The Unique and Physical Definition of the Free-Energy Landscape
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It is well-known that the conventionally defined free-energy landscape (FEL) in a small system exhibits unphysical dependence on the choice of reaction coordinates. We propose a new definition of FEL that is invariant under any smooth one-to-one transformation of reaction coordinates. Our definition corresponds to the conventional definition with the “right” choice of coordinates, and can be used to unambiguously extract physical properties such as the energy barrier or the transition state. A practical procedure for determining the FEL from time-series data is discussed.

The free-energy landscape (FEL) is believe to be a powerful tool for describing the stability, reaction-spontaneity, reaction path, transition state, and energetics of a small system in which thermal fluctuation plays a dominant role [1]. The FEL typically provides insights for biomolecular systems, chemical reactions, and the dynamics of cluster glasses [2, 3]. The FEL, which is sometimes referred to as the potential of mean force [4], enables one to describe states and dynamics of a system near equilibrium only in terms of a small number of coordinates. For example, the coordinates represent an internal or local structure of the molecule, such as the bond length, bond orientational order, and dihedral angle. Depending on the type of system and the context, these coordinates are referred to as “reaction coordinates,” “collective variables,” “slow variables,” or “coarse-grained variables.” In this paper, we refer to them as reaction coordinates.

Although there have been numerous applications of the FEL, it is known that there is a fundamental problem; the conventionally defined free-energy landscape (FEL) in a small system exhibits unphysical dependence on the choice of reaction coordinates, and there has been no criteria for selecting a unique definition. It was thus claimed that “it is not meaningful to speak of the free-energy landscape” [5]. In this Letter we propose a new definition which makes it possible to speak of the FEL.

We stress that our definition of FEL is not only logically founded, but also serves as a basis of practical applications. It provides a reliable foundation of the FEL and also practical methods for obtaining the FEL in a variety of systems mentioned above by means of time-series analysis of experimental or simulated data.

The conventional definition of the FEL.— Let us discuss the conventional definition of the FEL and its problem. Consider a classical system with a large degree of freedom whose microscopic coordinate and Hamiltonian are \( \Gamma \) and \( \mathcal{H}(\Gamma) \), respectively. We assume that the system is in the equilibrium state at temperature \( T \), and hence its microscopic state is described by the canonical distribution \( P(\Gamma) = e^{(\mathcal{F}_T - \mathcal{H}(\Gamma))/T} \), where \( \mathcal{F}_T \) is the macroscopic free energy. Let \( z = (z^1, z^2, ..., z^n) \) be a set of \( n \) reaction coordinates, where \( n \) is assumed to be much smaller than the degrees of freedom in \( \Gamma \). Each coordinate \( z^i \) is a function of \( \Gamma \), which we write as \( z^i(\Gamma) \). Then the probability density function of the reaction coordinates \( z \) in equilibrium is given by

\[
P(z) = \int d\Gamma \delta(z - z(\Gamma))P(\Gamma).
\]

The conventional FEL, which we call \( F_c(z) \), is defined by

\[
F_c(z) \equiv -T \ln P(z) + \mathcal{F}_T,
\]

or, equivalently, by \( P(z) = \exp[(\mathcal{F}_T - F_c(z))/T] \). The latter expression shows that \( F_c(z) \) is the effective potential for the canonical distribution of the reaction coordinates \( z \). Note that, unlike thermodynamic variables in macroscopic systems, the reaction coordinates are not necessarily extensive or intensive. Therefore, the FEL is not required to be a convex or a concave function of \( z \), and it can have many local minima and saddles. This is why the FEL can express transition states and energy barriers.

When the dynamics of the reaction coordinates can be regarded as a stationary ergodic process, we have an alternative expression

\[
P(z) = \langle \delta(z - z(t)) \rangle,
\]

for the probability density [11], where \( z(t) \) is a stochastic trajectory of the reaction coordinates, and \( \langle \cdot \rangle \) denotes the time average in the stationary process. This means that the probability density function \( P(z) \), and hence the FEL \( F_c(z) \), can be evaluated from a time series of \( z \) in a stationary process; \( P(z) \) is nothing but the frequency that a given coordinate value \( z \) is realized. This is indeed the basis of the histogram method, which is frequently used to compute \( F_c(z) \) from molecular dynamics simulations [3].

