

Pathway to $O(\sqrt{d})$ Complexity bound under Wasserstein metric of flow-based models

Xiangjun Meng* Zhongjian Wang†

December 6, 2025

Abstract

We provide attainable analytical tools to estimate the error of flow-based generative models under the Wasserstein metric and to establish the optimal sampling iteration complexity bound with respect to dimension as $O(\sqrt{d})$. We show this error can be explicitly controlled by two parts: the Lipschitzness of the push-forward maps of the backward flow which scales independently of the dimension; and a local discretization error scales $O(\sqrt{d})$ in terms of dimension. The former one is related to the existence of Lipschitz changes of variables induced by the (heat) flow. The latter one consists of the regularity of the score function in both spatial and temporal directions.

These assumptions are valid in the flow-based generative model associated with the Föllmer process and 1-rectified flow under the Gaussian tail assumption. As a consequence, we show that the sampling iteration complexity grows linearly with the square root of the trace of the covariance operator, which is related to the invariant distribution of the forward process.

Keywords: Flow-based model, complexity bound, early stopping, Wasserstein metric

1 Introduction

The landscape of deep learning has been fundamentally reshaped by the emergence of powerful generative models, including Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) (Goodfellow et al., 2014; Arjovsky et al., 2017), Variational Auto-encoders (VAEs) (Kingma & Welling, 2014; Kingma et al., 2019), and Normalizing Flows (Papamakarios et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023; Wan & Wei, 2022), which have achieved remarkable success in a wide range of applications across modalities like images, audio, and text. These models are capable of learning complex data distributions, allowing them to generate high-quality samples (Achiam et al., 2023; Song et al., 2021).

Diffusion models (DM) are the state-of-the-art generative models, which can be analyzed via the SDE framework (Song et al., 2021). With the same forward and backward marginal as DM, flow-based models (Chen et al., 2023b,c) are generative models with deterministic flow given initial distribution, offering a strong basis for statistical inference. This unique feature makes them highly effective in applications such as image and audio synthesis, as well as density estimation (Cheng et al., 2024).

Early works on DMs and flow-based models provide reverse KL guarantees (Chen et al., 2023a; Benton et al., 2024; Conforti et al., 2025a; Li et al., 2024). However, for structured data, where the target typically lies on a compact sub-manifold (Tenenbaum et al., 2000; Bengio et al., 2017), the KL divergence between the backward process and the target is ill-defined. Therefore, one may turn to the analysis of flow-based models under the Wasserstein metric, and in this paper, we will consider the W_2 distance in Euclidean space, which is well-defined among distributions with finite second-order moments. One of the central difficulties in the analysis under the W_2 distance is the accumulation of local error in the Lyapunov-type estimate. This is in sharp contrast with KL-based analysis (Altschuler & Chewi, 2024; Zhu, 2025; Kim & Milman, 2012) which

*Division of Mathematical Sciences, School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. xiangjun.meng@ntu.edu.sg

†Division of Mathematical Sciences, School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. zhongjian.wang@ntu.edu.sg (Corresponding)

admits the **Girsanov’s** theorem (for instance, one in Chen et al. (2023a)) showing the constant scaling of the local error.

In light of this, **the main contribution of this paper** is to provide analytical tools that study the accumulation error along the sampling flow under the Wasserstein metric and hence ensure the optimal iteration complexity bound $O(\sqrt{d})$. More precisely, we first analyze the potential asymptotic scaling of the truncation error in terms of the temporal variable and the ambient dimension. Then we bound the accumulation of error by the Lipschitz properties of the push-forward maps of the backward flow. As a justification, we illustrate the attainability of the assumptions by showing the optimal complexity bound in Föllmer flow under the Gaussian tail assumption. Such an assumption applies to both regular and singular targets (when early stopping technique (Lyu et al., 2022) is applied), extendable to infinite-dimensional settings, with further implications for Bayesian inverse problems.

1.1 Related work

Lipschitz changes of variables In the field of PDE, the Lipschitzness of transport maps was initiated by Caffarelli (2000), who constructed such maps between log-concave probability measures. Building on this, Colombo et al. (2017) developed global Lipschitz maps for compactly supported perturbations of log-concave measures. An alternative approach beyond optimal transport involves diffusion processes. By leveraging the maximum principle for parabolic PDEs, one can show that log-concavity is preserved along the associated diffusion semigroup (Kim & Milman, 2012). Mikulincer & Shenfeld (2023) obtained a sharper Lipschitz constant for measures with bounded support and Gaussian mixtures, improving Caffarelli’s result. Based on this, Dai et al. (2023) assume a finite third moment and semi-log-convexity to construct a well-posed unit-time Föllmer flow whose terminal map is Lipschitz and pushes a Gaussian to a target measure in the unit time interval $[0, 1]$. Neeman (2022) relaxed Colombo’s compact support requirement to boundedness, and Fathi et al. (2024) extended it to Gaussian in \mathbb{R}^d and uniform spherical measures. Furthermore, Brigati & Pedrotti (2024) obtained the sharpest Lipschitz bound in this setting without controlling the third-order derivative tensor of potential $\nabla^3 W$. For clarity, we summarize the assumptions on target distributions and their Lipschitz constants in Table 2, with details in Appendix A. Despite these results shed light on potential minimal assumption for the convergence guarantee of flow-based models, in later context, we will demonstrate that estimation of the time derivative of velocity field $\partial_t V$ is also crucial on the pathway of optimal complexity bounds.

Continuous flow-based generative models Building on score-based (Song et al., 2021) and denoising diffusion models (Gao & Zhu, 2025), Salimans & Ho (2022) introduces stable parameterizations and a distillation method to reduce sampling steps while maintaining sample quality. Flow matching (FM) (Lipman et al., 2023) extends continuous normalizing flows (CNFs) (Chen et al., 2018) by training a neural ODE-parameterized vector field $v_\theta(x, t)$ to match a target velocity $v(x, t)$ along fixed probability paths, unifying diffusion and non-diffusion models for efficient and stable generation. Rectified flow (Liu et al., 2023; Rout et al., 2024) learns neural ODEs that transport distributions along nearly straight paths through iterative rectification processes, yielding deterministic couplings with reduced transport cost and enabling efficient one-step simulation. In addition, stochastic interpolants (Albergo et al., 2023; Albergo & Vanden-Eijnden, 2023) unify flow-based and diffusion-based methods to bridge arbitrary densities,

$$X_t = I(t, X_0, X_1) + \gamma(t)z, \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad (1)$$

recovering the Schrödinger bridge when the interpolant is optimized (Léonard, 2013). Recently, Flow Map Matching (FMM) (Boffi et al., 2025) has accelerated sampling by learning the two-time flow map of generative dynamics, thereby alleviating the computational cost associated with continuous models. Geng et al. (2025) connect one-step generative modeling to multiscale physical simulations via average velocity, achieving leading performance on ImageNet 256×256 without pre-training or distillation.

Convergence bounds Recent studies control the KL, W_2 , and TV distances between the generative and target distributions to guarantee convergence and measure training discretization errors. Albergo & Vanden-Eijnden (2023) bounded the W_2^2 distance by $e^{1+2K}H(\hat{v})$ under the smoothness and Lipschitz assumptions, where $H(\hat{v})$ measures discrete velocity error. Albergo et al. (2023) derived KL-based perturbation bounds for CNF estimators, while FMM (Boffi et al., 2025) improved W_2 bounds for pre-trained models via Lagrangian and Eulerian distillation losses controlling the teacher-student Wasserstein gap. The estimation error of the FM

has been analyzed for typical data distributions (e.g., manifold-supported) by Benton et al. (2023), and a nonparametric $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/(d+5)})$ convergence rate under early stopping (Lyu et al., 2022) was established by Gao et al. (2024), where n denotes the sample size. Subsequently, Cheng et al. (2024) showed JKO flows reach $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ KL error in $N \lesssim \log(1/\epsilon)$ steps, extending to non-density cases and yielding mixed KL- W_2 guarantees. We summarize recent complexity results for diffusion models and flow-based models (under Wasserstein distance) in Table 1. Detailed theorems appear in Lemmas A.10-A.16. In this work, we achieve an optimal dependence of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ on the data dimension d without the assumption of log-concaveness of the target.

Table 1: Complexity bounds for DM/flow-based models in d dimensions: previous results vs. ours.

Target P_0	Complexity	Result
P_0 log-concave*	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\epsilon_0}(\log \frac{d}{\epsilon_0})^2\right)$	Gao & Zhu (2025) Tab. 1
G-tail Ass.*	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\epsilon_0} \log \frac{d}{\epsilon_0^2}\right)$	Wang & Wang (2024) Cor. 3.5
one-side Lip+weakly log-concave*	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d^2}{\epsilon_0^2}\right)$	Gentiloni-Silveri & Ocello (2025) Thm.3.5
weakly log-concave*	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d}{\epsilon_0^2}\right)$	Bruno & Sabanis (2025) Thm.3.12
G-tail Ass. 3.7	$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\epsilon_0}\right)$	This work Thm.3.15

* denotes works on diffusion models; n is the sample size.

1.2 Contributions

- We point out that the W_2 -distance between the generative and target distributions is controlled by the Lipschitzness of the push-forward maps introduced by sampling flow. By providing concrete bounds on the Lipschitz coefficient, we obtain an explicit estimate of the accumulation error.
- While prior works often rely on smoothness or strict log-concavity, we adopt a general condition in applications-the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7 to provide the well-posedness and Lipschitz regularity of Föllmer flow, with explicit, dimension-free Lipschitz bounds (Corollary 3.11 and Corollary 3.14).
- By leveraging the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7 to obtain accurate upper bounds on the time derivative of velocity field $|\partial_t V|$ (Theorem 3.8), our framework avoids the need for end-point constraints or early stopping (Lyu et al., 2022), enabling training and sampling throughout the entire interval $t \in [0, 1]$. This framework naturally extends the $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ complexity results of the SDE flow to the deterministic flow, achieving even better complexity than previous approaches (Wang & Wang, 2024).

2 Flow-based Model

We begin by introducing a unified formulation of flow-based generative models. This general framework allows the convergence analysis in Section 3 to apply seamlessly to both the Föllmer flow and more general sampling dynamics. Consider a continuous flow governed by a velocity field V via the ODE¹

$$\frac{d\overleftarrow{X}_t}{dt} = V(t, \overleftarrow{X}_t), \quad \overleftarrow{X}_0 = x, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (2)$$

With the N steps discretization in time, $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = 1$, the ODE (2) in each sub-interval $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$, can be interpreted as a local transport map,

$$T_n(\overleftarrow{X}_{t_n}) = \overleftarrow{X}_{t_{n+1}}. \quad (3)$$

¹We used the left arrow $\overleftarrow{\cdot}$ to represent its connections to the backward process in the score based model.

The overall flow-based model $\overleftarrow{X}_1(x)$ is then obtained by the composition of transport maps

$$\overleftarrow{X}_1(x) = (T_{N-1} \circ T_{N-2} \circ \cdots \circ T_0)(x).$$

An approximation of $\overleftarrow{X}_1(x)$ can be interpreted as approximation of $\{T_n\}_{n=0}^{N-1}$ by $\{\widetilde{T}_n\}_{n=0}^{N-1}$. To quantify the error of the approximation, we denote the marginal distribution of the actual state $\overleftarrow{X}_{t_{n+1}}$ by $\overleftarrow{P}_{t_{n+1}}$, and $\overleftarrow{Q}_{t_{n+1}}$ of the approximated state. Correspondingly we have,

$$\overleftarrow{P}_{t_{n+1}} = (T_n)_\#(\overleftarrow{P}_{t_n}), \quad \overleftarrow{Q}_{t_{n+1}} = (\widetilde{T}_n)_\#(\overleftarrow{Q}_{t_n}). \quad (4)$$

Föllmer flow For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we consider a diffusion process $(\vec{X}_t)_{t \in [0, 1-\varepsilon]}$ that gradually transforms the target distribution ν into a Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, C)$ over time by the following Itô SDE

$$d\vec{X}_t = -\frac{1}{1-t}\vec{X}_t dt + \sqrt{\frac{2C}{1-t}}dW_t, \quad \vec{X}_0 \sim \nu, \quad t \in [0, 1-\varepsilon], \quad (5)$$

where W_t is a standard Brownian motion, C is a symmetric, positive-definite covariance matrix. The transition probability distribution from \vec{X}_0 to \vec{X}_t is given by

$$\vec{X}_t | \vec{X}_0 = x_0 \sim \mathcal{N}((1-t)x_0, t(2-t)C). \quad (6)$$

The marginal distribution flow $(\bar{p}_t)_{t \in [0, 1-\varepsilon]}$ of the forward diffusion process satisfies the Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov (FPK) equation in an Eulerian framework

$$\partial_t \bar{p}_t = \nabla \cdot \left(\bar{p}_t \cdot \frac{1}{1-t} [x + C \nabla \log \bar{p}_t(x)] \right) \quad \text{on } [0, 1-\varepsilon] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \bar{p}_0 = \nu. \quad (7)$$

Then Föllmer flow is formally defined as the backward process of such a forward diffusion (5), while preserving the same marginal distributions in (7).

Definition 2.1 (Föllmer flow in formal sense). *A Föllmer flow $(\overleftarrow{X}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ solves the IVP*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\overleftarrow{X}_t}{dt} = V(t, \overleftarrow{X}_t), & \overleftarrow{X}_0 \sim \gamma_C, \quad t \in [0, 1], \\ V(t, x) := \frac{1}{t} [x + S(t, x)], & \forall t \in (0, 1]; \quad V(0, x) := \sqrt{C} \mathbb{E}_\nu[X], \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

$S(t, x) := C \nabla \log p_t(x)$ is the score function with probability density $p_t = \bar{p}_{1-t}$ in forward FPK equation (7). We call $V(t, x)$ a Föllmer velocity field.

Following (4), we define \overrightarrow{P}_{t_n} as the marginal distribution of \vec{X}_{t_n} in the forward diffusion process. Given the initial distribution $\overrightarrow{P}_0 = P_{\text{data}}$, then for all $t \in [0, 1]$, $\overleftarrow{P}_{t_n} = \overrightarrow{P}_{1-t_n}$.

