parameterization ( $\mu$ P) [14–16] refers to a specific family of initializations and learning rates, empirically reported to facilitate hyperparameter transfer from small to large models ( $\mu$ -Transfer). This paper investigates  $\mu$ P for transformers with respect to width; we do not use depthwise  $\mu$ P [16] since it requires only one linear layer stacked per residual block, while transformers use two.

The general formulation of  $\mu$ P when training with Adam [31] and using an i.i.d. Gaussian initialization is given by Yang et al. [15]. The first three columns of Table 2 display these rules for transformers. These columns use big-theta notation. Formally,  $f(x) = \Theta(g(x))$  if there exists  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $c, C > 0$  s.t.  $cg(x) \leq f(x) \leq Cg(x)$  for all  $x > x_0$ .

Table 2:  $\mu$ P scaling rules for transformers; a rule for attention scale is detailed in the main text.

Param	Init Variance ( $\Theta$ )	Adam LR ( $\Theta$ )	Init Variance (Exact)	Adam LR (Exact)
$\mathbf{W}^E$	1	1	1	$\alpha$
$\mathbf{W}^{AQ}$	$1/M$	$1/M$	$1/M$	$\alpha P/M$
$\mathbf{W}^{AK}$	$1/M$	$1/M$	$1/M$	$\alpha P/M$
$\mathbf{W}^{AV}$	$1/M$	$1/M$	$1/M$	$\alpha P/M$
$\mathbf{W}^{AO}$	$1/(HD)$	$1/(HD)$	$1/M$	$\alpha P/M$
$\mathbf{W}^{FI}$	$1/M$	$1/M$	$1/M$	$\alpha P/M$
$\mathbf{W}^{FO}$	$1/F$	$1/F$	$0.25/M$	$\alpha P/M$
$\mathbf{W}^U$	$1/M^2$	$1/M$	$1/M^2$	$\alpha P/M$

In the remainder of this paper, we assume  $HD = M$  and  $F = 4M$  unless specifically mentioned. We fix a proxy model width  $P = 128$  and head width  $D = 128$ ,<sup>1</sup> and follow the specific scaling rules in the last two columns of Table 2, where  $\alpha$  denotes the **base learning rate**. The base learning rate is so named because it is the learning rate for all parameters when  $M = P$ . These relative scaling rules are a special case of those in Appendix B.1 of Yang et al. [15].

In addition,  $\mu$ P uses an attention scale of  $\tau^{-1} = \Theta(1/D)$  instead of the usual  $\tau^{-1} = 1/\sqrt{D}$ . For simplicity, we use  $\tau^{-1} = 1/D$ , since in preliminary experiments we observed only a small improvement from using smaller multiples of  $1/D$ . Note that for  $D$  fixed across model widths  $M$ , any constant  $\tau^{-1} \neq 0$  technically complies with  $\mu$ P [15] but in the experiments,  $\tau^{-1}$  will be shown to have a major impact on performance and transfer.

It is also possible to add scalar multipliers throughout the network as hyperparameters, or to scale the initializations by constants. For simplicity, we focus on  $\mu$ -Transfer of the base learning rate.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

#### 4.1.1 Implementation

Our experiments are implemented using Jax/Flax [32, 33]. Training is performed on TPU V3 pod slices with 128-256 cores, using the fully-sharded data parallelism (FSDP) strategy from Xu et al. [34] to reduce memory overhead. Models train on the Colossal Clean Common Crawl (C4) dataset, using the T5 tokenizer [35] with context length  $C = 256$ .

The experiments use a bitwise-deterministic training pipeline, with shards of data written to disk in a random-access format similar to Nvidia Megatron [36]. Model checkpoints are saved periodically, and the validation loss is reported using the best one. The same seed is used for all experiments. Codebase available at [https://github.com/mu-transformer-authors/mu\\_transformer](https://github.com/mu-transformer-authors/mu_transformer).

<sup>1</sup>We consider other choices of  $D$  in Appendix A.1.

### 4.1.2 Configuration

We use the following default configuration for the experiments, deviating only when specifically mentioned. The depth is fixed at  $L = 24$ , and we consider model widths  $M \in \{128, 512, 2048\}$ , yielding three model sizes ranging from 4.7M to 1.2B non-embedding parameters. The head width is fixed at  $D = 128$ , the number of heads is  $H = M/D$ , and MLP hidden width is  $F = 4M$ . The models use RMS LayerNorm without gains [37], linear projections without biases [35], RoPE on the queries and keys [38], and ReLU for the MLP activation [27, 35].

By default, we use  $2^{18}$  tokens per batch, float32 parameters, and bfloat16 activations and gradients<sup>2</sup>. The optimizer is AdamW [21] with  $\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.98, \epsilon = 10^{-9}$ , with default weight decay 0.0 and gradient clip 1.0. Models train for 125K steps total, with 10K steps of learning rate warmup followed by linear decay to zero.

## 4.2 $\mu$ -Transfer Ablation Experiments

In these experiments, we sweep the base learning rate  $\alpha \in \{2^{-2j} : j \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq j \leq 5\}$  for each model size and experiment setting, and we report all results. This allows us to investigate impact of various experimental conditions on model quality and learning rate transferability. We focus on learning rate transfer because it is the main hyperparameter of interest for large transformer models.