We shall see however that the definition [2] is unphysical. Take another set of reaction coordinates \( z' \) that is related to \( z \) by \( z' = z'(z) \), where \( z'(\cdot) \) is a smooth one-to-one function. Clearly the coordinates \( z \) and \( z' \) are equivalent in the sense that they have exactly the same physical information about the system.
Now, note that the probability distribution function for \( z' \), \( P'(z') = \int d\tau \delta(z' - z'(\Gamma))|P(\Gamma) \) is related to \( P(z) \) by
\[
P'(z') = P(z(z'))|\frac{\partial z'}{\partial z}|. \tag{4}
\]
Therefore the corresponding FEL is given by
\[
F'_c(z') = -T \ln P'(z') + F_T = F_c(z(z')) - T \ln |\frac{\partial z}{\partial z'}|, \tag{5}
\]
which shows that \( F'_c(z') \) and \( F_c(z(z')) \) may differ in general. We thus conclude that the landscapes described by \( z \) and that described by \( z' \) are in general different. This is quite unphysical since the actual landscape (if it exists) should not depend on the choice of coordinates. It should be stressed that the different FELs indeed lead to different predictions about the behavior of the reaction coordinates. Note that the Jacobian contribution in (5) does not come from intrinsic properties of the system; rather, it is due to our choice of transformation. This shows that there is a serious problem about the reliability of free-energy barriers or reaction paths obtained from numerical simulations \([5, 6]\) or experimental data \([7]\).

Note that (5) implies \( F'_c(z') = F_c(z(z')) \) when \( T = 0 \). This is consistent with the fact that the energy landscape and the intrinsic reaction coordinate are well-defined quantities, free from the Jacobian problem \([8]\). Note also that one has \( F'_c(z') \approx F_c(z(z')) \) in a macroscopic system since \( F_c \) and \( F_T \) are proportional to the volume of the system while the Jacobian \( |\partial z/\partial z'| \) is of order 1. We see that the above problem of the coordinate dependence of the landscape is intrinsic to small systems at nonzero temperatures.

The case with \( n = 1 \).— We shall now discuss our new definition of FEL that is invariant under any coordinate transformation. Our basic assumption is that the time evolution \( z(\tau) = z(\Gamma(\tau)) \) of the reaction coordinates is described by an overdamped Langevin equation with multiplicative noise \([7]\) or \([14]\). Recall that we are interested in the situation where the number \( n \) of the reaction coordinates is much smaller than the number of microscopic degrees of freedom of the system, the state of the whole system is close to equilibrium, and the change in the reaction coordinates takes place much slower than that of the microscopic state of the system. Then it is well understood that the separations in the length scale and the time scale fully justifies the use of the overdamped Langevin description \([9]\).

We first assume that there is only one reaction coordinate, i.e., \( z \) has a single component. In this case our definition is not only simple but also completely satisfactory. Suppose there is a “right” choice of reaction coordinate, which we denote as \( \bar{z} \), with which the time-evolution becomes the standard overdamped Langevin equation at temperature \( T \):
\[
\frac{d\bar{z}(t)}{dt} = -\mu \frac{\partial \bar{F}(\bar{z}(t))}{\partial \bar{z}} + \sqrt{2\mu RT} \tag{6}
\]
Here \( \mu > 0 \) is the mobility, and \( R(t) \) is the zero-mean Gaussian white noise satisfying \( \langle R(t)R(t') \rangle = 2\delta(t - t') \). It is crucial that the strength of the noise is independent of \( \bar{z} \). We shall see below that such a coordinate \( \bar{z} \) always exists (provided that \( n = 1 \)). Here, and in what follows, stochastic differential equations are interpreted in the sense of Stratonovich \([10]\).

We now argue that \( \bar{F}(\bar{z}) \) in (6) can be unambiguously identified as describing a physically meaningful FEL, i.e., the FEL. This is indeed follows from the Langevin equation (6), but is most clearly illustrated in the case where \( \bar{F}(\bar{z}) \) is a double well potential. In such a situation, we should observe a transition between two states separated by the potential barrier. We can then deduce the corresponding reaction rate from the time-series of \( \bar{z}(t) \).

