Proposing new configurations in Monte Carlo simulations using truncated Markov Chains
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We propose a Monte Carlo method in which trial configurations are generated by iterating a finite number of times an initial guess, sampled from a prior distribution, using Markov updates. We define an extended configurational space comprising all possible ensembles of such updates leading to a given configuration in a finite number of steps. By enforcing detailed balance between extended configurations, we validate two prototypical schemes that sample desired target distributions while generating new configurations through truncated Markov Chains. Using representative systems, we identify the important factors controlling the quality of the sampling of this type of algorithms. Considering the problem of sampling polymers with fixed endpoints, truncated Markov Chains can outperform an existing algorithm in overstretched conditions. Applications of the proposed methodology range from the design of new generative models to the improvement of the portability of Monte Carlo algorithms, like Configurational Bias schemes, relying on exact sampling of a subset of terms entering the Hamiltonian while generating new configurations.

I. INTRODUCTION

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods are portable algorithms universally employed to sample probability functions, \( P_T \), in high-dimensional spaces (e.g. \textsuperscript{1,3,4}). In MCMC methods, Markov Chains (MCs) are used to generate new configurations, \( y \), from the current state of the system, \( x \), using transition matrices \( P(x \rightarrow y) \) that usually read as follows

\[
P(x \rightarrow y) = P_{\text{gen}}(x \rightarrow y) \cdot \text{acc}^P(x \rightarrow y),
\]

where \( P_{\text{gen}} \) is used to generate the proposed new configuration, \( y \), and \( \text{acc}^P \) is the probability of accepting it. For a given \( P_{\text{gen}} \), the corresponding acceptance is usually chosen to fulfill the detailed balance condition

\[
P_T(x) \cdot P(x \rightarrow y) = P_T(y) \cdot P(y \rightarrow x).
\]

Except for studies breaking the microreversibility condition (Eq. 2) to increase the diffusivity of the chain in the configurational space \textsuperscript{3,4,5,6}, many developments have focused on designing suitable \( P_{\text{gen}} \) leading to a high acceptance and a fast decorrelation between the configurations visited by the MC \textsuperscript{1,2}, for instance, through the development of cluster moves (e.g. \textsuperscript{7,8}).

In this work, we propose a generative method that leverages the portability of dynamic Monte Carlo in sampling arbitrary target distributions. Specific Monte Carlo methods (e.g., the Configurational Bias MCMC method \textsuperscript{9,11}) require performing exact sampling of a subset of degrees of freedom on the fly (e.g., generating polymer segments following given torsional and bending potentials). This pre-sampling task is usually addressed using ad hoc, system-dependent static methods \textsuperscript{12,15}. We propose new configurations (in the following labeled with \( y_n \)) by evolving states sampled from a prior distribution, \( P_0(y_0) \), using a second Markov chain, \( M \), iterated \( n \) times (\( y_n = M^n y_0 \), see Fig. 1). We present two implementations (below Algorithm A and Algorithm B) of a prototypical method that generates representative trial configurations using truncated MCs. The theoretical insight of this study is the derivation of acceptance rules (Eq. 1) that correct for the bias of truncating the MC \( M \). We stress how this is not a trivial task, given that Markov transformations do not conserve volumes in configurational space. In particular, from the Frobenius-Perron theorem, we can write

\[
M(x \rightarrow y) = P^{(M)}_T(y) + L(x \rightarrow y)
\]

where \( P^{(M)}_T \) is the equilibrium state of \( M \), and \( L \) is an operator orthogonal to \( P^{(M)}_T \).

\[
\sum_x P^{(M)}_T(x)M(x \rightarrow y) = P^{(M)}_T(y),
\]

with a spectral radius smaller than one. Acceptance rates of configurations proposed using iterations of \( M \) need to account for volumes’ compression in the directions orthogonal to \( P^{(M)}_T \). In this work, we sidestep the problem of computing the Jacobian of \( M^n(x \rightarrow y) \) by enforcing detailed balance conditions between states in an extended space representing trajectories engendered by \( M \) leading to a given configuration (Algorithm A, Sec. \textsuperscript{11B}). This algorithm is similar to the Configurational Bias method \textsuperscript{11,9}, which proposes new configurations from a batch of pre-sampled trials, and accepts new states by enforcing the microreversibility between each possible transition from old to new trials. We also propose a more efficient but expensive method (Algorithm B, Sec. \textsuperscript{11D}) which samples between ensembles of trajectories.
Truncated MCs are used to generate thermalized states in the so-called perfectly random sampling method [17]. However, this algorithm is only suitable to study discrete systems and could still require very long execution times [18]. In hybrid MCMC algorithms, $P_{\text{gen}}$ is implemented through a finite number of steps of a discretized Hamiltonian dynamics [19] [21] implemented using symplectic integrators [22] [23]. As compared to a hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm, our scheme allows rejecting some of the steps comprising the ensemble of updates defining $P_{\text{gen}}$.

As proven in Sec. III, the proposed method will make complex MCMC algorithms, e.g. [24], more portable and suitable to be scripted in powerful simulation engines (e.g. [25] [27]).

