

A theoretical interpretation of variance-based convergence criteria in perturbation-based theories

Xiaohui Wang¹, Zhaoxi Sun^{1,2*}

¹*State Key Laboratory of Precision Spectroscopy, School of Chemistry and Molecular Engineering, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200062, China*

²*Computational Biomedicine (IAS-5/INM-9), Forschungszentrum Jülich, Jülich 52425, Germany*

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: z.sun@fz-juelich.de

Abstract

Free energy simulation at high level of theory can be performed indirectly by constructing the thermodynamic cycle, where a low level force-field free energy simulation is combined with high level end-state corrections. As huge differences exist between the computational cost of low level MM and high level QM Hamiltonians, the errors in QM/MM indirect free energy simulation are mostly introduced in QM/MM end-state corrections. As a specific type of alchemical free energy simulation, QM/MM end-state corrections can be obtained from integration of the partial derivatives of alchemical Hamiltonians or from perturbation-based estimators including free energy perturbation (FEP) and acceptance ratio methods. When using FEP or exponential averaging (EXP), a number of researchers tend to only simulate MM end states and calculate single point energy in order to get the free energy estimates. In this case the sample size hysteresis arises and the convergence is determined by bias elimination rather than variance minimization. Various criteria are proposed to evaluate this convergence issue. Previously under the approximation of Gaussian distributed energy difference Ulf (JCTC. 2017, 13 (11), 5745-5752.) presented practical considerations into the convergence issue of QM/MM corrections and concluded that the variance of distribution is the best convergence criterion and those convergence criteria are also variance-dependent. However, this question is only partially answered. In this paper we present theoretical interpretations to dig the underlying statistical nature

behind the problem. Still, the variance of the distribution is the central quantity for all convergence criteria in Gaussian approximated Exponential averaging (GEXP). Further, we prove that these estimators are nonlinearly dependent on the variance of the free energy estimate. As these estimators are often orders of magnitude overestimated, the variance of the FEP estimate is orders of magnitude underestimated. Hence, computing this statistical uncertainty is meaningless in practice. The effective sample size is also proven to be a function of the overlap scalar. We hope this literature can help readers to get a deeper understanding of perturbation-based theories.

Introduction

Computer simulations are often less expensive than experimental studies. Aiming at reproducing experimental results, theoretical models are calibrated iteratively. Every model has its own success. Free energy difference between different states or models of a given system determines the thermodynamic tendency of physical processes in various scientific fields.¹⁻¹⁰ To obtain a reliable free energy estimate from free energy simulation, adequate sampling and accurate Hamiltonians are required. Although the errors associated with force fields are introduced in its parameterization and are normally unable to quantify exactly in free energy simulation, MM Hamiltonians or even coarser models enables milliseconds' (to microseconds') length simulation, thus making direct observations of phenomena happening at experimental timescales possible. A more detailed description is always desirable due to improved accuracy. However, the parameter-free QM treatments are computationally demanding for well converged phase space sampling and even prohibitive for biomolecules. Indirect QM/MM free energy simulations are thus introduced, which find alternative transformation pathways by constructing a thermodynamic cycle connecting two QM/MM end states.¹¹⁻¹⁵ Relatively cheap free energy simulations at MM level are combined with end-state QM/MM corrections to reproduce the result of direct QM/MM transformation. QM end-state corrections are often implemented with Thermodynamic Integration (TI) or perturbation-based theories.¹⁶⁻²⁶ Free energy profiles can also be obtained in a similar 'indirect' way.²⁷⁻³¹

Now lets' ignore the statement of end-state and focus on QM/MM corrections. If the PESs of MM and QM descriptions are significantly different, the overlap of the phase spaces under QM and MM Hamiltonians is small and configurations sampled at MM level would not be representative of those at QM level.³² A broadly distributed energy differences are expected and a strong bias exists in the free energy estimate, triggering a poor convergence behavior. To minimize the gap caused mostly by stiff degree of freedom, with a balanced computational cost efforts are mainly on a) inserting a medium level Hamiltonian between MM and QM as intermediate states followed by the normal windows sampling workflow, or simply replacing MM with SQM calculations,³² or modifying the MM Hamiltonian to get a better description as well as a better phase space overlap, b) using different transformation scheme such as non-equilibrium methods of Jarzynski's Identity (JI) and Crooks' Equation (CE).³³⁻³⁵ Although there are a number of bidirectional estimators that are statistically efficient and asymptotically unbiased, due to the orders of magnitude differences of computational costs between QM and MM Hamiltonians,

single state simulations using FEP-type estimators are always preferable, even it is often not so reliable. In this case, sample size hysteresis³⁶ is a much more significant issue than the variance minimization. The numerical stability of exponential average is often bad and abrupt changes happen. Thus researches on the sample size required to achieve convergence often concentrate on bias elimination, namely the number of sample needed to get an unbiased FEP result.

Very recently, Ulf presented a numerical study on the sample size issue and compared several criteria for the convergence of EXP estimates under Gaussian approximation.³⁷ This study does provide critical insights. In this paper we take one step further by presenting theoretical derivations and proving the consistency between several convergence criteria. Still, the variance of the distribution is the central quantity among all convergence criteria in Gaussian approximated Exponential averaging.