According to the Kramers’ escape rate formula \([10, 12]\), which is derived at sufficiently low temperatures within the harmonic approximation, the escape rate \( k \) is represented by the Arrhenius equation \( k \propto e^{-\Delta \bar{F}/T} \). Here the activation energy is given by \( \Delta \bar{F} = \bar{F}(\bar{z}^*) - \bar{F}(\bar{z}_*) \), with \( \bar{z}^* \) and \( \bar{z}_* \) corresponding to the minima of \( \bar{F} \) in the basin and the transition state, respectively. Thus the function \( \bar{F}(\bar{z}) \) describes stability, reaction-spontaneity, reaction path, transition state, and energetics, as we intended. It is also worth noting that the stationary probability distribution for the process (6) is given by \( P(\bar{z}) = \exp(\langle F_T - \bar{F}(\bar{z}) \rangle/\bar{T}) \), and hence \( \bar{F}(\bar{z}) = F_c(\bar{z}) \). We see that the conventional definition gives the physical FEL for the “right” coordinate \( \bar{z} \).

Now take a general reaction coordinate \( z \) that is related to \( \bar{z} \) by \( z = z(\bar{z}) \), where \( z(\cdot) \) is a smooth increasing function. As we have seen already, the conventional FEL, \( F_c(z) \), determined from (2) and (3) is in general different from the physical FEL \( \bar{F}(\bar{z}) \). This means that \( F_c(z) \) in general fails to describe the behavior of the reaction coordinate. To see the origin of this failure, we see from (6) and \( z = z(\bar{z}) \) that the time-evolution of \( z(t) \) is determined by the Langevin equation with multiplicative noise
\[
\frac{dz(t)}{dt} = A(z(t)) + \sqrt{D(z(t))}R(t), \tag{7}
\]
where \( A(z) \) and \( D(z) \) are given by
\[
A(z) = -\mu \left( \frac{\partial z(\bar{z})}{\partial \bar{z}} \right) \frac{\partial \bar{F}(\bar{z})}{\partial \bar{z}}, \tag{8}
\]
\[
D(z) = T\mu \left( \frac{\partial z(\bar{z})}{\partial \bar{z}} \right)^2 \tag{9}
\]
The difference between the equations (6) and (7) is evident. The noise intensity is independent of the reaction
the reaction coordinate brings not only a change in coordinate in (7). In other words, the transformation of $F_z$ but also a change in the intensity of thermal fluctuation. Suppose that one is given any reaction coordinate dependent noise. One next finds a smooth increasing coordinate $\bar{z} = \bar{z}(z)$ obeys the equation (6) with coordinate independent noise, and evaluates the physical FEL $\bar{F}(\bar{z})$. Finally the physically meaningful FEL for the original coordinate is obtained as $F(z) \equiv \bar{F}(\bar{z}(z)) = F_z(\bar{z}(z))$.

The above strategy can be implemented by using data from experiments or simulations as follows. Let $z(t)$ be a given time-series of a reaction coordinate, which is assumed to obey the generalized Langevin equation (7). We determine the coefficient $D(z)$ in Eq. 4 from a time-series analysis in the stationary process by

$$D(z) = \lim_{\tau \to 0} \frac{\langle (z(t + \tau) - z(t))^2 \rangle_{z(t)=z}}{2\tau}.$$  

(10)

This quantity is non-negative in general, but let us assume it is positive. We then define a new variable $\tilde{z}'$ by solving the differential equation

$$\tilde{z}'(t) = \int \frac{dz}{\sqrt{D(z)}}.$$  

(11)

We obviously see that $\tilde{z}'(t) = \tilde{z}(z(t))$ obeys

$$\frac{d\tilde{z}'(t)}{dt} = \left( \frac{A(z)}{\sqrt{D(z)}} \right)_{z=\tilde{z}(\tilde{z}'(t))} + R(t),$$  

(12)

which has a form of the standard Langevin equation (9), but with the normalization $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mu = 1$. We see that $\tilde{z}'$ is also the “right” coordinate. Because Eq. (11) leads to the Jacobian $d\tilde{z}'(z)/dz = 1/\sqrt{D(z)}$, the probability density of $\tilde{z}'$ is represented by the measurable quantities $P(z)$ and $D(z) = P'(z') = P(z)/\sqrt{D(z)}$. Therefore, the desired FEL is given by

$$F(z) \equiv \tilde{F}_{\mu} (\tilde{z}'(z)) = -T \int \left( P(z)/\sqrt{D(z)} \right) + \mathcal{F}_T.$$  

(13)

In this way, we can define the physically meaningful and unique FEL for a general reaction coordinate $z$. The difference between $\tilde{F}_{\mu}(z)$ and $\tilde{F}_{\mu}'(\tilde{z}')$ is a mere constant $\ln \sqrt{T}$, which does not affect the landscape.

