

Coarse-grained Markov chains capture molecular thermodynamics and kinetics in no uncertain terms

Gregory R. Bowman

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

(Dated: November 6, 2018)

Markov state models (MSMs)—or discrete-time master equation models—are a powerful way of understanding the structure and function of proteins and other molecular systems. However, they are typically too complicated to understand. Here, I present a Bayesian agglomerative clustering engine (BACE) for coarse-graining Markov chains—as well as a more general class of probabilistic models—making them more comprehensible while remaining as faithful as possible to the original kinetics by accounting for model uncertainty. The closed-form expression I derive here for determining which states to merge is equivalent to the generalized Jensen-Shannon divergence, an important measure from information theory that is related to the relative entropy. Therefore, the method has an appealing information theoretic interpretation. 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.

PACS numbers: 87.15.hp, 87.10.Mn

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—akin to local minima in the system’s free energy landscape—and a matrix of transition probabilities between them. Typically, the states are identified via a kinetic clustering of molecular dynamics simulations.

Unfortunately, building MSMs and extracting understanding from them is still a challenging task. Ideally, MSMs would be constructed using a purely kinetic clustering of a simulation data set. Calculating the transition rate between two conformations is an unsolved problem though, 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 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 trouble 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—i.e. the most rapidly mixing states. The key equation 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 [10], an information theoretic measure that has found numerous applications in the physical sciences [11–13]. Indeed, the expression is actually equivalent to the generalized Jensen-Shannon divergence [14], which can be interpreted as the average amount of information a single measurement gives about which of two possible distributions is being sampled. 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.

Code is available on the web




FIG. 1: A simple model demonstrating that BACE correctly deals with noise, whereas eigenspectrum-based methods like PCCA are confounded by it. Each of the nine microstates is color coded by its assignment into three macrostates using either BACE or PCCA. All the states and most of the transitions are well sampled—each microstate has 1000 self-transitions, thick connections represent 100 transitions, and medium lines represent 10 transitions. Therefore, the best coarse-graining into three states is to merge states 0-2, 3-5, and 6-8 because transitions within these groups are fast compared to transitions between the groups. However, there are also two noisy (or poorly sampled) connections with only a single transition between states 2-4 and 5-7. This noise causes PCCA to mistakenly assign states 3-4 with state 5. In contrast, BACE still works properly.

(<https://sites.google.com/site/gregoryrbowman/>) and through the msmbuilder project (<https://simtk.org/home/msmbuilder>).

BACE—The hierarchical structure of biomolecules’ free energy landscapes naturally suggests a hierarchical approach to model construction. The free energy landscapes of almost all biomolecules are extremely rugged, having numerous local minima separated by barriers of different heights. Put another way, free energy basins in this landscape can typically be subdivided into smaller local minima, giving rise to a hierarchy of minima. 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 [15]. 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—i.e. those with similar transition probabilities. Physically, this is equivalent

to merging states that mix rapidly because they are only separated by a low free energy barrier. 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. Specifically, I derive a closed-form expression for the log of a Bayes factor comparing how likely the data observed for a pair of states is to have come from either different or the same underlying distribution of transition probabilities. 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. The final expression for the BACE Bayes factor is

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

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 .

This expression is equivalent to the generalized Jensen-Shannon divergence [14] and, therefore, has an appealing information theoretic interpretation. Given a sample drawn from one of two probability distributions, the Jensen-Shannon divergence is the average information that sample provides about the identity of the distribution it was drawn from [16]. The result is zero if the two distributions are equivalent and reaches its maximal value if the distributions are non-overlapping and a single data point, therefore, uniquely specifies which distribution it was drawn from. 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. By iteratively merging the most kinetically similar states, BACE retains the most divergent states, which can be interpreted as keeping the states with the most information content.

To derive Eq. 1, we first recognize that every possible set of transition probabilities out of some initial state that satisfies $0 \leq \check{p}_{ij} \leq 1$ and $\sum_j \check{p}_{ij} = 1$ 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

$$P(\check{p}_i|C_i, \alpha_i) \propto P(C_i|\check{p}_i)P(\check{p}_i|\alpha_i) \quad (2)$$

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

$P(C_i|\check{p}_i)$ is called the likelihood and gives the probability that the given distribution generated the observed counts. Assuming the transition probabilities for each state are independent, the likelihood follows a multinomial distribution

$$P(C_i|\check{p}_i) = \frac{\hat{C}_i!}{\prod_k C_{ik}!} \prod_k \check{p}_{ik}^{C_{ik}}$$

$P(\check{p}_i|\alpha_i)$ 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

$$P(\check{p}_i|\alpha_i) = D(\alpha_i) = \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_{ik})}{\prod_k \Gamma(\alpha_{ik})} \prod_k \check{p}_{ik}^{\alpha_{ik}-1}$$

where α_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, 12].