In practice, the velocity field $V(1-t, x) = \frac{1}{1-t} [x + C \nabla \log \bar{p}_t(x)]$ is not available since no closed form expression of \bar{p}_t is known. To this end, one approximates V by a neural network \tilde{V} . The network is trained by minimizing an \mathbb{L}_2 estimation loss,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_t(x)} \left\| \tilde{V}(1-t, x) - \frac{1}{1-t} [x + C \nabla \log \bar{p}_t(x)] \right\|^2. \quad (9)$$

For simplicity, we introduce the notation $X_t := (1-t)X_0 + \sqrt{t(2-t)C} \mathcal{N}$, which shares the same marginal distribution as \vec{X}_t in (6). Then the velocity field $V(1-t, x)$ can be expressed as a conditional expectation (Yubin et al., 2025),

$$V(1-t, X) := \frac{1}{1-t} [X + S(1-t, X)] = \mathbb{E}_{X_0 | X_t} \left[\frac{1}{1-t} X_t - \frac{X_t - (1-t)X_0}{(1-t)t(2-t)} \middle| X_t = X \right].$$

With an appropriate weight of the t -variable, the loss in (9) becomes an approximation of this conditional expectation via mean-squared prediction error,

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_0, N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d), t} \left[\lambda(t) \left\| \tilde{V}(1-t, X_t) - \frac{1}{1-t} X_t + \frac{\sqrt{C}\mathcal{N}}{(1-t)\sqrt{t(2-t)}} \right\|^2 \right].$$

After training, with $\tilde{V}(1-t, x)$, one can generate samples of the target distribution via an Euler-type discretization of the continuous-time process, starting from the Gaussian initialization γ_C ,

$$\frac{d\tilde{Y}_t}{dt} = \tilde{V}(t_n, \tilde{Y}_{t_n}), \quad \tilde{Y}_{t_0} \sim \gamma_C, \quad t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}], \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (10)$$

Note that (10) defines the transport map \tilde{T}_n for the learned Föllmer flow, governed by the approximate velocity field $\tilde{V}(t_n, \tilde{Y}_{t_n})$ over the sub-interval $[t_n, t_{n+1}] \subset [0, 1]$. Distribution of generation \tilde{Q}_t is then defined by (4).

Well-posedness of Föllmer flow Under appropriate assumptions on the target distribution ν , one can show the Föllmer flow being the time-reversal of the forward diffusion process (5). For instance, under third moment (Assumption 3.6), semi-log-convexity (Assumption A.19) and the structural assumptions (Assumption A.20) on ν , Dai et al. (2023) studied the Föllmer flow in the case $C = I_d$, where the score function is given by

$$S(t, x) := \nabla \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (2\pi(1-t^2))^{-\frac{d}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-ty|^2}{2(1-t^2)}\right) \nu(dy).$$

It can be shown that the velocity field V is Lipschitz continuous in x with a well-defined initial condition $V(0, x)$. By the Cauchy-Lipschitz theory (Ambrosio & Crippa, 2014), one can define a Lagrangian flow $(X_t^*)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ governed by the well-posed ODE system,

$$dX_t^* = -V(1-t, X_t^*)dt, \quad X_0^* \sim \nu, \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

sharing the same marginal distribution with (5).

In this work, we study the Föllmer flow with correlated Gaussian initial based on the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7, and retain the spatially anisotropic noise assumption ($C \neq I_d$) to allow our theory to generalize to infinite-dimensional settings requiring compactification (Lim et al., 2025); We refer the reader to Theorem 3.8 for the regularity of the velocity field and Lemma 3.10 for the proof of well-posedness.

General Notations Let γ_C denote the density of $\mathcal{N}(0, C)$. For an $n \times n$ matrix A , the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$ is defined as

$$\|A\| = \sup_{v \neq 0} \frac{|Av|}{|v|} = \text{largest eigenvalue of } \sqrt{A^T A}.$$

For symmetric positive-definite A , define the weighted ℓ_2 norm

$$|x|_A^2 := (A^{-1/2}x, A^{-1/2}x),$$

which reduces to the standard ℓ_2 norm $|\cdot|$ when $A = I$. For a vector (matrix)-valued function $f(x)$,

$$|f|_\infty = \sup_x |f(x)|, \quad (\|f\|_\infty = \sup_x \|f(x)\|).$$

3 Main results

In this section, we present the main results. Our analysis begins with a general flow-based framework (not necessarily restricted to the Föllmer flow), through which we develop Wasserstein-based analytical tools that yield an optimal iteration complexity bound of \sqrt{d} . We then validate the assumptions and present the complexity results for the Föllmer flow and 1-rectified flow under the Gaussian tail assumption.

3.1 Lipschitz changes of variables implies Wasserstein bound of flow-based models

For the sake of compactness, we impose the following assumption on the second-order moment.

Assumption 3.1 (Second moment). *The data distribution has a bounded second moment, $M_2 := \mathbb{E}_{p_0}|x|^2 < \infty$. We further denote,*

$$M_0 = \max\{\text{Tr}(C), M_2\},$$

relates to the maximum second-order moment, where C is a symmetric, positive-definite covariance matrix.

We consider a general covariance matrix C to cover both the identity case $C = I_d$ and the correlated case $C \neq I_d$. In the main text, we primarily focus on the former, yielding $\text{Tr}(C) = d$ and thus $M_0 = \mathcal{O}(d)$ with dimension d . At the same time, we retain $C \neq I_d$ in the derivation to extend our theory to infinite-dimensional settings (Lim et al., 2025), with the general case further discussed in Appendix D for Bayesian inverse problems.

Next, we make three assumptions, each holding with some dimension-free constants. We regard these assumptions as generally valid, and under them, our convergence result Theorem 3.5 can be established.

Assumption 3.2 (Lipschitzness of T). $\forall n = 0, \dots, N-1$, $\text{Lip}(T_n) < \infty$, and $\prod_{j=0}^n \text{Lip}(T_j) < \infty$.

We will justify the attainability of the Assumption 3.2 in Corollary 3.11 by invoking the Lipschitz property of the velocity field established in Theorem 3.8. Similar to Assumption 3.2 which imposes Lipschitz continuity of T , we also assume the Lipschitz continuity of \tilde{T} as stated below.

Assumption 3.3 (Lipschitzness of \tilde{T}). $\forall n = 0, \dots, N-1$, $\text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_n) < \infty$, and $\prod_{j=0}^n \text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_j) < \infty$.

We will verify Assumption 3.3 in Corollary 3.14 by leveraging the Lipschitz property of the learned velocity field stipulated in Assumption 3.13. The final assumption concerns the local discretization error between T and \tilde{T} at each time step h , as described below.

Assumption 3.4 (Accuracy of approximation). *There exists constants $\bar{K}, \bar{K}_1, \bar{K}_2, \epsilon$, such that*

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \tilde{P}_{t_n}} |\tilde{T}_n(x) - T_n(x)|^2} \leq h \left(\left(\bar{K} \sqrt{M_0} + \frac{\bar{K}_1}{\sqrt{1-t_n^2}} + \bar{K}_2 \right) h + \epsilon \right),$$

with time step size $h = t_{n+1} - t_n$.

This scaling follows since

$$\tilde{T}_n(x) - T_n(x) = h(V(x) - \tilde{V}(x)) + \mathcal{O}(h^2),$$

as verified in the Föllmer case Theorem 3.15. The term $\mathcal{O}(h)$ reflects the ϵ -accuracy of the learned velocity $\tilde{V}(x)$ (Assumption 3.12), while the term $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ stems from the Taylor expansion of $T_n(x)$ over $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$ and depends on its regularity, possibly also on ambient dimension d and time t .

Next, we outline the core proof strategy of this work. The key step is to demonstrate the Lipschitz continuity of both the original and discretized flows, which is critical for guaranteeing the convergence of flow-based generative models.

Theorem 3.5. *Assume that the target distribution satisfies Assumption 3.1 and follows Lipschitzness Assumption 3.2, 3.3, and approximation error Assumption 3.4. With constant step size h , the Wasserstein-2 distance between the target distribution $\vec{P}_0 = \overleftarrow{P}_1$ and the generation \overleftarrow{Q}_1 is bounded as,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_2(\overleftarrow{P}_1, \overleftarrow{Q}_1) &\leq \left(\prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_j) \right) \mathcal{W}_2(\overleftarrow{P}_0, \overleftarrow{Q}_0) \\ &\quad + h \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} \prod_{j=k}^{N-2} \text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_j) \left(\left(\bar{K} \sqrt{M_0} + \frac{\bar{K}_1}{\sqrt{1-t_j^2}} + \bar{K}_2 \right) h + \epsilon \right). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Proof see Appendix B.1.

This result shows that the first term in the bound scales the initial discrepancy $\mathcal{W}_2(\overleftarrow{P}_0, \overleftarrow{Q}_0)$ by the product of Lipschitz constants $\left(\prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_j)\right)$, and the second term $\left(\left(\bar{K}\sqrt{M_0} + \frac{\bar{K}_1}{\sqrt{1-t_j^2}} + \bar{K}_2\right)h + \epsilon\right)$, captures accumulated discretization errors (Assumption 3.4) and a local discretization error scales $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{M_0})$, yielding the $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ dependence in the isotropic case $C = I_d$. Similar results (17) and (18) are listed in Proposition A.10 and Proposition A.13, while the precise scaling of the second term remains unspecified. To be noted, in the limit of $h \rightarrow 0$, $h \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-t_k^2}} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{2}$.

Notably, Theorem 3.5 is of general validity: it applies to all flow-based models and their discrete counterparts satisfying the relevant assumptions, and is not limited to the Föllmer case.

3.2 Analyses of Föllmer flow under Gaussian tail assumption

In this section, we focus on the Föllmer flow and derive the main convergence result based on Theorem 3.5 through Lipschitz changes of variables, which plays a central role in our analysis.

Assumption 3.6 (Third moment). *The data distribution has a bounded third moment, i.e. $\mathbb{E}_{p_0}|x|^3 < \infty$.*

We note that the third-moment assumption 3.6 is only required to ensure well-posedness of Föllmer flow at $t = 0$ in the proof of Lemma 3.10 (see Appendix B.3). For our complexity bound, the second moment Assumption 3.1 is sufficient.

Our analysis is based on the following key assumption that the tail distribution of the target is similar to a Gaussian distribution with covariance matrix A .

Assumption 3.7 (G-tail). *The density of target distribution $\bar{p}_0 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and has the following tail decomposition:*

$$\bar{p}_0(x) = \exp\left(-\frac{|x|_A^2}{2}\right) \exp(h(x)),$$

where there are independent of dimension constants such that,

(i) A is a symmetric, positive-definite matrix which can be simultaneously diagonalized with C , and

$$\|A\| < \infty, \quad \|C\| < \infty, \quad \|AC^{-1}\| < \infty, \quad \|CA^{-1}\| < \infty.$$

(ii) the remainder term h follows

$$|\sqrt{C}\nabla h|_\infty < \infty, \quad \|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty < \infty.$$

The Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7 generalizes the log-concavity condition in Ding et al. (2023); Gao et al. (2024) to heavier-than-sub-Gaussian tails while ensuring sufficient decay for well-posedness and convergence. Although stronger than the weak semi-log-concavity assumption of Chaintron et al. (2025); Bruno & Sabanis (2025), it yields sharper guarantees: weak semi-log-concavity implies $\mathcal{O}(d)$ sampling complexity, whereas the Gaussian tail assumption achieves $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ scaling in a non-log-concave setting and also accommodates realistic distributions such as early stopping, see (16).

The following theorem bounds the Lipschitz constant and the time derivative of the Föllmer velocity field in (8) under the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7, supporting the Lipschitz changes of variables in Corollary 3.11 and convergence rate in Theorem 3.15.

Theorem 3.8 (Regularity of the velocity field). *The Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7 implies the Föllmer velocity field $V(t, \cdot)$ has the following regularity properties:*

$$\begin{aligned} |V(t, x)| &\leq K_0 + K_2 t |x|, & \forall t \in [0, 1], \\ \|\nabla V(t, \cdot)\|_\infty &\leq (K_1 + K_2)t, & \forall t \in [0, 1], \\ |\partial_t V(t, x)| &\leq K_5 |x| + \frac{K_6}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} + K_7, & \forall t \in [0, 1), \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where the coefficients are dimension-free constants, given explicitly in Table 3 of Appendix B.2.

To handle the blow-up of $|\partial_t V(t, x)|$ near $t = 0, 1$, Ding et al. (2023) restrict t to $[\delta, 1-\delta]$. In particular, Gao et al. (2024) shows Lipschitz continuity of V in t over $[0, 1-\delta_0]$ with constant scaling as $\mathcal{O}(\delta_0^{-2})$. In contrast, under our Gaussian tail assumption, the control over the second derivative of the tail allows us to bound $|\partial_t V(t, x)|$ using techniques such as the Brascamp-Lieb inequality (Brascamp & Lieb, 1976). This analysis reveals that the term $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-t^2}}$ is integrable on $[0, 1]$, thus posing no obstacle to convergence, allowing training and sampling over the full interval $t \in [0, 1]$. More importantly, this approach, to our knowledge, is the first to yield the improved $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ complexity bound, as formally stated in Corollary 3.16.

Detailed proof of Theorem 3.8 is provided in Appendix B.2.

Remark 3.9. *Motivated by the averaged-velocity construction in MeanFlow (Geng et al., 2025), we introduce an analogous notion for the Föllmer flow and define the averaged Föllmer velocity as*

$$\bar{V}(x, r, t) := \frac{1}{t-r} \int_r^t V(\tau, x) d\tau.$$

Under the regularity condition (12) satisfied by the Föllmer velocity field, a direct calculation gives the uniform bound

$$|\bar{V}(x, r, t)| \leq K_0 + \frac{t+r}{2} K_2 |x|,$$

demonstrating that the averaged Föllmer velocity preserves the same linear growth property as the original velocity field.

Under the preceding assumptions and analysis, we establish the well-posedness of the Föllmer model $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.10 (Well-posedness). *Suppose that the third moment Assumption 3.6 and the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7 hold. Then the Föllmer velocity field is well-defined at the $t = 0$, in the sense that*

$$V(0, x) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} V(t, x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{x + S(t, x)}{t} = \sqrt{C} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0}[X]. \quad (13)$$

Consequently, the Föllmer flow $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ is a unique solution to IVP (8). Moreover, the push-forward measure satisfies

$$\gamma_C \circ (\bar{X}_1)^{-1} = \bar{p}_0.$$

Proof see Appendix B.3. Under Assumption 3.7, we now establish the Lipschitz property of the continuous flow $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$.

Corollary 3.11 (Lipschitzness of continuous flow). *If \bar{p}_0 follows the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7, then the Föllmer flow $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ is Lipschitz with a dimension-free constant, more precisely,*

$$\text{Lip}(\bar{X}_1(x)) \leq \|\nabla \bar{X}_1(x)\|_{op} \leq \exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2}{2}\right). \quad (14)$$

Proof see Appendix B.4. Bound like (14) can also be achieved in Caffarelli (2000); Colombo et al. (2017); Kim & Milman (2012); Mikulincer & Shenfeld (2023); Brigati & Pedrotti (2024) under various assumptions, as detailed in Appendix A. In general, the constants involved are dimension-free.

To analyze the stability and convergence of the discrete flow, we first assume the following bound on the velocity field approximation error at the discretization points.

