# Equilibrium free energies from fast-switching trajectories with large time steps

W olfgang Lechner, Harald Oberhofer, and Christoph Dellago Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Boltzmanngasse 5, 1090 Vienna, Austria

Phillip L. Geissler

Departm ent of Chem istry, University of California at Berkeley, 94720 Berkeley, CA, USA (D ated: A pril 14, 2024)

Jarzynski's identity for the free energy di erence between two equilibrium states can be viewed as a special case of a more general procedure based on phase space mappings. Solving a system's equation of motion by approximate means generates a mapping that is perfectly valid for this purpose, regardless of how closely the solution m in ics true time evolution. We exploit this fact, using crudely dynamical trajectories to compute free energy di erences that are in principle exact. Numerical simulations show that N ewton's equation can be discretized to low order over very large time steps (limited only by the computer's ability to represent resulting values of dynamical variables) without sacri cing therm odynamic accuracy. For computing the reversible work required to move a particle through a dense liquid, these calculations are more explore consequences of the phase space mapping perspective for systems at equilibrium, deriving an exact expression for the statistics of energy uctuations in simulated conservative system s.

## I. IN TRODUCTION

Them axim um work theorem, a consequence of the second law of therm odynamics, states that the amount of work performed by a therm odynamic system during a transformation from a speci c initial state A to a speci c nal state B is less than energy di erence between the two states [1]. The work W is maximum and equal to the free energy di erence, or reversible work, if the transformation is carried out reversibly. Equivalently, the average work performed on a system during such a transformation is bounded from below by the free energy di erence F,

$$hW$$
 i F: (1)

The notation h i implies an average over many in gen eral irreversible transform ations initiated in an equilibrium state. (For macroscopic systems every individual transform ation will require the same am ount of work but for sm all systems work uctuations occur.) Rem arkably, the inequality (1) can be turned into an equality by considering exponential averages [2],

$$\exp(F) = \exp(W)i:$$
(2)

where  $= 1 = k_B T$  is the inverse tem perature and  $k_B$  is Boltzm ann's constant. This identity, proven by Jarzynski [2] and later by C rooks [3] under very general conditions, relates the statistics of irreversible work to equilibrium free energy di erences.

The Jarzynski identity can be used to calculate free energy di erences in computer simulations of molecular system s [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. In statistical mechanical terms the free energy di erence  $F = F_B - F_A$  between a system at temperature T with H am iltonian H<sub>B</sub> (x) and another one at the same temperature with H am iltonian H<sub>A</sub> (x) is given by

$$F = k_{\rm B} T \ln \frac{R}{R} \frac{dx \exp f}{dx \exp f} \frac{H_{\rm B}(x)g}{H_{\rm A}(x)g} = k_{\rm B} T \ln \frac{Q_{\rm B}}{Q_{\rm A}};$$
(3)

where the integration extends over the entire phase space and x = fq; pg includes the positions q and m omenta p of all particles. In the above equation,  $Q_A$  and  $Q_B$  are the canonical partitions functions of system s A and B. To calculate F using Jarzynski's identity we introduce a parameter dependent H am iltonian H (x; ) de ned such that H<sub>A</sub> and H<sub>B</sub> are obtained for particular values of the control parameter, H (x; <sub>A</sub>) = H<sub>A</sub> (x) and H (x; <sub>B</sub>) = H<sub>B</sub> (x). By switching the control parameter from <sub>A</sub> to <sub>B</sub> we can continuously transform H<sub>A</sub> (x) into H<sub>B</sub> (x). If this is done over a time , while the system evolves from particular initial conditions x<sub>0</sub>, the work perform ed on the system is

$$W = \int_{0}^{Z} dt \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} -:$$
(4)

Its value depends on the initial conditions  $x_0$  and on the particular way the controlparam eter (t) is switched from its initial to its nal value. A coording to Jarzynski's identity, the free energy di erence can be evaluated by averaging the work exponentiale  $\[mu]$  over m any such transform ations. Speci cally, this average is perform ed over a canonical distribution of initial conditions in the initial equilibrium state,

$$Z$$
  
exp( F) = dx<sub>0</sub> (x<sub>0</sub>) expf W (x<sub>0</sub>)g; (5)

where  $(x_0) = \exp f \quad H_A(x)g=Q_A$ .

