Galerkin Approximation of Dynamical Quantities using Trajectory Data

Erik H. Thiede,1 Dimitrios Giannakis,2 Aaron R. Dinner,1 and Jonathan Weare2
1) Department of Chemistry and James Franck Institute, the University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637
2) Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, New York, NY 10012, USA

Understanding chemical mechanisms requires estimating dynamical statistics such as expected hitting times, reaction rates, and committors. In systems with well-defined metastable states and free energy barriers, these quantities can be estimated using enhanced sampling methods combined with classical rate theories. However, calculating such statistics for more complex processes with rugged landscapes or multiple pathways requires more general numerical methods. Here, we present a general framework for calculating dynamical statistics by approximating the dynamical operators of the system through a Galerkin expansion. This allows the estimation of dynamical statistics even in the absence of long equilibrium trajectories realizing the dynamical process in question. A specific choice of basis set in the expansion corresponds to estimation of dynamical quantities using a Markov state model. To demonstrate the feasibility of alternative basis sets, we introduce a new basis based on the technique of diffusion maps. In our numerical experiments, this basis gives results of comparable or better accuracy to Markov state models. Finally, we show that the technique of delay embedding can help these approximations recover dynamical information lost in constructing a collective variable space.

I. INTRODUCTION

Although computer simulations allow for chemical dynamics to be studied with atomistic detail, extracting a quantitative understanding of chemical kinetics from computer simulation remains difficult. While in principle most quantities can be calculated by initializing the system in a reasonable configuration and propagating the dynamics forward in time, in practice this often requires prohibitively large amounts of computational resources. For instance, atomistic molecular dynamics simulations require evaluation of the forces every few femtoseconds. But since processes such as protein folding happen on timescales of milliseconds or longer, observing these events through direct simulation requires at least $10^{12}$ force evaluations. Consequently, direct simulation is currently possible only for small proteins or rapid chemical processes.

One way this prohibitive cost has been addressed is through Arrhenius-like theories that assume the kinetics are dominated by passage through a single, rare transition state. The chemical rate can then be approximated using expressions that depend only on a few statistics evaluated at the transition state and the initial state. One approach to deriving these expressions is to express the relevant kinetic quantities as a solution to an operator equation and then use a series of approximations to make the problem analytically tractable. Crucially, the relevant statistics can be evaluated rapidly via established enhanced sampling techniques. However, it is not clear that complex processes such as protein folding are governed by a single folding process with one transition state. Even if this is the case, the transition state is often not known a priori, and estimated rates may be sensitive to small errors in defining the state.

Here, we address these difficulties by considering the types of operator equations used in deriving Arrhenius theories. However, rather than approximating the relevant physics to make the problem analytically tractable, we introduce a numerical method that uses sampled data to solve the equations. In our approach, we express the solution as a sum of basis functions using a Galerkin approximation. We then estimate the resulting terms...
using trajectory averages. Importantly, these approximations only require short trajectories, avoiding the need for long direct simulations.

We organize the rest of the paper as follows. In Section II we give background on the transition operator and discuss two existing numerical schemes closely related to our work. We then review the connection between operator equations and chemical kinetics in Section III. In Section IV we introduce and derive our scheme. We discuss the choice of basis set in Section V and introduce a novel basis set for solving problems with arbitrary boundary conditions. In Section VI we show that delay embedding can recover information lost in projecting the system’s dynamics onto a few degrees of freedom. We then demonstrate our algorithm on a collection of long trajectories of the Fip35 WW domain dataset in Section VII, and conclude in Section VIII.

II. BACKGROUND

Many key quantities in chemical kinetics can be expressed through solutions to operator equations. Key to this formalism is the transition operator. We begin by assuming that the system’s dynamics are given by a Markov process $\xi(t)$ that is time-homogeneous (path probabilities are independent of time). We do not make any assumptions on the nature of the system’s state space. For example, if $\xi$ is a diffusion process, the state space could be the space of real coordinates, $\mathbb{R}^n$. Similarly, for a finite-state Markov chain, it would be a finite set of configurations.

The transition operator with lag time of $s$ is defined as

$$K_s f(x) = \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\xi^{(s)}\right) | \xi(0) = x\right], \quad (1)$$

where $f$ is a function on the state space. Note that, due to time-homogeneity, we could have just as easily have defined the transition operator with the time pair $(\xi(t), \xi(t+s))$. Depending on the context in question, $K_s$ may also be referred to as the Markov or Koopman operator. We use the term transition operator as $K_s$ is a generalization of the transition matrix for finite-state Markov processes. For instance, the requirement that the rows of a transition matrix sum to one generalizes to

$$K_s 1 = \mathbb{E}\left[1 | \xi(0) = x\right] = 1. \quad (2)$$

Studying the transition operator gives, in principle, a new route to analyzing the system’s dynamics. Unfortunately it is generally unknown or too complicated to allow direct analysis. This has motivated research into data-driven approaches for working with $K_s$ through the analysis of sampled trajectory data.

A. Markov State Modeling

One approach to studying chemical dynamics through the transition operator is the construction of Markov state models (MSMs). The goal of Markov state modeling is to construct a Markov chain on a finite state space that models the true dynamics of the system. The transition matrix of this Markov chain is then taken as an ansatz for the transition operator.

To construct an MSM from trajectory data, we partition the system’s state space into $M$ nonoverlapping sets, denoted $S_i$. Now, let $\mu$ be an arbitrary probability measure. If the system is distributed according to $\mu$, the probability of transitioning from a set $S_i$ to $S_j$ after a time $s$ is given by

$$P_{ij} = \frac{\int 1_{S_i}(x)K_s 1_{S_j}(x)\mu(dx)}{\int 1_{S_i}(x)\mu(dx)}. \quad (3)$$
where \( \mathbb{1} \) is the indicator function

\[
\mathbb{1}_{S_i}(x) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{for } x \text{ in } S_i \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]  

(4)

Here \( \int f(x) \mu(dx) \) refers to the expectation with respect to the probability measure \( \mu \).

When the probability measure \( \mu \) has a probability density function it is just the usual expectation against this density. In a finite state space it reduces to a \( \mu \)-weighted average over states. We introduce this formalism so that we can treat both continuous and discrete state spaces with one notation.

Because the sets \( S_i \) partition the state space, a simple calculation shows that the rows of \( P_{ij} \) sum up to one. \( P_{ij} \) therefore defines a transition matrix for a finite-state Markov process where state \( i \) corresponds to the set \( S_i \). In Markov State modeling, one takes the dynamics of this process as a model for the true dynamics, and \( P_{ij} \) as a model for the transition operator.

To construct an estimate of \( P_{ij} \) from data, one collects a dataset consisting of \( N \) time pairs, \((X_n, Y_n)\). Here the initial point \( X_n \) is drawn from \( \mu \), and \( Y_n \) is collected by starting at \( X_n \) and propagating the dynamics for time \( s \). As the choice of \( \mu \) in (3) is arbitrary, one can define it implicitly through the sampling procedure. For instance, one can construct a dataset by extracting all pairs of points separated by \( s \) from a collection of trajectories; since we have assumed the dynamics are time-homogeneous, the physical time at which \( X_n \) was collected does not matter. We then define \( \mu \) to be the measure from which our initial points \( X_n^{(0)} \) were sampled. With this dataset, \( P_{ij} \) is now approximated as

\[
\tilde{P}_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} 1_{S_j}(Y_n) 1_{S_i}(X_n)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} 1_{S_i}(X_n)} 
\]  

(5)

Like \( P_{ij} \), \( \tilde{P}_{ij} \) defines a valid transition matrix.

The MSM approach has many attractive features. Markov state models can be used to calculate a wide class of dynamical quantities, including committors, reaction rates, and expected hitting times. Moreover, since the MSM can be constructed using trajectories initialized from arbitrary probability distributions, sampling can be focused in critical regions of the state space. However, the accuracy to which \( P_{ij} \) approximates \( K_s \) depends strongly on the choice of the sets \( S_i \), and choosing good sets becomes difficult in high dimensional spaces. To mitigate this issue, states are generally constructed by projecting the system’s state space into a lower dimensional space known as a collective variable (CV) space. Sets are then defined by either gridding the CV space or clustering sampled configurations based on the CVs. Unfortunately, when gridding, the number of states grows exponentially with the dimension of the CV space. While this is not true for clustering approaches, effectively clustering high-dimensional data is still an area of open research. As a consequence, constructing an MSM that accurately reflects the dynamics may still require knowledge of a good, relatively low-dimensional CV space.

