

# One-layer transformers fail to solve the induction heads task

Clayton Sanford\*      Daniel Hsu†      Matus Telgarsky‡

August 27, 2024

## Abstract

A simple communication complexity argument proves that no one-layer transformer can solve the induction heads task unless its size is exponentially larger than the size sufficient for a two-layer transformer.

## 1 Introduction

The mechanistic interpretability studies of Elhage et al. (2021) and Olsson et al. (2022) identified the ubiquity and importance of so-called “induction heads” in transformer-based language models (Vaswani et al., 2017; Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020). The basic task performed by an induction head is as follows.

- The input is an  $n$ -tuple of tokens  $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$  from a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$ .
- The output is an  $n$ -tuple of tokens  $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$  from the augmented alphabet  $\Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$ , where the  $i$ -th output  $\tau_i$  is equal to the input token that immediately follows the rightmost previous occurrence of the input token  $\sigma_i$ , or  $\perp$  if there is no such previous occurrence. That is:  $\tau_i = \perp$  if  $\sigma_j \neq \sigma_i$  for all  $j < i$ , and otherwise  $\tau_i = \sigma_{j_i+1}$  where  $j_i = \max\{j : j < i \wedge \sigma_j = \sigma_i\}$ .

Sanford et al. (2024) call this the “1-hop induction heads task”; they also define and study generalizations of the task with increasing difficulty, which they call “ $k$ -hop” (for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ). The special case of 2-hop is related to the function composition task defined and studied by Peng et al. (2024).

Bietti et al. (2023) gave an explicit construction of a transformer for solving the (1-hop) induction heads task. Their construction is a two-layer transformer with a single attention head in each layer. They also empirically found it difficult to train one-layer transformers to successfully solve the induction heads task under a certain data generation model, but training two-layer transformers was possible. Indeed, Elhage et al. (2021) noted: “In small two-layer attention-only transformers, composition seems to be primarily used for one purpose: the creation of [...] induction heads.”

In this note, we prove that a one-layer transformer cannot solve the induction heads task unless the size of the transformer is very large. By “size”, we mean the product of the number of self-attention heads  $h$ , the embedding dimension  $m$ , and the number of bits of precision  $p$  used by the transformer. By “very large”, we mean that  $hmp = \Omega(n)$ , where  $n$  is the size of the input. We

---

\*Columbia University, [clayton@cs.columbia.edu](mailto:clayton@cs.columbia.edu).

†Columbia University, [djhsu@cs.columbia.edu](mailto:djhsu@cs.columbia.edu).

‡New York University, [mjt10041@nyu.edu](mailto:mjt10041@nyu.edu).

note that when  $|\Sigma| \leq n$ , there is a two-layer transformer that solves the induction heads task with  $h = O(1)$ ,  $m = O(1)$ , and  $p = O(\log(n))$  (Bietti et al., 2023; Sanford et al., 2024). So our size lower bound for one-layer transformers is exponentially larger than the size that is sufficient for two-layer transformers.

The proof is based on a simple communication complexity argument. Lower bounds on the size of one-layer transformers that solve related tasks were given by Sanford et al. (2023) using similar arguments. Conditional lower bounds for the  $k$ -hop (for general  $k$ , mentioned above) were given by Sanford et al. (2024) for  $\Omega(\log k)$ -layer transformers, assuming the 1-vs-2 cycle conjecture in the Massively Parallel Computation model (Im et al., 2023). Peng et al. (2024) prove an average-case lower bound for one-layer transformers to solve their function composition task (which resembles the 2-hop), again using a communication complexity argument.

