

# Generalized Ensemble and Tempering Simulations: A Unified View

Walter Nadler<sup>1,\*</sup> and Ulrich H. E. Hansmann<sup>1,2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Physics, Michigan Technological University,  
1400 Townsend Drive, Houghton, MI 49931-1295, USA*

<sup>2</sup> *John-von-Neumann Institute for Computing, Forschungszentrum Jülich, D-52425 Jülich, Germany*  
(Dated: May 25, 2019)

We derive one-dimensional stochastic processes that describe generalized ensemble simulations as well as tempering (simulated and parallel) simulations from the underlying Master equations. The representations obtained are either in the form of a one-dimensional Fokker-Planck equation or a hopping process on a one-dimensional chain. They allow a unified discussion of the stationary distribution on, as well as stationary flow across order parameter and control parameter space. Finally, a discussion of the limits of validity of these approaches due to broken ergodicity is possible.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The effective simulation of complex thermal systems like proteins and glasses is a constant challenge in contemporary computational physics. Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation techniques for these systems have undergone remarkable advances in the last decades. Two main classes that have evolved are generalized ensemble and parallel tempering methods.

In the generalized ensemble (GE) approach [1] the goal is to sample the state space of a physical system so that particularly rare but important states, e.g. low energy or barrier states, are encountered frequently. A variety of weight functions have been tested, as well as methods for iteratively improving these functions [2].

A persistent problem of such simulations is that relaxation is slow due to barriers and bottlenecks that cannot be controlled by using weight functions on the usual order parameter spaces. Parallel tempering (PT) - sometimes also called replica exchange method - promised a way out of this dilemma [3, 4, 5]. Here simulations are performed in parallel at different values of a control parameter, most often the temperature. At certain times the current conformations of replicas at neighboring control parameter values are exchanged according to a generalized Metropolis rule. Thereby an individual replica could perform an additional random walk in control parameter space and - due to shorter relaxation times in some control parameter regime - explore state space more evenly.

However, also here the problem of slow relaxation arises, this time in the form of a slow and possibly uneven random walk through control parameter space. At least part of this problem seems to be related to finding an efficient discretization of control parameter space.

Increasing the flow through order parameter space in GE sampling as well as through control parameter space in PT was always an incentive. However, usually it was discussed only informally, and only recently Trebst et al.

[6, 7, 8] have made an attempt to look at that problem systematically. Instead of concentrating on the stationary distributions that arise from the sampling they concentrated on the stationary flow across order parameter and control parameter space. In order to optimize the flow they derived weight functions and control parameter discretization schemes.

In this contribution we want to give that approach a more fundamental basis. We will concentrate particularly on deriving the one-dimensional stochastic equations that are the basis for the flow analysis in a more systematic way from the underlying Master equations describing GE and PT simulations. This will also allow the possibility to look for connections to other concepts describing the dynamics of stochastic processes, e.g. first passage times.

We will focus in the next section on generalized ensemble sampling, while parallel tempering is the focus of the third section. We will close with a discussion of the effects of broken ergodicity on our results and an outlook.

## II. GENERALIZED ENSEMBLE SAMPLING

Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations utilize a certain move set in combination with an acceptance probability, most often of Metropolis form [9], to impose stochastic dynamics on a physical system. A move from state  $s$  to  $s'$  is accepted with the probability

$$p_M(s \rightarrow s') = \min[1, w(s')/w(s)] \quad . \quad (1)$$

The original choice for the weight function  $w(s)$  is the thermal or Boltzmann weight

$$w(s) \propto \exp[-\beta E(s)] \quad , \quad (2)$$

resulting in canonical sampling at inverse temperature  $\beta = 1/k_B T$ . However, other choices are possible as well, depending on which particular aspect of state space should be emphasized. We will assume in the following that the weight function is based only on the energy  $E(s)$  of the state  $s$ , and we will use  $w(s) = w[E(s)] = w(E)$  interchangeably.

In order to get a deeper understanding of simulations based on Eq. (1) we should look at their description via a

\*Electronic address: wnadler@mtu.edu

†Electronic address: hansmann@mtu.edu

Master equation in state space.  $P(s, t)$  is the probability to be in state  $s$  at time  $t$ , and its evolution in discrete

computer time is given by

$$P(s, t + 1) = \sum_{s'} P(s', t) W_s(s' \rightarrow s) - P(s, t) \sum_{s'} W_s(s \rightarrow s') \quad , \quad (3)$$

where the sums are over all possible states. The transition probabilities  $W(s \rightarrow s')$  in this equation are

$$\begin{aligned} W_s(s \rightarrow s') &= \frac{\psi(s \rightarrow s')}{\sum_{s''} \psi(s \rightarrow s'')} p_M(s \rightarrow s') \quad \text{for } s \neq s' \quad , \\ W_s(s \rightarrow s) &= 1 - \sum_{s' \neq s} W(s \rightarrow s') \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\psi(s \rightarrow s')$  is the characteristic function of the move set with  $\psi(s \rightarrow s') = 1$  if the move from  $s$  to  $s'$  is allowed and zero otherwise. Provided the move set is balanced and ergodic, the *stationary distribution* reached by this Markov chain is  $P_0(s) \propto w(s)$  because of detailed balance. Note however that in addition to  $\psi(s \rightarrow s') = \psi(s' \rightarrow s)$ , for  $(s, s')$  with  $\psi(s \rightarrow s') = 1$  the property  $\sum_{s''} \psi(s \rightarrow s'') = \sum_{s''} \psi(s' \rightarrow s'')$  must be fulfilled. Particularly the latter property, i.e. every state must connect to the same number of other states, is sometimes overlooked.