In fast switching simulations based on the Jarzynski identity, non-equilibrium trajectories are generated by approximately integrating the equation of motion, typ-

ically through a truncated Taylor expansion of the timeevolving phase space point x (t). The delity of trajectories obtained in this way to true m icroscopic dynam ics is determ ined by the time interval over which a low-order Taylor expansion is assumed to be accurate. Usually, the time step is chosen to be small, so that the total energy is nearly conserved when control param eters are held constant (in an isolated system ) [9, 10]. In this paper we show that fast switching trajectories integrated with large time steps, while perhaps poor simulations of dynamics, su ce to compute exact free energy di erences. This new approach, which can increase the e ciency of fast switching simulations by up to two orders of magnitude, is based on a generalization of Jarzynski's identity for general phase space mappings[11, 12]. Jarzynski's original expression corresponds to the particular phase space mapping provided by the dynamical propagator. H is result is valid, how ever, for any invertible phase space mapping. One could just as well use a concatenation of highly approxim ate m olecular dynam ics steps, the result of integrating equations of motion to low order over large time intervals, to map points in phase space. A though such large time step trajectories are not accurate dynam ical pathways, expressions for the free energy remain exact. Due to the reduced cost of large time step trajectories, a considerable e ciency increase is possible.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The form alism and the justi cation of the large time step approach are presented in section II. The e ciency of the resulting algorithm is discussed in section III. In section IV we demonstrate the validity of this algorithm by calculating the reversible work to transform a simple one-dimensional energy landscape, and that to drag a particle through a Lennard-Jones uid. Conclusions are given in section VI.

## II. FORMALISM

## A . Jarzynski's identity for phase space m appings

The determ inistic time evolution of a classical manyparticle system can be viewed as mapping every point in phase space to another: a system initially at  $x_0$  will be located at  $x_t = t(x_0)$  after a time t. The function t is called the propagator of the system. Since the system evolves determ inistically the point  $x_t$  is completely determined by the initial conditions  $x_0$ . The time reversibility of equations of motion further ensures that such a mapping is invertible, i.e., that from  $x_t$  the corresponding starting point  $x_0$  can be uniquely determined,  $x_0 = t(x_t)$ .

Consider now a general invertible and di erentiable mapping

$$x^{0} = (x)$$
: (6)

that m aps phase space point x into phase space point  $x^0$ . Here, the m apping (x) takes the place of the propagator  $_{\rm t}$  (x). For such mappings Jarzynski has derived an expression akin to the non-equilibrium work theorem [12]. To introduce the necessary notation we rederive this result. For this purpose we consider the de nition of the free energy di erence,

exp( F) = 
$$\frac{Q_B}{Q_A} = \frac{{}^{R} dx^0 expf H(x^0; B)g}{Q_A}$$
: (7)

Multiplying and dividing the integrand in the above equation with expf  $H( ^{1}(x^{0}); _{A})$ gwe obtain

$$\exp(F) = dx^{0} \frac{\exp f H(^{1}(x^{0}); A)g}{Q_{A}}$$
$$\exp f H(x^{0}; B) H(^{1}(x^{0}); A)g: (8)$$

A change of integration variables from  $x^0$  to  $x = {}^1 (x^0)$  yields

$$\exp(F) = \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}} \frac{\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}}{\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}} \frac{\exp[H(x; A)g]}{\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}}$$
$$\exp[H(x; A)g] = \exp[H(x; A)g] = \exp[H(x; A)g] = \exp[H(x; A)g]$$

where  $j^0(x)=0$  (x) is the Jacobian determ inant of the mapping (x). The above equation suggests generalizing the de nition of work

$$W = H ((x); B) H (x; A) k_B T \ln \frac{\theta(x)}{\theta x} : (10)$$

This \work" includes the energy change caused by switching the control parameter from  $_A$  to  $_B$ . In addition W includes a term involving the Jacobian of (x), which can be viewed as the work necessary to compress or expand the phase space volume when applying the mapping (x). This entropic contribution can be interpreted as \heat" absorbed during the mapping. In fact, if we choose the mapping to be the system's propagator, this term is exactly the heat. In this interpretation, Equ. (10) is nothing other than an expression of the mst law of therm odynam ics.