General case.— Let us move on to the general case with $n$ reaction coordinates. The overdamped Langevin equation with multiplicative noise corresponding to (7) takes the form

$$\frac{dz^i(t)}{dt} = A^i(z(t)) + S^{ij}(z(t)) R^i(t),$$  

(14)

where $R^i(t)$ is the zero-mean Gaussian white noise satisfying $\langle R^i(t) R^j(s) \rangle = 2\delta_{ij}\delta(t-s)$. Here, $A^i(z)$ and $S^{ij}(z)$ are not directly determined from a time-series analysis. Rather, the drift vector $v(z) = (v^i(z))_{i=1,2,...,n}$ and the diffusion matrix $D(z) = (D^{ij}(z))_{i,j=1,2,...,n}$ can be read off from a stationary process of reaction coordinates $z(t)$ as

$$v^i(z) = \lim_{\tau \to 0} \frac{\langle z^i(t + \tau) - z^i(t) \rangle_{z(t)=z}}{\tau},$$  

(15)

$$D^{ij}(z) = \lim_{\tau \to 0} \frac{\langle (z^j(t + \tau) - z^j(t))^2 \rangle_{z(t)=z} \langle (z^j(t + \tau) - z^j(t)) - (z^i(t + \tau) - z^i(t)) \rangle_{z(t)=z}}{2\tau}.$$  

(16)

See [10]. The above quantities are related with each other by

$$v^i(z) = A^i(z) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} S^{kj}(z) \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} S^{ij}(z),$$  

(17)

$$D^{ij}(z) = S^{ik}(z) S^{jk}(z).$$  

(18)

By definition, $D(z)$ is a positive semi-definite symmetric matrix. We additionally assume it is positive-definite so that its inverse exists. Let us assume that our system is close to equilibrium, and hence the detailed balance condition

$$v^i(z) P(z) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} [D^{ij}(z) P(z)] = 0,$$  

(19)

is valid. The drift vector $v(z)$ is then fully determined from $D(z)$ and $P(z)$. This means that we can completely specify the dynamics of the system by the diffusion matrix, $D(z)$, and the equilibrium probability density function, $P(z)$.

In the above setting, it was proved [10, 13] that, for arbitrary smooth one-to-one map $z'(z)$, the equilibrium probability density distributions, $P(z)$ and $P'(z')$, satisfy

$$P(z) \sqrt{\det D(z)} = P'(z') \sqrt{\det D'(z')}.$$  

(20)
where $D'(z')$ is the diffusion matrix in the $z'$-coordinate. We now propose to define the FEL by

$$F(z) \equiv -T \ln \left( P(z) \sqrt{\det D(z)} \right) + F_T. \quad (21)$$

The FEL (21) thus defined has a remarkable “geometric” property

$$F(z) = F'(z'), \quad (22)$$

which is nothing but the contra-variant property (20). Apparently (21) is a natural generalization of the unique definition (13) for the case with $n = 1$. It is easily verified that if there exists a “right” choice of coordinate $z$ for which the noise intensities $S^{ij}(z)$ in (13) do not depend explicitly on $z$, then the FEL defined by (21) coincides with the conventional FEL defined by (2).

So far the discussion has been parallel to that for a single component $z$, but there is an essential difference. Unlike in the case with $n = 1$, where the “right” coordinate is always obtained by solving (11), there is no guarantee that such a choice of coordinates is possible in the multi-component case. To see this, note that a straightforward generalization of Eq. (11) to $n$ dimensions should involve a line integral of the inverse square root of the diffusion matrix $S^{-1/2}(z)$. However, the line integral in general depends on the choice of the path. A condition that guarantees the independence of the integral on the choice of the path, and hence the existence of the “right” reaction coordinate is

