
KV-Fold: One-Step KV-Cache Recurrence for Long-Context Inference

Alireza Nadali *

Department of Computer Science
University of Colorado Boulder
Boulder, Colorado, 80301
a_nadali@colorado.edu

Patrick Cooper*

Department of Computer Science
University of Colorado Boulder
Boulder, Colorado, 80301
patrick.cooper@colorado.edu

Ashutosh Trivedi

Department of Computer Science
University of Colorado Boulder
Boulder, Colorado, 80301
ashutosh.trivedi@colorado.edu

Alvaro Velasquez

Department of Computer Science
University of Colorado Boulder
Boulder, Colorado, 80301
alvaro.velasquez@colorado.edu

Abstract

We introduce *KV-Fold*, a simple, training-free long-context inference protocol that treats the key–value (KV) cache as the accumulator in a left fold over sequence chunks. At each step, the model processes the next chunk conditioned on the accumulated cache, appends the newly produced keys and values, and passes the enlarged cache forward; the same one-step update is applied repeatedly, analogous to `foldl` in functional programming. Building on the KV cache concatenation primitive introduced for latent multi-agent communication, we repurpose it as a chunk-to-chunk recurrence for long-context inference. When processing chunk t , the model attends to the KV cache carried from earlier chunks as a prefix, reusing its internal state across segments without modifying or retraining the model. Despite its simplicity, the induced recurrence is stable: per-step drift rises briefly and then saturates into a flat plateau that persists across deep chains. This plateau is insensitive to a $10,000\times$ change in numerical precision, robust across chunk sizes, and consistent across model families. At the task level, KV-Fold preserves exact information over long distances. On a needle-in-a-haystack benchmark, it achieves 100% exact-match retrieval across 152 trials spanning contexts from 16K to 128K tokens and chain depths up to 511 on Llama-3.1-8B, while remaining within the memory limits of a single 40GB GPU. Compared to streaming methods, which trade fidelity for bounded memory, KV-Fold maintains long-range retrieval while operating as a sequence of tractable forward passes. Overall, our results show that frozen pretrained transformers already support a stable form of KV-cache recurrence, providing a practical route to long-context inference without architectural changes or training.

1 Introduction

Large pretrained transformers [1] have become the default architecture for language modeling, code generation, and long-form reasoning. However, their ability to use context remains constrained by the *attention budget* of a single forward pass. A token can attend only to the tokens represented within the current attention computation, while the memory cost of full attention grows quadratically with

*Equal Contribution

sequence length. As a result, applications that naturally generate long streams of information, such as repository-scale code assistance, longitudinal medical records, customer preference modeling over extended interaction histories, and monitoring of sensitive defense operations, quickly exceed the practical limits of ordinary inference. This raises a natural question: *can a pretrained transformer carry its internal state across successive chunks, turning long-context inference into a recurrence rather than a single monolithic forward pass?*

Although recent models have pushed context windows into the hundreds of thousands or even millions of tokens, the restriction remains binding in practice. Even at this scale, real workloads can exceed the available context: large codebases such as DOE systems like E3SM, FLASH, and NWChem span millions of lines of code, with each line corresponding to roughly ten or more tokens. Processing such sequences still requires truncation, repeated re-encoding, or approximations that alter the attention computation. A large body of work has sought to overcome this limitation. Streaming methods maintain bounded inference memory by retaining a small set of attention sinks together with a sliding window of recent tokens [9, 10]. KV-cache compression methods attempt to preserve useful past information while evicting, pruning, or quantizing parts of the cache [11–17]. Other approaches introduce recurrent memory or learned compression mechanisms [22–26, 28], modify positional encodings or attention patterns, or replace attention with state-space dynamics [34, 35]. These methods have produced impressive progress, but they also expose a persistent trade-off: they either modify the model, require training or fine-tuning, compress the past into a lossy state, approximate the attention computation, or discard old tokens entirely. In settings where exact recall matters, such as recovering an identifier from a long log or preserving a factual detail introduced much earlier in a document, these trade-offs can be unacceptable.

This paper explores a simpler possibility: the key–value (KV) cache of a pretrained transformer can itself serve as a recurrent state. In a decoder-only transformer, the KV cache stores layer-wise representations of previous tokens, which later tokens access through attention. Although this cache is usually treated as a serving optimization, it is also a structured record of the model’s past computation. Recent work on latent multi-agent communication [8] showed that one transformer pass can attend to another pass’s KV cache as a prefix, allowing information transfer directly through latent state. We repurpose this primitive for long-context inference within a single pretrained model.


We introduce *KV-Fold*. A long sequence is divided into chunks. When processing chunk t , the model attends to the accumulated KV cache from earlier chunks as a prefix, produces new keys and values for the current chunk, and passes the enlarged cache to chunk $t+1$. This turns standard transformer inference into a simple chunk-to-chunk recurrence in which the KV cache plays the role of the accumulator in a left fold: a single one-step update is applied repeatedly over the chunk sequence, analogous to `foldl` in functional programming. The model parameters remain unchanged, no special memory tokens are introduced, and no fine-tuning is required. The shift is purely operational: instead of a single monolithic full-context forward pass, the model processes the sequence as a chain of manageable forward passes, carrying its state forward through the KV cache. This comes with a tradeoff: the cache grows linearly with sequence length, increasing memory use and per-step latency relative to streaming approaches.

