

ParallelFlow: Parallelizing Linear Transformers via Flow Discretization

Nicola Muca Cirone

Department of Mathematics
Imperial College London
n.muca-cirone22@imperial.ac.uk

Cristopher Salvi

Department of Mathematics
Imperial College London
c.salvi@imperial.ac.uk

Abstract

We present a theoretical framework for analyzing linear attention models through matrix-valued state space models (SSMs), building on the foundations established in Cirone et al. [2024]. Our approach, *Parallel Flows*, provides a perspective that systematically decouples temporal dynamics from implementation constraints, enabling independent analysis of critical algorithmic components: chunking, parallelization, and information aggregation. Central to this framework is the reinterpretation of chunking procedures Hua et al. [2022], Sun et al. [2023] as computations of the *flows* governing system dynamics. This connection establishes a bridge to mathematical tools from rough path theory, opening the door to new insights into sequence modeling architectures. As a concrete application, we analyze DeltaNet Schlag et al. [2021] in a generalized low-rank setting motivated by recent theoretical advances Siems et al. [2025], Grazi et al. [2024]. Our methods allow us to design simple, streamlined generalizations of hardware-efficient algorithms Yang et al. [2024b] present in the literature, and to provide completely different ones, inspired by rough paths techniques, with provably lower complexity. This dual contribution demonstrates how principled theoretical analysis can both explain existing practical methods and inspire fundamentally new computational approaches.

1 Introduction

1.1 Linear attention transformers as associative linear RNNs

The attention mechanism Vaswani et al. [2017] has become a critical primitive for accurate sequence modeling, offering training efficiency through extensive

matrix multiplications that exploit the highly parallel processing capabilities and specialized accelerators of modern GPUs. However, its computational complexity scales quadratically with sequence length, making it inherently expensive for long sequences. Recent techniques Dao et al. [2022], Dao [2023] have enabled scaling attention to longer sequences by restructuring intermediate computations in a hardware-aware manner. Despite this progress, these methods still require storing the key and value vectors of previous elements, and managing this "KV cache" can become cumbersome when dealing with very long sequences. *Linear attention transformers* Katharopoulos et al. [2020] replace the exponential kernel in softmax attention with a dot product over (possibly transformed) key and query vectors. This adjustment allows linear attention to be formulated as a linear RNN with matrix-valued hidden states, eliminating the need for a KV cache and enabling constant-memory inference. More precisely, *associative linear RNNs* with matrix-valued hidden state $\mathbf{S}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and input sequence $(x_1, \dots, x_L) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ are defined by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_t &= \mathbf{S}_{t-1} \diamond \mathbf{A}_t + \mathbf{v}_t \mathbf{k}_t, & (\text{recurrence}) \\ \mathbf{o}_t &= \mathbf{S}_t \mathbf{q}_t, & (\text{memory readout}) \end{aligned}$$

where \diamond is an associative product (e.g. Hadamard product, matrix multiplication etc.), and the matrix \mathbf{A}_t and the vectors $\mathbf{v}_t, \mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{q}_t$ are (potentially non-linear) functions of the input sequence x_t . In this language, the hidden state recurrence in linear attention simply reads as $\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \mathbf{v}_t \mathbf{k}_t^\top$.

1.2 Sequential vs parallel form tradeoffs

Denoting by $\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ the matrices of stacked query, key, and value vectors, we can then compute the output $\mathbb{R}^{L \times d} \ni \mathbf{O} = (\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^\top \odot \mathbf{M})\mathbf{V}$ in parallel, where $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ is the standard causal mask. This parallel form and the above recurrent form have different FLOPs and memory cost trade-offs. The parallel form takes $\mathcal{O}(L^2d + Ld^2)$ and thus requires more FLOPs than the recurrent form, which takes $\mathcal{O}(Ld^2)$. However, the parallel form can often be faster in practice for moderate-length sequences as it can be fully parallelized and done in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ steps. This sequence-level parallelism also enables high GPU occupancy. While the recurrent form requires fewer FLOPs, the element-wise operations involved in the recurrence have low arithmetic intensity, unlike the matrix-multiplication operations in the parallel form. Thus, the recurrent form is often slower in practice when implemented on GPU hardware. Nonetheless, the presence of an associative operator \diamond enables the use of parallel scan Blelloch [1990] to parallelize the recurrent form and calculate the hidden states $\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_L$ in $\mathcal{O}(\log L)$ steps and $\mathcal{O}(Ld^2)$ FLOPs. However, this approach requires materializing the hidden state \mathbf{S}_t for each time step, which incurs significant memory I/O cost. Thus, finding an optimal tradeoff between parallelisation and memory footprint is of paramount importance.

1.3 Gated linear transformers and SSMs

While early versions of linear attention generally underperformed compared to softmax attention in language modeling tasks, recent ones incorporating data-dependent gating factors have shown competitiveness against strong transformer baselines. These *gated linear transformers* like

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{S}_t &= \gamma \mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \mathbf{v}_t \mathbf{k}_t^\top, && \text{(RetNet Qin et al. [2023])} \\ \mathbf{S}_t &= \mathbf{S}_{t-1} (\mathbf{1} \alpha_t^\top) + \mathbf{v}_t \mathbf{k}_t^\top, && \text{(GLA Yang et al. [2024a])}\end{aligned}$$

along with time-varying *state space models* (SSMs) such as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{S}_t &= \mathbf{S}_{t-1} \odot \exp(-(\alpha_t \mathbf{1}^\top)) \odot \exp(A) + (B \odot v_t \mathbf{1}^\top), && \text{(S4 Gu et al. [2022])} \\ \mathbf{S}_t &= \mathbf{S}_{t-1} \odot \exp(-(\alpha_t \mathbf{1}^\top)) \odot \exp(A) + (\alpha_t \odot \mathbf{v}_t) \mathbf{k}_t^\top, && \text{(Mamba Gu and Dao [2023])}\end{aligned}$$

have been proposed as potential alternatives to standard transformers. These models make use of cheap element-wise recurrence updates, in particular the Hadamard product, i.e. $\diamond = \odot$. Standard matrix multiplications (i.e. $\mathbf{S}_{t-1} \diamond \mathbf{A}_t = \mathbf{S}_{t-1} \mathbf{A}_t$) on the other hand can model richer interactions that go beyond elementwise recurrence. Without any structural assumptions on \mathbf{A}_t however, these operations would take $\mathcal{O}(dn^2)$ for each update (as opposed to $\mathcal{O}(dn)$ for the Hadamard product), which would be prohibitively expensive. However, despite their competitive language modeling performance, studies have shown that these models underperform compared to transformers on recall-intensive and long context tasks Arora et al. [2024]. To improve associative recall over long contexts, Schlag et al. [2020] introduced DeltaNet

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_{t-1} - \beta_t \mathbf{S}_{t-1} \mathbf{k}_t \mathbf{k}_t^\top + \beta_t \mathbf{v}_t \mathbf{k}_t^\top \quad \text{(DeltaNet Schlag et al. [2020])}$$

a variant of linear transformers that utilizes a delta rule-like update to retrieve and update the value vector associated with the current key. DeltaNet’s use of $\mathbf{A}_t = I - \beta_t \mathbf{k}_t \mathbf{k}_t^\top$ (i.e. identity + rank-1 matrix) can be seen as exploiting structured matrices to efficiently model interactions beyond elementwise recurrences. DeltaNet demonstrated effectiveness on synthetic tasks as well as small-scale language modeling and machine translation.

