

String Method for Generalized Gradient Flows: Computation of Rare Events in Reversible Stochastic Processes

Tobias Grafke

Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom*

(Dated: July 19, 2022)

Rare transitions in stochastic processes often can be rigorously described via an underlying large deviation principle. Recent breakthroughs in the classification of reversible stochastic processes as gradient flows have lead to a connection of large deviation principles to a generalized gradient structure. Here, we show that, as a consequence, metastable transitions in these reversible processes can be interpreted as heteroclinic orbits of the generalized gradient flow. As a consequence, this suggests a numerical algorithm to compute the transition trajectories in configuration space efficiently, based on the string method traditionally restricted only to gradient diffusions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Meta-stability frequently occurs in nature. A complex stochastic dynamical system often has multiple locally stable fixed points close to which it spends the majority of its time. Rarely, and on a much longer time-scale, fluctuations push the system from one such state to another. Typical examples include chemical reactions under thermal noise [1], nucleation [2], crystal deformation [3], etc. Another common setup is the coarse-graining of microscopic models in statistical mechanics, where effective dynamics can be derived including noise terms as fluctuating hydrodynamics [4]. If the effective limiting dynamics have multiple fixed points, such as for phase transitions, or when conditioning on rare observables, the intrinsic stochastic noise induced by the finiteness of the number of particles will trigger the rare event, a situation that is quantified by *macroscopic fluctuation theory* [5].

In all these cases, the computation of the most likely transition pathway is practically achievable whenever a *large deviation principle* (LDP) holds [6]. When present, it demands that the least unlikely of all transition scenarios will exponentially dominate all others, reducing the original stochastic sampling problem to a deterministic optimization problem. The analytical computation of the corresponding minimizers (*maximum likelihood pathways*, MLPs) is often impossible, and their numerical computation leads to a high-dimensional optimization problem, which for systems with a large number of degrees of freedom is hard to solve. The computation of the MLP is significantly simplified for a specific sub-class of stochastic processes: Whenever the dynamics is a diffusion in a potential landscape with small noise, the invariant measure of the process is given from the potential itself, and MLPs become minimum energy paths. The computation of transition trajectories is then simplified to the computation of heteroclinic orbits of the gradient flow, which is numerically achieved by the string method [7, 8].

An evolution driven by a negative gradient of a potential is a straightforward example of a gradient flow.

Recent breakthroughs allowed phrasing many more systems as (generalized) gradient flows, such as recognizing the Wasserstein gradient structure of the Fokker-Planck equation for interacting particle systems [9]. The relation to large deviation principles of microscopic particle systems is by now well understood [10]. The resulting class of dynamics is no longer restricted to diffusions or even the Gaussian case, but applicable e.g. to jump processes, lattice gas models or interacting particle systems. The main point of this paper is to show that under certain conditions, transition trajectories in reversible stochastic processes are heteroclinic orbits of the associated generalized gradient flow. Furthermore, this allows us to derive a generalized string method for the efficient and robust computation of the MLPs.

II. MAIN RESULTS

Let X_t^ε be a family of continuous time Markov jump processes (MJPs). If X_t^ε

- (i) fulfills a LDP in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ with rate function

$$I_T(\phi) = \int_0^T L(\phi, \dot{\phi}) dt$$

for *Lagrangian* L , and corresponding *Hamiltonian* H given by the Fenchel-Legendre transform

$$H(\psi, \theta) = \sup_{\eta} (\langle \theta, \eta \rangle - L(\psi, \eta)) ,$$

and

- (ii) obeys detailed balance,

then the transition trajectory $\{\phi(\tau)\}$ between points a and b in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ fulfills either

$$\dot{\phi} = \partial_{\theta} H(\phi, 0) \quad \text{or} \quad \dot{\phi} = -\partial_{\theta} H(\phi, 0) ,$$

i.e. the transition trajectory is described by the heteroclinic orbits of the *generalized gradient flow* field $\partial_{\theta} H(\phi, 0)$.

* T.Grafke@warwick.ac.uk

We can then numerically compute the transition trajectory with the *generalized string method*, which, starting from an initial guess ϕ_i^0 , where $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ enumerates system copies along the trajectory, iterates only two simple steps until convergence:

(i) Update,

$$\phi_i^{k+1} = \phi_i^k + \Delta t \partial_\theta H(\phi_i^k, 0).$$

(ii) Reparametrize,

$$\|\phi_{i+1}^{k+1} - \phi_i^{k+1}\| = \text{cst}. \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

The knowledge of the transition trajectory yields not only information about the most likely transition in the large deviation limit, but furthermore allows one to estimate the exponential scaling of its probability. Additionally, it yields the saddle points (transition states) of the limiting dynamics, i.e. the points where the trajectory crosses the separatrix between one basin of attraction and another, and can be used as a 'reaction coordinate' as a basis for more sophisticated sampling techniques, such as forward flux sampling [11] or importance sampling.

