

GW-MoE: Resolving Uncertainty in MoE Router with Global Workspace Theory

¹Haoze Wu*, ^{2,3}Zihan Qiu*[†], ³Zili Wang, ²Hang Zhao[‡], ⁴Jie Fu[‡]

¹Zhejiang University ²Tsinghua University ³INF Technology ⁴Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
waithz@zju.edu.cn, qzh11628@gmail.com, ziliwang.do@gmail.com,
hangzhao@tsinghua.edu.cn, jiefu@ust.hk

Abstract

Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) has been demonstrated as an efficient method to scale up models. By dynamically and sparsely selecting activated experts, MoE can effectively reduce computational costs. Despite the success, we observe that many tokens in the MoE models have uncertain routing results. These tokens have nearly equal scores for choosing each expert, and we demonstrate that this uncertainty can lead to incorrect selections. Inspired by the Global Workspace Theory (GWT), we propose a new fine-tuning method, GW-MoE, to address this issue. The core idea is to broadcast the uncertain tokens across experts during fine-tuning. Therefore, these tokens can acquire the necessary knowledge from any expert during inference and become less sensitive to the choice. GW-MoE does not introduce additional inference overhead. We validate that GW can mitigate the uncertain problem and consistently improve in different tasks (text classification, question answering, summarization, code generation, and mathematical problem solving) and model sizes (650M and 8B parameters). Our code is publicly available at <https://github.com/WaithZ/GW-MoE>.

1 Introduction

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) have developed rapidly (Devlin et al., 2019; Touvron et al., 2023; OpenAI et al., 2024) and have been widely applied in numerous fields, including education, healthcare, and smart transportation (Dan et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023b; Zheng et al., 2023). The impressive capabilities of LLMs can be mainly attributed to the increased model scale. However, continuously increasing the scale of LLMs raises the difficulty of model deployment and poses challenges for promoting LLMs within

	Bottom5%	Average	Top5%
Mixtral-8 × 7B	0.63	0.79	0.93
DeepSeek-16B	0.81	0.88	0.93
JetMoE-8B	0.88	0.94	0.97

Table 1: **Uncertain tokens are not uncommon in MoE models.** We calculate the expert selection entropy from routing scores in the first layer of three common MoE models. The entropy is normalized in $[0, 1]$ follow Sec 3.1, with value 1 corresponding to a uniform score distribution. Some tokens have almost uniform expert selection. We call them ‘uncertain tokens’.

the open-source community. As a result, the sparse activation moel MoE has been receiving increasing attention (Shazeer et al., 2017; Fedus et al., 2022).

MoE models reduce computational costs by sparsely activating only a small number of model parameters for a single input. In existing works (Fedus et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2024; Shen et al., 2024), the proportion of activated experts is typically $\frac{1}{8}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$. Specifically, the router (usually a linear layer) in MoE models outputs the score of selecting each expert based on the input, and those with the highest scores will be selected. However, when testing some common open-source MoE models with billion parameters (Jiang et al., 2024; Dai et al., 2024; Shen et al., 2024) on Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023), we notice that router assign some tokens to experts with almost uniform scores. We use normalized entropy to measure the uncertainty of the expert selection of tokens. Normalized entropy is calculated by summing the products of each outcome’s probability and its logarithm, divided by the logarithm of the number of outcomes. When the value approaches 1, it indicates that the score distribution output by the router is close to be uniform. As shown in Tab 1, a subset of tokens has a normalized entropy that is greater than 0.9 in all three MoE models. We use **uncertain tokens** for such phenomena in the rest of the passage.

Additionally, we demonstrate on JetMoE-8B that

*Equal contribution

[†]Work done while interning at INF Technology.

[‡]Corresponding authors

randomly selecting experts for uncertain tokens can outperform the choices made by the Top- K operator, as shown in Fig 1. More unfortunately, vanilla fine-tuning increases the number of uncertain tokens. We find that 72% of the tokens in the JetMoE-8B remain uncertain after fine-tuning, and the number of uncertain tokens is 3.4 times larger than before.




Figure 1: **Randomly selecting experts for uncertain tokens can give better results.** We let the uncertain tokens (entropy greater than 2.0) in the last layer of JetMoE randomly select experts, and the average results (blue) from multiple experiments on three tasks are better than those obtained by using the Top- K operator to select experts (dashed line). To further verify, we let the same proportion of arbitrary tokens randomly select experts and observe that the results (gray) are worse than uncertain random. The metrics for each task are the same as those in Sec 4.5.

Why is it important for tokens to select the correct expert? Geva et al. (2021); Qiu et al. (2024) suggest that the FFN layer, commonly replaced by MoE in transformers, acts as a key-value memory network. In the MoE models, each expert acts as an independent memory block, and the router determines which one to access for each token. If the router is uncertain for some tokens, these tokens may fail to access the necessary knowledge.

To solve this problem, we take inspiration from human brains. GWT (Baars, 1993) suggests that there are independent functional modules in the human brain for processing different neural signals. For complex signals, modules can cooperate by broadcasting information through a global workspace. When learning new knowledge, this broadcasting mechanism helps form long-term memory and strengthens the stability and accessibility of knowledge recall. Similar to the human brain, each expert in MoE models can be seen as a

functional module; like complex signals, uncertain tokens also need to be more easily accessible. We believe that GWT provides valuable insights for fine-tuning MoE models.

