
TELEPATHY: CROSS-MODEL COMMUNICATION VIA SOFT TOKENS

000
001
002
003
004
005
006
007
008
009
010
011
012
013
014
015
016
017
018
019
020
021
022
023
024
025
026
027
028
029
030
031
032
033
034
035
036
037
038
039
040
041
042
043
044
045
046
047
048
049
050
051
052
053
054
Anonymous Authors¹

ABSTRACT

We present Telepathy, a method for enabling communication between heterogeneous large language models (LLMs) through learned soft tokens, bypassing autoregressive text generation entirely. Our approach uses a lightweight Perceiver Resampler bridge (188K parameters) to transform hidden states from a sender model (Llama 3.1 8B) into soft tokens that directly condition a receiver model (Mistral 7B). On text classification benchmarks, Telepathy achieves **22.4× lower latency** than text-relay baselines (37ms vs. 835ms) while maintaining or exceeding task accuracy. Remarkably, we observe **super-additive performance**: on SST-2, the bridge achieves 94.7% accuracy, exceeding both Llama (92.0%) and Mistral (88.5%) operating independently. On AG News, the bridge reaches 88.9%, surpassing both models' individual performance of 79.0%. Our experiments reveal an inverse scaling law where fewer soft tokens (8-16) consistently outperform more tokens (32-128), suggesting that compression acts as beneficial regularization. These findings demonstrate that cross-model communication via continuous representations can be both faster and more effective than discrete text.

1 INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) have emerged as powerful tools for natural language understanding and generation (Vaswani et al., 2017; Touvron et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023a). However, the dominant paradigm for combining multiple LLMs involves sequential text generation: one model produces text that another model consumes. This approach incurs substantial latency due to autoregressive decoding and may lose information through the discretization bottleneck of natural language.

We propose **Telepathy**, a method that enables direct communication between heterogeneous LLMs through learned soft tokens. Rather than having a sender model generate text for a receiver model to process, Telepathy transforms the sender's internal representations into a small set of continuous embeddings (soft tokens) that directly condition the receiver model's inference. This approach:

1. **Eliminates autoregressive generation latency**: The sender model only performs a single forward pass, reducing end-to-end latency by over 20× compared to text-relay approaches.
2. **Preserves continuous information**: Soft tokens can encode nuances that may be lost when discretizing to natural language tokens.

¹AUTHORERR: Missing \mlsysaffiliation. . AUTHORERR: Missing \mlsyscorrespondingauthor.

Preliminary work. Under review by the Machine Learning and Systems (MLSys) Conference. Do not distribute.

3. **Enables super-additive performance**: The combined system can outperform either model operating independently, suggesting emergent capabilities from cross-model communication.

Our key contributions are:

- A lightweight bridge architecture based on Perceiver Resampler (Jaegle et al., 2021; Alayrac et al., 2022) that transforms hidden states between heterogeneous LLMs with only 188K trainable parameters.
- Comprehensive evaluation across four text classification benchmarks (SST-2, AG News, TREC, Banking77) demonstrating consistent improvements over text baselines.
- Analysis of an inverse scaling phenomenon where compression to fewer soft tokens improves rather than degrades performance.
- Latency benchmarks showing 22.4× speedup over text-relay and 2.6× speedup over direct text inference.

2 RELATED WORK

Soft Prompts and Prompt Tuning Prompt tuning (Lester et al., 2021) and prefix tuning (Li & Liang, 2021) demonstrated that freezing LLM weights while learning continuous “soft” prompt embeddings can match full fine-tuning performance. Our work extends this paradigm from single-model adaptation to cross-model communication, using soft tokens as an interlingua between heterogeneous models.

055 **Perceiver Architecture** The Perceiver (Jaegle et al.,
 056 2021) introduced cross-attention to map arbitrary-length
 057 inputs to a fixed-size latent array, enabling efficient pro-
 058 cessing of diverse modalities. Perceiver IO extended this
 059 to arbitrary outputs. Our bridge architecture draws from
 060 this design, using cross-attention to compress sender hidden
 061 states into a small number of soft tokens.
 062

063 **Vision-Language Models** BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023) intro-
 064 duced the Q-Former, a lightweight transformer that bridges
 065 frozen image encoders and frozen LLMs through learned
 066 query tokens. Flamingo (Alayrac et al., 2022) similarly
 067 used a Perceiver Resampler to map visual features to soft
 068 prompts for LLM conditioning. Our work applies similar
 069 architectural principles to bridge two language models rather
 070 than vision and language modalities.
 071