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

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

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

where $\mathcal{H}(p_i) = -\sum_k p_{ik} \ln p_{ik}$ is the entropy of p_i and we have made the substitutions $\hat{C}_i = \sum_k C_{ik}$, $p_{ik} = C_{ik}/\hat{C}_i$, $\Gamma(C_{ik} + 1/n) \approx \Gamma(C_{ik} + 1) = C_{ik}!$, $\Gamma(1/n) \approx n$, and Stirling's approximation.

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 way to determine which of two models best explains a 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, 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.

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 ,

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

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 , Θ_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. 5 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

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

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. Only considering connected states helps to ensure that only rapidly mixing states are merged, not states that just happen to have similar transition probabilities. 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.

Beyond this qualitative improvement, a quantitative measure of model validity shows that coarse-grainings from BACE capture both the thermodynamics and kinetics of molecular systems better than existing eigenspectrum-based methods (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]. Both

TABLE I: Comparison of BACE with eigenspectrum-based methods using the model comparison method from Ref [9] with 100 bootstrapped samples. Mean and 68% confidence interval are reported. The large numbers are comparable to those found in Ref. [9] and arise from the exponential terms in the likelihood function. The zero entry for comparing the performance of BACE and PCCA+ on the simple model arises from the fact that they give equivalent results in this case.

Model	$\log_{10} \frac{P(BACE C)}{P(PCCA C)}$	$\log_{10} \frac{P(BACE C)}{P(PCCA+ C)}$
Simple ^a	1324 (1079, 1548)	0
Alanine dipeptide ^b	3239 (3152, 3312)	2707 (2573, 2862)
Villin ^c	11450 (10913, 12038)	16997 (16076, 17856)

^a 9 state model from Fig. 1.

^b 181 state model from Ref. [17].

^c 10,000 state model from Ref. [18].

this method and the one outlined here compare the consistency of two coarse-grainings with the original microstate trajectories. This comparison integrates over all possible macrostate transition probability matrices and all possible microstate equilibrium probabilities within each macrostate for each coarse-graining and, therefore, captures both the thermodynamics and kinetics of each model. Table I shows that the coarse-grainings from BACE are typically many orders of magnitude better than those from eigenspectrum-based methods by this metric. Moreover, the gap between these methods widens with increasing model complexity as one moves from the simple model in Fig. 1 to real molecular systems—the alanine dipeptide has two degrees of freedom and villin has thousands. 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 addition, having this hierarchy allows the user to determine how many macrostates are appropriate to use. 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




FIG. 2: Bayes factors identify the most meaningful level of the hierarchy of models from BACE. (A) Mean and 68% confidence interval of the BACE Bayes factor (BACE BF, dashed line) and evidence from the approximate model comparison expression (x's) and the more exact method enforcing reversibility (squares). (B) A dendrogram representation of the results from BACE highlights the methods ability to capture the hierarchical nature of the underlying landscape.

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 that significantly outperforms existing methods in capturing the thermodynamics and kinetics of molecular systems. The method is also directly applicable to other Markov chains and could easily be extended to other probabilistic models. The development of the method was guided by physical intuition regarding the hierarchical nature of the free energy landscapes that ultimately govern the structure and dynamics of molecular systems. The final result is equivalent to the generalized Jensen-Shannon divergence and, therefore, the method also has an appealing information theoretic interpretation in terms of the information content of a measurement. Therefore, BACE could greatly facilitate a deeper

understanding of molecular systems. In particular, it can provide 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 and to TJ Lane and DA Sivak for helpful comments.

* 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] S. Kullback and R.A. Leibler, *Ann. Math. Stat.* 22, 79 (1951).
- [11] M.S. Shell, *J. Chem. Phys.* 129, 144108 (2008).
- [12] G.R. Bowman, D.L. Ensign, and V.S. Pande, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 6, 787 (2010).
- [13] G.E. Crooks and D.A. Sivak, *J. Stat. Mech.* P06003 (2011).
- [14] J. Lin, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 37, 145 (1991).
- [15] J.G. Kemeny and J.L. Shell, *Finite Markov Chains* (Springer, Berlin, 1976).
- [16] D.M. Endres and J.E. Schindelin, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 49, 1858 (2003).
- [17] K.A. Beauchamp *et al.*, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 7, 3412 (2011).
- [18] G.R. Bowman and V.S. Pande, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 107, 10890 (2010).