
CompeteSMoE - Effective Sparse Mixture of Experts Training via Competition

Quang Pham¹ Giang Do² Huy Nguyen³ TrungTin Nguyen⁴ Chenghao Liu⁵ Mina Sartipi² Binh T. Nguyen⁶
Savitha Ramasamy⁷ Xiaoli Li⁷ Steven Hoi^{*1} Nhat Ho^{*3}

Abstract

Sparse mixture of experts (SMoE) offers an appealing solution to scale up the model complexity beyond the mean of increasing the network’s depth or width. However, effective training of SMoE has proven to be challenging due to the representation collapse issue, which causes parameter redundancy and limited representation potentials. In this work, we propose a competition mechanism to address this fundamental challenge of representation collapse. By routing inputs only to experts with the highest neural response, we show that, under mild assumptions, competition enjoys the same convergence rate as the optimal estimator. We further propose CompeteSMoE, an effective and efficient algorithm to train large language models by deploying a simple router that predicts the competition outcomes. Consequently, CompeteSMoE enjoys strong performance gains from the competition routing policy while having low computation overheads. Our extensive empirical evaluations on two transformer architectures and a wide range of tasks demonstrate the efficacy, robustness, and scalability of CompeteSMoE compared to state-of-the-art SMoE strategies.

1. Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have emerged as a promising framework for artificial general intelligence. In recent years, LLMs have shown a remarkable success in solving many cognitive tasks, ranging from language, vision understanding (Bao et al., 2022b; Gulati et al., 2020; Dosovitskiy et al., 2021; Ruiz et al., 2021; Bao et al., 2022a; Li et al., 2022; 2023), to code generation (Wang et al., 2021),

reinforcement learning (Chow et al., 2023) and life sciences (Rives et al., 2021). Since the release of the original Transformer model (Vaswani et al., 2017), extensive efforts have been devoted to scaling up the model complexities to take advantage of massive datasets and advanced computing resources (Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020; Du et al., 2022). To go beyond simply increasing the network depth and width, Sparse Mixture-of-experts (SMoE) (Fedus et al., 2022) has risen as an appealing solution for scaling LLMs. By modularizing the network and activating only subsets of experts per input, SMoE offers constant computational costs while scaling up the model complexity, which often results in improved performances.

Despite the initial success, effective SMoE training has been well-known to be notoriously challenging because of the representation collapse issue (Lee-Thorp & Ainslie, 2022; Riquelme et al., 2021; Chi et al., 2022) where all experts converge to learn similar representations or all tokens are only routed to a few experts. As a result, SMoE often suffers from limited representation capabilities and wasteful parameter usage. Thus, over the years, advances in SMoE algorithmic research are driven by the efforts to alleviate the representation collapse problem. Nevertheless, state-of-the-art strategies mostly rely on intuitive conceptualizations, which can only offer greedy solutions such as using a cosine router (Chi et al., 2022) or a two-phase training procedure (Dai et al., 2022). Furthermore, due to the large scale nature of LLM experiments, empirical evaluations are often restricted to the vanilla Transformer, which does not take into account the advanced architectures such as GLaM (Du et al., 2022) or Brainformer (Zhou et al., 2023).

This work focuses on improving the training effectiveness of SMoE by addressing its core challenge of representation collapse. To this end, we first seek to develop a reliable strategy to route inputs to experts. Motivated by the Winner-take-all (WTA) principle (Grossberg & Grossberg, 1982) originated from biology (Riesenhuber & Poggio, 1999; Andersen et al., 1969; Eccles, 2013), we propose the *competition* mechanism for SMoE training, which works by routing token only to experts with the highest neural responses. By doing so, experts are encouraged to *compete* with one another to be associated to the current input and result in a natural and parameter-free routing algorithm. We further investigate the

^{*}Co last authors ¹Singapore Management University ²University of Tennessee at Chattanooga ³Department of Statistics and Data Sciences, University of Texas at Austin, USA ⁴School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland ⁵Salesforce Research ⁶AISIA Lab, University of Science, Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City ⁷Institute for Infocomm Research (I²R), A*STAR, Singapore. Correspondence to: Quang Pham <hqpham.2017@phdcs.smu.edu.sg>.

competition’s theoretical learning property by showing that it has *the same* convergence rate as the *optimal estimator in hindsight*. Based on this solid foundation, we develop *CompeteSMoE* as a novel SMoE training framework for LLMs. CompeteSMoE innovatively employs a router trained to both minimize the task loss and predict the competition outcomes. As a result, CompeteSMoE produces high quality routing policy that are relevant to the task of interest with low computational overhead. We empirically compare CompeteSMoE with a suite of state-of-the-art SMoE learning strategies on two large-language-model architectures to demonstrate its efficacy, scalability, and robustness.

In summary, our work contributes the following innovations. First, we propose a novel *competition* mechanism for training SMoE, which enjoys the same convergence rate as the optimal estimator in hindsight. Second, we develop *CompeteSMoE*, a scalable and effective training strategy for SMoE training via competition. CompeteSMoE employs a router trained to predict the competition outcome in a scheduled manner. Thus, the router can learn high quality routing policy that are relevant to the current task. Lastly, we conduct extensive experiments to demonstrate strong learning capabilities of CompeteSMoE and show its promising scalability to large scale architectures.

2. Background

Table 6 in the Appendix summarizes all notations used in this work. We first describe the SMoE training process, which consists of a router $\mathcal{R}(\cdot, W_r)$ parameterized by W_r and N experts $\{g(\cdot, W_{e_i})\}_{i=1}^N$ parameterized by $W_{e_i}, i \in [N]$, respectively. We follow Fedus et al. (2022) and only implement SMoE in the fully connected layers. Given an input token x and its representation $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, SMoE first uses its router to calculate the affinity scores between z and each experts as $s = \mathcal{R}(z)$. Then, a sparse gating function, TopK, is applied to select only K experts with the largest affinity scores. Here we define the TopK function as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TopK}(v_i, K) \\ := \begin{cases} v_i, & \text{if } v_i \text{ is in the } K \text{ largest elements of } v \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Finally, the selected experts *independently* calculate their outputs, which are then linearly combined according to their affinity scores as the final prediction as:

$$\hat{y} = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{softmax}(\text{TopK}(s_i, i)) \cdot g(\mathbf{h}; W_{e_i}), \quad (2)$$

where $\text{softmax}(s_i) := \exp(s_i) / \sum_{j=1}^K \exp(s_j)$. In this work, we mainly focus on top-2 routing ($K = 2$) since it has been shown to achieve the best trade-off between

training efficiency and testing performance (Lepikhin et al., 2021; Du et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2023).

The naive SMoE training in equation (2) has been the standard practice in large scale implementations. However, it is also susceptible to the representation collapse issue due to the joint optimization of the router and experts’ parameter (Lee-Thorp & Ainslie, 2022). Therefore, extensive efforts have been devoted to improve the effectiveness of SMoE training by alleviating the representation collapse issue. The first line of work is based on the motivation that decoupling the router and expert training can help alleviate the collapse. Thus, StableMoE (Dai et al., 2022) proposes a two-stage training process where only the routers or experts are trained in each stage. Based on the similar idea, SMoE-Dropout (Chen et al., 2023) fixes a randomly initialized router and propose the “self-slimmable” strategy that gradually increases the number of selected experts throughout training. Secondly, XMoE (Chi et al., 2022) proposes to alleviate the collapse issue by implementing a deep router with a down-projection and normalization layers. Then, HyperRouter (Do et al., 2023) addresses the compromise between fixed and trainable routers in SMoE training by leveraging a random but fixed Hypernetwork (Ha et al., 2017) to dynamically generate the router parameters. However, such strategies either fix a random policy or train the router to minimize the task loss, which is often referred to as the greedy strategy (Dai et al., 2022). Consequently, we argue that such greedy objectives could result in suboptimal routing policies and hinder the overall performances.

These limitations necessitate the need to develop a reliable strategy for selecting the most affinitive experts given an input and how to maintain this routing strategy throughout training. To this end, we propose CompeteSMoE with two key innovations: (i) using competition as the expert routing strategy; and (ii) a scheduled training process to distill the competition mechanism into a router, which results in both improve efficacy and low overheads. Table 1 summarizes key characteristics of CompeteSMoE versus state-of-the-art SMoE training strategies discussed thus far. A detailed literature overview will be provided in Section 5.

3. CompeteSMoE

This Section details the competition mechanism and outlines the CompeteSMoE algorithm.

3.1. Routing via Competition

We propose the *competition* mechanism as an effective routing policy. For simplicity, we consider a single fully connected layer implemented with the SMoE mechanism and leave the generalization to deep networks in Section 3.3. The competition mechanism’s key innovation is the use

Method	Venue	Router	Router training	Routing objective	Guarantee
Switch Transformer	JMLR 2022	Linear	Yes	Greedy	No
XMoE	NeurIPS 2022	Cosine	Yes	Greedy	No
StableMoE	ACL 2022				
- Stage 1	-	Linear	Yes	Greedy	No
- Stage 2	-	Linear	No	Fixed Routing	No
SMoE-Dropout	ICLR 2023	Linear	No	Fixed Routing	No
CompeteMoE	-	Linear	Scheduled	Competition	Yes

Table 1. Characteristics of state-of-the-art SMoE strategies for training LLMs.

of expert’s activation norm as its affinity score, i.e. $s_i = \|g(\mathbf{h}, W_{e_i})\|_2$. Consequently, the competition-based SMoE training procedure can be summarize as:

1. Calculate each expert output: $g(\mathbf{h}, W_{e_i}), \forall i \in [N]$
2. Calculate the expert’s affinity score:
 $s_i = \|g(\mathbf{z}, W_{e_i})\|_2, \forall i \in [N]$
3. Calculate the final output:
 $\hat{y} = \sum_{i=1}^K \text{softmax}(\text{TopK}(s_i, K)) \cdot g(\mathbf{z}, W_{e_i})$

The key idea of competition is associating the expert’s affinity score with its actual output, i.e. *experts that have higher responses are more likely to be associated to the current input*. This strategy starkly contrasts the standard SMoE implementation discussed in Section 2 where the affinity score is calculated as the dot product between the input \mathbf{z} and the expert’s embedding, i.e. columns of W_r , and only the few selected experts actually perform their calculation. Although using expert embedding is more efficient, it results in suboptimal routing policies because the embedding is detached from the expert’s forward calculation. Therefore, competition provides a trade-off between efficiency and an optimal routing policy. We will investigate its theoretical guarantees in Section 4.

3.2. Scheduled Training the Router

Router loss. One drawback of the competition mechanism is that it requires activating all experts to calculate the affinity scores, which is expensive in large models. Therefore, to facilitate the large scale integration of competition, we propose to employ a router $\mathcal{R}(\cdot, W_r)$ described in Section 2. Notably, instead of greedy training, we propose to train the router to *predict the competition outcomes*, which can be characterized by the mean-squared error (MSE) between the competition and router policies. Particularly, let $s_{\mathcal{R}}$ and s_C be the affinity scores from the router and the competition, respectively, we propose to train the router by minimizing the router loss, denoted by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}}(s_{\mathcal{R}}, s_C)$, defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}_i}(s_{\mathcal{R}}, s_C) := \text{MSE}(\text{softmax}(\text{TopK}(s_{\mathcal{R}}, K)), \text{softmax}(\text{TopK}(s_C, K))) \tag{3}$$

Consequently, we expect to use a well-trained router as a proxy to the competition routing policy without the expensive costs of activating all experts at every iteration.