Theory

Consistency of convergence criteria under Gaussian Approximation. End-states QM corrections are essentially electrostatic corrections, as the VDW parts of QM and MM Hamiltonians are normally the same. Thus, using linear mixing of Hamiltonians, according to Linear Response Approximation (LRA),³⁸ the electrostatic response should be linear, namely $\frac{\partial U}{\partial \lambda}(\lambda_i)$ varying linearly with the order parameter λ . Here U is the reduced energy function. Considering this feature, using TI with LRA is a reasonable choice. In LRA the distribution of energy differences is Gaussian. Hence, normally the end-state FEP corrections are performed with Gaussian-approximations.

Firstly we define

$$x = \Delta U(\mathbf{q})_{ij} = U(\mathbf{q})_j - U(\mathbf{q})_i \quad (1)$$

, as the dimensionless energy difference between state i and state j for sample with coordinate vector \mathbf{q} .

In the formulism of EXP, the dimensionless free energy difference between state i and state j ΔF_{ij} and the corresponding variance can be calculated by

$$\Delta F_{ij} = F_j - F_i = -\ln \left(\frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{n=1}^{N_i} e^{-\Delta U(\mathbf{q}_n)_{ij}} \right) = -\ln \langle e^{-x} \rangle_i$$

$$\sigma_{\Delta F_{ij}}^2 = \frac{\sigma_{\langle e^{-x} \rangle_i}^2}{N \langle e^{-x} \rangle_i^2} \quad (2)$$

, where n refers to the n th sample from state i , N is the sample size and conventional angle brackets represent canonical averages. With Gaussian approximation, the distribution of x is

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (3)$$

, where σ is the standard deviation of the energy difference and the center of the distribution is at μ .

We hereafter omit subscripts i and j without causing confusion. Under this approximation, we have

$$\langle e^{-x} \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x} \rho(x) dx = e^{\frac{\sigma^2}{2} - \mu} \quad (4)$$

. The GEXP estimate can thus be obtained with

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta F &= \mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \\ \sigma_{\Delta F}^2 &= \frac{\sigma^2}{N} + \frac{\sigma^4}{2(N-1)} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

.³⁹ The percentage weight of sample i in the exponential average is

$$w_i = \frac{e^{-x(\mathbf{q}_i)}}{\sum_{n=1}^N e^{-x(\mathbf{q}_n)}} \quad (6)$$

. Following Ulf we consider convergence criteria for QM/MM end-state corrections of Kish's approximate estimation of the effective sample size

$$Q = \frac{\left(\sum_{n=1}^N w_n \right)^2}{\sum_{n=1}^N w_n^2} \quad (7)$$

, and the information entropy

$$S = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (w_n \ln w_n) \quad (8)$$

.^{37, 40} Applying the Gaussian approximation into numerical integration, in the large sample size regime, we have

$$Q_{GEXP} = \frac{(N \langle w \rangle)^2}{N \langle w^2 \rangle} = \frac{N}{e^{\sigma^2}} \quad (9)$$

, and the entropy becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (w_i \ln w_i) \\
&= -\langle w \ln w \rangle \\
&= \frac{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \ln N}{N}
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

. Now, an obvious phenomenon can thus be seen. These convergence criteria are actually calculating the same thing— σ^2 , the variance of the distribution of the energy difference. This is an important value which is linearly dependent on the GEXP estimate in Eq.(5) and needs to be converged in using GEXP. Hence, these convergence criteria are actually evaluating the convergence of the distribution of the energy difference and their results are essentially the same. We can rescale S by its information length for normalization

$$S_1 = \frac{NS}{\ln N} = \frac{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \ln N}{\ln N} \tag{11}$$

, or multiply it by N to make it more like the logarithm of Q and recover the Shannon entropy of

$$\begin{aligned}
S_0 &= NS = -\frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \ln N \\
\ln Q_{GEXP} &= \ln N - \sigma^2 = S_0 - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

. Obvious conclusions from this equation are: a) $\ln Q_{GEXP}$ is 1-fold more sensitive to small variations in the variance of the distribution of the energy difference than the entropy, namely

$$\frac{\partial \ln Q_{GEXP}}{\partial \sigma} = 2 \frac{\partial S_0}{\partial \sigma} = -2\sigma \tag{13}$$

, b) their responses to the number of samples are the same,

$$\frac{\partial \ln Q_{GEXP}}{\partial N} = \frac{\partial S_0}{\partial N} = \frac{1}{N} \tag{14}$$

. These two conclusions are only valid when the exponential average is converged. If not, we expect the curves to vary from the ideal case. Hence, from a theoretical point of view, to get statistics that define the convergence, we should always use Kish's effective sample size or its logarithm rather than the

entropy.

