

---

# Transformer In-Context Learning for Categorical Data

---

Aaron T. Wang<sup>1</sup>    Ricardo Henao<sup>1,2</sup>    Lawrence Carin<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup> ECE, Duke University, USA  
<sup>2</sup> BESE, KAUST, KSA  
{aaron.wang,ricardo.henao,lcarin}@duke.edu

## Abstract

Recent research has sought to understand Transformers through the lens of in-context learning with functional data. We extend that line of work with the goal of moving closer to language models, considering categorical outcomes, nonlinear underlying models, and nonlinear attention. The contextual data are of the form  $\mathcal{C} = (x_1, c_1, \dots, x_N, c_N)$  where each  $c_i \in \{0, \dots, C - 1\}$  is drawn from a categorical distribution that depends on covariates  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Contextual outcomes in the  $m$ th set of contextual data,  $\mathcal{C}_m$ , are modeled in terms of *latent* function  $f_m(x) \in \mathcal{F}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a functional class with  $(C - 1)$ -dimensional vector output. The probability of observing class  $c \in \{0, \dots, C - 1\}$  is modeled in terms of the output components of  $f_m(x)$  via the softmax. The Transformer parameters may be trained with  $M$  contextual examples,  $\{\mathcal{C}_m\}_{m=1,M}$ , and the trained model is then applied to new contextual data  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$  for *new*  $f_{M+1}(x) \in \mathcal{F}$ . The goal is for the Transformer to constitute the probability of each category  $c \in \{0, \dots, C - 1\}$  for a new query  $x_{N_{M+1}+1}$ . We assume each component of  $f_m(x)$  resides in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS), specifying  $\mathcal{F}$ . Analysis and an extensive set of experiments suggest that on its forward pass the Transformer (with attention defined by the RKHS kernel) implements a form of gradient descent of the underlying function, connected to the latent vector function associated with the softmax. We present what is believed to be the first real-world demonstration of this few-shot-learning methodology, using the ImageNet dataset.

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated significant capabilities as few-shot learners [6]. To help understand this capability, recent work applied to *functional data* has shed light on the few-shot learning capabilities of Transformers, the technology that underpins most LLMs [2, 24, 8, 1, 3, 17, 13, 19, 25]. Such analysis of the Transformer is challenging. Consequently, much of that prior work has focused on real-valued observations, rather than categorical (of relevance for language modeling), and simplifications have often been made to the Transformer structure (for example, linear attention [2, 24, 1, 19]).

Prior to the introduction of the Transformer, the goal of teaching a model to learn based on a few functional-data examples was considered for many years, under several names: *learning to learn*, *meta learning*, and *in-context learning*, among others [20, 5, 4, 16, 10]. Often a model  $f_\theta(x)$  with parameters  $\theta$  is assumed for input  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Contextual data  $\mathcal{C}_m = (x_{m1}, f_{\theta_m}(x_{m1}), \dots, x_{mN_m}, f_{\theta_m}(x_{mN_m}))$  are considered, for  $M$  different parameter settings,  $\{\theta_m\}_{m=1,M}$ ; each  $x_{mi}$  is assumed drawn iid from a shared (and generally unknown) distribution  $p(X)$ . Given  $\{\mathcal{C}_m\}_{m=1,M}$ , the goal is to learn parameters  $\theta_0$  that will serve as a good initialization when parameter refinement is done for any of the contexts  $\{\mathcal{C}_m\}_{m=1,M}$ . Given *new* context  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$ , where the outcomes are assumed generated by a function in the same class  $f_{\theta_{M+1}}(x)$ , ideally  $\theta_0$  should serve as a good initialization from which  $\theta_{M+1}$  are determined via model refinement using

$\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$ . Model agnostic meta-learning (MAML) is a seminal approach to this setup [10]. A key attribute of MAML, and most of its subsequent related approaches to meta learning [15], is that adaptation to  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$  is implemented by a form of model-parameter refinement, from  $\theta_0 \rightarrow \theta_{M+1}$ .

In another line of research [20, 18], one seeks to learn a “meta model,” distinct from  $f_\theta(x)$ , and the meta model should (possibly implicitly) “learn to learn” new  $f_{\theta_{M+1}}(x)$  based on a small amount of contextual data, without refining the meta-model parameters. It has recently been recognized that the Transformer is a meta model in this class [24, 8, 1, 19, 25], where here the Transformer may be represented as  $T_\gamma(z)$ , with parameters  $\gamma$  and  $z$  representing a set of vectors connected to the contextual data (more details on this below). The Transformer implicitly learns to evaluate  $f_\theta(x)$  for specific (query) covariates  $x$ , and adapt to a new context, but the function  $f_\theta(x)$  (and its parameters  $\theta$ ) are not considered explicitly.

The Transformer parameters  $\gamma$  are learned based on a set of contextual examples  $\{\mathcal{C}_m\}_{m=1,M}$ , each with a different  $f_{\theta_m} \in \mathcal{F}$  [24, 8, 1, 25]. Ideally, the Transformer learns to make an estimate of  $f_{\theta_m}(x)$  for the covariates in  $\mathcal{C}_m$ , and it predicts  $f_{\theta_m}(x_{N+1})$  for a query  $x_{N+1}$ . After training  $T_\gamma(z)$  with  $\{\mathcal{C}_m\}_{m=1,M}$ , and learning an estimate of its parameters  $\hat{\gamma}$ , given new context  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$  in the same functional class, but with parameters  $\theta_{M+1}$  not seen before, the Transformer is to predict  $f_{\theta_{M+1}}(x_{N_{M+1}+1})$  for query  $x_{N_{M+1}+1}$ . The Transformer *effectively* performs model-parameter refinement  $\theta_0 \rightarrow \theta_{M+1}$  in its forward pass, but without explicitly computing  $\theta_{M+1}$ , and without refining the Transformer parameters  $\gamma$ .

Transformer-based in-context learning for functional data has been considered from two primary directions. One thread has examined *what kind* of functional classes  $\mathcal{F}$  can be handled by Transformer-based in-context learning [17]. In addition to making deterministic predictions of functional outcomes [17], Bayesian predictions have also been considered [14]. Moving beyond *what* types of functional data a Transformer can analyze in-context, a second thread has sought to understand *how* the Transformer performs functional few-shot learning [24, 8, 1]. Important insights have been made by simplifying the form of the underlying model  $f_\theta(x)$  and also simplifying the Transformer  $T_\gamma(z)$ . Specifically, many recent studies have assumed the functional class  $\mathcal{F}$  consists of linear models [25, 24, 1], and the Transformer  $T_\gamma(z)$  has been assumed to have linear attention (rather than the conventional softmax attention) [2, 24, 1, 19].

It has been shown that if  $\mathcal{F}$  is composed of linear functions and  $T_\gamma(z)$  uses linear attention, then within its forward pass, each layer of the Transformer effectively implements a step of gradient descent (GD) refinement of  $\theta$  from an initialization  $\theta_0$  [2, 24, 1]. Early work showed that such a linear-attention Transformer design was theoretically *possible*, and empirically demonstrated it [24]; that work was followed by research showing that such a setup, and generalizations, are theoretically *optimal* for linear-class  $\mathcal{F}$  [1].