The main empirical finding is that this recurrence is stable. If each chunk boundary introduced independent error, one would expect the difference from full attention to grow with chain depth. Instead, we observe a short transient followed by a flat plateau: per-step drift rises in the first few transitions and then stabilizes, remaining essentially unchanged even across deep chains. This plateau is insensitive to a $10,000\times$ change in numerical precision, robust across chunk sizes, and consistent across transformer families. In other words, KV-Fold does not behave like accumulated numerical error; it moves the model into a slightly shifted but stable attention regime.

Notably, this stable regime preserves useful long-range information. Because the KV state is not compressed, earlier tokens remain available for content-based addressing. On a needle-in-a-haystack benchmark spanning $T \in \{16\text{K}, 32\text{K}, 64\text{K}, 96\text{K}, 128\text{K}\}$ tokens, KV-Fold recovers 100% of inserted facts at every tested distance, including chain depth 511 on Llama-3.1-8B at the full 128K native context window.

The method occupies a distinct point on the memory-versus-retrieval trade-off. Compared to full attention, peak working memory is dramatically lower: at $T = 128\text{K}$ on a 40 GB A100, a single full-attention forward is infeasible (its attention-scores matrix alone is ~ 1 TB), while KV-Fold fits within the hardware budget at 35.6 GB peak and completes in 171 s. Compared to streaming methods,

Figure 1: **Headline result.** *Left:* on Llama-3.1-8B at $T = 128\text{K}$, KV-Fold holds 100% exact-match retrieval at every tested distance through chain depth 511, while StreamingLLM falls to 0% once the needle exits its 1024-token cache. *Right:* peak GPU memory grows linearly at 0.13 KB per token; the chain at $T = 128\text{K}$, depth 511 completes in 171 s.



peak memory is substantially higher: StreamingLLM [9] holds a constant 1024-token cache (16.6 GB peak at $T=128\text{K}$) while KV-Fold’s cache grows linearly to 17.18 GB for similar setting. The extra memory pays for retrieval: KV-Fold maintains 100% at every tested distance, while StreamingLLM loses access once the needle exits its 1024-token window (Figure 1).

This paper introduces *KV-Fold*, a training-free protocol for long-context inference with pretrained transformers, and provides a systematic empirical characterization of its behavior. Our contributions are as follows:

- We propose KV-Fold, a simple inference-time protocol that turns a frozen pretrained transformer into a recurrent long-context model by carrying the accumulated KV cache across chunks as the accumulator in a left fold, without architectural changes, special memory tokens, or fine-tuning.
- We show that the induced recurrence is stable: its drift relative to full attention rises briefly and then saturates into a flat plateau, rather than accumulating with chain depth.
- We show that this plateau is structural rather than numerical: it is largely unchanged under a $10,000\times$ increase in numerical precision, consistent across model families, and robust across a wide range of chunk sizes.
- We demonstrate that KV-Fold preserves exact long-range information, matching full-attention retrieval on needle-in-a-haystack benchmarks through contexts up to 128K tokens and chain depths up to 511.
- We characterize its practical trade-offs relative to streaming methods such as StreamingLLM: streaming achieves bounded-memory and faster runtime, but loses retrieval once content exits the window, whereas KV-Fold preserves retrieval by retaining the full KV history with linear memory.

Overview of questions. Taken together, these results raise a set of concrete questions about the behavior of the recurrence. Does error accumulate with chain depth, or does it settle into a bounded regime? If drift appears, is it driven by numerical precision or by a structural shift in the attention computation? How robust is this behavior across architectures and operational choices such as chunk size? Does the recurrence preserve task-level information, in particular the ability to retrieve exact facts introduced far back in the sequence? Finally, how does the method scale in practice, in terms of memory, compute, and achievable context length on real hardware? We answer each of these questions empirically in the sections that follow.

Organization. Section 2 introduces KV-Fold. Section 3 studies the stability of the recurrence and characterizes drift as a function of chain depth. Section 3.1 examines whether this drift is numerical or structural, and robustness across architectures and chunk sizes. Section 4 measures task-level retrieval, and Section 5 analyzes scaling behavior in memory, compute, and context length.




Figure 2: **KV-Fold**. Queries in chunk t attend to the KV cache from earlier chunks (amber) as a prefix; chunk t 's KV states are then appended and carried forward. No compression or additional parameters are introduced.

2 KV-Fold

We adopt the chunked-attention setup standard in the long-context literature. A long sequence of length T is divided into chunks of length C , yielding $N = T/C$ chunks indexed $0, 1, \dots, N-1$. Each chunk is processed as a single forward pass through the model. At chunk t , we run a forward pass on the input chunk $\mathbf{x}_t = [x_{tC}, x_{tC+1}, \dots, x_{(t+1)C-1}]$ (boldface $\mathbf{x}_t$ denotes the length- C chunk vector; plain x_i denotes the individual token at absolute position i), and use the previous chunk's KV cache as the prefix. Concretely, for each transformer layer ℓ , the attention computation at chunk t produces queries $Q_t^{(\ell)}$ from the new tokens and uses keys $K_{0:t}^{(\ell)} = [K_0^{(\ell)}; K_1^{(\ell)}; \dots; K_{t-1}^{(\ell)}; K_t^{(\ell)}]$ and analogously concatenated values $V_{0:t}^{(\ell)}$, where $K_s^{(\ell)}$ and $V_s^{(\ell)}$ are the keys and values produced when chunk s was processed. Position identifiers for the new tokens are continued from the absolute sequence position tC , so the positional embedding RoPE [2] rotations are aligned with the original sequence. This is the LatentMAS Equation 4 primitive applied across consecutive chunks instead of across distinct agents. Figure 2 illustrates one chunk-to-chunk transition: chunk $t-1$'s K and V are passed unchanged into chunk t 's attention as prefix, with continuous position IDs across the boundary.

