

CrystalGRW: Generative Modeling of Crystal Structures with Targeted Properties via Geodesic Random Walks

Krit Tangsongcharoen,^{1,2,*} Teerachote Pakornchote,^{3,†} Chayanon Atthapak,¹
 Natthaphon Choomphon-anomakhun,¹ Annop Ektarawong,^{1,4} Björn Alling,⁵
 Christopher Sutton,³ Thiti Bovornratanaraks,^{1,2,‡} and Thiparat Chotibut^{4,§}

¹*Extreme Conditions Physics Research Laboratory and Center of Excellence in Physics of Energy Materials (CE:PEM),
 Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand*

²*Thailand Center of Excellence in Physics, Ministry of Higher Education, Science,
 Research and Innovation, 328 Si Ayutthaya Road, Bangkok 10400, Thailand*

³*Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of South Carolina, South Carolina 29208, USA*

⁴*Chula Intelligent and Complex Systems Lab, Department of Physics,
 Faculty of Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand*

⁵*Theoretical Physics Division, Department of Physics,
 Chemistry and Biology (IFM), Linköping University, Linköping, SE-581 83 Sweden*

(Dated: January 16, 2025)

Determining whether a candidate crystalline material is thermodynamically stable depends on identifying its true ground-state structure, a central challenge in computational materials science. We introduce CrystalGRW, a diffusion-based generative model on Riemannian manifolds that proposes novel crystal configurations and can predict stable phases validated by density functional theory. The crystal properties, such as fractional coordinates, atomic types, and lattice matrices, are represented on suitable Riemannian manifolds, ensuring that new predictions generated through the diffusion process preserve the periodicity of crystal structures. We incorporate an equivariant graph neural network to also account for rotational and translational symmetries during the generation process. CrystalGRW demonstrates the ability to generate realistic crystal structures that are close to their ground states with accuracy comparable to existing models, while also enabling conditional control, such as specifying a desired crystallographic point group. These features help accelerate materials discovery and inverse design by offering stable, symmetry-consistent crystal candidates for experimental validation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Crystal structures, defined as the periodic arrangement of atoms in a lattice, directly influence material properties such as stability, band gap, and mechanical strength. Understanding and predicting the behavior of materials from the atomistic level relies on knowing accurate structures. The search for novel materials involves identifying crystal structures and their compositions that are thermodynamically metastable. However, this task is complicated by the vast number of degrees of freedom that must be explored to identify local minima on the free energy surface [1, 2].

Many advanced algorithms for sampling configurations on the potential energy surface have been developed for ground state structure prediction, these approaches typically combine (stochastic) samples technique such as evolutionary algorithms, *ab-initio* random structure searching, simulated annealing, metadynamics, basin hopping, and molecular dynamics simulations [2–8], with quantum mechanics-based method, such as density functional the-

ory (DFT) to accurately predict the energy of the sampled configurations. However, the cubic scaling with respect to the number of basis functions in DFT leads to a substantial computational time for searching for new candidate materials. Machine-learned interatomic potentials (MLIPs) are an accurate and efficient alternative to DFT [9–16], and therefore can speed up the prediction process. Nonetheless, improving the structure generation task remains an important challenge for materials discovery.

Instead of the traditional approach of starting from an initial structure and performing sampling to find new (possibly lower energy) structures, generative models enable a direct and much more efficient way to produce novel molecular and crystal structures because they can sample new materials given knowledge from the learned data distribution without being constrained by energy barriers [17–27]. Diffusion-based generative models draw principles from non-equilibrium thermodynamics to transform random noise into structured data [28–31]. These models generate samples through stochastic differential equations (SDEs) that consist of data-dependent drift and diffusion terms. The Brownian motion component introduces stochastic noise, enabling the generation of new crystal structures [29]. Recent works show that properly designed diffusion models can generate crystal structures with realistic characteristics, such as atoms do not overlap, lattice parameters are rea-

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

† These authors contributed equally to this work.; Correspondence to: pakornct@mailbox.sc.edu

‡ Correspondence to: thiti.b@chula.ac.th

§ Email: thiparatc@gmail.com

sonable, and crystallographic symmetries are imposed [21, 22].

Moreover, materials discovery focuses not only on generating new structures but also on their properties. For subsequent property prediction, the candidate structures produced from generative approaches tend to closely resemble the DFT-optimized structures (similar to performing a structure relaxation with MLIPs), thereby reducing the time required for subsequent DFT relaxations. Additionally, generative models can be applied for inverse design, where the generated materials are tailored to possess specific, controlled properties [27, 32–35].

To specify crystal structures, three properties are essential: fractional coordinates, atomic types, and lattice matrices. The first two properties reside in distinct non-Euclidean spaces, while the third property lies in Euclidean space. In particular, fractional coordinates lie on the 3D torus $\mathbb{T}^3 = [0, 1]^3$ (Appendix A 3), and atomic-type compositions lie on the d -dimensional simplex Δ^d , with $d \sim 100$ in many inorganic materials (Appendix A 4). Introducing naive stochastic noise can corrupt these properties by moving them outside their natural domains. This issue can be circumvented by introducing noise distributions that align with their domains, such as wrapped normal distributions for fractional coordinates and categorical distributions for atomic types [36, 37]. Models like DiffCSP [23] and MatterGen [27] employ these domain-aligned approaches to generate crystal properties, thereby improving crystal structure generation.

Instead of selecting specific noise distributions that align with the natural domains of the properties, Bortoli et al. [38] introduced the Riemannian Score-Based Generative Model (RSGM), which extends diffusion models to operate on Riemannian manifolds. In RSGM, data undergo random walks along geodesic paths on manifolds that appropriately represent the data’s natural domain, rather than diffusing strictly within Euclidean space. This framework enables the use of manifolds that accommodate non-Euclidean crystal properties, such as 3D torus for fractional coordinates and d -simplex for atomic types. Recent advances have further enhanced diffusion models on Riemannian manifolds. Riemannian flow matching [39] unifies diffusion and flow models within Riemannian manifolds, while FlowMM [25] leverages this approach using optimal transport-based distributions for crystal structure generation, thereby improving generation performance and accelerating the sampling process.

In this work, we introduce CrystalGRW, a generative model designed for crystal structure generation with specifiable target properties. CrystalGRW combines the Riemannian score-based generative model (RSGM) with EquiformerV2 [13], an equivariant graph neural network with an attention mechanism. The model generates three key properties of crystals: atomic coordinates, atomic types, and lattice parameters. We demonstrate that CrystalGRW can produce realistic crystal structures that are close to their ground states with accuracy compar-

able to existing models. Moreover, our model incorporates conditional control to specify properties of the generated structures using classifier-free guidance [40]. To illustrate this conditional control capability, we train CrystalGRW to generate structures with specific point groups as dictated by the input conditions, highlighting its potential for targeted materials discovery.

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. CrystalGRW

The crystal generative model aims to generate crystal properties $\mathbf{x} \in \{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{L}\}$ of N atoms in a unit cell where $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} = (\mathbf{r}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{r}^{(N)})$ are fractional coordinates of each atom, $\tilde{\mathbf{a}} = (\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(N)})$ are their atomic types, and \mathbf{L} is a lattice matrix. Similar to diffusion probabilistic models, we generate new data by reversing a diffusion process, wherein trained neural networks map noise distributions to structured data distributions. In this work, new crystals emerge through geodesic random walks on manifolds that capture each property: a 3D torus for fractional coordinates $\mathbf{r}^{(i)}$, a d -dimensional simplex Δ^d for atomic-type probabilities $\mathbf{a}^{(i)}$, and Euclidean space for the lattice matrix \mathbf{L} . See Section IV A and Appendix A for details.

Although atomic-type vectors naturally reside in Δ^d , directly performing random walks on the simplex can be cumbersome due to boundary conditions of its geometry. To circumvent this, we adopt a uniform-spacing *bijection* [41] that maps $\mathbf{a}^{(i)} \in \Delta^d$ to $\mathbf{A}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, d -dimensional hypercube. We then carry out the geodesic random walk on $\mathbf{A}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, where reflections at the boundary are straightforward (see Eq. (A11) and Appendix A 4), and finally map back to $\mathbf{a}^{(i)} \in \Delta^d$. This approach preserves the simplicity of a hypercube-based walk while respecting the simplex geometry of atomic types.

For denoising crystal properties in reverse diffusion, we employ EquiformerV2 [13], an *equivariant graph neural network* (GNN) that accounts for rotational and translational equivariance to effectively capture tensorial and vectorial quantities, e.g. atomic forces [12, 42–44]. Specifically, EquiformerV2 uses l -degree irreducible representations (irreps) of the SO(3) group [45]. Fractional coordinate denoiser is produced via an $l = 1$ output head that yields a 3D equivariant vector, while atomic type and lattice matrix denoisers come from $l = 0$ output heads providing 100- and 9-dimensional invariant features, respectively. Further details are given in Appendix B.

Fig. 1 illustrates training and sampling schemes of CrystalGRW. During training, crystal properties are corrupted using the geodesic random walk (GRW), as described in Algorithm 1. A distorted structure is then constructed from the corrupted properties and passed through the graph neural network to learn the score function. For crystal structure generation, the three crystal

properties are initially sampled from a random distribution and gradually denoised through a *reverse* GRW process, computed using the learned scores. When using the condition-guided scheme, specific conditions are embedded alongside the node features during both the training and generation processes.

B. Generating realistic structures

We use the MP-20 dataset, containing 45K training crystal structures with compounds of up to 10 elements and atomic numbers up to 94, acquired from the Materials Project database [46], to train and evaluate the model. We generated 10,062 structures where the number of atoms for each structure is sampled from a distribution the same as in the MP-20 training set (see Fig. 8(a)). CrystalGRW starts with random atomic positions, atomic types, and lattice matrices, and then iteratively denoises them through GRW for K steps until they approach candidate crystal structures using Algorithm 5.

Two criteria are used to evaluate whether generated structures are considered to be valid: 1) all interatomic distances be at least 0.5 Å (i.e., structural validity); 2) the total charge of the atoms be neutral [21] (i.e., compositional validity). Although these criteria are relatively loose, as noted in Ref. [21], they provide a useful sanity check for the model’s outcomes. For the 10,062 generated structures from CrystalGRW, all are structurally valid, while 85.40% have valid compositions (Table I). These results are in comparable to other models.

We further identify the symmetry of the generated structures using `SpacegroupAnalyzer` from `pymatgen` with symmetry criteria of `symprec = 0.1` and `angle = 1.0` [47, 48]. Fig. 2 compares the relative frequency of each point group in the MP-20 training set and the generated structures. CrystalGRW is able to generate both high-symmetry groups, such as $\bar{6}m$, $4/mmm$, $6/mmm$, $43m$, and $m\bar{3}m$, and lower-symmetry groups, like $2/m$ and $mm2$, in proportions similar to the MP-20 dataset. However, it produces low-symmetry structures excessively, such as 1 , $\bar{1}$, and m , while marginally generating structures in some symmetries, like mmm and groups with a 3-fold principal axis (trigonal lattice). Nonetheless, this result indicates that generated structures possess crystallographic symmetry upon creation.

TABLE I. Structural and composition validity for 10,062 structures generated from random noise using the models trained on the MP-20 dataset.

	Structural (%)	Composition (%)
CDVAE	100.00	86.70
DP-CDVAE	99.59	85.44
DiffCSP	100.00	83.25
FlowMM (500 steps)	96.86	83.24
CrystalGRW	100.00	85.40

C. Generating stable, unique, and novel structures

To present the performance of the generative models for crystalline materials, the generated structures should be stable, unique, and novel (S.U.N.) [27]. Firstly, the stability measures if a structure is experimentally synthesizable. In thermodynamics, materials typically evolve to the global minimum on the free energy landscape; however, they could be metastable by falling into local minima where the energy above the convex hull (E_{hull}) is defined at a certain temperature and pressure. Materials must be dynamically and mechanically stable as well [49]. Nevertheless, the materials here are considered to be stable if their E_{hull} are lower than 100 meV/atom after the DFT relaxations at 0 K and 0 GPa [27]. Secondly, uniqueness refers to a structure being distinct from other structures in the generation set. Lastly, the novelty is an evaluation of the number of generated structures that do not match the training set (see Appendix G).

