

SPHERE ENCODER 2

Kaiyu Yue¹ Sean McLeish¹ Ruchit Rawal¹ Brian Bartoldson² Menglin Jia³ Tom Goldstein¹

¹University of Maryland ²Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory ³Cornell University

ABSTRACT Sphere Encoder is an autoencoder that generates images by decoding random points from a high-dimensional latent sphere. We identify two limitations of the original formulation that reduce its generation quality. First, random points concentrate near the equator relative to the pole on an encoded latent, but the training rotation never reaches this region, leaving a gap that limits one-step generation. Second, training for generation with pixel-wise reconstruction loss encourages the decoder to average over plausible images, producing blurry images that lack high-frequency details. We present Sphere Encoder 2 to address both limitations, substantially improving image generation quality while maintaining the speed and simplicity of an autoencoder. Models are released at github.com/kaiyuyue/sphere2.




Figure 1: **Curated 1-step generation** without CFG on ImageNet 512×512 by Sphere Encoder 2.




Figure 2: **Sphere Encoder vs. Sphere Encoder 2.** Uncurated generation on ImageNet 256×256 from Sphere Encoder (Yue et al., 2026) (top) and Sphere Encoder 2 (bottom) with same classes.

1 INTRODUCTION

Sphere Encoders (Yue et al., 2026; Do et al., 2026; Man et al., 2026) are simple standalone autoencoders with strong generative capabilities. They consist of an encoder that maps images into a spherical latent space, and a decoder that maps a latent vector back to an image. When trained properly, the training images cover the latent sphere with an approximately uniform distribution, enabling generation of novel images by sampling a random latent vector and passing it through the decoder. Unlike the many-step generation process used by diffusion models, sphere encoders enable fast image generation in as little as one step.

The original Sphere Encoder (Yue et al., 2026) is able to represent the ImageNet distribution, but its single-step generations are blurry (Fig. 2, top). Sharp images were obtained by iteratively passing a generated image through the encoder and decoder as many as 4 times, yet soft edges remain even after this refinement. We trace this to two causes. First, while noise is added to latent vectors during training to achieve good coverage of the sphere, the original Sphere Encoder only adds up to 85° of noise to latents, possibly leaving some of the sphere unseen during training. Second, it trains the decoder for generation with the pixel-wise reconstruction loss, which is minimized by averaging over all plausible images and thus yields blurry outputs.

Sphere Encoder 2 fixes both issues (Fig. 2, bottom). First, we adopt a parameterization of noise that robustly adds a full 90° of noise to latents during training, allowing the decoder to see more of the sphere during training. Second, we decouple the decoder’s task into two regimes: low-noise reconstruction, which keeps the pixel-wise loss, and high-noise generation, which drops it. In the high-noise/generative regime, we propose a new and efficient latent score matching loss. This encourages outputs to lie on the image manifold without requiring adversarial training. The result is sharp one-step generation on ImageNet 512×512 (Fig. 1).

Among pixel-space generators on ImageNet, Sphere Encoder 2 achieves the best FDr⁶ at 256×256 and the second best at 512×512 with only 4×2 network evaluations (NFE), whereas pixel diffusion models such as JiT (Li & He, 2026) and PixNerd (Wang et al., 2026a) take 200. This amounts to $23\times$ to $40\times$ less sampling compute in total GFLOPs. Without classifier-free guidance (CFG) (Ho & Salimans, 2022), 4 steps outperform JiT-H and one-step pMF-H (Lu et al., 2026) at both resolutions.

2 RELATED WORK

Autoencoders (Bourlard & Kamp, 1988; Hinton & Zemel, 1993; Kingma & Welling, 2014) compress images into a latent space, but making them generate on their own is hard on complex datasets, *e.g.*, ImageNet (Deng et al., 2009). Hierarchical VAEs such as NVAE (Vahdat & Kautz, 2020) and

VDVAE (Child, 2021) deepen the latent space, yet their generation quality stays far below diffusion models (Dhariwal & Nichol, 2021) and GANs (Sauer et al., 2023). Deep VAEs (Luhman & Luhman, 2023) reach high fidelity on ImageNet only when trained inside the latent space of a pretrained tokenizer. Autoencoders then settled for the two-stage paradigm: an autoencoder only compresses, and a secondary latent diffusion Rombach et al. (2022) or autoregressive (AR) prior (Tian et al., 2024) generates. Sphere Encoder (Yue et al., 2026) revisits single-stage paradigm with a non-variational autoencoder and reaches competitive quality on ImageNet, but its generation is blurry because it treats generation as reconstruction. Sphere Encoder 2 still stays single-stage but removes the blur.

Sampling from a prior is what turns an autoencoder into a generator, and most work focuses on learning a richer prior, from mixture priors (Tomczak & Welling, 2018) to the hierarchical priors above. Spherical latents have also been explored, but either at small scale with a von Mises-Fisher posterior (Davidson et al., 2018), or with a prior still learned on top of spherical latents, autoregressive in SphereAR (Ke & Xue, 2025) and Riemannian flow matching over representation-encoder latents in RJF (Kumar & Patel, 2026). Sphere Latent Encoder (Do et al., 2026) builds on Sphere Encoder without a learned prior, but it is two-stage again and relies on a RAE decoder (Zheng et al., 2026) to reach pixels. StyleGAN (Karras et al., 2019) normalizes its input noise onto a sphere, but it does not synthesize from the sphere directly: a learned mapping network first transforms random inputs into the intermediate latent space $\mathcal{W}$, whose distribution is also a learned prior. Closest to our setting, (Zhao et al., 2019) decode random points on a sphere directly to pixels, but only working on MNIST and CelebA. Sphere Encoder is the first to scale sphere-to-pixel decoding to ImageNet: the decoder is trained with noise to cover the entire sphere, so no learned prior is needed.

One-step and few-step generation can be reached by two main paths. Distillation compresses a pretrained multi-step teacher into a few steps, by progressively halving steps (Salimans & Ho, 2022; Meng et al., 2023; Luhman & Luhman, 2021), straightening trajectories (Liu et al., 2022; 2024), enforcing consistency (Song et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2024), or matching scores or distributions (Luo et al., 2023b; Yin et al., 2024b;a; Zhou et al., 2024), optionally with an adversarial term (Sauer et al., 2024), while from-scratch methods train one/few-step models directly, including consistency training (Song et al., 2023; Song & Dhariwal, 2024; Geng et al., 2025b; Lu & Song, 2025; Luo et al., 2023a), flow-map methods such as shortcut models, IMM, MeanFlow and its variants (Frans et al., 2025; Zhou et al., 2025; Geng et al., 2025a; 2026; Lu et al., 2026; Boffi et al., 2024), drifting models (Deng et al., 2026), GANs (Goodfellow et al., 2020; Brock et al., 2019; Kang et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2024; Sauer et al., 2023; Hyun et al., 2026), and Sphere Encoders (Yue et al., 2026; Do et al., 2026; Man et al., 2026). Sphere Encoder 2 is trained from scratch without distillation. One step decodes random points on the sphere directly into pixels, and each extra step loops the model by encoding, rotating, and decoding.

Distribution matching is the core of generative modeling for high-fidelity synthesis. The most effective method is the adversarial loss: a discriminator learns to tell real images from generated ones, and its gradient pushes the generator toward the data distribution (Goodfellow et al., 2020; Brock et al., 2019; Kang et al., 2023). However, adversarial training needs careful tuning and architecture design (Huang et al., 2024; Hyun et al., 2026), and its stability is a problem: BigGAN (Brock et al., 2019) collapses after a few hundred ImageNet epochs and must be stopped early, and the discriminator overfits as training proceeds (Karras et al., 2020). Distribution matching distillation (DMD) (Yin et al., 2024b) proposes an alternative: a pretrained diffusion teacher provides the real score, a second model tracks the fake score online, and their difference moves samples toward the data distribution (Wang et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2024). The cost is the teacher: DMD requires a pretrained diffusion model of the same data or a superset of it, so it is a distillation method rather than a standalone loss for any generator. SMT (Jayashankar et al., 2025) tries to drop the teacher by learning the score of the real/fake mixture online, but operates in pixel space at 64×64 or below. Concurrent work matches real and generated features of frozen encoders with MMD or optimal transport (Feng et al., 2026; Zhang et al., 2026), estimating the transport direction non-parametrically from a batch, but so far only as post-training of pretrained multi-step generators. In this work, we propose a lightweight score matching loss without a pretrained teacher. It trains two score models online from scratch, one for real and one for fake features, each a two-layer transformer following standard EDM (Karras et al., 2022), and both operate in a frozen feature space rather than pixel space, as in Projected GAN (Sauer et al., 2021), StyleGAN-T (Sauer et al., 2023), and drifting loss (Deng et al., 2026). Like a GAN loss, the score matching loss depends only on real and generated images, not on the generator itself, so in principle it can be plugged into any generator training pipeline.

3 PRELIMINARIES: SPHERE ENCODER

Sphere Encoder (Yue et al., 2026) is a non-variational autoencoder that can be efficiently sampled to generate images. It consists of an encoder $\mathcal{E}$ and a decoder $\mathcal{D}$. Given an input image $\mathbf{X}^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$, the encoder produces a latent $\mathbf{Z} = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$, where N is the number of tokens and D is the feature dimension. The latent $\mathbf{Z}$ is then projected onto a global sphere by the spherify function $\mathcal{F}$:

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{Z}) = \sqrt{d} \frac{\text{vec}(\mathbf{Z})}{\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{Z})\|_2} \in \sqrt{d} \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \quad d = N \times D, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ denotes the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$, so $\mathbf{z}$ lies on a sphere of radius $\sqrt{d}$. The decoder then maps the spherical latent back to the image space: $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{z})$, reconstructing the original image.

For generation, the Sphere Encoder exploits the fact that the latent space is approximately uniformly distributed on the sphere, enabling the decoder to be run with a uniform sample as input. A latent vector is chosen by spherifying a random Gaussian vector, resulting in a uniformly sampled vector on the sphere (Blum et al., 2020), and the decoder transforms it into an image:

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})), \quad \mathbf{e} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d). \quad (2)$$

3.1 GAP TO THE EQUATOR

For the direct pixel generation in Eq. (2) to succeed, the decoder must handle latents that are far from any encoded $\mathbf{z}$ seen at training time. Sphere Encoder bridges the gap between the discrete training distribution and continuous uniform distribution using a process called *spherify with noise*, which adds noise to a clean latent $\mathbf{z}$ before train-time reconstruction:

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}(\alpha) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{z} + \tan(\alpha) \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})), \quad (3)$$

where α approximates the angle between $\mathbf{z}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(\alpha)$ in high dimensions. During training, α is uniformly sampled from $[0, \alpha_{\max}]$ with $\alpha_{\max} = 85^\circ$.

This objective leaves a mismatch between the latents seen in training and those used for generation. Specifically, on a high-dimensional sphere, almost all of the surface measure concentrates in a thin band around the equator relative to any fixed direction (Blum et al., 2020; Goldstein & Studer, 2018).