The converged curvature of Q indicates converged GEXP estimates. The $Q=1$ line is $N = e^{\sigma^2}$, meaning that the number of independent samples required to get an effective sample increases exponentially with the variance of the distribution. We check the derivatives of the effective sample size

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial Q_{GEXP}}{\partial N} &= e^{-\sigma^2} \\ \frac{\partial Q_{GEXP}}{\partial \sigma} &= -2N\sigma e^{-\sigma^2} \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

. The above equation shows that when the linear dependence of Q_{GEXP} on the sample size is achieved, converged σ is obtained and thus according to the formula of GEXP in Eq.(5), the converged free energy estimate is obtained. We also notice that the sensitivity of Q_{GEXP} to small variations of σ varies with N and σ . Hence, the magnitude of σ should also be taken into consideration. Monitoring the curvature of the $Q-N$ curve and considering the magnitude of σ (the sensitivity of Q to the change of σ) we can somehow determine whether the convergence is achieved. Still, we should note that the above relation is only valid in the large sample size regime.

A generalization of GEXP Q in Eq.(9) is the EXP formula,

$$Q_{EXP} = \frac{N \langle e^{-x} \rangle^2}{\langle e^{-2x} \rangle} \tag{16}$$

, which means that Q is an estimate of exponential average. Hence, the curvature of $Q-N$ provides direct estimates of exponential terms. Converged curvatures indicate converged exponential averages. However, if σ is too large the convergences of these terms are abrupt due to the observations of rare events. Then, how should we define convergence with Q practically? A reasonable solution is comparing the theoretical line with the numerical one. However, in the following parts we show that those variance based convergence criteria are generally useless in the exponential averaging case.

Simulation details

As we are dealing with ideal Gaussian distributions, Timeseries data are generated from model MD simulation with harmonic potential energy function to get the desired Gaussian distribution. Statistical inefficiency is computed to extract independent samples.⁴¹⁻⁴² In the following parts we are only dealing with uncorrelated samples. The data can be provided upon request. A comparison between distributions from numerical samples and the analytical formula is shown in Figure 1.

As at 300 K for dimensionless σ 1 equals 0.59 kcal/mol (2.46 kJ/mol) and 10 equals 5.9 kcal/mol (24.6 kJ/mol), we consider σ as integers from 1 to 10, which already covers the normal range of σ observed in the free energy perturbation. An illustration of these Gaussian distributions is shown in Figure 1.

Results and discussions

Is Q really useful in exponential averaging? Firstly in Figure 2 we present the theoretical Q_{GEXP} surface in σ and N spaces, its projections on σ and its derivatives. From the definition of the effective sample size Q , its value is within the range between 0 and N. Hence the curves are truncated at $Q = 0.1$. From $\sigma = 0$ Q decreases exponentially with σ and for σ as large as 4 we already cannot obtain one effective sample even we have accumulated more than one million statistical independent samples. The normal sample size obtained in MD simulation ranges from 1000 to 10000, and the threshold for σ is about 3. Assumed the statistical inefficiency for the central collective variable x is 10 ps, this means more than 10 ns simulation and also a large number of QM/MM single point calculations, and the outcome is only 1 sample. We thus wonder, does this worth it? From the $\frac{\partial Q_{GEXP}}{\partial \sigma}$ we notice that for σ larger than 4, the sensitivity of Q_{GEXP} almost does not respond to small variations of σ . The N dependency of Q_{GEXP} is linear.

For practical considerations of using the effective sample size, in the theory section we give one reasonable solution that monitoring the time-dependent behaviors of the analytical curve (Q_{GEXP} in Eq.(9)) and the numerical one (Q_{EXP} in Eq.(16)) may be useful. The analytical line is an estimate of $e^{-\sigma^2}$ which determines the accuracy of GEXP estimate while the numerical curve plots the change of

the exponential terms, namely the EXP estimate. We show in Figure 3 the comparison between those $Q-N$ curves and in Figure 4 the convergence behavior of EXP and GEXP estimates, in one exponential average trial under each σ .

In Figure 3 the numerical $Q-N$ curves are obtained from the timeseries of standard deviation estimates and the analytical curves are obtained with Eq. (9). Theoretical estimates are obtained from the σ used to generate the Gaussian distributions. A major observation for $Q-N$ curves is that mismatches increases dramatically with σ . The analytical line almost overlaps with the theoretical one while the numerical one deviates significantly. When $\sigma=0$ all three estimates are identical while when $\sigma > 4$ we cannot even see any effective sample within 100000 samples (meaning 1 μs sampling). However, both the theoretical lines and the numerical lines seem to be converged. Then, we need to identify the slope of which line is reliable and why this happens. For a real number k we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e^{-kx} \rangle &= e^{\frac{k^2}{2}\sigma^2 - k\mu} \\ Q_{\langle e^{-kx} \rangle} &= \frac{N \langle e^{-kx} \rangle^2}{\langle e^{-2kx} \rangle} = \frac{N}{e^{k^2\sigma^2}} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