Fig. 3(a) shows that approximately 75% of the generated structures (from 10^2 to 10^4 samples) are novel. Additionally, around 86% of 10^3 structures are unique, with this percentage decreasing to 66% for 10^4 samples. For the novelty, our model yields the similar number to MatterGen; however, almost all of MatterGen structures are unique. It is worth noting that MatterGen uses much larger dataset than ours where the MP-20 dataset is a subset of their combined dataset [27].

Moreover, we compute the E_{hull} using DFT (see section IV D) for 952 relaxed structures [50] sampled from 10062 generated structures. Fig. 3(b) illustrates distributions of the E_{hull} where 71% of the relaxed structures [50] have E_{hull} lower than 100 meV/atom, and when an anion correction is applied [51], 85.7% are stable. We find that S.U.N. rates are 52.8% and 56.5% with the anion correction, surpassing the other models using the MP-20 dataset [25, 27], whereas 33 S.U.N. structures are new ground-state configurations based on E_{hull} .

D. Generating ground state structures

One of the primary goals of generative models is to generate crystal structures that are close to DFT ground states. Ground state structures are in equilibrium under thermodynamic conditions (pressure 0 GPa and temperature 0 K for the MP-20 dataset) where the total force acting on every atom should be 0 eV/Å. However, investigating the equilibrium of every structure using DFT can be computationally expensive. Machine learning force fields (MLFFs) have demonstrated high accuracy in force predictions and interatomic potential calculations close to the DFT level, with significantly faster computation [9, 11, 52]. Thus, we employ SevenNet [10], a pretrained MLFF, to compute the total forces of all generated structures.

After obtained forces from the MLFF, we average magnitudes of the forces acting on each atom in the struc-




FIG. 1. **Overview of the CrystalGRW workflow.** (a) **Training scheme.** Starting from pristine crystal properties \mathbf{x}_0 , which include fractional coordinates $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0 \in (\mathbb{T}^3)^N$, atomic types $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_0 \in (\Delta^d)^N$, and a lattice matrix $\mathbf{L}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, the model applies noise via *forward* geodesic random walks on their respective manifolds, generating corrupted crystal properties \mathbf{x}_t at a time step t . Here N is the number of atoms in a unit cell. Then, an equivariant graph neural network (GNN) processes these corrupted properties to predict manifold-specific scores \mathbf{s}_θ (tangent vectors on each manifold), which are used to compute the training loss \mathcal{L}_θ . (b) **Sampling scheme.** Beginning from noisy crystal properties \mathbf{x}_t , the trained GNN computes the trained scores \mathbf{s}_θ associated with these inputs. Guided by these scores, a *reverse* geodesic random walk iteratively denoises \mathbf{x}_t until reaching \mathbf{x}_0 , which is the final crystal structure sample. Specific crystal-structure conditions \mathbf{c} can be added to the network during training and used to guide attributes (e.g., crystal symmetry) of the generated structures through a classifier-free guidance scheme. The 2D torus, 2-simplex (triangle), and 3D Euclidean space manifolds schematically depict the respective manifolds for fractional coordinates, atomic types, and the lattice matrix, serving only as a conceptual visualization rather than an actual representation of these higher-dimensional domains.

tures (F_{avg}). Fig. 4 shows that 98% of MP-20 training set, which is statistically significant, have $F_{\text{avg}} \leq 0.2$ eV/Å/atom while 25%, illustrated as the first peak of the distribution, have $F_{\text{avg}} \leq 0.01$ eV/Å/atom, whereas $F_{\text{avg}} > 0.01$ eV/Å/atom could be the error of the MLFF itself since the structures in the training set have been relaxed by the DFT. A previous study [53] shows that the number of metastable structures predicted using an MLFF model is significantly higher than that predicted

using DFT. This suggests that there is some level of uncertainty in the MLFF predictions compared to DFT. Therefore, we present our results based on these two criteria: $F_{\text{avg}} \leq 0.2$ eV/Å/atom and $F_{\text{avg}} \leq 0.01$ eV/Å/atom.

We compute the forces for 10,062 generated structures using the MLFF, finding that 30% of the samples have $F_{\text{avg}} \leq 0.01$ eV/Å/atom (see Fig. 4(a)) where about 1300 structures are novel and about 1700 structures are non-




FIG. 2. Relative frequency of 32 crystallographic point groups appearing in the MP-20 training (blue) and generated structures (pink). The point groups are sorted from low order (left) to high order (right) symmetry.




FIG. 3. (a) Percentage of generated structures that are novel (blue), unique (orange), and novel and unique (green) with respect to the number of samples. (b) Distribution of E_{hull} for novel and unique structures computed using the GGA/GGA+ U scheme with and without the anion correction. Vertical dash lines are at 0 and 0.1 eV/atom marking the energy on the convex hull and the stability criterion, respectively.

novel (see Fig. 4(b)). It is worth noting that the F_{avg} distributions for both novel and non-novel structures are similar. Nevertheless, the amount of samples that have $F_{\text{avg}} \leq 0.2$ eV/Å/atom is 57% which is fewer compared to 98% of the MP-20 dataset. These results indicate that

43% of the generated structures, which have $F_{\text{avg}} > 0.2$ eV/Å/atom, might not be close to ground state and can be screened out before passing to the DFT process.




FIG. 4. Distributions of average force predictions using MLFF in the unit of eV/Å/atom comparing (a) between the MP-20 dataset and the generation set and (b) between novel and non-novel structures in the generation set.

E. Generating structures with targeted properties

One advantage of the generative models is their ability to perform inverse design, generating structures with spe-

cific targeted properties. To achieve this, we implement the classifier-free guidance method [40], which enhances our model to sample crystal structures on given conditions. We demonstrate our model to control 32 crystallographic point groups of the output structures. However, the number of point groups in the dataset are unbalanced, so we create 7 classes, consisting of n_1, n_2, n_3 for three rotational axes, m_h, m_v, m_d for horizontal, vertical, and diagonal mirror planes, respectively, and i for an inversion, to represent each point group. Figs. 8(b-c) shows that the training set is more balanced when labeled by these 7 classes. We generate 128 structures for each point group, specifying 2 and 4 atoms per unit cell and guidance strength $w = 0.5$ [40]. Fig. 5 presents heat maps comparing the input (conditioned) point groups with the output (generated) point groups. Notably, entries below the diagonal indicate cases where the output symmetry is lower than the input symmetry, while entries above the diagonal indicate higher output symmetry relative to the input. For 2 atoms per unit cell, the generated structures match the input point groups for frequently occurring symmetries in the dataset, such as $m\bar{3}m$, $\bar{4}3m$, $3m$, and mmm . For 4 atoms per unit cell; however, the output point groups tend to exhibit lower symmetry than the input, except for $\bar{4}3m$ and $3m$. Some mispredictions, such as 432, $m\bar{3}$, and $\bar{6}$, occur in point groups that are either absent or infrequent in the dataset. However, the structures with input point groups like 6 and $\bar{6}$ still result in output point groups belonging to either the hexagonal or trigonal crystal systems. Since both systems share hexagonal conventional cells, these outcomes can be expected.

III. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we introduced CrystalGRW, a generative model leveraging diffusion on Riemannian manifolds and EquiformerV2 to produce crystal structures with desired properties. CrystalGRW generates stable, unique, and novel structures that are close to ground state, validated by MLFF and DFT calculations. Based on the S.U.N. criteria, CrystalGRW can outperform other current models. We also demonstrated that the properties of generated structures can be controlled by the input conditions, illustrated with the point groups, highlighting the potential to accelerate materials discovery by enabling inverse design through the property guidance.

IV. METHODS

A. Riemannian score-based generative model

We consider data $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, where \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian manifold that may be compact, such as a torus (for fractional coordinates) or a finite-volume hypercube (for




FIG. 5. Heat maps illustrate the input conditions, represented as the guiding point groups of output structures (vertical axis), versus the actual point groups of the generated structures (horizontal axis). The generated structures are constrained to contain 2 atoms per unit cell (top) and 4 atoms per unit cell (bottom). Black diagonal blocks indicate cases where the input and output point groups match, while orange diagonal blocks highlight instances where the input and output point groups have the same symmetry order. The color bar denotes the number of structures, ranging from 0 to 128.

atomic types), or non-compact Euclidean space (for lattice matrices). Our goal is to learn a generative model for \mathbf{x}_0 through a score-based diffusion process defined on \mathcal{M} . In the continuous-time limit, the forward noising mechanism can be viewed as an SDE on \mathcal{M} , whose reverse-time counterpart depends on the score $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_t} \log p_t(\mathbf{x}_t)$. In particular, one performs a forward (*noising*) diffusion phase that starts with real data \mathbf{x}_0 and evolves it over $[\eta, T]$ until it resembles a tractable noise distribution at $t = T$ where $\eta \approx 0$. Then, one applies a reverse (*sampling*) diffusion phase, beginning from that noise distribution at $t = T$ and integrating backward to yield new samples at

$t = 0$.

To implement these phases in discrete time, we employ a *geodesic random walk* (GRW) that updates \mathbf{x}_k along geodesics in \mathcal{M} , adding drift and noise within the tangent space.

Forward geodesic random walk (noising) Let $\gamma = T/K$ be the step size, with $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$ so that $t = k\gamma$. The forward update is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{k+1}^{\mathcal{M}} &= \gamma \mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_k, t) + \sqrt{\gamma} \sigma^{\mathcal{M}}(t) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k, \\ \mathbf{x}_{k+1} &= \exp_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{W}_{k+1}^{\mathcal{M}}), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ is an i.i.d. Gaussian in the tangent space $T_{\mathbf{x}_k} \mathcal{M}$, and the noise schedule $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}(t)$ specifies how the noise amplitude evolves with time (details in Appendix E). The exponential map $\exp_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{\mathcal{M}}$ displaces \mathbf{x}_k by the tangent vector $\mathbf{W}_{k+1}^{\mathcal{M}}$. A crucial choice is the manifold-dependent drift $\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

On *compact manifolds*, such as tori or closed hypercubes, we typically set $\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbf{0}$, which is sufficient to make the random walk become ergodic yielding the late-time noise distribution that approaches the uniform distribution.

On *non-compact* manifolds, the late-time density will converge to a Riemannian normal distribution [54] by choosing $\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{M}} = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} U(\mathbf{x})$ with the potential $U(\mathbf{x}) \propto d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})^2$, where $d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ is the geodesic distance and $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}$ is a mean location. The forward noising process then follows overdamped Langevin dynamics that eventually converges to the stationary density that is proportional to $e^{-U(\mathbf{x})}$. This Riemannian normal distribution reduces to the standard Gaussian distribution on \mathbb{R}^d when the geodesic distance becomes the usual Euclidean norm. In practice, we further simplify by ignoring $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} U(\mathbf{x})$ and setting $\mathbf{b}^{\mathbb{R}^d} = \mathbf{0}$ directly (as in a variance-exploding approach [31]) to ensure a wide final distribution. For this no-drift approximation, see Appendix Fb.

After K iterations of Eq. (1), the state \mathbf{x}_K approximates a tractable noise distribution: uniform on compact manifolds, or Gaussian-like on non-compact ones.

Reverse geodesic random walk (sampling) Reversing the forward process yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_k^{\mathcal{M}} &= \gamma \left[-\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, T-k\gamma) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\sigma^{\mathcal{M}})^2(T-k\gamma) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_{T-k\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \right] \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\gamma} \sigma^{\mathcal{M}}(T-k\gamma) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k, \\ \mathbf{x}_k &= \exp_{\mathbf{x}_{k+1}}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{W}_k^{\mathcal{M}}), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_t(\mathbf{x})$ is the *score* of the intermediate distribution p_t . Note that the sign of $\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{M}}$ switches in reverse time. We next discuss how to approximate $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_t$ with a learnable score function of each manifold $\mathbf{s}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, t) \approx \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_t(\mathbf{x})$.

