Exploring stratospheric rare events with transition path theory and short simulations
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ABSTRACT

Extreme weather events are simultaneously the least likely and the most impactful features of the climate system, increasingly so as climate change proceeds. Extreme events are multi-faceted, highly variable processes which can be characterized in many ways: return time, worst-case severity, and predictability are all sought-after quantities for various kinds of rare events. A unifying framework is needed to define and calculate the most important quantities of interest for the purposes of near-term forecasting, long-term risk assessment, and benchmarking of reduced-order models. Here we use Transition Path Theory (TPT) for a comprehensive analysis of sudden stratospheric warming (SSW) events in a highly idealized wave-mean flow interaction system with stochastic forcing. TPT links together probabilities, dynamical behavior, and other risk metrics associated with rare events that represents their full statistical variability. At face value, fulfilling this promise demands extensive direct simulation to generate the rare event many times. Instead, we implement a highly parallel computational method that launches a large ensemble of short simulations, estimating long-timescale rare event statistics from short-term tendencies. We specifically investigate properties of SSW events including passage time distributions and large anomalies in vortex strength and heat flux. We visualize high-dimensional probability densities and currents, obtaining a nuanced picture of critical altitude-dependent interactions between waves and the mean flow that fuel SSW events. We find that TPT more faithfully captures the statistical variability between events as compared to the more conventional minimum action method.

1. Introduction

Extreme weather events, by definition, are exceptional and occupy the fringes of the atmosphere’s behavior distribution. Nevertheless, extreme events play an important role in atmospheric circulation. Large storms and changes in circulation are responsible for rapid movement of heat and moisture through the atmosphere. From a human perspective, weather is inconsequential when it follows mean behavior; it is the anomalies that challenge society (Lesk et al. 2016; Kron et al. 2019). Extreme weather is taking an increasing toll on ecosystems, economies, and human life, due to both a changing climate and increasing reliance on weather-susceptible infrastructure (e.g., Mann et al. 2017; Frame et al. 2020).

Historically, significant effort has already gone toward estimating rare event probabilities and forecasting them with as much lead time as possible (e.g., Stephenson et al. 2008; Kim et al. 2019; Vitart and Robertson 2018). Earth system models are growing ever more powerful and heterogeneous, from fully coupled GCMs to regional climate models to machine learning parameterizations, and there is increasing interest in measuring their fidelity on extreme events, beyond just mean behavior (Hu et al. 2019). Capturing extremes is arguably the most important task of climate modeling, and part of our goal here is to motivate a holistic and relevant set of quantities that a good model should reproduce.

Commonly used benchmarks are sensible and important, but necessarily ad hoc given the variety of extreme events. Quantiles of univariate distributions provide some information. For example, O’Gorman and Dwyer (2018)
use the 99.9th percentile of 3-hour rainfall, as a function of latitude, to validate a machine-learned convection parameterization. Qi and Majda (2020) incorporate tail probabilities explicitly into the loss function for a machine-learned shallow water wave model. Extreme value theory provides another mathematically rigorous way to quantify tails (Katz 2010; Lucarini et al. 2016). However, fidelity of different metrics can conflict with each other. Li et al. (2018) experimented with a regional climate model under increasing temperature, and successfully matched observed trends in spatial extent but failed to match observed trends in extreme rainfall. Moreover, the many scales and components of the climate system lead to ambiguous definitions of extremes. For example, atmospheric blocking is a recurrent large-scale feature driving many kinds of weather extremes, but a multitude of definitions hampers objective comparison across models (Woollings et al. 2018; Chan et al. 2019; Gállfi et al. 2019; Chattopadhyay et al. 2020).

The heterogeneity of rare weather events and their impacts calls for a unifying, but flexible, rubric for describing them. For a given event, however defined, we wish to quantify its precursors, its frequency, and its spatiotemporal structure. Most rare event studies, such as those cited above, address some subset of these metrics depending on the methodology, but rarely all together. Transition path theory (TPT), introduced in E and Vanden-Eijnden (2006), is a statistical mechanics framework that ties together all of these quantities by abstracting the rare event into a path through high-dimensional state space. TPT has been applied within numerous studies of conformational change in biomolecules (e.g., Noé et al. 2009a; Meng et al. 2016; Liu et al. 2019; Thiede et al. 2019; Strahan et al. 2021), but has only recently been applied to geophysical dynamics. Miron et al. (2021) used TPT to map out garbage transport paths across the two-dimensional ocean, and Finkel et al. (2020) used TPT to understand rare stratospheric transitions across a three-dimensional model state space due to Ruzmaikin et al. (2003) and Birner and Williams (2008). Here, we explore a stochastically forced version of the classic model of Holton and Mass (1976), one of the first models to capture important aspects of sudden stratospheric warming (SSW). In the language of TPT, a SSW event is a system trajectory that begins in a climatologically “normal” state (a strong polar vortex) and ends in an “extreme” state (a sudden warming, where the vortex has been broken down).

TPT analysis is related to, but distinct from, the forecasting problem, whose importance is well-recognized. Every extra day of advance warning helps us prepare for the ensuing cold snaps following SSW. The subseasonal-to-seasonal (S2S) timescale on which SSW occurs is an outstanding challenge in state-of-the-art weather forecasting (Vitart and Robertson 2018). Many data-driven and probabilistic approaches are building on traditional ensemble forecasting methods. In a recent paper (Finkel et al. 2021), we computed two key forecasting quantities for a prototype model of SSW, the Holton-Mass model—namely, the committor probability and lead time, to be defined below—as functions of initial condition, finding optimally predictive physical observables for SSW onset. Tantet et al. (2015) computed early warning signs of atmospheric blocking by estimating a committor (by a different name) in a reduced state space. Lucente et al. (2019) and Lucente et al. (2021) have also computed committor functions for simple models of El Niño, mathematically quantifying the so-called predictability barrier. Bayesian machine learning (Chen et al. 2021) and kernel forecasting (Wang et al. 2020) are also being investigated in the quest to forecast El Niño.

But near-term forecasting alone does not completely characterize long-term risk or the event’s mechanism from start to finish; this is what TPT provides. In the present paper, we use TPT to connect the short-term weather forecasting problem to the long-term climatology of SSW events, including their precursors, overall frequency, and distribution of severity (by several metrics). Furthermore, TPT offers detailed insight into the development of SSW through the probability current: the average tendency of the system conditioned on the occurrence of an SSW. By visualizing the current in various ways, we will quantitatively assess the interplay between wave disturbances, zonal wind anomalies, and heat flux during SSW, and the extent to which they are uniquely associated with an SSW. Crucially, TPT tells us the variability of these processes, not just their mean behavior. In particular, we will see a dichotomy between successive stages of an SSW event. The preconditioning of the polar vortex manifests as a steady, predictable weakening of the lower-level zonal wind. The latter stage is an abrupt burst of heat flux and collapse of zonal wind that is much more variable in its timing and intensity. These are only a few deliverables of TPT, which can be adapted to probe many other weather phenomena.

The statistical ensemble of transition pathways characterized by TPT can be compared to the single pathway found by minimizing the Freidlin-Wentzell action (Freidlin and Wentzell 1970). That pathway is representative of the rare event’s development in the low-noise limit and is computed by the minimum-action method (e.g., E et al. 2004). “Noise” here means unresolved processes that evolve quickly and unpredictably relative to the large-scale variables of interest, and are typically represented by stochastic forcing (e.g., Berner et al. 2017). The minimum-action method plays a central role in recent rare event analyses, such as Hoffman et al. (2006a) and Plotkin et al. (2019) for tropical cyclones, Bouchet et al. (2014) for two-dimensional fluid mechanics, and Dematteis et al. (2018) for rogue waves. The prominent role of one single trajectory is both a strength and weakness of this method: eliminating all variability among realizations of the rare event leads to a clear, but possibly biased, narrative.
The straightforward way to quantify the statistical ensemble of transition paths is by direct numerical simulation (DNS): integrate a model for a long time until many such events are observed, and then proceed with statistical analysis. Alternatively, in very low-dimensional models, one can compute the necessary quantities by fully discretizing state space, as in Finkel et al. (2020). Unfortunately, for rare events in high-dimensional models, discretization is impossible and DNS becomes too expensive to generate a data set with statistical power. In this paper, as in Finkel et al. (2021), we circumvent this problem by simulating many very short trajectories in parallel, and combining information from all of them to compute rare event statistics without ever observing a complete rare event. The particular approach we use was introduced in (Thiede et al. 2019; Strahan et al. 2021) and extends work in the biophysics community over the last decade on approaches to analyze long timescale phenomena using short simulated trajectories (e.g., Jayachandran et al. 2006, Chodera and Noé 2014 and references therein). In particular in (Noé et al. 2009b) the authors combine an approach using short simulated trajectories similar to the one employed in this paper with TPT to study a protein folding event.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we summarize the dynamical model under study. In section 3, we define TPT quantities of interest and visualize them on the Holton-Mass model. In particular, we use probability densities and currents to give a description of the geometry and dynamical behavior of transition pathways. We also examine the relationship between TPT and the minimum action method. The resulting physical insight will motivate the more technical section 4, where we outline the computational approach and tabulate some quantitative statistical properties of transition paths and their variability. We assess future possibilities and conclude in section 5.

2. Model description

We use exactly the same prototype model for SSW events as analyzed in Finkel et al. (2021). We review the key features of the model here, but direct the reader to section 2b of Finkel et al. (2021) for more details.

Holton and Mass (1976) developed a minimal model for the variability of the winter stratospheric polar vortex, capturing the wave-mean flow interactions behind sudden stratospheric warming events. The model’s prognostic variables consist of a zonally averaged zonal wind \( \bar{u}(y, z, t) \) and a perturbation geostrophic streamfunction \( \psi'(x, y, z, t) \) reduced down to a single wave mode. Two competing forces in the model bring about bistability. First, an altitude-dependent radiative cooling \( a(z) \) relaxes the zonal wind toward a strong polar winter state in thermal wind balance with a radiative equilibrium temperature field. This is the basic mechanism maintaining the winter polar vortex, which in the Holton-Mass model corresponds to a stable equilibrium we denote state \( \mathbf{a} \). Second, a wave perturbation is forced at the lower boundary, the nominal tropopause, associated with stationary waves in the troposphere induced by topography and land-sea contrast. The second state in the model is a wave propagation regime, where upward propagating stationary waves flux momentum down to the lower boundary, creating a highly disturbed state with weak zonal winds. This is a second stable equilibrium we denote state \( \mathbf{b} \).

Sudden stratospheric warming events are abrupt transitions from the strong vortex state (\( \mathbf{a} \)) to the disturbed, wave driven state (\( \mathbf{b} \)). If a strong wave from below happens to catch the stratospheric vortex in a “vulnerable” configuration—e.g., measured by an index of refraction (Charney and Drazin 1961; Yoden 1987)—then a burst of wave activity can propagate upward, ripping apart the polar vortex and causing zonal wind to collapse. With certain parameters, the vortex can get stuck in repeated “vacillation cycles”, in which the vortex begins to restore with the help of radiative forcing, only to be undermined quickly by the wave. The coexistence of these two regimes is fundamental to the Holton-Mass model.

For reference we write down the PDE system here, but refer the reader to Holton and Mass (1976); Yoden (1987); Christiansen (2000) and Finkel et al. (2021) for complete explanations. The zonal wind \( \bar{u}(y, z, t) \) and perturbation streamfunction \( \psi'(x, y, z, t) \) are projected onto a single wavenumber \( k = 2/(a \cos \theta) \) in the zonal direction and a single wavenumber \( ℓ = 3/a \) in the meridional direction (\( a \) = the radius of Earth), hence the ansatz

\[
\bar{u}(y, z, t) = U(z, t) \sin(\ell y) \tag{1}
\]

\[
\psi'(x, y, z, t) = \text{Re}(\Psi(z, t) e^{i k x}) e^z 2H \sin(\ell y). \tag{2}
\]

where \( H \) is the scale height, 7 km. In the resulting highly reduced model, the state space consists of \( \Psi(z, t) \) (which is complex) and \( U(z, t) \). We impose the boundary conditions according to a height parameter, \( h \), representing the orographic forcing, and a background radiative zonal wind profile \( U^R(z) \) that increases linearly with altitude:

\[
\Psi(0, t) = \frac{g h}{f_0}, \quad \Psi(z_{top}, t) = 0, \tag{3}
\]

\[
U(0, t) = U^R(0), \quad \partial_z U(z_{top}, t) = \partial_z U^R(z_{top}).
\]

We fix \( h = 38.5 \text{ m} \) in this study; \( g \) and \( f_0 \) are the gravitational acceleration and coriolis parameter, respectively.

The reduced state variables (2) are then inserted into the prediction equation for \( \bar{u} \) and the linearized quasi-geostrophic potential vorticity equation for \( \psi' \). We nondimensionalize the equations with the parameter \( G^2 = H^2 N^2/(f_0^2 L^2) \), where \( T = 86400 \text{ s} \) (1 day) and \( L \) is a tunable length scale. Note that \( G = L_d/L \), where \( L_d = NH/f_0 \) is the deformation radius. In order to make a data set homogeneously distributed in state space, we select a length
scale $L = 2 \times 10^5$ m and thus $G = 4.4$, a choice motivated by numerics rather than dynamics. The resulting QGPV equation reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left[ -G^2(k^2 + l^2) + \frac{1}{4} \right] + \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial t^2} = &\left[ \left( \frac{a - \alpha z}{2} - i G^2 k \beta \right) - \alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial z} - a \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right] \Psi \\
+ &\left[ i k \epsilon \left( k^2 G^2 + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right) U \right] \Psi - i k \epsilon \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial z^2} U,
\end{aligned}
$$

specifying the tendency of the wave $\Psi$. The mean flow prediction equation becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left[ -G^2 \beta^2 - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right] \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} = &\left[ (a_z - \alpha) U R_z - a U R \right] \\
- &\left[ (\alpha z - \alpha) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \alpha \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right] U + \frac{e k^2}{2} R \epsilon \text{Im} \left\{ \frac{G^2 \Psi}{\partial z^2} \right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\alpha = \alpha(z)$ is the cooling coefficient and $\epsilon = 8/(3\pi)$ is a mode projection coefficient. The notation follows Christiansen (2000), where the parameters are explained in more detail.