U sing the work de nition (10) we can rewrite Equ. (9) as

$$\exp(F) = \frac{dx}{dx} \frac{\exp f H(x; A)g}{QA} \exp f W(x)g$$
(11)

or, as an average over the initial equilibrium distribution,

$$\exp(F) = \operatorname{hexpf} W(x)\operatorname{gi}$$
: (12)

This equation can be viewed as a generalization of Jarzynski's identity. If the mapping is chosen to be the propagator  $_{\rm t}(x)$  of N ewtonian dynamics, the work W equals the physical work W carried out on the system as it evolves from  $x_0$  to  $x_t$ ,

$$W = H (x_t; B) H (x_0; A):$$
(13)

and Equ. (12) reduces to Jarzynski's identity. In deriving this result we have exploited the fact that New tonian dynam ics conserves phase space volume { even when a control parameter changes with time, the Jacobian appearing in the de nition of W [Equ. (10)] is unity.

### B. Long tim e step trajectories

Instead of the propagator t, we can choose a sequence of m olecular dynamics steps as our mapping. Each of these steps, which are designed to approximate the time evolution of the system over a small time interval t, maps a phase point  $x_i$  into a phase point  $x_{i+1}$ . Equation (12) can be applied to a map de ned by n such steps, together taking the initial point  $x_0$  into a nal point  $x_n = n(x_0)$ . The expression for the work W is particularly simple for integrators such as the Verlet algorithm, which both conserve phase space volume and are time-reversible[9, 10]. In this case the Jacobian of the mapping is unity, and, according to Equ. (10),

$$W (x_0) = H (x_n; B) H (x_0; A); \quad (14)$$

so that

$$e^{F} = hexpf$$
 [H (x<sub>n</sub>; <sub>B</sub>) H (x<sub>0</sub>; <sub>A</sub>)]gi: (15)

This relation is exact regardless of the size of the time step tused in applying these integrators.

Equation (15) suggests the following algorithm . (1) A canonical distribution (x0) of initial conditions is sam pled with a Monte Carlo procedure or with an appropriately therm ostatted molecular dynamics simulation. (Note that in the latter case a su ciently sm all time step must be used in order to preserve the correct equilibrium distribution.) (2) These initial conditions are then used as starting points for fast switching trajectories obtained by repeated application of the Verlet algorithm . (3) During the integration the control param eter is changed from  $_{\rm A}$  to  $_{\rm B}$  . Since Equ. (15) is exact for any size of the time step t, the chosen integration time step can be arbitrarily large, provided that the variables specifying the state of the system (for instance, positions and momenta of all particles) retain values that do not exceed the range a computer can represent. We call this lim it the stability lim it. For each trajectory the energy difference  $W = H(x_n; B)$   $H(x_0; A)$  is determined and used to calculate the exponential average appearing in Equ. (15). Since large time step trajectories are com putationally less expensive, this algorithm holds prom ise to increase the e ciency of fast-switching free energy calculations. W hether this is actually the case depends on how the work distribution is modiled by the increase in time step length. In Sec. III we describe how to analyze the e ciency of fast switching simulations with large time steps.

## C. Stochastic dynam ics

O fien the dynam ics of m odelm olecular system s evolve by stochastic equations of m otion. Common examples include the Langevin equation [13],

$$p = \frac{\partial H}{\partial q} p + (t);$$
 (16)

where is a friction coe cient and (t) is a uctuating random force; and determ inistic dynam ics coupled to stochastic therm ostats, such as the Andersen therm ostat [14]. It has been shown that the Jarzinsky relation remains valid also in these cases [3, 15]. In this section we discuss the question whether the large time step approach discussed in the previous section can be applied to stochastic dynam ics as well.

