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#### Abstract

A $n$ optim ized $m$ ethod for estim ating path-ensem ble averages using data from processes driven in opposite directions is presented. B ased on th is estim ator, bidirectionalexp ressions for reconstructing free energies and potentials ofm ean force from single-m olecule force spectroscopy $\mid$ valid for biasing potentials of arbitrary sti ness| are developed. N um ericalsim ulations on a m odelpotentialindicate that these $m$ ethods perform better than unidirectional strategies.


C rooks' path-ensemble average theorem (Eq. (1) encom passes a set of exact results in nonequilibrium statisticalm echanics pertinent to system $s$ driven from therm al equilibrium by a tim e-dependent extemal potential [1]. These include Jarzynski's equality [2] and the $C$ rooks uctuation theorem [3], which relate equilibrium free energy di erences to the nonequilibrium work distribution, as well as rew eighting relations that allow one to recover arbitrary equilibrium ensemble averages from $m$ easure$m$ ents of driven nonequilibrium processes [1]. Because of the intim ate connection betw een such processes and m olecular force spectroscopy, these theorem s have been widely invoked to extract free energies and potentials of $m$ ean force (PM Fs) from single-m olecule pulling experi$m$ ents [4, $5,6,7,8]$.

W hile form ally correct, the practical utility of these relations is lim ited by the presence of exponential averages of the work, which are dom inated by rare events and therefore have notoriously slow convergence properties [9]. In order to im prove their convergence, strategies such as w ork-w eighted tra jectory sam pling [10, 11, 12, 13] have been proposed. H ere we suggest another $m$ ethod to accelerate the convergence of these averages: including trajectories from the reverse process in the forw ard path-ensem ble. $T$ his is $m$ otivated in part by the observation that the exponential average of the work in the forw ard process is dom inated by those rare tra jectories that resem ble tim e-reversed counterparts (\con jugate tw ins") of typical trajectories generated by the reverse protocol [14]. Thus, our goals are to construct optim ized forw ard path-ensem ble average estim ators that explicitly include such trajectories, and apply them to the problem of estim ating free energies and potentials of $m$ ean force from single-m olecule pulling experim ents.

The starting point of our analysis is Crooks' pathensem ble average theorem, which relates the forw ard average of an arbitrary functional $F=F$ [ ] of the phase space trajectory $=f q(t) ; p(t) g$ to its work-w eighted average in the reverse process, nam ely [1]

$$
\begin{equation*}
h F i_{F}=\hat{F e}(\mathbb{F}+F)_{R}^{E}: \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the above, the forw ard average $h:: i_{F}$ is an average over all traj jectories (path-ensem ble average) generated in the forw ard process, wherein an extemal param eter
(e.g. the position of a harm onic trap in a single-m olecule pulling experim ent) is driven from the value $A$ to $B$ in units of tim e after equilibration at $A$, while h:: $: i_{R}$ is a sim ilarly de ned average in the reverse direction, from B to A. The total work W [ ] accum ulated up to the nal time is de ned in term s of the tim e-dependent Ham iltonian $H=H(q(t) ; p(t) ; t)$ as $W=0(@ H=@ t) d t$, while $F=F_{B} \quad F_{A}$ is the free energy di erence betw een the equilibrium states corresponding to the endpoints A and B. Finally, the notation $\hat{F^{\prime}} \quad F[\hat{\jmath}]$ is a shorthand for the value of the functional when evaluated over the tim e-reversalof , viz. ${ }^{\wedge}=\mathrm{fq}(\mathrm{t})$; $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{g}$.

By choosing $\mathrm{F}\left[{ }^{0}\right]=\left[\quad{ }^{0}\right]$ in Eq. (1) and using the property $\mathrm{W}[\hat{\jmath}]=\mathrm{W}$ [ ], one obtains an identity betw een the distribution oftra jectories in the tw o directions [1, 15],

$$
\begin{equation*}
F()=e^{(\mathbb{W} \quad F)} R(\hat{\gamma}) ; \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $_{F}()$ and $R_{( }()$are the probabilities of observing a particular trajectory in the forw ard and reverse processes, respectively. This result o ers a m eans of achieving the aforem entioned goal | trajectories from the reverse process can indeed be included in the forw ard pathensem ble when their density is rew eighted by e (w) ${ }^{(W)}$. O ur next goal is to optim ally com bine direct estim ates of ${ }_{F}()$ from forw ard processes $w$ th indirect estim ates obtained from $R$ ( ) via Eq. (2) ; this w ill.be done w ith the weighted histogram analysis m ethod (W HAM) [16, 17].