Relative to $\mathbf{z}$, a random point $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$ lies near the equator at $\alpha \rightarrow 90^\circ$. With $\alpha_{\max} = 85^\circ$, the decoder is never trained on the equatorial band, and the residual gap of 5° limits its one-step generation quality. Closing the gap by setting $\alpha_{\max} = 90^\circ$ is not an option in Eq. (3), since $\tan(\alpha)$ diverges as $\alpha \rightarrow 90^\circ$. This main limitation motivates a new formulation that reaches the equator exactly.

4 SPHERE ENCODER 2

In this section, we introduce Sphere Encoder 2, which improves generation quality by closing the gap to the equator. We explain its design choices through ablation studies.

4.1 ROTATION TO THE EQUATOR

We replace additive perturbation and reprojection in Eq. (3) with an explicit rotation:

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}(\alpha) = \cos(\alpha) \mathbf{z} + \sin(\alpha) \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e}), \quad \alpha \in [0, 90^\circ]. \quad (4)$$

Since $\mathbf{z}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$ are nearly orthogonal in high dimensions, $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(\alpha)$ stays on the sphere of radius $\sqrt{d}$, and α is exactly the angle of rotation away from $\mathbf{z}$ toward $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$. The endpoints are well defined: $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(0^\circ) = \mathbf{z}$ recovers the clean latent, and $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(90^\circ) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$ lands on the equator (see Fig. 3).

This objective closes the gap in two ways. First, the range of α now includes 90° , so the decoder is trained on the equatorial band that one-step generation samples from. Second, although the distribution of the clean latents $\mathbf{z}$ is not necessarily uniform, $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(90^\circ)$ is uniform on the equatorial subsphere relative to $\mathbf{z}$, which is exactly the distribution of the generation latents $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$ in Eq. (2).

¹Bold capital letters denote matrices, and bold lower-case letters denote column vectors. The notation $\mathbf{x}_i$ represents the i^{th} column of a matrix $\mathbf{X}$, while x_{ij} denotes its entry in the i^{th} row and j^{th} column. Non-bold letters denote scalars, and $\text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$ denotes the vectorization of $\mathbf{X}$.




Figure 3: **Sphere Encoder 2.** The encoder $\mathcal{E}$ maps an image to a clean latent $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(0^\circ)$ on the sphere $\mathbb{S}$, which is then rotated toward a random direction by an angle $\alpha \in [0, 90^\circ]$ in Eq. (4). The cutoff angle α_{cutoff} splits the arc into a reconstruction regime ($\alpha \leq \alpha_{\text{cutoff}}$) and a generation regime ($\alpha \geq \alpha_{\text{cutoff}}$). The decoder $\mathcal{D}$ serves both: near the pole it reconstructs the input, and at the equator $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(90^\circ) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$ it generates a new image from a random latent in Eq. (2).

4.2 STILL AN AUTOENCODER

Sphere Encoder 2 keeps the simplicity of a single encoder and decoder. We use a frozen DINOv3-small (Siméoni et al., 2025) as the encoder $\mathcal{E}$ for fast forward and high-quality generation. Each image is encoded into $N = 16 \times 16$ tokens with $D = 384$ features per token, giving a latent size of $d = 98,304$. The latent size is shared across image resolutions of 256×256 and 512×512 , with patch sizes of 16×16 and 32×32 in pixel prediction head of the decoder, respectively.

Only the decoder $\mathcal{D}$, just a ViT (Dosovitskiy et al., 2021), is trained and scaled. We name models by decoder size, Sphere2-B and Sphere2-L for base and large decoders. The decoder is conditioned on the class embedding $\mathbf{y}$ and the rotation angle α , so it can behave differently along the rotation arc. Formally, the unconditional generation Eq. (2) becomes

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e}), \mathbf{y}, \alpha). \quad (5)$$

We embed α in the same way as diffusion timesteps (Nichol et al., 2021; Nichol & Dhariwal, 2021). The angle embedding is added to both the positional embedding of the input tokens and the class embedding used by adaLN-Zero (Peebles & Xie, 2023; Perez et al., 2018).

Alg. 1 summarizes the sampling forward. One-step generation decodes a random point on the sphere. For few-step generation, we repeatedly encode the generated image, rotate its latent toward the fixed noise direction $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$ by a fixed angle α , and decode it again. Unless otherwise specified, we set $\alpha = 85^\circ$ in default for experiments and generate images without classifier-free guidance (CFG) (Ho & Salimans, 2022).

Algorithm 1 Sampling forward of Sphere Encoder 2.

```
e = Normal(0, 1).sample([d]) # random point
# one-step generation
x = D(F(e), y, alpha)
# few-step refinement
for _ in range(K - 1): # K steps in total
    z = cos(alpha) * E(x) + sin(alpha) * F(e)
    x = D(z, y, alpha)
return x
```

4.3 ANGLE CUTOFF: TWO REGIMES ON ONE SPHERE

Sphere Encoder treats generation as reconstruction: the pixel-wise reconstruction loss is applied to the rotated latent $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(\alpha)$ along the whole arc. A pixel-space loss, however, is minimized by the mean of all plausible images, so the decoder learns to generate mean images in one-step generation.

To address this issue, we first split the rotation arc at a cutoff α_{cutoff} into two regimes, each with its own training losses. The reconstruction regime covers the low angles, $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_{\text{cutoff}}]$, where the

decoder is trained with the pixel-wise reconstruction loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pix-recon}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{LPIPS}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{X}) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{L1}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{X}), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{LPIPS}}$ is the perceptual loss (Zhang et al., 2018b). This regime keeps the clean latent $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(0^\circ)$ faithful, and anchors the low-angle/noise area so that rotating toward the equator starts from a semantically meaningful latent.

The generation regime covers angles $\alpha \in [\alpha_{\text{cutoff}}, 90^\circ]$ near the equator. The generated images from this regime should stay semantically consistent with the input image, yet vary freely in appearance and structure. Before introducing the generation loss, we define a smooth cutoff function to weight the losses across these two regimes. The loss weight w for the generation regime is a standard sigmoid centered at α_{cutoff} (Fig. 4):

$$w(\alpha; \alpha_{\text{cutoff}}, \beta) = \text{sigmoid}\left(\frac{\alpha - \alpha_{\text{cutoff}}}{\beta/4}\right). \quad (7)$$

The reconstruction regime receives $1 - w$. The bandwidth $\beta > 0$ controls the transition width: the scale $\beta/4$ makes w rise from 0.02 to 0.98 within $\pm\beta$ of the cutoff.




Figure 4: **Loss weight** w for generation regime with $\alpha_{\text{cutoff}} = 70^\circ$ and $\beta = 5^\circ$ used by default.

4.4 TAMING THE GENERATION REGIME

Reconstruction has been well studied in prior work (Yao et al., 2025; Zheng et al., 2026; Esser et al., 2024; Yue et al., 2026), and is not the focus of this work. We keep the reconstruction regime as is, without adversarial sharpening, so that any change in generation quality can be attributed to the generation losses alone. Our focus in this work is the generation regime, with the goal set above: along the rotation arc in Fig. 3, generated images should stay semantically consistent with the reconstruction while varying in appearance and structure.

4.4.1 SEMANTIC ALIGNMENT

To preserve semantic consistency between the generation $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ and the input $\mathbf{X}$, we align their logits from the ImageNet-pretrained ConvNext used in LPIPS (Zhang et al., 2018b):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{sem}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{LPIPS-logits}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{X}). \quad (8)$$

This loss adds no cost: it shares the LPIPS perceptual loss forward in the reconstruction regime. It requires no labels, since the target is the input image itself rather than a class or a caption. In principle, a different frozen pretrained network with a global semantic embedding could also be used, such as the CLS token of CLIP (Radford et al., 2021), or SigLIP (Tschannen et al., 2025).

The cutoff angle α_{cutoff} decides how much of the arc is devoted to generation. Thus how far generated images may deviate from the input under the semantic alignment loss. We ablate this trade-off with a Sphere2-B trained on Oxford Flowers 256×256 (Nilsback & Zisserman, 2008) in Fig. 5.

First, in Fig. 5 left, reconstruction quality degrades as the cutoff moves past 45° toward the equator. This is expected: beyond 45° , $\sin(\alpha) > \cos(\alpha)$ in Eq. (4), noise $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$ overwhelms the clean latent $\mathbf{z}$ and the decoder cannot faithfully invert. Second, Fig. 5 middle and right show that 1-step and 4-step generation quality (measured by FID and FID⁶, respectively) improves as α_{cutoff} moves toward the equator, peaking at 70° . We use $\alpha_{\text{cutoff}} = 70^\circ$ for all experiments by default.

Fig. 6 visualizes the decoder outputs along the rotation arc, given the input image on the left. Below $\alpha_{\text{cutoff}} = 70^\circ$, the decoder reconstructs the input with minor variations; the softness is the intended effect of omitting adversarial training. Beyond the cutoff, generated images remain semantically consistent with the input while differing in structure and style, which is exactly the behavior the generation regime is designed for. The deviation grows with the angle, and at 90° the output is a pure class-conditional sample, exactly the one-step generation in Eq. (2) at the equator. Current generated images are waffle-ish because the semantic alignment constrains what the decoder generates, but nothing yet drives it toward sharp, high-fidelity textures. We address this next.




Figure 5: **Cutoff angle** α_{cutoff} , which splits the rotation arc into the reconstruction and generation regimes. Generation improves as the cutoff moves toward the equator until 70° .




Figure 6: **Reconstruction and generation regimes** at different angles from 0° to 90° on Oxford Flowers 256×256 . On the same rotation arc with $\alpha_{\text{cutoff}} = 70^\circ$, the decoder reconstructs the input below the cutoff and generates new images above it.

4.4.2 FIDELITY IMPROVEMENT

Improving synthesis fidelity with a loss is a long-standing problem in generative modeling. The adversarial loss (Goodfellow et al., 2020; Brock et al., 2019; Kang et al., 2023) remains the most effective approach, but it requires careful tuning and architecture design (Huang et al., 2024; Hyun et al., 2026), and its long training suffers from stability issues (Karras et al., 2020).

We seek a simple alternative with two properties: (1) it is stable over long training on large datasets, *e.g.*, hundreds of epochs on ImageNet; and (2) it consistently yields effective fidelity supervision as the generator improves, rather than saturating once the generator catches up. Inspired by DMD (Yin et al., 2024b; Deng et al., 2026), we propose a score matching loss that is agnostic to the generator and plugs in as a standalone loss module, in the same way as a GAN loss.

Like a GAN loss, it trains an auxiliary model online alongside the generator, but instead of a discriminator that classifies real from fake, it trains two lightweight score models, each only two transformer layers following standard EDM (Karras et al., 2022), that estimate the real and fake distributions in a frozen feature space; their difference gives the direction to move fake features toward real ones. Like a discriminator (Reed et al., 2016; Sauer et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2018a; Kang et al., 2023; Sauer et al., 2024), the score models can be unconditional or conditioned on the class or caption.