### 4.2.1 Baseline $\mu$ P

In this group of experiments, we establish  $\mu$ P baselines to facilitate comparison in later ablations. In addition, we verify that  $\mu$ -Transfer works reliably even with mixed-precision training. Following [39, 40], we utilize the Google Brain floating point format, bfloat16, for the activations and gradients. This format is supported by Google TPUs and recent Nvidia GPUs, and previously used by [24]. Recent work [41] notably suggests this format may reduce prevalence of emergent outliers [20, 42].

As shown in Table 1, the learning rates transfer reliably across model sizes via  $\mu$ P. Despite each model being 4x wider (and 16x larger) than the last, the smallest model’s optimal base learning rate  $\alpha$  directly predicts the optimum in the sweeps for the larger model sizes.

### 4.2.2 Projection Biases

It is not clear if trainable bias vectors in linear layers are beneficial for model quality, and several prior works omit them [35, 22, 43]. Here we test their benefit and impact on learning rate transferability, keeping all other details identical to the baseline  $\mu$ P settings. Following Yang et al. [15], the learning rate for the biases under  $\mu$ P is given as  $\Theta(1)$ , so we use  $\alpha$  for the exact learning rate.

As shown in Table 1, the learning rates do transfer across model sizes via  $\mu$ P. However, including biases in the linear layers does not reliably improve quality over the baseline  $\mu$ P models when  $\alpha$  is optimized for each model.

### 4.2.3 RMSNorm Gains

It is not clear if trainable scale vectors (‘gains’) in RMSNorm [37] are beneficial for model quality and many frameworks offer the option to omit them. This ablation tests their benefit and impact on learning rate transferability under  $\mu$ P. We also test a variant where the trainable gain vector is replaced with a trainable scalar multiplier, similar to Elhage et al. [42].

As shown in Table 1, optimal learning rates for these models do not reliably transfer when using  $\alpha = \Theta(1)$  learning rate scaling for the gains as dictated by Yang et al. [15].

Intriguingly however, when comparing to the baseline  $\mu$ P results, we find trainable gains harm the quality of the largest  $\mu$ P models when the base learning rate  $\alpha$  is optimal. This suggests trainable gains can simply be omitted in  $\mu$ P models without loss of quality at scale. Moreover, in Section 4.5 we find that  $\mu$ P transformers without trainable gains *outperform* standard transformers using them.

---

<sup>2</sup>During evaluation, output logits are computed in float32.

#### 4.2.4 Query Initialization

The usual  $\mu\text{P}$  initialization for query projections  $\mathbf{W}^{A_Q}$  is Gaussian with variance  $\Theta(1/M)$ . One alternative is to use zero-initialized query projections, which yield equal attention weights over all past timesteps at initialization. This change was recommended by Yang et al. [15] to improve transfer, so we investigate its effects as well.

As shown in Table 1, the learning rates transfer across model sizes when using  $\mu\text{P}$  with zero-initialized query projections. There is also a slight yet consistent improvement in loss.

#### 4.2.5 SP Attention Scale

The usual attention scale  $\tau^{-1} = 1/\sqrt{D}$  was first proposed by Vaswani et al. [27] and generally used since. However,  $\mu\text{P}$  proposes  $\tau^{-1} = \Theta(1/D)$ , and we use  $\tau^{-1} = 1/D$ . Notably in our experiments we scale the model width  $M$  and keep the head width  $D$  fixed across model sizes, so the attention scale would presumably not actually matter for purposes of transfer, as any difference between  $1/\sqrt{D}$  and  $1/D$  can be treated as a constant multiplier. Nonetheless, we investigate the effect of using the standard  $1/\sqrt{D}$  attention scale.

As shown in Table 1, the  $1/\sqrt{D}$  attention scale appears quite suboptimal, yielding worse performance than the corresponding  $\mu\text{P}$  baselines and apparently preventing transfer of the learning rate optimum. In Appendix A.1, we investigate using  $D = 32$ , and likewise obtain transfer with the baseline  $\mu\text{P}$  configuration using  $\tau^{-1} = 1/D$  yet not when using SP attention scale  $\tau^{-1} = 1/\sqrt{D}$ . Moreover, for  $D = 32$  performance was better with the  $\mu\text{P}$  attention scale (Table 5). Given the consistent results for  $D \in \{32, 128\}$ , our recommendation is to use  $\tau^{-1} = 1/D$ .

#### 4.2.6 SP Unembedding Initialization

The  $\mu\text{P}$  initialization for unembedding matrix  $\mathbf{W}^U$  is a Gaussian distribution with variance  $\Theta(1/M^2)$ , while the so-called standard parameterization (SP) uses  $1/M$  [15]. We thus ablate the impact of using the standard initialization on performance and transfer.

As shown in Table 1, despite using SP initialization for the unembedding projection, the learning rates empirically transfer across model sizes. A simple alternative to either initialization is a zero-initialized unembedding projection [15], which we found to perform similarly to the  $\mu\text{P}$  initialization and to also facilitate transfer.

#### 4.2.7 Cosine Schedule

The linear learning rate schedule used as our default configuration is one of several possible choices [6, 44, 45, 25]. In this ablation, we instead use a cosine schedule decaying to zero.