A recurrent view. This procedure can be interpreted as recurrence over chunks. Let $(\mathcal{K}^{(t)}, \mathcal{V}^{(t)})$ denote the accumulated KV cache after chunk t . Then

$$(\mathcal{K}^{(t)}, \mathcal{V}^{(t)}) = \mathcal{F}_\theta((\mathcal{K}^{(t-1)}, \mathcal{V}^{(t-1)}), \mathbf{x}_t),$$

where $\mathcal{F}_\theta$ is the standard transformer forward pass. Equivalently, the full inference can be written as a left fold over the chunk sequence,

$$(\mathcal{K}^{(N-1)}, \mathcal{V}^{(N-1)}) = \text{foldl}(\mathcal{F}_\theta, (\emptyset, \emptyset), [\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{N-1}]),$$

with the KV cache playing the role of the accumulator and the same one-step update applied at every step. Unlike classical recurrent models, this state is not compressed into a fixed-dimensional vector; it grows with the sequence and retains structured representations of past tokens, allowing continued content-based addressing through attention.

Three reference conditions. For every experiment we measure three quantities per chunk:

- **FULL**: the next-token negative log-likelihood under a single full-attention forward pass over the entire T -token sequence. This is the ceiling.
- **ISOLATED**: Negative Log Likelihood (NLL) when each chunk is processed in isolation, with no prefix. This is the floor: each chunk sees no context from earlier chunks.
- **KV-FOLD**: NLL when each chunk is processed with the accumulated KV-cache prefix described above.

We define the per-depth drift as $\text{drift}(d) = \text{NLL}_{\text{KV-FOLD}}(d) - \text{NLL}_{\text{FULL}}(d)$ and the per-depth recurrence advantage as $\text{advantage}(d) = \text{NLL}_{\text{ISOLATED}}(d) - \text{NLL}_{\text{KV-FOLD}}(d)$, where d is the chain depth (chunk




Figure 3: **Drift saturates; advantage persists.** Per-step drift (blue) and recurrence advantage (green) versus chain depth on Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct ($T = 16,384$, $C = 256$). Drift saturates at ~ 0.04 nats by depth 7 and remains flat through depth 63, while recurrence advantage stays positive throughout.

index minus 1). We use the validation split of PG-19 [23], a benchmark of long-form prose, sampled at random with a fixed seed. Each window starts with 200 tokens into a document and spans the next T tokens. All NLL values are computed in bfloat16 unless stated otherwise.

3 Stability of the recurrence

If KV-Fold simply accumulated error at each step, drift would grow steadily with depth. Instead, we observe a short transient followed by a stable plateau. On Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct [39] with $T = 16,384$ and $C = 256$ (depths 0–63), drift rises during the first few transitions, saturates by depth seven, and remains essentially unchanged thereafter. Between depths 15 and 60, the total change is just -0.0003 nats, well within window-to-window noise ($N = 42$). The central empirical result is therefore not growing error, but bounded drift: after a small initial shift at early chunk boundaries, further chaining does not move the system farther from the full-attention regime.

The recurrence also remains useful across the entire chain. The advantage of KV-FOLD over isolated chunks ranges from $+0.33$ nats at $d = 1$ to $+0.45$ nats at $d = 63$ and stays positive throughout (Figure 3), closing 89 to 94% of the gap between isolated processing and full attention.

Interpretation as a stable attention regime. The saturation behavior in Figure 3 suggests a simple way to think about KV-Fold. Each step in the chain applies the same computation: the model reads a new chunk while attending to the accumulated KV cache from all previous chunks. This naturally defines a deterministic recurrence over the model’s internal state. Writing $(\mathcal{K}^{(t)}, \mathcal{V}^{(t)})$ for the cache after chunk t , we can express this as (introduced in Section 2):

$$(\mathcal{K}^{(t)}, \mathcal{V}^{(t)}) = \mathcal{F}_\theta((\mathcal{K}^{(t-1)}, \mathcal{V}^{(t-1)}), x^{(t)}).$$

What the experiments show is that this recurrence does not lead to unbounded drift. Instead, after a few steps, the system settles into a regime where applying the same update again has essentially no further effect on the model’s predictions. The plateau in drift reflects this: once the model has adjusted to the KV-Fold regime, additional chunk transitions leave it operating in the same regime.

A useful way to interpret this is as a fixed point of the induced dynamics. KV-Fold appears to move the model from its full-attention operating point into a nearby, self-consistent one. The initial rise in drift corresponds to this transition; the flat region that follows indicates that the model remains there under repeated application of the same computation.

Importantly, this regime is not degenerate. Two features of the construction help preserve useful behavior. First, the KV state is neither compressed nor bounded: the cache *accumulates* rather than overwrites — at chunk t it holds the keys and values from every earlier chunk $0, 1, \dots, t-1$ together

Table 1: Robustness ablations. *Left*: increasing numerical precision by $10,000\times$ reduces plateau drift by only 2.8%. *Right*: plateau drift varies by less than 9% across an $8\times$ range of chunk sizes, with no monotonic dependence on C . The plateau remains structurally unchanged in both settings.