In what follows, we will first derive the main results of the paper in section III. Subsequently, in section IV, the connection to the mathematical literature on generalized gradient flows is made. In section V, the numerical computation of limiting trajectories is discussed, and the full string method for generalized gradient flows is introduced. Finally, its capabilities are demonstrated in section VI on two important examples: A zero range lattice gas model exhibiting condensation, and the hydrodynamic limit of interacting particles.

III. TRANSITION TRAJECTORIES IN REVERSIBLE MARKOV JUMP PROCESSES

A. Large deviation principles and transition trajectories

Let $X_t^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}^\varepsilon$ be a family MJPs in the state spaces $\mathcal{E}^\varepsilon$ with generators $\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon$ and unique invariant measures μ_∞^ε . We say that X_t^ε fulfills a *large deviation principle* (LDP) if in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the probability to observe a transition from $a \in \mathcal{E}$ to $b \in \mathcal{E}$ fulfills,

$$\mathcal{P}(a \rightarrow b) \asymp \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1} \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{C}_a^b} S_T(\psi)) \quad (1)$$

with $\mathcal{C}_a^b = \{\psi(t) \in \mathcal{D}[0, T] | \psi(0) = a, \psi(T) = b\}$, and $\mathcal{E}$ the limiting state space. Here, the sign $\asymp$ stands for asymptotic logarithmic equivalence, i.e. that for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the logarithm of both sides has the same limit. For a precise definition of large deviation principles for stochastic processes, see e.g. [12]. The large deviation *rate function*

$$S_T(\psi) = V(\psi(0)) + I_T(\psi), \quad I_T(\psi) = \int_0^T L(\psi, \dot{\psi}) dt$$

can be split up into two terms: $V(a)$ describes the probability of observing an initial condition a . The second term, $I_T(\psi)$, quantifies the probability of observing a given trajectory $\psi(t)$ from a to b . $L(\psi, \dot{\psi})$ is called the *Lagrangian*, which permits a corresponding *Hamiltonian* as its Fenchel-Legendre transform

$$H(\psi, \theta) = \sup_\eta (\langle \theta, \eta \rangle - L(\psi, \eta)).$$

In the course of this paper, we are interested in finding explicitly the *minimizer* (or *instanton*) ϕ that solves the minimization problem (1) for given endpoints a, b ,

$$I_T(\phi) = \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{C}_a^b} I_T(\psi).$$

This minimizer describes the most likely transition trajectory in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. It can equivalently be described as a solution to the Hamilton's equations

$$\dot{\phi} = \partial_\theta H(\phi, \theta), \quad \dot{\theta} = -\partial_\phi H(\phi, \theta). \quad (2)$$

A special case is the situation of a trajectory $\phi(t)$, such that $I_T(\phi) = 0$. Since $L \geq 0$, these trajectories are necessarily (global) minimizers, and are called *zero action pathways* or *relaxation dynamics*. As realized in [10] and discussed below, these correspond to *generalized gradient flows* in their variational formulation. The equivalent dynamics define a *deterministic* dynamical system as limit of the original stochastic process which can be interpreted as a law of large numbers (LLN) or hydrodynamic limit of the MJP. In terms of the Hamiltonian, they correspond to solutions of (2) with $\theta = 0$, $\dot{\theta} = 0$, and therefore

$$\dot{\phi} = \partial_\theta H(\phi, 0).$$

In the following, we will first restrict ourselves to a situation where the relaxation dynamics have a unique and stable fixed point a , i.e. $\partial_\theta H(a, 0) = 0$, and we only consider trajectories starting from that fixed point. Then we can specifically choose $V(x)$ to be consistent with a distribution of the initial conditions according to the limiting invariant measure μ_∞ . The large deviation principle demands, for consistency,

$$V(b) = V(a) + \inf_{T>0} \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{C}_a^b} \int_0^T I_T(\psi) \quad (3)$$

i.e. the probability of observing the process at b amounts to it starting at a and transitioning from there to b in an arbitrary amount of time (including infinitely long, $T \rightarrow \infty$). Here, $V(a)$ can be interpreted as an arbitrary constant, and we can set $V(a) = 0$. In this context, the function $V(x)$ is also called the *quasi-potential* [6], which loosely generalizes the notion of a free energy to non-equilibrium systems.

