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#### Abstract

We present a maximum likelihood estimator for computing free energy differences and thermodynamic expectations of physical quantities, as well as their uncertainties, from samples drawn from multiple equilibrium states. The resulting estimator is similar to the weighted histogram analysis method (WHAM), but is derived without the need to invoke histograms. The estimator is asymptotically efficient; in the large sample limit, it is unbiased and has the lowest variance of any estimator previously derived utilizing a given set of sampled data.


A recurring challenge for statistical physicists and computational chemists is the computation of physical quantities that are extremely slow to converge when estimated from samples from a single equilibrium state. Such quantities include potentials of mean force, phase coexistence curves, fluctuation or temperaturedependent properties, and free energy differences, and arise most frequently in the computer simulation of physical or chemical models. In these cases, obtaining estimates with the desired precision at reasonable computational cost generally requires multiple simulations to be performed at different thermodynamic states within the same ensemble [1]. Multi-state simulation techniques such as umbrella sampling [2], simulated [3] and parallel tempering $[4,5]$, and the use of alchemical intermediates in free energy calculations can greatly aid convergence.

Even with these methods, it may require a large amount of simulation time to converge desired quantities to the desired precision. The statistical efficiency of the estimator used to extract information from the data can therefore be critical in allowing these computations to be accomplished in reasonable computer time. While the choice of states to sample can also greatly affect the efficiency of a computation, here we focus only on the problem of statistically efficient estimation given samples from predetermined states.

Early methods for computing free energy differences relied upon one-sided exponential averaging (EXP) [6, 7], which is formally exact but does not make the most efficient use of data when samples from more than one state are available. The Bennett acceptance ratio method (BAR) $[8,9]$ greatly improved upon EXP, producing statistically optimal estimates of free energy differences when two states are sampled [9] and yielding in estimates that can be more than an order of magnitude more precise [10]. Later, the weighted histogram analysis method (WHAM) $[11,12]$ was proposed as a way to incorporate data from multiple states to produce es-

[^0]timates of free energy differences and equilibrium expectations for arbitrary thermodynamic states, including states not sampled.

WHAM has been shown to produce statistically optimal estimates of the discretized densities of states [11] or histogram occupation probabilities [13]. However, it is not ideal for analyzing multiple simulations for several reasons. First, it is often difficult to quantify the bias introduced by the reliance on histograms of finite size which can be substantial in many some cases [14]. Second, unlike BAR, there are no direct expressions to estimate the statistical uncertainty in free energy differences or expectations obtained from WHAM. Third, the reliance upon constructing multidimensional histograms (requiring a number of bins that grows exponentially in the number of states in the worst case) makes direct application of WHAM intractable for even modest numbers of states. While more recent maximum likelihood [13] and Bayesian extensions [15] somewhat mitigate the memory requirements, they do not remove the histogram bias effects and require additional costly Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling to estimate uncertainties [15, 16].

Here, we use recent results from the field of statistical inference [17, 18, 19, 20] to construct a statistically optimal estimator for computing free energy differences and equilibrium expectations at arbitrary thermodynamic states, using samples produced from simulations of multiple thermodynamic states. The resulting estimator bears a strong resemblance to WHAM in the limit that histogram bin widths are shrunk to zero but is derived without the need to invoke histograms. This approach not only remains computationally convenient when many states are present, but allows the asymptotic covariance matrix to be computed, which provides a useful estimate of the statistical uncertainties in computed free energy differences and equilibrium expectations.

Nonparametric maximum likelihood estimator.- The cornerstone of our estimator of free energy differences and expectations is a nonparametric maximum likelihood estimator of the measure originally due to Vardi [17] and later adapted by Kong et al. [19] for the computation of ratios of normalization constants. The proper-
ties of this estimator have been studied in detail elsewhere $[18,19,20]$ - we briefly review only its key results below. To compute quantities such as free energy differences and equilibrium expectations, we need ratios $c_{i} / c_{j}$ of integrals of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{k}=\int_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} q_{k}(\boldsymbol{x}) d \mu \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a family of known functions $q_{k}(\boldsymbol{x}), k=1, \ldots, K$, with $\mu$ a measure on the space $\Gamma$. A measure is a function for assigning a weight to a volume element of phase space; in classical physics, the usual measure is the Lebesgue measure, giving equal weight to each volume element of Cartesian phase space. While the integrals could in principle be computed numerically, this can be computationally costly if the dimension of $x$ is high. Instead, we seek to estimate these ratios from a statistical sample.