## 2 Transformer model

In this section, we give a generic definition of one-layer transformers that allows for general forms of token embeddings and positional encodings. A *self-attention head* with *embedding dimension*  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  is a triple  $(Q, K, V)$  where  $Q: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $K: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , and  $V: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  are, respectively, called the query, key, and value embedding functions, and the first arguments to  $Q, K, V$  enable the commonly-used positional encoding. The self-attention head defines a mapping  $\text{SA}_{Q,K,V}: \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  as follows. On input  $X = [X_1, \dots, X_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , the output  $Y = [Y_1, \dots, Y_n]^\top = \text{SA}_{Q,K,V}(X) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  is defined by

$$Y_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{i,j} V(j, X_j)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where } (\alpha_{i,1}, \dots, \alpha_{i,n}) &= \text{softmax}(\langle Q(i, X_i), K(1, X_1) \rangle, \dots, \langle Q(i, X_i), K(n, X_n) \rangle) \\ &= \frac{(\exp(\langle Q(i, X_i), K(1, X_1) \rangle), \dots, \exp(\langle Q(i, X_i), K(n, X_n) \rangle))}{\sum_{j=1}^n \exp(\langle Q(i, X_i), K(j, X_j) \rangle)}. \end{aligned}$$

A *one-layer transformer* with  $h$  self-attention heads and embedding dimension  $m$  is a collection of  $h$  self-attention heads  $(Q_t, K_t, V_t)_{t=1}^h$  each with embedding dimension  $m$ , together with an input encoding function  $\psi_{\text{in}}: \mathbb{N} \times \Sigma_{\text{in}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  and an output decoding function  $\psi_{\text{out}}: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \Sigma_{\text{out}}$ . Here, the input alphabet  $\Sigma_{\text{in}}$  and the output alphabet  $\Sigma_{\text{out}}$  are finite sets. The transformer defines a mapping  $\text{TF}_{((Q_t, K_t, V_t)_{t=1}^h, \psi_{\text{in}}, \psi_{\text{out}})}: \Sigma_{\text{in}}^n \rightarrow \Sigma_{\text{out}}^n$  as follows. On input  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \Sigma_{\text{in}}^n$ , the output  $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) = \text{TF}_{((Q_t, K_t, V_t)_{t=1}^h, \psi_{\text{in}}, \psi_{\text{out}})}(\sigma) \in \Sigma_{\text{out}}^n$  is defined by

$$\tau_i = \psi_{\text{out}}(i, \psi_{\text{in}}(i, X_i) + Z_i) \quad \text{where} \quad [Z_1, \dots, Z_n]^\top = \sum_{t=1}^h \text{SA}_{Q_t, K_t, V_t}([\psi_{\text{in}}(1, X_1), \dots, \psi_{\text{in}}(n, X_n)]^\top).$$

We say that a transformer uses  $p$  bits of precision if the outputs of all embedding functions  $(Q_t, K_t, V_t, \psi_{\text{in}})$  and the self-attention heads may be rounded to rational numbers with at most  $p$  bits of precision without changing the behavior of the mapping  $\text{TF}_{((Q_t, K_t, V_t)_{t=1}^h, \psi_{\text{in}}, \psi_{\text{out}})}$ .

### 3 Size of one-layer transformers for the induction heads task

**Theorem 1.** *If a one-layer transformer with  $h$  self-attention heads, embedding dimension  $m$ , and  $p$  bits of precision solves the induction heads task for input sequences of length  $n$  over a three-symbol alphabet, then  $hmp = \Omega(n)$ .*

*Proof.* We give a reduction from the one-way communication problem INDEX (Kushilevitz and Nisan, 1997, Example 4.19). In this problem, Alice is given a bit string  $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k) \in \{0, 1\}^k$ , and Bob is given an index  $i^* \in [k]$ . Alice can send a message to Bob, and after receiving it, Bob has to output  $f_{i^*}$ . By the pigeonhole principle, in any protocol for INDEX, Alice must send at least  $k$  bits to Bob.

Suppose there is a one-layer transformer (with  $h$  self-attention heads and embedding dimension  $m$ , using  $p$  bits of precision) that solves the induction heads task with a three-symbol alphabet  $\Sigma = \{0, 1, ?\}$  (so  $\Sigma_{\text{in}} = \Sigma$  and  $\Sigma_{\text{out}} = \Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$ ). We show that it specifies a one-way communication protocol for INDEX. Consider the input  $n$ -tuple  $\sigma$ , with  $n = 2k + 1$ , defined by

$$\sigma = (e_1, f_1, e_2, f_2, \dots, e_k, f_k, ?) \in \{0, 1, ?\}^{2k+1}$$

where  $f_1, \dots, f_k$  are taken from Alice's input, and

$$e_i = \begin{cases} ? & \text{if } i = i^*, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq i^*, \end{cases}$$

which is based on Bob's input. The  $(2k + 1)$ -th output of the transformer on input  $\sigma$  is  $f_{i^*}$ , which is exactly the correct output for INDEX. We show that Alice can send a message to Bob such that, subsequently, Bob can compute the  $(2k + 1)$ -th output of the transformer and hence determine  $f_{i^*}$ .

