

# Statistically optimal analysis of samples from multiple equilibrium states

Michael R. Shirts<sup>1,\*</sup> and John D. Chodera<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Chemistry, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Chemistry, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305*

(Dated: July 21, 2022)

We present a new estimator for computing free energy differences and thermodynamic expectations of physical quantities, as well as their uncertainties, from samples obtained from multiple equilibrium states via simulation or experiment. The estimator is similar to the weighted histogram analysis method (WHAM), but is derived without the need to construct histograms and provides significant advantages over it. The estimator is asymptotically efficient; in the large sample limit, it is unbiased and has the lowest variance of any estimator previously presented utilizing a given set of equilibrium data.

## I. INTRODUCTION

A recurring challenge in statistical physics, computational chemistry, and single molecule experiments is the convergence of physical quantities to adequate precision in the timescales accessible to measurement. In computer simulations of physical or chemical models, such quantities include potentials of mean force, phase coexistence curves, fluctuation or temperature-dependent properties, and free energy differences. In single-molecule experiments, these quantities might include potentials of mean force along a pulling coordinate or in the distance between fluorescence probes during resonant energy transfer. In these cases, obtaining estimates with the desired precision at reasonable computational cost generally requires multiple simulations to be performed at different thermodynamic states [1] or measurements performed under different applied fields in order to collect sufficient statistics for a reliable estimate. In computer simulations, multi-state techniques such as umbrella sampling [2], simulated [3] and parallel tempering [4] and the use of alchemical intermediates in free energy calculations can greatly aid convergence.

Even with these methods, it may require a large quantity of data to produce estimates with the desired precision. Estimating quantities of interest from the data collected with high statistical efficiency can therefore be critical in allowing these quantities to be computed in reasonable computer time. While the choice of thermodynamic states sampled can also greatly affect the efficiency of a computation, we focus here on only 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) [5, 6], which is formally exact but does not make the most efficient use of data when samples from more than one state are available [7]. Similarly, estimation of equilib-

rium expectations at states other than the one sampled required exponential (sometimes referred to as “umbrella”) reweighting [2]. Subsequently, the Bennett acceptance ratio method (BAR) [8, 9] greatly improved upon EXP for the computation of free energy differences, producing statistically optimal estimates of free energy differences when two states are sampled [9] and yielding estimates that can be more than an order of magnitude more precise [7]. More recently, multiple histogram reweighting methods [10, 11] were proposed as a way to incorporate data from multiple states to produce estimates of free energy differences and equilibrium expectations for arbitrary thermodynamic states, including states not sampled.

While multiple histogram techniques, most popularly the weighted histogram analysis method (WHAM) [11] extensions, can produce statistically optimal estimates of the discretized densities of states [10], such as Ising spin models, or histogram occupation probabilities [12], they have several drawbacks for the treatment of continuous systems. First, the reliance on histograms of width sufficient to contain many samples introduces a bias that can be substantial and often difficult to assess [13]. Second, unlike BAR, there are no direct expressions to estimate the statistical uncertainty in free energy differences or expectations obtained from WHAM. Third, the application of WHAM to a series of simulations with a biasing potential that is not trivially scaled by a linear field parameter (as in alchemical free energy calculations) requires a number of bins that grows exponentially in the number of states, making it computationally intractable for even modest numbers of states. While more recent maximum likelihood [12] and Bayesian formulations [14] mitigate the memory requirements, they do not remove the histogram bias effects and introduce a costly Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling procedure to estimate uncertainties [14, 15].

Here, we use recent results from the field of statistical inference [16, 17, 18, 19] to construct a statistically optimal estimator for computing free energy differences and equilibrium expectations at arbitrary thermodynamic states, using equilibrium samples from multiple thermodynamic states. The resulting estimator, termed the multistate Bennett acceptance ratio (MBAR) estimator

\*Electronic address: [michael.shirts@columbia.edu](mailto:michael.shirts@columbia.edu)

†Electronic address: [jchodera@stanford.edu](mailto:jchodera@stanford.edu)

as it reduces to Bennett's method when only two states are considered [8], is equivalent to WHAM in the limit that histogram bin widths are shrunk to zero but is derived without the need to invoke histograms. Unlike WHAM, this estimator provides an assessment of uncertainties, critical in making comparisons between experiment and theory, and the computational expense of computing the estimator remains modest across a wider variety of applications. Furthermore, it can easily be applied to data sampled from non-Boltzmann sampling schemes, or to the analysis of single-molecule experiments in cases where an external bias potential is applied.

## II. EXTENDED BRIDGE SAMPLING ESTIMATOR

Suppose we obtain  $N_k$  uncorrelated equilibrium samples [20] from each of  $K$  states within the same thermodynamic ensemble (such as NVT, NPT, or  $\mu$ VT). Each state is characterized by a specified combination of inverse temperature, potential energy function, pressure, and/or chemical potential(s), depending upon the ensemble. We define the *reduced potential function*  $u_k(\mathbf{x})$  for state  $k$  to be

$$u_k(\mathbf{x}) = \beta_k[U_k(\mathbf{x}) + p_k V(\mathbf{x}) + \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^T \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})] \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma$  denotes the configuration of the system within a configuration space  $\Gamma$ , with volume  $V(\mathbf{x})$  (in the case of a constant pressure ensemble) and  $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$  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,  $U_k(\mathbf{x})$  the potential energy function (which may include biasing weights),  $p_k$  the external pressure, and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$  the vector of chemical potentials of the  $M$  system components.

Configurations  $\{\mathbf{x}_{kn}\}_{n=1}^{N_k}$  from state  $k$  are sampled from the probability distribution

$$p_k(\mathbf{x}) = c_k^{-1} q_k(\mathbf{x}) \quad ; \quad c_k = \int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_k(\mathbf{x}) \quad (2)$$

where  $q_k(\mathbf{x})$  is here nonnegative and represents an unnormalized density function, and  $c_k$  is the (generally unknown) normalization constant (known in statistical mechanics as the *partition function*). In samples obtained from standard Metropolis Monte Carlo or molecular dynamics simulations or from experiment, this unnormalized density is simply the Boltzmann weight

$$q_k(\mathbf{x}) = \exp[-u_k(\mathbf{x})] \quad (3)$$

but the  $q(\mathbf{x})$  may in general differ in simulations employing non-Boltzmann weights, such as multicanonical simulations [21] and those using Tsallis statistics [22].