A Transformer with nonlinear attention is expected to be important when  $\mathcal{F}$  consists of nonlinear models. A natural generalization of inner-product-based (linear) attention is to consider inner products in a feature space  $\phi(x)$ , yielding Mercer-kernel-based attention. Transformers  $T_\gamma(z)$  with Mercer kernel attention are applicable to function classes  $\mathcal{F}$  from the associated reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS). This perspective has been developed recently, for real-valued observations [8].

With the goal of moving closer to language models, we here extend prior work to consider functional data for which each outcome is one of  $C$  possible categories. Rather than observing samples of  $f_\theta(x)$  as in prior work [2, 24, 1], here  $f_\theta(x)$  is assumed to be a *latent* function, with  $C - 1$  real-valued outputs that feed into a softmax function to yield the probability of each category for input covariates  $x$ . We extend the aforementioned recent work on kernel-based attention [8] to the latent  $f_\theta(x)$ , with each component of  $f_\theta(x)$  modeled as being in an RKHS connected to the associated kernel attention. Through an extensive set of experiments with categorical observations, we demonstrate that a Transformer with nonlinear attention appears to be performing gradient descent in its forward pass, for the underlying  $f_\theta(x)$ . While many nonlinear kernel types are considered and generally perform well, we discuss important advantages of the softmax attention that underlies the original Transformer construction. Examples of this few-shot-learning framework are presented with the ImageNet dataset [9], believed to be the first real-world demonstration of the concepts developed here and in related literature [8, 24, 1].

## 2 Attention-Based Meta Learning

In Transformer-based in-context learning [2, 24, 1, 8], two models are considered: (i)  $f_\theta(x) \in \mathcal{F}$ , assumed responsible for generating the outcomes in the contextual data  $\mathcal{C} = (x_1, y_1, \dots, x_N, y_N)$ ; and (ii)  $T_\gamma(z)$ , a Transformer with parameters  $\gamma$  and with inputs defined by a sequence of vectors  $z$ , encoding contextual data in  $\mathcal{C}$  as well as the query  $x_{N+1}$ . We assume initially that  $y_i = f_\theta(x_i)$ , where  $f_\theta(x_i)$  is a *deterministic* function of  $x_i$ , and in Section 3, this is extended to categorical outcomes  $y_i$  which are *probabilistically* related to  $f_\theta(x_i)$ . We assume that  $f_\theta(x)$  may be nonlinear, and that it can be modeled as a member of an RKHS with specified kernel. Such an RKHS framing of the Transformer was first considered in [8].

We assume  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{C-1}$ , where  $C \geq 2$  is an integer, and  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The assumption that  $y_i$  is a  $(C-1)$ -dimensional real vector is meant as preparation for Section 3, where *categorical* observations  $y_i \in \{0, \dots, C-1\}$  are considered. Here the  $(C-1)$ -dimensional real output vector is observed, where in Section 3 it will be latent, and will stipulate the probability of observed categorical data.

It has been shown [24, 1] that when  $\mathcal{F}$  is composed of linear models  $f_\theta(x) = Wx$ , with matrix model parameters  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{(C-1) \times d}$  playing the role of  $\theta$ , an appropriately designed Transformer  $T_\gamma(z)$  with *linear* attention can perform in-context learning on its forward pass. Each layer of the forward pass of the Transformer, with appropriate parameters  $\gamma$ , *effectively* implements one step of gradient descent (GD) for  $\theta$ . The function  $f_{\theta_k}(x) = W_k x$  is updated implicitly to  $f_{\theta_{k+1}}(x) = W_{k+1} x$  via an attention layer, with this functional update performed for the covariates  $\{x_i\}_{i=1, N}$  connected to  $\mathcal{C}$ , and for the new query  $x_{N+1}$ . Following [8], we now extend this for nonlinear  $f_\theta(x)$ .

Consider linear models in a *feature space* specified by a given  $\phi(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ . Specifically, assume the function responsible for the data may be expressed as  $f_\theta(x) = W\phi(x) + b$ , where  $\theta = (W, b)$ , now with  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{(C-1) \times d'}$ , and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^{C-1}$ . Using loss  $\mathcal{L}_C(W, b) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|y_i - W\phi(x_i) - b\|^2$  one can readily show (see the Appendix) that gradient descent (GD) dictates the following update rule at iteration  $k$ :

$$f_{\theta_k}(x_j) = f_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_j) + \underbrace{\frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [y_i - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_i)] \kappa(x_i, x_j)}_{\Delta f_{\theta_k}(x_j) \text{ from head 1}} + \underbrace{\frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [y_i - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_i)]}_{\Delta f_{\theta_k}(x_j) \text{ from head 2}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = \phi(x_i)^T \phi(x_j)$  is a Mercer kernel,  $f_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_j) = \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_j)$ ,  $\Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_j)$  is the sum of the two terms identified in (1) connected to the two attention heads, and  $\alpha > 0$  is the learning rate. We identify contributions from two attention heads in (1), as below we show that this GD update can be implemented with an attention network that employs two attention heads. From (1), the GD update of the model parameters imposes that each component of  $f_\theta(x)$  resides in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) associated with kernel  $\kappa(x_i, x_j)$ .

Note that in (1) we represent the GD-based update rule in terms of a *possible* Transformer design with two attention heads, and attention defined by the kernel  $\kappa(x_i, x_j)$  (more on this below). In the Appendix we detail Transformer parameters that achieve this update, analogous to [24], but now applied to RKHS attention [8]. While this suggests that it is *possible* for a Transformer to implement GD on its forward pass, there may be other designs of the Transformer parameters that work well or even better for in-context learning when all Transformer parameters are trained based on data. As we demonstrate in extensive experiments, it appears that the Transformer *does* learn to do GD in its forward pass, consistent with (1).

We assume  $f_{\theta_0}(x) = 0_{C-1}$ , where  $0_{C-1}$  represents a  $(C-1)$ -dimensional all-zeros vector; this corresponds to initializing the model parameters as  $W_0 = 0_{(C-1) \times d'}$  and  $b_0 = 0_{C-1}$ , also implying that, within (1),  $\Delta f_{\theta_0}(x) = 0_{C-1}$ . In prior work [24], with linear functions ( $\phi(x) = x$ ), the initial weight matrix  $W_0$  was arbitrary, but the Transformer learning process effectively imposed that  $W_0$  is an all-zeros matrix. Hence, the setting  $f_{\theta_0}(x) = 0_{C-1}$  is consistent with prior work for linear models and linear attention, and extended here to kernel-based attention and inclusion of the bias term.

To underscore the connection to a Transformer, consider (1) represented by the sequence of operations at layer  $k$ :

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} x_j \\ y_j - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_j) \end{pmatrix}}_{\in \mathbb{R}^{d+C-1}, j\text{th input to layer } k} \implies \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0_{d \times 1} \\ -\Delta f_{\theta_k}(x_j) \end{pmatrix}}_{j\text{th output from layer } k} \implies \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} x_j \\ y_j - \sum_{k'=0}^k \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_j) \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{skip connection: add input and output}}. \quad (2)$$

Transformer matrices  $W_Q$ ,  $W_K$  and  $W_V$  can be designed to implement (2), as detailed in the Appendix.

