

# Bayesian agglomerative clustering engine for coarse-graining Markov state models

Gregory R. Bowman

*Departments of Chemistry and Molecular & Cell Biology, University of California, Berkeley, CA, 94720\**

(Dated: January 1, 2019)

Markov state models (MSMs) are a powerful means of understanding the structure and function of biomolecules by describing their free energy landscapes as a set of local minima (a.k.a. states) and the probabilities of transitioning between them. Unfortunately, it can be difficult to gain an intuition for an MSM because they typically must have tens of thousands of states to quantitatively describe the rugged landscapes of most biomolecules. Here, I derive a Bayesian agglomerative clustering engine (BACE) for coarse-graining MSMs, making them suitable for extracting human understanding. BACE considerably outperforms existing methods by iteratively lumping together the most kinetically similar states while taking into account model uncertainty. I also present an extremely efficient expression for Bayesian model comparison that can be used to identify the most meaningful levels of the hierarchy of models from BACE. Code for both methods is available on the web (<https://sites.google.com/site/gregoryrbowman/>).

PACS numbers: 87.15.hp, 87.10.Mn

*Introduction*—Markov state models (MSMs) are a powerful means of understanding dynamic processes on the molecular scale, like protein folding and function [1, 2]. These discrete-time master equation models consist of a set of states—corresponding to local minima in the system’s free energy landscape—and a matrix of transition probabilities between each pair of states. Typically, the states are identified via a kinetic clustering of extensive molecular dynamics simulations.

Unfortunately, extracting human understanding from MSMs is still a challenging task. Calculating the transition probability between two conformations in a given time interval is an unsolved problem, so, MSMs are generally built in a two-stage process. First, the conformations sampled are clustered into microstates based on geometric criteria such that the degree of geometric similarity between conformations in the same state implies a kinetic similarity. Such models are excellent for making a quantitative connection with experiments because of their high temporal and spatial resolution. However, it is difficult to examine such models to gain an intuition for a system because the rugged nature of most biomolecules free energy landscapes requires that the initial microstate model have tens of thousands of states. Therefore, it is necessary to coarse-grain the initial state space by lumping rapidly interconverting—or kinetically close—microstates together into macrostates to obtain a more compact and comprehensible model.

A major challenge in coarse-graining MSMs to better understand them is dealing with uncertainty. The most common methods for coarse-graining MSMs—like Perron Cluster Cluster Analysis (PCCA) [3] and PCCA+ [4]—make use of the eigenspectrum of the transition probability matrix to find the partitioning that best captures the slowest transitions. Such methods are well-suited to data-rich situations but often fail when there is noise or




FIG. 1: A simple model demonstrating how noise confounds eigenspectrum-based methods for coarse-graining MSMs. The nine microstates each have 1000 self transitions and the thickness of the connections between states indicates the number of transitions between them (thick=100, medium=10, thin=1). Without noise (i.e. the weak connections from 2 to 4 and 5 to 7), PCCA finds the correct partitioning into three macrostates (0-2, 3-5, 6-8). However, with this noise added, PCCA mis-groups microstates 3-4 with 0-2 (see color coding).

insufficient data [5]. For example, Fig. 1 shows a case where PCCA fails once a small amount of noise is added. Eigenspectrum based methods also have troubles creating mesoscale models—models with a large number of macrostates that are still quantitatively predictive yet are significantly more compact than the original microstate model—due to issues like propagating error.

Here, I present a Bayesian agglomerative clustering engine (BACE) for coarse-graining MSMs in a manner that accounts for model uncertainty and can easily create mesoscale models. Bayesian methods have found wide applications in the physical sciences, and in MSMs in particular [6–9], for their ability to deal with uncertainty. Inspired by the hierarchical nature of biomolecules free energy landscapes, BACE performs an agglomerative clustering of microstates into macrostates by iteratively lumping together the most kinetically similar states. The key expression derived here is a closed-form expression for a Bayes factor that quantifies how likely two states are to be kinetically identical. This expression is related to

the relative entropy, a function originally from information theory that has also found numerous applications in the physical sciences [10, 11]. I also present an approximate expression for model comparison that allows one to identify the most informative levels of the hierarchy of models generated with BACE. These methods could be applied directly to other Markov processes and could also be extended to other probabilistic models.