Suppose we generate $n=1, \ldots, N_{k}$ independent and identically distributed samples $\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}$ from each of $k=$ $1, \ldots, K$ probability density functions on $\Gamma$ defined by non-negative $q_{k}(\boldsymbol{x})$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
d p_{k}=c_{k}^{-1} q_{k}(\boldsymbol{x}) d \mu \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

While the measure $\mu$ is technically known (in most physical problems, the Lebesgue measure), we make the key assumption that the measure $\mu$ is actually unknown. By then constructing a maximum-likelihood estimator (MLE) $\hat{\mu}$ from the sampled data, we can obtain an estimator for the $c_{k}$ that is both statistically and computationally efficient.

The likelihood of observing the data $\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}$ can be written in terms of the measure $\mu$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(\mu)=\prod_{k=1}^{K} \prod_{n=1}^{N_{k}} p_{k}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)=\prod_{k=1}^{K} \prod_{n=1}^{N_{k}} \frac{q_{k}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right) \mu\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)}{c_{k}[\mu(\boldsymbol{x})]} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the dependence of $c_{k}$ on $\mu$ (through Eq. 1) has been been made explicit.

It is easier to work with the log-likelihood $l(\mu)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
l(\mu) \equiv & \ln L(\mu)=-\sum_{k=1}^{K} N_{k} \ln c_{k}[\mu(\boldsymbol{x})] \\
& +\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{k}} \ln q_{k}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)+\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{k}} \ln \mu\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The likelihood $L(\mu)$ can be maximized by finding the stationary point of $l(\mu)$. Equating $\partial l / \partial \mu=0$ gives the MLE for the measure in terms of the data

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\mu}(\boldsymbol{x})=\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{k}} \frac{\delta\left(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{K} N_{k^{\prime}} c_{k^{\prime}}^{-1}[\hat{\mu}(\boldsymbol{x})] q_{k^{\prime}}(\boldsymbol{x})} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is unique up to a multiplicative constant. Substitution of the MLE $\hat{\mu}$ into Eq. 1 gives an estimator for $c_{i}$
in terms of a self-consistent set of equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{c}_{i}=\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{k}} \frac{q_{i}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{K} N_{k^{\prime}} \hat{c}_{k^{\prime}}^{-1} q_{k^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Under Vardi's conditions [17] - that the functions $p_{i}(\boldsymbol{x})>0$ and $p_{j}(\boldsymbol{x})>0$ over a common region of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ for all $i$ and $j$, or that there exists a chain of such relationships connecting each pair - the solution will be unique up to a multiplicative constant. As a result, only ratios $\hat{c}_{i} / \hat{c}_{j}$ are meaningful.

This estimator is unbiased in the limit of large $n$, and the error will be distributed according to a normal distribution [18]. The asymptotic covariance of the $\theta_{i}=\ln c_{i}$, which we denote by $\Theta_{i j}=\operatorname{cov}\left(\theta_{i}, \theta_{j}\right)$, can be computed from the Fisher information matrix [19, 20], and can be written in matrix form [19] as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}=\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\mathbf{I}_{N}-\mathbf{W} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}}\right)^{+} \mathbf{W} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{I}_{N}$ is the $N \times N$ identity matrix (where $N=$ $\sum_{k=1}^{K} N_{k}$ is the total number of samples), and $\mathbf{N}=$ $\operatorname{diag}\left(N_{1}, N_{2}, \ldots, N_{K}\right)$. The superscript ${ }^{+}$denotes a suitable generalized inverse, such as the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse, since the quantity in parentheses will have less than full rank. W denotes the $N \times K$ matrix of weights where

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{n k}=\frac{\hat{c}_{k}^{-1} q_{k}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{n}\right)}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{K} N_{k^{\prime}} \hat{c}_{k^{\prime}}^{-1} q_{k^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{n}\right)} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The sampled data $x$ are now indexed by a single index $n=1, \ldots, N$, as the association which samples $\boldsymbol{x}_{n}$ came from which distribution $p_{k}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is no longer important. The weights are normalized such that $\sum_{n=1}^{N} W_{n k}=$ $\sum_{k=1}^{K} N_{k} W_{n k}=1$.