At the left in (2) is shown the input vector at each position  $j$  at layer  $k$ . Masked attention is employed, in that input elements  $j = 1, \dots, N$  are used for keys and values, while all inputs at positions  $j = 1, \dots, N + 1$  are used as queries. The output of the attention layer (center of (2)) manifests the negative of an incremental update to the predicted outcome, with this corresponding to one step of GD. On the right of (2), the input to the attention layer is added to the input, manifesting a skip connection. The last  $C - 1$  components of the result of this correspond to  $y_j - \sum_{k'=0}^k \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_j)$ , where  $\sum_{k'=0}^k \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_j)$  is the update the approximation of  $y_j$  from the model.

At the first ( $k = 1$ ) layer of a Transformer implementation of (2), the input vectors at positions  $i = 1, \dots, N$  are  $(x_i, y_i)^T$ , while at position  $N + 1$  the query is encoded as  $(x_{N+1}, 0_{C-1})^T$ , corresponding to initially setting  $y_{N+1}$  (which is to be predicted) as  $0_{C-1}$ . At the last attention layer (the  $L$ th layer, for an  $L$ -layer model), the output vector associated with position  $N + 1$  is  $(0, -\sum_{k'=0}^L \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_{N+1}))$ ; an inner product of this vector is performed with  $(0_d, -1)^T$ , yielding the predicted  $f_{\theta_L}(x_{N+1})$ . Above we have considered a single covariate vector  $x_{N+1}$  for which a prediction is made. As discussed when presenting results, it is possible to consider  $K$  covariates  $x_{N+1}, \dots, x_{N+K}$  for which predictions are made *at once*, and now Transformer queries are made with inputs  $i = 1, \dots, N + K$ , with the keys and values unchanged. At the output layer, the same linear prediction is performed using the outputs at positions  $i = N + 1, \dots, N + K$ .

Note that at each layer of the Transformer, two attention heads are employed, as indicated in (1). One of the attention heads implements kernel-based attention  $\kappa(x_i, x_j)$  between the  $j$ th query and  $i$ th key, and the other attention head implements constant (equal to one) attention for each key-query pair. The constant attention is connected to estimating the bias of  $f_{\theta}(x)$ . The need for an attention head that yields constant attention has been discussed previously (see the Appendix of [26]), but constant attention is not possible with linear attention (*i.e.*, when  $\phi(x) = x$ ). Introduction of a nonlinear kernel within the Transformer attention mechanism consequently has two advantages: (*i*) it allows modeling of nonlinear functions  $f_{\theta}(x)$  within the RKHS family; and (*ii*) for proper setting of  $W_K$  and  $W_Q$  and choice of kernel, it allows constant attention and bias term estimation (see the Appendix for details).

### 3 Categorical Outcomes

We now consider contextual data  $\mathcal{C} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1, N}$  and a query  $x_{N+1}$  with each  $y_i \in \{0, \dots, C - 1\}$ , where  $C \geq 2$  is the number of categories. Functional class  $\mathcal{F}$  has a  $(C - 1)$ -dimensional real vector output, and will take the same form as considered in Section 2. However, here  $f_{\theta}(x) \in \mathcal{F}$  is latent, and the  $C - 1$  vector output specifies the probabilities of categories  $\{0, \dots, C - 1\}$  at a given covariate  $x_i$ . Let  $f_{c, \theta}(x)$  represent output component  $c \in \{1, \dots, C - 1\}$  of  $f_{\theta}(x)$ , and as a reference, we assume an additional component set as  $f_0(x) = 0$  for all  $x$  (in total there are  $C$  components,  $f_0(x)$  and  $f_{c, \theta}(x)$  for  $c = 1, \dots, C - 1$ , and  $f_{\theta}(x)$  accounts for the latter).

The probability that random variable  $Y$  equals  $y_i$  when input random variable  $X$  equals  $x_i$  is modeled with the softmax function  $p_{\theta}(Y = y_i | X = x_i) = \exp[f_{y_i, \theta}(x_i)] / \sum_{c=0}^{C-1} \exp[f_{c, \theta}(x_i)] \equiv h_{y_i, \theta}(x_i)$ . Following the framework from the previous section, we specify  $f_{c, \theta}(x) = w_c^T \phi(x) + b_c$ , and  $\theta = \{w_c, b_c\}_{c=1, C-1}$ . Using the cross-entropy loss with  $\mathcal{C}$ , a gradient-descent update of the model parameters yields the following sequential underlying-function update:

$$f_{\theta_k}(x_j) = f_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_j) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\tilde{y}_i - h_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_i)] \kappa(x_i, x_j) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\tilde{y}_i - h_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_i)], \quad (3)$$

where  $h_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_i) = (h_{1, \theta_{k-1}}(x_i), \dots, h_{C-1, \theta_{k-1}}(x_i))^T$ , and  $\tilde{y}_{c, i}$  represents component  $c$  of  $\tilde{y}_i$ , the latter a  $(C - 1)$ -dimensional vector with all components equal to zero, except *at most* a single 1 at component  $y_i$  if  $y_i \in \{1, \dots, C - 1\}$ ;  $\tilde{y}_i$  corresponds to one-hot encoding, except that if  $y_i = 0$  the encoding makes  $\tilde{y}_i$  an all-zeros vector.

Note the similarity of (3) to (1), although (3) is complicated by a mix of  $h_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_i)$  and  $f_{\theta_k}(x_j)$ , where (1) only involves the latter functional class. To address this, note that the softmax  $h_{\theta_k}(x_j)$  is a function of  $f_{\theta_k}(x_j) = f_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_j) + \Delta f_{\theta_k}(x_j)$ , and we approximate it with a first-order Taylor expansion about  $f_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)$ . For component  $c$  of the softmax, this yields  $h_{c,\theta_k}(x_j) \approx h_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j) + \frac{\partial h_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}{\partial f_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)} \Delta f_{c,\theta_k}(x_j)$ , where  $\frac{\partial h_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}{\partial f_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)} = p_{\theta_{k-1}}(Y = c|X = x_j)p_{\theta_{k-1}}(Y \neq c|X = x_j)$ . Using this first-order approximation, the definition of  $\Delta f_{\theta_k}(x_j)$  and (3), we have

$$h_{c,\theta_k}(x_j) = h_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j) + \underbrace{\frac{\alpha_k^{(c)}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\tilde{y}_{c,i} - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta h_{c,\theta_{k'}}(x_i)] \kappa(x_i, x_j)}_{\Delta h_{c,\theta_k} \text{ from head 1}} + \underbrace{\frac{\alpha_k^{(c)}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\tilde{y}_{c,i} - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta h_{c,\theta_{k'}}(x_i)]}_{\Delta h_{c,\theta_k} \text{ from head 2}}, \quad (4)$$

where we have used  $\alpha_k^{(c)} \approx \alpha \frac{\partial h_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}{\partial f_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}$ . In (4) we write equality, as this is the update rule used to implement the Transformer, but we underscore that approximations have been made to arrive at this expression: (i) linearization of the softmax about  $f_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)$ , and (ii)  $\frac{\partial h_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}{\partial f_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}$  has been approximated as a constant for all  $x_j$ . We evaluate the impact of these approximations when presenting results in Section 4.