W e describe the stochastic component of these dynam ics through a \noise history" (t). In the case of Langevin dynam ics the noise history is, as the notation suggests, the trajectory of the random force. For a given realization of (t), the time evolution of a stochastic system can be regarded as determ inistic, and we may write

$$x_t = [x_0; (t)];$$
 (17)

where the second argument in the determ inistic map indicates its dependence on the noise history (t). Since this mapping is invertible and di erentiable, Equ. (12) applies for any particular noise history,

$$exp(F) = dx(x)expfW[x;(t)]gi;(18)$$

where we have averaged over canonically distributed initial conditions and

H ( [x; (t)]; B) H (x; A) 
$$k_B T \ln \frac{\theta [x; (t)]}{\theta x}$$
:(19)

This result above is valid for any noise-dependent map

 $[x_0; (t)]$ , so we are free to choose a mapping comprised of repeated application of B rownian dynamics steps [9] with arbitrary step size. Because the result of averaging expf W [x; (t)]g over initial conditions is completely independent of (t), the remaining average over noise histories is trivial, yielding

Here, the notation D (t) indicates sum m ation over all noise histories and P [ (t)] is the probability distribution for observing a particular realization.

Interestingly, the above derivation in plies that Equ. (20) can be applied to mappings with a completely arbitrary stochastic component. In particular, it is not necessary that the magnitude of stochastic uctuations be related in any way to the rate of dissipation. In order to preserve a canonical distribution, the Langevin equation must be supplemented with such a constraint on the statistics of (t) (henceforth assumed to be Gaussian white noise):

h (t) 
$$(t^{0})i = 2k_{B}T$$
 (t  $t^{0}$ ): (21)

This uctuation-dissipation relation, ensuring detailed balance, is a necessary condition for the applicability of Jarzynski's original identity concerning the exponential average of work de ned in the conventional way. O btaining that result from Equ. 20 is not nearly as straightforward as was the analogous task for determ inistic dynam ics. For stochastic mappings the Jacobian determ inant does not directly correspond to heat, even in the lim it of sm all tim e step size. Instead, for a trajectory of length

$$\lim_{t! 0} \frac{\theta [x; (t)]}{\theta x} = e^{n_{f}};$$
 (22)

where  $n_f$  is the number of momentum degrees of freedom. The volume of a phase space element evolving under Langevin dynamics thus decays steadily as time evolves and has no contribution from the uctuating random force. Mathematically, this phase space compression arises from the systematic damping of kinetic energy through the friction term in Equ. 16. Physically, its cancellation of contributions from heat Q in the exponential average of Equ. 20 is a subtle consequence of detailed balance. C rooks has shown that, for trajectories generated by any balanced dynamical rules, e<sup>Q</sup> is equivalent to the ratio of probability densities of forw and and time-reversed pathways. This ratio is closely related to a mapping's Jacobian, as will be shown in Sec. V.

The practical utility of our large time step result for free energy di erences is comprom ised in the speci c case of Langevin dynam ics by at least two issues. First, the rapid decay of  $j \in [x; (t)] = 0 \times j$  could damp all but the largest uctuations, making convergence of the average in Equ. 20 problem atic. Second, an exact calculation of the Jacobian for large time steps is cum bersom e when m any degrees of freedom interact. The insensitivity Equ. (20) to the form of stochastic noise m ight be exploited to o set these problem s, but it is not obvious how to do so.

## III. EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS

In a straightforward application of the fast switching procedure, the free energy di erence F is estimated from a nite sample of N trajectories originating from canonically distributed initial conditions. Here we assume that these initial conditions are statistically uncorrelated samples. De ning

we can write the free energy di erence for nite N as

$$\overline{F}_{N}$$
  $k_{B}T \ln \overline{X}_{N}$ : (24)

where X  $_{\rm N}\,$  is the average of X  $\,$  over N  $\,$  independent trajectories:

$$\overline{X}_{N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{X^{N}} X^{(i)}$$
: (25)

Here, X <sup>(i)</sup> is the value of X obtained from the i-th trajectory. We now repeat this entire procedure M times (generating a total of M N trajectories) and average over all M resulting free energy estimates  $\overline{F}_{N}^{(j)}$ . The limiting result of this protocol is

$$h \overline{F}_{N} i \lim_{M ! 1} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M'} \overline{F}_{N}^{(j)} : \qquad (26)$$