For transition trajectories between two fixed points a and b , as depicted in figure 1, we need to generalize equation (3) so that it holds true locally in each basin of attraction. Importantly, for the purpose of this discussion,




FIG. 1. The minimizing trajectory between two fixed points of a gradient flow $\dot{\phi} = \partial_{\theta} H(\phi, 0)$ is a heteroclinic orbit connecting each stable fixed point to the saddle point.

a restriction of the arguments to single basins, and subsequent 'stitching' of $V(x)$ to neighboring basins, proofs to be sufficient to describe bi-stable transitions of the form of figure 1. We will not consider cases of more generic attractors such as limit cycles, etc.

B. Adjoint Process and Minimizing Trajectories

For a MJP $X_t \in \mathcal{E}$, the *adjoint process* $X_t^* \in \mathcal{E}$ is defined as having the $L^2(\mathcal{E}, \mu_{\infty})$ -adjoint of $\mathcal{L}$ as generator $\mathcal{L}^*$, i.e. for ρ_{∞} being the density of μ_{∞} with respect to counting or Lebesgue measure,

$$\mathcal{L}^* = \rho_{\infty}^{-1} \mathcal{L}^{\dagger} \rho_{\infty},$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{\dagger}$ is the usual $L^2(\mathcal{E})$ -adjoint of $\mathcal{L}$. Intuitively, the probability of observing a trajectory under $\mathcal{L}$ is equal to observing the *time-reversed* trajectory under $\mathcal{L}^*$. Note that X_t and X_t^* have the same invariant measure μ_{∞} .

Assume now that $(X_t)^{\varepsilon}$ is a family of MJPs and $(X_t^*)^{\varepsilon}$ are their adjoint processes, so that both permit LDPs for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ with Lagrangians L and L^* , respectively, as well as Hamiltonians H and H^* . We then have the relation

$$V(a) + \int_0^T L(\psi, \dot{\psi}) dt = V(b) + \int_0^T L^*(\psi, -\dot{\psi}) dt, \quad (4)$$

for any trajectory $\{\psi\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ with $\psi(0) = a, \psi(T) = b$. This follows directly from the definition of the adjoint process: The probability of starting at a and observing the trajectory $\psi(t)$ is equal to the probability of observing the reverse trajectory $\psi^*(t) = \psi(T - t)$ starting at b .

We then have the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *All minimizers of the rate function are either paths of vanishing action, or time-reversed paths of vanishing action of the adjoint process.*

Paths of vanishing action are necessarily minimizers since the rate function is always non-negative. For all

other minimizers, consider a minimizing pair (ϕ, T) for the quasi-potential (3). It follows that

$$V(b) = V(a) + \int_0^T L(\phi, \dot{\phi}) dt. \quad (5)$$

By plugging this into equation (4), this shows that $\phi(t)$ is also a trajectory that has

$$L^*(\phi, -\dot{\phi}) = 0. \quad (6)$$

In other words, minimizers of the forward process are reversed relaxation paths of the adjoint process, i.e.

Proposition 2. *The minimizers of the rate function fulfill either*

$$\dot{\phi} = \partial_{\theta} H(\phi, 0) \quad \text{or} \quad \dot{\phi} = \partial_{\theta} H^*(\phi, 0). \quad (7)$$

Proposition 2 establishes that all large deviation minimizers follow a generalized gradient flow, either of the normal or of the adjoint process. As discussed, the first of the alternatives in equation (7) corresponds to the relaxation dynamics, and is often described intuitively as the *downhill dynamics*. The second alternative of (7) can similarly be called the *uphill dynamics*. These terms stem from the fact that for diffusions in a potential, downhill dynamics occur along maximally decreasing potential, while uphill dynamics occur along maximally increasing potential. This intuition breaks down in the general case. In particular, even though the notion of the quasi-potential replaces the potential, it is not true that relaxation paths are obeying $\dot{\phi} = -\nabla V(\phi)$. Instead, relaxation paths are *generalized gradient flows* in the quasi-potential, and uphill paths are *adjoint generalized gradient flows* in the quasi-potential.

Even though this describes the minimizer completely, relations (7) are not helpful for computing the actual trajectory, because in general we have no access to H^* as the adjoint process is not known. As we will see next, additionally demanding time-reversal symmetry of the underlying limiting process will simplify the computation of the minimizers considerably.