II. PRESENTATION OF THE ALGORITHMS

A. Generating new configurations

We define the truncated Markov chain that is iteratively used to generate a trial configuration as $M = K \cdot \text{acc}^{(M)}(y_i \rightarrow K y_i)$. No constraint on the asymptotic state visited by $M$ ($P_{T}^{(M)}$) is assumed or required. When proposing a new configuration, $y_n$, we sample $n$ volume-conserving transformations $K_i$ distributed with $\mu(K)$, a starting configuration $y_0$ distributed with $P_0(y_0)$, and choose $y_n$ as (see Fig. 1a and c, left)

$$y_n = \prod_{j=1}^{n} (K_j)^{\eta_j} y_0 = \prod_{j=i+1}^{n} (K_j)^{\eta_j} y_i$$

where $\eta_i = 0$ or 1, respectively, if the transformation $K_i$ is rejected or accepted. $y_i$ is the evolution of $y_0$ found after $i$ iterations. The probability of generating an ensemble of configurations leading to $y_n$, $y = \{y_0, \cdots, y_n\}$, is then given by

$$P_{\text{gen}}(y|\{K_i\}) = P_0(y_0) \prod_{i=1}^{n} f_{K_i,\eta_i}(y_{i-1} \rightarrow y_i)$$

with $f_{K_i,\eta_i} = \text{acc}^{(M)}(y_{i-1} \rightarrow y_i)$ and $f_{K_i,\eta_i} = 1 - \text{acc}^{(M)}(y_{i-1} \rightarrow y_i)$, respectively, if $\eta_i = 1$ and $\eta_i = 0$. Notice that when proposing a new configuration, $y_n$, we generate $n+1$ (differently distributed, see Fig. 1b) replicas of the physical system, $y_i \ (i = 0, \cdots, n)$. As shown in Fig. 1c, $y_i$ and $y_{i-1}$ could be equal (when placed at the same level on the Figure) or different (when $y_i$ is higher than $y_{i-1}$), depending on accepting or rejecting the transformation $K_i$. A detailed-balance condition should then involve pairs of ensembles of replicates, $x$ and $y$, in the following defined as configurations in the extended space. In Eq. 6, $y_i \ (i > 1)$ are uniquely determined by $y_0$ and the ensemble of $\{\eta_i\}$. It is convenient to treat the physical variable $y_n$ as an independent variable. Therefore, we will identify a configuration in the extended space with $y_n$ and $\{\eta_i\}$ (or simply $y$), and calculate $y_0$ by inverting Eq. 2 [29]. Detailed-balance also requires a statistical distribution defined on the extended space. Extended partition functions allow reconstructing trajectories $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ terminating in the current physical state visited by the simulation (in the following $x_n$, see Fig. 1, center and right), asymptotically distributed as $P_T(x_n)$. In the following, we introduce two partition functions (Algorithm A and B) and show how they lead to two different acceptance rules for new configurations generated identically. Algorithm A employs detailed balance conditions between single trajectories leading to the new, $y_n$, and the old state, $x_n$. Instead, Algorithm B samples all the trajectories leading to $x_n$ and $y_n$ for a given set of $K$, $\{K_j\} \ (j = 1, \cdots, n)$.

B. Algorithm A

We define the following extended partition function

$$Z^{(A)} = \int dx_n \prod_{i=1}^{n} d\eta_i d\mu(K_i) P_T(x_n)$$

where the integral over $\eta_i$ is the sum over two discrete values, $\eta_i = 0, 1$. First, we notice that the marginal distribution of the physical variable, $x_n$, is $P_T$. Secondly, for a given $x_n$ and $\{K_i\}$, all $\eta_i$ are uniformly distributed, $\text{Prob}(\eta_i = 0) = \text{Prob}(\eta_i = 1) = 1/2$. This observation allows writing the detailed-balance condition of an algorithm using $P_{\text{gen}}$ (Eq. 6) to generate new configurations. In particular, for a given ‘old’ configuration in the physical space, $x_n$, we sample $n$, uniformly distributed $\eta_i$, and reconstruct $x_i \ (i = n-1 \rightarrow 0)$ by inverting Eq. 5 (using iteratively $x_{i-1} = (K_i)^{-\eta_i} x_i$). This is illustrated in Fig. 1f (center). We then use Eq. 6 to calculate $P_{\text{gen}}(x|\{K_i\})$ (see Appendix C for more details). The new configuration is then accepted with probability $\text{acc}^{(P)} = F(z_A)$, e.g. $F(z_A) = \min[1, z_A]$ or $F(z_A) = z_A / (1 + z_A)$ when using, respectively, the Metropolis or the heat-bath acceptance [12]. For Algorithm A we have

$$z_A = \frac{P_{\text{gen}}(x|\{K_i\}) P_T(y_n)} {P_{\text{gen}}(y|\{K_i\}) P_T(x_n)}.$$  

Notice that the possibility of reconstructing $x$ from $x_n$, using the set of $\{K_i\}$ used to generate the new configuration $y_n$, is a key property of the method. Indeed, as required by ergodicity, the new configuration is generated using a set of $\{K_i\}$ which does not coincide with the set of transformations used to originally generate the old configuration, making it impossible to locally update configurations in the extended space.

C. Two-dimensional Model

To illustrate the method and verify the validity of the algorithm, we consider the two-dimensional system of Fig. 1a. The prior distribution, $P_0$, is a two-dimensional Gaussian distribution while the target distribution, $P_T$,
FIG. 1. (a) Schematic representation of the method for a two-dimensional model (see Appendix A 2 and [28] for details of the model and simulation parameters). Dashed and solid lines represent the level lines, respectively, of the prior, $P_0$, and target distribution, $P_T$. New configurations, $y_n$, are generated by accepting or rejecting a series of local displacements $K_i$ (in the panel the second displacement, $K_2$, is rejected) starting from $y_0$ distributed as $P_0$. Similarly, for a given state $x_n$, the method reconstructs an extended configuration by accepting or rejecting the series of reverse transitions used to generate $y_n$ ($K_{i-1}$). In the panel, Algorithm A accepts $K_{i-1}$ and $K_{i-2}$, while Algorithm B accepts $K_{i-1}$ and $K_{i-3}$. (b) Full lines are marginal distributions of the target distribution of panel (a). Algorithm A and B properly sample $P_T$ (symbols). Dotted and dashed lines are the distributions of $y_n$ with $n = 10$ and $n = 4$, respectively. (c) $\eta_i = 1$ ($\eta_i = 0$) if the update $K_i$ or ($K_i$) is accepted (rejected) when generating the new or old configuration, respectively. When generating $y_n$ (left) $\eta_i$ is calculated using acceptance rates. When reconstructing the old state (center and right), Algorithm A and B calculate $\eta$ differently (see text). In panels a and c $n = 4$, while in panels a and b the scale bar represents the unit length.