*BACE*—The hierarchical structure of biomolecule’s free energy landscapes naturally suggests a hierarchical approach to model construction. The free energy landscapes of most all biomolecules are extremely rugged, having numerous local minima separated by barriers of different heights. Transitions across low barriers occur exponentially more often than those across higher barriers. Groups of local minima separated by low barriers will mix rapidly and, therefore, appear as a single larger state to other minima separated from them by larger barriers. Thus, these groups can satisfy a requirement for coarse-graining models called lumpability. A microstate MSM is considered lumpable with respect to some set of macrostates if and only if, for every pair of macrostates  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  and any pair of microstates  $i$  and  $j$  in  $M_1$   $\sum_{k \in M_2} p_{ik} = \sum_{k \in M_2} p_{jk}$  where  $p_{ij}$  is the probability that the system will transition to state  $j$  given that it is currently in state  $i$ .

We can exploit the concept of lumpability to construct coarse-grained models by progressively lumping together the most kinetically similar states. One might be tempted to use an L1 or L2 norm between the transition probabilities out of each pair of states to determine which are most similar. However, such an approach would ignore the fact that some states and transitions are better sampled than others and, therefore, would be susceptible to the same pitfalls as eigenspectrum-based methods.

Instead, I propose a Bayesian method for determining which states to lump together based on how likely the data observed for each pair of states is to have come from either different or the same underlying distribution of transition probabilities. Specifically, I derive a closed-form expression for the log of the BACE Bayes factor

$$\ln \frac{P(\text{different}|C)}{P(\text{same}|C)} \approx \hat{C}_i \mathcal{D}(p_i||q) + \hat{C}_j \mathcal{D}(p_j||q) \quad (1)$$

where  $C$  is the transition count matrix,  $\hat{C}_i$  is the number of transitions observed from state  $i$ ,  $\mathcal{D}(p_i||q) = \sum_k p_{ik} \ln \frac{p_{ik}}{q_k}$  is the relative entropy between probability distribution  $p_i$  and  $q$ ,  $p_i$  is a vector of maximum likelihood transition probabilities from state  $i$ , and  $q = \frac{\hat{C}_i p_i + \hat{C}_j p_j}{\hat{C}_i + \hat{C}_j}$  is the vector of expected transition probabilities from combining states  $i$  and  $j$ . Bayes factors compare the evidence (or marginal likelihood) for two different models. In calculating these marginal likelihoods, one integrates over all possible distributions, thereby accounting for uncertainty. In this case, the larger the Bayes

factor is, the more likely the data for each state are to have come from different underlying distributions.

To derive this expression, we first recognize that every possible set of transition probabilities out of some initial state that satisfies  $0 \leq p_{ij} \leq 1$  and  $\sum_j p_{ij} = 1$  has some probability of generating the observed transitions out of that state. From Bayes rule, the probability of some distribution being the true underlying distribution given a set of observed transitions is

$$P(p_i|C_i, \alpha_i) \propto P(C_i|p_i)P(p_i|\alpha_i) \quad (2)$$

where  $C_i$  is a vector of transition counts out of state  $i$  and  $\alpha_i$  will be discussed shortly. The left-hand side of Eq. 2 is called the posterior distribution.