However, although the original implementation can be parallelized across sequence length by means of parallel scan, as stated above, the naive approach incurs a high memory cost leading to hardware-inefficient training. In Yang et al. [2024b] an hardware-efficient algorithm is proposed for rank 1 updates, finding a good compromise between sequence-length parallelization and memory efficiency. However, it remains unclear how to efficiently scale DeltaNet to cases with updates with rank $R > 1$.

1.4 Contributions

This work strengthens the connection between State Space Models (SSMs) and controlled differential equations (CDEs) established in Cirone et al. [2024], ex-

	tensorInv	sigDelta
Memory	$\mathcal{O}(L^2R^2 + LRd + d^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(L^2R^2 + LRd + d^2)$
Sequential	$\mathcal{O}(L^2R(d^2 + Rd + LR^2))$	$\mathcal{O}(L^2R(d^2 + Rd + R))$
Parallel	$\mathcal{O}(L^2R + d)$	$\mathcal{O}(LR + d)$

Table 1: Comparison of memory and theoretical computational complexities of the proposed algorithms: **tensorInv** is the algorithm computing \mathbf{S}_1 as per Theorem 3.3, **sigDelta** as per Theorem 3.5.

tending it to the setting of *matrix-valued SSMs* needed to draw connections to linear transformer architectures Dao and Gu [2024].

By adopting this high-level perspective, we disentangle *temporal dynamics* from *implementation-specific choices*, enabling a modular analysis of the core components governing numerical performance and algorithm design. Key computational stages—chunking, parallelization, and information aggregation—are systematically decoupled and studied independently. Our method, which we dub *Parallel Flows*, rests on interpreting the chunking procedure Hua et al. [2022], Sun et al. [2023], Yang et al. [2024b] as *flow computation*, providing a unified framework for parallelizable pipelines. We argue this perspective offers a principled foundation for future investigations into expressivity and scaling limits, see Section 5.

As a first case study, in Section 3.1 we propose a generalized Delta rule Schlag et al. [2021] for linear transformers, where update matrices are of rank $R \geq 1$. This extension is motivated by recent theoretical insights Siems et al. [2025], Grazzi et al. [2024] demonstrating that increased rank enhances model expressivity. Placing these models into our framework yields two key contributions:

- **Hardware-efficient algorithms** (Theorem 3.3): We obtain simplified derivations generalizing to higher ranks existing intra-chunk computation strategies Yang et al. [2024b]. Our solutions address the current lack of dedicated low-rank kernels and, most crucially, it does so by keeping the parallelism across sequence length intact.
- **Signature-Inspired Technique** (Theorem 3.5): A novel algorithm inspired by signature kernel techniques Salvi et al. [2021a], computing the same low-rank solution, parallel-in-time, and with theoretically superior temporal scaling properties. A comparison of complexities of the algorithms is presented in Table 1, where it’s shown how this new approach improves on the previous solution by one order of magnitude in sequence length L .

2 CDEs: a unifying framework for autoregressive sequence models.

As originally remarked for SSMS in the recent work Cirone et al. [2024], the previous examples are nothing but discretisations of linear *controlled differential equations* (CDEs). We focus on matrix-valued CDEs of the form ¹

$$d\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_t \cdot d\boldsymbol{\omega}_t + d\boldsymbol{\xi}_t, \quad (1)$$

driven by matrix-valued paths $\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\xi} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.

2.1 Flows as series of iterated integrals

CDEs are the core object studied in *rough path theory* Lyons [1998], a robust solution theory for non-linear control systems driven by irregular signals. As proved in Cirone et al. [2024][Appendix E], the solution to the CDE (1) over an interval $[s, t]$ has the following form:

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbb{W}_{s,t} \mathbf{S}_s + \int_s^t \mathbb{W}_{r,t} d\boldsymbol{\xi}_r \quad (2)$$

where the *flow* $\mathbb{W}_{s,t}$ is a linear map from $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ defined as

$$\mathbb{W}_{s,t} A = A \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{s < r_1 < \dots < r_n < t} d\boldsymbol{\omega}_{r_1} \cdots d\boldsymbol{\omega}_{r_n} \right)$$

In conclusion we see that:

Proposition 2.1 (Flow). *Given matrix-valued paths $\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\xi} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, the CDE defined by*

$$d\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_t \cdot d\boldsymbol{\omega}_t + d\boldsymbol{\xi}_t \quad (3)$$

can be solved on any interval $[s, t] \subseteq [0, 1]$ as

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_s \mathbb{P}_{s,t} + \int_s^t d\boldsymbol{\xi}_r \mathbb{P}_{r,t}, \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{s,t} = Id + \int_s^t \mathbb{P}_{s,r} d\boldsymbol{\omega}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}. \quad (5)$$

The proof of this result is given in Appendix A.

¹Our results extend to more general cases, such as ones where an Hadamard product takes the place of matrix multiplication.

3 Parallel Flows

We now build on the general CDE formalism by proposing the *Parallel Flow* perspective, which-by interpreting chunking procedures as computations of the *flows* of Proposition 2.1-enables independent analysis of critical algorithmic components without being tied to specific architectures. As established in Proposition 2.1 the flow can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_s \mathbb{P}_{s,t} + \int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r,t},$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{s,t} = Id + \int_s^t \mathbb{P}_{s,r} d\omega_r \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}.$$

Given the state \mathbf{S}_s at time s , this formulation enables direct computation of \mathbf{S}_t for any $t > s$ without requiring intermediate states \mathbf{S}_r for $r \in (s, t)$, provided one has precomputed the propagator matrix $\mathbb{P}_{s,t}$ and the integrated term $\int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r,t}$. This perspective unlocks an efficient parallelization strategy for computing \mathbf{S}_1 :

1. **Chunk.** Partition $[0, 1]$ into M sub-intervals $\{(t_{k-1}, t_k)\}_{k=1}^L$ using grid points $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_L = 1$.
2. **Parallel Compute.** Independently compute $\mathbb{P}_{t_{k-1}, t_k}$ and $\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r, t_k}$ for each sub-interval. These computations are fully parallel as they involve no cross-interval dependencies.
3. **Scan.** Aggregate results across intervals using a parallel scan algorithm Smith et al. [2023], propagating the initial condition \mathbf{S}_0 through the composed flow.

Interval Selection. The choice of partition points $\{t_m\}$ impacts both computational efficiency and numerical stability. While uniform partitions suffice for basic implementations, adaptive step-size strategies based on regularity properties of the driving path ω could optimize chunk granularity. Another interesting approach is provided by the *log-ODE method*, a higher-order solver which allows to take larger steps at the cost of using higher-order iterated integrals of the path ω captured by its *log-signature*. See for example [Cass and Salvi, 2024, Section 3.2.2] for a description of the algorithm and [Morrill et al., 2021] for a description of how to integrate it within a continuous-time sequence model. Quantifying the trade-offs between approximation quality and computational gains through more refined adaptive partitioning or higher-order mechanism remains an open question for future work.

Intra-Chunk Computation. Efficient intra-chunk computation of $\mathbb{P}_{t_{k-1}, t_k}$ and $\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r, t_k}$ becomes crucial for practical efficiency. By the parallel nature of the problem, one may assume without loss of generality that $(t_{k-1}, t_k] \equiv (0, 1]$ through temporal rescaling. Here, three key factors dominate implementation:

(1) the algebraic structure of the driving processes ω and ξ , (2) the path representation choice (*e.g.*, piecewise-linear, polynomial, or piecewise-constant approximations), and (3) the numerical methods employed for evaluating the flow operators. These design decisions ultimately determine the computational complexity-accuracy tradeoff in implementations, and as such are of critical importance. In particular one should make sure the structure of the objects allows the computation of the flow operators through the highly efficient tensor operations of modern hardware. In this paper we will focus mainly on 1) and 3) and we leave the choice of path interpolator to future work.