. The larger absolute value of k is, the harder the convergence of its slope will be. We can expect that k equals 2 converges worse than k equals 1. Thus convergence of the slope of Q_{EXP} is quite hard and also has a dependency on higher-order terms. The fake convergence of the numerical $Q-N$ slope can be quite misleading. Even when σ is small the differences between the numerical slopes and the analytical (and theoretical) slopes are relatively large. An illustrative example is the case $\sigma = 5$. At the end of 100000 the EXP estimate is -11.623, the GEXP estimate is -12.498 and the theoretical result is -12.5. The EXP bias is 0.88, $\langle e^{-x} \rangle$ is $e^{0.88} = 2.4$ fold of the converged result and $\langle e^{-2x} \rangle$ is about 1.1×10^8 smaller than the converged result, leading to a 2×10^7 -fold overestimate of Q_{EXP} . This behavior tells us that those Q -like terms perform quite badly in exponential averaging. Hence, in various cases of exponential averaging we should not use Q or related terms to check the

convergence. Simply monitoring the convergence of the mean and the variance of the distribution is much more efficient (considering their formulas of Q). Also, sudden changes in the value of Q_{EXP} can be seen, which is often observed in the time evolution of EXP estimates and indicates poor convergence.

The poor convergence behavior of EXP lines in Figure 4 agrees with the poor convergence of the slope of the effective sample size. By contrast, the convergence of GEXP estimates is quite well, which should be caused by the efficiencies of ordinary average and σ estimation. Again, rather than using Q_{EXP} , monitoring the convergence behavior of the standard deviation of the distribution is a better choice. Note that when σ is small using EXP is still efficient, due to the relative largeness of Q_{EXP} and Q_{σ^2} (the relative magnitude of e^{σ^2} and 3).

We should note that, if the acceptable accuracy is $1/k_B T$, the ‘convergence’ can be achieved for $\sigma < 6$ with 100000 independent samples. Also, information entropies (S , S_0 , and S_1) show the same behaviors of the effective sample size (results not shown).

How many configurations are needed to converge? A theoretical interpretation. Then, we consider the number of samples needed to achieve a certain accuracy and confidence, which has been done in reference.³⁷ We use the exactly the same threshold (for accuracy and confidence) with the reference for comparison.

As has been observed in reference,³⁷ from numerical results in Figure 5 we know that the exponential dependence of N on the σ . Further, consider the effective sample size in the ideal case,

$$\ln N = \ln Q_{GEXP} + \sigma^2 \quad (18)$$

. Ideally the logarithm of the number of independent samples should vary linearly with the variance of the distribution. Assumed the numbers of effective samples needed to converge for distributions with different σ are approximately the same, based on this equation, we plot the dependency of the number of samples for convergence in EXP on σ^2 , in Figure 5. Here, a well behaved linear dependency can be seen. In this way, when the convergence threshold is fixed, we can interpolate the number of samples needed for converged EXP estimate in large σ cases from data obtained in small σ cases. Further, the dependency varies with the tightness of the convergence threshold. The validity

of the almost equal effective sample size assumption is discussed below Eq. (20).

As in numerical simulation the convergence is defined by the required accuracy and confidence, a convergence threshold related factor needs to be added,

$$\ln N = (\ln Q_{GEXP} + \sigma^2) f(\text{threshold}) \quad (19)$$

, where the threshold depends mainly on the accuracy requirement as confidence level should at least be 95% for safety. To quantify the threshold-dependent factor, theoretically we know that in the tightest threshold limit $f(\text{threshold}) \rightarrow \infty$ and if no accuracy is required $f(\text{threshold}) \rightarrow 0$. Nonlinear functions can be proposed or fitted from numerical scanning the magnitude of the convergence threshold. However, instead, we believe that using a linear fit is simpler and easier to calculate. And in Figure 6 the linear fit does not provide significantly worse estimates of the slope compared with the exact result, in the neighborhood of the accuracy required in the normal cases. Normally we use accuracy of dimensionless threshold is about 1 to 2. Hence, the slope is generally 0.4-0.45. We recommend the users use higher values such as 0.45 or 0.5 for safety. The convergence of GEXP estimate is rather simple, as it only contains the convergence of the mean and the variance of the distribution and related contents can be found in a number of references.

Variance based convergence criteria in perturbation-based theories. Aside from the criteria for single-state estimator of FEP, various criteria evaluating the convergence issue of bidirectional estimators⁴³⁻⁴⁴ and multistate estimators⁴⁵⁻⁴⁶ are also variance-dependent. Here, the variance can be referred to both the variance of distribution and the variance of the free energy estimates, as they are highly correlated values. Take variance as the variance of the free energy difference and examples can be seen such as time-derivatives of the variance (TDV) (linearly dependent),⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹ the overlap matrix⁵⁰ (non-linearly dependent) and the overlap of distributions⁴⁴ (non-linearly dependent). From a statistical point of view these estimators and convergence criteria perform much better than single-directional EXP, as they are using better weighting functions than the exponential average. If the Gaussian approximation is applicable, the question can be solved by applying GEXP. If not, considering the exponential dependency of the number of independent samples on the variance of the energy-difference distribution to obtain converged EXP estimates, performing relatively expensive QM/MM simulation to get information in backward perturbations (MM-> QM as forward) in order to eliminate the bias effectively should be considered.