C. Detailed Balance and Time Reversibility

Written in terms of the Hamiltonian, normal and reversed dynamics are connected by

$$H(\psi, \theta) = H^*(\psi, \nabla V - \theta). \quad (8)$$

This is a consequence of (4), which implies

$$L(\psi, \dot{\psi}) = L^*(\psi, -\dot{\psi}) + \frac{d}{dt} V(\psi) = L^*(\psi, -\dot{\psi}) + \langle \nabla V, \dot{\psi} \rangle$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}(\psi, \theta) &= \sup_{\eta} (\eta\theta - \mathcal{L}(\psi, \eta)) \\
&= \sup_{\eta} (\eta\theta - \eta\nabla V - \mathcal{L}^*(\psi, -\eta)) \\
&= \sup_{-\eta} (\eta(\nabla V - \theta) - \mathcal{L}^*(\psi, \eta)) \\
&= \mathcal{H}^*(\psi, \nabla V - \theta)
\end{aligned}$$

(compare also [5, 10]). With this, we can rewrite the result of proposition 2 as

$$\dot{\phi} = \partial_{\theta} H(\phi, 0) \quad \text{or} \quad \dot{\phi} = \partial_{\theta} H(\phi, \nabla V). \quad (9)$$

Even though (9) is written completely in terms of the forward process and any reference to the adjoint process is dropped, this relation does not simplify the computation of the trajectory itself, since in general, the quasi-potential $V(x)$ is not available easily (in fact, it is usually computed through finding the minimizing trajectories).

A MJP is called *reversible* or in *detailed balance*, if it is equivalent to its adjoint process, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^*$. If it permits a LDP, we furthermore have $L = L^*$ and $H = H^*$. Therefore, as immediate consequence,

Proposition 3. *For a process in detailed balance, the minimizers of the rate function fulfill either*

$$\dot{\phi} = \partial_{\theta} H(\phi, 0) \quad \text{or} \quad \dot{\phi} = -\partial_{\theta} H(\phi, 0). \quad (10)$$

Now, both up- and downhill portion of the transition trajectory are readily available by simple integration, as no reference is made to either the quasi-potential or the adjoint process.

Intuitively, this result states the unsurprising fact that time-reversal symmetry is restored for transition trajectories. At the same time, it implies that all minimizing trajectories are *heteroclinic orbits* of the *generalized gradient flow* induced by the large deviation principle of X_t^{ε} . It therefore allows for an extension of the string method [7] to more general situations. This will be discussed in section V.

IV. CONNECTION TO GENERALIZED GRADIENT FLOWS

To make the connection to the mathematical literature, we want to highlight here the relation of the above considerations to generalized gradient flows and their connection to large deviation theory. This is of particular importance in the context of statistical mechanics and stochastic thermodynamics, where the connection between large deviations and hydrodynamic limits [5], statistical mechanics [13] and non-equilibrium thermodynamics [14] is known in considerable detail.

Consider the space $\mathcal{E}$ to be a Riemannian manifold, with tangent bundle $T\mathcal{E}$ and cotangent bundle $T^*\mathcal{E}$. Define on $\mathcal{E}$ a convex, continuously differentiable function

$\psi_x(v) : T\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and its Legendre-dual $\psi_x^*(w) : T^*\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_x^*(w) &= \sup_{v \in T_x \mathcal{E}} (\langle v, w \rangle - \psi_x(v)) \\
\psi_x(v) &= \sup_{w \in T_x^* \mathcal{E}} (\langle v, w \rangle - \psi_x^*(w)).
\end{aligned}$$

Additionally we demand $\psi_x(0) = \psi_x^*(0) = 0$. Then, (ψ, ψ^*) are called *dissipation potentials* in the context of thermodynamics (note that here, the notation $*$ denotes Legendre-duality, and not the adjoint process).

Furthermore, consider a continuously differentiable function (potential) $V : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then, any evolution on $\mathcal{E}$ according to $\dot{x} = F(x)$ that fulfills

$$\psi_x(F(x)) + \psi_x^*(-\nabla V(x)) + \langle F(x), \nabla V(x) \rangle = 0$$

is called a *generalized gradient flow* with respect to $(\mathcal{E}, \psi, V)$ [10]. This is equivalent to saying

$$F(x) = \partial_x \psi_x^*(-\nabla V(x)). \quad (11)$$

The connection to large deviations is made when taking

$$\psi_x^*(\theta) = H(x, \theta + \nabla V(x)) - H(x, \nabla V(x)), \quad (12)$$

for a large deviation Hamiltonian $H(\psi, \theta)$. The choice (12) fulfills the assumptions of (ψ, ψ^*) to be dissipation potentials, and furthermore, equation (11) leads to

$$\dot{x} = \partial_{\theta} H(x, 0)$$

as gradient flow [10].

The same argument goes through for the adjoint process, which is a gradient flow for H^* , and which finalizes the argument.

V. NUMERICAL COMPUTATION OF THE TRANSITION TRAJECTORY

With the realization of proposition 3, implementing a string method for generalized gradient flows in the spirit of the original string method [7, 8] becomes straightforward.