3.1 Low-Rank Delta Rule

The parallel flow formulation motivates architectural choices for the driving processes ξ and ω that balance expressiveness with computational efficiency. We present a concrete realization through *Low-Rank Delta Rules*, demonstrating how low-rank matrix parameterizations enable both theoretically richer representations, as recently proved by Grazi et al. [2024], and inherit the hardware-friendly implementations of the rank-1 case of Yang et al. [2024b].

Under this light we propose to address the first two key factors determining the performance of intra-chunk computation as follows :

- **Driver Parameterization:** For matrix-valued paths $\mathbf{A}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{B} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times R}$, we define the drivers as low-rank (R) temporal interactions:

$$d\omega_t = \mathbf{A}_t \mathbf{B}_t^\top dt \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad d\xi_t = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t \mathbf{B}_t^\top dt \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \quad (6)$$

Crucially \mathbf{B} is shared by both drivers, this will allow for an efficiently computable, compact representation of the flow as shown in Proposition 3.2.

- **Discretization Scheme:** We consider piecewise-linear drivers on a grid $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_L = 1$. This induces discrete updates (with Δt terms absorbed into \mathbf{B}), where $0 \leq k < L$:

$$\Delta\omega_{t_k} = \mathbf{A}_{t_k} \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top, \quad \Delta\xi_{t_k} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{t_k} \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top \quad (7)$$

Remark 3.1. This constitutes a higher-rank generalization of the DeltaNet architecture from Yang et al. [2024b], where the original rank-1 formulation corresponds to the special case $R = 1$ with $\mathbf{A}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{B}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ given by

$$\mathbf{A}_t = \beta_t \mathbf{k}_t, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t = -\beta_t \mathbf{v}_t, \quad \mathbf{B}_t = -\mathbf{k}_t \quad (8)$$

with both $\beta_t : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{v} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ data-dependent paths.

The following result, proved in Appendix A.2.1, presents in continuous time a useful decomposition of the flow:

Proposition 3.2. For matrix-valued paths $\mathbf{A}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{B} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times R}$ let the drivers be given by

$$d\boldsymbol{\omega}_t = \mathbf{A}_t \mathbf{B}_t^\top dt \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad d\xi_t = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t \mathbf{B}_t^\top dt \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \quad (9)$$

then the flow can be written as

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_s + \int_s^t (\mathbf{S}_s \mathbf{W}_{s,r} + \mathbf{U}_{s,r}) \mathbf{B}_r^\top dr \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{s,t}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{s,t}$ are the solution of the following integral equations

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,t} = \mathbf{A}_t + \int_s^t \mathbf{W}_{s,r} \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_t dr, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{U}_{s,t} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t + \int_s^t \mathbf{U}_{s,r} \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_t dr. \quad (12)$$

Discretization and Intra-Chunk computation As previously discussed, thanks to the parallel nature of the problem and through temporal rescaling one may assume without loss of generality the chunk to be the entire interval $(0, 1]$ where, with a slight abuse of notation by writing $\mathbf{W}_t := \mathbf{W}_{0,t}$ and $\mathbf{U}_t := \mathbf{U}_{0,t}$, we have

$$\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{S}_0 + \int_0^1 (\mathbf{S}_0 \mathbf{W}_r + \mathbf{U}_r) \mathbf{B}_r^\top dr \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_t = \mathbf{A}_t + \int_0^t \mathbf{W}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_t dr \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times R}, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{U}_t = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t + \int_0^t \mathbf{U}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_t dr \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times R}.$$

Under discretization (7), on the grid $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_L = 1$, the dynamics can be discretised as

$$\mathbf{S}_{t_{k+1}} = \mathbf{S}_{t_k} + \mathbf{S}_{t_k} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{t_k} \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{t_k} \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top. \quad (15)$$

and the flow equations (13) and (14) become

$$\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{S}_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} (\mathbf{S}_0 \mathbf{W}_{t_k} + \mathbf{U}_{t_k}) \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_{t_k} = \mathbf{A}_{t_k} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{W}_{t_m} \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_k}, \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{U}_{t_k} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{t_k} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{U}_{t_m} \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_k}.$$

These discretized equations can be completely written in terms of highly-efficient tensor operations:

Theorem 3.3. Define, with a slight abuse of notation, the tensors $\mathbf{A}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{(L \times R) \times d}$ defined from the above equations and with entries $[\square]_{k,i}^m = [\square_{t_{k-1}}^i]_m$. Then

$$\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{S}_0 + (\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{S}_0^\top)^\top \mathbf{B} \quad (18)$$

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{A} + (\mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^\top)\mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{U} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}} + (\mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^\top)\mathbf{U}$$

Where $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{(L \times R) \times (L \times R)}$ has entries $[\mathbf{M}]_{t,i}^{s,j} = \mathbb{I}(s < t)$ and composition of tensors corresponds to contraction of corresponding co-variant and contra-variant indices e.g.

$$[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^\top]_{k,i}^{k',i'} := \sum_{m=1}^d [\mathbf{A}]_{k,i}^m [\mathbf{B}^\top]_m^{k',i'} = \sum_{m=1}^d [\mathbf{A}]_{k,i}^m [\mathbf{B}]_{k',i'}^m$$

Here \odot stands for component-wise product. In particular the implicit equations defining \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{U} can be explicitly solved as

$$\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{A}, \quad (19)$$

$$\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^\top)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \quad (20)$$

where $[\mathbf{Id}]_{s,i}^{t,j} = \delta_s^t \delta_i^j$ and $(\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^\top)^{-1}$ is the inverse of $(\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{(L \times R) \times (L \times R)}$.

Note that the triangular nature of the matrix to invert allows for an efficient *forward-substitution* algorithm, which can be computed sequentially in $\mathcal{O}(L^3 R^3)$ steps, but importantly also in parallel with lowered $\mathcal{O}(L^2 R)$ complexity:

Proposition 3.4 (Triangular Tensor Inversion). Let $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{(T \times R) \times (T \times R)}$ be such that

$$s > t \implies [\mathbf{C}]_{t,i}^{s,j} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathbf{C}]_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot} \in GL(R), \quad \forall t.$$

Define the tensor $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{(T \times R) \times (T \times R)}$ as follows:

for $s > t$

$$\mathbf{D}_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R},$$

for $s = t$

$$\mathbf{D}_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot} = (\mathbf{C}_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot})^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R},$$

and for $s < t$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} &= -(\mathbf{C}_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot})^{-1} \left(\sum_{r=s}^{t-1} \mathbf{C}_{t,\cdot}^{r,\cdot} \mathbf{D}_{r,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} \right) \\ &= -\mathbf{D}_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot} \left(\sum_{r=s}^{t-1} \mathbf{C}_{t,\cdot}^{r,\cdot} \mathbf{D}_{r,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} \right), \end{aligned}$$

Then, \mathbf{D} is the the inverse of \mathbf{C} for tensor composition, i.e.

$$\mathbf{D}\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Id}.$$

Proofs for the results above can be found in Appendix A.2.1.

Figure 1 presents our PyTorch Paszke et al. [2017] implementation for computing \mathbf{S}_1 . As summarized in Table 1, the algorithm requires $\mathcal{O}(L^2R^2 + LRd + d^2)$ memory complexity. The computational complexity is $\mathcal{O}(L^2R(d^2 + Rd + LR^2))$ in sequential execution, which can theoretically be further reduced to $\mathcal{O}(L^2R + d)$ via parallel computation.

