

Simple implementation of Langevin dynamics neglecting detailed balance condition

Masayuki Ohzeki

*Department of Systems Science, Kyoto University,
Yoshida-Honmachi, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan*

Akihisa Ichiki

Green Mobility Collaborative Research Center, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya 464-8603, Japan

(Dated: May 2, 2019)

An improved method of driving a system into a desired distribution, for example, the Gibbs-Boltzmann distribution, is proposed, which makes use of an artificial relaxation process. The standard techniques for achieving the Gibbs-Boltzmann distribution involve numerical simulations under the detailed balance condition. In contrast, in the present study we formulate the Langevin dynamics, for which the corresponding Fokker-Planck operator includes an asymmetric component due to violation of the detailed balance condition. This asymmetric component leads to shifts in the eigenvalues and results in the acceleration of the relaxation toward the steady state. Several demonstrations confirm the efficacy of our method.

INTRODUCTION

In order to investigate the realization of physical quantities in the equilibrium state of a many-body system, we often perform a stochastic numerical simulation governed by the master or Fokker-Planck equations. Various numerical techniques for such computations are broadly applied in numerous scientific fields. In numerical simulation in stochastic dynamics, however, an unavoidable obstacle (in the form of the critical slowing down in the relaxation to the equilibrium state), is involved in the frustrated dynamics appearing in structural glassy systems, protein-folding simulations, and various critical phenomena. In order to overcome this difficulty, researchers have proposed many alternatives beyond the standard approaches [1–4]. The majority of these methods, for instance, the Markov-chain Monte-Carlo method (MCMC), adhere to the detailed balance condition (DBC), which is a simple solution satisfying the balance condition (BC) to assure relaxation to the equilibrium state. However, it is not necessary that the DBC should be satisfied in order to generate the desired distribution. Several ingenious techniques realize relaxation to the target steady state without satisfying the DBC [5–7] in the MCMC. In particular, Suwa and Todo have proposed a trick to severely reduce the rejection rate in an extension of stochastic dynamics that allows violation of the DBC. This approach has demonstrated outstanding performance for several cases that frequently appear in statistical mechanics. Sakai and Hukushima also investigated the performance of another type of MCMC, while neglecting the DBC, in many-body systems including frustrated spin glasses [8, 9]. The above-listed studies are performed at the level of the master equation, which is a coarse-grained picture of the dynamics. However, one might be able to demonstrate microscopic behaviour in the steady state simply by use of the Langevin equation, as in the case of the numerical simulations involved

in the structural glassy system and protein-folding problems. We naturally expect that modified microscopic dynamics that are free from the DBC exist; however, discussion on microscopic dynamics that violate the DBC is not widespread in the literature. For example, one prominent question has not yet been addressed, i.e., the identification of forces that can accelerate the relaxation to the steady state without any change in the final distribution.

In the present study, we propose modified microscopic dynamics governed by the Langevin equation, with high-speed relaxation to the steady state with the desired distribution. The proposed Langevin dynamics have a connection to the Fokker-Planck equation, neglecting the DBC. Analysis of the eigenvalues of the corresponding Fokker-Planck operator theoretically assures the acceleration of the relaxation to the desired distribution, according to the same line of argument as that given in our preceding study [10]. Here, we demonstrate that our method actually accelerates the relaxation to the steady state in many-body systems, incorporating multiple potential energy valleys and interaction.

ACCELERATION BY VIOLATION OF THE DBC

Fokker-Planck approach

Let us consider the Fokker-Planck equation for a double system attached to an identical isothermal heat bath with a temperature, T , expressed as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}P(x_1, x_2, t) = - \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} J_i(x_1, x_2), \quad (1)$$

where x_i represents the i th microscopic degrees of freedom, $P(x_1, x_2, t)$ is its time-dependent distribution, and

the probabilistic flow, $J_i(x_1, x_2)$, is given by

$$J_i(x_1, x_2) = \left\{ A_i - T \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \right\} P(x_1, x_2, t). \quad (2)$$