After discretizing to 27 vertical levels, we end up with a state space with a dimension of $d = 3 \times (27 - 2) = 75$, with a state vector

$$
X(t) = \left[ \text{Re}\{\Psi(t)\}, \text{Im}\{\Psi(t)\}, U(t) \right] \in \mathbb{R}^{75}
$$

each of the three entries representing a vector with 25 discrete altitudes.

SSWs are associated with both internal stratospheric variability, generated even with time-independent forcing from the troposphere (Scott and Polvani 2006; Matthewman and Esler 2011), and external time-dependent forcing (Sjoberg and Birner 2012; Scott et al. 2008). As a minimal demonstration of our computational approach, we consider only time-independent boundary conditions, but add stochastic perturbations to the zonal wind profile, as specified in Finkel et al. (2021), to drive transitions between the weak and strong vortex states. The noise is smooth in space, but white in time, consisting of two Fourier modes in the vertical. This stochasticity represents unresolved processes such as gravity waves, an idea originally put forward by Birner and Williams (2008) and used more recently by Esler and Mester (2019). It could also represent model error, i.e., variations in the flow associated with smaller scale waves that have been truncated. We emphasize that while this use of stochastic forcing affects the transition path statistics, it does not affect the method for computing them.

The two stable equilibria arising from these competing forces are depicted in Fig. 1 (a,b): $a$ is the strong vortex state, with a linearly increasing zonal wind profile and almost barotropic streamfunction, while $b$ is the disturbed vortex state, with a weak zonal wind profile and a phase-tilted streamfunction. A transition path is defined as an unbroken segment, or trajectory, of the system that begins in a region $A$ of state space and travels to another region $B$ without returning to $A$. In this paper we define $A$ and $B$ as spherical neighborhoods (in non-dimensional space) about the two fixed points:

$$
A = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - a| \leq r_A = 8 \}
$$

$$
B = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - b| \leq r_B = 30 \}
$$

A larger “ball” around $B$ is needed to capture equivalent populations in each state. An “SSW” is then a transition from $A$ to $B$, while the reverse, from $B$ to $A$, represents the recovery of the vortex. This departs slightly from Finkel et al. (2021), where we defined $A$ and $B$ based on zonal wind at a single altitude. The definition based exclusively on the zonal wind near 10 hPa was chosen to be consistent with the standard WMO definition. In this paper, we focus on dynamical insights into the entire process from $A$ to $B$, and the transient dynamics are not over once $U(30 \text{ km})$ drops below an arbitrary threshold.

The second row of Fig. 1 illustrates the state space geometry. The 75-dimensional fixed points $a$ and $b$ are projected onto two-dimensional subspaces, along with plots of the system’s evolution from a long control simulation including two transition paths from $A \rightarrow B$ and back. The heavy clusters of black curves around $a$ and $b$ indicate that their neighborhoods $A$ and $B$ are metastable, the vortex tending to linger in one of the regions for an extended period before quickly switching to the other. The transition paths are highlighted in orange ($A \rightarrow B$) and green ($B \rightarrow A$), beginning precisely when the path last exits $A$ and ending when it first enters $B$ or vice versa. These two samples are only anecdotal, meant to give a general sense for the dynamics. The transition path ensemble refers to the infinite collection of paths, which vary significantly from the two samples shown.

The subspaces in Fig. 1 (c,d) are dynamically relevant to SSW physics. The vertical axis is zonal wind at 30 km, approximately where the $b$ profile reaches its minimum. Panel (c) has wave magnitude $|\Psi|$ in the horizontal, which is greatly enhanced during vacillation cycles and during the $A \rightarrow B$ transition. Panel (d) has vertically integrated heat flux up to 30 km, abbreviated IHF(30 km), in the horizontal, which quantifies both the magnitude and phase of the streamfunction across altitudes. In the Holton-Mass model,

$$
\overline{\psi T}(z) = \frac{H f_0}{R} \overline{\frac{\partial \psi'}{\partial y}} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} \propto e^{z/H} |\Psi(z)| \frac{1}{\partial z^2}
$$

$f_0$ is the Coriolis parameter at 60°N, $R$ is the ideal gas constant for dry air, and $\phi$ is the phase of $\Psi$. Hence the heat flux is related to the amplitude and phase tilt of the
The two stable equilibria of the Holton-Mass model, similar to Fig. 1 of Finkel et al. (2021). The upper two panels show the zonal wind $U(z)$ and the streamfunction $\psi'(z)$ for the two fixed points a (the strong vortex, in blue) and b (the weak vortex, in red). The lower panels project a model integration onto two subspaces: $(U, \psi')$ and $(U, \text{IHF})$, at 30 km. Several SSW events (transitions from A $\rightarrow$ B, highlighted in orange) and recovery events (transitions from B to A, highlighted in green), are observed.

The horizontal axis of (d) is also weighted by density before being integrated:

$$\text{IHF}(30\text{km}) = \int_{0\text{km}}^{30\text{km}} e^{-z/H} \nu' T'(z) \, dz$$

The right side measures the area swept out in the complex plane by $\Psi(z)$, $0\text{km} \leq z \leq 30\text{km}$. Whether interpreted dynamically or geometrically, this quantity is important for SSW and separates a and b more than the wave amplitude itself, as seen by the horizontal separation between a and b in panel (d).

Fig. 1 (c) and (d) illustrate some of the transitory dynamics we wish to capture quantitatively. For example, the orange $A \rightarrow B$ segments take an excursion to especially large wave magnitude and negative zonal wind before approaching set $B$ and the cluster of vacillation cycles. This motivates the more restrictive definitions of A and B in (7): here, the early and late transition stages are part of the path, rather than being obscured by the states. The green $B \rightarrow A$ segments take an altogether different route through state space, gradually increasing in zonal wind and decreasing in wave amplitude, with a late negative spike in IHF.

3. Describing transition paths: sample and mean behavior

We first point out some physically notable features of simulated transition paths. Motivated by anecdotal observations, we then visualize probability densities and currents from TPT, which characterize the statistical behavior of transition paths, providing a richer description than the minimum-action path.
a. Qualitative transition path properties

In the left column of Fig. 2, we plot several observable functions for the first 3000 days of a control simulation, the same data as shown in Fig. 1 (c) and (d). The functions are zonal wind, $U$, at 30 km, streamfunction magnitude, $|\Psi|$ at 30 km, heat flux, $\sqrt{T/\gamma}$, at 30 km, and the vertically integrated heat flux, IHF, up to 30 km. The sets $A$ and $B$ divide the dynamics into four separate “phases” delimited by highlights in the time series plots. (1) In the $A \rightarrow B$ phase, marked by orange, the vortex is breaking down, en route from $A$ to $B$. (2) In the $B \rightarrow A$ phase, marked by green, the vortex is recovering from the vacillating regime back to the radiatively driven regime. (3) In the $A \rightarrow A$ phase, the vortex is strong and remaining strong for the time being, either inside set $A$ or taking a brief excursion before returning back to $A$ (between the end of a green segment and the start of an orange segment). (4) In the $B \rightarrow B$ phase, the vortex is weak, caught in ongoing vacillation cycles in the vicinity of $B$ (between the end of an orange segment and the start of a green segment).

Fig. 2 demonstrates that the system behaves very differently in each phase. Zonal wind is weaker overall during $B \rightarrow B$ than $A \rightarrow A$ (by definition), but moreover it oscillates at a higher frequency, similar to the “vacillation cycles” observed originally by Holton and Mass (1976). But the largest negative zonal wind spikes appear to occur during the SSW, i.e., during the $A \rightarrow B$ phase; see the two large dips in zonal wind at the first transition in Fig. 1, which corresponds to the orange transition path in Fig. 1 (c) that loops twice. A similar pattern appears in both $|\Psi|$ and $\sqrt{T/\gamma}$ time series, where the $B \rightarrow B$ phase supports regular oscillations that are overshadowed by the preceding $A \rightarrow B$ transition.

The vortex recovery phase $B \rightarrow A$ appears considerably tamer, at least in terms of zonal wind, which exhibits no obvious “extremal” behavior while recovering. Rather, the oscillations inherent to set $B$ gradually weaken through the first half of the recovery, after which a smooth restoration to $A$ ensues. However, the lower left panel of Fig. 2 shows unusually negative dips in IHF at 30 km midway through the $B \rightarrow A$ transitions. IHF is a proxy for streamfunction phase tilt and amplitude, which must decrease from $B$ to $A$, but the overshoot, indicating wave reflection and downward propagation, is not necessary a priori.

These observations, though potentially insightful, are based on only two transitions. We start to evaluate the hypotheses quantitatively by describing each phase with a conditional probability distribution. TPT focuses specifically on the $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow A$ phases, during which we say that $X$ is “reactive”, using a term from chemistry literature where the passage from $A$ (reactant) to $B$ (product) models a chemical reaction.

b. Steady-state and reactive probability densities

The right-hand column of Fig. 2 shows five probability distributions projected onto the vertical coordinate. The process as a whole exhibits a steady-state density $\pi(x)$, which describes the long-term probability that the system is in a state near $x$. It can be computed simply by DNS, i.e., integrating the dynamics for a long time and binning data into a histogram. We have instead performed the Dynamic Galerkin Approximation (DGA) procedure (described in the supplement) with only short simulations. $\pi(x)$, shown in black in the right column of Fig. 2, is a weighted mixture of the other four phase-specific densities $\pi_{AA}$, $\pi_{BB}$, $\pi_{AB}$, and $\pi_{BA}$ (the latter two are called reactive densities). The weights are given by the percentage of time spent in each phase, listed in Table 1 along with the average period of the cycle (or inverse rate). The table presents numbers according to both DGA and DNS. It is difficult to assess its uncertainty, but we can assess the uncertainty in the DNS estimate by dividing the long $2 \times 10^5$-day simulation into 10 equal-sized chunks, calculating the appropriate statistic in each chunk, and taking the sample variance of the 10 sample means. Table 1 presents the 95% confidence interval of each number, i.e., two standard deviations in each direction. The interval includes the DGA point estimate in all cases except for the $A \rightarrow B$ time fraction. We discuss numerical error and how it can be reduced in the supplement.

Table 1 specifies the weight of each phase distribution $\pi_{AA}$, $\pi_{AB}$, etc., but their shapes reveal their unique characteristics. Each density is peaked in a different place: while $\pi$ is strongly bimodal with peaks near $a$ and $b$, the reactive densities have more probability at intermediate wind strength, which transition paths must cross through. $\pi_{BA}$ even has a secondary peak around $U = 20$ m/s, suggesting that the recovery process tends to stall or slow down on its way back to $A$. Comparing with the $B \rightarrow A$ transition paths highlighted in green, the slowdown seems to coincide with the mid-recovery switch from weakening oscillations to steady recovery of zonal wind.

$\pi_{AB}$ also has a secondary peak, not at intermediate strength but rather at a negative extreme. This confirms the observation above that zonal wind tends to plummet.
Fig. 2. **Observed transition paths and reactive densities.** Each row displays a timeseries of a different observable: zonal wind $U(30\,\text{km})$, wave magnitude $|\Psi|(30\,\text{km})$, meridional heat flux $v'T'(30\,\text{km})$, and integrated heat flux $\int_{30\text{km}}^{0\text{km}} \rho v'T' \, dz$, a proxy for phase tilt. Several SSW events (transitions from $A \rightarrow B$, highlighted in orange) and recovery events (transitions from $B$ to $A$, highlighted in green), are observed.

especially low during the vortex breakdown process. Meanwhile, the negative IHF anomalies during $B \rightarrow A$ are also borne out by the density $\pi_{BA}$ in the lower right panel, which has a slightly heavier negative tail than $\pi$ or $\pi_{AB}$. Over the variable $v'T'(30\,\text{km})$, the large spikes observed in both of the two orange intervals suggest that $\pi_{AB}$ has a heavier upper tail than the other distributions. The tail is so small compared to its peak that a visual assessment is not practical, and we confirm this observation below.

To corroborate these effects numerically, we display a selection of *lifecycle averages* in Fig. 3. We have defined three “indicator functions” tailored to capture the anomalies described above:

\[ \Gamma(x) = \mathbb{1}\{U(30\,\text{km}) < -20\,\text{m/s}\} \quad (11) \]
\[ \Gamma(x) = \mathbb{1}\{v'T'(30\,\text{km}) > 60\,\text{K}\cdot\text{m/s}\} \quad (12) \]
\[ \Gamma(x) = \mathbb{1}\left\{\int_{30\text{km}}^{0\text{km}} e^{-z/H} v'T'(z) \, dz < 0\,\text{K}\cdot\text{m}^2/\text{s}\right\} \quad (13) \]

i.e., $\Gamma(x)$ in (11) is one if $x$ is a state with $U(30\,\text{km}) < -20$ m/s and zero otherwise. Assuming ergodicity, the fraction of time spent with $U(30\,\text{km}) < -20$ m/s is

\[ \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^{T} \Gamma(X(t)) \, dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(x) \pi(x) \, dx =: \langle \Gamma \rangle_{\pi}, \quad (14) \]

or equivalently, the area under the black curve in Fig. 2(b) below the $-20$ m/s tick mark. The average can also be
IHF is a largely unique trait of $B \rightarrow A$ transitions. The DGA/DNS matches are rough, but typically within the error bars and consistent in terms of ranking phases against each other.

