Model	Deg ↓	Clus ↓	Orb ↓	V.U.N. ↓
Stochastic Block Model				
SPECTRE	1.9	1.6	1.6	53%
ConGress	34.1	3.1	4.5	0%
DiGress	1.6	**1.5**	1.7	74%
Flow Matching	10.2	2.0	3.2	22%
Dirichlet FM	1.7	**1.5**	**1.4**	80%
CatFlow	**1.5**	**1.5**	**1.4**	**85**%
Planar Graphs				
SPECTRE	2.5	2.5	2.4	25%
ConGress	23.8	8.8	2590	0%
DiGress	**1.4**	**1.2**	1.7	75%
Flow Matching	5.1	5.6	5.5	30%
Dirchlet FM	1.5	1.3	**1.5**	**80**%
CatFlow	**1.4**	1.3	**1.5**	**80**%

Table 1: Results on Stochastic Block Model and Planar Graphs. We ran extra experiments for **(standard) flow matching and Dirichlet flow matching**. We observe that CatFlow obtains SOTA performance on all tasks and metrics. Moreover, it is worth noting CatFlow was significantly faster to train than Dirichlet FM due to a computationally cheaper forward process.

	QM9			**ZINC250k**		
	Valid ↑	Unique ↑	FCD ↓	Valid ↑	Unique ↑	FCD ↓
MoFlow	91.36	98.65	4.467	63.11	99.99	20.931
EDP-GNN	47.52	99.25	2.680	82.97	99.79	16.737
GraphEBM	8.22	97.90	6.143	5.29	98.79	35.471
GDSS	95.72	98.46	2.900	97.01	99.64	14.656
Digress	99.00	96.20	-	-	-	-
Flow Matching	94.10	98.20	5.155	94.01	96.98	18.764
Dirichlet FM	99.10	98.15	0.888	97.52	99.20	14.222
CatFlow	**99.81**	**99.95**	**0.441**	**99.21**	**100.00**	**13.211**

Table 2: Results molecular generation. We ran extra experiments for **(standard) flow matching and Dirichlet flow matching**. We observe that CatFlow beats SOTA performance on all tasks and metrics. Moreover, it is worth noting CatFlow was significantly faster to train than Dirichlet FM due to a computationally cheaper forward process.