Scheduled training. Due to the expensive computation, competition training of the router should only be performed sparingly. Dai et al. (2022) explored a two-phase training process where only the router is trained in the first phase and only the experts are trained in the second phase. However, since the experts are randomly initialized at the beginning, this strategy only fits the routing policy of random experts and does not model the experts’ evolution when they observe training samples. Therefore, we propose a scheduled training strategy to ensure that the router can take into account the experts evolution.

To this end, at iteration t , we perform a coin flip with probability for head $\lambda(t)$ to decide whether to perform competition (head) or normal router training (tail). For competition training, the router is trained to minimize both the task loss (negative log-likelihood) and the router loss in equation (3). By changing $\lambda(t)$, one can control how often the router can learn from the competition. In one extreme, by setting $\lambda(t) = 0$, we achieve the standard SMoE training. In this work, we simply implement $\lambda(t)$ as a small constant (e.g. $\lambda(t) = 0.05$). We explore and compare more different choices of $\lambda(t)$ in the numerical experiment and leave the more sophisticated designs of $\lambda(t)$ for the future work.

3.3. The CompeteSMoE Algorithm

We now introduce the CompeteSMoE algorithm that effectively trains large scale models via competition. CompeteSMoE focuses to facilitate SMoE training of LLMs, which comprise a stack of multihead self-attention (MHSA), fully-connected (FC), and SMoE layers (Fedus et al., 2022).

Given a network with L layers, CompeteSMoE replaces each SMoE layer **independently** with its competition mechanism, which comprises a set of experts, a router, and a schedule. At iteration t , CompeteSMoE performs L coin flips to determine the scheduled training at each layer. Then, CompeteSMoE updates the experts parameters to minimize the task loss while updating the routers according to their



(a) With probability $\lambda(t)$, train the router to minimize the competition outcomes and task loss

(b) With probability $1 - \lambda(t)$, train the routers and experts to minimize the task loss

Figure 1. An illustrative of the CompeteSMoE algorithm on three experts.

schedule. Figure 1 illustrates the CompeteSMoE algorithm for one layer of three experts. In summary, CompeteSMoE training dynamic is outlined as:

$$W_e^l \leftarrow W_e^l - \epsilon_t \frac{\partial}{\partial W_e^l} \mathcal{L}_{\text{NLL}}(\hat{y}, y), \quad l \in [L] \quad (4)$$

$$W_r^l \leftarrow W_r^l - \epsilon_t \frac{\partial}{\partial W_r^l} [\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}_l}(\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{R}_l}, \mathbf{s}_{C_l}) + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{\text{NLL}}(\hat{y}, y)], \quad l \sim \Lambda(t) \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{NLL} is the negative log-likelihood between the predicted output \hat{y} and the ground-truth y , $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the router loss defined in equation (3), ϵ_t is the current step size, α is the balance factor, and $\Lambda(t)$ is the set of all layers performing competition according to the schedule $\lambda(t)$.

We highlight two key ideas when implementing CompeteSMoE. First, the competition mechanism should be activated independently per layer rather than globally across the network. Although competition is guaranteed to find an optimal routing policy for a single SMoE layer (as we will show in Section 4), performing competition simultaneously in a deep network is a greedy strategy and does not guarantee an optimal routing policy across layers. We argue that performing competition independently per layer can improve the representation robustness and at a cheaper computation cost. Secondly, the router optimization dynamic involves the interleaving of the router with the negative log-likelihood losses. While the router loss drives the routing policy toward optimal, the negative log-likelihood loss ensures that the learned policy is helpful in performing the current task.

4. Statistical Guarantee of the Competition Mechanism

In this section, we investigate the convergence rate of the SMoE trained with competition and show that it enjoys the same convergence rate as the best estimator in hindsight.

Problem setting. Let $(X_1, Y_1) \dots, (X_n, Y_n) \in \mathcal{X}^d \times \mathcal{Y}$

be i.i.d samples drawn from bounded subsets $\mathcal{X}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}$. We consider the following density function to characterize SMoE with the competition mechanism:

$$p_{G_*}(Y|X) := \sum_{i=1}^{k_*} \left[\text{softmax}(\text{TopK}(|g(x, W_{e_i}^*)|, K)) \times f(Y|g(x, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*) \right]. \quad (6)$$

Here, k_* is a true number of experts and for any vector $v = (v_i)_{i=1}^{k_*}$, the softmax and TopK functions are defined in equations (1) and (2) respectively. Additionally, $g(X, W_e)$ stands for an expert function, while $f(\cdot|\mu, \sigma)$ denotes an univariate Gaussian density with mean μ and variance σ . In addition, we also define $G_* := \sum_{i=1}^{k_*} \delta_{(W_{e_i}^*, \sigma_i^*)}$ as a true mixing measure where $(W_{e_i}^*, \sigma_i^*)$ are ground-truth expert parameters and δ is the Dirac measure. In this work, we assume that $(W_{e_1}^*, \sigma_1^*), \dots, (W_{e_{k_*}}^*, \sigma_{k_*}^*) \in \Theta$ are pairwise different with Θ being a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}_+$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Next, we assume that the expert function $g(X, W_e)$ is non-zero and differentiable with respect to W_e for almost surely X . Furthermore, if there exist $\alpha_u \in \mathbb{R}$ for $1 \leq u \leq q$ such that $\sum_{u=1}^q \alpha_u \frac{\partial g}{\partial W_e^{(u)}}(X, W_e) = 0$ for almost surely X , then we must have $\alpha_u = 0$ for all $1 \leq u \leq q$.

Maximum Likelihood Estimation. In this paper, we propose using the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) method to estimate unknown parameters in the above model as follows:

$$\hat{G}_n \in \arg \max_{G \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(p_G(Y_i|X_i)), \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta) := \{G = \sum_{i=1}^{k_*} \delta_{(W_{e_i}, \sigma_i)} : (W_{e_i}, \sigma_i) \in \Theta\}$ stands for the set of all mixing measures with exactly k_* components.

Theorem 4.1 (Density Estimation). *With the MLE defined in equation 7, the convergence rate of density estimation*

$p_{\widehat{G}_n}(Y|X)$ to the true density $p_{G_*}(Y|X)$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{E}_X[h(p_{\widehat{G}_n}(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))]\right) &> C\sqrt{\log(n)/n} \\ &\lesssim \exp(-c\log(n)), \end{aligned}$$

for some universal positive constants C and c depending only on Θ . Here, h is the Hellinger distance defined as $h^2(f_1, f_2) := \frac{1}{2} \int (\sqrt{f_1} - \sqrt{f_2})^2 d\nu$ for any two probability density functions f_1, f_2 dominated by the Lebesgue measure ν .

Proof of Theorem 4.1 is in Appendix B.1. It follows from this theorem that $p_{\widehat{G}_n}$ converges to its true counterpart p_{G_*} under the Hellinger distance at a parametric rate of order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ (up to some logarithmic term). Subsequently, we leverage this result to establish the estimation rates of ground-truth parameters $(W_{e_j}^*, \sigma_j^*)$ for any $j \in [k_*]$.

Given some mixing measure $G := \sum_{i=1}^{k_*} \delta_{(W_{e_i}, \sigma_i)}$, we distribute its components to the following Voronoi cells which are generated by the support of the true mixing measure $G_* := \sum_{j=1}^{k_*} \delta_{(W_{e_j}^*, \sigma_j^*)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_j &\equiv \mathcal{A}_j(G) \\ &:= \{i \in [k_*] : \|\theta_i - \theta_j^*\| \leq \|\theta_i - \theta_\ell^*\|, \forall \ell \neq j\}, \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

where we denote $\theta_i := (W_{e_i}, \sigma_i)$ and $\theta_j^* := (W_{e_j}^*, \sigma_j^*)$ for any $i, j \in [k_*]$. Based on these Voronoi cells, we propose the following Voronoi loss functions for the sake of characterizing the convergence rates of parameter estimation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(G, G_*) \\ &:= \max_{\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_K\}} \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_{\tau_j}} \left[\|W_{e_i} - W_{e_{\tau_j}}^*\| + |\sigma_i - \sigma_{\tau_j}^*| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here, the maximum is subject to all K -element subsets $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_K\}$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, k_*\}$.

Theorem 4.2 (Parameter Estimation). *When the true number of experts k_* is known, we show that the following Hellinger lower bound holds for any mixing measure $G \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)$:*

$$\mathbb{E}_X[h(p_G(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))] \gtrsim \mathcal{D}(G, G_*). \quad (10)$$

This lower bound together with the density estimation rate in Theorem 4.1 leads to the following convergence rate of the MLE \widehat{G}_n to the true mixing measure G_* :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{D}(\widehat{G}_n, G_*) > C_1\sqrt{\log(n)/n}\right) \lesssim \exp(-c_1\log(n)), \quad (11)$$

where C_1 and c_1 are some universal constants.

Proof of Theorem 4.2 is in Appendix B.2. Equation (11) indicates that the MLE \widehat{G}_n also converges to G_* at the parametric rate of order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ under the Voronoi metric \mathcal{D} . As a consequence, the rates for estimating both $W_{e_i}^*$ and σ_i^* are optimal at $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ for any $i \in [k_*]$.

5. Related Work

5.1. Sparse Mixture of Experts

Mixture of Experts (MoE) is a fundamental model in machine learning (Jacobs et al., 1991; Jordan & Jacobs, 1994) and an instance of the conditional computation framework where different experts are responsible for different regions of the input space (Yuksel et al., 2012; Bengio, 2013; Masoudnia & Ebrahimpour, 2014; Nguyen & Chamroukhi, 2018; Nguyen, 2021). In literature, extensive efforts have been devoted to establishing a theoretical foundation for MoE, including the universal approximation properties (Norets, 2010; Nguyen et al., 2016; 2019; 2020; 2021a; 2023b), model selection criterion (Khalili, 2010; Montuelle & Le Pennec, 2014; Nguyen et al., 2021b; 2022; 2023c), convergence rate for density estimations (Mendes & Jiang, 2012; Norets & Pelenis, 2021; 2022) and the problem of parameter estimation (Ho et al., 2022; Nguyen et al., 2023a; 2024c;a).