3.2 A signature kernel inspired algorithm

We introduce a new algorithm, drawing inspiration from signature kernel techniques Salvi et al. [2021a], that does not require an explicit tensor inversion, and thus exhibits theoretically superior scaling behavior with $\mathcal{O}(L^2R(d^2 + Rd + R))$ sequential and $\mathcal{O}(LR + d)$ parallel complexities, furthermore maintaining the same $\mathcal{O}(L^2R^2 + LRd + d^2)$ memory footprint (see Table 1). A code snippet of a PyTorch implementation is given in Figure 2.

Theorem 3.5. *The solution to the implicit equation*

$$\mathbf{W}_{t_k} = \mathbf{A}_{t_k} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{W}_{t_m} \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_k}, \quad (21)$$

is given by the diagonal elements $\mathbf{W}(t_k, t_k)$ of the system defined by

$$\mathbf{W}(t_0, t_k) = \mathbf{A}_{t_k},$$

$$\mathbf{W}(t_{k+1}, t_{k+1}) = \mathbf{W}(t_k, t_{k+1}) + \mathbf{W}(t_k, t_k) \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}}$$

and for $m < k$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}(t_{m+1}, t_{k+1}) &= \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_{k+1}) + \mathbf{W}(t_{m+1}, t_k) - \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_k) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top (\mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} - \mathbf{A}_{t_k}). \end{aligned}$$

Refer to Appendix A.3 for the proof.

The system described in Theorem 3.5 closely resembles an equation that defines a key concept in rough path theory, the *signature kernel*, for which a similar parallelisable algorithm was provided by Salvi et al. [2021a]. We note that this kernel has also been identified as the scaling limit of a large class of SSMS with Gaussian vector fields by Cirone et al. [2023].

Building on this analogy, we can achieve parallelization of the dynamics by reordering the computation. Rather than processing the equation row-by-row or column-by-column, we update the solution grid along its “antidiagonals.” Since there are no data dependencies within an antidiagonal, all its elements can be updated simultaneously. This breaks the quadratic complexity in L , that becomes $\mathcal{O}(L)$, thus achieving linear memory and linear time complexity for the computation of the dynamics.

However, we observe a gap between theoretical expectations and our practical implementation: the expected complexity improvements do not materialize

due to technical constraints imposed by Triton, our chosen GPU kernel framework. These limitations arise from fundamental restrictions in tensor operation support within modern accelerator programming paradigms, as we will explain in more details in the experimental section 4.

3.3 An alternative representation of the flow as product of exponentials

We note that on a discrete grid $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_L = 1$ the following representation of the flow holds

$$\mathbb{P}_{t_k, t_m} = \prod_{i=k}^{m-1} \exp(\Delta\omega_{t_i}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \quad (22)$$

where $\Delta\omega_{t_k} = \omega_{t_{k+1}} - \omega_{t_k}$ is an increment.

The discretization of the flow \mathbb{P} via Euler-Scheme, for example used in Equation (17), corresponds to a naive approximation

$$\exp(\Delta\omega) = Id + \Delta\omega$$

in Equation (22). Note however how, for $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times R}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^\top) &= Id + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^\top)^k \\ &= Id + \mathbf{A} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A})^{k-1} \right) \mathbf{B}^\top \\ &= Id + \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} (\exp(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A}) - Id) \mathbf{B} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R}$. If the matrices are rank-1 the previous computations simplify dramatically. In effect, when $R = 1$ we can compute the matrix exponential, without explicitly matrix exponentiations, as

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}^\top) &= Id + \left(\frac{e^{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a} \rangle} - 1}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a} \rangle} \right) \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}^\top \\ &= Id + \left(\frac{e^{tr(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}^\top)} - 1}{tr(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}^\top)} \right) \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}^\top \end{aligned}$$

Thus in case $\Delta\omega_{t_k}$ is always of rank 1, one ends up with the *exact* formula

$$\mathbb{P}_{t_k, t_m} = \prod_{i=k}^{m-1} \left(Id - \left(\frac{e^{tr(\omega_{t_i})} - 1}{tr(\omega_{t_i})} \right) \omega_{t_i} \right). \quad (23)$$

4 Numerics

While Theorem 3.5 demonstrates an L -factor complexity improvement over the tensor-inversion approach of Theorem 3.3, in both sequential and parallel regimes, practical realization of these gains remains elusive. This discrepancy stems from fundamental constraints in the Triton programming framework Tillet et al. [2019], which we adopted to ensure fair comparison with the original DeltaNet implementation Yang et al. [2024b], Yang and Zhang [2024] on top of which we built the low-rank, tensor-inversion extension.

The crux of the implementation bottleneck lies in Triton’s lack of native support for tensor-slicing operations - a requirement for two critical components:

- efficient parallel computation of future values $\square_{t_{k+1}}$ (implemented via `torch.roll` operations in the code snippet of Figure 2),
- anti-diagonal extraction from the tensor $[\mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top (\mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} - \mathbf{A}_k)]_{m,k}$, part of the core mechanism enabling the complexity-breaking mechanism.

These limitations fundamentally constrain our ability to exploit the theoretical advantages of the signature-inspired approach, despite its mathematical promise. The challenge highlights an important practical consideration when bridging theoretical complexity analysis with hardware-aware implementations: framework-specific constraints can dominate algorithmic improvements at scale.

We provide both PyTorch and Triton kernel implementations in the *supplementary material*.

These implementation challenges suggest concrete engineering pathways: careful memory management through CUDA-level kernel optimization could circumvent current Triton limitations. We hypothesize that direct control over GPU memory would unlock the theoretical $\mathcal{O}(L)$ advantage demonstrated in Table 1, leaving this empirical validation for future work.

5 Conclusions and Future Directions

The *Parallel Flows* framework we introduced in this paper establishes a principled foundation for analyzing matrix-valued SSMs through the lens of controlled differential equations. We made the following key contributions: (1) provided a simplified derivations of existing hardware-efficient algorithms, (2) generalized to the more expressive low-rank regime, while preserving parallelism across sequence length, and (3) discovered fundamentally new, parallel in time, computational approaches inspired by rough path theory leading to an improvement in computational cost by an entire order of magnitude in sequence length L .

Beyond our current results, this perspective opens three promising research directions:

- **Scaling limit analysis:** Leveraging the CDE formalism to derive closed-form solutions for infinite-depth limits, following the methodology of Cirone et al. [2023, 2024]. This would enable precise characterization of expressive power.

- **Adaptive step-size solvers** As mentioned before, while uniform partitions are adequate for basic implementations, adaptive step-size strategies that leverage the regularity properties of the driving path ω can optimize chunk granularity more effectively.
- **Higher order solvers** Higher order CDE solvers, such as the log-ODE method provides a particularly promising approach, offering a solution that accommodates larger step sizes by utilizing higher-order iterated integrals of the driving path ω through its log-signature. This method has the potential to reduce computational complexity by a factor of $1/k$, where k represents the number of steps captured by the log-signature locally, aligning with the fundamental principles of rough path theory.