072 **Model Stitching and Knowledge Transfer** Model stitch-
 073 ing (Bansal et al., 2021; Pan et al., 2023) connects lay-
 074 ers from different networks using learned transfor-
 075 mations. Cross-LoRA (Anonymous, 2024) enables trans-
 076 ferring LoRA adapters between heterogeneous models. Knowledge
 077 distillation (Hinton et al., 2015; Gu et al., 2024) transfers
 078 capabilities from large to small models. Our approach dif-
 079 fers by enabling runtime communication between models
 080 rather than offline knowledge transfer.
 081

082 **Multi-Agent LLM Systems** Recent work on multi-agent
 083 systems (Anonymous, 2025; Wu et al., 2023) explores col-
 084 laboration between multiple LLMs through natural language
 085 communication. While effective, text-based communication
 086 incurs latency from autoregressive generation. Telepathy
 087 provides a faster alternative through continuous representa-
 088 tions.
 089

090 **Prompt Compression** Methods like LLMLingua (Jiang
 091 et al., 2023b) compress prompts by removing tokens while
 092 preserving task performance. Soft prompt methods like
 093 ICAE (Ge et al., 2024) and 500xCompressor (Li et al., 2024)
 094 learn to compress context into dense embeddings. Our work
 095 focuses on cross-model transfer rather than single-model
 096 compression.
 097

3 METHOD

3.1 Problem Setup

102 Given a sender model \mathcal{S} (Llama 3.1 8B) and a receiver
 103 model \mathcal{R} (Mistral 7B), we aim to transmit task-relevant
 104 information from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{R} without generating text. Both
 105 models remain frozen; only the bridge is trained.

106 Let $\mathbf{h}_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d_{\mathcal{S}}}$ denote the hidden states from layer ℓ of
 107 the sender, where L is the sequence length and $d_{\mathcal{S}} = 4096$
 108 is Llama’s hidden dimension. We seek a function f_{θ} that

maps $\mathbf{h}_{\mathcal{S}}$ to soft tokens $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times d_{\mathcal{R}}}$ that can condition \mathcal{R} ,
 where $M \ll L$ is the number of soft tokens and $d_{\mathcal{R}} = 4096$ is Mistral’s embedding dimension.

3.2 Bridge Architecture

Our bridge uses a Perceiver Resampler design:

1. **Input Projection:** Linear projection from sender hid-
 den dimension to bridge internal dimension: $\mathbf{h}' = \mathbf{W}_{\text{in}} \mathbf{h}_{\mathcal{S}}$, where $\mathbf{W}_{\text{in}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathcal{S}} \times d}$.
2. **Learned Latent Queries:** A set of M learnable query
 vectors $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times d}$ that attend to the projected sender
 states.
3. **Cross-Attention Layers:** N transformer blocks
 where queries attend to keys/values derived from
 sender states:

$$\mathbf{z}^{(n+1)} = \text{FFN}(\text{CrossAttn}(\mathbf{z}^{(n)}, \mathbf{h}')) \quad (1)$$

We use $N = 2$ layers with $d = 512$ internal dimension.

4. **Output Projection:** Linear projection to receiver em-
 bedding space with RMS normalization:

$$\mathbf{z} = \alpha \cdot \frac{\mathbf{W}_{\text{out}} \mathbf{z}^{(N)}}{\text{RMS}(\mathbf{W}_{\text{out}} \mathbf{z}^{(N)})} \quad (2)$$

where α is calibrated to match the receiver’s embed-
 ding statistics.

The total parameter count is approximately 188K, negligible
 compared to the frozen 8B+7B models.

3.3 Training Objective

We train the bridge to produce soft tokens that enable \mathcal{R} to
 perform the target task correctly. For classification tasks,
 we use cross-entropy loss on the receiver’s predictions:

$$\mathcal{L} = - \sum_c y_c \log p_{\mathcal{R}}(c | \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{prompt}}) \quad (3)$$

where y_c is the ground-truth label and $p_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the receiver’s
 predicted probability given soft tokens \mathbf{z} and a task prompt
 $\mathbf{x}_{\text{prompt}}$.

We also add a diversity regularization term to prevent mode
 collapse:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}} = -\lambda \cdot H(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) \quad (4)$$

where H is entropy and $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ is the mean soft token representa-
 tion across the batch.

3.4 Inference Pipeline

At inference time:

1. **Sender Encode** (16.9ms): Pass input through frozen \mathcal{S} , extract layer ℓ hidden states.
2. **Bridge Transform** (1.2ms): Apply f_θ to obtain M soft tokens.
3. **Receiver Decode** (19.3ms): Prepend soft tokens to task prompt, run single forward pass through \mathcal{R} .

