

Anchor-Token Masking Produces an Out-of-Distribution Generalization Advantage in Retrieval-Grounded Masked-Diffusion Language Models

Thomas Garren¹

May 9, 2026

ABSTRACT.

Abstract

We empirically compare three masking strategies for fine-tuning masked-diffusion language models (MDLMs) on retrieval-grounded data: anchor-token masking (prefix question never masked, answer statement always subject to noise schedule), random-position masking (uniform over both prefix and target), and a reverse-asymmetric control (prefix always subject to schedule, target never masked). Using rank-16 LoRA adapters trained on a 1.3B-parameter undertrained MDLM (Cassandra T1, epoch-5 cross-entropy 2.26) for 300 steps on 144 (Q, A) examples, we evaluate corpus-vocabulary overlap of generated text around forced-anchor positions across in-domain queries and four held-out semantic domains spanning astronomy, medicine, law, and culinary arts. Anchor-token masking produces a $1.67\times$ pooled out-of-distribution generalization advantage over random-position masking (95% bootstrap confidence interval [$1.51\times$, $1.85\times$]; $P(\text{anchor} > \text{random}) = 1.000$ across $N = 48$ held-out queries), with the OOD advantage statistically larger than the in-domain advantage (CI [$1.18\times$, $1.34\times$]; non-overlapping with the OOD CI). The reverse-asymmetric control performs significantly worse than random-position masking on held-out queries (diff = -0.038 , $P = 0.006$), establishing that the *direction* of the asymmetry is load-bearing, not merely its presence. A sample-efficiency sweep across six (data-size \times step-count) configurations shows the advantage peaks at low training budgets (1.97 - $2.19\times$ at 100 steps) and attenuates monotonically with step count (collapsing to $1.07\times$ at 1000 steps on 144 examples), characterizing the technique as a low-shot fine-tuning advantage rather than a fundamental scaling advantage. Four independent mechanism probes — direction-of-asymmetry, attention-pattern instrumentation, LoRA weight allocation analysis, and a direct V/O ablation — establish V/O (value/output) projections as causally necessary and sufficient for the inductive bias: V/O-only LoRA (with Q/K frozen) outperforms full LoRA at half the trainable parameters (0.416 vs 0.337 held-out `corpus_overlap`), while Q/K-only LoRA falls below even the random-mask control (0.136 vs 0.214). The mechanism is therefore not “the model learns to look at anchors” but “the model learns to extract anchor-extending content from positions it was already

attending to.” We discuss implications for retrieval-augmented MDLM design, fine-tuning API specification, and vertical productization. All artifacts are released under Apache 2.0.

thomas@sophiaxt.com · sophiaxt.com

Independent research

1. Introduction

Masked-diffusion language models (MDLMs) [@austin2021d3pm; @lou2024sedd] generate text by iteratively unmasking corrupted sequences over a fixed number of denoising steps, with each position predicted in parallel conditional on visible context at that step. The dominant training objective applies the masking schedule symmetrically across positions: every position is equally likely to be masked at any given diffusion timestep. This symmetric training does not exploit a structural asymmetry that retrieval-grounded inference introduces: at inference time, *retrieved-fact tokens are known* (or known with high confidence from a retrieval system) and *the surrounding response must be generated*. Forced-anchor decoding [@garren2026forcedanchor] makes this asymmetry concrete by locking retrieved-fact token positions in the answer slot, exempting them from the unmasking loop, and asking the model to fill in connecting tissue.

A natural training-time complement is to align the training distribution with the inference-time forced-anchor access pattern: train the model with prefix-anchor positions never masked and target-statement positions always subject to the noise schedule. We refer to this objective as **anchor-token masking**.

Whether anchor-token masking produces measurably different generation behavior than the standard symmetric objective on identical training data has not, to our knowledge, been characterized in published work. The closest precedent is prefix-LM training in the autoregressive paradigm [@raffel2020t5], in which a bidirectional prefix and an autoregressively-generated suffix are loss-weighted asymmetrically. The masked-diffusion analog has not been independently studied with controlled validation.

We provide that controlled validation. We train rank-16 LoRA adapters on an undertrained 1.3B-parameter MDLM (Cassandra T1, [@garren2026cassandra]) using three masking strategies on identical training data: anchor-token masking, random-position masking, and a reverse-asymmetric control. We

evaluate generation quality around forced-anchor positions on both in-domain and out-of-distribution queries, using a bootstrap-CI-tight metric (`corpus_overlap`) that captures topical coherence without LLM-as-judge dependencies. We probe the underlying mechanism through attention-pattern instrumentation and LoRA weight-allocation analysis.

1.1 Contributions

1. We formalize *anchor-token masking* as a small modification of the standard MDLM training objective and contrast it with random-position masking and reverse-asymmetric masking.
2. We empirically demonstrate that anchor-token masking produces a $1.67\times$ pooled out-of-distribution generalization advantage over random-position masking on identical data (95% bootstrap CI [$1.51\times$, $1.85\times$], $P(\text{anchor} > \text{random}) = 1.000$), with the OOD advantage statistically larger than the in-domain advantage.
3. We replicate the effect across four independent held-out semantic domains, ruling out single-domain artifacts.
4. We provide **four convergent mechanism probes** — direction-of-asymmetry control, attention-pattern instrumentation, LoRA weight allocation analysis, and a direct V/O ablation — that together support a causally-tested mechanistic account: anchor-token masking reallocates LoRA capacity from attention-pattern projections (Q/K) to value-output projections (V/O), producing an inductive bias for topical extension of fixed prefix anchors. The V/O ablation establishes V/O as both necessary and sufficient: V/O-only LoRA outperforms full LoRA at half the trainable parameters; Q/K-only LoRA falls below the random-position-mask control.
5. We characterize the technique’s regime via a sample-efficiency sweep showing the advantage peaks at low training budgets ($1.97\text{-}2.19\times$ at 100 steps) and attenuates at higher budgets ($1.07\times$ at 1000 steps).
6. We discuss implications for retrieval-augmented MDLM design and propose specific follow-up experiments.
7. We release all weights, code, corpora, and per-query outputs under Apache 2.0.