Training via Riemannian score matching To train $\mathbf{s}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}}$, we adopt a Riemannian score-matching approach,

such as Varadhan’s asymptotic [38, 55], which gives a manifold-specific loss function

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{s}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_t, t) - \frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{x}_t}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_0) \right\|^2 \right]. \quad (3)$$

Here, one uniformly samples a random time $t \in [\eta, T]$, applies Eq. (1) up to that time t , and compares $\mathbf{s}_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$ to

$$\frac{1}{t} \mathbf{v}_t^{\mathcal{M}} \equiv \frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{x}_t}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_0), \quad (4)$$

the latter being the manifold-specific inverse exponential map from \mathbf{x}_t to \mathbf{x}_0 , whose analytical expressions for relevant manifolds are given in Appendix A.

We set $\eta = 10^{-6}$ rather than 0 for three key reasons. First, it prevents division by zero in the term $\frac{1}{t}$ and help avoid pathologically large gradients arising from Varadhan’s asymptotic near $t = 0$. Second, it ensures a non-trivial denoising task at the earliest time $t = \eta$ (instead of an identity mapping at $t = 0$). And lastly, it promotes stable training signals and faster convergence, as the model never sees fully uncorrupted data in its noised phase.

Variation on adaptive timesteps The RSGM algorithm [38] suggests that each diffusion step can be split into several smaller random-walk increments to enhance numerical stability. However, in our experiments, we find that training the model by performing only a single (final) random-walk update per diffusion step is both more computationally efficient and converges faster. Moreover, in reverse diffusion, generated crystal structures become more realistic by using an adaptive timestep ($\gamma \propto k^5$) for sampling like in previous studies such as in [56] and [57]. See the details in Algorithm 3 and Appendix F.

B. Implementation in CrystalGRW

In our *CrystalGRW* implementation, we let $\mathbf{x} = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{L})$ reside on three distinct manifolds ($(\mathbb{T}^3)^N$, $(\mathbb{C}^d)^N$, $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$), reflecting the natural domains of fractional coordinates, atomic types, and lattice parameters, respectively. We define a manifold-specific drift $\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ that vanishes on the compact manifolds but equals $-\frac{1}{2} \nabla U$ for the Euclidean one, and train an equivariant graph neural network \mathbf{s}_{θ} (EquiformerV2 [13]) which provides separate outputs for each manifold slice. To learn the score function jointly across all manifolds, we minimize the total loss

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta} = \lambda_{\mathbb{T}^3} \mathcal{L}_{\theta}^{\mathbb{T}^3} + \lambda_{\mathbb{C}^d} \mathcal{L}_{\theta}^{\mathbb{C}^d} + \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \mathcal{L}_{\theta}^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}},$$

where each term follows the Riemannian score-matching objective in Eq. (3) and each $\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a hyperparameter that weights the contribution of the loss on each manifold. However, for the finite hypercube manifold describing atomic types, we find it both more efficient and more accurate to train an estimator network in place of a direct score predictor; details of this atomic-type denoising

approach appear in Appendix C. Appendix B details the equivariant network architecture, and Algorithm 2 provides the step-by-step training procedure.

After completing the training procedure, we sample from the trained generative model by first drawing a final noisy state \mathbf{x}_K from either a uniform prior (if the manifold is compact) or a Gaussian prior (if it is Euclidean). We then run the reverse geodesic random walk in Eq. (2), using the learned score \mathbf{s}_θ , to generate a new sample \mathbf{x}_0 . The complete procedure is detailed in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm modifications A key challenge lies in generating atomic types. As discussed in Appendix C, our experiments revealed that using Algorithms 2 and 3 to generate atomic types, particularly for perovskite compositions, resulted in suboptimal performance. To address this, we adapted the process by training atomic types against their ground truths, as outlined in Algorithm 4, and sampling them using Algorithm 5. Detailed discussions and methodologies are provided in Appendix C. All reported results in Figs. 2-4 are based on the modified Algorithms 4 and 5.

Condition guidance When conditional sampling is desired (e.g., for controlling point groups or compositions), we apply *classifier-free guidance* [40] in our manifold-aware pipeline. Let $\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{c})$ be the score for a condition \mathbf{c} , and let $\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x} | \emptyset)$ be the unconditional score (i.e., with a null condition). We construct a *condition-guided* score by combining a conditional prediction $\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{c})$ with an unconditional one $\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x} | \emptyset)$ as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\theta(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{c}) = (1 + w)\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{c}) - w\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x} | \emptyset), \quad (5)$$

where w is the guidance strength. During training, we randomly replace a fraction (e.g. 10%) of the conditional samples with a null condition \emptyset , obtained by zeroing out the condition vector. Thus, if the batch size is 10, about 1 sample per batch is trained with \emptyset while the others include the true condition \mathbf{c} . In sampling process, we interpolate between $\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{c})$ and $\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x} | \emptyset)$ according to w using Eq. (5), thereby controlling how strongly the generation is influenced by \mathbf{c} . This procedure naturally extends to our manifold setting by applying $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\theta$ in the reverse diffusion step Eq. (2), and ensures consistent conditional guidance across all manifold components.

C. Crystal graphs

Here we describe how $\mathbf{x} = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{L})$ and \mathbf{c} are integrated into inputs of graph neural networks. Since GNNs incorporate inductive biases via graph structures [58], we represent each crystal as a multigraph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. The node set \mathcal{V} includes both atom-centric features and positions, while the edge set \mathcal{E} captures interactions between pairs of atoms. In this multigraph setting, the same pair of nodes can be connected by multiple edges if different crystallographic directions link those atoms. Concretely,

ALGORITHM 1. Forward Geodesic Random Walk (Noising) for Multi-Manifold States

Require:

- $\mathbf{X}_0 = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0, \mathbf{L}_0)$, each on manifolds $(\mathbb{T}^3)^N, (\mathbb{C}^d)^N, \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ respectively
- Total steps K , final time T (hence $\gamma = T/K$)

- 1: **for** $k = 0$ to $K - 1$ **do**
- 2: $t = k\gamma$
- 3: Get drift coefficients

$$\left(\underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{(\mathbb{T}^3)^N}, \underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^N}, \underbrace{\mathbf{b}^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\approx \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \right) \leftarrow \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_k, t)$$

▷ See Appendix Fb for no drift approximation

- 4: Apply to all manifolds

$$\mathbf{W}_{k+1}^{\mathcal{M}} = \gamma \mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{M}} + \sqrt{\gamma} \sigma^{\mathcal{M}}(t) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k, \quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$$

▷ Specific parameterizations of $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}(t)$ in Appendix E

- 5: $(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_k, \mathbf{L}_k) \leftarrow \mathbf{X}_k$
- 6: Apply manifold-specific exponential maps

$$\mathbf{r}_{k+1}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{r}_k^{(i)}}^{\mathbb{T}^3}(\mathbf{W}_{k+1}^{\mathbb{T}^3, (i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{k+1}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{A}_k^{(i)}}^{\mathbb{C}^d}(\mathbf{W}_{k+1}^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{L}_{k+1} = \exp_{\mathbf{L}_k}^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}(\mathbf{W}_{k+1}^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}})$$

- 7: $\mathbf{X}_{k+1} = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{k+1}, \mathbf{L}_{k+1})$

8: **end for**

- 9: **return** $\mathbf{X}_K = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_K, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_K, \mathbf{L}_K)$
-

we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} &= \{(\mathbf{f}^{(i)}, \mathbf{r}'^{(i)}) \mid \mathbf{f}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N, \mathbf{r}'^{(i)} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{r}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^3\}, \\ \mathcal{E} &= \{\Delta \mathbf{r}'_{ji}^{(\mathbf{T})} \mid \Delta \mathbf{r}'_{ji}^{(\mathbf{T})} = \mathbf{r}'^{(j)} - \mathbf{r}'^{(i)} + \mathbf{T}; \mathbf{r}'^{(j)}, \mathbf{r}'^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^3\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{f}^{(i)}$ is a node attribute (e.g. atomic number derived from the atomic type $\mathbf{a}^{(i)}$), $\mathbf{r}'^{(i)}$ is the Cartesian position of atom i , \mathbf{T} is a translation vector, and N is the number of atoms in a unit cell. The lattice matrix $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ maps fractional coordinates $\mathbf{r}^{(i)}$ to $\mathbf{r}'^{(i)}$. Although some previous works represented \mathbf{L} in \mathbb{R}^6 [25, 27], we find that diffusing all nine elements of \mathbf{L} yields similar performance. For a detailed discussion of crystal graphs defined by Eq. (6), see Ref. [59].

For each node, we concatenate its node attributes (e.g. atomic numbers) with a time step t to reflect the diffusion stage. Empirically, appending the corrupted lattice variables to the node attributes further improve model performance. For the conditional generations, we similarly append condition vector embeddings \mathbf{c} (e.g. point groups) to these node features (see Fig. 1), thereby allowing the GNN to handle conditional guidance alongside the core crystal geometry.

ALGORITHM 2. *Training* Multi-Manifold Crystal Properties

Require:

- $\mathbf{x}_0 = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_0, \mathbf{L}_0)$, each on manifolds $(\mathbb{T}^3)^N, (\Delta^d)^N, \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ respectively

- Total steps K

- 1: $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0 = \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_0)$
- 2: $\mathbf{X}_0 = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0, \mathbf{L}_0)$
- 3: **repeat**
- 4: $t \sim \text{Uniform}(\eta, T)$
- 5: $(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t, \mathbf{L}_t) \leftarrow \text{GRW}(\mathbf{X}_0, K, t)$ ▷ Algorithm 1
- 6: Compute inverse exponential maps

$$\mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{T}^3, (i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)}}^{-1, \mathbb{T}^3}(\mathbf{r}_0^{(i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{A}_t^{(i)}}^{-1, \mathbb{C}^d}(\mathbf{A}_0^{(i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} = \exp_{\mathbf{L}_t}^{-1, \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}(\mathbf{L}_0)$$

- 7: $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_t = \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t)$
- 8: $\mathbf{x}_t = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_t, \mathbf{L}_t)$
- 9: $(\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}) \leftarrow \mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$
- 10: Compute the loss ▷ Varadhan’s asymptotic

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\theta &= \frac{\lambda_{\mathbb{T}^3}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3, (i)} - \mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{T}^3, (i)} / t \right\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{\lambda_{\mathbb{C}^d}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)} - \mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)} / t \right\|^2 \\ &+ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \left\| \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} - \mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} / t \right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

- 11: Take gradient descent step on $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_\theta$
 - 12: **until** converged
-

D. DFT setting

We evaluate energies and perform structural relaxations using density functional theory (DFT) [60, 61], adopting the projector augmented wave (PAW) method [62, 63] as implemented in the Vienna *Ab Initio* Simulation Package (VASP) [64, 65]. Our calculations follow the Materials Project workflow [66], including exchange-correlation functionals and setting a plane-wave energy cutoff of 520 eV and an energy convergence threshold of 10^{-5} eV. Brillouin zone sampling is achieved via Monkhorst-Pack k -point grids [67], maintaining a k -point density of 1000 k -points reciprocal per atom for different unit-cell sizes. We use the Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof (PBE) exchange-correlation functional for the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) [68] and the GGA with Hubbard U corrections (GGA+ U) [69, 70], where the spin polarization is enabled for the latter method. The fractional coordinates and lattice vectors of the structures are fully relaxed, with a force convergence threshold of 10^{-5} eV/Å during structural optimization.