We wish to produce an estimator for the difference in dimensionless free energies

$$\Delta f_{ij} \equiv f_j - f_i = -\ln \frac{c_i}{c_j} = -\ln \frac{\int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_i(\mathbf{x})}{\int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_j(\mathbf{x})} \quad (4)$$

where the  $f_i$  are related to the unit-bearing free energies  $F_i$  by  $f_i = \beta_i F_i$ , and also the equilibrium expectations  $\langle A \rangle$

$$\langle A \rangle_i \equiv \int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} p_i(\mathbf{x}) A(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} A(\mathbf{x}) q_i(\mathbf{x})}{\int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_i(\mathbf{x})}. \quad (5)$$

These expectations can be computed as ratios of the normalization constants if we define new functions  $q(\mathbf{x}) = A(\mathbf{x})q_i(\mathbf{x})$ , where the  $q(\mathbf{x})$  no longer need be nonnegative for states from which no samples are collected [23].

To construct an estimator for these ratios of normalization constants, we first note the identity

$$\begin{aligned} c_i \langle \alpha_{ij} q_j \rangle_i &= \int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{\int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_i(\mathbf{x}) \alpha_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) q_j(\mathbf{x})}{\int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_i(\mathbf{x})} \\ &= \int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_j(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{\int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_j(\mathbf{x}) \alpha_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) q_i(\mathbf{x})}{\int_{\Gamma} d\mathbf{x} q_j(\mathbf{x})} \\ &= c_j \langle \alpha_{ij} q_i \rangle_j \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which holds for arbitrary choice of functions  $\alpha_{ij}(\mathbf{x})$ , provided the  $c_i$  are nonzero.

Using this relation, summing over the index  $j$ , and substituting the empirical estimator  $N_i^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{N_i} g(\mathbf{x}_{in})$  for the expectations  $\langle g \rangle_i$ , we obtain a set of  $K$  estimating equations

$$\sum_{j=1}^K \frac{\hat{c}_i}{N_i} \sum_{i=1}^{N_i} \alpha_{ij} q_j(\mathbf{x}_{in}) = \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{\hat{c}_j}{N_j} \sum_{j=1}^{N_j} \alpha_{ij} q_i(\mathbf{x}_{jn}) \quad (7)$$

where solution of the set of equations for the  $\hat{c}_i$  yields an estimate of the  $c_i$  from the sampled data determined up to a scalar multiplier.

Eq. 7 defines a family of asymptotically unbiased estimators parameterized by the choice of functions  $\alpha_{ij}(\mathbf{x})$ , known in the statistics literature as *extended bridge sampling estimators* [19]. By making the choice

$$\alpha_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{N_j \hat{c}_j^{-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^K N_k \hat{c}_k^{-1} q_k(\mathbf{x})}, \quad (8)$$

we obtain an estimator that has been proven to be optimal [19], in the sense that it has the lowest variance of for all choices of  $\alpha_{ij}(\mathbf{x})$ . This estimator is also asymptotically unbiased and guaranteed to have a unique solution (up to a constant). The resulting estimator can also be derived from maximum-likelihood measure theoretic methods [18] and reverse logistic regression [24].

While a closed-form expression for the  $\hat{c}_k$  cannot be obtained from Eqs. 7 and 8, the  $\hat{c}_i$  can nevertheless be easily computed by any suitable method for solving systems of coupled nonlinear equations. A simple self-consistent iteration method and an efficient Newton-Raphson solver are described in Appendix A.

In the large-sample limit, the error in the ratios  $\hat{c}_i/\hat{c}_j$  will be normally distributed [19], and the asymptotic covariance matrix  $\Theta_{ij} = \text{cov}(\theta_i, \theta_j)$ , where  $\theta_i \equiv \ln c_i$ , is given by [18]

$$\hat{\Theta} = \mathbf{W}^T(\mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{N}\mathbf{W}^T)^+ \mathbf{W} \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{I}_N$  is the  $N \times N$  identity matrix (with  $N = \sum_{k=1}^K N_k$  the total number of samples), and  $\mathbf{N} = \text{diag}(N_1, N_2, \dots, N_K)$ . The superscript  $+$  denotes a suitable generalized inverse, such as the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse, since the quantity in parentheses will be rank-deficient.  $\mathbf{W}$  denotes the  $N \times K$  matrix of weights where

$$W_{nk} = \frac{\hat{c}_k^{-1} q_k(\mathbf{x}_n)}{\sum_{k'=1}^K N_{k'} \hat{c}_{k'}^{-1} q_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_n)}. \quad (10)$$

The sampled data  $\mathbf{x}$  are now indexed by a single index  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , as the association which samples  $\mathbf{x}_n$  came from which distribution  $p_k(\mathbf{x})$  is no longer relevant. Note that the weights are normalized such that  $\sum_{n=1}^N W_{nk} = \sum_{k=1}^K N_k W_{nk} = 1$ . The computational cost of computing the pseudoinverse of an  $N \times N$  matrix in computing  $\hat{\Theta}$  can be reduced to that of computing the eigenvalue decomposition of a  $K \times K$  matrix (See Appendix B).

The covariance of estimates of arbitrary functions  $\phi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K)$  and  $\psi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K)$  of the normalization constants can be computed from  $\hat{\Theta}$  by

$$\text{cov}(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^K \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \theta_i} \hat{\Theta}_{ij} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta_j}. \quad (11)$$

Details of the derivation of the asymptotic covariance matrix (Eq. 9) and its efficient computation are provided in Appendix B.