Based on this, we propose a novel method for fine-tuning MoE models called **Global Workspace tuning for Mixture-of-Experts (GW-MoE)**. During fine-tuning, we broadcast uncertain tokens to all experts, allowing each to learn the relevant knowledge, so that during inference, uncertain ones can obtain the necessary knowledge from any expert, as shown in Fig 2. Because all experts have learned knowledge of uncertain tokens during fine-tuning, GW-MoE does not introduce any additional inference overhead. This ensures that the model remains efficient in various applications.

We evaluate GW-MoE across different model scales (from hundreds of millions to several billions parameters) on various tasks, including natural language understanding, question answering, summarization, mathematical problem-solving, and code generation. Extensive experimental results have demonstrated that our method consistently outperforms standard fine-tuning.

Summarizing, our core contributions are:

- We observe ‘uncertain tokens’ in pre-trained MoE models, and we prove that these tokens may select the wrong expert.
- We propose a novel fine-tuning method GW-MoE that does not introduce additional inference overhead, helping all experts learn the knowledge of uncertain tokens and reducing the impact of choosing the wrong expert during inference.
- GW-MoE outperforms standard fine-tuning across various model scales and natural language tasks.

2 Background

2.1 Mixture of Experts

Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) is an efficient method for scaling up model sizes (Shazeer et al., 2017; Fedus et al., 2022). It usually consists of two components: a router G and a set of experts $\{E_1, E_2, \dots, E_N\}$. In the transformer architecture, MoE is typically employed to replace the feed-forward networks (FFNs) layer. Each expert can be regarded as a new FFN, and G determines which K experts to select and computes their respective weights. Formally, the output y of an input token x is computed as follows:




Figure 2: Overview of GW-MoE. **Left:** Based on the GWT, some neural signals (grey) only need to activate a single functional module in the human brain, while others (blue) will use the global workspace to broadcast information, facilitating cooperation between modules. **Right:** GW-MoE is inspired by GWT. When the router’s output score is nearly uniform, those tokens (blue) are called uncertain tokens and are broadcast to all experts during fine-tuning; during inference, since all experts have learned the knowledge of uncertain tokens, these tokens can obtain the necessary information from any expert. The rest (grey) are certain tokens, routed to the Top K experts during both inference and fine-tuning, following standard MoE.

$$\mathbf{y} = \sum_{g_i \in \text{Top}K(G(\mathbf{x}))} g_i E_i(\mathbf{x}) \quad (1)$$

where g_i is the score computed by the router for selecting expert i .

Deciding which expert to choose is a difficult discrete optimization problem. In addition to the greedy Top- K experts per token shown in Eq. 1, there are many other methods, such as greedy Top- K tokens per expert (Zhou et al., 2022), reinforcement learning (Bengio et al., 2016), optimal transport (Liu et al., 2023a), linear programs (Lewis et al., 2021) and deterministic fixed rules (Roller et al., 2021; Dai et al., 2022).

2.2 Global Workspace Theory

GWT (Baars, 1993) is an explanation proposed for human cognition. It suggests that the human brain has independently functioning modules, and these different modules can compete to send messages into the global workspace. Messages in the global workspace can be responded to by other modules; therefore, some complex neural signals can be collaboratively processed by multiple modules. When learning new knowledge, messages in the global workspace are more readily encoded into long-term memory, enhancing knowledge accessibility.

In MoE, experts are similar to the modules in the human brain, with typically only a small number of experts processing the input tokens. However, MoE has no component similar to the global workspace. In our method, uncertain tokens can broadcast messages to all experts.

3 Method

Overview. Inspired by the GWT, we propose GW-MoE. The key idea is to broadcast those uncertain

tokens to all experts. Compared to standard fine-tuning, all experts can learn the knowledge of uncertain tokens, so during inference, uncertain tokens can obtain information from any expert, reducing the impact of incorrect selections.

3.1 Which Tokens Are Uncertain?

The first question to address is what kind of tokens are considered uncertain? Intuitively, the tokens that are difficult to determine which K experts to select are uncertain. The output of router G can be expressed as follows:

$$G(\mathbf{x}) = [g_0, g_1, \dots, g_{N-1}] \quad (2)$$

N is the total number of experts, and g_i is the score that token \mathbf{x} chooses expert i . The uncertainty of the router G in selecting experts for \mathbf{x} can be measured by entropy:

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = - \sum_i g_i \log(g_i) \quad (3)$$

Taking $K = 1$ as an example, when the router is very certain about choosing expert j , there will be $g_j = 1, g_{i \neq j} = 0$, and the entropy takes the minimum value 0. Conversely, if the router is completely uncertain about which expert to choose, there will be $g_i = \frac{1}{N}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$, and entropy takes the maximum value $\log N$.

In Tab 1, to compare MoE models with different numbers of experts, we adopt normalized entropy as follows:

$$H_{norm}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{H(\mathbf{x})}{\log N} \quad (4)$$

It can be observed that all three models have a portion of tokens that difficult to determine which experts to choose, especially in the JetMoE-8B.

In practice, we measure the entropy distribution of the base model’s router output and take the top 5% of the values as the threshold H^* . Tokens with entropy greater than H^* are considered uncertain.