Due to the non-linearity of the logarithm relating the average  $\overline{X}_N$  to the free energy estimate  $\overline{F}_N$  (see Equ. (24)), h  $\overline{F}_N$  idi ers from the true free energy di erence F even in the limit of in nitely many repetitions. For su ciently large N this deviation, or bias, is given by [11, 16, 17]

$$b_N$$
 h  $\overline{F}_N$  i  $F = \frac{k_B T}{2N} \frac{h(X)^2 i}{hX i^2};$  (27)

where the uctuation X X hX i is the deviation of X from its average value. This equation is obtained by expanding the logarithm in Equ. (24) in powers of relative uctuations of  $\overline{X}_N$  and truncating the expansion after the quadratic term.

In addition to the system atic bias, we must account for random error in each free energy estimate  $\overline{F}_N^{(j)}$ . A sum ing the statistical errors of di errent sam ples to be uncorrelated, and denoting their variance as

$$h[\overline{F}_{N} \quad h \quad \overline{F}_{N} \quad i]^{2}i;$$
 (28)

we obtain the totalm ean squared deviation from the true free energy di erence,

$$h[\overline{F}_{N} \quad F]^{2}i = b_{N}^{2} + \frac{2}{N}:$$
 (29)

Note that the bias decays with sample size as  $b_N \ / \ 1=N$  for large N  $_p \underline{w} \underline{h}$  ile the scale of random error decays only as  $_N \ / \ 1= \ N$ . Thus, for su ciently large N only the statistical errors in the free energy estimate are relevant, and we can safely approximate

$${}^{2}_{N} = {}^{2}_{N} = \frac{k_{B}^{2} T^{2}}{N} \frac{h(X)^{2} i}{hX i^{2}}$$
: (30)

From Equ. (30) one can determ ine the number of trajectories N necessary to obtain a certain level of error ,

$$N = \frac{k_{\rm B}^2 T^2}{2} \frac{h(X)^2 i}{hX i^2}; \qquad (31)$$

The computational cost of each trajectory is roughly proportional to the number of required force calculations and hence proportional to the number of steps n = t necessary to generate a trajectory of length . Neglecting the cost of the generation of initial conditions we can thus de ne a norm alized computational cost

С

$$n \frac{h(X)^{2}i}{hX i^{2}} = -\frac{h(X)^{2}i}{t hX i^{2}}:$$
 (32)

This computational cost  $C_{CPU}$  is the CPU-time required to obtain an accuracy in the free energy of  $= k_B T$ measured in units of the CPU-time required to carry out one single molecular dynamics time step. Note that while hX i is independent from the stepsize t, the mean square

uctuations h( X $\frac{3}{2}$ i depend on it. To determ ine an optim al tim e step size for a fast-switching free energy calculation, we must m inim ize the entire quantity  $C_{CPU}$ . In the following section we will present calculations of this norm alized CPU-time as a function of the stepsize t for two di erent models.

#### IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

## A. One-dim ensional system

We rst study the e ect of large time step integration for a simple model introduced by Sun [7]. In this onedimensionalmodel a point particle of unit mass moves in a potential that depends on a control parameter. The Ham iltonian for the system as a function of the position q and the momentum p of the moving particle is

H (q;p; ) = 
$$\frac{1}{2}p^2 + q^4$$
 16(1 ) $q^2$ ; (33)

Here, all quantities are scaled to be unitless. For = 0 the potential has two symmetric minima located at  $q = -\frac{1}{8}$  separated by a barrier of height E = 64 located at q = 0. For = 1 the potential energy function reduces to a single quartic well. For a given value of the control parameter the partition function is dqdpexpf H (q;p; )g. The free energy di erence between the two states corresponding to = 1 and = 0, respectively, can be calculated analytically to be  $62:9407k_BT$  [11].

