

LiT: Delving into a Simplified Linear Diffusion Transformer for Image Generation

Jiahao Wang^{1†} Ning Kang³ Lewei Yao³ Mengzhao Chen¹ Chengyue Wu¹
 Songyang Zhang² Shuchen Xue^{4*} Yong Liu⁵ Taiqiang Wu¹ Xihui Liu¹
 Kaipeng Zhang² Shifeng Zhang³ Wenqi Shao^{2†} Zhenguo Li^{3†} Ping Luo¹
¹HKU ²Shanghai AI Lab ³Huawei Noah’s Ark Lab ⁴UCAS ⁵THU Sz
 wang-jh19@tsinghua.org.cn shaowenqi@pjlab.org.cn li.zhenguo@huawei.com

Abstract

In commonly used sub-quadratic complexity modules, linear attention benefits from simplicity and high parallelism, making it promising for image synthesis tasks. However, the architectural design and learning strategy for linear attention remain underexplored in this field. In this paper, we offer a suite of ready-to-use solutions for efficient linear diffusion Transformers. Our core contributions include: (1) Simplified Linear Attention using few heads, observing the free-lunch effect of performance without latency increase. (2) Weight inheritance from a fully pre-trained diffusion Transformer: initializing linear Transformer using pre-trained diffusion Transformer and loading all parameters except for those related to linear attention. (3) Hybrid knowledge distillation objective: using a pre-trained diffusion Transformer to help the training of the student linear Transformer, supervising not only the predicted noise but also the variance of the reverse diffusion process. These guidelines lead to our proposed Linear Diffusion Transformer (LiT), an efficient text-to-image Transformer that can be deployed offline on a laptop. Experiments show that in class-conditional 256×256 and 512×512 ImageNet benchmark LiT achieves highly competitive FID while reducing training steps by 80% and 77% compared to DiT. LiT also rivals methods based on Mamba or Gated Linear Attention. Besides, for text-to-image generation, LiT allows for the rapid synthesis of up to 1K resolution photorealistic images. Project page: <https://techmonsterwang.github.io/LiT/>.

*Work done when Shuchen Xue interns at Huawei.

†Correspondence to: Jiahao Wang (wang-jh19@tsinghua.org.cn), Wenqi Shao (shaowenqi@pjlab.org.cn) and Zhenguo Li (li.zhenguo@huawei.com).

1. Introduction

Diffusion models [29, 67] based on Transformer [71], such as PixArt- Σ [7] and Stable Diffusion 3 [16], recently demonstrate potential commercial value in the field of high-resolution text-to-image generation. However, one of the core computational modules *i.e.*, self-attention, exhibits a quadratic complexity with respect to sequence length, leading to increased latency and GPU memory usage in high-resolution scenarios, which makes it less feasible for resource-limited edge devices, as illustrated in Fig. 4 and Fig. 8 (Sec. B of the appendix).


Accordingly, existing works [69, 87] adopt sub-quadratic modules, such as State Space Models (SSM) [20, 21] and Gated Linear Attention (GLA) [78], to construct diffusion models for image generation. Their designs are illustrated in Fig. 2-(a). While they all achieve sub-quadratic complexity, the overall complexity differs substantially. First, both SSM blocks and GLA rely on recurrent states, leading to iterative computation that limits parallelization opportunities. Second, these modules have complex computational graphs and involve low-arithmetic-intensity operations (*e.g.*, element-wise multiplication).

In contrast, linear attention [1, 3, 6, 23, 38] linear attention provides an efficient alternative to self-attention, with a simple design and easy parallelization. It can be observed that linear attention speeds up generation compared to self-attention at the same resolution. For example, at a 2048 resolution, linear attention is nearly 9× faster (shown in Fig. 4-(a) and (b)). Besides, linear attention allows for fewer GPU memory for higher-resolution image generation. For instance, the GPU memory for generating 2048px image with DiT-S/2 can be dropped from \sim 14GB to 4GB if replacing with the linear attention counterpart. Therefore, training a high-performance diffusion Transformer with linear attention is valuable for edge-side devices with strict latency and computational resource requirements.

Nevertheless, *how to effectively and rapidly train lin-*



A boy and a girl fall in love



Editorial photoshoot of a old woman, high fashion 2000s fashion



Crocodile in a sweater



stars, water, brilliantly, gorgeous large scale scene, a little girl, in the style of dreamy realism, light gold and amber, blue and pink, brilliantly illuminated in the background.



beautiful lady, freckles, big smile, blue eyes, short ginger hair, dark makeup, wearing a floral blue vest top, soft light, dark grey background



3d digital art of an adorable ghost, glowing within, holding a heart shaped pumpkin, Halloween, super cute, spooky haunted house background

Figure 1. **1K Generated samples of LiT following user instructions.** LiT shares the same macro/micro-level design as PixArt- Σ [7], but elegantly replaces all self-attention with cheap linear attention. While being more simple and efficient, LiT with our cost-effective training strategy, is still able to generate exceptional high-resolution images following complicated user instructions.

ear attention-based diffusion Transformer for challenging image generation tasks? On one hand, although linear attention successfully replicates the effectiveness of self-attention in visual recognition, architectural designs for linear attention in image generation remain an under-explored issue. On the other hand, training diffusion models from scratch is costly. For example, as statistically reported in [8], training RAPHAEL [76] requires 60K A100 GPU days. As a result, cost-effective training strategies for linear Diffusion Transformers are still worth exploring.

In this work, we systematically study the diffusion Transformer implementation by pure linear attention, from both architectural design and training strategy. For architectural refinement, we draw on successful practices from multimodal understanding models and observe the *free lunch* effect of the linear attention. For training strategies, we focus on two cost-effective methods—*weight inheritance* and *knowledge distillation*—to improve the training process.

Our findings about *architectural refinement* and *optimization strategies* on efficient linear DiT can be summarized as the following practical guidelines: **1)** employ Simplified Linear Attention in image understanding tasks; **2)** use few (*e.g.*, 2) heads in the linear attention for better performance but no latency increase; **3)** initialize the weights of the linear diffusion Transformer from a well-trained self-attention based diffusion model; **4)** load all weights except for the linear attention to achieve cost-effective training; **5)** adopt hybrid distillation objective—distilling not only the predicted noise but also variances of the reverse diffusion process—to facilitate the student diffusion Transformer.

These guidelines lead us to develop **LiT**, a diffusion Transformer using *pure linear attention*. LiT is trained in a highly cost-effective manner while maintaining a high-resolution-friendly property during inference, and can be deployed offline on a Windows 11 laptop. In class-conditional image generation on the ImageNet [13]




Figure 2. **The design and training strategies we explored for linear attention enhance their generative performance while maintaining simple design.** (a): Compared to Mamba SSM and gated linear attention, linear attention achieves sub-quadratic computational complexity with a remarkably simple design, and it does not depend on any recurrent states. (b): We study a series of architectural designs and training strategies aimed at improving the generative performance of linear attention.

256×256 benchmark, LiT-S/B/L (patch size of 2) with only 100K training steps outperforms corresponding 400K steps pre-trained DiT-S/B/L in terms of Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) [27]. For large-scale model on the ImageNet 256×256 and 512×512 benchmark, LiT-XL/2 competes comparably to DiT-XL/2 (2.32 vs. 2.27, 3.69 vs. 3.04 in FID) with only 20% and ~23% of training steps (respectively for 256×256 and 512×512 settings). In challenging text-to-image generation, our LiT-0.6B can stably generate highly photorealistic images (Fig. 7) with only ~40K training steps. As a result, we summarize the main contributions:

- We introduce a *linear diffusion Transformer*, LiT, which optimizes the latency-capacity trade-off by using a *few heads* (e.g., 2) in linear attention.
- We initialize LiT with weight inheritance to ensure a *cost-effective* training process, while achieving linear computational complexity that facilitates high-resolution generation scenarios during inference.
- We propose a *hybrid* distillation approach, thereby successfully apply LiT to class-conditional image generation and text-to-image generation.
- The pretrained LiT-0.6B model can be deployed on a Windows 11 laptop to generate high-resolution, photorealistic images offline based on user prompts.

2. Related Work

Diffusion models [29, 67, 68] have proven effective in image generation, and can be implemented using Transformer architecture based on self-attention [71], e.g., DiT [53], PixArt- α [8], PixArt- Σ [7], and Lumina-T2X [18].

From an architectural perspective, recent work begins focusing on efficient diffusion models [34, 69, 77], based on Mamba [11, 21] and RWKV [54] to compete with DiT. Meanwhile, linear attention [38], as a simple linear complexity token mixer [83], is being applied in diffusion Trans-

formers for image synthesis, e.g., Mediator [58], DiG [87] for class-conditional image generation, and Sana [75], LinFusion [46] for text-to-image generation. In summary, existing work trains diffusion Transformers with linear attention *from scratch*. In contrast, our LiT aims for *cost-effective* training by exploring linear attention design, weight inheritance and knowledge distillation. Moreover, our approach has been validated on both class-conditional image generation and text-to-image generation.