### III. ESTIMATOR FOR FREE ENERGY DIFFERENCES

When configurations are sampled with Boltzmann statistics ( $q_k(\mathbf{x}) = \exp[-u_k(\mathbf{x})]$ ), Eqs. 7 and 8 produce the following estimating equations for the dimensionless free energies

$$\hat{f}_i = -\ln \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} \exp[-u_i(\mathbf{x}_{kn})]}{\sum_{k'=1}^K N_{k'} \exp[\hat{f}_{k'} - u_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_{kn})]} \quad (12)$$

which must be solved self-consistently for the  $\hat{f}_i$ . Again, because the normalization constants are only determined up to a multiplicative constant, the estimated free energies  $\hat{f}_i$  are determined uniquely only up to an additive constant, so only differences  $\Delta \hat{f}_{ij} = \hat{f}_j - \hat{f}_i$  will be meaningful.

The uncertainty in the estimated free energy difference can be computed from Eqs. 9 and 11 as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 \Delta \hat{f}_{ij} &\equiv \left\langle \left( \Delta \hat{f}_{ij} - \langle \Delta \hat{f}_{ij} \rangle \right)^2 \right\rangle \\ &= \text{cov}(-\ln \hat{c}_i / \hat{c}_j, -\ln \hat{c}_i / \hat{c}_j) \\ &= \hat{\Theta}_{ii} - 2\hat{\Theta}_{ij} + \hat{\Theta}_{jj} \end{aligned}$$

Free energy differences and uncertainties between states not sampled are easily estimated by augmenting the set of states with additional reduced potentials  $u_k(\mathbf{x})$  with the number of samples  $N_k = 0$ .

### IV. ESTIMATOR FOR EXPECTATIONS OF OBSERVABLES

The equilibrium expectation of some mechanical observable  $A(\mathbf{x})$  that depends only on configuration  $\mathbf{x}$  (and not momentum) is given by Eq. 5, and can be computed as a ratio of normalization constants  $c_A/c_a$  by defining two additional functions

$$q_A(\mathbf{x}) = A(\mathbf{x}) q(\mathbf{x}) \quad ; \quad q_a(\mathbf{x}) = q(\mathbf{x})$$

where  $q(\mathbf{x}) = \exp[-u(\mathbf{x})]$  if the expectation with respect to the Boltzmann weight is desired [23]. While  $q_A(\mathbf{x})$  may no longer be strictly nonnegative, we may still make use of the extended bridge sampling estimator (Eq. 7) since  $N_A = N_a = 0$ .

If we augment the matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  (Eq. 10) with the columns  $W_{nA}$  and  $W_{na}$  corresponding to  $q_A(\mathbf{x})$  and  $q_a(\mathbf{x})$ , respectively, we can write the estimator as

$$\hat{A} = \frac{\hat{c}_A}{\hat{c}_a} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N W_{nA}}{\sum_{n=1}^N W_{na}} = \sum_{n=1}^N W_{na} A(\mathbf{x}_n). \quad (13)$$

We note that, if the dimensionless free energies  $\hat{f}_k$  have already been determined, computation of  $\hat{A}$  for any  $A(\mathbf{x})$  and any  $q(\mathbf{x})$  does not require additional solution of self-consistent equations.

The uncertainty in  $\hat{A}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 \hat{A} &\equiv \left\langle \left( \hat{A} - \langle \hat{A} \rangle \right)^2 \right\rangle \\ &= \text{cov}(\hat{c}_A / \hat{c}_a, \hat{c}_A / \hat{c}_a) \\ &= \hat{A}^2 (\hat{\Theta}_{AA} + \hat{\Theta}_{aa} - 2\hat{\Theta}_{Aa}) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the covariance matrix  $\hat{\Theta}$  is computed from the augmented  $\mathbf{W}$ . 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 applying Eq. 11 to compute the desired uncertainty.

## V. DISCUSSION

The MBAR estimator presented here provides a rapid and robust way to extract estimates of free energy differences and equilibrium expectations of data from multiple equilibrium simulations of different thermodynamics in a statistically well-defined optimal way. As the estimator is asymptotically efficient among a very wide class of “bridge sampling” estimators [19], the resulting estimates have the lowest variance (in the large sample limit) of EXP, BAR, or WHAM.

While weighted histogram techniques [10, 11, 12, 14] have been widely used for combining data from multi-state simulations, the MBAR estimator supplants all of these previous techniques. Perhaps most importantly, it provides a reliable and inexpensive method for estimating the uncertainties in the resulting estimates and their correlations, which are critical for propagating uncertainties to quantities of interest. It also eliminates the memory problems for histograms of high dimensionality found in the standard implementation of histogram techniques. Additionally, the elimination of histograms avoids both the difficult-to-characterize bias arising from discretization of continuous parameters as well as the computational overhead of constructing and storing high dimensional histograms.

In this framework, multiple histogram reweighting methods such as WHAM can be understood as a histogram kernel density estimator approximation to MBAR. In some cases, this can reduce the computational expense required for solving the estimating equations (Eq. 7) at the expense of introducing bias. When samples are distributed according to the Boltzmann weight  $q_i(\mathbf{x}) = \exp[-u_i(\mathbf{x})]$ , the estimator for the free energies (Eq. 12) is precisely Eq. 21 of [11] or Eq. 15 of [25], in both cases presented as a reduction of the histogram bin width to zero in the standard WHAM equations (Eqs. 19–20 of [11]). While this limit is dubious — the derivations in these references rely upon an estimate of the uncertainty in each histogram count which cannot be correct when the bins are nearly empty — the derivation of this equation from the extended bridge sampling estimator demonstrates that for the first time that this equation in common use is in fact an asymptotically unbiased estimator of the true free energy differences.

The MBAR estimator also can be considered a multistate generalization of Bennett’s acceptance ratio estimator (BAR) [8]. In deriving BAR, Bennett constructed an estimator from Eq. 6 directly, determining the single  $\alpha(\mathbf{x})$  which minimized the variance of the free energy difference between states. Here, summing over all states  $j$  and determining the functions  $\alpha_{ij}$  that minimize the covariance matrix of the ratios of normalization constants [19] produces an optimal estimator for the multistate case. A demonstration of the reduction of MBAR to Bennett’s original estimator and its variance estimate is provided in Appendix C.