For this model we carried out fast switching simulations using di erent tim e steps tranging from t. = 0.002 to t = 0.1. The equations of motion were integrated with the velocity Verlet algorithm [9, 10], yielding positions qt and momenta pt as a function of time t. For this model the Verlet algorithm becomes unstable for time steps larger than t = 0:1. In all cases the total trajectory length was = 10, corresponding to a transform ation su ciently gradual to allow accurate calculation of the free energy di erence and of the mean square uctuations h(X )i. For each time step size we integrated 10<sup>6</sup> trajectories from initial conditions sam pled from a canonical distribution (with = 0) using a M onte Carlo procedure. A long the trajectories the controlparam eterwas varied from its initial to its nalvalue. M ore precisely, after each velocity Verlet step, carried out at constant , the control parameter was increased by 1=n where n = = t is the number of time steps in the trajectory. At the end of each trajectory the work W = H (q; p; 1) H  $(q_0; p_0; 0)$  was calculated and added to the exponential average. (Note that, when advancing time in large steps, it is important to use this generalized

de nition of work rather than sum m ing estim ates of the physical work perform ed during each stepw ise change of the control param eter.)



FIG.1: W ork distributions P (W) obtained for the Sun m odel for a trajectory length = 10 and step sizes t = 0.1 (solid line) and 0.01 (dashed line). W ork distributions for all time steps sm aller than t = 0.01 are indistinguishable from the distribution for t = 0.01 on the scale of the gure.

W ork distributions P (W) obtained for di erent step sizes t (and hence for di erent numbers of steps per trajectory) are shown in Fig. 1. P (W) deviates visibly from its small time step limit only for the largest step size, t = 0:1 These di erences originate in the inaccuracy of the integration algorithm for large step sizes. Even though the work distribution varies with the size of integration steps, the resulting free energies show no step size dependence (see Fig. 2), provided the stability limit of the integration algorithm is not exceeded.



FIG.2: Free energy di erences (circles) obtained for the Sun model from fast switching trajectories of length = 10 with di erent step sizes t. The dotted line denotes the exact free energy di erence. Also shown is the average work hW i (squares).

To quantify the statistical error in the free energy estim ates shown in Fig. 2 we have calculated the relative uctuations h( $X^{3}i=hX^{2}$ , which according to Equ. (30)

determ ine the mean squared error  $^2_N$ . These relative

uctuations are plotted in Fig. 3. The irregular shape of this curve re ects changes in the features (such as the peak near W = 62) of the work distributions shown in Fig. 1.



FIG.3: Relative uctuations h(X)<sup>2</sup> i=hX i<sup>2</sup> for the Sun m odel as a function of the step size t.

The computational cost  $C_{CPU}$  follows from the relative uctuations and is shown as a function of the step size in Fig. 4. Over the range of time steps depicted in the gure the computational cost decreases from about  $10^4$ . Thus, the fast switching simulation can be accelerated by two orders of magnitude if the conservative step size of t = 0.001 is replaced by a step size t = 0.1 near the stability limit. A lthough in the latter case the equations of motion are not faithfully solved (see Sec. V, Fig. 10), the expression for the free energy remains exact.



FIG.4: Normalized CPU time  $C_{CPU}$  for the Sun model as a function of the step size t for  $k_B T = 1$ . For all step sizes the total trajectory length was = 1. This result indicates that for this model the computational cost of a free energy calculation with a given error decreases for increasing step size until the stability lim it is reached.

## B. Dragged particle in Lennard-Jones uid

Our second example involves a system with many degrees of freedom and is therefore likely to be more relevant for typical molecular systems of interest. Spepci – cally, we tested the large-timestep version of the Jarzynski identity for a particle dragged through a Lennard-Jones uid. In these simulations, a tagged particle is coupled to a harm onic trap whose minimum is shifted from one position to another while the system evolves in time. If this process is carried out at a nite rate, work is performed on the system by the moving trap. Nevertheless, the free energy di erence between the two states corresponding to the initial and nalposition of the trap vanishes due to symmetry.