3. Preliminaries and Motivation


3.1. Preliminaries

Diffusion models. Suppose we have a clean image \mathbf{x}_0 , and progressively add noise at each step t to obtain \mathbf{x}_T , $t \in [1, T]$. The forward (diffusion) process is defined as: $q(\mathbf{x}_t | \mathbf{x}_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_t; \sqrt{1 - \beta_t} \mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \beta_t \mathbf{I})$, where $\alpha_t = 1 - \beta_t$ and $\bar{\alpha}_t = \prod_{i=1}^t \alpha_i$. Diffusion models [29, 48, 67, 74] learn a network p_θ to reverse the diffusion process: $p_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{t-1} | \mathbf{x}_t) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t))$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$ denote the mean and variance of the reverse process. In DDPM [29], a simple training objective is demonstrated effective in training diffusion models: $L_t^{\text{simple}} = \mathbb{E}_{t, \mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon_t} [\|\epsilon_t - \epsilon_\theta(\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t} \mathbf{x}_0 + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t} \epsilon_t, t)\|^2]$, where ϵ_t represents noise of the t step, expected to be approximated by the output of a denoising network ϵ_θ . ϵ_θ can be realized using Transformers [7, 8, 49, 53] with time-intensive self-attention, calling for cheap alternatives.


Linear attention. For a standard softmax attention with h heads, sequence length N , and hidden dimension $D = h \cdot d$, denoting $\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$ as query, key and value, its output $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$ can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{O}_i = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\text{Sim}(\mathbf{Q}_i, \mathbf{K}_j)}{\sum_{j=1}^N \text{Sim}(\mathbf{Q}_i, \mathbf{K}_j)} \mathbf{V}_j, \quad (1)$$

Guideline 1&2: Linear DiT with **Few Heads**



Guideline 3&4: Inheriting Weight **w/o SA**



Guideline 5: Distilling **Noise and Variance**




Figure 3. **Overall training procedure of LiT.** Following the macro/micro-level design of DiT [53] (for class-conditioned image generation) and PixArt- Σ [7] (for text-to-image generation), LiT replace the self-attention in each block with the linear attention. We linearize diffusion Transformers by (1) building a strong linear DiT baseline with few heads, (2) inheriting weights from a DiT teacher and (3) distilling useful knowledge (predicted noise and the variances of the reverse diffusion process) from the teacher model.

where $\text{Sim}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}) = \exp(\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^\top / \sqrt{d})$ is a similarity measurement function. In linear attention, the aforementioned function is modified into a simplified form with a nonlinear kernel $\phi(\cdot)$, i.e., $\text{Sim}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}) = \phi(\mathbf{Q})\phi(\mathbf{K})^\top$. Thus, Eq. 1 can be rewritten as Eq. 2 and simplified to Eq. 3 using the associative property of multiplication.

$$\mathbf{O}_i = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\phi(\mathbf{Q}_i)\phi(\mathbf{K}_j)^\top}{\sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{Q}_i)\phi(\mathbf{K}_j)^\top} \mathbf{V}_j, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{O}_i = \frac{\phi(\mathbf{Q}_i) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{K}_j)^\top \mathbf{V}_j \right)}{\phi(\mathbf{Q}_i) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \phi(\mathbf{K}_j)^\top \right)}, \quad (3)$$

The computational complexities of softmax attention and linear attention are $\mathcal{O}(N^2D)$ and $\mathcal{O}(ND^2/h)$, respectively. Detailed presentation is provided in Sec. 4.2.

3.2. Motivation

For scenarios requiring high-resolution generation (e.g., 1024×1024), self-attention is latency-intensive. In a common setup, using a latent diffusion Transformer [62] with an $8 \times$ downsampling VAE [39] encoder (as in DiT-XL/2 [53]), the input latent resolution is 128×128 , bringing a sequence length of 4096. Accordingly, we have $\frac{N^2D}{ND^2/h} \approx 56.9$. For higher resolutions, this ratio will increase.

Based on this analysis, self-attention is not well-suited for commercially valuable high-resolution generation tasks. *Can we use cheap linear attention to replace self-attention in diffusion models?* To this end, we aim to explore how to *cost-effectively* train a linear DiT with photorealistic generation quality by focusing on *linear attention design, weight inheritance, and diffusion knowledge distillation* paradigm. We discuss our experiments and conclusions in detail below.

4. Cost-Effectively Training of Linear DiT

In this section, we provide the LiT design trajectory. Given the limited research on linear DiT, we first build a suitable linear attention baseline for generative tasks, before investigating advanced training strategies. Our baseline shares the same macro architecture as DiT [53], which has recently proven effective for text-to-image generation [7, 8, 44], with the only difference being that we replace self-attention with linear attention that is computationally efficient in high-resolution image synthesis. Additionally, we employ latent diffusion [62] consistent with DiT. LiT generally follows DiT’s configuration (for S/B/L/XL), except the number of attention heads. All experiments are conducted on the class-conditional ImageNet [13] 256×256 benchmark, with models trained for 400K iterations using a batch size of 256. We report the FID-50K [27], Inception Score [65] and Precision/Recall [40] metrics. The radar chart of the experimental results is shown in Fig. 2-(b). Detailed results can be found in Sec. D of the appendix.

4.1. Simplified Linear Attention in DiT

Guideline 1: Simplified linear attention in image recognition is sufficient for DiT-based image generation.

Linear attention has been successfully applied in *perceptual* ViTs [1, 3, 23, 24] as a replacement for self-attention, which are used to extract *high-level* features for image classification. On the other hand, pioneering works apply them in *generative* models [46, 58, 75], where they are used to predict *low-level* noise for text-to-image synthesis. Inspired by the successful practices in ViTs [15], we now investigate how to simplify the linear attention design in LiT while effectively preserving the fidelity of generated im-




Figure 4. **Efficiency of linear attention and redundancy in linear attention heads.** (a) and (b): Comparison of (a) module latency and (b) GPU memory between **softmax attention** and **linear attention** based DiT (DiT-S/2 vs. **baseline linear DiT-S/2**) in synthesizing images of different resolutions. We test on one NVIDIA A100 GPU with a batch size of 1, and do not use any extra acceleration techniques for attention (e.g., flash attention [12]). (c): Attention maps of different heads of LiT-S/2 (6 heads) show high average cosine similarity.

DiT	Attention	FID-50K (\downarrow)	IS (\uparrow)
S/2	softmax	68.40	-
S/2	ReLU linear	88.46	15.11
S/2	Simplified linear (ReLU)	63.66	22.16
S/2	focused linear (ReLU)	63.05	22.49
S/2	focused linear (GELU)	70.83	19.41
B/2	softmax	43.47	-
B/2	ReLU linear	56.92	25.80
B/2	Simplified linear (ReLU)	42.11	34.60
B/2	focused linear (ReLU)	40.58	35.98
B/2	focused linear (GELU)	58.86	24.23

Table 1. **Linear attention ablation on ImageNet 256 \times 256.** All models are DiT trained for 400K steps. We report FID-50K (*without* classifier-free guidance) and Inception Score metrics.

ages. We start with a common practice, *i.e.*, ReLU linear attention [38], which uses the ReLU activation as a *kernel* function to approximate the non-linearity of the *softmax* function. For performance reference, we compare it to DiT, where any performance difference can be attributed to the impact of linear attention on generation quality. As shown in Tab. 1, compared to DiT, LiT-S/2 and B/2 with a trivial ReLU linear attention leads to an unacceptable performance drop, with FID decreasing by approximately 20/13 for the S/2 and B/2 models. The results suggest that linear attention commonly used in visual recognition have room for improvement in noise prediction tasks.

We then explore the following approaches: (1) simplified linear attention [22] (ReLU linear attention with a depth-wise convolution (DWC) [9, 33]; (2) focused linear attention [23]; (3) replacing the ReLU kernel with GELU [26] function, commonly used in Transformers [71]. Each of these choices maintains linear complexity, preserving LiT’s advantage in computational efficiency. We use a relatively large convolution kernel (*i.e.*, 5) to ensure a sufficiently large receptive field when predicting noise. Tab. 1 shows that adding DWC alone improves generation quality beyond

softmax attention, with FID of 63.66 and 42.11 for S/2 and B/2. We attribute the result to the model’s tendency to focus on information from neighboring pixels when predicting noise for a given pixel, thus requiring the assistance of convolution. Meanwhile, we identify that the focused function has limited effectiveness, which we attribute to its design motivation to help linear attention focus on specific regions. This feature may suit classification models, but may not be necessary for noise prediction.


Remark 1. Given that a major motivation for using linear attention is to address latency issues with high-resolution images, we use simplified linear attention for simplicity and performance. Next, we focus on heads of the linear attention for a better latency-performance trade-off.

4.2. Linear Attention with Few Heads


Guideline 2: Using few heads in the linear attention increases computation but not latency. In practice, DiT-S/B/L/XL are designed to have 6/12/16/16 heads, respectively. Denoting the number of heads, sequence length, and hidden dimension as h, N, D , GMACs of multi-head self-attention and linear attention are $\mathcal{C}_{\text{MHSA}}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{MHLA}}$, respectively, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\text{MHSA}} &= \underbrace{4ND^2}_{\text{Proj}} + \underbrace{2N^2D}_{\text{Self Attention}}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{\text{MHLA}} &= \underbrace{4ND^2}_{\text{Proj}} + \underbrace{ND + 3ND^2/h}_{\text{Linear Attention}} + \underbrace{k^2ND}_{\text{DWC}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Theoretically, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{MHSA}}$ is independent of the number of heads, but in linear attention, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{MHLA}}$ has a negative correlation with it. Intuitively, using *many* heads can loose the computational stress. But on the contrary, we prefer to use *few* heads, based on the identified *free lunch* effect of linear attention. We illustrate the effect in Fig. 5, where we visualize the **latency** and theoretical **GMACs** of linear attention in



(a) Results of small (S) and base (B) model



(b) Results of large (L) and Xlarge (XL) model

Figure 5. **Free lunch in linear attention.** Comparison of **latency** and theoretical **GMACs** for linear attention with different number of heads. We test the latency to generate 256×256 resolution images using one NVIDIA A100 GPU with a batch size of 8. Results of (a) S/2/B/2 and (b) L/2/XL/2 models were averaged over 30 times. As the number of heads decreases, GMACs consistently increase, but no ascending trend in latency has been observed. Based on the observation, we use few heads (e.g., 2) to get the free lunch in linear attention.