Equation (3) is an exact description of the simulation process and it is also the basis for more thorough investigations in the mathematics of Metropolis simulations [10, 11, 12, 13]. However from a physicist's point of view a *reduced* description in terms of *slow order parameters* is of more interest. Prominent among the order parameters chosen is the energy itself. Eliminating fast degrees of freedom, an approximate Master equation in energy space can be formulated

$$P(E, t + 1) = \sum_{E'} P(E', t) W_E(E' \rightarrow E) - P(E, t) \sum_{E'} W_E(E \rightarrow E') \quad . \quad (5)$$

where the transition probabilities  $W_E(E \rightarrow E')$  could - in principle - be derived from Eq. (4). Note however that, in contrast to Eq. (3), Eq. (5) is an approximation, valid only if all other degrees of freedom relax much faster than the energy. Nevertheless, even if relaxation orthogonal to the energy is slow, Eq. (5) can be viewed as a *Markovian* approximation to the fully non-Markovian process. Due to the degeneracy of states with energy, the stationary distribution of Eq. (5) is now

$$P_0(E) \propto n(E) w(E) \quad . \quad (6)$$

Here  $n(E)$  is the density of states and we have assumed that the weight function for the Metropolis algorithm is based on energies only, as mentioned above in the discussion of Eq. (1)

Coarse graining time and energy leads to a form of the Master equation that is continuous in both variables

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(E, t) = \int_{E'} P(E', t) R_E(E' \rightarrow E) - P(E, t) \int_{E'} R_E(E \rightarrow E') \quad . \quad (7)$$

where the transition probabilities have been replaced by rates  $R_E(E \rightarrow E')$ . Note that for various systems state space and energy  $E$  could have been continuous from the start, i.e. the sums in Eqs. (3) and (5) could have been integrals already. The continuous form of the Master equation in energy space is now the starting point for our final approximation. Using various techniques, e.g. the Kramers-Moyal expansion [14, 15, 16], a second order partial differential equation can be derived from Eq. (7), the Fokker-Planck equation for  $P(E, t)$  [16],

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(E, t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial E} D(E) \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial E} - F(E) \right] P(E, t) \quad . \quad (8)$$

We have written this equation already in a form that separates static and dynamic properties.  $D(E)$  is the energy-dependent diffusion coefficient that describes the local mobility and  $F(E)$  is the drift term which in one dimension can be derived from a potential,  $F(E) = -(d/dE)U(E)$ . In particular the stationary distribution of Eq. (8) is fully determined by this potential only,

$$P_0(E) \propto \exp[-U(E)] \quad . \quad (9)$$

The transition from the Master equation (7) to the Fokker-Planck equation (8) is possible only if the transition rates  $R_E(E \rightarrow E')$ , i.e. the transition probabilities  $W_E(E \rightarrow E')$ , are *sufficiently local* in the en-

ergy. Only in that limit the Fokker-Planck equation is an effective description of the more general Eq. (7). Nevertheless, even if there are non-local contributions to the transition rates, Eq. (8) can be viewed as the best *local* approximation to Eq. (7).

Eq. (8) can be written in a more compact form using the stationary distribution  $P_0(E)$ ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(E, t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial E} D(E) P_0(E) \frac{\partial}{\partial E} P_0(E)^{-1} \right] P(E, t). \quad (10)$$

In this form the fact that  $P_0(E)$  is the stationary distribution can be seen immediately from the vanishing of the rightmost derivative on the *rhs* if  $P(E, t)$  is replaced by  $P_0(E)$ . This equation will be the basis for our further analysis of distribution and flow in energy space.

The stationary distribution in energy space,  $P_0(E)$ , is actually the histogram  $H(E)$  of the energy distribution that is observed in an actual simulation. Moreover, it is still given by Eq. (6), i.e. it is given by the Metropolis weight function  $w(E)$  multiplied with the density of states  $n(E)$ . By an appropriate choice of the weight function *any* histogram can be produced in the simulation. The usual choice of Boltzmann weights leads to the canonical distribution,  $H(E) \propto n(E) \exp(-\beta E)$ , while the choice  $w(E) \propto 1/n(E)$  leads to a flat histogram  $H(E) = \text{const}$  [2, 17]. The latter is most appropriate to describe the properties of the system in question over a wide temperature range with equal accuracy. Various methods have been discussed to actually obtain approximations to  $n(E)$  by iteratively improving simulations [2, 18]. However, all of them are plagued by the problem that equilibration in the system can still be slow, in particular when a wide energy range is considered.