3.2 GW-MoE

In standard fine-tuning, the model updates are not fully-differentiable (Puigcerver et al., 2024; Zhong et al., 2024). Because of the Top- K operator, the gradients of the objective function are only propagated back to the selected experts. Therefore, it is difficult to obtain the necessary knowledge when a token cannot choose the correct expert.

GW-MoE enables the expert updates caused by uncertain tokens to be fully-differentiable. During fine-tuning, the input tokens are divided into certain and uncertain parts based on H^* . The certain part is processed using the standard MoE approach, as shown in Eq. 1. These inputs correspond to simple signals in the human brain, which cannot compete for the right to broadcast themselves to the global workspace. The tokens in the uncertain parts will broadcast themselves to all experts as follows:

$$\mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} g_i E_i(\mathbf{x}) \quad (5)$$

Combining Eq. 1 and Eq. 5, we can get the complete GW-MoE:

$$\mathbf{y} = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} g_i E_i(\mathbf{x}), & H(\mathbf{x}) \geq H^* \\ \sum_{g_i \in \text{Top}K(G(\mathbf{x}))} g_i E_i(\mathbf{x}), & H(\mathbf{x}) < H^* \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

During inference, all tokens use the standard MoE approach, which means no additional inference overhead is introduced.

3.3 Implementation Details

In addition to using H^* to distinguish whether tokens are uncertain, we also introduce an additional hyper-parameter *max num slots*. In some tasks, we observe that during the initial stages of fine-tuning, the average entropy first increases and then gradually decreases. To avoid the increase of training time and memory requirements caused by entropy changes, we use *max num slots* to limit the maximum number of tokens broadcast in each batch. We specify the value of *max num slots* based on the average length of the dataset in practice.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We evaluate GW-MoE on multiple datasets across diverse tasks including nature language understanding, question answering, summarization, math problem solving and code generation. GLUE (Wang et al., 2019) is a widely used benchmark for testing models’ language understanding capabilities. It consists of a series of text classification tasks: sentence similarity (STS_B; Cer et al. 2017), (QQP; Wang et al. 2017), (MRPC; Dolan and Brockett 2005), sentiment analysis (SST2; Socher et al. 2013), sentence acceptability (CoLA; Warstadt et al. 2018), natural language inference (MNLI; Williams et al. 2018), (QNLI; Demszky et al. 2018), (RTE; Giampiccolo et al. 2007). For the summarization task, we use DialogSum (Chen et al., 2021b), which consists of 13460 dialogues with corresponding manually labeled summaries and topics. For the question-answering task, we use SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016) and Quoref (Dasigi et al., 2019). The former contains questions and answers extracted from Wikipedia articles, designed to assess the machine’s ability to understand reading comprehension; the latter is used to test the model’s understanding of referential expressions.

In large-scale experiments, we use Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023) to instruction-tune the model, which contains a series of human instructions and output pairs. We test the model’s common sense reasoning on the ARC Challenge (Clark et al., 2018), its ability to solve mathematical problems on the GSM8k (Cobbe et al., 2021), and evaluate the code generated by the model using HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021a).

4.2 Experiments Details

Firstly, we evaluate GW-MoE on Switch-Base-8 (Fedus et al., 2022), which is built on T5-Base (Raffel et al., 2020) with 650M parameters. Each MoE layer in Switch-Base-8 contains 8 experts and activates 1 experts for each token. After that, we evaluate our method on the larger-scale model JetMoE-8B (Shen et al., 2024). It also contains 8 experts in each layer but activates 2 experts for each token. Same as (He et al., 2023), we fine-tune pretrained base models on selected datasets and report results of the last checkpoint. To the best of our knowledge, there is no specialized fine-tuning method proposed for MoE models, and in

Method	CoLA	SST-2	MRPC	STS-B	QQP	RTE	QNLI	MNLI	Avg
Standard FT	54.65	94.86	88.48	88.62	91.66	67.10	92.88	88.29	83.32
GW-MoE	55.17	94.90	88.35	88.96	91.70	70.49	92.81	88.43	83.85

Table 2: Overall comparison on GLUE. For STS-B, we report Pearson Correlation. For CoLA, we report Matthews correlation. For others, we report accuracy. The best result on each block is in **bold**.

Method	DialogSum	SQuAD	Quoref
Standard FT	24.06	83.35	25.97
GW-MoE	24.34	83.52	26.56

Table 3: Overall comparison on DialogSum, SQuAD and Quoref. For DialogSum, we report Rouge-2 (\uparrow). For the question-answering tasks of SQuAD and Quoref, we report the Exact Match (\uparrow).

all experiments, we use standard fine-tuning as our baseline. Following the recommendations of (Shen et al., 2023; Chi et al., 2022), we freeze routers’ parameters during fine-tuning. As discussed in Sec 3.1, we will select the value of H^* from 1.6 and 1.8 for Switch-Base-8 based on the statistical results of the base model on the dataset, and set H^* to 2.0 in JetMoE. Other hyperparameters used in our experiments and more details can be found in Appendix A. All experimental results are the average of three runs with different seeds, the standard deviation of the main results is presented in Appendix B.

4.3 Main Results

GLUE. Tab 2 compares GW-MoE and the standard fine-tuning on the GLUE benchmark. Specifically, GW-MoE shows an average 0.53 increase compared to standard fine-tuning. The results demonstrate the advantage of GW-MoE in natural language understanding tasks. It’s worth mentioning that we also attempt not to freeze the router’s parameters during fine-tuning. Compared to freezing, it decreases performance in almost all tasks. This is consistent with (Shen et al., 2023; Chi et al., 2022).