2. Related Work

2.1 Masked-diffusion language models

Discrete-diffusion language models [@austin2021d3pm; @hoogeboom2021argmax; @lou2024sedd; @zhao2024mercury] generate text by iterative unmasking of `<MASK>`-corrupted sequences. The standard

training objective samples masking ratios from a noise schedule and applies the resulting mask uniformly across positions; the model predicts original tokens at masked positions, conditional on visible context.

Variants modify the mask sampling distribution within sequences. Span masking [@joshi2020spanbert; @lewis2020bart] groups consecutive positions into spans of correlated mask states. Curriculum masking schedules vary mask ratios over training [@bao2022curriculum]. These variants are *position-symmetric* — they do not introduce class-level asymmetry between prefix-conditioning positions and target-generation positions of the kind we study.

2.2 Prefix-LM training in autoregressive models

T5 [@raffel2020t5] and the prefix-LM family use bidirectional attention over a prefix and autoregressive generation on a suffix, with cross-entropy loss computed only over the suffix. This is conceptually analogous to anchor-token masking — prefix never masked, suffix always subject to the autoregressive prediction objective — but in the autoregressive paradigm. Prefix-LM training is a well-established autoregressive technique; the masked-diffusion analog has not, to our knowledge, been published with controlled validation against random-position-masking baselines.

2.3 Retrieval-augmented generation for diffusion LMs

SPREAD [@wang2026spread] addresses the *response semantic drift* failure mode in DLM-RAG via query-relevance-guided denoising at inference time. SPREAD modifies the trajectory of the unmasking loop; our work modifies the training objective. The two approaches are mechanistically orthogonal and could compose: SPREAD provides a soft probabilistic constraint at inference; anchor-token masking provides a training-time inductive bias that may complement the SPREAD trajectory.

2.4 Atomic-fact retrieval and grounded generation

Atomic-fact decomposition [@min2023factscore; @afev2025] structures retrieved knowledge into self-contained claims. The LTMi-XT format [@garren2026ltxmixt] used in our training data builds on this lineage by adding a four-level breadcrumb hierarchy and a hash-derived 3D lattice index. This combination of structured retrieval format and asymmetric training objective is, to our knowledge, novel in this specific composition.

2.5 Parameter-efficient fine-tuning

We use LoRA [@hu2022lora] at rank 16 on `q_proj`, `k_proj`, `v_proj`, `o_proj` projections following standard practice. Our weight-allocation analysis (§5.4) inspects the Frobenius norms of effective LoRA delta-weight matrices per projection type to characterize where each training strategy invests its limited adaptation capacity.

3. Method

3.1 Training objective

Given an LTMi-XT-formatted (Q, A) pair with question tokens `Q` and answer-statement tokens `A`, padded to sequence length `L`, the position partition is `positions = Q U A U Pad`. The three masking strategies we compare are:

Anchor-token masking. Mask sampling restricted to `A`:

$$m_i = \begin{cases} 0 & i \in Q \\ \text{Bernoulli}(\gamma(t)) & i \in A \\ 0 & i \in \text{Pad} \end{cases}$$

Loss is computed over $\{i \in A: m_i = 1\}$.

Random-position masking (control). Mask sampling uniform over `Q U A`:

$$m_i = \begin{cases} \text{Bernoulli}(\gamma(t)) & i \in Q \cup A \\ 0 & i \in \text{Pad} \end{cases}$$

Loss is computed over $\{i \in Q \cup A: m_i = 1\}$.

Reverse-asymmetric masking (mechanism control). Mask sampling restricted to `Q`:

$$m_i = \begin{cases} \text{Bernoulli}(\gamma(t)) & i \in Q \\ 0 & i \in A \\ 0 & i \in \text{Pad} \end{cases}$$

Loss is computed over $\{i \in Q: m_i = 1\}$.

All three strategies sample mask ratio $\gamma(t)$ uniformly from $[0.5, 0.9]$ per training step. All other hyperparameters (batch size, learning rate, sequence length, optimizer, gradient clipping, LoRA rank and target modules, training step count, random seed) are identical across conditions.

3.2 Forced-anchor decoding

At inference time, given a query q and a retrieved locus statement s , we tokenize s and lock its tokens at fixed positions $[0, |\text{tokenize}(s)|)$ of the answer slot. The masked-diffusion unmasking loop excludes locked positions from the `is_masked` set throughout all denoising steps; the model fills in the surrounding positions conditional on the locked tokens at each step. Locked positions are deterministically preserved by construction — no decoding strategy or hallucination mode can dislodge them. This mechanism is identical across all conditions and is not affected by LoRA training.

3.3 Coherence metric: `corpus_overlap`

We define `corpus_overlap(text, vocab)` as the fraction of word-tokens (regex `[A-Za-z0-9.\-]+`) in `text` whose lowercase string is in the corpus’s vocabulary `vocab`, where `vocab` is the union of tokens

across all locus statements in the relevant corpus. For each query, we compute the metric on the *post-anchor portion* of the generated text (positions following the locked-anchor span).

This is a coarse proxy for “does the generated text use words from the topical domain?” It does not require an LLM judge, is reproducible deterministically given fixed seeds, and admits straightforward bootstrap CI computation. It does not penalize incoherent ordering of correct topical tokens or reward grammatical structure. We treat it as a **necessary but not sufficient** indicator of topical coherence — generation that lacks corpus-vocabulary overlap is clearly off-topic; generation that has high overlap may still lack coherence at higher structural levels.

3.4 Bootstrap CI methodology

For each comparison of interest, we draw 10000 bootstrap resamples from the per-query `corpus_overlap` values and compute the percentile-method 95% CI on the difference (or ratio) of means. We report both the point estimate and the CI, plus $P(a > b) =$ the fraction of bootstrap resamples in which $\text{mean}(a) > \text{mean}(b)$.

4. Experimental Setup

4.1 Base model

We use Cassandra T1 v1 [[@garren2026cassandra](#)], a 1.3B-parameter masked-diffusion LM with the following architecture: 28 transformer layers, 2048 hidden dimensions, grouped-query attention with 16 query heads and 4 key-value heads, RoPE position encoding with $\theta = 5 \times 10^5$, RMSNorm normalization, SwiGLU activation, 32K BPE vocabulary, 128K context length, sliding-window attention with window size 4096 and 256 global tokens, 12 inference denoising steps, and a PDE-cosine noise schedule. The released checkpoint `cassandra_ep5_fp16.pt` (SHA-256 verified) has training cross-entropy 2.2561 at epoch 5; the model is undertrained at this checkpoint and produces incoherent unconditional output. The model architecture and training pipeline are described in [[@garren2026cassandra](#)].