As shown in Table 1, both schedules perform similarly and the learning rates transfer across model sizes, showing that  $\mu\text{P}$  is compatible with a cosine schedule. In theory, all learning rate schedules are compatible with  $\mu$ -Transfer; in particular, we expect all the schedules cited above to be compatible.

#### 4.2.8 Decoupled Weight Decay

Decoupled weight decay for Adam [21] is commonly used to train transformers. In libraries such as Pytorch and Optax, the applied decay rate is given by a hyperparameter  $\lambda$  times the current learning rate, not  $\lambda$  times the schedule multiplier. The latter ‘independent’ variant was studied by [46, 47] but we focus on the version used by these libraries. We found the ‘independent’ variant led to training instability in large transformer models not seen in small ones for  $\lambda > 0$  constant and  $\alpha$  swept over.

As shown in Table 1, when using decoupled weight decay, the optimal base learning rate  $\alpha$  may not always transfer from the smallest model to the larger ones. On the other hand, these experiments use the strongest typical setting at  $\lambda = 0.1$ , and yet the optimum for  $\alpha$  is not visibly changed between the two larger models. The larger-model optimum for  $\alpha$  also appears to match  $\alpha$ ’s optimum for the baseline  $\mu\text{P}$  models without weight decay, which does not drift as a function of size.

Based on these observations, decoupled weight decay appears unlikely to alter the optimal learning rate for the target model significantly when  $\lambda \leq 0.1$  and  $M \gg P$ , so one strategy would be to omit it when training the proxy model, and apply it to the target model only.

### 4.2.9 Embedding Normalization

We consider using normalized embeddings following [48, 49], using RMSNorm without trainable gains [37]. We do not change the learning rate from the setting in Table 2 nor adjust the initialization.

As shown in Table 1, the optimal learning rate transfers across models using  $\mu P$ ; however, the improvement in model quality over the baseline is negligible. We briefly investigated using lower initialization variances, but found this harmed stability with the width-constant embedding learning rate of  $\mu P$  Adam, perhaps due to similar effects.

### 4.2.10 Multiplicative Nonlinearities

Multiplicative nonlinearities such as SwiGLU [22] and Squared ReLU [23] are increasingly used in the MLP blocks to improve transformer quality [5, 6, 50, 48, 8]. In this experiment, we investigate both of the aforementioned nonlinearities, which are notably ‘superlinear’ and thus may create outliers that interfere with  $\mu$ -Transfer, as discussed by Yang et al. [15]. For SwiGLU, we use  $F = 5M$ , so the MLP has  $7.5M^2$  parameters.

As shown in Table 1, the SwiGLU and Squared ReLU nonlinearities both allow  $\mu$ -transfer of the learning rate across model sizes. The outcomes here contrast nicely with RMSNorm gains experiments, since transfer occurs despite the multiplicative interactions.

## 4.3 Lion Optimizer

We empirically investigate if the Lion optimizer [44, 51] is compatible with  $\mu$ -Transfer. This optimizer is at least twice as memory-efficient as the Adam optimizer, and was reported to yield models of similar quality, including transformers [44]. A notable property of this optimizer is that its updates are constrained to  $\{-1, +1\}$  per coordinate, yielding a coordinate size of  $\Theta(1)$  per step. Thus a  $\Theta(1/M)$  transfer rule for hidden weight learning rates, similar to  $\mu P$  Adam, may be appropriate [15].

As shown in Table 1, the Lion optimizer did not admit transfer of the base learning rate from the smallest model size. The scaling rules do appear to preserve the optimum  $\alpha$  between larger models, and transfer is obtained when using extra attention heads per layer via  $D = 32$  (Appendix A.1).

## 4.4 Multi-Query Attention

Multi-Query Attention [52] and its grouped generalization [53] are increasingly used in transformer LLMs [43, 6, 54, 3, 7]. These techniques aim to improve the inference speed of transformers by sharing keys/values across multiple heads. This ablation investigates the impact on  $\mu$ -Transfer. Similar to Shazeer [52], we approximately correct for the parameter increase by setting  $F = 5M$ .

As shown in Table 1, multi-query attention is empirically compatible  $\mu$ -Transfer.

### 4.4.1 4x Larger Batch

Large-batch training can reduce wall time, but may also have a considerable influence on the training dynamics [55, 56]. In this section, we consider scaling up the batch size by  $4\times$  while keeping the number of training tokens the same. For this ablation, we adopt the learning rate scaling rule from You et al. [56], Malladi et al. [57], so that each learning rate formula in Table 2 is scaled by  $2\times$ .

As shown in Table 1, the  $4\times$  larger batch size admits transfer of the learning rate via  $\mu P$ .

### 4.4.2 4x Smaller Batch

An important question is if  $\mu$ -Transfer requires a minimum batch size to work [24]. In this section, we consider scaling the batch size down by  $4\times$ , while keeping the number of training tokens the same. For this ablation, we again adopt the learning rate scaling rule from You et al. [56], Malladi et al. [57], so that each learning rate formula in Table 2 is scaled by  $0.5\times$ .

As shown in Table 1, the  $4\times$  smaller batch size admits transfer of the learning rate via  $\mu P$ . Nonetheless, further research on the permissible batch sizes for  $\mu$ -Transfer seems advisable.