The computational cost of computing the pseudoinverse of an $N \times N$ matrix in Eq. 6 can be avoided by use of the singular value decomposition of $\mathbf{W}$ [21]. If the $q_{k}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are unique, a well-conditioned expression that requires only standard inversion of a $K \times K$ matrix can then be written

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}=\left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1}-\mathbf{N}+\mathbf{1}_{K} \mathbf{1}_{K}^{\mathrm{T}} / N\right]^{-1} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The covariance of estimates of arbitrary functions $\phi\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{K}\right)$ and $\psi\left(\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{K}\right)$ of the normalization constants can be computed from $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{cov}(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi})=\sum_{i, j=1}^{K} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \theta_{i}} \hat{\Theta}_{i j} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta_{j}} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

For example, to compute $\operatorname{cov}\left(\hat{c}_{i}, \hat{c}_{j}\right)$, we can choose $\phi \equiv$ $e^{\theta_{i}}$ and $\psi \equiv e^{\theta_{j}}$ to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{cov}\left(\hat{c}_{i}, \hat{c}_{j}\right)=\hat{c}_{i} \hat{\Theta}_{i j} \hat{c}_{j} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Estimator for free energy differences.- Suppose we conduct $K$ equilibrium simulations in the same thermodynamic ensemble (such as NVT, NPT, or $\mu \mathrm{VT}$ ) but with different thermodynamic states, collecting $N_{k}$ uncorrelated configurations from each [22]. Each state is characterized by a specified combination of inverse temperature, potential energy function, pressure, and / or chemical potential(s), depending upon the thermodynamic ensemble. We define the reduced potential function $u_{k}(\boldsymbol{x})$ for state $k$ to be

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{k}(\boldsymbol{x})=\beta_{k}\left[U_{k}(\boldsymbol{x})+p_{k} V(\boldsymbol{x})+\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x})\right] \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}$ denotes the coordinates of the system, with volume $V(\boldsymbol{x})$ (in the case of a constant pressure ensemble) and $\boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x})$ the number of molecules of each of $M$ components of the system (in the case of a (semi)grand ensemble). For each state $k, \beta_{k}$ denotes the inverse temperature, $U_{k}(\boldsymbol{x})$ the potential energy function (which may include biasing weights), $p_{k}$ the external pressure, and $\mu_{k}$ the vector of chemical potentials of the $M$ system components.

To produce an estimator of the dimensionless free energies

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{i} \equiv-\ln \int_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} \exp \left[-u_{i}(\boldsymbol{x})\right] d \boldsymbol{x} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

(which are related to the unit-bearing free energies $F_{i}$ by $f_{i}=\beta_{i} F_{i}$ ), we employ the maximum likelihood estimator of the measure. Choosing $q_{i}(\boldsymbol{x})=\exp \left[-u_{i}(\boldsymbol{x})\right]$ and noting that $f_{i}=-\ln c_{i}$, we obtain (using Eq. 5)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{f}_{i}=-\ln \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{k}} \frac{\exp \left[-u_{i}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)\right]}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{K} N_{k^{\prime}} \exp \left[\hat{f}_{k^{\prime}}-u_{k^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)\right]} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again, because the normalization constants $c_{i}$ in Eq. 5 are only determined up to a multiplicative constant, the free energies $f_{i}$ are determined only up to an additive constant, so only differences $f_{i}-f_{j}$ will be meaningful.

Eq. 13 is precisely Eq. 21 of [11] or Eq. 15 of [23], in both cases presented as a reduction of the histogram bin width to zero in the standard WHAM equations (Eqs. 19-20 of [11]). The validity of such a procedure is questionable due to the reliance on histograms of finite width in the derivation of WHAM. The present analysis demonstrates that, in spite of their heuristic origin, the equations themselves are valid and are asymptotically unbiased estimators of the correct free energy.