Investigating MoE to handle complex data structures such as vision or speech is an equally attractive research direction (Eigen et al., 2013). However, since activating all experts for every input is expensive for large models, a sparse version (Shazeer et al., 2017) (SMoE) is often more attractive since it offers low computational costs while enjoying improved representation capabilities. To this end, SMoE has been widely explored to improved the training efficiency of LLMs, with various routing strategies proposed, from (i) letting tokens select the top- k experts (Lepikhin et al., 2021; Fedus et al., 2022; Zuo et al., 2022; Chi et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2023), (ii) letting experts select the top- k tokens (Zhou et al., 2022), to (iii) globally decide expert assignment (Lewis et al., 2021; Clark et al., 2022). Nevertheless, despite the empirical success, advanced in theoretical studies (Nguyen et al., 2023a; 2024b;a) have not been translated into practical and effective algorithms for large scale modes. In contrast, our work goes beyond both the pure theoretical or analytical studies by developing a theoretically-grounded algorithm for effective training of large scale LLM models

5.2. Competitive Learning

Competitive learning refers to a framework where computational units compete with one another for the right to response to an input (McClelland et al., 1987). Its development is closely related to the biological brain where only

certain cells respond strongly to a particular pattern and send suppressive signals to the remaining cells (Andersen et al., 1969; Stefanis, 1969; Eccles, 2013). Early investigations of competitive learning showed encouraging results in various domains such as action selection (Feldman & Ballard, 1982), self-organizing maps (Von der Malsburg, 1973; Kohonen, 1982), feature discovery (Rumelhart & Zipser, 1985), and spiking networks (Oster & Liu, 2005). Recently, the competition mechanism also motivates the development of various advanced machine learning methods such as maxout networks (Goodfellow et al., 2013), compete to compute (Srivastava et al., 2013), and independent mechanisms (Goyal et al., 2021; ALIAS PARTH GOYAL et al., 2021). The work most related to us is TIM (Lamb et al., 2021), which uses competition as an inductive bias to the vanilla Transformer and implements it via the MHSA mechanisms. However, this study shares the same weaknesses as the competitive learning framework in that it always activates all experts, which makes scaling to million parameters prohibitive. In contrast, our work not only provides a theoretical guarantee for the competition mechanism but also a training framework to distill this mechanism to a simple router and enjoy the effective routing policy with low overheads.

6. Experiment

We conduct experiments to investigate the following hypotheses: (i) CompeteSMoE offers an effective SMoE training algorithm for LLMs; and (ii) CompeteSMoE scales well with the model complexity, computational resources, while being robust to the hyper-parameter configurations.

6.1. Experimental Settings

Training tasks We explore two common tasks in training and evaluation of LLMs. First, character-level language modeling on the enwik8 or text8 datasets (Mahoney, 2011), which are common datasets to evaluate the model’s pre-training capabilities. We also consider the word-level language modeling task on WikiText-103 (Merity et al., 2017), a much larger and more challenging dataset, to test the models scaling capabilities. For all datasets, we follow the default splits of training-validation-testing. Second, we consider finetuning the models on downstream applications to investigate the models capabilities of adapting to different domains. To this end, we consider pre-trained medium models on enwik8 and finetuning it on a downstream task. We choose the SST-2 (Socher et al., 2013), SST-5 (Socher et al., 2013), IMDB (Maas et al., 2011), and BANKING77 (Casaneva et al., 2020) datasets, which are common NLP tasks to evaluate pre-trained models. Following Chen et al. (2023), we freeze the router and only optimize the experts’ parameter in this experiment.

Architecture. We consider two decoder-only architectures:

(i) the standard Switch Transformer (Fedus et al., 2022); and (ii) and GLaM (Du et al., 2022), a more advanced SMoE architecture. Due to resource constraints, training massive LLM models is prohibitive without industrial resources. Thus, we consider three model configurations: (i) tiny: with three SMoE blocks and **7M** parameters; (ii) small: with six SMoE layers and **15M** parameters; and (iii) medium: with eight SMoE layers and **36M** parameters. We emphasize that we are not trying to achieve state-of-the-art results due to the limited resource constraints. Instead, we evaluate the small and medium models on various datasets to demonstrate the scalability and efficacy of our algorithm. Lastly, we conduct extensive investigations using the tiny model to understand the algorithm behaviours and its robustness to different design choices. Lastly, unless otherwise stated, we implement TopK with $K = 2$ in the experiments.

Baselines. We compare our CompeteSMoE with state-of-the-arts SMoE training strategies for LLMs. **SwitchTransformer** (Fedus et al., 2022) employs a simple router trained end-to-end with the experts. **StableMoE** (Dai et al., 2022) proposes a two-phase training process where the first phase greedily trains only the router, then the router is fixed to train the experts in second phase. **XMoe** (Chi et al., 2022) implements a deep router that comprises a down-projection and normalization layer and a gating network with learnable temperatures. Lastly, motivated by SMoE-Dropout (Chen et al., 2023), we implement the **SMoE-Fixed** strategy that employs a randomly initialized router and freeze it throughout the training process. We do not consider gradually activate all experts since it is infeasible for large scale models.

Training procedure. For the language modeling experiments, we optimize the small models for 60,000 steps and the medium models for 80,000 steps. We use an Adam (Kingma & Ba, 2014) optimizer with a learning rate schedule of $1/\sqrt{t}$. The lowest validation loss checkpoint is used to report the final performance on the test set. For XMoe and StableMoE, we follow the default hyper-parameter configurations. For CompeteSMoE, there are two hyper-parameters: the schedule $\lambda(t)$ and the balance factor α . We first cross-validate the schedule $\lambda(t)$ with a random value of α . Then, we proceed to cross-validate α with respect to the optimal $\lambda(t)$ found. This strategy’s complexity only grows linearly with the number of configurations, which is more suitable for large models with million parameters compared to other alternatives. For each finetuning dataset, we consider the pretrained checkpoint of the medium model on enwik8, remove the last layer and employ two randomly initialized fully connected layers as the classifier. We finetune all methods for 5,000 steps with the same learning rate. Lastly, all experiments do not consider the balancing loss (Fedus et al., 2022) so that we can focus on validating the routing policy quality. We will leave the extension of competition and the balancing loss to the

Configuration		Enwik8 (BPC)		Text8 (BPC)		WikiText-103 (Perplexity)	
Architecture	Algorithm	Small	Medium	Small	Medium	Small	Medium
Switch Transformer	CompeteSMoE	1.177	1.115	1.289	1.220	83.750	31.299
	SMoE	1.191	1.130	1.291	1.231	85.061	34.145
	SMoE-Fixed	1.202	1.138	1.308	1.237	86.656	35.392
	XMoE	1.198	1.126	1.291	1.244	84.686	34.322
	StableMoE	1.194	1.124	1.300	1.238	85.267	34.179
GLaM	CompeteSMoE	1.175	1.081	1.281	1.211	54.380	34.233
	SMoE	1.186	1.139	1.286	1.235	54.856	34.672
	SMoE-Fixed	1.191	1.123	1.308	1.238	57.284	35.640
	XMoE	1.187	1.111	1.289	1.219	55.618	34.613
	StableMoE	1.189	1.109	1.291	1.217	54.730	35.320

Table 2. BPC on the enwik-8 and text8 test sets; and perplexity on the Wikitext-103 test set. Lower is better, best results are in bold.




Figure 2. Validation loss of the small transformer model on enwik8 throughout training.

future work. Lastly, we run the the tiny configuration five times and only one time for other configurations because of the large scale nature of these experiments. Due to space constraints, we provide all experiment details, including hardware setup, standard deviations, and additional visualization in the Appendix.

6.2. Language Modeling Evaluation

Table 2 reports the evaluation metrics of CompeteSMoE versus state-of-the-art strategies. We also report the evolution of the performance on the validation set of the small model in Figure 2. We first observe that across all methods, the GLaM architecture offers better performances than the standard Switch Transformer on all datasets. Furthermore, state-of-the-art strategies like XMoE or StableMoE tend to outperform the vanilla SMoE when we increase the model complexity (from small to medium) or introduce more data (from enwik8 to WikiText-103). However, the improvements of these strategies are quite inconsistent or marginal. In contrast, our CompeteSMoE can consistently outperform other competitors on all benchmarks (note that the BPC metric is log-scaled), architectures, and offer faster convergent rate (Figure 2). This result demonstrates CompeteSMoE’s capabilities in learning a good routing policy to facilitate

the language modeling pre-training task.

Table 2 also shows an interesting result that SMoE-Fixed performs the worse among all methods considered, showing that the random policy is insufficient and needs to be updated for effective training. This result sheds light on the success of SMoE-Dropout (Chen et al., 2023) by showing its performance gains mostly come from the self-slimmable strategy of linearly increasing the number experts activated (K) throughout training. However, self-slimmable transforms the sparse network into dense, which goes against the motivation of SMoE for large scale models.

6.3. Finetuning Evaluation

Method	SST-2	SST-5	IMDB	BANKING77
CompeteSMoE	79.8	38.3	84.8	72.9
SMoE	77.1	35.1	84.4	69.2
SMoE-Fixed	78.6	34.4	83.5	66.7
XMoE	76.7	35.3	83.3	67.4
StableMoE	77.7	34.3	83.9	60.8

Table 3. Accuracy of the model after finetuned on various datasets. Higher is better, best results are in bold.

Table 3 reports the accuracy of the models finetuned on the test sets of various datasets. Overall, we observe that CompeteSMoE demonstrates strong transfer learning capabilities by achieving the highest accuracy on all datasets. Notably, on the more challenging datasets of SST-5 and BANKING77, which have fewer training samples or more classes, we observe larger performance gains from CompeteSMoE versus the remaining baselines (over 3% improvements compared to the second best method). This result shows that CompeteSMoE can learn routing policies that are not only good for pre-training but also exhibit strong transfer capabilities to various downstream tasks.




Figure 3. BPC on enwik8 wrt the number of experts activated.

6.3.1. SCALABILITY TO DIFFERENT TopK VALUES

Figure 3 reports the BPC on enwik8 of various methods with respect to the number of experts. We only consider the Tiny transformer configuration for comparison. From Figure 3, we first observe that SMoE-Fixed achieved the worst results in all cases, further showing the low quality routing policy from the randomly initialized routers. Overall, CompeteSMoE consistently outperforms SMoE and SMoE-Fixed across all values of K , showing its scalability to the number of experts activated.

It is important to note that when all experts are activated $K = 16$, the predictions of each method are still different because of the different affinity scores from the router. Thus, this result shows that even when we fix the same experts, CompeteSMoE can learn to adjust the contribution of each expert accordingly to improve the learning outcomes.

6.4. Ablation Study

We investigate the robustness of CompeteSMoE to the different hyper-parameter settings. All experiments are conducted using the tiny transformer architecture.

6.4.1. ROBUSTNESS TO THE SCHEDULE $\lambda(t)$

Frequency $\lambda(t)$	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.09
SwitchTransformer	1.733	1.330	1.303	1.310	1.309
GLaM	1.587	1.366	1.298	1.300	1.294

Table 4. BPC on enwik8 with respect to $\lambda(t)$. Lower is better, best results are in bold.

We first fix the the balance factor α and investigate the effect of the schedule $\lambda(t)$. Table 4 reports the BPC on enwik8 with respect to $\lambda(t)$. When $\lambda(t) = 0$, CompeteSMoE reduces to the vanilla SMoE. We first observe that when $\lambda(t) = 0.01$, the competition learning is too sparse, and may inject noise to the learning process, resulting in the performance degrade. Once we increase the competition frequency, CompeteSMoE consistently outperforms SMoE, demonstrating the benefits of competition to the routing policy. Importantly, we observe that when $\lambda(t) \geq 0.05$,

CompeteSMoE’s performance becomes saturated, indicating that even reasonably small competition frequency is sufficient to achieve significant improvements. Furthermore, it is important to note that the balancing factor α is cross-validated with respect to $\lambda(t) = 0.05$, which explains why it achieves the best performance in this experiment.

6.4.2. ROBUSTNESS TO THE BALANCING FACTOR α

α	0.1	1	5	25	250
SwitchTransformer	1.306	1.307	1.303	1.321	1.328
GLaM	1.280	1.285	1.298	1.304	1.319

Table 5. BPC on enwik8 with respect to the balancing factor α . Lower is better, best results are in bold.