DiT-S/B/L/XL models with different head numbers. We use one NVIDIA A100 GPU to generate 256×256 resolution images with a batch size of 8, averaging the results over 30 experiments. The results show that *decreasing the number of heads leads to a steady increase in theoretical GMACs but not the practical latency, which even shows a decrease*. Accordingly, we summarize it as the free lunch effect of linear attention. We also observe this phenomenon on the standard NVIDIA V100 GPU, as reported in Sec. C of the appendix. As such, we argue that setting a small number of heads enables a high theoretical compute budget, which, according to scaling law [31, 37, 45], allows the model to reach a higher upper bound in generation performance. The argument can be empirically demonstrated in Tab. 2. For different model scales, equipping linear attention with a few heads (e.g., 2, 3, 4) outperforms the default settings in DiT. Instead, using an excessive number of heads (e.g., 96 for S/2 or 192 for B/2) seriously hinders the generation quality.

Besides, we also evaluate the necessity of using many heads in linear attention from a *representation similarity* lens. Specifically, we visualize the average cosine similarity among the attention maps of different heads in LiT-S/2 (with 6 heads). As depicted in Fig. 4-(c), for different denoising steps or layers, the attention across different heads is quite homogeneous, with the average cosine similarity reaching up to above 0.5. The observation suggests that a small number of heads dominate the major information in the linear attention, which positively supports the empirical generative results in Tab. 2.

Remark 2. Previous works [51, 84] discuss the a single head self-attention for ViTs for classification. We first study such practice of linear attention in diffusion models, pro-

DiT	Head	FID-50K (↓)	IS (↑)	Prec. (↑)	Rec. (↑)
S/2	1	64.42	21.54	0.380	0.574
S/2	2	63.24	22.07	0.385	0.570
S/2	3	63.21	22.08	0.386	0.583
S/2	6	63.66	22.16	0.383	0.580
S/2	48	78.76	17.46	0.322	0.482
S/2	96	116.00	11.49	0.224	0.261
B/2	1	41.77	34.78	0.487	0.631
B/2	2	41.39	35.59	0.494	0.631
B/2	3	40.86	35.79	0.497	0.629
B/2	12	42.11	34.60	0.484	0.631
B/2	96	68.30	20.45	0.375	0.531
B/2	192	112.39	12.07	0.240	0.282
L/2	1	24.46	57.36	0.600	0.637
L/2	2	24.37	57.02	0.599	0.622
L/2	4	24.04	59.02	0.597	0.636
L/2	16	25.25	54.67	0.587	0.632
XL/2	1	21.13	65.06	0.619	0.632
XL/2	2	20.66	65.39	0.624	0.636
XL/2	4	20.82	65.52	0.619	0.632
XL/2	16	21.69	63.06	0.617	0.628

Table 2. **Head number ablation of linear attention on ImageNet 256×256 .** We report FID-50K (*without* classifier-free guidance), Inception Score, Precision/Recall metrics. DiTs setting.

viding a clear comparison of latency on mainstream GPU, GMACs, and generation performance.

4.3. Inheriting Weights from Diffusion Transformer

LiT shares some structural components with DiT, allowing weights to be inherited from the pre-trained DiT. These weights contain rich knowledge related to noise prediction, which is expected to transfer to LiT in a cost-effective way. Therefore, we load the pre-trained DiT weights into LiT,

Load	Iter.	FFN	Modu.	Attention	FID-50K (\downarrow)
model	400K	✓	✓	✗	56.07
ema	400K	✓	✓	✗	56.07
model	200K	✓	✓	✗	57.84
model	300K	✓	✓	✗	56.95
model	400K	✓	✓	✗	56.07
model	600K	✓	✓	✗	54.80
model	800K	✓	✓	✗	53.83
model	600K	✓	✓	Q, K, V	55.29
model	600K	✓	✓	K, V	55.07
model	600K	✓	✓	V	54.93
model	600K	✓	✓	Q	54.82
model	600K	✓	✓	O	54.84

Table 3. **Weight inheritance ablation on ImageNet 256×256.** Baseline linear DiT-S/2 (using 2 heads) are trained for 400K steps.

except for the linear attention. This includes parameters related to FFN, adaptive layer norm (adaLN), positional encoding, and conditional embedding. To thoroughly investigate this, we conduct ablation experiments to explore how the degree of training on inherited weights affects the model’s generation performance.

Guideline 3: Linear diffusion Transformer should be initialized from a converged DiT. We first pre-train DiT-S/2 [53] for five types of iterations—200K, 300K, 400K, 600K, and 800K—and in separate experiments, load these pre-trained weights into LiT-S/2, keeping only the linear attention parameters randomly initialized. The initialized LiT-S/2 is then trained for 400K iterations on class-conditional ImageNet, with results shown in Tab. 3. Some interesting findings are identified: (1) DiT’s pre-trained weights, even trained only 200K steps, play a significant role, improving the FID from 63.24 to 57.84. (2) Using exponential moving average (EMA) [57] of pre-trained weights has minimal impact. (3) Longer pre-training of DiT makes them better suited as initialization for LiT, even though the architectures are not fully aligned.

Remark 3. We suppose a possible explanation for this phenomenon is the functional decoupling of different modules in diffusion Transformers, as explored in large language models for content generation [73, 79]. Basically, although DiT and LiT have different architectures, their shared components (*e.g.*, FFN and adaLN) act quite similarly. As a result, the knowledge in the pre-trained parameters of these components can be transferred, and extensive pre-training may not hinder the optimization of the non-transferred parts.

Guideline 4: Projection matrices of query, key, value, and output in linear attention should be initialized randomly. In LiT, some of the weights in linear attention overlap with those in self-attention of DiT, including the query, key, value, and output projection matrices. Despite the differences in computation paradigms, these weights can be directly loaded from DiT into the LiT without ad-

Iter.	Teacher	λ_1	λ_2	FID-50K (\downarrow)	IS (\uparrow)
800K	DiT-S/2	0.1	0.0	55.11	26.28
800K	DiT-XL/2	0.0	0.0	<u>53.83</u>	<u>27.16</u>
800K	DiT-XL/2	0.1	0.0	53.05	27.43
800K	DiT-XL/2	0.05	0.0	53.41	27.26
800K	DiT-XL/2	0.5	0.0	51.13	28.89
800K	DiT-XL/2	0.1	0.05	52.76	27.70
800K	DiT-XL/2	0.0	0.05	53.49	27.26
800K	DiT-XL/2	0.05	0.05	53.14	27.46
800K	DiT-XL/2	0.5	0.05	50.79	29.17

Table 4. **Knowledge distillation results on ImageNet 256×256.** Baseline linear DiT-S/2 (using 2 heads), initialized using pre-trained DiT-S/2, are trained for 400K steps. w/o distillation.

ditional processing. However, whether this can accelerate its convergence remains an open question. We use a DiT-S/2 pre-trained for 600K iterations to conduct ablation experiments. Five different types of loading strategies are explored, including (1) query, key, and value projection matrices; (2) key and value projection matrices; (3) the value projection matrix; (4) the query projection matrix; and (5) the output projection matrix. Evaluation results are presented in Tab. 3. In comparison to the baseline without loading self-attention weights, none of the explored strategies shows better generative performance. The phenomenon can be attributed to differences in computation paradigms. Specifically, linear attention *directly computes the product of key and value matrices*, whereas self-attention does not. Consequently, weights related to key and value from self-attention offer limited benefit to linear attention. Clearly, as presented in Tab. 3, inheriting the weights of the key and value projector leads to a larger degradation (FID of 55.29 and 55.07).

Remark 4. Inheriting weights from a LiT-like pre-trained model is a favorable approach. We recommend loading all pre-trained parameters except for the linear attention, as it is easy to implement and well-suited for diffusion models based on the Transformer macro architecture. With substantial GPU resources, extensive pre-training can further improve linear LiT’s convergence and optimization, resulting in an efficient but strong model.

4.4. Distilling Both Predicted Noise and Variance

Guideline 5: Hybrid distillation is necessary for student linear diffusion Transformer. We distill not only the predicted noise but also variances of the reverse diffusion process, but in a moderate way. Knowledge distillation [28] commonly employs a teacher network to help the training of a lightweight student network, which has been validated in *ConvNets* [19] and *ViTs* [70, 72, 85]. For diffusion models, distillation typically focuses on reducing the sampling steps of the target model [64, 80, 81]. In contrast, we focus on how a heavy teacher model can aid the learning of an efficient student from an architecture perspective, while maintaining the sampling steps [46].