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_{jk}^i}{\partial z^l} - \frac{\partial \Gamma_{jl}^i}{\partial z^k} + \Gamma_{nl}^i \Gamma_{jk}^n - \Gamma_{nl}^j \Gamma_{nk}^n = 0, \quad (23)$$

for all $z$ and $i, j, k, l$, where $\Gamma_{mn}^i$ is the Christoffel symbols (the Levi-Civita connection) defined by

$$\Gamma_{mn}^i = \frac{1}{2} D^{ij} \left( \frac{\partial D_{in}}{\partial z^m} + \frac{\partial D_{jm}}{\partial z^n} - \frac{\partial D_{mn}}{\partial z^j} \right), \quad (24)$$

with $D^{ij} D_{jk} = \delta_k^i$. Note that $D(z)$ can be regarded as a metric tensor because it is the second-rank contra-variant tensor, which satisfies

$$D^{kl}(z) = \frac{\partial z^k}{\partial z^i} \frac{\partial z^l}{\partial z^j} D^{ij}(z). \quad (25)$$

Then one sees that the left-hand side of Eq. (23) is the corresponding Riemann curvature tensor. We thus see that the condition (23) for the existence of a “right” coordinate is equivalent to the flatness of the geometry. In general the curvature tensor is not always zero, and hence the condition (23) is not satisfied.

We nevertheless argue that (21) always defines the FEL that is physically meaningful. The most important reason is that (21) is essentially the only reasonable definition that is invariant under any change of reaction coordinates. Recalling the fact that the thermodynamic free energy is always invariant under the change of variables, one might interpret our requirement of invariance as a counterpart or a generalization of the requirement of extensivity in thermodynamics. We also stress that the discussion as in the case with $n = 1$ unambiguously shows that our FEL properly recovers the dynamical behavior of the reaction coordinates when the curvature, i.e., the left-hand side of (23), is sufficiently small.

It is worth noting that our FEL (21) depends both on the equilibrium probability density $P(z)$ and the diffusion matrix $D(z)$, while the conventional definition (2) depends only on $P(z)$. As is clear from (14) and (18), the basic role of $D(z)$ is to set the time-scale for the change of $z(t)$. Therefore even if there are numerical simulations that lead to the same equilibrium probability density $P(z)$, the corresponding FELs may be different, depending on the update rules, such as the molecular dynamics, the Monte Carlo with an importance sampling, etc. To evaluate a realistic energy barrier or the heat of a reaction from a simulation, it is necessary not only to develop a sampling method to calculate the equilibrium distribution (3), but also to develop a method to calculate the non-uniform diffusion matrix $D(z)$ based on a dynamics that describes realistic experimental situations. It is also challenging to investigate if our point of view, especially the role of $D$ in the FEL, sheds light on the long-standing problem whether the origin of glass transitions is thermodynamic or kinetic (14).

**Discussion.—** In this Letter, we reexamined the fundamental problem of the conventional definition of FEL, and proposed a new definition that is invariant under the change of reaction coordinates. When the reaction coordinate has only one component, we proved that our FEL properly describes the behavior of the reaction coordinate, including the reaction path, transition state, activation energy, and heat of reaction. For the general case with multi-component reaction coordinates, ours is still the unique natural definition that is invariant under the change of reaction coordinates, and hence can be regarded as physically meaningful FEL. We also illustrated a practical method for evaluating the FEL from time-series data obtained numerically or experimentally.

In the conventional definition of FEL, the reaction coordinate was implicitly assumed to be Cartesian. The assumption, however, is not based on any physical requirement, and hence should be reexamined. In this letter, we introduced a metric tensor on a Riemannian manifold in terms of the diffusion matrix. Consequently, we successfully defined FEL as an invariant on the manifold. This implies that a description with a Riemannian manifold is necessary for the foundation of FEL.

We have been so far assuming that a set of reaction coordinates that is sufficient to describe the reaction of interest is already known. For the set of coordinates, the Arrhenius rate should show a good agreement with a directly measured reaction rate. In other words, the
agreement provides a criterion to evaluate how properly the set of reaction coordinates describe a reaction path. Generally, the disagreement indicates two possibilities: the variables that are necessary to describe the reaction is not taken into consideration or the metric is not chosen properly. Because our formulation eliminates the latter possibility, we can concentrate on the improvement of the former possibility when we redefine an alternative set of reaction coordinates. Data-driven methods will help to solve the former problem efficiently; therefore, they are complementary to our formulation [15–19].

We expect that the newly defined FEL enables us to develop a material-design method aided by simulations that is considerably more effective than those based on the conventional FEL. Our FEL may be also applied to detect energy transfer, e.g., in a molecular motor experiments, that is hardly analyzed within the conventional schemes.
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