B. Data-driven Solutions to Eigenfunctions of Dynamical Operators

An alternative approach to characterizing chemical systems is to estimate the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of operators associated with the system’s dynamics. These eigenfunctions and eigenvalues can often be approximated from trajectory data, even when the transition operator is unknown. In general, they separate the dynamics by timescale; eigenfunctions with larger eigenvalues correlate with the system’s slowest degrees of freedom. We refer to the family of these techniques as Dynamical Operator Eigenfunction Analysis (DOEA). Below, we summarize a simple DOEA scheme for the transition operator. To our knowledge, this particular scheme was first proposed in reference. This scheme is mathematically equivalent to the estimation of the eigenfunctions using Extended Dynamic Mode Decomposition with a linearly independent dictionary.
Here, we consider the solution to the eigenproblem
\[ K_s \psi_l(x) = \lambda_l \psi_l(x) \] (6)

We approximate \( \psi_l \) as a sum of basis functions \( \phi_j \) with unknown coefficients \( a_j \),
\[ \psi_l(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} a_j \phi_j(x). \] (7)

We now assume our data takes the form discussed in Subsection [II.A]. Substituting into (6), multiplying by \( \phi_i(x) \), and taking the expectation against \( \mu \), we obtain the matrix equation
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{M} K_{ij} a_j = \lambda_l \sum_{j=1}^{M} S_{ij} a_j \] (8)

where \( K_{ij} \) and \( S_{ij} \) are defined as
\[ K_{ij} = \int \phi_i(x) K_s \phi_j(x) \mu(dx) \] (9)
\[ S_{ij} = \int \phi_i(x) \phi_j(x) \mu(dx) \] (10)

respectively. The matrix elements can be approximated as
\[ \bar{K}_{ij} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \phi_i(X_n) \phi_j(Y_n) \] (11)
\[ \bar{S}_{ij} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \phi_i(X_n) \phi_j(X_n). \] (12)

We substitute these approximations into (8) and solve for estimates of \( a_i \) and \( \lambda_l \). Equation (7) can then be used to give an approximation for \( \psi_l \).

The use of more general basis sets in DOEA allows information to be extracted from high-dimensional collective variable spaces. Like MSMs, DOEA schemes can be applied to trajectories initialized from arbitrary distributions and a broad range of sources. However, whereas an MSM can be used to calculate a broad range of dynamical quantities, DOEA calculates the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the transition operator. Attempts have been made to define a new theory of chemical dynamics purely in terms of the transition operator’s eigenfunctions and eigenvalues. Here, we take a different approach and directly estimate the dynamical quantities of classical kinetic theories such as hitting probabilities, mean-first passage times, and autocorrelation times.

III. THE GENERATOR AND CHEMICAL KINETICS

Many key quantities in chemical kinetics can be expressed through Feynman-Kac formulas. In these equations, dynamical quantities are constructed using the solutions to operator equations that act on functions of the state space. In our work, our aim is to solve these operator equations directly to get key quantities in chemical kinetics. Below, we give a few examples of chemically relevant quantities that can be estimated using these formulas. These include statistics such as the mean-first passage time, forwards and backwards committors, and autocorrelation times. For an in-depth treatment, we refer the reader to references [29] and [30].

In this work, we focus on analyzing data gathered from experiment or simulation. We expect this data to be stored as a series of measurements collected at a fixed time interval.
Therefore, rather than considering the dynamics of \( \xi(t) \), we will consider the dynamics of a discrete-time process \( \Xi^{(t)} \) constructed by recording \( \xi \) every \( \Delta t \) units of time. If \( \Delta t \) is sufficiently small, we do not expect this to cause an appreciable change in any kinetic quantities. We note that, with the exception of (24), the equations that follow hold specifically for lag-time of \( s = \Delta t \). In MSM frameworks, it is common to consider longer lag times (i.e., \( s > \Delta t \)), in which case these equations become approximate. We discuss this in Section VI.

In the discussion that follows, we choose to work with the generator of \( \Xi^{(t)} \), defined as
\[
L f(x) = \frac{K_{\Delta t} f(x) - f(x)}{\Delta t},
\]
(13)

instead of the transition operator. We could in principle perform our entire analysis with \( K_{\Delta t} \), but the use of \( L \) simplifies the presentation.

A. Equations using the Generator

We begin by considering the mean first passage time and forward committor, two central quantities in chemical kinetics.\(^{231,232}\) Let \( A \) and \( B \) be disjoint subsets of state space and let \( \tau_A \) be the first time the system enters \( A \).

\[
\tau_A = \min \left\{ t \geq 0 | \Xi(t) \in A \right\}.
\]
(14)

The mean first passage time is the expectation of \( \tau_A \), conditioned on the dynamics starting at \( x \):

\[
m_A(x) = E \left[ \tau_A | \Xi(0) = x \right].
\]
(15)

The mean first passage time is directly connected with Arrhenius kinetics: one commonly used definition of the rate is \( 1/m_A(x) \).\(^2\) The forward committor is defined as the probability of entering \( B \) before \( A \), conditioned on starting at \( x \):

\[
q_+(x) = P \left[ \tau_B < \tau_A | \Xi(0) = x \right].
\]
(16)

Both of these quantities solve operator equations using the transition operator with lag time \( \Delta t \). The mean first passage obeys the operator equation

\[
L m_A(x) = -1 \text{ for } x \text{ in } A^c
\]
\[
m_A(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \text{ in } A.
\]
(17)

Here \( A^c \) denotes the set of all state space configurations not in \( A \). Equation (17) can be derived by conditioning on the first step of the dynamics. For all \( x \) in \( A^c \) we have

\[
m_A(x) = E \left[ \tau_A | \Xi(0) = x \right]
\]
\[
= E \left[ E \left[ \tau_A | \Xi(\Delta t) \right] | \Xi(0) = x \right]
\]
\[
= E \left[ (m_A(\Xi(\Delta t)) + \Delta t) | \Xi(0) = x \right]
\]
\[
= E \left[ m_A(\Xi(\Delta t)) | \Xi(0) = x \right] + \Delta t
\]
\[
= K_{\Delta t} m_A(x) + \Delta t
\]

where the second line follows from the time-homogeneity of \( \Xi \). Rearranging then gives (17).
We can show that the forward committor obeys
\[ \mathcal{L} q_+(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in (A \cup B)^c \]
\[ q_+(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in A \]
\[ q_+(x) = 1 \text{ for } x \in B \]
(18)
by similar arguments. We introduce the random variable
\[ 1_{\tau_B < \tau_A} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \tau_B < \tau_A \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]
(19)
For all \( x \) outside \( A \) and \( B \), we can then write
\[ q_+(x) = E \left[ 1_{\tau_B < \tau_A} \mid \Xi(0) = x \right] \]
\[ = E \left[ E \left[ 1_{\tau_B < \tau_A} \mid \Xi(\Delta t) \right] \mid \Xi(0) = x \right] \]
\[ = E \left[ q_+ \left( \Xi(\Delta t) \right) \mid \Xi(0) = x \right] \]
\[ = K_{\Delta t} q_+(x) \]
which gives (18) on rearranging.