Precision	Plateau	$d = 1$	C	chunks	max d	Plateau
bf16	+0.0647	−0.0001	128	32	31	0.108
fp32	+0.0629	+0.0006	256	16	15	0.121
			512	8	7	0.129
Reduction	2.8%	—	1024	4	3	0.118

Table 2: Cross-architecture replication. Plateau drift averaged over depths 7–63 (7–15 for OLMoE, limited by its 4K context window). *OLMoE gap closed measured at $d = 15$. Despite differences in plateau magnitude (0.040–0.122 nats), all three models show the same qualitative pattern: brief initial drift followed by saturation into a stable plateau with positive recurrence advantage throughout.

Model	Family	Plateau drift	Advantage @ $d = 63$	Gap closed
OLMoE-1B-7B	Sparse MoE	0.122	+0.381	76%*
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	Dense (Qwen2)	0.040	+0.454	92%
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct [41]	Dense (Llama-3)	0.117	+0.391	77%

with the current chunk’s, and grows linearly with chain depth. Second, attention continues to provide content-based access to this state. Thus, even though the overall distribution shifts slightly, the model can still retrieve specific information from far back in the sequence. The needle-in-a-haystack results make this concrete: values inserted in the first chunk remain exactly recoverable after hundreds of subsequent transitions. As opposed to bounded-cache streaming methods such as StreamingLLM [9], whose sliding window evicts old tokens after a few hundred steps: perplexity is preserved but retrievability is lost past the window boundary — a contrast we quantify directly in Section 6.

We stress that this interpretation is descriptive rather than formal. We do not prove convergence or characterize the fixed point analytically. However, the consistency of the plateau (across depth, numerical precision, fragment size, and model family) suggests that it reflects a genuine property of the induced attention dynamics, rather than an artifact of a particular implementation.

3.1 Source of the drift: structural vs. numerical

A natural first hypothesis for the saturation behavior is that drift is dominated by accumulated rounding error. We test this directly by repeating the same protocol on Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct [39] (same model family, fits in fp32 on a single 40GB GPU) at both bf16 and fp32 precision.

Increasing precision by roughly $10,000\times$ (from ~ 3 decimal digits to ~ 7) reduces plateau drift by only 2.8% (Table 1, left). At depth one, drift is essentially zero in both precisions, confirming that a single chaining step is exactly information-preserving within numerical limits.

The drift plateau itself remains essentially unchanged. This points to a structural effect: chaining moves the model into a slightly different attention regime, after which additional transitions no longer introduce further shift. In other words, the discrepancy from full attention is set early and then stabilizes, rather than growing with depth.

Robustness across architectures. We replicate the depth experiment on three pretrained models from three families. Table 2 reports plateau drift and *recurrence advantage* at chain depth 63, where recurrence advantage is the per-depth NLL improvement of KV-FOLD over ISOLATED chunks ($\text{NLL}_{\text{ISOLATED}} - \text{NLL}_{\text{KV-FOLD}}$): how much information the recurrence transfers across chunk boundaries that isolated processing cannot. The qualitative pattern (sharp initial drift saturating into a flat plateau, with positive recurrence advantage throughout) is identical in all three architectures. The mechanism is a property of pretrained transformer attention itself, not of any specific training recipe or family.

Robustness to chunk size. We sweep chunk size $C \in \{128, 256, 512, 1024\}$ on OLMoE-1B-7B [40] at fixed total context $T = 4096$. Plateau drift varies by less than 9% across this $8\times$ range, with no monotonic dependence on C (Table 1, right). This suggests that the plateau is driven primarily by the chunk-boundary transition itself rather than by the amount of within-chunk context. In practice,

Table 3: Needle-in-a-haystack retrieval on Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct. FULL: full-attention upper bound; ISOLATED: question chunk without haystack context; KV-FOLD: KV-Fold. Twenty trials per distance. KV-FOLD matches full attention exactly across all tested distances.

Distance d	FULL	ISOLATED	KV-FOLD	ratio
1	100% (20/20)	0% (0/20)	100% (20/20)	1.00
15	100% (20/20)	0% (0/20)	100% (20/20)	1.00
31	100% (20/20)	0% (0/20)	100% (20/20)	1.00
62	100% (20/20)	0% (0/20)	100% (20/20)	1.00
overall	100% (80/80)	0% (0/80)	100% (80/80)	1.00

chunk size therefore becomes a flexible trade-off between chain depth and per-step compute: smaller chunks increase depth, while larger chunks amortize overhead, with little effect on drift.

4 Long-range retrieval

NLL is a marginal-distribution measure averaging over many kinds of predictions. We additionally evaluate at the task level using a needle-in-a-haystack retrieval benchmark [36], the standard probe of long-context retrieval employed by long-context evaluation suites [37, 38]. For each trial:

1. Sample a 16,384-token PG-19 window.
2. Sample a key from a fixed list of uncommon English words (*e.g.*, “amaranth”, “obsidian”, “halcyon”) and a uniformly random 5-digit value.
3. Insert the sentence “*The magic number for [key] is [value].*” at a controlled chunk position.
4. After all 64 data chunks, ask the model: “*Earlier in the document, what was the magic number associated with [key]? Reply with only the number.*”
5. Greedy-decode 30 tokens; extract the first 5-digit number from the output and compare to the gold value.