These “reactive probability densities” can be projected onto any observable of interest, providing a simple but powerful tool to measure unique aspects of transition paths. However, reactive densities do not tell the whole story, because they are static. For example, the negative tail of $\pi_{AB}$ over $U(30 \text{ km})$ says nothing about the shape of the vacillation cycles as they wind through state space. In other words, reactive densities say where transitions go and for how long they linger, but not the details of their route. In the next two subsections we explain and visualize committors and reactive currents (E and Vanden-Eijnden 2006), which go further to describe the dynamic behavior of transition pathways.

c. Committors

A necessary prerequisite to understand the motion of transition pathways is a suitable measure of progress from $A$ to $B$, namely a committor function. Suppose an initial condition $X(t_0) = x$ is observed with a vortex that is neither strong nor fully broken down, so $x \notin A \cup B$. $X(t)$ will soon evolve into either $A$ or $B$, since both are attractive, and the respective probabilities define the committor function:

$$q^+(x) = \mathbb{P}_x \{ X(\tau^+(t_0)) \in B \}$$

where $\tau^+(t_0)$ is the first hitting time to set $A$ or $B$,

$$\tau^+(t_0) = \inf \{ t > t_0 : X(\tau^+(t_0)) \in A \cup B \}$$

(a random variable), and the subscript $x$ denotes a conditional probability given $X(t_0) = x$. We assume the system is autonomous, so we can safely set $t_0 = 0$ and drop the argument from $\tau^+$ (however, the argument returns in the mathematical formulation of TPT presented in section ?? of the supplement). We will also use the intuitive notation $q^+(x) = \mathbb{P}_x \{ x \rightarrow B \}$, as $q^+$ simply tells how likely it is to next go to $B$, not $A$. The committor measures probabilistic progress toward $B$, and we argued for its utility as a forecast in Finkel et al. (2021). However, it does not distinguish the $A \rightarrow B$ phase from the $B \rightarrow B$ phase, i.e., it tells us nothing about the past of $X(t)$ for $t < t_0$. For this we also need to introduce the backward committor:

$$q^-(x) = \mathbb{P}_x \{ X(\tau^-(t_0)) \in A \} =: \mathbb{P}_x[A \rightarrow x]$$

where $\tau^-(t_0)$ is the most recent hitting time

$$\tau^-(t_0) = \sup \{ t < t_0 : X(\tau^-(t_0)) \in A \cup B \}$$

The backward-in-time probabilities refer specifically to the process $X(t)$ at equilibrium, allowing us once again to set $t_0 = 0$.
The forward and backward committors are shown in Fig. 4(a) and (b). Note that their contour structures are very different, a sign of irreversible behavior. In particular, the negative extreme of zonal wind has both large $q^+$ and large $q^-$, meaning that whenever a negative wind anomaly is observed, chances are high that the vortex has undergone an SSW and is on its way from a strong vortex (state $A$) to a weak vortex (state $B$). We see this more clearly by combining the two committors:

$$q^-(x)q^+(x) = \mathbb{P}_x(A \rightarrow x)\mathbb{P}_x(x \rightarrow B)$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}_x(A \rightarrow B)$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)$$

$$(1 - q^-(x))(1 - q^+(x)) = \mathbb{P}_x(B \rightarrow x)\mathbb{P}_x(x \rightarrow A)$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}_x(B \rightarrow A)$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)$$

We display these probabilities in Fig. 4(c,d) to highlight signatures of the $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow A$ transitions. The red crescent along the right and bottom flank of state space confirms that large positive $|\Psi|$ spikes and negative $U$ spikes are strongly associated with the $A \rightarrow B$ transition, meaning SSWs are responsible for a disproportionate share of these anomalies. This confirms the precedence of the $A \rightarrow B$ phase in Fig. 3(a), but also reveals details of the dynamical interaction between zonal wind and wave amplitude. Meanwhile, a small region of low $|\Psi|$ and medium $U$ is associated with the $B \rightarrow A$ transition. A projection onto (HIF,$U$) space (which we omit) confirms the association between negative IHF anomalies and the $B \rightarrow A$ phase that we have observed in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3(c).

The maps in Fig. 4(c,d) are related to the reactive densities discussed in the last subsection, viz.

$$\pi_{AB}(x) \propto q^+(x)q^-(x)\pi(x)$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}_x(A \rightarrow B)\pi(x)$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)$$

and likewise for $B \rightarrow A$. The proportionality constants are for normalization. These maps, although static, hint at preferred routes through state space, which we confirm in the next subsection by visualizing the reactive current.

d. Reactive current and minimum-action path

In parallel with the three probability densities $\pi(x)$, $\pi_{AB}(x)$ and $\pi_{BA}(x)$ are three probability currents. The equilibrium current $J(x)$ is a vector field over $\mathbb{R}^d$ that indicates, roughly speaking, the “average” motion of the system as it passes through $x$, regardless of the SSW phase. The reactive current $J_{AB}(x)$ describes the average motion of $A \rightarrow B$ transition paths crossing through $x$, and likewise $J_{BA}(x)$ describes $B \rightarrow A$ transitions. We define these currents precisely in the supplement, but first make an analogy with fluid-dynamical currents. If $A$ and $B$ are two coherent eddies in a body of water, a tracer particle spends most of its time trapped in one of the two, but is occasionally ejected from one eddy and entrained in the other. The equilibrium current is thus dominated by the velocity fields of the two eddies, but the reactive current highlights the smaller filaments that connect them.

This analogy helps to interpret Fig. 5, which maps out the equilibrium and reactive densities and currents in the same subspace ($|\Psi(30\text{km})|, U(30\text{km})$) as shown in Fig. 1(c). The orange-scale color shading in Fig. 5(a) indicates the steady-state density $\pi(x)$, the same as the black curves in the right column of Fig. 2, but now projected onto two dimensions and mapped with a logarithmic scale. $\pi(x)$ is larger near $a$ and $b$, indicating the system’s overall bimodality. Overlaid on $\pi(x)$ is the equilibrium current $J(x)$, which is disorderly near $a$, but highly organized as an “eddy” around $b$. This reflects the vacillation cycles in the $B \rightarrow B$ phase seen in the time series of Fig. 2, and offers a dynamical perspective not available from the stationary distribution $\pi(x)$. Each cycle consists of a slow buildup of zonal wind driven by radiative cooling, wave enhancement allowed by the growing PV gradient, and subsequent collapse of zonal wind. Mathematically, the linearized system near $b$ has imaginary eigenvalues; however, since $b$ is stable, without noise the oscillations would die out eventually. Stochasticity is essential to maintain those circulations at equilibrium. In a sense we can think of them as hinting at the ghost of the limit cycle lurking beyond a Hopf bifurcation. A similar effect termed “self-induced stochastic resonance” has been observed and analyzed in simple excitable systems (Muratov et al. 2005), and Weiss et al. (2020) recognized current loops, or “probability angular momentum,” as a ubiquitous feature in climate dynamics.

The equilibrium current in between $A$ and $B$ is weaker, but essential for carrying the system during the transitory phases. In panel (a), the horizontal slice in phase space near $U(30\text{km}) = 20 \text{ m/s}$ exhibits vector field arrows lying almost horizontally in the ($|\Psi|, U$) plane, forming a probabilistic basin boundary between two eddies. For a transition to occur, that boundary has to be ruptured, and exactly where and how it breaks indicates a lot about the preferred transition mechanism; this is the subject of panels (b) and (c).

Panel (b) shows the reactive current $J_{AB}(x)$, overlaid on the $A \rightarrow B$ reactive density in the background, i.e., the orange curves in the right column of Fig. 2. Gray patches indicate the metastable regions $A$ and $B$, where reactive density is zero by definition (modulo the projected-out dimensions). Whereas the trajectories in Fig. 1(c) and the time series in Fig. 2 give us only a few noisy transition paths, following the reactive current through state space allows to understand the transition dynamics at an ensemble level. To corroborate the faithful representation of transition pathways, and to compare with a more classical method, we have also plotted five realized transition paths (in both directions) from the reference simulation in blue, as well as the minimum-action pathways in cyan.

In Fig. 5(b), $J_{AB}$ emerges from set $A$ with gradually increasing wave amplitude and decreasing zonal wind. Fol-
Fig. 4. Committors and transition probabilities. First row: committors $q^+(x) = \mathbb{P}_x \{ x \rightarrow B \}$ (a), the probability of hitting $B$ next, and $q^-(x) = \mathbb{P}_x \{ A \rightarrow x \}$ (b), the probability of hitting $A$ next. Second row: $q^+(x)q^-(x) = \mathbb{P}_x \{ A \rightarrow B \}$ (c), the probability of being en route from $A$ to $B$, and $(1-q^+(x))(1-q^-(x)) = \mathbb{P}_x \{ B \rightarrow A \}$ (d), the probability of being en route from $B$ to $A$. All fields are projected onto the $(|\Psi|, U)$ plane at 30 km.

Following this current highway farther away from $A$, the field weakens and then spreads out, indicating that pathways tend to meander more widely through this stage. The current flows to large streamfunction amplitude, and eventually extremely negative zonal wind before approaching set $B$ from below, generally tracking along the red crescent of Fig. 4(a). But the current does not completely stall out when hitting $B$; instead, the current loops cyclically around $B$, indicating that some paths orbit the weak-zonal-wind fixed point, perhaps several times, before approaching closely enough to enter $B$. This behavior, of course, depends on the size and shape we assigned to set $B$: with a smaller radius, more cycling occurs, and with a larger radius, paths will generally terminate sooner and cycling will become less prevalent.

From a weather forecasting perspective, there may be little interest in charting the evolution of an SSW after the first dip into negative zonal wind territory, which is why we used a different definition of $A$ and $B$ in Finkel et al. (2021). In that case, transition paths end by definition as soon as the wind reverses, and any further oscillations are considered part of the $B \rightarrow B$ phase, not the $A \rightarrow B$ phase. But from a dynamical systems perspective, these oscillations are robust features of the event’s final stages, and distinct from the following oscillations in the $B \rightarrow B$ phase.

The cyan-colored minimum-action pathway represents the most likely transition path in the low-noise limit (e.g., Freidlin and Wentzell 1970; E et al. 2004; Forgoston and Moore 2018). The pathway solves an optimization problem, deviating as minimally as possible from the deterministic dynamics while still bridging the gap all the way from $A$ to $B$. These deviations from deterministic behavior represent the minimum necessary stochastic forcing required to actuate the transition. We have computed the least action path by minimizing the integrated magnitude of perturba-
Fig. 5. **Densities and currents.** (a) shows the equilibrium density $\pi(x)$ and equilibrium current $J(x)$. (b) and (c) show $J_{AB}(x)$ overlaid on $\pi_{AB}(x)$ and $J_{BA}(x)$ overlaid on $\pi_{BA}(x)$ respectively. Cyan curves mark the minimum-action pathways in each direction, while blue curves are sampled realized transition pathways. Gray dots are data points inside $A$ and $B$, which are spheres in 75 dimensions, so some transition path segments appear to overlap with $A$ and $B$ in this projection.

We turn now to the $B \rightarrow A$ current in Fig. 5(c), which is very different from a reversed $A \rightarrow B$ current (another sign of irreversible dynamics). However, there is symmetry between the two directions. $J_{AB}$ dives beneath set $B$ in an exceptional wind collapse, and subsequently merges smoothly from below with the equilibrium vacillation cycles. After an extended stay in $B$, $J_{BA}$ escapes out the top of the vacillation loop, breaking the cycle during the wave amplification phase by climbing upward in $U$ space ever so slightly, to breach the “basin boundary” from below. At this point, the vortex has reached a sufficiently strong state to inhibit wave propagation, and radiative relaxation takes over.

The minimum-action path from $B$ to $A$ begins with some tortuous maneuvers to escape from the stable spiral $b$, but upon reaching the boundary of set $B$ it follows a simi-
lar route as the reactive current. The path escapes from a vacillation cycle at the top of $B$, during the strong-wind phase, giving the radiative forcing a chance to pull the vortex back into shape. But as with the $A \rightarrow B$ direction, the minimum-action path strays significantly from the vector field streamlines, especially in the final stages with the negative IHF anomaly: while $J_{BA}$ enters $A$ from the right (high $|\Psi|$), the minimum-action path enters $A$ from below.

The minimum-action paths depend in part on choices in the optimization strategy, as detailed in the supplement. However, the systematic differences with reactive current are robust with respect to the optimization parameters. Moreover, any single pathway cannot possibly represent the variety of paths present that the reactive current finds.

e. Visualizing transition states

In the visualization of reactive current and minimum-action paths, we have chosen a two-dimensional space to provide some physical insight into the transition path mechanisms; details on this projection are provided in the supplement and in Strahan et al. (2021). However, any two-dimensional projection must sacrifice all other degrees of freedom, here 73, missing interaction between dynamical fields and altitudes which simply cannot be visualized in this kind of two-dimensional plot. In Finkel et al. (2021), we partially addressed this problem with sparse regression to approximate the committor through a small number of highly predictive physical proxies. This seems promising for predication—it identifies the key observations required for a forecast—but it leaves much to be desired for detailed physical understanding. We offer further visualizations in this section to aggregate the higher-dimensional dependencies, and to compare the transition according to TPT and action minimization. For the remainder of the paper, we focus on the $A \rightarrow B$ transition, the prototype for a SSW.