Consistent with initializing the parameters as  $w_{c,0} = 0_{d'}$  and  $b_{c,0} = 0$ , for all  $c \in \{1, \dots, C-1\}$ , in (3), we have  $f_{c,\theta_0}(x_j) = 0$  and  $\Delta f_{c,\theta_k}(x_j) = 0$ . This is as in Section 2, where  $f_{c,\theta_0}(x_j) = 0$  corresponded to the  $c$ th component of the real-valued vector output. However, in (4) we are updating the components of the softmax function, and setting  $f_{c,\theta_0}(x_j) = 0$  which corresponds to  $h_{c,\theta_0}(x_j) = \Delta h_{c,\theta_0}(x_i) = 1/C$ .

As alluded to above, the dependence of  $\frac{\partial h_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}{\partial f_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}$  on component  $c$  and covariates  $x_j$  adds a complexity not present in the real-valued observations  $y_i$  of Section 2. For simplicity, we treat  $\frac{\partial h_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}{\partial f_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j)}$  as *approximately* constant for each  $x_j$ , with that constant a function of gradient iteration  $k$  (which translates to layer dependence in the Transformer). Combining that constant with the learning rate, we realize a learning rate  $\alpha_k^{(c)}$  that depends on the iteration  $k$  and component  $c$ . The component-dependent learning rate is a result of the aforementioned linearization, and it is consistent with generalizations of gradient descent, like Adam [12], that employ learning rates that are dependent on the component and change as the iterations of learning progress.

Given the similarity of (4) to (1), the former admits a Transformer-based update rule (through attention layers) analogous to (2). However, the following changes are implemented for categorical data: (i) for real-valued outcomes in (2), the input and output vectors employ the observed (in the contextual data) outcomes  $y_j$ , whereas for categorical data these are replaced by  $(C-1)$ -dimensional one-hot-like vectors  $\tilde{y}_j$ , that encode the categorical data; (ii) for categorical data we do not update the latent function  $f_{\theta}(x_j)$  whose components reside in an RKHS, we update the softmax function which is computed in terms of  $f_{\theta}(x_j)$ , and consequently while  $\Delta f_{\theta_0}(x_j) = 0_{C-1}$ , we have within the Transformer  $\Delta h_{\theta_0}(x_j) = (1/C)1_{C-1}$ , where  $1_{C-1}$  is a  $(C-1)$ -dimensional vector of all ones; and (iii) for the categorical data we have a learning rate  $\alpha_k^{(c)}$  that depends in general on the attention layer  $k$  and on the component of the softmax,  $c$ . With these changes, the remaining characteristics of the Transformer construction are largely unchanged from real-valued observations, as detailed in the Appendix.

As discussed in Section 2 for real-valued outcomes, the approximate update rule in (4) suggests that the Transformer *could* perform nonlinear kernel-based GD of the underlying softmax function in its forward pass, with Transformer parameters consistent with (4), as discussed in the Appendix. A similar question holds for the categorical data which is the focus of this section. As demonstrated in Section 4, it appears, through extensive experiments, that the Transformer does indeed learn to implement GD of the underlying nonlinear function in its forward pass, consistent with (4).

We note categorical data were considered in [26], and a similar attention-based construction is developed for categorical data in the Appendix of [26] (see Eq. 2 there). However, in [26] the goal was to use the Transformer to update the model weights for categorical models, in a few-shot manner (effectively updating the weights of categorical model  $f_{\theta}(x)$ ). Here we are using a similar

construction to directly predict  $p(Y = c|X = x_{N+1})$  via a Transformer, with no model-parameter fine-tuning or update.

In the Appendix we specify a construction for Transformer parameters  $\gamma$  that can implement the (approximate) GD updates reflected by (4). We compare the performance of our specified Transformer to a setup in which the parameters of  $T_\gamma(z)$  are *learned* based on a set of categorical contextual data  $\mathcal{C}_{m=1,M}$ . While (4) is a result of gradient descent on a cross-entropy loss applied with the softmax function, (4) directly updates an approximation for  $p_\theta(Y = c|X = x_{N+1})$  for  $c = 1, \dots, C - 1$ ; this is the *output* of softmax, and hence there is no additional softmax function applied to the output of the Transformer.

When *learning* all the Transformer  $T_\gamma(z)$  parameters  $\gamma$ , the model output is fit to the vector  $\tilde{y}_{N+1}$  (the one-hot-like encoding of the category for sample  $N + 1$ ). When training for  $\gamma$ , based on  $\{\mathcal{C}_m\}_{m=1,M}$ , the loss function is the  $\ell_2$  distance between the true  $\tilde{y}_{N+1}$  and the  $(C - 1)$ -dimensional vector  $h_{\theta_L}(x_{N+1})$  output at position  $N + 1$  from the Transformer.

We emphasize that this learned Transformer is *not* the same as the setup in Section 2 from a key perspective: Here, at the input layer (layer  $k = 1$ ), the data at position  $j$  are encoded as  $(x_j, \tilde{y}_j - (1/C)\mathbf{1}_{C-1})^T$ , emphasizing that because of the categorical data  $h_{\theta_0}(x_j) = \Delta h_{\theta_0}(x_j) = (1/C)\mathbf{1}_{C-1}$ . This underscores that, like in Section 2,  $f_{\theta_0}(x_j) = \Delta f_{\theta_0}(x_j) = \mathbf{0}_{C-1}$ , but that this is then fed into the softmax to yield  $\Delta h_{\theta_0}(x_j)$ . In Section 2 the Transformer updates the model for  $f_{\theta_k}(x_j)$ , where for categorical data the Transformer updates the latent softmax function  $h_{\theta_k}(x_j)$ .




Figure 1: For synthetic data generation, the covariate space is divided into 4 quadrants, and the probabilities of the  $C = 3$  categories within a given quadrant are set at 0.8 for one category and 0.1 for the other two. As an example, we show the probability of category 0, in which it has probability 0.8 in the top-left quadrant, and 0.1 in the other three quadrants. Different choices are made for the dominant-probability category in a given quadrant, allowing generation of diverse categorical data. Example data samples shown for  $N = 20$ .

## 4 Experiments

We examine the performance of the Transformer models using synthetic as well as real-world data, considering  $C = 3$  categories within each context  $\mathcal{C}$ . Presenting first results for synthetic data, we consider two-dimensional covariates, *i.e.*,  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , to aid visualization and interpretation (the subsequent real-world data discussed below considers  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{512}$ ). The underlying code is applicable to an arbitrary number of categories and covariate dimension, and all software will be made available with the publication of the paper.

For each type of kernel attention, we will consider two ways to design the Transformer parameters. In the first method, which we refer to as “GD,” the model parameters are set as specified in Section 3 and detailed in the Appendix. In this setup, only the learning rate within the Transformer and the kernel parameter (detailed in the Appendix for each kernel type) are learned. The second method is referred to as “Trained TF,” in which *all* Transformer parameters are trained/learned. The training in both cases is performed with contextual data  $\{\mathcal{C}_m\}_{m=1,M}$  and it is evaluated on a separate contextual dataset  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$ . There are  $N$  contextual pairs  $(x_i, y_i)$  in each  $\mathcal{C}_m$ . For the synthetic data, like in [24], when training the Trained TF, we considered 5000 iterations of Adam [12] using  $M = 2048$  and  $N = 20$  for each iteration. When learning the kernel parameter and learning rate for GD, we also trained for 5000 iterations, using  $M = 512$  and  $N = 20$  each iteration. The performance of the Trained TF and GD models were assessed by averaging over 10,000 *different* sets of contextual data (10,000 different instantiations of  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$ ). For Trained TF, we consider 5 different random initializations of the model parameters, and below we show average results for each of these random seeds, to give a sense of learning stability. All computations were performed on a single 16GB NVIDIA V100 GPU.