NLG Tasks. Tab 3 shows the comparison results across summarization tasks and question-answering tasks. Our method achieves better results on all three datasets than standard fine-tuning, with an average improvement of 0.35. These results indicate that GW-MoE is effective in NLU tasks and can improve MoE models’ performance in natural language generation (NLG) tasks, even in summarization tasks with long inputs.

4.4 Impact of Additional Computation

Although GW-MoE does not introduce additional inference costs, broadcasting uncertain tokens dur-

Method	SQuAD	Quoref	DialogSum
Standard FT	217.7	95.72	119.5
GW-MoE	189.4	89.76	110.4

Table 4: The number of samples per second during fine-tuning for different tasks on Switch-Base-8.

Method	Arc	GSM8K	HumanEval
Standard FT	48.9	26.1	30.5
GW-MoE	49.5	27.2	32.3

Table 5: Comparison of results after fine-tuning on JetMoE-8B. For Arc Challenge, we report accuracy (\uparrow). For GSM8K, we report strict match (\uparrow). And for HumanEval, we report pass@1 (\uparrow).

ing fine-tuning introduces extra computation. We evaluate the number of samples per second during fine-tuning for different tasks on Switch-Base-8, as shown in Tab 4. The same task is tested on the same machine, and the batch size is the same. By setting the *max num slots* based on the average length of the dataset, our method’s training speed is only reduced by about 10% compared to standard fine-tuning. This indicates that our method improves performance and does not introduce significant additional computational costs during training.

4.5 Performance in Scaling-Size

To further verify whether GW-MoE remains effective at a larger scale, we fine-tuned JetMoE-8B on the Alpaca dataset. Following (Gao et al., 2023), we test the models’ common sense reasoning ability on the Arc-Challenge and its ability to solve mathematical problems on the GSM8K. Both two tasks are configured with a 5-shot learning setup. For code generation, we test models on the humaneval benchmark following (Ben Allal et al., 2022). To fairly compare the code generation capabilities, we uniformly adopt greedy decoding and report pass@1. The results is shown in Tab 5. In these three tasks, the models fine-tuned by our method all exhibit better performance. This indicates that GW-MoE can be used not only for models with hundreds of millions of parameters but can also be extended to those with billions of parameters.

5 Analysis

5.1 Uncertainty and Wrong Selection.

In Sec 1, we present our findings: there are some uncertain tokens in the MoE models with billions of parameters, as shown in Tab 1. We hypothesize that **this uncertainty in the router may lead to the incorrect expert selection**. To validate our hypothesis, we let the uncertain tokens ($H > 2$) in the final layer of the JetMoE base randomly select experts and set the scores of both selected experts to 0.5. We test the model on the three tasks in Sec 4.5. One may argue that such repeated tests may lead to test information leaks and an unfair comparison with the baseline. We (1) repeat such experiments x times for each task and report the average performance. We also (2) set up control experiments where the same proportion of arbitrary tokens randomly selected experts. These experiments are also repeated with the same seeds in (1). Such configurations help us separate the effects of lucky improvement from random search.

The results is shown in Fig 1. The three tasks consistently demonstrate the following results: 1) allowing uncertain tokens to randomly select experts can lead to better performance; 2) allowing the same number of arbitrary tokens to randomly select experts can lead to a decrease in performance. From this result, we can infer that uncertain tokens may choose the incorrect experts during inference.

5.2 Global Workspace Broadcasts Knowledge

Compared to standard fine-tuning, GW-MoE makes the updates to the experts by uncertain tokens fully-differentiable. This ensures that during fine-tuning, all experts can learn the knowledge from the uncertain tokens. In other words, if we consider the experts as memory blocks, we store the information needed by uncertain tokens in all the blocks. During inference, uncertain tokens that cannot determine the choice of experts can obtain the necessary knowledge from any expert. Therefore, if GW broadcasts knowledge for uncertain tokens to all experts, we can expect a GW-tuned MoE to perform better than the standard-tuned one when we enforce uncertain tokens to select experts randomly.

To verify this, we conduct experiments of random expert selection on the GW-tuned and standard-tuned Switch-Base-8 models. To better illustrate the differences, we let all layers' uncertain tokens to randomly select experts. Tab 6 shows the

Method	EM	Decrease
Standard FT	80.28	3.07
GW-MoE	82.74	0.78

Table 6: The impact of uncertain tokens randomly selecting experts. We report the values of EM on the SQuAD dataset and the decrease compared to using the Top- K selection of experts.

results: when uncertain tokens in the GW-tuned model randomly select experts, the Exact Match (EM) only decreases 0.78; in contrast, the standard-tuned model suffers a 3.07 decrease. This suggests that in the models trained with GW-MoE, **the knowledge for uncertain tokens is stored in all experts** and they can acquire the necessary knowledge from any expert. Thus, the uncertain tokens are less sensitive to the choice of experts. Although such broadcasting can lead to redundancies in each expert for the uncertain tokens, we will show it is an effective solution since it's hard to correct the router for the uncertain tokens directly.