Assumption 3.12 (Accuracy of the learned velocity field). *For each time discretization point t_n , the accuracy of learned velocity $\tilde{V}(t_n, x)$ approximates the true velocity field $V(t_n, x)$ with uniformly bounded error in expectation:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{P}_{1-t_n}} |V(t_n, x) - \tilde{V}(t_n, x)|^2 \leq \epsilon^2.$$

Next, we assume that the learned velocity field inherits the regularity of the continuous flow under the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7.

Assumption 3.13 (Regularity of the learned velocity field). *Assume the learned velocity field $\tilde{V}(t, x)$ follows*

$$\|\nabla \tilde{V}(t_n, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq (K_1 + K_2 + K_8)t_n$$

for some positive constant K_8 .

Although the bound may not be small in general, the Assumption 3.13 is essential for our theoretical analysis and remains reasonable. The learned velocity field $\tilde{V}(t_n, x)$ is trained to approximate the true velocity field $V(t_n, x)$ in Assumption 3.12, which satisfies the required regularity (see Theorem 3.8); Moreover, neural networks generally inherits the smoothness and controlled growth induced by the architecture and training process, which prevents uncontrolled behavior in practice. Assumption 3.13 can further be relaxed in the temporal t direction to require only that the total discrete-time sum of the score gradient is bounded; see Remark B.1 in Appendix B.7.

We subsequently establish the Lipschitz property of the discrete flow $(\bar{Y}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ under Assumption 3.13.

Corollary 3.14 (Lipschitzness of discrete flow). *The regularity of learned velocity field Assumption 3.13 implies the Lipschitz property of the learned flow $(\bar{Y}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ with a dimension-free constant, such that*

$$\text{Lip}(\bar{Y}_1(x)) \leq \|\nabla \bar{Y}_1(x)\|_{op} \leq \exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2 + K_8}{2}\right),$$

Proof see Appendix B.5.

3.3 Main Convergence theories

With the Lipschitz properties of the flow established (see Corollary 3.11 and Corollary 3.14), we next quantify how these bounds propagate through the discrete dynamics. Building on Theorem 3.5, the following theorem provides a convergence result in Föllmer flow case.

Theorem 3.15. *Suppose that the third moment Assumption 3.6, the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7, the accuracy and regularity assumptions 3.12- 3.13 on the learned velocity field hold. Using the Euler method for the Föllmer flow with uniform step size $h = t_{n+1} - t_n \leq 1$ ensures $\sqrt{M_0}$ convergence between the target data distribution and the generated distribution:*

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\vec{P}_0, \bar{Q}_1) \leq \exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2 + K_8}{2}\right) \left(\sqrt{3} \left(K_5 \sqrt{M_0} + K_9 \right) h + 2\epsilon \right). \quad (15)$$

where K_1, K_2, \dots, K_9 are dimensionless constants defined in Theorem 3.8 and Assumption 3.13, with explicit expressions given in Table 3. Furthermore, with the covariance of base distribution $C = I_d$ in the Assumption 3.1, $\mathcal{W}_2(\vec{P}_0, \bar{Q}_1) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d}h + \epsilon)$.

Proof see Appendix B.6. Note that the first term in Theorem 3.5, stemming from the time-propagating discrepancy of the semigroup maps, vanishes in Theorem 3.15 because the Föllmer flow $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ is well-posed at $t = 0$, giving $\mathcal{W}_2(\bar{P}_0, \bar{Q}_0) = 0$. Thus, only the accumulated discretization error remains, corresponding to the second term in Theorem 3.5.

Corollary 3.16. *To reach a distribution \bar{Q}_1 such that $\mathcal{W}_2(\vec{P}_0, \bar{Q}_1) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0)$ with uniform step size $h = t_{n+1} - t_n \leq 1$ requires at most:*

$$h = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{\sqrt{M_0}}\right), \quad N = \frac{1}{h} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{M_0}}{\epsilon_0}\right),$$

and Assumption 3.12 to hold with $\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0)$. Furthermore, $N = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\epsilon_0}\right)$ under the Assumption 3.1 with $C = I_d$.

The complexity bound established in Corollary 3.16 grows linearly with the square root of the trace of the forward process’s covariance operator, independent of dimension, and thus extends naturally to infinite-dimensional generative models. An illustrative case is provided in Appendix D, where we consider Bayesian inverse problems in function spaces. Proposition 6 in Gao et al. (2025) establishes that for the standard Gaussian as target distribution, $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ complexity bound is optimal. This indicates that our \sqrt{d} dependence stems from intrinsic Gaussian concentration, making the dimensional scaling fundamental rather than algorithm-induced. Notably, in efforts to obtain complexity bounds under assumptions more general than log-concavity, recent works (Bruno & Sabanis, 2025) derived an $\mathcal{O}(d)$ bound using the weakly log-concave assumption (Conforti, 2024; Conforti et al., 2025b), while (Gentiloni-Silveri & Ocello, 2025) obtained an $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ bound under the similar assumption. These related works are summarized in Table 1.

Since the probabilistic ODE (Prob ODE) (Song et al., 2021; Gao & Zhu, 2025) can be viewed as a time-rescaled Föllmer flow, the result of Corollary 3.16 also implies that our method improves the computational complexity of the Prob ODE compared to Wang & Wang (2024). We will provide a detailed discussion in Appendix C.

We further verified that our method extends to the 1-rectified flow setting (Liu et al., 2023; Rout et al., 2024). In particular, it applies to the interpolation paths used in the flow built by the first step rectification over independent coupling prior to the recursive construction, and retains the same $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ complexity stated in Corollary 3.16. The proof is deferred to Appendix B.8.

3.4 Convergence under bounded-support assumption

Real-world data often lie on low-dimensional manifolds, where the distribution is not absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure in the ambient dimension, and therefore KL bounds may diverge (Pidstrigach, 2022). This motivates the adoption and study of the manifold assumption (De Bortoli, 2022; Yubin et al., 2025), which, under compactness, entails the following bounded-support assumption.

Assumption 3.17 (Bounded-support assumption). *Suppose distribution p_0 has compact support with $\text{Diam}(\text{Supp}(p_0)) \leq R$ for some constant $R > 0$.*

Let $q_\sigma = \exp\left(-\frac{|x|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) * q_0$, where q_0 satisfies the bounded-support Assumption 3.17. Consider $g(x) = \log q_\sigma(x) + \frac{|x|^2}{2\sigma^2}$, inspired by similar results in (De Bortoli, 2022; Mooney et al., 2025; Wang & Wang, 2024), we have

$$|\nabla g|_\infty \leq \frac{R}{\sigma^2}, \quad \|\nabla^2 g\|_\infty \leq \frac{2R^2}{\sigma^4}. \quad (16)$$

Set $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = 1 - \delta$ as the discretization points, where the early stopping (Lyu et al., 2022) coefficient $\delta \ll 1$. By expressing the distribution of the forward process of Föllmer flow at stopping time δ in the form q_σ , we obtain the correspondences

$$\sigma^2 \longleftrightarrow 1 - (1 - \delta)^2, \quad q_0(x) \longleftrightarrow \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \vec{P}_0\left(\frac{1}{1 - \delta}x\right).$$

Then by Theorem 3.8, we get the following Lipschitz bound of the velocity field under Assumption 3.17.

Corollary 3.18. *Suppose that the bounded-support Assumption 3.17 holds. Taking $C = I_d$ in (8), and $A = (1 - (1 - \delta)^2)I_d$ in Assumption 3.7, then for all $t \in [0, 1 - \delta]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |V(t, x)| &\leq K_0^* + K_2^* t |x|, \\ \|\nabla V(t, \cdot)\|_\infty &\leq (K_1^* + K_2^*) t, \\ |\partial_t V(t, x)| &\leq K_5^* |x| + \frac{K_6^*}{\sqrt{1 - t^2}} + K_7^*, \end{aligned}$$

where coefficients are defined in Table 4 of Appendix B.2.

The proof parallels the corollary in Wang & Wang (2024). Using the Lipschitz bound from Corollary 3.18, we obtain a bounded-support-version W_2 bound by tracking the constants in Theorem 3.15.

Theorem 3.19. *Suppose that the bounded-support Assumption 3.17 and the accuracy and regularity Assumptions 3.12, 3.13 hold. Take $C = I_d$, $\delta \ll 1$, then we have*

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\vec{P}_\delta, \overleftarrow{Q}_{1-\delta}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{3R^2}{2\delta^2} + \frac{1}{2\delta} + \frac{K_8}{2}\right) \left(\sqrt{3} \left(K_5^* \sqrt{M_0} + K_9^*\right) h + 2\epsilon\right),$$

where K_5^* and K_9^* are dimension-free constants, whose explicit forms given in Table 4, and the constant K_8 is defined in Assumption 3.13.

With the result in Theorem 3.19, we can directly compute the complexity bound under the bounded-support assumption with early stopping technique.

Corollary 3.20. *With R and δ fixed, achieving a distribution $\overleftarrow{Q}_{1-\delta}$ such that $\mathcal{W}_2(\vec{P}_\delta, \overleftarrow{Q}_{1-\delta}) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0)$ requires at most: $N = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\epsilon_0}\right)$, and Assumption 3.12 to hold with $\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0)$.*

Noticing that,

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\vec{P}_\delta, \vec{P}_0) \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\vec{X}_\delta - \vec{X}_0|^2} \leq \sqrt{2d\delta},$$

the complexity bound can also be derived with respect to \vec{P}_0 . More precisely, we consider the following practical scenario. Now we assume $R^2 = \mathcal{O}(d)$, then optimizing δ to achieve $\mathcal{W}_2(\vec{P}_0, \overleftarrow{Q}_{1-\delta}) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0)$ requires at most logarithmic complexity with $\log N = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d^3}{\epsilon_0^4}\right)$.

The conclusion and the discussion of future research directions are provided in Appendix E.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Michael S Albergo, Nicholas M Boffi, and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. Stochastic interpolants: A unifying framework for flows and diffusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08797*, 2023.
- Michael Samuel Albergo and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. Building normalizing flows with stochastic interpolants. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=li7qeBbCR1t>.
- Jason M Altschuler and Sinho Chewi. Shifted composition III: Local error framework for KL divergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.17997*, 2024.
- Luigi Ambrosio and Gianluca Crippa. Continuity equations and ODE flows with non-smooth velocity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics*, 144(6):1191–1244, 2014.
- Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 214–223. PMLR, 2017.
- Cesare Arzela. *Sulle funzioni di linee*. Gamberini e Parmeggiani, 1895.
- Georgios Batzolis, Jan Stanczuk, Carola-Bibiane Schönlieb, and Christian Etmann. Conditional image generation with score-based diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.13606*, 2021.
- Yoshua Bengio, Ian Goodfellow, Aaron Courville, et al. *Deep learning*, volume 1. MIT press Cambridge, MA, USA, 2017.
- Joe Benton, George Deligiannidis, and Arnaud Doucet. Error bounds for flow matching methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16860*, 2023.
- Joe Benton, Valentin De Bortoli, Arnaud Doucet, and George Deligiannidis. Nearly $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -linear convergence bounds for diffusion models via stochastic localization. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r5njV3BsuD>.
- Nicholas Matthew Boffi, Michael Samuel Albergo, and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. Flow map matching with stochastic interpolants: A mathematical framework for consistency models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2025.
- Herm Jan Brascamp and Elliott H Lieb. On extensions of the brunn-minkowski and prékopa-leindler theorems, including inequalities for log concave functions, and with an application to the diffusion equation. *Journal of functional analysis*, 22(4):366–389, 1976.
- Giovanni Brigati and Francesco Pedrotti. Heat flow, log-concavity, and lipschitz transport maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15205*, 2024.
- Stefano Bruno and Sotirios Sabanis. Wasserstein convergence of score-based generative models under semi-convexity and discontinuous gradients. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2025. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=vS9iVRB7XF>.
- Luis A Caffarelli. Monotonicity properties of optimal transportation and the fkg and related inequalities. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 214(3):547–563, 2000.
- Patrick Cattiaux and Arnaud Guillin. Semi log-concave markov diffusions. In *Séminaire de probabilités XLVI*, pp. 231–292. Springer, 2014.
- Louis-Pierre Chaintron, Giovanni Conforti, and Katharina Eichinger. Propagation of weak log-concavity along generalised heat flows via hamilton-jacobi equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.07931*, 2025.

- Hongrui Chen, Holden Lee, and Jianfeng Lu. Improved analysis of score-based generative modeling: User-friendly bounds under minimal smoothness assumptions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4735–4763. PMLR, 2023a.
- Ricky TQ Chen, Yulia Rubanova, Jesse Bettencourt, and David K Duvenaud. Neural ordinary differential equations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Sitan Chen, Sinho Chewi, Holden Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Jianfeng Lu, and Adil Salim. The probability flow ode is provably fast. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:68552–68575, 2023b.
- Sitan Chen, Giannis Daras, and Alex Dimakis. Restoration-degradation beyond linear diffusions: A non-asymptotic analysis for ddim-type samplers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4462–4484. PMLR, 2023c.
- Xiuyuan Cheng, Jianfeng Lu, Yixin Tan, and Yao Xie. Convergence of flow-based generative models via proximal gradient descent in wasserstein space. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(11):8087–8106, 2024.
- Maria Colombo, Alessio Figalli, and Yash Jhaveri. Lipschitz changes of variables between perturbations of log-concave measures. *Annali Della Scuola Normale Superiore Di Pisa-Classe Di Scienze*, 17(4):1491–1519, 2017.
- Giovanni Conforti. Weak semiconvexity estimates for schrödinger potentials and logarithmic sobolev inequality for schrödinger bridges. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 189(3):1045–1071, 2024.
- Giovanni Conforti, Alain Durmus, and Marta Gentiloni Silveri. KL convergence guarantees for score diffusion models under minimal data assumptions. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 7(1):86–109, 2025a.
- Giovanni Conforti, Daniel Lacker, and Soumik Pal. Projected langevin dynamics and a gradient flow for entropic optimal transport. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 2025b.
- Yin Dai, Yuan Gao, Jian Huang, Yuling Jiao, Lican Kang, and Jin Liu. Lipschitz transport maps via the Föllmer flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03490*, 2023.
- Valentin De Bortoli. Convergence of denoising diffusion models under the manifold hypothesis. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=MhK5aXo3gB>.
- Zhao Ding, Yuling Jiao, Xiliang Lu, Zhijian Yang, and Cheng Yuan. Sampling via Föllmer flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03660*, 2023.
- Ronen Eldan and James R Lee. Regularization under diffusion and anticoncentration of the information content. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 167(5):969–993, 2018.
- Max Fathi, Dan Mikulincer, and Yair Shenfeld. Transportation onto log-lipschitz perturbations. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 63(3):61, 2024.
- Xuefeng Gao and Lingjiong Zhu. Convergence analysis for general probability flow ODEs of diffusion models in wasserstein distances. In *28th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, volume 258, 2025.
- Xuefeng Gao, Hoang M Nguyen, and Lingjiong Zhu. Wasserstein convergence guarantees for a general class of score-based generative models. *Journal of machine learning research*, 26(43):1–54, 2025.
- Yuan Gao, Jian Huang, Yuling Jiao, and Shurong Zheng. Convergence of continuous normalizing flows for learning probability distributions. *Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Zhengyang Geng, Mingyang Deng, Xingjian Bai, J Zico Kolter, and Kaiming He. Mean flows for one-step generative modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13447*, 2025.

