Table 1: **FID comparison of few-step generation with diffusion models.** Results of the base ODE solvers are reported on each top rows, highlighted in gray. **Bold** indicates the best results, and underline marks the second best.

Method	NFE=4	NFE=6	NFE=8	NFE=10	Method	NFE=4	NFE=6	NFE=8	NFE=10
CIFAR-10 32 × 32 with EDM (Karras et al., 2022) (Teacher FID: 2.08)									
UniPC	50.30	19.33	9.64	6.16	iPNDM	29.53	9.84	5.30	3.75
+ DMN	26.42	8.11	4.22	2.79	+ DMN	28.29	9.33	4.82	3.52
+ GITS	24.83	11.02	6.68	5.02	+ GITS	16.20	6.80	4.07	3.30
+ LD3	<u>12.04</u>	<u>3.56</u>	<u>2.43</u>	<u>2.62</u>	+ LD3	<u>9.97</u>	<u>4.42</u>	<u>2.93</u>	<u>2.44</u>
+ BézierFlow	**9.55**	**3.13**	**2.40**	**2.09**	+ BézierFlow	**6.93**	**3.35**	**2.81**	**2.43**
FFHQ 64 × 64 with EDM (Karras et al., 2022) (Teacher FID: 2.86)									
UniPC	47.62	14.96	7.76	8.93	iPNDM	28.75	11.15	6.68	4.80
+ DMN	25.87	9.44	5.06	4.06	+ DMN	30.89	11.93	7.33	6.20
+ GITS	22.99	12.12	8.90	4.40	+ GITS	18.51	9.21	5.58	4.37
+ LD3	<u>22.48</u>	**6.16**	<u>4.25</u>	**2.92**	+ LD3	<u>15.55</u>	**5.89**	**3.74**	**3.03**
+ BézierFlow	**17.05**	<u>7.43</u>	**3.82**	<u>3.13</u>	+ BézierFlow	**15.39**	<u>7.84</u>	<u>5.56</u>	<u>3.75</u>
AFHQv2 64 × 64 with EDM (Karras et al., 2022) (Teacher FID: 2.04)									
UniPC	23.59	10.15	7.76	6.38	iPNDM	15.14	6.12	3.80	3.01
+ DMN	30.39	14.40	3.98	3.69	+ DMN	33.21	15.95	5.99	5.29
+ GITS	<u>13.20</u>	7.50	3.89	3.94	+ GITS	14.31	5.81	3.88	3.57
+ LD3	18.17	<u>4.95</u>	**2.68**	<u>3.02</u>	+ LD3	**11.85**	**3.11**	**2.45**	<u>2.18</u>
+ BézierFlow	**12.27**	**4.46**	<u>2.75</u>	**2.67**	+ BézierFlow	<u>14.44</u>	<u>4.69</u>	<u>2.63</u>	**2.16**