To evaluate the thermodynamic stability [50, 71],

ALGORITHM 3. Reverse Geodesic Random Walk (*Sampling*) for Multi-Manifold States

Require: $N, K, T, \xi, \mathbf{s}_\theta$

- 1: $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_T = (\mathbf{r}_T^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{r}_T^{(N)}) \sim \text{Uniform}([0, 1])^{N \times 3}$
- 2: $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_T = (\mathbf{A}_T^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T^{(N)}) \sim \text{Uniform}([0, 1]^d)^N$
- 3: $\mathbf{L}_T \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \frac{h_f + h_0}{2} \mathbf{I})$ where $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$
- 4: $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_K = \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_K)$
- 5: $\mathbf{x}_K = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_K, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_K, \mathbf{L}_K)$
- 6: **for** $k = K$ to 1 **do**
- 7: $\gamma = (T/K)k^\xi$
- 8: $t = \gamma k$
- 9: $(\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}) \leftarrow \mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_k, t)$
- 10: Get drift coefficients

$$\left(\underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{(\mathbb{T}^3)^N}, \underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^N}, \underbrace{\mathbf{b}^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}}_{\approx \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \right) \leftarrow \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_k, t)$$

- 11: Apply to all manifolds

$$\mathbf{W}_{k-1}^{\mathcal{M}} = \gamma \left[-\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{M}} + (\sigma^{\mathcal{M}})^2(t) \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathcal{M}} \right] + \sqrt{\gamma} \sigma^{\mathcal{M}}(t) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k, \quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$$

- 12: $(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_k, \mathbf{L}_k) \leftarrow \mathbf{X}_k$
- 13: Apply manifold-specific exponential maps

$$\mathbf{r}_{k-1}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{r}_k^{(i)}}^{\mathbb{T}^3}(\mathbf{W}_{k-1}^{\mathbb{T}^3, (i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{k-1}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{A}_k^{(i)}}^{\mathbb{C}^d}(\mathbf{W}_{k-1}^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{L}_{k-1} = \exp_{\mathbf{L}_k}^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}(\mathbf{W}_{k-1}^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}})$$

- 14: $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{k-1} = \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{k-1})$
 - 15: $\mathbf{x}_{k-1} = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{k-1}, \mathbf{L}_{k-1})$
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: **return** $\mathbf{x}_0 = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_0, \mathbf{L}_0)$
-

we compute the E_{hull} using the GGA/GGA+ U mixing scheme and construct phase diagrams with PhaseDiagram tool from pymatgen [72, 73]. Additionally, we apply the anion correction scheme to address discrepancies in our GGA functionals treat electron localization between elements and solids. We assign atomic sites as cations for oxidation states above 0.25, anions for those below -0.25, and neutral otherwise using Bader charge analysis [74]. The anion correction is then applied to the compounds that have anions for specific species, listed in Ref. [51].

CODE AVAILABILITY

The code is available at <https://github.com/trachote/crystalgrw>.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

K.T. and T.B. acknowledge funding support from Thailand Science Research and Innovation Fund Chulalongkorn University (IND_FF_68_285_2300_072). T.C. and A.E. acknowledge the funding support from the NSRF via the Program Management Unit for Human Resources & Institutional Development, Research and Innovation [grant number B39G670016]. A.E. also gratefully acknowledges the supports from the Sci-Super X fund, Faculty of Science, Chulalongkorn University. B.A. acknowledges the financial support from the Swedish Research Council (VR) through Grant No. 2019-05403 and 2023-05194, and from the Swedish Government Strategic Research Area in Materials Science on Functional Materials at Linköping University (Faculty Grant SFO-MatLiU No. 2009-00971). T.P. and C.S. acknowledge the financial support from the Army Research Office and Air Force Office of Scientific Research (FA9550-23-1-0505). The authors acknowledge high performance computing resources including NVIDIA A100 GPUs from Chula Intelligent and Complex Systems Lab, Faculty of Science and from the Center for AI in Medicine (CU-AIM), Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand. The supporting computing infrastructure is provided by NSTDA, CU, CUAASC, NSRF via PMUB [B05F650021, B37G660013] (Thailand). URL:www.e-science.in.th. We also acknowledge the computing resource from the National Academic Infrastructure for Supercomputing in Sweden (NAISS) partially funded by the Swedish Research Council through grant agreement no. 2022-06725. This research used resources of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center (NERSC), a Department of Energy Office of Science User Facility, using the award GenAI@NERSC.

Appendix A: Manifolds for Fractional Coordinates, Atomic Types, and Lattice Matrices

In this appendix, we describe the manifold structures relevant to our crystal-geometry formulation. Throughout, let \mathcal{M} be a Riemannian manifold equipped with tangent bundles $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}$ at each point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$.

1. General definitions

Suppose $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}_1}\mathcal{M}$ is a tangent vector at $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathcal{M}$. Moving \mathbf{x}_1 along \mathbf{u} by a geodesic yields a new point

$$\mathbf{x}_2 = \exp_{\mathbf{x}_1}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{u}), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\exp_{\mathbf{x}_1}^{\mathcal{M}}$ is the exponential map. Conversely, if \mathbf{x}_2 is known, we can recover $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}_2}\mathcal{M}$ that points back toward \mathbf{x}_1 via

$$\mathbf{v} = \exp_{\mathbf{x}_2}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_1). \quad (\text{A2})$$

Below, we detail how these maps take concrete forms for the Euclidean manifold (for lattice matrices), the 3-dimensional torus (for fractional coordinates), and a hypercube (for atomic types).

2. Euclidean manifold $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ for lattice matrices

A lattice matrix \mathbf{L} lives in $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$. Consider the Euclidean manifold \mathbb{R}^d . The exponential map from a point \mathbf{x}_1 to \mathbf{x}_2 along a vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ simply becomes

$$\mathbf{x}_2 = \exp_{\mathbf{x}_1}^{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{u}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

and the corresponding inverse exponential map is

$$\mathbf{v} = \exp_{\mathbf{x}_2}^{-1, \mathbb{R}^d}(\mathbf{x}_1) = \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Because \mathbb{R}^d is flat, geodesics are just straight lines.

3. 3D torus \mathbb{T}^3 for fractional coordinates

Fractional coordinates of crystal lattices have an intrinsic periodicity, which we interpret as a 3D torus, \mathbb{T}^3 . In this compact manifold, one often wraps coordinates modulo 1 to enforce periodic boundaries. For an infinitesimal tangent vector \mathbf{u} at $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{T}^3$, the exponential map can be explicitly written as

$$\mathbf{x}_2 = \exp_{\mathbf{x}_1}^{\mathbb{T}^3}(\mathbf{u}) = \cos(\|\mathbf{u}\|) \mathbf{x}_1 + \sin(\|\mathbf{u}\|) \frac{\mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{u}\|}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

with the inverse map

$$\mathbf{v} = \exp_{\mathbf{x}_2}^{-1, \mathbb{T}^3}(\mathbf{x}_1) = \arccos(\langle \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1 \rangle) \frac{\mathbf{x}_1 - \langle \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1 \rangle \mathbf{x}_2}{\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \langle \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1 \rangle \mathbf{x}_2\|}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

In practice, one usually implements these periodic transformations by coordinate wrapping (modulo 1) rather than the analytic trigonometric form, but the latter is useful for conceptualizing geodesics on \mathbb{T}^3 .

4. d -simplex Δ^d and d -hypercube \mathbb{C}^d for atomic types

Each atomic site i can be occupied by any one of $d+1$ possible species. One can naturally encode this uncertainty in a probability vector $\mathbf{a}^{(i)} = (a_1^{(i)}, a_2^{(i)}, \dots, a_d^{(i)})$, where $a_\alpha^{(i)} \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and $\sum_{\alpha=1}^d a_\alpha^{(i)} = 1$. Hence, $\mathbf{a}^{(i)} \in \Delta^d$, the d -dimensional probability simplex. For instance, if $d+1 = 100$, an inorganic material might allow up to 100 distinct species at each site, with $a_\alpha^{(i)}$ capturing the probability of site i hosting species α .

However, performing a random walk directly on Δ^d can be tricky. As a component $a_\alpha^{(i)}$ approaches a boundary, naive step updates risk stepping outside the simplex.

To overcome this boundary condition issue, one can first embed Δ^d into the hypercube $\mathbb{C}^d = [0, 1]^d$ and employ modular arithmetic so the random walk wraps around the boundary naturally. The mapping between the two spaces can be done via a *bijective* transformation based on uniform spacings [41].

Intuitively, we can think of this as mapping a normalized probability (summing to one) onto a stretched counterpart in the hypercube. Then we can perform the walk there with a convenient boundary condition, and then mapping back. Concretely, we convert each $\mathbf{a}^{(i)} \in \Delta^d$ into a hypercube vector $\mathbf{A}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, perform geometric random walk in \mathbb{C}^d , and finally invert the mapping to identify an updated corresponding probability vector $\mathbf{a}'^{(i)}$.

In practice, one might also draw a one-hot site assignment by sampling $\mathbf{a}^{(i)}$ from a multinomial distribution, effectively picking a vertex of the d -simplex. Regardless of how these atomic types are sampled, the critical embedding and subsequent inverse transform ensure that the random-walk updates remain in the simplex. Next we describe this bijective transformation.

In the *forward* direction, consider a vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{d+1})$ in the d -simplex $\Delta^d \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. We construct $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_d)$ in the d -dimensional hypercube $\mathbb{C}^d = [0, 1]^d$ by setting

$$A_1 = a_1, \quad A_j = A_{j-1} + a_j \quad \text{for } j = 2, \dots, d. \quad (\text{A7})$$

We denote this *forward* map of the uniform spacing Eq. (A7) $\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \Delta^d$ as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}). \quad (\text{A8})$$

In the *inverse* direction, we sort the components of \mathbf{A} into an ordered list $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d)$ from smallest to largest. We then reconstruct \mathbf{a} by

$$a_1 = z_1, \quad a_j = z_j - z_{j-1} \quad \text{for } j = 2, \dots, d, \quad a_{d+1} = 1 - z_d. \quad (\text{A9})$$

We define the procedure Eq. (A9) as the *inverse* map of the uniform spacing $\mathcal{H}^{-1} : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \Delta^d$ as

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathbf{A}). \quad (\text{A10})$$

This forward–inverse pair is a bijection, so no information is lost.

Once the atomic-type data live in \mathbb{C}^d , we define geodesic updates by a simple modular rule. Suppose we are at a point $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and wish to add a tangent step \mathbf{u} . We impose a reflecting boundary condition on each component j of the updated vector

$$(\mathbf{x}_2)_j = \left(\exp_{\mathbf{x}_1}^{\mathbb{C}^d}(\mathbf{u}) \right)_j = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{u})_j \bmod 2, & \text{if } (\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{u})_j \bmod 2 < 1, \\ 2 - (\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{u})_j \bmod 2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A11})$$

This reflecting boundary condition enforces the random walk to remain in the d -hypercube.

Next, the inverse exponential map under this convention is simply

$$\mathbf{v} = \exp_{\mathbf{x}_2}^{-1, \mathbb{C}^d}(\mathbf{x}_1) = \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, \quad (\text{A12})$$

similar to that of the Euclidean manifold. These steps provide a clean way to handle discrete atomic types.

Figure 6 illustrates how a geodesic random walk within a 2-hypercube (left) is mapped to a 2-simplex (right) via the hypercube spacing transform. The walk starts near the top-right corner (blue) and finishes around the middle (orange), with each intermediate step residing strictly inside the hypercube. After mapping, every point in the walk lies within the simplex, highlighting that the transformation is bijective and preserves the validity of points. In higher-dimensional settings, the same principle applies; each step on the d -hypercube corresponds uniquely to a point in the d -simplex.

Appendix B: Equivariant Graph Neural Networks

Equivariant models are designed so that applying a symmetry transformation to the *input* is equivalent to applying the similar transformation to the *output*. Formally, let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a function, and let $g \in G$ be a symmetry operation from some group G . We say f is *equivariant* if

$$f(g * \mathbf{x}) = g * f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall g \in G, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where “ $*$ ” denotes the group action on vectors or tensor features. In the case $G = SO(3)$, the group elements can be represented by Wigner D -matrices, $\mathbf{D}^l(\mathbf{R})$, indexed by l , which capture how tensors of different *ranks* transform under 3D rotations. Concretely, if \mathbf{x} transforms as an l -rank feature, then

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{D}^l(\mathbf{R}^{-1}) \cdot f(\mathbf{D}^l(\mathbf{R}) \cdot \mathbf{x}). \quad (\text{B2})$$

One notable instance of such a function is given by the spherical harmonics $\mathbf{Y}^l(\mathbf{x})$, which exhibit this same symmetry property: applying $\mathbf{D}^l(\mathbf{R}^{-1})$ to the output is equivalent to applying $\mathbf{D}^l(\mathbf{R})$ to the input argument.




FIG. 6. A geodesic random walk (GRW) on a 2-hypercube with a reflecting boundary condition (left), generated using Algorithm 1, is mapped onto a 2-simplex (right) via the hypercube spacing transform (*inverse* uniform spacing transform of Eq. (A9)). The blue and orange markers indicate the initial and final positions of the walk, respectively.