4.2 Training data

Training pairs are derived from three LTMi-XT-formatted corpora authored by the researcher (C1: cold-storage operations, C2: Cassandra T1 architecture specifications, C3: business operations). Each corpus contains 15-23 atomic loci. For each locus, we generate three (Q, A) pairs by templated breadcrumb decomposition:

- “Tell me about {concept} in the context of {topic}.” → locus statement
- “What does the source say about {concept}?” → locus statement

- “Regarding {topic}: {concept}?” → locus statement

This yields 144 (Q, A) pairs total. Pairs are encoded as `f"Q: {SYS}\n\n{q}\nA: {a}"` with system prompt

```
SYS = "You are Cassandra T1, a diffusion language model by SOPHIA XT. Direct, helpful, honest."
```

4.3 LoRA configuration

LoRA rank 16, alpha 32, applied to q_proj, k_proj, v_proj, o_proj projections in all 28 layers. Total trainable parameters: 7M (0.5% of base model). LoRA A matrix initialized via Kaiming uniform; B matrix initialized to zero. Base model frozen throughout training.

4.4 Training hyperparameters (identical across conditions)

AdamW with learning rate 1×10^{-4} decaying via cosine schedule to 1×10^{-5} , betas (0.9, 0.95), weight decay 0.01, batch size 2, sequence length 192, 300 training steps, gradient norm clipping at 1.0, mask ratio sampled uniformly from [0.5, 0.9], random seed 42. Wall-clock training time 75-100 seconds per LoRA on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 Ti.

4.5 Eval data

In-domain queries (15 total): hand-written queries against C1, C2, C3 content from `queries.json` [[@garren2026ltmixt-eval](#)].

Held-out queries (48 total, 12 per domain): four corpora authored as semantically distant from training: - **C4 — astronomy** (15.6% vocabulary overlap with training): solar system, stars, galaxies, cosmology - **C5 — medical/anatomy** (11.5% vocab overlap): cardiology, neurology, pharmacology, genetics, immunology - **C6 — legal/contracts** (10.5% vocab overlap): contract, tort, constitutional, criminal, civil procedure - **C7 — cooking/cuisine** (13.9% vocab overlap): French, Italian, Japanese, baking, fermentation, chemistry

Each held-out corpus contains 12 atomic loci with corresponding eval queries.

4.6 Decoding configuration (identical across conditions)

12 unmasking steps, temperature 0.8, top-p 0.9, beta 0.5, repetition penalty 1.3, answer length 96 tokens, generation seed 1234. Forced-anchor positions occupy the first $|\text{tokenize}(\text{locusstatement})|$ positions of the answer slot; remaining positions are masked at initialization.

4.7 Compute

Training: 75-100 seconds per LoRA. Eval: 12 queries \times 4 corpora \times 2 conditions (forced/unforced) \times 4 arms \approx 25 minutes per arm. Bootstrap analysis: <1 minute. Total reproduction time \sim 60 minutes on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 Ti.

5. Results

5.1 Aggregate `corpus_overlap` by arm and corpus set

Arm	Force	In-domain (n=15)	Held-out pooled C4–C7 (n=48)
base	forced	0.0147	0.0045
base	unforced	0.0204	0.0123
anchor_lora	forced	0.6239	0.3571
anchor_lora	unforced	0.5857	0.3128
random_lora	forced	0.4946	0.2137
random_lora	unforced	0.4914	0.2146
reverse_lora	forced	0.3612	0.1760
reverse_lora	unforced	0.3614	0.1604

The base model produces near-zero `corpus_overlap` on all conditions (essentially random-token output). All three LoRAs produce substantially higher overlap. The anchor-LoRA produces the highest overlap on both in-domain and held-out conditions.

5.2 Per-domain held-out replication

Corpus	Base	Anchor	Random	Reverse	Anchor / Random	P(anchor > random)
C4 astronomy	0.0063	0.3272	0.1594	0.1535	2.05×	1.000
C5 medical	0.0036	0.3277	0.1909	0.1668	1.72×	1.000
C6 legal	0.0035	0.3805	0.1731	0.1477	2.20×	1.000
C7 cooking	0.0048	0.3930	0.3314	0.2362	1.19×	0.994
POOLED (n=48 per arm)	0.0045	0.3571	0.2137	0.1760	1.67×	1.000

(Pooled 95% bootstrap CI on the anchor/random ratio: [1.51×, 1.85×].)

The anchor-vs-random advantage replicates with $P = 1.000$ across three of four held-out domains and weakly with $P = 0.994$ on the fourth. The C7 (cooking) domain shows a smaller anchor advantage; we attribute this to a higher generic-vocabulary overlap between cooking corpora and our training corpora (C7's random-LoRA `corpus_overlap` of 0.331 is anomalously high, suggesting a generic-vocabulary floor effect).

5.3 Bootstrap confidence intervals

10,000 bootstrap resamples, percentile-method 95% CIs, all on forced-anchor `corpus_overlap` :

Comparison	Ratio	95% CI	P(a > b)
anchor_lora vs base, in-domain	42.50×	[28.5, 76.0]	1.000
anchor_lora vs random_lora, in-domain	1.26×	[1.18, 1.34]	1.000
anchor_lora vs base, held-out (pooled)	78.73×	[54.3, 113.4]	1.000
anchor_lora vs random_lora, held-out (pooled)	1.67×	[1.51, 1.85]	1.000
random_lora vs base, in-domain	33.69×	[22.6, 59.8]	1.000
random_lora vs base, held-out (pooled)	47.55×	[29.8, 75.8]	1.000
reverse_lora vs random_lora, held-out (pooled)	0.82×	[0.69, 0.97]	0.006

Two findings of statistical significance for the central claim:

- 1. The anchor-vs-random in-domain CI [1.18, 1.34] does not overlap the held-out CI [1.51, 1.85].** The OOD advantage is statistically larger than the ID advantage, ruling out the simplest “easier-objective fits training data better” alternative.
- 2. The reverse-asymmetric LoRA performs significantly worse than random-position on held-out** ($P = 0.006$, CI on the difference is entirely negative). This rules out the alternative that asymmetry alone explains the effect; *direction* of asymmetry is load-bearing.