5.3 Router is Hard to Correct

As GW provides the router with more information about the experts, one may expect GW to bring improvement by helping some uncertain tokens find suitable experts and reduce their choice entropy. However, we find the ratio of uncertain tokens before and after fine-tuning on Alpaca is approximately 1 : 3 on JetMoE when both GW-tuned or standard-tuned. This indicates it's hard to directly correct the uncertain token problem via tuning even when the router is provided with more information under the current MoE framework. Therefore, the broadcast knowledge in Sec 5.2 brought by GW is the main factor for the improvement. We leave other methods to solve the uncertain token problem without redundancy for future works.

This also highlights one potential limitation in the existing Top- K routing design: some tokens can't find the best expert combination. This can also explain why shared-expert (Wu et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2024) design brings benefits: the shared-experts improve the min-max results for tokens that can't find suitable experts.

5.4 Uncertain Tokens

An interesting question is which tokens in natural languages are more likely to be uncertain in MoE models. We count the 50 most frequently broadcast tokens in JetMoE on the Alpaca dataset, as shown

in Fig 3. Surprisingly, the most uncertain tokens are those without clear semantics, such as articles, conjunctions, prepositions, punctuation marks, and some very common verbs and nouns.

One possible explanation is that when a model predicts the next token autoregressively, it is indeed difficult to determine which expert to process these words without specific meaning. For instance, when the word "sing" appears, one might naturally anticipate the next word to be "song." However, when the current word is an article like "a", without context, it is impossible to make a prediction because there are too many possible options. These tokens require different expert knowledge due to different contexts, hence they have higher H .

"_to", "_in", "_of", "_be", "_is", "_", "_for", "_that", "_as", "_are", "_", "_can", "_it", "_with", "_data", "_a", "_have", "_on", "_by", "_s", "_was", "_help", "_should", "_from", "_used", "_the", "_has", "ing", "_", "_tasks", "_been", "_not", "_reduce", "_you", "_them", "_I", "_at", "_use", "_they", "_provide", "_will", "_technology", "_had", "_.", "_learning", "_system", "_make", "_model", "_create", "_such",

Figure 3: The 50 most frequently broadcast tokens in JetMoE. Most of them do not have a clear semantic.

We use the same H^* and also count the most broadcast tokens on the DialogSum dataset by Switch-Base-8. Since the model is based on the T5 architecture, we perform separate statistics for the encoder and decoder. The most broadcast tokens in the decoder are highly similar to those in JetMoE, and the most broadcast tokens in the encoder are shown in Fig 4. Unlike the decoder, the tokens that are broadcast the most in the encoder include more words with clear semantics. The role of the encoder is to integrate information, so there is no need to pay special attention to words that lack semantics; instead, common words with clear semantics have higher H .

"_people", "_example", "_facebook", "_mom", "_", "_prepared", "_afternoon", "_like", "_work", "_life", "_study", "_designed", "a", "_move", "_drive", "_remain", "_bought", "_lunch", "_planned", "_file", "_prescribed", "allons", ":", "_to", "_", "_all", "_make", "_only", "_first", "_back", "_day", "_business", "_game", "_plan", "_access", "_house", "_music", "_film", "_practice", "_summer", "_favorite", "_cut", "_talk", "_trip", "_weekend", "_dance", "_beach", "_dinner", "_focused", "_ran",

Figure 4: The 50 most frequently broadcast tokens in the encoder of Switch-Base-8. These tokens are mostly common words with clear semantics.

6 Ablation Study

Activating more experts for all tokens results in worse performance. GW-MoE activates more

	Top1 FT	Top2 FT
Top1 Eval	83.35	82.29
Top2 Eval	78.98	81.78

Table 7: EM of different Top- K tuning/inference combinations on SQuAD.

	GLUE (avg)	SQuAD	Quoref	DialogSum
w/o broadcast	83.85	83.52	26.56	24.34
w/ broadcast	83.70	83.48	26.43	24.26

Table 8: Comparison of whether to broadcast uncertain tokens during inference with the same metrics as Sec 4.3.

experts for uncertain tokens during fine-tuning. A naive approach would be to activate more experts for all tokens. We conduct validation experiments on the SQuAD dataset using the Switch-Base-8. In Tab 7, we report the EM of the following four settings: Top1 fine-tuning/Top1 eval, Top2 fine-tuning/Top1 eval, Top1 fine-tuning/Top2 eval and Top2 fine-tuning/Top2 eval. It can be observed that activating more experts during evaluation than during pre-training can lead to performance drop, even if the number of active experts is changed during fine-tuning. We believe that not all tokens require the activation of more experts during fine-tuning, only the uncertain tokens need to pass information to all experts. In addition, it is also important to ensure that the number of activated experts remains consistent with that during pre-training.

It’s not necessary to broadcast uncertain tokens during inference. GW-MoE does not introduce additional inference costs, it remains the same as the standard model during inference. We test the impact of broadcasting uncertain tokens on performance during inference, as shown in Tab 8. Interestingly, not broadcasting uncertain tokens is a better choice during inference in almost all tasks. We speculate that the reason might be the difference in entropy distribution between the training set and the test set, where some tokens that are certain in the training set are incorrectly broadcast during inference. Unlike (Huang et al., 2024), GW-MoE focuses on the uncertainty of expert selection rather than activating more experts for harder tokens.