is multimodal (see Fig. 1a). The analytic expressions of $P_0$ and $P_T$ are reported in Appendix A 2. Importantly, we challenge the algorithm by choosing a prior distribution $P_0$ not overlapping with $P_T$. Each step of the truncated Markov Chain attempts to displace a configuration within a square with size equal to 2. The results of Fig. 1b have been obtained with $2 \cdot 10^6$ iterations [28]. Fig. 1b shows that Algorithm A properly samples the target distribution, $P_T$. In Fig. 1 we considered a Markov matrix $M$ that asymptotically samples $P_T$, $P_T(x) = P_T^{(M)}(x)$. In this case, the distributions of $y_n$ tempt to reproduce $P_T$ at large values of $n$ (see Fig. 1b). We test a case in which $P_T(x) \neq P_T^{(M)}(x)$ in Appendix B 1.

Despite the fact that in Fig. 1b $y_n$ samples $P_T$ for $n \to \infty$, arbitrarily big values of $n$ do not improve the quality of the sampling. In particular, the acceptance, for a given $\mu(K)$, is non-monotonic in $n$ (see 2D, Algorithm A in Fig. 2). The poor performance of Algorithm A at large values of $n$ is because the ensembles of replicas $x = \{x_i\}$ are random walks that do not tempt to descend the landscape provided by $P_T^{(M)}$ (as is the case when generating $y = \{y_i\}$, Eq. 4). For the same reason, $x_0$ may be outside of the range of typical configurations distributed as $P_0$ (see Fig. 1a). It is important to stress that $\{x_i\}$ and $\{y_i\}$ are distributed differently. In particular, $\{y_i\}$ are determined by the growing procedure ($P_0$ and $M$, see Eq. 6), while $\{x_i\}$ by the extended partition functions ($Z^{(A)}$, see Eq. 8). These considerations will in general result in small values of $P_{gen}(x|\{K_i\})$ and therefore in small acceptances (or small $z_A$, see Eq. 8). This analysis is supported by Fig. 3 (see 'A old' and 'new') comparing the distributions of the averaged probabilities of generating new and old configurations. In particular,
for the new configurations (‘new’) we have
\[ \bar{P}_{\text{gen}} = \int d\mu(K) d\eta P_0(y_0) P_{\text{gen}}(y | \{K_i\}) \]  
(9)

with the acceptances \{\eta_i\} calculated as in Eq. 6. Instead, for the old configurations we have (‘old A’)
\[ \bar{P}_{\text{gen}} = \int d\mu(K) d\eta P_T(x_n) P_{\text{gen}}(x | \{K_i\}) \]  
(10)

with the acceptances \{\eta_i\} sampled uniformly as described above and in Appendix C. We notice that rejected stated could be used to improve the quality of the sampling [30].

D. Algorithm B

To alleviate the problem of low values of \( P_{\text{gen}}(x | \{K_i\}) \) as compared to \( P_{\text{gen}}(y | \{K_i\}) \), we modify the extended partition function (Eq. 7). Following the conclusions of the previous section, we aim at increasing overlapping between the distribution of \( \{x_i\} \) and \( \{y_i\} \). Specifically, we constrain the distribution of an equilibrium configuration \( \{x_i\} \) (for a given \( x_n \) and \( \{K_i\} \)) to \( P_{\text{gen}}(x | \{K_i\}) \) with \( P_{\text{gen}} \) given by Eq. 6. This observation leads to the following extended partition function
\[
Z^{(B)} = \int dx_n J(\{K_i\}, x_n) P_0(x_0) \\
\prod_{i=1}^{n} d\eta_i d\mu(K_i) f_{K_i, \eta_i}(x_{i-1} \rightarrow x_i) P_T(x_n).
\]  
(11)

In the previous expression, \( J \) is a bias term that constrains the marginal distribution of the physical variable \( x_n \) to be equal to \( P_T(x_n) \). This observation implies that the distribution of \( \{x_i\} \) and \( \{y_i\} \) are still not overlapping, given that \( y_n \) is not distributed as \( P_{\text{gen}}^{(M)} \) (in this section \( P_{\text{gen}}^{(M)} = P_T \); a case with \( P_T^{(M)} \neq P_T \) is given in Appendix B/2). The same conclusion follows from Fig. 3 (compare ‘new’ with ‘B old’). The expression of \( J \) reads as follows
\[
J(\{K_i\}, x_n) = \left[ \sum_{\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n} P_{\text{gen}}(y | \{K_i\}, \eta_n = x_n) \right]^{-1}
\]  
(12)

where the relation between \( y \) and \( \eta \) is given by Eq. 6. Notice that in Eq. 12 \( y \) is a simple integration variable. \( J \) is the inverse of the probability of proposing \( x_n \) as a new configuration using Eq. 6. As done in Algorithm A, for a given \( x_n \) and \( \{K_i\} \), we need to reconstruct the configuration in the extended space, \( x \), by sampling Eq. 11. We consider the tree made of all trajectories (for a given \( \{K_i\} \)) leading to \( x_n \) (see Fig. 1c, right). We then select \( x_i \) on layer \( i \) within the \( 2^{n-1} \) possible states using Bayes equation. In particular, given \( x_i \), we choose \( x_{i-1} \) (and therefore \( \eta_i \)) among \( x_i \) and \( \{K_i\}^{-1} x_i \) with probability
\[
P((K_i)^{-\eta_i} x_i | x_i) = \frac{P(x_i | (K_i)^{-\eta_i} x_i) P_{i-1}((K_i)^{-\eta_i} x_i)}{P_i(x_i)}
\]  
\[
P_i(x_i) = P(x_i | (K_i)^{-1} x_i) P_{i-1}((K_i)^{-1} x_i)
+ P(x_i | x_i) P_{i-1}(x_i) \]  
(13)