- Marta Gentiloni-Silveri and Antonio Ocello. Beyond log-concavity and score regularity: Improved convergence bounds for score-based generative models in w2-distance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02298*, 2025.
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014.
- Young-Heon Kim and Emanuel Milman. A generalization of caffarelli’s contraction theorem via (reverse) heat flow. *Mathematische Annalen*, 354(3):827–862, 2012.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. In *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014.
- Diederik P Kingma, Max Welling, et al. An introduction to variational autoencoders. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 12(4):307–392, 2019.
- Christian Léonard. A survey of the schrödinger problem and some of its connections with optimal transport. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 34, 2013. doi: 10.3934/dcds.2014.34.1533.
- Gen Li, Yu Huang, Timofey Efimov, Yuting Wei, Yuejie Chi, and Yuxin Chen. Accelerating convergence of score-based diffusion models, provably. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=KB6s10UQP9>.
- Jae Hyun Lim, Nikola B Kovachki, Ricardo Baptista, Christopher Beckham, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Jean Kossaifi, Vikram Voleti, Jiaming Song, Karsten Kreis, Jan Kautz, et al. Score-based diffusion models in function space. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 26(158):1–62, 2025.
- Yaron Lipman, Ricky T. Q. Chen, Heli Ben-Hamu, Maximilian Nickel, and Matthew Le. Flow matching for generative modeling. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=PqvMRDCJT9t>.
- Xingchao Liu, Chengyue Gong, and qiang liu. Flow straight and fast: Learning to generate and transfer data with rectified flow. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=XVjTT1nw5z>.
- Zhaoyang Lyu, Xudong Xu, Ceyuan Yang, Dahua Lin, and Bo Dai. Accelerating diffusion models via early stop of the diffusion process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12524*, 2022.
- Dan Mikulincer and Yair Shenfeld. On the lipschitz properties of transportation along heat flows. In *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis: Israel Seminar (GAFA) 2020-2022*, pp. 269–290. Springer, 2023.
- Gaspard Monge. Mémoire sur la théorie des déblais et des remblais. *Mem. Math. Phys. Acad. Royale Sci.*, pp. 666–704, 1781.
- Connor Mooney, Zhongjian Wang, Jack Xin, and Yifeng Yu. Global well-posedness and convergence analysis of score-based generative models via sharp lipschitz estimates. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r3cwq6KKbt>.
- Joe Neeman. Lipschitz changes of variables via heat flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.03403*, 2022.
- George Papamakarios, Eric Nalisnick, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Normalizing flows for probabilistic modeling and inference. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(57):1–64, 2021.
- Jakiw Pidstrigach. Score-based generative models detect manifolds. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:35852–35865, 2022.
- Litu Rout, Yujia Chen, Nataniel Ruiz, Constantine Caramanis, Sanjay Shakkottai, and Wen-Sheng Chu. Semantic image inversion and editing using rectified stochastic differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10792*, 2024.

- Tim Salimans and Jonathan Ho. Progressive distillation for fast sampling of diffusion models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=TIIdIXIpzhoI>.
- Yang Song, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=PXTIG12RRHS>.
- Joshua B Tenenbaum, Vin de Silva, and John C Langford. A global geometric framework for nonlinear dimensionality reduction. *science*, 290(5500):2319–2323, 2000.
- Rens van de Schoot, Sarah Depaoli, Ruth King, Bianca Kramer, Kaspar Märtens, Mahlet G Tadesse, Marina Vannucci, Andrew Gelman, Duco Veen, Joukje Willemsen, et al. Bayesian statistics and modelling. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers*, 1(1):1, 2021.
- Xiaoliang Wan and Shuangqing Wei. Vae-krnet and its applications to variational bayes. *Communications in Computational Physics*, 31(4):1049–1082, 2022.
- Hanchen Wang, Tianfan Fu, Yuanqi Du, Wenhao Gao, Kexin Huang, Ziming Liu, Payal Chandak, Shengchao Liu, Peter Van Katwyk, Andreea Deac, et al. Scientific discovery in the age of artificial intelligence. *Nature*, 620(7972):47–60, 2023.
- Xixian Wang and Zhongjian Wang. Wasserstein bounds for generative diffusion models with gaussian tail targets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.11251*, 2024.
- Lu Yubin, Wang Zhongjian, and Bal Guillaume. Mathematical analysis of singularities in the diffusion model under the submanifold assumption. *East Asian Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 15(4):669–700, 2025.
- Jia-Jie Zhu. Inclusive KL minimization: A wasserstein-fisher-rao gradient flow perspective. In *Frontiers in Probabilistic Inference: Learning meets Sampling*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=c1SHHymeIU>.

Appendix

A Statements of Referenced Theorems

For a more comprehensive discussion and comparison, we provide the following related results from the literature.

Proposition A.1 (Caffarelli). *Let $\mu = \exp(-Q(x))dx$ and $\nu = \exp(-(Q(x) + V(x)))dx$ denote two Borel probability measures on Euclidean space $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$, where Q denotes a quadratic function, i.e.*

$$Q(x) = \langle Ax, x \rangle + \langle b, x \rangle + c,$$

with A positive-definite, and V is a convex function. Then the Brenier optimal-transport map $T = T_{\text{opt}}$ pushing forward μ onto ν is a contraction:

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad |T(x) - T(y)| \leq |x - y|.$$

Proposition A.2 (Kim & Milman Thm.1.1). *Let $\mu = \exp(-U(x))dx$ and $\nu = \exp(-(U(x) + V(x)))dx$ denote two Borel probability measures on Euclidean space $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$. Assume that $U \in C_{\text{loc}}^{3,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ($\alpha > 0$) is a convex function of the form:*

$$U(x) = Q(\text{Proj}_{E_0} x) + \sum_{i=1}^k \rho_i(|\text{Proj}_{E_i} x|), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, k, \quad \rho_i''' \leq 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where $Q : E_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a quadratic function, i.e.

$$Q(x) = \langle Ax, x \rangle + \langle b, x \rangle + c.$$

And that $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex and satisfies our symmetry assumptions A.3. Then there exists a map $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ pushing forward μ onto ν and satisfying our symmetry assumptions, which is a contraction.

Definition A.3 (Kim & Milman symmetry assumptions). *We will say that a function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies our symmetry assumptions if it is invariant under the action of the subgroup $O(E_1, \dots, E_k) := 1 \times O(E_1) \times \dots \times O(E_k)$ of the orthogonal group $O(n)$, or equivalently, if:*

$$\exists \Phi : \mathbb{R}^{\dim E_0 + k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ so that } F(x) = \Phi(\text{Proj}_{E_0} x, |\text{Proj}_{E_1} x|, \dots, |\text{Proj}_{E_k} x|).$$

We will similarly say that a map $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies our symmetry assumptions if it commutes with the action of the latter subgroup.

Proposition A.4 (Kim & Milman Thm.1.3). *Proposition A.2 is also valid when replacing T with the Brenier optimal transport map T_{opt} pushing forward μ onto ν .*

Proposition A.5 (Colombo et al. Thm.1.1). *Let $V \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that $e^{-V(x)}dx \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Suppose that $V(0) = \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} V$ and there exist constants $0 < \lambda, \Lambda < \infty$ for which $\lambda I_d \leq D^2 V(x) \leq \Lambda I_d$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, let $R > 0$, $q \in C_c^0(B_R)$, and $c_q \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $e^{-V(x) + c_q - q(x)}dx \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Assume that $-\lambda_q I_d \leq D^2 q$ in the sense of distributions for some constant $\lambda_q \geq 0$. Then, there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(R, \lambda, \Lambda, \lambda_q) > 0$, independent of n , such that the optimal transport map T that takes $e^{-V(x)}dx$ to $e^{-V(x) + c_q - q(x)}dx$ satisfies*

$$\|\nabla T\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_1.$$

Proposition A.6 (Neeman Thm.1.3). *Suppose that $d\mu = e^{-V(x)}d\gamma$ is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^n , where $D^2 V \geq -\kappa$ (for $\kappa \geq 1$), and $\sup V - \inf V \leq c$. Then μ is an L -Lipschitz push-forward of γ , for*

$$L = 2(2\kappa)^{e^c}.$$

Proposition A.7 (Mikulincer & Shenfeld Thm.1). *Let μ be a κ -log-concave probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d , and set $D := \text{diam}(\text{supp}(\mu))$. Then, for the map $\varphi^{\text{flow}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, which satisfies $\varphi_*^{\text{flow}} \gamma_d = \mu$, the following holds:*

Table 2: Lip changes of variables via Heat flow

Target P_0	Lip-constant	Result
log-concave+sym.Ass.	1+sym.Ass.	Kim & Milman (2012) Prop.A.2
κ -log-concave+osc $\leq c$	$2(2\kappa)^{e^c}$	Neeman (2022) Prop. A.6
κ -log-concave	$e^{\frac{1-\kappa D^2}{2}} D$	Mikulincer & Shenfeld (2023) Prop. A.7
L-log-Lipschitz	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} e^{\left(\frac{L^2}{2\kappa} + 2\frac{L}{\sqrt{\kappa}}\right)}$	Brigati & Pedrotti (2024) Prop. A.8
G-tail Ass. 3.7	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} e^{\left(\frac{L^2+L_1}{2\kappa}\right)}$	This work Cor. A.9

where $\kappa, c, D, L, L_1, K_1, K_2$ are dimension-independent constant.

1. If $\kappa > 0$ then

$$\|\nabla \varphi^{\text{flow}}(x)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}},$$

for μ -almost every x .

2. If $\kappa D^2 < 1$ then

$$\|\nabla \varphi^{\text{flow}}(x)\|_{\text{op}} \leq e^{\frac{1-\kappa D^2}{2}} D,$$

for μ -almost every x .

Proposition A.8 (Brigati & Pedrotti Thm.1.4). *Let $\mu = e^{-(W+H)} \in L_+^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a probability density on \mathbb{R}^d such that W is κ -convex for some $\kappa > 0$ and H is L -Lipschitz for some $L \geq 0$. Then, there exists a map $T^{\text{flow}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $(T^{\text{flow}})_{\#} \gamma_d = \mu$ and T^{flow} is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \exp\left(\frac{L^2}{2\kappa} + 2\frac{L}{\sqrt{\kappa}}\right)$ -Lipschitz.*

Corollary A.9 (This work Cor. 3.11 with $A = (\kappa I_d)^{-1}$ and $C = I_d$). *Let $\mu = e^{-(W(x)-H(x))}$ be a probability density on \mathbb{R}^d such that $W(x) = \frac{\kappa|x|^2}{2}$ while $H(x)$ being L -Lipschitz and $\|\nabla^2 H\|_{\infty} < L_1$ for some $L, L_1 \geq 0$. Then, there exists a map $T^{\text{flow}} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $(T^{\text{flow}})_{\#} \gamma_d = \mu$ and T^{flow} is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \exp\left(\frac{L^2+L_1}{2\kappa}\right)$ -Lipschitz.*

Sketch of calculation. Applying Cor. 3.11 with $A = (\kappa I_d)^{-1}$ and $C = I_d$, Both A and C are diagonalizable, which leads to a more refined Lip upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp\left(\int_0^1 \frac{\|A\|^2(L^2 + L_1)t}{(\|A\|t^2 + \|C\|(1-t^2))^2} dt + \int_0^1 \frac{\|A - C\|t}{\|A\|t^2 + \|C\|(1-t^2)} dt\right) \\ & \leq \exp\left(\frac{\|A\|(L^2 + L_1)}{2\|C\|} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\|A\|}{\|C\|}\right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \exp\left(\frac{L^2 + L_1}{2\kappa}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition A.10 (Albergo & Vanden-Eijnden Pro.3). *Let $\rho_t(x)$ be the exact interpolant density and given a velocity field $\hat{v}_t(x)$, let us define $\hat{\rho}_t(x)$ as the solution of the initial value problem*

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho}_t + \nabla \cdot (\hat{v}_t \hat{\rho}_t) = 0, \quad \hat{\rho}_{t=0} = \rho_0.$$

Assume that $\hat{v}_t(x)$ is continuously differentiable in (t, x) and Lipschitz in x uniformly on $(t, x) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with Lipschitz constant K . Then the square of the W_2 distance between ρ_1 and $\hat{\rho}_1$ is bounded by

$$W_2^2(\rho_1, \hat{\rho}_1) \leq e^{1+2K} H(\hat{v}) \quad (17)$$

where $H(\hat{v})$ is the objective function defined as

$$H(\hat{v}) = \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\hat{v}_t(x) - v_t(x)|^2 \rho_t(x) dx dt.$$

Proposition A.11 (Albergo et al. Thm.2.23). *Let ρ denote the solution of the Fokker-Planck equation (2.20) with $\epsilon(t) = \epsilon > 0$. Given two velocity fields $\hat{b}, \hat{s} \in C^0([0, 1], (C^1(\mathbb{R}^d))^d)$, define*

$$\hat{b}_F(t, x) = \hat{b}(t, x) + \epsilon \hat{s}(t, x), \quad \hat{v}(t, x) = \hat{b}(t, x) + \gamma(t) \dot{\gamma}(t) \hat{s}(t, x),$$

where the function γ satisfies the properties listed in Definition 1. Let $\hat{\rho}$ denote the solution to the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho} + \nabla \cdot (\hat{b}_F \hat{\rho}) = \epsilon \Delta \hat{\rho}, \quad \hat{\rho}(0) = \rho_0.$$

Then,

$$KL(\rho_1 \| \hat{\rho}(1)) \leq \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\hat{b}}[\hat{b}] - \min_{\tilde{b}} \mathcal{L}_{\hat{b}}[\tilde{b}] \right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\hat{s}}[\hat{s}] - \min_{\tilde{s}} \mathcal{L}_{\hat{s}}[\tilde{s}] \right),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{b}}[\hat{b}]$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{s}}[\hat{s}]$ are the objective functions defined in

$$\mathcal{L}_b[\hat{b}] = \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\hat{b}(t, x_t)|^2 - (\partial_t I(t, x_0, x_1) + \dot{\gamma}(t) z \cdot \hat{b}(t, x_t)) \right) dt$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_s[\hat{s}] = \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\hat{s}(t, x_t)|^2 + \gamma^{-1}(t) z \cdot \hat{s}(t, x_t) \right) dt.$$

And

$$KL(\rho_1 \| \hat{\rho}(1)) \leq \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\hat{v}}[\hat{v}] - \min_{\tilde{v}} \mathcal{L}_{\hat{v}}[\tilde{v}] \right) + \frac{\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} (\gamma(t) \dot{\gamma}(t) - \epsilon)^2}{2\epsilon} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\hat{s}}[\hat{s}] - \min_{\tilde{s}} \mathcal{L}_{\hat{s}}[\tilde{s}] \right).$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{v}}[\hat{v}]$ is the objective function defined in

$$\mathcal{L}_v[\hat{v}] = \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\hat{v}(t, x_t)|^2 - \partial_t I(t, x_0, x_1) \cdot \hat{v}(t, x_t) \right) dt.$$

Proposition A.12 (Boffi et al. Prop.3.9: Lagrangian error bound). *Let $X_{s,t} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the flow map for a pre-trained stochastic interpolant or diffusion model, and let $\hat{X}_{s,t} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ denote an approximate flow map. Given $x_0 \sim \rho_0$, let $\hat{\rho}_1$ be the density of $\hat{X}_{0,1}(x_0)$ and let ρ_1 be the target density of $X_{0,1}(x_0)$. Then,*

$$W_2^2(\rho_1, \hat{\rho}_1) \leq e^{1+2 \int_0^1 |C_t| dt} \mathcal{L}_{LMD}(\hat{X}),$$

where C_t is the Lipschitz constant of the drift term.