As suggested by Kumar et al. [11], the $\hat{f}_{i}$ could be obtained by self-consistent iteration of Eq. 13. For numerical reasons, it is convenient to constrain one of the $f_{i}=0$ during the course of iteration to obtain a unique solution. In this case, any initial choice of the $f_{i}$ is guaranteed to converge [19]. In the case of instantaneous switching between two states $(K=2)$, the estimators in this paper for both the free energy and the asymptotic variance reduce exactly to those of $\operatorname{BAR}[9,21]$

The free energies of states from which no samples are collected can also be estimated with this formalism. We simply use the nonparametric MLE $\hat{\mu}$ derived from samples from $K$ states (Eq. 4) to calculate the integral in Eq. 12, at an arbitrary $u(\boldsymbol{x})$ different from any $u_{i}(\boldsymbol{x})$. This yields an estimate for $f$ that is identical to Eq. 13, but with $u(\boldsymbol{x})$ in the place of $u_{i}(\boldsymbol{x})$. This procedure is mathematically equivalent to setting $N_{i}=0$ in Eq. 13 and elsewhere, and is permitted by Vardi's conditions [17]. For example, covariances involving unsampled states can be computed by setting $N_{i}=0$ for these states in Eqs. 7 and 8.

Estimator for expectations of observables.- We are often interested the equilibrium expectation of some mechanical observable or phase space function $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ for a given thermodynamic state characterized by reduced potential $u(\boldsymbol{x})$. The equilibrium expectation can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle A\rangle \equiv \frac{\int_{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} A(\boldsymbol{x}) \exp [-u(\boldsymbol{x})] d \boldsymbol{x}}{\int_{\Gamma} \exp [-u(\boldsymbol{x})] d \boldsymbol{x}} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

As suggested by Doss [24], this expectation can be expressed as a ratio of two integrals of the form in Eq. 1. We can compute both the equilibrium average and the variance by adding two additional states $A$ and $a$ to the $K$ states from which samples have been collected, with

$$
q_{a}(\boldsymbol{x})=\exp [-u(\boldsymbol{x})] \quad, \quad q_{A}(\boldsymbol{x})=A(\boldsymbol{x}) \exp [-u(\boldsymbol{x})]
$$

$\langle A\rangle$ can therefore be written simply as $c_{A} / c_{a}$, provided $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ does not depend on the momentum of any of the degrees of freedom.

We again make use of Eq. 5 to construct an estimator for $\langle A\rangle$, noting that $N_{A}=N_{a}=0$. If we add the columns $W_{n A}$ and $W_{n a}$ to $\mathbf{W}$ (Eq. 7), we can write

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{A} & =\frac{\hat{c}_{A}}{\hat{c}_{a}}=\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{k}} \frac{A\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right) \exp \left[\hat{f}_{a}-u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)\right]}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{K} N_{k^{\prime}} \exp \left[\hat{f}_{k^{\prime}}-u_{k^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)\right]} \\
& =\sum_{n=1}^{N} W_{n a} A\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{n}\right) \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

where we switch in the last step to a sum over $n=$ $1, \ldots, N$. The uncertainty in $\hat{A}$ can be computed by substituting $\phi\left(\theta_{A}, \theta_{a}\right)=\exp \left(\theta_{A}-\theta_{a}\right)$ into Eq. 9 to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta \hat{A}=|\hat{A}|\left(\hat{\Theta}_{A A}+\hat{\Theta}_{a a}-2 \hat{\Theta}_{A a}\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the matrix $\Theta$ is given by Eq. 6, with the augmented $\mathbf{W}$. If $A(\boldsymbol{x})$ takes negative values, $\ln c_{A}$ may not be well defined. However, this equation for the variance of $c_{A} / c_{a}$ is still be valid for any $q_{A}(\boldsymbol{x})$ that can take negative values as long as $N_{A}=0$ [20].

Covariances between estimates of $\langle A\rangle$ at different thermodynamic states or between two observables $\langle A\rangle$ and $\langle B\rangle$ can also be constructed by adding the appropriate columns to the covariance matrix and using Eq. 9.