BAR and a recent pairwise multistate generalization

(PBAR) [26] differ from the current method in that they can also be applied to *nonequilibrium* work measurements between pairs of states, in addition to equilibrium reduced potential differences (*instantaneous* work measurements). However, PBAR constructs a total likelihood function from products of likelihood functions connecting pairs of states, which assumes independence of all work measurements. This means that a sampled configuration  $\mathbf{x}_n$  from a state  $i$  can only be used to provide information about the instantaneous work required to switch to a *single* other state  $j$  for use in the PBAR estimator, whereas in the present analysis,  $\mathbf{x}_n$  can provide information about *all* states. The estimator presented here should therefore be more efficient than PBAR in analysis of *equilibrium* data, as PBAR requires significantly more samples from each state for equivalent precision.

Application of the estimator presented here to simulation data requires  $u_k(\mathbf{x}_n)$  to be evaluated for all  $K$  reduced potential functions  $u_k(\mathbf{x})$  and all  $N$  uncorrelated sampled configuration  $\mathbf{x}_n$ , a total of  $KN$  reduced potential evaluations. In practice, this is not overly burdensome; the samples  $\mathbf{x}_n$  are generally produced by schemes that generate chains of highly correlated samples, such as molecular dynamics or Monte Carlo simulations. Once the stored configurations are subsampled to eliminate correlations and produce an effectively uncorrelated sample [20], the number of remaining samples  $N$  is generally smaller than the number of samples produced during the simulation by several orders of magnitude. Additionally, in cases where the  $u_k(\mathbf{x})$  differ only by a linear scaling parameter of one or more components (such as temperature or external field parameter), computation of  $u_k(\mathbf{x}_n)$  for all  $K$  states is a trivial operation.

The estimator described here is not limited in application to data produced from simulation — it can also be applied to combine data from multiple equilibrium experiments in the presence of externally-applied fields. To illustrate, we applied the estimator to extract the potential of mean force (PMF) of a DNA hairpin attached by dsDNA linkers to glass beads along the distance between the beads. A set of 16 equilibrium trajectories of 50 000 samples each under a variety of constant force loads (corresponding to a linear external potential along the extension coordinate) for the hairpin system 20R55/4T collected by an optical double trap experiment [27, 28] were analyzed to produce an optimal estimate of the PMF under a force load of 14.19 pN (Figure 1, see Appendix D for more information). The analysis consumed 18 s on a standard 2.16 GHz Intel Mac laptop, and the resulting error bars are more than an order of magnitude smaller than those derived from the single trajectory at this force load in the poorly sampled region of the PMF.

FIG. 1: Potential of mean force of DNA hairpin and dsDNA handles system 20R55/4T under 14.19 pN external force.



## Acknowledgments

We are indebted to Michael Woodside for providing us with detailed datasets from Ref. [28] and helpful comments. We thank Sanghyun Park, Andrew Gelman, Jun S. Liu, Zhiqiang Tan, and Evangelos Coutsias for enlightening discussion, as well as David M. Mobley, M. Scott Shell, Gavin E. Crooks, Libusha Kelly, and the reviewers for constructive comments on this manuscript. JDC gratefully acknowledges support from Ken A. Dill through NIH grant GM34993 and Vijay S. Pande through an NSF grant for Cyberinfrastructure (NSF CHE-0535616), and MRS support from Richard A. Friesner and an NIH NRSA Fellowship.

- [1] Here, a *thermodynamic state* is defined by a combination of potential energy function (including any biasing potentials) and external thermodynamic parameters, such as temperature, pressure, and chemical potential, all within the same thermodynamic ensemble (e.g. canonical, isothermal-isobaric, (semi)grand canonical).
- [2] G. M. Torrie and J. P. Valleau, *J. Comput. Phys.* **23**, 187 (1977).
- [3] E. Marinari and G. Parisi, *Europhys. Lett.* **19**, 451 (1992).
- [4] K. Hukushimi and K. Nemoto, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **65**, 1604 (1996).
- [5] R. W. Zwanzig, *J. Chem. Phys.* **22**, 1420 (1954).
- [6] B. Widom, *J. Chem. Phys.* **39**, 2808 (1963).
- [7] M. R. Shirts and V. S. Pande, *J. Chem. Phys.* **122**, 144107 (2005).
- [8] C. H. Bennett, *J. Comp. Phys.* **22**, 245 (1976).
- [9] M. R. Shirts, E. Bair, G. Hooker, and V. S. Pande, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 140601 (2003).
- [10] A. M. Ferrenberg and R. H. Swendsen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 1195 (1989).
- [11] S. Kumar, D. Bouzida, R. H. Swendsen, P. A. Kollman, and J. M. Rosenberg, *J. Comput. Chem.* **13**, 1011 (1992).
- [12] C. Bartels and M. Karplus, *J. Comput. Chem.* **18**, 1450 (1997).
- [13] M. N. Kobra, *J. Comput. Chem.* **24**, 1437 (2003).
- [14] E. Gallicchio, M. Andrec, A. K. Felts, and R. M. Levy, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **109**, 6722 (2005).
- [15] S. Park, D. L. Ensign, and V. S. Pande, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 066703 (2006).
- [16] Y. Vardi, *Ann. Stat.* **13**, 178 (1985).
- [17] R. D. Gill, Y. Vardi, and J. A. Wellner, *Ann. Stat.* **16**, 1069 (1988).
- [18] A. Kong, P. McCullagh, X.-L. Meng, D. Nicolae, and Z. Tan, *J. Royal Stat. Soc. B.* **65**, 585 (2003).
- [19] Z. Tan, *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **99**, 1027 (2004).
- [20] A set of uncorrelated configurations can be obtained from a correlated time series, such as is generated by a molecular dynamics or Metropolis Monte Carlo simulation, by subsampling the timeseries with an interval larger than the statistical inefficiency of the reduced potential  $u_k$  of the timeseries. The statistical inefficiency can be estimated by standard procedures [29, 30, 31, 32].
- [21] E. Mezei, *J. Comp. Phys.* **68**, 237 (1987).
- [22] C. Tsallis, *J. Stat. Phys.* **52**, 479 (1988).
- [23] Honi Doss makes this suggestion in the conference discussion of [18].
- [24] C. J. Geyer, Technical Report No. 568, School of Statistics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota (unpublished).
- [25] M. Souaille and B. Roux, *Comp. Phys. Commun.* **135**, 40 (2001).
- [26] P. Maragakis, M. Spichty, and M. Karplus, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 100602 (2006).
- [27] W. J. Greenleaf, M. T. Woodside, E. A. Abbondanzieri, and S. M. Block, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 208102 (2005).
- [28] M. T. Woodside, W. M. Behnke-Parks, K. Larizadeh, K. Travers, D. Herschlag, and S. M. Block, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 6190 (2006).
- [29] J. D. Chodera, W. C. Swope, J. W. Pitera, C. Seok, and K. A. Dill, *J. Chem. Theor. Comput.* **3**, 26 (2007).
- [30] W. C. Swope, H. C. Andersen, P. H. Berens, and K. R. Wilson, *J. Chem. Phys.* **76**, 637 (1982).
- [31] H. Flyvbjerg and H. G. Petersen, *J. Chem. Phys.* **91**, 461 (1989).
- [32] W. Janke, in *Quantum Simulations of Complex Many-Body Systems: From Theory to Algorithms*, edited by J. Groten-dorst, D. Marx, and A. Murmatsu (John von Neumann Institute for Computing, Jülich, Germany, 2002), Vol. 10, pp. 423–445.
- [33] M. T. Woodside, P. C. Anthony, W. M. Behnke-Parks, K. Larizadeh, D. Herschlag, and S. M. Block, *Science* **314**, 1001 (2006).