It was the important new step by Trebst et al. [6] to look systematically at the flow in energy space in simulations. Instead of monitoring the histogram  $H(E)$ , corresponding to the stationary distribution, they added a label to the system and changed its value whenever it reached minimal and maximal values in the energy, i.e.  $E_{min}$  and  $E_{max}$ . By counting just these labels at each energy  $E$ , the distributions of systems moving up and down in energy, denoted by  $n_{up}(E)$  and  $n_{down}(E)$ , respectively, can be monitored. The original histogram is recovered from  $H(E) = n_{up}(E) + n_{down}(E)$ . However, in this way it is also possible to measure the fraction of systems moving up,

$$f_{up}(E) = \frac{n_{up}(E)}{n_{up}(E) + n_{down}(E)} \quad (11)$$

and, correspondingly, that of systems moving down in energy,  $f_{down}(E)$ . Note that  $f_{up}(E) + f_{down}(E) = 1$ . Both distributions actually are the stationary distributions of probability flow in the systems with boundary conditions  $f_{up}(E_{min}) = 1$ ,  $f_{up}(E_{max}) = 0$  and  $f_{down}(E_{min}) = 0$ ,  $f_{down}(E_{max}) = 1$ , respectively.

This flow in energy space can now be analyzed also using the above Fokker Planck equations. Note that

Eqs. (8, 10) are actually continuity equations for the probability flow,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(E, t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial E} J(E, t) \quad , \quad (12)$$

with  $J(E, t)$  the probability current. The current between  $E_{min}$  and  $E_{max}$  can now be determined as the stationary solution of (12),

$$J = \left[ D(E) P_0(E) \frac{\partial}{\partial E} P_0(E)^{-1} \right] P_J(E) \equiv \text{const} \quad , \quad (13)$$

with  $P_J(E)$  being the stationary distribution for the flow under the above boundary conditions. Note that the stationary distribution  $P_0(E)$  discussed before is actually the solution for zero flow! Integrating that equation we obtain

$$\frac{P_J(E)}{P_0(E)} - \frac{P_J(E_{min})}{P_0(E_{min})} = J \int_{E_{min}}^E dE' \frac{1}{D(E') P_0(E')} \quad (14)$$

Using any of the above boundary conditions the total flow across energy space is then given by

$$|J| = \left\langle [D(E) P_0(E)]^{-1} \right\rangle^{-1} \quad (15)$$

where we used the notation  $\langle . \rangle = \int_{E_{min}}^{E_{max}} dE$ .

In order to optimize the weight function  $w(E)$  used for the simulation to reach maximal flow across energy space, Trebst et al. maximized Eq. (15) under the constraint of keeping the distribution  $P_0(E)$  normalized, which is done by adding a Lagrange multiplier

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta P_0(E)} \left[ \left\langle [D(E) P_0(E)]^{-1} \right\rangle^{-1} + \lambda \langle P_0(E) \rangle \right] = 0 \quad (16)$$

Optimizing another measure for flow across energy space leads to a similar equation. The mean first passage time is the average time a particle starting at one end of a diffusion space needs to reach the other end for the first time [19]. The total mean first passage time for crossing energy space from  $E_{min}$  to  $E_{max}$  in both directions,

$$\tau = \tau(E_{min} \rightarrow E_{max}) + \tau(E_{max} \rightarrow E_{min}) \quad (17)$$

can be derived from Eqs (8,10) and is given by [20]

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= \int_{E_{min}}^{E_{max}} dE \frac{1}{D(E) P_0(E)} \int_{E_{min}}^E dE' P_0(E') + \\ &\int_{E_{min}}^{E_{max}} dE \frac{1}{D(E) P_0(E)} \int_E^{E_{max}} dE' P_0(E') \\ &= \left\langle [D(E) P_0(E)]^{-1} \right\rangle \langle P_0(E) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Note that  $P_0(E)$  actually does not have to be normalized here. Minimization of  $\tau$  with respect to  $P_0(E)$  leads to

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta P_0(E)} \left[ \left\langle [D(E)P_0(E)]^{-1} \right\rangle \langle P_0(E) \rangle \right] = 0 \quad (19)$$

Note that both equations, (16) and (19), lead to the same solution

$$P_{0,opt} \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{D(E)}} \quad , \quad (20)$$

which was already derived in [6] from Eq. (16). This current-optimized stationary distribution leads to an interesting symmetric form of the Fokker Planck equation,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(E, t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial E} \sqrt{D(E)} \frac{\partial}{\partial E} \sqrt{D(E)} \right] P(E, t) \quad . \quad (21)$$

In order to reach such a current optimized histogram,  $H_{opt}(E)$ , in an actual simulation, the weight function has to be chosen accordingly. In order to do that it is necessary to obtain the local diffusion coefficient from a simulation using some initial weight function  $w(E)$ . Differentiating Eq. (14),  $D(E)$  can be obtained from

$$D(E) = \left[ P_0(E) \frac{d}{dE} \frac{P_J(E)}{P_0(E)} \right]^{-1} = [H(E)f'(E)]^{-1} \quad (22)$$

where the we used the fact that

$$f(E) = \frac{P_J(E)}{P_0(E)} \quad (23)$$

holds. Note that both,  $f_{up}(E)$  as well as  $f_{down}(E)$  can be used for that purpose. However, practically some smoothening may have to be performed for the obtaining a smooth derivative, as discussed in [6]. Since  $P_{0,opt}(E) = n(E)w_{opt}(E)$ , as discussed above, the optimized weight function is given by

$$w_{opt}(E) = \frac{1}{n(E)\sqrt{D(E)}} \quad . \quad (24)$$

Using the fact that  $n(E)$  is obtained from the actual simulation by  $n(E) = H(E)/w(E)$ , we arrive at the iteration formula

$$w_{opt}(E) = w(E) \sqrt{\frac{f'(E)}{H(E)}} \quad (25)$$

At the fixed point of this iteration  $f'(E) = H(E)$ , leading to  $H(E) = 1/\sqrt{D(E)}$ , as required.