We extract features of the input image $\mathbf{X}$ (real) and the generated image $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ (fake) from a frozen pretrained network $\phi(\cdot)$, such as ConvNeXt (Woo et al., 2023) or DINO (Caron et al., 2021):

$$\mathbf{v}_j = \frac{\phi_j(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_j}{s_j}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}_j = \frac{\phi_j(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) - \mu_j}{s_j}, \quad (9)$$




Figure 7: **Score matching loss.** Fake features from the frozen extractor ϕ are denoised by the real and fake score models (each a two-layer transformer EDM denoiser (Karras et al., 2022)), and their difference gives the direction $\mathbf{g}$ that pulls fake features toward real ones. During transport, both score models are frozen and run once each; only the decoder $\mathcal{D}$ is updated by $\mathbf{g}$ through $\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}}$.

where j indicates the j^{th} layer of ϕ . $\mathbf{v}_j, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{L_j \times C_j}$ have L_j tokens and C_j channels. μ_j and s_j , estimated on real features only, standardize j^{th} -layer features to zero mean and standard deviation $\sigma_{\text{data}} = 0.5$, as assumed by EDM (see Sec. C). We drop j for simplicity in the following discussion.

We build two score models, ψ_{real} and ψ_{fake} , trained on the real features $\mathbf{v}$ and the fake features $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$, respectively. Both follow EDM (Karras et al., 2022) with its standard preconditioning, and each has only two transformer layers. For a feature $\mathbf{u} \in \{\mathbf{v}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}\}$ and a noise level σ , the noisy feature is

$$\mathbf{u}_\sigma = \mathbf{u} + \sigma \mathbf{n}, \quad \mathbf{n} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}), \quad (10)$$

then ψ_{real} and ψ_{fake} learn to denoise $\mathbf{u}_\sigma$ with $\mathbf{E}_{\sigma, \mathbf{n}}[\lambda(\sigma)\|\psi(\mathbf{u}_\sigma, \sigma) - \mathbf{u}\|_2^2]$, where $\lambda(\sigma) = (\sigma^2 + \sigma_{\text{data}}^2)/(\sigma \sigma_{\text{data}})^2$ is the EDM loss weighting and σ follows the EDM log-normal $p(\sigma)$.

To supervise the generator, we freeze both score models, evaluate them on the noisy fake feature $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma$, and take their difference, as illustrated in Fig. 7:

$$\mathbf{g} = \frac{\psi_{\text{fake}}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma, \sigma) - \psi_{\text{real}}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma, \sigma)}{\|\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \psi_{\text{real}}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma, \sigma)\|_1 / LC}, \quad (11)$$

where the denominator is the denoising residual of the real score model, which normalizes the magnitude of $\mathbf{g}$ across noise levels following DMD (Yin et al., 2024b). $\mathbf{g}$ carries no gradient and is applied to the generator through a proxy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}} = \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \text{sg}(\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{g})\|_2^2, \quad (12)$$

where $\text{sg}(\cdot)$ is the stop-gradient operator. Its gradient with respect to $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is exactly $\mathbf{g}$, so a step moves the fake features toward the real distribution. In practice, we score two layers of ϕ , a middle and a deep one, and balance their losses so that each contributes a gradient of equal magnitude. By default, we use the frozen ConvNeXt V2-N(ano) (Woo et al., 2023) (14.98M) as ϕ and train the score models on its middle two layers, producing the module with just total 24.16M parameters. All details of the implementation are described in Sec. C.

4.4.3 LATENT CONSISTENCY

We also keep the latent consistency loss of Sphere Encoder (Yue et al., 2026), which encodes the generated image and matches its latent to that of the input:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{lat-con}} = 1 - \text{cos-sim}(\mathcal{E}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}), \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X})). \quad (13)$$

Since $\mathcal{E}$ is the frozen DINOv3-small, this becomes semantic alignment again, now in the latent space rather than in the logit space of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{sem}}$. It adds one encoder forward on the generated image, which is cheap since DINOv3-small has only 29M parameters with trivial FLOPs.

4.4.4 TRAINING OBJECTIVE

In summary, Sphere Encoder 2 trains the decoder $\mathcal{D}$ with a weighted combination of four losses:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \underbrace{(1 - w) \mathcal{L}_{\text{pix-recon}}}_{\text{reconstruction regime}} + \underbrace{w (\mathcal{L}_{\text{sem}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{score}} + 0.1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{lat-con}})}_{\text{generation regime}}. \quad (14)$$

5 EXPERIMENTS

Tabs. 1 and 2 summarize the results of Sphere Encoder 2 on Oxford Flowers and ImageNet, respectively. For both datasets, we generate 50K images and report FDr⁶ (Yang et al., 2026) and gFID (Heusel et al., 2017) against the whole training set. We prioritize FDr⁶ over gFID, since it averages over six feature spaces rather than Inception alone, which provides a more robust evaluation of generation quality. For Sphere2 models, the sampling angle (Sec. B.4) and guidance angle (Sec. B.5) are chosen by FDr⁶, and gFID is reported at the same setting rather than tuned separately, since the two metrics prefer different settings. All training and evaluation details are in Sec. D.

On Oxford Flowers 256×256 , Sphere2-B with one step and no CFG outperforms both the previous Sphere Encoder (Yue et al., 2026) and Sphere Latent Encoder (Do et al., 2026) at 4 steps with CFG, while using $6 \times$ fewer parameters than Sphere Encoder. At this resolution, Sphere2-L improves FDr⁶ over Sphere2-B at every step count but has worse gFID, showing that the two metrics are not always correlated. Fig. 8 shows uncured 4-step samples at 512×512 .

Table 1: **Main comparison on Oxford Flowers.** Compared with Sphere Encoder (Yue et al., 2026) and Sphere Latent Encoder (Do et al., 2026). Params for Sphere2 cover both encoder and decoder; for latent-space models they cover the generator only. Sphere2 has no CFG in sampling.

Model	Params	Guid.	NFE	FDr ⁶ ↓ @ K steps				gFID ↓ @ K steps			
				1	2	4	6	1	2	4	6
<i>Image Size 256×256</i>											
Sphere (2026)	948M	CFG	$K \times 2$	10.59	5.44	3.96	3.92	25.12	14.08	11.25	10.63
Sphere Latent (2026)	130M	CFG	$K \times 2$	—	—	—	—	—	12.22	8.61	7.85
Sphere2-B	159M	—	K	2.67	2.23	2.17	2.19	7.62	7.45	7.50	7.55
Sphere2-L	487M	—	K	2.19	1.85	1.82	1.83	9.36	8.33	7.98	7.93
<i>Image Size 512×512</i>											
Sphere2-B	161M	—	K	4.86	4.18	4.08	4.10	9.47	8.83	8.49	8.32
Sphere2-L	489M	—	K	4.22	3.67	3.60	3.61	9.56	8.34	7.70	7.59



Figure 8: **Uncured 4-step generation** without CFG on Oxford Flowers 512×512 by Sphere2-L.

On ImageNet, Tab. 2 compares Sphere Encoder 2 with latent-space and pixel-space generators. Since Sphere Encoder 2 generates in pixel space, we mainly focus on pixel-space baselines: PixNerd (Wang et al., 2026a), JiT (Li & He, 2026), Drift (Deng et al., 2026), and pMF (Lu et al., 2026), covering both one-step and many-step generation.

At 256×256 without CFG, Sphere2-B at 1 NFE is on par with JiT-B (14.53 vs. 15.78) and pMF-B (14.53 vs. 13.83), and at 4 NFE it outperforms JiT-L (8.58 vs. 10.73). Sphere2-L at 4 NFE reaches 5.77, better than JiT-H (7.66) and pMF-H (6.87), and second only to PixNerd (5.01), which uses

$46\times$ more sampling compute. The same ordering holds at 512×512 . Figs. 11 to 13 show uncured 512×512 samples of Sphere2-L at 4, 2 and 1 steps without CFG, side by side with RAE-DiT^{DH}-XL/2 (50×2 NFE), JiT-L (50×4 NFE) and pMF-L (1 NFE), respectively.

While Sphere2 leads on FDr⁶, its gFID is higher than that of other models. We attribute the gap to the feature space rather than the loss: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}}$ matches real and fake distributions only in ConvNeXt V2-N features, and the match carries over to the other five modern spaces of FDr⁶ (Tab. A11) but not to the old Inception space. We investigate this in Sec. B.1 and train a second group of Sphere2 models with an FD-lite loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ that mitigates this problem, marked by [†] in Tab. 2; Sphere2 models without the mark are trained without it. gFID drops for every model, and FDr⁶ improves in most settings, almost entirely through its FID term; the other five feature spaces do not move much.

Table 2: **Main comparison on ImageNet** 256×256 and 512×512 . Params and GFLOPs for Sphere2 cover both encoder and decoder; for latent-space models they cover the generator only and *exclude* the VAE decoder. GFLOPs are measured for a single forward, so Total GFLOPs = GFLOPs $\times$ NFE. Guidance: CFG is classifier-free guidance applied at sampling, so NFE is doubled; AG is AutoGuidance (Karras et al., 2024), which doubles NFE with a smaller guiding model; CFG* denotes guidance folded into the training target for single-forward sampling. Among pixel-space models, taking each model at its best setting, the best, second and third FDr⁶ per resolution are shaded , and . [†] marks Sphere2 models trained with the $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ loss in Sec. B.1.

Model	Params	Guid.	Total GFLOPs	256 × 256		512 × 512	
			GFLOPs × NFE	FDr ⁶ ↓	gFID ↓	FDr ⁶ ↓	gFID ↓
Latent space							
SiT-XL/2 (2024)	675M	CFG	119 × 250 × 2	8.44	2.06	–	2.62
SiT-XL/2 + REPA (2025)	675M	CFG	119 × 250 × 2	5.45	1.42	–	2.08
LightningDiT-XL/2 (2025)	675M	CFG	119 × 250 × 2	4.57	1.35	–	–
DDT-XL/2 (2026b)	675M	CFG	119 × 250 × 2	5.70	1.26	–	1.28
RAE-DiT ^{DH} -XL/2 (2026)	839M	AG	146 × 50 × 2	3.26	1.13	2.74	1.13
MAR-L (2024)	478M	CFG	129 × 256 × 2	6.68	1.80	–	–
MAR-H	942M	CFG	252 × 256 × 2	5.61	1.56	–	–
Sphere Latent-XL (2026)	675M	CFG	230 × 6 × 2	–	2.11	–	–
GAT-XL/2 (2026)	602M	–	119 × 1	9.26	2.06	–	–
Drift-L (2026)	463M	CFG*	87 × 1	10.92	1.53	–	–
iMF-XL (2026)	610M	CFG*	174 × 1	8.39	1.82	–	–
iMF-XL	610M	CFG*	174 × 2	7.48	1.61	–	–
Pixel space							
PixNerd-XL (2026a)	700M	CFG	106 × 100 × 2	5.01	2.10	5.68	2.84
JiT-B (2026)	131M	CFG	25 × 50 × 4	15.78	3.66	16.31	4.19
JiT-L	459M	CFG	88 × 50 × 4	10.73	2.36	11.35	2.53
JiT-H	953M	CFG	182 × 50 × 4	7.66	1.86	8.66	1.94
Sphere-XL (2026)	1.3B	CFG	977 × 4 × 2	10.44	4.02	–	–
Drift-L	465M	CFG*	87 × 1	10.51	1.43	–	–
pMF-B (2026)	118M	CFG*	66 × 1	13.83	3.15	14.26	3.63
pMF-L	410M	CFG*	117 × 1	9.09	2.72	9.96	2.75
pMF-H	935M	CFG*	271 × 1	6.87	2.29	8.24	2.48
Sphere2-B	161M	–	22 × 1	14.53	5.20	15.17	5.88
		–	22 × 4	8.58	4.89	9.35	6.04
		CFG	22 × 4 × 2	7.83	7.00	8.61	7.94
Sphere2-L	487M	–	115 × 1	11.96	8.59	13.52	10.46
		–	115 × 4	5.77	4.19	6.35	5.83
		CFG	115 × 4 × 2	5.46	5.38	6.27	7.10
Sphere2-B [†]	161M	–	22 × 1	12.76	3.43	13.91	3.85
		–	22 × 4	7.95	3.07	8.49	2.92
		CFG	22 × 4 × 2	6.91	3.90	7.82	4.47
Sphere2-L [†]	487M	–	115 × 1	13.97	5.14	11.65	3.69
		–	115 × 4	5.14	2.44	6.60	3.02
		CFG	115 × 4 × 2	4.92	2.86	5.99	3.53