References

- S. Arora, S. Eyuboglu, M. Zhang, A. Timalsina, S. Alberti, D. Zinsley, J. Zou, A. Rudra, and C. Ré. Simple linear attention language models balance the recall-throughput tradeoff. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18668*, 2024.
- I. P. Arribas, C. Salvi, and L. Szpruch. Sig-sdes model for quantitative finance. In *ACM International Conference on AI in Finance*, 2020.
- B. Barancikova, Z. Huang, and C. Salvi. Sigdiffusions: Score-based diffusion models for long time series via log-signature embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10354*, 2024.
- G. E. Blelloch. Prefix sums and their applications. Technical Report CMU-CS-90-190, School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University, Nov. 1990.
- T. Cass and C. Salvi. Lecture notes on rough paths and applications to machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06583*, 2024.
- N. M. Cirone and C. Salvi. Rough kernel hedging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09683*, 2025.
- N. M. Cirone, M. Lemercier, and C. Salvi. Neural signature kernels as infinite-width-depth-limits of controlled resnets. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'23*. JMLR.org, 2023.
- N. M. Cirone, A. Orvieto, B. Walker, C. Salvi, and T. Lyons. Theoretical foundations of deep selective state-space models. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3SzrqwupUx>.
- T. Cochrane, P. Foster, V. Chhabra, M. Lemercier, T. Lyons, and C. Salvi. Sk-tree: a systematic malware detection algorithm on streaming trees via the signature kernel. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Cyber Security and Resilience (CSR)*, pages 35–40. IEEE, 2021.
- T. Dao. Flashattention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08691*, 2023.
- T. Dao and A. Gu. Transformers are ssms: generalized models and efficient algorithms through structured state space duality. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'24*. JMLR.org, 2024.
- T. Dao, D. Fu, S. Ermon, A. Rudra, and C. Ré. Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:16344–16359, 2022.
- A. Fermanian, T. Lyons, J. Morrill, and C. Salvi. New directions in the applications of rough path theory. *IEEE BITS the Information Theory Magazine*, 2023.

- R. Grazi, J. Siems, J. K. H. Franke, A. Zela, F. Hutter, and M. Pontil. Unlocking state-tracking in linear rnns through negative eigenvalues, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.12537>.
- A. Gu and T. Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752*, 2023.
- A. Gu, K. Goel, and C. Ré. Efficiently modeling long sequences with structured state spaces, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.00396>.
- M. Hoglund, E. Ferrucci, C. Hernández, A. M. Gonzalez, C. Salvi, L. Sanchez-Betancourt, and Y. Zhang. A neural rde approach for continuous-time non-markovian stochastic control problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14258*, 2023.
- C. Holberg and C. Salvi. Exact gradients for stochastic spiking neural networks driven by rough signals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13587*, 2024.
- B. Horvath, M. Lemerrier, C. Liu, T. Lyons, and C. Salvi. Optimal stopping via distribution regression: a higher rank signature approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01479*, 2023.
- W. Hua, Z. Dai, H. Liu, and Q. Le. Transformer quality in linear time. In K. Chaudhuri, S. Jegelka, L. Song, C. Szepesvari, G. Niu, and S. Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 9099–9117. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/hua22a.html>.
- Z. Issa, B. Horvath, M. Lemerrier, and C. Salvi. Non-adversarial training of neural sdes with signature kernel scores. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- A. Katharopoulos, A. Vyas, N. Pappas, and F. Fleuret. Transformers are RNNs: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2020.
- P. Kidger, P. Bonnier, I. Perez Arribas, C. Salvi, and T. Lyons. Deep signature transforms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- M. Lemerrier, C. Salvi, T. Cass, E. V. Bonilla, T. Damoulas, and T. Lyons. Sigpde: Scaling sparse gaussian processes on sequential data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021a.
- M. Lemerrier, C. Salvi, T. Damoulas, E. Bonilla, and T. Lyons. Distribution regression for sequential data. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3754–3762. PMLR, 2021b.
- T. J. Lyons. Differential equations driven by rough signals. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 14(2):215–310, 1998.

- G. Manten, C. Casolo, E. Ferrucci, S. W. Mogensen, C. Salvi, and N. Kilbertus. Signature kernel conditional independence tests in causal discovery for stochastic processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18477*, 2024.
- C. D. Meyer. Generalized inverses of block triangular matrices. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 19(4):741–750, 1970. ISSN 00361399. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2100157>.
- J. Morrill, C. Salvi, P. Kidger, and J. Foster. Neural rough differential equations for long time series. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7829–7838. PMLR, 2021.
- A. Pannier and C. Salvi. A path-dependent pde solver based on signature kernels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11738*, 2024.
- A. Paszke, S. Gross, S. Chintala, G. Chanan, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, Z. Lin, A. Desmaison, L. Antiga, and A. Lerer. Automatic differentiation in pytorch. 2017. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:40027675>.
- Z. Qin, D. Li, W. Sun, W. Sun, X. Shen, X. Han, Y. Wei, B. Lv, F. Yuan, X. Luo, et al. Scaling transormer to 175 billion parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.14995*, 2023.
- C. Salvi. *Rough paths, kernels, differential equations and an algebra of functions on streams*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 2021.
- C. Salvi, T. Cass, J. Foster, T. Lyons, and W. Yang. The signature kernel is the solution of a Goursat PDE. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 3(3):873–899, 2021a.
- C. Salvi, M. Lemerrier, C. Liu, B. Horvath, T. Damoulas, and T. Lyons. Higher order kernel mean embeddings to capture filtrations of stochastic processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:16635–16647, 2021b.
- C. Salvi, J. Diehl, T. Lyons, R. Preiss, and J. Reizenstein. A structure theorem for streamed information. *Journal of Algebra*, 634:911–938, 2023.
- I. Schlag, T. Munkhdalai, and J. Schmidhuber. Learning associative inference using fast weight memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.07831*, 2020.
- I. Schlag, K. Irie, and J. Schmidhuber. Linear transformers are secretly fast weight programmers. In M. Meila and T. Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 9355–9366. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/schlag21a.html>.
- D. Shmelev and C. Salvi. Sparse signature coefficient recovery via kernels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08579*, 2024.

- J. Siems, T. Carstensen, A. Zela, F. Hutter, M. Pontil, and R. Grazzi. Deltaproduct: Improving state-tracking in linear rnnns via householder products, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.10297>.
- J. T. Smith, A. Warrington, and S. Linderman. Simplified state space layers for sequence modeling. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Ai8Hw3AXqks>.
- Y. Sun, L. Dong, S. Huang, S. Ma, Y. Xia, J. Xue, J. Wang, and F. Wei. Retentive network: A successor to transformer for large language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.08621>.
- P. Tillet, H. T. Kung, and D. Cox. Triton: an intermediate language and compiler for tiled neural network computations. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGPLAN International Workshop on Machine Learning and Programming Languages*, MAPL 2019, page 10–19, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450367196. doi: 10.1145/3315508.3329973. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3315508.3329973>.
- A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- S. Yang and Y. Zhang. Fla: A triton-based library for hardware-efficient implementations of linear attention mechanism, Jan. 2024. URL <https://github.com/fla-org/flash-linear-attention>.
- S. Yang, B. Wang, Y. Shen, R. Panda, and Y. Kim. Gated linear attention transformers with hardware-efficient training. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’24*. JMLR.org, 2024a.
- S. Yang, B. Wang, Y. Zhang, Y. Shen, and Y. Kim. Parallelizing linear transformers with the delta rule over sequence length. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=y8Rm4VNRPH>.

A Theoretical Proofs

A.1 Flow Equation for matrix-valued SSMs

Proposition A.1. *Given matrix valued paths $\omega, \xi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, the CDE defined by*

$$d\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_t \cdot d\omega_t + d\xi_t \quad (24)$$

can be solved on any interval $[s, t] \subseteq [0, 1]$ as

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_s \mathbb{P}_{s,t} + \int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r,t}, \quad \mathbb{P}_{s,t} = Id + \int_s^t \mathbb{P}_{s,r} d\omega_r \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}. \quad (25)$$

Proof. Here $V \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}))$ is the linear vector field encoding matrix multiplication *i.e.* $V(A) \cdot B := A \cdot B$.