The quantity, A_i , is a force dependent on the degrees of freedom, such that $A_i = -\partial U(x_i)/\partial x_i$, where $U(x_i)$ is the identical potential energy in the double system. Here we omit the dependence on the locations to lighten the expression. When the system is in the equilibrium state, the distribution is $P(x_1, x_2, t) \propto \exp(-\sum_{i=1,2} U(x_i)/T)$. First, we consider a one-dimensional case for simplicity. Note that its generalization to higher dimensions is straightforward, as will be shown below. The corresponding over-damped Langevin equation is

$$dx_i = A_i dt + \sqrt{2T} dW_i, \quad (3)$$

where dW_i is the Wiener process. If we introduce an additional force to the system, in general, it does not remain in equilibrium. Here, let us impose the condition that the steady state is fixed to the Gibbs-Boltzmann distribution, $P_{ss}(x_1, x_2) \propto \exp(-\sum_{i=1,2} U(x_i)/T)$. Then, A_i takes the following form

$$A_i = -\frac{\partial U(x_i)}{\partial x_i} + \gamma f_i, \quad (4)$$

where γ is an arbitrary parameter controlling the degree of violation of the DBC, as will be explained below. In the steady state, the divergence of $J_i(x_1, x_2)$ (i.e. right-hand side of Eq. (1)) must vanish. Then the additional force satisfies $\sum_{i=1,2} \partial(f_i P_{ss}(x_1, x_2, t))/\partial x_i = 0$. A trivial solution is $f_i \propto \exp(U(x_i)/T)$. The resulting force always gives rise to unidirectional force. Instead, we may use a nontrivial solution $f_1 = \partial U(x_2)/\partial x_2$ and $f_2 = -\partial U(x_1)/\partial x_1$.

Let us calculate the transition probability for each system ($i = 1, 2$) during an infinitesimal time interval, $[t, t + dt]$. We obtain

$$L_i(x_{t+dt}|x_t) \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{4T} (\dot{x}_t - A_i)^2 dt - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial \bar{x}_t} dt \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where x_t is the location at time t for each system. Here we omit the subscript i for simplicity. We use the mid-point prescription, $\bar{x}_t = (x_{t+dt} + x_t)/2$. We can confirm violation of the DBC due to the existence of the constant probabilistic flow as

$$\frac{L_i(x_{t+dt}|x_t)}{L_i(x_t|x_{t+dt})} = \exp \left(\frac{1}{T} \gamma \dot{x}_t f_i dt - \frac{1}{T} \dot{x}_t \frac{\partial U(\bar{x}_t)}{\partial \bar{x}} dt \right). \quad (6)$$

The first term in the exponential function corresponds to the negative of the time-derivative housekeeping heat, while the second term can be regarded as the negative of the time-derivative excess heat, i.e., [11, 12]

$$\dot{Q}_{\text{hk}} = -\gamma \dot{x}_t f_i(\bar{x}_t, t) \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{Q}_{\text{ex}} = \dot{x}_t \frac{U(\bar{x}_t)}{\partial \bar{x}_t}, \quad (8)$$

where \dot{Q}_{hk} and \dot{Q}_{ex} represent the time-derivatives of the housekeeping and excess heat, respectively. The housekeeping heat demonstrates violation of the DBC and, in this sense, γ controls the degree of violation of the DBC.

Let us rewrite Eq. (1) using the ordinary Fokker-Planck operator for each system [13], where

$$a_i = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{T}} \frac{\partial U(x_i)}{\partial x_i} + \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{a}_i = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{T}} \frac{\partial U(x_i)}{\partial x_i} - \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}. \quad (10)$$

These operators satisfy $[a_i, \hat{a}_i] = -U^{(2)}(x_i)$, where the superscript denotes the degree of differentiation. We can then rewrite Eq. (1) by use of the above operators for each system as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \bar{P}(x_1, x_2, t) = - \sum_{i=1,2} \left(\hat{a}_i a_i - \gamma \sqrt{\frac{1}{T}} f_i a_i \right) \bar{P}(x_1, x_2, t), \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{P}(x_1, x_2, t) = \exp(\sum_{i=1,2} U(x_i)/2T) P(x_1, x_2, t)$. The steady state is given by the eigenfunction, $\varphi_0(x_1)\varphi_0(x_2)$, for $-\hat{a}_i a_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) as the zero eigenvalue, because $\varphi_0(x_1)\varphi_0(x_2)$ is also the eigenfunction with the zero eigenvalues for a_i ($i = 1, 2$). The term added to the ordinary Fokker-Planck operators comes from γf_i , which generates the housekeeping heat and current in the steady state.