Lastly, we investigate the robustness of the balancing factor α given a fixed schedule $\lambda(t)$ and report the result in Table 5. Overall, we see that CompeteSMoE is robust to small values of α , i.e., where $\alpha \leq 5$. Such values provide a good trade-off between enforcing the router to follow the competition policy versus improving the learned policies for the current task, resulting in good overall performances. It is important to note that any α configurations reported offer better performances than SMoE ($\alpha = 0$).

Summary and hyper-parameter configuration guidelines.

Our experiments show that CompeteSMoE demonstrates not only strong pre-training and transfer learning capabilities but also robustness to the hyper-parameter configurations. Our ablation studies in Section 6.4 suggest CompeteSMoE is robust to small values of the hyper-parameters, i.e., $0.03 \leq \lambda(t) \leq 0.09$ and $\alpha \leq 5$. This result serves as a general guide for efficiently cross-validating CompeteSMoE. We provide visualizations of the routers quality in Appendix C.5.

7. Conclusion

This work proposes competition, a theoretically-grounded strategy for effective SMoE training. By routing tokens only to the winning experts, we show that competition enjoys the same convergence rate as the optimal routing policy in hindsight. From this foundation, we propose the CompeteSMoE algorithm that employs a router trained to predict the competition outcome. Consequently, CompeteSMoE enjoys the guarantee of competition while avoiding the expensive costs of activation all experts. We conduct extensive evaluations with two transformer architectures on both pre-training and finetuning tasks to demonstrate CompeteSMoE strong capabilities, scalability, and robustness compared to state-of-the-art training strategies. Lastly, we believe that extending the competition to train with the balancing loss and large scale evaluations of CompeteSMoE are two promising future research directions.

Impact Statements

This paper presents work that aims to advance the field of Machine Learning. Our work is conducted in an academic setting using publicly available benchmarks and does not involve human subjects or proprietary assets. Therefore, we believe that there are no significant societal implications of our work. However, since we have trained large language models from datasets collected from the web, there may be potential issues such as gender or racial biases, which will require additional efforts to mitigate their negative impact. In addition, despite encouraging results, training large numbers of LLMs is inevitably costly and requires substantial computing resources.

References

- ALIAS PARTH GOYAL, A. G., Didolkar, A., Ke, N. R., Blundell, C., Beaudoin, P., Heess, N., Mozer, M. C., and Bengio, Y. Neural production systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:25673–25687, 2021. (Cited on page 6.)
- Andersen, P., Gross, G. N., Lomo, T., and Svein, O. Participation of inhibitory and excitatory interneurons in the control of hippocampal cortical output. In *UCLA forum in medical sciences*, volume 11, pp. 415–465, 1969. (Cited on pages 1 and 6.)
- Bao, H., Dong, L., Piao, S., and Wei, F. BEiT: BERT Pre-Training of Image Transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=p-BhZSz59o4>. (Cited on page 1.)
- Bao, H., Wang, W., Dong, L., Liu, Q., Mohammed, O. K., Aggarwal, K., Som, S., Piao, S., and Wei, F. VLMO: Unified Vision-Language Pre-Training with Mixture-of-Modality-Experts. In Oh, A. H., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., and Cho, K. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=bydKs84JEyw>. (Cited on page 1.)
- Bengio, Y. Deep Learning of Representations: Looking Forward. In Dediú, A.-H., Martı́n-Vide, C., Mitkov, R., and Truthe, B. (eds.), *Statistical Language and Speech Processing*, pp. 1–37, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-642-39593-2. (Cited on page 5.)
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 1877–1901, 2020. (Cited on page 1.)
- Casanueva, I., Temćinas, T., Gerz, D., Henderson, M., and Vulić, I. Efficient intent detection with dual sentence encoders. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Conversational AI*, pp. 38–45, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.nlp4convai-1.5. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.nlp4convai-1.5>. (Cited on page 6.)
- Chen, T., Zhang, Z., JAISWAL, A. K., Liu, S., and Wang, Z. Sparse moe as the new dropout: Scaling dense and self-slimmable transformers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. (Cited on pages 2, 5, 6, and 7.)
- Chi, Z., Dong, L., Huang, S., Dai, D., Ma, S., Patra, B., Singhal, S., Bajaj, P., Song, X., Mao, X.-L., Huang, H., and Wei, F. On the Representation Collapse of Sparse Mixture of Experts. In Oh, A. H., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., and Cho, K. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mWaYC6CZf5>. (Cited on pages 1, 2, 5, and 6.)
- Chow, Y., Tulepbergenov, A., Nachum, O., Gupta, D., Ryu, M., Ghavamzadeh, M., and Boutilier, C. A Mixture-of-Expert Approach to RL-based Dialogue Management. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=4FBUIhxz5nm>. (Cited on page 1.)
- Clark, A., De Las Casas, D., Guy, A., Mensch, A., Paganini, M., Hoffmann, J., Damoc, B., Hechtman, B., Cai, T., Borgeaud, S., Van Den Driessche, G. B., Rutherford, E., Hennigan, T., Johnson, M. J., Cassirer, A., Jones, C., Buchatskaya, E., Budden, D., Sifre, L., Osindero, S., Vinyals, O., Ranzato, M., Rae, J., Elsen, E., Kavukcuoglu, K., and Simonyan, K. Unified Scaling Laws for Routed Language Models. In Chaudhuri, K., Jegelka, S., Song, L., Szepesvari, C., Niu, G., and Sabato, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 4057–4086. PMLR, July 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/clark22a.html>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Dai, D., Dong, L., Ma, S., Zheng, B., Sui, Z., Chang, B., and Wei, F. StableMoE: Stable Routing Strategy for Mixture of Experts. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 7085–7095, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.489. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.489>. (Cited on pages 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.)

- Do, T., Khiem, L., Pham, Q., Nguyen, T., Doan, T.-N., Nguyen, B., Liu, C., Ramasamy, S., Li, X., and Hoi, S. HyperRouter: Towards Efficient Training and Inference of Sparse Mixture of Experts. In Bouamor, H., Pino, J., and Bali, K. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 5754–5765, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.351>. (Cited on page 2.)
- Dosovitskiy, A., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Weissenborn, D., Zhai, X., Unterthiner, T., Dehghani, M., Minderer, M., Heigold, G., Gelly, S., Uszkoreit, J., and Houlsby, N. An Image is Worth 16x16 Words: Transformers for Image Recognition at Scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YicbFdNTTy>. (Cited on page 1.)
- Du, N., Huang, Y., Dai, A. M., Tong, S., Lepikhin, D., Xu, Y., Krikun, M., Zhou, Y., Yu, A. W., Firat, O., Zoph, B., Fedus, L., Bosma, M. P., Zhou, Z., Wang, T., Wang, E., Webster, K., Pellat, M., Robinson, K., Meier-Hellstern, K., Duke, T., Dixon, L., Zhang, K., Le, Q., Wu, Y., Chen, Z., and Cui, C. GLaM: Efficient Scaling of Language Models with Mixture-of-Experts. In Chaudhuri, K., Jegelka, S., Song, L., Szepesvari, C., Niu, G., and Sabato, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5547–5569. PMLR, July 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/du22c.html>. (Cited on pages 1, 2, 6, and 21.)
- Eccles, J. C. *The cerebellum as a neuronal machine*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013. (Cited on pages 1 and 6.)
- Eigen, D., Ranzato, M., and Sutskever, I. Learning factored representations in a deep mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.4314*, 2013. (Cited on page 5.)
- Fedus, W., Zoph, B., and Shazeer, N. Switch Transformers: Scaling to Trillion Parameter Models with Simple and Efficient Sparsity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(120):1–39, 2022. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/21-0998.html>. (Cited on pages 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 21.)
- Feldman, J. A. and Ballard, D. H. Connectionist models and their properties. *Cognitive science*, 6(3):205–254, 1982. (Cited on page 6.)
- Goodfellow, I., Warde-Farley, D., Mirza, M., Courville, A., and Bengio, Y. Maxout networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1319–1327. PMLR, 2013. (Cited on page 6.)
- Goyal, A., Lamb, A., Hoffmann, J., Sodhani, S., Levine, S., Bengio, Y., and Schölkopf, B. Recurrent Independent Mechanisms. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mLcmdlEUxy->. (Cited on page 6.)
- Grossberg, S. and Grossberg, S. Contour enhancement, short term memory, and constancies in reverberating neural networks. *Studies of Mind and Brain: Neural Principles of Learning, Perception, Development, Cognition, and Motor Control*, pp. 332–378, 1982. (Cited on page 1.)
- Gulati, A., Qin, J., Chiu, C.-C., Parmar, N., Zhang, Y., Yu, J., Han, W., Wang, S., Zhang, Z., Wu, Y., and Pang, R. Conformer: Convolution-augmented Transformer for Speech Recognition. In *Proc. Interspeech 2020*, pp. 5036–5040, 2020. doi: 10.21437/Interspeech.2020-3015. (Cited on page 1.)
- Ha, D., Dai, A. M., and Le, Q. V. HyperNetworks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rkpACellx>. (Cited on page 2.)
- Ho, N., Yang, C.-Y., and Jordan, M. I. Convergence Rates for Gaussian Mixtures of Experts. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(323):1–81, 2022. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/20-1129.html>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Jacobs, R. A., Jordan, M. I., Nowlan, S. J., and Hinton, G. E. Adaptive mixtures of local experts. *Neural computation*, 3(1):79–87, 1991. Publisher: MIT Press. (Cited on page 5.)
- Jordan, M. I. and Jacobs, R. A. Hierarchical mixtures of experts and the EM algorithm. *Neural computation*, 6(2): 181–214, 1994. Publisher: MIT Press. (Cited on page 5.)
- Khalili, A. New estimation and feature selection methods in mixture-of-experts models. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 38(4):519–539, 2010. (Cited on page 5.)
- Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014. (Cited on page 6.)
- Kohonen, T. Self-organized formation of topologically correct feature maps. *Biological cybernetics*, 43(1):59–69, 1982. (Cited on page 6.)
- Lamb, A., He, D., Goyal, A., Ke, G., Liao, C.-F., Ravanelli, M., and Bengio, Y. Transformers with competitive ensembles of independent mechanisms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00336*, 2021. (Cited on page 6.)