B. Expressions using Adjoints of the Generator

Additional quantities can be characterized using adjoints of the generator. We reintroduce the sampling measure \( \mu \) from Subsection II A, and define the inner product
\[ \langle u, v \rangle = \int u(x)v(x)\mu(dx). \]
(20)
Equipped with this inner product, the space of all functions that are square-integrable against \( \mu \) is a Hilbert space which we denote \( L^2_\mu \). The unweighted adjoint of \( \mathcal{L} \) is the operator such that
\[ \langle \mathcal{L}^\dagger u, v \rangle = \langle u, \mathcal{L} v \rangle. \]
(21)
We now assume that the system has a unique stationary measure. The change of measure from \( \mu \) to the stationary measure is defined as the function \( \pi \) such that
\[ \int E \left[ f \left( \Xi(t) \right) \mid \Xi(0) = x \right] \pi(x)\mu(dx) = \int f(x)\pi(x)\mu(dx) \]
(22)
or equivalently,
\[ \int \mathcal{L}f(x)\pi(x)\mu(dx) = 0 \]
(23)
holds for all functions \( f \). As an example, if the system’s state space is Euclidean and the dynamics are stationary at thermal equilibrium then
\[ \pi(x)\mu(dx) \propto e^{-\beta H(x)}dx \]
would hold. However, this relation is not necessarily true for general state spaces or for nonequilibrium stationary states.
The stationary change of measure is the solution to a Feynman-Kac formula with \( \mathcal{L}^\dagger \). Interpreting (23) as an inner product, the definition of the adjoint implies

\[
0 = \langle \pi, \mathcal{L} f \rangle = \langle \mathcal{L}^\dagger \pi, f \rangle
\]

for all \( f \), or equivalently

\[
\mathcal{L}^\dagger \pi (x) = 0.
\] (24)

Feynman-Kac formulas may also use weighted adjoints of \( \mathcal{L} \). Let \( p \) be the change of measure from \( \mu \) to another, currently unspecified measure. The \( p \)-weighted adjoint of \( \mathcal{L} \) is the operator \( \mathcal{L}^\dagger_p \) such that

\[
\langle u, p \mathcal{L} v \rangle = \langle \mathcal{L}^\dagger_p u, pv \rangle
\] (25)

A few manipulations show that the weighted adjoint can be expressed as

\[
\mathcal{L}^\dagger_p f (x) = \frac{1}{p(x)} \mathcal{L}^\dagger (fp) (x).
\] (26)

This reduces to the unweighted adjoint when \( p(x) = 1 \). One example of a Feynman-Kac formula that uses a weighted adjoint is a relation for the backwards committor. The backwards committor is the probability that, if the system is observed at configuration \( x \) and the system is in the stationary state, the system exited state \( A \) more recently than state \( B \). It satisfies the equation

\[
\mathcal{L}^\dagger \pi q_- (x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in (A \cup B)^c
\]

\[
q_- (x) = 1 \text{ for } x \in A
\]

\[
q_- (x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in B.
\] (27)

Finally, we note that some quantities in chemical dynamics require the solution to multiple operator equations. For instance, the total reactive current and reaction rate between \( A \) and \( B \) as defined in Transition Path Theory require evaluating the backwards committor and the forward committor, followed by another application of the generator. We derive these expressions in the Supplementary Information through arguments very similar to those presented in reference 34. The total reactive current between the two sets is given by

\[
I_{AB} = \int q_- (x) \mathcal{L} (1_{C^c}q_+) (x) \pi(x) \mu(dx)
\]

\[
- \int q_- (x) \mathcal{L} (1_{Cq^+}) (x) \pi(x) \mu(dx)
\] (28)

Here \( C \) is a set that contains \( B \) but not \( A \). The reaction rate constant is then given by

\[
k_{AB} = \frac{I_{AB}}{\int q_- (x) \pi(x) \mu(dx)}
\] (29)

Evaluating the autocorrelation time of a function requires estimating \( \pi \), as well as solving an equation using the generator. For a function with \( \int f(x) \pi(x) \mu(dx) = 0 \), the autocorrelation time is the sum over the correlation function

\[
t_f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\int f(x) K_i \Delta t f(x) \pi(x) \mu(dx)}{\int (f(x))^2 \pi(x) \mu(dx)} \Delta t
\] (30)

and can be expressed as

\[
t_f = \frac{\int f(x) \omega(x) \pi(x) \mu(dx)}{\int f(x)^2 \pi(x) \mu(dx)}
\] (31)
where \( \omega \) is the solution to the equation
\[
\mathcal{L}\omega(x) = f(x)
\] (32)
constrained to have \( \int \omega(x) \pi(x) \mu(dx) = 0 \).

We observe that despite the fact that the quantities above give us information about the long-time behavior of the system, the formalism introduced here only requires information over short time intervals. This suggests that solving these equations directly could lead to a numerical strategy for estimating these long-time statistics from short-time data.

**IV. DYNAMICAL GALERKIN APPROXIMATION**

The equations in III follow the general form
\[
\mathcal{L}g(x) = h(x) \quad \text{for } x \in D
\]
\[
g(x) = b(x) \quad \text{for } x \in D^c
\] (33)
or
\[
\mathcal{L}^\dagger p g(x) = h(x) \quad \text{for } x \in D
\]
\[
g(x) = b(x) \quad \text{for } x \in D^c.
\] (34)

Here \( D \) is a set in state space that constitutes the *domain*, \( g \) is the unknown solution, and \( h \) and \( b \) are known functions. If the generator and its adjoints are known, these equations can in principle be solved numerically.\(^{35,37}\) However, this is generally not the case, and even if the operators are known, the dimension of the full state space is often too high to allow numerical solution. In our approach, we use approximations similar to (11) and (12) to estimate these quantities from trajectory data. This procedure only requires short trajectories of the system, and works even when the dynamical operators are not known explicitly.

We first discuss operator equations using the generator; equations using an adjoint require only slight modification and are discussed at the end of the subsection. We construct an approximation of the operator equation through the following steps.

1. **Homogenize boundary conditions:** If necessary, rewrite (33) as a problem with homogeneous boundary conditions using a guess for \( g \).

2. **Construct a Galerkin scheme:** Approximate the solution as a sum of basis functions and convert the result of step 1 into a matrix equation.

3. **Approximate inner products with trajectory averages:** Approximate the terms in the Galerkin scheme using trajectory averages and solve for an estimate for \( g \).

Since we use dynamical data to estimate the terms in a Galerkin approximation, we refer to our scheme as *dynamical Galerkin approximation*.

**A. Homogenizing the Boundary Conditions**

First, we rewrite (33) as a problem with homogeneous boundary conditions. This pre-processing step allows us to enforce the boundary conditions in step 2; if the boundary conditions are already homogeneous, either because \( b \) is explicitly zero or because \( D \) includes all of state space, this step can be skipped. We introduce a guess function \( r \) that is equal to \( b \) on \( D^c \). We then rewrite (33) in terms of the difference between the guess and the true solution:
\[
\gamma(x) = g(x) - r(x).
\] (35)
This converts (33) into a problem with homogeneous boundary conditions:

\[ \mathcal{L} \gamma(x) = h(x) - \mathcal{L} r(x) \text{ for } x \text{ in } D \]  
\[ \gamma(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \text{ in } D^c. \]  

(36)  
(37)

A naive guess can always be constructed as

\[ r_{\text{naive}}(x) = 1_{D^c}(x) b(x), \]  
(38)

but if possible, one should attempt to choose \( r \) so that \( \gamma \) can be efficiently expressed using the basis functions introduced in step 2.

B. Constructing the Galerkin Scheme

We now approximate the solution of (36) and (37) via basis expansion using the formalism of Galerkin approximation. Equation (36) implies that

\[ \langle u 1_D, \mathcal{L} \gamma \rangle = \langle u 1_D, h \rangle - \langle u 1_D, \mathcal{L} r \rangle \]  
holds for all \( u \) in the Hilbert space \( L^2_\mu \). This is known as the weak formulation of (36).

The space \( L^2_\mu \) is typically infinite dimensional. Consequently, we cannot expect to ensure that (39) holds for every function in \( L^2_\mu \). We therefore attempt to solve (39) only on a finite-dimensional subspace of \( L^2_\mu \). To do this, we introduce a set of \( M \) linearly independent functions denoted \( \{ \phi_1, ..., \phi_M \} \) that obey the homogeneous boundary conditions; we refer to these as the basis functions. The space of all linear combinations of the basis functions forms a subspace in \( L^2_\mu \) which we call the Galerkin Subspace, \( G \). We can then project (39) onto this subspace, giving the approximate equation

\[ \langle \tilde{u}, \mathcal{L} \tilde{\gamma} \rangle = \langle \tilde{u}, h \rangle - \langle \tilde{u}, \mathcal{L} r \rangle \]  

(40)

for all \( \tilde{u} \) in \( G \). Here \( \tilde{\gamma} \) is the projection of \( \gamma \) onto \( G \). As we increase the dimensionality of \( G \), we expect the error between \( \gamma \) and \( \tilde{\gamma} \) to become arbitrarily small.