Discussion.- While the estimator for the free energies derived here is equivalent to a form of the WHAM equations presented elsewhere [11, 23], the derivation here is based on a rigorous statistical foundation using maximum likelihood methods. This not only avoids the dubious mathematical procedure of shrinking histograms to delta functions while still relying on their finite populations, but produces an efficient way of estimating uncertainties in free energies and expectations in the estimated quantities. The elimination of histograms also avoids both bias from discretization, which can be significant [25], as well as the computational overhead of constructing and storing multidimensional histograms.

The MLE of the measure $\hat{\mu}$ is asymptotically efficient among all possible measures [18], meaning that in the large sample limit it is unbiased and has the lowest possible variance among all estimators with the same number of samples. Although it is not clear if it immediately follows that the free energies and expectations calculated using $\hat{\mu}$ have the same optimality properties, Tan has shown that the estimator of the integrals employed here, besides being asymptotically unbiased with a normal distribution, is asymptotically efficient among a very wide class of "bridge sampling" estimators [20] to estimate partition coefficients. It therefore has equal or lower variance (in the large sample limit) than EXP, BAR, or WHAM, though not necessarily thermodynamic integration, which is asymtotically biased but might have lower total error in some special cases.

BAR and its recent multistate generalization (MBAR) [26] are in principle more general than the current method as they can also be applied to nonequilibrium work measurements between pairs of states as well as equilibrium reduced potential differences. However, MBAR constructs a total likelihood function from products of likelihood functions connecting pairs of states, assuming independence in all work measurements; once a configuration $\boldsymbol{x}_{n}$ has been used to compute an instantaneous switching work to some state $j$, it is not be used again to compute the instantaneous switching work to another state $l$. For this reason, we expect the estimator presented here to be more efficient
than MBAR in analysis of equilibrium data, as MBAR would require a factor of $K$ more equilibrium samples from each state to fulfill the independence assumption.

Application of this method to simulation data requires all $K$ reduced potential functions $u_{k}(\boldsymbol{x})$ to be evaluated for each uncorrelated sampled configuration $\boldsymbol{x}_{n}$, for a total of $K N$ evaluations. In practice, this is not overly burdensome; the $\boldsymbol{x}_{n}$ are generally produced by schemes that generate chains of correlated samples, such as molecular dynamics or Monte Carlo simulations. The number of additional energy evaluations for the uncorrelated samples will usually be far fewer than the energy evaluations needed to generate the samples in the first place.

In this paper, we have presented an optimally efficient estimator of the free energies between states and observables at arbitrary state, given independent samples from these states. It should prove of immediate use to any computational chemist or physicist seeking to combine data from simulations of multiple thermodynamics states. We have prepared a Python script implementing the estimator described here, using both a straightforward iterative method, and an efficient NewtonRaphson (NR) method. The rapid convergence properties of NR greatly reduce the computational cost for large datasets. This script and a reference implementation can be found at http:/ / simtk.org/home/pymbar.
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## APPENDIX A: ESTIMATORS OF THE ASYMPTOTIC COVARIANCE MATRIX

The $N \times K$ matrix $\mathbf{W}$ (Eq. 7 in the main paper) can be written in terms of its singular value decomposition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{W}=\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{A1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{U}$ is an $N \times N$ unitary matrix of left singular vectors (such that $\mathbf{U U}^{\mathrm{T}}=\mathbf{I}_{N}$ ), $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is an $N \times K$ matrix containing $L<K$ singular values along the diagonal, and $\mathbf{V}$ is a $K \times K$ unitary matrix of right singular vectors.

The estimator for the asymptotic covariance matrix $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ (Eq. 6 in the main paper) can then be expanded to

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} & =\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\mathbf{I}_{N}-\mathbf{W} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}}\right)^{+} \mathbf{W} \\
& =\left(\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\mathbf{I}_{N}-\left(\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \mathbf{N}\left(\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right]^{+}\left(\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \\
& =\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\mathbf{I}_{N}-\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}}\right]^{+} \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
& =\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}}-\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}}\right]^{+} \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
& =\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\mathbf{U}\left(\mathbf{I}_{N}-\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}}\right]^{+} \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
& =\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}\left[\mathbf{I}_{N}-\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}}\right]^{+} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
& =\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\mathbf{I}_{N}-\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\mathrm{T}}\right]^{+} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{A2}
\end{align*}
$$