5.4 Mechanism probe 1: direction-of-asymmetry

The 4-arm ranking on held-out forced `corpus_overlap` :

$$\text{anchor}(0.357) > \text{random}(0.214) > \text{reverse}(0.176) \gg \text{base}(0.005)$$

The reverse-asymmetric LoRA, trained on identical data with identical hyperparameters but with the masking direction flipped (Q always subject to schedule, A never masked), performs *worse* than the random-position control. Qualitative outputs from the reverse-LoRA show characteristic question-template fragments (“Tell me about”, “Answer me”, “the source”) and system-prompt boilerplate, consistent with a model that has learned the inverse operation: generating questions from answers.

This rules out the alternative hypothesis that asymmetric optimization landscape alone (regardless of direction) is responsible for the effect. The direction in which the asymmetry points is load-bearing.

5.5 Mechanism probe 2: attention-pattern instrumentation

We instrument `SlidingWindowAttention.forward` to capture per-layer attention weights (mean across heads) during a single forward pass on each of four held-out queries (one per domain). For each layer we compute the mean attention weight from post-anchor query positions to anchor key positions, then average across layers and queries.

Result:

Arm	anchor_share	Δ vs base
base	0.256	—
anchor_lora	0.272	+0.016 (+0.013 vs random)
reverse_lora	0.263	+0.007
random_lora	0.259	+0.003

The 4-arm ranking matches the behavioral hypothesis (anchor > reverse > random > base), but the magnitude is small. Anchor-LoRA’s anchor-share advantage over random-LoRA (+0.013) is approximately 10% of its behavioral `corpus_overlap` advantage (+0.143). The simplest version of the

inductive-bias story — “the model learns to look at anchors more” — is not the primary driver of the behavioral effect.

5.6 Mechanism probe 3: LoRA weight allocation

We compute the Frobenius norm of the effective LoRA delta-weight matrix ($\Delta W = BA$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d_{in}}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times r}$) for each projection type across all 28 layers.

Result:

Arm	q_proj	k_proj	v_proj	o_proj	V+O	Q+K	V+O / Q+K
anchor_lora	0.285	0.132	0.146	0.335	0.481	0.417	1.153
reverse_lora	0.409	0.163	0.160	0.378	0.538	0.572	0.940
random_lora	0.432	0.187	0.142	0.349	0.491	0.618	0.794

The anchor-LoRA is the only configuration where V+O (value/output projection) capacity exceeds Q+K (attention-pattern projection) capacity. Random- and reverse-LoRAs both invest substantially more in Q-projection updates (0.43 and 0.41, respectively) than the anchor-LoRA does (0.29).

We propose this is a direct mechanical consequence of the training-objective asymmetry. Under anchor-token masking, the prefix Q is fully visible at every training step, so the LoRA need not adapt q_proj behavior to handle masked-Q reconstruction. This frees rank-16 capacity to specialize V/O — which control *what content gets read out from* attended positions, not where the model attends. Random-position masking, by contrast, sometimes masks Q tokens, requiring the LoRA to update Q projections to handle the partially-masked Q case, consuming capacity that could otherwise specialize V/O.

5.7 Mechanism probe 4: V/O ablation (causal test)

The first three probes provide correlational evidence that V/O is the load-bearing component. To causally test this, we train two ablation LoRAs on identical anchor-token-masked data:

- **V/O-only LoRA:** only v_proj and o_proj are wrapped with rank-16 LoRA; q_proj and k_proj are frozen at their base values
- **Q/K-only LoRA:** only q_proj and k_proj are wrapped; v_proj and o_proj are frozen

Both ablation LoRAs have 2.98M trainable parameters (vs 7.0M for the full LoRA). Training and evaluation are otherwise identical to the main experiments.

Result:

Arm	Held-out pooled <code>corpus_overlap</code>	Trainable params	
base (no LoRA)	0.005	0	noise floor
random-mask full LoRA	0.214	7.0M	control reference
full anchor-LoRA	0.337	7.0M	reference
V/O-only anchor- LoRA	0.416	2.98M	← outperforms full LoRA
Q/K-only anchor- LoRA	0.136	2.98M	← below random control

Two findings:

1. V/O-only LoRA outperforms the full LoRA at half the trainable parameters. The V/O-only configuration (0.416) exceeds the full LoRA (0.337) by 23% on held-out `corpus_overlap`. This is direct causal evidence that V/O is sufficient for the effect, and that Q/K updates in the full LoRA were *actively counterproductive* — burning capacity on attention-pattern adjustments that did not generalize out-of-domain.

2. Q/K-only LoRA is worse than the random-mask full LoRA. With Q/K alone (0.136), the model cannot develop the topical-extension behavior; performance falls below even the random-position-masked control with full Q/K/V/O capacity. This is direct causal evidence that V/O is *necessary* for the effect.

Together, these establish V/O as both **necessary and sufficient** for the anchor-token-masking inductive bias. The earlier weight-allocation analysis (§5.6) was correctly identifying the load-bearing component, not just observing a downstream consequence of training.

5.8 Cohesive mechanistic account

The four mechanism probes converge on a causally-supported account:

- **The asymmetric training objective frees Q/K capacity** by removing the need to model masked-Q reconstruction.
- **The freed capacity is allocated to V/O specialization.**
- **V/O specialization is causally responsible for the inductive bias** (V/O ablation §5.7).
- **V/O specialization encodes a learned operator for “extending the topical content of fixed prefix tokens.”**

- **At inference time on out-of-distribution prompts, this V/O-encoded bias produces topical extension; the alternative random-mask LoRA, having spent capacity on Q/K instead, falls back to training-corpus regurgitation under uncertainty.**

This account is consistent with all four probes (direction-of-asymmetry, attention pattern, weight allocation, V/O ablation) and is more specific than the original “inductive bias” framing. The mechanism is not “the model learns to look at anchors,” but rather “the model learns to extract anchor-extending content from the positions it was already attending to.”

5.9 Practical implication: optimal LoRA configuration

The V/O ablation result has a direct practical consequence for productizing anchor-token-masked fine-tuning: **V/O-only LoRA outperforms full Q/K/V/O LoRA at half the trainable parameters.** Practitioners deploying customer-specific fine-tunes should default to V/O-only LoRA configurations:

- 57% smaller adapter files (2.98M vs 7M params)
- ~50% lower memory pressure during training (more concurrent training sessions on same hardware)
- ~23% better held-out generalization on the metric studied
- Identical wall-clock training time per LoRA

This recommendation is specific to the anchor-token-masking objective. Whether V/O-only configurations are similarly optimal for random-position-masking objectives or for autoregressive prefix-LM fine-tuning is not tested here.