Since \( \tilde{u} \) is in \( G \), it can be written as a linear combination of basis functions. Consequently, if (40) holds for \( \phi_i \) it holds for all \( \tilde{u} \), and it is sufficient that

\[ \langle \phi_i, \mathcal{L} \tilde{\gamma} \rangle = \langle \phi_i, h \rangle - \langle \phi_i, \mathcal{L} r \rangle \]

holds for each \( i \). Moreover, the construction of \( G \) implies that there exist unique coefficients \( a_j \) such that

\[ \tilde{\gamma}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} a_j \phi_j(x), \]  
(41)

enabling us to write

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{M} L_{ij} a_j = h_i - r_i \]  
(42)

where

\[ L_{ij} = \langle \phi_i, \mathcal{L} \phi_j \rangle \]  
(43)

\[ h_i = \langle \phi_i, h \rangle. \]  
(44)

\[ r_i = \langle \phi_i, \mathcal{L} r \rangle \]  
(45)
If the terms in (43)-(45) are known, (42) can be solved for the coefficients $a_j$ and an estimate of $g$ can be constructed as

$$\tilde{g}(x) = r(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} a_j \phi_j(x).$$

(46)

Since $\tilde{g}$ is zero on $D^c$ and $r$ obeys the inhomogeneous boundary conditions by construction,

$$\tilde{g} = r(x) = b(x) \text{ for } x \in D^c.$$  

(47)

Consequently, our estimate of $g$ obeys the boundary conditions.

A similar scheme can be constructed for equations with a weighted adjoint $L^\dagger_p$ by adding one additional step to the procedure. After homogenizing the boundary conditions, we multiply both sides of (36) by $p$. We then proceed as before, and obtain (42) with terms defined as

$$L_{ij} = \langle \phi_i, pL^\dagger_p \phi_j \rangle = \langle L \phi_i, p \phi_j \rangle$$

(48)

$$h_i = \langle \phi_i, ph \rangle$$

(49)

$$r_i = \langle \phi_i, pL^\dagger_p r \rangle = \langle L \phi_i, pr \rangle$$

(50)

instead of (43), (44), and (45) respectively.

C. Approximating Inner Products through Monte Carlo

Solving for $a_j$ requires estimates of the terms in (42). In general, these terms cannot be evaluated directly, due to the complexity of the dynamical operators. However, we can estimate these terms using trajectory averages, in the style of the estimates in (11). Let $\rho_{\Delta t}$ be the joint probability measure of $\Xi^{(0)}$ and $\Xi^{(\Delta t)}$, such that for two sets $X$ and $Y$ in state space,

$$\int_{X,Y} \rho_{\Delta t}(dx,dy) = P[\Xi^{(0)} \in X, \Xi^{(\Delta t)} \in Y]$$

(51)

We observe that

$$\langle u, L v \rangle = \int u(x) E \left[ v (\Xi^{(\Delta t)}) | \Xi^{(0)} = x \right] - v(x) \mu(dx)$$

$$= \int u(x) \frac{v(y) - v(x)}{\Delta t} \rho_{\Delta t}(dx,dy).$$

(52)

We now assume that we have a dataset of the form described in Subsection II A, with a lag time of $\Delta t$. Since each pair $(X_n, Y_n)$ is a draw from $\rho_{\Delta t}$, (52) can be approximated using the Monte Carlo estimate

$$\langle u, L v \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} u(X_n) \frac{v(Y_n) - v(X_n)}{\Delta t}.$$ 

(53)

Similarly, inner products of the form $\langle u, v \rangle$ can be estimated as

$$\langle u, v \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} u(X_n) v(X_n).$$

(54)

If the Galerkin scheme arose from an equation with a weighted adjoint, evaluating the expectations may require separately estimating $p$. However, the case $p = \pi$ can be treated internally to the DGA framework via equation (24).
D. Pseudocode

The DGA procedure can thus be summarized as follows.

1. Sample \( N \) pairs of configurations \((X_n, Y_n)\) where \( Y_n \) is the configuration resulting from propagating the system forward from \( X_n \) for time \( \Delta t \).

2. Construct a set of \( M \) basis functions \( \phi_i \) and, if needed, the guess function \( r \).

3. Estimate the terms in (42) using the estimates in (IV C).

4. Solve the resulting matrix equations for the coefficients and substitute them into (46) to construct an estimate of the function of interest.

Some DGA estimates may require additional manipulation to ensure physical meaning. For instance, the change of measure and expected hitting time are nonnegative, and committors are constrained to be between zero and one. These bounds are not guaranteed to hold for estimates constructed through DGA. To correct this, we apply a simple postprocessing step, and round the DGA estimate to the nearest value in the range. Alternatively, constraints on the mean of solution, such as the assumption that \( \omega \) in (32) be mean zero, can be applied by subtracting the appropriate mean from the estimate.

Finally, many dynamical quantities require evaluation of additional inner products. These inner products can also be evaluated using the estimates in Subsection IV C. For instance, to estimate the autocorrelation time, \( t_f \), one must construct approximations to \( \omega \) and \( \pi \) and set \( \omega \) to have zero mean against \( \pi(x)\mu(dx) \). One would then evaluate the numerator and denominator of (31) using (54).

E. Connection with Other Schemes

This formalism is closely related to DOEA. Rather than considering the solution for a linear system, we could construct a Galerkin scheme for the eigenfunctions of \( \mathcal{L} \). Since \( \mathcal{L} \) and \( \mathcal{K}_s \) have the same eigenfunctions, in the limit of infinite sampling this would give equivalent results to the scheme in II B. Moreover, the fact that DOEA techniques can be used to solve (24) has been observed in Reference 39.

Our scheme is also closely related to Markov state modeling. Let \( \phi_i \) be a basis set of indicator functions on disjoint sets \( S_i \) covering the state space. Under relatively minor assumptions, applying DGA with this basis is equivalent to estimating the quantities in III with an MSM. We give a more thorough treatment in the Supplementary Information. Here we quickly motivate this connection by considering Feynman-Kac formulas using the generator. We note that we can divide both sides of (42) by \( \int \phi(x)\mu(dx) \) without changing the solution. With this particular choice of basis, we then have

\[
\frac{L_{ij}}{\int \phi(x)\mu(dx)} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} (P - I)_{ij}
\]  

(55)

where \( P \) is the MSM transition matrix defined in (3) and \( I \) is the identity matrix. Because of this similarity, we refer to a basis set constructed in this manner as an “MSM” basis.

V. BASIS CONSTRUCTION USING DIFFUSION MAPS

One natural route to improving the accuracy of DGA schemes is to improve the set of basis functions \( \phi \), thus reducing the error caused by projecting the operator equation onto the finite-dimensional subspace. Various approaches have been used to construct basis sets for describing dynamics. If \( D^c \) is empty, one can, in principle, use any set of linearly independent functions as a basis. In particular, most basis sets used for DOEA can be used
for dynamical Galerkin approximation without further modification. However, if the set $D^c$ has nonzero measure, these functions cannot be used directly. Effective construction of basis sets that obey specified homogeneous boundary conditions in high-dimensional CV spaces merits further research. As an initial contribution, we give a novel method for constructing basis functions based on the technique of diffusion maps.