Note how we can write the field action in coordinates as

$$V(A) \cdot B = A \cdot B = \sum_{i,j=1}^d (A \cdot \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j) B_{i,j} = \sum_{i,j=1}^d V_{i,j}(A) B_{i,j}.$$

But we know (Cirone et al. [2024] Appendix E) how to write the explicit solution to a CDE of this form:

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbb{W}_{s,t} \mathbf{S}_s + \int_s^t \mathbb{W}_{r,t} d\xi_r \quad (26)$$

where $\mathbb{W} := W^{V,\omega} : \{(s,t) \in [0, T] \times [0, T] \mid s \leq t\} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ is the *Wronskian* matrix defined by the series

$$\begin{aligned} W_{s,t}^{V,\omega}(\bullet) &:= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} V^{\otimes n}(\bullet) \text{Sig}(\omega)_{s,t}^{\otimes n} \\ &= \sum_{(I,J)} V_{i_n, j_n} \circ \dots \circ V_{i_1, j_1}(\bullet) \text{Sig}(\omega)_{s,t}^{(I,J)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that since $V_{i,j}(A) = A \cdot \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j$ then

$$\begin{aligned} V_{i_n, j_n} \circ \dots \circ V_{i_1, j_1}(A) &= A \cdot (\mathbf{e}_{i_1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{j_1}) \cdots (\mathbf{e}_{i_n} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{j_n}) \\ &= A \cdot (\mathbf{e}_{i_1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{j_n}) \prod_{k=2}^n \delta_{j_{k-1}, i_k} \end{aligned}$$

hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\otimes n}(A) \text{Sig}(\omega)_{s,t}^{\otimes n} &= \sum_{i,j=1}^d \sum_{\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n=1}^d A \cdot (\mathbf{e}_{i_1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_j) \iiint_{s < r_1 < \dots < r_n < t} d\omega_{r_1}^{i, \alpha_2} \dots d\omega_{r_n}^{\alpha_n, j} \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^d A \cdot (\mathbf{e}_{i_1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_j) \iiint_{s < r_1 < \dots < r_n < t} [d\omega_{r_1} \cdots d\omega_{r_n}]_{i,j} \\ &= A \cdot \iiint_{s < \dots < t} d\omega_{r_1} \cdots d\omega_{r_n} \end{aligned}$$

from which

$$\mathbb{W}_{s,t}(A) = A \cdot \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \iiint_{s < \dots < t} d\omega_{r_1} \cdots d\omega_{r_n} \right) \quad (27)$$

Let

$$\mathbb{P}_{s,t} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \iiint_{s < \dots < t} d\omega_{r_1} \cdots d\omega_{r_n}$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}_{s,t} = Id + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \iiint_{s < \dots < t} d\omega_{r_1} \cdots d\omega_{r_n} = Id + \int_s^t \mathbb{P}_{s,r} d\omega_r$$

and as needed

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_s \mathbb{P}_{s,t} + \int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r,t}.$$

□

A.2 Parallel Flows

A.2.1 Low-Rank Delta Rule

Proposition A.2. For matrix-valued paths $\mathbf{A}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{B} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times R}$ let the drivers be given by

$$d\omega_t = \mathbf{A}_t \mathbf{B}_t^\top dt \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad d\xi_t = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t \mathbf{B}_t^\top dt \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \quad (28)$$

then the flow can be written as

$$\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_s + \int_s^t (\mathbf{S}_s \mathbf{W}_{s,r} + \mathbf{U}_{s,r}) \mathbf{B}_r^\top dr \quad (29)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{s,t}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{s,t}$ are the solution of the following integral equations

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,t} = \mathbf{A}_t + \int_s^t \mathbf{W}_{s,r} \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_t dr, \quad \mathbf{U}_{s,t} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t + \int_s^t \mathbf{U}_{s,r} \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_t dr. \quad (30)$$

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$\mathbf{S}_s \mathbb{P}_{s,t} = \mathbf{S}_s + \int_s^t \mathbf{S}_s \mathbf{W}_{s,r} \mathbf{B}_r^\top dr, \quad \int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{s,r} = \int_s^t \mathbf{U}_{s,r} \mathbf{B}_r^\top dr.$$

To see this note how

$$\mathbb{P}_{s,t} = Id + \int_s^t \mathbb{P}_{s,r} d\omega_r = Id + \int_s^t \mathbb{P}_{s,r} \mathbf{A}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top dr \quad (31)$$

and defining $\mathbf{W}_{s,t} := \mathbb{P}_{s,t} \mathbf{A}_t$ we obtain

$$\mathbf{W}_{s,t} = \mathbb{P}_{s,t} \mathbf{A}_t = \mathbf{A}_t + \int_s^t \mathbb{P}_{s,r} \mathbf{A}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_t dr = \mathbf{A}_t + \int_s^t \mathbf{W}_{s,r} \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_t dr \quad (32)$$

Regarding the term $\int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r,t}$ note

$$\int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r,t} = \int_s^t \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbb{P}_{r,t} dr = \int_s^t \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top dr + \int_{r=s}^t \int_{u=r}^t \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbb{P}_{r,u} \mathbf{A}_u \mathbf{B}_u^\top du dr \quad (33)$$

Now exchanging the order of the integrals we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r=s}^t \int_{u=r}^t \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbb{P}_{r,u} \mathbf{A}_u \mathbf{B}_u^\top du &= \int_{u=s}^t \int_{r=s}^u \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbb{P}_{r,u} \mathbf{A}_u \mathbf{B}_u^\top dr du \\ &= \int_{r=s}^t \int_{u=s}^r \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_u \mathbf{B}_u^\top \mathbb{P}_{u,r} \mathbf{A}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top du dr \end{aligned}$$

so that, and here crucially the fact that \mathbf{B} is the same in both ξ and ω , one has

$$\int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r,t} = \int_s^t \left(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_r + \int_{u=s}^r \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_u \mathbf{B}_u^\top \mathbb{P}_{u,r} \mathbf{A}_r du \right) \mathbf{B}_r^\top dr. \quad (34)$$

Let $\mathbf{U}_{s,t} := \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t + \int_{r=s}^t \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbb{P}_{r,t} \mathbf{A}_t dr$ then

$$\mathbf{U}_{s,t} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t + \int_{r=s}^t \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_r \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbb{P}_{r,t} \mathbf{A}_t dr = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t + \int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{r,t} \mathbf{A}_t = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t + \int_s^t \mathbf{U}_{s,r} \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_t dr. \quad (35)$$

and just as wanted

$$\int_s^t d\xi_r \mathbb{P}_{s,r} = \int_s^t \mathbf{U}_{s,r} \mathbf{B}_r^\top dr.$$

□

Discretization and Intra-Chunk computation

Theorem A.3. *Define, with abuse of notation, the 3-tensors $\mathbf{A}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{(L \times R) \times d}$ with entries $[\square]_{k,i}^m = [\square_{t_{k-1}}]_m^i$ then*

$$\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{S}_0 + (\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{S}_0^\top)^\top \mathbf{B} \quad (36)$$

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{A} + (\mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top) \mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{U} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}} + (\mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top) \mathbf{U} \quad (37)$$

Where $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{(L \times R) \times (L \times R)}$ has entries $[\mathbf{M}]_{t,i}^{s,j} = \mathbb{I}(s < t)$ and composition of tensors corresponds to contraction of corresponding co-variant and contra-variant indices. In particular the implicit equations defining \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{U} can be explicitly solved as

$$\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{A}, \quad \mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \quad (38)$$

where $[\mathbf{Id}]_{s,i}^{t,j} = \delta_s^t \delta_i^j$ and $(\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top)^{-1}$ is the inverse of $(\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{(L \times R) \times (L \times R)}$.

Remark A.4. The notation employs an axis swap, defined by the relation $[\square]_{k,\cdot}^\top = \square_{t_{k-1}}^\top$ for $\mathbf{A}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{U}$. This choice aligns mathematical conventions, where elements of \mathbb{R}^d are naturally treated as column vectors, with practical implementations, where data is often stored and manipulated as row vectors.