The objective of W HAM is to nd an optim al (i.e. least variance) estim ator for a desired probability distribution from a series of independent estim ates of biased distributions, where \biased" here $m$ eans that the distribution of interest is related to the rem aining ones by a sim ple rew eighting factor. To be speci c, given a series of norm alized distributions ${ }_{i}^{b}(x)$ of a random variable $x$, $w$ ith $i=1 ;::: ; M$, and $M$ unbiasing relations of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\mathrm{x})=\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{x}){\underset{i}{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{x}) ; ~}^{\mathrm{b}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $(x)$ is the distribution of interest and $f_{i}(x)$ is the unbiasing factor for the i-th distribution, the W HAM strategy seeks a linear com bination of M independent estim ates of ( $x$ ) obtained from the $m$ easured biased distributions ${\underset{i}{b}(x) \text { via Eq. (3) , such that its variance }{ }^{2}[(x)]}^{2}$
is m in im ized. T his results in [16, 17]

$$
\begin{equation*}
(x)=\frac{P_{i=1}^{M} n_{i} \sum_{i}^{b}(x)}{M=1} n_{i}^{M} f_{i}^{1}(x), \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $n_{i}$ is the num ber of sam ples in the estim ate of the i-th distribution. (For notational sim plicity, here we do not distinguish the exact distribution and its sam ple esti$m$ ate). Applied to the problem ofestim ating $F()$ from
$n_{F}$ forw ard and $n_{R}$ reverse tra jectories, Eqs. (2)-(4) give an optim ized estim ator for the forw ard probability distribution of trajectories in term $s$ of the $m$ easured forw ard and reverse densities:

$$
\begin{equation*}
F()=\frac{n_{F}()+n_{R}(\hat{)})}{n_{F}+n_{R} e^{(W)}}: \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e are now ready to derive the $m$ ain results of our paper. Taking the average of $F$ [ ] using the optim ized density from Eq. (5), we obtain the follow ing estim ator for the forw ard path-ensem ble average of $F$ :
where in the last average w e have again used the property that the totalw ork is odd under tim e-reversal. (A $n$ analogous expression for the reverse path-ensem ble can be obtained by sw itching the de nitions of forw ard and reverse.) This general result form $s$ the basis of our bidirectionalm ethod, and di erent applications can be obtained with suitable choices of $F$.

O ur rst exam ple is concemed w ith free energy di erences, where we choose $F_{b}=e^{W}{ }_{0}^{t}$, with $W_{a}^{b}=W_{a}^{b}[]$ de ned as the partial w ork betw een tim es a and b along the tra jectory, i.e. $W \underset{a}{b} \quad{ }_{a}^{R_{b}}(@ H=@ t) d t$. (N ote that, according to this notation, the total work $W$ coincides with $\left.W_{0}\right)$. Invoking Jarzynski's equality e ${ }^{\left(F_{t_{A}} F_{A}\right)}=$ he $W_{0}^{t} i_{F}$ for the lh .s. of Eq. (6), this choige of F gives
where $F_{t}=F_{t} \quad F_{A}$ is the free energy di erence between the equilibrium states de ned by the $H$ am iltonians $H(q ; p ; t)$ and $H(q ; p ; 0)$, and in the last average we have used the property $W{ }_{0}^{t}[\hat{]}=W \quad t[]$. For the particular cases where $t=0$ or $t=$, this result can be rearranged to yield the Bennett A coeptance $R$ atio (BAR) form ula for $F$ [18], as generalized to nonequilibrium processes by $C$ rooks [1] (for a multistate extension, see [19]). The above equation further generalizes BAR to estim ate interm ediate free energy di erences $F t$. Operationally, when estim ating an interm ediate free energy di erence, we m ust rst estim ate $F$ to use in the rh.s. of Eq. (7). This can be accom plished w th BAR, which has been shown to be a m axim um likelihood estim ator of F [20].

Free energy di erences can also be estim ated using a cum ulant expansion of Jarzynski's equality [6]. In order to analyze bidirectionaldata $w$ ith this approach, one should apply Eq. (6) to estim atem om ents of the w ork distribution, choosing $F=W^{n}$. This is $m$ ore rigorous than a $m$ ethod which applies the $C$ rooks uctuation theorem betw een states which are not in equilibrium [21]. A bidirectionalestim ator for the energetic contribution to $\mathrm{F} t_{t}$ can be obtained by choosing $\left.F=H(q ; p ; t) e^{(w)} \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)$ in Eq. (6). This results in the average energy at tim e $t$, as was show $n$ in the unidirectional case [22].