To provide further insights into the effective sample size, we relate it with the variance of the EXP estimate. From the formula of EXP in Eq. (2) we know direct calculation of the variance of the EXP estimate can be obtained from Q_{EXP} , namely

$$\sigma_{\Delta F, EXP}^2 = \frac{\sigma_{\langle e^{-x} \rangle}^2}{N \langle e^{-x} \rangle^2} = \frac{\langle e^{-2x} \rangle}{N \langle e^{-x} \rangle^2} - \frac{1}{N} = \frac{1}{Q_{EXP}} - \frac{1}{N} \quad (20)$$

. Under Gaussian approximation the above equation becomes

$$\sigma_{\Delta F, GEXP}^2 = \frac{1}{Q_{GEXP}} - \frac{1}{N} = \frac{e^{\sigma^2} - 1}{N} \quad (21)$$

, and cumulant expanding it to the 2nd order term it gives exactly the formula of Eq. (5).

As is shown above, practically the effective sample size is overestimated by orders of magnitudes. Then the variance of the free energy estimate is significantly underestimated. We can expect the number of independent samples N is a large number and the variance of the free energy estimate is approximately the reciprocal of the effective sample size. Then some further discussion on the questionable results in the previous researches due to the overestimation of Q_{EXP} should be done. Take the result in ref. 35 as an example. In its Figure 6c, when the desired accuracy (bias elimination) is achieved, such as 4 kJ/mol (≈ 1.63), the standard error of the EXP estimate should be larger than the bias should be larger than the bias 1.63 in order to get the reliably unbiased estimate. Thus the effective sample size should be smaller than about 0.38. However, we can see two orders of magnitude overestimation of Q_{EXP} in this result, which can never be called convergence. Further, as the curvature of Q_{EXP} is extremely hard to converge and so is the EXP estimate, the variance or standard error of the EXP estimate is orders of magnitude underestimated. Hence, we deeply question the meaning of calculating these error quantities. If the distribution is not Gaussian, this phenomenon is further exaggerated. Do we actually need those extremely underestimated values to determine convergence?

Another thing we can interpret is the number of effective samples to get a converged EXP estimate. As is assumed around Eq. (18), the converged estimate requires almost the same effective sample size. According to Eq. (20), this means that the variance of the EXP estimate should be decreased to a certain threshold. This is what we normally expect to get a converged (unbiased) EXP estimate.

If we use the Fermi function to weight samples and include the optimal shift in weighting as is

done in BAR,⁴³⁻⁴⁴

$$\begin{cases} \Delta F = \ln \frac{\langle f(C-x) \rangle_j}{\langle f(x-C) \rangle_i} + C \\ C = \Delta F + \ln \left(\frac{N_j}{N_i} \right) \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\Delta F, BAR}^2 &= \frac{\langle f^2(x-C) \rangle_i - \langle f(x-C) \rangle_i^2}{N_i \langle f(x-C) \rangle_i^2} + \frac{\langle f^2(C-x) \rangle_j - \langle f(C-x) \rangle_j^2}{N_j \langle f(C-x) \rangle_j^2} \\ &= \left(\frac{\langle f^2 \rangle_i}{N_i \langle f \rangle_i^2} - \frac{1}{N_i} \right) + \left(\frac{\langle f^2 \rangle_j}{N_j \langle f \rangle_j^2} - \frac{1}{N_j} \right) \\ &= \sigma_i^2 + \sigma_j^2 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

, where f denotes the Fermi function and σ_i^2 is the variance contributed by the sample from state i .

Using Fermi function to weight samples, we have the effective sample size

$$Q_{f,i} = \frac{N_i \langle f \rangle_i^2}{\langle f^2 \rangle_i} \quad (24)$$

. Still the dependency of the BAR variance on Q is the same with the EXP one,

$$\sigma_i^2 = \frac{1}{Q_{f,i}} - \frac{1}{N_i} \quad (25)$$

. Hence, the statistical efficiency should not be estimated with the effective sample size. The reliability of the results is mainly determined by the nature of weighting function. We note that this variance-dependent behavior of Q has been observed previously in numerical studies.⁵¹

The formula of Gaussian approximated $Q_{f,i}$ for the Fermi weighting function can be easily obtained with the Fermi-Dirac-like integral. However, as in perturbation based theories Q gives the same information with the variance of the free energy estimate, we do not find such formula useful.

Substituting Eq. (25) into Eq. (23), we have

$$\sigma_{\Delta F, BAR}^2 = \sigma_i^2 + \sigma_j^2 = \frac{1}{Q_{f,i}} - \frac{1}{N_i} + \frac{1}{Q_{f,j}} - \frac{1}{N_j} = \frac{1}{Q_{f,i}} + \frac{1}{Q_{f,j}} - \frac{2}{N} \quad (26)$$

, under the equal sample size rule $N_i = N_j = N$. From the definition of Eq. (23) we also know that

$$\sigma_{\Delta F, BAR}^2 = \left(\int \frac{N_i N_j \rho_i \rho_j d\mathbf{q}}{N_i \rho_i + N_j \rho_j} \right)^{-1} - \frac{1}{N_i} - \frac{1}{N_j} = \frac{1}{N} \left((O)^{-1} - 2 \right) \quad (27)$$