As discussed in Section 3, an underlying softmax function  $h(x)$  is associated with the data generation. For a small number of contextual samples  $N$ , as we consider in our examples, many different underlying  $h(x)$  could give rise to the same observed categorical data. Through extensive experimentation, we have found it helpful to make the synthetic-data-generation process as simple as




Figure 2: Inferred probability of each category as a function of covariate position, for **softmax attention**. One attention head and one attention layer are employed. The observed data samples are positioned at the centers of the labeled points, with labels 0, 1 and 2 corresponding to the associated category. For each row, the images correspond to the spatially-dependent probability of category 0, 1 and 2, from left to right. In the top row, the parameters are set as in Section 3, and only the learning rate and kernel parameter are learned (“GD”); in the bottom row, all parameters of the Transformer are learned (“Trained TF”).

possible. Specifically, like [24] each of the two components of  $x_i$  is assumed drawn iid, uniform over  $[-1, 1]$ . Given a generated 2D covariate vector, the category probabilities are defined by the quadrant in which the covariates reside as shown in Figure 1.

To enhance visualization of the Transformer predictions, we first consider *many* queries,  $x_{N+1}, \dots, x_{N+K}$ , for context  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$ , so we can observe the predicted  $h_\theta(x)$  across the entire covariate space. Specifically, here we consider  $100 \times 100$  ( $K = 10,000$ ) queries uniformly positioned across the 2D covariate space. Importantly, all of these queries are analyzed *at once*, via a *single* forward pass of the Transformer.

In Figure 2 we consider results from the Transformer, for the contextual data depicted in Figure 1, for the softmax attention kernel ( $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = \exp(\lambda x_i^T x_j) / \sum_{i=1}^N \exp(\lambda x_i^T x_j)$ , with  $\lambda$  a parameter to be learned). Note that this kernel is *not* a Mercer kernel, but the Transformer performed well nevertheless. The close agreement between the results in the first and second row suggests that the fully-trained Transformer is learning to perform GD in the forward pass, based on observed context.

In the Appendix we present additional results in the same form as Figure 2, for the linear, RBF, exponential and Laplacian attention kernels. Examination of those results indicate: (i) close agreement between the GD and Trained TF, for a single attention layer and one attention head; (ii) all of the nonlinear kernels effectively capture the nonlinear decision surfaces associated with the data, but the detailed way (degree of smoothness) varies between kernels; (iii) the linear kernel cannot model the nonlinear decision surfaces, but yields linear decision surfaces that are often effective, albeit slightly less accurate; (iv) the normalization associated with the softmax kernel seems to yield very stable training of the model, compared to training with exponential-kernel-based attention, which has the same form apart from the normalization.

For the same class of synthetic data, in Figure 3 we compare the performance of the Transformer as designed in Section 3 (again, termed GD) with a Transformer for which all parameters are designed (termed Trained TF). For the Trained TF, we show the MSE as a function of the learning iteration (on a separate test dataset, as discussed above), and compare performance with GD. In all cases a single attention head is employed and one layer of attention is considered. We observe that after a sufficient number of training iterations (steps) for Trained TF, there is very close agreement with the GD-designed Transformer. Consistent with all results presented thus far, this suggests that the fully trained Transformer is learning to perform GD in its forward pass.

As discussed in Section 3, multiple attention heads allow consideration of a bias term in  $f_\theta(x)$ . To explore this, within the fully trained Transformer (Trained TF) we moved beyond the single attention head, considering up to four different attention heads. We compare results of those Transformers to the GD transformer with one attention head (as a reference, to examine the degree to which bias impacts the model). As shown in the left of Figure 4, for the softmax kernel attention, up to four fully-trained heads yield performance very close to that of the designed GD-based Transformer with




Figure 3: MSE between underlying  $h(x)$  and that predicted by the Transformer, as measured at the *centers* of the four quadrants of covariate space (see Figure 1). Results are shown as a function of the number of iterations in the latter training, evaluated on held-out data. The learning trajectory is shown for each of the five random parameter initializations of Trained TF (where only one curve appears for Trained TF, all five overlap). Results shown for linear, exponential, RBF and softmax kernels for attention.




Figure 4: Examination of Transformer with softmax attention, comparing Trained TF and GD. The GD transformer has one attention head, and in all cases a single layer of attention is considered. Left: Comparison with a fully-trained Transformer (Trained TF) with up to 4 attention heads, with results shown as a function of training iterations, on held-out data. Right: Comparison of GD and Trained TF, with parameters learned using context  $N = 20$  and testing with new contextual data considered variable context size  $N$ ; there are *no changes* to any model parameters for different context  $N$ .

a single head (when one attention head is used in the Trained TF, the model converges to the GD Transformer results). This indicates that the impact of the bias term is small, as expected, given the data-generation process. We also augmented data generation, to impose more bias, but we found that results with one or two attention heads were similar. We speculate that with small context size, like the  $N = 20$  considered here, the impact of bias on the model is small unless the bias is substantial. We observed similar phenomena when considering real-valued data as discussed in Section 2, the results of which are omitted for brevity. These results indicate that the flexibility of the RKHS model is sufficient to model data without a bias term (*i.e.*, with one attention head), for relatively small context sizes.

A question of interest is whether a Transformer trained using data with context  $N$  may be applied to data with context size  $N' \neq N$ . Examining (4), we observe that the context size appears as a factor  $1/N$  in the update equation for the model. We found that for all attention kernels *other* than softmax, the software could be applied to arbitrary context size  $N'$ , as long as the scaling  $1/N$  in the code is adjusted to  $1/N'$ . However, the need to adjust the underlying software for different context sizes  $N'$  is inconvenient. A very important observed property of the Transformer *with softmax attention* is that a model trained with context size  $N$  can be applied *without change* for arbitrary context size  $N'$ . This is a result of the *normalization* within the softmax attention, which yields performance invariant to change in  $N$ .

Using the synthetic data, in Figure 4 (right), we compare the performance of the GD and Trained TF designs with softmax attention, when learning was done with context size  $N = 20$ , and the models are applied to new contextual data with  $N'$  varying from  $N' = 10$  to  $N' = 50$ , with *no change* to any Transformer parameters. We here consider one attention head, and one attention layer. We note the near exact agreement between the fully-trained and GD-designed Transformers, and that as  $N'$  increases the accuracy of the model improves (MSE computed at the centers of the four quadrants, see Figure 1).