## APPENDIX A: EFFICIENT SOLUTION OF THE ESTIMATING EQUATIONS

A number of methods can be used to obtain a self-consistent solution to the free energy estimating equations obtained from combining Eqs. 7 and 8

$$\hat{f}_i = -\ln \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} q_i(\mathbf{x}_{kn})}{\sum_{k'=1}^K N_{k'} \exp[\hat{f}_{k'}] q_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_{kn})}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

While any method capable of solving a coupled set of nonlinear equations may be employed here, we describe some practical choices we made in the implementation of this algorithm. While any method capable of solving a coupled set of nonlinear equations may be employed, we describe two approaches to their solution: a straightforward yet reliable self-consistent iteration method and an efficient yet slightly less reliable Newton-Raphson method. Both methods are implemented in the Python implementation of the estimator available online at <https://simtk.org/home/pymbar>.

### 1. Self-consistent iteration

As in [11], the  $\hat{f}_i$  could be obtained by self-consistent iteration of Eq. 12 using the last set of iterates  $\{\hat{f}_i^{(n)}\}_{i=1}^K$  to produce a new estimated set of iterates  $\{\hat{f}_i^{(n+1)}\}_{i=1}^K$ :

$$\hat{f}_i^{(n+1)} = -\ln \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} q_i(\mathbf{x}_{kn})}{\sum_{k'=1}^K N_{k'} \exp[\hat{f}_{k'}^{(n)}] q_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_{kn})}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Convergence is assured regardless of the initial choice of  $f_i^{(0)}$ , so it is sufficient to initialize the iteration by choosing  $f_i^{(0)} = 0$ . Alternative initial choices of the initial reduced free energies  $f_i^{(0)}$  may speed convergence. For example, we have found the choice

$$f_k^{(0)} = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} \ln q(\mathbf{x}_{kn}) \quad (\text{A3})$$

which, for Boltzmann weighting ( $q_k(\mathbf{x}) = \exp[-u_k(\mathbf{x})]$ ) corresponds to the average reduced potential energy, usually works well. Additional inexpensive choices are possible, such as fixing  $f_1^{(0)} = 0$  and estimating consecutive differences  $(f_{k+1}^{(0)} - f_k^{(0)})$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$  using the Bennett acceptance ratio (BAR) estimator [8, 9].

#### a. Cautions

For numerical reasons, it is convenient to constrain  $f_1 = 0$  during the course of iteration by subtracting  $f_1$  from the updated values in order to obtain a unique solution and prevent uncontrolled growth in the magnitude of the estimates. Iteration is terminated when the quantities of interest change by a fraction of the desired precision with additional iterations, but a convenient rule of thumb is to terminate when  $\max_{i=2, \dots, K} |f_i^{(n+1)} - f_i^{(n)}| / |f_i^{(n)}| < 10^{-7}$ . Because the quantities of interest and the relative free energies can converge at different rates, it is advised that the former be monitored when possible.

It is also critical to avoid *overflow* in the computation of exponentials  $e^a$ . To compute sums of the form  $\sum_{n=1}^N e^{a_n}$ , we can use the equivalent form

$$\ln S = \ln \sum_{n=1}^N \exp[a_n] = c + \ln \sum_{n=1}^N \exp[a_n - c] \quad (\text{A4})$$

where  $c \equiv \max_n a_n$ . To minimize the effects of *underflow*, the terms can be summed in order from smallest to largest.

## 2. Newton-Raphson

A more efficient approach to determination of the  $\hat{f}_i$  is to employ a Newton-Raphson solver, which has the advantage of quadratic convergence (a near doubling of the number of digits of precision) with each iteration when sufficiently near the solution. Because each iteration requires inversion of a  $(K - 1) \times (K - 1)$  matrix, this approach is only efficient if  $K$  is small, say  $K < 100$ , but this will be satisfied in a wide number of cases.