#### 4.5 Standard Parameterization Experiment

In this experiment, we investigate the claim from Yang et al. [15] that  $\mu\text{P}$  models outperform models using the standard parameterization (SP). In particular, the SP transformer studied here uses trainable biases in linear layers, trainable gains in RMSNorm layers, attention scale  $1/\sqrt{D}$ , and unembedding initialization variance  $1/M$ . Adam is used for optimization, and the learning rate for all parameter tensors are equal. The learning rate for each model size is swept over in the table below. All other hyperparameters are identical to the  $\mu\text{P}$  baseline.

Table 3: Validation losses for SP models.

Width	LR				
	$2^{-10}$	$2^{-8}$	$2^{-6}$	$2^{-4}$	$2^{-2}$
128	3.841	3.757	<b>3.706</b>	3.879	4.030
512	3.013	<b>2.967</b>	2.987	3.383	7.403
2048	<b>2.738</b>	2.902	7.247	7.477	7.314

As shown in Tables 3 and 6, for all model sizes, the optimal loss at each SP transformer is worse (higher) than the optimal loss for corresponding the baseline  $\mu\text{P}$  model shown in Table 1. This suggests  $\mu\text{P}$  not only facilitates learning rate transfer, but may also improve the validation loss. We observed a similar improvement for training loss, suggesting  $\mu\text{P}$  improves optimization.

#### 4.6 Large-Scale Transfer Experiment

In this experiment, we combine the architectural choices that both transferred and improved performance, and investigate if  $\mu$ -Transfer continues to work as desired at scale.

We use depth  $L = 12$  and consider widths  $M \in \{128, 512, 2048, 8192\}$ , yielding models with approximately 2M, 40M, 600M, and 10B non-embedding parameters, respectively. We use zero-initialized queries [15] and Squared ReLU nonlinearity [23]. We use  $2^{21}$  tokens per batch, training for 90K steps. We use AdamW [21] with  $\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.95, \epsilon = 10^{-8}$ , decoupled weight decay  $\lambda = 0.1$ , and gradient clip 1.0.

Table 4: Validation losses for our large-scale experiment.

Params	Width	Base LR		
		$2^{-8}$	$2^{-6}$	$2^{-4}$
2M	128	3.791	<b>3.766</b>	3.814
40M	512	3.016	<b>2.983</b>	3.004
600M	2048	2.513	<b>2.459</b>	2.466
10B	8192	2.238	<b>2.167</b>	2.169

As shown in Table 4, the optimal learning rate in the sweep transfers from a model  $5000\times$  smaller. This suggests that  $\mu$ -Transfer continues to predict the optimal learning rate at scale. Moreover, the outcome may suggest that ‘emergent outliers’ may not be a serious source of interference for  $\mu$ -Transfer, given that these reportedly appear at around 7B parameters [20].

As shown in Table 7, when increasing the LR sweep resolution by  $2\times$ , we find there is a slight drift in the optimum learning rate w.r.t. model width. This drift is potentially due to the weight decay; disabling weight decay in the proxy allowed direct transfer of the base LR  $\alpha$  to the largest models using  $\lambda = 0.1$ , providing a degree of corroboration for the strategy suggested in Section 4.2.8.

### 5 Related Works

The  $\mu$ -Parameterization ( $\mu\text{P}$ ) is proposed in the Tensor Programs series [17–19, 14, 15, 46, 16].

The empirical observation of hyperparameter transfer via  $\mu\text{P}$  was first reported by Yang et al. [15]. Notably, the largest model trained in that report had 6.7B parameters. It used FP32 computation



for numerical stability, as well as using a different position encoding mechanism and a different learning rate schedule than the baseline, which was trained in FP16. This led to an open question whether  $\mu$ -Parameterized transformers could be made stable, efficient, and competitive at large scale. Moreover, the large-scale experiment did not specifically demonstrate that  $\mu$ -Transfer predicted the hyperparameter optima to the 6.7B target model.

Some recent works have adopted  $\mu$ P for hyperparameter tuning [24, 58, 25, 59, 26], but do not provide evidence the hyperparameter optimum is preserved under  $\mu$ -Transfer when the target model is very large (e.g., 10B parameters). For example, Dey et al. [24] trained a suite of models, but only used  $\mu$ P transformers with up to 2.7B parameters, while their largest model using a standard parameterization had 13B parameters. This left open the question of whether  $\mu$ -Transfer worked reliably on larger-scale target models.

Several recent works suggest to apply  $\mu$ P alongside specific ideas such as depthwise scaling [60, 61, 16, 62] or loss prediction [63, 64]. However, similar to the other works, these papers do not study whether  $\mu$ -Transfer correctly predicts the optimal hyperparameters themselves when the target model is very large (e.g., 10B parameters).

A potential alternative to  $\mu$ P was recently proposed by DeepSeek-AI et al. [45], namely a scaling law for the optimal learning rate solely in terms of compute budget. However, empirical scaling laws are strongly affected by the choice of independent variables and the fitted data, so the fitted scaling law may not transfer to other setups.