where \( P(x_i | (K_i)^{-\eta_i} x_i) = f_{K_i, \eta_i}(K_i)^{-\eta_i} x_i \rightarrow x_i) \) (Eq. 6). \( P_i(x_i) \) is the probability to visit the state \( x_i \) when sampling layer \( i \) at a given \( \{\eta_{i+1}, \eta_{i+2}, \ldots, \eta_n\} \), \( \{K_j\}^n \), and \( x_n \) [31]. In particular, we have that \( P_0(x_n) = J(\{K_i\}, x_n)^{-1} \). We report details of the calculation of \( P_i \) and \( \{\eta_i\} \) in Appendix C. Importantly, the calculation of \( P_i \) limits the algorithm to small values of \( n \) given the necessity of enumerating \( 2^n \) states. After sampling \( \{\eta_i\} \) and iteratively using Eq. 13, it can be shown that the probability of selecting \( x \) is still given by Eq. 6.

FIG. 2. Acceptance rates of Algorithm A and Algorithm B as a function of the number of iterations \( n \) in the truncated Markov Chain. We report three systems studied in this work: the model of Fig. 1 (2D) and the molecules with 3 and 4 branches (BM2 and BM3, see Fig. 5).

FIG. 3. Distribution of the probability of generating new (‘new’, see Eq. 9) and old configurations using Algorithm A and B (‘A old’ and ‘B old’, see Eq. 10) for two representative values of \( n \). In Algorithm A, the acceptances \{\eta_i\} are uniformly distributed while in Algorithm B follow Eq. 13 (see Appendix C.2 for more details). The distributions have been calculated while producing the results of Fig. 1b.
The new configuration is then accepted with probability \( \text{acc}(P) = F(z_B) \) with

\[
z_B = \frac{J(\{K_1\}, y_n)P_T(y_n)}{J(\{K_1\}, x_n)P_T(x_n)} = \frac{P_n(x_n)P_T(y_n)}{P_n(y_n)P_T(x_n)}. \tag{14}
\]

\( z_B \) is not a function of \( P_{\text{gen}}(x|\{K_1\}) \) and \( P_{\text{gen}}(y|\{K_1\}) \) as they cancel the corresponding terms appearing in the asymptotic distribution of the extended space (Eq. 14).

In Fig. 4(b) we verify that Algorithm B is not biased in reproducing the target distribution, \( P_T \). Moreover, Fig. 2 shows how the acceptance now increases with \( n \) (2D Algorithm B in Fig. 2) as a result of higher values of \( P_{\text{gen}} \) (compare A with B in Fig. 3). In Fig. 3 \( P_{\text{gen}} \) for Algorithm B is calculated using Eq. 10 with the acceptances \( \{\eta_i\} \) calculated in Eq. 13 (see Appendix C 2 for more details).

As already observed, Algorithm A and B are not peculiar to the use of transition matrices (M) having as asymptotic state \( P_T \) (as for the examples discussed above). This property is crucial in cases where the evaluation of \( P_T \) is computationally expensive (e.g. \( P_T \) is a multibody function) and could be approximated by a less complex function \( M \). As a proof of principle, in Appendix B we describe and validate (using the system of Fig. 1) the case in which \( P_T(M) \sim 1 \).

![Figure 4](image)

**FIG. 4.** (a) Schematic of the truncated Markov Chain strategy employed to sample polymers with fixed endpoints. (b) Comparison of the acceptance rates obtained by configurational bias MC (with \( k = 1000 \) trials) and Algorithm B (with \( n = 10 \)) for a chain with 6 and 11 monomers (\( N_T = 5 \) and 11) as a function of the end-to-end distance \( d \). Inset: Asymptotic distributions of the \( i \)th monomer along the stretching direction \( r_{x,i} \) (with \( i = 1, 5, 9, \) and \( N_T = 10 \)) sampled by Algorithm B compared with the expected distribution (solid lines).

## III. SAMPLING POLYMERS WITH FIXED ENDPOINTS

In this section, we develop a method to generate chains with fixed endpoints based on Algorithm B (see Sec. 11D). This problem underlies efficient sampling of configurational volumes in polymer systems and is usually addressed using Configurational Biased Monte Carlo (CBMC) simulations [14]. We consider a chain with \( N_T + 1 \) monomers \( \{r_i, i = 0, \cdots, N_T\} \) and endpoints fixed at a distance equal to \( d \) (\(|r_{N_T} - r_0| = d\)). Neighboring monomers interact via a harmonic potential, \( V_0 \) (see Appendix A 3), with the configurational energy of the system given by

\[
U_{\text{HS}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} V_0(r_i, r_{i-1}). \tag{15}
\]

As in CBMC, new configurations are generated one monomer at a time. We use \( N_T - 1 \) different truncated Markov Chains, \( \{M^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{N_T-1} \), to sequentially generate new monomers, \( r^{\text{new}}_i \equiv y_i^{(j)} \) (\( i = 1, \cdots, N_T - 1 \)). A proposal of monomer \( j \) (\( y_j^{(j)} \), see Fig. 4(a)), is selected by first sampling \( y_j^{(j)} \) distributed as \( P_0(y_j^{(j)}) = \exp[-V_0(y_j^{(j)}, r_j^{\text{new}})] \) (see Appendix A 3), where \( r_j^{\text{new}} \) is the proposed \( j - 1 \) monomer (\( r_j^{\text{new}} \equiv r_i \) if \( j = 1 \)).