The minimum-action method is easy to visualize; it is one single path, whereas TPT provides the full range of paths. However, TPT quantities can be used to reconstruct snapshots of “transition states” that are typical in the following sense. A defining property of reactive current is constant flux across dividing surfaces: if we draw a surface $C$ in the $(|\Psi|, U)$ plane of Fig. 5 that encircles $A$ without intersecting $B$, and compute the total outward flux \[ \int_C J_{AB} \cdot d\sigma, \] the result is a constant regardless of which surface $C$ is chosen. That constant is the rate, or inverse return time, which is the average number of SSW events in a given long time period. (Here $d\sigma$ is an area element on $C$.) An expanding sequence of dividing surfaces can be constructed to bridge the gap all the way from $A$ to $B$, each one supporting a different flux distribution with the same integral. Stringing together the peaks of the distributions, we can assemble a (discretized) typical path from $A$ to $B$, as well as a spread around it. This is a simpler version of the transition tubes defined in Vanden-Eijnden (2006); we call it the high probability flux path. It is not to be interpreted as the path of a single event, but rather as the flow of SSW “traffic” through a sequence of thresholds.

A natural choice of dividing surface is a level set of the forward committor shown in 4(a), i.e., all states where the likelihood of a SSW is equal. To represent both typical paths and their variability at different stages through the transition, we pick out three committor levels (0.1, 0.5, 0.9) and identify as candidates all data points (from our finite data set) whose estimated committor is within a small margin (0.05) of the selected level. For committor level sets, the surface normal vector is $n = \nabla q^+ / |\nabla q^+|$. At each point on the level set, we can therefore calculate $J_{AB} \cdot n$, the local contribution to the total flux (the rate) across the surface. The points with the greatest local flux density are in that sense most representative of the pathway through this surface. For each committor level, we have identified all points with flux density with at least 10% of the maximum magnitude, giving a discrete weighted sampling of the flux distribution on each surface. Fig. 6 shows the mean and spread of this distribution in terms of the zonal wind and heat flux profiles. Blue and red dashed curves represent the fixed points $a$ and $b$, the solid curves show the mean profiles at each committor level, and the shading shows the range between the 5th and 95th percentile (note they are not symmetric about the mean). The supplement provides details on how these statistics are calculated.

The progression from $A$ to $B$ starts off gradual and constrained, but in the latter stages explodes in both magnitude and variability. The $q^+ = 0.1$ and $q^+ = 0.5$ profiles form tight bundles, consistent with the narrow stream of $J_{AB}$ close to $A$, while the $q^+ = 0.9$ profiles spread out dramatically, especially in terms of heat flux. Another striking aspect is that the upper level winds remain quite close to the radiative solution even for high committor levels, a long way into the transition process; the collapse of upper level wind happens very fast and very late after the vortex has practically committed to breaking down. Comparing the wind profiles at a forecast probability of 0.1 vs. 0.5 suggests that the key evidence of an impending SSW is a subtle, but significant weakening of the midlevel vortex between 20 and 40 km. There is more spread in the lower-level winds around 10–20 km at the 50% point, but not a significant difference in the mean. The key role of the midlevel winds suggests the importance of preconditioning the vortex (McIntyre 1982; Albers and Birner 2014). Strong winds inhibit upward wave propagation (e.g., Charney and Drazin 1961) and an initial weakening of the mid-level winds allows for the abrupt burst of wave activity in the SSW event.

In terms of the heat flux, the key evidence of an impending warming event is the subtle increase in heat flux (i.e., upward wave propagation) at lower levels, 10 km and lower. The increase in wave propagation from the boundary is the key precursor. The explosion of upper levels (the 0.9
Typical transition states and variability. For a sequence of three committor level surfaces, we plot (a) the zonal wind profile and (b) the meridional heat flux profile that is most typical of that surface in the sense of reactive current flux density. Shading represents the 5th and 95th percentiles of the flux distribution. Blue, gold, and red curves come from the $0_{Y_1}$, $0_{Y_3}$, and $0_{Y_9}$ level sets of the committor, respectively. Blue and red dashed curves represent the profiles for the fixed points $a$ and $b$, respectively.

surface) comes when the event is already in progress. The middle altitudes may be critical for this model’s preconditioning, or receptivity to planetary waves propagating from below. Preconditioning is a key concept for predictability, and has been explored in Bancalá et al. (2012) and Albers and Birner (2014) in reanalysis data. The details of preconditioning are more complex in three-dimensional resolved models, and it may furthermore differ between split- and displacement-type warmings.

While Fig. 6 divides the transition into stages based on the committor, it does not indicate how long each stage takes. To compare TPT more directly with the minimum-action pathway, which is parameterized by time, we choose another set of dividing surfaces defined as level sets of the lead time to the SSW, i.e., to reach set $B$:

$$\eta^+(x) = \mathbb{E}_{x} [T^+ | x \rightarrow B].$$ (25)

This measures the progress from $A$ to $B$ in terms of time, as presented in Finkel et al. (2021) as an important forecasting metric. We select 15 different level sets of $\eta^+$ from 100 days to 0 days, matching the time horizon of the minimum-action path, and compute the mean and standard deviation wind profile as described above. Fig. 7 displays both minimum-action path (left) and high probability flux path (right), showing the evolution of $U(30 \text{ km})$, $U(z)$, and $|\Psi(z)|$ profiles. The two paths are qualitatively similar, both zonal wind profiles slowly decaying and then rapidly plummeting down to $b$. But they differ, primarily in the magnitude of extremal behavior: the zonal wind dips lower and the wave magnitude rises higher in the minimum-action path as opposed to the high probability flux path.

A vertical dashed line marks the beginning of the conventional SSW event, when $U(30 \text{ km})$ first dips below the threshold for state $a$. While this event is clearly defined for the minimum-action path, in Fig. 7(b) the high probability flux path actually stagnates in its descent, not crossing the threshold until the transition is almost finished. This is not because real transition paths don’t plummet to negative wind—Fig. 5 clearly shows that they do, both from the current and from the observed path samples—but because the subsequent large oscillations around set $B$ cancel out the negative spike, on average. The orange flux distribution spreads out rapidly even as the mean profile flattines, confirming that mean behavior belies some important variability in the transition path ensemble. We thus put the vertical line in the right-hand column where the 5th percentile of zonal wind drops below $a$, as the minimum-action path corresponds most closely to the negative tail of the transition path ensemble. This is consistent with the comparison between the minimum-action path and reactive flux in Fig. 5: nonzero noise tends to (1) blunt the largest negative zonal wind spikes, and (2) lead to subsequent large positive oscillations before the vortex enters $B$.

4. Transition path statistics and numerical benchmarks

In this section we present various statistics over the transition path ensemble, including metrics of SSW severity. We also report numerical benchmarks to assess the accuracy of the DGA method.

a. Numerical method: DGA

DGA is detailed in the supplement and in previous papers (Thiede et al. 2019; Strahan et al. 2021; Finkel et al. 2021), but we briefly sketch the procedure to provide context for the statistics to follow. We generate a data set by
sampling many points $X_n(0)$ from all over state space according to some sampling measure, $\mu$, and then launching a short trajectory from each one, yielding a data set $(X_n(t) : 0 \leq t \leq \Delta t)_{n=1}^N$. This sampling measure, the number $N = 3 \times 10^5$ trajectories, and the length $\Delta t = 20$ days, are key parameters of the method. The trajectories are significantly shorter than the typical $\sim 100$ day duration of SSW. As in Finkel et al. (2021), the initial conditions are resampled from a long ($2 \times 10^5$ days) control simulation to be uniformly distributed on the space $(|\Psi(30\text{ km})|, U(30\text{ km}))$. With a more complex (expensive) model we would not be able to rely on a control simulation to seed the initial points, but here we focus on TPT and DGA as a proof of concept rather than optimizing the numerical procedure.

After generating the data, we expand several unknown “forecast functions” of interest—$q^+(x), q^-(x), \eta^+(x), \eta^-(x), \pi(x)$ etc, see the supplement—in basis sets informed by the data, and then solve matrix equations for the expansion coefficients. The choice of basis is another key parameter of the method. The entries in the matrix equations are expectations over both the initial conditions $X_n(0)$ and the final conditions $X_n(\Delta t)$ and are estimated by sample averaging using our short trajectory data set. The forecast functions then lead directly to all the other quantities presented here,

Fig. 7. Minimum-action paths (left) and high probability flux paths (right). The first row shows $U(30\text{ km})$ as a function of time, while the second row displays the evolution of the whole zonal wind profile $U(z)$. The third row shows the evolution of the profile of wave amplitude $|\Psi(z)|$. The high probability flux path is defined as a sequence of maximizers of the flux distribution on level sets of the lead time to $B$ (see text for details). The two paths are similar, but the minimum-action path goes through larger extremes in both wind and wave amplitude.
including reactive densities, currents, and the path integral moments to be described next.

DGA is an attractive alternative to DNS because it is parallelizable and flexible with respect to the sampling distribution \( \mu \). DNS, by contrast, samples state space according to \( \pi \), which is small in the transition regions between \( A \) and \( B \). DNS generates transition events only rarely, and thus the transition path statistics of interest may take a long time to converge. As DGA is a new, rapidly developing method, rigorous error bounds are not yet available for general systems, and certainly beyond the scope of this paper. In practice, the performance of DGA depends strongly on the specific choice of sampling measure, basis functions, and lag time \( \Delta t \). Because we have performed both DGA and DNS on the Holton-Mass model, we can compare them quantitatively, and furthermore put error bars on DNS, as a rough validation, albeit with significant room for improvement.

\[ \int_{\tau^-}^{\tau^+} \Gamma(X(t)) \, dt \]  

where \( \Gamma \) is a physical observable to represent the magnitude, or severity, of an event.  

Fig. 8(a) shows the expected transit time of all \((A \rightarrow B)\) transitions passing through \( x \),  

\[ \mathbb{E}_X[\tau^+ - \tau^- | A \rightarrow B]. \]  

The blue regions indicate a small \( \tau^+ - \tau^- \), i.e., the fast routes through state space between \( A \) and \( B \). The red regions indicate traps, where stray transition pathways encounter delays. The fastest route generally follows the reactive current, with a large spike in wave amplitude preceding the zonal wind dropoff.

Next consider the total heat flux at 30 km. Panel (b) shows the expected total heat flux of transition paths crossing through \( x \), while panel (c) shows the instantaneous heat flux at 30 km as a static function of state space, viz. Equation (9), highlighting its association with large wave magnitude and weak zonal wind. Counterintuitively, the low-heat flux path route passes through the high-heat flux region of state space. To resolve this paradox, we turn back to the reactive current \( J_{AB} \) in Fig. 5 and note again the presence of extra loops around set \( B \) in the final stages of transition. A proportion of transition paths execute some extra loops, having missed the set the first time around, and accumulate more heat flux into the path integral. The red interior region of large total heat flux in Fig. 8(c) is a signature of these multi-loop pathways, one of which is already shown in the relatively brief simulation window of Figs. 1 and 2. Panel (d) draws attention to where total heat flux is large and total time is small: i.e., the most intense events. It appears greatest right where transition paths tend to enter set \( B \) after the first major deceleration of the vortex, similar to the minimum-action path shown in Fig. 5(b). This is the sweet spot where paths reach the weak vortex state without getting trapped in a number of cycles about \( B \).

### b. Forecast maps: distinguishing transition routes

With reactive densities, we describe the properties of instantaneous configurations along transition paths. With reactive currents, we describe the movement between successive configurations during a transition. Here, we go one step further and describe the properties of full, coherent pathways as discrete objects drawn from an ensemble. We focus on just two simple summary statistics that are physically relevant to our insights so far. The first statistic is the transit time: how long it takes for the vortex to break down completely. Formally, transit time is \( \tau^+ - \tau^- \), where \( \tau^- \) is the beginning of the path (when it leaves \( A \)) and \( \tau^+ \) is the end of the path (when it hits \( B \)). The second statistic is the total heat flux, \( \int_{\tau^-}^{\tau^+} \sqrt{TT'}(30 \text{ km}) \, dt \): a quantification of the size of the spikes observed in Fig. 2(c) during the \( A \rightarrow B \) SSW phase. Both quantities are random variables that differ from event to event, and we would like to distinguish different pathways based on their transit time and total heat flux. We can apply the same analysis to any path integral of the form

The fastestroutegenerallyfollowsthereactivecurrent,withalargespikeinwaveamplitudeprecedingthezonalwinddropoff.
the same information given enough time, but in more expensive models we expect DGA to become more favorable. We will present both sets of results together, simultaneously bolstering our scientific claims and validating the DGA method.

The first two moments are visually assessed in Fig. 9(a), where we have plotted the transition path duration against the integrated heat flux for all observed transitions from the control simulation. Cyan and red crosses indicate the mean and $\pm 1$ standard deviation envelope estimated from DNS and DGA respectively. Note that the crosses are not error bars on the mean, but estimates of the variances of the transition path integral distributions. DNS and DGA agree approximately in these first two moments, but the distribution is plainly skewed, indicating that higher moments are necessary to fully describe it. Panels (b) and (c) show the first three moments, normalized to the same units by taking a $k$-norm,

$$\left\{ E\left[ \left( \int_{\tau^-}^{\tau^+} \Gamma(X(t)) dt \right)^k \right] \right\}^{1/k}, \quad (28)$$

which have the same dimensions of $[\Gamma] \cdot [T]$ for $k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$.

The two methods are consistent given the 95% confidence interval on DNS and produce similar moment patterns as a function of moment number $k$. The errors suffered by DNS are due to poorly sampled tails in the distribution, which are rare events among rare events. The fundamental data scarcity problem applies to the transition path ensemble itself, and we have found the moment error bars to decrease slowly as the DNS data set increases.