1. Equivariant convolutions on graphs

Building on the idea of preserving $SE(3)$ symmetries (rotations and translations) in neural networks, the Tensor Field Network (TFN) [43] introduced a convolution that propagates features between pairs of nodes while maintaining equivariance. In particular, suppose node j carries a feature $\mathbf{x}_j^{l_i}$ that transforms as an l_i -rank tensor, and let $\mathbf{Y}^{l_f}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj})$ encode the geometric dependence on the direction $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}$ (via spherical harmonics of rank l_f). TFN constructs a rank- l_o message by

$$\mathbf{m}_{nj}^{l_o} = \sum_{l_i, l_f} \mathbf{w}_{l_i, l_f, l_o} (\mathbf{x}_j^{l_i} \otimes_{l_i, l_f}^{l_o} \mathbf{Y}^{l_f}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj})), \quad (\text{B3})$$

where $\otimes_{l_i, l_f}^{l_o}$ is a tensor product mapping $(l_i \times l_f)$ into l_o . The learnable weights $\mathbf{w}_{l_i, l_f, l_o}$ specify how each combination of input rank l_i and spherical-harmonic rank l_f contributes to the output rank l_o . In practice, these products incorporate Clebsch–Gordan coefficients

$$C_{(l_i, m_i), (l_f, m_f)}^{(l_o, m_o)},$$

which vanish unless l_f lies between $|l_i - l_o|$ and $l_i + l_o$. One can rewrite Eq. (B3) more explicitly as

$$\mathbf{m}_{nj}^{l_o} = \sum_{l_i, l_f} \mathbf{w}_{l_i, l_f, l_o} \bigoplus_{m_o} \left[\mathbf{x}_j^{l_i} \left(C_{(l_i, m_i), (l_f, m_f)}^{(l_o, m_o)} \mathbf{Y}_{m_f}^{l_f}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}) \right) \right], \quad (\text{B4})$$

where \bigoplus_{m_o} denotes a concatenation over the index m_o . Often, one aligns $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}$ along a principal axis, simplifying the terms that survive [44].

To handle orientation, a final rotation $(\mathbf{D}^{l_o})^{-1}$ is typically applied. Writing $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j^{l_i} = \mathbf{D}^{l_o} \mathbf{x}_j^{l_i}$, one obtains

$$\mathbf{m}_{nj}^{l_o} = (\mathbf{D}^{l_o})^{-1} \sum_{l_i} \bigoplus_{m_o} [\mathbf{y}_{nj}^{l_i, l_o}]_{m_o}, \quad (\text{B5})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_{m_o, nj}^{l_i, l_o} &= \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{m_o}^{l_i, l_o} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{m_o, j}^{l_i} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{-m_o}^{l_i, l_o} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{-m_o, j}^{l_i} & \text{for } m_o < 0, \\ \mathbf{y}_{-m_o, nj}^{l_i, l_o} &= \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{-m_o}^{l_i, l_o} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{m_o, j}^{l_i} + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{m_o}^{l_i, l_o} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{-m_o, j}^{l_i} & \text{for } m_o > 0, \\ \mathbf{y}_{-m_o, nj}^{l_i, l_o} &= \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{m_o}^{l_i, l_o} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{m_o, j}^{l_i} & \text{for } m_o = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ are additional learnable parameters.

2. EquiformerV2 and SO2Attn

Building on TFN-style operations, the Equiformer architecture [12] (and its successor, EquiformerV2 [13]) integrates *attention* into equivariant message passing. Concretely, scalar features ($l = 0$) undergo a standard attention mechanism, while higher-rank features ($l > 0$) traverse *separable S^2 activations* that act on spherical harmonics.

For scalar features, let $\mathbf{m}_{nj}^{l_o=0}$ be the message from node j to node n . EquiformerV2 computes an attention score

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{nj} &= \mathbf{w}_a^\top \text{LeakyReLU}(\text{LN}(\mathbf{m}_{nj}^{l_o=0})), \\ \text{attn}_{nj} &= \frac{\exp(\mathbf{z}_{nj})}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(n)} \exp(\mathbf{z}_{nk})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{LN}(\cdot)$ denotes layer normalization, and LeakyReLU is a standard nonlinear activation. These attn_{nj} scalars dictate how strongly node j influences node n . Meanwhile, any $l_o > 0$ features $\mathbf{m}_{nj}^{l_o}$ are mapped to S^2 point samples, processed by a nonlinearity (e.g. SiLU), and then reconverted to irreps, ensuring full rotational equivariance. EquiformerV2 multiplies the scalar and higher-rank pathways to combine geometric and scalar information, before converting the result back to the original frame via $(\mathbf{D}^{l_o})^{-1}$. The final node update for a rank- l_o feature becomes

$$\mathbf{h}_n^{l_o} = \text{Linear} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(n)} \mathbf{m}_{nj}^{l_o} \right), \quad (\text{B6})$$

where $\text{Linear}(\cdot)$ is a fully connected layer. The combination of TFN-style convolutions and attention-based S^2 activations is termed *SO2Attn* in EquiformerV2, enabling fully equivariant message passing for 3D geometric data.

By adopting these equivariant operations, EquiformerV2 preserves rotational and translational symmetries in materials or molecular graphs, yielding embeddings or predictions (e.g. forces, energies, or diffusion-model scores) that remain consistent under global $SE(3)$ transformations, a crucial inductive bias for crystalline materials modeling.

Output heads After obtaining the hidden features from Eq. (B6), CrystalGRW, by using EquiformerV2, gener-

ates three outputs corresponding to each manifold slice:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3} &= \text{SO2Attn}(\mathbf{h}_n^{l_o=1}), \\ \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d} &= \text{SO2Attn}(\mathbf{h}_n^{l_o=0}), \\ \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} &= \text{global_pool}(\text{FFN}(\mathbf{h}_n^{l_o=0})), \end{aligned}$$

where FFN denotes a feed-forward network and global_pool is a function that pools node-level features into graph-level features. This setup allows the network to produce manifold-specific scores or feature vectors for fractional coordinates, atomic types, and lattice parameters, respectively. Specifically, these three heads then form the overall score function,

$$\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t) = \left(\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \right), \quad (\text{B7})$$

so that each manifold slice receives its own specialized output.

Appendix C: Score Function for Atomic Types

1. Atomic-type estimator

For atomic-type variables, recall the goal to learn a score function $\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d}(\mathbf{a}_t^{(i)}, t)$ that, at each time t , points from the noised $\mathbf{A}_t^{(i)}$ toward the original atomic-type configuration $\mathbf{A}_0^{(i)}$. In principle, we could approximate this score by learning the manifold inverse exponential map directly from

$$\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)}(\mathbf{a}_t^{(i)}, t) \approx \frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{A}_t^{(i)}}^{-1, \mathbb{C}^d}(\mathbf{A}_0^{(i)}).$$

However, an alternative that perform better at sampling atomic types in our experiments is to introduce a network $\mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}(\mathbf{a}_t^{(i)}, t)$, which directly predicts $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0^{(i)}$ from $\mathbf{a}_t^{(i)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_0^{(i)} &= \mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}(\mathbf{a}_t^{(i)}, t), \\ \hat{\mathbf{A}}_0^{(i)} &= \mathcal{H}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0^{(i)}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0^{(i)}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_0^{(i)}$ are estimates of original data in Δ^d and \mathbb{C}^d , respectively. The score can then be recovered by composing the network with the inverse exponential map by

$$\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)}(\mathbf{a}_t^{(i)}, t) = \frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{A}_t^{(i)}}^{-1, \mathbb{C}^d} \left(\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}(\mathbf{a}_t^{(i)}, t)) \right). \quad (\text{C2})$$

In this approach, the network $\mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}$ is trained via a mean-squared error criterion that compares its prediction $\mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}(\mathbf{a}_t^{(i)}, t)$ to the ground truth $\mathbf{a}_0^{(i)}$

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta^{\Delta^d} = \frac{\lambda_{\Delta^d}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}(\mathbf{a}_t^{(i)}, t) - \mathbf{a}_0^{(i)} \right\|^2. \quad (\text{C3})$$




FIG. 7. Number of generated structures (from 1280 samples) identified as having perovskite compositions across four model variants: Model I predicts $\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d}$, Models II and III predict $\mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}$ where output heads are FFN and SO2Attn, respectively, and Model IV is similar to Model II but trained with the cross-entropy loss. Red bars indicate the total count of perovskite structures produced, while blue bars represent how many are unique within each method.

After training, we can switch back to the score-based perspective by applying Eq. (C2) whenever we need the gradient of the log-probability with respect to $\mathbf{A}_t^{(i)}$.

In the actual implementation, CrystalGRW utilizes Algorithms 4 and 5 for training and sampling, respectively. The model’s output head for generating atomic types is

$$\mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d} = \text{softmax}(\text{SO2Attn}(\mathbf{h}_n^{l_o=0})),$$

thereby giving the overall score function

$$\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t) = \left(\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3}, \mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \right). \quad (\text{C4})$$

2. Comparisons of Model Variants for Perovskite Compositions

Figure 7 compares four approaches for predicting perovskite compositions where the models are trained with the Perov-5 dataset [21]. Model I employs a scheme where the network predicts all three scores as in Eq. (B7). Models II and III rely on a model’s architecture (Eq. (C2)), differing in their neural network heads (feed-forward vs. SO2Attn) while their model’s schemes are to predict $\mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t) = \left(\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3}, \mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \right)$. Model IV is similar to Model II but replaces the mean-squared error with a cross-entropy objective. Although Model I struggles to generate valid perovskite structures, Models II, III, and IV perform substantially better in capturing the correct stoichiometry. Among these, Model III yields the highest fraction of unique ones, so our choice of architecture for atomic-type head is SO2Attn.

ALGORITHM 4. Modified *Training* Multi-Manifold Crystal Properties

Require:

- $\mathbf{x}_0 = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_0, \mathbf{L}_0)$, each on manifolds $(\mathbb{T}^3)^N, (\Delta^d)^N, \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ respectively
- Total steps K

- 1: $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0 = \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_0)$
- 2: $\mathbf{X}_0 = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0, \mathbf{L}_0)$
- 3: **repeat**
- 4: $t \sim \text{Uniform}(\eta, T)$
- 5: $(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t, \mathbf{L}_t) \leftarrow \text{GRW}(\mathbf{X}_0, K, t)$ ▷ Algorithm 1
- 6: Compute inverse exponential maps

$$\mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{T}^3, (i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)}}^{-1, \mathbb{T}^3}(\mathbf{r}_0^{(i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{A}_t^{(i)}}^{-1, \mathbb{C}^d}(\mathbf{A}_0^{(i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} = \exp_{\mathbf{L}_t}^{-1, \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}(\mathbf{L}_0)$$

- 7: $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_t = \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t)$
- 8: $\mathbf{x}_t = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_t, \mathbf{L}_t)$
- 9: $(\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3}, \mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}) \leftarrow \mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$
- 10: Compute the loss ▷ Varadhan’s asymptotic

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\theta &= \frac{\lambda_{\mathbb{T}^3}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3, (i)} - \mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{T}^3, (i)} / t \right\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{\lambda_{\Delta^d}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d, (i)} - \mathbf{a}_0^{(i)} \right\|^2 \\ &+ \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \left\| \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} - \mathbf{v}_t^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} / t \right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

- 11: Take gradient descent step on $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_\theta$
 - 12: **until** converged
-

Appendix D: Statistics of the MP-20 Dataset

To generate crystal structures, we first sample the number of atoms per unit cell (N) from its empirical distribution in the MP-20 dataset. Consequently, for the 10,062 generated structures, the distribution of N closely matches that of the training set (Fig. 8(a)).

Point groups in the MP-20 dataset are imbalanced (Fig. 2). For example, trigonal and hexagonal lattices (e.g. $\bar{3}$ or $6mm$) are far less frequent than cubic or orthorhombic lattices. To address this, we aggregate the 32 point groups into seven classes covering three principal rotation-axis classes (n_1, n_2, n_3), three mirror-plane classes (m_h, m_v, m_d), and inversion symmetry (i). Figures 8(b) and (c) show how these classes appear in MP-20: panel (b) focuses on the distribution of the three principal rotation-axis classes, while panel (c) indicates whether each mirror-plane class and inversion are present or absent. Together, these aggregated classes are more evenly represented than the original 32 point groups.