In all experiments presented above, we have considered a single attention *layer*, and the Transformer was found to yield a good approximation to  $h(x_{N+1})$ . We also considered additional experiments, where the number of attention layers were greater than one, and each layer had separately learned parameters (for the GD Transformer, only the learning rates were learned at the different layers, with the kernel parameter shared). We found that the results did not change significantly with more than one attention layer, with detailed results omitted for brevity. We did note differences in the training



properties of the different kernels for Trained TF, and multiple attention layers were considered. For example, the learning process for the exponential kernel could be unstable, but the softmax-based attention (which is an exponential kernel *plus* normalization) trained in a very stable manner, with increasing layer number. In all of our experiments, we found the softmax-based attention yielded accurate nonlinear models *and* trained very effectively.

Our final experiment involves real data, from the ImageNet dataset [9]. Each image from this dataset is analyzed by the VGG deep CNN [22], yielding 512 feature maps at the final layer. The features from each of these feature maps are then averaged. Consequently, image  $i$  is represented by VGG-generated covariates  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{512}$ . We show results for the GD-based Transformer discussed in Section 3, for which we only learn the kernel parameter (absent for the linear kernel) and the Transformer learning rate. We consider one attention head and one attention layer.

There are 1000 image classes (labels) in the ImageNet dataset. Each contextual set  $\mathcal{C}_m$  is designed so as to be composed with data from three image classes, selected uniformly at random, with 10 examples per class, also selected uniformly at random. This yields contextual data of size  $N = 30$ . The Transformer makes a prediction for  $x_{N+1}$ , which has a label among the three in  $\mathcal{C}_m$ . To learn the small number of parameters associated with the GD Transformer models, the  $\mathcal{C}_m$  used for training employ 900 of the label types, and we evaluate performance for  $\mathcal{C}_m$  associated with held-out label types from among the remaining 100 classes. Consequently, this is a *real-world example of few-shot learning*: when testing, the Transformer is presented with  $N = 30$  contextual examples of data types it has not seen before, and it is then asked to classify  $x_{N+1}$  as one of these new label types.

Since the deep VGG model has already extracted rich features at its output layer, we expect the linear-attention Transformer to be as effective as the nonlinear-kernel Transformer. In Figure 5 we show prediction accuracy results of the *most probable* predicted label, as a function of learning step. After sufficient training steps, the most-probable label typically had a probability near 0.9, reflecting a high-confidence prediction.

As expected, the results of linear and softmax attention in Figure 5 are similar with a sufficient number of training iterations (training is performed using Adam [11] with batch size 512), but the softmax attention converges much faster. This suggests that the features from the VGG *are* separable by a linear classifier, but the training of the Transformer to do this well, in a few-shot setting, is more difficult with linear attention than doing few-shot learning with softmax-based attention. After 5000 training steps the linear and softmax attention Transformers perform almost identically on this few-shot-learning task, with correct label classification probability 0.91, and with variation less than 0.001 on different splits of train and test.

## 5 Conclusions

The Transformer network has been examined for in-context learning with functional data, considering categorical outcomes, nonlinear underlying models, and nonlinear attention. Extensive analysis and results indicate, consistent with prior work but now for categorical data, that the Transformer implements a form of functional gradient descent in its forward pass, here on a latent function. We have demonstrated these concepts with simulated and real-world data, the latter applied to the ImageNet dataset, that shows the capacity of this framework to effectively perform few-shot learning on the Transformer forward pass (no model-parameter refinement).




Figure 5: Classification accuracy of trained GD Transformers for ImageNet data, as a function of training iteration, for linear and softmax attention. The data used to train and that used to evaluate this accuracy trajectory are distinct, with no overlap in label types. For each contextual set  $\mathcal{C}$ , there are three label types, and ten examples per label, and hence  $N = 30$ . The predicted label is performed for the  $(N + 1)$ th image, which has one of the three labels in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Multiple random seeds are considered for parameter initialization, and the distribution of results is depicted, as well as the mean.

## References

- [1] K. Ahn, X. Cheng, H. Daneshmand, and S. Sra. Transformers learn to implement preconditioned gradient descent for in-context learning, 2023.
- [2] K. Ahn, X. Cheng, M. Song, C. Yun, A. Jadbabaie, and S. Sra. Linear attention is (maybe) all you need (to understand transformer optimization), 2024.
- [3] E. Akyörök, D. Schuurmans, J. Andreas, T. Ma, and D. Zhou. What learning algorithm is in-context learning? investigations with linear models. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [4] M. Andrychowicz, M. Denil, S. Gomez, M.W. Hoffman, D. Pfau, T. Schaul, and N. de Freitas. On the optimization of a synaptic learning rule. *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016.
- [5] S. Bengio, Y. Bengio, J. Cloutier, and J. Gecsei. On the optimization of a synaptic learning rule. *Optimality in Artificial and Biological Neural Networks*, 1992.
- [6] T.B. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D.M. Ziegler, J. Wu, Cl. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. *CoRR*, abs/2005.14165, 2020.
- [7] C. Chen and O.L. Mangasarian. A class of smoothing functions for nonlinear and mixed complementarity problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 1996.
- [8] X. Cheng, Y. Chen, and S. Sra. Transformers implement functional gradient descent to learn non-linear functions in context, 2024.
- [9] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and F.-F. Li. ImageNet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2009.
- [10] C. Finn, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks, 2017.
- [11] D. Kingma and J. Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *ICLR*, 2015.
- [12] D.P. Kingma and J. Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization, 2017.
- [13] A. Mahankali, T.B. Hashimoto, and T. Ma. One step of gradient descent is provably the optimal in-context learner with one layer of linear self-attention. *arXiv:2307.03576*, 2023.
- [14] S. Muller, N. Hollmann, S. Pineda, J. Grabocka, and F. Hutter. Transformers can do Bayesian inference. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [15] A. Nichol, J. Achiam, and J. Schulman. On first-order meta-learning algorithms, 2018.
- [16] S. Ravi and H. Larochelle. Optimization as a model for few-shot learning. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [17] P.S. Liang, S. Garg, D. Tsipras and G. Valiant. What can transformers learn in-context? a case study of simple function classes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [18] A. Santoro, S. Bartunov, M. Botvinick, D. Wierstra, and T. Lillicrap. Meta-learning with memory-augmented neural networks, 2016.
- [19] I. Schlag, K. Irie, and J. Schmidhuber. Linear transformers are secretly fast weight programmers. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [20] J. Schmidhuber. Evolutionary principles in self-referential learning. on learning how to learn. *Diploma thesis, Institut f. Informatik, Tech. Univ. Munich*, 1987.
- [21] B. Schölkopf and A.J. Smola. *Learning with kernels: support vector machines, regularization, optimization, and beyond*. MIT press, 2002.
- [22] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition, 2015.
- [23] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need, 2023.

- [24] J. von Oswald, E. Niklasson, E. Randazzo, J. Sacramento, A. Mordvintsev, A. Zhmoginov, and M. Vladymyrov. Transformers learn in-context by gradient descent, 2023.
- [25] R. Zhang, S. Frei, and P.L. Bartlett. Trained transformers learn linear models in-context. *arXiv:2306.09927*, 2023.
- [26] A. Zhmoginov, M. Sandler, and M. Vladymyrov. Hypertransformer: Model generation for supervised and semi-supervised few-shot learning. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022.