Class-Conditional ImageNet 256×256					
Model	Training Steps	FID↓	IS↑	Prec.↑	Rec.↑
● DiT-S/2 [53]	400K	68.40	-	-	-
● DiT-B/2	400K	43.47	-	-	-
● DiT-L/2	400K	23.33	-	-	-
● DiT-XL/2	400K	19.47	-	-	-
▶ DiG-S/2 [87]	400K	62.06	22.81	0.39	0.56
▶ DiG-S/2 [87]	400K	39.50	37.21	0.51	0.63
▶ DiG-S/2 [87]	400K	22.90	59.87	0.60	0.64
▶ DiG-S/2 [87]	400K	18.53	68.53	0.63	0.64
★ LiT-S/2	100K	60.91	23.51	0.399	0.583
★ LiT-B/2	100K	38.39	38.59	0.516	0.627
★ LiT-L/2	100K	17.80	76.26	0.639	0.636
★ LiT-XL/2	100K	12.90	95.80	0.657	0.653
★ LiT-S/2	400K	50.79	29.17	0.443	0.618
★ LiT-B/2	400K	29.55	50.57	0.557	0.645
★ LiT-L/2	400K	13.73	90.53	0.656	0.650
★ LiT-XL/2	400K	10.67	110.95	0.668	0.667

Table 5. Comparison with DiT for different model variants on class-conditional image generation. LiT trained for only 100K steps, outperforms DiT with 400K training steps.

A pre-trained DiT-S/2/XL/2 serves as the teacher network to distill the student LiT-S/2. For strong performance, we use a DiT-S/2 pre-trained for 800K iterations for initialization, following **Guideline 3&4**. Denote $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times C \times H \times W}$ as the noised input latent in timestep t , where H , W , C are height, width and the number of channels of the input latent. $\theta^{(T)}$, $\theta^{(S)}$ denote network parameters of the teacher diffusion Transformer \mathcal{T} and the student LiT network \mathcal{S} , respectively. As denoising diffusion models, the output of DiT and LiT include both noise predictions $\epsilon_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$ and variances of the reverse diffusion process $\Sigma_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$. DDPM [29] fixes the variance and optimizes model parameters using \mathcal{L}_{simple} . Naturally, a straightforward idea is to align the student network’s noise prediction capabilities with those of the teacher through a mean squared error (MSE) objective. Thus, we have:

$$\mathcal{L}_{noise} = \alpha_1 \|\epsilon_{\theta^{(T)}}(\mathbf{x}_t, t) - \epsilon_{\theta^{(S)}}(\mathbf{x}_t, t)\|_F^2, \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha_1 = 1/BCHW$ is the normalization factor. The impact of distilling the predicted noise is reported in Tab. 4. It shows that using a stronger teacher model (e.g., DiT-XL/2) improves the student model’s generation capability (51.13 vs. 53.83, measured by FID). Moreover, increasing the weight of the distillation objective from 0.05 to 0.5 consistently boosts performance, suggesting that the cheap linear attention can benefit from the supervision of the self-attention in diffusion Transformers.

As demonstrated in IDDPM [52], a suitable variance can contribute to the initial steps of the diffusion process, thereby improving the log-likelihood. Accordingly, the authors set the variance $\Sigma_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$ learnable. Based on the finding, we propose to use the variance from the teacher diffusion model as a supervision for the student, but in a moderate way. The MSE between the reverse process vari-

Class-Conditional ImageNet 256×256				
Model	FID↓	IS↑	Precision↑	Recall↑
■ BigGAN-deep [2]	6.95	171.4	0.87	0.28
■ StyleGAN-XL [66]	2.30	265.12	0.78	0.53
▲ ADM [14]	10.94	100.98	0.69	0.63
▲ ADM-G	4.59	186.70	0.82	0.52
▲ ADM-G, ADM-U	3.94	215.84	0.83	0.53
▲ CDM [30]	4.88	158.71	-	-
▲ RIN [36]	3.42	182.0	-	-
▲ LDM-4-G (cfg=1.25) [62]	3.95	178.22	0.81	0.55
▲ LDM-4-G (cfg=1.50)	3.60	247.67	0.87	0.48
▲ Simple Diffusion (U-Net) [32]	3.76	171.6	-	-
● Mask-GIT [5]	6.18	182.1	-	-
● Simple Diffusion (U-ViT, L)	2.77	211.8	-	-
● DiT-XL/2 [53]	9.62	121.50	0.67	0.67
● DiT-XL/2-G (cfg=1.25)	3.22	201.77	0.76	0.62
● DiT-XL/2-G (cfg=1.50)	2.27	278.24	0.83	0.57
● SiT-XL [49] (cfg=1.50)	2.06	277.50	0.83	0.59
▶ DiM-L [69]	2.64	-	-	-
▶ DiM-H [69]	2.40	-	-	-
▶ DiffuSSM-XL-G [77]	2.28	259.13	0.86	0.56
★ LiT-XL/2	10.24	114.79	0.666	0.674
★ LiT-XL/2-G (cfg=1.25)	3.60	191.06	0.758	0.623
★ LiT-XL/2-G (cfg=1.50)	2.32	265.20	0.824	0.574

Table 6. System-level comparison on class-conditional image generation on ImageNet 256×256 benchmark. LiT-XL/2 achieves highly competitive FID using cheap linear attention.

ances of teacher and student can be calculated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{var} = \alpha_2 \|\Sigma_{\theta^{(T)}}(\mathbf{x}_t, t) - \Sigma_{\theta^{(S)}}(\mathbf{x}_t, t)\|_F^2, \quad (6)$$

where $\alpha_2 = 1/BCHW$. With Eq. 5 and Eq. 6, we introduce a hybrid diffusion knowledge distillation objective, involving both the predicted noise and the variance:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{simple} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{noise} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{var}, \quad (7)$$

where λ_1 , λ_2 are hyper-parameters. We thoroughly study some representative settings of our hybrid distillation objective as presented in Tab. 4, and identifies two key findings: (1) Compared to the baseline (distilling noise only), the proposed hybrid distillation contributes positively (50.79 vs. 51.13, measured by FID), but the variance distillation should be moderate. (e.g., λ_2 set to 0.05). (2) Distilling only the variance is counterproductive for optimization, probably as the denoising capability is the major focus for diffusion.

Closing remarks. So far, we have finalized the roadmap. LiT follows the macro/micro-level design of DiT but employs efficient linear attention. Using our cost-effective training strategies, LiT-S/2 significantly improves the FID. Next, we validate it on larger variants (e.g., B/L/XL) and challenging tasks (e.g., text-to-image generation).

5. Experiments

5.1. Class-Conditional Image Generation

256×256 ImageNet. We first evaluate LiT on the 256×256 ImageNet [13] benchmark for conditional image

Class-Conditional ImageNet 512×512				
Model	FID↓	IS↑	Precision↑	Recall↑
■ BigGAN-deep [2]	8.43	177.90	0.88	0.29
■ StyleGAN-XL [66]	2.41	267.75	0.77	0.52
▲ ADM [14]	23.24	58.06	0.73	0.60
▲ ADM-U	9.96	121.78	0.75	0.64
▲ ADM-G	7.72	172.71	0.87	0.42
▲ ADM-G, ADM-U	3.85	221.72	0.84	0.53
▲ Simple Diffusion (U-Net) [32]	4.28	171.0	-	-
● Mask-GIT [5]	7.32	156.0	-	-
● Simple Diffusion (U-ViT, L)	4.53	205.3	-	-
● DiT-XL/2 [53]	12.03	105.25	0.75	0.64
● DiT-XL/2-G (cfg=1.25)	4.64	174.77	0.81	0.57
● DiT-XL/2-G (cfg=1.50)	3.04	240.82	0.84	0.54
● SiT-XL [49] (cfg=1.50)	2.62	252.21	0.84	0.57
★ LiT-XL/2	14.00	92.84	0.76	0.62
★ LiT-XL/2-G (cfg=1.50)	3.69	207.97	0.85	0.53

Table 7. **System-level comparison on class-conditional image generation on ImageNet 512×512 benchmark.** LiT-XL/2 achieves highly competitive FID using cheap linear attention.

generation. The LiT-S/2, B/2, L/2, XL/2 configurations are consistent with DiT, except that the linear attention heads are set to 2/3/4/4, following the guideline 2 in Sec. 4.2. DWC kernel size is set to 5 for all model variants. Detailed configuration are provided in Sec. A of the appendix. We train 400K steps with a batch size of 256. For LiT-XL/2, we extend training to 1.4M steps (20% of DiT’s [53] 7M steps). We used the AdamW [47] optimizer with a learning rate of $1e^{-4}$ and weight decay set to 0. Following Sec. 4.3, we initialize LiT’s parameters using the pre-trained DiT. λ_1, λ_2 in hybrid knowledge distillation, are set to 0.5 and 0.05. Evaluation metrics include FID-50K [27], Inception Score [65] and Precision/Recall [40].

Tab. 5 compares the results of different model variants of LiT and DiT. Notably, LiT trained for only 100K steps already outperforms the DiT trained for 400K steps across various evaluation metrics and different model variants. With extra training up to 400K steps, the model’s performance continues to improve. In Tab. 6, we compare LiT-XL/2 trained for 1.4M steps with high-performance baselines. Despite having only 20% of the training steps of DiT-XL/2, LiT still competes on par with DiT (2.32 vs. 2.27). Besides, LiT competes favorably with several U-Net [63] based baselines. The results demonstrate that the linear attention, when combined with suitable optimization strategies, can be reliably used in image generation applications.