Consider one of the self-attention heads  $(Q, K, V)$ , and define  $\tilde{Q} := Q \circ \psi_{\text{in}}$ ,  $\tilde{K} = K \circ \psi_{\text{in}}$ , and  $\tilde{V} := V \circ \psi_{\text{in}}$ . (We leave out the positional arguments in  $Q, K, V, \psi_{\text{in}}$  for brevity.) The  $(2k + 1)$ -th output of  $\text{SA}_{Q,K,V}(\psi_{\text{in}}(\sigma_1), \dots, \psi_{\text{in}}(\sigma_n))$  is

$$Y_{2k+1} = \frac{\underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(e_i)) \tilde{V}(e_i)}_{\text{known to Bob}} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(f_i)) \tilde{V}(f_i)}_{\text{known to Alice}} + \underbrace{\exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(?)) \tilde{V}(?)}_{\text{known to both}}}{\underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(e_i))}_{\text{known to Bob}} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(f_i))}_{\text{known to Alice}} + \underbrace{\exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(?))}_{\text{known to both}}}.$$

In order for Bob to compute  $Y_{2k+1}$  to  $p$  bits of precision, it suffices for Alice to send the values

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(f_i)) \tilde{V}(f_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(f_i))} \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad \text{and} \quad \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(f_i)) \right) \in \mathbb{R}$$

rounded to  $O(p)$  bits of precision to Bob in a message of size  $Cmp$  bits for some constant  $C > 0$  (see Appendix A for details). Such messages can be sent for all  $h$  self-attention heads simultaneously; in total, Alice sends just  $Chmp$  bits to Bob, and after that, Bob computes the output of the transformer and hence determines  $f_{i^*}$ , thereby solving the INDEX problem. Since every protocol for INDEX must require Alice to send at least  $k$  bits, we have

$$hmp \geq \frac{k}{C} = \frac{n-1}{2C} = \Omega(n). \quad \square$$

## References

- Alberto Bietti, Vivien Cabannes, Diane Bouchacourt, Herve Jegou, and Leon Bottou. Birth of a transformer: A memory viewpoint. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36*, 2023.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33*, 2020.
- Nelson Elhage, Neel Nanda, Catherine Olsson, Tom Henighan, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Tom Conerly, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Andy Jones, Jackson Kernion, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, and Chris Olah. A mathematical framework for transformer circuits. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2021. <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2021/framework/index.html>.
- Sungjin Im, Ravi Kumar, Silvio Lattanzi, Benjamin Moseley, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Massively parallel computation: Algorithms and applications. *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, 5(4):340–417, 2023.
- Eyal Kushilevitz and Noam Nisan. *Communication Complexity*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Catherine Olsson, Nelson Elhage, Neel Nanda, Nicholas Joseph, Nova DasSarma, Tom Henighan, Ben Mann, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Tom Conerly, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Scott Johnston, Andy Jones, Jackson Kernion, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, and Chris Olah. In-context learning and induction heads. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2022. <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2022/in-context-learning-and-induction-heads/index.html>.
- Binghui Peng, Srinu Narayanan, and Christos Papadimitriou. On limitations of the transformer architecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08164*, 2024.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. Technical report, OpenAI, 2019.
- Clayton Sanford, Daniel Hsu, and Matus Telgarsky. Representational strengths and limitations of transformers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36*, 2023.
- Clayton Sanford, Daniel Hsu, and Matus Telgarsky. Transformers, parallel computation, and logarithmic depth. In *Forty-First International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, 2017.