The first term in Eq 2 is called the likelihood and gives the probability that the given distribution generated the observed counts. In this case, the likelihood follows a multinomial distribution

$$P(C_i|p_i) = \prod_k p_{ik}^{C_{ik}}$$

The second term in Eq 2 is called the prior and gives the probability of the given distribution before any data is observed. A Dirichlet prior ( $D$ ) is typically chosen when the likelihood is a multinomial because these distributions are conjugate. That is, if the prior is a Dirichlet then the posterior is also a Dirichlet. The prior is then

$$P(p_i|\alpha_i) = D(\alpha_i) = \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_{ik})}{\prod_k \Gamma(\alpha_{ik})} \prod_k p_{ik}^{\alpha_{ik}-1}$$

where  $\alpha_i$  is a vector of pseudocounts giving the expected number of transitions before any data is observed. We choose  $\alpha_{ik} = 1/n$  where  $n$  is the number of states because for a state to exist we must have observed at least one transition originating from that state and, prior to observing any data, the chance that that transition is to any particular state is equal [6, 11].

Combining the expressions for the likelihood and prior, the posterior distribution from Eq. 2 is  $P(p_i|C_i, \alpha_i) = D(C_i + \alpha_i)$ .

We can now calculate the log of the evidence for a particular model (M)

$$\begin{aligned} \ln P(C_i|M) &= \ln \int_{p_i} P(C_i|p_i)P(p_i|\alpha_i) \\ &= \ln \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_{ik})}{\Gamma(\sum_k [C_{ik} + \alpha_{ik}])} \prod_k \frac{\Gamma(C_{ik} + \alpha_{ik})}{\Gamma(\alpha_{ik})} \\ &\approx \sum_k C_{ik} \ln p_{ik} - n \ln n + n \\ &\approx -\hat{C}_i \mathcal{H}(p_i) - n \ln n + n \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}(p_i) = -\sum_k p_{ik} \ln p_{ik}$  is the entropy of  $p_i$ , we have made the substitutions  $\hat{C}_i = \sum_k C_{ik}$  and  $p_{ik} =$

$C_{ik}/\hat{C}_i$ , and we use the approximation  $\Gamma(C_{ik} + 1/n) = \Gamma(C_{ik} + 1) = C_{ik}!$  to simplify the math without affecting the performance of the method.

The BACE Bayes factor given in Eq 1 is then the ratio of the evidence for the transition counts from states  $i$  and  $j$  coming from two different distributions versus a single distribution ( $\ln \frac{P(\text{different}|C)}{P(\text{same}|C)} = \ln \frac{P(C|\text{different})P(\text{different})}{P(C|\text{same})P(\text{same})}$ ) where we assume the prior probabilities for the two models are equal and drop terms depending only on  $n$  as they simply introduce a constant that has no effect on the relative ordering of Bayes factors comparing various states.

*Bayesian Model Comparison*—Bayesian model comparison is a powerful means of determining which of two models best explains a given set of observations. Such methods are of great value here as they can be used to compare the results of BACE to other coarse-graining methods. Moreover, in principle, they can be used to decide which levels of the hierarchy of models from BACE are most deserving of further analysis. However, current methods [9] are too computationally demanding for this second task to be tractable.

Using similar mathematical machinery to that employed in the derivation of BACE and paralleling the derivation in Ref. [9], we can also derive a closed-form expression for the log of the Bayes factor comparing two coarse-grainings—or lumpings—of an MSM,  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ ,

$$\ln \frac{P(L_1|C)}{P(L_2|C)} = \sum_{M \in L_2} \hat{B}_M [\mathcal{H}(p_M) + \mathcal{H}(\Theta_M)] - \sum_{M \in L_1} \hat{B}_M [\mathcal{H}(p_M) + \mathcal{H}(\Theta_M)] \quad (4)$$

where  $B$  and  $C$  are the transition count matrices at the macrostate and microstate levels, respectively,  $M$  is a macrostate in lumping  $L$ ,  $\hat{B}_M$  is the number of transitions originating in  $M$ ,  $p_M$  is a vector of transition probabilities from  $M$ ,  $\Theta_M$  is a vector of the probabilities of being in each microstate  $m$  given that the system is in  $M$ , and  $\mathcal{H}$  is the entropy. Evaluating this expression is extremely efficient, making it feasible to compare the merits of each model in the hierarchy generated by BACE.