H^* **needs to match the $max\ num\ slots$.** In GW-MoE, two additional hyperparameters are introduced: H^* and $max\ num\ slots$. The latter is used to limit the additional computational overhead during fine-tuning. We fix the encoder’s $max\ num\ slots$ to 16, decoder’s to 1, and we try different values

of H^* on the SQuAD dataset. The variation of EM with H^* can be seen in Fig 5. EM is highest when H^* is 1.8, which is also the value we adopt in our experiments based on the distribution of the encoder’s entropy. When H^* greater than 1.8, we suspect it could cause the exclusion of uncertain tokens from selection, resulting in a decrease of EM; when H^* is less than 1.8, due to the limitation of the *max num slots*, certain tokens might occupy the limited broadcasting rights, preventing the truly uncertain tokens from being broadcast. In summary, the two additional hyperparameters in GW-MoE need to match each other. We suggest using a value close to 5% of the dataset’s average length as the *max num slots*, corresponding to the statistical method of H^* in Sec 3.1. In our experiments, such settings typically result in a stable improvement.




Figure 5: The variation of EM with H^* . The dashed line indicates the result of standard fine-tuning.

7 Related Work

7.1 Mixture of Experts

Shazeer et al. (2017) introduce the Mixture of Experts (MoE) into the LSTM model and apply it to the machine translation task. Subsequently, Lepikhin et al. (2020) is the first to introduce MoE into the transformer model. With the release of Switch Transformer (Fedus et al., 2022), MoE begins to be widely used in the training of LLMs, such as (Jiang et al., 2024; Dai et al., 2024; Shen et al., 2024). At the same time, many works focus on the design of the router: Roller et al. (2021); Dai et al. (2022) propose using static routing to ensure load balancing among experts and stable training; Zhou et al. (2022) propose using expert-choice, allowing different tokens to be assigned to various experts. Liu et al. (2023b); Qiu et al. (2023) use the experts’

first layer weights as expert embedding to further connect the router and expert. In addition, Wu et al. (2022); Rajbhandari et al. (2022); Dai et al. (2024) utilized shared experts to represent the common knowledge among experts.

Recently, many works have suggested that the number of experts should be dynamically determined based on the input tokens (Li et al., 2023a; Huang et al., 2024). These works are more relevant to ours; they also select more experts for some tokens based on the router’s information. Unlike they activate more parameters for some tokens during inference, our method focuses on the tokens in the input sequence that are uncertain about the expert choice. We activate all experts for these tokens only during fine-tuning while remaining consistent with the standard MoE during inference, thus not introducing additional overhead.

We also find that there is limited research on fine-tuning MoE models. Shen et al. (2023) and Chi et al. (2022) suggest that freezing the router parameters can prevent overfitting during fine-tuning. Zhao et al. (2024) introduces an additional hypernetwork to provide information from unselected experts. By learning the parameters of the hypernetwork during fine-tuning, it performs better than the standard MoE. Our work does not introduce additional parameters and provides a new perspective on routing uncertainty for model fine-tuning.

7.2 Global Workspace Theory

GWT (Baars, 1993), as a theory of consciousness, is receiving growing attention in the quest to build Artificial General Intelligence. These works (VanRullen and Kanai, 2021; Butlin et al., 2023) leverage GWT to discuss how to build true intelligence from existing models. Our work differs from theirs, we focus on how to draw on GWT to make uncertain tokens be able to acquire the required knowledge during inference.

8 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce GW-MoE, a novel MoE model fine-tuning method, which does not introduce any additional inference overhead. We observe many uncertain tokens in the pre-trained MoE model, and routers can assign worse-than-random experts to them. Inspired by GWT, we broadcast uncertain tokens during fine-tuning, allowing all experts to learn this part of the knowledge; during inference, the required knowledge can be obtained

from any expert. We show the effectiveness of our method on multiple NLP tasks. We conduct in-depth analyses of the router behaviors in MoE and prove GWT brings improvement via broadcasting knowledge. Our analysis can provide insights for the design of routers and MoE pre-training.

Limitations

There are several limitations: 1) In this work, we only focus on the models' fine-tuning and did not explore the possibility of using GW-MoE during the pre-training. 2) Due to the limitations of experimental conditions, we did not validate our method on larger-scale models, such as Mixtral $8 \times 7B$ and Mixtral $8 \times 22B$. 3) Based on experimental observations and the results from DeepSeek MoE (Dai et al., 2024), we find that MoE models underperform dense models in understanding tasks like MMLU. Due to the lack of semantics in the broadcast tokens, GW-MoE is also unable to provide an enhancement to decoder-only models in understanding tasks. We will leave the improvements for these issues to future work.