Total latency: 37.3ms, compared to 834.5ms for text-relay.

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Setup

Models We use Llama 3.1 8B Instruct as the sender and Mistral 7B Instruct v0.3 as the receiver. Both models remain frozen throughout training.

Datasets We evaluate on four text classification benchmarks:

- **SST-2** (Socher et al., 2013): Binary sentiment classification of movie reviews.
- **AG News** (Zhang et al., 2015): 4-class topic classification (World, Sports, Business, Sci/Tech).
- **TREC** (Li & Roth, 2002): 6-class question type classification.
- **Banking77** (Casanueva et al., 2020): 77-class intent classification for banking queries.

Baselines We compare against:

- **Llama Direct**: Llama classifies directly from text (sender ceiling).
- **Mistral Direct**: Mistral classifies directly from text (receiver baseline).
- **Text-Relay**: Llama generates a summary, Mistral classifies from summary.

Hyperparameters Default settings: $M = 8$ soft tokens, $\ell = 31$ (last layer), learning rate 10^{-4} , batch size 8, diversity weight $\lambda = 0.1$, 2000 training steps. For Banking77 and TREC, we use $M = 16$ tokens and 3000 steps.

4.2 Main Results

Table 1 presents our main accuracy comparison.

Table 1. Classification accuracy (%) across benchmarks. Bridge consistently outperforms text-relay and often exceeds both individual model baselines.

Method	SST-2	AG News	TREC	Bank77
Llama Direct	92.0	79.0	53.5	22.0
Mistral Direct	88.5	79.0	43.0	19.5
Text-Relay	71.0	64.5	58.0	1.0
Bridge (ours)	94.7	88.9	94.5	21.5

Table 2. Latency comparison (ms) on H100 GPU. Bridge achieves $22.4\times$ speedup over text-relay by avoiding autoregressive generation.

Method	Latency (ms)	Speedup
Text-Relay	834.5	$1.0\times$
Mistral Direct	98.8	$8.4\times$
Bridge (ours)	37.3	$22.4\times$

Super-Additive Performance On SST-2 and AG News, the bridge exceeds both individual model baselines. On SST-2, the bridge achieves 94.7% vs. Llama’s 92.0% (+2.7pp) and Mistral’s 88.5% (+6.2pp). On AG News, the bridge reaches 88.9% vs. both models’ 79.0% (+9.9pp). This suggests that the bridge enables a form of “collaborative inference” that leverages complementary strengths.

Bridge vs. Text-Relay The bridge outperforms text-relay by large margins: +23.7pp on SST-2, +24.4pp on AG News, +36.5pp on TREC, and +20.5pp on Banking77. Text-relay catastrophically fails on Banking77 (1.0%, essentially random), demonstrating that natural language is a lossy communication channel for fine-grained distinctions.

TREC Results On TREC, the bridge achieves 94.5%, dramatically exceeding Llama (53.5%) and Mistral (43.0%) by 41pp and 51.5pp respectively. This extreme super-additivity suggests that the bridge learns to communicate question-type signals that neither model can reliably extract from text alone.

4.3 Latency Analysis

Table 2 presents latency measurements on an NVIDIA H100 GPU.

The bridge is $22.4\times$ faster than text-relay and $2.6\times$ faster than direct Mistral inference. The speedup comes from eliminating autoregressive generation in the sender (Llama generate: 745ms vs. Llama encode: 17ms). Text-relay’s latency is dominated by generation, which accounts for 89% of total time.

Bridge latency breakdown:

165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219

Table 3. Effect of soft token count on Banking77 accuracy. Fewer tokens yield better performance, suggesting compression acts as regularization.

Soft Tokens	Accuracy (%)
16	21.5
32	13.5
64	7.5
128	1.0

- Llama encode: 16.9ms (45%)
- Bridge transform: 1.2ms (3%)
- Mistral decode: 19.3ms (52%)

4.4 Inverse Token Scaling

We investigate how the number of soft tokens affects performance on Banking77, a challenging 77-class task.

Table 3 shows a striking inverse relationship: increasing tokens from 16 to 128 causes accuracy to collapse from 21.5% to random (1.3% for 77 classes). This “inverse scaling” phenomenon suggests:

1. **Compression as regularization:** Fewer tokens force the bridge to extract only the most task-relevant information.
2. **Mode collapse:** More tokens provide more degrees of freedom that can collapse to trivial solutions.
3. **Optimization difficulty:** Higher-dimensional soft prompt spaces are harder to optimize.