In an actual simulation situation one iteration might not suffice. This is discussed in detail in [6, 7, 8]. In the following we will attempt to apply the same approach to tempering simulations.

### III. PARALLEL TEMPERING

Generalized ensemble sampling can be extended by adding movement in *control parameter space*. In addition to moves among different states of the system at a particular value of the control parameter, moves along one or more control parameter directions are possible. The motivation behind such an extension is that relaxation in some control parameter regime is faster, thereby facilitating relaxation in the whole *state + control parameter space* [3]

Usually, the motion along control parameter directions is not made continuous. Instead, a list of monotonically increasing values is chosen, thereby introducing control parameter hopping. The most commonly used control parameter is temperature, although other choices are possible, too [21]. Simulations at a particular control parameter value are performed using the Metropolis criterion (1) with a weight function  $w(\beta, s)$ , as before. Note that, although Boltzmann weights are usually chosen, leading to canonical simulations at each parameter value, in principle any weight function is possible.

Parallel tempering is the parallelized extension of a method called simulated tempering which we will sketch only briefly. In simulated tempering [22, 23], a single instance of the system is simulated only. After certain times, an attempt is made to change the control parameter value. In order to ensure that the stationary distribution at each control parameter value is given by  $w(\beta, s)$ , the Metropolis criterion

$$p_M [(\beta, s) \rightarrow (\beta', s)] = \min \left( 1, \frac{w(\beta', s)}{w(\beta, s)} \right) \quad (26)$$

is used for the acceptance of a control parameter change. It turned out that in order to ensure appreciable exchange between different control parameter values using Boltzmann weights (2), the weight function has to be adjusted by a control parameter dependent function  $g(\beta)$ ,

$$w(\beta, s) = \exp[-\beta E(s) + g(\beta)] \quad . \quad (27)$$

This function  $g(\beta)$  actually determines the distribution of the single system among the control parameter values and – up to an additive constant – the optimal choice is the free energy  $g(\beta) = \beta F(\beta)$  of the system analyzed [23]. However, the problem of determining  $g(\beta)$  has hampered this approach.

This problem is solved in parallel tempering. Here, copies of the system are simulated in parallel at each of the control parameter values. At certain times *exchanges* of replicas with neighboring control parameter values are attempted. In order to ensure that the stationary distribution at each control parameter value is given by  $w(\beta, s)$ , the generalized Metropolis criterion

$$p_M [(\beta, s) \rightarrow \beta', s'] = \min \left( 1, \frac{w(\beta, s')w(\beta', s)}{w(\beta, s)w(\beta', s')} \right) \quad (28)$$

has to be used for the acceptance of such an attempt. It can be seen easily that any function  $g(\beta)$  in the weight function (27), in particular the one that was necessary to ensure equilibration among control parameter values in simulated tempering, simply drops out in the parallel form. Thereby, the problem of determining the free energy in order to optimize the simulation vanishes. In the case of Boltzmann weights (28) reduces to

$$p_M [(\beta, s) \rightarrow (\beta', s')] = \min [1, \exp(\Delta\beta\Delta E)] \quad (29)$$

with  $\Delta\beta = \beta' - \beta$  and  $\Delta E = E' - E$ .

We will concentrate on temperature hopping in the following and choose the list of inverse temperatures  $\beta_0 > \beta_1 > \dots > \beta_N$ . In a parallelized implementation simulations at a particular value  $\beta_n$  are usually run on

a particular node of the parallel computer, conveniently labeled  $n$ . In order to simplify the notation, we will therefore abbreviate  $\beta_n$  by  $n$  whenever possible and also use "node" synonymously with "control parameter value".

It is sufficient to follow only a single replica through state and control parameter space, since all replicas are equivalent. For times between replica exchanges, simulations are performed at each node independently, and the time evolution of the distribution function  $P [(\beta_n, s), t]$  at a particular node  $n$  is described by the Master equation (3) with the respective transition probabilities determined by the appropriate temperature  $\beta_n$ . For times  $t = mT$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , replica exchange is attempted. For this time step the Master equation in state and temperature space is

---


$$P [(\beta_n, s), t + 1] = \sum_{s'} \{P [(\beta_{n-1}, s'), t] W_s [(\beta_{n-1}, s') \rightarrow (\beta_n, s)] + P [(\beta_{n+1}, s'), t] W_s [(\beta_{n+1}, s') \rightarrow (\beta_n, s)]\} + P [(\beta_n, s), t] \sum_{s'} \{1 - W_s [(\beta_n, s) \rightarrow (\beta_{n-1}, s')] - W_s [(\beta_n, s) \rightarrow (\beta_{n+1}, s')]\} \quad (30)$$

The transition probabilities are given by

$$W_s [(\beta, s) \rightarrow (\beta', s')] = \frac{1}{\Omega N} p_M [(\beta, s) \rightarrow (\beta', s')] \quad \text{for } s \neq s' \quad ,$$

$$W_s (s \rightarrow s) = 1 - \sum_{s' \neq s} W (s \rightarrow s') \quad . \quad (31)$$

where  $\Omega$  is the normalization by state space and  $N$  takes into account that just for one random neighboring pair of nodes a replica exchange is attempted. Due to the exchange of replicas in parallel tempering the transition probabilities are symmetric, i.e.