Other recent lines of work investigate transformer training instabilities via small proxy models [47], proposing architectural adjustments that reduce the loss sensitivity to the learning rate, rather than predict the optimal one. A number of works [65–69] propose methods for tuning the learning rate of existing or bespoke optimizers during training; Defazio et al. [70] proposes a ‘schedule-free’ optimizer requiring only a constant learning rate. Noci et al. [71] proposes a transformer parameterization with a well-defined infinite-width-and-depth limit, showing training stability from an SDE perspective; Noci et al. [72] describes a connection between learning rate transfer and the stability of the top eigenvalue of the training loss Hessian across model sizes.

## 6 Limitations

The main limitation of this work is that it is not theoretical in nature: it seeks only to evaluate the reliability of  $\mu$ -Transfer under various experimental conditions. We focus on autoregressive language modeling using the decoder-only transformer architecture, and consider only learning rate transfer; while this is the main hyperparameter of interest to practitioners, further study of model initialization scales or parameter multipliers seems warranted.

Additional limitations are that our ablations use only one run per sweep value and a slightly coarse learning rate sweep multiple of  $4\times$ . Future experiments may benefit from extra random seeds or increased resolutions of the learning rate sweeps, though it should be noted we do include two increased-resolution sweeps in the appendix, obtaining broadly consistent results with the main text.

## 7 Conclusion

This paper studies the reliability of  $\mu$ -Transfer on the learning rate, focusing on transformers. In our experiments,  $\mu$ -Transfer worked as desired in most cases, including for multiplicative nonlinearities, multi-query attention, and large/small batch training. However,  $\mu$ P did not admit transfer if using trainable gain parameters or too large an attention scale. Interestingly, these limitations seem unproblematic; including either harmed the loss.

The simple  $\mu$ P recipe used in this work also outperformed the ‘standard parameterization’ commonly used for transformers. This is consistent with Yang et al. [15] and suggests  $\mu$ P improves optimization.

Lastly, we found  $\mu$ -Transfer from a 2M parameter model predicted the optimal learning rate from a sweep at the scale of 10B parameters. To the best of our knowledge, this is the largest target model where this property has been verified. We hope our findings prove helpful and simplify the training of future large-scale models.

## 8 Broader Impact

This work involves foundational research in neural network optimization and hyperparameter search. Beyond this foundational aspect, we do not anticipate broader societal impacts of this work.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

The author thanks Oleg Filatov, Kevin Yin, Stella Biderman, Lucas Nestler, Hailey Schoelkopf, Nora Belrose, and the broader EleutherAI community for helpful remarks. This work was generously supported by Cloud TPUs from Google’s TPU Research Cloud.

## References

- [1] OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>.
- [2] Anthropic. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku. [https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model\\_Card\\_Claude\\_3.pdf](https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model_Card_Claude_3.pdf), 2024. Accessed: 2024-03-13.
- [3] Gemini Team. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. *CoRR*, abs/2312.11805, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11805>.
- [4] Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, and Julian Schrittwieser et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *CoRR*, abs/2403.05530, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.05530>.
- [5] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, and Faisal Azhar et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *CoRR*, abs/2302.13971, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13971>.
- [6] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, and Shruti Bhosale et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288>.
- [7] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, and Florian Bresnand et al. Mixtral of experts. *CoRR*, abs/2401.04088, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.04088>.
- [8] Jupinder Parmar, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Joseph Jennings, Mostofa Patwary, Sandeep Subramanian, Dan Su, Chen Zhu, Deepak Narayanan, Aastha Jhunjhunwala, and Ayush Dattagupta et al. Nemotron-4 15b technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2402.16819, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.16819>.
- [9] Mostafa Dehghani, Josip Djolonga, Basil Mustafa, Piotr Padlewski, Jonathan Heek, Justin Gilmer, Andreas Steiner, Mathilde Caron, Robert Geirhos, and Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin et al. Scaling vision transformers to 22 billion parameters. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7480–7512. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/dehghani23a.html>.
- [10] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=w0H2xGH1kw>.
- [11] OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o, 2024. URL <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>.