DGA is not perfect either, displaying a consistent bias in the time moments relative to DNS, which may depend sensitively on the definition of $B$. In principle, one can use...
5. Conclusion

Extreme weather events are central to the modern challenge of climate modeling. As the impacts of flooding, heat waves, cold spells, and other natural disasters become increasingly stark, the scientific community is endeavoring to better capture these events, as well as average behavior, in numerical models. While many exciting techniques are being developed to simulate and diagnose rare events, there is an overall lack of standard language and benchmarks to do so, due to the sheer variety of extreme-weather phenomena under study. Closely coupled to this conceptual problem is the computational problem that rare events take a long time to appear and hence a very long time to produce a significant statistical distribution, whether in an observational record or in a simulation.

We have advocated two major ideas to advance an organized approach to extreme weather modeling. First, as a conceptual demonstration, we have presented a detailed transition path theory (TPT) analysis of a prototypical extreme event, sudden stratospheric warmings in the Holton-Mass model. TPT provides a set of summary statistics that encapsulate important features of rare events, including frequency, precursors, and various severity metrics. Reactive densities and reactive currents tell us how the system evolves through state space to a SSW event, as well as momentum and heat transfers along the way. The minimum-action method provides a useful but limited point of comparison, as it provides no information about the variability of transitions. We have furthermore extended the TPT framework to calculate statistics of the total time elapsed and integrated heat flux during a vortex breakdown event, both for the entire path ensemble and for different kinds of paths through state space. Comparing reactive current with maps of various forecasts and aftcasts, we can infer many qualitative properties of the path ensemble, especially what makes transition paths unique relative to “everyday” dynamics.

Second, we have demonstrated the numerical ability to use short simulations to estimate rare event statistics, which has great potential as a parallelizable alternative to running long simulations. This was demonstrated in Finkel et al. (2021) for the narrow goal of forecasting sudden stratospheric warming events in the Holton-Mass model. In the current paper we have used the same computational method to ask more intricate statistical questions about the evolution of SSW from start to finish.

Our work is an early application of TPT to atmospheric science, where we believe it holds potential as a framework for forecasting, risk analysis, and uncertainty quantification. Thus far, it has been used mainly to analyze protein folding in molecular dynamics, but is becoming recognized as informative for diverse fields such as social science (Helfmann et al. 2021), as well as ocean and atmospheric science (Finkel et al. 2020; Helfmann et al. 2020;
Lucente et al. 2021). We stress that TPT and DGA are specialized to describe certain aspects of rare events, but not all aspects. Our method targets specific integral quantities of the form (26), but nonlinear functionals may also be worth computing. Furthermore, successive rare events may carry long-time correlations, which we have not quantified. For example, a large earthquake might release enough tectonic stress to make the next one less severe. Our approach will require further extensions to address such issues.

Significant challenges remain for deploying DGA at scale to state-of-the-art climate models. The numerical pipeline used in this paper is far from optimal, as we have focused on communicating the basic deliverables of TPT. One important limitation is the data generation step. We used a long ergodic trajectory to sample the attractor, which served the double purpose of seeding initial data points for short trajectories (i.e., defining the sampling measure $\mu$) and providing a ground truth for validating the accuracy of DGA. In a real application where DGA is advantageous, this dataset would not be available, and more advanced sampling methods would be required. One promising strategy is splitting: starting from initial points in $A$ and $B$, simulate forward for a short time, and replicate trajectories that explore new regions of state space. Efficient sampling is an active research area, with recent work including Hoffman et al. (2006b); Weare (2009); Bouchet et al. (2011, 2014); Vanden-Eijnden and Weare (2013); Chen et al. (2014); Yasuda et al. (2017); Farazmand and Sapsis (2017); Dematteis et al. (2018); Mohamad and Sapsis (2018); Dematteis et al. (2019); Wever et al. (2019); Bouchet et al. (2019a,b); Plotkin et al. (2019); Simonnet et al. (2020); Ragone and Bouchet (2020); Sapsis (2021); Abbot et al. (2021). We will draw upon these developing methods when scaling DGA up to more realistic models and data. In the meantime, our calculations here serve as a conceptual and numerical foundation for holistic rare event description in atmospheric dynamics.
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1 Transition path theory formalism

1.1 The transition path ensemble

We begin a quantitative description of transition paths by formalizing the ensemble notion. The theoretical development parallels [Vanden-Eijnden(2006)], but expands on it in several ways that we will clarify. Consider the stratosphere, or any other stochastic ergodic dynamical system, evolving through a very long time interval \((-T, T)\), during which it crosses from \(A\) to \(B\) and back a number \(M\) of times. As \(T \to \infty\), ergodicity guarantees that \(M \to \infty\) as well. The \(m\)th transition path begins at time \(\tau_m^-\) (so \(X(\tau_m^-) \in A^1\)) and ends at time \(\tau_m^+\) (so \(X(\tau_m^+) \in B\)). Each \(\tau_m^-\) marks the beginning of an orange segment in Fig. 2, and \(\tau_m^+\) marks the end of it.

We will describe the transition path ensemble at two levels of granularity. At the first level, we consider the set of transition snapshots, which are the instantaneous model states \(X(t)\) realized in the course of a transition without regard to their ordering in time or their grouping into separate transition events:

\[
\text{Transition snapshots} = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{t=\tau_m^-}^{\tau_m^+} X(t).
\]  

This ensemble is described completely by the densities such as \(\pi_{AB}\) and \(\pi_{BA}\) in the right-hand column of Fig. 2, which lump together all reactive snapshots into a single distribution, regardless of which transition event they came from. In other words, every orange point in Fig. 2 (c) and (d) contributes one sample to the ensemble. The reactive densities describe how the stratosphere looks at a single moment in transition, but not how it evolves through the transition.

At the second level, we distinguish each transition path as a unique, coherent object, containing a sequence of snapshots ordered in time. We formally define the \((A \to B)\) transition path ensemble as

\[
\text{Transition paths} = \left\{ (t, X(t)) : \tau_m^- \leq t < \tau_m^+ \right\}, m = 1, 2, \ldots
\]  

Technically, we assume \(X(t)\) is right-continuous with left limits, meaning \(X(\tau_m^-) \notin A\) but \(\lim_{t \downarrow \tau_m^-} X(t) \in A\). This detail is not important for us here.
The inner set is the collection of snapshots along the $m$th transition path, and the outer set is the collection of paths, which becomes infinite as $T \to \infty$. There is no fixed duration of transition paths; each one has a different duration $\tau^+_m - \tau^-_m$. For this reason, the space of paths has infinite dimension. Therefore, there is no probability density to describe the path ensemble. However, functionals of transition paths do have well-defined distributions. Using the abbreviation $X^{(m)} := \{(t, X(t)) : \tau^-_m \leq t < \tau^+_m\}$ for the $m$th transition path, we can define arbitrary functionals $\mathcal{G}$ such as

$$\mathcal{G}[X^{(m)}] = \tau^+_m - \tau^-_m,$$

$$\mathcal{G}[X^{(m)}] = \int_{\tau^-_m}^{\tau^+_m} v\sqrt{T'(30\text{ km})} \, dt,$$

$$\mathcal{G}[X^{(m)}] = \max \left\{ \frac{U(30\text{ km})(t_2) - U(30\text{ km})(t_1)}{t_2 - t_1} : \tau^-_m \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq \tau^+_m \right\},$$

which quantify the elapsed time, the total heat flux at 30 km, and the fastest drop in wind speed at 30 km recorded over the whole transition path. (A time derivative is not technically well-defined for a white noise-driven process.) The quantities of interest $\mathcal{G}$ will, of course, depend on the application. For any fixed scalar-valued or vector-valued $\mathcal{G}$, the collection of random variables $\{\mathcal{G}[X^{(1)}], \mathcal{G}[X^{(2)}], \ldots\}$ has a well-defined steady-state distribution that we wish to characterize. In principle, we could do this by “direct numerical simulation” (DNS): integrate the system for a long time, collect many $A \to B$ transition paths $X^{(m)}$, calculate $\mathcal{G}[X^{(m)}]$ for each one, and estimate summary statistics. Although DNS is simple and general, it is expensive for high-dimensional models, particularly for rare event simulation. The DGA method, explained below in section 2, circumvents DNS by using only short trajectories, short not only compared to the return time $\tau^-_{m+1} - \tau^+_m$, but even compared to the $(A \to B)$ transit time $\tau^+_m - \tau^-_m$. We focus on functionals of the form (??), repeated here for reference:

$$\mathcal{G}[X^{(m)}] = \int_{\tau^-_m}^{\tau^+_m} \Gamma(X(t)) \, dt$$

where $\Gamma$ is a user-defined quantity of interest. For example $\Gamma(x) = 1$ yields the transit time (4) and $\Gamma = v\sqrt{T'(30 \text{ km})}$ yields the total heat flux at 30 km, (5). For certain extreme weather events, $\Gamma$ might be chosen to measure accumulated damage of some kind, say, the total rainfall deposited over an area (in the case of hurricanes) or total time with surface temperatures above a certain threshold (in the case of heat waves). In a downward-coupled SSW model, one could define $\Gamma$ to reflect the human impact of extreme cold spells, but in the simple Holton-Mass model we value $\Gamma$ only for dynamical insight into SSW variability. We will refer to $\int \Gamma(X(t)) \, dt$ as a transition path integral. A limitation of DGA is that it cannot directly handle more complex nonlinear functionals of the form (6). We will return to address this issue later on.

The essential insight of TPT is to express these quantities of interest in terms of a set of forecast functions. We follow the formulation of TPT in [Vanden-Eijnden(2006)], but expand upon it substantially to include a broader class of transition path statistics, as required by this application. Subsequently, we will describe the computational method that uses only short trajectories.

1.1.1 Forecast functions

A forecast is an estimate of the future conditioned on the present, which in probability language takes the form

$$F^+(x) = \mathbb{E}_x[Q(\{(t, X(t)) : t \geq 0\})].$$
Here, \( \mathbb{E}_x \) indicates a conditional expectation given a fixed initial condition \( X(0) = x \) (we can set \( t_0 = 0 \) when assuming autonomous dynamics). \( Q \) is a generic functional of the future evolution of the state \( X(t) \). It is explicitly a random variable under the stochastic forcing we impose here, but even in a deterministic model, uncertainty from initial conditions and model error lead to effective randomness. For example, \( Q \) could return 1 if \( X(t) \) next hits \( B \) before \( A \), and 0 if \( X(t) \) next hits \( A \) before \( B \). This makes \( F^+ \) simply the forward committor, as introduced in section ??:

\[
F^+(x) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ 1_B(X(\tau^+)) \right] = \mathbb{P}_x \{ X(\tau^+) \in B \} =: q^+(x) 
\]  

(9)

We might also wish to forecast the time it takes to get there, by defining \( Q = \tau^+ 1_B(X(\tau^+)) \) and making \( F^+(x)/q^+(x) \) the (conditional) mean first passage time. Both of these functions were estimated in [Finkel et al. (2021) Finkel, Webber, Abbot, Gerber, and Weare], and are useful in their own right for real-time forecasting and analysis of those forecasts.

As explained in section ??(??), the forward committor only looks to the future, and the backward committor is needed to single out the \( A \rightarrow B \) phase.

\[
q^-(x) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ 1_A(X(\tau^-)) \right] = \mathbb{P}_x \{ X(\tau^-) \in A \} 
\]  

(11)

This is a backward-in-time forecast, or *aficast*.

Forward and backward committors are central components in the existing transition path theory laid out in [E and Vanden-Eijnden (2006) E and Vanden-Eijnden, Vanden-Eijnden (2006), ??, ??, ??], and elsewhere. Here, we generalize committors to forecast not only where the trajectory ends up, but what happens along the way. We consider forecast/aficast functions of the form

\[
F^+_\Gamma(x; \lambda) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ 1_B(X(\tau^+)) \exp \left( \lambda \int_0^{\tau^+} \Gamma(X(r)) \, dr \right) \right] 
\]  

(12)

\[
F^-_\Gamma(x; \lambda) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ 1_A(X(\tau^-)) \exp \left( \lambda \int_{\tau^-}^0 \Gamma(X(r)) \, dr \right) \right] 
\]  

(13)

where \( \lambda \) is a real free parameter. With \( \lambda = 0 \) (and any \( \Gamma \)), \( F^+_\Gamma \) and \( F^-_\Gamma \) in (12) and (13) reduce to the forward and backward committors. We can use the fact that the past and future are independent *conditional on the present*, and multiply them together to get an expectation over transition paths crossing through \( x \):

\[
F^\Gamma(x; \lambda) F^\Gamma(x; \lambda) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ 1_A(X(\tau^-)) 1_B(X(\tau^+)) \exp \left( \lambda \int_{\tau^-}^{\tau^+} \Gamma(X(r)) \, dr \right) \right] 
\]  

(14)

This product is now seen to be a moment-generating function for the transition path integral (7). Differentiating in \( \lambda \) at \( \lambda = 0 \) provides us with any moment of the path integral distribution:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \left[ F^-_\Gamma(x; \lambda) F^+_\Gamma(x; \lambda) \right]_{\lambda=0} = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ 1_A(X(\tau^-)) 1_B(X(\tau^+)) \left( \int_{\tau^-}^{\tau^+} \Gamma(X(r)) \, dr \right)^k \right] 
\]  

(15)

where, again, the expectation is restricted to paths crossing through \( x \). Setting \( k = 0 \), this is simply \( q^+(x) q^-(x) \), the probability of an observed snapshot \( x \) being part of a transition path, which is
shown in Fig. ??(c). With \( k \geq 1 \), it is natural to condition on snapshots being reactive by dividing by \( q^+ (x) q^- (x) \).

\[
\frac{\partial^k_k [ F^+_{\Gamma}(x, \lambda) F^-_{\Gamma}(x, \lambda)]_{t=0}}{q^+ (x) q^- (x)}
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \left( \int_{\tau^-}^{\tau^+} \Gamma (x(r)) \, dr \right)^k \left| X(\tau^-) \in A, X(\tau^+) \in B \right. \right]
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \left( \int_{\tau^-}^{\tau^+} \Gamma (x(r)) \, dr \right)^k \left| A \to B \right. \right] \quad \text{(abbreviation)}
\]

As a function of \( x \), these forecast maps describe the character of transition paths that take different routes through state space. We have already displayed forecast maps in Fig. ??, \( \Gamma = 1 \) and \( \Gamma = \sqrt{\nu'T'}(30 \text{ km}) \).