Figure 9: **Generation quality vs. sampling compute** on ImageNet 256×256 among pixel-space models. Circles are pixel-space baselines and stars are Sphere2 at 1, 4 (without CFG) and 4×2 NFE (with CFG), joined per model. The halo area around each marker is proportional to parameters.

Table 3: **Sampling speed** at 512×512 on a single NVIDIA H100. Timings are end-to-end, averaged over runs after warmup (std below 1%), at batch size 1 and 16. For Sphere2, “loop $\times K$ ” denotes K sampling steps of Alg. 1. NFE counts decoder forwards; “+ m enc.” adds the encoder forwards used by spherical CFG, and “+ 49 guide” the guiding-model forwards of AutoGuidance. Sphere2 and JiT run in bf16, pMF and RAE-DiT in fp32, following their official implementations.

Model	Sampler	Guid.	bsz	img/s $\uparrow$	NFE	ms/NFE	50K imgs (min) $\downarrow$
Sphere2-L	loop $\times 1$	–	1	53.4	1	18.7	16
	loop $\times 2$	CFG	1	14.5	4 + 2 enc.	17.3	58
	loop $\times 4$	CFG	1	6.1	8 + 6 enc.	20.7	137
	loop $\times 1$	–	16	424.8	1	2.4	2
	loop $\times 2$	CFG	16	145.4	4 + 2 enc.	1.7	6
	loop $\times 4$	CFG	16	62.8	8 + 6 enc.	2.0	14
JiT-L/32	Heun $\times 50$	CFG	1	0.5	198	10.3	1666
	Heun $\times 50$	CFG	16	4.5	198	1.1	185
pMF-L/32	MeanFlow $\times 1$	CFG*	1	42.9	1	23.3	20
	MeanFlow $\times 1$	CFG*	16	157.7	1	6.3	6
RAE-DiT ^{DH} -XL/2	Euler $\times 49$	AG	1	0.6	49 + 49 guide	30.8	1389
	Euler $\times 49$	AG	16	0.9	49 + 49 guide	22.1	926

Fig. 9 plots generation quality against sampling compute for the pixel-space models. Without CFG, Sphere2-B sits below Drift-L and pMF-B/L at almost the same compute, and below JiT-B/L at far less compute, *i.e.*, better FDr^6 for equal or fewer GFLOPs. Sphere2-L without CFG likewise sits below pMF-H and JiT-H. Tab. 3 compares the sampling speed of the large models at 512×512 on a single H100, and adds RAE-DiT^{DH}-XL/2, the latent diffusion model with the best FDr^6 at this resolution in Tab. 2. For sampling 50K images at batch size 16, Sphere2-L with CFG is $13\times$ faster than JiT-L and $66\times$ faster than RAE-DiT^{DH}-XL/2.

6 CONCLUSION

Sphere Encoders are an emerging paradigm with progress from several teams (Do et al., 2026; Man et al., 2026), generating images with few steps and low compute. Sphere Encoder 2 takes this paradigm a step further, matching the image quality of more expensive diffusion models while keeping that simplicity and speed. It closes the gap to the equator with an explicit rotation, and splits the rotation arc into reconstruction and generation regimes on the same sphere. The generation regime is trained with a simple objective: semantic alignment and latent consistency keep generated images semantically faithful to the input but structurally different, and a lightweight score matching loss sharpens them without adversarial training. Several other families also targeted one-step generation

from scratch, including consistency models, MeanFlow and its variants, drifting models, and GANs. Sphere Encoder 2 adds a complementary path to this landscape by bringing the autoencoder back as a generator in its own right and could be a viable candidate for one/few-step generation.



Figure 10: **Curated 2-step generation** without CFG on ImageNet 512×512 by Sphere Encoder 2.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the NSF TRAILS Institute (2229885), and Coefficient Giving. This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research under the Advancements in AI for Science program. This research used resources from the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, a U.S. DOE Office of Science user facility at Argonne National Laboratory, which is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. DOE under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357.

Prepared by LLNL under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344 and supported by the LLNL-LDRD Program under Project No. 24-ERD-010 (LLNL-PROC-2025006). This manuscript has been authored by Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC52-07NA27344 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The United States Government retains, and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes.




Figure 11: **Uncurated samples on ImageNet 512×512 .** Left: RAE-DiT^{DH}-XL/2 with NFE = 50×2 and Guidance = 1.5. Right: Sphere2-L with NFE = 4 and no CFG. Best viewed zoomed in.




Figure 12: **Uncurated samples on ImageNet 512×512 .** Left: JiT-L/32 with NFE = 50×4 and CFG = 2.5. Right: Sphere2-L with NFE = 2 and no CFG. Best viewed zoomed in.




Figure 13: **Uncurated samples on ImageNet 512×512 .** Left: pMF-L/32 with NFE = 1 and CFG = 7.5. Right: Sphere2-L with NFE = 1 and no CFG. Best viewed zoomed in.

APPENDIX

A INTERPOLATION

Fig. A14 shows class interpolation: $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e}), \mathbf{y}, \alpha)$. The random point $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$ is fixed in Eq. (5) and interpolate five points between two class embeddings $\mathbf{y}_a, \mathbf{y}_b$ by spherical linear interpolation (slerp).



Figure A14: **Class interpolation on ImageNet** 512×512 by Sphere2-L with 4-step sampling and no CFG. Each row fixes the random point and slerps between two class embeddings, from the left class to the right one. Rows are ordered from similar pairs at the top to dramatic pairs at the bottom.

Fig. A15 interpolates from images *outside* ImageNet. The input $\mathbf{X}$ is looped under an ImageNet class starting from $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{y}, \alpha)$, then Alg. 1 carries it toward target class $\mathbf{y}$. At $\alpha = 0^\circ$, in the reconstruction regime, the decoder reconstructs the input from its clean latent. The reconstruction shows the waffle-like texture seen in Fig. 6, which is expected since this regime omits adversarial sharpening. At $\alpha = 85^\circ$, in the generation regime, the output is sharper and drifts toward the ImageNet manifold. Each further refinement step moves it closer to the target class.



Figure A15: **Interpolation from non-ImageNet images** by Sphere2-L trained on ImageNet 512×512 . The first column shows input images *outside* the ImageNet classes: a raccoon, a matcha cake, and grapes. The second and third columns decode the clean latent of each input conditioned on $\alpha = 0^\circ$ and $\alpha = 85^\circ$, respectively. The remaining columns unroll the refinement loop of Alg. 1, which carries the input toward a target class: raccoon to red panda (class 387), matcha cake to espresso (class 967), and grapes to indigo bunting (class 14).

B ABLATION STUDIES

B.1 DISTRIBUTION SHIFT

$\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}}$ matches the fake and real distributions in one feature space, ConvNeXt V2-N. As Sec. 5 notes, the match carries over to the five modern spaces of FDr⁶ but not to the old Inception space of gFID, where the statistics of generated images drift away from those of real images. This is a mirror image of the metric paradox in FDr⁶ (Yang et al., 2026): most generators beat gFID but not the eye, while ours satisfies the modern feature spaces but not gFID. Ideally, we could learn a feature space specific to ImageNet as drifting models do (Deng et al., 2026), or add score models in the Inception space, but both are expensive and cumbersome. We seek a simple and cheap alternative.

To pin the statistics in place, we borrow an idea from FD loss (Yang et al., 2026) and add a Fréchet distance term on frozen features as a regularizer:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}} = \sum_i \frac{\text{FD}_{\phi_i}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{X})}{\text{sg}(\text{FD}_{\phi_i}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{X})) + \epsilon}, \quad (\text{A15})$$

where $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ and FD_{ϕ_i} is the Fréchet distance (Heusel et al., 2017) between real and generated features from the i^{th} frozen extractor ϕ_i . Each term is normalized by its own detached value, so every extractor contributes a gradient of unit scale. The mean and covariance of real and fake features are tracked with exponential moving averages (EMA) online, and FD_{ϕ_i} is computed between them. We use three small extractors: Inception, our encoder $\mathcal{E}$ (DINOv3-small, 29M), and our score feature extractor ϕ (ConvNeXt V2-N, 16M). The latter two are already run for $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lat-con}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}}$, so $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ adds one Inception forward and almost no compute.

Table A4: **Effect of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ per feature space** on ImageNet 256×256 . FDr⁶ at K sampling steps, trained with and without $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$, broken down into its six feature spaces.

Steps K	$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$	gFID $\downarrow$	FDr ⁶ $\downarrow$	FDr ⁶ $\downarrow$ per feature space					
				Incep.	ConvNeXt	DINOv2	MAE	SigLIP	CLIP
<i>Sphere2-B</i>									
1	-	5.20	14.53	3.49	2.99	13.18	15.08	28.01	24.42
	✓	3.43	12.76	2.30	2.59	11.55	13.64	24.41	22.03
2	-	4.72	9.48	3.17	2.67	8.83	10.80	16.09	15.35
	✓	2.69	8.43	1.81	2.36	7.43	9.62	14.83	14.51
4	-	4.89	8.58	3.28	3.35	7.87	10.05	13.51	13.41
	✓	3.07	7.95	2.06	3.39	6.87	8.82	13.38	13.19
<i>Sphere2-L</i>									
1	-	8.59	11.96	5.76	2.49	9.18	13.54	21.29	19.48
	✓	5.14	13.97	3.45	3.11	9.01	14.65	29.71	23.89
2	-	5.77	6.42	3.88	1.78	5.43	7.39	9.62	10.41
	✓	3.13	5.92	2.10	1.70	4.68	6.97	9.75	10.31
4	-	4.19	5.77	2.81	2.69	5.00	6.56	8.50	9.05
	✓	2.44	5.14	1.64	2.05	4.15	6.01	8.16	8.86

Where the drift is. We train Sphere2-B and Sphere2-L on ImageNet 256×256 with and without $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ for 100 epochs from the same initial start, and report FDr⁶ in each feature space in Tab. A4. The Inception space is where the regularizer acts: its FDr drops by 34–46% for both models at every step count (Incep. column in Tab. A4), which is the gFID improvement in Tab. 2. The other five modern spaces move far less, mostly by single digits, confirming that the drift is specific to the decade-old Inception space rather than a general mismatch.