A truncated Markov chain (\( M^{(j)} \), attempting to displace a monomer within a cube of size 4) is then used to evolve \( y_j^{(j)} \) to \( y_j^{(j)} \). The asymptotic state visited by \( M^{(j)} \), \( P_T(M^{(j)}) \), is taken equal to \( P_T(M^{(j)})(y^{(j)}) \sim P_G(y_j^{(j)}, r_{N_T})P_0(y_j^{(j)}) \), where \( P_G \) is a guiding function biasing the chain’s growth towards the fixed end monomer [1] [14]. \( P_G \) is chosen as the end-to-end distance distribution of a chain segment of length \( N_T - j \) with unconstrained end-to-end distance (see Appendix A 3). Given the old configuration, \( \{r_i^{\text{old}}\} \), we reconstruct the tree of possible trajectories for each monomer using \( M^{(j)} \) (Fig. 4(b) reports one of these trajectories for monomer \( i \)). Each monomer contributes to the acceptance factor, \( F(z_{\text{MC}}) \), with a term given by Eq. 14. In particular

\[
z_{\text{MC}} = \frac{\exp(-U_{\text{HS}}^{\text{new}})}{\exp(-U_{\text{HS}}^{\text{old}})} \prod_{i=1}^{N_T-1} \frac{P_n(r_i^{\text{old}})}{P_n(r_i^{\text{new}})}, \tag{16}
\]

where \( P_n(r_i^{\alpha}) \) (\( \alpha = \text{new or old} \) is calculated using the tree engendered by \( M^{(j)} \) (see Fig. 1(c), right), while \( U_{\text{HS}}^{\text{new}}/U_{\text{HS}}^{\text{old}} \) is the configurational energy of the new/old configuration (Eq. 15).

We compare our method with a standard CBMC algorithm in which monomer \( r_i^{\text{new}} \) is selected from \( k \) trials, distributed as \( P_0 \ (r_i^{(\alpha)}, \alpha = 1, \cdots, k) \), using \( P_G \)

\[
\text{Prob}(r_i^{\text{new}}) = \frac{P_G(r_i^{\text{new}}, r_{N_T})}{W_i}, \quad W_i = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{k} P_G(r_i^{(\alpha)}, r_{N_T}), \tag{17}
\]
where $W_i$ is the contribution of monomer $i$ to the Rosenbluth weight of the new configuration. The acceptance, $F(z_{CBMC})$, reads as follows

$$z_{CBMC} = \frac{e^{-V_0(r_{NT - 1}^{\text{new}}, r_{N_T})}}{e^{-V_0(r_{NT - 1}^{\text{old}}, r_{N_T})}} \prod_{i=1}^{N_T - 1} \frac{W_{\text{new}} P_G(r_i^{\text{old}})}{W_{\text{old}} P_G(r_i^{\text{new}})}. \tag{18}$$

Fig. 4b shows how CBMC is more efficient for small values of $d$. However, when increasing $d$, the acceptance of CBMC plummets while truncated Markov Chains can more easily generate overstretched configurations. This is more evident in system with small values of $N_T$. In the overstretched regime, CBMC fails since $P_0(r_i)$ does not overlap with the equilibrium distribution of $r_i$. Instead, truncated Markov Chains can sample distributions not overlapping with $P_0$, as explicitly shown in Fig. 1b and b. For $d = 10$, the inset of Fig. 4b shows how the asymptotic distributions of $r_i$ (with $i = 1, 5, 9$, and $N_T = 10$) sampled by Algorithm B follow the expected distributions.

Notice that the computational complexity of the CBMC with $k = 1000$ is comparable with the truncated MC employed in Fig. 4b (Algorithm B with $n = 10$). We stress that a more efficient CBMC algorithm would generate trial segments distributed as $cP_T P_0$, where $c$ is a normalization constant. However, sampling $P_T P_0$ would require developing system-specific sampling procedures [13]. On the other hand, the truncated Markov Chain method can readily be employed for any type of potentials (including bending and torsional terms). In that sense, truncated Markov Chain algorithms are more portable.

**IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT ALGORITHM**

In this section we highlight how the proposed method may be limited by a poor overlapping between the distribution of $y_n$ and the target distribution $P_T$. That is the case in systems in which a single Markov chain is used to propose multiple degrees of freedom in one time (notice that in Sec. [11] different monomers are proposed using different $M$). We consider branched molecules which are test systems in Configurational Bias MCMC developments [12–14]. We consider 2-methylpropane (BM2) and 2,2-dimethylpropane (BM3) molecules constituted, respectively, by three and four branches (see Fig. 5). The length of the branches is fixed while different branches interact through stiff bending terms $U_{\text{bend}}$ (see Appendix A 4 for details of the model). We fix the branch 0 and label the branches that are sampled from 1 to $n_b$, where $n_b = 2$ (for BM2) or 3 (for BM3). The target distribution is given as

$$P_T = c \prod_{i < j} \exp[-\beta U_{\text{bend}}(\theta_{ij})], \tag{19}$$

where $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$, $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant, $T$ the temperature, $\theta_{ij}$ is the angle between the branches $i$ and $j$, and $c$ a normalization constant (see Appendix A 4). We choose the following prior distribution

$$P_0 = c_0 \prod_{i > 0} \exp[-\beta U_{\text{bend}}(\theta_{i0})], \tag{20}$$

where $c_0$ is the normalization factor. The trial moves, $K_i$, employed by the Markov Chain $M$ act as follows. One of the $n_b$ dynamic branches is chosen with uniform probability and rotated by a random angle (chosen within $-\pi/2$ and $\pi/2$) around a random unit vector centered at the center of the molecule. For each point of Fig. 5 we performed $10^6$ iterations of the algorithm [28].