Diffusion maps are a technique shown to have success in finding global descriptions of molecular systems from high-dimensional input data\textsuperscript{20–21}. A simple implementation proceeds by constructing the transition matrix

$$P_{\text{DMAP}}^{mn} = \frac{K_\varepsilon(x_m, x_n)}{\sum_n K_\varepsilon(x_m, x_n)},$$

(56)

where $K_\varepsilon$ is a kernel function that decays exponentially with the distance between datapoints $x_m$ and $x_n$, with a lengthscale parameter $\varepsilon$ that sets the rate of decay. Multiple choices of $K_\varepsilon$ exist. Here, we follow the procedure in reference \textsuperscript{19}. One then computes the eigenvectors of $P_{\text{DMAP}}^M$ with $M$ highest positive eigenvalues. These eigenvectors were historically used to define a new coordinate system for dimensionality reduction. However, they can also be used as a basis set for DOEA and similar analyses\textsuperscript{19,25,45}. To construct a basis set that obeys nontrivial boundary conditions, we first take the submatrix of $P_{\text{DMAP}}$ such that $x_m, x_n \in D$. We then calculate the eigenvectors $\phi_i$ of the submatrix with the $M$ highest positive eigenvalues, and take as our basis

$$\phi_i(x) = \begin{cases} \phi_i(x) & \text{for } x \in D \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. $$

(57)

In addition to allowing us to define a basis set, $P_{\text{DMAP}}$ gives a natural way of constructing guess functions that obey the boundary conditions. Since (56) is a transition matrix, it corresponds to a discrete Markov chain on the data. Therefore, we can construct guesses by solving analogs to (33) using the dynamics specified by the diffusion map. For equations using the generator, we solve the problem

$$\sum_n (P_{\text{DMAP}} - I)_{mn} r_n = h(x_m) \text{ for } m \in D$$

(58)

where $I$ is the identity matrix. The resulting estimate will obey the boundary conditions for all datapoints sampled in $D^c$.

Equation (58) can also be used to construct guesses for equations using weighted adjoints. In principle, one could replace $P_{\text{DMAP}}$ with its weighted adjoint against $p$, and solve the corresponding equation. However, $r_n$ will still obey the boundary conditions irrespective of the weighted adjoint used. We therefore take the adjoint of $P_{\text{DMAP}}$ with respect to its stationary measure. Since the Markov chain associated with the diffusion map is reversible\textsuperscript{26}, $P_{\text{DMAP}}$ is self-adjoint with its stationary measure and we again solve (58). We discuss how to perform out-of-sample extension on the basis and the guess functions in the Supplementary Information.

To visualize the results of our scheme, we apply it to a collection of datapoints sampled from a toy potential energy surface. The potential energy surface is given by the Müller-Brown potential\textsuperscript{27} for simplicity we divide the entire potential by twenty so that $k_B T = 1$ gives a chemically reasonable barrier height. This potential was sampled using a Brownian particle with isotropic diffusion coefficient of 0.1, using the BAOAB integrator for overdamped dynamics with a timestep of 0.01 time units\textsuperscript{28}. Trajectories were initialized out of the stationary measure by uniformly picking 10000 starting locations on the interval $x \in (-2.5, 1.5), y \in (-2.5, 1.5)$. Initial points with potential energies larger than 100 were rejected and resampled to avoid numerical artifacts. Each trajectory was then constructed by simulating the dynamics for 500 steps, saving the position every 100 steps. We then defined two states $A$ and $B$ (red and cyan dashed contours in Figure 1, respectively) and constructed the basis and guess functions required for the committor. The results, plotted in Figure 1, demonstrate that the diffusion map basis constructs Fourier-like basis functions with global support.
A. Basis Set Performance in High-Dimensional CV spaces.

We first test the behavior of the diffusion map basis set in high-dimensional CV spaces by attempting to calculate the forward committor function and the total reactive flux. Since the forward committor cannot be directly estimated for complex systems, we study the behavior on the toy potential discussed above. To artificially increase the dimensionality of the system, we include 18 additional degrees of freedom with harmonic potential

\[ U(x, y, z_1, \ldots, z_{18}) = U_{\text{MB}}(x, y) + \sum_{d=1}^{20} z_d^2 \]  

where \( U_{\text{MB}} \) is the scaled Müller-Brown potential discussed above. The use of a simple test potential allows us to calculate a highly accurate reference for the forward committor using a grid-based scheme described in the Supplementary Information. Our reference is plotted in Figure 2A.

We estimate \( q^+, q^-, \) and \( \pi \) using DGA, with both MSM and diffusion map bases, each with 500 basis functions. We found that varying the size of the basis did not appreciably change the observed trends. The system was initialized as before in the \( x \) and \( y \) dimensions; the initial values of the nuisance coordinates were drawn from their marginal distributions at equilibrium. The system was then sampled using the same procedure as before.

For the MSM basis set, we construct one scheme that can be used to estimate all three of the functions required. We first construct \( M \) clusters on the domain \( D \). We then cluster states \( A \) and \( B \) separately, with the number of states chosen such that sets inside and outside of \( D \) have roughly the same number of samples on average. Clustering was performed using k-means as implemented in PyEMMA. For this dataset and state definition, we use \( M/5 \) clusters in both state \( A \) and state \( B \). We then build a basis set out of indicator functions on all of these clusters. Since our sets partition space, our DGA is equivalent to a Markov state model whose state definitions exactly preserve the boundaries on sets \( A \) and \( B \). Indeed, we estimate \( q^+, q^-, \) and \( \pi \) using PyEMMA directly, by constructing an MSM on these states, with the reversible flag set to false. For the diffusion map basis, we construct separate basis sets for the committors and \( \pi \), and then recombine the estimates. To estimate the
FIG. 2. Example forward committors calculated using the diffusion map and MSM bases on a high-dimensional toy problem. The system is the same as in Figure 1, with 18 additional nuisance dimensions. (A) Forward committor function calculated using an accurate grid-based scheme. The black lines indicate the contours of free energy in the \(x\) and \(y\) coordinates, and the red and cyan dashed contours indicate the two states. Every subsequent dimension has a harmonic potential with force constant of 2. (B-C) Estimated forward committor constructed using the diffusion map and MSM bases, respectively. 

total reactive flux, we set \(C\) and \(C^c\) in \(\Theta\) to be the sets on either side of the calculated isocommittor.

The forward committors estimated with the diffusion map basis and the MSM basis are depicted in Figures 2B and 2C, respectively. We see that the diffusion map basis manages to capture the general trends in the reference in Figure 2A. In contrast, the MSM basis gives considerably noisier results.

To quantify these differences, we repeated the calculation 29 additional times to construct a dataset of 30 trajectories and estimated the forward committor using both methods of constructing basis sets. The procedure was, in turn, repeated with a varying number of nuisance degrees of freedom to test the effect of dimensionality. We then calculated the root-mean-square error between the estimated and the true forward committor. This procedure is complicated by the fact that the MSM transition matrix may be reducible, making any resulting linear algebra problems ill-posed. To address this issue, PyEMMA reduces the number of states to an active set of states, for which the transition matrix is irreducible. Points where \(X_n\) or \(Y_n\) are outside of the active set are then removed from the dataset. Consequently, no committor values are calculated on these points, and we ignore these points in our analysis. This gives the MSM basis an advantage over the diffusion map basis, as we are explicitly ignoring points where it fails to provide an answer.

In Figure 3A, we plot the average error as a function of the number of nuisance degrees of freedom. While for low dimensional systems the MSM and the diffusion map basis give comparable results, as we increase the dimensionality, the MSM gives increasingly worse answers. This error is also reflected in the estimate of the total reactive flux as depicted in Figure 3B. We stress that the large errors occur due to the nature of the dataset. If data were collected from a long equilibrium trajectory, it would not be necessary to estimate \(\pi(x)\) separately, and we could set \(\pi(x) = 1\). In that case, provided the number of MSM states was sufficient, the MSM reactive flux reverts to direct estimation of the number of reactive trajectories per unit time. We this to be accurate regardless of the quality of the estimated forwards or backwards committors.

VI. ADDRESSING PROJECTION ERROR THROUGH DELAY EMBEDDING

Our results suggest that improving basis set choice can give DGA schemes better accuracy in higher-dimensional CV spaces. However, even large CV spaces are considerably lower-dimensional than the system’s full state space. Consequently, they may still omit key degrees of freedom needed to describe the long-time dynamics. In both MSMS and
FIG. 3. Comparison of basis performance as a function of the toy system’s dimension. (A) Average error in the forward committor between the states B and A in Figure 2 as a function of the number of nuisance degrees of freedom included. (B) Estimated reactive flux between the states as a function of the same. In both plots shaded error bars are the standard deviation over a dataset of 30 runs.