Model size matters. Sphere2-B benefits in every space at every step count. Sphere2-L benefits at 2 and 4 steps, but at 1 step its overall FDr⁶ gets worse by 17%: the Inception term improves as before, but ConvNeXt, MAE, SigLIP and CLIP all degrade (Fig. A16, right). We read this as a capacity effect. The smaller decoder has slack to satisfy the extra constraint, while the larger decoder, which already matches the modern spaces closely without the regularizer, trades some one-step fidelity in

those spaces for the Inception match. Multi-step sampling recovers the loss, since each refinement step re-encodes the image and pulls it back toward the real manifold.




Figure A16: **Effect of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$** for Sphere2-L on ImageNet 256×256 . Left and middle: FID and FDr^6 with and without the loss at different sampling steps. Right: relative FDr reduction in each of the six feature spaces.



Figure A17: **Distribution shift is invisible but measurable.** 4-step samples on ImageNet 256×256 from Sphere2-B trained with and without $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ are visually indistinguishable, yet the loss aligns their feature statistics with those of real data in the Inception space where gFID is measured. More uncensored samples for side by side comparison are in Fig. A18 for 1 step and Fig. A19 for 4 steps.

Invisible to the eye. Fig. A17 compares generations with and without $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ from Sphere2-B, the model it affects more. The two sets are visually indistinguishable², yet the loss aligns their feature statistics with those of real data in the space where gFID lives. A good metric for image generation is still an open problem, and we hope our results on ImageNet encourage more work on it. If a model is judged by human preference or prompt-following benchmarks rather than gFID, as text-to-image models commonly are, we believe $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ is unnecessary and can be dropped.

Relation to FD loss. We call ours $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ because it differs from the original FD loss (Yang et al., 2026) in purpose, and as a result in cost. The original is a post-training objective: it is the only loss applied to a pretrained multi-step generator, and its job is to repurpose the generator for one-step generation, which visibly and dramatically improves one-step quality. Ours is a regularizer. It runs alongside our other three losses throughout training with a small weight of 0.1, and only keeps the statistics of already plausible samples from drifting particularly in the Inception space. Being a regularizer rather than the main objective, it does not need the heavy extractors of the original, Inception, SigLIP-so400M and MAE-Large, and reuses the two we already run in our loss functions.

²We release Sphere2 checkpoints trained with and without $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ in our repo for readers' own FDr^6 .




Figure A18: **Uncurated samples on ImageNet 256×256 .** Left: Sphere2-B without $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ and NFE = 1. Right: Sphere2-B with $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ and NFE = 1.




Figure A19: **Uncurated samples on ImageNet** 256×256 . Left: Sphere2-B without $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ and NFE = 4. Right: Sphere2-B with $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$ and NFE = 4.

B.2 ANGLE CONDITIONING

$\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}}$ asks the decoder to cover the real distribution rather than collapse onto its mean. We hypothesize that an angle-blind decoder hedges toward the mean, since it cannot tell latents at different angles apart. Tab. A5 ablates conditioning the decoder on α – finding our hypothesis is correct. Angle conditioning effectively improves metrics, so we keep it by default.

Table A5: **Angle conditioning** in the Sphere2-B trained on Oxford Flowers 256×256 .

α cond	FDr ⁶ ↓			gFID ↓		
	1	2	4	1	2	4
-	4.00	3.21	3.23	14.02	12.09	11.95
✓	3.92	3.14	3.04	10.29	8.24	7.51

B.3 ANGLE DISTRIBUTION IN TRAINING

Diffusion models commonly concentrate training samples in the high-noise region, via a noise-level (Li & He, 2026) or timestep shift (Esser et al., 2024). Sphere Latent Encoder (Do et al., 2026) likewise found that concentrating samples at high-angle noise improves generation. One might expect Sphere Encoder 2 to benefit from more training at high angles as well, especially since its decoder is conditioned on α . To test this expectation, we train a Sphere2-B on Oxford Flowers 256×256 and control the sampling density of α during training with a single parameter by drawing it from a rational curve:

$$\alpha = 90^\circ \cdot \frac{(k+1)r}{kr+1}, \quad r \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 1], \quad (\text{A16})$$

where $k > -1$ sets the shape of the curve (Fig. A20 left). Setting $k = 0$ gives uniform sampling. A positive k concentrates samples near the equator, and a negative k near the pole. Fig. A20 middle and right tell a different story from common practice.

Uniform sampling ($k = 0$) gives the best 1-step gFID, and the best FDr⁶ at every step count. Concentrating samples near the equator ($k > 0$) buys only a marginal gain in multi-step gFID at $k = 5$. We attribute this to the angle cutoff: each regime already receives a loss tailored to it, so the decoder no longer needs an uneven sampling density to prioritize the generation. We therefore use uniform sampling by default, as the simplest and most effective choice.




Figure A20: **Angle distribution in training.** Left: sampling curves of α for different k . Middle and right: generation quality of Sphere2-B on Oxford Flowers 256×256 for each k . Uniform sampling ($k = 0$) is the best choice.




Figure A21: **Sampling angle** α with 1-step generation using Sphere2-B trained on ImageNet 256×256 . Sampling angle decides the generation diversity by forcing the decoder away from the mean.

B.4 SAMPLING ANGLE AT INFERENCE

Since the decoder is conditioned on the angle α , we investigate sampling properties at different angles. We sweep α from 0° to 90° in 5-degree increments for one-step generation with Sphere2-B trained on ImageNet 256×256 . Fig. A21 shows that the sampling angle controls the diversity of generated images. With $\alpha = 90^\circ$, the generated images are almost the same, which is expected: the decoder sees only the pure noise $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$ in Eq. (4) without any reference information from the input image during training. Thus, the decoder collapses to the mean of all plausible images in the class. With $\alpha < 90^\circ$, the decoder sees a mixture of the clean latent and the noise during training, so it starts to generate images with more diversity. Fig. A22 quantifies the effect of sampling angle on ImageNet 256×256 .




Figure A22: **Sampling angle** α with 1-step generation using Sphere2-B trained on ImageNet 256×256 . FDr^6 and FID agree in a “U” shape along the angle, with the best quality at 86° .

For multi-step generation, we apply a dense sweep and investigate the effect of sampling angle α on ImageNet and Oxford Flowers at both resolutions of 256×256 and 512×512 . The alpha α is fixed for all intermediate steps in the loop of Alg. 1. We found the FDr^6 and FID do not agree on the best α for multi-step generation. For simplicity, we pick $\alpha = 85.5^\circ$ for Sphere-B and $\alpha = 84^\circ$ for Sphere-L to report the main results in Tabs. 1 and 2, in order to prioritize FDr^6 over FID.

B.5 SPHERICAL CFG

Classic CFG (Ho & Salimans, 2022) linearly extrapolates from the unconditional prediction to the conditional one, which would push a latent off the sphere. We instead guide on the sphere with a rotation. From the same noise $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$, we follow two parallel arcs of Alg. 1: a conditional arc with class $\mathbf{y}$ and an unconditional arc with the null class $\mathbf{y}_{\text{null}}$. Following common practice, the null class is learned during training by dropping the class embedding to $\mathbf{y}_{\text{null}}$ with probability 0.1. At each refinement step, we encode both generated images into latents $\mathbf{z}_c$ and $\mathbf{z}_u$, and rotate $\mathbf{z}_c$ away from $\mathbf{z}_u$ along their great circle by a fixed guidance angle γ :

$$\mathbf{z}_{\text{cfg}} = \frac{\sin(\theta + \gamma)}{\sin \theta} \mathbf{z}_c - \frac{\sin \gamma}{\sin \theta} \mathbf{z}_u, \quad \theta = \angle(\mathbf{z}_u, \mathbf{z}_c). \quad (\text{A17})$$

The guided latent $\mathbf{z}_{\text{cfg}}$ stays on the sphere at angle $\theta + \gamma$ from $\mathbf{z}_u$, and replaces $\mathbf{z}_c$ in the rotation toward the noise in Eq. (4).³ Unlike a guidance scale, γ fixes the step on the sphere regardless of how far apart the two arcs are, and $\gamma = 0$ recovers Alg. 1. The unconditional arc is never guided and continues from its own latent $\mathbf{z}_u$; if it were decoded from $\mathbf{z}_{\text{cfg}}$, the two arcs would merge after one step and leave nothing to guide against. Since guidance acts on the refinement steps, it requires $K \geq 2$, and one-step generation stays unguided. Alg. 2 summarizes the sampling procedure.

³When $\mathbf{z}_c$ and $\mathbf{z}_u$ are parallel or antiparallel ($\sin \theta = 0$), no rotation plane is defined, and we keep $\mathbf{z}_{\text{cfg}} = \mathbf{z}_c$. This never occurs in practice, since the two arcs decode different images in the high-dimensional latent space.

Algorithm 2 Sampling with spherical CFG. `rotate_away` is Eq. (A17) and γ is the guidance angle. $\gamma = 0^\circ$ disables guidance and recovers Alg. 1.

```

e = F(Normal(0, 1).sample([d])) # random point

# one-step generation
x = D(e, y, alpha) # conditional arc
x_u = D(e, y_null, alpha) # unconditional arc

# few-step refinement
for _ in range(K - 1):
    z_c, z_u = F(E(x)), F(E(x_u))
    z = rotate_away(z_c, z_u, gamma) # guided on the sphere

    x = D(cos(alpha) * z + sin(alpha) * e, y, alpha)
    x_u = D(cos(alpha) * z_u + sin(alpha) * e, y_null, alpha)

return x

```

Table A6: **Guidance angle** γ of spherical CFG on ImageNet 256×256 and 512×512 . Sampling angle α is fixed per model, listed as 256/512 when it differs between resolutions.