- Lee-Thorp, J. and Ainslie, J. Sparse Mixers: Combining MoE and Mixing to build a more efficient BERT. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pp. 58–75, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-emnlp.5>. (Cited on pages 1 and 2.)
- Lepikhin, D., Lee, H., Xu, Y., Chen, D., Firat, O., Huang, Y., Krikun, M., Shazeer, N., and Chen, Z. GShard: Scaling Giant Models with Conditional Computation and Automatic Sharding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=qrwe7XHTmYb>. (Cited on pages 2 and 5.)
- Lewis, M., Bhosale, S., Dettmers, T., Goyal, N., and Zettlemoyer, L. BASE Layers: Simplifying Training of Large, Sparse Models. In Meila, M. and Zhang, T. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 6265–6274. PMLR, July 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/lewis21a.html>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Li, J., Li, D., Xiong, C., and Hoi, S. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. (Cited on page 1.)
- Li, J., Li, D., Savarese, S., and Hoi, S. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597*, 2023. (Cited on page 1.)
- Maas, A. L., Daly, R. E., Pham, P. T., Huang, D., Ng, A. Y., and Potts, C. Learning Word Vectors for Sentiment Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 142–150, Portland, Oregon, USA, June 2011. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P11-1015>. (Cited on page 6.)
- Mahoney, M. Large text compression benchmark, 2011. URL <http://www.matmahoney.net/dc/text.html>. (Cited on page 6.)
- Masoudnia, S. and Ebrahimpour, R. Mixture of experts: a literature survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 42(2):275–293, 2014. ISSN 1573-7462. doi: 10.1007/s10462-012-9338-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-012-9338-y>. (Cited on page 5.)
- McClelland, J. L., Rumelhart, D. E., Group, P. R., et al. *Parallel distributed processing, volume 2: Explorations in the microstructure of cognition: Psychological and biological models*, volume 2. MIT press, 1987. (Cited on page 5.)
- Mendes, E. F. and Jiang, W. On convergence rates of mixtures of polynomial experts. *Neural computation*, 24(11):3025–3051, 2012. Publisher: MIT Press. (Cited on page 5.)
- Merity, S., Xiong, C., Bradbury, J., and Socher, R. Pointer Sentinel Mixture Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Byj72udxe>. (Cited on page 6.)
- Montuelle, L. and Le Pennec, E. Mixture of Gaussian regressions model with logistic weights, a penalized maximum likelihood approach. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8(1):1661–1695, 2014. Publisher: The Institute of Mathematical Statistics and the Bernoulli Society. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, H., Nguyen, T., and Ho, N. Demystifying softmax gating in Gaussian mixture of experts. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023a. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, H., Akbarian, P., and Ho, N. Is temperature sample efficient for softmax Gaussian mixture of experts? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13875*, 2024a. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, H., Akbarian, P., Yan, F., and Ho, N. Statistical perspective of top-k sparse softmax gating mixture of experts. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024b. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, H., Nguyen, T., Nguyen, K., and Ho, N. Towards convergence rates for parameter estimation in Gaussian-gated mixture of experts. In *Proceedings of The 27th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2024c. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, H. D. and Chamroukhi, F. Practical and theoretical aspects of mixture-of-experts modeling: An overview. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 8(4):e1246, 2018. Publisher: Wiley Online Library. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, H. D., Lloyd-Jones, L. R., and McLachlan, G. J. A universal approximation theorem for mixture-of-experts models. *Neural computation*, 28(12):2585–2593, 2016. Publisher: MIT Press. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, H. D., Chamroukhi, F., and Forbes, F. Approximation results regarding the multiple-output Gaussian gated mixture of linear experts model. *Neurocomputing*, 366:208–214, 2019. ISSN 0925-2312. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2019.08.014>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/>

- [science/article/pii/S0925231219311336](#). (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, H. D., Nguyen, T., Chamroukhi, F., and McLachlan, G. J. Approximations of conditional probability density functions in Lebesgue spaces via mixture of experts models. *Journal of Statistical Distributions and Applications*, 8(1):13, August 2021a. ISSN 2195-5832. doi: 10.1186/s40488-021-00125-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40488-021-00125-0>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, T. *Model Selection and Approximation in High-dimensional Mixtures of Experts Models: from Theory to Practice*. PhD Thesis, Normandie Université, December 2021. URL <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-03524749>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, T., Nguyen, H. D., Chamroukhi, F., and McLachlan, G. J. Approximation by finite mixtures of continuous density functions that vanish at infinity. *Cogent Mathematics & Statistics*, 7(1):1750861, January 2020. ISSN null. doi: 10.1080/25742558.2020.1750861. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/25742558.2020.1750861>. Publisher: Cogent OA. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, T., Nguyen, H. D., Chamroukhi, F., and McLachlan, G. J. An l_1 -oracle inequality for the Lasso in mixture-of-experts regression models. *arXiv:2009.10622*, January 2021b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2009.10622>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, T., Nguyen, H. D., Chamroukhi, F., and Forbes, F. A non-asymptotic approach for model selection via penalization in high-dimensional mixture of experts models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 16(2):4742–4822, 2022. doi: 10.1214/22-EJS2057. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/22-EJS2057>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, T., Chamroukhi, F., Nguyen, H. D., and McLachlan, G. J. Approximation of probability density functions via location-scale finite mixtures in Lebesgue spaces. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 52(14):5048–5059, 2023b. doi: 10.1080/03610926.2021.2002360. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610926.2021.2002360>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Nguyen, T., Nguyen, D. N., Nguyen, H. D., and Chamroukhi, F. A non-asymptotic risk bound for model selection in high-dimensional mixture of experts via joint rank and variable selection. In *Australasian Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 2023c. (Cited on page 5.)
- Norets, A. Approximation of conditional densities by smooth mixtures of regressions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(3):1733–1766, 2010. doi: 10.1214/09-AOS765. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/09-AOS765>. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics. (Cited on page 5.)
- Norets, A. and Pelenis, J. Adaptive Bayesian estimation of conditional discrete-continuous distributions with an application to stock market trading activity. *Journal of Econometrics*, 2021. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2021.11.004>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030440762100261X>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Norets, A. and Pelenis, J. Adaptive Bayesian Estimation of Discrete-Continuous Distributions Under Smoothness and Sparsity. *Econometrica*, 90(3):1355–1377, 2022. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA17884>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.3982/ECTA17884>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Oster, M. and Liu, S.-C. Spiking inputs to a winner-take-all network. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 18, 2005. (Cited on page 6.)
- Press, O., Smith, N. A., and Levy, O. Improving transformer models by reordering their sublayers. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 2996–3005, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.270. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.acl-main.270>. (Cited on page 21.)
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. (Cited on page 1.)
- Riesenhuber, M. and Poggio, T. Hierarchical models of object recognition in cortex. *Nature neuroscience*, 2(11):1019–1025, 1999. (Cited on page 1.)
- Riquelme, C., Puigcerver, J., Mustafa, B., Neumann, M., Jenatton, R., Susano Pinto, A., Keyzers, D., and Houlsby, N. Scaling vision with sparse mixture of experts. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:8583–8595, 2021. (Cited on page 1.)
- Rives, A., Meier, J., Sercu, T., Goyal, S., Lin, Z., Liu, J., Guo, D., Ott, M., Zitnick, C. L., Ma, J., and Fergus, R. Biological structure and function emerge from scaling unsupervised learning to 250 million protein sequences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118, 2021. URL <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2016239118>. (Cited on page 1.)

- Ruiz, C. R., Puigcerver, J., Mustafa, B., Neumann, M., Jenatton, R., Pinto, A. S., Keyzers, D., and Hounsby, N. Scaling Vision with Sparse Mixture of Experts. In Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=NGPmH3vbAA_. (Cited on page 1.)
- Rumelhart, D. E. and Zipser, D. Feature discovery by competitive learning. *Cognitive science*, 9(1):75–112, 1985. (Cited on page 6.)
- Shazeer, N., Mirhoseini, A., Maziarz, K., Davis, A., Le, Q., Hinton, G., and Dean, J. Outrageously Large Neural Networks: The Sparsely-Gated Mixture-of-Experts Layer. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=B1ckMDqlg>. (Cited on page 5.)
- Socher, R., Perelygin, A., Wu, J., Chuang, J., Manning, C. D., Ng, A., and Potts, C. Recursive Deep Models for Semantic Compositionality Over a Sentiment Treebank. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1631–1642, Seattle, Washington, USA, October 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D13-1170>. (Cited on page 6.)
- Srivastava, R. K., Masci, J., Kazerounian, S., Gomez, F., and Schmidhuber, J. Compete to compute. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013. (Cited on page 6.)
- Stefanis, C. Interneuronal mechanisms in the cortex. In *UCLA forum in medical sciences*, volume 11, pp. 497–526, 1969. (Cited on page 6.)
- van de Geer, S. *Empirical Processes in M-estimation*. Cambridge University Press, 2000. (Cited on page 14.)
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, A., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is All you Need. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *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. (Cited on page 1.)
- Von der Malsburg, C. Self-organization of orientation sensitive cells in the striate cortex. *Kybernetik*, 14(2):85–100, 1973. (Cited on page 6.)
- Wang, Y., Wang, W., Joty, S., and Hoi, S. C. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00859*, 2021. (Cited on page 1.)
- Yuksel, S. E., Wilson, J. N., and Gader, P. D. Twenty Years of Mixture of Experts. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 23(8):1177–1193, 2012. ISSN 2162-2388 VO - 23. doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2012.2200299. (Cited on page 5.)
- Zhou, Y., Lei, T., Liu, H., Du, N., Huang, Y., Zhao, V., Dai, A. M., Chen, z., Le, Q. V., and Laudon, J. Mixture-of-Experts with Expert Choice Routing. In Koyejo, S., Mohamed, S., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., Cho, K., and Oh, A. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 7103–7114. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/2f00ecd787b432c1d36f3de9800728eb-Paper-Conference.pdf. (Cited on page 5.)
- Zhou, Y., Du, N., Huang, Y., Peng, D., Lan, C., Huang, D., Shakeri, S., So, D., Dai, A. M., Lu, Y., et al. Brainformers: Trading simplicity for efficiency. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 42531–42542. PMLR, 2023. (Cited on pages 1 and 2.)
- Zuo, S., Liu, X., Jiao, J., Kim, Y. J., Hassan, H., Zhang, R., Gao, J., and Zhao, T. Taming Sparsely Activated Transformer with Stochastic Experts. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=B72HXs80q4>. (Cited on page 5.)

Supplementary Material for “CompeteSMoE - Effective Training of Sparse Mixture of Experts via Competition”

This document is organized as follow. Appendix A summarizes the notations used in our work. Appendix B presents the detailed proof of our theoretical analysis in Section 4. Appendix C presents all the implementation details, additional results, and visualizations.

A. Summary of Main Notations

We summarize the main notations used in the main paper in Table 6, including those introduced later in the supplementary material.

B. Proof for Results in Section 4

B.1. Proof of Theorem 4.1

In this proof, we first present some fundamental results on the density estimation problem for M-estimators in (van de Geer, 2000), and then provide the main proof in Appendix B.1.1. To streamline our discussion, let us introduce some necessary concepts from the empirical process theory. In particular, let $\mathcal{P}_k(\Theta)$ be the set of all conditional densities with respect to mixing measures in $\mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta) := \{p_G(Y|X) : G \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)\}.$$

Additionally, we also consider two following variants of the set $\mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{P}}_k(\Theta) &:= \{p_{(G+G_*)/2}(Y|X) : G \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)\}, \\ \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta) &:= \{p_{(G+G_*)/2}^{1/2}(Y|X) : G \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we define for each $\delta > 0$ a Hellinger ball centered around the true conditional density $p_{G_*}(Y|X)$ and intersect with the set $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta)$ as below

$$\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, \delta) := \{p^{1/2}(Y|X) \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta) : h(p_G, p_{G_*}) \leq \delta\}.$$

Moreover, the size of this Hellinger ball is quantified by the following term:

$$\mathcal{J}_B(\delta, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, \delta)) := \int_{\delta^2/2^{13}}^{\delta} H_B^{1/2}(t, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, t), \|\cdot\|) dt \vee \delta, \quad (12)$$

where $H_B(t, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, t), \|\cdot\|)$ stands for the bracketing entropy of $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, t)$ under the ℓ_2 -norm, and $t \vee \delta := \max\{t, \delta\}$. Now, we are ready to recall the results in (van de Geer, 2000).