512×512 ImageNet. We further validate LiT-XL/2 on the 512×512 ImageNet benchmark. Using the pre-trained DiT-XL/2 [53] as the teacher model, we initialize LiT-XL/2 with its weights. For knowledge distillation, we set λ_1 and λ_2 to 1.0 and 0.05, respectively, and train LiT-XL/2 for only 700K steps ($\sim 23\%$ of DiT’s [53] 3M steps). Notably, unlike DiT, which used a batch size of 256, we adopt a smaller batch size of 128, requiring twice the training steps to com-




Figure 6. **Offline deployment of on a Windows 11 laptop.** LiT can run on the edge-side in an offline manner, generating 1K resolution images.

plete 1 epoch (*i.e.*, processing the entire training dataset once). Aside from this, all other hyper-parameter settings were consistent with the 256×256 experiments. The results are reported in Tab. 7.

Despite being trained for only 700K steps, which is equivalent in training epochs to 350K steps with a batch size of 256 on the same dataset, LiT, using pure linear attention, achieves an impressive FID of 3.69, comparable to DiT trained for 3M steps, reducing the training steps by $\sim 77\%$. Additionally, LiT outperforms several strong baselines. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed cost-efficient training strategy on higher-resolution datasets.

5.2. Text-to-Image Generation

512px resolution. Text-to-image generation is important in generative models for commercial use. Following PixArt- α [8], we add cross-attention module to our LiT-XL/2 to support text embedding input. We set the linear attention heads to 2 and the DWC kernel size to 5. Following PixArt- Σ [7], we use pre-trained SDXL [56] VAE Encoder and T5 [10] Encoder (*i.e.*, Flan-T5-XXL) to extract image and text features, respectively. We use PixArt- Σ as the teacher to supervise the training of LiT, with λ_1, λ_2 set to 1.0, 0.05. As in Sec. 4.3, we inherit the weights from PixArt- Σ , except for the parameters in the self-attention. Subsequently, we train LiT on an internal dataset with a learning rate of $2e^{-5}$ for only 45400 steps, which is significantly fewer than the multi-stage training used for PixArt- α .


Fig. 7, Fig. 11, and Fig. 12 (illustrated in Sec. E of the appendix) depict the 512px images generated by LiT. Despite using linear attention in each block, along with our cost-effective training strategy, LiT can still produce exceptional, photorealistic images. The results show the general-



A photo of beautiful mountain with realistic sunset and blue lake, highly detailed, masterpiece



anthropomorphic profile of the white snow owl Crystal priestess, art deco painting, pretty and expressive eyes, ornate costume, mythical, ethereal, intricate, elaborate, hyperrealism, hyper detailed, 3D, 8K



a handsome 24 years old boy in the middle with sky color background wearing eye glasses, it's super detailed with anime style, it's a portrait with delicate eyes and nice looking face



Steampunk makeup, in the style of vray tracing, colorful impasto, whd image, indonesian art, fine feather details with bright red and yellow and green and pink and orange colours, intricate patterns and details, dark cyan and amber makeup. Rich colourful plumes. Victorian style.



An illustration of a human heart made of translucent glass, standing on a pedestal amidst a stormy sea. Rays of sunlight pierce the clouds, illuminating the heart, revealing a tiny universe within.



A dog that has been meditating all the time

Figure 7. 512px generated samples of LiT following user instructions. LiT shares the same macro/micro-level design as PixArt- Σ [7], but elegantly replaces all self-attention with cheap linear attention. While being more simple and efficient, LiT with our cost-effective training strategy, is still able to generate exceptional high-resolution images following complicated user instructions.

ity and commercial value of our approach for cost-effective training of efficient text-to-image frameworks.

1K resolution. We then scale the resolution to the more challenging 1K setting. Model of 512px is selected as the starting point for training, with positional embeddings (PE) Interpolation trick applied. Token length is increased from 120 to 300. We use the PixArt- Σ [7] model, designed for 1K resolution, as the teacher model. We prepare two internal datasets: one follows the PixArt- α setup, and the other follows the PixArt- Σ setup, with a caption ratio of 60% long (sharept caption) and 40% short (original captions). The training consists of multiple stages: stage 1 trains on the first dataset, and stages 2, 3, and 4 train on the second dataset. We use 32 NVIDIA V100 GPUs, with batch sizes of 64, 64, 256, and 256 for the four stages. In the final stage, no knowledge distillation method is used.

Fig. 1 shows the sampled 1K resolution images generated by LiT. Despite replacing all self-attention with the cheap linear attention, LiT is still able to generate photo-realistic images at high resolution.

5.3. On-Device Deployment

In this section, we deploy the LiT model for 1K resolution images to an edge device to validate its on-device capability. Specifically, we deploy the model trained after stage 3 of the 1K resolution experiments from Sec. 5.2 to a laptop powered by the Windows 11 operating system. Considering the GPU memory limitations of the laptop, we quantize the text encoder to 8 bits while maintaining fp16 precision during the linear attention computation. Fig. 6 shows our deployment results. The pre-trained LiT can quickly generate photo-realistic 1K resolution images in an offline setting (without network connection). These results confirm

the successful implementation of LiT as an on-device diffusion model, advancing high-resolution text-to-image tasks on edge devices.

6. Conclusion and Limitation

This paper explores using linear attention to implement diffusion Transformer for text-to-image task. We reexamine attention head number, weight inheritance, and knowledge distillation. Our model can handle class-conditional image generation, as well as synthesize photorealistic images based on instructions. Ultra-high resolution scenarios (e.g., 4K resolution) for image generation remains a limitation, which we leave in future work.

References

- [1] Daniel Bolya, Cheng-Yang Fu, Xiaoliang Dai, Peizhao Zhang, and Judy Hoffman. Hydra attention: Efficient attention with many heads. In *ECCV*, 2022. 1, 4, 2
- [2] Andrew Brock, Jeff Donahue, and Karen Simonyan. Large scale gan training for high fidelity natural image synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2019. 8, 9
- [3] Han Cai, Junyan Li, Muyan Hu, Chuang Gan, and Song Han. Efficientvit: Lightweight multi-scale attention for high-resolution dense prediction. In *ICCV*, 2023. 1, 4, 2, 3
- [4] Han Cai, Muyang Li, Zhuoyang Zhang, Qinsheng Zhang, Ming-Yu Liu, and Song Han. Condition-aware neural network for controlled image generation. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3
- [5] Huiwen Chang, Han Zhang, Lu Jiang, Ce Liu, and William T Freeman. Maskgit: Masked generative image transformer. In *CVPR*, 2022. 8, 9
- [6] Hanting Chen, Zhicheng Liu, Xutao Wang, Yuchuan Tian, and Yunhe Wang. Dijiang: Efficient large language models through compact kernelization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19928*, 2024. 1, 2
- [7] Junsong Chen, Chongjian Ge, Enze Xie, Yue Wu, Lewei Yao, Xiaozhe Ren, Zhongdao Wang, Ping Luo, Huchuan Lu, and Zhenguo Li. Pixart- σ : Weak-to-strong training of diffusion transformer for 4k text-to-image generation. In *ECCV*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 7, 8
- [8] Junsong Chen, Jincheng Yu, Chongjian Ge, Lewei Yao, Enze Xie, Yue Wu, Zhongdao Wang, James Kwok, Ping Luo, Huchuan Lu, et al. Pixart- α : Fast training of diffusion transformer for photorealistic text-to-image synthesis. In *ICLR*, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 9
- [9] François Chollet. Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions. In *CVPR*, 2017. 5
- [10] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2024. 9
- [11] Tri Dao and Albert Gu. Transformers are ssms: Generalized models and efficient algorithms through structured state space duality. In *ICML*, 2024. 3, 2
- [12] Tri Dao, Dan Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 5
- [13] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*, 2009. 2, 4, 8
- [14] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Nichol. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. In *NeurIPS*, 2021. 8, 9
- [15] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *ICLR*, 2020. 4
- [16] Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, Andreas Blattmann, Rahim Entezari, Jonas Müller, Harry Saini, Yam Levi, Dominik Lorenz, Axel Sauer, Frederic Boesel, et al. Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *ICML*, 2024. 1
- [17] Zhengcong Fei, Mingyuan Fan, Changqian Yu, Debang Li, and Junshi Huang. Diffusion-rwkv: Scaling rwkv-like architectures for diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04478*, 2024. 2
- [18] Peng Gao, Le Zhuo, Ziyi Lin, Chris Liu, Junsong Chen, Ruoyi Du, Enze Xie, Xu Luo, Longtian Qiu, Yuhang Zhang, et al. Lumina-t2x: Transforming text into any modality, resolution, and duration via flow-based large diffusion transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05945*, 2024. 3
- [19] Jianping Gou, Baosheng Yu, Stephen J Maybank, and Dacheng Tao. Knowledge distillation: A survey. *IJCV*, 2021. 7
- [20] Albert Gu. *Modeling Sequences with Structured State Spaces*. Stanford University, 2023. 1
- [21] Albert Gu and Tri Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752*, 2023. 1, 3, 2
- [22] Jialong Guo, Xinghao Chen, Yehui Tang, and Yunhe Wang. Slab: Efficient transformers with simplified linear attention and progressive re-parameterized batch normalization. In *ICML*, 2024. 5, 2
- [23] Dongchen Han, Xuran Pan, Yizeng Han, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. Flatten transformer: Vision transformer using focused linear attention. In *ICCV*, 2023. 1, 4, 5, 2
- [24] Dongchen Han, Tianzhu Ye, Yizeng Han, Zhuofan Xia, Siyuan Pan, Pengfei Wan, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. Agent attention: On the integration of softmax and linear attention. In *ECCV*, 2024. 4, 2
- [25] Song Han, Huizi Mao, and William J Dally. Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and huffman coding. In *ICLR*, 2016. 2
- [26] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. Gaussian error linear units (gelus). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415*, 2016. 5
- [27] Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. In *NeurIPS*, 2017. 3, 4, 9, 2, 5, 6
- [28] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015. 7