In Fig. 5 we test the algorithm by sampling the dihedral angle, $\omega_{ij}$, defined as the angle between the plane spanned by the branches 0 and $i$ and the plane spanned by the branches 0 and $j$ (see Appendix A 4). As expected, the proposed methods can reproduce the target distribution. However, the acceptance rates could be quite small, especially in the case of the 4-branches molecule, even when using the expensive Algorithm B (see Fig. 2). Fig. 5 shows how the distributions of $y_n$ for the highest value of $n$ considered are still far from $P_T$. This observation unveils a possible limitation of the method: In high dimensions, larger values of $n$ are required to generate acceptable configurations. In favor of the proposed method, one should notice that most of the proposed configurations were rejected due to a completely agnostic selection of the proposed updates, $K_i$. Instead, as in hybrid MCMC, one could envisage using symplectic transformations to generate updates driving far from equilibrium states into the basins of $P_T$ in few updates. Investigations in this direction will be addressed in future efforts.
V. CONCLUSIONS

As compared to static methods (e.g., Von Neumann rejection schemes), dynamic Monte Carlo algorithms sample target distributions only asymptotically. On the other hand, dynamic schemes are more portable (e.g., they do not require knowing features of \( P_T \) which are necessary to implement an efficient rejection scheme) and suitable to sample high-dimensional spaces. In this paper, we showed how truncated Markov chains could be used to propose new configurations in Monte Carlo simulations. We defined an extended space comprising all the trajectories generated by the truncated Markov Chain and derived two prototypical algorithms (A and B). In Algorithm A, the quality of the sampling is not only affected by how well the target distribution is approximated by the truncated Markov chain but also by the overlapping between the distribution of the equilibrium and generated trajectories. Algorithm B can address the last issue at the cost of a higher computational cost which heavily limits the length of the truncated Markov Chain. It will be interesting in the future to understand if a stochastic approximation of the acceptance function (Eq. 14) could reduce the computational burden [32]. As proven by the results presented in Sec. III our scheme will be useful to methods requiring exact sampling of a subset of degrees of freedom on the fly. The method could also inspire new developments in the field of generative models where, traditionally, neural networks are used to map a prior into a target distribution (e.g. [33]).
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Appendix A: Prior and target distributions employed

1. Notations and conventions

Throughout this work, we define a \( d \)-dimensional Gaussian distribution as

\[
N(x; \mu, \Sigma) = \frac{\exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}(x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu) \right\}}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} \quad (A1)
\]

where \( \mu \) is the \( d \)-dimensional mean vector and \( \Sigma \) the covariance matrix.

2. Two-dimensional system (Fig. 1)

The prior distribution is a two-dimensional Gaussian distribution

\[
P_0(v) = N(v; 0, \Sigma_0), \quad (A2)
\]

with a covariance matrix given by \( \Sigma_0 = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2) \) where \( \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 0.6 \). We use a multimodal target distribution given by the sum of three Gaussian distributions

\[
P_T(v) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} N(v; \mu_i, \Sigma_i) \quad (A3)
\]

where the inverse of the covariance matrix \( \Sigma_i \) is given by

\[
\Sigma_i^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{i1}^2 \sigma_{i2}^2 (1 - \rho_i^2)} \begin{pmatrix}
\sigma_{i2}^2 & -\rho_i \sigma_{i1} \sigma_{i2} \\
-\rho_i \sigma_{i1} \sigma_{i2} & \sigma_{i1}^2
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (A4)
\]

with

\[
\begin{align*}
\mu_1 &= (-2, -2), & \rho_1 &= 0.7, \\
\sigma_{11} &= 0.5, & \sigma_{12} &= 0.5, \\
\mu_2 &= (-1, -2), & \rho_2 &= 0, \\
\sigma_{21} &= 0.3, & \sigma_{22} &= 0.6, \\
\mu_3 &= (-2, 2), & \rho_3 &= 0.3, \\
\sigma_{31} &= 0.6, & \sigma_{32} &= 0.3.
\end{align*}
\]

Prior and target distributions are shown on Fig. 1.

3. The harmonic chain system (Sec. III)

In the system of Sec. III neighboring monomers interact via a harmonic potential, \( V_0 \), which reads as follows

\[
V_0(r_i, r_{i-1}) = \frac{1}{2} |r_i - r_{i-1}|^2. \quad (A5)
\]

The prior distributions employed to select \( y_0^{(j)} \) \( j = 1, \ldots, N_T - 1 \) follow

\[
P_0(y_0^{(j)}) = N(y_0^{(j)}; r_{\text{rew}}^{(j-1)}, 1). \quad (A6)
\]

The asymptotic state visited by \( M^{(j)} \), \( P_T^{M^{(j)}} \), is taken equal to

\[
P_T^{M^{(j)}}(y^{(j)}) = \frac{P_G(y^{(j)}, r_{N_T}) P_T(y^{(j)})}{\int dy^{(j)} P_G(y^{(j)}, r_{N_T}) P_T(y^{(j)})}, \quad (A7)
\]

with

\[
P_G(y_0^{(j)}, r_{N_T}) = N(y_0^{(j)}; r_{N_T}, \sqrt{N_T - j} \cdot 1). \quad (A8)
\]

4. Branched molecules (Fig. 5)

We consider molecules constituted by \( n_b + 1 \) branches \( (n_b = 2 \text{ and } 3) \), see Fig. 5. \( P_T \) reads as follows

\[
P_T(\theta_{01}, \ldots, \theta_{n_b}, \theta_{12}, \ldots, \theta_{(n_b-1)n_b}) = \frac{1}{N_T} \exp \left\{ -\beta \sum_{i=0}^{n_b} \sum_{j>i} U_{\text{bend}}(\theta_{ij}) \right\}, \quad (A9)
\]
where $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$, $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant, $T$ the temperature, $\theta_{ij}$ is the angle between the branches $i$ and $j$, and $N_T$ a normalization constant. The bending potential $U_{\text{bend}}(\theta_{ij})$ is defined as

$$U_{\text{bend}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} k_\theta (\theta - \theta_0)^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (A10)

where $k_\theta$ and $\theta_0$ are parameters of the system (see below). We choose the following prior distribution

$$P_0(\theta_{01}, \ldots, \theta_{0n_k}) = \frac{1}{N_0} \exp \left\{ -\beta \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} U_{\text{bend}}(\theta_{0i}) \right\},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A11)

where $N_0$ is the normalization factor.