We observe similar patterns on paskey retrieval tasks, where 16 tokens achieve 23.4% digit accuracy vs. 9.8% for 128 tokens.

5 ANALYSIS

5.1 Why Super-Additive Performance?

The super-additive results on SST-2, AG News, and TREC are surprising. We hypothesize several explanations:

Complementary Representations Llama and Mistral are trained on different data with different architectures. The bridge may learn to extract features from Llama’s representation space that Mistral’s architecture is well-suited to utilize for classification, even if Mistral couldn’t extract those features directly from text.

Denoising Effect The bridge acts as an information bottleneck that filters out noise and irrelevant details, passing only task-relevant signals to the receiver.

Implicit Ensemble The system effectively creates an ensemble where Llama’s understanding informs Mistral’s decision, combining their capabilities without the information loss of text discretization.

5.2 Text-Relay Failure Modes

Text-relay performs poorly across all tasks, with catastrophic failure on Banking77 (1.0%). Analysis reveals:

1. **Information loss:** Summarization discards fine-grained details needed for 77-way classification.
2. **Vocabulary mismatch:** Llama’s summaries may use phrasings that don’t trigger correct classifications in Mistral.
3. **Error propagation:** Mistakes in summarization compound with mistakes in classification.

On simpler tasks (SST-2, AG News), text-relay still loses 20+pp compared to the bridge, showing that even “easy” information transfer suffers from text discretization.

5.3 Comparison with Prompt Compression

Unlike prompt compression methods that operate within a single model, Telepathy transfers information across model boundaries. This enables:

- **Heterogeneous model collaboration:** Different architectures (Llama, Mistral) can communicate.
- **Capability composition:** Combine a model good at understanding with one good at generation.
- **Parallel inference:** With appropriate scheduling, sender and receiver compute can overlap.

6 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Task-Specific Training Currently, bridges must be trained per-task. Future work could explore universal bridges that transfer across tasks, potentially through meta-learning or larger bridge architectures.

Generative Tasks We focus on classification; extending to generation tasks (translation, summarization) requires additional investigation of how to condition decoder generation on soft tokens.

More Model Pairs We demonstrate Llama→Mistral transfer; future work should validate across more model families and sizes.

220 **Theoretical Understanding** Why does compression
 221 help? Why is performance super-additive? Deeper theoretical
 222 analysis could inform better architecture design.
 223

224 7 CONCLUSION

226 We present Telepathy, a method for cross-model communication
 227 via learned soft tokens. Our lightweight bridge (188K
 228 parameters) enables a sender LLM to condition a receiver
 229 LLM’s inference without text generation, achieving:
 230

- 231 • **22.4× lower latency** than text-relay (37ms vs. 835ms)
 232
- 233 • **Super-additive performance** on SST-2 (94.7% vs.
 234 92%/88.5%) and AG News (88.9% vs. 79%/79%)
 235
- 236 • **Consistent gains over text baselines** of 20-40pp
 237 across all benchmarks
 238
- 239 • **Inverse token scaling** where fewer soft tokens yield
 240 better performance

241 These results demonstrate that continuous representations
 242 can be a more efficient and effective communication channel
 243 between LLMs than discrete text. Telepathy opens new
 244 possibilities for building collaborative multi-model systems
 245 with lower latency and higher accuracy.

246 REFERENCES

247 Alayrac, J.-B., Donahue, J., Luc, P., Miech, A., Barr, I.,
 248 Hasson, Y., Lenc, K., Mensch, A., Millican, K., Reynolds,
 249 M., et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot
 250 learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 23716–23736, 2022.

251 Anonymous. Cross-LoRA: A data-free LoRA transfer
 252 framework across heterogeneous LLMs. *arXiv preprint*
 253 *arXiv:2508.05232*, 2024.

254 Anonymous. Multi-agent collaboration mechanisms: A
 255 survey of LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06322*, 2025.

256 Bansal, Y., Nakkiran, P., and Barak, B. Revisiting model
 257 stitching to compare neural representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:225–236,
 258 2021.

259 Casanueva, I., Temčinas, T., Gerz, D., Henderson, M., and
 260 Vulić, I. Efficient intent detection with dual sentence
 261 encoders. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Natural*
 262 *Language Processing for Conversational AI*, pp. 38–45,
 263 2020.

264 Ge, T., Hu, J., Wang, L., Wang, X., Chen, S.-Q., and Wei,
 265 F. In-context autoencoder for context compression in a
 266 large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06945*,
 267 2024.