- [29] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *NeurIPS*, 2020. 1, 3, 8
- [30] Jonathan Ho, Chitwan Saharia, William Chan, David J Fleet, Mohammad Norouzi, and Tim Salimans. Cascaded diffusion models for high fidelity image generation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2022. 8
- [31] Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*, 2022. 6
- [32] Emiel Hoogeboom, Jonathan Heek, and Tim Salimans. simple diffusion: End-to-end diffusion for high resolution images. In *ICML*, 2023. 8, 9
- [33] Andrew G Howard, Menglong Zhu, Bo Chen, Dmitry Kalenichenko, Weijun Wang, Tobias Weyand, Marco Andreetto, and Hartwig Adam. Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. In *CVPR*, 2017. 5
- [34] Vincent Tao Hu, Stefan Andreas Baumann, Ming Gui, Olga Grebenkova, Pingchuan Ma, Johannes S Fischer, and Björn Ommer. Zigma: A dit-style zigzag mamba diffusion model. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3, 2
- [35] Sergey Ioffe and Christian Szegedy. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In *ICML*, pages 448–456, 2015. 2
- [36] Allan Jabri, David Fleet, and Ting Chen. Scalable adaptive computation for iterative generation. In *ICML*, 2023. 8
- [37] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020. 6
- [38] Angelos Katharopoulos, Apoorv Vyas, Nikolaos Pappas, and François Fleuret. Transformers are rnns: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention. In *ICML*, 2020. 1, 3, 5, 2
- [39] Diederik P Kingma. Auto-encoding variational bayes. In *ICLR*, 2014. 4
- [40] Tuomas Kynkäänniemi, Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, Jaakko Lehtinen, and Timo Aila. Improved precision and recall metric for assessing generative models. In *NeurIPS*, 2019. 4, 9, 2, 5, 6
- [41] Muyang Li, Tianle Cai, Jiabin Cao, Qinsheng Zhang, Han Cai, Junjie Bai, Yangqing Jia, Ming-Yu Liu, Kai Li, and Song Han. Distrifusion: Distributed parallel inference for high-resolution diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2
- [42] Xiuyu Li, Yijiang Liu, Long Lian, Huanrui Yang, Zhen Dong, Daniel Kang, Shanghang Zhang, and Kurt Keutzer. Q-diffusion: Quantizing diffusion models. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2
- [43] Yanjing Li, Sheng Xu, Xianbin Cao, Xiao Sun, and Baochang Zhang. Q-dm: An efficient low-bit quantized diffusion model. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. 2
- [44] Zhimin Li, Jianwei Zhang, Qin Lin, Jiangfeng Xiong, Yanxin Long, Xincheng Deng, Yingfang Zhang, Xingchao Liu, Minbin Huang, Zedong Xiao, et al. Hunyuan-dit: A powerful multi-resolution diffusion transformer with fine-grained chinese understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08748*, 2024. 4
- [45] Zhengyang Liang, Hao He, Ceyuan Yang, and Bo Dai. Scaling laws for diffusion transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.08184*, 2024. 6
- [46] Songhua Liu, Weihao Yu, Zhenxiong Tan, and Xinchao Wang. Linfusion: 1 gpu, 1 minute, 16k image. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.02097*, 2024. 3, 4, 7, 2
- [47] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *ICLR*, 2019. 9
- [48] Calvin Luo. Understanding diffusion models: A unified perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11970*, 2022. 3
- [49] Nanye Ma, Mark Goldstein, Michael S Albergo, Nicholas M Boffi, Eric Vanden-Eijnden, and Saining Xie. Sit: Exploring flow and diffusion-based generative models with scalable interpolant transformers. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3, 8, 9
- [50] Xinyin Ma, Gongfan Fang, and Xinchao Wang. Deepcache: Accelerating diffusion models for free. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2
- [51] Paul Michel, Omer Levy, and Graham Neubig. Are sixteen heads really better than one? In *NeurIPS*, 2019. 6
- [52] Alexander Quinn Nichol and Prafulla Dhariwal. Improved denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *ICML*, 2021. 8
- [53] William Peebles and Saining Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers. In *ICCV*, 2023. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 1, 2, 5
- [54] Bo Peng, Eric Alcaide, Quentin Anthony, Alon Albalak, Samuel Arcadinho, Stella Biderman, Huanqi Cao, Xin Cheng, Michael Chung, Matteo Grella, et al. Rkv: Reinventing rnns for the transformer era. In *EMNLP*, 2023. 3, 2
- [55] Hao Phung, Quan Dao, Trung Dao, Hoang Phan, Dimitris Metaxas, and Anh Tran. Dimsum: Diffusion mamba—a scalable and unified spatial-frequency method for image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04168*, 2024. 2
- [56] Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Jonas Müller, Joe Penna, and Robin Rombach. Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01952*, 2023. 9
- [57] Boris T Polyak and Anatoli B Juditsky. Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 1992. 7
- [58] Yifan Pu, Zhuofan Xia, Jiayi Guo, Dongchen Han, Qixiu Li, Duo Li, Yuhui Yuan, Ji Li, Yizeng Han, Shiji Song, et al. Efficient diffusion transformer with step-wise dynamic attention mediators. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3, 4, 2
- [59] Zhen Qin, Weixuan Sun, Hui Deng, Dongxu Li, Yunshen Wei, Baohong Lv, Junjie Yan, Lingpeng Kong, and Yiran Zhong. cosformer: Rethinking softmax in attention. In *ICLR*, 2022. 2
- [60] Zhen Qin, Songlin Yang, Weixuan Sun, Xuyang Shen, Dong Li, Weigao Sun, and Yiran Zhong. Hgrn2: Gated linear rnns with state expansion. In *COLM*, 2024.
- [61] Zhen Qin, Songlin Yang, and Yiran Zhong. Hierarchically gated recurrent neural network for sequence modeling. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 2
- [62] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, 2022. 4, 8

- [63] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In *MICCAI*, 2015. 9, 2
- [64] Tim Salimans and Jonathan Ho. Progressive distillation for fast sampling of diffusion models. In *ICLR*, 2021. 7, 3
- [65] Tim Salimans, Ian Goodfellow, Wojciech Zaremba, Vicki Cheung, Alec Radford, and Xi Chen. Improved techniques for training gans. In *NeurIPS*, 2016. 4, 9, 2, 5, 6
- [66] Axel Sauer, Katja Schwarz, and Andreas Geiger. Stylegan-xl: Scaling stylegan to large diverse datasets. In *SIGGRAPH*, 2022. 8, 9
- [67] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. In *ICML*, 2015. 1, 3
- [68] Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models. In *ICLR*, 2020. 3
- [69] Yao Teng, Yue Wu, Han Shi, Xuefei Ning, Guohao Dai, Yu Wang, Zhenguo Li, and Xihui Liu. Dim: Diffusion mamba for efficient high-resolution image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14224*, 2024. 1, 3, 8, 2
- [70] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, Matthijs Douze, Francisco Massa, Alexandre Sablayrolles, and Hervé Jégou. Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention. In *ICML*, 2021. 7
- [71] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NIPS*, 2017. 1, 3, 5, 2
- [72] Jiahao Wang, Songyang Zhang, Yong Liu, Taiqiang Wu, Yujin Yang, Xihui Liu, Kai Chen, Ping Luo, and Dahua Lin. Riformer: Keep your vision backbone effective but removing token mixer. In *CVPR*, 2023. 7
- [73] Peng Wang, Zexi Li, Ningyu Zhang, Ziwen Xu, Yunzhi Yao, Yong Jiang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, and Huajun Chen. Wise: Rethinking the knowledge memory for life-long model editing of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14768*, 2024. 7
- [74] Lilian Weng. What are diffusion models? *lilian-weng.github.io*, 2021. 3
- [75] Enze Xie, Junsong Chen, Junyu Chen, Han Cai, Yujun Lin, Zhekai Zhang, Muyang Li, Yao Lu, and Song Han. Sana: Efficient high-resolution image synthesis with linear diffusion transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10629*, 2024. 3, 4, 2
- [76] Zeyue Xue, Guanglu Song, Qiushan Guo, Boxiao Liu, Zhuofan Zong, Yu Liu, and Ping Luo. Raphael: Text-to-image generation via large mixture of diffusion paths. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 2
- [77] Jing Nathan Yan, Jiatao Gu, and Alexander M Rush. Diffusion models without attention. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3, 8
- [78] Songlin Yang, Bailin Wang, Yikang Shen, Rameswar Panda, and Yoon Kim. Gated linear attention transformers with hardware-efficient training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06635*, 2023. 1, 2
- [79] Yunzhi Yao, Ningyu Zhang, Zekun Xi, Mengru Wang, Ziwen Xu, Shumin Deng, and Huajun Chen. Knowledge circuits in pretrained transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17969*, 2024. 7
- [80] Tianwei Yin, Michaël Gharbi, Taesung Park, Richard Zhang, Eli Shechtman, Fredo Durand, and William T Freeman. Improved distribution matching distillation for fast image synthesis. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 7, 3
- [81] Tianwei Yin, Michaël Gharbi, Richard Zhang, Eli Shechtman, Fredo Durand, William T Freeman, and Taesung Park. One-step diffusion with distribution matching distillation. In *CVPR*, 2024. 7, 3
- [82] Sihyun Yu, Sangkyung Kwak, Huiwon Jang, Jongheon Jeong, Jonathan Huang, Jinwoo Shin, and Saining Xie. Representation alignment for generation: Training diffusion transformers is easier than you think. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06940*, 2024. 3
- [83] Weihao Yu, Mi Luo, Pan Zhou, Chenyang Si, Yichen Zhou, Xinchao Wang, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. Metaformer is actually what you need for vision. In *CVPR*, 2022. 3
- [84] Seokju Yun and Youngmin Ro. Shvit: Single-head vision transformer with memory efficient macro design. In *CVPR*, 2024. 6
- [85] Jinnian Zhang, Houwen Peng, Kan Wu, Mengchen Liu, Bin Xiao, Jianlong Fu, and Lu Yuan. Minivit: Compressing vision transformers with weight multiplexing. In *CVPR*, 2022. 7
- [86] Yang Zhao, Yanwu Xu, Zhisheng Xiao, and Tingbo Hou. Mobicdiffusion: Subsecond text-to-image generation on mobile devices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16567*, 2023. 2
- [87] Lianghui Zhu, Zilong Huang, Bencheng Liao, Jun Hao Liew, Hanshu Yan, Jiashi Feng, and Xinggang Wang. Dig: Scalable and efficient diffusion models with gated linear attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18428*, 2024. 1, 3, 8, 2