5.10 Qualitative behavior

We present representative held-out outputs for selected queries. Locked anchor content is shown in italics; generated content follows.

C4 astronomy — query: “What are the moons of Mars?” (locus: “*Mars has two small moons named Phobos and Deimos that may be captured asteroids from the asteroid belt.*”)

- **Anchor-LoRA:** “*Mars has two small moons named Phobos and Deimos that may be captured asteroids from the asteroid belt.*” The mission scheduled with April the., October was during module 14. the mission schedule for the missions for included three... (`corpus_overlap` = 0.52)
- **Random-LoRA:** “*Mars has two small moons named Phobos and Deimos that may be captured asteroids from the asteroid belt.*” Cassandra T1, Cassandra T1, Cassandra T1 Direct: Direct helpful using 1 2 in Cassandra T1 of Cassandra T1... (`corpus_overlap` = 0.11)
- **Reverse-LoRA:** “*Mars has two small moons named Phobos and Deimos that may be captured asteroids from the asteroid belt.*” Two of Two of: Cassandra T1, a diffusion language model by

SOPHIA XT. Tell me about: Cassandra T1, Direct, helpful, honest... (`corpus_overlap` = 0.16)

The behavioral distinctions are visible on inspection:

- **Anchor-LoRA** reaches for content topical to the anchor’s domain (mission, schedule, missions, three) — wrong on specifics but topically aligned.
- **Random-LoRA** ignores the anchor’s domain and generates training-corpus boilerplate (Cassandra T1, Direct, helpful).
- **Reverse-LoRA** generates question-template fragments (“*Tell me about*”) and system-prompt self-references — the inverse operation it was trained to perform.

These behavioral signatures are consistent across all four held-out domains.

6. Discussion

6.1 What the findings establish

We have empirically demonstrated, with bootstrap-CI-tight effects across four held-out semantic domains and four convergent mechanism probes (including a direct V/O ablation that causally establishes V/O as necessary and sufficient), that:

- 1. Anchor-token masking produces a measurable out-of-distribution generalization advantage** over random-position masking on retrieval-grounded MDLM fine-tuning.
- 2. The OOD advantage is statistically larger than the in-domain advantage** (non-overlapping CIs), indicating a genuine generalization-favoring effect rather than improved training-data fit alone.
- 3. The direction of asymmetry is load-bearing** — reverse-asymmetric masking performs worse than random-position masking, ruling out the “asymmetry alone” alternative.
- 4. The mechanism is in V/O projections, not attention pattern.** Anchor-token masking reallocates limited LoRA capacity from Q/K (where you look) to V/O (what you extract), with a small residual attention-pattern shift in the predicted direction.

6.2 What the findings do not establish

We are explicit about scope:

- The result is from one base model (1.3B undertrained Cassandra T1 v1). The mechanism may behave differently on more-trained models, larger models, or different MDLM architectures.

- We test only as a fine-tuning regime. Whether anchor-token masking provides equivalent advantages in from-scratch pretraining is an open question.
- LoRA rank 16 is one configuration. Rank-dependence not characterized.
- The `corpus_overlap` metric is a coarse proxy. LLM-judge replication would strengthen the topical-coherence interpretation.
- The held-out corpora were authored by the researcher rather than drawn from external benchmarks; reviewer-strength validation would use independently-curated benchmark data.

6.3 Implications for retrieval-augmented MDLM design

The core implication is that **the training-time masking schedule is a meaningful design lever for retrieval-grounded MDLMs**, with budget-dependent effects characterized in Appendix C. Specifically:

- Fine-tuning APIs that expose only random-position masking are leaving measurable improvement on the table for retrieval-grounded use cases, *particularly in low-budget fine-tuning regimes*.
- The advantage attenuates at high training budgets (Appendix C); we do not claim a fundamental scaling advantage. The effect is most pronounced at 100-300 training steps on 50-150 examples (1.7-2.2× anchor-vs-random ratio), and approximately disappears at 1000+ steps on the same data scale.
- The technique composes with inference-time methods like SPREAD [[@wang2026spread](#)] — they are mechanistically orthogonal (training-objective vs inference-trajectory) and could be combined.

For practitioners deploying MDLMs in retrieval-augmented pipelines:

- **Per-customer fine-tuning with anchor-token masking on customer-supplied (Q, A) pairs is a reasonable default for short fine-tuning budgets** (~100-300 steps on 50-150 examples).
- The training cost is identical to vanilla LoRA fine-tuning (same wall-clock, same compute budget); only the masking schedule changes.
- For longer fine-tuning runs, monitor for advantage attenuation; if held-out performance plateaus or degrades, switch to random-position masking or use early stopping.
- The gain compounds with semantic distance from training data, making the technique particularly relevant for domain-specific deployments where customers supply specialized corpora that may not match the base model’s training distribution.

6.4 Implications for from-scratch pretraining

We did not run from-scratch pretraining experiments and cannot make scaling claims for that regime. However, we provide a related result at the **continued-pretraining** scale: full-model continued

training (not LoRA) of Cassandra T1 v1 with anchor-token masking on the same C1+C2+C3 training corpora produces a substantial held-out forced-anchor `corpus_overlap` improvement. See §6.4a below.

We propose from-scratch pretraining experiments as direct future work for labs with the compute resources to test: pretrain a small MDLM (e.g., 350M parameters, 5B tokens) under three conditions — uniform masking, anchor-token masking on retrieval-grounded data, and a curriculum mixing the two — and measure downstream retrieval-augmented benchmark performance.

6.4a Continued-pretraining result

To probe whether the technique scales beyond LoRA fine-tuning, we ran continued full-model pretraining of Cassandra T1 v1 with the anchor-token-masking objective on the same 144 (Q, A) training pairs derived from C1+C2+C3 corpora, for 1000 steps total with checkpoints saved at step 500 and step 1000. All other hyperparameters were continued-pretraining-appropriate values: LR 5×10^{-5} with 50-step warmup and cosine decay to 5×10^{-6} , batch size 2 with gradient accumulation 2 (effective batch 4), sequence length 512, bfloat16 throughout (model + gradients + AdamW state). Total wall-clock: 7.6 minutes on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 Ti. Memory peak: 10.8 GB.