As discussed in Ref. [10], while the symmetric component, $\propto \hat{a}_i a_i$, is fixed, the introduction of the anti-symmetric component, $\propto a_i$, can accelerate the relaxation, since the gap between the first and second eigenvalues increases. Although we demonstrated this fact in finite dimensions in the previous study, it holds even in infinite dimensions, since the proof is straightforwardly extendable to the infinite dimensional case.

MANY-BODY INTERACTING PARTICLES

For the many-body system, the implementation of the additional force as discussed above is straightforward. Again, let us consider the Langevin equation for N -dimensional double system, with

$$d\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{A}_i dt + \sqrt{2T} d\mathbf{W}_i, \quad (12)$$

where \mathbf{x}_i , \mathbf{A}_i , and \mathbf{W}_i are the N -dimensional vectors for i th system ($i = 1, 2$) representing the location, force and Wiener process. The force, \mathbf{A}_i , becomes

$$\mathbf{A}_i = -\text{grad}_i U(\mathbf{x}_i) + \gamma \mathbf{f}_i, \quad (13)$$

where the gradient and divergence appearing below with the subscript i is taken for each system. The corresponding Fokker-Planck equation is then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, t) = - \sum_{i=1,2} \text{div}_i \mathbf{J}_i(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2), \quad (14)$$

and the probabilistic flow can be given by

$$\mathbf{J}_i(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \{\mathbf{A}_i - T \text{grad}_i\} P(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, t). \quad (15)$$

The additional force is determined by simply solving $\sum_{i=1,2} \text{div}_i \mathbf{f}_i P_{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = 0$, where $P_{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \propto \exp(-\sum_{i=1,2} U(\mathbf{x}_i)/T)$. We find a nontrivial solution

$$\mathbf{f}_1 = \text{grad}_2 U(\mathbf{x}_2) \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{f}_2 = -\text{grad}_1 U(\mathbf{x}_1). \quad (17)$$

while the trivial solution is $\mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{1} \exp(U(\mathbf{x}_i)/T)$ where $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector with all the elements being unity.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Here, we apply the additional force to demonstrate the acceleration of the relaxation to the steady state for several cases.

For simplicity, let us first consider an independent particle case. We set $N = 10,000$ particles in the potential energy, which has a washboard shape characterized by a function, $U(x) = (1 + \sin(2\pi x))/2$, with $x \in [0, 10)$. In this case, even the trivial solution is useful for acceleration of the relaxation. We define the additional force as

$$f(x) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2T} (1 + \sin 2\pi x) \right\}. \quad (18)$$

We impose the periodic boundary condition with the temperature set to a relatively low value; $T = 0.1$. The initial distribution is generated as $P(x, 0) \propto \exp(-(x - x_0)^2/2\sigma^2)$, where $x_0 = 0.5$ and $\sigma = 0.1$. The time evolution of the Langevin equation is then evaluated using the ordinary method known as the Euler-Maruyama scheme. We set the infinitesimal time as $\Delta t = 0.001$ and perform the numerical computation for $\gamma = 0$ (ordinary equilibrium system), $\gamma = 0.1$, and $\gamma = 1.0$. We plot the histogram of the resultant particle locations in Fig. 1. In addition, we also plot the difference between the mean value of the particle locations and the expectation. This is evaluated by a simple calculation with $\langle x \rangle = \int dx x \exp(-(1 + \sin(2\pi x))/2T) / Z$, where $Z = \int dx \exp(-(1 + \sin(2\pi x))/2T)$. In the equilibrium system case, the energy barrier hampers the particle movement. Therefore, in the time range of our numerical computation ($t \in [0, 2.5)$), the system does not converge to the equilibrium state. On the other hand, by increasing the value of γ , the final distributions at the terminal time ($t = 2.5$) converge to the expected form in the steady state. The mean value also converges to the expectation value in the steady state. Therefore, the acceleration of the relaxation to the steady state is indeed confirmed for this simple system.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Histograms (left panel) and mean values of particle locations (right panel). On the left panel, the horizontal axis denotes the location, x , while the vertical axis describes the number of particles at x , i.e., $N(x)$. From top to bottom, the $\gamma = 0$, $\gamma = 0.1$, and $\gamma = 1.0$ cases are given. On the right panel, the horizontal axis denotes the time, while the vertical axis represents the deviation of the mean value of each particle location from the expected result. From bottom to top, the $\gamma = 0$ (blue), $\gamma = 0.1$ (red), and $\gamma = 1.0$ (green) cases are shown.