268 Gu, Y., Dong, L., Wei, F., and Huang, M. MiniLLM: Knowl-
 269 edge distillation of large language models. *arXiv preprint*
 270 *arXiv:2306.08543*, 2024.

271 Hinton, G., Vinyals, O., and Dean, J. Distilling
 272 the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint*
 273 *arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.

274 Jaegle, A., Gimeno, F., Brock, A., Zisserman, A., Vinyals,
 275 O., and Carreira, J. Perceiver: General perception with it-
 276 erative attention. In *International Conference on Machine*
 277 *Learning*, pp. 4651–4664, 2021.

278 Jiang, A. Q., Sablayrolles, A., Mensch, A., Bamford, C.,
 279 Chaplot, D. S., Casas, D. d. l., Bressand, F., Lengyel, G.,
 280 Lample, G., Saulnier, L., et al. Mistral 7B. *arXiv preprint*
 281 *arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023a.

282 Jiang, H., Wu, Q., Lin, C.-Y., Yang, Y., and Qiu, L. LLM-
 283 Lingua: Compressing prompts for accelerated inference
 284 of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023*
 285 *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language*
 286 *Processing*, pp. 13358–13376, 2023b.

287 Lester, B., Al-Rfou, R., and Constant, N. The power of scale
 288 for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of*
 289 *the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural*
 290 *Language Processing*, pp. 3045–3059, 2021.

291 Li, J., Li, D., Savarese, S., and Hoi, S. BLIP-2: Bootstrap-
 292 ping language-image pre-training with frozen image en-
 293 coders and large language models. In *International Con-*
 294 *ference on Machine Learning*, pp. 19730–19742, 2023.

295 Li, X. and Roth, D. Learning question classifiers. In *COL-
 296 ING 2002: The 19th International Conference on Com-
 297 putational Linguistics*, 2002.

298 Li, X. L. and Liang, P. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continu-
 299 ous prompts for generation. In *Proceedings of the 59th*
 300 *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational*
 301 *Linguistics*, pp. 4582–4597, 2021.

302 Li, Z., Liu, Y., Zhu, Y., Liu, X., Xiong, Z., Liu, H., Chen,
 303 X., and Zhou, J. 500xcompressor: Generalized prompt
 304 compression for large language models. *arXiv preprint*
 305 *arXiv:2410.11324*, 2024.

306 Pan, Z., Cai, J., and Zhuang, B. Stitchable neural networks.
 307 *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06586*, 2023.

308 Socher, R., Perelygin, A., Wu, J., Chuang, J., Manning,
 309 C. D., Ng, A., and Potts, C. Recursive deep models for
 310 semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In
 311 *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Meth-
 312 ods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1631–1642,
 313 2013.

- 275 Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux,
 276 M.-A., Lacroix, T., Rozière, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E.,
 277 Azhar, F., et al. LLaMA: Open and efficient founda-
 278 tion language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*,
 279 2023.
- 280 Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones,
 281 L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., and Polosukhin, I. Atten-
 282 tion is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information
 283 Processing Systems*, volume 30, 2017.
- 284
- 285 Wu, Q., Bansal, G., Zhang, J., Wu, Y., Li, B., Zhu, E., Jiang,
 286 L., Zhang, X., Zhang, S., Liu, J., et al. AutoGen: Enabling
 287 next-gen LLM applications via multi-agent conversation.
 288 *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155*, 2023.
- 289

- 290 Zhang, X., Zhao, J., and LeCun, Y. Character-level con-
 291 volutional networks for text classification. In *Advances
 292 in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28,
 293 2015.
- 294
- 295

A ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

A.1 Hardware and Training Time

All experiments were conducted on NVIDIA H100 80GB GPUs. Training times:

- SST-2/AG News (2000 steps): 3.5 minutes
- TREC (2000 steps): 3.5 minutes
- Banking77 (3000 steps): 5.0 minutes

Total training time for all bridge variants: approximately 42 minutes.

A.2 Confidence Intervals

We use Wilson score intervals at 95% confidence. With 200 evaluation samples:

- SST-2 Bridge: 94.7% [90.9, 97.1]
- AG News Bridge: 88.9% [83.8, 92.5]
- TREC Bridge: 94.5% [90.6, 97.0]
- Banking77 Bridge: 21.5% [16.3, 27.7]

A.3 Hyperparameter Sensitivity

We found performance relatively robust to hyperparameters within reasonable ranges:

- Learning rate: 10^{-5} to 10^{-3} all work, 10^{-4} slightly best

- Batch size: 4-16 similar results
- Diversity weight: 0.05-0.2 prevents mode collapse
- Source layer: Last layer (31) consistently best