$$W_s [(\beta, s) \rightarrow (\beta', s')] = W_s [(\beta', s') \rightarrow (\beta, s)] \quad . \quad (32)$$

Elimination of fast degrees of freedom orthogonal to the energy is possible. This leaves us with

$$P [(\beta_n, E), t + 1] = \sum_{E'} \{P [(\beta_{n-1}, E'), t] W_E [(\beta_{n-1}, E') \rightarrow (\beta_n, E)] + P [(\beta_{n+1}, E'), t] W_E [(\beta_{n+1}, E') \rightarrow (\beta_n, E)]\} + P [(\beta_n, E), t] \sum_{E'} \{1 - W_E [(\beta_n, E) \rightarrow (\beta_{n-1}, E')] - W_E [(\beta_n, E) \rightarrow (\beta_{n+1}, E')]\} \quad (33)$$

The symmetry (32) leads to

$$W_E [(\beta, E) \rightarrow (\beta', E')] = W_E [(\beta', E') \rightarrow (\beta, E)] \quad . \quad (34)$$

In order to finally derive an effective Master equation for hopping in temperature space, we have to additionally assume fast relaxation in energy space, i.e. on times scales  $t < T$ . This means that at any particular node we assume to have reached the respective equilibrated distribution  $P_0(\beta, E)$ . From these distributions effective transition probabilities can be derived,

$$W(\beta \rightarrow \beta') = \int dE \int dE' P_0(\beta, E) p_M [(E, \beta) \rightarrow (E', \beta')] P_0(\beta', E') \quad . \quad (35)$$

We will discuss in the Appendix the properties of these effective transition probabilities in particular situations. This last approximation leads to the final form of the Master equation in temperature space on a coarse grained time scale  $t \rightarrow t/TN$ ,

$$P(\beta_n, t + 1) = P(\beta_{n-1}, t) W_\beta(\beta_{n-1} \rightarrow \beta) + P(\beta_{n+1}, t) W_\beta(\beta_{n+1} \rightarrow \beta) - P(\beta_n, t) [1 - W_\beta(\beta \rightarrow \beta_{n-1}) - W_\beta(\beta \rightarrow \beta_{n+1})] \quad (36)$$

The property  $W_\beta(\beta \rightarrow \beta') = W_\beta(\beta' \rightarrow \beta)$  holds analogously to the above. Due to this last property, the stationary distribution for PT can be derived easily from Eq. (36) and is given simply by

$$P_0(\beta) = \text{const} \quad , \quad (37)$$

i.e. in an equilibrated simulation every single replica appears on each control parameter node with the same probability,  $1/(N+1)$  with  $N+1$  being the number of nodes. This result is an important simplification of the situation over the case of simulated annealing and over GE, and is due to the construction of replica exchange.

Flow between the control parameter nodes can now be analysed, too. Here, replicas reaching node 0 or  $N$  are labelled and the respective distributions over the nodes can be monitored. Using the same notation as before,  $n_{up}(i)$  being the number of replicas at node  $i$  that came from node 0, and  $n_{down}(i)$  being the number of replicas at node  $i$  that came from node  $N$ , we can measure the fraction of replicas moving up

$$f_{up}(i) = \frac{n_{up}(i)}{n_{up}(i) + n_{down}(i)} \quad , \quad (38)$$

and a corresponding quantity for those moving down,  $f_{down}(i)$ . Both distributions are stationary distributions of probability flow between temperature nodes with boundary conditions  $f_{up}(0) = 1, f_{up}(N) = 0$  and  $f_{down}(0) = 0, f_{down}(N) = 1$ , respectively. As before, they can be analyzed by looking at the stationary solution of the underlying stochastic equation (36). It can be written as

$$P(\beta_n, t+1) - P(\beta_n, t) = J(\beta_n, t) - J(\beta_{n-1}, t) \quad (39)$$

which is the discrete form of the continuity equation (12). The discrete case current  $J(\beta_n, t)$  is given by

$$J(\beta_n, t) = P(\beta_{n+1}, t)W_\beta(\beta_{n+1} \rightarrow \beta_n) - P(\beta_n, t)W_\beta(\beta_n \rightarrow \beta_{n+1}) \quad . \quad (40)$$

Consequently, the stationary current  $J$  is determined from

$$\begin{aligned} J &= P_J(\beta_{n+1})W_\beta(\beta_{n+1} \rightarrow \beta_n) - \\ &P_J(\beta_n)W_\beta(\beta_n \rightarrow \beta_{n+1}) \\ &= \text{const} \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

with  $P_J(\beta_n)$  being the stationary distribution for flow under the above boundary conditions. Taking into account the symmetry properties of the transition probabilities, the stationary distribution for constant current between nodes  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_N$  is given by

$$P_J(\beta_n) = J^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{W_\beta(\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_{i+1})} \quad (42)$$

with the current

$$J = \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{W_\beta(\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_{i+1})} \right]^{-1} \quad (43)$$

Due to simple form of the stationary distribution among nodes (37), the analytic forms for  $P_J(i)$  and  $J$  are considerably simple than for GE.