, where the probability density $\rho_i = \frac{e^{-U}}{\int e^{-U} dq}$ and the overlap scalar $O = \int \frac{2\rho_i \rho_j dq}{\rho_i + \rho_j}$.⁴⁴ Then another interesting result can be obtained: The effective sample size is, actually, an estimation of phase space overlap, namely

$$O = \frac{Q_{f,i} Q_{f,j}}{N(Q_{f,i} + Q_{f,j})} \quad (28)$$

. We also note that as TDV is linear dependent on the variance, TDV is also a nonlinear-function of the overlap scalar. Hence, as we already have variance-based criteria such as the overlap scalar and the TDV from which sufficient insights can be obtained, we do not find the effective sample size or other criteria useful.

We should note that all the above discussion can be directly extended to nonequilibrium free energy estimators of JI and CE. Further, considering all discussion above, if one still wants to use exponential averaging rather than Fermi weighting, to narrow the distribution of energy difference (work), one can apply staging into equilibrium free energy simulation or lengthen the duration of nonequilibrium transformation or apply stratification in nonequilibrium simulation. A practical consideration is that the standard deviation of the distribution should be smaller than 2. Still, one should remember that variance of the free energy estimate is underestimated and check the convergence carefully.

Conclusion

In this paper we present a theoretical explanation of the time-dependent behavior of various variance-based convergence criteria for perturbation-based estimators in free energy simulation. Our theoretical proof leads to the conclusion that for Gaussian distributed energy differences we should never use those effective sample size related criteria to determine the convergence of exponential average. Rather, the convergence of the distribution should be of much more importance. The reason is mainly that the Kish's effective sample size only provides a crude estimate of the sample size and in exponential averaging the phenomenon is exaggerated. The effective sample size is also a non-linear function of the variance of the EXP (and BAR) estimates and normally the same size is as large as 1000,

thus the variance of the EXP estimate being approximately the reciprocal of Q_{EXP} . Thus Q_{EXP} gives almost the same information as the variance. As Q_{EXP} is significantly overestimated and thus the variance is orders of magnitude underestimated, we believe that calculating the standard error to estimate the statistical uncertainty is meaningless, until the ‘reliable’ convergence is achieved.

Obtaining a converged estimate of the curvature of Kish’s Q in exponential averaging requires much larger sample size than those we usually obtained. Further, the number of samples needed for EXP convergence for Gaussian distributed energy difference with width σ can be approximated from Eq.(19) in this paper. When a desired accuracy is achieved, normally the variance of the free energy estimate and Q_{EXP} are still biased, due to their dependency on higher-order terms. Thus, they play no role in bias detection and thus they are useless in convergence assessment. Only with Gaussian approximation we can get some information from them.

As for obtaining unbiased free energy estimates, GEXP can only solve part of the question. For non-Gaussian situations EXP we have to use EXP. Poor convergence behavior is triggered by the inefficient weighting scheme. As the sample size required for convergence in EXP increases exponentially with the variance of the distribution, in a balanced scheme performing QM/MM simulation rather than only single point calculation and using bidirectional estimators should also be considered.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported China Scholarship Council. We thank Jiawei Zhang (University of Minnesota) for helpful discussion and Wenping Lv (Forschungszentrum Juelich) for proofreading the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