We partition the matrix of singular values $\Sigma$ into a $K \times K$ diagonal region $\Sigma_{K}$ (of which only the first $L \leq K$ diagonal entries will be nonzero) and an $(N-K) \times K$ zero matrix $\mathbf{0}$ :

$$
\boldsymbol{\Sigma}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K}  \tag{A3}\\
\mathbf{0}
\end{array}\right]
$$

We can then rewrite the above expression as

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} & =\mathbf{V}\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K} & \mathbf{0}
\end{array}\right]\left\{\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{I}_{K} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{(N-K)}
\end{array}\right]-\left[\begin{array}{c}
\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K} \\
\mathbf{0}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N V}\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K} & \mathbf{0}
\end{array}\right]\right\}^{+}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K} \\
\mathbf{0}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
& =\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K}\left[\mathbf{I}_{K}-\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K}\right]^{+} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{A4}
\end{align*}
$$

We note that pseudoinversion of the quantity in brackets now only requires $\mathcal{O}\left(K^{3}\right)$ work, though this can be further reduced to $\mathcal{O}\left(L^{3}\right)$ work if the reduced SVD is used.

The singular values $\Sigma_{K}$ and matrix of right singular vectors $\mathbf{V}$ can easily be computed from the eigenvalue decomposition of $\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W} & =\left(\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \\
& =\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{T} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
& =\mathbf{V}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{T} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\right) \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{A5}
\end{align*}
$$

In the case that $\mathbf{W}$ has full column rank (because all $q_{k}(\boldsymbol{x}), k=1, \ldots, K$ are different) then we can make further progress. Using Eq. A4, we can write

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} & =\left[\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{I}_{K}-\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K}+\mathbf{1 1} \mathbf{1}^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K}^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}}\right]^{-1} \\
& =\left[\mathbf{V}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{K}^{-2}\right) \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{T}}-\mathbf{N}\right]^{+} \\
& =\left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1}-\mathbf{N}\right]^{+} \tag{A6}
\end{align*}
$$

We note that $\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{1}_{N}=\mathbf{1}_{K}$, and $\mathbf{W N} \mathbf{1}_{K}=\mathbf{1}_{N}$, and so $\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{1}_{N}=\mathbf{1}_{K}$, and observe that $\left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1}-\mathbf{N}\right]$ has rank $K-1$ with kernel $\mathbf{1}_{K}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1}-\mathbf{N}\right] \mathbf{1}_{K} } & =\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{K}-\mathbf{N} \mathbf{1}_{K} \\
& =\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{1}_{K}-\mathbf{N} \mathbf{1}_{K} \\
& =\mathbf{N} \mathbf{1}_{K}-\mathbf{N} \mathbf{1}_{K} \\
& =\mathbf{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

We can supplement the quantity in brackets with $b \mathbf{1}_{K} \mathbf{1}_{K}^{\mathrm{T}}$, where $b$ is some nonzero scalar, without changing the covariance values computed from it, and make it invertible:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}=\left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1}-\mathbf{N}+b \mathbf{1}_{K} \mathbf{1}_{K}\right]^{-1} \tag{A7}
\end{equation*}
$$

We choose $b=N^{-1}$ to ensure the inversion is well-conditioned (as in [19]). This relation appears as Eq. 8 in the main paper.

## APPENDIX B: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BAR AND THE CURRENT METHOD

We start with Eq. 13 in the main paper, the maximum likelihood measure estimator for the free energy. For ease of use, we define $\Delta f=f_{2}-f_{1}$ and $\Delta u(\boldsymbol{x})=u_{2}(\boldsymbol{x})-u_{1}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $M=\ln N_{2} / N_{1}$ Without loss of generalization, we examine the self-consistent equation for $f_{1} . f_{i}$ here refers to the maximum likelihood estimate, not the true free energy.