In the context of single-m olecule pulling experim ents, the system is typically driven out of equilibrium by a tim e-dependent potential $V_{t}=V\left(z_{t} ; t\right)$ acting on a collective coordinate $\mathrm{z}_{\mathrm{t}}=\mathrm{z}(\mathrm{q}(\mathrm{t})$ ) (e.g. the end-to-end distance of a protein) such that the total Ham iltonian is $H=H_{0}+V_{t}$, where $H_{0}$ is the (tim e-independent) $H$ am il-
tonian in the absence of the extemalperturbation. In this case, the free energy di erence $F$ t involves the equilibrium states of the system corresponding to the potential at $V_{t}$ and $V_{0}$. H ow ever, one is often $m$ ore interested in the potential of $m$ ean force $G_{0}(z)$ of the unperturbed H am iltonian, i.e. in the e ective potential dictating the equilibrium distribution of $z$-values in the absence of the extemal potential. A though in the lim it of su ciently sti potentials the free energy di erence approaches the PMF [6], this approxim ation fails for soft springs [23] such as those used in optical tw eezer experim ents [7], in $w$ hich case one should use $m$ ore rigorous $m$ ethods. O ne approach starts from the observation that the equilibrium distribution of $z$-values in the absence of the extemal potential (i.e. the unbiased distribution) is given by $0(z)=C^{1} e^{v(z, t)} h\left(\begin{array}{ll}z & \left.z_{t}\right) e^{w} 0^{t} i_{F} \text { [4, 5], where }\end{array}\right.$ $\left.C=h e{ }^{(W)}{ }_{0}^{t} V_{t}\right) i_{\text {I }}$ is an overallnorm alization constant,
which can be show $n$ to be independent of $t$. $W$ ith this result in $m$ ind, a bidirectionalestim ator for $0(z)$ can be obtained from Eq. (6) by choosing $F=\left(\begin{array}{ll}z & z_{t}\end{array}\right) e^{\mathrm{w}} \stackrel{\mathrm{t}}{0}$. $M$ oreover, since this expression for $0(z)$ is correct for all tim es $t$, di erent estim ates of $0(z)$ can be obtained from di erent tim e-slices during the pulling process, and these can in tum be com bined according to the W HAM prescription (Eqs. (3) and (4) ). Indeed, rew riting the above result for $o(z)$ in the form of Eq. (3), viz.

$$
\begin{equation*}
0(z)=C^{1} e^{[(z ; t)} F_{t]}^{"} \frac{h\left(Z \quad z_{t}\right) e^{W 0_{0}^{t} j_{F}}}{e^{F_{t}}} ; \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the factore $F_{t}=$ he ${ }^{W}{ }_{0}^{t} \dot{I}_{F}$ is introduced to norm alize the distribution in square brackets, one arrives at the Hum m er-Szabo estim ator for 0 ( z ) [4, 5],

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{G O(z)}=\frac{P_{t} h_{p}\left(z \quad z_{t}\right) e^{W} 0_{0}^{t} i_{F} e^{F_{t}}}{\left.t^{[N(z ; t)} F^{F}\right]} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $G_{0}(z) \quad{ }^{1} \ln 0(z)$ is de ned up to an additive constant. The above PM F form alism has been extended to account form ultiple pulling protocols [24] and multiple dim ensions [25].

In order to optim ally include trajectories from the reverse perturbation in Eq. (9) , we choose F $=\left(z \quad z_{t}\right) e^{w}{ }_{0}^{t}$ in Eq. (6) and substitute the ensuing expression for $h\left(\begin{array}{ll}z & z_{t}\end{array}\right) e^{w}{ }_{0}^{t} i_{F}$ in Eq. (9) . This leads to our bidirectional PM F estim ator:
where $F_{t}$ is estim ated via Eq. (7) and $F=F$ via BAR. (As in WHAM, $F t$ can also be estim ated self-consistently by iterative cycles of Eq. (10) and num erically integrating $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}=$ e $\left.{ }^{[G \circ} \circ(z)+v(z ; t)\right] d z={ }^{R}$ e $\left[G \circ\left(z^{0}\right)+v\left(z^{0} ; 0\right)\right] d z^{0}$.) If we switch the de nitions of forw ard and reverse, then $G \circ(z)$ differs by the constant F .

To dem onstrate these results, we perform B rownian dynam ics sim ulations on a one-dim ensional potential whose unperturbed H am iltonian is $\mathrm{H}_{0}(\mathrm{z})=\left(5 \mathrm{z}^{3} 10 \mathrm{z}+\right.$ 3) $z$ (as used by Hummer [26]). The tim e-dependent Ham iltonian is $H(z ; t)=H_{0}(z)+V(z ; t), w$ ith $V(z ; t)=$ $k_{s}(z \quad z(t))^{2}=2$ and $k_{s}$ chosen as 15. In the forw ard direction, the center of the potential $z(t)$ is linearly varied from -1.5 to 1.5 over 750 steps; it is varied from 1.5 to -1.5 in the reverse direction. Before pulling, tra jectories are equilibrated for 100 steps. D ynam ics are run w th a di usion coe cient $D=1$, tem perature param eter $=1$, and tim e step $t=0: 001$. W ork is calculated $w$ th the discrete formula $W_{a}^{b}={ }_{\mathrm{b}=\mathrm{a}^{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{b}} \mathbb{H}(\mathrm{z}(\mathrm{t}+\mathrm{t}) ; \mathrm{t}+\mathrm{t})$ H $(z(t+t) ; t)]$.