We can now analyze the total mean first passage time to cross the network of nodes. For the general hopping process (36), this is given by [14, 15]

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= \tau(0 \rightarrow N) + \tau(N \rightarrow 0) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{P_0(\beta_i)W_\beta(\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_{i+1})} \sum_{j=0}^i P_0(\beta_j) + \\ &\quad \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{P_0(\beta_i)W_\beta(\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_{i-1})} \sum_{j=i}^N P_0(\beta_j) \\ &= \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{P_0(\beta_i)W_\beta(\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_{i+1})} \right) \left( \sum_{i=0}^N P_0(\beta_i) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

This final result is practically a discrete version of Eq. (18). Taking into account that the stationary distribution in PT is constant, we finally obtain a result that is just the inverse of Eq. (43),

$$\tau = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{W_\beta(\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_{i+1})} \quad . \quad (45)$$

Here is an important difference to GE. There the local diffusion coefficient was fixed by the move set and - as it turned out in actual simulations - mostly independent from the chosen weight function. The stationary distribution, however, was free to be chosen by varying the weight function.

In the case of PT this is exactly the opposite. Here the stationary distribution is fixed by construction of the replica exchange process. However, by adjusting the control parameter intervals, the transition probabilities can be chosen relatively freely. Hence, we are interested in obtaining the optimal distribution of transition probabilities that maximizes the flow across the control parameter space. Since we are mainly interested in local variations of the optimized transition probabilities, i.e. in deviations from an average value (that will be actually determined afterwards), we keep the average transition probability constant via a Lagrangian multiplier, i.e.

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta W_\beta(j \rightarrow j+1)} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{W_\beta(\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_{i+1})} \right)^{-1} + \lambda \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} W_\beta(\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_{i+1}) \right] = 0 \quad (46)$$

An equivalent equation results for  $\tau$ .

It is easily seen that optimizing the current as well as the mean first passage time simply gives a constant transition probability between neighboring nodes the whole range of control parameter values,

$$W^{opt} = \text{const} \quad (47)$$




FIG. 1: Sketch of state space for generalized ensemble sampling (GE) in the case of broken ergodicity;  $X$  denotes any degree of freedom orthogonal to the control parameter (energy).

as optimal solution. Consequently, from (42) we can conclude that the optimal flow distribution among the nodes is linear in the node number.

$$P_J(\beta_n) = n/N \quad . \quad (48)$$

Therefore, the goal of an optimal temperature spacing is to obtain such a flow distribution and constant transition probabilities in an actual simulation

We note that these qualitative results were obtained for PT in [7] by mapping PT onto GE and assuming a particular temperature dependence for the local diffusion coefficient. Here however, we see that it follows directly from the hopping-description of PT.

#### IV. DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

The goal of most recent advances in Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling is to analyze and increase the flow through state space. To do so, heuristic equations have been used to describe the flow in reduced state space along a slow order parameter, e.g. the energy, in generalized ensemble sampling (GE) and among nodes performing simulations at various control parameter values in parallel tempering (PT) [6, 7, 8].

In this contribution we have derived such one-dimensional stochastic equations for GE and PT sampling from the underlying Master equations. Using these stochastic equations, weight functions for GE and strategies for finding optimal control parameter values for PT can be devised that optimize the flow through order parameter and control parameter space, respectively. We have also demonstrated that optimization of flow is




FIG. 2: Sketch of bi- and multi-furcations in the case broken ergodicity for parallel tempering (PT); for certain nodes the system partitions into several disjoint free energy wells.

equivalent to minimizing the first passage time to cross the system.

All considerations in the previous sections were based on the assumptions that the Fokker-Planck (8) or hopping (36) equations give a fairly accurate description of the reduced dynamics. That, however, is true only if the approximations discussed there apply.

In the case of GE these approximations are that relaxations in the degrees of freedom orthogonal to the energy are fast, together with the locality of moves. Since the ultimate goal of deriving Eq (8) is the optimization of flow through state space, a violation of the latter condition is not detrimental. Non-locality in the energy of the move set usually leads to faster relaxation since state space is connected more densely. This is for example one reason for the success of the Swendsen-Wang algorithm [24]. Although in such a situation Eq. (8) may not be able to capture the full dynamics correctly, it nevertheless is still able to identify some local bottlenecks. Optimizing the flow according to the methods discussed can handle these local bottlenecks in the transition between neighboring energy values.

However, slow relaxation orthogonal to the energy leads to a more complicated situation. Now it may not be possible anymore to practically reach all values of the orthogonal coordinate by moves local in the energy. Instead, detours via other - usually high energy - areas of the state space have to be performed. This leads to the comb-like structure of the accessible state space sketched in Fig. 1. It reflects disconnected free energy basins at constant energy.

Now it is actually this feature of state space partitioning that lead us to the requirement of large flow between low and high energy areas of the state space in the first

place. Only for a large flow the "teeth" of the comb-like structure in Fig. 1 can be sampled adequately. Nevertheless, it also leads to the situation that the effective one-dimensional Fokker-Planck equation (8) is only the best Markovian one-dimensional approximation of an underlying effectively higher-dimensional process.