1. Gelman, A.; Meng, X.-L., Simulating normalizing constants: From importance sampling to bridge sampling to path sampling. *Statistical science* **1998**, 163-185.
2. Pohorille, A.; Jarzynski, C.; Chipot, C., Good practices in free-energy calculations. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2010**, *114* (32), 10235-53.
3. Kim, I.; Allen, T. W., Bennett's acceptance ratio and histogram analysis methods enhanced by umbrella sampling along a reaction coordinate in configurational space. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2012**, *136* (16), 164103-164103.
4. Sun, Z.; Yan, Y. N.; Yang, M.; Zhang, J. Z., Interaction entropy for protein-protein binding. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *146* (12), 124124.
5. Kofke, D. A., On the sampling requirements for exponential-work free-energy calculations. *Mol. Phys.* **2006**, *104* (22), 3701-3708.
6. Hahn, A.; Then, H., Using bijective maps to improve free-energy estimates. *Physical Review E* **2009**, *79* (1), 011113.
7. Sun, Z.; Wang, X.; Zhang, J. Z. H., Protonation-dependent base flipping in the catalytic triad of a small RNA. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2017**, 684.
8. Heimdal, J.; Ryde, U., Convergence of QM/MM free-energy perturbations based on molecular-mechanics or semiempirical simulations. *Phys Chem Chem Phys* **2012**, *14* (36), 12592-604.
9. Procacci, P., I. Dissociation free energies of drug-receptor systems via non-equilibrium alchemical simulations: a theoretical framework. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *18* (22), 14991-15004.
10. Nerattini, F.; Chelli, R.; Procacci, P., II. Dissociation free energies in drug-receptor systems via nonequilibrium alchemical simulations: application to the FK506-related immunophilin ligands. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *18* (22), 15005-15018.
11. Gao, J.; Luque, F. J.; Orozco, M., Induced dipole moment and atomic charges based on average electrostatic potentials in aqueous solution. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98* (4), 2975-2982.
12. †, V. L.; Warshel, A., Microscopic models for quantum mechanical calculations of chemical processes in solutions: LD/AMPAC and SCAAS/AMPAC calculations of solvation energies. *J. Comput. Chem.* **1992**, *13* (2), 199-213.
13. Wesolowski, T.; Warshel, A., Ab Initio Free Energy Perturbation Calculations of Solvation Free Energy Using the Frozen Density Functional Approach. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, *98* (20), 5183-5187.
14. Gao, J.; Xia, X., A priori evaluation of aqueous polarization effects through Monte Carlo QM-MM simulations. *Science* **1992**, *258* (5082), 631-5.
15. Zheng, Y. J.; Merz, K. M., Mechanism of the human carbonic anhydrase II-catalyzed hydration of carbon dioxide. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, *114* (26).
16. König, G.; Boresch, S., Non-Boltzmann sampling and Bennett's acceptance ratio method: How to profit from bending the rules. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2011**, *32* (6), 1082-90.
17. Heimdal, J.; Rydberg, P.; Ryde, U., Protonation of the proximal histidine ligand in heme peroxidases. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2008**, *112* (8), 2501-10.
18. Mikulskis, P.; Cioloboc, D.; Andrejić, M.; Khare, S.; Brorsson, J.; Genheden, S.; Mata, R. A.; Söderhjelm, P.; Ryde, U., Free-energy perturbation and quantum mechanical study of SAMPL4 octa-acid host-guest binding energies. *J. Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* **2014**, *28* (4), 375-400.
19. Fox, S. J.; Pittock, C.; Tautermann, C. S.; Fox, T.; Christ, C.; Malcolm, N. O.; Essex, J. W.; Skylaris, C. K., Free energies of binding from large-scale first-principles quantum mechanical calculations: application to ligand hydration energies. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2013**, *117* (32), 9478-85.
20. Genheden, S.; Ryde, U.; Söderhjelm, P., Binding affinities by alchemical perturbation using QM/MM with a

large QM system and polarizable MM model. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2015**.

21. Genheden, S.; Martinez, A. I. C.; Criddle, M. P.; Essex, J. W., Extensive all-atom Monte Carlo sampling and QM/MM corrections in the SAMPL4 hydration free energy challenge. *J. Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* **2014**, *28* (3), 187-200.
22. Fox, S. J.; Pittock, C.; Tautermann, C. S.; Fox, T.; Christ, C.; Malcolm, N. O. J.; Essex, J. W.; Sklyaris, C. K., Free Energies of Binding from Large-Scale First-Principles Quantum Mechanical Calculations: Application to Ligand Hydration Energies. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2013**, *117* (32), 9478-85.
23. Woods, C. J.; Manby, F. R.; Mulholland, A. J., An efficient method for the calculation of quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics free energies. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *128* (1), 152-159.
24. Caveayland, C.; Sklyaris, C. K.; Essex, J. W., Direct Validation of the Single Step Classical to Quantum Free Energy Perturbation. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2014**, *119* (3), 1017-25.
25. König, G.; Hudson, P. S.; Boresch, S.; Woodcock, H. L., Multiscale Free Energy Simulations: An Efficient Method for Connecting Classical MD Simulations to QM or QM/MM Free Energies Using Non-Boltzmann Bennett Reweighting Schemes. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2014**, *10* (4), 1406-1419.
26. Rod, T. H.; Ryde, U., Quantum mechanical free energy barrier for an enzymatic reaction. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2005**, *94* (13).
27. Lameira, J. S.; Kupchenko, I.; Warshel, A., Enhancing Parodynamics for QM/MM Sampling of Enzymatic Reactions. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2016**, *120* (9), 2155.
28. Plotnikov, N. V.; Warshel, A., Exploring, refining, and validating the parodynamics QM/MM sampling. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2012**, *116* (34), 10342-10356.
29. Bentzien, J.; Muller, R. P.; Florián, J.; Warshel, A., Hybrid ab initio quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics calculations of free energy surfaces for enzymatic reactions: the nucleophilic attack in subtilisin. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **1998**, *102* (12), 2293-2301.
30. Plotnikov, N.; Kamerlin, S. C. L.; Warshel, A., ParaDynamics: An Effective and Reliable Model for Ab Initio QM/MM Free Energy Calculations and Related Tasks. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2011**, *115* (24), 7950-62.
31. Polyak, I.; Benighaus, T.; Boulanger, E.; Thiel, W., Quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics dual Hamiltonian free energy perturbation. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2013**, *139* (6), 578.
32. König, G.; Hudson, P. S.; Boresch, S.; Woodcock, H. L., Multiscale Free Energy Simulations: An Efficient Method for Connecting Classical MD Simulations to QM or QM/MM Free Energies Using Non-Boltzmann Bennett Reweighting Schemes. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2014**, *10* (4), 1406-1419.
33. Jarzynski, C., Equilibrium free-energy differences from nonequilibrium measurements: A master-equation approach. *Physical Review E* **1997**, *56* (5), 5018-5035.
34. Hudson, P. S.; Woodcock, H. L.; Boresch, S., Use of Nonequilibrium Work Methods to Compute Free Energy Differences Between Molecular Mechanical and Quantum Mechanical Representations of Molecular Systems. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2015**, *6* (23), 4850-6.
35. Crooks, G. E., Nonequilibrium Measurements of Free Energy Differences for Microscopically Reversible Markovian Systems. *J. Stat. Phys.* **1998**, *90* (5), 1481-1487.
36. Wood, R. H.; Muhlbauer, W. C. F.; Thompson, P. T., Systematic errors in free energy perturbation calculations due to a finite sample of configuration space: sample-size hysteresis. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1991**, *95* (17), 6670-6675.
37. Ryde, U., How Many Conformations Need To Be Sampled To Obtain Converged QM/MM Energies? The Curse of Exponential Averaging. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2017**, *13* (11), 5745-5752.
38. Lee, F. S.; Chu, Z. T.; Bolger, M. B.; Warshel, A., Calculations of antibody-antigen interactions: microscopic and semi-microscopic evaluation of the free energies of binding of phosphorylcholine analogs to McPC603. *Protein Eng.* **1992**, *5* (3), 215-28.