First, we write the estimating equations in terms of a set of functions  $g_i(\theta)$  such that the solution of the estimating equations (Eq. A1) corresponds to  $\mathbf{g}(\hat{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}$ . Several such choices of both the function  $\mathbf{g}(\theta)$  and the parameterization (the normalization constants  $c_i$  or their logarithms  $\theta_i$ ) are possible, and the efficiencies of approaches based on different choices may differ substantially, but we find it convenient to choose

$$g_i(\theta) = N_i - N_i \sum_{n=1}^N W_{ni}(\theta). \quad (\text{A5})$$

where  $W_{ni}$  is defined in Eq. 10. It can easily be seen that  $\mathbf{g}(\hat{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}$  is equivalent to the estimating equations:

$$\begin{aligned} g_i(\hat{\theta}) &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow N_i - N_i \sum_{n=1}^N W_{ni}(\hat{\theta}) &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow N_i - N_i \frac{\hat{c}_i^{-1} q_i(\mathbf{x}_n)}{\sum_{k'=1}^K N_{k'} \hat{c}_{k'}^{-1} q_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_n)} &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \hat{c}_i &= \frac{q_i(\mathbf{x}_n)}{\sum_{k'=1}^K N_{k'} \hat{c}_{k'}^{-1} q_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_n)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

In Newton-Raphson, the function  $\mathbf{g}(\theta)$  is expanded about the current iterate  $\theta^{(n)}$  to first order:

$$\mathbf{g}(\theta^{(n+1)}) \approx \mathbf{g}(\theta^{(n)}) + \mathbf{H}(\theta^{(n)})(\theta^{(n+1)} - \theta^{(n)}). \quad (\text{A7})$$

where

$$H_{ij}(\theta) = \frac{\partial g_i(\theta)}{\partial \theta_j} = \begin{cases} -\sum_{n=1}^N N_i W_{ni}(1 - N_i W_{ni}) & \text{if } i = j \\ \sum_{n=1}^N N_i W_{ni} N_j W_{nj} & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases} \quad (\text{A8})$$

We seek the next iterate  $\theta^{(n+1)}$  such that  $\mathbf{g}(\theta^{(n+1)}) = \mathbf{0}$ , which yields the update equation

$$\theta^{(n+1)} = \gamma [\mathbf{H}(\theta^{(n)})]^+ \mathbf{g}(\theta^{(n)}) \quad (\text{A9})$$

where  $^+$  denotes the pseudoinverse. If all the  $q_i(\mathbf{x})$  are unique and  $N_i > 0$  for all states, the standard matrix inverse may be substituted for the pseudoinverse.

### a. Cautions

We only need to iterate over states for which  $N_i > 0$ ; the relative free energies of states where  $N_i = 0$ , and expectation values at all states, can be determined after the self-consistent equations are solved to determine the relative free energies of states where  $N_i > 0$ . Since we must constrain  $f_1 = 0$  to avoid drift during the process of free energy determination, we can simply use a modified form of Eq. A9 where rows and columns corresponding to the first state are omitted.

$$\theta_{(2:K,2:K)}^{(n+1)} = \gamma [\mathbf{H}(\theta^{(n)})_{(2:K,2:K)}]^+ \mathbf{g}(\theta^{(n)})_{(2:K,2:K)}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

$\gamma \in (0, 1]$  is a scalar multiplier that controls the rate of convergence. Since the initial iterate  $\theta^{(1)}$  may be far from the realm of quadratic convergence (i.e. outside the range at which the Taylor expansion in Eq. A7 holds), it is often safer to choose an initial  $\gamma \ll 1$ . We have found  $\gamma = 0.1$  works well for the first step, with  $\gamma = 1$  used thereafter.

Even then, there are times when with reduced  $\gamma$  does not prevent numerical instability. The instability may be due to the initial guess iterate  $\theta^{(0)}$  being too far from the region of quadratic convergence, such that the first-order Taylor expansion above is a poor approximation to  $\mathbf{g}(\theta)$  in Eq. A7. In this case, a better procedure for choosing the initial iterate may aid convergence. Starting with one or more iterations of the self-consistent method (Section A1), or using an initial estimate from application of BAR [9] to sequential states may be sufficient. Less commonly, failure to converge may be result from numerical precision limiting the accurate calculation of the pseudoinverse  $[\mathbf{H}(\theta^{(n)})_{(2:K, 2:K)}]^+$ . In all cases, we find that self-consistent iteration still works reliably to recover the estimator, and can be used as a fallback procedure.

## APPENDIX B: EFFICIENT COMPUTATION OF THE ASYMPTOTIC COVARIANCE MATRIX

### 1. Singular value decomposition

The  $N \times K$  matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  (Eq. 10 in the main paper) can be written in terms of its singular value decomposition

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $\mathbf{U}$  is an  $N \times N$  unitary matrix of left singular vectors (such that  $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{I}_N$ ),  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  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  $\hat{\Theta}$  (Eq. 9) can then be expanded to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta} &= \mathbf{W}^T(\mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{N}\mathbf{W}^T)^+ \mathbf{W} \\ &= (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T)^T [\mathbf{I}_N - (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T)\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T)^T]^+ (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T) \\ &= \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^T \mathbf{U}^T [\mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Sigma}^T \mathbf{U}^T]^+ \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \\ &= \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^T \mathbf{U}^T [\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Sigma}^T \mathbf{U}^T]^+ \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \\ &= \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^T \mathbf{U}^T [\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Sigma}^T)\mathbf{U}^T]^+ \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \\ &= \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^T \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U} [\mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Sigma}^T]^+ \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \\ &= \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^T [\mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Sigma}^T]^+ \mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

We partition the matrix of singular values  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  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  $\mathbf{0}$ :

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_K \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B3})$$

We can then rewrite the above expression as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta} &= \mathbf{V} \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_K & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_K & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{(N-K)} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_K \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_K & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right\}^+ \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_K \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \\ &= \mathbf{V}\Sigma_K [\mathbf{I}_K - \Sigma_K \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{N} \mathbf{V} \Sigma_K]^+ \Sigma_K \mathbf{V}^T \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

We note that pseudoinversion of the quantity in brackets now only requires  $\mathcal{O}(K^3)$  work, though this can be further reduced to  $\mathcal{O}(L^3)$  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  $\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W} &= (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T)^T (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T) \\ &= \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^T \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \\ &= \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^T \mathbf{\Sigma})\mathbf{V}^T \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B5})$$