We test four needle placements, parameterized by the number of chain transitions d between the needle and the question: $d = 1$ (needle in the chunk immediately before the question), $d = 15$, $d = 31$, and $d = 62$ (needle in the first chunk, 62 transitions back, the deepest position in the 64-chunk haystack). Each placement is tested across twenty independent trials. The model is Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct.

Table 3 reports retrieval accuracy. KV-Fold achieves 100% exact-match retrieval at every tested distance, matching full attention exactly, while isolated chunks remain at 0%. The recurrence preserves specific factual content across deep chains: retrieving a previously unseen 5-digit value from chunk 1 across 62 chain transitions succeeds 20/20 times.

5 Scaling to long contexts

The needle-in-a-haystack experiment of Section 4 established 100% retrieval at 16K total context and chain depth 62. A natural question is whether this property extends to larger contexts where chunked recurrence is operationally required, i.e. where a single full-attention forward over the equivalent total context would be infeasible on the same hardware.

We use Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct [41] for this experiment because it has a 128K native context window: all our tested T values stay within the model’s trained position range, isolating chain-depth effects from any out-of-distribution RoPE behavior. We run the same needle-in-a-haystack protocol of Section 4 at four operating points: $T = 32$ K (chain depth 127, 10 trials per distance), $T = 64$ K (chain depth 255, 5 trials per distance), $T = 96$ K (chain depth 383, 3 trials per distance), and $T = 128$ K (chain depth 511, 3 trials per distance). At each operating point we test four needle-to-question distances: 1, 31, approximately the chain midpoint, and the maximum chain depth.

Retrieval, memory, and compute. Table 4 reports retrieval accuracy, KV cache size, peak GPU memory, and wall-clock at every operating point. Across 24 distance-cells spanning chain depths 1 to 511, every trial recovered the gold needle exactly. Combined with the 80/80 result of Section 4, the KV-Fold recurrence preserves precise factual content through chain depth 511, an order of magnitude

Table 4: Single-needle retrieval, memory, and compute at scale on Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct (A100 40GB). Retrieval is 100% at every tested distance (4 distances per row, 24 distance-cells in total; combined with Section 4, 152/152 trials). Memory and timing are from the first trial at each T . KV cache scales linearly at 0.13422 KB/token, matching the analytical prediction of $32 \times 8 \times 128 \times 2 \times 2 = 131,072$ bytes/token in bf16.

T	depth	trials/ d	retrieval	KV cache	peak GPU	per-chunk	total chain
32K	127	10	100%	4.29 GB	21.00 GB	0.103 s	13.2 s
64K	255	5	100%	8.59 GB	25.86 GB	0.176 s	44.9 s
96K	383	3	100%	12.88 GB	30.72 GB	0.252 s	96.9 s
128K	511	3	100%	17.18 GB	35.57 GB	0.335 s	171.3 s

Table 5: Multi-needle retrieval. K independent (key, value) pairs are inserted at evenly-spaced chunk positions; each key is queried separately. KV-Fold recovers all K needles simultaneously in 35/36 trials. The single miss is at $K = 4$, $d = 42$, a middle-distance position.

Model	T	K	trials	per-needle	all-correct	ISOLATED
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	16K	2	10	20/20 (100%)	10/10	0/20
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	16K	4	10	39/40 (97.5%)	9/10	0/40
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	16K	8	10	80/80 (100%)	10/10	0/80
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	128K	4	3	12/12 (100%)	3/3	0/12
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	128K	8	3	24/24 (100%)	3/3	0/24
combined			36	175/176 (99.4%)	35/36	0/176

deeper than the original needle benchmark. Memory and timing are reported for the first trial at each T . Peak memory at 128K leaves 4.4 GB of headroom on a 40 GB A100; this is the operational ceiling under the naive protocol, and coincides with Llama-3.1-8B’s full native context window.

The single-needle protocol of Section 4 can be strengthened by inserting K independent (key, value) pairs at K evenly-spaced chunk positions across the haystack and querying each key separately. This is the canonical multi-needle stress test used by RULER [37] and LongBench [38], and probes whether multiple distinct facts coexist in the cache without interference. We test $K \in \{4, 8\}$ on Llama-3.1-8B at $T = 128K$ with three trials per K (Table 5). KV-Fold achieves 100% per-needle retrieval (36/36 needles across 6 trials), with all K needles simultaneously recovered in every trial; the ISOLATED floor is 0/36. Eight distinct facts coexist through chain depth 510 without measurable interference. A larger-trial sweep on Qwen2.5-7B at $T = 16K$ ($K \in \{2, 4, 8\}$, 10 trials per K) gives 139/140 per-needle retrieval, with the single miss at a middle-distance position ($K = 4$, $d = 42$). The recurrence preserves distributed factual information, not just single salient facts.

The KV-Fold recurrence does *not* reduce total memory consumption below full attention: the cache at chain depth N stores the same information that a full forward over NC tokens would store.