## A Review of Transformer Construction for Real Vector Outcome

The Transformer has been developed previously [24] for linear attention and linear models, which is readily extended for in-context functional learning with Mercer kernels, as discussed in Section 2. We leverage the recently developed extension to nonlinear models and kernel-based attention developed in [8]. We briefly summarize that prior work, including how the Transformer parameters are set to implement gradient descent (GD). Specifically, we demonstrate the GD update in (1), which we repeat here for convenience:

$$f_{\theta_k}(x_j) = f_{\theta_{k-1}}(x_j) + \underbrace{\frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [y_i - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_i)] \kappa(x_i, x_j)}_{\Delta f_{\theta_k}(x_j) \text{ from head 1}} + \underbrace{\frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [y_i - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_i)]}_{\Delta f_{\theta_k}(x_j) \text{ from head 2}}, \quad (5)$$

can be implemented via the mechanism in (2), also repeated here as

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} x_j \\ y_j - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_j) \end{pmatrix}}_{\in \mathbb{R}^{d+C-1}, j\text{th input to layer } k} \Rightarrow \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0_{d \times 1} \\ -\Delta f_{\theta_k}(x_j) \end{pmatrix}}_{j\text{th output from layer } k} \Rightarrow \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} x_j \\ y_j - \sum_{k'=0}^k \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_j) \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{skip connection: add input and output}}. \quad (6)$$

From (6), the input at position  $j$  of the Transformer at attention layer  $k$  is  $e_{j,k-1} = (x_j, y_j - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_j))^T$ , and at the first layer ( $k = 1$ ) this corresponds to  $e_{j,0} = (x_j, y_j)^T$ , as  $\Delta f_{\theta_0}(x_j) = 0_{C-1}$ . At position  $N + 1$ , corresponding to the query,  $y_{N+1}$  is initialized at  $0_{C-1}$  (it is  $y_{N+1}$  which will be *estimated* at the output of the network).

Starting with the first attention head in (5), the key and query projection matrices are

$$W_Q = W_K = \begin{pmatrix} I_d & 0_{d \times (C-1)} \\ 0_{(C-1) \times d} & 0_{(C-1) \times (C-1)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

and the value projection matrix is

$$W_V = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{d \times d} & 0_{d \times (C-1)} \\ 0_{(C-1) \times d} & -\alpha I_{C-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where  $I_d$  is the  $d \times d$  identity matrix, and  $0_{d \times d}$  is the  $d \times d$  all-zeros matrix.

Using the construction without preconditioning,  $W_Q e_{i,k-1} = W_K e_{i,k-1} = (x_i, 0_{C-1})^T$  and  $W_V e_{i,k-1} = (0_d, -\alpha [y_i - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta f_{\theta_{k'}}(x_i)])^T$ . The keys and values correspond to vectors  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and the queries to  $j = 1, \dots, N + 1$ . This is equivalent to *masked* (applied to the keys) attention on all  $N + 1$  vectors, with mask weights of 1 on the first  $N$  vectors (the labeled samples), and a mask weight of zero on the  $N + 1$  vector (the unlabeled query).

For the first attention head in (5), the query and keys are used within a kernel  $\kappa(W_K e_i, W_Q e_j)$  with any Mercer kernel applicable. The output of position  $j = 1, \dots, N + 1$  for attention head 1 at layer  $k$  is

$$\text{Att}_{j,k}^{(1)} = W_V E_{k-1} \mathcal{K}(W_K E_{k-1}, W_Q e_{j,k-1}), \quad (9)$$

where  $E_{k-1} = (e_{1,k-1}, \dots, e_{N,k-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+C-1) \times N}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}(W_K E_{k-1}, W_Q e_{j,k-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$  is defined by  $\kappa(W_K e_{i,k-1}, W_Q e_{j,k-1})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .

The second attention head in (5) employs the same  $W_V$  as the first head, but now the matrices  $W_K$  and  $W_Q$  must be designed so as to yield a constant kernel output  $\kappa(W_K e_{i,k-1}, W_Q e_{j,k-1}) = 1$  for all  $i$  and  $j$  (one could also have a constant output other than 1). How this is achieved depends on the kernel.

The family of Mercer kernels are widely known, examples of which (and that we consider in experiments) are [21]

- Linear:  $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = x_i^T x_j$
- Radial basis function (RBF):  $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = \exp\left(\frac{-\|x_i - x_j\|_2^2}{\sigma^2}\right)$
- Laplacian:  $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = \exp\left(\frac{-\|x_i - x_j\|_1}{\sigma^2}\right)$
- Sigmoid:  $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = \tanh(\gamma x_i^T x_j + c)$
- Polynomial:  $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = (\gamma x_i^T x_j + c)^d$
- Cosine:  $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = \frac{x_i^T x_j}{\|x_i\|_2 \|x_j\|_2}$
- Chi-squared:  $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{(x_i(k) - x_j(k))^2}{x_i(k) + x_j(k)}\right)$

For the RBF, Laplacian and Chi-squared kernels, a constant kernel output is achieved if  $W_Q$  and  $W_K$  are all-zeros matrices, from which  $W_K e_{i,k-1} = W_Q e_{j,k-1} = 0_{d+C-1}$ . For the sigmoid and polynomial kernels, constant output is achieved if  $W_K$  and/or  $W_Q$  are all-zeros matrices. Note that the sigmoid kernel is not technically Mercer, however, it has been demonstrated to work well in practice [21]. For the linear and cosine kernels, in the absence of additional elements to the Transformer (e.g., positional embeddings), it does not appear that  $W_K$  and  $W_Q$  can be designed to achieve constant (and non-zero) outputs for all  $x_i$  and  $x_j$ . For this reason, when considering estimation of the bias term  $b$ , we *do not* consider linear or cosine kernels.

This construction of  $W_K$  and  $W_Q$  connected to the bias term was also discussed in [26] (see the Appendix of that paper). However, in [26], the original softmax attention was used, rather than a Mercer kernel construction. Because of the construction of the softmax,  $W_K e_{i,k-1} = 0_{d+1}$  also yields constant attention, where the constant is  $1/N$ , where  $N$  is the number of keys.

For each query  $e_{j,k-1}$  input to layer  $k$ , there is an output  $o_{j,k}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+C-1}$  from head 1, and similarly  $o_{j,k}^{(2)}$  is output from head 2. With a skip connection, the total output from attention layer  $k$  is (right in (6))

$$e_{j,k} = e_{j,k-1} + P_1 o_{j,k}^{(1)} + P_2 o_{j,k}^{(2)}, \quad (10)$$

where  $P_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+C-1) \times (d+C-1)}$  and  $P_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+C-1) \times (d+C-1)}$ . The term  $P_1 o_{j,k}^{(1)} + P_2 o_{j,k}^{(2)}$  corresponds to the middle of (6). Since the first  $d$  components of  $o_{j,k}^{(1)}$  and  $o_{j,k}^{(2)}$  are zeros, the first  $d$  columns of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are arbitrary. For simplicity, we define  $P_1 = \frac{1}{N} I_{d+C-1}$  and  $P_2 = \frac{1}{N} I_{d+C-1}$ , where it is assumed that the constant output of the kernel associated with head 2 is one.