Model	α	Steps	Metric	Guidance angle γ , 256×256								Guidance angle γ , 512×512							
				0°	5°	10°	15°	20°	30°	40°	50°	0°	5°	10°	15°	20°	30°	40°	50°
Sphere2-B	85.5°	2	FDr ⁶ ↓	9.48	9.03	8.77	8.63	8.55	8.55	8.67	8.89	10.28	9.85	9.56	9.45	9.33	9.26	9.35	9.52
			gFID ↓	4.72	5.30	5.80	6.30	6.78	7.66	8.34	9.04	5.64	6.11	6.46	7.06	7.46	8.24	9.16	9.81
		4	FDr ⁶ ↓	8.58	8.08	7.89	7.83	7.91	8.20	8.65	9.17	9.35	8.92	8.69	8.61	8.66	8.91	9.33	9.85
			gFID ↓	4.89	5.58	6.33	7.00	7.66	8.66	9.54	10.02	6.04	6.62	7.36	7.94	8.50	9.54	10.51	11.23
Sphere2-L	84°	2	FDr ⁶ ↓	6.42	6.31	6.28	6.30	6.39	6.62	6.94	7.32	7.50	7.37	7.28	7.30	7.31	7.44	7.61	7.84
			gFID ↓	5.77	6.82	7.82	8.53	9.25	10.52	11.53	12.42	7.59	8.62	9.35	10.17	10.74	11.78	12.51	13.05
		4	FDr ⁶ ↓	5.77	5.46	5.46	5.57	5.81	6.39	7.04	7.89	6.35	6.27	6.30	6.45	6.64	7.04	7.52	8.11
			gFID ↓	4.19	5.38	6.50	7.39	8.35	9.82	10.81	11.85	5.83	7.10	8.19	9.02	9.87	10.93	11.56	12.30




Figure A23: **Guidance angle** γ of spherical CFG at 4 sampling steps on ImageNet 256×256 and 512×512 in Tab. A6. The hollow marker on each curve is the FDr⁶-optimal γ , which the CFG rows of Tab. 2 use. Sampling angle α is 85.5° for Sphere2-B and 84° for Sphere2-L at both resolutions. See Fig. A24 for generated images along the γ sweep.

B.6 FROZEN LATENT SPACE

Tab. A7 ablates the choice of the frozen encoder $\mathcal{E}$. Since the encoder runs at every sampling step, we restrict the comparison to the small and base sizes of two model families, DINOv3 (Siméoni et al., 2025) and SigLIP2 (Tschannen et al., 2025) for training and inference efficiency. The small size has latent dimension $D = 384$ and the base size $D = 768$. We also test a lower-dimensional variant of each, adding a single linear layer that reduces D to 256 for small and 384 for base. The results show: (1) DINOv3 outperforms SigLIP2 at every size, and (2) DINOv3-small with its original $D = 384$ gives the best trade-off between quality and efficiency. We therefore use it by default.



Figure A24: **Spherical CFG** for 2-step generation on ImageNet 256×256 with Sphere2-B. Each row is one random point decoded at increasing guidance angle γ . Guidance fixes the bad structures and strengthen the class semantics.

Table A7: **Frozen latent space** of the encoder $\mathcal{E}$ with different pretrained encoders and latent dimensions on Oxford-Flowers 256×256 .

Encoder	$d = N \times D$	Compression ratio	FDr ⁶ ↓			gFID ↓		
			1	2	4	1	2	4
DINOv3-small	$16^2 \times 384$	2	3.92	3.14	3.04	10.29	8.24	7.51
DINOv3-small	$16^2 \times 256$	3	4.53	3.77	3.61	17.67	13.64	12.27
DINOv3-base	$16^2 \times 768$	1	4.28	3.58	3.51	11.47	9.28	8.69
DINOv3-base	$16^2 \times 384$	2	5.17	4.48	4.46	18.18	15.67	15.78
SigLIP2-base	$16^2 \times 768$	1	5.82	4.37	4.18	15.15	13.73	15.15
SigLIP2-base	$16^2 \times 384$	2	4.91	4.25	4.24	16.32	13.15	13.07

B.7 SCORE FEATURE SPACE

$\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}}$ needs a frozen feature space ϕ and a choice of layers. We compare two lightweight extractors: ConvNeXt V2-N, our default, and DINO-S/8, the classic choice for GAN losses (Zheng et al., 2026). For each, we sweep which layers feed the score models in Tab. A8, using Sphere2-B. The combination of a middle layer and a deep layer gives the best enough capacity for both extractors. Adding more layers costs up to twice the parameters and helps a little.

Table A8: **Feature extractor ϕ and its layers used by the score loss** on Oxford Flowers 256×256 . Each score model is a two-layer transformer with width 384. Params counts total parameters of all score models. Params of DINO-S/8 is 21.67M, and ConvNeXt V2-N f_{cmse} is 14.98M.

Feature ϕ	Layers	Params	FDr ⁶ ↓		gFID ↓	
			1	4	1	4
DINO-S/8	5 11	25.19M	6.16	4.63	24.86	17.17
	3 7 11	37.79M	5.95	4.49	27.23	17.68
	5 8 11	37.79M	6.20	4.72	24.28	17.80
	2 5 8 11	50.38M	6.48	5.12	27.20	20.28
ConvNeXt V2-N	1 2	24.16M	6.51	4.88	26.80	18.60
	1 3	44.79M	6.42	5.18	29.85	21.52

B.8 SCORE SIGMA DISTRIBUTION

$\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}}$ interleaves two procedures: training the score models and transporting the generator with them. The score models are standard EDM denoisers, trained on the noisy features of Eq. (10) with σ drawn from the EDM log-normal $p(\sigma)$, $(p_{\text{mean}}, p_{\text{std}}) = (-1.2, 1.2)$, without clamping. For the transport in Eq. (11), we draw σ from a second log-normal $q(\sigma)$ with $(q_{\text{mean}}, q_{\text{std}})$. Two considerations guide the choice of $q(\sigma)$. First, $q(\sigma)$ should stay within the bulk of $p(\sigma)$, so the score models are never queried at noise levels they were not trained on. Second, $q(\sigma)$ should lean toward small noise levels, where the score difference carries the fine detail that pushes the generator toward high-fidelity and sharp generations.




Figure A25: **Noise sampling distribution for score models** of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}}$ in training $p(\sigma)$ and transport $q(\sigma)$.

Tab. A9 sweeps $(q_{\text{mean}}, q_{\text{std}})$ with $p(\sigma)$ fixed, using Sphere2-B. The best $q(\sigma)$ is $(-1.5, 1.0)$: shifted toward small σ and slightly narrower than $p(\sigma)$, as Fig. A25 shows. Pushing further hurts. At $(-1.8, 0.8)$, $q(\sigma)$ concentrates away from the mode of $p(\sigma)$, and FDr⁶ becomes worse. Additionally, the ImageNet finetuned version of ConvNeXt V2-N $f_{\text{t-in1k}}$ provides a better feature space

than the pretrained ConvNeXt V2-N $f_{\text{cm}ae}$ on Oxford Flowers, so we use it by default for all experiments.

Table A9: **Sigma distribution for transport procedure** of the score loss on Flowers 256×256 .

Feat. ϕ	Transport ($q_{\text{mean}}, q_{\text{std}}$)	FDr ⁶ ↓		gFID ↓	
		1	4	1	4
DINO-S/8	(−1.2, 1.0)	4.54	3.93	13.69	10.89
	(−1.5, 1.0)	4.57	3.94	13.35	10.54
	(−1.8, 1.0)	4.61	3.96	13.19	10.37
	(−1.8, 0.8)	4.97	4.28	14.46	11.02
ConvNeXt V2-N $f_{\text{t-inlk}}$	(−1.2, 1.0)	3.82	3.09	11.40	8.28
	(−1.5, 1.0)	3.92	3.04	10.29	7.51
	(−1.8, 1.0)	4.81	3.64	13.50	9.40
	(−1.8, 0.8)	6.16	5.04	15.78	13.90
ConvNeXt V2-N $f_{\text{cm}ae}$	(−1.2, 1.0)	5.03	3.83	15.07	13.09
	(−1.5, 1.0)	4.92	3.96	14.00	12.58
	(−1.8, 1.0)	5.15	4.18	14.74	12.85
	(−1.8, 0.8)	5.48	4.21	14.37	13.22

C SCORE MATCHING LOSS

C.1 DIFFERENTIABLE AUGMENTATION

We apply differentiable augmentations (Zhao et al., 2020) to the decoder output before it is passed to the frozen feature extractor ϕ during score model training. The decoder produces images of size 256×256 or 512×512 , and we mainly investigate DINO-S/8 (Caron et al., 2021) and ConvNeXt V2-N(ano) (Woo et al., 2023) as the feature extractor. For DINO-S/8, instead of resizing the image to 224×224 , we interpolate the positional embedding to match the image size. We use two differentiable augmentations: horizontal flip with probability 0.5, and translation with probability 1.0. The translation ratio is 0.015625 for both resolutions, i.e., up to 4 pixels at 256×256 and 8 pixels at 512×512 , with reflect padding. The translation smooths the patch boundaries. Since DINO-S/8 uses 8×8 patches, a shift of up to 4 or 8 pixels is half a patch at 256×256 and a full patch at 512×512 , so the extractor sees the generated image at every offset relative to its patch grid.

C.2 FEATURE STANDARDIZATION

Eq. (9) standardizes the output of each scored layer j of ϕ . Since the procedure is identical for every layer, we drop the index j here. The raw feature $\phi(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times C}$ has L spatial locations (ConvNeXt V2-N) or tokens (DINO-S/8) and C channels. EDM (Karras et al., 2022) assumes the input has zero mean and standard deviation $\sigma_{\text{data}} = 0.5$, so we standardize the layer feature to this scale before it enters the score models.

Given a global batch of B real images, we compute the per-channel mean and second moment of the raw features,

$$m = \frac{1}{BL} \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{l=1}^L \phi(\mathbf{X}_b)^l, \quad M = \frac{1}{BL} \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{l=1}^L (\phi(\mathbf{X}_b)^l)^2, \quad m, M \in \mathbb{R}^C, \quad (\text{A18})$$

where b indexes the batch and l indexes the spatial locations or tokens. The two statistics are accumulated as a running average over the first 1000 training steps and then frozen. Since ϕ is frozen, they converge quickly, and freezing them keeps the standardization fixed for the rest of training. They are estimated on real features only and applied to both real and fake features. This keeps the score models blind to the distribution difference between real and fake features, which is what the transport is meant to expose.

The standardization statistics of Eq. (9) are then

$$\mu = m, \quad s = \frac{\sigma_{\text{feat}}}{\sigma_{\text{data}}}, \quad \sigma_{\text{feat}} = \sqrt{M - m^2} \in \mathbb{R}^C, \quad (\text{A19})$$

so that $\mathbf{v} = (\phi(\mathbf{X}) - \mu)/s$ has zero mean and standard deviation σ_{data} in every channel. For ConvNeXt V2-N, we keep s per-channel wise, because a few channels have far larger variance than the rest. This is because the Global Response Normalization (GRN) layer leaves one channel dominating the others in magnitude. Each channel’s standard deviation is floored at 0.1 times the median over channels, so a nearly constant channel is not amplified. For DINO-S/8, the channels are naturally balanced, and we use a single scalar s per layer, the root mean of the per-channel variances.

C.3 TRANSPORT DIRECTION

The direction $\mathbf{g}$ in Eq. (11) is computed per sample. Its denominator is the mean absolute denoising error of the real score model over the LC entries of the feature map, floored at a small constant,

$$\mathbf{g} = \frac{\psi_{\text{fake}}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma, \sigma) - \psi_{\text{real}}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma, \sigma)}{n}, \quad n = \max\left(\frac{1}{LC} \|\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \psi_{\text{real}}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\sigma, \sigma)\|_1, 10^{-2}\right). \quad (\text{A20})$$

The floor only guards against division by a vanishing error when a sample already lies on the real manifold at this σ ; in practice it sits well below the typical value of n . The noise level σ is drawn from $q(\sigma)$ and clamped to $[0.002, 8.0]$. Both score models are frozen here, so $\mathbf{g}$ carries no gradient.