Consider a reversible MJP $X_t^{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{E}^{\varepsilon}$ with limiting state space $\mathcal{E}$ that obeys a LDP with Lagrangian L and Hamiltonian H . Following [8], denote by $\phi(\tau)$, $\tau \in [0, 1]$ a *string*, i.e. a candidate limiting transition trajectory connecting two fixed points $a, b \in \mathcal{E}$. A heteroclinic orbit in the gradient flow induced by H then obeys the relations

$$\phi(0) = a, \quad \phi(1) = b, \quad (\partial_{\theta} H(\phi(\tau), 0))^{\perp} = 0, \quad (13)$$

where for a vector field $v(\phi(\tau))$ along the string $\phi(\tau)$, the notation $v^{\perp}$ describes the component in the plane perpendicular to the string,

$$\begin{aligned}
v(\phi(\tau))^{\perp} &= v(\phi(\tau)) - \langle v(\phi(\tau)), \gamma(\tau) \rangle \gamma(\tau), \\
\gamma(\tau) &= |\dot{\phi}(\tau)|^{-1} \dot{\phi}(\tau).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, denote by ϕ_n^k , $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, the k -th approximation of the n -th image along the discretized string. An update then consists of two steps.

- (i) Following proposition 3, integrate the forward gradient flow (9), $\dot{\phi}(\tau) = \partial_\theta H(\phi(\tau), 0)$ for every image along the string via an appropriate integration scheme. For example, when choosing forward Euler, set

$$\phi_n^* = \phi_n^k + \Delta t \partial_\theta H(\phi_n^k, 0). \quad (14)$$

More sophisticated and higher order time integration schemes are similarly viable, including implicit ones. In particular, if the operator with the tightest stability restrictions is linear, it is generally a good idea to consider exponential time-differencing schemes [15]. In general, all considerations that are valid for the integration of the limiting dynamics also apply to the string update step. After applying (14), the images along the string are no longer distributed in an equidistant way, and would accumulate at the fixed points a or b if (14) would be repeated indefinitely. Therefore, as a second step,

- (ii) reparametrize ϕ_n^* by arc-length. The arc-length parameter of the n -th image is given by the recursive relation

$$s_0 = 0, s_n = s_{n-1} + \|\phi_n^* - \phi_{n-1}^*\|.$$

This information can then be used to re-interpolate the images ϕ_n^* to ϕ_n^{k+1} at the positions

$$\tilde{s}_n = ns_N/N.$$

This ensures that now

$$\|\phi_{n+1}^{k+1} - \phi_n^{k+1}\| = \text{cst}.$$

The re-parametrization step moves points only along the string $\phi(\tau)$ (up to the accuracy prescribed by the interpolation scheme). Therefore, after convergence of the algorithm, the remaining change that occurs in step (i), is necessarily parallel to the string, or in other words, at the fixed point of the iteration the orthogonality condition (13) is fulfilled.

Remark 1. All results regarding computational complexity and order of convergence of the original 'simplified and improved string method' [8] apply also here.

Remark 2. The difficulty of implementing the string method is roughly equal to implementing the limiting dynamics. Furthermore, we can solve the minimization problem with the computational cost of the forward integration of the equation, multiplied by the number of copies. This is in stark contrast to the full optimization problem (1) posed by minimizing the original rate function, as the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation is second order (in time), the highest order operator of which will be the original order squared. For example, if

the stochastic PDE in question was the stochastic heat equation,

$$\dot{\rho} = \partial_x^2 \rho + \eta, \quad \mathbb{E}(\eta\eta') = \delta(t - t')\delta(x - x'),$$

then the corresponding Lagrangian is

$$L(\rho, \dot{\rho}) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\dot{\rho} - \partial_x^2 \rho|^2 dx$$

and the Euler-Lagrange equation, to be solved with suitable boundary conditions, is

$$0 = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \rho} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\rho}} = \ddot{\rho} + \partial_x^4 \rho.$$

For the string method, one only needs to integrate

$$0 = \dot{\rho} - \partial_x^2 \rho.$$

Consequently, implementation and efficiency of the string method always exceeds more complex generic optimization methods such as the MAM [2] or gMAM [16, 17], and should be preferred whenever the detailed balance condition holds.