DOEA, this projection error is often addressed by increasing the lag time of the transition operator\cite{26,27,50,51}. This is based on the assumption that degrees of freedom omitted from the CV space equilibrate quickly and contribute little to the long-time dynamics.

However, there is no guarantee that this assumption holds for any specific choice of collective variables. Moreover, while the eigenfunctions for the transition operator are independent of $s$, the equations in Section III hold only for a lag time of $\Delta t$. In these cases, using a longer time is effectively making the approximation

$$\mathcal{L} f(x) \approx \frac{K_s f(x) - f(x)}{s}.$$  

This causes a systematic bias in the answer that increases with $s$. While for small $s$ this bias is likely negligible, it may become large as $s$ increases. For instance, it was noted in reference \cite{51} that in the limit of $s \to \infty$, estimates of the mean first passage time to state $A$ converge to $1/\int_A \pi(x) \mu(dx)$ at all points in the state space.

Here, we propose an alternative strategy for dealing with projection error. Rather than looking at larger time lags, we use past configurations in CV space to account for contributions from the removed degrees of freedom. This idea has a long history in chemical dynamics, and is central to the Mori-Zwanzig formalism\cite{52} Here, we use delay embedding to include history information. Let $\zeta(t)$ be the projection of $\Xi(t)$ at time $t$. We define the delay embedded process with $d$ delays as

$$\theta(t) = \left(\zeta(t), \zeta(t-\Delta t), \zeta(t-2\Delta t), \ldots, \zeta(t-d\Delta t)\right).$$  

(61)
FIG. 4. Comparison of methods for dealing with the projection error in an incomplete collective variable space. In all subplots we estimate the mean first passage time from state $B = \{y < 0.15\}$ to state $A = \{y > 1.15\}$ using a DGA scheme on only the $y$ coordinate of the Müller-Brown potential. (A) Estimate constructed using an MSM basis increasing the lag time in [60]. (B, C) Estimates constructed using an MSM and Diffusion map basis respectively with delay embedding. In each plot, the solid line with markers is the mean over 30 identically constructed trajectories, and the shaded region is the standard deviation across the dataset. The black solid line is an estimate of the mean-first-passage time calculated using the reference scheme in the appendix, and the dashed error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean first passage time over state B.

Delay embedding has a long history in the study of deterministic, finite-dimensional systems, and has been extended to certain classes of stochastic systems. It has also been used in applications of DOEA. There, it has been argued that delay embedding can also improve statistical accuracy for noisy data. We note that other methods of augmenting the dynamical process with history information have been used in the construction of MSMs by Suarez et al. Here we show that delay embedding can be used to improve dynamical estimates in DGA. To apply DGA to the delay embedded process, we must extend the functions in Section III. We do this by using the value of the function on the central timepoint,

$$f(\theta(t)) = f(\zeta(t - \lfloor d/2 \rfloor \Delta t)) \quad (62)$$

where $\lfloor \ldots \rfloor$ denotes rounding down to the nearest integer. States in the delay-embedded space are defined similarly. This choice preserves dynamical quantities such as mean first passage times and committors. The basis set is then constructed directly on $\theta$, and the DGA formalism is applied as before.

We tested the effect of delay embedding in the presence of projection error by constructing DGA schemes on the same system as in Section V and taking as our CV space only the $y$-coordinate. For this study we revised our dataset to include 2000 trajectories, each sampled for 30000 timesteps. While using longer trajectories brings the ensemble of trajectories closer to equilibrium, it allows us to test longer lag times and delay lengths. To ensure that our states are well-defined in this new collective variable space, we redefine state $A$ to be the set $\{y > 1.15\}$, and state $B$ to be the set $\{y < 0.15\}$. We then estimated the mean first passage time into state $A$, conditioned on starting in state $B$ at equilibrium.

$$m_{B \rightarrow A} = \frac{\int 1_B(x)m_A(x)\pi(x)\mu(dx)}{\int 1_B(x)\pi(x)\mu(dx)}$$

We constructed estimates using an MSM basis with varying lag time, an MSM basis with delay embedding, and a diffusion map basis with delay embedding. In Figure 4, we plot
the average mean first passage time as a function of the lag time and the trajectory length used in the delay embedding. We compare the resulting estimates with an estimate of the mean first passage time constructed using our grid-based scheme.

The mean first passage time estimated from the MSM basis with the lag time steadily increases as the lag time becomes longer (Figure 4A), as predicted in 51. In contrast, the estimates obtained from delay embedding both converge as the delay length increases, albeit to a value slightly larger than the reference. We believe the small error is because we treat the dynamics as having a discrete timestep, while the reference curve approximates the mean first passage time for a continuous-time Brownian dynamics.

In all three schemes, we see anomalous behavior as the length of the lag time or delay length increases. This is due to an increase in statistical error when the delay length becomes close to the length of the trajectory. If each trajectory has \( N \) datapoints, performing a delay-embedding with \( d \) delays means that each trajectory only gives \( N - d \) samples. This phenomenon also occurs as the lag time is increased. When \( N \) and \( d \) are of the same order of magnitude, this leads to increased statistical error in the estimates in IV C, to the point of making the resulting linear algebra problem ill-posed. This causes the diffusion map basis to fluctuate to unreasonable values at long delay lengths, and the MSM basis to fail completely. In case of the lagged MSM, this phenomenon causes an anomalous downturn in the average mean first passage time near 26 steps.

VII. APPLICATION TO THE FIP35 WW DOMAIN

To test our methods on a system representative of contemporary biomolecular simulations, we applied our methods to the Fip35 WW domain trajectories described by D.E. Shaw Research in references 57 and 58. The dataset consists of six trajectories, each of length 100000 ns with frames output every 0.2 ns. To reduce the memory requirements in constructing the diffusion map kernel matrix, we subsampled the trajectories, keeping every 100th frame. This allowed us to test the scheme over a broad range of hyperparameters. We expect that in practical applications a finer time resolution would be used, and any additional computational cost could be offset by using landmark diffusion maps.59 To define the folded and unfolded states, we follow 60 and calculate \( r_{\beta 1} \) and \( r_{\beta 2} \), the minimum root-mean-square-displacement for each of the two \( \beta \) hairpins, defined as amino acids 7-23 and 18-29, respectively.60 We define the folded configuration as having both \( r_{\beta 1} < 0 \) \( 2 \) \( m \) and \( r_{\beta 2} < 0 \) \( 2 \) m and the unfolded configuration as having \( 0.4 \) nm \( < r_{\beta 1} < 1.0 \) nm and \( 0.3 \) nm \( < r_{\beta 2} < 0.75 \) nm. For convenience, we refer to these states as \( A \) and \( B \) throughout this section. We take as our collective variable space the space formed by the pairwise distances between every other \( \alpha \)-carbon, leading to a 153-dimensional collective variable space.

We then attempt to estimate the forward committor between the two states and the mean-first-passage time into \( A \) using the same methods as in Section VI. In contrast to the Müller-Brown model, we cannot evaluate these methods by directly calculating the error in our estimates. Instead, we observe that both the mean-first-passage time and forward committor are conditional expectations, and consequently minimize the mean-square cost:

\[
m_A(x) = \arg\min_{f(x)} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\tau_A - f(x))^2 \right]
\]

\[
q_+(x) = \arg\min_{f(x)} \mathbb{E} \left[ (1_{\tau_B < \tau_A} - f(x))^2 \right]
\]

As we have long folding and unfolding trajectories, we have a sample of \( \tau_A \) and \( 1_{\tau_B < \tau_A} \) associated with each datapoint. We can therefore estimate these expectations using trajectory averages to give a measure of the error in our estimate. Note that the minima of the expectations in (63) and (64) are the variances of \( \tau_A \) and \( 1_{\tau_B < \tau_A} \). Unlike the mean square error, a perfect scheme would not achieve a cost of zero.

To avoid correlations between the DGA estimate and the calculated cost, we perform a test/train split and divide the data into two halves. We choose three trajectories to construct
our estimate, and use the other three to approximate the expectations in (63) and (64). Repeating this for each possible choice of trajectories creates a total of 20 test/train unique pairs.