For $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}$ estim ates on this m odel system, our bidirectional strategy outperform $s$ existent $m$ ethods ( $F$ ig. (1). U nidirectional estim ates of $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}$ based on Jarzynski's equality are $m$ arkedly biased as the states are further perturbed from the starting equilibrium state. C helliand cow orkers have also developed an asym ptotically correct bidirectional estim ator that reduces to BAR at the end states (Eq. (16) in [27]). H ow ever, their derivation is lim ited to determ in istic system $s$, and although we have em pirical evidence that their estim ator approaches the correct $F_{t}$ for Brownian simulations in the lim it of a large num ber of trajectories (data not shown), it leads to a m ore pronounced bias than Eq. (7) for the sim ulations under the above conditions ( $F$ ig. (1). W e suspect


FIG. 1: (Color online) Comparison of $F_{t}$ estim ators: Jarzynski's equality applied to 500 forw ard (rightw ard triangles) or reverse pullings (leftw ard triangles, tim e reversed so that $F_{t}=F$ at $\left.t=0: 75\right)$; our optim ized estim ator, Eq. (7) (upw ard triangles) and Eq. (16) of R ef. 27] (dotted line) applied to 250 pullings in each direction. The exact F t, calculated by applying $G$ auss $K$ ronrod quadrature in MATLAB 7.5 to num erically integrate $\int e^{\text {H (z;t) }} \mathrm{dz}$ betw een $z$ (t) $5<z<z(t)+5$, is show $n$ as a shaded line.
that this slow er convergence is due to the use of an unoptim ized Jarzynskiestim ator (see Eq. (7) in [27]), but since a generalderivation of their results is not yet available, it is presently di cult to verify this as the source of discrepancy betw een these tw o estim ators, and we leave this question for fiuture investigations.

O ur PM F reconstruction $m$ ethods also com pare favorably w ith unidirectionalm ethods ( F ig. (2). Asw ith F t,
reconstructed PM Fs from separate forw ard and reverse processes in creasingly overestim ate the PM F farther from region sam pled by the original state. In contrast, our bidirectional form ula, Eq. (10), optim ally com bines the data to reduce this bias. As the $m$ ethod of $C$ helli and cow orkers for PM F reconstruction requires a sti -spring assum ption, it is not applicable here.


FIG.2: (C olor online) C om parison of PM F estim ators: (a) H um m er and Szabo'sm ethod, Eq. (9), applied to 500 forw ard (rightw ard triangles) or reverse (leftw ard triangles) pullings. (b) O ur estim ator, Eq. (10), applied to 250 forw ard and 250 reverse pullings (upw ard triangles). The shaded line is the exact PMF. PM Fs from forw ard and bidirectional data are shifted to align $w$ ith the exact PMF at $z=1: 25$; for the reverse, they are aligned at $z=1: 25$. In (b), the harm on ic potentialused in our pullings is show n as a dashed line.

In sum $m$ ary, building on the observation that the convergence of Jarzynski's nonequilibrium work average is dom inated by tim e-reversed countenparts of tra jectories generated via the reverse process [14], we have introduced a formula that optim ally includes such trajectories in generic nonequilibrium path-averages (Eq. (6)). As an application of this result, we have derived a bidirectional estim ator for free energy di erences in term s of nonequilibrium $m$ easurem ents ofw ork (Eq. (7)). A though it reduces to BAR for the special case ofendpoint free energy di erences $F$, our form ula also allow $s$ for the estim ation of interm ediate values $F_{t}$ of the free energy during the sw itching process. W hen applied to the problem of esti$m$ ating potentials of $m$ ean force $G_{0}(z)$ in nonequilibrium force spectroscopy, ourm ethods yield a bidirectionalesti$m$ ator for $G_{0}(z)$ that optim ally com bines tim e-slices from forw ard and reverse $m$ easurem ents of position and work (Eq. (10) ). N um erical com parison of our form ula with unidirectionalestim ates based on the Jarzynskiequality [2] or the H um m er-Szabo m ethod [4, 5] reveal that our reconstructed free energy di erences are ofbetter overall quality than these unidirectional estim ators, which are increasingly biased as one drives the system farther aw ay from its original equilibrium state. It has been noted that faster pullings farther from equilibrium contain less instrum ent noise and therefore lead to $m$ ore accurate free energy estim ates [28]. It is thus expected that our bidirectional estim ators $w$ ill further im prove the quality of
such experim entalestim ates by appreciably reducing the nite-sam ple bias $m$ ost evident in fast pullings.
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