VI. EXAMPLES

A. Diffusion in a gradient potential

A trivial example is the classical case of diffusion in a gradient potential. Let the configuration space $\mathcal{E}^\varepsilon = \mathbb{R}^d \forall \varepsilon > 0$, and the system state $X_t \in \mathcal{E}$ evolve according to the Itô SDE

$$dX_t^\varepsilon = -\nabla U(X_t^\varepsilon) dt + \sqrt{2\varepsilon} dW_t. \quad (15)$$

Then necessarily $V(x) = U(x)$, and from Freidlin-Wentzell theory it follows that

$$L(\psi, \dot{\psi}) = \frac{1}{4} |\dot{\psi} + \nabla U(\psi)|^2, \quad H(\psi, \theta) = -\langle \theta, \nabla U \rangle + |\theta|^2. \quad (16)$$

It is easy to check that indeed the detailed balance condition (8) is fulfilled for $H = H^*$, i.e. $H(\psi, \theta) = H(\psi, \nabla U - \theta)$. The minimizers therefore follows

$$\dot{\phi} = \pm \nabla U(\phi). \quad (17)$$

This is the standard setup for which the string method was originally devised. Numerous applications exist, most importantly for chemical systems and molecular dynamics, including Lennard-Jones clusters, water clusters, peptides [1], crystal deformations [3], and quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics simulations [18]. A straightforward generalization of the flow (15) is to choose an additional *mobility* matrix $M(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ which is symmetric and divergence free (i.e. $\sum_i \partial_{x_i} M(x) = 0$), so the evolution equation becomes

$$dX_t^\varepsilon = -M(X_t^\varepsilon) \nabla U(X_t^\varepsilon) dt + \sqrt{2\varepsilon} M^{1/2}(X_t^\varepsilon) dW_t, \quad (18)$$




FIG. 2. String of the zero-range process towards condensation in a single lattice site $i = 8$ (left), and corresponding strength of the generalized gradient flow (right).

where $M^{1/2}(M^{1/2})^T = M$. Then it still holds that $V(x) = U(x)$, and Lagrangian and Hamiltonian of equation (16) are only modified by choosing the appropriate inner products $\langle u, v \rangle_M = \langle u, Mv \rangle$ and $|u|_M = \langle u, u \rangle_M^{1/2}$. In this case, the minimizer obeys the modified relation

$$\dot{\phi} = \pm M(\phi) \nabla U(\phi), \quad (19)$$

and the detailed balance condition $H(\psi, \theta) = H(\psi, M \nabla U - \theta)$ is fulfilled.

Remark 3. If $M(x)$ is not divergence free, the detailed balance condition is still applicable if equation (18) additionally is extended by the deterministic drift $\varepsilon \operatorname{div} M(x) dt$, while the LDP remains unchanged [19].

Remark 4. If $M(x)$ is not symmetric, the detailed balance condition is violated. In this case though, the adjoint dynamics can be written down explicitly. Decompose $M = S + A$, with $S = S^T$ and $A = -A^T$. Then the adjoint dynamics are

$$dX_t^\varepsilon = -(S - A) \nabla U(X_t^\varepsilon) dt + \sqrt{2\varepsilon} S^{1/2} dW_t,$$

and a modified string method based on proposition 2 instead of proposition 3 can be built.

B. Zero-range process

Consider a lattice gas on the lattice with $L \in \mathbb{N}$ sites, where on each lattice site i there are n_i particles. The

system state is described by $\vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^L$. Particles can hop to neighboring sites on the left or right with a rate $\gamma(n_i)$ depending only on the local occupation number, so that the total number of particles N is conserved, $N = \sum_{i=1}^L n_i$. Such a system is called a zero-range process (ZRP), which is a MJP with generator

$$\mathcal{L}f(\vec{n}) = \sum_{i=1}^L \gamma(n_i) (f(\vec{n} + \vec{e}_i^+) + f(\vec{n} + \vec{e}_i^-) - 2f(\vec{n})),$$

where $\vec{e}_i^\pm$ is the vector with zero entries everywhere, except -1 at i and 1 at $i \pm 1$. For finite L , a large deviation principle can be obtained for this MJP in $\varepsilon = N^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ by considering the rescaled quantity $\rho_i = \bar{\rho} n_i / N = \varepsilon n_i$, $\bar{\rho} > 0$, for $\mathcal{E}^\varepsilon = \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}_+^L$ and $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}_+^L$. The generator then reads

$$\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon f(\vec{\rho}) = \sum_{i=1}^L \gamma(\rho_i) (f(\vec{\rho} + \varepsilon \vec{e}_i^+) + f(\vec{\rho} + \varepsilon \vec{e}_i^-) - 2f(\vec{\rho})),$$

where the jump rates γ and the time have been appropriately rescaled [5, 12]. The large deviation Hamiltonian reads

$$H(\rho, \theta) = \sum_i \gamma(\rho_i) (e^{\theta_{i-1} - \theta_i} + e^{\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i} - 2)$$