This effect is even clearer in the case of PT. If the relaxation at a particular control parameter value is faster than the time scale of hopping in control parameter space, then the requirements for the analysis performed in the previous section are fulfilled. However, if that is not the case the state space at such a node partitions into disjoint free energy basins that do not communicate practically. Viewed over the whole control parameter range, we are actually dealing with a hierarchical network of free energy basins as sketched in Fig 2. Such a situation has been aptly termed *broken ergodicity* [25, 26] and was discussed in the field of glassy dynamics several years ago.

In principle, the topology of the tree-like control+state space depends on the time scale of the control parameter hopping. If relaxation is possible at all nodes, then no bifurcations occur and the system is just a one-dimensional hopping chain as it was analyzed in the previous section. However, this is true only in the limit of infinite time between replica exchange steps,  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Practically, the topology will be the same over a wide range of time scales and only the position of the branching nodes may vary.

For a truly one-dimensional system the optimized transition probabilities are constant and – equivalently – the optimal flow stationary distribution is  $f(n) \propto n$ . Under conditions of broken ergodicity, this equivalence will no longer hold. Nevertheless, we believe an advantage of PT in particular is that such situations can be ana-

lyzed directly, without resorting to an actual system. In a way, it will be possible to *simulate the simulations* to investigate possible flow behaviors. By analyzing the Master equations modelling the hierarchical broken ergodicity networks, conclusions about the behavior of actual simulations can be drawn [27] Thereby, the present results open the way to investigate the effects of broken ergodicity in GE and PT in a more systematic way.

### Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to thank P. Grassberger for a critical reading of the manuscript. This research was supported by NSF-grant No. CHE-0313618.

### APPENDIX A: TRANSITION PROBABILITIES FOR PARALLEL TEMPERING

In GE, a general analysis of the effective transition probabilities  $W(E \rightarrow E')$  is not easy since they depend strongly on the – usually unknown – distributions orthogonal to the energy, combined with a possibly sparse move set. In contrast to GE, PT allows more insight into the effective transition probabilities that govern the temperature hopping. Since transitions are possible between any energy values, the complications due to a particular sparse move set do not arise. The only requirement is the assumption of equilibration at each temperature. In this limit, we can calculate the effective transition probability by

$$W(\beta \rightarrow \beta') = \int dE \int dE' P_0(\beta, E) p_M [(E, \beta) \rightarrow (E', \beta')] P_0(\beta', E') \quad (\text{A1})$$

with  $P_0(\beta, E)$  being the equilibrated distribution at  $\beta$  and  $p_M$  given by Eq. (28).

There have been several approaches to evaluate that formula. Predescu et al. [29] and Kofke [30] emphasize the importance of taking into account the asymmetry of an actual distribution, having a low energy cutoff and an exponential tail at high energies. Nevertheless, Kone and Kofke [31] later use an approximation based on the Gaussian assumption together with the assumption of constant specific heat over the entire range. All authors limit themselves to unimodal distributions in their analysis and do not question the peak is quadratic in  $E$ .

However, the distributions change dramatically at critical values of the control parameter, i.e. at first and second order phase transitions. While at second order phase transitions the functional form of the peak changes from quadratic to quartic, at first order phase transitions

the energy distributions become bimodal. On the other hand, since the goal is anyhow to optimize the transition probabilities, one should try to avoid control parameter intervals so large that the explicit structure of the tails become relevant. Moreover, Eq. (A1) is anyhow only valid in the limit of fast relaxation at a node. So it is from the outset only an approximation to the actually observed transition rate. Since, in order to optimize the flow, large values of the transition probabilities are sought for, a quantitative analysis makes sense only for the cases where the overlap is appreciable, i.e. for small temperature differences.

We therefore add here our approach to evaluate (A1) using the first order approximations to these distribu-



tions, i.e. Gaussians,

$$P_0(\beta, E) \propto \exp \left[ -\frac{[E - \overline{E}(\beta)]^2}{2\sigma^2(\beta)} \right] \quad (\text{A2})$$

with  $\overline{E}(\beta)$  the average energy and  $\sigma^2(\beta) = \overline{[E - \overline{E}(\beta)]^2}$  the energy fluctuations at  $\beta$ .

Assuming  $\beta < \beta'$  and using step function approximations of the error functions that result from the inner integrals and a symmetric evaluation we get

$$W(\beta \rightarrow \beta') \approx \frac{1}{4} \exp \left[ \Delta\beta \Delta E + \frac{1}{2} \Delta\beta^2 (\sigma + \sigma') \right] \left[ 2 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{\Delta E + \Delta\beta(\sigma^2 + \sigma'^2)}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{\Delta E + \Delta\beta(\sigma^2 + \sigma'^2)}{\sqrt{2}\sigma'} \right) \right] + \frac{1}{4} \left[ \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) + \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\sqrt{2}\sigma'} \right) \right] \quad (\text{A3})$$

where we have used the abbreviations  $\Delta\beta = \beta - \beta'$  and  $\Delta E = \overline{E}(\beta) - \overline{E}(\beta')$ .