The compute saving is asymptotically zero in FLOPs but operationally substantial in working memory. A single full-attention forward at $T=128K$ would require materializing the attention-scores matrix $QK^\top$, of shape $[H, T, T]$: with 32 attention heads and bfloat16, this is approximately $32 \times 128K \times 128K \times 2$ bytes ≈ 1 TB; infeasible on a 40 GB A100 by orders of magnitude. KV-Fold’s per-chunk attention-scores matrix at the largest step has shape $[H, C, T]$, approximately $32 \times 256 \times 128K \times 2$ bytes ≈ 2.1 GB, comfortably within budget. Per-chunk wall-clock grows linearly with the mean cache size during the chain ($0.103 \rightarrow 0.176 \rightarrow 0.252 \rightarrow 0.335$ s), matching the predicted $O(C \cdot \text{cache_size})$ scaling. Total chain wall-clock at 128K is 171 seconds. At scale, the benefit is direct: KV-Fold replaces a single intractable forward pass with a sequence of smaller ones, preserving the retrieval behavior of full attention while staying within per-chunk memory limits of practical hardware. This is not a reduction in total memory or FLOPs, but a reorganization that makes computation feasible in practice. On a 40 GB A100, the operational ceiling is reached at $T \approx 135K$ (by linear extrapolation), aligning with Llama-3.1-8B’s native context window. Pushing further requires either more GPU memory or compression of the stored cache. The latter is a separate axis of investigation that does not change the recurrence’s behavior in the regime tested here.

Table 6: Comparison at $T = 128\text{K}$, chain depth 511. Three trials per retrieval cell, three windows for NLL. KV-Fold achieves lower next-token loss and preserves retrieval at all tested distances; StreamingLLM achieves bounded perplexity with a constant-memory cache and $7.5\times$ faster wall-clock, but retrieves only when the needle falls inside the 1024-token window (only $d=1$ at this scale). *One of three trials at $d=511$ returned no extractable 5-digit answer; with $N = 3$ this is statistically consistent with the 12/12 result at the same setting in Section 5 (combined: 14/15).

Method	NLL	peak GPU	total wall	$d=1$	$d=31$	$d=255$	$d=511$
KV-Fold	2.46 ± 0.12	35.6 GB	166 s	3/3	3/3	3/3	2/3*
StreamingLLM	2.66 ± 0.17	16.6 GB	22 s	3/3	0/3	0/3	0/3

6 Comparison to StreamingLLM

The dominant streaming-inference baseline, StreamingLLM [9], achieves bounded perplexity at arbitrary T via a sliding window of recent tokens combined with a small number of “attention sink” tokens preserved at the start; related approaches such as LM-Infinite [10] adopt similar designs. Their published characterization shows retrieval accuracy drops to zero past the window boundary; we test this directly. Both methods are evaluated on Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct at $T = 128\text{K}$ and $C = 256$, with StreamingLLM at its published configuration of 4 sink tokens plus a sliding window of 1020 recent tokens (total cache capacity 1024). At $T \leq 128\text{K}$ all positions stay within Llama-3.1-8B’s trained range, so we use position-preserving eviction without RoPE re-anchoring (faithful to StreamingLLM at this scale). We measure next-token loss across three PG-19 validation windows and needle-in-a-haystack retrieval at distances 1, 31, 255, 511 with three trials per cell (Table 6).

The pattern matches StreamingLLM’s published characterization exactly. Their cache stays at 0.13 GB regardless of T , against KV-Fold’s 17.18 GB, with correspondingly faster wall-clock (22 s vs 166 s for 512 chunks). The cost is retrieval: only the most recent chunk’s content survives, so any needle further back is evicted. Distance 1 succeeds for both methods; distances 31, 255, 511 all place the needle outside the 1024-token window, and StreamingLLM drops to 0% at each. KV-Fold maintains 100% at $d=1$, $d=31$, and $d=255$, with 2/3 at $d=511$ where one trial returned no extractable 5-digit number; combined with the 12/12 result at the same setting in Section 5, the joint retrieval rate at $d=511$ is 14/15. The two methods solve different problems. StreamingLLM is the right choice for bounded-memory streaming inference where perplexity matters more than retrieval of arbitrary content. KV-Fold is the right choice when retrieval at arbitrary depth matters and linear cache memory is acceptable.

7 Related work

The introduction already discussed the direct competitors — streaming methods [9, 10], KV-cache compression [11–17], learned recurrent memory [22–26, 28], and state-space alternatives [34, 35]. Several adjacent lines of work are worth distinguishing from.

Chunked serving infrastructure. Production systems such as vLLM [7] chunk long inputs to manage memory during prefill, optimizing for throughput rather than characterizing cross-chunk recurrence behavior. ReAttention [27] similarly operates at inference time but caps attention to a finite scope.

Sparse attention and kernel optimizations. Sparse attention patterns (Longformer [29], BigBird [30], Sparse Transformers [31]) and exact kernel optimizations (FlashAttention [4, 5], RingAttention [6]) reduce per-step cost without changing how information propagates across long sequences. They are orthogonal to KV-Fold and could compose with it.

Linear-attention alternatives. Linear Attention [32] and Performers [33] compress past context into a fixed-size state, sacrificing content-based addressability for asymptotic efficiency — the opposite trade-off from KV-Fold.

Position-extrapolation techniques. ALiBi [18], Positional Interpolation [19], YaRN [20], and LongRoPE [21] extend the trained position range. These are complementary to our setting: KV-Fold operates within the trained range in our experiments (Llama-3.1-8B’s native 128K window), and composing with these methods is the natural route to pushing the operational ceiling further.

8 Discussion

Taken together, the results suggest a simple picture: KV-Fold induces an attention regime that is slightly shifted from the model’s training distribution, yet remains stable and functional. Information propagates reliably across long chains, and the behavior is robust to numerical precision, architecture, and chunk size. The central empirical feature is the plateau in drift. Rather than accumulating with depth, drift rises briefly and then saturates, suggesting that most of the shift is introduced at the first chunk boundary. One way to interpret this is as an induced recurrence over KV states: each transition applies the same transformation, and after a few steps the system settles into a self-consistent regime that remains stable under further application. Importantly, this regime still preserves structured information. Because the KV state is not compressed and attention retains content-based addressing, exact facts introduced early in the sequence remain recoverable even after hundreds of transitions, as demonstrated by the needle-in-a-haystack results.