ALGORITHM 5. Modified Reverse Geodesic Random Walk (*Sampling*) for Multi-Manifold States

Require: $N, K, T, \xi, \mathbf{s}_\theta$

- 1: $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_T = (\mathbf{r}_T^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{r}_T^{(N)}) \sim \text{Uniform}([0, 1])^{N \times 3}$
- 2: $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_T = (\mathbf{A}_T^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_T^{(N)}) \sim \text{Uniform}([0, 1]^d)^N$
- 3: $\mathbf{L}_T \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \frac{h_f + h_0}{2} \mathbf{I})$ where $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$
- 4: $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_K = \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_K)$
- 5: $\mathbf{x}_K = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_K, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_K, \mathbf{L}_K)$
- 6: **for** $k = K$ to 1 **do**
- 7: $\gamma = (T/K)k^\xi$
- 8: $t = \gamma k$
- 9: $(\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{T}^3}, \mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d}, \mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}) \leftarrow \mathbf{s}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_k, t)$
- 10: $\mathbf{s}_\theta^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)} = \frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{A}_t^{(i)}}^{-1, \mathbb{C}^d}(\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_\theta^{\Delta^d, (i)}))$
- 11: Get drift coefficients

$$\left(\underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{(\mathbb{T}^3)^N}, \underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{(\mathbb{C}^d)^N}, \underbrace{\mathbf{b}}_{\approx \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \right) \leftarrow \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_k, t)$$

- 12: Apply to all manifolds

$$\mathbf{W}_{k-1}^M = \gamma \left[-\mathbf{b}^M + (\sigma^M)^2(t) \mathbf{s}_\theta^M \right] + \sqrt{\gamma} \sigma^M(t) \epsilon_k, \quad \epsilon_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$$

- 13: $(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_k, \mathbf{L}_k) \leftarrow \mathbf{X}_k$
- 14: Apply manifold-specific exponential maps

$$\mathbf{r}_{k-1}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{r}_k^{(i)}}^{\mathbb{T}^3}(\mathbf{W}_{k-1}^{\mathbb{T}^3, (i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{k-1}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{A}_k^{(i)}}^{\mathbb{C}^d}(\mathbf{W}_{k-1}^{\mathbb{C}^d, (i)}),$$

$$\mathbf{L}_{k-1} = \exp_{\mathbf{L}_k}^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}(\mathbf{W}_{k-1}^{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}})$$

- 15: $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{k-1} = \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{k-1})$
 - 16: $\mathbf{x}_{k-1} = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{k-1}, \mathbf{L}_{k-1})$
 - 17: **end for**
 - 18: **return** $\mathbf{x}_0 = (\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_0, \mathbf{L}_0)$
-

Appendix E: Step-Length Scheduler on a General Manifold

1. SDE Formulation and Score-Based Generative Modeling

Consider a stochastic process $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{M}$, where \mathcal{M} is an arbitrary Riemannian manifold. In local coordinates, an SDE on \mathcal{M} can be written as

$$d\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}_t, t) dt + \sigma(\mathbf{x}_t, t) d\mathbf{B}_t^M, \quad (\text{E1})$$

where \mathbf{B}_t^M denotes Brownian motion intrinsic to \mathcal{M} , \mathbf{b} is a *drift* vector field on the tangent bundle $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}_t} \mathcal{M}$, and σ is a scalar (or tensor) diffusion coefficient. In many *score-based generative models*, one wishes to design \mathbf{b} and σ so that, by time T , samples \mathbf{x}_T approximate some simple “noise” distribution (e.g. uniform on a compact manifold or wide Gaussian on a non-compact manifold).




FIG. 8. (a) Relative frequency of the number of atoms in a unit cell for the MP-20 dataset and the generated structures. (b) Relative frequency of the three principal rotation-axis classes (n_1, n_2, n_3). (c) Fraction of structures for which each of the three mirror-plane types (m_h, m_v, m_d) and inversion symmetry (i) is present or not.

a. Forward and Reverse SDE. When data $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim p_0(\mathbf{x})$ is corrupted forward, \mathbf{x}_t evolves from $t = 0$ to $t = T$. Reversing this process amounts to sampling from $\mathbf{x}_T \sim \rho_T$ and integrating backward in time where ρ_T is a prior distribution. Formally, if we pick local coordinates and treat

$$\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) = f(t)\mathbf{x}, \quad \sigma(\mathbf{x}, t) = g(t),$$

one obtains an SDE akin to

$$d\mathbf{x} = f(t)\mathbf{x}dt + g(t)d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (\text{E2})$$

Under mild conditions, the time reversal of Eq. (E2) yields

$$d\mathbf{x} = \left[-f(t)\mathbf{x} + g^2(t)\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x}) \right] dt + g(t)d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^{\mathcal{M}}, \quad (\text{E3})$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x})$ is the *score* of the distribution at time t (defined intrinsically on the manifold), and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t^{\mathcal{M}}$ is the backward Brownian motion. Score-based generative models learn a network $s_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, t) \approx \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x})$.

b. Score-Matching and Varadhan's Asymptotic. We begin with the forward diffusion on a manifold \mathcal{M} . Let $p_t(\mathbf{x})$ be the density of \mathbf{x}_t at time t . Recall we seek to learn a score function

$$s_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, t) \approx \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x}),$$

by minimizing the expected mean-squared difference

$$\mathcal{L}_t = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_t} \left[\left\| s_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x}) \right\|^2 \right]. \quad (\text{E4})$$

To connect $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x})$ with the original data \mathbf{x}_0 , we first rewrite

$$p_t(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} p_t(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x}_0) p_0(\mathbf{x}_0) d\mathbf{x}_0,$$

where $p_t(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x}_0)$ is the *forward transition kernel* describing how \mathbf{x}_0 evolves to \mathbf{x}_t . We can rewrite

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} p_t(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x}_0) p_0(\mathbf{x}_0) d\mathbf{x}_0 \right).$$

By applying a small-time (or local) expansion to $p_t(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x}_0)$ for t near zero, or by using a Girsanov's theorem to relate forward and reverse SDEs (cf. [38]), one obtains the approximation

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x}) \approx \frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$$

for \mathbf{x} close to \mathbf{x}_0 . Intuitively, for very small t , the diffusion around \mathbf{x}_0 is almost Gaussian-like in a local coordinate patch, and $\exp_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ can be thought of as the vector in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{M}$ pointing from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{x}_0 . This leads to *Varadhan's asymptotic* [55], which states that

$$p_t(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x}_0) \sim \exp \left[-\frac{d_{\mathcal{M}}^2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0)}{2t} \right] \quad (\text{as } t \rightarrow 0),$$

where $d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0)$ is the geodesic distance. Differentiating with respect to \mathbf{x} gives

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x}_0) \approx \frac{\exp_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_0)}{t}.$$

Hence, in the score-matching objective Eq. (E4), one can replace the true $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\log p_t(\mathbf{x})$ by $\frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ in small- t regimes or within each noising step.

When implementing the forward diffusion in discrete time, one typically draws a random t from $[\eta, T]$, applies a geodesic random walk from \mathbf{x}_0 to \mathbf{x}_t , and then enforces

$$s_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_t, t) \approx \frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{x}_t}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_0).$$

Minimizing

$$\mathcal{L}_t = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_t} \left[\left\| s_{\theta}^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_t, t) - \frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{x}_t}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_0) \right\|^2 \right]$$

ensures $s_\theta^{\mathcal{M}}$ learns to approximate the manifold score. Empirical results [38] show that this approach still accurately reconstructs the data distribution, even though the local expansion is formally exact only as $t \rightarrow 0$. Also, note that Girsanov’s theorem [75, 76] formally justifies rewriting the SDE in reverse time, while the local expansions (Varadhan’s asymptotic) give the explicit $\frac{1}{t} \exp_{\mathbf{x}_t}^{-1, \mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ form. For additional details and proofs in a Riemannian context, see [38] or [77] and the references therein for manifold-based diffusions.

2. Fokker–Planck Equation and Closed-Form Solutions

In local coordinates, the forward density $p(\mathbf{x}, t \mid \mathbf{x}_0)$ on a Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} satisfies a Fokker–Planck (Kolmogorov forward) equation of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} p(\mathbf{x}, t \mid \mathbf{x}_0) = & - \operatorname{div} \left[p(\mathbf{x}, t \mid \mathbf{x}_0) \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{trace} \left[\nabla^2 \left(p(\mathbf{x}, t \mid \mathbf{x}_0) \Sigma(\mathbf{x}, t) \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the drift in local coordinates, and $\Sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the *diffusion tensor*. If the noise amplitude is $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and the metric tensor is $g_{ij}(\mathbf{x})$, then one often writes

$$\Sigma(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)^2 g^{ij}(\mathbf{x}),$$

so that Σ is a matrix specifying how Brownian increments are curved by g_{ij} . In fact, the corresponding generator of this SDE is closely related to the Laplace–Beltrami operator Δ , which generalizes the flat-space ∇^2 . On a *compact* manifold, one frequently sets $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{0}$, implying a pure diffusion whose generator is $\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta$. This diffusion is ergodic and converges to the uniform distribution over \mathcal{M} as $t \rightarrow \infty$, reflecting the finite volume and absence of drift, so that the random walk explores all regions equally over long times.

For the simpler, yet illustrative, case $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) = f(t) \mathbf{x}$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, t) = g(t)$ in \mathbb{R}^d , the closed-form solution

$$p(\mathbf{x}, t \mid \mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{[2\pi \alpha^2(t) \beta^2(t)]^{\frac{d}{2}}} \exp \left[- \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \alpha(t) \mathbf{x}_0\|^2}{2 \alpha^2(t) \beta^2(t)} \right] \quad (\text{E5})$$

arises, where

$$\alpha(t) = \exp \left(\int_0^t f(t') dt' \right), \quad \beta(t) = \sqrt{\int_0^t \frac{g^2(t')}{\alpha^2(t')} dt'}. \quad (\text{E6})$$

If instead $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is chosen as $-\nabla U(\mathbf{x})$ or $-\lambda \mathbf{x}$, then the late-time stationary distribution becomes a finite-variance Gaussian, akin to the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck (OU) process. In a more general manifold setting, local expansions or approximate solutions can still guide how \mathbf{x}_t evolves, and one obtains an analogous $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x}, t \mid \mathbf{x}_0)$ for the *reverse* SDE.

3. Linear Scheduler for the Diffusion Coefficient

A common design choice in *score-based* or *diffusion-based* models is to let the diffusion amplitude $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ grow over time in a simple, *linear* fashion. Denoting the squared diffusion coefficient by $g^2(t)$, we set

$$\sigma^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \equiv g^2(t) = h_0 + (h_f - h_0) \frac{t}{T}, \quad (\text{E7})$$

where $h_0, h_f > 0$ are chosen so that the noise is mild at $t = 0$ (ensuring minimal corruption near the start) and large at $t = T$ (ensuring a wide or uniform final distribution). On a *compact* manifold, large $g^2(T)$ promotes *uniform* coverage, whereas on a *non-compact* manifold (e.g. Euclidean-like domains), it broadens the distribution similarly to a Gaussian random walk.

Table II summarizes our choice of (h_0, h_f) for manifolds such as a 3D torus (\mathbb{T}^3), a hypercube (\mathbb{C}^d), or Euclidean space ($\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$).

TABLE II. Our choice of (h_0, h_f) for the linear scheduler Eq. (E7) on different manifolds.

Manifold	h_0	h_f
\mathbb{T}^3	10^{-4}	1
\mathbb{C}^d	10^{-6}	5
$\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$	10^{-3}	20

Fig. 9 illustrates how varying h_f affects the final random-walk distribution on a torus, with each run starting from points in the dataset. As h_f increases, the distribution becomes more uniform; however, experiments show that both training and generation quality degrade significantly once h_f is too large. In practice, $h_f = 1$ gives a good balance that preserves the data distribution while still provides enough diffusion. For the hypercube manifold, setting $h_f = 5$ similarly yields a sufficiently uniform distribution and facilitates the mapping to the uniform distribution on the simplex (see Fig. 10).