References

- Bernard J. Baars. 1993. *A Cognitive Theory of Consciousness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Loubna Ben Allal, Niklas Muennighoff, Logesh Kumar Umaphathi, Ben Lipkin, and Leandro von Werra. 2022. A framework for the evaluation of code generation models. <https://github.com/bigcode-project/bigcode-evaluation-harness>.
- Emmanuel Bengio, Pierre-Luc Bacon, Joelle Pineau, and Doina Precup. 2016. *Conditional computation in neural networks for faster models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:1511.06297.
- Patrick Butlin, Robert Long, Eric Elmoznino, Yoshua Bengio, Jonathan Birch, Axel Constant, George Deane, Stephen M. Fleming, Chris Frith, Xu Ji, Ryota Kanai, Colin Klein, Grace Lindsay, Matthias Michel, Liad Mudrik, Megan A. K. Peters, Eric Schwitzgebel, Jonathan Simon, and Rufin VanRullen. 2023. *Consciousness in artificial intelligence: Insights from the science of consciousness*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.08708.
- Daniel Cer, Mona Diab, Eneko Agirre, Inigo Lopez-Gazpio, and Lucia Specia. 2017. *Semeval-2017 task 1: Semantic textual similarity multilingual and crosslingual focused evaluation*. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021a. *Evaluating large language models trained on code*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2107.03374.
- Yulong Chen, Yang Liu, Liang Chen, and Yue Zhang. 2021b. *DialogSum: A real-life scenario dialogue summarization dataset*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 5062–5074, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zewen Chi, Li Dong, Shaohan Huang, Damai Dai, Shuming Ma, Barun Patra, Saksham Singhal, Payal Bajaj, Xia Song, Xian-Ling Mao, Heyan Huang, and Furu Wei. 2022. *On the representation collapse of sparse mixture of experts*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2204.09179.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv:1803.05457v1*.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Chenggang Zhao, R. X. Xu, Huazuo Gao, Deli Chen, Jiashi Li, Wangding Zeng, Xingkai Yu, Y. Wu, Zhenda Xie, Y. K. Li, Panpan Huang, Fuli Luo, Chong Ruan, Zhifang Sui, and Wenfeng Liang. 2024. *Deepseekmoe: Towards ultimate expert specialization in mixture-of-experts language models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.06066.
- Damai Dai, Li Dong, Shuming Ma, Bo Zheng, Zhifang Sui, Baobao Chang, and Furu Wei. 2022. *Stablemoe: Stable routing strategy for mixture of experts*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2204.08396.
- Yuhao Dan, Zhikai Lei, Yiyang Gu, Yong Li, Jianghao Yin, Jiaju Lin, Linhao Ye, Zhiyan Tie, Yougen Zhou, Yilei Wang, Aimin Zhou, Ze Zhou, Qin Chen, Jie Zhou, Liang He, and Xipeng Qiu. 2023. *Educhat: A large-scale language model-based chatbot system for intelligent education*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.02773.
- Pradeep Dasigi, Nelson F. Liu, Ana Marasovic, Noah A. Smith, and Matt Gardner. 2019. Quoref: A reading comprehension dataset with questions requiring coreferential reasoning. *arXiv:1908.05803v2*.
- Dorottya Demszky, Kelvin Guu, and Percy Liang. 2018. *Transforming question answering datasets into natural language inference datasets*. *Preprint*, arXiv:1809.02922.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. *Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding*. *Preprint*, arXiv:1810.04805.

- William B Dolan and Chris Brockett. 2005. Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Paraphrasing*.
- William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2022. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *Preprint*, arXiv:2101.03961.
- Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Alain Le Noac’h, Haonan Li, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Chris Ociepa, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Hailey Schoelkopf, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. 2023. A framework for few-shot language model evaluation.
- Mor Geva, Roei Schuster, Jonathan Berant, and Omer Levy. 2021. Transformer feed-forward layers are key-value memories. *Preprint*, arXiv:2012.14913.
- Danilo Giampiccolo, Bernardo Magnini, Ido Dagan, and Bill Dolan. 2007. The third PASCAL recognizing textual entailment challenge. In *Proceedings of the ACL-PASCAL workshop on textual entailment and paraphrasing*, pages 1–9. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shwai He, Run-Ze Fan, Liang Ding, Li Shen, Tianyi Zhou, and Dacheng Tao. 2023. Merging experts into one: Improving computational efficiency of mixture of experts. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14685–14691, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Quzhe Huang, Zhenwei An, Nan Zhuang, Mingxu Tao, Chen Zhang, Yang Jin, Kun Xu, Kun Xu, Liwei Chen, Songfang Huang, and Yansong Feng. 2024. Harder tasks need more experts: Dynamic routing in moe models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.07652.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th  ophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. *Mixture of experts*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.04088.
- Dmitry Lepikhin, HyoukJoong Lee, Yuanzhong Xu, Dehao Chen, Orhan Firat, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Noam Shazeer, and Zhifeng Chen. 2020. Gshard: Scaling giant models with conditional computation and automatic sharding. *Preprint*, arXiv:2006.16668.
- Mike Lewis, Shruti Bhosale, Tim Dettmers, Naman Goyal, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2021. *Base layers: Simplifying training of large, sparse models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2103.16716.
- Jiamin Li, Qiang Su, Yitao Yang, Yimin Jiang, Cong Wang, and Hong Xu. 2023a. Adaptive gating in mixture-of-experts based language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.07188.
- Yunxiang Li, Zihan Li, Kai Zhang, Ruilong Dan, Steve Jiang, and You Zhang. 2023b. Chatdoctor: A medical chat model fine-tuned on a large language model meta-ai (llama) using medical domain knowledge. *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.14070.
- Tianlin Liu, Joan Puigcerver, and Mathieu Blondel. 2023a. Sparsity-constrained optimal transport. *Preprint*, arXiv:2209.15466.
- Zeyu Leo Liu, Tim Dettmers, Xi Victoria Lin, Veselin Stoyanov, and Xian Li. 2023b. Towards a unified view of sparse feed-forward network in pre-training large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13999*.
- OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2024. *Gpt-4 technical report*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.08774.
- Joan Puigcerver, Carlos Riquelme, Basil Mustafa, and Neil Houlsby. 2024. From sparse to soft mixtures of experts. *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.00951.
- Zihan Qiu, Zeyu Huang, and Jie Fu. 2023. Emergent mixture-of-experts: Can dense pre-trained transformers benefit from emergent modular structures? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10908*.
- Zihan Qiu, Zeyu Huang, Youcheng Huang, and Jie Fu. 2024. Empirical study on updating key-value memories in transformer feed-forward layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12233*.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Samyam Rajbhandari, Conglong Li, Z. Yao, Minjia Zhang, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, A. Awan, Jeff Rasley, and Yuxiong He. 2022. Deepspeed-moe: Advancing mixture-of-experts inference and training to power next-generation ai scale. *ArXiv*, abs/2201.05596.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Li. 2016. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05250*.