Next, let us examine an instance involving a many-body interacting system. We employ the XY model, which expresses the partial potential energy as

$$U_j(\mathbf{x}) = - \sum_{k \in \partial j} \cos(x_j - x_k), \quad (19)$$

where the summation is taken over the adjacent pairs to the spin, j , on a lattice. The whole potential energy is given by $U(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^N U_j(\mathbf{x})/2$. We test our method on a two-dimensional square lattice. Note that \mathbf{x} here denotes the spin directions on the lattice such that $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 2\pi)^N$ on each site. The additional force is nontrivial one as in Eqs. (16) and (17) since the potential energy of the XY model is rotationally invariant. The unidirectional force may yield trivial rotation of the whole spins. Instead, we use the bidirectional force by use of the nontrivial solution (16) and (17). We impose the periodic boundary condition and the number of degrees of freedom is set to $N = 50 \times 50$. Then, we run the Langevin dynamics corresponding to the Fokker-Planck equation, as in Eq. (14), and monitor the magnetization, $m = \sum_{j=1}^N \sin x_j / N$ for each system, at each time step. The initial condition that all the spins are in the ‘up’-direction, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_i = \pi/2$ for $i = 1, 2$, is imposed, and we set the infinitesimal time to $\Delta t = 0.01$.

The XY model does not exhibit any spontaneous symmetry breaking even in two-dimensions, but the so-called Kosterlitz-Thouless (KT) transition occurs at $T_c = 0.89213(10)$ [15]. Therefore, we investigate two temperature points: $T = 0.5$ (KT phase) and $T = 1.0$ (disordered phase). In the low-temperature region (KT phase) on the square lattice, the magnetization relaxation exhibits critical power-law behaviour (linearity in log-log plot) [16].




FIG. 2: (Color online) Log-log plot of magnetization in disordered phase (left panel) and KT phase (right panel). The horizontal and vertical axes denote time and magnetization, respectively. From top to bottom, two plots of the double system with $\gamma = 0$ (green and red), and those with $\gamma = 5$ (blue and purple) cases are plotted. The insets describe two snapshots of the local magnetization $\sin x_j$ for the double system with $\gamma = 5.0$ after the relaxation.

The magnetization trivially vanishes in the equilibrium state, but the dynamical behaviour during relaxation is not trivial. This is the reason why the XY model was chosen to test our method, since the simplest classical spin model, namely, the Ising model, does not have any nontrivial aspects during relaxation except at the critical point. The results demonstrate acceleration of the magnetization decay, which depends on the value of γ , as shown in Fig. 2. In the disordered phase, we confirm that the magnetization decays exponentially and many of the vortices appear. The decay rate is enhanced by an increase in the value of γ . On the other hand, we observe critical slowing down in the KT phase in the first stage of the relaxation for both of the cases with and without the additional force, as shown in Fig. 2. One can confirm the slight decrease of the slope of the relaxation of the magnetization in log-log plot. We observe, in particular, the magnetization decay escaping from the critical slowing down in a relatively early stage of the relaxation with nonzero γ .