- [12] Jade Copet, Felix Kreuk, Itai Gat, Tal Remez, David Kant, Gabriel Synnaeve, Yossi Adi, and Alexandre Défossez. Simple and controllable music generation, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.05284>.
- [13] Sander Dieleman, Charlie Nash, Jesse Engel, and Karen Simonyan. Variable-rate discrete representation learning, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.06089>.
- [14] Greg Yang and Edward J. Hu. Tensor Programs IV: Feature learning in infinite-width neural networks. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11727–11737. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/yang21c.html>.
- [15] Greg Yang, Edward Hu, Igor Babuschkin, Szymon Sidor, Xiaodong Liu, David Farhi, Nick Ryder, Jakub Pachocki, Weizhu Chen, and Jianfeng Gao. Tensor Programs V: Tuning large neural networks via zero-shot hyperparameter transfer. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 17084–17097. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2021/file/8df7c2e3c3c3be098ef7b382bd2c37ba-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/8df7c2e3c3c3be098ef7b382bd2c37ba-Paper.pdf).
- [16] Greg Yang, Dingli Yu, Chen Zhu, and Soufiane Hayou. Tensor Programs VI: Feature learning in infinite depth neural networks. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=17pVDnpwwl>.
- [17] Greg Yang. Tensor Programs I: Wide feedforward or recurrent neural networks of any architecture are gaussian processes. *CoRR*, abs/1910.12478, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.12478>.
- [18] Greg Yang. Tensor Programs II: Neural tangent kernel for any architecture. *CoRR*, abs/2006.14548, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.14548>.
- [19] Greg Yang. Tensor Programs III: Neural matrix laws. *CoRR*, abs/2009.10685, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.10685>.
- [20] Tim Dettmers. LLM.int8() and emergent features. <https://timdettmers.com/2022/08/17/llm-int8-and-emergent-features/>, 2022. Accessed: 2024-03-09.
- [21] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Fixing weight decay regularization in adam. *CoRR*, abs/1711.05101, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.05101>.
- [22] Noam Shazeer. GLU variants improve transformer. *CoRR*, abs/2002.05202, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.05202>.
- [23] David So, Wojciech Mańke, Hanxiao Liu, Zihang Dai, Noam Shazeer, and Quoc V Le. Searching for efficient transformers for language modeling. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 6010–6022. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2021/file/2f3c6a4cd8af177f6456e7e51a916ff3-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/2f3c6a4cd8af177f6456e7e51a916ff3-Paper.pdf).
- [24] Nolan Dey, Gurpreet Gosal, Zhiming Chen, Hemant Khachane, William Marshall, Ribhu Pathria, Marvin Tom, and Joel Hestness. Cerebras-GPT: Open compute-optimal language models trained on the cerebras wafer-scale cluster. *CoRR*, abs/2304.03208, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.03208>.
- [25] Shengding Hu, Yuge Tu, Xu Han, Chaoqun He, Ganqu Cui, Xiang Long, Zhi Zheng, Yewei Fang, Yuxiang Huang, and Weilin Zhao et al. MiniCPM: Unveiling the potential of small language models with scalable training strategies. *CoRR*, abs/2404.06395, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.06395>.
- [26] XAI. Grok-1, 2024. URL <https://github.com/xai-org/grok-1>.

- [27] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf).
- [28] Peter J. Liu, Mohammad Saleh, Etienne Pot, Ben Goodrich, Ryan Sepassi, Lukasz Kaiser, and Noam Shazeer. Generating wikipedia by summarizing long sequences, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.10198>.
- [29] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners, 2019. [https://cdn.openai.com/better-language-models/language\\_models\\_are\\_unsupervised\\_multitask\\_learners.pdf](https://cdn.openai.com/better-language-models/language_models_are_unsupervised_multitask_learners.pdf) Last visited on 2023/09/07.
- [30] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Identity mappings in deep residual networks. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*, pages 630–645. Springer, 2016.
- [31] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>.
- [32] James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, George Necula, Adam Paszke, Jake VanderPlas, Skye Wanderman-Milne, and Qiao Zhang. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018. URL <http://github.com/google/jax>.
- [33] Jonathan Heek, Anselm Levskaya, Avital Oliver, Marvin Ritter, Bertrand Rondepierre, Andreas Steiner, and Marc van Zee. Flax: A neural network library and ecosystem for JAX, 2023. URL <http://github.com/google/flax>.
- [34] Yuanzhong Xu, HyoukJoong Lee, Dehao Chen, Blake Hechtman, Yanping Huang, Rahul Joshi, Maxim Krikun, Dmitry Lepikhin, Andy Ly, and Marcello Maggioni et al. GSPMD: General and scalable parallelization for ML computation graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2105.04663, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.04663>.
- [35] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html>.
- [36] Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-LM: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *CoRR*, abs/1909.08053, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.08053>.
- [37] Biao Zhang and Rico Sennrich. Root mean square layer normalization. *CoRR*, abs/1910.07467, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07467>.
- [38] Jianlin Su, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Bo Wen, and Yunfeng Liu. RoFormer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *CoRR*, abs/2104.09864, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.09864>.
- [39] Jack W. Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, and Susannah Young et al. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher. *CoRR*, abs/2112.11446, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.11446>.
- [40] Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, and Aidan Clark et al. Training compute-optimal large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2203.15556, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.15556>.