This system is not in detailed balance in general, and one has to choose the rates $\gamma(x)$ correctly in order to enforce it. The detailed balance condition amounts to

$$\frac{P(\vec{\rho} \rightarrow \vec{\rho} + \varepsilon \vec{e}_i^+)}{P(\vec{\rho} + \varepsilon \vec{e}_i^+ \rightarrow \vec{\rho})} = \frac{P(\vec{\rho} + \varepsilon \vec{e}_i^-)}{P(\vec{\rho})} \quad (20)$$

i.e. the ratio of the probabilities of forward and backward reaction has to correspond to their relative probability. Since $P(\vec{\rho}) = \exp(-\varepsilon^{-1} V(\vec{\rho}))$, $P(\vec{\rho} \rightarrow \vec{\rho} + \varepsilon \vec{e}_i^+) = \gamma(\rho_i)$, and $P(\vec{\rho} + \varepsilon \vec{e}_i^+ \rightarrow \vec{\rho}) = \gamma(\rho_{i+1})$, the detailed balance condition (20) translates to

$$\frac{\gamma(\rho_{i+1})}{\gamma(\rho_i)} = \exp(-(\nabla_i V(\vec{\rho}) - \nabla_{i+1} V(\vec{\rho}))),$$

so that a possible choice is

$$\nabla_i V(\vec{\rho}) = \ln \gamma(\rho_i) + C,$$

where the constant C is fixed by the conserved mean density $\bar{\rho} = L^{-1} \sum_i \rho_i$ via $C = -\ln \gamma(\bar{\rho})$. We therefore obtain

$$V(\vec{\rho}) = \sum_i \int_0^{\rho_i} (\ln \gamma(y) + C) dy,$$

which is the correct potential for the ZRP [20]. In particular, for non-interacting particles, we have $\gamma(x) = x$ and

$$V(\vec{\rho}) = \sum_i \left(\rho_i \ln \left(\frac{\rho_i}{\bar{\rho}} \right) - \rho_i \right).$$




FIG. 3. String of the interacting particle system, where the cluster of attractive particles performs one revolution around the periodic domain (left), and corresponding strength of the Wasserstein gradient flow (right).

For general $\gamma(x)$ obeying the detailed balance condition, the transition trajectories now follow

$$\dot{\rho}_i = \pm \partial_{\theta_i} H(\vec{\rho}, 0) = \pm (\gamma(\rho_{i-1}) + \gamma(\rho_{i+1}) - 2\gamma(\rho_i)). \quad (21)$$

Notably, for specific choices of $\gamma(x)$, this system has multiple stable fixed points. For example, taking $\gamma(x) = D + \exp(-x)$, for $D = \frac{1}{10}$ and $\bar{\rho} = 1$ provides two stable fixed points, one being a constant solution at $\rho_i = \bar{\rho}$ and one being a *condensate*, where a macroscopic fraction of the density is concentrated in a single cell. This setup is metastable in that fluctuations from the finiteness of the number of particles will eventually force the system from one fixed-point to the other, the transition happening along the heteroclinic orbits of equation (21) in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. The corresponding transition trajectory is depicted in figure 2 (left), starting at the constant density at $s = 0$, and transitioning into the condensate at $s = 1$. Notably, a spatially extended condensate forms into a *critical nucleus*, which is reached at the saddle point marked in the plot. Its location is made evident by looking at the magnitude of the gradient field along the transition trajectory, $\|\partial_{\theta} H(\phi, 0)\|$, depicted in figure 2 (right), which vanishes at all fixed points.

C. Interacting particle system

On a periodic domain $\Omega = [0, 1]$, consider a system of N interacting Brownian particles at $X_i \in \Omega$,

$i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, in a potential $U(x) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, each modeled by its own Itô diffusion,

$$dX_i(t) = -\nabla U(X_i(t)) dt - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \nabla K(X_i(t) - X_j(t)) dt + \sqrt{2} dW_i(t).$$

The hydrodynamic limit of this system is

$$\partial_t \rho = \partial_x^2 \rho + \partial_x (\rho \partial_x U + \partial_x (\rho \star K)).$$

As discussed in [21], this can be interpreted as a generalized gradient flow in the (ρ -dependent) Wasserstein metric, evolving according to

$$\partial_t \rho = -M(\rho) \nabla_{\rho} V, \quad M(\rho) \xi = \nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla \xi)$$

with

$$V(\rho) = \int (\rho \log \rho - \rho + \rho U + \frac{1}{2} \rho (K \star \rho)) dx.$$

As concrete demonstration of our algorithm, we take a periodic potential $U(x) = \alpha \cos(2\pi x)$, which has a unique minimum at the center of the domain. As interaction potential, we pick $K(x)$ such that $\partial_x K(x) = w(x - \delta)$, with