In Sec. IV we considered 2-methylpropane molecules with parameters

$$n_b = 2, \hspace{1cm} (A12)$$
$$T = 300 \text{ K}, \hspace{1cm} (A13)$$
$$\theta_0 = 112 \text{ (deg)}, \hspace{1cm} (A14)$$
$$k_\theta/k_B = 62500 \text{ K}, \hspace{1cm} (A15)$$

as well as 2,2-dimethylpropane with parameters

$$n_b = 3, \hspace{1cm} (A16)$$
$$T = 300 \text{ K}, \hspace{1cm} (A17)$$
$$\theta_0 = 109.47 \text{ (deg)}, \hspace{1cm} (A18)$$
$$k_\theta/k_B = 62500 \text{ K}. \hspace{1cm} (A19)$$

The dihedral angle $\omega_{ij}$ (see Fig. 5) is the angle between the plane spanned by the branches 0 and $i$ and the plane spanned by the branches 0 and $j$. This angle is obtained from the bending angles $\theta_{0i}$, $\theta_{0j}$ and $\theta_{ij}$ as

$$\cos(\omega_{ij}) = \frac{\cos(\theta_{ij}) - \cos(\theta_{0i}) \cos(\theta_{0j})}{\sin(\theta_{0i}) \sin(\theta_{0j})}. \hspace{1cm} (A20)$$

\textbf{Appendix B: Truncated Markov Chain sampling with} $P_T \neq P_T^{(M)}$

We consider the scenario where the new configurations, $y_n$, are generated using acceptances, $\{\eta_i\}$, uniformly distributed, $\text{Prob}(\eta_i = 1) = \text{Prob}(\eta_i = 0) = 1/2$. In other terms, proposed updates of $y_i$ (with $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$) are accepted with probability $1/2$ ($f_{K_{i,0}} = f_{K_{i,1}} = 1/2$). The probability of generating an extended configuration leading to $y_n$, $y = \{y_0, \ldots, y_n\}$ is then

$$P_{\text{gen}}(y|\{K_i\}) = P_0(y_0) \frac{1}{2^n}. \hspace{1cm} (B1)$$

Contrary to the algorithms employed in Fig. 1 and 3 in the present case the distributions of the new configurations do not attempt to reproduce the target distribution, $P_T$. Below, we develop Algorithms A and B in the case in which $P_{\text{gen}}$ is given by Eq. [B1]. Using the 2D system of Fig. 1, we prove that the two algorithms (A’ and B’) are not biased.

![FIG. 6. 2D model: Comparison of the marginal distributions of $v_1$ (a) and $v_2$ (b) for Algorithm A’ and B’ (symbols) with the analytical target distribution (solid line). The dashed (dotted) lines show the distributions of the new configurations for $n = 4$ ($n = 10$). The dash-dotted lines depict the prior-distribution.](image)

1. Algorithm A’

Given $x_n$ and $\{K_i\}$, the probability of generating the new configuration $x = \{x_0, \ldots, x_n\}$ is (see Eq. 7 and [B1])

$$P_{\text{gen}}(x|\{K_i\}) = P_0(x_0) \frac{1}{2^n}, \hspace{1cm} (B2)$$

where

$$x_0 = \prod_{j=1}^{n} (K_j)^{-\eta_j} x_n. \hspace{1cm} (B3)$$

The new configuration is then accepted with probability $F(z_{A'})$ with (see Eq. 8)

$$z_{A'} = \frac{P_{\text{gen}}(x|\{K_i\}) P_T(y_n)}{P_{\text{gen}}(y|\{K_i\}) P_T(x_n)} = \frac{P_0(x_0) P_T(y_n)}{P_0(y_0) P_T(x_n)}. \hspace{1cm} (B4)$$

Fig. 6 shows that Algorithm A’ is not biased. We observe from Fig. 7 that the acceptance rate is reduced compared to Algorithm A for small values of $n$, which is explained by a poorer overlapping between the distribution of the proposed new configurations (dashed and
dotted lines in Fig. 9 with \( P_T \) as compared to Algorithm A (see Fig. 2 B). For larger values of \( n \), Algorithm A’ outperforms Algorithm A as in the latter case \( P_{gen}(x|\{K_i\})/P_{gen}(y|\{K_i\}) \) is smaller.

2. Algorithm B’

If \( f_{K_i,n_i} = 1/2 \), \( P_n(y_n) \) becomes as follows

\[
P_n(y_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} P_0(y_{0,i}) \frac{1}{2^n}, \tag{B5}
\]

where \( \{y_{0,i}\} \) is the list of the \( 2^n \) states obtained from \( y_n \)

\[
y_{0,i} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} (K_j)^{-\eta_j} y_n, \tag{B6}
\]

with \( \eta_j = 0 \) or 1. Similarly for the old configuration \( x \) we obtain

\[
P_n(x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} P_0(x_{0,i}) \frac{1}{2^n}, \quad x_{0,i} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} (K_j)^{-\eta_j} x_n. \tag{B7}
\]

The new configuration is accepted with probability

\[
\text{acc}^{(P)} = P(z_{B'}) \quad \text{with (see Eq. 14)}
\]

\[
z_{B'} = \frac{P_n(x_n) P_T(y_n)}{P_n(y_n) P_T(x_n)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{2^n} P_0(x_{0,i}) P_T(y_n)}{\sum_{i=1}^{2^n} P_0(y_{0,i}) P_T(x_n)}. \tag{B8}
\]

We can verify that the conclusions made for Algorithm A’ also apply here. Fig. 6 shows that the Algorithm B’ is not biased but, as shown in Fig. 6, has a lower acceptance rate compared to Algorithm B.