The time-dependent H am iltonian for our M -particle system is

$$H (p;q;t) = \sum_{i=1}^{X^{i}} \frac{p_{i}^{2}}{2m_{i}} + \sum_{i$$

where  $p_i$  is the momentum of particle i,  $r_i$  is the position of particle i,  $r_{ij}$  is the distance between particles i and j and the second sum on the right hand side extends over all particle pairs. The particles interact via the Lennard-Jones potential

$$v(r) = 4" - \frac{12}{r} - \frac{6}{r}$$
 (35)

Here, " and are parameters describing the depth of the potential well and the interaction range of the strongly repulsive core, respectively. The last term in Equ. (34) describes the potential energy of one particular particle (we arbitrarily pick particle 1) in a harm onic trap with force constant k. In Equ. (34) R (t) denotes the tim e-dependent position of the trap's minimum, which is moved from the origin in the x-direction with constant speed ,

$$R(t) = e_x t;$$
 (36)

where  $e_x$  is the unit vector in x-direction. During a total time the trap is displaced by an amount L = . W hile the trap's m inimum roughly determines the position of particle 1, this particle does uctuate about R (t). The work W performed on the system along a particular trajectory from fq\_p; p\_0 g to fq ;p g is given by

$$W = H (q; p; ) H (q; p_0; 0):$$
 (37)

Since the free energy of the system does not depend on the trap's location, F = 0, the exponential work average carried out over m any realizations of this process is

hexp(
$$W$$
)i = exp( $F$ ) = 1: (38)

Here, angular brackets indicate a canonical average for a xed position of the trap.

We have carried out a fast switching procedure for M = 108 particles of unit m ass in a three-dim ensional, cubic simulation box with periodic boundary conditions. = 0.8 <sup>3</sup>, is roughly that at The uid's density, the triple point, and its initial tem perature places it in the liquid phase. Canonically distributed initial conditions were generated by a molecular dynamics simulation, employing an Andersen therm ostat at tem perature  $k_B T =$ " = 1:0 [14], with the trap xed at the origin. For the generation of initial conditions, the equations of motions were integrated with the velocity Verlet algorithm and a time step of dt = 0.001 ("=m)<sup>1=2</sup>. The state of the system was recorded every 50 steps along this equilibrium trajectory, providing an ensemble of initial conditions for the fast switching procedure.

From these initial conditions we generated fast switching trajectories of total length = 1:2 ("=m)<sup>1=2</sup> with di erent tim e steps ranging from t = 0.001 ("=m)<sup>1=2</sup> to t = 0.02 ("=m)<sup>1=2</sup>. The corresponding pathways ranged in number of steps from n = 1200 to n = 60, respectively. In each case the total displacem ent of the trap from its initial to its nalposition was L = 0.5corresponding to a velocity of  $= 5=12 \text{ (m =")}^{1=2}$ . The velocity Verlet algorithm without therm ostat was used to integrate New ton's equations of motion. A long these trajectories the particle trap was displaced stepw ise by a small distance L=n after each molecular dynamics step. W ork distributions obtained in this manner are shown in Fig. 5 for three di erent step sizes. Free energy di erences F and the average work W calculated in these simulations are depicted in Fig. 6.



FIG. 5: W ork distributions P (W) for a particle dragged through a Lennard-Jones uid for step size t = 0.001 ("=m)<sup>1=2</sup> (solid line), step size t = 0.015 ("=m)<sup>1=2</sup> (dashed line) and step size t = 0.02 ("=m)<sup>1=2</sup> (dotted line).

We used the relative uctuations h(X3)i=hX i<sup>2</sup> (see Fig. 7) to calculate the norm alized CPU time C<sub>CPU</sub>, which is plotted in Fig. 8. The computational effort required to obtain a speci c accuracy decreases with increasing step size until the largest value, t = 0.02 ("=m)<sup>1=2</sup>. Just as in the schem atic one-dimensional example, the most e cient fast-switching calculation for dragging a particle through a dense uid is obtained for



FIG.6: Free energy di erences (circles) for a particle dragged through a Lennard-Jones uid as a function of step size t. The trajectory length was = 1.2 ("=m)<sup>1-2</sup> for all step sizes. A lso shown is the average work hW i (squares).

step sizes close to the stability lim it.