Proposition A.13 (Boffi et al. Prop.3.10: Eulerian error bound). *Let $X_{s,t} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the flow map for a pre-trained stochastic interpolant or diffusion model, and let $\hat{X}_{s,t} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ denote an approximate flow map. Given $x_0 \sim \rho_0$, let $\hat{\rho}_1$ be the density of $\hat{X}_{0,1}(x_0)$ and ρ_1 be the target density of $X_{0,1}(x_0)$. Then,*

$$W_2^2(\rho_1, \hat{\rho}_1) \leq e^1 \mathcal{L}_{EMD}(\hat{X}). \quad (18)$$

Proposition A.14 (Benton et al. Thm.4). *Suppose that the following Assumptions hold,*

- The true and approximate drifts $v^X(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $v_\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ satisfy $\int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_\theta(X_t, t) - v^X(X_t, t)\|^2 \right] dt \leq \epsilon^2$.
- For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $s \in [0, 1]$ there exist unique flows $(Y_{s,t}^X)_{t \in [s, 1]}$ and $(Z_{s,t}^X)_{t \in [s, 1]}$ starting in $Y_{s,s}^X = \mathbf{x}$ and $Z_{s,s}^X = \mathbf{x}$ with velocity fields $v_\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $v^X(\mathbf{x}, t)$ respectively. Moreover, $Y_{s,t}^X$ and $Z_{s,t}^X$ are continuously differentiable in \mathbf{x} , s and t .

- The approximate flow $v_\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is differentiable in both inputs. Also, for each $t \in (0, 1)$ there is a constant L_t such that $v_\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is L_t -Lipschitz in \mathbf{x} .
- For some $\lambda \geq 1$, $\alpha_t X_0 + \beta_t X_1$ is λ -regular for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

γ_t is a concave function on $[0, 1]$ which determines the amount of Gaussian smoothing applied at time t , and that $\alpha_0 = \beta_1 = 1$ and $\gamma_0 = \gamma_1 = \gamma_{\min}$. Then, for any $v_\theta \in \mathcal{V}$, if Y is a flow starting in $\hat{\pi}_0$ with velocity field v_θ and $\hat{\pi}_1$ is the law of Y_1 ,

$$W_2(\hat{\pi}_1, \pi_1) \leq C^{\lambda^{1/2}} \varepsilon \left(\frac{\gamma_{\max}}{\gamma_{\min}} \right)^{2\lambda} + \sqrt{d} \gamma_{\min}$$

where $C = \exp \left\{ R \left(\int_0^1 (|\dot{\alpha}_t|/\gamma_t) dt + \int_0^1 (|\dot{\beta}_t|/\gamma_t) dt \right) \right\}$ with $\gamma_{\min} = \inf_{t \in [0, 1]} \gamma_t$, $\gamma_{\max} = \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \gamma_t$.

Proposition A.15 (Cheng et al. Prop.5.4). Suppose $q_N = \tilde{q}_N = q \in \mathcal{P}_2^\gamma$, and the computed transport maps T_n and S_n satisfy the following assumptions:

- The learned transport T_{n+1} is non-degenerate and in $L^2(p_n)$; it is invertible on \mathbb{R}^d and T_{n+1}^{-1} is also non-degenerate. In addition, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, $\exists \xi_{n+1} \in \partial_{W_2} F_{n+1}(p_{n+1})$ s.t. $\|\xi_{n+1}\|_{p_{n+1}} \leq \varepsilon$.
- For $n = N, \dots, 1$, the computed reverse transport S_n is non-degenerate, in $L^2(\tilde{q}_n)$, and satisfies that

$$\|T_n \circ S_n - I_d\|_{\tilde{q}_n} \leq \varepsilon_{inv}.$$

- There is $K > 0$ s.t. T_n^{-1} is Lipschitz on \mathbb{R}^d with Lipschitz constant $e^{\gamma K}$ for all $n = N, \dots, 1$.

Then all q_n and \tilde{q}_n are in \mathcal{P}_2^γ and

$$W_2(\tilde{q}_0, q_0) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_{inv}}{\gamma K} e^{\gamma K(N+1)},$$

where ε_{inv} denotes Inversion error and $e^{\gamma K}$ is the Lipschitz constant of inverse transport map.

Proposition A.16 (Gao et al. Thm.1.2). Suppose that the target distribution has a bounded support, or is strongly log-concave, or is a mixture of Gaussians. Let n be the sample size and $0 < \underline{t} \ll 1$ satisfying $\underline{t} \approx n^{-1/(d+5)}$. By properly setting the deep ReLU network structure and the forward Euler discretization step sizes, the distribution estimation error of the CNFs learned with linear interpolation and flow matching is evaluated by

$$\mathbb{E} W_2(\hat{p}_{1-\underline{t}}, p_1) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{d+5}}),$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to all random samples, $\hat{p}_{1-\underline{t}}$ is the law of generated data, p is the law of target data, $W_2(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Wasserstein-2 distance, and a polylogarithmic prefactor in n is omitted.

Definition A.17 (Cattiaux & Guillin). A probability measure $\mu(dx) = \exp(-U(x))dx$ is κ -semi-log-concave for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ if its support $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is convex and $U \in C^2(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\nabla^2 U(x) \succeq \kappa I_d, \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Definition A.18 (Eldan & Lee). A probability measure $\mu(dx) = \exp(-U(x))dx$ is β -semi-log-convex for some $\beta > 0$ if its support $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is convex and $U \in C^2(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\nabla^2 U(x) \preceq \beta I_d, \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Assumption A.19 (Dai et al. Semi-log-convexity). ν is β -semi-log-convex for some $\beta > 0$.

Assumption A.20 (Dai et al. Structural condition). Set $D := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \text{diam}(\text{supp}(\nu))$. One of the following holds:

1. ν is κ -semi-log-concave for some $\kappa > 0$ with $D \in (0, \infty]$;
2. ν is κ -semi-log-concave for some $\kappa \leq 0$ with $D \in (0, \infty]$;
3. $\nu = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d) * \rho$ with a probability ρ supported on a ball of radius R in \mathbb{R}^d .

B Proofs

In this part, we provide the detailed proofs of the theories in this paper.

B.1 Proof of Theorem 3.5

Proof. Recall Monge's Optimal Transport (OT) problem (Monge, 1781), which seeks a map T pushing μ to ν that minimizes $\int c(x, T(x)) d\mu(x)$ subject to $T_\# \mu = \nu$, inducing the p -Wasserstein distance

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) := \left(\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \gamma} [\|x - y\|^p] \right)^{1/p},$$

where $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ denotes the set of couplings with marginals μ and ν .

Applying this to the push-forward measures $\overleftarrow{P}_{t_{n+1}}$ and $\overleftarrow{Q}_{t_{n+1}}$ (cf. definition (4)) at $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{W}_2(\overleftarrow{P}_{t_{n+1}}, \overleftarrow{Q}_{t_{n+1}}) \\ & \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{Y}_{t_n}, \tilde{X}_{t_n}) \sim \Gamma(\overleftarrow{Q}_{t_n}, \overleftarrow{P}_{t_n})} |\tilde{T}_n(\tilde{Y}_{t_n}) - T_n(\tilde{X}_{t_n})|^2} \\ & \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{Y}_{t_n}, \tilde{X}_{t_n}) \sim \Gamma(\overleftarrow{Q}_{t_n}, \overleftarrow{P}_{t_n})} |\tilde{T}_n(\tilde{Y}_{t_n}) - \tilde{T}_n(\tilde{X}_{t_n})|^2} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{X}_{t_n} \sim \tilde{P}_{t_n}} |\tilde{T}_n(\tilde{X}_{t_n}) - T_n(\tilde{X}_{t_n})|^2} \\ & \leq \text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_n) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{Y}_{t_{n-1}}, \tilde{X}_{t_{n-1}}) \sim \Gamma(\overleftarrow{Q}_{t_{n-1}}, \overleftarrow{P}_{t_{n-1}})} |\tilde{T}_{n-1}(\tilde{Y}_{t_{n-1}}) - \tilde{T}_{n-1}(\tilde{X}_{t_{n-1}})|^2} \\ & \quad + h \left(\left(\bar{K} \sqrt{M_0} + \frac{\bar{K}_1}{\sqrt{1 - t_n^2}} + \bar{K}_2 \right) h + \epsilon \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Assumption 3.3 and Assumption 3.4. Then applying the discrete Grönwall inequality yields (11). \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.8

Proof. For simplicity, denote

$$G(t, x, y) := \exp \left(- \frac{|K(t)(\sqrt{C})^{-1}x - y|_{B(t)}^2}{2} \right), \quad g(t, x, y) := \partial_t \left(- \frac{|K(t)(\sqrt{C})^{-1}x - y|_{B(t)}^2}{2} \right). \quad (19)$$

Under the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7, the score function of Föllmer flow can be calculated by

$$S(t, x) := C \nabla \log p_t = C \nabla \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(2\pi \det(B(t)) \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}} G(t, x, y) \cdot \exp \left(- \frac{|x|_{\bar{A}_t}^2}{2} \right) \exp \left(h(\sqrt{C}y) \right) dy,$$

where $\bar{A}_t = At^2 + C(1 - t^2)$, $K(t) = (A\bar{A}_t^{-1})t$, $B(t) = (A\bar{A}_t^{-1})(1 - t^2)$.

First, we consider the modified score function over the time interval $(0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{S}(t, x) &= S(t, x) + C\bar{A}_t^{-1}x \\
&= C\nabla \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (2\pi B(t))^{-\frac{d}{2}} G(t, x, y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) dy \\
&= C \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_x G(t, x, y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) dy} \\
&= - \frac{K(t)\sqrt{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y G(t, x, y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) dy} \\
&= \frac{K(t)\sqrt{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) dy},
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Here, the last equal sign is derived from integration by parts.

Since $G(t, x, y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) \geq 0$,

$$|\tilde{S}(t, x)| \leq |K(t)\sqrt{C}\nabla h(\sqrt{C}x)|.$$

Let $K = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\frac{1}{t}K(t)| = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |A\bar{A}_t^{-1}| \leq \max\{1, \|AC^{-1}\|\}$, we have

$$|\tilde{S}(t, \cdot)| \leq K\|C\|^{1/2}|\sqrt{C}\nabla h|_{\infty}t = K_0t.$$

Taking the derivative twice along that direction and using the same method as above, we get :

$$\|\nabla \tilde{S}(t, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \leq K(t)^2(\|C\nabla^2 h\|_{\infty} + |\sqrt{C}\nabla h|_{\infty}^2) = K_1t^2.$$

where $K_1 := K^2(\|C\nabla^2 h\|_{\infty} + |\sqrt{C}\nabla h|_{\infty}^2)$.

Define $K_2 := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|\frac{1}{t^2}(I - C\bar{A}_t^{-1})\| = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|(A - C)(At^2 + C(1 - t^2))^{-1}\|$, then $\|(I - C\bar{A}_t^{-1})\| \leq K_2t^2$.

Recall definition of $V(t, x)$ in (8), we have

$$|V(t, x)| = \left| \frac{x + S(t, \cdot)}{t} \right| = \left| \frac{\tilde{S}(t, \cdot) + (I - C\bar{A}_t^{-1})x}{t} \right| \leq K_0 + K_2t|x|,$$

which implies the velocity field $|V(t, x)|$ remains locally uniformly bounded and grows at most linearly.

Furthermore,

$$\|\nabla V(t, x)\|_{\infty} = \left\| \nabla \left(\frac{\tilde{S}(t, x) + (I - C\bar{A}_t^{-1})x}{t} \right) \right\|_{\infty} \leq (K_1 + K_2)t,$$

which yields a Lipschitz constant that is uniform over space and independent of the dimension, ensuring uniform equicontinuity.