Everything we say about transition paths stems originally from the functions \( F^+_{\Gamma} \) and \( F^-_{\Gamma} \) for various \( \Gamma \), as well as the steady-state distribution \( \pi \). More specifically, we need the ability to compute \( \partial^k_k F^+_{\Gamma}(x; 0) \) for any \( k \geq 0 \) and for any user-defined \( \Gamma \). Thus, we spend the remainder of this section defining the quantities of interest, some of which have already been seen in the results, and then expressing them in terms of \( F^+_{\Gamma} \), \( F^-_{\Gamma} \), and \( \pi \). Section 2 will then explain how to compute them using short simulation data.

### 1.1.2 Reactive snapshot averages

In this subsection, we use committors to define statistics over the transition path ensemble at the level of snapshots, or equivalently, averages with respect to the reactive densities \( \pi_{AB} \) and \( \pi_{BA} \). The following subsection does the same at the level of paths, and uses the more general \( F^+_{\Gamma} \) forecasts rather than just committors. The key to transforming forecasts into ensemble averages (at either level) is the ergodic assumption, which says that for any suitable observable \( \Gamma (x) \), time averaging is equivalent to spatial averaging with respect to the steady-state distribution \( \pi \):

\[
\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^{T} \Gamma (x(t)) \, dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma (x) \pi (x) \, dx =: \langle \Gamma \rangle_\pi \quad \text{(17)}
\]

For example, if \( S \) is a small region of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( \Gamma (x) = \mathbb{I}_S (x) \), the formula (17) says that the fraction of time \( X(t) \) spends in \( S \) is equal to the total mass of \( \pi \) contained in \( S \). While Equation (17) gives us equilibrium averages over the system’s entire history, describing reactive snapshots means restricting the time horizon \( (-T, T) \) to times when \( X(t) \) is en route from \( A \) to \( B \). The ergodic assumption easily allows for this in two steps. First, we find the time fraction that \( X(t) \) is reactive during \( (-T, T) \):

\[
\text{Fraction of time reactive} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \sum_{m=1}^{M_T} (\tau^+_m - \tau^-_m)
\]

\[
= \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^{T} \mathbb{I}_A (X(\tau^- (t))) \mathbb{I}_B (X(\tau^+ (t))) \, dt
\]

\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}_x [ \mathbb{I}_A (X(\tau^-)) \mathbb{I}_B (X(\tau^+))] \pi (x) \, dx
\]

\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} q^- (x) q^+ (x) \pi (x) \, dx = \langle q^- q^+ \rangle_\pi \quad \text{(18)}
\]
Inserting $\Gamma$ into the integral above and normalizing gives us a restricted average:

$$\text{Average of } \Gamma \text{ over reactive snapshots} = \frac{\langle \Gamma q^- q^+ \rangle_\pi}{\langle q^- q^+ \rangle_\pi}$$

$$= \int \Gamma(x) \frac{q^-(x)q^+(x)\pi(x)}{\langle q^- q^+ \rangle_\pi} \, dx =: \langle \Gamma \rangle_{\pi_{AB}}$$

The fraction in the last integral, $q^- q^+ \pi / \langle q^- q^+ \rangle_\pi$, is a properly normalized probability density that defines the reactive density $\pi_{AB}(x)$, the orange curves in Fig. ?? and the background shading in Fig. ??(c,e). The $(B \rightarrow A)$ density $\pi_{BA}$, is obtained in the same way, but switching the roles of $A$ and $B$ or by taking complements of probabilities, i.e., $\pi_{BA} = \pi(1-q^-)/(1-q^-)$. The phases $A \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow B$ can be characterized similarly.

### 1.1.3 Transition path averages and currents

Thinking about transition paths from start to finish as discrete, coherent objects unlocks a richer description of the rare event, which is ultimately related to the reactive currents. In this section we use forecast functions (12) and (13) to compute the transition rate and statistics of the path integrals (7) with a single framework centered around the 

generalized symmetric rate:

$$R_T(\lambda) := \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \sum_{m=1}^{M_T} \exp \left( \lambda \int_{\tau_m^+}^{\tau_m^-} \Gamma(X(r)) \, dr \right)$$

The notation emphasizes that $R_T$ depends on the observable $\Gamma$ and the real parameter $\lambda$. To unpack this formula, first set $\lambda = 0$ and observe that $R_T(0) = \frac{M_T}{2T}$ is the number of transitions per unit time, or symmetric rate, whose inverse is the average period of the full SSW life cycle. This is not to be confused with the asymmetric forward and backward rates,

$$k_{AB} = \frac{R_T(0)}{\langle q^- \rangle_\pi}, \quad k_{BA} = \frac{R_T(0)}{\langle 1-q^- \rangle_\pi}$$

which distinguish the $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow A$ directions by how fast they occur. The factor $\langle q^- \rangle_\pi$ is the time fraction spent having last been in $A$ rather than $B$, and $\langle 1-q^- \rangle$ is the opposite. For example, if $A$ were very stable and $B$ very unstable, the system would spend most of its time in the basin of attraction of $A$, making $\langle q^- \rangle_\pi$ large and $k_{AB} \ll k_{BA}$. Asymmetric rates (or “rate constants”) are very important for chemical applications, but the symmetric rate is more useful to us presently.

All of these rates have been studied extensively with TPT and preceding theories. Our novel contribution is to introduce the exponential factor $\exp \left( \lambda \int \Gamma(X(t)) \, dt \right)$ to additionally study transition path integrals. The theoretical development below therefore reduces to classical TPT by replacing $\Gamma$ with 0.

Returning to (20), we divide through by $R_T(0)$:

$$\frac{R_T(\lambda)}{R_T(0)} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{M_T} \sum_{m=1}^{M_T} \exp \left( \lambda \int_{\tau_m^+}^{\tau_m^-} \Gamma(X(r)) \, dr \right)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\text{paths}} \left[ \exp \left( \lambda \int_{\tau^-}^{\tau^+} \Gamma(X(r)) \, dr \right) \right]$$

where the subscript “paths” distinguishes the expectation as over all transition paths, not just those crossing through a fixed $x$ as in (16). The right side of (22) is a moment-generating function for the
transition path integral (7). Differentiating in \( \lambda \) yields the moments of that distribution, including its variance, skew, and kurtosis:

\[
\frac{\partial^k R_T(0)}{R_T(0)} = \mathbb{E}_{\text{paths}} \left[ \left( \int_{\tau^{-}}^{\tau^{+}} \Gamma(\mathbf{X}(r)) \, dr \right)^k \right].
\] (23)

Thus, \( R_T(\lambda) \) contains much information about the transition ensemble as measured by path integrals.

We now express \( R_T \) in terms of the forecast functions \( F_{\tau}^c \) and \( F_{\tau} \), again using the key assumption of ergodicity. We must convert Equation (20), a sum over transition paths \( \sum_{n=1}^{M_T(\cdot)} \), into an integral over time \( \int_{-T}^{T} (\cdot) \, dt \) and then (by ergodicity) into an integral over space \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\cdot) \pi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \). This approach extends the rate derivation in [Vanden-Eijnden (2006)] and [Strahan et al. (2021)] to generalized rates.

To write the rate as a time integral, we introduce a dividing surface between \( A \) and \( B \) (such as a committor level surface) and use the fact that a transition path crosses such a surface an odd number of times. A mask is applied to the time integral to select only the time segments when a reactive trajectory segment is crossing this surface (+1 for positive crossings and –1 for negative crossings), resulting in unit weight for each transition path. To be more explicit, let \( S \) be a region of state space that contains \( A \) and excludes \( B \), so that its boundary \( \partial S \) is a dividing surface between \( A \) and \( B \). The generalized rate (20) can then be written as the following time integral:

\[
R_T(\lambda) = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^{T} \exp \left( \int_{-T-(t)}^{T-(t)} \Gamma(\mathbf{X}(r)) \, dr \right) \times
\]

\[
\mathbb{I}_A(\mathbf{X}(\tau^-(t))) \mathbb{I}_B(\mathbf{X}(\tau^+(t+\Delta t))) \times\]

\[
\mathbb{I}_S(\mathbf{X}(t)) \mathbb{I}_{S^c}(\mathbf{X}(t+\Delta t)) \] \[\ldots \]

\[
\mathbb{I}_{S^c}(\mathbf{X}(t)) \mathbb{I}_S(\mathbf{X}(t+\Delta t)) \] \[\ldots \]

\[
dt \] \[\ldots \]

The idea is to restrict the interval \((-T, T)\) to the collection of time intervals \((t, t + \Delta t)\) during which the path crosses the surface \( \partial S \). Line (26) applies a mask picking out transition path segments, which are those that come from \( A \) and next go to \( B \). Line (27) applies a further mask picking out the narrow time intervals when \( \mathbf{X}(t) \) exits the region from \( S \) to \( S^c \), while line (28) subtracts the backward crossings from \( S^c \) to \( S \). Using ergodicity, we can replace the time integral with a space integral and insert conditional expectations inside. For example, the part of the integrand

\[
\exp \left( \int_{-T+(t+\Delta t)}^{T+(t+\Delta t)} \Gamma(\mathbf{X}(r)) \, dr \right) \times
\]

\[
\mathbb{I}_B(\mathbf{X}(\tau^+(t + \Delta t))) \] \[\ldots \]

\[
\mathbb{I}_{S^c}(\mathbf{X}(t + \Delta t)) \] \[\ldots \]

becomes, after taking conditional expectations,

\[
\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{S^c}(\mathbf{X}(t + \Delta t)) F_{\tau}^c(\mathbf{X}(t + \Delta t))|\mathbf{X}(t) = \mathbf{x}] \] \[\ldots \]

\[
=: \mathcal{T}^{\Delta t} \mathbb{E}_x[F_{\tau}^c(\mathbf{x})] \] \[\ldots \]

Where the transition operator is defined as \( \mathcal{T}^{\Delta t} f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}_x[f(\mathbf{X}(\Delta t))] \). Applying similar logic to all
terms in the integrand, we have the following generalized rate formula:

\[
R_\Gamma(\lambda) = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F^-_\Gamma(x; \lambda) \times \left\{ 1_S \mathcal{M} \left[ 1_S F^+_\Gamma \right] - 1_S \mathcal{T} \left[ 1_S F^+_\Gamma \right] \right\}(x) \pi(x) \, dx
\]

which holds for any dividing surface \( S \). This is a form estimable from short simulation data, which the next section will explain.

The rate formula (31) is suggestive of a surface integral, counting hopping events across the surface \( \partial S \). In fact, the reactive current \( J_{AB} \) is defined as the vector field whose surface integral is equal to the symmetric rate:

\[
R_\Gamma(0) = \int_{\partial S} J_{AB} \cdot n \, d\sigma
\]

We have visualized \( J_{AB} \) in section 3 using a discretization of the integrand in (31). Note that the integral does not depend on the specific dividing surface we choose, which implies that \( J_{AB} \) is divergence-free outside of \( A \cup B \), but has a source of field lines at \( A \) and a sink at \( B \). Since every dividing surface supports the same total flux, large local current magnitude means a constrained reaction mechanism, as demonstrated by the early transition states in Fig. ??.

We have now completely described the mathematics of TPT, and our extensions to it. Exact knowledge of \( \pi, F^+_\Gamma, F^-_\Gamma \), and their derivatives is enough to generate all of the figures shown so far. The next section explains both how to compute these fundamental ingredients from data and assemble them into generalized rates.