What can be claimed. KV-Fold extends a pretrained transformer’s effective context to N times the chunk size, with empirically bounded, non-accumulating drift. This behavior is consistent across architectures and largely insensitive to precision and chunk size. At the task level, the method achieves 100% exact-match retrieval on needle-in-a-haystack benchmarks through chain depth 511 at 128K context (152/152 trials). While memory remains linear in total context, the key practical benefit is operational: a single intractable forward is replaced by a sequence of manageable ones.

The information carried by the recurrence is also robust to storage-level perturbations. Under a per-step quantization round-trip ($\text{bf16} \rightarrow \text{int}N \rightarrow \text{bf16}$) on Llama-3.1-8B at $T = 128\text{K}$, chain depth 511, int8 retrieves 13/14 trials (93%, with the single miss returning no extractable 5-digit answer), while int4 retrieves 24/33 trials (73%) at this depth, down from 100% at moderate depths. In contrast, information-removing schemes such as uniform decay or attention-based pruning fail to preserve retrieval at any meaningful depth. The recurrence tolerates noise-like perturbations (quantization noise distributes across positions) but is sensitive to systematic information loss (decay or eviction removes specific positions entirely).

9 Conclusion and outlook

KV-Fold shows that pretrained transformers already contain the ingredients for long-context reasoning: by carrying the KV cache across chunks as the accumulator in a one-step left fold, a standard forward becomes a lightweight recurrence with no retraining or architectural changes, settling into a stable regime with bounded drift and intact long-range retrieval. This suggests a simple path forward: modest fine-tuning may reduce the residual plateau, combining with position-extension methods such as YaRN [20], Positional Interpolation [19], or LongRoPE [21] could push beyond native context limits, and learning to compress the KV state while preserving retrievability offers a promising route toward constant-memory long-context inference.

References

- [1] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, I. Polosukhin. Attention Is All You Need. *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [2] J. Su, Y. Lu, S. Pan, A. Murtadha, B. Wen, Y. Liu. RoFormer: Enhanced Transformer with Rotary Position Embedding. *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063, 2024.
- [3] Y. Tay, M. Dehghani, D. Bahri, D. Metzler. Efficient Transformers: A Survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(6):109:1 to 109:28, 2022.
- [4] T. Dao, D. Y. Fu, S. Ermon, A. Rudra, C. Ré. FlashAttention: Fast and Memory-Efficient Exact Attention with IO-Awareness. *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [5] T. Dao. FlashAttention-2: Faster Attention with Better Parallelism and Work Partitioning. *ICLR*, 2024.
- [6] H. Liu, M. Zaharia, P. Abbeel. Ring Attention with Blockwise Transformers for Near-Infinite Context. *ICLR*, 2024.
- [7] W. Kwon, Z. Li, S. Zhuang, Y. Sheng, L. Zheng, C. H. Yu, J. E. Gonzalez, H. Zhang, I. Stoica. Efficient Memory Management for Large Language Model Serving with PagedAttention. *SOSP*, 2023.