- [41] Arash Ahmadian, Saurabh Dash, Hongyu Chen, Bharat Venkitesh, Stephen Gou, Phil Blunsom, Ahmet Üstün, and Sara Hooker. Intriguing properties of quantization at scale, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.19268>.
- [42] Nelson Elhage, Robert Lasenby, and Christopher Olah. Privileged bases in the transformer residual stream. <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2023/privileged-basis/index.html>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-03-09.
- [43] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, and Sebastian Gehrmann et al. PaLM: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24 (240):1–113, 2023. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/22-1144.html>.
- [44] Xiangning Chen, Chen Liang, Da Huang, Esteban Real, Kaiyuan Wang, Yao Liu, Hieu Pham, Xuanyi Dong, Thang Luong, and Cho-Jui Hsieh et al. Symbolic discovery of optimization algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/2302.06675, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.06675>.
- [45] DeepSeek-AI, Xiao Bi, Deli Chen, Guanting Chen, Shanhuang Chen, Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Honghui Ding, Kai Dong, and Qiushi Du et al. DeepSeek LLM: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. *CoRR*, abs/2401.02954, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.02954>.
- [46] Etai Littwin and Greg Yang. Adaptive optimization in the  $\infty$ -width limit. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=zgVDqw9ZUES>.
- [47] Mitchell Wortsman, Peter J. Liu, Lechao Xiao, Katie Everett, Alex Alemi, Ben Adlam, John D. Co-Reyes, Izzeddin Gur, Abhishek Kumar, and Roman Novak et al. Small-scale proxies for large-scale transformer training instabilities. *CoRR*, abs/2309.14322, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.14322>.
- [48] Bo Peng, Eric Alcaide, Quentin Anthony, Alon Albalak, Samuel Arcadinho, Stella Biderman, Huanqi Cao, Xin Cheng, Michael Chung, and Leon et al. Derczynski. RWKV: Reinventing RNNs for the transformer era. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 14048–14077, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.936. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.936>.
- [49] Gemma Team. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology, 2024. URL <https://storage.googleapis.com/deepmind-media/gemma/gemma-report.pdf>.
- [50] Erich Elsen, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Sağnak Taşlılar, Tri Dao, Curtis Hawthorne, Deepak Moparthy, and Arushi Somani. Releasing persimmon-8b, 2023. URL <https://www.adept.ai/blog/persimmon-8b>.
- [51] Lizhang Chen, Bo Liu, Kaizhao Liang, and Qiang Liu. Lion secretly solves a constrained optimization: as Lyapunov predicts. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=e4xS9ZarDr>.
- [52] Noam Shazeer. Fast transformer decoding: One write-head is all you need. *CoRR*, abs/1911.02150, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.02150>.
- [53] Joshua Ainslie, James Lee-Thorp, Michiel de Jong, Yury Zemlyanskiy, Federico Lebrón, and Sumit Sanghai. GQA: Training generalized multi-query transformer models from multi-head checkpoints. *CoRR*, abs/2305.13245, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.13245>.
- [54] Ebtesam Almazrouei, Hamza Alobeidli, Abdulaziz Alshamsi, Alessandro Cappelli, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Mérouane Debbah, Étienne Goffinet, Daniel Hesslow, Julien Launay, and Quentin Malartic et al. The falcon series of open language models. *CoRR*, abs/2311.16867, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.16867>.
- [55] Sam McCandlish, Jared Kaplan, Dario Amodei, and OpenAI Dota Team. An empirical model of large-batch training. *CoRR*, abs/1812.06162, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.06162>.

- [56] Yang You, Jing Li, Sashank Reddi, Jonathan Hseu, Sanjiv Kumar, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Xiaodan Song, James Demmel, Kurt Keutzer, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Large batch optimization for deep learning: Training BERT in 76 minutes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Syx4wnEtvH>.
- [57] Sadhika Malladi, Kaifeng Lyu, Abhishek Panigrahi, and Sanjeev Arora. On the SDEs and scaling rules for adaptive gradient algorithms. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=F2mhZjHkQP>.
- [58] Nolan Dey, Daria Soboleva, Faisal Al-Khateeb, Bowen Yang, Ribhu Pathria, Hemant Khachane, Shaheer Muhammad, Zhiming Chen, Robert Myers, and Jacob Robert Steeves. Btlm-3b-8k: 7b parameter performance in a 3b parameter model. *CoRR*, abs/2309.11568, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.11568>.
- [59] Shengding Hu, Xin Liu, Xu Han, Xinrong Zhang, Chaoqun He, Weilin Zhao, Yankai Lin, Ning Ding, Zebin Ou, Guoyang Zeng, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Predicting emergent abilities with infinite resolution evaluation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=1DbjooxLkD>.
- [60] Samy Jelassi, Boris Hanin, Ziwei Ji, Sashank J. Reddi, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, and Sanjiv Kumar. Depth dependence of  $\mu p$  learning rates in relu mlps. *CoRR*, abs/2305.07810, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.07810>.
- [61] Blake Bordelon, Lorenzo Noci, Mufan Bill Li, Boris Hanin, and Cengiz Pehlevan. Depth-wise hyperparameter transfer in residual networks: Dynamics and scaling limit. *CoRR*, abs/2309.16620, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16620>.
- [62] Wuyang Chen, Junru Wu, Zhangyang Wang, and Boris Hanin. Principled architecture-aware scaling of hyperparameters. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HZndRcfyNI>.
- [63] Yiqun Yao and Yequan Wang. Research without re-search: Maximal update parametrization yields accurate loss prediction across scales. *CoRR*, abs/2304.06875, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.06875>.
- [64] Siqi Fan, Xiusheng Huang, Xuezhi Fang, Yiqun Yao, Xiang Li, Ziyi Ni, Xin Jiang, Xuying Meng, Peng Han, and Shuo Shang et al. NanoLM: An affordable LLM study benchmark via accurate loss prediction across scales, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mao3y822aM>.
- [65] Jeremy Bernstein, Chris Mingard, Kevin Huang, Navid Azizan, and Yisong Yue. Automatic gradient descent: Deep learning without hyperparameters. *CoRR*, abs/2304.05187, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.05187>.
- [66] Atilim Gunes Baydin, Robert Cornish, David Martinez Rubio, Mark Schmidt, and Frank Wood. Online learning rate adaptation with hypergradient descent. *CoRR*, abs/1703.04782, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.04782>.
- [67] Kartik Chandra, Audrey Xie, Jonathan Ragan-Kelley, and Erik Meijer. Gradient descent: The ultimate optimizer. *CoRR*, abs/1909.13371, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.13371>.
- [68] Aaron Defazio and Konstantin Mishchenko. Learning-rate-free learning by d-adaptation, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.07733>.
- [69] Konstantin Mishchenko and Aaron Defazio. Prodigy: An expeditiously adaptive parameter-free learner, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.06101>.
- [70] Aaron Defazio, Xingyu Yang, Konstantin Mishchenko, Ashok Cutkosky, Harsh Mehta, and Ahmed Khaled. Schedule-free learning - a new way to train, 2024. URL [https://github.com/facebookresearch/schedule\\_free](https://github.com/facebookresearch/schedule_free).