## 2. When $\mathbf{W}$ has full column rank

In the case that  $\mathbf{W}$  has full column rank (because all  $q_k(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$  are unique) we can make further progress. Using Eq. B4, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Theta} &= [\mathbf{V}\Sigma_K^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_K - \Sigma_K\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{N}\mathbf{V}\Sigma_K + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T)\Sigma_K^{-1}\mathbf{V}^T]^{-1} \\ &= [\mathbf{V}(\Sigma_K^{-2})\mathbf{V}^T - \mathbf{N}]^+ \\ &= [(\mathbf{W}^T\mathbf{W})^{-1} - \mathbf{N}]^+\end{aligned}\tag{B6}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}[(\mathbf{W}^T\mathbf{W})^{-1} - \mathbf{N}]\mathbf{1}_K &= (\mathbf{W}^T\mathbf{W})^{-1}\mathbf{1}_K - \mathbf{N}\mathbf{1}_K \\ &= (\mathbf{W}^T\mathbf{W})^{-1}\mathbf{W}^T\mathbf{W}\mathbf{N}\mathbf{1}_K - \mathbf{N}\mathbf{1}_K \\ &= \mathbf{N}\mathbf{1}_K - \mathbf{N}\mathbf{1}_K \\ &= \mathbf{0}\end{aligned}$$

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

$$\hat{\Theta} = [(\mathbf{W}^T\mathbf{W})^{-1} - \mathbf{N} + b\mathbf{1}_K\mathbf{1}_K^T]^{-1}\tag{B7}$$

We choose  $b = N^{-1}$  to ensure the inversion is well-conditioned (as in [18]), producing

$$\hat{\Theta} = [(\mathbf{W}^T\mathbf{W})^{-1} - \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{1}_K\mathbf{1}_K^T/N]^{-1}.\tag{B8}$$

## APPENDIX C: EQUIVALENCE OF THE BENNETT ACCEPTANCE RATIO FOR TWO STATES

We start with Eq. 12. For ease of use, we define  $\Delta\hat{f} = \hat{f}_2 - \hat{f}_1$  and  $\Delta u(\mathbf{x}) = u_2(\mathbf{x}) - u_1(\mathbf{x})$  and  $M = \ln N_2/N_1$ . Without loss of generalization, since the equations are symmetric, we examine the self-consistent equation for  $\hat{f}_1$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f}_1 &= -\ln \sum_{k=1}^2 \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} \frac{\exp[-u_1(\mathbf{x}_{kn})]}{\sum_{k'=1}^2 N_{k'} \exp[\hat{f}_{k'} - u_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_{kn})]} \\ \exp[-\hat{f}_1] &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} \frac{\exp[-u_1(\mathbf{x}_{1n})]}{\sum_{k'=1}^2 N_{k'} \exp[\hat{f}_{k'} - u_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_{1n})]} + \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} \frac{\exp[-u_1(\mathbf{x}_{2n})]}{\sum_{k'=1}^2 N_{k'} \exp[\hat{f}_{k'} - u_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_{2n})]} \\ 1 &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} \frac{\exp[\hat{f}_1 - u_1(\mathbf{x}_{1n})]}{N_1 \exp[\hat{f}_1 - u_1(\mathbf{x}_{1n})] + N_2 \exp[\hat{f}_2 - u_2(\mathbf{x}_{1n})]} + \\ &\quad \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} \frac{\exp[\hat{f}_1 - u_1(\mathbf{x}_{2n})]}{N_1 \exp[\hat{f}_1 - u_1(\mathbf{x}_{2n})] + N_2 \exp[\hat{f}_2 - u_2(\mathbf{x}_{2n})]} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} \frac{1}{N_1 + N_2 \exp[\Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{1n})]} + \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{N_1 + N_2 \exp[\Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{2n})]} \\ N_1 &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{N_2}{N_1} \exp[\Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{1n})]} + \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{N_2}{N_1} \exp[\Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{2n})]} \\ N_1 &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} \frac{1}{1 + \exp[M + \Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{1n})]} + \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{1 + \exp[M + \Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{2n})]}\end{aligned}\tag{C1}$$

We make the additional observation that

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

which allows us to write Eq. C1 as:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \exp[M + \Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{1n})]} - 1 \right] + \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{1 + \exp[M + \Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{2n})]} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} \frac{1}{1 + \exp[M + \Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{1n})]} - \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{1 + \exp[-M - \Delta\hat{f} + \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_{2n})]} \end{aligned}$$

Which is exactly the equation for BAR presented in Shirts *et al.* [9].

We now examine the expression for the variance limited to two states. When the two thermodynamic states are not identical, the  $\mathbf{W}$  will have full rank, and the asymptotic covariance matrix can be written as (see Eq. B7 above):

$$\Theta = [(\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W})^{-1} - \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{1}_K \mathbf{1}_K^T / N]^{-1}$$

where we have from Eq. 10

$$W_{nk} = \frac{\exp(\hat{f}_k - u_k(\mathbf{x}_n))}{\sum_{k'=1}^K N_{k'} \exp(\hat{f}_{k'} - u_{k'}(\mathbf{x}_n))}$$

Defining  $f$  as the Fermi function (not to be confused with the free energies  $\hat{f}_i$ ), and  $X_n = M + \Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}_n)$ , then in the case of two states  $W_{n1} = N_1^{-1} f(X_n)$  and  $W_{n2} = N_2^{-1} f(-X_n)$ .

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

$$\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W} = \sum_{n=1}^N \begin{pmatrix} N_1^{-2} f(X_n)^2 & N_1^{-1} N_2^{-1} f(X_n) f(-X_n) \\ N_1^{-1} N_2^{-1} f(X_n) f(-X_n) & N_2^{-2} f(-X_n)^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{C2})$$

If we represent the matrix  $(\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W})_{ij} = a_{ij}$ , the determinant  $|\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W}|$  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  $\mathbf{1}_K \mathbf{1}_K^T$ , 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:

$$\Theta^{-1} = (\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W})^{-1} - \mathbf{N} + b \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a_{22}}{D} - N_1 + b & -\frac{a_{21}}{D} + b \\ -\frac{a_{12}}{D} + b & \frac{a_{11}}{D} - N_2 + b \end{pmatrix}$$

The determinant will then be:

$$|\Theta^{-1}| = \frac{1}{D} - \frac{N_2 a_{22} - N_1 a_{11}}{D} + N_1 N_2 - b(N_1 + N_2) + b \frac{a_{11} + a_{22} + a_{12} + a_{21}}{D} \quad (\text{C3})$$