LiT: Delving into a Simplified Linear Diffusion Transformer for Image Generation

Supplementary Material

A. Model Configuration

We report the configurations of LiT variants in Tab. 8, which basically follow the hyper-parameters of DiT [53], except for using few heads. For class-conditional image generation, we set 2/3/4/4 heads for linear attention used in LiT. For LiT-XL/2, used for text-to-image tasks, we use 2 heads for linear attention.

Model	Layers	Hidden size	Heads	Patch size
LiT-S	12	384	2	2
LiT-B	12	768	3	2
LiT-L	24	1024	4	2
LiT-XL	28	1152	4	2
LiT-XL [◊]	28	1152	2	2

Table 8. **Configurations of LiT** for class-conditional image generation and text-to-image generation (denoted by [◊]). Apart from using few heads, we generally follow the DiT [53] setting.

B. Latency Analysis in Diffusion Transformer

We conduct a component-wise latency analysis of the Diffusion Transformer, with results shown in Fig. 8. The analysis was performed using the DiT-B/4 [53] model on an NVIDIA A100 GPU. The results indicate that the self-attention module accounts for 42.6% of the total latency of a DiT block. We attribute the observed considerable latency proportion to the quadratic computational complexity of the self-attention.

C. Detailed Latency and Theoretical GMACs

We use one NVIDIA V100 GPU to evaluate the **latency** and theoretical **GMACs** of the DiT-S/B models with different numbers of heads. The task was to generate 256×256 resolution images with a batch size of 8, following the experimental setup of Fig. 5 (except for the GPU type), and the results are shown in Fig. 10.

We observe that both the small and base models on the V100 GPU exhibit a phenomenon similar to that on the A100 GPU: as theoretical **GMACs** increased, practical **latency** does not follow the same trend and even descend (in the B/2 model). This finding supports the generalizability of the free lunch effect of linear attention.




Figure 8. **Latency analysis of different components** in DiT-B/4 [53] with a batch size of 8 using NVIDIA A100 GPU. Latency of the vanilla self-attention occupies about 42.6% of the backbone. Our LiT successfully replaces the heavy attention module with simple linear attention, by using the proposed architectural design and training guidelines.




Figure 9. **Comparing training efficiency between our LiT and DiT.** LiT outperforms DiT (400K training steps) with only 100K training steps for different model sizes.




Figure 10. **Free lunch in linear attention.** Comparison of latency and theoretical GMACs for linear attention with different number of heads. We test the latency to generate 256×256 resolution images using one NVIDIA V100 GPU with a batch size of 8. Results of S/2 and B/2 model were averaged over 30 times. Results for the case of the V100 GPU demonstrate a similar phenomenon to the A100 GPU.

D. Detailed Results on Class-Conditional Image Generation

Detailed results on Sec. 4. We provide detailed results for Tab. 1, Tab. 2, Tab. 3 and Tab. 4 in the main text in Tab. 9, Tab. 10, Tab. 11, and Tab. 12, respectively. In each table, we report results involving FID-50K [27] (*without* classifier-free guidance), Inception Score (IS) [65] and Precision/Recall [40]. IS, and Precision/Recall show results similar to FID-50K. As a result, the conclusions drawn in Sec. 4 of the main paper apply not only to metrics evaluating the distance between generated images and real images (*e.g.*, FID-50K) but also to metrics reflecting the quality of the generated images themselves (*e.g.*, IS).

E. More Results on Text-to-Image Generation

We provide more text-to-image results in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12. As shown, LiT can accurately generate 512px photo-realistic images in various styles, themes, and content, whether the human instructions are simple or complicated. These results demonstrate that LiT effectively learns useful knowledge from the teacher model while maintaining exceptional computational efficiency, validating the effectiveness of our proposed cost-effective training strategy.

F. Code in PyTorch

PyTorch-like code of the linear attention used in our LiT for text-to-image generation is provided in Alg. 1. As shown, when training LiT for text-to-image generation, we use fp16

precision (except for the main part of linear attention, where fp32 is used) to prevent the loss from becoming NaN, basically following PixArt- Σ [7]. We set the kernel size of the depthwise convolution to 5.

G. Full Related Work

Linear attention. As a computationally efficient alternative to self-attention, linear attention [38] reduces computational complexity from quadratic to linear and has been proven effective in both visual understanding domain [1, 3, 22–24] and language domain [6, 59–61, 78]. EfficientViT [3] introduces a multi-scale linear attention with hardware-efficient operations to obtain a general vision backbone. Flatten Transformer [23] introduces focused linear attention to address the deficiencies in focus ability and feature diversity of linear attention, incorporating a focused function and depthwise convolution (DWC). SLAB [22] simplifies focused linear attention by retaining only the DWC component and introduces a progressive re-parameterized batch normalization to adapt offline batch normalization [35] for achieving low inference latency. These studies have been validated on visual understanding. Meanwhile, our work refines a linear attention module tailored for image generation tasks and identifies the free lunch of using few heads.

Efficient diffusion Transformer for image generation.

Limited by the quadratic computational complexity of self-attention, recent studies focus on developing efficient Transformer-style architectures for diffusion models. For example, DiM [69], ZigMa [34], and DiMSUM [55] explore implementing Mamba-based [11, 21] DiT-style [53] models. Diffusion-RMKV [17] studies RWKV-style [54] models for diffusion. Mediator [58] introduces an attention mediator to obtain an efficient diffusion Transformer with linear complexity. DiG [87] replaces the self-attention in DiT with gated linear attention to speed up training. LinFusion [46] and Sana [75] apply linear attention to UNet-based [63] and Transformer-based [71] diffusion models, respectively, and train these models from scratch to generate high-quality images based on user instructions. Other studies [42, 43] explore efficient diffusion models through perspectives of low-bit quantization [25], feature map reusing [41, 50], and lightweight architecture design [86]. Differently, our work not only refines the design of linear attention but also introduces cost-effective training strategies, including weight inheritance and a novel hybrid diffusion distillation approach.

Advanced training method for diffusion models. Some studies explore improved training strategies to enhance the optimization of diffusion models or achieve more efficient

Algorithm 1 Linear Attention in LiT, PyTorch-like Code

```
import torch
import torch.nn as nn

class LinearAttention(nn.Module):
    def __init__(
        self,
        dim,
        num_heads=8,
        qkv_bias=False,
        attn_drop=0.,
        proj_drop=0.,
        kernel_function=nn.ReLU,
        kernel_size=5,
        **block_kwargs,
    ):
        super().__init__()
        assert dim % num_heads == 0, f"dim_{dim}_should_be_divisible_by_num_heads_{num_heads}."

        self.dim = dim
        self.num_heads = num_heads
        head_dim = dim // num_heads

        self.q = nn.Linear(dim, dim, bias=qkv_bias)
        self.kv = nn.Linear(dim, dim * 2, bias=qkv_bias)
        self.attn_drop = nn.Dropout(attn_drop)
        self.proj = nn.Linear(dim, dim)
        self.proj_drop = nn.Dropout(proj_drop)

        self.dwc = nn.Conv2d(in_channels=head_dim, out_channels=head_dim, kernel_size=kernel_size,
                             groups=head_dim, padding=kernel_size // 2)
        self.kernel_function = kernel_function()

    def forward(self, x, HW=None):
        B, N, C = x.shape
        new_N = N
        if HW is None:
            H = W = int(N ** 0.5)
        else:
            H, W = HW

        q = self.q(x) # (B, N, D)
        dtype = q.dtype

        kv = self.kv(x).reshape(B, N, 2, C).permute(2, 0, 1, 3) # (2, B, N, D)
        k, v = kv[0], kv[1] # (B, N, D)

        q = self.kernel_function(q) + 1e-6 # (B, N, D)
        k = self.kernel_function(k) + 1e-6 # (B, N, D)

        q = q.reshape(B, N, self.num_heads, -1).permute(0, 2, 1, 3).to(dtype) # (B, h, N, D/h)
        k = k.reshape(B, N, self.num_heads, -1).permute(0, 2, 1, 3).to(dtype) # (B, h, N, D/h)
        v = v.reshape(B, N, self.num_heads, -1).permute(0, 2, 1, 3).to(dtype) # (B, h, N, D/h)

        use_fp32_attention = getattr(self, 'fp32_attention', False) # necessary for NAN loss
        if use_fp32_attention:
            q, k, v = q.float(), k.float(), v.float()

        with torch.cuda.amp.autocast(enabled=not use_fp32_attention):
            z = 1 / (q @ k.mean(dim=-2, keepdim=True).transpose(-2, -1) + 1e-6) # (B, h, N, 1)
            kv = (k.transpose(-2, -1) * (N ** -0.5)) @ (v * (N ** -0.5)) # (B, h, D/h, N) @ (B, h, N, D/h) = (B,
                h, D/h, D/h)
            x = q @ kv * z # (B, h, N, D/h) @ (B, h, D/h, D/h) * (B, h, N, 1) = (B, h, N, D/h)

            x = x.transpose(1, 2).reshape(B, N, C) # (B, N, D)
            v = v.reshape(B * self.num_heads, H, W, -1).permute(0, 3, 1, 2) # (B*h, D/h, H, W)
            x = x + self.dwc(v).reshape(B, C, N).permute(0, 2, 1) # (B, N, D)

        x = self.proj(x)
        x = self.proj_drop(x)

    return x
```