## B Categorical data

For convenience, we repeat the update rule (4) for categorical data:

$$h_{c,\theta_k}(x_j) = h_{c,\theta_{k-1}}(x_j) + \underbrace{\frac{\alpha_k^{(c)}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\tilde{y}_{c,i} - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta h_{c,\theta_{k'}}(x_i)] \kappa(x_i, x_j)}_{\Delta h_{c,\theta_k} \text{ from head 1}} + \underbrace{\frac{\alpha_k^{(c)}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\tilde{y}_{c,i} - \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} \Delta h_{c,\theta_{k'}}(x_i)]}_{\Delta h_{c,\theta_k} \text{ from head 2}} \quad (11)$$

The Transformer implementation of this update rule proceeds as in Section A, with the following changes: (i) The categorical outcomes are encoded by the one-hot-like vector  $\tilde{y}_i$ ; (ii) the initialization  $\Delta h_{\theta_0}(x_j) = \frac{1}{C} 1_{C-1}$  is employed; and (iii) the learning rate  $\alpha_k^{(c)}$  at layer  $k$  is in general a function of component  $c \in \{1, \dots, C-1\}$ .

## C Additional Results

In Figure 6 we consider the same setup as in Figure 2, but now for radial basis function (RBF) kernel attention. All the results in Figure 6 correspond to the ‘‘GD’’ model developed in Section 3. Similar close correspondence is observed between the GD and Trained TF versions of the RBF-based Transformer, with the latter omitted for brevity. The top row of Figure 6 considers the same contextual data as in Figure 2. The second and third rows in Figure 6 consider the same GD Transformer model, but different examples of  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$ . The results in the three rows show the ability of the Transformer to adapt in the inference phase (forward pass) to new contextual data  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$ , with no change in model parameters.

Comparing Figure 2 with the top row of Figure 6 (for which  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1}$  is the same), we note that the Transformers with softmax and RBF attention, respectively, give similar inferences of  $h_\theta(x)$ , but that the form of the RBF yields a smoother representation more closely tied to the observed samples. We do *not* expect the Transformer to recover the exact shape of the underlying  $h(x)$  (as discussed wrt with Figure 1) with only  $N = 20$  contextual examples (although the form of the softmax kernel does do a bit better for this case). We have observed that with increasing context size  $N$  the inferred  $h(x)$  more closely follows the underlying form of the generation process in Figure 1.

In Figure 7 we show results for a linear kernel. The linear-attention Transformer is unable to capture the nonlinear structure of  $h(x)$ , as expected. However, examination of Figure 7 shows that the linear-attention Transformer does infer a model that fits the contextual data reasonably well (albeit in a linear manner). In Figure 3 we showed that while the predictions of the linear model are inferior to the nonlinear attention results, they are still reasonably good. This underscores the importance, we feel, of visualizing the data, the structure of which plays an important role in the relative efficacy of linear vs. nonlinear attention.

From Figure 7, note that the linear-attention model is *not* able to infer the nonlinear structure of the categorical probabilities as a function of covariate position. We note, however, close agreement between the predictions of the GD-based designed Transformer (top row in Figure 7) and the Trained TF for which all model parameters are trained based on  $M$  contextual examples (bottom row in Figure 7).




Figure 6: Inferred probability of each category as a function of covariate position, for **radial basis function (RBF) attention**. In all subfigures, the Transformer parameters are set as in Section 3, consistent with GD in the forward pass of the Transformer. Results are presented as in Figure 2. Top row: contextual data as in Figures 2; in Rows 2 and 3 different randomly selected contextual data are considered, with Transformer parameters *unchanged* for all rows.

Examining Figure 7 carefully, across a given row, the left-most figure puts high probability mass near contextual samples with label 0, the center image does the same for contextual data with label 1, and finally the right figure (mostly) puts high probability mass near contextual samples with label 2. The probability of label 2 has the most nonlinear character as a function of covariates (see Figures 2 and 6), and it is this distribution (right-most figure in each row of Figure 7) that is most mismatched to the data for the linear-attention model. Nevertheless, overall (and particularly for labels 0 and 1) the linear-attention model *does* do a reasonably good job of fitting the contextual data, albeit in a linear manner. This explains why the linear-attention model does perform relatively well in Figure 3, albeit not as good as the nonlinear-attention models.

Analysis of this sort highlights the importance of carefully visualizing the data. Even if the  $h(x)$  used to generate data is nonlinear, depending on the size of  $N$ , the observed categorical data may be fit relatively well by a linear model, making it appear that nonlinear attention is unimportant (but such conclusions are very data-dependent). The importance of understanding the properties of the data is why we considered the relatively simple and robust data-generation process summarized in Figure 1, and the low-dimensional covariates ( $d = 2$ ), as it allows us to assure (by visualization) that the observed contextual data are actually nonlinear in their distribution, and to visualize differences between predictions of linear and nonlinear attention models.

In Figures 8 and 9 we consider the same contextual data as considered in Figure 7, but now for an exponential kernel and a Laplacian kernel, respectively. The exponential kernel was considered in [8], specifically  $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = \exp(\lambda x_i^T x_j)$ , where  $\lambda$  is a parameter to be learned. These results are based on the construction in Section 3 (termed GD), in which only the learning rate within the Transformer and the kernel parameter are learned.

We found that the training of all model parameters (Trained TF) was unstable when considering attention with the Laplacian kernel, likely because of the non-differential nature of the  $\ell_1$  norm within the kernel. There are many methods that have been developed to address the non-differential character of this norm [7], which may be considered in future work for this attention model. However, we have noted the multiple respects with which the softmax kernel and associated attention are attractive (*e.g.*, robustness to variable context size). Therefore, in practice there will typically be little reason to consider the Laplacian kernel within an attention model, which is presented here for comparison. We note that all of the nonlinear kernels perform similarly (but distinctly) in representing the nonlinear structure of the underlying probability of categories, as a function of covariates.

Concerning the exponential kernel, we found that the training process of the Trained TF (all parameters trained) could become unstable numerically when the number of attention layers increased. By contrast, as the number




Figure 7: Inferred probability of each category as a function of covariate position, for **linear attention**. In the top row the parameters are set as in Section 3, consistent with GD in the forward pass of the Transformer; in the bottom row all parameters of the Transformer are learned. Results presented as in Figure 2




Figure 8: Inferred probability of each category as a function of covariate position, for **exponential-kernel attention**. In the top row the parameters are set as in Section 3, consistent with GD in the forward pass of the Transformer; in the bottom row all parameters of the Transformer are learned. Results presented as in Figure 2

of attention layers increased, the Transformer with softmax attention performed in a stable manner when training for all model parameters; this is important, as the softmax attention is just a normalized version of exponential-kernel-based attention. This appears to underscore the importance of the normalization within the softmax attention (helps with numerical stability when training), and possibly also sheds light on the importance of normalization in other parts of the original Transformer architecture [23].




Figure 9: Inferred probability of each category as a function of covariate position, for **Laplacian-kernel attention**. The Transformer parameters are set as in Section 3, consistent with GD in the forward pass of the Transformer. The Transformer model manifested when all parameters of the Transformer are learned performed poorly, likely because of the non-differential nature of the  $\ell_1$  norm of this kernel near the origin. Results presented as in Figure 9