Held-out forced-anchor `corpus_overlap` (12-query subset across C4-C7):

Checkpoint	Held-out pooled <code>corpus_overlap</code>	vs v1 base
v1 base (no continued training)	0.008	—
Continued step 500	0.481	+0.473 (58.7×)
Continued step 1000	0.440	+0.432 (53.7×)

The held-out generalization advantage at step 500 (0.481) **exceeds every prior LoRA-based result in this report**, including the V/O-only LoRA’s 0.416. The step-500-vs-step-1000 ordering recapitulates the overfitting pattern from the LoRA sample-efficiency sweep (App. C) — at this data scale, ~500 steps of full-model continued training is the sweet spot.

Caveat: unconditional generation degrades. Inspection of unconditional samples (no locked anchor) reveals that the continued-trained model produces coherent-English-shaped text but with content that is largely memorized from the training corpora. Free-form prompts about subjects not in the training set produce outputs filled with training-corpus references rather than topical extension. The model has effectively become a *specialized forced-anchor extender* — it produces topical content when given an anchor (with held-out-domain vocabulary as shown in §5.10) but cannot produce coherent free-form text without anchors.

This trade-off is consistent with our mechanism account: the model has internalized the “extract anchor-extending content from attended positions” inductive bias to the extent that absent an anchor it

has no topical signal to extend. For productization use cases where forced-anchor decoding is always applied (per-customer fine-tuning on retrieval corpora), this trade-off is favorable. For general-purpose model use, it is unfavorable.

Implications:

- The technique generalizes from LoRA-scale (rank 16) to full-model continued pretraining at the 1.3B-parameter scale, on the same base model.
- The optimal training budget for full-model continued training appears to follow a similar shape to the LoRA sweep — short training is best; long training overfits.
- The unconditional-generation degradation suggests the technique should likely be one *phase* of a curriculum rather than the whole training distribution, even at fine-tune scale. Interleaving anchor-token-masked phases with standard masked-diffusion phases on diverse data may preserve general language modeling while still inducing the forced-anchor inductive bias.
- The wall-clock cost of producing this result on consumer hardware (~8 minutes on a 3090 Ti) suggests anchor-token-masked continued training is a practical productization tool for per-domain model specialization.

6.5 Implications for autoregressive paradigms

The masked-diffusion paradigm structurally enables this type of asymmetric training objective via direct manipulation of the masking schedule. Autoregressive models can approximate the same effect via prefix-LM training [raffel2020t5], but with a structural difference: AR models always condition autoregressively on prefix tokens at inference time, so the asymmetry is built into the architecture, not a configurable training-objective choice. The MDLM paradigm offers a flexibility that AR does not — different fine-tuning datasets can use different masking schedules without architectural changes — which may be a previously-unarticulated practical advantage of MDLM systems for vertical fine-tuning use cases.

6.6 Implications for productization

For commercial MDLM-RAG systems, the findings suggest a two-step productization pattern:

- 1. Training-time:** offer anchor-token-masked LoRA fine-tuning of a base MDLM on customer-supplied retrieval corpora. Customer gets a model with measurably better OOD generalization on their domain than vanilla LoRA fine-tuning would produce.
- 2. Inference-time:** deploy with forced-anchor decoding on retrieved facts, providing deterministic preservation of high-stakes identifiers (case citations, drug names, part numbers, etc.) at the token level.

The training-time technique is the new contribution from this work. The inference-time technique is established from prior work on parallel-unmasking decoders. Combined, they offer a defensible value proposition for high-reliability vertical applications: provable identifier preservation at inference plus measurable topical extension quality from training.

6.7 *Honest scope*

This work is small in scale: one base model, one rank-16 LoRA configuration, 144 training examples, 63 eval queries across 5 corpora. The validation methodology is rigorous within that scope (controlled comparisons, multi-domain replication, bootstrap CIs, mechanism probes), but the absolute scope is limited.

We position this as a **motivating empirical result** rather than a complete characterization of the asymmetric-masking design space. The implications above are framed as predictions and proposals, not established conclusions at scale. We invite replication, scaling experiments, and critique.

7. Limitations

- 1. Scale.** 1.3B base model, rank-16 LoRA, 144 training pairs, 63 eval queries. Results may differ at larger scales.
- 2. Single base model.** Cassandra T1 v1 is undertrained (cross-entropy 2.26). Effects may attenuate on fully-trained MDLMs.
- 3. No from-scratch pretraining.** Anchor-token masking is studied here only as a fine-tuning regime.
- 4. Coarse coherence metric.** Corpus-vocabulary overlap is a proxy; LLM-judge replication would strengthen claims.
- 5. Manual held-out corpora.** Held-out content was authored by the researcher (factually verifiable but not from external benchmarks).
- 6. One outlier domain** (cooking, C7) shows weaker effect, attributable to vocabulary-floor effects.
- 7. Budget-dependent advantage.** The sample-efficiency sweep (Appendix C) shows the anchor advantage attenuates monotonically with training step count and approximately disappears at 1000 steps on 144 examples. The technique is best characterized as a low-shot fine-tuning advantage, not a fundamental scaling advantage. The $1.67\times$ headline number is from a mid-regime measurement; the maximal advantage in our sweep was $2.19\times$ at the lowest budget tested.
- 8. Anchor-LoRA's training objective is technically easier** (smaller per-step loss surface). The held-out advantage growing rather than shrinking *at fixed budget* (in-domain CI [1.18, 1.34] vs held-

out CI [1.51, 1.85]) is the main reason this concern does not subsume the result. The budget-dependence (limitation 7) is consistent with the easier-objective concern at high budgets but not at low budgets.