Lemma B.1 (Theorem 7.4, (van de Geer, 2000)). *Take $\Psi(\delta) \geq \mathcal{J}_B(\delta, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, \delta))$ such that $\Psi(\delta)/\delta^2$ is a non-increasing function of δ . Then, for a universal constant c and $\sqrt{n}\delta_n^2 \geq c\Psi(\delta_n)$, we achieve that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(h(p_{\hat{G}_n}, p_{G_*}) > \delta\right) \leq c \exp(-n\delta^2/c^2),$$

for any $\delta \geq \delta_n$.

Proof of Lemma B.1 is available in (van de Geer, 2000). Apart from this result, we also need to introduce the upper bounds of the covering number $N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \|\cdot\|_1)$ and the bracketing entropy $H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), h)$ as follows:

Lemma B.2. *Suppose that Θ is a bounded set, then we have for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ that*

- (a) $\log N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \|\cdot\|_1) \lesssim \log(1/\varepsilon)$;
- (b) $H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), h) \lesssim \log(1/\varepsilon)$.

Proof of Lemma B.2 is deferred to Appendix B.1.2.

Symbol	Description
W_r	Router parameter
W_e	Expert parameter
N	Number of experts used
\mathcal{R}	Router network (function)
g	Expert network (function)
\mathbf{x}, X	Token, input
z	Token representation
s	Affinity score
TopK	TopK function
K	Top K experts with the largest affinity scores
\hat{y}, Y	Final prediction, output
$s_{\mathcal{R}}$	Router affinity score
s_C	Competition affinity score
t	Current t -th iteration
$\lambda(t)$	Schedule (probability for head) at t -th iteration
\mathcal{L}_{NLL}	Negative log-likelihood
$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}}$	Router loss
ϵ_t	Step size
α	Balance factor
n	Sample size
$[n]$	Set of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for any positive integer n
$a_n = \mathcal{O}(b_n)$ or $a_n \lesssim b_n$	If $a_n \leq Cb_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $C > 0$ is some universal constant
u^z	$u^z = u_1^{z_1} u_2^{z_2} \dots u_d^{z_d}$, for any vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $z := (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$
$ u $	$ u := u_1 + u_2 + \dots + u_d$, for any vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$
$z!$	$z! := z_1! z_2! \dots z_d!$, for any vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $z := (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$
k^*	True number of experts
$f(\cdot \mu, \sigma)$	Univariate Gaussian density with mean μ and variance σ
G_*	True mixing measure
δ	Dirac measure
ν	Lebesgue measure
Θ	Parameter space
q	Dimension of expert parameter space
\hat{G}_n	Maximum likelihood estimation of the true mixing measure G_*
$\mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)$	Space of all mixing measures with exactly k_* components
$\ \cdot\ , \ \cdot\ _1$	2-norm and 1-norm value
$ A $	Cardinality of any set A
h	Hellinger distance
V	Total Variation distance
\mathcal{D}	Voronoi loss function
$\mathcal{P}_k(\Theta), \bar{\mathcal{P}}_k(\Theta), \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta)$	Set of all conditional densities with respect to mixing measures in $\mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)$ and two variants
$\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, \delta)$	Hellinger ball centered around the true conditional density $p_{G_*}(Y X)$ and intersect with $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta)$
$\mathcal{J}_B(\delta, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, \delta))$	Size of the Hellinger ball $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, \delta)$
$N(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \ \cdot\ _1)$	Covering number
$H_B(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), h)$	Bracketing entropy

Table 6. Summary of Main Notations.

B.1.1. MAIN PROOF

From equation 12 and part (b) of Lemma B.2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_B(\delta, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, \delta)) &= \int_{\delta^2/2^{13}}^{\delta} H_B^{1/2}(t, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, t), \|\cdot\|) dt \vee \delta \\ &\leq \int_{\delta^2/2^{13}}^{\delta} H_B^{1/2}(t, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, t), h) dt \vee \delta \\ &\lesssim \int_{\delta^2/2^{13}}^{\delta} \log(1/t) dt \vee \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we choose $\Psi(\delta) = \delta\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}$ such that $\Psi(\delta) \geq \mathcal{J}_B(\delta, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_{k_*}^{1/2}(\Theta, \delta))$. Then, with $\delta_n = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log(n)/n})$, it follows from Lemma B.1 that for some universal constants C and c which depend only on Θ , we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(h(p_{\widehat{G}_n}, p_{G_*}) > C\sqrt{\log(n)/n}\right) \lesssim \exp(-c\log(n)).$$

Hence, the proof is completed.

B.1.2. PROOF OF LEMMA B.2

Part (a). Recall that Θ is a compact set, then there exists an ε -cover, which we denote as $\overline{\Theta}_\varepsilon$. Moreover, it can be verified that $|\overline{\Theta}_\varepsilon| \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-(q+1)k_*})$. Next, for each mixing measure $G = \sum_{i=1}^{k_*} \delta_{(W_{e_i}, \sigma_i)} \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)$, we consider another one $\overline{G} = \sum_{i=1}^{k_*} \delta_{(\overline{W}_{e_i}, \overline{\sigma}_i)}$, where $(\overline{W}_{e_i}, \overline{\sigma}_i) \in \overline{\Theta}_\varepsilon$ is the closet point to (W_{e_i}, σ_i) in this set for any $i \in [k_*]$. Then, the conditional density $p_{\overline{G}}(Y|X)$ belongs to the following set

$$\mathcal{Q} := \left\{ p_G(Y|X) \in \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta) : (W_{e_i}, \sigma_i) \in \overline{\Theta}_\varepsilon, \forall i \in [k_*] \right\}.$$

Subsequently, we demonstrate that \mathcal{Q} is an ε -cover of the metric space $(\mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \|\cdot\|_1)$. In other words, we need to show that for any $p_G(Y|X) \in \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta)$, there exists some density $p_{\overline{G}} \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\|p_G - p_{\overline{G}}\|_1 \lesssim \varepsilon$. For this sake, let us consider $P := \binom{[k_*]}{K}$ K -element subsets of $[k_*]$, which are of the form $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}$ for any $\tau \in [P]$. Additionally, we also denote $\{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\} := [k_*] \setminus \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}$, and then partition the covariate space \mathcal{X} in two ways as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_\tau &:= \{x \in \mathcal{X} : |g(x, W_{e_i})| \geq |g(x, W_{e_j})|, \forall i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}, j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}\} \\ \overline{\mathcal{X}}_\tau &:= \{x \in \mathcal{X} : |g(x, \overline{W}_{e_i})| \geq |g(x, \overline{W}_{e_j})|, \forall i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}, j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

As Θ and \mathcal{X} are bounded, we may assume that $\|W_{e_i} - \overline{W}_{e_i}\| \leq C\eta$ for any parameter W_{e_i} , where η is some positive constant and $C > 0$ will be chosen later. Similarly, since \mathcal{X} is a bounded set, then for any $\tau \in [P]$, we can find some constant $c_\tau \geq 0$ that satisfies

$$\min_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{X}_\tau, i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}, \\ j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}}} [|g(x, W_{e_i})| - |g(x, W_{e_j})|] = c_\tau \eta,$$

Now, we point out that $\mathcal{X}_\tau \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{X}}_\tau$ if $c_\tau > 0$, and \mathcal{X}_τ has measure zero otherwise.

Case 1: $c_\tau > 0$.

Recall that $g(x, W_e)$ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to W_e , i.e.

$$|g(x, W_{e_i}) - g(x, \overline{W}_{e_i})| \leq L(x)\|W_{e_i} - \overline{W}_{e_i}\|,$$

where $L(x)$ is some positive constant depending on x . Since \mathcal{X} is bounded, we get that $L(x) \leq A$ for some positive constant, which follows that $|g(x, W_{e_i}) - g(x, \overline{W}_{e_i})| \leq AC\eta$. As a result, for $x \in \mathcal{X}_\tau$, $i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}$ and $j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |g(x, \overline{W}_{e_i})| &\geq |g(x, W_{e_i})| - |g(x, W_{e_i}) - g(x, \overline{W}_{e_i})| \\ &\geq |g(x, W_{e_j})| + c_\tau \eta - AC\eta \\ &\geq |g(x, \overline{W}_{e_j})| - |g(x, \overline{W}_{e_j}) - g(x, W_{e_j})| + c_\tau \eta - AC\eta \\ &\geq |g(x, \overline{W}_{e_j})| - 2AC\eta + c_\tau \eta. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing $C = \frac{c_\tau}{2A}$, we obtain that $|g(x, \overline{W}_{e_i})| \geq |g(x, \overline{W}_{e_j})|$ for any $i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}$ and $j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}$. Therefore, $x \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}_\tau$, and we can conclude that $\mathcal{X}_\tau \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{X}}_\tau$.

Case 2: $c_\tau = 0$.

For $x \in \mathcal{X}_\tau$, we assume that

$$|g(x, W_{e_{\tau_1}})| \geq \dots \geq |g(x, W_{e_{\tau_K}})| \geq |g(x, W_{e_{\tau_{K+1}}})| \geq \dots \geq |g(x, W_{e_{\tau_{k_*}}})|.$$

Now that $c_\tau = 0$, we have

$$|g(x, W_{e_{\tau_K}})| - |g(x, W_{e_{\tau_{K+1}}})| = 0.$$

As a consequence, we obtain that \mathcal{X}_τ is a subset of

$$\mathcal{S} : \{x \in \mathcal{X} : |g(x, W_{e_{\tau_K}})| = |g(x, W_{e_{\tau_{K+1}}})|\}.$$

Since \mathcal{S} has measure zero, \mathcal{X}_τ also inherits this property.

Thus, we already proved that $\mathcal{X}_\tau \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{X}}_\tau$ if $c_\tau > 0$, and \mathcal{X}_τ has measure zero otherwise.

Next, let us consider $X \in \mathcal{X}_\tau$, where $\tau \in [P]$ such that $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\} = \{1, \dots, K\}$, we can check that $H_n := \left[\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(|g(X, \overline{W}_{e_j})|) \right] \cdot [p_G(Y|X) - p_{\overline{G}}(Y|X)]$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} H_n &= \sum_{i=1}^K \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i})|) \left[f(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}), \sigma_i) - f(Y|g(X, \overline{W}_{e_i}), \overline{\sigma}_i) \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^K \left[\exp(|g(X, W_{e_i})|) - \exp(|g(X, \overline{W}_{e_i})|) \right] \cdot \left[f(Y|g(X, \overline{W}_{e_i}), \overline{\sigma}_i) - p_G(Y|X) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As Θ and \mathcal{X} are bounded, we may assume that $\exp(|g(X, W_{e_i})|) \leq B_1$ and $|f(Y|g(X, \overline{W}_{e_i}), \overline{\sigma}_i) - p_G(Y|X)| \leq B_2$ for some positive constants B_1, B_2 . Thus, we obtain that

$$|H_n| \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^K B_1 \cdot \left[\|W_{e_i} - \overline{W}_{e_i}\| + |\sigma_i - \overline{\sigma}_i| \right] + \sum_{i=1}^K B_2 \cdot \|W_{e_i} - \overline{W}_{e_i}\| \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Additionally, since $\left[\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(|g(X, \overline{W}_{e_j})|) \right] \cdot [p_G(Y|X) - p_{\overline{G}}(Y|X)] \geq K$, we also achieve that $|p_G(Y|X) - p_{\overline{G}}(Y|X)| \lesssim \varepsilon$. Analogously, we can show that this inequality holds for $X \in \mathcal{X}_\tau$ for any $\tau \in [P]$. Since $\bigcup_{\tau=1}^P \mathcal{X}_\tau = \mathcal{X}$, we also deduce that the previous bound holds for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Consequently, it follows that $\|p_G(X, Y) - p_{\overline{G}}(Y|X)\| \lesssim \varepsilon$. This result indicates that \mathcal{Q} is an ε -cover of the metric space $(\mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \|\cdot\|_1)$. Therefore, we get

$$N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \|\cdot\|_1) \leq |\overline{\Theta}_\varepsilon| \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-(q+1)k_*}),$$

or equivalently,

$$\log N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \|\cdot\|_1) \leq |\overline{\Theta}_\varepsilon| \lesssim \log(1/\varepsilon).$$