C.4 TRANSPORT BALANCE

Eq. (12) is applied to every scored layer j of ϕ . In practice we average the squared error over the $L_j C_j$ entries,

$$\mathcal{L}_j = \frac{1}{2L_j C_j} \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j - \text{sg}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j - \mathbf{g}_j)\|_2^2, \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_j}{\partial \hat{\mathbf{v}}_j} = \frac{1}{L_j C_j} \mathbf{g}_j, \quad (\text{A21})$$

which differs from Eq. (12) by a constant $1/(L_j C_j)$ that the balance weights below absorb. Since $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j$ is standardized with divisor $s_j = \sigma_{\text{feat}}^j / \sigma_{\text{data}}$ in Eq. (9), $\partial \hat{\mathbf{v}}_j / \partial \phi_j = 1/s_j$, and the gradient reaching the generated image is

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_j}{\partial \hat{\mathbf{X}}} = \frac{1}{L_j C_j} \frac{1}{s_j} \left(\frac{\partial \phi_j(\hat{\mathbf{X}})}{\partial \hat{\mathbf{X}}} \right)^\top \mathbf{g}_j. \quad (\text{A22})$$

Its magnitude therefore scales as

$$a_j \triangleq \frac{\|\mathbf{g}_j\|_2}{L_j C_j s_j}, \quad \|\partial \mathcal{L}_j / \partial \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|_2 \leq \kappa_j a_j, \quad \kappa_j = \|\partial \phi_j / \partial \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|_2. \quad (\text{A23})$$

All three factors of a_j depend on the layer properties: $L_j C_j$ is fixed, s_j is known, and $\|\mathbf{g}_j\|_2$ is estimated on the fly. For DINO-S/8, s_j is the per-layer scalar of the feature standardization. For ConvNeXt V2-N, whose s_j is a per-channel vector, we collapse it to the scalar $(\frac{1}{C_j} \sum_c s_{j,c}^{-2})^{-1/2}$. This is the effective divisor: the gradient in channel c is scaled by $1/s_{j,c}$, so its norm over channels is $\|\mathbf{g}_j\|_2$ times the root mean square of $1/s_{j,c}$, assuming $\mathbf{g}_j$ spreads evenly across channels.

Given a target magnitude T , we weight each layer by

$$w_j = \frac{T}{a_j}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{score}} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J w_j \mathcal{L}_j, \quad (\text{A24})$$

so that $w_j a_j = T$ for every layer, and the average over the J scored layers keeps the loss weight independent of how many feature layers are used. Because the regression target of Eq. (A20) is detached in the proxy loss function, $\mathbf{g}_j$ does not depend on w_j , and scaling $\mathcal{L}_j$ by w_j scales its gradient by exactly w_j , so no custom backward is needed.

Since $\|\mathbf{g}_j\|_2$ drifts as the generator improves, we track it with a running mean over the first 1000 transport steps on Oxford Flowers and 10000 on ImageNet, and an EMA with decay 0.99 afterwards. The target T is set to the mean of the a_j during those 1000 steps and then frozen. The balance thus equalizes the layers and, at the same time, holds the overall gradient magnitude at its calibrated level rather than letting it fade as the fake features approach the real ones. w_j is clipped to $[0.05, 20]$ as a guard against a collapsed layer taking unbounded weight.

D IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Tab. A10 lists the architecture, training, and sampling configurations of Sphere2-B and Sphere2-L used for the Oxford Flowers results in Tab. 1 and the ImageNet results in Tab. 2. Tab. A11 and Tab. A12 list the six representation models used to compute FDr^6 at 256×256 and 512×512 on both Oxford Flowers and ImageNet.

Table A10: **Configurations of experiments.** Values in a merged cell are shared by both models.

	Sphere2-B	Sphere2-L
<i>architecture</i>		
encoder $\mathcal{E}$	DINOv3-small (frozen, 29M)	
latent	$N = 16 \times 16, D = 384, d = 98,304$	
decoder $\mathcal{D}$	ViT-B	ViT-L
depth	12	24
hidden dim	768	1024
heads	12	16
image size	256, 512	
patch size of $\mathcal{D}$	image.size / 16	
conditioning	class $\mathbf{y}$ and angle α via adaLN-Zero	
params (encoder + decoder)	161M	487M
GFLOPs (single forward)	22	115
<i>training</i>		
epochs	2000 on Oxford Flowers, 300 on ImageNet	
warmup epochs	10 on Oxford Flowers, 5 on ImageNet	
optimizer	AdamW	
batch size	256	
learning rate	1×10^{-4}	
learning rate schedule	constant	
weight decay	0	
ema decay	0.99985	
angle sampler	$\alpha \sim \mathcal{U}[0^\circ, 90^\circ]$	
cutoff angle α_{cutoff} , bandwidth β	$70^\circ, 5^\circ$	
data augmentation	center crop, horizontal flip $p = 0.5$	
feature extractors for $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$	Inception, DINOv3-small, ConvNeXt V2-Nano	
class dropout probability (for CFG)	0.1	
<i>score matching loss</i>		
training start epoch	1000 on Oxford Flowers, 100 on ImageNet	
transport start epoch	1150 on Oxford Flowers, 115 on ImageNet	
score feature space ϕ	ConvNeXt V2-N ft-in1k (frozen, 16M), two middle layers	
score models $\psi_{\text{real}}, \psi_{\text{fake}}$	2-layer transformers, EDM preconditioning	
score model hidden dim	384	
score model learning rate	5×10^{-4} , same for ψ_{real} and ψ_{fake}	
score model learning rate schedule	cosine decay to 5×10^{-5}	
score σ for training $p(\sigma)$	log-normal $(p_{\text{mean}}, p_{\text{std}}) = (-1.2, 1.2)$, no clip	
score σ for transport $q(\sigma)$	log-normal $(q_{\text{mean}}, q_{\text{std}}) = (-1.5, 1.0)$, clip $[0.002, 8]$	
transport balance	EMA 0.99, $w_j \in [0.05, 20]$	
differentiable augmentation	horizontal flip $p = 0.5$, translate $p = 1.0$ with pixel ratio 1/64	
<i>loss weights</i>		
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pix-recon}}$	1.0	
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{sem}}$	1.0	
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{score}}$	1.0	
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{lat-con}}$	0.1	
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FD-lite}}$	0.1	
<i>sampling</i>		
sampling angle α	85.5°	84°
guidance angle γ	15°	5°

Table A11: **Representation models of FDr⁶** at 256×256 . The set follows the setup of FDr⁶ (Yang et al., 2026), which is originally for ImageNet 256×256 .

Model	timm identifier	Arch.	Dim	Input	Objective	Pooling
Inception-v3 (Szegedy et al., 2016)	inception_v3 (torch-fidelity)	CNN	2048	299	supervised	global avg pool
ConvNeXt-v2 (Woo et al., 2023)	convnextv2_base.fcmae.ft_in22k_in1k	CNN	1024	224	self-supervised	global avg pool
MAE (He et al., 2022)	vit_large_patch16_224_mae	ViT	1024	224	reconstructive	CLS token
DINOv2 (Oquab et al., 2024)	vit_large_patch14_dinov2.lvd142m	ViT	1024	256	contrastive	CLS token
SigLIP2 (Tschannen et al., 2025)	vit_so400m_patch16_siglip256.v2.webl	ViT	1152	224	vision-language	CLS token
CLIP (Radford et al., 2021)	vit_large_patch14_clip_224_openai	ViT	1024	256	vision-language	CLS token

Table A12: **Representation models of FDr⁶** at 512×512 . Each family uses the highest-resolution checkpoint. Inception-v3 and MAE have no such checkpoint and keep the ones from Tab. A11.

Model	timm identifier	Arch.	Dim	Input	Objective	Pooling
Inception-v3 (Szegedy et al., 2016)	inception_v3 (torch-fidelity)	CNN	2048	299	supervised	global avg pool
ConvNeXt-v2 (Woo et al., 2023)	convnextv2_base.fcmae.ft_in22k_in1k_384	CNN	1024	384	self-supervised	global avg pool
MAE (He et al., 2022)	vit_large_patch16_224_mae	ViT	1024	224	reconstructive	CLS token
DINOv2 (Oquab et al., 2024)	vit_large_patch14_dinov2.lvd142m	ViT	1024	518	contrastive	CLS token
SigLIP2 (Tschannen et al., 2025)	vit_so400m_patch16_siglip512.v2.webl	ViT	1152	512	vision-language	CLS token
CLIP (Radford et al., 2021)	vit_large_patch14_clip_336_openai	ViT	1024	336	vision-language	CLS token

REFERENCES

- Avrim Blum, John Hopcroft, and Ravindran Kannan. *Foundations of data science*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Nicholas M Boffi, Michael S Albergo, and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. Flow map matching with stochastic interpolants: A mathematical framework for consistency models. *TMLR*, 2024.
- Hervé Bouchard and Yves Kamp. Auto-association by multilayer perceptrons and singular value decomposition. *Biological cybernetics*, 1988.
- Andrew Brock, Jeff Donahue, and Karen Simonyan. Large scale gan training for high fidelity natural image synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *ICCV*, 2021.
- Rewon Child. Very deep vaes generalize autoregressive models and can outperform them on images. In *ICLR*, 2021.
- Tim R Davidson, Luca Falorsi, Nicola De Cao, Thomas Kipf, and Jakub M Tomczak. Hyperspherical variational auto-encoders. In *UAI*, 2018.
- Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*, 2009.
- Mingyang Deng, He Li, Tianhong Li, Yilun Du, and Kaiming He. Generative modeling via drifting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.04770*, 2026.
- Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Nichol. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- Tung Do, Thuan Hoang Nguyen, and Hao Li. Efficient image synthesis with sphere latent encoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.15592*, 2026.
- Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *ICLR*, 2021.
- Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, Andreas Blattmann, Rahim Entezari, Jonas Müller, Harry Saini, Yam Levi, Dominik Lorenz, Axel Sauer, Frederic Boesel, et al. Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *ICML*, 2024.
- Lan Feng, Wuyang Li, Eloi Zablocki, Matthieu Cord, and Alexandre Alahi. Representation distribution matching for one-step visual generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.02375*, 2026.
- Kevin Frans, Danijar Hafner, Sergey Levine, and Pieter Abbeel. One step diffusion via shortcut models. In *ICLR*, 2025.
- Zhengyang Geng, Mingyang Deng, Xingjian Bai, J Zico Kolter, and Kaiming He. Mean flows for one-step generative modeling. In *NeurIPS*, 2025a.
- Zhengyang Geng, Ashwini Pople, William Luo, Justin Lin, and J Zico Kolter. Consistency models made easy. In *ICLR*, 2025b.
- Zhengyang Geng, Yiyang Lu, Zongze Wu, Eli Shechtman, J Zico Kolter, and Kaiming He. Improved mean flows: On the challenges of fastforward generative models. In *CVPR*, 2026.
- Tom Goldstein and Christoph Studer. Phasemax: Convex phase retrieval via basis pursuit. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2018.
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 2020.