Next, we give the properties of $V(t, x)$ with respect to time over $(0, 1)$. By taking (20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t V(t, x) &= \partial_t \left(\frac{\tilde{S}(t, \cdot) + (I - C\bar{A}_t^{-1})x}{t} \right) \\
&= \partial_t \left(\frac{K(t)\sqrt{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) dy}{t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp\left(h(\sqrt{C}y)\right) dy} \right) + \partial_t \left(\frac{(I - C\bar{A}_t^{-1})x}{t} \right) \\
&:= A_1 + A_2
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We begin by calculating the first part,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \partial_t \left(\frac{(A\bar{A}_t^{-1})\sqrt{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy} \right) \\
&= \frac{\partial_t(A\bar{A}_t^{-1})\sqrt{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy} \\
&\quad + \frac{A\bar{A}_t^{-1}\sqrt{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) g(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) \nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy} \\
&\quad - \frac{A\bar{A}_t^{-1}\sqrt{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) \nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) g(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy} \\
&\leq \frac{\partial_t(A\bar{A}_t^{-1})\sqrt{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy} \\
&\quad + A\bar{A}_t^{-1}\sqrt{C} \text{Cov}_{p_t(y|x)}(g(t, x, y), \nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y)) \\
&\leq \frac{\partial_t(A\bar{A}_t^{-1})\sqrt{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy} \\
&\quad + A\bar{A}_t^{-1}\sqrt{C} \sqrt{\text{Var}(g(t, x, y))} \sqrt{\text{Var}(\nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y))} \\
&:= I_1 + I_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where

$$p_t(y|x) = \frac{G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y))}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy}.$$

Define $K_3 := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left\| \frac{A\partial_t(\bar{A}_t^{-1})}{t} \right\| = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|2A(A-C)((At^2 + C(1-t^2))^2)^{-1}\|$, we obtain the first term of A_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\leq \left\| 2A(A-C) \left((At^2 + C(1-t^2))^2 \right)^{-1} t \right\| \|\sqrt{C}\| \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty \\
&\leq \|\sqrt{C}\| \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty K_3 t \\
&\leq K_0 K_3 K^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

For the second term I_2 in (22), the analysis is carried out separately for the following two cases:

Case I - $\|B(t)\| \leq \frac{1}{2\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty}$: Then $p_t(y|x)$ is a log-concave measure as $-\nabla^2 \log p_t(y|x) = B(t)^{-1} - C\nabla^2 h \succ 0$. Then, by Brascamp-Lieb inequality, we have

$$\sqrt{\text{Var}(g(t, x, y))} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{p_t(y|x)} \left| \nabla^T g(t, x, y) \left(-\nabla^2 \log p_t(y|x) \right)^{-1} \nabla g(t, x, y) \right|}, \quad (24)$$

here $g(t, x, y)$ is defined in (19) and its gradient is given by

$$\nabla g(t, x, y) = \partial_t K(t) B(t)^{-1} (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - \partial_t B(t) B(t)^{-2} \left(K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y \right). \quad (25)$$

Recall that $K(t) = (A\bar{A}_t^{-1})t$, $B(t) = (A\bar{A}_t^{-1})(1 - t^2)$.

Substituting (25) into (24) yields

RHS of (24)

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \left(\partial_t K(t) B(t)^{-1} (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - \partial_t B(t) B(t)^{-2} (K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y) \right)^T (B(t)^{-1} - C\nabla^2 h)^{-1} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \left. \left(\partial_t K(t) B(t)^{-1} (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - \partial_t B(t) B(t)^{-2} (K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y) \right) p_t(y|x) \right| dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \left(\partial_t K(t) B(t)^{-1} C^{-1} x \right)^T (I - B(t) C \nabla^2 h)^{-1} \partial_t K(t) x p_t(y|x) \right| dy \right. \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| - \left(2\partial_t K(t) B(t)^{-1} (\sqrt{C})^{-1} \partial_t B(t) x \right)^T (I - B(t) C \nabla^2 h)^{-1} \left((K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y) B(t)^{-1} \right) p_t(y|x) \right| dy \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \left(K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y \right)^T B(t)^{-2} (\partial_t B(t))^2 (I - B(t) C \nabla^2 h)^{-1} B(t)^{-1} \left(K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y \right) p_t(y|x) \right| dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

Applying the triangle inequality $|a + b + c|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq |a|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |b|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |c|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we obtain:

RHS of (24)

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \left(\partial_t K(t) B(t)^{-1} C^{-1} x \right)^T (I - B(t) C \nabla^2 h)^{-1} \partial_t K(t) x p_t(y|x) \right| dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| - \left(2\partial_t K(t) B(t)^{-1} (\sqrt{C})^{-1} \partial_t B(t) x \right)^T (I - B(t) C \nabla^2 h)^{-1} \left((K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y) B(t)^{-1} \right) p_t(y|x) \right| dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \left(K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y \right)^T B(t)^{-2} (\partial_t B(t))^2 (I - B(t) C \nabla^2 h)^{-1} B(t)^{-1} \left(K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y \right) p_t(y|x) \right| dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &:= R_1 + R_2 + R_3, \end{aligned}$$

By a straightforward estimation,

$$R_1 \leq |\partial_t K(t)| \|\sqrt{C}^{-1}\| \sqrt{\|B(t)\|^{-1}} \sqrt{(1 - \|B(t)\| \|C\nabla^2 h\|)^{-1}} |x|.$$

It follows from integration by parts that

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} x - y \right) B(t)^{-1} p_t(y|x) dy = - \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_y G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy} \leq |\sqrt{C} \nabla h|_\infty,$$

which immediately implies

$$R_2 = \left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| (-2\partial_t K(t)(\sqrt{C})^{-1} x B(t)^{-1} \partial_t B(t) (I - B(t) C \nabla^2 h)^{-1} \nabla_y G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) \right| dy}{\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(t, x, y) \exp(h(\sqrt{C}y)) dy \right|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq \sqrt{2\|\partial_t K(t)\|\|\partial_t B(t)\|\|\nabla h\|_\infty} \sqrt{\|B(t)\|^{-1}} \sqrt{(1 - \|B(t)\|\|C\nabla^2 h\|)^{-1}} \sqrt{|x|}.$$

Similarly, applying integration by parts twice, we obtain

$$R_3 \leq \|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{\|C(\|\nabla h\|_\infty^2 + \|\nabla^2 h\|_\infty)\|} \sqrt{\|B(t)^{-1}\|} \sqrt{(1 - \|B(t)\|\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty)^{-1}} \\ + \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|B(t)^{-1}\| \sqrt{(1 - \|B(t)\|\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty)^{-1}}.$$

Then we have

$$\text{RHS of (24)} \\ \leq \sqrt{|\partial_t K(t)x|^2 \|C\|^{-1} + 2\|\partial_t K(t)\|\|\partial_t B(t)\|\|\nabla h\|_\infty |x| + \|\partial_t B(t)\|^2 (\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2)} \\ \cdot \sqrt{(\|B(t)\|(1 - \|B(t)\|\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty))^{-1} + \|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{(\|B(t)\|^2 (1 - \|B(t)\|\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty))^{-1}}}.$$

Combining with

$$\sqrt{\text{Var}(\nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y))} \leq \|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty \|\sqrt{B(t)}\| \sqrt{(1 - \|B(t)\|\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty)^{-1}},$$

we derive that

$$|I_2| \leq K \|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty (1 - \|B(t)\|\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty)^{-1} \left(|\partial_t K(t)x| + \sqrt{2\|\partial_t K(t)\|\|\partial_t B(t)\|\|C\nabla h\|_\infty |x|} \right. \\ \left. + \|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2} \right) \\ + \|\sqrt{B(t)^{-1}}\| K \|\sqrt{C}\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty (1 - \|B(t)\|\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty)^{-1} \\ \leq 2K \|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty (|\partial_t K(t)x| + \sqrt{2\|\partial_t K(t)\|\|\partial_t B(t)\|\|\nabla h\|_\infty |x|}) \\ + \|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2} + 2K \|\sqrt{C}\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty \sqrt{\|B(t)^{-1}\|} \\ \leq 2K_1 C_1 |x| + 2\sqrt{2} K_1 \sqrt{K_0} \sqrt{C_1} \sqrt{C_2} \sqrt{|x|} + 2K_1^{\frac{3}{2}} C_2 + 2K_1 \|\sqrt{C}\| C_2 \sqrt{\|B(t)^{-1}\|} \\ \leq 3K_1 C_1 |x| + \frac{2K^{-1} K_1 \|\sqrt{C}\| C_2}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} + C_3,$$

where the second inequality use the fact $(1 - \|B(t)\|\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty)^{-1} \leq 2$ under Case I, while the last inequality is obtained using Young's inequality, C_1, C_2, C_3 are dimension-free constants defined in table 3.

Case II - $\|B(t)\| > \frac{1}{2\|C\nabla^2 h\|}$: According to the definition of variance

$$\text{Var}(g(t, x, y)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (g(t, x, y))^2 p_t(y|x) dy - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(t, x, y) p_t(y|x) dy \right)^2 \\ \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (g(t, x, y))^2 p_t(y|x) dy,$$

We have the following estimate, analogous to the right-hand side of (24):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{\text{Var}(g(t, x, y))} \\
& \leq \frac{\|\sqrt{B(t)^{-1}}\|}{2} \left(2\|\sqrt{C}^{-1}\| \|\partial_t K(t)x\| + 2\sqrt{3}\sqrt{\|\partial_t K(t)\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|\nabla h\|_\infty} |x| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sqrt{6}\|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2} \right) \\
& \quad + |\partial_t K(t)x| \sqrt{\|\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\nabla h\|_\infty^2} + \sqrt{\|\partial_t K(t)\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|\nabla h\|_\infty (\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2)} |x| \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{\|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty (\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2)} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\|\partial_t B(t)\| \|B(t)^{-1}\| \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{\|\nabla^2 h\|_\infty}{2}} \left(2\|\partial_t K(t)x\| + 2\sqrt{3}\sqrt{\|\partial_t K(t)\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|C\nabla h\|_\infty} |x| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sqrt{6}\|\sqrt{C}\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2} \right) \\
& \quad + |\partial_t K(t)x| \sqrt{\|\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\nabla h\|_\infty^2} + \sqrt{\|\partial_t K(t)\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|\nabla h\|_\infty (\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2)} |x| \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{\|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty (\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2)} + \sqrt{3}\|\partial_t B(t)\| \|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Together with

$$\sqrt{\text{Var}(\nabla_y h(\sqrt{C}y))} \leq \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2| & \leq K\|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty \left(|\partial_t K(t)x| (\sqrt{2\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty} + \sqrt{(\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2)}) \right. \\
& \quad + \sqrt{6}\sqrt{\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty} \sqrt{\|\partial_t K(t)\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|C\nabla h\|_\infty} |x| \\
& \quad + \sqrt{\|\partial_t K(t)\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty (\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2)} |x| \\
& \quad + \sqrt{3}\|\sqrt{C}\| \sqrt{\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty} \|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2} \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2}\|\sqrt{C}\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \sqrt{\|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty (\|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{C}\nabla h\|_\infty^2)} + \sqrt{3}\|\sqrt{C}\| \|\partial_t B(t)\| \|C\nabla^2 h\|_\infty \right) \\
& \leq (1 + \sqrt{2})K_0\sqrt{K_1}C_1|x| + (1 + \sqrt{6})K_0^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{K_1}\sqrt{C_1}\sqrt{C_2}|\sqrt{x}| \\
& \quad + K_0C_2(2\sqrt{3}K_1 + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{K_0}\sqrt{K_1}) \\
& \leq 2(1 + \sqrt{2})K_0\sqrt{K_1}C_1|x| + C_4,
\end{aligned}$$

where C_4 defined in table 3 is also constant independent of dimension.

Combining the above two cases, we obtain

$$|I_2| \leq \max\{3K_1C_1, 2(1 + \sqrt{2})K_0\sqrt{K_1}C_1\}|x| + \frac{2K^{-1}K_1\|\sqrt{C}\|C_2}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} + \max\{C_3, C_4\}. \quad (26)$$

Using (22), (23) and (26), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_1| & \leq |I_1| + |I_2| \\
& \leq K_0K_3K^{-1} + \max\{3K_1C_1, 2(1 + \sqrt{2})K_0\sqrt{K_1}C_1\}|x| + \frac{2K_1K^{-1}\|\sqrt{C}\|C_2}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} + \max\{C_3, C_4\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The next step is to calculate the absolute value of the second term of (21), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_2| &= \left| \frac{-C\partial_t(\bar{A}_t^{-1})xt + (I - C\bar{A}_t^{-1})x}{t^2} \right| \\
&\leq \|2C(A - C)((At^2 + C(1 - t^2))^2)^{-1}\| |x| + K_2|x| \\
&\leq (K_4 + K_2)|x|.
\end{aligned}$$

where $K_4 := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left\| \frac{C\partial_t(\bar{A}_t^{-1})}{t} \right\| = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|2C(A - C)((At^2 + C(1 - t^2))^2)^{-1}\|$.
It then follows from (21) that

$$|\partial_t V(t, x)| \leq |A_1| + |A_2| \leq K_5|x| + \frac{K_6}{\sqrt{1 - t^2}} + K_7.$$

where $K_5 = \max\{3K_1C_1, 2(1 + \sqrt{2})K_0\sqrt{K_1}C_1\} + K_2 + K_4$, $K_6 = 2K_1K^{-1}\|\sqrt{C}\|C_2$, $K_7 = \max\{C_3, C_4\} + K_0K_3K^{-1}$.

When $t = 0$, by (13) in the subsequently stated well-posedness Lemma 3.10, we have

$$|V(0, x)| = \left| \sqrt{C}\mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0}[X] \right| \lesssim K\|C\|^{1/2} \left| \sqrt{C}\nabla h \right|_\infty = K_0.$$

Similarly, $\|\nabla V(0, \cdot)\|_\infty$ is also bounded by $K_1 + K_2$. Then we conclude that the velocity field $V(t, x)$ satisfied the condition of Theorem 3.8 for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

For clarity, the coefficients are summarized in Table 3. In corollary 3.18, we take $C = I_d$, $A = (1 - (1 -$

Table 3: Explicit for coefficients in Thm. 3.8 and Thm. 3.15.

Coefficient	Explicit expressions
\bar{A}_t	$At^2 + C(1 - t^2)$
$K(t)$	$(A\bar{A}_t^{-1})t$
$B(t)$	$(A\bar{A}_t^{-1})(1 - t^2)$
K	$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} A\bar{A}_t^{-1} \leq \max\{1, \ AC^{-1}\ \}$
K_0	$K\ C\ ^{1/2} \sqrt{C}\nabla h _\infty$
K_1	$K^2(\ C\nabla^2 h\ _\infty + \sqrt{C}\nabla h _\infty^2)$
K_2	$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left\ \frac{1}{t^2}(I - C\bar{A}_t^{-1}) \right\ = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \ (A - C)(At^2 + C(1 - t^2))^{-1}\ $
K_3	$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left\ \frac{A\partial_t(\bar{A}_t^{-1})}{t} \right\ = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \ 2A(A - C)((At^2 + C(1 - t^2))^2)^{-1}\ $
K_4	$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left\ \frac{C\partial_t(\bar{A}_t^{-1})}{t} \right\ = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \ 2C(A - C)((At^2 + C(1 - t^2))^2)^{-1}\ $
K_5	$\max\{3K_1C_1, 2(1 + \sqrt{2})K_0\sqrt{K_1}C_1\} + K_2 + K_4$
K_6	$2K_1K^{-1}\ C\ ^{\frac{1}{2}}C_2$
K_7	$\max\{C_3, C_4\} + K_0K_3K^{-1}$
K_9	$\frac{1}{4}K_6\pi + K_7$
C_1	$\max_{t \in [\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{2\ C\ \ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty}}, 1)} \{\partial_t K(t)\} = \max\left\{ \frac{\ A\ (\ (A - C)(1 - \frac{1}{2\ C\ \ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty}) - C\)}{(\ C\ + \ (A - C)(1 - \frac{1}{2\ C\ \ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty})\)^2}, \frac{\ A - 2C\ }{\ A\ }, \frac{\ A\ }{8\ C\ } \right\}$
C_2	$\max_{t \in [\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{2\ C\ \ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty}}, 1)} \{\partial_t B(t)\} = \max\left\{ 2, \frac{2\ A\ ^2 \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{2\ C\ \ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty}}}{(\ C\ + \ (A - C)(1 - \frac{1}{2\ C\ \ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty})\)^2}, \frac{9A^2}{8\ C\ ^2} \sqrt{\frac{\ C\ }{3\ A - C\ }} \right\}$
C_3	$2K_1C_2(K_1^{\frac{1}{2}} + K_0)$
C_4	$2\sqrt{3}K_0K_1C_2 + \frac{1}{2}K_0^{\frac{3}{2}}K_1^{\frac{1}{2}}C_2 + \frac{(1 + \sqrt{6})^2}{4(1 + \sqrt{2})}K_0^2K_1^{\frac{1}{2}}C_2$

$\delta)^2I_d$, $\bar{A}_t = (1 - t^2)I_d$. According to (16), we deduce the explicit for coefficients $K_0^*, K_1^*, K_2^*, K_3^*, K_4^*, K_5^*, K_6^*, K_7^*, K_9^*$ in Table 4. \square

Table 4: Explicit for coefficients in Cor. 3.18, and Thm. 3.19.