- 9. V/O ablation tested at single configuration.** The V/O ablation (§5.7) was run at one (data, steps, rank) configuration. Whether the V/O-only superiority holds across the full sample-efficiency curve, at different LoRA ranks, or at different base model scales is open.
-

8. Future Work

The direct V/O ablation, sample-efficiency curve, and direction-of-asymmetry probes proposed in earlier drafts of this work are now reported in §5.4-§5.7 and Appendix C. The remaining open questions:

- 1. From-scratch pretraining experiment.** Train small MDLMs ($\leq 500\text{M}$ parameters) under uniform vs anchor-token-masked vs curriculum-mixed conditions and measure downstream retrieval-augmented benchmark performance. The mechanism we characterize predicts a measurable advantage at pretraining scale, but whether the inductive bias trades off against general language modeling capability is open.
- 2. Cross-architecture replication.** Apply the analog (prefix-LM training vs random-span corruption) to a small autoregressive LM, testing whether the inductive-bias finding is paradigm-specific or paradigm-general.
- 3. LLM-judge metric replication.** Run a rubric-based LLM judge on a sampled subset of generations to confirm `corpus_overlap` captures the intended topical-coherence signal.
- 4. V/O ablation across configurations.** Our V/O ablation (§5.7) is at one (data, steps, rank) configuration. Whether the V/O-only superiority holds across the full sample-efficiency curve, at different LoRA ranks, or on more-trained base models is open.
- 5. Per-step attention dynamics.** Our attention probe (§5.5) is a single-forward-pass measurement at $t=0.5$. Tracking attention patterns across the full 12-step unmasking trajectory could reveal time-dependent mechanisms not captured at fixed t .

We commit to publishing results from any of these follow-ups whether positive or negative.

9. Conclusion

We have demonstrated, with controlled validation across four held-out domains, four convergent mechanism probes (including a direct V/O ablation), and bootstrap-CI-tight effects, that anchor-token masking produces a measurable out-of-distribution generalization advantage over random-position masking in retrieval-grounded masked-diffusion language model fine-tuning. The direction of the asymmetric masking is load-bearing — reverse-asymmetric masking is statistically worse than random-position masking. The mechanism is causally established as capacity reallocation: anchor-token masking frees LoRA capacity from query/key (attention-pattern) projections to value/output (content-extraction) projections, encoding an inductive bias for topical extension of fixed prefix anchors. V/O-only LoRA fine-tuning outperforms full LoRA at half the trainable parameters, providing a directly productizable practical recommendation.

The result is small in absolute scope (one base model, rank-16 LoRA, 144 examples, 63 queries) but the methodology is rigorous. We position this as a motivating empirical result that suggests asymmetric masking objectives are a meaningful design space for retrieval-augmented MDLM training, with predictions extending to from-scratch pretraining and cross-architecture replication that we have not tested at scale.

We release all code, weights, corpora, queries, and per-query outputs under Apache 2.0.

Acknowledgments

This work was conducted independently and unfunded. The author thanks the Inception Labs Mercury team and Apple’s GLaM-Diffusion team for releasing model and methodology details that motivated this investigation.

Reproducibility

Repository: github.com/Chorozion/Cassandra-t1-diffusion-edge-model (release pending; available privately on request).

Code: - [runner/lora_finetune.py](#) — anchor-token-masked LoRA training -
[runner/lora_finetune_random.py](#) — random-position-masked LoRA training (control) -
[runner/lora_finetune_reverse.py](#) — reverse-asymmetric LoRA training (mechanism control) -
[runner/run_diagnostic_eval.py](#) — initial 4-arm eval (in-domain + C4 held-out) -

`runner/run_multidomain_eval.py` — multi-domain held-out eval (C5/C6/C7) -
`runner/run_reverse_eval.py` — reverse-LoRA eval - `runner/attention_analysis.py` — attention-pattern
instrumentation - `runner/vo_ablation.py` — V/O ablation: V-only and Q-only LoRA training and eval -
`runner/sample_efficiency_sweep.py` — 6-config (data, steps) sweep with matched anchor + random
LoRAs - `runner/bootstrap_analysis.py` — bootstrap CI computation

Weights: - `weights/cassandra_ep5_fp16.pt` — base model (1.3B, SHA-256 verified) -
`lora_adapters/v1_ltmi_r16.pt` — anchor-LoRA (~24 MB) - `lora_adapters/v1_ltmi_random_r16.pt` —
random-position LoRA (~24 MB) - `lora_adapters/v1_ltmi_reverse_r16.pt` — reverse-asymmetric LoRA
(~24 MB)

Data: - `C1.json`, `C2.json`, `C3.json` — in-domain corpora (LTMi-XT format) - `C4.json`, `C5.json`,
`C6.json`, `C7.json` — held-out corpora - `queries.json`, `queries_heldout.json`,
`queries_heldout_extended.json` — eval queries

Outputs: - `eval_out/diagnostic_eval.jsonl` — 162 per-query results (initial 4-arm) -
`eval_out/multidomain_eval.jsonl` — 216 per-query results (multi-domain) -
`eval_out/reverse_eval.jsonl` — 126 per-query results (reverse-asymmetric) -
`eval_out/diagnostic_summary.json`, `eval_out/multidomain_summary.json`,
`eval_out/reverse_summary.json` — aggregate metrics - `eval_out/attention_analysis.json` — per-layer
attention statistics - `eval_out/vo_ablation_results.json` — V/O ablation results -
`eval_out/sweep_results.jsonl`, `eval_out/sweep_summary.json` — sample-efficiency sweep outputs -
`eval_out/bootstrap_results.json` — bootstrap CI computations

Reproduction time: ~60 minutes total on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 Ti.

Random seeds: LoRA training 42, eval generation 1234.

References

[austin2021d3pm] Austin, J., Johnson, D. D., Ho, J., Tarlow, D., & van den Berg, R. (2021). Structured Denoising Diffusion Models in Discrete State-Spaces. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34* (NeurIPS 2021).

[hoogeboom2021argmax] Hoogeboom, E., Nielsen, D., Jaini, P., Forré, P., & Welling, M. (2021). Argmax Flows and Multinomial Diffusion: Towards Non-Autoregressive Language Models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34* (NeurIPS 2021).

[lou2024sedd] Lou, A., Meng, C., & Ermon, S. (2024). Discrete Diffusion Modeling by Estimating the Ratios of the Data Distribution. *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*

(ICML 2024).

[zhao2024mercury] Inception Labs. (2024). *Mercury Coder: A Diffusion Language Model*. Technical Report.

[joshi2020spanbert] Joshi, M., Chen, D., Liu, Y., Weld, D. S., Zettlemoyer, L., & Levy, O. (2020). SpanBERT: Improving Pre-training by Representing and Predicting Spans. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8, 64-77.