models. For example, CAN [4] introduces a condition-aware weight generation module to the diffusion Transformer, and demonstrate the technique can be further equipped with EfficientViT [3] to achieve both effectiveness and efficiency. REPA [82] proposes aligning the intermedi-

ate features of the denoising model with those extracted by a pre-trained visual encoder during the training of diffusion models. Some studies [64, 80, 81] explore distillation techniques to reduce the sampling steps of the diffusion model. Unlike the goal of reducing sampling steps, our proposed

hybrid knowledge distillation focuses on an architectural perspective, exploring how a lightweight student model can learn from a computationally intensive teacher model.

DiT	Attention	Resolution	Batch Size	Training Steps	FID-50K (\downarrow)	IS (\uparrow)	Precision (\uparrow)	Recall (\uparrow)
S/2	softmax	256	256	400K	68.40	-		
S/2	ReLU linear	256	256	400K	88.46	15.11	0.29	0.45
S/2	Simplified linear (ReLU)	256	256	400K	63.66	22.16	0.38	0.58
S/2	focused linear (ReLU)	256	256	400K	63.05	22.49	0.39	0.58
S/2	focused linear (GELU)	256	256	400K	70.83	19.41	0.36	0.54
B/2	softmax	256	256	400K	43.47	-		
B/2	ReLU linear	256	256	400K	56.92	25.80	0.42	0.59
B/2	Simplified linear (ReLU)	256	256	400K	42.11	34.60	0.48	0.63
B/2	focused linear (ReLU)	256	256	400K	40.58	35.98	0.50	0.63
B/2	focused linear (GELU)	256	256	400K	58.86	24.23	0.42	0.57

Table 9. **Detailed results of Tab. 1 in the main paper.** We report FID-50K [27] (*without* classifier-free guidance), Inception Score [65] and Precision/Recall [40] metrics.

DiT	Head	Resolution	Batch Size	Training Steps	FID-50K (\downarrow)	IS (\uparrow)	Precision (\uparrow)	Recall (\uparrow)
S/2	1	256	256	400K	64.42	21.54	0.380	0.574
S/2	2	256	256	400K	63.24	22.07	0.385	0.570
S/2	3	256	256	400K	63.21	22.08	0.386	0.583
S/2	6	256	256	400K	63.66	22.16	0.383	0.580
S/2	48	256	256	400K	78.76	17.46	0.322	0.482
S/2	96	256	256	400K	116.00	11.49	0.224	0.261
B/2	1	256	256	400K	41.77	34.78	0.487	0.631
B/2	2	256	256	400K	41.39	35.59	0.494	0.631
B/2	3	256	256	400K	40.86	35.79	0.497	0.629
B/2	12	256	256	400K	42.11	34.60	0.484	0.631
B/2	96	256	256	400K	68.30	20.45	0.375	0.531
B/2	192	256	256	400K	112.39	12.07	0.240	0.282
L/2	1	256	256	400K	24.46	57.36	0.600	0.637
L/2	2	256	256	400K	24.37	57.02	0.599	0.622
L/2	4	256	256	400K	24.04	59.02	0.597	0.636
L/2	16	256	256	400K	25.25	54.67	0.587	0.632
XL/2	1	256	256	400K	21.13	65.06	0.619	0.632
XL/2	2	256	256	400K	20.66	65.39	0.624	0.636
XL/2	4	256	256	400K	20.82	65.52	0.619	0.632
XL/2	16	256	256	400K	21.69	63.06	0.617	0.628


Table 10. **Detailed results of Tab. 2 in the main paper.** We report FID-50K [27] (*without* classifier-free guidance), Inception Score [65] and Precision/Recall [40] metrics. DiTs [53] setting.

Load	Iterations	FFN	Modulation Layer	Attention	FID-50K (\downarrow)	IS (\uparrow)	Precision (\uparrow)	Recall (\uparrow)
model	400K	✓	✓	✗	56.07	25.62	0.418	0.608
ema	400K	✓	✓	✗	56.07	25.61	0.416	0.601
model	200K	✓	✓	✗	57.84	24.72	0.408	0.600
model	300K	✓	✓	✗	56.95	25.04	0.414	0.608
model	400K	✓	✓	✗	56.07	25.62	0.418	0.608
model	600K	✓	✓	✗	54.80	26.65	0.424	0.613
model	800K	✓	✓	✗	53.83	27.16	0.425	0.614
model	600K	✓	✓	Q, K, V	55.29	26.09	0.419	0.619
model	600K	✓	✓	K, V	55.07	26.38	0.422	0.609
model	600K	✓	✓	V	54.93	26.44	0.427	0.612
model	600K	✓	✓	Q	54.82	26.72	0.423	0.605
model	600K	✓	✓	O	54.84	26.33	0.425	0.607

Table 11. **Detailed results of Tab. 3 in the main paper.** We report FID-50K [27] (*without* classifier-free guidance), Inception Score [65] and Precision/Recall [40] metrics.

Model Size	Iterations	Teacher	λ_1	λ_2	Training Steps	FID-50K (\downarrow)	IS (\uparrow)	Precision (\uparrow)	Recall (\uparrow)
S/2	800K	DiT-S/2	0.1	0.0	400K	55.11	26.28	0.419	0.614
S/2	800K	DiT-XL/2	0.0	0.0	400K	<u>53.83</u>	<u>27.16</u>	<u>0.425</u>	<u>0.614</u>
S/2	800K	DiT-XL/2	0.1	0.0	400K	53.05	27.43	0.431	0.609
S/2	800K	DiT-XL/2	0.05	0.0	400K	53.41	27.26	0.427	0.610
S/2	800K	DiT-XL/2	0.5	0.0	400K	51.13	28.89	0.438	0.616
S/2	800K	DiT-XL/2	0.1	0.05	400K	52.76	27.70	0.431	0.620
S/2	800K	DiT-XL/2	0.0	0.05	400K	53.49	27.26	0.429	0.609
S/2	800K	DiT-XL/2	0.05	0.05	400K	53.14	27.46	0.431	0.609
S/2	800K	DiT-XL/2	0.5	0.05	400K	50.79	29.17	0.443	0.618

Table 12. **Detailed results of Tab. 4 in the main paper.** We report FID-50K [27] (*without* classifier-free guidance), Inception Score [65] and Precision/Recall [40] metrics.



A alpaca made of colorful building blocks, cyberpunk



A blue jay standing on a large basket of rainbow macarons.



A car made out of vegetables.



A cute orange kitten sliding down an aqua slide, happy excited, 16mm lens in front. we see his excitement and scared in the eye. vibrant colors. water splashing on the lens



A realistic landscape shot of the Northern Lights dancing over a snowy mountain range in Iceland.



portrait photo of a girl, photograph, highly detailed face, depth of field

Figure 11. 512px generated samples of LiT following user instructions (part 1). LiT shares the same macro/micro-level design as PixArt- Σ [7], but elegantly replaces all self-attention with cheap linear attention. While being more simple and efficient, LiT with our cost-effective training strategy, is still able to generate exceptional high-resolution images following complicated user instructions.



Frog, in forest, colorful, no watermark, no signature, in forest, 8k



Astronaut in a jungle, cold color palette, muted colors, detailed, 8k



dog



An extreme close-up of an gray-haired man with a beard in his 60s, he is deep in thought pondering the history of the universe as he sits at a cafe in Paris, his eyes focus on people offscreen as they walk as he sits mostly motionless, he is dressed in a wool coat suit coat with a button-down shirt, he wears a brown beret and glasses and has a very professional appearance, and the end he offers a subtle closed-mouth smile as if he found the answer to the mystery of life, the lighting is very cinematic with the golden light and the Parisian streets and city in the background, depth of field, cinematic 35mm film.



Game-Art - An island with different geographical properties and multiple small cities floating in space



Pirate ship trapped in a cosmic maelstrom nebula, rendered in cosmic beach whirlpool engine, volumetric lighting, spectacular, ambient lights, light pollution, cinematic atmosphere, art nouveau style, illustration art artwork by SenseiJaye, intricate detail.

Figure 12. 512px generated samples of LiT following user instructions (part 2). LiT shares the same macro/micro-level design as PixArt- Σ [7], but elegantly replaces all self-attention with cheap linear attention. While being more simple and efficient, LiT with our cost-effective training strategy, is still able to generate exceptional high-resolution images following complicated user instructions.