$$
\begin{align*}
f_{1}= & -\ln \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{k}} \frac{\exp \left[-u_{1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)\right]}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{2} N_{k^{\prime}} \exp \left[f_{k^{\prime}}-u_{k^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k n}\right)\right]} \\
\exp \left[-f_{1}\right]= & \sum_{n=1}^{N_{1}} \frac{\exp \left[-u_{1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{2} N_{k^{\prime}} \exp \left[f_{k^{\prime}}-u_{k^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]}+\sum_{n=1}^{N_{2}} \frac{\exp \left[-u_{1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{2} N_{k^{\prime}} \exp \left[f_{k^{\prime}}-u_{k^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]} \\
1= & \sum_{n=1}^{N_{1}} \frac{\exp \left[f_{1}-u_{1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]}{N_{1} \exp \left[f_{1}-u_{1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]+N_{2} \exp \left[f_{2}-u_{2}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]}+ \\
& \sum_{n=1}^{N_{2}} \frac{\exp \left[f_{1}-u_{1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]}{N_{1} \exp \left[f_{1}-u_{1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]+N_{2} \exp \left[f_{2}-u_{2}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]} \\
= & \sum_{n=1}^{N_{1}} \frac{1}{N_{1}+N_{2} \exp \left[\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]}+\sum_{n=1}^{N_{2}} \frac{1}{N_{1}+N_{2} \exp \left[\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]} \\
N_{1}= & \sum_{n=1}^{N_{1}} \frac{1}{1+\frac{N_{2}}{N_{1}} \exp \left[\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]}+\sum_{n=1}^{N_{2}} \frac{1}{1+\frac{N_{2}}{N_{1}} \exp \left[\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]} \\
N_{1}= & \sum_{n=1}^{N_{1}} \frac{1}{1+\exp \left[M+\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]}+\sum_{n=1}^{N_{2}} \frac{1}{1+\exp \left[M+\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]} \tag{B1}
\end{align*}
$$

We make the additional observation that

$$
\frac{1}{1+\exp (x)}-1=-\frac{1}{1+\exp (-x)}
$$

which allows us to write Eq. B1 as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & =\sum_{n=1}^{N_{1}}\left[\frac{1}{1+\exp \left[M+\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]}-1\right]+\sum_{n=1}^{N_{2}} \frac{1}{1+\exp \left[M+\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]} \\
& =\sum_{n=1}^{N_{1}} \frac{1}{1+\exp \left[M+\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1 n}\right)\right]}-\sum_{n=1}^{N_{2}} \frac{1}{1+\exp \left[-M-\Delta f+\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{2 n}\right)\right]}
\end{aligned}
$$

Which is exactly the equation for BAR presented in Shirts et al. [9]. We note that this equation is unchanged upon reversal of the state indices 1 and 2 , indicating that the choice of $f_{1}$ at the beginning was indeed arbitrary.

We now examine the expression for the variance limited to two states. The covariance matrix given in Eq. 8 of the main paper is

$$
\boldsymbol{\Theta}=\left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1}-\mathbf{N}+\mathbf{1}_{K} \mathbf{1}_{K}^{\mathrm{T}} / N\right]^{-1}
$$

where we have from Eq. 7 of the main paper

$$
W_{n k}=\frac{\exp \left(f_{k}-u_{k}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{n}\right)\right)}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{K} N_{k^{\prime}} \exp \left(f_{k}^{\prime}-u_{k^{\prime}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{n}\right)\right)}
$$

Defining $f$ as the Fermi function (not to be confused with the free energies $f_{i}$, which are constants and have subscripts), and $\left.X_{n}=M+\Delta f-\Delta u\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{n}\right)\right)$, then in the case of two states $W_{n 1}=N_{1}^{-1} f\left(X_{n}\right)$ and $W_{n 2}=N_{2}^{-1} f\left(-X_{n}\right)$.