Appendix F: Adaptive Timestep and No-Drift Approximation

a. Adaptive step size. Numerically solving the reverse-time SDE (Sec. IV A) often involves discretizing time and applying a geodesic random walk step at each interval. A simple fixed-step scheme (e.g. Euler–Maruyama) can be suboptimal, so we use an *adaptive* timestep, which has been described in earlier publications [56] and [57], by choosing

$$\gamma(t) = t^\xi \frac{T}{K},$$

where t is the current time in reverse diffusion, T is the final time, K is the total number of timesteps, and ξ is a hyperparameter. Intuitively, $\gamma(t)$ shrinks at early

TABLE III. Key hyperparameters for the MP-20 dataset.

Hyperparameters	MP-20 Dataset
<u>Optimizer & Scheduler</u>	
Optimizer	AdamW
Learning-rate scheduling	Reduce on plateau
Max learning rate	4×10^{-4}
Weight decay	1×10^{-3}
Model EMA decay	0.999
Gradient clipping norm threshold	100
Batch size	32
<u>Loss Weights</u>	
Coordinate weight $\lambda_{\mathbb{T}^3}$	1
Atom-type weight $\lambda_{\mathbb{C}^d}$	1
Lattice weight $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}}$	1
<u>EquiformerV2 Setup</u>	
Cutoff radius (\AA)	12
Maximum number of neighbors	12
Number of radial bases	512
d_{edge} (hidden scalar dimension for radial functions)	(0, 128)
Maximum degree l_{max}	4
Maximum order m_{max}	2
Number of Transformer blocks	8
Embedding dimension d_{embed}	(4, 128)
Attention hidden dimension $d_{\text{attn_hidden}}$	(4, 64)
Number of attention heads h	8
Attention alpha dimension $d_{\text{attn_alpha}}$	(0, 64)
Attention value dimension $d_{\text{attn_value}}$	(4, 16)
Feedforward network hidden dimension d_{ffn}	(4, 128)
Resolution of point samples R	18
Dropout rate	0.1
<u>Output Heads</u>	
Coordinate hidden dimension	128
Atom-type hidden dimension	128
Lattice hidden dimension	256
<u>Additional Features</u>	
Time embedding dimension	128
Condition embedding dimension	128
Probability of training under the null condition (for training with guided conditions)	0.1
<u>Sampling parameters</u>	
Total timesteps K	1000
Final time T	1
Adaptive timestep parameter ξ	1
Guidance strength w (for condition-guided generations)	0.5

times if $\xi > 0$, allowing finer resolution when $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_t(\mathbf{x})$ changes quickly, and grows at later times to speed up sampling. Empirically, we find that $\xi = 1$ yields higher-quality samples compared to a constant Δt approach, presumably because the network can better invert the forward noising at early timesteps.

b. No drift (variance-exploding) SDE in Euclidean space. For a Euclidean manifold \mathbb{R}^d , one may neglect the drift $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, yielding a *variance-exploding* process

[31]. Namely, if $f(t) = 0$ in Eq. (E5), the diffusion amplitude $\beta^2(t)$ must be large enough at $t = T$ to overwhelm the original data distribution such that

$$p(\mathbf{x}_T | \mathbf{x}_0) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_0, \beta^2(T)) \approx \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \beta^2(T)),$$

where we assume the effect of the original mean of the data is negligible once $\beta^2(T)$ becomes sufficiently large. In practice, ignoring the drift in \mathbb{R}^d simplifies the forward noising yet still ensures that $p(\mathbf{x}_T)$ is effectively wide by time T .




FIG. 9. Final random-walk distributions on the 3D torus \mathbb{T}^3 for various h_f values. The leftmost figure illustrates the initial distribution of real data, with each data point to evolve and be sampled 1000 times. As h_f increases from left to right ($h_f = 0.25, 1, 2$), the random walk becomes more uniform, though excessively large h_f can degrade training stability. The late-time distribution saturates the uniform density at $h_f = 2$.




FIG. 10. Top row: Final random-walk distributions on a 2D hypercube $\mathbb{C}^2 = [0, 1]^2$ for various h_f values, each starting from a single point and sampled 5×10^7 times. Bottom row: The corresponding probability densities on the 2-simplex Δ^2 , obtained by applying the hypercube spacing transform to the top-row distributions. As h_f increases from 1 to 10 (left to right), the random walk becomes increasingly uniform and saturates the uniform density at $h_f = 5$ in both \mathbb{C}^2 and its simplex representation.

c. One-step random walk vs. multiple small steps. A previous study [78] shows that if the SDE drift is $f(t)\mathbf{x}$ and the diffusion $g(t)$ depends only on t , then the transition kernel simplifies to Eq. (E5)

$$p(\mathbf{x}_t | \mathbf{x}_0) = \mathcal{N}\left(\alpha(t)\mathbf{x}_0, \alpha^2(t)\beta^2(t)\right),$$

where $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ follow Eq. (E6). This kernel can be integrated in *one* geodesic random walk step per diffusion step, rather than many small increments, giving an equivalent result at a smaller computational cost. For instance, using the closed-form solution in Eq. (E5) directly replaces multiple fine steps by a single jump, and speed up training while preserving exactness in the forward or backward transitions.

In summary, for the implementation of geometric random walks, we utilize (1) the no-drift variance-exploding

approach [31] for the random walks in \mathbb{R}^d , (2) a single random-walk increment ($K = 1$) instead of many small increments during the training (Algorithm 4), and (3) *adaptive* timesteps for discretizing the reverse SDE. These strategies yield higher-quality samples and improve computational efficiency.

Appendix G: Uniqueness and novelty

The similarity between two structures can be evaluated using `StructureMatcher` from the `pymatgen`, with tolerance parameters set to `ltol=0.2`, `stol=0.3`, `angle_tol=5.0`, following MatterGen’s setting [27]. `StructureMatcher` receives a pair of structures with the same compositions and determines the similarity of their lattice vectors and atomic positions within the Niggli cell.

It also considers permutations of atoms within each of the two cells.

To compute uniqueness, the similarities between every pair of structures in the generated set are evaluated. The number of similar pairs is then divided by the total number of structures in the generation set. For novelty, each structure in the generation set is compared with every structure in the MP-20 training set. The number of generated structures that are not similar to any structures in the MP-20 training set is then divided by the total number of generated structures.

Appendix H: Hyperparameters

We train our models using a learning-rate scheduler that reduces the learning rate upon detecting plateaus

in training loss. Specifically, we begin with a maximum learning rate of 4×10^{-4} , apply a patience of 30 epochs (with a 0.6 reduction factor), and allow up to 300 epochs of patience before stopping. Unless otherwise noted, the batch size is 32 for experiments on the MP-20 dataset. Our equivariant GNN follows the 31M EquiformerV2 model described in [13], with the key hyperparameters summarized in Table III.

-
- [1] A. R. Oganov, C. J. Pickard, Q. Zhu, and R. J. Needs, Structure prediction drives materials discovery, *Nature Reviews Materials* **4**, 331 (2019).
- [2] R. J. Needs and C. J. Pickard, Perspective: Role of structure prediction in materials discovery and design, *APL Materials* **4**, 053210 (2016).
- [3] A. R. Oganov and C. W. Glass, Crystal structure prediction using ab initio evolutionary techniques: Principles and applications, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **124**, 244704 (2006).
- [4] Y. Wang, J. Lv, L. Zhu, and Y. Ma, Crystal structure prediction via particle-swarm optimization, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 094116 (2010).
- [5] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt, and M. P. Vecchi, Optimization by simulated annealing, *Science* **220**, 671 (1983).
- [6] A. Laio and M. Parrinello, Escaping free-energy minima, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **99**, 12562 (2002).
- [7] D. J. Wales and J. P. K. Doye, Global optimization by basin-hopping and the lowest energy structures of lennard-jones clusters containing up to 110 atoms, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **101**, 5111 (1997).
- [8] R. Car and M. Parrinello, Unified approach for molecular dynamics and density-functional theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 2471 (1985).
- [9] I. Batatia, P. Benner, Y. Chiang, A. M. Elena, D. P. Kovács, J. Riebesell, X. R. Advincula, M. Asta, M. Avaylon, W. J. Baldwin, F. Berger, N. Bernstein, A. Bhowmik, S. M. Blau, V. Cărare, J. P. Darby, S. De, F. D. Pia, V. L. Deringer, R. Elijošius, Z. El-Machachi, F. Falcioni, E. Fako, A. C. Ferrari, A. Genreith-Schriever, J. George, R. E. A. Goodall, C. P. Grey, P. Grigorev, S. Han, W. Handley, H. H. Heenen, K. Hermanson, C. Holm, J. Jaafar, S. Hofmann, K. S. Jakob, H. Jung, V. Kapil, A. D. Kaplan, N. Karimitari, J. R. Kermode, N. Kroupa, J. Kullgren, M. C. Kuner, D. Kuryla, G. Liepuoniute, J. T. Margraf, I.-B. Magdău, A. Michaelides, J. H. Moore, A. A. Naik, S. P. Niblett, S. W. Norwood, N. O'Neill, C. Ortner, K. A. Persson, K. Reuter, A. S. Rosen, L. L. Schaaf, C. Schran, B. X. Shi, E. Sivonxay, T. K. Stenczel, V. Svahn, C. Sutton, T. D. Swinburne, J. Tilly, C. van der Oord, E. Varga-Umbrich, T. Vegge, M. Vondrák, Y. Wang, W. C. Witt, F. Zills, and G. Csányi, *A foundation model for atomistic materials chemistry* (2024), [arXiv:2401.00096](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.00096) [physics.chem-ph].
- [10] Y. Park, J. Kim, S. Hwang, and S. Han, Scalable parallel algorithm for graph neural network interatomic potentials in molecular dynamics simulations, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **20**, 4857 (2024), PMID: 38813770, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.4c00190>.
- [11] C. Chen and S. P. Ong, A universal graph deep learning interatomic potential for the periodic table, *Nature Computational Science* **2**, 718 (2022).
- [12] Y.-L. Liao and T. Smidt, *Equiformer: Equivariant graph attention transformer for 3d atomistic graphs* (2023), [arXiv:2206.11990](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.11990) [cs.LG].
- [13] Y.-L. Liao, B. M. Wood, A. Das, and T. Smidt, Equiformerv2: Improved equivariant transformer for scaling to higher-degree representations, in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations* (2024).
- [14] A. Bochkarev, Y. Lysogorskiy, and R. Drautz, Graph atomic cluster expansion for semilocal interactions beyond equivariant message passing, *Phys. Rev. X* **14**, 021036 (2024).
- [15] L. R. Timmerman, S. Kumar, P. Suryanarayana, and A. J. Medford, Overcoming the chemical complexity bottleneck in on-the-fly machine learned molecular dynamics simulations, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **20**, 5788 (2024), PMID: 38975655.
- [16] N. Karimitari, W. J. Baldwin, E. W. Muller, Z. J. L. Bare, W. J. Kennedy, G. Csányi, and C. Sutton, Accurate crystal structure prediction of new 2d hybrid organic-inorganic perovskites, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **146**, 27392 (2024), PMID: 39344597.
- [17] M. Xu, S. Luo, Y. Bengio, J. Peng, and J. Tang, Learning neural generative dynamics for molecular conformation generation, in *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2021).