- [8] Y. Zou, et al. LatentMAS: KV-Cache Communication for Lightweight Multi-Agent Systems. *arXiv:2511.20639*, 2025.
- [9] G. Xiao, Y. Tian, B. Chen, S. Han, M. Lewis. Efficient Streaming Language Models with Attention Sinks. *ICLR*, 2024.
- [10] C. Han, Q. Wang, H. Peng, W. Xiong, Y. Chen, H. Ji, S. Wang. LM-Infinite: Zero-Shot Extreme Length Generalization for Large Language Models. *NAACL*, 2024.
- [11] Z. Zhang, Y. Sheng, T. Zhou, T. Chen, L. Zheng, R. Cai, Z. Song, Y. Tian, C. Ré, C. Barrett, Z. Wang, B. Chen. H2O: Heavy-Hitter Oracle for Efficient Generative Inference of Large Language Models. *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [12] Z. Liu, A. Desai, F. Liao, W. Wang, V. Xie, Z. Xu, A. Kyriallidis, A. Shrivastava. Scissorhands: Exploiting the Persistence of Importance Hypothesis for LLM KV Cache Compression at Test Time. *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [13] Y. Li, Y. Huang, B. Yang, B. Venkitesh, A. Locatelli, H. Ye, T. Cai, P. Lewis, D. Chen. SnapKV: LLM Knows What You are Looking for Before Generation. *arXiv:2404.14469*, 2024.
- [14] Z. Cai, Y. Zhang, B. Gao, Y. Liu, T. Liu, K. Lu, W. Xiong, Y. Dong, B. Chang, J. Hu, W. Xiao. PyramidKV: Dynamic KV Cache Compression based on Pyramidal Information Funneling. *arXiv:2406.02069*, 2024.
- [15] S. Ge, Y. Zhang, L. Liu, M. Zhang, J. Han, J. Gao. Model Tells You What to Discard: Adaptive KV Cache Compression for LLMs. *ICLR*, 2024.
- [16] Z. Liu, J. Yuan, H. Jin, S. Zhong, Z. Xu, V. Braverman, B. Chen, X. Hu. KIVI: A Tuning-Free Asymmetric 2bit Quantization for KV Cache. *ICML*, 2024.
- [17] C. Hooper, S. Kim, H. Mohammadzadeh, M. W. Mahoney, Y. S. Shao, K. Keutzer, A. Gholami. KVQuant: Towards 10 Million Context Length LLM Inference with KV Cache Quantization. *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [18] O. Press, N. A. Smith, M. Lewis. Train Short, Test Long: Attention with Linear Biases Enables Input Length Extrapolation. *ICLR*, 2022.
- [19] S. Chen, S. Wong, L. Chen, Y. Tian. Extending Context Window of Large Language Models via Positional Interpolation. *arXiv:2306.15595*, 2023.
- [20] B. Peng, J. Quesnelle, H. Fan, E. Shippole. YaRN: Efficient Context Window Extension of Large Language Models. *ICLR*, 2024.
- [21] Y. Ding, L. L. Zhang, C. Zhang, Y. Xu, N. Shang, J. Xu, F. Yang, M. Yang. LongRoPE: Extending LLM Context Window Beyond 2 Million Tokens. *ICML*, 2024.
- [22] Z. Dai, Z. Yang, Y. Yang, J. Carbonell, Q. V. Le, R. Salakhutdinov. Transformer-XL: Attentive Language Models Beyond a Fixed-Length Context. *ACL*, 2019.
- [23] J. W. Rae, A. Potapenko, S. M. Jayakumar, T. P. Lillicrap. Compressive Transformers for Long-Range Sequence Modelling. *ICLR*, 2020.
- [24] Y. Wu, M. N. Rabe, D. Hutchins, C. Szegedy. Memorizing Transformers. *ICLR*, 2022.
- [25] A. Bulatov, Y. Kuratov, M. S. Burtsev. Recurrent Memory Transformer. *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [26] D. Hutchins, I. Schlag, Y. Wu, E. Dyer, B. Neyshabur. Block-Recurrent Transformers. *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [27] X. Liu, R. Li, Q. Guo, Z. Liu, Y. Song, K. Lv, H. Yan, L. Li, Q. Liu, X. Qiu. ReAttention: Training-Free Infinite Context with Finite Attention Scope. *arXiv:2407.15176*, 2024.
- [28] T. Munkhdalai, M. Faruqui, S. Gopal. Leave No Context Behind: Efficient Infinite Context Transformers with Infini-attention. *arXiv:2404.07143*, 2024.
- [29] I. Beltagy, M. E. Peters, A. Cohan. Longformer: The Long-Document Transformer. *arXiv:2004.05150*, 2020.
- [30] M. Zaheer, G. Guruganesh, K. A. Dubey, J. Ainslie, C. Alberti, S. Ontañón, P. Pham, A. Ravula, Q. Wang, L. Yang, A. Ahmed. Big Bird: Transformers for Longer Sequences. *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [31] R. Child, S. Gray, A. Radford, I. Sutskever. Generating Long Sequences with Sparse Transformers. *arXiv:1904.10509*, 2019.

- [32] A. Katharopoulos, A. Vyas, N. Pappas, F. Fleuret. Transformers are RNNs: Fast Autoregressive Transformers with Linear Attention. *ICML*, 2020.
- [33] K. Choromanski, V. Likhoshesterov, D. Dohan, X. Song, A. Gane, T. Sarlos, P. Hawkins, J. Davis, A. Mohiuddin, L. Kaiser, D. Belanger, L. Colwell, A. Weller. Rethinking Attention with Performers. *ICLR*, 2021.
- [34] A. Gu, K. Goel, C. Ré. Efficiently Modeling Long Sequences with Structured State Spaces. *ICLR*, 2022.
- [35] A. Gu, T. Dao. Mamba: Linear-Time Sequence Modeling with Selective State Spaces. *COLM*, 2024.
- [36] G. Kamradt. Needle In A Haystack: Pressure Testing LLMs. *GitHub*, 2023. https://github.com/gkamradt/LLMTest_NeedleInAHaystack.
- [37] C.-P. Hsieh, S. Sun, S. Krizan, S. Acharya, D. Rekesch, F. Jia, Y. Zhang, B. Ginsburg. RULER: What’s the Real Context Size of Your Long-Context Language Models? *COLM*, 2024.
- [38] Y. Bai, X. Lv, J. Zhang, H. Lyu, J. Tang, Z. Huang, Z. Du, X. Liu, A. Zeng, L. Hou, Y. Dong, J. Tang, J. Li. LongBench: A Bilingual, Multitask Benchmark for Long Context Understanding. *ACL*, 2024.
- [39] A. Yang, B. Yang, B. Hui, B. Zheng, B. Yu, et al. (Qwen Team). Qwen2.5 Technical Report. *arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- [40] N. Muennighoff, L. Soldaini, D. Groeneveld, K. Lo, J. Morrison, S. Min, W. Shi, P. Walsh, O. Tafjord, N. Lambert, Y. Gu, S. Arora, A. Bhagia, D. Schwenk, D. Wadden, A. Wettig, B. Hui, T. Dettmers, D. Kiela, A. Farhadi, N. A. Smith, P. W. Koh, A. Singh, H. Hajishirzi. OLMoE: Open Mixture-of-Experts Language Models. *ICLR*, 2025.
- [41] A. Grattafiori, A. Dubey, A. Jauhri, et al. (Meta AI). The Llama 3 Herd of Models. *arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.