- [71] Lorenzo Noci, Chuning Li, Mufan Bill Li, Bobby He, Thomas Hofmann, Chris Maddison, and Daniel M. Roy. The shaped transformer: Attention models in the infinite depth-and-width limit, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.17759>.
- [72] Lorenzo Noci, Alexandru Meterez, Thomas Hofmann, and Antonio Orvieto. Why do learning rates transfer? reconciling optimization and scaling limits for deep learning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.17457>.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Extra Heads per Layer

In this section, we investigate the effect of using extra attention heads per transformer layer, using a narrower head width  $D = 32$  with  $H = M/D$  to keep the parameter count equal. We investigate the effect of extra heads for the baseline configuration and the ablations where transfer between the proxy model and the next largest model size failed.

Table 5: Validation losses for extra-heads  $\mu$ -transfer ablations.

Ablation	Width	Base LR					Transfer
		$2^{-10}$	$2^{-8}$	$2^{-6}$	$2^{-4}$	$2^{-2}$	
Baseline $\mu$ P	128	3.813	3.720	<b>3.678</b>	3.997	7.519	
	512	3.106	2.985	<b>2.951</b>	3.005	6.962	✓
SP Attention Scale	128	3.798	<b>3.716</b>	3.865	4.105	7.273	
	512	3.097	2.986	<b>2.958</b>	3.451	7.158	✗
Decoupled Weight Decay	128	3.722	<b>3.650</b>	3.660	3.708	3.919	
	512	3.049	2.951	<b>2.945</b>	3.218	3.414	✗
Lion Optimizer	128	3.676	<b>3.666</b>	4.092	10.380	10.380	
	512	2.943	<b>2.942</b>	3.421	10.373	10.373	✓

As shown in Table 5, using  $D = 32$  did not qualitatively alter our transfer results, with the exception of the Lion optimizer experiment, where transfer now appears to work.

### A.2 Increased-Resolution SP Ablation

In this section, we validate the findings presented in the main text for the SP transformer model, utilizing a  $2\times$  higher resolution learning rate sweep.

Table 6: Validation losses for SP models.

Width	LR									
	$2^{-13}$	$2^{-12}$	$2^{-11}$	$2^{-10}$	$2^{-9}$	$2^{-8}$	$2^{-7}$	$2^{-6}$	$2^{-5}$	$2^{-4}$
128	4.187	4.036	3.917	3.841	3.792	3.757	3.726	<b>3.706</b>	3.724	3.879
512	3.264	3.127	3.051	3.013	2.988	2.967	<b>2.961</b>	2.987	3.185	3.383
2048	2.623	<b>2.574</b>	2.605	2.738	2.739	2.902	2.853	7.247	7.142	7.477

Our conclusion is qualitatively unchanged from the lower-resolution sweep. Interestingly, the pattern for the optimal LR of the standard parameterization model is highly irregular, and the combined SP model is much worse at large width than SP attention scale or RMSNorm gain models (Table 1).

### A.3 Increased-Resolution Large-Scale Sweep

Table 7: Validation losses for our large-scale experiment.

Params	Width	Weight Decay	Base LR				
			$2^{-8}$	$2^{-7}$	$2^{-6}$	$2^{-5}$	$2^{-4}$
2M	128	0.0	3.870	3.843	3.819	<b>3.803</b>	3.805
2M	128	0.1	3.791	3.768	<b>3.766</b>	3.773	3.814
40M	512	0.1	3.016	2.996	<b>2.983</b>	2.985	3.004
600M	2048	0.1	2.513	2.477	2.459	<b>2.456</b>	2.466
10B	8192	0.1	2.238	2.190	2.167	<b>2.161</b>	2.169



#### A.4 Absolute Scaling Rules

In this section, we investigate using absolute scaling rules, dividing the hidden weights' learning rate by their fan-in width instead of by a width-expansion ratio relative to a proxy model.

While these learning rate scaling rules are equivalent up to architecture-dependent constants, an important practical difference is that the learning rates for hidden weights are no longer precisely equalized, since each is given by  $\alpha \cdot \text{fan\_in}$ .

Table 8: Validation losses for absolute scaling  $\mu$ -transfer ablations.

Ablation	Width	Base LR				Transfer
		$2^{-1}$	$2^1$	$2^3$	$2^5$	
Baseline $\mu$ P	128	3.687	<b>3.664</b>	3.677	4.191	
	512	2.986	<b>2.950</b>	2.966	3.579	✓
	2048	2.588	<b>2.538</b>	3.029	3.776	