To derive Eq. 4, we need to calculate the evidence for a particular coarse-graining,  $L$ ,

$$\ln P(C|L) = \ln \int_T \int_{\Theta} P(B|T, L) P(C|B, \Theta, L) P(T, \Theta)$$

where  $T$  is the macrostate transition probability matrix. Because the macrostate trajectory and selection of microstates are independent, this can be rewritten as

$$\ln P(C|L) = \ln \int_T P(B|T, L) P(T) + \ln \int_{\Theta} P(C|B, \Theta, L) P(\Theta) \quad (5)$$

Assuming the transition counts from each state come from independent multinomial distributions and using

similar reasoning as employed in the derivation of BACE, the first term in Eq. 4 is

$$\ln \int_T P(B|T, L) P(T) \approx - \sum_{M \in L} \hat{B}_M \mathcal{H}(p_M)$$

From Ref. [9], the second term in Eq. 4 is

$$\ln \int_{\Theta} P(C|B, \Theta, L) P(\Theta) = \ln \prod_{M \in L} \frac{\Gamma(|M|) \prod_{m \in M} \Gamma(\hat{C}_m + 1)}{\Gamma(\hat{B}_M + |M|)}$$

where  $m$  is a microstate in macrostate  $M$ ,  $|M|$  is the number of microstates in  $M$ , and we have assumed a pseudocount of 1 to reflect our prior belief that for a microstate to exist, we must have observed at least one transition originating in that state. Using  $\frac{\Gamma(Y)}{\Gamma(X+Y)} \approx \frac{1}{X!}$  and, again, the reasoning from BACE, this becomes

$$\ln \int_{\Theta} P(C|B, \Theta, L) P(\Theta) \approx - \sum_{M \in L} \hat{B}_M \mathcal{H}(\Theta_M)$$

*Results*—One can construct a hierarchy of coarse-grained models by repeatedly applying the lumping criterion derived here. Starting at the microstate level, we first calculate the BACE Bayes factor from Eq. 1 for every pair of connected states—i.e. every pair of states with at least one direct transition between them. We then identify the pair of states that are most likely to have come from the same underlying distribution and merge them by summing their transition counts. Finally, we update the Bayes factors and repeat the lumping procedure until the desired number of states is obtained.

The computational complexity of this algorithm is equivalent to existing eigenspectrum-based methods ( $O(n^3)$ ). If we recalculated every Bayes factor during each iteration of the algorithm, the complexity of this method would be  $O(n^4)$ . However, we can greatly improve upon this situation by recognizing that merging two states has a negligible effect on Bayes factors not involving either of them and only recalculating Bayes factors including the new merged state, resulting in a complexity of  $O(N^3)$ . Moreover, the runtime of this method is typically much better than this worst case scenario because of the sparsity of MSM's transition count matrices.

More importantly, BACE is much better at dealing with uncertainty than current eigenspectrum-based methods. For example, it is able to correctly identify the three macrostates in the simple model shown in Fig. 1 even in the presence of noise that confounds eigenspectrum-based methods. BACE also naturally lumps states with few samples into larger ones, whereas eigenspectrum based methods tend to make such states into singleton macrostates. With BACE, a significantly better sampled state will dominate the Bayes factor when compared to a poorly sampled state, leading to a high likelihood that the poorly sampled state will be absorbed into its better sampled neighbor.

TABLE I: Comparison of BACE with eigenspectrum-based methods using the model comparison method from Ref [9] with 500 samples.

Model	$\log_{10} \frac{P(BACE C)}{P(PCCA C)}$	$\log_{10} \frac{P(BACE C)}{P(PCCA+ C)}$
Simple <sup>a</sup>	1324	0
Alanine dipeptide <sup>b</sup>	3229	2722
Villin <sup>c</sup>	3692383	5193636

<sup>a</sup> 9 state model from Fig. 1.

<sup>b</sup> 181 state model from Ref. [12].

<sup>c</sup> 10,000 state model from Ref. [13].