- [18] M. Xu, L. Yu, Y. Song, C. Shi, S. Ermon, and J. Tang, Geodiff: A geometric diffusion model for molecular conformation generation, in *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2022).
- [19] J. Guan, W. W. Qian, X. Peng, Y. Su, J. Peng, and J. Ma, 3d equivariant diffusion for target-aware molecule generation and affinity prediction, in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations* (2023).
- [20] M. Xu, A. S. Powers, R. O. Dror, S. Ermon, and J. Leskovec, Geometric latent diffusion models for 3D molecule generation, in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 202, edited by A. Krause, E. Brunskill, K. Cho, B. Engelhardt, S. Sabato, and J. Scarlett (PMLR, 2023) pp. 38592–38610.
- [21] T. Xie, X. Fu, O.-E. Ganea, R. Barzilay, and T. S. Jaakkola, Crystal diffusion variational autoencoder for periodic material generation, in *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2022).
- [22] T. Pakornchote, N. Choomphon-anomakhun, S. Arrerut, C. Atthapak, S. Khamkao, T. Chotibut, and T. Bovornratanarak, Diffusion probabilistic models enhance variational autoencoder for crystal structure generative modeling, *Scientific Reports* **14**, 1275 (2024).
- [23] R. Jiao, W. Huang, P. Lin, J. Han, P. Chen, Y. Lu, and Y. Liu, Crystal structure prediction by joint equivariant diffusion on lattices and fractional coordinates, in *Workshop on "Machine Learning for Materials" ICLR 2023* (2023).
- [24] R. Jiao, W. Huang, Y. Liu, D. Zhao, and Y. Liu, Space group constrained crystal generation, in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations* (2024).
- [25] B. K. Miller, R. T. Q. Chen, A. Sriram, and B. M. Wood, **Flowmm: Generating materials with riemannian flow matching** (2024), [arXiv:2406.04713 \[cs.LG\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.04713).
- [26] A. Sriram, B. K. Miller, R. T. Q. Chen, and B. M. Wood, FlowLLM: Flow matching for material generation with large language models as base distributions, in *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (2024).
- [27] C. Zeni, R. Pinsler, D. Zügner, A. Fowler, M. Horton, X. Fu, S. Shysheya, J. Crabbé, L. Sun, J. Smith, B. Nguyen, H. Schulz, S. Lewis, C.-W. Huang, Z. Lu, Y. Zhou, H. Yang, H. Hao, J. Li, R. Tomioka, and T. Xie, **Mattergen: a generative model for inorganic materials design** (2024), [arXiv:2312.03687 \[cond-mat.mtrl-sci\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.03687).
- [28] J. Sohl-Dickstein, E. Weiss, N. Maheswaranathan, and S. Ganguli, Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics, in *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 37, edited by F. Bach and D. Blei (PMLR, Lille, France, 2015) pp. 2256–2265.
- [29] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, Denoising diffusion probabilistic models, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33, edited by H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin (Curran Associates, Inc., 2020) pp. 6840–6851.
- [30] Y. Song and S. Ermon, Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 32, edited by H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett (Curran Associates, Inc., 2019).
- [31] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole, Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations, in *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021* (OpenReview.net, 2021).
- [32] I. Takahara, K. Shibata, and T. Mizoguchi, **Generative inverse design of crystal structures via diffusion models with transformers** (2024), [arXiv:2406.09263 \[cond-mat.mtrl-sci\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.09263).
- [33] G. Guo, T. Saidi, M. Terban, S. J. Billinge, and H. Lipson, **Diffusion models are promising for ab initio structure solutions from nanocrystalline powder diffraction data** (2024), [arXiv:2406.10796 \[physics.comp-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.10796).
- [34] E. A. Riesel, T. Mackey, H. Nilforoshan, M. Xu, C. K. Badding, A. B. Altman, J. Leskovec, and D. E. Freedman, Crystal structure determination from powder diffraction patterns with generative machine learning, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **0**, null (0), pMID: 39298266.
- [35] K. Choudhary, Atomgpt: Atomistic generative pretrained transformer for forward and inverse materials design, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **15**, 6909 (2024), pMID: 38935647.
- [36] B. Jing, G. Corso, J. Chang, R. Barzilay, and T. S. Jaakkola, Torsional diffusion for molecular conformer generation, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, edited by A. H. Oh, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, and K. Cho (2022).
- [37] J. Austin, D. D. Johnson, J. Ho, D. Tarlow, and R. van den Berg, Structured denoising diffusion models in discrete state-spaces, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, edited by A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. W. Vaughan (2021).
- [38] V. D. Bortoli, E. Mathieu, M. J. Hutchinson, J. Thornton, Y. W. Teh, and A. Doucet, Riemannian score-based generative modelling, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, edited by A. H. Oh, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, and K. Cho (2022).
- [39] R. T. Q. Chen and Y. Lipman, Flow matching on general geometries, in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations* (2024).
- [40] J. Ho and T. Salimans, Classifier-free diffusion guidance, in *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Deep Generative Models and Downstream Applications* (2021).
- [41] L. Devroye, *Non-uniform random variate generation* (Springer, New York, NY, 2013) pp. 207–210.
- [42] T. S. Cohen, M. Geiger, J. Köhler, and M. Welling, Spherical CNNs, in *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2018).
- [43] N. Thomas, T. E. Smidt, S. Kearnes, L. Yang, L. Li, K. Kohlhoff, and P. Riley, Tensor field networks: Rotation- and translation-equivariant neural networks for 3d point clouds, *CoRR* **abs/1802.08219** (2018), 1802.08219.
- [44] S. Passaro and C. L. Zitnick, **Reducing so(3) convolutions to so(2) for efficient equivariant gnns** (2023), [arXiv:2302.03655 \[cs.LG\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.03655).
- [45] M. Geiger, T. Smidt, A. M., B. K. Miller, W. Boomsma, B. Dice, K. Lapchevskyi, M. Weiler, M. Tyszkiewicz, S. Batzner, D. Madiseti, M. Uhrin, J. Frellsen, N. Jung, S. Sanborn, M. Wen, J. Rackers, M. Rød, and M. Bailey, **e3nn/e3nn: 2022-04-13** (2022).

- [46] A. Jain, S. P. Ong, G. Hautier, W. Chen, W. D. Richards, S. Dacek, S. Cholia, D. Gunter, D. Skinner, G. Ceder, *et al.*, Commentary: The materials project: A materials genome approach to accelerating materials innovation, *APL materials* **1**, 011002 (2013).
- [47] S. P. Ong, W. D. Richards, A. Jain, G. Hautier, M. Kocher, S. Cholia, D. Gunter, V. L. Chevrier, K. A. Persson, and G. Ceder, Python materials genomics (pymatgen): A robust, open-source python library for materials analysis, *Computational Materials Science* **68**, 314 (2013), xxx.
- [48] A. Togo and I. Tanaka, Spglib: a software library for crystal symmetry search, <https://github.com/spglib/spglib> (2018), [arXiv:1808.01590](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.01590).
- [49] F. Mouhat and F. m. c.-X. Coudert, Necessary and sufficient elastic stability conditions in various crystal systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 224104 (2014).
- [50] Materials Project database v2023.11.1, <https://docs.materialsproject.org/changes/database-versions>, the Materials Project database, specifically v2023.11.1, has deprecated all compounds containing Yb. Out of 1000 relaxed structures, 48 contain Yb, so their energy above hull are unable to determine. Consequently, only 952 structures were considered for computing stability and S.U.N. rates.
- [51] A. Wang, R. Kingsbury, M. McDermott, M. Horton, A. Jain, S. P. Ong, S. Dwaraknath, and K. A. Persson, A framework for quantifying uncertainty in dft energy corrections, *Scientific Reports* **11**, 15496 (2021).
- [52] B. Deng, P. Zhong, K. Jun, J. Riebesell, K. Han, C. J. Bartel, and G. Ceder, Chgnet as a pretrained universal neural network potential for charge-informed atomistic modelling, *Nature Machine Intelligence* **5**, 1031 (2023).
- [53] N. Gruver, A. Sriram, A. Madotto, A. G. Wilson, C. L. Zitnick, and Z. W. Ulissi, Fine-tuned language models generate stable inorganic materials as text, in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations* (2024).
- [54] X. Pennec, Intrinsic statistics on riemannian manifolds: Basic tools for geometric measurements, *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision* **25**, 127 (2006).
- [55] S. R. S. Varadhan, On the behavior of the fundamental solution of the heat equation with variable coefficients, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **20**, 431 (1967).
- [56] F. Bao, C. Li, J. Zhu, and B. Zhang, Analytic-dpm: an analytic estimate of the optimal reverse variance in diffusion probabilistic models, *CoRR abs/2201.06503* (2022), 2201.06503.
- [57] D. Watson, J. Ho, M. Norouzi, and W. Chan, Learning to efficiently sample from diffusion probabilistic models, *CoRR abs/2106.03802* (2021), 2106.03802.
- [58] P. W. Battaglia, J. B. Hamrick, V. Bapst, A. Sanchez-Gonzalez, V. Zambaldi, M. Malinowski, A. Tacchetti, D. Raposo, A. Santoro, R. Faulkner, C. Gulcehre, F. Song, A. Ballard, J. Gilmer, G. Dahl, A. Vaswani, K. Allen, C. Nash, V. Langston, C. Dyer, N. Heess, D. Wierstra, P. Kohli, M. Botvinick, O. Vinyals, Y. Li, and R. Pascanu, *Relational inductive biases, deep learning, and graph networks* (2018), [arXiv:1806.01261](https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.01261) [cs.LG].
- [59] T. Pakornchote, A. Ektarawong, and T. Chotibut, Straintensornet: Predicting crystal structure elastic properties using se(3)-equivariant graph neural networks, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 043198 (2023).
- [60] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Inhomogeneous electron gas, *Physical review* **136**, B864 (1964).
- [61] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation effects, *Physical review* **140**, A1133 (1965).
- [62] G. Kresse and D. Joubert, From ultrasoft pseudopotentials to the projector augmented-wave method, *Physical review b* **59**, 1758 (1999).
- [63] D. Hobbs, G. Kresse, and J. Hafner, Fully unconstrained noncollinear magnetism within the projector augmented-wave method, *Physical Review B* **62**, 11556 (2000).
- [64] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Efficiency of ab-initio total energy calculations for metals and semiconductors using a plane-wave basis set, *Computational materials science* **6**, 15 (1996).
- [65] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Efficient iterative schemes for ab initio total-energy calculations using a plane-wave basis set, *Physical review B* **54**, 11169 (1996).
- [66] A. Jain, G. Hautier, C. J. Moore, S. P. Ong, C. C. Fischer, T. Mueller, K. A. Persson, and G. Ceder, A high-throughput infrastructure for density functional theory calculations, *Computational Materials Science* **50**, 2295 (2011).
- [67] H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, Special points for Brillouin-zone integrations, *Physical review B* **13**, 5188 (1976).
- [68] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, Generalized gradient approximation made simple, *Physical review letters* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- [69] L. Wang, T. Maxisch, and G. Ceder, Oxidation energies of transition metal oxides within the gga+u framework, *Physical Review B—Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* **73**, 195107 (2006).
- [70] A. Jain, G. Hautier, S. P. Ong, C. J. Moore, C. C. Fischer, K. A. Persson, and G. Ceder, Formation enthalpies by mixing gga and gga+ u calculations, *Physical Review B—Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* **84**, 045115 (2011).
- [71] C. J. Bartel, Review of computational approaches to predict the thermodynamic stability of inorganic solids, *Journal of Materials Science* **57**, 10475 (2022).
- [72] S. P. Ong, L. Wang, B. Kang, and G. Ceder, Li-fe-p-o2 phase diagram from first principles calculations, *Chemistry of Materials* **20**, 1798 (2008).
- [73] S. P. Ong, A. Jain, G. Hautier, B. Kang, and G. Ceder, Thermal stabilities of delithiated olivine mpo4 (m=fe, mn) cathodes investigated using first principles calculations, *Electrochemistry Communications* **12**, 427 (2010).
- [74] G. Henkelman, A. Arnaldsson, and H. Jónsson, A fast and robust algorithm for bader decomposition of charge density, *Computational Materials Science* **36**, 354 (2006).
- [75] I. V. Girsanov, On transforming a certain class of stochastic processes by absolutely continuous substitution of measures, *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **5**, 285 (1960), <https://doi.org/10.1137/1105027>.
- [76] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve, in *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus* (Springer New York, New York, NY, 1998).
- [77] M. Arnaudon, F. Barbaresco, and L. Yang, Medians and means in riemannian geometry: Existence, uniqueness and computation, in *Matrix Information Geometry*, edited by F. Nielsen and R. Bhatia (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013) pp. 169–197.

- [78] T. Karras, M. Aittala, T. Aila, and S. Laine, Elucidating the design space of diffusion-based generative models, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, edited by A. H. Oh, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, and K. Cho (2022).