Part (b). Firstly, we will derive an upper bound for the Gaussian experts $f(Y|g(X, W_e), \sigma)$. Since Θ is a compact set, we have $|g(X, W_e)| \leq m_1$ and $m_2 \leq \sigma \leq m_3$ for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $(W_e, \sigma) \in \Theta$. Then, it follows that $f(Y|g(X, W_e), \sigma) \leq B(X, Y)$, where

$$B(Y|X) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}m_2} \exp(-Y^2/(8m_3^2)), & \text{for } |Y| \geq 2m_1 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}m_2}, & \text{for } |Y| < 2m_1, \end{cases}$$

for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Next, let $\eta \leq \varepsilon$ be some positive constant that we choose later, then we denote $\{h_1, \dots, h_N\}$ as an η -cover over $\mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta)$. Based on this cover, we build the following brackets $L_i(Y|X) := \max\{h_i(Y|X) - \eta, 0\}$ and

$U_i(Y|X) := \max\{h_i(Y|X) + \eta, B(Y|X)\}$, for any $i \in [N]$. We can validate that $\mathcal{P}_{k_*}(Y|X) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^N [L_i(Y|X), U_i(Y|X)]$ and $U_i(X, Y) - L_i(X, Y) \leq \min\{2\eta, B(Y|X)\}$. Moreover, let $M := \max\{2m_1, \sqrt{8}m_3\} \log(1/\eta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_i - L_i\|_1 &= \int [U_i(Y|X) - L_i(Y|X)] d(X, Y) \\ &\leq \int_{|Y| < 2m_1} [U_i(Y|X) - L_i(Y|X)] d(X, Y) + \int_{|Y| \geq 2m_1} [U_i(Y|X) - L_i(Y|X)] d(X, Y) \\ &\leq M\eta + \exp(-M^2/(2m_3^2)) \leq c\eta, \end{aligned}$$

where c is some positive universal constant. The above result implies that

$$H_B(c\eta, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \|\cdot\|_1) \leq \log N(\eta, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \|\cdot\|_1) \lesssim \log(1/\eta).$$

Then, we choose $\eta = \varepsilon/c$, we arrive at $H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), \|\cdot\|_1) \lesssim \log(1/\varepsilon)$. Furthermore, as ℓ_1 -norm is upper bounded by the Hellinger distance h , we obtain that

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{P}_{k_*}(\Theta), h) \lesssim \log(1/\varepsilon).$$

Hence, the proof is completed.

B.2. Proof of Theorem 4.2

First of all, we will demonstrate the Hellinger bound given in equation 10. Since the Hellinger distance is lower bounded by the Total Variation distance, i.e. $h \geq V$, it is sufficient to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_X[V(p_G(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))] \gtrsim \mathcal{D}(G, G_*).$$

For this purpose, we split the proof of this bound into two parts which we refer to as local part and global part.

Local part: In this part, we will derive the following inequality:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf_{G \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta): \mathcal{D}(G, G_*) \leq \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_X[V(p_G(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))] / \mathcal{D}(G, G_*) > 0. \quad (13)$$

Assume by contrary that this claim does not hold, then there exists a sequence of mixing measures $G_n := \sum_{i=1}^{k_*} \delta_{(W_{e_i}^n, \sigma_i^n)} \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)$ that satisfies two following limits: $\mathbb{E}_X[V(p_{G_n}(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))] / \mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*) \rightarrow 0$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now, we consider Voronoi cells $\mathcal{A}_j^n := \mathcal{A}_j(G_n)$ defined as in equation 8. As we use asymptotic arguments in this proof, we may assume without loss of generality (WLOG) that the above Voronoi cells do not depend on the sample size n , that is, $\mathcal{A}_j^n = \mathcal{A}_j$. Additionally, since each Voronoi cell has only one element, we can also assume that $\mathcal{A}_j = \{j\}$ for any $j \in [k_*]$. This together with the fact that $\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*) \rightarrow 0$ indicates that $(W_{e_j}^n, \sigma_j^n) \rightarrow (W_{e_j}^*, \sigma_j^*)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $j \in [k_*]$. Subsequently, we assume WLOG that

$$\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*) := \sum_{j=1}^K [\|W_{e_j}^n - W_{e_j}^*\| + |\sigma_j^n - \sigma_j^*|]. \quad (14)$$

Next, we will partition the covariate space \mathcal{X} in order to specify the value of top-K sparse softmax gating function in the conditional density $p_{G_*}(Y|X)$. In particular, we consider $P := \binom{k_*}{K}$ different subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, k_*\}$, each of which contains K elements. Moreover, we denote these subsets as $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_K\}$, and let $\{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\} := [k_*] \setminus \{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_K\}$ for any $\tau \in [P]$. Then, we divide the covariate space \mathcal{X} into smaller regions as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_{*,\tau} &:= \{x \in \mathcal{X} : |g(x, W_{e_i}^*)| \geq |g(x, W_{e_j}^*)|, \forall i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}, j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}\}, \\ \mathcal{X}_{n,\tau} &:= \{x \in \mathcal{X} : |g(x, W_{e_i}^n)| \geq |g(x, W_{e_j}^n)|, \forall i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}, j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we show that $\mathcal{X}_{*,\tau} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{n,\tau}$ for sufficiently large n for any $\tau \in [P]$. Given some $\eta > 0$, since $W_{e_j}^n \rightarrow W_{e_j}^*$ for any $j \in [k_*]$, we have that $\|W_{e_j}^n - W_{e_j}^*\| \leq C\eta$ for sufficiently large n , where $C > 0$ will be chosen later. Moreover, as \mathcal{X} is a bounded set, there exists some positive constant c_τ such that

$$\min_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{X}_\tau, i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}, \\ j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}}} [|g(x, W_{e_i}^*)| - |g(x, W_{e_j}^*)|] = c_\tau \eta.$$

By arguing similarly to Case 2 in part (a) of Appendix B.1.2, we get that if $c_\tau = 0$, then $\mathcal{X}_{*,\tau}$ has measure zero. Therefore, we may assume that $c_\tau > 0$. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}_{*,\tau}$ and follow the same arguments used for Case 1 in part (a) of Appendix B.1.2, we obtain that

$$|g(x, W_{e_i}^n)| \geq |g(x, W_{e_j}^n)| - 2AC\eta + c_\tau\eta,$$

for sufficiently large n , $i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}$ and $j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}$, where A is an upper bound of the Lipschitz constant of expert function $g(x, W_e)$. Then, by setting $C = \frac{c_\tau}{2A}$, we achieve that $|g(x, W_{e_i}^n)| \geq |g(x, W_{e_j}^n)|$ for sufficiently large n , $i \in \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\}$ and $j \in \{\tau_{K+1}, \dots, \tau_{k_*}\}$. This result indicates that $x \in \mathcal{X}_{n,\tau}$, and thus, $\mathcal{X}_{*,\tau} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{n,\tau}$ for sufficiently large n .

For $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X}_{*,\tau} \times \mathbb{R}$ where $\tau \in [P]$ such that $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K\} = \{1, \dots, K\}$, two conditional densities $p_{G_n}(Y|X)$ and $p_{G_*}(Y|X)$ are represented as

$$p_{G_*}(Y|X) = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{\exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(|g(X, W_{e_j}^*)|)} \cdot f(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*),$$

$$p_{G_n}(Y|X) = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{\exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^n)|)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(|g(X, W_{e_j}^n)|)} \cdot f(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^n), \sigma_i^n).$$

Then, it can be verified that the quantity $Z_n := \left[\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(|g(X, W_{e_j}^*)|) \right] \cdot [p_{G_n}(Y|X) - p_{G_*}(Y|X)]$ can be decomposed as

$$Z_n = \sum_{i=1}^K \left[\exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^n)|) f(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^n), \sigma_i^n) - \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|) f(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*) \right]$$

$$- \sum_{i=1}^K \left[\exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^n)|) - \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|) \right] p_{G_n}(Y|X).$$

Our upcoming arguments are separated into three steps as follows:

Step 1: Taylor expansion. In this step, we apply the first-order Taylor expansions to the first and second terms in the decomposition of Z_n as

$$Z_n = \sum_{i=1}^K \left\{ \sum_{u=1}^q (\Delta W_{e_i}^n)^{(u)} \frac{\partial g}{\partial W_e^{(u)}}(X, W_{e_i}^*) \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|) \left[s_{g,i}^*(X) \cdot f(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*) \right. \right.$$

$$+ \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial g}(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*) \right] + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta \sigma_i^n) \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|) \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial g^2}(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*) \left. \right\} + R_1(X, Y)$$

$$- \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{u=1}^q (\Delta W_{e_i}^n)^{(u)} \frac{\partial g}{\partial W_e^{(u)}}(X, W_{e_i}^*) \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|) s_{g,i}^*(X) \cdot p_{G_n}(Y|X) + R_2(X, Y).$$

Here, we denote $\Delta W_{e_i}^n := W_{e_i}^n - W_{e_i}^*$, $\Delta \sigma_i^n := \sigma_i^n - \sigma_i^*$ and $s_{g,i}^*(X) := \text{sign}(g(X, W_{e_i}^*))$. Meanwhile, $R_j(X, Y)$ is a Taylor remainder such that $R_j(X, Y)/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. From the above equation, $Z_n - R_1(X, Y) - R_2(X, Y)$ can be seen as a linear combination of elements of the set $\mathcal{F} := \bigcup_{i=1}^K \bigcup_{\tau=0}^3 \mathcal{F}_{\tau,i}$ where we define

$$\mathcal{F}_{0,i} := \left\{ \frac{\partial g}{\partial W_e^{(u)}}(X, W_{e_i}^*) \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|) s_{g,i}^*(X) \cdot f(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*) : 1 \leq u \leq q \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{1,i} := \left\{ \frac{\partial g}{\partial W_e^{(u)}}(X, W_{e_i}^*) \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|) \frac{\partial f}{\partial g}(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*) : 1 \leq u \leq q \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{2,i} := \left\{ \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|) \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial g^2}(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*) \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{3,i} := \left\{ \frac{\partial g}{\partial W_e^{(u)}}(X, W_{e_i}^*) \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|) s_{g,i}^*(X) \cdot p_{G_n}(Y|X) : 1 \leq u \leq q \right\}.$$

Step 2: Non-vanishing coefficients. Let $E_{0,i}(u)$, $E_{1,i}(u)$, $E_{2,i}$ and $E_{3,i}(u)$ be coefficients associated with those elements in the aforementioned linear combination. Then, we have $E_{0,i}(u) = E_{1,i}(u) = -E_{3,i}(u) = (\Delta W_{e_i}^n)^{(u)}$ and $E_{2,i} = (\Delta \sigma_i^n)/2$ for any $i \in [K]$ and $u \in [q]$. We will show that at least one among $E_{0,i}(u)/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)$, $E_{1,i}(u)/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)$, $E_{2,i}/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)$ and $E_{3,i}(u)/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)$ does not approach zero when n goes to infinity. Assume by contrary that all of them vanish as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\Delta W_{e_i}^n\|_1}{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} &= \sum_{u=1}^q \frac{|E_{0,i}(u)|}{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} \rightarrow 0, \\ \frac{|\Delta \sigma_i^n|}{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} &= \frac{2|E_{2,i}|}{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Putting these limits and the formulation of $\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)$ in equation 14 together, we obtain that

$$1 = \frac{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)}{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} = \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{\|\Delta W_{e_i}^n\|_1}{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} + \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{|\Delta \sigma_i^n|}{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which is a contradiction. As a result, not all the ratios $E_{0,i}(u)/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)$, $E_{1,i}(u)/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)$, $E_{2,i}/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)$ and $E_{3,i}(u)/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)$ vanish when n goes to infinity.