## 2 Numerical method: dynamical Galerkin approximation (DGA)

### 2.1 Feynman-Kac formulae

We now sketch the numerical method, following [Thiede et al.(2019)Thiede, Giannakis, Dinner, and Weare, Strahan et al.(2021)Strahan, Antoszewski, Lorpaiboon, Vani, Weare, and Dinner], and [Finkel et al.(2021)Finkel, Webber, Abb]. Equations (12) and (13) involve an integral in time all the way from \( t = 0 \) to \( t = \tau^+ \) or (in backward time) to \( \tau^- \), when \( X(t) \) hits either \( A \) or \( B \) after wandering through state space for an indeterminate period. This would seem to require long trajectories to estimate. Amazingly, it turns out that \( F^\pm_\Gamma \) obey partial differential equations called Feynman-Kac formulae [?, ?, ?], which are fully local in state space and can be discretized using only short trajectories. The Feynman-Kac formulae read

\[
\begin{align*}
\left( \mathcal{L} + \lambda \Gamma(x) \right) F^+_\Gamma(x; \lambda) &= 0 \quad x \in D \\
F^+_\Gamma(x) &= 0 \quad x \in A \\
F^+_\Gamma(x) &= 1 \quad x \in B
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \mathcal{L} \phi(x) := \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \phi(X(\Delta t)) \right] - \phi(x) \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\left( \mathcal{L} + \lambda \Gamma(x) \right) F^-_\Gamma(x; \lambda) &= 0 \quad x \in D \\
F^-_\Gamma(x) &= 1 \quad x \in A \\
F^-_\Gamma(x) &= 0 \quad x \in B
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \mathcal{L} \phi(x) := \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \phi(X(\Delta t)) \right] - \phi(x) \)
The linear operators $\mathcal{L}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ are known as the forward and backward infinitesimal generators, pushing observable functions $\phi$ forward or backward in time analogously to a material derivative in fluid mechanics. The backward-in-time expectations are defined specifically for the equilibrium process, leading to $\mathcal{L}\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\pi(x)}\mathcal{L}^*\pi\phi(x)$, where $\mathcal{L}^*$ is the adjoint of $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to the reference (Lebesgue) measure $d\mathbf{x}$. Equivalently, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ is the adjoint of $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to the steady-state measure $\pi(x) \, dx$. In addition, we have the stationary Fokker-Planck equation for $\pi$ itself:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{L}^*\pi(x) &= 0 \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \pi(x) \, dx &= 1 
\end{align*}
$$

(37)

We can further obtain equations for the derivatives of $F^\pm_\lambda$ with respect to $\lambda$, using the Kac moment method [?] as also described in [Finkel et al.(2021)Finkel, Webber, Abbot, Gerber, and Weare]. Differentiating the equation (34) itself in $\lambda$ and setting $\lambda = 0$ yields a recursive sequence of equations for the higher derivatives of $F^\pm_\lambda$:

$$
\mathcal{L}\left[\partial_\lambda F^\pm_\lambda\right](x;0) = -k\partial_\lambda F^\pm_\lambda(x;0),
$$

(38)

with boundary conditions $\partial_\lambda F^\pm_\lambda|_{A \cup B} = 0$. The same procedure can be applied to the aftercast $F^-_\lambda$.

The product rule immediately provides all the moments $\partial^k_\lambda [F^\pm_\lambda(x,\lambda)F^\pm_\lambda(x,\lambda)]|_{\lambda=0}$, as needed for the forecast maps (15). Thus, our entire numerical pipeline boils down to solving equations of the form (33), (35), and (37). (Eq. (38) is a special case of (35), and the corresponding backward-time version is a special case of (33), once the right-hand sides are known.)

### 2.2 Discretization of Feynman-Kac formulae

We will now describe how to discretize and solve these three equations, which requires three similar but distinct procedures.

First we attack (33). The generator of a diffusion processes can be expressed as a partial differential operator, and so the above equations are PDEs over state space. PDEs cannot be practically discretized in high dimensions, but the essential property of spatial locality allows for data-driven approximation with short trajectories, using the probabilistic definition in (34) and (36). This is how we use our large data set of short trajectories,

$$\{\mathbf{X}_n(t) : 0 \leq t \leq \Delta t\}_{n=1}^N,$$

(39)

where the initial points $\mathbf{X}_n(0)$ are drawn from a sampling measure $\mu$, which we will define in the following subsection. To discretize Eq. (33), we first eliminate the numerically problematic limit $\Delta t \to 0$ and integrate the equation using Dynkin’s Formula [?, ?]: for any stopping time $\theta > 0$,

$$
\mathbb{E}_x[f(\mathbf{X}(\theta))] = f(x) + \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\theta \mathcal{L}f(\mathbf{X}(t)) \, dt\right]
$$

(40)

Here we take $\theta = \min(\Delta t, \tau)$, where $\tau$ is the first-hitting time to the metastable sets $A \cup B$ (viz. Eq. (??)). In other words, we artificially halt the $n$th trajectory $\mathbf{X}_n(t)$ if it wanders into $A \cup B$ before the terminal time $\Delta t$. The $n$th stopping time from the data set is called $\theta_n$. The operator on the left-hand side of (40) is known as the stopped transition operator $\mathcal{T}^\theta$. Applying it to the unknown forecast function $F^\pm_\lambda$ in (33) and using the fact $\mathcal{L}F^+_\lambda = -\lambda F^+_\lambda$, we get

$$
\mathcal{T}^\theta F^+_\lambda(x,\lambda) = F^+_\lambda(x,\lambda) - \lambda \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\theta \Gamma(\mathbf{X}(t)) F^+_\lambda(\mathbf{X}(t);\lambda) \, dt\right]
$$

(41)
To be more concise, we define the integral operator $I_\theta \Gamma f(x) = \mathbb{E}[\int_0^\theta \Gamma(X(t))f(X(t)) \, dt]$, and write an integrated version of (33):

$$\begin{cases}
(T^\theta - 1 + \lambda I^\theta_t)F^+_t(x;\lambda) = 0 & x \in D \\
F^+_t(x;\lambda) = 0 & x \in A \\
F^+_t(x;\lambda) = 1 & x \in B
\end{cases} \quad (42)$$

To discretize this equation and impose regularity on the solution, we approximate $F^+_t$ as a finite linear combination:

$$F^+_t(x;\lambda) \approx \hat{F}^+_t(x;\lambda) + \sum_{j=1}^M c_j(\lambda)\phi_j(x;\lambda) \quad (43)$$

where $\hat{F}^+_t$ is a guess function obeying the boundary conditions on $A \cup B$, and $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^M$ is a collection of basis functions that are zero on $A \cup B$, which will be defined in the following subsection. The task is now to solve for the coefficients $c_j(\lambda)$. Equation (42) becomes a system of linear equations in $c_j(\lambda)$:

$$\sum_{j=1}^M c_j(\lambda)(T^\theta - 1 + \lambda I^\theta_t)\phi_j(x;\lambda) = -(T^\theta - 1 + \lambda I^\theta_t)\hat{F}^+_t(x;\lambda) \quad (44)$$

Since the transfer and integral operators are expectations over the future state of the system beginning at $x$, we can estimate their action at $x = X_n(0)$ (a short-trajectory starting point) as

$$(T^\theta - 1 + \lambda I^\theta_t)\phi_j(X_n(0);\lambda) \approx \phi_j(X_n(\theta_n);\lambda) - \phi_j(X_n(0);\lambda) \quad (45)$$

or, if multiple independent trajectories are launched from $x$, we can average over them. Applying this to every short trajectory and plugging into Eq. (44), we obtain a system of $N$ equations in $M$ unknowns. In practice, $N \gg M$, meaning we have many more trajectories than basis functions, and the system is overdetermined. A unique solution is obtained by casting it into weak form: we multiply both sides by $\phi_i(x)$ and integrate over state space:

$$\sum_{j=1}^M c_j(\lambda)\left\{\phi_i, (T^\theta - 1 + \lambda I^\theta_t)\phi_j \right\}_\zeta = -\left\{\phi_i, (T^\theta - 1 + \lambda I^\theta_t)\hat{F}^+_t \right\}_\zeta \quad (46)$$

where the inner products are defined with respect to a measure $\zeta$:

$$\langle f, g \rangle_\zeta = \int f(x)g(x)\zeta(x) \, dx \quad (47)$$

With our finite data set, we approximate the inner product by a sum over pairs of points. Given that $X_n(0) \sim \mu$, the law of large numbers ensures that for any bounded function $H(x)$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N H(X_n(0)) \approx \int H(x)\mu(x) \, dx \quad (48)$$
becomes more accurate as \( N \to \infty \). Thus we set \( H(x) = \phi_i(x)(T^\theta - 1 + \lambda L^\theta)\phi_j(x) \) as estimated by (45), approximate the inner products with \( \zeta = \mu \), plug them into (46), and solve the \( M \times M \) system of linear equations for \( c_j(\lambda) \).

Next we address (37). The integrated version of (37) is found by observing that for any bounded function \( H \),

\[
\mathbb{E}_{\pi} [H(X(t))] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [H(X(T))] 
\]

where \( X(0) \sim \pi \) means the initial condition is drawn from equilibrium, and thus so is \( X(T) \) since \( \pi \) is stationary. Of course, our initial data is not distributed according to \( \pi \), but rather by \( \mu \); the goal is to solve for the change of measure \( w(x) = \frac{d\pi}{d\mu}(x) \). Writing (49) as an integral,

\[
\int T^\Delta x H(x) \pi(x) \, dx = \int H(x) \pi(x) \, dx 
\]

\[
0 = \int (T^\Delta - 1)H(x) \pi(x) \, dx 
\]

\[
= \int (T^\Delta - 1)H(x) w(x) \mu(x) \, dx 
\]

\[
= \langle (T^\Delta - 1)H, w \rangle_{\mu} 
\]

As this holds for every bounded \( H \), we enforce the equation for \( H = \phi_i, i = 1, \ldots, M \) and approximate \( w = \sum_{j=1}^M c_j \phi_j \), resulting in a homogeneous linear system for the coefficients \( c_j \) similar to (46). The matrix elements are

\[
\langle (T^\Delta - 1)\phi_i, \phi_j \rangle_{\mu} = \langle \phi_i, (T^\Delta - 1)^\ast_{\mu} \phi_j \rangle_{\mu} 
\]

where \( (\cdot)^\ast_{\mu} \) denotes the adjoint operator with respect to \( \mu \). Dividing by \( \Delta t \) and taking the limit \( \Delta t \to 0 \) gives us the strong form of the Fokker-Planck equation, (37). We solve this homogeneous system by \( QR \) decomposition. Note that there are no boundary conditions, and the trajectories need not be stopped early. Instead there is a normalization condition, which we enforce as \( \sum_{n=1}^N w(X_n(0)) = 1 \).

Furthermore, the basis \( \{\phi_j\} \) is different between \( w \) and \( F^\top_\gamma \). To ensure that the matrix has a nontrivial null vector, one can add a constant vector to the basis. However, the specific basis we explain below guarantees a null space automatically. Given the weights \( w(X_n(0)) \), we can take any ergodic average \( \Gamma \) by inserting the change of measure:

\[
\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\pi} = \int \Gamma(x) \pi(x) \, dx = \int \Gamma(x) \approx \sum_{n=1}^N \Gamma(X_n(0))w(X_n(0)) 
\]

Finally, we address the time-reversed Kolmogorov equation (35). The only modification from (33) is that the inner products in (46) are interpreted in backward time, i.e., with all trajectories reversed, \( X_n(\Delta t) \) becoming the beginning and \( X_n(0) \) becoming the end. The problem is that \( X_n(\Delta t) \) is not distributed according to \( \mu \), and so we cannot use the same Monte Carlo inner product as in Eq. (48) with reference measure \( \zeta = \pi \). However, we can solve the problem by reweighting with the change of measure as follows, leading to \( \zeta = \pi \). We let the trajectory be discrete in time, i.e.,

\[
X_n = \left[ X_n(0), X_n\left(\frac{\Delta t}{K}\right), X_n\left(\frac{2\Delta t}{K}\right), \ldots, X_n(\Delta t) \right] 
\]
and consider functionals $H[X_n]$ of the whole trajectory. Defining the transition density $p(x, y)$ for each step of size $\Delta t$, the expectation of $H$ with $X_n(0) \sim \pi$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{X(0) \sim \pi} H[X] = \int dx_0 \pi(x_0) \int dx_1 p(x_0, x_1) \int \ldots \int dx_K p(x_{K-1}, x_K) H[x_0, \ldots, x_K]$$  \hspace{1cm} (57)

The time reversal step explicitly assumes the equilibrium backward process, leading to a backward transition kernel $\bar{p}(y, x) = \frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(y)} p(y, x)$. Inserting this throughout converts the expectation over $X(0)$ into an expectation over $X(\Delta t)$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{X(0) \sim \pi} H[X] = \int dx_0 \pi(x_0) \int dx_1 \frac{\pi(x_1)}{\pi(x_0)} \bar{p}(x_1, x_0) \int \ldots \int dx_K \bar{p}(x_K, x_{K-1}) H[x_0, \ldots, x_K]$$  \hspace{1cm} (58)

$$= \int dx K \pi(x_K) \int dx_{K-1} \bar{p}(x_K, x_{K-1}) \int \ldots \int dx_0 \bar{p}(x_1, x_0) H[x_0, \ldots, x_K]$$  \hspace{1cm} (59)

$$= \mathbb{E}_{X(\Delta t) \sim \pi} H[X]$$  \hspace{1cm} (60)

where $\mathbb{E}$ denotes backward-in-time expectation. This is precisely what we need to apply (48) to the time-reversed process, namely

$$\phi_i(X(\Delta t)) (\mathcal{T}^{\theta} - 1 + \lambda \mathcal{T}^{\theta}) \phi_j(X(\Delta t)) = H[X]$$  \hspace{1cm} (62)

$$\langle \phi_i, (\mathcal{T}^{\theta} - 1 + \lambda \mathcal{T}^{\theta}) \phi_j \rangle_{\pi} = \mathbb{E}_{X(\Delta t) \sim \pi} H[X]$$  \hspace{1cm} (63)

$$= \mathbb{E}_{X(0) \sim \pi} H[X] \approx \sum_{n=1}^{N} H[X_n] w(X_n(0))$$  \hspace{1cm} (64)

The right-hand side of Eq. (48) can be estimated similarly, also with $\zeta = \pi$.

In both forward- and backward-time estimates, we never solve for $F_\Gamma^+(x, \lambda)$ or $F_\Gamma^-(x, \lambda)$ with nonzero $\lambda$; rather, we repeat the process with Eq. (38).