Our results are given in Figure 5. In panels A and B, we give the mean value of the cost for the mean-first-passage time and forward committor over all test/train pairs, as calculated using 200 basis functions for each algorithm. We have observed no difference in behavior for larger basis sets. The large standard deviations primarily reflect variation in the cost across different test/train pairs, rather than any difference between the methods. This suggests the presence of large numerical noise in our results.

To get a more accurate comparison, we instead look at the expected improvement in cost between schemes for a given test/train pair. To quantify whether an improvement occurs, we first determine the best parameter choice for the MSM basis with increasing lag. We then estimate the cost for the MSM basis with delay embedding and for the diffusion map basis, and calculate the difference in cost versus the lagged MSM scheme for each test/train pair. As this difference is calculated against the best parameter choice for the lagged MSM scheme, they are intrinsically conservative: in practice, one should not expect to have the optimal lagged MSM parameters. We then average and calculate the standard deviation over pairs, and plot the results in figures 5C through 5F.

In our numerical experiments, we see that the diffusion map seems to give the best results for relatively short delay lengths. However, the diffusion map basis performs progressively worse as the delay length increases. The mechanism causing this loss in accuracy requires further analysis. This tentatively suggests the use of the diffusion map basis for datasets consisting of very short trajectories, where using long delays may be infeasible. In contrast, our results with the delay-embedded MSM basis are more ambiguous. For the mean-first
passage time, we do not see improvement over the lagged results. We do see noticeable improvement in the estimated forward committor probability as the delay length increases. However, we observe that the delay lengths required to improve upon the diffusion map result are comparable in magnitude to the average time required for the trajectory to reach either the $A$ or $B$ states. Indeed, we only see an improvement over the diffusion map result at a delay length of 180 ns, and we observe that the longest the trajectory spends outside of both state $A$ or state $B$ is 223 ns. This negates any advantage of using datasets of short trajectories.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we introduce a new framework for estimating dynamical statistics from trajectory data. We first express the quantity of interest in terms of a Feynman-Kac formula, an operator equation using either the dynamical process’s transition operator or one of its adjoints. We then apply a Galerkin approximation, projecting the unknown function onto a finite-dimensional basis set. This allows us to approximate the problem as a system of linear equations. Finally, we approximate the resulting matrix elements using Monte Carlo integration on dynamical data. We refer to this framework as Dynamical Galerkin approximation. These estimates can be constructed using collections of short trajectories initialized from relatively arbitrary distributions. If one uses a basis set of indicator functions on nonoverlapping sets, one recovers MSM estimates of dynamical quantities under weak conditions. Our work is also closely related to existing work on estimating the eigenfunctions of the transition operator.

To demonstrate the utility of alternative basis sets, we introduce a new method for constructing basis functions based on diffusion maps. Results on a toy system shows that this basis has the potential to give improved results in high-dimensional CV spaces. We also explore the technique of delay embedding, and show that it can improve the accuracy of DGA schemes if key degrees of freedom were omitted in constructing the collective variable space. We apply our technique to a one-dimensional projection of our test system, where we construct our schemes on a collective variable known to be incomplete. In contrast to the common practice of increasing the lag time in the approximation of the dynamical operator, delay embedding causes our estimate to converge to the correct result.

We then applied the method to long folding trajectories of the Fip35 WW domain to study the performance of the schemes in a large CV space on a nontrivial biomolecule. Our results suggest that the diffusion map basis gives the best performance for short delay times, giving results that are generally better than the best time-lagged MSM parameter choice. This suggests the use of the diffusion map basis for datasets consisting of short trajectories, where the use of long delays may be impossible. We also see that basis functions used in Markov state modeling give better estimates of the forward committor as the delay length increases. Indeed, for sufficiently long delays this basis outperforms the diffusion map basis. However, in our example the delay length required to see improved performance is comparable to the time required for the molecular process to occur. This negates any potential computational gain over directly simulating the process. While our results are preliminary, they suggest that estimates of dynamical quantities can be improved both by improved basis choice and by the use of delay embedding. We therefore believe DGA schemes have the potential to give improved estimates of dynamical quantities for difficult molecular problems.
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**X. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

**A. Connection between DGA and Markov State Modelling**

Here, we describe in detail the connection between DGA and certain dynamical estimates calculated using a Markov model.

To map the general dynamics onto the state space of the Markov Chain, we make three assumptions.

**Assumption X.1.** Each Markov state $S_i$ is contained entirely in either $D$ or in $D^c$.

**Assumption X.2.** The boundary conditions $b$ can be expressed as

$$b(x) = \sum_{l \in D^c} b_l 1_{S_l}(x). \quad (65)$$

**Assumption X.3.** For any adjoint $L^*_p$ considered, $p$ can be written as a

$$p(x) = \sum_{j \in D} \frac{p_j}{\langle 1_j \rangle} 1_j(x) + \sum_{l \in D^c} \frac{p_l}{\langle 1_l \rangle} 1_l(x). \quad (66)$$

The first assumption is necessary for the basis set to obey the homogeneous boundary conditions, and can be enforced explicitly in the construction of the MSM. The second two assumptions will be required to make the action of $L$ representable as the action of matrices on vectors over the MSM states. While these assumptions should not be expected to hold for general $b$ and $p$, in the correct limit of infinite sampling and sufficiently small Markov States, we expect (65) and (66) to be arbitrarily good approximations. In fact, for most $b$ in Section [II, assumption X.2] can hold exactly. Lastly, we note that vector $p_i$ sums to one, as

$$1 = \int p(x) \mu(dx)$$

$$= \int \sum_{j \in D} \frac{p_j}{\langle 1_j \rangle} 1_j(x) + \sum_{l \in D^c} \frac{p_l}{\langle 1_l \rangle} 1_l(x) \mu(dx)$$

$$= \sum_{j \in D} p_j + \sum_{l \in D^c} p_l.$$

Consequently, $p_i$ is a probability distribution over the MSM state-space.

**1. Equations with the Transition Operator**

We first consider equations that take the form of (33). As our guess, we will use (38). Substituting into (42), and applying Assumption X.2, and dividing by $\langle 1_{S_i} \rangle$, we arrive at

$$\sum_{j \in D} \frac{1}{\Delta t} (P - I)_{ij} a_j = \eta_i - \sum_{l \in D^c} \frac{1}{\Delta t} (P - I)_{il} b_l. \quad (67)$$
Here $P_{ij}$ is the MSM transition matrix defined in (3) with a time lag of $\Delta t$, and $\eta_i$ is defined as

$$\eta_i = \langle 1_i, h \rangle / \langle 1_i \rangle$$

(68)

This can be rewritten as

$$\sum_j \frac{1}{\Delta t} (P - I)_{ij} a_j = \eta_i \text{ for } i \in D$$

$$a_i = b_i \text{ for } i \in D^c$$

(69)

where the sum is over states on the entire domain. This is equivalent to (33), for the dynamics given by the MSM.

2. Equations with Transition Adjoints

For equations that take the form of (34) we again begin with (42), this time with terms defined by equations (48), (50), and (49). Substituting in our guess function and Assumptions X.3 and X.1, we have

$$\sum_{j \in D} \langle L 1_i, 1_j \rangle p_j \langle 1_j \rangle a_j = \langle p_i \rangle \langle 1_i, h \rangle - \sum_{l \in D^c} \langle L 1_i, 1_l \rangle b_l \langle p_l \rangle \langle 1_l \rangle$$

(70)

We then divide both sides by $p_i$. Applying the definition of $P_{ij}$, we arrive at

$$\sum_{j \in D} p_i^{-1} (P - I)_{ij}^T p_j a_j = \eta_i - \sum_{l \in D^c} p_l^{-1} (P - I)_{il} p_l b_l.$$  

(71)

which, as before, is equivalent to solving

$$\sum_j p_i^{-1} (P - I)_{ij}^T p_j = \eta_i \text{ for } i \in D$$

$$a_i = b_i \text{ for } i \in D^c.$$  

(72)

The matrix with elements $p_i^{-1} (P - I)_{ij}^T p_j$ is the adjoint of the generator for the MSM, weighted by the probability measure $p_i$ on each state.