Proof. This is just a matter of checking that entries correspond. Writing for 3-tensors $[\square^\top]_m^{k,i} := [\square]_{k,i}^m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_1 &= \mathbf{S}_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} (\mathbf{S}_0 \mathbf{W}_{t_k} + \mathbf{U}_{t_k}) \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top = \mathbf{S}_0 + \sum_{k=1}^L (\mathbf{S}_0 \mathbf{W}_{t_{k-1}} + \mathbf{U}_{t_{k-1}}) \mathbf{B}_{t_{k-1}}^\top \\ &= \mathbf{S}_0 + \sum_{k=1}^L (\mathbf{S}_0 [\mathbf{W}^\top]_{\cdot}^{k,\cdot} + [\mathbf{U}^\top]_{\cdot}^{k,\cdot}) [\mathbf{B}]_{k,\cdot} = \mathbf{S}_0 + (\mathbf{S}_0 \mathbf{W}^\top + \mathbf{U}^\top) \mathbf{B} \end{aligned}$$

as needed. Similarly, from

$$\mathbf{W}_{t_{k-1}} = \mathbf{A}_{t_{k-1}} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-2} \mathbf{W}_{t_m} \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k-1}} = \mathbf{A}_{t_{k-1}} + \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{W}_{t_{m-1}} \mathbf{B}_{t_{m-1}}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k-1}}$$

we get the 3-tensor equation

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{W}]_{k,\cdot} &= [\mathbf{A}]_{k,\cdot} + \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} [\mathbf{A}]_{k,\cdot} [\mathbf{B}^\top]_{\cdot}^{m,\cdot} [\mathbf{W}]_{m,\cdot} \\ &= [\mathbf{A}]_{k,\cdot} + \sum_{m=1}^L \mathbb{I}(m < k) [\mathbf{A}]_{k,\cdot} [\mathbf{B}^\top]_{\cdot}^{m,\cdot} [\mathbf{W}]_{m,\cdot} \\ &= [\mathbf{A}]_{k,\cdot} + \sum_{m=1}^L ([\mathbf{M}]_{k,\cdot}^{m,\cdot} \odot [\mathbf{A}]_{k,\cdot} [\mathbf{B}^\top]_{\cdot}^{m,\cdot}) [\mathbf{W}]_{m,\cdot} \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{A} + (\mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top) \mathbf{W}. \quad (39)$$

The equation for \mathbf{U} follows analogously.

From

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{A} + (\mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top) \mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{U} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}} + (\mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top) \mathbf{U} \quad (40)$$

immediately follows that

$$(\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top) \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{A}, \quad (\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top) \mathbf{U} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \quad (41)$$

so that it remains to prove the existence of a left-inverse computable with $\mathcal{O}(L^3 R^3)$ complexity. This follows from Proposition A.5 given that $[\mathbf{Id}]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} = \delta_s^t \text{Id}$ and $[\mathbf{M}]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} = \mathbb{I}(s < t)$ thus,

$$\begin{aligned} s > t &\implies [\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} = [\mathbf{Id}]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} - [\mathbf{M}]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} \odot [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} = \mathbf{0} \\ s = t &\implies [\mathbf{Id} - \mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} = [\mathbf{Id}]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} - [\mathbf{M}]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} \odot [\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top]_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} = \text{Id} \in GL(R). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following proposition is a reformulation of the classical inversion result for block-triangular matrices:

Proposition A.5 (Triangular Tensor Inversion). *Let $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{(T \times R) \times (T \times R)}$ be such that*

$$s > t \implies [\mathbf{C}]_{t,i}^{s,j} = 0, \quad \forall t. [\mathbf{C}]_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot} \in GL(R). \quad (42)$$

Then the tensor $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{(T \times R) \times (T \times R)}$ with entries

$$s > t \implies \mathbf{D}_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R} \quad (43)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot} = (\mathbf{C}_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot})^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R} \quad (44)$$

$$s < t \implies \mathbf{D}_{t,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} = -(\mathbf{C}_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot})^{-1} \left(\sum_{r=s}^{t-1} \mathbf{C}_{t,\cdot}^{r,\cdot} \mathbf{D}_{r,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} \right) = -\mathbf{D}_{t,\cdot}^{t,\cdot} \left(\sum_{r=s}^{t-1} \mathbf{C}_{t,\cdot}^{r,\cdot} \mathbf{D}_{r,\cdot}^{s,\cdot} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R} \quad (45)$$

is inverse for composition i.e. $\mathbf{DC} = \mathbf{Id}$.

Proof. Under the identification $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{(T \times R) \times (T \times R)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{TR \times TR}$ given by $[\phi(\mathbf{A})]_{i+(k-1)R}^{j+(m-1)R} = [\mathbf{A}]_{k,i}^{m,j}$ we have

$$\phi(\mathbf{A})\phi(\mathbf{B}) = \phi(\mathbf{AB}), \quad \phi(\mathbf{Id}) = Id$$

i.e. ϕ is an isomorphism for tensor composition. Since $\phi(\mathbf{C})$ is a block triangular matrix the result follows from the classical inversion formula Meyer [1970]. \square

A.3 Signature-Inspired algorithm for DeltaNet

Signature methods are a modern class of algorithms inspired by rough path theory which recently became popular in machine learning applications dealing with sequential data Fermanian et al. [2023], Cass and Salvi [2024]. These methods have seen a rapid rise in popularity in recent years have been applied in a variety of contexts including deep learning Kidger et al. [2019], Morrill et al. [2021], Cirone et al. [2023], Høglund et al. [2023], Cirone et al. [2024], Issa et al. [2024], Barancikova et al. [2024], kernel methods Salvi et al. [2021a], Salvi [2021], Lemerrier et al. [2021b,a], Manten et al. [2024], quantitative finance Arribas et al. [2020], Salvi et al. [2021b], Horvath et al. [2023], Pannier and Salvi [2024], Cirone and Salvi [2025], information theory Salvi et al. [2023], Shmelev and Salvi [2024], cybersecurity Cochrane et al. [2021], and computational neuroscience Holberg and Salvi [2024] among others. In particular, the following algorithm is inspired from signature kernel techniques presented in Salvi et al. [2021a], where the authors were able to solve a two dimensional partial differential equation (PDE) by refactoring the operations of the corresponding finite difference solver in a diagonal-wise fashion, thus obtaining a parallelisable scheme.

Theorem A.6. *The solution to the implicit equation*

$$\mathbf{W}_{t_k} = \mathbf{A}_{t_k} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{W}_{t_m} \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_k}, \quad (46)$$

is given by the diagonal elements $\mathbf{W}(t_k, t_k)$ of the system

$$\mathbf{W}(t_0, t_k) = \mathbf{A}_{t_k}, \quad \mathbf{W}(t_{k+1}, t_{k+1}) = \mathbf{W}(t_k, t_{k+1}) + \mathbf{W}(t_k, t_k) \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} \quad (47)$$

$$m < k \implies \mathbf{W}(t_{m+1}, t_{k+1}) = \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_{k+1}) + \mathbf{W}(t_{m+1}, t_k) - \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_k) + \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top (\mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} - \mathbf{A}_{t_k}). \quad (48)$$

Proof. We want to show how

$$\mathbf{W}(t_k, t_k) = \mathbf{A}_{t_k} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_k}, \quad (49)$$

to do so we will prove the stronger statement for $n \leq k$

$$\mathbf{W}(t_n, t_k) = \mathbf{A}_{t_k} + \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_k}. \quad (50)$$