### 2.3 Rate estimate

To estimate generalized rates, we reproduce here the rate estimate from [Strahan et al. (2021)] Strahan, Antoszewski, Lorpaiboon, Vani, Weare "and Dinner" for reference, which is an almost-direct implementation of the formula (31), repeated here:

$$R_\Gamma^+(\lambda) = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F_\Gamma^-(x; \lambda) \times$$  \hspace{1cm} (65)

$$\left\{ \mathbb{1}_S T^{\Delta t} F_\Gamma^+ - \mathbb{1}_S T^{\Delta t} \mathbb{1}_S F_\Gamma^+ \right\}(x) \pi(x) \, dx$$

While the integral could be estimated directly with any choice of dividing surface $S$, but the sum would only use data either exiting $S$ (first term) or entering $S$ (second term). We can use all the data at once and improve numerical stability by averaging over multiple such surfaces, and furthermore converting the transition operator $T^{\Delta t}$ into the generator $\mathcal{L}$. However, we cannot simply take the limit under the integral due to the discontinuity in $\mathbb{1}_S$. Instead we get a smooth function into the
The integrand with the following steps. First, replace \( 1 \) with \( 1 - 1 \) everywhere:

\[
R_T(\lambda) = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F^{-}_t(x; \lambda) \times \left( (1 - \mathbb{1}_{S^c}) T^{\Delta t} \mathbb{1}_{S^c} F^+_t \right) (x) \pi(x) \, dx
\]

(66)

\[
\left\{ (1 - \mathbb{1}_{S^c}) T^{\Delta t} \mathbb{1}_{S^c} F^+_t \right\} (x) \pi(x) \, dx
\]

(67)

\[
= \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F^{-}_t(x; \lambda) \left\{ T^{\Delta t} \mathbb{1}_{S^c} F^+_t \right\} (x) \pi(x) \, dx
\]

(68)

Next, add and subtract \( \mathbb{1}_{S^c} F^+_t \) inside the integrand.

\[
R_T(\lambda) = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F^{-}_t(x; \lambda) \left\{ T^{\Delta t} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \mathbb{1}_{S^c} F^+_t \right\} (x) \pi(x) \, dx
\]

(70)

At this point it is tempting to take the limit inside the integral, as \((T^{\Delta t} - 1) / \Delta t\) formally approaches \( L \). But the first term acts on a discontinuous function, which won’t have a well-defined time derivative. We first replace \( \mathbb{1}_{S^c} \) with a smooth function (on \( D \)), as follows.

Let \( K : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, 1] \) be a function that increases from 0 on set \( A \) to 1 on set \( B \) (for instance, the committor). Let \( S_\zeta = \{ x : K(x) \leq \zeta \} \) for \( \zeta \in (0, 1) \), and integrate both sides over \( \zeta \), noting that \( \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{S_\zeta} (x) \, d\zeta = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{\{ K(x) > \zeta \}} \, d\zeta = K(x) \).

\[
\int_0^1 R_T(\lambda) \, d\zeta = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F^{-}_t(x; \lambda) \left\{ T^{\Delta t} \frac{1}{\Delta t} [KF^+_t] - K LF^+_t \right\} (x) \pi(x) \, dx
\]

(71)

Now we can move the limit inside and use the PDE to find

\[
R_T(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F^{-}_t(x; \lambda) \left\{ \mathcal{L} [KF^+_t](x) + \lambda K(x) \Gamma(x) F^+_t(x) \right\} \pi(x) \, dx
\]

(72)

This formula can be estimated directly from knowledge of \( F^{-}_t, F^+_t \), and \( \pi \), using the ergodic assumption and with a discrete finite difference in time to estimate \( \mathcal{L} [KF^+_t] \), i.e.,

\[
\mathcal{L} [KF^+_t](x_n(0)) \approx \frac{K(X_n(\Delta t))F^+_t(X_n(\Delta t)) - K(X_n(0))F^+_t(X_n(0))}{\Delta t}
\]

(73)

Derivatives with respect to \( \lambda \) can be found by iterating the product rule, as we have solved for the derivatives of \( F^+_t \) and \( F^-_t \).

### 2.4 Reactive current projection and flux distributions

The formulas above follow closely those in [Strahan et al.(2021)]Strahan, Antoszewski, Lorpaiboon, Vani, Weare., and Dinner], but generalize slightly by using forecasts \( F^+_t \) and \( F^-_t \) rather than just \( q^+ \) and \( q^- \). We use the exact same reactive current formula as in the supplement of [Strahan et al.(2021)]Strahan, Antoszewski, Lorpaiboon, Vani, Weare., and Dinner], but repeat it here for reference. We have defined the current informally in \( d \)-dimensional space, but in Figure ?? we have projected it onto a two-dimensional observable subspace. Let \( y = \mathbf{Y}(x) \) be an observable subspace, typically with dimension much less than that of \( x \). The projected current is defined as

\[
J^Y_{AB}(y) = \int J_{AB}(x) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{Y}(x) \pi(x) \delta(\mathbf{Y}(x) - y) \, dx
\]

(74)
In practice, the y space is partitioned into grid boxes dy, in which the discretized projected current is

$$J_{AB}^Y(y) \approx \frac{1}{2\Delta t} \sum_{n=1}^{N} w(X_n(0)) \left[ \mathbb{1}_{dy}(X_n(0)) q^- \left( X_n(0) \right) q^+ \left( \theta_n \right) \frac{Y(X_n(\theta_n)) - Y(X_n(0))}{\theta_n} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (75)

$$+ \mathbb{1}_{dy}(X_n(\Delta t)) q^- \left( X_n(\tilde{\theta}_n) \right) q^+ \left( X_n(\Delta t) \right) \frac{Y(X_n(\Delta t)) - Y(X_n(\tilde{\theta}_n))}{\Delta t - \tilde{\theta}_n}$$  \hspace{1cm} (76)

where \(\theta_n\) and \(\tilde{\theta}_n\) are the “first-entry times” to \(D = (A \cup B)^c\) in the nth trajectory with time running forward and backward, respectively.

We make use of the same formula to compute the flux distribution across a surface of constant lead time \((Y = \eta^+)|\) or committor \((Y = q^+)|\). The first and second terms in brackets represent contributions from the forward and backward generators, respectively. The flux contribution from the nth trajectory segment, therefore, is the average of those two terms. In selecting a set of candidate trajectories for a given level set, say of \(q^+\), we choose trajectories whose midpoint has a \(q^+\) value close to that level, and among those candidates only those whose contribution is greater than 10% of the maximum. This defines the discrete sampling of the distribution from which we extract weighted averages and quantiles for the max-flux path in Fig. ??.

### 2.5 Algorithmic parameters

Having sketched the general numerical procedure, we now provide the exact parameters used here, which are similar to those in [Finkel et al. (2021)](Finkel, Webber, Abbot, Gerber, and Weare). We use \(N = 3 \times 10^5\) trajectories, each of length \(\Delta t = 20\) days, with a sampling interval of 1 day. The initial conditions are resampled from a long \((2 \times 10^5\)-day\) control simulation to be uniformly distributed on the space \((|\mathbb{P}|(30\text{km}), U(30\text{km}))\). With a more complex, expensive model, we cannot rely on a control simulation to seed the initial points, but here we focus on TPT and DGA as a proof of concept rather than optimizing the numerical procedure. We use \(M = 1200\) basis functions defined as indicators on a partition induced by \(K\)-means clustering on \(\{X_n(0)\}\). The clustering is hierarchical so that the cluster size does not become too imbalanced.

There are many potential directions for methodological improvement. In an expensive model without the ability to run a long control simulation, we should use a splitting and killing method to seed the initial trajectories across state space. Moreover, we could perform DGA repeatedly with new data seeded at each iteration in areas of high sensitivity. The choice of basis function can also powerfully affect DGA’s performance. Indicator functions are advantageous in producing a bona fide Markov matrix and guaranteeing a maximum principle for the committor probabilities. However, smooth and/or global basis functions have in some cases found to be more efficient at capturing the structure of the committor with fewer basis elements [Thiede et al. (2019)](Thiede, Giannakis, Dinner, and Weare, Strahan et al. (2021))Strahan, Antoszewski, Vani, Weare, and Dinner]. It would also behoove future experiments to repeat the procedure with multiple random seeds for the short trajectories, and thereby estimate a DGA variance that can be assessed alongside DNS variance.

### 3 Minimum-action method

To compute the minimum-action paths, we use a completely discrete approach for simplicity and to accommodate the low-rank nature of the stochastic forcing. Heuristically, we wish to find the most probable path connecting \(A\) and \(B\), which we take as the mode of the (discretized) path density over the distribution of paths from \(A\) to \(B\). For concreteness, fix \(x(0) = x_0 \in A\) and a time horizon \(T\).
discretized into $K$ intervals, with a timestep $\delta t = T/K = 0.005$ days. The discretized dynamics evolve according to the Euler-Maruyama method as

$$x(k\delta t) = x((k-1)\delta t) + v(x((k-1)\Delta t)) \Delta t + \sigma \eta_k \sqrt{\delta t} \tag{77}$$

where $\eta_k$ is a vector of i.i.d. unit normal samples, $v$ is the deterministic drift, and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times m}$ is the diffusion matrix, with a noise rank $m = 3$ and a spatially smooth structure as defined in [Finkel et al.(2021)Finkel, Webber, Abbot, Gerber, and Weare]. In the classical minimum-action approach, $\sigma$ is assumed to be a $d \times d$ invertible matrix, and the probability density of a path $(x_0, \ldots, x_K)$ (where $x_k = x(k\delta t)$) is

$$\prod_{k=1}^{K} \mathcal{N}(x_k | x_{k-1} + v(x_{k-1}) \delta t, \sigma \sigma^\top \delta t) \tag{78}$$

$$= \prod_{k=1}^{K} \frac{1}{(2\pi \delta t)^{dK/2}(\det \sigma)^K} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( x_k - x_{k-1} - v(x_{k-1}) \delta t \right) ^\top (\sigma \sigma^\top)^{-1} \left( x_k - x_{k-1} - v(x_{k-1}) \delta t \right) \right\} \tag{79}$$

$$\propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{\delta t}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( \frac{x_k - x_{k-1}}{\delta t} - v(x_{k-1}) \right) ^\top (\sigma \sigma^\top)^{-1} \left( \frac{x_k - x_{k-1}}{\delta t} - v(x_{k-1}) \right) \right\} \tag{80}$$

$$\sim \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \left[ \dot{x}(t) - v(x(t)) \right] \left( \sigma \sigma^\top \right)^{-1} \left[ \dot{x}(t) - v(x(t)) \right] dt \right\} \text{ as } \delta t \to 0 \tag{81}$$

and the problem becomes to minimize the quadratic form in the argument of the exponential, which is the Freidlin-Wentzell action functional, subject to the constraint $x_K \in B$. However, because we stir the wind field with smooth spatial forcing in only $m \ll d$ wavenumbers, $\sigma$ is low-rank and thus $\sigma \sigma^\top$ is singular. Given any realized path $(x_0, \ldots, x_K)$, there may be no possible underlying forcing $\eta_k$ that could have produced it under our noise model. So the obvious optimization strategy of fixing $x_0$ and $x_K$ and varying the steps in between may lead to impossible paths. For this reason, we perform optimization in the space of perturbations, and ensure that every step of the optimization is realizable under our noise model. This is a strategy we adopt from the cyclogenesis model [?]. The result will be a simpler, convex objective function at the expense of a more complicated constraint. The probability density of a particular forcing sequence $(\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_K)$ is given by

$$\prod_{k=1}^{K} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{mK/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \eta_k^\top \eta_k \right\} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{mK/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \eta_k^\top \eta_k \right\} \tag{82}$$

The objective inside the exponential is now a simple quadratic in perturbation space which can be easily differentiated with respect to those perturbations. The constraint, meanwhile, takes the form of a complicated iterated function. Define the flow map $F(x) = x + v(x) \delta t$ as the deterministic part of the timestep, so $x_k = F(x_{k-1}) + \sigma \eta_k \sqrt{\delta t}$. In terms of $F$, the endpoint has to be written as a recursive function

$$x_K = F(x_{K-1}) + \sigma \eta_K \sqrt{\delta t} \tag{84}$$

$$x_{K-1} = F(x_{K-2}) + \sigma \eta_{K-1} \sqrt{\delta t} \tag{85}$$

$$\vdots \tag{86}$$

$$x_1 = F(x_0) + \sigma \eta_1 \sqrt{\delta t} \tag{87}$$
We impose the end constraint by adding to the action a penalty $\Phi(x_K) = \text{dist}(x_K, B)$, a function which linearly increases with distance to $B$. The full optimization problem is

$$
\min_{\eta} \left\{ \frac{1}{2K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \eta_k^2 \eta_k + \alpha \Phi(x_K) \right\} \tag{88}
$$

$x_0 \in A$ is fixed \tag{89}

$x_k = F(x_{k-1}) + \sigma \eta_k \sqrt{\delta t}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$ \tag{90}

Here $\alpha$ is a weight which can be increased to harden the end constraint. We divide by $K$ so that the path action does not overwhelm the endpoint penalty as $K \to \infty$. (This makes the sum converge to an integral.) We set $x_0$ to be the fixed point $a \in A$ when finding the least-action path from $A$ to $B$ and the fixed point $b \in B$ when finding the least-action path from $B$ to $A$. We used the L-BFGS method as implemented in scipy, with a maximum of 10 iterations. We differentiate $\Phi(x_K)$ with respect to $\eta_k$ using knowledge of the adjoint model, with a backward pass through the path to compute each gradient. At each descent step, we refine the stepsize with backtracking line search. One way to guarantee the end constraint is ultimately satisfied is to gradually increase $\alpha$ and lengthen $T$; however, we found it sufficient to fix $\alpha = 1.0$ and $T = 100$, in keeping with the typical observed transit time. We have kept the algorithm simple, not devoting too much effort to finding the global optimum over all time horizons, as we only care for a qualitative assessment to compare with results of TPT.
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