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} \beta x \exp\left(-\frac{2x^2}{1-2x^2}\right) & x \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

which results in a locally parabolic interaction which tapers off to 0. Notably, for $\delta \neq 0$, the interaction potential is not symmetric, resulting in an effective net force, e.g. to the right for $\delta > 0$. In total, particles tend to stick together and try to move right, but collect within the basin of the potential. As a consequence, the system is not meta-stable, and the unique fixed point is a cluster of particles slightly off $x = \frac{1}{2}$. We can nevertheless compute an interesting transition trajectory: We can force the particle cloud to revolve once around the periodic domain, i.e. ask for the most likely trajectory that leads to the particles collectively traveling up the barrier of $U(x)$ towards $x = 1$, and down again from $x = 0$ towards the fixed point. The resulting string is depicted in figure 3 (left), and the corresponding strength of the gradient drift is depicted in figure 3 (right). Concretely, we choose $\alpha = 0.5 \cdot 10^3$, $\beta = 0.5 \cdot 10^2$, and $\delta = 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we showed how the fact that a large deviation principle induces a generalized gradient flow can be used to classify limiting transition trajectories and rare events. In particular, we showed that under suitable conditions every minimizer of a large deviation principle can be interpreted as a heteroclinic orbit in a gradient flow, either of the original limiting Markov jump process or its adjoint. Additionally demanding detailed balance

(and therefore equating the MJP and its adjoint) leads to all transition trajectories being heteroclinic orbits of the generalized gradient flow itself.

This fact has important consequences for the numerical computation of the most likely transition trajectories. In particular, the string method, originally devised to effectively compute minimizing trajectories for diffusions in a potential landscape, can be adapted to the wider class of generalized gradient flows.

We demonstrated the feasibility of this approach by computing transition trajectories for the condensation of a zero range process, a particular lattice gas model, as

well as the hydrodynamic limit of interacting particles, in both cases computing the most likely trajectory realizing a certain event, and identifying the saddle point along the transition, at which the dynamics cross between the different basins of attraction.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TG would like to thank M. Peletier, A. Montefusco, and E. Vanden-Eijnden for fruitful discussions.

-
- [1] D. J. Wales, *International Reviews in Physical Chemistry* **25**, 237 (2006), wOS:000238374900007.
 - [2] W. E, W. Ren, and E. Vanden-Eijnden, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **57**, 637 (2004).
 - [3] W. E, W. Q. Ren, and E. Vanden-Eijnden, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **109**, 6688 (2005), wOS:000228231200029.
 - [4] J. M. Ortiz de Zárate and J. V. Sengers, *Hydrodynamic fluctuations in fluids and fluid mixtures* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2006) oCLC: 728077858.
 - [5] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **87**, 593 (2015).
 - [6] M. I. Freidlin and A. D. Wentzell, *Random perturbations of dynamical systems*, Vol. 260 (Springer, 2012).
 - [7] W. E, W. Ren, and E. Vanden-Eijnden, *Physical Review B* **66**, 052301 (2002).
 - [8] W. E, W. Ren, and E. Vanden-Eijnden, *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 164103 (2007).
 - [9] R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer, and F. Otto, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* (2006), 10.1137/S0036141096303359.
 - [10] A. Mielke, M. A. Peletier, and D. R. M. Renger, *Potential Analysis* **41**, 1293 (2014).
 - [11] R. J. Allen, C. Valeriani, and P. R. t. Wolde, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **21**, 463102 (2009).
 - [12] J. Feng and T. G. Kurtz, *Large deviations for stochastic processes*, Mathematical surveys and monographs No. 131 (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006) oCLC: 634887801.
 - [13] H. Touchette, *Physics Reports* **478**, 1 (2009).
 - [14] R. Kraaij, A. Lazarescu, C. Maes, and M. Peletier, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **170**, 492 (2018).
 - [15] A. Kassam and L. Trefethen, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **26**, 1214 (2005).
 - [16] M. Heymann and E. Vanden-Eijnden, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **61**, 1052 (2008).
 - [17] T. Grafke, T. Schäfer, and E. Vanden-Eijnden, in *Recent Progress and Modern Challenges in Applied Mathematics, Modeling and Computational Science*, Fields Institute Communications (Springer, New York, NY, 2017) pp. 17–55.
 - [18] H. Hu and W. Yang, *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* **59**, 573 (2008), wOS:000255723500023.
 - [19] A. Donev and E. Vanden-Eijnden, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **140**, 234115 (2014).
 - [20] S. Grosskinsky, G. M. Schütz, and H. Spohn, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **113**, 389 (2003).
 - [21] S. Adams, N. Dirr, M. Peletier, and J. Zimmer, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series A* **371**, 20120341 (2013).