- Stephen Roller, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Arthur Szlam, and Jason Weston. 2021. [Hash layers for large sparse models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2106.04426.
- Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. 2017. [Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1701.06538.
- Sheng Shen, Le Hou, Yanqi Zhou, Nan Du, Shayne Longpre, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Barret Zoph, William Fedus, Xinyun Chen, Tu Vu, Yuexin Wu, Wuyang Chen, Albert Webson, Yunxuan Li, Vincent Zhao, Hongkun Yu, Kurt Keutzer, Trevor Darrell, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Mixture-of-experts meets instruction tuning: a winning combination for large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.14705.
- Yikang Shen, Zhen Guo, Tianle Cai, and Zengyi Qin. 2024. [Jetmoe: Reaching llama2 performance with 0.1m dollars](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.07413.
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D Manning, Andrew Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*, pages 1631–1642.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. [Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2302.13971.
- Rufin VanRullen and Ryota Kanai. 2021. [Deep learning and the global workspace theory](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2012.10390.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. [Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1804.07461.
- Zhiguo Wang, Wael Hamza, and Radu Florian. 2017. [Bilateral multi-perspective matching for natural language sentences](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1702.03814.
- Alex Warstadt, Amanpreet Singh, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2018. Neural network acceptability judgments. *arXiv preprint 1805.12471*.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2018. A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*.
- Lemeng Wu, Mengchen Liu, Yinpeng Chen, Dongdong Chen, Xiyang Dai, and Lu Yuan. 2022. Residual mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.09636*.
- Hao Zhao, Zihan Qiu, Huijia Wu, Zili Wang, Zhaofeng He, and Jie Fu. 2024. [HypermoE: Towards better mixture of experts via transferring among experts](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.12656.
- Ou Zheng, Mohamed Abdel-Aty, Dongdong Wang, Zijin Wang, and Shengxuan Ding. 2023. [Chatgpt is on the horizon: Could a large language model be suitable for intelligent traffic safety research and applications?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.05382.
- Zexuan Zhong, Mengzhou Xia, Danqi Chen, and Mike Lewis. 2024. [Lory: Fully differentiable mixture-of-experts for autoregressive language model pre-training](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.03133.
- Yanqi Zhou, Tao Lei, Hanxiao Liu, Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Vincent Zhao, Andrew Dai, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc Le, and James Laudon. 2022. [Mixture-of-experts with expert choice routing](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2202.09368.

A Hyperparameters Used and More Experiments Details

We use Adam optimizer for all tasks with the first 10% warm-up steps. For GLUE benchmarks, we employ a batch size of 32, train for 10 epochs besides RTE (20 epochs), and perform a grid search for the appropriate learning rate between $1e - 5$ and $5e - 5$. In our method, the *max num slots* is set to 8 for encoder, and 1 for decoder. In question answering tasks, we adopt a batch size of 64, a learning rate of $3e - 5$, and train for 10 epochs with *max num slots* allocated as 16 for the encoder and 1 for the decoder. For the summarization task, we utilize a batch size of 64, a learning rate of $5e - 5$ and train for 10 epochs. The *max num slots* is set to 32 for encoder, and 8 for decoder. In large-scale experiments, we use 128 as batch size, $2e - 5$ as learning rate, 16 as *max num slots* and train 3 epochs. For Switch-Base-8, we set the maximum token length to 384 for question-answering tasks, 256 for other tasks besides DialogSum. We set max length to 1024, and max target length to 256 for DialogSum. In larger scale experiments, we set max length to 512 during instruction-tuning; during evaluation, we set max length to 4096 and max target length to 512.

Our all experiments are conducted on eight Nvidia 80GB A100 GPUs, with the running time for different tasks ranging from a few minutes to ten hours.

Method	CoLA	SST-2	MRPC	STS-B	QQP	RTE	QNLI	MNLI
Standard FT	54.65±1.92	94.86±0.24	88.48±0.32	88.62±0.21	91.66±0.04	67.10±0.96	92.88±0.32	88.29±0.03
GW-MoE	55.17±1.13	94.90±0.28	88.35±1.67	88.96±0.12	91.70±0.09	70.49±3.23	92.81±0.02	88.43±0.17

Table 9: The results with standard deviations for the GLUE in section 4.3.

Method	DialogSum	SQuAD	Quoref
Standard FT	24.06±0.28	83.35±0.18	25.97±0.63
GW-MoE	24.34±0.33	83.52±0.15	26.56±0.07

Table 10: The results with standard deviations for NLG tasks in section 4.3.

B Standard Deviation of the Main Results

Tab 9 and Tab 10 demonstrate the standard deviations of the results for GLUE and the NLG tasks in section 4.3.