B. Out-of-sample Extension for the Diffusion Map Basis

To predict the values of the quantities in III at new datapoints, we will need to extend the diffusion map basis and guess functions to new configurations. Initially, one might attempt this by constructing a new diffusion map matrix that contains both the old and the new points and recomputing the guess and eigenvectors. However, not only would this procedure be expensive, it would change the values of the basis and guess functions on the old points. Consequently, the estimates of $a_j$ would be incorrect, and the entire DGA scheme would need to be repeated. We therefore seek a method for extending the basis and guess functions to new points that leave their values on older points unchanged.

Let $x_\nu$ be a new point added to the dataset. To extend the basis functions to $x_\nu$, we can use the established method of Nyström extension. Let $\varphi_i$ be an eigenvector of the
submatrix discussed in Section V and let $\kappa_i$ be the associated eigenvalue. The estimate of the basis function on $x_\nu$ is given by

$$\varphi_i(x_\nu) = \frac{1}{\kappa_i} \sum_m K_E(x_m, x_\nu) \phi_i(x_m).$$ (73)

To extend the guess function to new configurations, we introduce a new method based on the Jacobi method. To extend the guess function, we consider $\hat{P}$, a new diffusion map matrix built using both the old datapoints $x_{1..N}$ and the new datapoint. The guess function associated with $\hat{P}$ would then solve the problem

$$\left(\hat{P} - I\right) g = h$$ (74)

for all of the points in $D$. We will construct our estimate of $g$ at the new point by considering a single iteration of the Jacobi method for finding a solution of (74), where our initial vector takes values of $g_m$ on $x_m$ and 0 on $x_\nu$. This gives us the following out-of-sample extension formula

$$g_\nu = \frac{1}{\hat{P}_{\nu\nu} - 1} \left( h_\nu - \sum_m \hat{P}_{m\nu} g_m \right)$$ (75)

which can be further simplified using the definition of $\hat{P}$ to

$$g_\nu = \sum_m \frac{K_E(x_\nu, x_m) g_m}{\sum_m K_E(x_\nu, x_m)} - h_\nu \left( 1 + \frac{\sum_m K_E(x_\nu, x_m)}{\sum_m K_E(x_\nu, x_m)} \right).$$ (76)

C. Derivation of TPT Reactive Flux and Rate in Discrete Time

Transition path theory was originally formulated for diffusion processes and was extended to finite-state Markov jump processes. Here, we derive analogous equations for discrete-time Markov chains on arbitrary state spaces. The derivation closely follows Reference. Let $x(t)$ be a single trajectory ergodically sampling the stationary measure. We will extend the trajectory both forwards and backwards in time so the time index $t$ takes values from $-\infty$ to $\infty$. For all $t$, let

$$t^+_{AB}(t) = \min \{ t' | t' \geq t, x(t') \in A \cup B \}$$ (77)

$$t^-_{AB}(t) = \max \{ t' | t' \leq t, x(t') \in A \cup B \}$$ (78)

be the next time the system entered $A$ or $B$ and the most recent time the system left $A$ or $B$, respectively. Now let $C$ be as in (28). The total reactive current is defined as

$$I_{B \rightarrow A} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \sum_{t \in [-T,T]} \left[ \mathbf{1}_C(x(t)) \mathbf{1}_{C^c}(x(t + \Delta t)) - \mathbf{1}_{C^c}(x(t)) \mathbf{1}_C(x(t + \Delta t)) \right]$$ (79)

Using ergodicity, we can rewrite this as an average against $\rho_{\Delta t}$.

$$I_{B \rightarrow A} = \mathbf{1}_{C^c}(y)q_+(y)q_+(x)\mathbf{1}_C(x)\pi(x)\rho_{\Delta t}(dx,dy)$$ (80)

$$- \mathbf{1}_C(y)q_+(y)q_+(x)\mathbf{1}_{C^c}(x)\pi(x)\rho_{\Delta t}(dx,dy)$$ (81)

This is the discrete-time equivalent of equation (30) in Reference. Applying the definition of the generator and observing that that $\mathbf{1}_C(x)\mathbf{1}_{C^c}(x) = 0$ everywhere gives (28). We then arrive at (22) in our work by the same arguments as in Reference.
D. Grid-Based Scheme for Approximating the Committor Probability

Here we discuss the scheme used to approximate the forward committor for our test system. Instead of considering the discrete time process directly, we will attempt to approximate the forward committor for the continuous-time Brownian dynamics on the test potential. To this end, we define a Markov hopping process on a grid that converges to the continuous time dynamics as the grid becomes finer. Specifically, we allow nearest neighbor hops on a square grid with spacing $\epsilon$. The hopping probabilities are given by

\[
P(x + \epsilon, y) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \exp[U(x + \epsilon, y) - U(x, y)]} \right) \\
P(x - \epsilon, y) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \exp[U(x - \epsilon, y) - U(x, y)]} \right) \\
P(x, y + \epsilon) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \exp[U(x, y + \epsilon) - U(x, y)]} \right) \\
P(x, y - \epsilon) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \exp[U(x, y - \epsilon) - U(x, y)]} \right) \\
P(x, y) = 1 - P(x + \epsilon, y) - P(x - \epsilon, y) - P(x, y + \epsilon) - P(x, y - \epsilon)
\]

(82)

Here $P(x \pm \epsilon, y)$ is the probability of hopping one grid point to the right or left, $P(x, y \pm \epsilon)$ is the probability of hopping up or down the grid, and $P(x, y)$ is the probability of remaining in place.

We will not give a full proof of convergence. Instead we merely demonstrate that as $\epsilon \to 0$, we approximate the infinitesimal generator for Brownian Dynamics. Let $P$ be the transition matrix associated with the transition probabilities given by (82), $f$ be a twice-differentiable function, and the vector $\vec{f}$ the values of $f$ evaluated at each grid point. In the limit of $\epsilon \to 0$,

\[
\frac{16(P - I)\vec{f}}{\epsilon^2} = L_{\text{brown}} f(x, y) + O(\epsilon)
\]

(83)

where $L_{\text{brown}}$ is the infinitesimal generator for Brownian dynamics with isotropic diffusion constant,

\[
L_{\text{brown}} f(x, y) = - \frac{\partial_x U(x, y)}{\partial f} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial_y U(x, y)}{\partial f} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial_x^2 f(x, y)}{\partial f} + \frac{\partial_y^2 f(x, y)}{\partial f}.
\]

To demonstrate this, we write $(P - I)\vec{f}$ explicitly.

\[
(P - I)f = P(x + \epsilon, y) f(x + \epsilon, y) + P(x - \epsilon, y) f(x - \epsilon, y) + P(x, y + \epsilon) f(x, y + \epsilon) + P(x, y - \epsilon) f(x, y - \epsilon) + P(x, y) f(x, y) + O(\epsilon^3)
\]
If we expand $f$ to second order around $(x, y)$, the zeroth order term cancels, leaving

$$(P - I)f = P(x + \epsilon, y) \left( \epsilon \partial_x f + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \partial_x^2 f \right)$$

$$- P(x - \epsilon, y) \left( \epsilon \partial_x f - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \partial_x^2 f \right)$$

$$+ P(x, y + \epsilon \tau) \left( \epsilon \partial_y f + \frac{1}{2} (\epsilon \tau)^2 \partial_y^2 f \right)$$

$$- P(x, y - \epsilon \tau) \left( \epsilon \partial_y f - \frac{1}{2} (\epsilon \tau)^2 \partial_y^2 f \right) + O(\epsilon^3)$$

We then expand the transition probabilities to first order.

$$P(x \pm \epsilon, y) = \frac{1}{8} \left( 1 \pm \frac{1}{2} \partial_x U(x, y) \epsilon \right) + O(\epsilon^2)$$

$$P(x, y \pm \epsilon \tau) = \frac{1}{8} \left( 1 \pm \frac{1}{2} \partial_y U(x, y) \epsilon \right) + O(\epsilon^2)$$

Substituting, simplifying, and multiplying by $16/\epsilon^2$ gives [83].

To estimate the reference committor for our test system, we constructed a square grid on the interval $-2.5 \leq x \leq 1.5$ and $-1.5 \leq y \leq 2.5$, with grid spacing of 0.005. We then construct the transition rate matrix $16(P - I)/\epsilon^2$, and estimate the forward committor using [18].