However, we note that  $(\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W})^{-1} - \mathbf{N}$  is singular, as shown in Appendix A, and thus the sum of the first three terms in Eq. C3 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:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Theta^{-1}| &= \frac{b}{D} [a_{11} + a_{22} + a_{12} + a_{21} - (N_1 + N_2)D] \\ &= \frac{4ab}{D} \end{aligned}$$

We then obtain:

$$\Theta = [(\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W})^{-1} - \mathbf{N} + b \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T]^{-1} = \frac{D}{4ab} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a_{11}}{D} - N_2 + b & \frac{a}{D} - b \\ \frac{a}{D} - b & \frac{a_{22}}{D} - N_1 + b \end{pmatrix}$$

The variance in  $f_1 - f_2$  will be  $\Theta_{11} + \Theta_{22} - 2\Theta_{12}$ , which reduces to:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f_1 - f_2) &= \frac{D}{4ab} \left[ \frac{a_{11} - N_1 D + bD + a_{22} - N_2 D + bD - 2a + 2bD}{D} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4ba} [(a_{11} - a - N_2 D) + (a_{22} - a - N_1 D) + 4bD] \\ &= \frac{D}{a} \end{aligned}$$

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  $D = N_1^{-1}N_2^{-1}(1 - Na)$ . We then obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2) &= \frac{a_{11}a_{22} - a^2}{a} \\
&= \frac{1 - Na}{N_1N_2a} \\
&= \frac{1}{N_1N_2a} - \frac{N}{N_1N_2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^N f(X_n)f(-X_n)} - \frac{N}{N_1N_2} \\
&= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2 + 2 \cosh(X_n)} \right]^{-1} - \frac{N}{N_1N_2} \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \left[ \left\langle \frac{1}{2 + 2 \cosh(M + \Delta\hat{f} - \Delta u(\mathbf{x}))} \right\rangle^{-1} - \left( \frac{N}{N_2} + \frac{N}{N_1} \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

This is the equation for the asymptotic covariance of of free energies given for the BAR method in Shirts *et al.* [9]

#### APPENDIX D: EXTRACTING THE POTENTIAL OF MEAN FORCE OF A DNA HAIRPIN

The complete dataset for the 20R55/4T hairpin system described in [28] were obtained from Michael Woodside (National Institute for Nanotechnology, NRC and Deptment of Physics, University of Alberta). This dataset consisted of 16 trajectories at 296.15 K, each 5 s in duration sampled with a period of 0.1 ms, totaling 50 000 samples each. Each trajectory was collected under a different constant force load, with force loads ranging from 12.35 pN to 14.41 pN, with an estimated 10% relative error in the measurement of this force value. The sampled extension range was divided up into 50 unequally-sized bins such that the number of samples per bin was equal in order to avoid regions with zero histogram counts, as would occur with equally-spaced bins.

To estimate the potential of mean force from the 14.19 pN trajectory alone (black filled squares in Figure 1), the total number of counts  $N_i$  per histogram bin was determined, and the reduced potential of mean force (in units of  $kT$ )  $f_i$  computed up to an irrelevant additive constant from

$$f_i = -\ln(N_i/w_i) \quad (\text{D1})$$

where  $w_i$  is the relative width of bin  $i$ , necessary to correct for the nonuniform bin sizes. The statistical uncertainty in the histogram count was estimated by standard methods (see Eq. 26 of [29])

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2 N_i &= g N_i (1 - N_i/N) \\
\delta^2 f_i &= \frac{\delta^2 N_i}{N_i^2}
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

where  $g$  is the statistical inefficiency of the extension timeseries, estimates from the autocorrelation function (see Section 5.2 of [29]).

To estimate the potential of mean force using the optimal estimator described herein, the dataset was first sub-sampled with an interval equal to the statistical inefficiency of each trajectory at constant force to produce a set of uncorrelated samples. The reduced potential energy for each state  $k$  under the experimental conditions corresponds to

$$u_k(\mathbf{x}) = \beta[U_0(\mathbf{x}) + U_k^{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{x}) + pV(\mathbf{x})] \quad (\text{D3})$$

where the externally applied biasing potential is given by

$$U_k^{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{x}) = -F_k z(\mathbf{x}) + a_k \quad (\text{D4})$$

where  $z(\mathbf{x})$  is the extension coordinate,  $F_k$  is the constant applied force along the positive  $z$  direction, and  $a_k$  is a constant offset.

Because only differences  $u_i(\mathbf{x}) - u_j(\mathbf{x})$  appear in the estimating equations (Eq. 12), many components of the previous equations cancel out and need not be considered

$$u_i(\mathbf{x}) - u_j(\mathbf{x}) = -\beta(F_i - F_j)z(\mathbf{x}) + \beta(a_i - a_j) \quad (\text{D5})$$

While the constant term  $\beta(a_i - a_j)$  involving the constant zero potential intercepts will appear in the estimated state free energies, these do not influence computed expectations in Eq. 13, and are hence irrelevant.

The probability of finding the system in a bin  $i$  under the conditions of interest is given by the expectation

$$p_i = \langle \chi_i(z) \rangle \quad (\text{D6})$$

where  $\chi_i(z)$  is an indicator function that assumes the value of 1 if the system is in bin  $i$  and zero otherwise. The potential of mean force can then be computed from these probabilities, up to an irrelevant additive constant, as

$$f_i = -\ln(p_i/w_i) \quad (\text{D7})$$

and the uncertainties propagated as described in Section IV.

Because each potential of mean force is only determined up to an arbitrary additive constant, the mean value of each PMF was subtracted before plotting. This is equivalent to choosing the additive constants so as to obtain an optimal least-squares RMS fit between the two PMFs.

It should be noted that these PMF corresponds to the potential of mean force along the entire system connected to the glass beads, which includes not only the DNA hairpin but the two dsDNA linkers and their attachments to the glass beads. In other work, deconvolution or related methods have been applied to correct for the stretching of the linkers to estimate PMF for the DNA hairpin alone [33].

---