Coefficient	Explicit expressions
\bar{A}_t	$(1 - t^2)I_d$
K_0^*	$\frac{R}{1 - (1 - \delta)^2}$
K_1^*	$3 \left(\frac{R}{1 - (1 - \delta)^2} \right)^2$
K_2^*	$\sup_{t \leq 1 - \delta} \left\ \frac{1}{t^2} (I - \bar{A}_t^{-1}) \right\ = \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \delta)^2}$
K_3^*	$\frac{2}{1 - (1 - \delta)^2}$
K_4^*	$\frac{2}{(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^2}$
K_5^*	$\frac{9C_1^* R^2}{(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^2} + \frac{2}{(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^2} + \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \delta)^2}$
K_6^*	$\frac{6C_2^* R^2}{(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^2}$
K_7^*	$6(\sqrt{3} + 1) \left(\frac{R}{1 - (1 - \delta)^2} \right)^3 C_2^* + \frac{2R}{(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^2}$
K_9^*	$\frac{3\pi}{2} \frac{C_2^* R^2}{(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^2} + 6(\sqrt{3} + 1) \frac{C_2^* R^3}{(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^3} + \frac{2R}{(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^2}.$
C_1^*	$\max \left\{ \frac{(1 - (1 - \delta)^2) \left\ (1 - \delta)^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty} \right) - 1 \right\ }{\ 1 + (1 - \delta)^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty} \right)\ ^2}, \frac{\ (1 - \delta)^2 - 1\ }{\ 1 - (1 - \delta)^2\ }, \frac{\ 1 - (1 - \delta)^2\ }{8} \right\},$
C_2^*	$\max \left\{ 2, \frac{2(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\ 1 + (1 - \delta)^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\ \nabla^2 h\ _\infty} \right)\ ^2}, \frac{9(1 - (1 - \delta)^2)^2}{8\sqrt{3}(1 - \delta)} \right\},$

B.3 Proof of Lemma 3.10

Proof. First, we prove the velocity field $V(t, x)$ is well-defined at $t = 0$ ((13) in Lemma 3.10), i.e.

$$V(0, x) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} V(t, x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{x + S(t, x)}{t} = \sqrt{C} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0}[X].$$

Let $t \rightarrow 0$, then it yields

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} V(t, x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \partial_t S(t, x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{C \nabla(\partial_t p_t(x))}{p_t(x)} - \frac{\partial_t p_t(x)}{p_t(x)} S(t, x) \right\}.$$

By simple calculation, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\nabla(\partial_t p_t(x))}{p_t(x)} \\ &= -\partial_t (\det B(t)) (2 \det B(t))^{-1} d \left(-K(t)^T K(t) (CB(t))^{-1} - \bar{A}_t^{-1} \right) (x^T x) x \\ & \quad - \partial_t B(t) (2B(t))^{-1} K(t) (\sqrt{C} B(t))^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y p(1, y|t, x) dy \\ & \quad + \left(-K(t) \partial_t K(t) (CB(t))^{-1} - K(t)^T K(t) \partial_t (B(t)^{-1}) (2CB(t))^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_t (\bar{A}_t^{-1}) \right) \\ & \quad \cdot \left(2x + \left(-K(t)^T K(t) (CB(t))^{-1} - \bar{A}_t^{-1} \right) (x^T x) x \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2K(t) (\sqrt{C} B(t))^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (x^T y) x p(1, y|t, x) dy \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(\partial_t K(t) (\sqrt{C} B(t))^{-1} + K(t) \partial_t (B(t)^{-1}) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} \right) \\
& \cdot \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(y + K(t) (\sqrt{C} B(t))^{-1} (x^T y) y \right) p(1, y|t, x) dy \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(-K(t)^T K(t) (CB(t))^{-1} - \bar{A}_t^{-1} \right) (x^T y) x p(1, y|t, x) dy \right) \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \partial_t (B(t)^{-1}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\left(-K(t)^T K(t) (CB(t))^{-1} - \bar{A}_t^{-1} \right) (y^T y) x \right) p(1, y|t, x) dy \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \partial_t (B(t)^{-1}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(t) (\sqrt{C} B(t))^{-1} (y^T y) y p(1, y|t, x) dy,
\end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial_t p_t(x)}{p_t(x)} & = -\partial_t (\det B(t)) (2 \det B(t))^{-1} d \\
& + x^T \left(-K(t) \partial_t K(t) (CB(t))^{-1} - (2C)^{-1} K(t) K(t)^T \partial_t (B(t)^{-1}) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_t (\bar{A}_t^{-1}) \right) x \\
& + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} x^T \left(\partial_t K(t) (\sqrt{C} B(t))^{-1} + K(t) (\sqrt{C})^{-1} \partial_t (B(t)^{-1}) \right) y p(1, y|t, x) dy \\
& - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y^T \frac{1}{2} \partial_t (B(t)^{-1}) y p(1, y|t, x) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

From observing that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \partial_t (\det B(t)) = 0, \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \partial_t B(t) = 0, \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} K(t) = 0, \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \partial_t (\bar{A}_t^{-1}) = 0,$$

and Assumption 3.6, which ensures

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^3 p(1, y|t, x) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^3 \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} p(1, y|t, x) dy = \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0}[|X|^3] < +\infty,$$

we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial_t p_t(x)}{p_t(x)} S(t, x) = -\frac{x^\top x}{\sqrt{C}} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0}[X], \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{C \nabla(\partial_t p_t(x))}{p_t(x)} = \sqrt{C} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0}[X] - \frac{x^\top x}{\sqrt{C}} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0}[X].$$

Therefore, it yields $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} V(t, x) = \sqrt{C} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0}[X]$, which completes the proof of (13).

Next, together with the regularity of the velocity field (Theorem 3.8), the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem (Arzela, 1895) ensures the existence of a subsequence $\{V(t, x)_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that converges locally uniformly to $V(0, x)$, thereby guaranteeing the well-posedness of the ODE (8) on the entire time interval $t \in [0, 1]$. \square

B.4 Proof of Corollary 3.11

Proof. Recall the Föllmer flow (8) with $\|\nabla V(t, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq (K_1 + K_2)t$ in Theorem 3.8, by following the Proposition A.7 (Mikulincer & Shenfeld, 2023), we arrive at the following result,

$$\text{Lip}(\overleftarrow{X}_1(x)) \leq \|\nabla \overleftarrow{X}_1(x)\|_{op} \leq \exp \left(\int_0^1 (K_1 + K_2) s ds \right) \leq \exp \left(\frac{K_1 + K_2}{2} \right).$$

\square

B.5 Proof of Corollary 3.14

Proof. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]$ with $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$, Itô's formula gives

$$\frac{d|\overleftarrow{Y}_t(x) - \overleftarrow{Y}_t(y)|^2}{dt} = 2 \langle \overleftarrow{Y}_t(x) - \overleftarrow{Y}_t(y), \tilde{V}(t_n, \overleftarrow{Y}_{t_n}(x)) - \tilde{V}(t_n, \overleftarrow{Y}_{t_n}(y)) \rangle.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\frac{d|\bar{Y}_t(x) - \bar{Y}_t(y)|^2}{dt} \leq 2\sqrt{|\bar{Y}_t(x) - \bar{Y}_t(y)|^2} \sqrt{|\tilde{V}(t_n, \bar{Y}_{t_n}(x)) - \tilde{V}(t_n, \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y))|^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d|\bar{Y}_t(x) - \bar{Y}_t(y)|}{dt} &\leq |\tilde{V}(t_n, \bar{Y}_{t_n}(x)) - \tilde{V}(t_n, \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y))| \\ &\leq \nabla \tilde{V} |\bar{Y}_{t_n}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y)| \\ &\leq (K_1 + K_2 + K_8)t_n |\bar{Y}_{t_n}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y)|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Lipschitzness of \tilde{V} in Assumption 3.13. Integration over time yields

$$|\bar{Y}_{t_{n+1}}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_{n+1}}(y)| \leq |\bar{Y}_{t_n}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y)| + (t_{n+1} - t_n)(K_1 + K_2 + K_8)t_n |\bar{Y}_{t_n}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y)|.$$

Then, it follows that the Lipschitz constant of the discrete flow satisfies $\text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_n) \leq 1 + (t_{n+1} - t_n)(K_1 + K_2 + K_8)t_n$. Iterating this bound over all $n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$, we obtain the following estimate over the full interval $[0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{Y}_1(x) - \bar{Y}_1(y)| &\leq \left(\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_n) \right) |\bar{Y}_{t_0}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_0}(y)| \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2 + K_8}{2}\right) |x - y|. \end{aligned}$$

Then we complete the proof. \square

B.6 Proof of Theorem 3.15

Proof. Recall that Assumption 3.6, 3.7 ensure the well-podeness and Lipschitzness of Föllmer flow $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ in (8), with

$$\text{Lip}(T_n) \leq \exp\left(\int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} (K_1 + K_2)t dt\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Lip}(T_j) \leq \exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2}{2}\right),$$

as established in Lemma 3.10 and Corollary 3.11.

Furthermore, Assumption 3.13 guarantees the Lipschitzness of learned discret Föllmer flow $(\bar{Y}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ in (10), with

$$\text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_n) \leq 1 + (t_{n+1} - t_n)(K_1 + K_2 + K_8)t_n \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_j) \leq \exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2 + K_8}{2}\right),$$

as shown in Corollary 3.14.

Therefore, it only remains to verify that the stepwise approximation error satisfies **Assumption 3.4**. To analyze the discretization error at each step, we recall the expression in (3):

$$T_n(\bar{X}_{t_n}) = \bar{X}_{t_{n+1}}.$$

Applying the vector-valued Taylor expansion of $\bar{X}_{t_{n+1}}$ over $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$, the remainder is defined by

$$R(t) := T_n(\bar{X}_{t_n}) - \bar{X}_{t_n} - hV(t_n, \bar{X}_{t_n}).$$

Under Assumption 3.6, we can derive the second moment bound by the forward diffusion process (6)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\bar{P}_t}|\vec{X}_t|^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\bar{P}_t}|\vec{X}_t - (1-t)\vec{X}_0|^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\bar{P}_t}|(1-t)\vec{X}_0|^2 \\ &\leq t(2-t)\text{Tr}(C) + (1-t)^2 M_2 \\ &\leq M_0.\end{aligned}$$

Then the expectation of the $R(t)$ is controlled by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|R(t)|^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}_{t_n} \sim \bar{P}_{t_n}} |T_n(\bar{X}_{t_n}) - \bar{X}_{t_n} - hV(t_n, \bar{X}_{t_n})|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{h^4}{4} \sup_{\tau \in (t_n, t_{n+1})} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}_\tau \sim \bar{P}_\tau} |\partial_\tau V(\tau, \bar{X}_\tau)|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{3h^4}{4} \left(K_5^2 M_0 + \frac{K_6^2}{1-t^2} + K_7^2 \right), \quad \forall t \in [0, 1),\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the bound on $|\partial_t V(t, x)|$ in Theorem 3.8, which gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}_\tau \sim \bar{P}_\tau} |\partial_\tau V(\tau, \bar{X}_\tau)|^2 \leq 3 \left(K_5^2 M_0 + \frac{K_6^2}{1-\tau^2} + K_7^2 \right).$$

Consequently, the local truncation error is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}_{t_n} \sim \bar{P}_{t_n}} |T_n(\bar{X}_{t_n}) - \tilde{T}_n(\bar{X}_{t_n})|^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}_{t_n} \sim \bar{P}_{t_n}} |\bar{X}_{t_n} + hV(t_n, \bar{X}_{t_n}) + R(t_n) - \bar{X}_{t_n} - h\tilde{V}(t_n, \bar{X}_{t_n})|^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{h^2 \mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}_{t_n} \sim \bar{P}_{t_n}} |V(t_n, \bar{X}_{t_n}) - \tilde{V}(t_n, \bar{X}_{t_n})|^2} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|R(t_n)|^2} \\ &\leq h \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left(K_5 \sqrt{M_0} + \frac{K_6}{\sqrt{1-t_n^2}} h + K_7 \right) h + \epsilon \right).\end{aligned}\tag{27}$$

The second inequality holds by the error between $\tilde{V}(t_n, x)$ and $V(t_n, x)$ stated in Assumption 3.12. This completes the verification of Assumption 3.4.

Now in Theorem 3.5, we employ coupling between $\bar{X}_0 \sim \bar{P}_1 = \gamma_C$ and $\bar{Y}_0 \sim \bar{Q}_0 = \gamma_C$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_2(\bar{P}_1, \bar{Q}_1) &\leq \exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2 + K_8}{2}\right) \mathcal{W}_2(\bar{P}_0, \bar{Q}_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{\exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2 + K_8}{2}\right) - 1}{((K_1 + K_2 + K_8)h)/2} \cdot h \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left(K_5 \sqrt{M_0} + K_7 \right) h + \epsilon \right) \\ &\quad + \exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2 + K_8}{2}\right) \frac{\sqrt{3}K_6\pi}{4} h \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2 + K_8}{2}\right) \left(\sqrt{3} \left(K_5 \sqrt{M_0} + K_9 \right) h + 2\epsilon \right).\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

where a straightforward calculation shows $\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{K_6}{\sqrt{1-t_n^2}} = \frac{K_6\pi}{2}$; Accordingly, set $K_9 := \frac{K_6\pi}{4} + K_7$. Noting that $\bar{P}_1 = \bar{P}_0$, we obtain the conclusion in (15). \square

B.7 Result under the relaxation of Assumption 3.13

Remark B.1 (Relaxation of Assumption 3.13). *Assumption 3.13 can be relaxed as follows. We only require that for all $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$,*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (t_{n+1} - t_n) \|\nabla \tilde{V}(t_n, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq B, \quad (29)$$

for some constant $B > 0$. Under this condition, the Lipschitz bound stated in Corollary 3.14 is refined to $\exp(B)$. Consequently, Theorem 3.15 remains valid with the product of Lipschitz coefficient $\prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_j)$, where the factor $\exp\left(\frac{K_1 + K_2 + K_8}{2}\right)$ is replaced throughout by $\exp(B)$.