[lewis2020bart] Lewis, M., Liu, Y., Goyal, N., Ghazvininejad, M., Mohamed, A., Levy, O., Stoyanov, V., & Zettlemoyer, L. (2020). BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension. *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2020)*.

[bao2022curriculum] Bao, F., Li, C., Zhu, J., & Zhang, B. (2022). Analytic-DPM: An Analytic Estimate of the Optimal Reverse Variance in Diffusion Probabilistic Models. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2022)*.

[raffel2020t5] Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., & Liu, P. J. (2020). Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140), 1-67.

[wang2026spread] Wang, J., et al. (2026). Unlocking the Potentials of Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Diffusion Language Models: A Semantic Drift Perspective. *arXiv:2601.11342*.

[min2023factscore] Min, S., Krishna, K., Lyu, X., Lewis, M., Yih, W., Koh, P. W., Iyyer, M., Zettlemoyer, L., & Hajishirzi, H. (2023). FActScore: Fine-grained Atomic Evaluation of Factual Precision in Long Form Text Generation. *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2023)*.

[afev2025] Liu, X., et al. (2025). Atomic Fact Extraction and Verification. *arXiv:2506.07446*.

[hu2022lora] Hu, E., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., & Chen, W. (2022). LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2022)*.

[garren2026forcedanchor] Garren, T. (2026). Forced-Anchor Decoding for Masked-Diffusion Language Models. *Technical report, SOPHIA XT LLC*.

[garren2026cassandra] Garren, T. (2026). Cassandra T1: An Open-Released 1.3B Masked-Diffusion Language Model. *Technical report, SOPHIA XT LLC*.

[garren2026ltmixt] Garren, T. (2026). LTMi-XT vo.1: A Retrieval Format with Hash-Derived Spatial Indexing. *Technical specification, SOPHIA XT LLC*.

[garren2026ltmixt-eval] Garren, T. (2026). LTMi-XT Evaluation Corpora and Queries. *Reproducibility artifact, SOPHIA XT LLC*.

Appendix A: Full per-query outputs

Per-query JSONL outputs for all 504 generations (4 arms × 5 corpora × ~12 queries × 2 conditions) are released at `eval_out/diagnostic_eval.jsonl`, `eval_out/multidomain_eval.jsonl`, and `eval_out/reverse_eval.jsonl`. Each entry includes generated text, retrieved locus, expected keywords, `hit_strict`, `hit_lenient`, `corpus_overlap`, `english_ratio`, and `anchor_preservation`.

Appendix B: LTMi-XT corpus format

All corpora used in this study are JSONL files in the LTMi-XT vo.1 format. Each locus has the structure:

```
{
  "id": "a-<blake2b-128>",
  "breadcrumb": ["topic", "subtopic", "concept", "claim"],
  "lattice": [x, y, z],
  "statement": "<atomic factual claim>",
  "kind": "fact" | "rule" | "definition",
  "confidence": float,
  "horizon": "short" | "long" | "archived",
  "decay": float,
  "source": {"id": "s-<id>", "offset": [start, end]},
  "first_seen": "<ISO-8601>",
  "last_referenced": "<ISO-8601>",
  "references": int
}
```

The breadcrumb hierarchy is the source of the templated questions used to build (Q, A) training pairs.

Appendix C: Sample-efficiency sweep

To characterize how the anchor-vs-random advantage scales with training budget, we trained matched anchor-LoRA and random-LoRA pairs at six (training-set-size, training-step) configurations. Each pair uses identical data (subsampling from the 144 available examples), identical hyperparameters, and identical seeds. Each LoRA is evaluated on a held-out subset of 12 queries (3 per domain across C4-C7) using forced-anchor `corpus_overlap`.

C.1 Results

n_pairs	n_steps	Anchor	Random	Ratio	Diff
50	100	0.483	0.246	1.97×	+0.237
50	1000	0.411	0.222	1.85×	+0.189
100	300	0.378	0.207	1.82×	+0.170
144	100	0.387	0.177	2.19× ← max	+0.211
144	300	0.337	0.180	1.87×	+0.157
144	1000	0.203	0.190	1.07×	← collapse +0.014

C.2 Interpretation

Two patterns are visible:

The anchor advantage is largest at the lowest budget regimes. At (144 pairs, 100 steps) the ratio peaks at 2.19×. At (50 pairs, 100 steps) the ratio is 1.97×. The technique is most effective when training is short.

The advantage attenuates monotonically with step count, holding data fixed. At 144 training pairs, the anchor-LoRA's `corpus_overlap` on held-out drops 0.387 → 0.337 → 0.203 as steps increase 100 → 300 → 1000. The random-LoRA shows the opposite trend: 0.177 → 0.180 → 0.190 (mild improvement). At (144, 1000) the two arms have nearly converged (1.07×).

This is an **overfitting effect specific to the anchor-token-masked objective**. The asymmetric loss surface (predict A given fully-visible Q) is more sharply structured than the symmetric loss surface (predict any masked position from any visible context); the anchor-LoRA reaches its best generalization quickly and then degrades as it memorizes the small training set. The random-LoRA's broader objective is implicitly more regularizing.

C.3 Practical implication

The optimal regime for the technique is short fine-tuning on small datasets. For customer-facing per-corpus fine-tuning, training budgets of approximately 100-300 steps on 50-150 examples produce the largest anchor advantage; longer fine-tuning runs erode the advantage. This has the convenient consequence that anchor-token-masked LoRA fine-tuning is *cheap*: ~30-100 seconds on a consumer GPU per customer, well within practical productization economics.

For from-scratch pretraining at scale, the implication is that anchor-token masking should likely be one phase of a curriculum rather than the entire training distribution; once the model has acquired the inductive bias, further training under the asymmetric objective may produce diminishing or negative returns.

C.4 Honest scope

The sweep is small (12 queries per LoRA, 6 budget configurations). It establishes the *direction* of the effect-vs-budget relationship but not its precise functional form. A larger sweep with more queries per cell, more configurations, and matched random seeds would tighten the curve. We treat the sweep as a *qualitative* result indicating “the advantage attenuates at high budgets” rather than a *quantitative* characterization of when exactly the crossover occurs.

Working draft v0.2 · 2026-05-09 · SOPHIA XT LLC · Apache 2.0 license proposed for paper, code, weights, and reproducibility artifacts.