The results of Fig. 6 have been obtained with \( 2 \cdot 10^6 \) iterations, except in the \( n = 10 \) case, Algorithm B’ for which we generated \( 10^5 \) new configurations.

### Appendix C: Numerical recipes

Below we detail the methods to compute the probability of generating an old trajectory \( P_{gen}(x|\{K_i\}) \), Eq. 8 and the total probability of generating a configuration \( x_n, P_n(x_n) \) (Eq. 14), summed over all trajectories leading to \( x_n \) (see Fig. 12, center). While calculating \( P_n(x_n) \) we also sample the acceptances \( \{\eta_i\} \) defining the old configuration, \( x \), in the extended space for model B. These are used to calculate \( P_{gen} \) (‘B old’) in Fig. 3.

1. \( P_{gen}(x|\{K_i\}) \), Algorithm A

Given a configuration \( x_n \) in the physical space and a set of displacements, \( \{K_i\} \), we want to reconstruct a trajectory \( x = \{x_i\} \) leading to \( x_n \) and calculate the probability of generating it using the procedure described in Eq. 6. In Algorithm A, we sample \( n \) random acceptances, \( \{\eta_i\} \) (\( \eta_i = 0 \) or 1 with equal probability), and calculate \( x_i \) as

\[
x_i = \left( \prod_{j=i+1}^{n} (K_j)^{-\eta_j} \right) x_n. \tag{C1}
\]

\( P_{gen} \) is then calculated using Eq. 6

\[
P_{gen}(x|\{K_i\}) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} f_{K_i,\eta_j}(x_j, x_{j+1}) \tag{C2}
\]

with \( f_{K_i,\eta_j} \) defined as in Eq. 6.

2. \( P_{gen}(x|\{K_i\}) \) and \( P_n(x_n) \), Algorithm B

A first method would calculate \( P_n(x_n) \) using Eq. 6

\[
P_n(x_n) = \sum_{z} P_{gen}(z|\{K_i\}) \delta_{z,x_n}, \tag{C3}
\]

by listing all possible trajectories, \( z \), leading to \( x_n \). Alternatively, one can first construct a 2\( n \) dimensional vector \((v_n, \alpha = 0, \cdots, 2^n - 1)\) with the list of states at layer 0, \( x_0^{(a)} \), leading to \( x_n \) with a combination of displacements \( \{K_i\} \) (corresponding to the states flagged with \( x_0^B \) in Fig. 11, right). In particular, \( x_0^{(a)} = (K_1^{-b_1}) \cdots (K_n^{-b_n}) x_n \) where \( b_i \) is the \((i + 1)\)th digit of the binary representation of \( m = 2^n + \alpha \) extracted using the routine available at [34]. To compute \( P_n(x_n) \) and \( P_{gen}(x|\{K_i\}) \), we initialize two vectors, \( P_\alpha \) and \( J_\alpha \), by using the prior probability, \( P_\alpha = J_\alpha = P_0(v_n) \). We then iterate \( P_\alpha \) and \( J_\alpha \) \( n \) times using the following procedure. At the \( i \)th iteration, we sequentially update the components of \( P_\alpha \) and \( J_\alpha \) with \( \alpha = p \cdot 2^i \) (with \( p = 0, 1, \cdots, 2^n-i-1 \)) using Eqs. 13:

\[
\begin{align*}
J_{p \cdot 2^i} & \leftarrow \begin{cases} J_{p \cdot 2^i} f_{K_i,0}(v_{p \cdot 2^i} \rightarrow v_{p \cdot 2^i+1}) & \text{Prob} = 1 - \gamma \\
J_{p \cdot 2^{i+1}+1} f_{K_i,1}(v_{p \cdot 2^i+2^{i+1}} \rightarrow v_{p \cdot 2^i}) & \text{Prob} = \gamma
\end{cases} \\

P_{p \cdot 2^i} & \leftarrow P_{p \cdot 2^i} f_{K_i,0}(v_{p \cdot 2^i} \rightarrow v_{p \cdot 2^i}) + P_{p \cdot 2^{i+1}+1} f_{K_i,1}(v_{p \cdot 2^i+2^{i+1}} \rightarrow v_{p \cdot 2^i}) \tag{C4}
\end{align*}
\]
where $v_{p,2^i} = K_i v_{p,2^{i+1}}$ and

$$\gamma = \frac{P_{p,2^i+2^{i-1}} f_{K_i,1}(v_{p,2^i+2^{i-1}} \rightarrow v_{p,2^i})}{V}$$ (C5)

$$V = P_{p,2^i} f_{K_i,0}(v_{p,2^i} \rightarrow v_{p,2^i})$$

$$+ P_{p,2^i+2^{i-1}} f_{K_i,1}(v_{p,2^i+2^{i-1}} \rightarrow v_{p,2^i})$$

After the $n$th iteration, the value of $P_n(x_n)$ and $P_{gen}(x|\{K_i\})$ are found as $P_n(x_n) = P_0$ and $P_{gen}(x|\{K_i\}) = J_0$.


[28] The codes used for the simulations are publicly available at https://github.com/jo-mab/TruncatedMC

[29] Notice that the Jacobian of the change of variables $y_i \rightarrow y_n$, $\{\eta_i\} \rightarrow \eta_n$, is equal to 1 if $K$ conserves volumes in configurational space.


[31] Notice that some with the $2^{n−i}$ possible states at layer $i$ may coincide. That is often the case when considering discrete systems. In that case, $P_i(y)$ is the probability of sampling $y_i$ divided by the multiplicity of $y_i$ at a given $\{K_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $x_n$. 


[34] The routine to extract the bits of the binary representation of a number is publicly available at https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/python-slicing-extract-k-bits-given-position.