Step 3: Fatou's arguments. By applying the Fatou's lemma, we have

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_X[V(p_{G_n}(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))]}{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} = \frac{1}{2} \int \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|p_{G_n}(Y|X) - p_{G_*}(Y|X)|}{\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} dX dY,$$

which implies that $[p_{G_n}(Y|X) - p_{G_*}(Y|X)]/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for almost surely (X, Y) . As a result, this limit also holds for almost surely $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X}_{*,\tau} \times \mathbb{R}$ where $\tau \in [P]$ such that $\{\tau_1, p_2, \dots, \tau_K\} := \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. Let us denote by m_n the maximum of the absolute values of these four ratios. Since at least one among them does not tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $1/m_n \not\rightarrow \infty$. Additionally, we denote

$$\frac{(\Delta W_{e_i}^n)^{(u)}}{m_n \mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} \rightarrow \alpha_i(u), \quad \frac{(\Delta \sigma_i^n)/2}{m_n \mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} \rightarrow \beta_i,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $i \in [K]$ and $u \in [q]$ with a note that at least one among $\alpha_{u,i}, \beta_i$ is non-zero. Then, it follows from the fact $[p_{G_n}(Y|X) - p_{G_*}(Y|X)]/\mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left[\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(|g(X, W_{e_j}^*)|) \right] \cdot [p_{G_n}(Y|X) - p_{G_*}(Y|X)]}{m_n \mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_n}{m_n \mathcal{D}(G_n, G_*)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K \left[\sum_{\tau=0}^2 T_{\tau,i}(X) s_{g,i}^*(X) \cdot \frac{\partial^\tau f}{\partial g^\tau}(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), \sigma_i^*) + T_{3,i}(X) s_{g,i}^*(X) \cdot p_{G_*}(Y|X) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

for almost surely $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X}_{*,\tau} \times \mathbb{R}$, where we define

$$\begin{aligned} T_{0,i}(X) &= T_{1,i}(X) = -T_{3,i}(X) := \sum_{u=1}^q \alpha_{u,i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial W_e^{(u)}}(X, W_{e_i}^*) \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|), \\ T_{2,i}(X) &:= \beta_i \exp(|g(X, W_{e_i}^*)|). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for almost surely $X \in \mathcal{X}_{*,\tau}$, the set

$$\left\{ s_{g,i}^*(X) \cdot \frac{\partial^\tau f}{\partial g^\tau}(Y|g(X, W_{e_i}^*), s_{g,i}^*(X) \cdot p_{G_*}(Y|X) : 0 \leq \tau \leq 2 \right\}$$

is linearly independent w.r.t Y . Thus, the result in equation 15 implies that $T_{\tau,i}(X) = 0$ for almost surely $X \in \mathcal{X}_{*,\tau}$ for $0 \leq \tau \leq 3$ and $i \in [K]$. In other words, we obtain for any $i \in [K]$ that $\beta_i = 0$ and

$$\sum_{u=1}^q \alpha_{u,i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial W_e^{(u)}}(X, W_{e_i}^*) = 0,$$

for almost surely $X \in \mathcal{X}_{*,\tau}$. Due to the assumption on the expert function g , the above equation leads to $\alpha_{u,i} = 0$ for any $i \in [K]$ and $u \in [q]$. This contradicts the fact that not all the terms $\alpha_{u,i}, \beta_i$ are equal to zero. Hence, we reach the conclusion in equation 13.

Consequently, there exists some positive constant $\varepsilon' > 0$ that satisfies

$$\inf_{G \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta): \mathcal{D}(G, G_*) \leq \varepsilon'} \mathbb{E}_X[V(p_G(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))]/\mathcal{D}(G, G_*) > 0$$

Global part. Given the above result, it is sufficient to point out that

$$\inf_{G \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta): \mathcal{D}(G, G_*) > \varepsilon'} \mathbb{E}_X[V(p_G(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))]/\mathcal{D}(G, G_*) > 0. \quad (16)$$

Assume that this claim does not hold true, then we can find a sequence $\tilde{G}_n \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)$ such that $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{G}_n, G_*) > \varepsilon'$ and $\mathbb{E}_X[V(p_{\tilde{G}_n}(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since Θ is a compact set, we are able to replace \tilde{G}_n with its subsequence which converges to some mixing measure $\tilde{G} \in \mathcal{E}_{k_*}(\Theta)$. Recall that $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{G}_n, G_*) > \varepsilon'$, then we also get that $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{G}, G_*) > \varepsilon'$.

On the other hand, by means of the Fatou's lemma, we have

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_X[2V(p_{\tilde{G}_n}(\cdot|X), p_{G_*}(\cdot|X))] \geq \int \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |p_{\tilde{G}_n}(Y|X) - p_{G_*}(Y|X)| dX dY,$$

which follows that $p_{\tilde{G}}(Y|X) - p_{G_*}(Y|X) = 0$ for almost surely (X, Y) . Thus, we achieve that $\tilde{G} \equiv G_*$, or equivalently $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{G}, G_*) = 0$. This contradicts to the fact that $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{G}, G_*) > \varepsilon' > 0$.

Hence, we reach the conclusion in equation 16, and the proof is completed.

C. Additional implementation details

This section provides the details parameters of our experiments in Section 6.

C.1. General Setting

The experiments are developed based on the publicly available Sandwich Transformers (Press et al., 2020) implementation¹. However, the pre-training models were conducted on a single A100 GPU. Please note that parallel training on multiple GPUs might yield different results.

C.2. Pre-training Experiments

Tab. 7 provides the detail configurations for pre-training our Switch Transformer (Fedus et al., 2022) and GLaM (Du et al., 2022) with two versions (*small & medium*) on Enwik8, Text8 and WikiText-103.

Dataset	Input length	Batch size	Optimizer	Lr	# Iterations (<i>Small / Medium</i>)
Enwik8	512	48	Adam	7.0e-4	60k / 80k
Text	512	48	Adam	7.0e-4	60k / 80k
WikiText-103	512	48	Adam	7.0e-4	60k / 80k

Table 7. Detail configurations for pre-training experiments on Enwik8, Text8 and WikiText-103 datasets.

¹https://github.com/ofirpress/sandwich_transformer

C.3. Finetuning Experiments

For finetuning experiments, we use the same model architecture as in pre-training. Tab. 8 shows the detail configurations used for finetuning experiments on SST-2, SST-5, IMDB, and BANKING77 datasets.

Dataset	Input length	Batch size	Optimizer	Lr	# Epochs
SST-2	512	16	Adam	1e-4	5
SST-5	512	16	Adam	1e-4	5
IMDB	512	4	Adam	1e-4	5
BANKING77	512	16	Adam	1e-4	50

Table 8. Detail configurations for finetuning experiments on four different datasets.

C.4. Significant Results

We investigate the significant of our pre-training experiments in Section 6.2. We consider the tiny transformer configuration and repeat the training process five times using SMoE and CompeteSMoE. Table 9 reports the result of each run, the average and standard deviation values. We can see that CompeteSMoE achieves better results than SMoE in all runs, resulting better average and also smaller standard deviations. The two-sided t-test returns the p -value at 0.016, suggesting the improvements of CompeteSMoE is significant.

Furthermore, we also note that the training overhead of CompeteSMoE is also quite marginal, only at around 10% longer training time. Overall, the experimental results show that CompeteSMoE provides better pre-training and transfer learning capabilities with low training overheads.

Enwik8 (BPC)	CompeteSMoE	SMoE
1st	1.303	1.333
2nd	1.303	1.322
3rd	1.307	1.315
4th	1.315	1.320
5th	1.304	1.310
Average	1.306	1.320
	± 0.005	± 0.009
Training epoch time (h)	0.13	0.11

Table 9. BPC of multiple runs on the enwik8 test set using the tiny configuration.


C.5. Routing Visualization

This experiment investigate the quality of routers learned from various training algorithm. To this end, we consider reporting the entropy from the router’s softmax output. Routers with high entropy produce close to uniform policies, indicating a less-confident assignment. In contrast, low entropy routers are more confident in assigning experts to tokens. Although entropy alone cannot determine the router quality, when combined with the evaluation outcome, one can gauge the learned routers quality. Particularly, if a router has low entropy and achieve better evaluation results, one can expect that the learned routing policy has high quality.


Table 10 reports the entropy of each router in a small model on the enwik8 test set. We can see that CompeteSMoE achieved lower entropy in four out of six routers, and lower average entropy. Together with the better performance, we can conclude that the routers learned by CompeteSMoE have higher quality (better token-expert assignment) than other baselines.

We further visualize the softmax output of the routers from one randomly chosen sample in Figure 4. In most cases, we can observe the distributional outputs are much sharper in CompeteSMoE (lower entropy) than other baselines.

CompeteSMoE - Effective Training of Sparse Mixture of Experts via Competition



(a) CompeteSMoE



(b) SMoE

Figure 4. Visualization of the distribution for the output of routers.

Method	Router 1	Router 2	Router 3	Router 4	Router 5	Router 6	Average
CompeteSMoE	0.3441 ± 0.29	0.4015 ± 0.37	0.5946 ± 0.39	0.6810 ± 0.38	0.6081 ± 0.37	1.3636 ± 0.35	0.6655 ± 0.36
SMoE	0.1158 ± 0.23	0.6411 ± 0.48	0.4247 ± 0.35	0.8331 ± 0.48	0.9701 ± 0.48	1.3681 ± 0.42	0.7255 ± 0.41
SMoE-Fixed	2.2473 ± 0.34	2.5103 ± 0.13	2.2579 ± 0.13	2.3565 ± 0.26	2.3181 ± 0.23	2.3947 ± 0.22	2.3942 ± 0.22
XMoE	0.7618 ± 0.47	0.6792 ± 0.42	1.1808 ± 0.38	0.9822 ± 0.45	0.8439 ± 0.42	1.4097 ± 0.40	0.9763 ± 0.43
StableMoE	0.7657 ± 0.71	1.2659 ± 0.58	1.1378 ± 0.56	1.2000 ± 0.51	1.4161 ± 0.48	1.8161 ± 0.41	1.2669 ± 0.54

Table 10. Average entropy of the router distribution on the `enwik8` dataset. Lower is better.





Figure 4. Visualization of the distribution for the output of routers.




Figure 4. Visualization of the distribution for the output of routers.