The matrix $\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}$ can then be written as:

$$
\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}=\sum_{n=1}^{N}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
N_{1}^{-2} f\left(X_{n}\right)^{2} & N_{1}^{-1} N_{2}^{-1} f\left(X_{n}\right) f\left(-X_{n}\right)  \tag{B2}\\
N_{1}^{-1} N_{2}^{-1} f\left(X_{n}\right) f\left(-X_{n}\right) & N_{2}^{-2} f\left(-X_{n}\right)^{2}
\end{array}\right)
$$

If we represent the matrix $\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)_{i j}=a_{i j}$, the determinant $\left|\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right|$ will be $D=a_{11} a_{22}-a_{21} a_{12}$. The variance of ratios is actually independent of multiplicative factor used in front of $\mathbf{1}_{K} \mathbf{1}_{K}$, as we will show below, so we will use $b$ in place of $1 / N$ for generality. The inverse of the covariance matrix is then:

$$
\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{-1}=\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1}-\mathbf{N}+b \mathbf{1}_{N} \mathbf{1}_{N}^{\mathrm{T}}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{a_{22}}{D}-N_{1}+b & -\frac{a_{21}}{D}+b \\
-\frac{a_{12}}{D}+b & \frac{a_{11}}{D}-N_{2}+b
\end{array}\right)
$$

The determinant will then be:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Theta^{-1}\right|=\frac{1}{D}-\frac{N_{2} a_{22}-N_{1} a_{11}}{D}+N_{1} N_{2}-b\left(N_{1}+N_{2}\right)+b \frac{a_{11}+a_{22}+a_{12}+a_{21}}{D} \tag{B3}
\end{equation*}
$$

However, we note that $\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1}-\mathbf{N}$ is singular, as shown in Appendix A, and thus the sum of the first three terms in Eq. B3 equals zero. Additionally, because it has kernel $\mathbf{1}_{K}$, it must also satisfy $a_{22}-a_{21}-N_{1} D=0$ and $a_{11}-a_{12}-N_{2} D=0$. Because we know by symmetry that $a_{12}=a_{21}$, which we denote by simply $a$, this determinant then becomes:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{-1}\right| & =\frac{b}{D}\left[a_{11}+a_{22}+a_{12}+a_{21}-\left(N_{1}+N_{2}\right) D\right] \\
& =\frac{4 a b}{D}
\end{aligned}
$$

We then obtain:

$$
\boldsymbol{\Theta}=\left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{W}\right)^{-1}-\mathbf{N}+b \mathbf{1}_{N} \mathbf{1}_{N}^{\mathrm{T}}\right]^{-1}=\frac{D}{4 a b}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{a_{11}}{D}-N_{2}+b & \frac{a}{D}-b \\
\frac{a}{D}-b & \frac{a_{22}}{D}-N_{1}+b
\end{array}\right)
$$

The variance in $f_{1}-f_{2}$ will be $\Theta_{11}+\Theta_{22}-2 \Theta_{12}$, which reduces to:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Var}\left(f_{1}-f_{2}\right) & =\frac{D}{4 a b}\left[\frac{a_{11}-N_{1} D+b D+a_{22}-N_{2} D+b D-2 a+2 b D}{D}\right] \\
& =\frac{1}{4 b a}\left[\left(a_{11}-a-N_{2} D\right)+\left(a_{22}-a-N_{1} D\right)+4 b D\right] \\
& =\frac{D}{a}
\end{aligned}
$$

Which is indeed independent of $b \neq 0$. Since $a_{22}=N_{1}+a$ and $a_{11}=N_{2}+a$, given $D=a_{11} a_{22}-a^{2}$ (as noted above), we can find that $D=N_{1}^{-1} N_{2}^{-1}(1-N a)$. We then obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Var}\left(f_{1}-f_{2}\right) & =\frac{a_{11} a_{22}-a^{2}}{a} \\
& =\frac{1-N a}{N_{1} N_{2} a} \\
& =\frac{1}{N_{1} N_{2} a}-\frac{N}{N_{1} N_{2}} \\
& =\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} f\left(X_{n}\right) f\left(-X_{n}\right)}-\frac{N}{N_{1} N_{2}} \\
& =\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2+2 \cosh \left(X_{n}\right)}\right]^{-1}-\frac{N}{N_{1} N_{2}} \\
& =\frac{1}{N}\left[\left\langle\frac{1}{2+2 \cosh (M+\Delta f-\Delta u(\boldsymbol{x}))}\right\rangle^{-1}-\left(\frac{N}{N_{2}}+\frac{N}{N_{1}}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

This is the equation for the covariance of BAR in Shirts et al. [9]
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