We can now employ the fact that the specific heat is given by

$$c = \frac{d}{dT} \overline{E}(T) = -\beta^2 \frac{d}{d\beta} \overline{E}(\beta) \quad (\text{A4})$$

as well as by

$$c = \beta^2 \overline{[E - \overline{E}(\beta)]^2} = \beta^2 \sigma^2(\beta) \quad (\text{A5})$$

to obtain a relationship between the derivative of the average energy and the energy fluctuations

$$-\frac{d}{d\beta} \overline{E}(\beta) = \overline{[E - \overline{E}(\beta)]^2} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Using

$$\overline{E}'(\beta) \equiv \frac{d}{d\beta} \overline{E}(\beta) = -\sigma^2(\beta) \quad (\text{A7})$$

this relation can be employed to approximate the difference of the average energies by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E &= \overline{E}(\beta) - \overline{E}(\beta') \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2} \left( \overline{E}'(\beta) + \overline{E}'(\beta') \right) \Delta\beta \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} (\sigma^2 + \sigma'^2) \Delta\beta \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

Note that we have assumed  $\beta < \beta'$ , i.e.  $\Delta\beta < 0$  and, consequently,  $\Delta E > 0$  in the evaluation of Eq. (A1). This result shows that the exponent in Eq. (A3) cancels and, using  $\operatorname{erf}(-x) = -\operatorname{erf}(x)$ , we have the final approximate expression for the transition probability

$$\begin{aligned} W(\beta \rightarrow \beta') &\approx \frac{1}{2} \left[ \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) + \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\sqrt{2}\sigma'} \right) \right] \\ &= \left[ \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{|\Delta\beta|(\sigma^2 + \sigma'^2)}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) + \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{|\Delta\beta|(\sigma^2 + \sigma'^2)}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma'} \right) \right] \quad (\text{A9}) \end{aligned}$$

For small values of  $\Delta E/\sigma^2$  this can be further approximated to

$$\begin{aligned} W(\beta \rightarrow \beta') &\approx 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} + \frac{\Delta E}{\sqrt{2}\sigma'} \right) + \\ &\frac{1}{6\sqrt{2\pi}} \left[ \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right)^3 + \left( \frac{\Delta E}{\sqrt{2}\sigma'} \right)^3 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

- [1] U.H.E. Hansmann and Y. Okamoto, *Phys. Rev. E* **56**, 2228 (1997).  
 [2] B.A. Berg, *J. Stat. Phys.* **82** (1996)  
 [3] C.J. Geyer and A. Thompson, *J. Am. Stat. Ass.* **90** 909 (1995).  
 [4] K. Hukushima and K. Nemoto, *J. Phys. Soc. (Jpn.)* **65**, 1604 (1996).

- [5] U.H.E. Hansmann, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **281**, 140 (1997).  
 [6] S. Trebst, D.A. Huse, and M. Troyer, *Phys. Rev E* **70**, 046701 (2004).  
 [7] S. Trebst, M. Troyer, and U.H.E. Hansmann, *Optimized Parallel Tempering Simulations of Proteins*, *J. Chem. Phys.* **124**, 174903 (2006).  
 [8] S. Trebst, D.A. Huse, E. Gull, H.G. Katzgraber, U.H.E.

- Hansmanns and M. Troyer, *Ensemble optimization techniques for the simulation of slowly equilibrating systems*, to appear in the proceedings of the 19th annual workshop "Recent Developments in Computer Simulation Studies in Condensed Matter Physics", Athens, GA, Feb 20-24, 2006.
- [9] Metropolis, N., Rosenbluth, A., Rosenbluth, M., Teller, A., and Teller, E., *J. Chem. Phys.* **21** (1953) 1087–1092.
- [10] P. Diaconis, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **93**, 1659 (1996).
- [11] P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste, *J. Comp. Sys. Sci.* **57** 20 (1998).
- [12] L.J. Billera and P. Diaconis, *Stat. Sci.* **16** 335 (2001).
- [13] P. Diaconis and J.W. Neuberger, *Exp. Math.* **13**, 207 (2004).
- [14] C. W. Gardiner, *Handbook of Stochastic Methods for Physics, Chemistry and the Natural Sciences* 3rd ed., (Springer, Berlin, 1985);
- [15] N.G. van Kampen, *Stochastic processes in physics and chemistry*, North Holland (1981);
- [16] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation : Methods of Solutions and Applications (Springer Series in Synergetics)* (Berlin, Springer, 1996, 2nd ed.).
- [17] B.A. Berg, T. Neuhaus, *Phys. Lett. B* **267**, 249, (1991).
- [18] F. Wang, D.P. Landau, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 2050, (2001).
- [19] S. Redner, *A Guide to First-Passage Processes* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- [20] Schulten, K., Schulten, Z., & Szabo, A. (1981) *J. Chem. Physics* **74**, 4426-4432
- [21] W. Kwak and U.H.E. Hansmann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95** 138102 (2005).
- [22] M. Lubartsev and V. Vorontzov, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **96**, 1776, (1992)
- [23] E. Marinari, R. Parisi, *Europhys. Lett.*, **69**, 2292, (1992)
- [24] R. H. Swendsen and J.-S. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 86 (1987).
- [25] R. Palmer, *Adv. Phys.* **31**, 669-736 (1982).
- [26] D.L. Stein C.M. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **51**, 5228-5238 (1995)
- [27] W. Nadler and U.H.E. Hansmann, manuscript in preparation.
- [28] P. Dayal et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 097201 (2004).
- [29] C. Predescu, M. Predescu, and C. Ciabanu, *J. Chem. Phys.* **120**, 4119 (2004).
- [30] D.A. Kofke, *J. Chem. Phys.* **117**, 6911 (2004).
- [31] A. Kone and D.A. Kofke, *J. Chem. Phys.* **122**, 206101 (2005).