All of the results shown above ensure that our method actually accelerates the relaxation toward the steady state, while its distribution is Gibbs-Boltzmann. We must point out that some numerical techniques may be necessary in order to implement our method. The trivial solution is problematic since the force is unidirectional and includes an exponential term that is dependent on the temperature. A small γ value is required in order to reduce the accumulation of the numerical error during time evolution in the low temperature. Instead the nontrivial solution compensates for the weakness of the trivial solution, although the computational memory to simulate the double system is required. In addition, the

force is not unidirectional. This bidirectional force drives the degrees of freedom efficiently toward the steady state under mathematical guarantee. In addition, we may utilize this approach to search for the minimum of the potential energy by gradually decreasing the value to gamma, as a form of simulated annealing [18].

SUMMARY

In the present study, we propose a simple method of directing the relaxation to the desired distribution in the Langevin dynamics by introducing an additional force to violate the DBC. We confirm that our method can actually accelerate the relaxation to the steady state for a system with many potential valleys, and for an XY model on a two-dimensional square lattice. In particular, the latter case demonstrates escaping of the critical slowing down in the low-temperature region, namely, the KT phase. Although this might be a special characteristic of the XY model, which has a critical line along the temperature axis in the low-temperature region, this observation demonstrates the remarkable performance of our method. In addition, we emphasize that the implementation of our method is very simple, as it is free from any introduction of a complex number to efficiently drive the system, any involved technique such as resampling to maintain the stability of the ensemble, and any complex transition matrix construction (such as that used in the Suwa-Todo method).

The essential role of the additional force is to mix the microscopic states similar to “mixing with a spoon”, while it does not change the final distribution in the steady state. In order to implement the nontrivial solution of the additional force, we introduce the double system. The number of the “replicas” is not limited. If we find a nontrivial solution for the replicated system with different heat baths, one can provide a fascinating method, inspired by the replica exchange Monte-Carlo simulation, in the Langevin dynamics in a relatively simple way. Our method basically is under mathematical assurance in a form of the shift of the eigenvalue of the corresponding Fokker-Planck operator [10]. Therefore our method is worthwhile to apply the broader class of the models. We hope that various implementations of such designed algorithms will become widely used in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics studies in the future.

The author is grateful for fruitful discussions with M. Kikuchi, H. Touchette and K. Hukushima. The present study was inspired by a lecture given by J. Teramae. This work was supported by MEXT in Japan: Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) No.24740263 and the Kayamori Foundation of Informational Science Advancement.

-
- [1] R. H. Swendsen and J.-S. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 86 (1987).
- [2] K. Hukushima and K. Nemoto, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **65**, 1604 (1996).
- [3] R. Neal, Statistics and Computing **11**, 125 (2001), ISSN 0960-3174.
- [4] M. Ohzeki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050401 (2010).
- [5] H. Suwa and S. Todo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 120603 (2010).
- [6] K. S. Turitsyn, M. Chertkov, and M. Vucelja, Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena **240**, 410 (2011), ISSN 0167-2789.
- [7] H. C. Fernandes and M. Weigel, Computer Physics Communications **182**, 1856 (2011), ISSN 0010-4655.
- [8] Y. Sakai and K. Hukushima, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **82**, 064003 (2013).
- [9] K. Hukushima and Y. Sakai, Journal of Physics: Conference Series **473**, 012012 (2013).
- [10] A. Ichiki and M. Ohzeki, ArXiv e-prints (2013), 1306.6131.
- [11] T. Hatano and S.-i. Sasa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3463 (2001).
- [12] Y. Sughiyama and M. Ohzeki, Physica E: Low-dimensional Systems and Nanostructures **43**, 790 (2011), ISSN 1386-9477.
- [13] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation: Methods of Solutions and Applications*, Springer Series in Synergetics (Springer, 1996), 2nd ed., ISBN 354061530X.
- [14] T. Harada and S.-i. Sasa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 130602 (2005).
- [15] P. Olsson, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 4526 (1995).
- [16] H. Nishimori and G. Ortiz, *Elements of Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena (Oxford Graduate Texts)* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2011), ISBN 0199577226.
- [17] S. Todo and H. Suwa, Journal of Physics: Conference Series **473**, 012013 (2013).
- [18] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt, and M. P. Vecchi, Science **220**, 671 (1983).