-
- Kaiming He, Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, Yanghao Li, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- Geoffrey E Hinton and Richard Zemel. Autoencoders, minimum description length and helmholtz free energy. In *NeurIPS*, 1993.
- Jonathan Ho and Tim Salimans. Classifier-free diffusion guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12598*, 2022.
- Yiwen Huang, Aaron Gokaslan, Volodymyr Kuleshov, and James Tompkin. The gan is dead; long live the gan! a modern gan baseline. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Sangeek Hyun, MinKyu Lee, and Jae-Pil Heo. Scalable gans with transformers. In *ICML*, 2026.
- Tejas Jayashankar, Jongha Jon Ryu, and Gregory W Wornell. Score-of-mixture training: One-step generative model training made simple via score estimation of mixture distributions. In *ICML*, 2025.
- Minguk Kang, Jun-Yan Zhu, Richard Zhang, Jaesik Park, Eli Shechtman, Sylvain Paris, and Taesung Park. Scaling up gans for text-to-image synthesis. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks. In *CVPR*, 2019.
- Tero Karras, Miika Aittala, Janne Hellsten, Samuli Laine, Jaakko Lehtinen, and Timo Aila. Training generative adversarial networks with limited data. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- Tero Karras, Miika Aittala, Timo Aila, and Samuli Laine. Elucidating the design space of diffusion-based generative models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Tero Karras, Miika Aittala, Tuomas Kynkäänniemi, Jaakko Lehtinen, Timo Aila, and Samuli Laine. Guiding a diffusion model with a bad version of itself. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Guolin Ke and Hui Xue. Hyperspherical latents improve continuous-token autoregressive generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.24335*, 2025.
- Dongjun Kim, Chieh-Hsin Lai, WeiHsiang Liao, Naoki Murata, Yuhta Takida, Toshimitsu Uesaka, Yutong He, Yuki Mitsufuji, and Stefano Ermon. Consistency trajectory models: Learning probability flow ode trajectory of diffusion. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. In *ICLR*, 2014.
- Amandeep Kumar and Vishal M Patel. Learning on the manifold: Unlocking standard diffusion transformers with representation encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.10099*, 2026.
- Tianhong Li and Kaiming He. Back to basics: Let denoising generative models denoise. In *CVPR*, 2026.
- Tianhong Li, Yonglong Tian, He Li, Mingyang Deng, and Kaiming He. Autoregressive image generation without vector quantization. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Xingchao Liu, Chengyue Gong, and Qiang Liu. Flow straight and fast: Learning to generate and transfer data with rectified flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.03003*, 2022.
- Xingchao Liu, Xiwen Zhang, Jianzhu Ma, Jian Peng, et al. InstafLOW: One step is enough for high-quality diffusion-based text-to-image generation. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- Cheng Lu and Yang Song. Simplifying, stabilizing and scaling continuous-time consistency models. In *ICLR*, 2025.

-
- Yiyang Lu, Susie Lu, Qiao Sun, Hanhong Zhao, Zhicheng Jiang, Xianbang Wang, Tianhong Li, Zhengyang Geng, and Kaiming He. One-step latent-free image generation with pixel mean flows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.22158*, 2026.
- Eric Luhman and Troy Luhman. Knowledge distillation in iterative generative models for improved sampling speed. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.02388*, 2021.
- Troy Luhman and Eric Luhman. High fidelity image synthesis with deep vaes in latent space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13714*, 2023.
- Simian Luo, Yiqin Tan, Longbo Huang, Jian Li, and Hang Zhao. Latent consistency models: Synthesizing high-resolution images with few-step inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04378*, 2023a.
- Weijian Luo, Tianyang Hu, Shifeng Zhang, Jiacheng Sun, Zhenguo Li, and Zhihua Zhang. Diff-instruct: A universal approach for transferring knowledge from pre-trained diffusion models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023b.
- Nanye Ma, Mark Goldstein, Michael S Albergo, Nicholas M Boffi, Eric Vanden-Eijnden, and Saining Xie. Sit: Exploring flow and diffusion-based generative models with scalable interpolant transformers. In *ECCV*, 2024.
- Sean Man, Ron Raphaeli, Matan Kleiner, and Or Ronai. SP³: Spherical priors for plug-and-play restoration. In *NeurIPS*, 2026.
- Chenlin Meng, Robin Rombach, Ruiqi Gao, Diederik Kingma, Stefano Ermon, Jonathan Ho, and Tim Salimans. On distillation of guided diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- Alex Nichol, Prafulla Dhariwal, Aditya Ramesh, Pranav Shyam, Pamela Mishkin, Bob McGrew, Ilya Sutskever, and Mark Chen. Glide: Towards photorealistic image generation and editing with text-guided diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10741*, 2021.
- Alexander Quinn Nichol and Prafulla Dhariwal. Improved denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *ICML*, 2021.
- Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *Conference on computer vision, graphics & image processing*, 2008.
- Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. DINOv2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *TMLR*, 2024.
- William Peebles and Saining Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers. In *ICCV*, 2023.
- Ethan Perez, Florian Strub, Harm De Vries, Vincent Dumoulin, and Aaron Courville. Film: Visual reasoning with a general conditioning layer. In *AAAI*, 2018.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, 2021.
- Scott Reed, Zeynep Akata, Xinchun Yan, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Bernt Schiele, and Honglak Lee. Generative adversarial text to image synthesis. In *ICML*, 2016.
- Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2022.
- Tim Salimans and Jonathan Ho. Progressive distillation for fast sampling of diffusion models. In *ICLR*, 2022.
- Axel Sauer, Kashyap Chitta, Jens Müller, and Andreas Geiger. Projected gans converge faster. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- Axel Sauer, Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, Andreas Geiger, and Timo Aila. Stylegan-t: Unlocking the power of gans for fast large-scale text-to-image synthesis. In *ICML*, 2023.

-
- Axel Sauer, Dominik Lorenz, Andreas Blattmann, and Robin Rombach. Adversarial diffusion distillation. In *ECCV*, 2024.
- Oriane Siméoni, Huy V Vo, Maximilian Seitzer, Federico Baldassarre, Maxime Oquab, Cijo Jose, Vasil Khalidov, Marc Szafraniec, Seungeun Yi, Michaël Ramamonjisoa, et al. Dinov3. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.10104*, 2025.
- Yang Song and Prafulla Dhariwal. Improved techniques for training consistency models. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- Yang Song, Prafulla Dhariwal, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Consistency models. In *ICML*, 2023.
- Christian Szegedy, Vincent Vanhoucke, Sergey Ioffe, Jon Shlens, and Zbigniew Wojna. Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision. In *CVPR*, 2016.
- Keyu Tian, Yi Jiang, Zehuan Yuan, Bingyue Peng, and Liwei Wang. Visual autoregressive modeling: Scalable image generation via next-scale prediction. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Jakub Tomczak and Max Welling. Vae with a vampprior. In *Conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, 2018.
- Michael Tschannen, Alexey Gritsenko, Xiao Wang, Muhammad Ferjad Naeem, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Nikhil Parthasarathy, Talfan Evans, Lucas Beyer, Ye Xia, Basil Mustafa, et al. Siglip 2: Multilingual vision-language encoders with improved semantic understanding, localization, and dense features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14786*, 2025.
- Arash Vahdat and Jan Kautz. Nvae: A deep hierarchical variational autoencoder. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- Shuai Wang, Ziteng Gao, Chenhui Zhu, Weilin Huang, and Limin Wang. Pixnerd: Pixel neural field diffusion. In *ICLR*, 2026a.
- Shuai Wang, Zhi Tian, Weilin Huang, and Limin Wang. Ddt: Decoupled diffusion transformer. In *CVPR*, 2026b.
- Zhengyi Wang, Cheng Lu, Yikai Wang, Fan Bao, Chongxuan Li, Hang Su, and Jun Zhu. Prolificdreamer: High-fidelity and diverse text-to-3d generation with variational score distillation. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- Sanghyun Woo, Shoubhik Debnath, Ronghang Hu, Xinlei Chen, Zhuang Liu, In So Kweon, and Saining Xie. Convnext v2: Co-designing and scaling convnets with masked autoencoders. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- Jiawei Yang, Zhengyang Geng, Xuan Ju, Yonglong Tian, and Yue Wang. Representation fréchet loss for visual generation. In *NeurIPS*, 2026.
- Jingfeng Yao, Bin Yang, and Xinggang Wang. Reconstruction vs. generation: Taming optimization dilemma in latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2025.
- Tianwei Yin, Michaël Gharbi, Taesung Park, Richard Zhang, Eli Shechtman, Fredo Durand, and William T Freeman. Improved distribution matching distillation for fast image synthesis. In *NeurIPS*, 2024a.
- Tianwei Yin, Michaël Gharbi, Richard Zhang, Eli Shechtman, Fredo Durand, William T Freeman, and Taesung Park. One-step diffusion with distribution matching distillation. In *CVPR*, 2024b.
- Sihyun Yu, Sangkyung Kwak, Huiwon Jang, Jongheon Jeong, Jonathan Huang, Jinwoo Shin, and Saining Xie. Representation alignment for generation: Training diffusion transformers is easier than you think. In *ICLR*, 2025.
- Kaiyu Yue, Menglin Jia, Ji Hou, and Tom Goldstein. Image generation with a sphere encoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.15030*, 2026.
- Chi Zhang, Haoyang Shi, Yueyi Liu, Ruichuan An, Junkang Zhou, Chang Li, Xiuyuan Lu, Yichi Zhang, Bo Wang, Yuhang Wu, Sen Cui, and Miao Liu. Unifying distributional training for one-step visual generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.35763*, 2026.

-
- Han Zhang, Tao Xu, Hongsheng Li, Shaoting Zhang, Xiaogang Wang, Xiaolei Huang, and Dimitris N Metaxas. Stackgan++: Realistic image synthesis with stacked generative adversarial networks. *TPAMI*, 2018a.
- Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *CVPR*, 2018b.
- Deli Zhao, Jiapeng Zhu, and Bo Zhang. Latent variables on spheres for autoencoders in high dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.10233*, 2019.
- Shengyu Zhao, Zhijian Liu, Ji Lin, Jun-Yan Zhu, and Song Han. Differentiable augmentation for data-efficient gan training. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- Boyang Zheng, Nanye Ma, Shengbang Tong, and Saining Xie. Diffusion transformers with representation autoencoders. In *ICLR*, 2026.
- Linqi Zhou, Stefano Ermon, and Jiaming Song. Inductive moment matching. In *ICML*, 2025.
- Mingyuan Zhou, Huangjie Zheng, Zhendong Wang, Mingzhang Yin, and Hai Huang. Score identity distillation: Exponentially fast distillation of pretrained diffusion models for one-step generation. In *ICML*, 2024.