Let's reason by induction on k . The base case $k = 0$ is trivially true. Assume then the equality holds until $k > 0$ included. Reasoning by induction on $n \leq k+1$ we have that the base case $n = 0$ once again is trivial, moreover for $n < k$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}(t_{n+1}, t_{k+1}) &= \mathbf{W}(t_n, t_{k+1}) + \mathbf{W}(t_{n+1}, t_k) - \mathbf{W}(t_n, t_k) + \mathbf{W}(t_n, t_n) \mathbf{B}_{t_n}^\top (\mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} - \mathbf{A}_{t_k}) \\ &= \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \mathbf{A}_{t_k} + \sum_{m=0}^n \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_k} \\ &\quad - \mathbf{A}_{t_k} - \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_k} + \mathbf{W}(t_n, t_n) \mathbf{B}_{t_n}^\top (\mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} - \mathbf{A}_{t_k}) \\ &= \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \mathbf{W}(t_n, t_n) \mathbf{B}_{t_n}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_k} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{W}(t_n, t_n) \mathbf{B}_{t_n}^\top (\mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} - \mathbf{A}_{t_k}) \\ &= \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \mathbf{W}(t_n, t_n) \mathbf{B}_{t_n}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} \\ &= \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \sum_{m=0}^n \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} \end{aligned}$$

as needed. To conclude note that if the equality holds for all $n < k$ then it does also for $n = k$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}(t_{k+1}, t_{k+1}) &= \mathbf{W}(t_k, t_{k+1}) + \mathbf{W}(t_k, t_k) \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} \\ &= \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \mathbf{W}(t_k, t_k) \mathbf{B}_{t_k}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} \\ &= \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}} + \sum_{m=0}^k \mathbf{W}(t_m, t_m) \mathbf{B}_{t_m}^\top \mathbf{A}_{t_{k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

B Pseudocode

```
1 def chunk_tensorInv_deltaRule(A, Alpha, B, S_0):
2     '''
3     Computes S_1 on the chunk [0, 1]
4
5     A/Alpha/B: tensors shape [L, R, d]
6     S_0: tensor of shape [d, d]
7     L: length, R: rank, d: dimension
8
9     Naive Complexity:  $O(L^2 * R * (d^2 + R*d + L*R^2))$ 
10    Parallel Complexity:  $O_{\text{par}}(L^2*R + d)$ 
11    Memory:  $O(L^2*R^2 + L*R*d + d^2)$ 
12    '''
13
14    L, R, d = A.shape
15    # Utils ||  $O(L^2 * R^2)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(1)$ 
16    M = torch.tril(torch.ones((L, L))) - torch.eye(L)
17    Id = torch.eye(R)[None, :, None, :] * torch.eye(L)[: , None, :, None]
18
19    # Compute C := (I - M \odot (A @ B.T)) ||  $O(L^2 * R^2 * d)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(d)$ 
20    C = einsum(A, B, "t i k, s j k -> t i s j") # [L, R, L, R]
21    C = Id - M[: , None, :, None] * C
22
23    # Compute the inverse D :=  $C^{-1}$  ||  $O(L^3 * R^3)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(L^2 * R)$ 
24    D = torch.zeros_like(C)
25    for t in range(L):
26        D[t, :, t, :] = torch.eye(R)
27        # Forward substitute ||  $O(L^2 * R^3)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(L * R)$ 
28        D[t, :, :t, :] -= einsum(C[t, :, :, :], D[: , :, :t, :], "i r j, r
29            j s k -> i s k")
30
31    # Compute W and U ||  $O(L^2 * R^2 * d)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(L * R)$ 
32    W = einsum(D, A, "t i s j, s j k -> t i k")
33    U = einsum(D, Alpha, "t i s j, s j k -> t i k")
34
35    # Compute the final value S_1 ||  $O(L * R * d^2)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(d + L * R)$ 
36    # S_1 = S_0 + (U + (W @ S_0.T)).T @ B
37    temp = U + einsum(W, S_0, "t i k, k m -> t i m")
38    S_1 = S_0 + einsum(temp, B, "t i m, t i k -> m k")
39
40    return S_1
```

Figure 1: Pytorch code showing a simple implementation of the algorithm.

```

1 def chunk_sigDeltaRule_optim(A, Alpha, B, S_0):
2     '''
3     Computes S_1 on the chunk [0, 1] with signature kernel method
4     A/Alpha/B: tensors shape [L, R, d]
5     S_0: tensor of shape [d, d]
6     L: length, R: rank, d: dimension
7
8     Naive complexity:  $O(L^2 * R * (d^2 + R*d))$ 
9     Parallel Complexity:  $O_{\text{par}}(L*R + d)$ 
10    Memory:  $O(L^2*R^2 + L*R*d + d^2)$ 
11    '''
12
13    L, R, d = A.shape
14    idx = torch.arange(0, L)
15
16    # G[s, t] = (A[s+1] - A[s]) @ B[t].T || [L, L, R, R] ||  $O(L^2 * R^2 * d)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(d)$ 
17    G = einsum(torch.roll(A, -1, dims=0) - A, B, 's i k, t j k -> s t i j')
18    # G_off_diag[t] = A[t+1] @ B[t].T || [L, R, R] ||  $O(L * R^2 * d)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(d)$ 
19    G_off_diag = einsum(torch.roll(A, -1, dims=0), B, 't i k, t j k -> t i j')
20
21    # Initialise W and U chunk
22    A_Alpha = torch.cat([A[...], None], Alpha[...], None], dim=-1)
23    WU = torch.where(idx[:, None, None] == 0, A_Alpha, 0) # [L, R, d, 2]
24
25    diagonals = torch.zeros([3, L, R, d, 2])
26    for i in range(1, 2*L - 1): # Multiply all  $O(\text{---})$  inside by  $O(L)$ 
27
28        # Roll Diags ||  $O(L * R * d)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(1)$ 
29        diagonals = torch.roll(diagonals, -1, dims=0)
30
31        # Utils
32        t = i // 2
33        mask = (idx <= t) & (idx > i - L) # [L]
34
35        # Compute gram entries on diagonal ||  $O(L * R^2)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(1)$ 
36        G_entries = torch.zeros([L, R, R])
37        for s in range(max(0, i - L - 1), min(i-1, L)):
38            G_entries[s] = G[i - s - 2][s]
39
40        # Initialise next diagonal
41        if i < L: diagonals[1, 0] = A_Alpha[i]
42
43        # Diagonals Update ||  $O(L * R^2 * d)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(R)$ 
44        temp = diagonals[0] + torch.roll(diagonals[0], -1, dims=0) - diagonals[-1]
45        temp += einsum(G_entries, WU, 't i j, t j k u -> t i k u')
46        temp = torch.roll(temp, 1, dims=0)
47        diagonals[1, 1:] = temp[1:]
48        diagonals[1] *= mask[:, None, None, None]
49
50        # Set WU value ||  $O(R^2 * d)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(R)$ 
51        if i % 2 == 0:
52            temp = diagonals[0, t-1].clone()
53            temp += einsum(G_off_diag[t-1], WU[t-1], 'i j, j k u -> i k u')
54            diagonals[1, t], WU[t] = temp, temp
55
56    W, U = WU[...], 0], WU[...], 1]
57
58    # Compute the final value S_1 ||  $O(L * R * d^2)$  ||  $O_{\text{par}}(d + L * R)$ 
59    # S_1 = S_0 + (U + (W @ S_0.T)).T @ B
60    temp = U + einsum(W, S_0, "t i k, k m -> t i m")
61    S_1 = S_0 + einsum(temp, B, "t i m, t i k -> m k")
62
63    return S_1

```

Figure 2: Pytorch code showing a simple implementation of the sigDelta algorithm.