## A Precision details

The  $j$ -th component of  $Y_{2k+1}$  can be expressed as  $(A + B)/(Z_A + Z_B)$  where

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^k \exp((\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(f_i)) \tilde{V}(f_i)_j), \quad B = \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(?) \tilde{V}(?)_j) + \sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(e_i) \tilde{V}(e_i)_j),$$

$$Z_A = \sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(f_i)), \quad Z_B = \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(?)) + \sum_{i=1}^k \exp(\tilde{Q}(?)^\top \tilde{K}(e_i)).$$

Define  $r := A/Z_A$  and  $s := \log Z_A$ . Alice's message to Bob contains  $\hat{r}$  and  $\hat{s}$ , which are obtained by rounding  $r$  and  $s$ , respectively, to  $3p$  bits of precision. Hence,  $\hat{r}$  and  $\hat{s}$  satisfy  $|r - \hat{r}| \leq \epsilon$  and  $|s - \hat{s}| \leq \epsilon$  where  $\epsilon := 2^{-3p}$ . It suffices to show that Bob can approximate  $(A + B)/(Z_A + Z_B)$  up to error  $2^{-p}$  using

$$\frac{\hat{r}e^{\hat{s}} + B}{e^{\hat{s}} + Z_B},$$

which only depends on  $\hat{r}$ ,  $\hat{s}$ ,  $B$ , and  $Z_B$ . Observe that

$$\frac{\hat{r}e^{\hat{s}} + B}{e^{\hat{s}} + Z_B} - \frac{A + B}{Z_A + Z_B} = \underbrace{r \left( \frac{e^{\hat{s}}}{e^{\hat{s}} + Z_B} - \frac{e^s}{e^s + Z_B} \right)}_{T_1} + \underbrace{\frac{(\hat{r} - r)e^{\hat{s}}}{e^{\hat{s}} + Z_B}}_{T_2} + \underbrace{\frac{B}{Z_A + Z_B} \left( \frac{e^s - e^{\hat{s}}}{e^{\hat{s}} + Z_B} \right)}_{T_3}.$$

By assumption on the embedding functions, we may assume without loss of generality that  $|\tilde{V}(\sigma_i)_j| \leq 2^p$  for all  $\sigma_i \in \Sigma$ . Therefore

$$|r| \leq \max_{i \in [k]} |\tilde{V}(f_i)_j| \leq 2^p \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|B|}{Z_A + Z_B} \leq \frac{|B|}{Z_B} \leq \max \left\{ |\tilde{V}(?)_j|, \max_{i \in [k]} |\tilde{V}(e_i)_j| \right\} \leq 2^p.$$

We now bound each of  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ , and  $T_3$  in magnitude. To bound  $|T_1|$ , we use the (1/4)-Lipschitzness of the sigmoid function:

$$|T_1| = |r| \left| \frac{e^{\hat{s}}}{e^{\hat{s}} + Z_B} - \frac{e^s}{e^s + Z_B} \right| \leq \frac{|r| |\hat{s} - s|}{4} \leq \frac{2^p \epsilon}{4}.$$

To bound  $|T_2|$ :

$$|T_2| = |\hat{r} - r| \frac{e^{\hat{s}}}{e^{\hat{s}} + Z_B} \leq |\hat{r} - r| \leq \epsilon.$$

Finally, to bound  $|T_3|$ , we use the approximation  $e^t(e^t - 1) \leq 1.25t$  for  $t \in [0, 1/8]$ :

$$|T_3| = \frac{|B|}{Z_A + Z_B} \left| \frac{e^s - e^{\hat{s}}}{e^{\hat{s}} + Z_B} \right| \leq \frac{|B|}{Z_A + Z_B} \cdot \frac{Z_A}{Z_A + Z_B} \cdot \frac{e^{|\hat{s}-s|} - 1}{e^{-|\hat{s}-s|}} \leq 2^p \cdot 1.25\epsilon.$$

Therefore

$$\left| \frac{\hat{r}e^{\hat{s}} + B}{e^{\hat{s}} + Z_B} - \frac{A + B}{Z_A + Z_B} \right| \leq |T_1| + |T_2| + |T_3| \leq \left( \frac{3}{2} \cdot 2^p + 1 \right) \epsilon \leq 2^{-p}.$$