FIG. 2: Bayes factors identify the most meaningful level of the hierarchy of models from BACE. (A) Comparison of the BACE Bayes factor (BACE BF, dashed line) and evidence from the approximate model comparison expression (triangles) with the evidence from the more exact method enforcing reversibility (black line). (B) A dendrogram representation of the results from BACE highlights the methods ability to capture the hierarchical nature of the underlying landscape.

Beyond this qualitative improvement, a quantitative measure of model validity shows that coarse-grainings from BACE are typically many orders of magnitude better than those from eigenspectrum-based methods and the gap between these methods widens with increasing model complexity (Table I). To make this comparison, I employed a Bayesian method for model comparison that calculates the evidence for different coarse-grainings while taking into account many of the constraints on valid MSMs, like reversibility [9]. Such quantitative comparisons are crucial because the complexity of most real-world MSMs renders a qualitative assessment of a coarse-graining’s validity impossible.

Another advantage of BACE is that it generates an entire hierarchy of models. Having this hierarchy makes it possible to look for general properties that are robust to the degree of coarse-graining and, therefore, may be important properties of the system being investigated. In theory, one could employ the Bayesian model comparison method accounting for reversibility from Ref. [9] to

decide which levels of the hierarchy are most deserving of further analysis but, in practice, this would be impractical due to the time requirements of that method. However, both the BACE Bayes factor and the approximate model comparison method presented here correlate well with the reversible method (Fig. 2A) and, therefore, can be used to guide which levels of the hierarchy are pursued further. Each Bayes factor changes more rapidly when more distinct states are lumped together, so models immediately preceding these dramatic jumps are ideal for further analysis. The BACE Bayes factor can even be used to visualize the hierarchical nature of a system’s free energy landscape and choose appropriate levels for further analysis (Fig. 2). One could also combine the methods by using the approximate expression to guide the application of the reversible method.

*Conclusions*—I have presented a Bayesian agglomerative clustering engine (BACE) for coarse-graining MSMs—and possibly other models—that significantly outperforms existing methods. BACE could greatly facilitate a deeper understanding of molecular systems, particularly by providing an entire hierarchy of models that captures the hierarchical nature of a molecule’s free energy landscape. The Bayes factors derived here can be used to guide which levels of the hierarchy are used for analysis and a fast, approximate expression for model comparison derived here may prove valuable in situations where more exact expressions are too expensive.

*Acknowledgments*—I am grateful to the Miller Institute for funding.

\* Electronic address: gregoryrbowman@gmail.com

- [1] G.R. Bowman, X. Huang, and V.S. Pande, Cell Res. 20, 622 (2010).
- [2] F. Noé and S. Fischer, Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol. 18, 154 (2008).
- [3] P. Deuffhard, W. Huisinga, A. Fischer, and C. Schütte, Linear Algebra Appl. 315, 39 (2000).
- [4] P. Deuffhard and M. Weber, Linear Algebra Appl. 398, 161 (2005).
- [5] X. Huang *et al.*, Pac. Symp. Biocomput. 15, 228 (2010).
- [6] N.S. Hinrichs and V.S. Pande, J. Chem. Phys. 126, 244101 (2007).
- [7] F. Noé, J. Chem. Phys. 128, 244103 (2008).
- [8] S. Sriraman, I. Kevrekidis, and G. Hummer, J. Phys. Chem. B 109, 6479 (2005).
- [9] S. Bacallado, J.D. Chodera, and V.S. Pande, J. Chem. Phys. 131, 045106 (2009).
- [10] M.S. Shell, J. Chem. Phys. 129, 144108 (2008).
- [11] G.R. Bowman, D.L. Ensing, and V.S. Pande, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 6, 787 (2010).
- [12] K.A. Beauchamp *et al.*, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 7, 3412 (2011).
- [13] G.R. Bowman, K.A. Beauchamp, G. Boxer, and V.S. Pande, J. Chem. Phys. 131, 124101 (2009).