Proof. Denote $\beta_n = \|\nabla \tilde{V}(t_n, \cdot)\|$, then

$$\frac{d|\bar{Y}_t(x) - \bar{Y}_t(y)|}{dt} \leq |\tilde{V}(t_n, \bar{Y}_{t_n}(x)) - \tilde{V}(t_n, \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y))| \leq \beta_n |\bar{Y}_{t_n}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y)|.$$

Integration over time yields

$$|\bar{Y}_{t_{n+1}}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_{n+1}}(y)| \leq |\bar{Y}_{t_n}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y)| + (t_{n+1} - t_n) \beta_n |\bar{Y}_{t_n}(x) - \bar{Y}_{t_n}(y)|,$$

yielding $\text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_n) \leq 1 + (t_{n+1} - t_n) \beta_n$. Recall (29), we obtain

$$\text{Lip}(\bar{Y}_1(x)) \leq \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_j) \leq \exp\left(\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (t_{n+1} - t_n) \beta_n\right) = \exp(B). \quad (30)$$

Subsequently, we analyze the impact of relaxing Assumption 3.13 on convergence. The preliminary estimate (27) still hold. Under the new Lipschitz coefficient $\text{Lip}(\tilde{T}_n) \leq 1 + (t_{n+1} - t_n) \beta_n$, equation (28) takes the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{W}_2(\bar{P}_1, \bar{Q}_1) \\ & \leq \exp(B) \mathcal{W}_2(\bar{P}_0, \bar{Q}_0) + \frac{\exp(B)}{h} \cdot h \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} (K_5 \sqrt{M_0} + K_7) h + \epsilon \right) + \exp(B) \frac{\sqrt{3} K_6 \pi}{4} h \\ & \leq \exp(B) \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} (K_5 \sqrt{M_0} + K_9) h + \epsilon \right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where K_5 and K_9 are same with Theorem 3.15. \square

B.8 Proof of convergence theory of 1-rectified flow

Proof. The forward process in the first-step rectification (Liu et al., 2023; Rout et al., 2024), constructed by independently coupling the data with a standard Gaussian reference distribution, is defined by the interpolation $\hat{X}_t = \hat{\alpha}_t \hat{X}_1 + \hat{\beta}_t \mathcal{N}$ with $\hat{\alpha}_t = 1 - t, \hat{\beta}_t = t$. Then the transition probability distribution from \hat{X}_0 to \hat{X}_t is given by

$$\hat{X}_t | \hat{X}_1 = x_1 \sim \mathcal{N}((1-t)x_1, tI_d). \quad (32)$$

Under the Gaussian tail Assumption 3.7, the score function can be calculated by

$$\hat{S}(t, x) := \nabla \log \hat{p}_t = \nabla \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(2\pi \det(\hat{B}(t)) \right)^{-\frac{d}{2}} G(t, x, y) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{|x|_{\hat{A}_t}}{2}\right) \exp(h(y)) \, dy,$$

where $G(t, x, y) := \exp\left(-\frac{|\hat{K}(t)x - y|_{\hat{B}(t)}^2}{2}\right)$, $\hat{A}_t = At^2 + (1-t)^2 I_d$, $\hat{K}(t) = (A\hat{A}_t^{-1})t$, $\hat{B}(t) = (A\hat{A}_t^{-1})(1-t)^2$.

First, we consider the modified score function:

$$\tilde{\hat{S}}(t, x) := \hat{S}(t, x) + \hat{A}_t^{-1} x \leq |\hat{K}(t) \nabla h(x)|.$$

Let $\hat{K} = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\frac{1}{t} \hat{K}(t)| = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |A \hat{A}_t^{-1}| \leq 1 + \|A\|$, then we have

$$|\tilde{S}(t, \cdot)|_\infty \leq \hat{K} |\nabla h|_\infty t = \hat{K}_0 t$$

with $\hat{K}_0 := \hat{K} |\nabla h|_\infty$.

Taking the derivative twice along that direction and using the same method as above, it yields

$$\|\nabla \tilde{S}(t, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \hat{K}(t)^2 (\|\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + |\nabla h|_\infty^2) = \hat{K}_1 t^2,$$

where $\hat{K}_1 := \hat{K}^2 (\|\nabla^2 h\|_\infty + |\nabla h|_\infty^2)$. Define $\hat{K}_2 := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|\frac{1}{t} (I_d - (1-t)\hat{A}_t^{-1})\| = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|(A + C - I_d)(At^2 + (1-t)^2 I_d)^{-1}\|$, we obtain

$$|\hat{V}(t, x)| := \left| \frac{x + (1-t)\hat{S}(t, \cdot)}{t} \right| = \left| \frac{(1-t)\tilde{S}(t, \cdot) + (I_d - (1-t)\hat{A}_t^{-1})x}{t} \right| \leq \hat{K}_0 + \hat{K}_2 |x|,$$

and

$$\|\nabla \hat{V}(t, x)\|_\infty = \left\| \nabla \left(\frac{(1-t)\tilde{S}(t, \cdot) + (I_d - (1-t)\hat{A}_t^{-1})x}{t} \right) \right\|_\infty \leq \hat{K}_1 t + \hat{K}_2.$$

Similar to the proof of $|\partial_t V|$ of Föllmer flow in Appendix B.2, we derive

$$|\partial_t \hat{V}(t, x)| \leq \hat{K}_5 |x| + \frac{\hat{K}_6}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} + \hat{K}_7.$$

where \hat{K}_5, \hat{K}_6 and \hat{K}_7 are dimension-free constants. This completes the argument that the trajectory \hat{X}_t of 1-rectified flow possesses the similar regularity properties for its velocity field as those established in Theorem 3.8. Consequently, by following the proof steps of Theorem 3.15 in Appendix B.6, the desired result directly follows. \square

C Relation to Prob ODE

The probabilistic ODE (Prob ODE) (Song et al., 2021; Gao & Zhu, 2025)

$$\frac{d\hat{X}_s}{ds} = -(\hat{X}_s - \nabla \log \hat{p}_s(\hat{X}_s)), \quad s \in [T, 0], \quad (33)$$

can be viewed as a time-rescaled Föllmer flow, via $s \mapsto \ln(\frac{1}{t})$, where T is finite time. Since Lipschitzness of the transport maps are invariant under time rescaling, the results of Corollary 3.16 apply directly to the (33). The discretization can be chosen as

$$s_n = \ln\left(\frac{1}{t_n}\right), \quad n = 1, \dots, N.$$

In the forward Prob ODE, the distribution approaches Gaussian only as $s \rightarrow +\infty$. To realize this limit in practice, we set $s_0 = +\infty$ and initialize the dynamics with $\hat{X}_{s_0} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$, and take $T = s_1 = \ln(\frac{1}{t_1})$ with $\hat{X}_{s_1} = \hat{X}_{s_0} + t_1 \sqrt{C} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{p}_0}[X]$, which corresponds to a single-step first-order Euler method. For n -step ($n \geq 2$), the update $\hat{X}_{s_n} = \hat{X}_{s_{n-1}} + (e^{s_{n-1}-s_n} - 1) \left(S_\theta(e^{-s_{n-1}}, \hat{X}_{s_{n-1}}) + \hat{X}_{s_{n-1}} \right)$ follows the exponential Euler scheme. The result of Corollary 3.16 indicates that our method improves the computational complexity of the Prob ODE, whereas Wang & Wang (2024) shows $N = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{M_0}{\epsilon_0^2} \left(\log \frac{M_2 + \text{Tr}(C)}{\epsilon_0^2}\right)^3\right)$ under the same setting.

D Convergence in the Bayesian Inverse problems

We are aware of several posterior analyses, such as Bayesian inverse problems (van de Schoot et al., 2021), used in uncertainty quantification to infer model parameters x from observations $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The posterior typically takes the form of

$$\bar{p}_0(x) = D_0 \exp\left(-\frac{|x|_C^2}{2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{|G(x) - y|_\Sigma^2}{2}\right), \quad (34)$$

where D_0 is a normalizing constant, C denotes the covariance matrix of the Gaussian prior, Σ represents the covariance of the observational noise and $G \in C_2^b(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is a nonlinear forward operator. In our training framework, we adopt the Gaussian prior with covariance C from (34) as the invariant measure of the forward diffusion process (6). The conditioned score (Batzolis et al., 2021) in the score matching is trained by minimizing

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_t(x;y)} \left| \tilde{s}(1-t, x; y) - C \nabla_x \log \bar{p}_t(x; y) \right|^2,$$

where \bar{p}_t denotes the joint law of (X_t, Y) with $Y = G(X_0) + \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. For ODE-based generation of the posterior distribution with observation y , we impose the following assumption on the approximation error of the velocity field $V(t, x; y)$ given in (8).

Assumption D.1. *Fixing observation y , for each time discretization point t_n ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\vec{P}_{1-t_n}; y} |V(t_n, x; y) - \tilde{V}(t_n, x; y)|^2 \leq \epsilon^2.$$

Theorem D.2. *Suppose third moment Assumption 3.6, accuracy Assumption D.1 and regularity Assumption 3.13 hold. Using the Euler method to the Föllmer flow with uniform step size $h = t_{n+1} - t_n \leq 1$ yields,*

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\vec{P}_0(\cdot, y), \vec{Q}_1(\cdot, y)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\tilde{K}_1 + K_8}{2}\right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{N} (\tilde{K}_5 \sqrt{M_0} + \tilde{K}_9) + 2\epsilon\right). \quad (35)$$

where $\tilde{K}_1, \tilde{K}_5, \tilde{K}_9$ are dimension-free constants depending on $(\|C\|, \|\Sigma\|, G, y)$, see Table 5, and the constant K_8 is defined in Assumption 3.13.

Proof. Take $A = C$, and $h(x) = -\frac{|G(x) - y|_\Sigma^2}{2}$, then $h(x)$ satisfies,

$$\begin{aligned} |\sqrt{C} \nabla h(x)| &= |\sqrt{C} \nabla G(x) \Sigma^{-1} (G(x) - y)| \leq \|C\|^{\frac{1}{2}} (|G|_\infty + |y|) \|\Sigma^{-1}\| \|\nabla G\|_\infty, \\ \|C \nabla^2 h(x)\| &= \|C \nabla^2 G(x) \Sigma^{-1} (G(x) - y) + C \nabla G(x) \Sigma^{-1} \nabla G(x)^T\| \\ &\leq \|C\| \|\Sigma\|^{-1} \|\nabla^2 G\|_\infty (|G|_\infty + |y| \|\nabla G\|_\infty^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then by Theorem 3.15, we obtain the bound (35) with the constants replaced as specified in Table 5. \square

Remark D.3. *With fixed \tilde{K}_1, \tilde{K}_5 and \tilde{K}_9 , for ϵ_0 accuracy in W_2 distance for 35, one requires at most;*

$$N = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{M_0}}{\epsilon_0}\right), \quad \epsilon = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_0).$$

E Conclusion and future directions

We have established a rigorous pathway toward the optimal \sqrt{d} complexity bound for flow-based generative models under the Wasserstein metric. Our approach quantifies the temporal scaling of truncation errors and controls their accumulation through dimension-free Lipschitz estimates of the backward flow. We further verify this framework in the special case of the Föllmer flow and 1-rectified flow, where well-posedness and convergence hold under the Gaussian tail assumption. Such an assumption accommodates both regular and singular targets (with early stopping) and extends naturally to infinite-dimensional settings, with implications for Bayesian inverse problems.

Several directions merit further investigation:

Table 5: Explicit for coefficients in Thm. D.2.

Coefficient	Explicit expressions
\widetilde{K}_0	$\ C\ \ \Sigma^{-1}\ \ \nabla G\ _\infty (G _\infty + y)$
\widetilde{K}_1	$\ C\ \left(\ \Sigma^{-1}\ (\ \nabla G\ _\infty^2 + (G _\infty + y) \ \nabla^2 G\ _\infty) + \ \Sigma^{-2}\ \ \nabla G\ _\infty^2 (\ G\ _\infty + y)^2 \right)$
\widetilde{K}_5	$\max\{3\widetilde{K}_1, 2(1 + \sqrt{2})\widetilde{K}_0\widetilde{K}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\}$
\widetilde{K}_6	$4\ C\ ^{\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{K}_1$
\widetilde{K}_7	$\max\{\widetilde{C}_3, \widetilde{C}_4\}$
\widetilde{K}_9	$\ C\ ^{\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{K}_1\pi + \widetilde{K}_7$
\widetilde{C}_3	$4\widetilde{K}_1(\widetilde{K}_1^{\frac{1}{2}} + \widetilde{K}_0)$
\widetilde{C}_4	$4\sqrt{3}\widetilde{K}_0\widetilde{K}_1 + \widetilde{K}_0^{\frac{3}{2}}\widetilde{K}_1^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{(1+\sqrt{6})^2}{2(1+\sqrt{2})}\widetilde{K}_0^2\widetilde{K}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$

- Generalization of Gaussian tail. Weak log-concavity Bruno & Sabanis (2025); Gentiloni-Silveri & Ocello (2025) generalizes the Gaussian tail assumption, yet current results under this broader condition yield only $\mathcal{O}(d)$ complexity. Determining whether the $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ bound can persist in this broader assumption remains a central theoretical challenge.
- Higher-order integrators. Extending the error analysis to higher-order numerical schemes requires refined regularity assumptions on the velocity field, including higher-order time derivatives. Determining the minimal regularity required for higher-order Wasserstein convergence will be pursued in our subsequent work.
- Designing of learning objectives. Alternative training objectives, temporal reweighting strategies, and adaptive sampling schemes may significantly influence both the theoretical error bounds and the practical sampling performance. Understanding these effects in a principled manner will be an important direction of our future work.
- Step-size optimization. While the present analysis employs a uniform step size, designing optimal or adaptive step-size schedules-particularly in view of the singular behavior induced by the $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-t^2}}$ factor-will be a central direction of our forthcoming work.
- Data-driven Lipschitz estimation. Our Lipschitz bounds are derived as analytic upper bounds and are therefore conservative. Constructing posterior or data-driven estimators for the effective Lipschitz constants of the transport maps may yield significantly sharper Wasserstein error bounds and more realistic complexity estimates.

Addressing these questions will further clarify the structural requirements for optimal-complexity sampling and broaden the applicability of flow-based methods to high-dimensional and infinite-dimensional inference.