39. Ytreberg, F. M.; Swendsen, R. H.; Zuckerman, D. M., Comparison of free energy methods for molecular systems. *J Chem Phys* **2006**, *125* (18), 184114.
40. Kish, L., Survey sampling. In *Survey sampling*, John Wiley & Sons: 1965.
41. Janke, W., *Quantum Simulations of Complex Many-Body Systems: From Theory to Algorithms*. Grotendorst, J.; Marx, D.; Murmatsu, A., Vol. 10, p 423–445.
42. Chodera, J. D.; Swope, W. C.; Pitera, J. W.; Seok, C.; Dill, K. A., Use of the Weighted Histogram Analysis Method for the Analysis of Simulated and Parallel Tempering Simulations. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2007**, *3* (1), 26–41.
43. Shirts, M. R.; Bair, E.; Hooker, G.; Pande, V. S., Equilibrium free energies from nonequilibrium measurements using maximum-likelihood methods. *Phys Rev Lett* **2003**, *91* (14), 140601.
44. Bennett, C. H., Efficient estimation of free energy differences from Monte Carlo data. *J. Comput. Phys.* **1976**, *22* (2), 245-268.
45. Hub, J. S.; Groot, B. L. D.; Spoel, D. V. D., g_wham—A Free Weighted Histogram Analysis Implementation Including Robust Error and Autocorrelation Estimates. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2015**, *6* (9), 3713-3720.
46. Shirts, M. R.; Chodera, J. D., Statistically optimal analysis of samples from multiple equilibrium states. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *129* (12), 124105.
47. Sun, Z. X.; Wang, X. H.; Zhang, J. Z. H., BAR-based optimum adaptive sampling regime for variance minimization in alchemical transformation. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *19* (23), 15005-15020.
48. Wang, X.; Tu, X.; Zhang, J. Z. H.; Sun, Z., BAR-based optimum adaptive sampling regime for variance minimization in alchemical transformation: the nonequilibrium stratification. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2018**, *20* (3), 2009-2021.
49. Sun, Z.; Wang, X.; Song, J., Extensive Assessment of Various Computational Methods for Aspartate's pKa Shift. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **2017**, *57* (7), 1621-1639.
50. Klimovich, P. V.; Shirts, M. R.; Mobley, D. L., Guidelines for the analysis of free energy calculations. *J. Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* **2015**, *29* (5), 397-411.
51. Dybeck, E. C.; König, G.; Brooks, B. R.; Shirts, M. R., Comparison of Methods To Reweight from Classical Molecular Simulations to QM/MM Potentials. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2016**, *12* (4), 1466-1480.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Comparison between the numerical distribution generated and the analytical one (left) and an illustration of Gaussian distribution studied in this work with σ from 1 to 10 (right).

Figure 2. Top: The effective number of samples as functions of σ of the Gaussian distribution and the number of independent samples. We truncate the curve at $Q = 0.1$ as the sample size should be larger than 1. Bottom: Its projections on σ and its derivatives are also given. The numbers in the legend refer to the number of independent samples.

Figure 3. Comparisons of numerical (Q_{EXP}), theoretical and analytical (Q_{GEXP}) $Q - N$ curves. $\sigma =$ a) 0, b) 1, c) 2, d) 3, e) 4, f) 5.

Figure 4. Convergence of EXP estimates (top) and GEXP estimates (bottom).

Figure 5. The number of samples required to get certain accuracies (black 4 kJ/mol, red 10 kJ/mol and green 20 kJ/mol) and a confidence of 95%. Left: x axis as σ . Right: x axis as σ^2 .

Figure 6. The slope of the $N - \sigma^2$ curve as a function of the convergence threshold.




Figure 1





Figure 2




Figure 3





Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6