FIG. 7: Relative uctuations  $h(X)^2$  i=hX i<sup>2</sup> for the particle dragged through a Lennard-Jones uid as a function of the step size t.

## V. DISCUSSION

M olecular dynam ics sin ulations carried out with large time steps do not faithfully reproduce the dynam ics of any system with con guration-dependent forces. If such large time steps are used in the generation of fast switching trajectories to calculate free energy di erences on the basis of Jarzynski's identity, integration errors lead to work distributions di erring from those obtained in the small time step limit. N evertheless, as we have shown in Sec. II, the Jarzynski identity remains exactly valid in principle for time steps of arbitrary size. As a practical matter the stability limit provides an upper bound to the step size. Since the computational cost of m olecular dynam ics trajectories is proportional to the num ber of integration steps, large time steps can be bene cial.



FIG.8: Normalized CPU time  $C_{CPU}$  for the particle dragged through a Lennard-Jones uid of M = 108 particles at a density = 0.8 <sup>3</sup> as a function of the step size tat  $k_B T = = 1$ . The particle is dragged through the uid by a parabolic potential with force constant  $k = 10^3$  ("= <sup>2</sup>) moving at constant speed = 5=12 (m = ")<sup>1-2</sup>. For all step sizes the total trajectory length was = 1.2 ("=m)<sup>1-2</sup>. A lso for this model the cost of a free energy calculation decreases up to step sizes just short of the stability limit.

W hether an increase of computational e cieny can really be achieved depends on how the relative squared uctuations h( $X^{\frac{3}{2}}$ i=hX i<sup>2</sup> scale with the size of the inte-

gration time step. If these uctuations increase with t sublinearly, using large time steps is advantageous.

In both of the num erical exam ples presented in Sec. IV, increasing the size of the time step well beyond the range appropriate for equilibrium simulations proved favorable. Resulting e ciency increases reached up to two orders of magnitude. Here we ask more generally, and with com plex molecular systems in mind, what circum stances should allow large time step integration to improve upon fast switching simulations. To answer that question it is convenient to write the work W performed on the system during the transformation as sum of two parts. This separation is particularly natural if the control parameter

is changed stepwise, i.e., if each step is performed at constant and is followed by an increase in the control parameter by an increment = 1=n.

W e de ne the rst contribution to the generalized work W as the change in energy due to the changes in control param eter for xed phase points,

$$W \qquad \begin{array}{c} X^{n} \\ H [k_{i}; i ] H [k_{i}; (i 1) ]: \quad (39) \\ \\ I = 1 \end{array}$$

Here,  $x_i$  is the phase space point reached after i integration steps starting from phase space point  $x_0$ . In C rooks's considerations of system s out of equilibrium, W is precisely the physical work exerted by the change of control parameter [3].

In a system that evolves according to Newton's equations with a time-independent potential energy function, the total energy is a constant of the motion. But when these equations are integrated approximately over nite time steps, the energy of the system is not perfectly conserved. Sum m ing the energy changes due to integration error in the intervals between stepw ise increases of , we obtain the other contribution to W :

To sum marize our decom position of W , the work W involves changes in control parameter at xed phase space points, while the less physical contribution W involves changes in the phase space point at constant control parameter. The total work performed during the transform ation is the sum of these two quantities,

$$W = W + W : \tag{41}$$

In the lim it ofvery sm alltim e steps, the energy of the system is conserved whenever is constant. In this case, the \error" work W vanishes and the entire work is caused by changes in the control param eter, W = W. If a system is driven away from equilibrium by a stepw ise increase of the control param eter, the error work serves as a sim – ple m easure for the accuracy of approximate num erical integration.

Neglecting correlations between W and W for the moment, we can write

hexp(
$$W$$
)i = hexp( $W$ )ihexp( $W$ )i: (42)

A coordingly, the free energy change is the sum of two terms originating from W  $\,$  and W  $\,$  ,

$$F = F + F$$
  
= k<sub>P</sub>T lnhe<sup>W</sup> i k<sub>P</sub>T lnhe<sup>W</sup> i: (43)

This separation of the free energy di erence into two terms related to  ${\tt W}$  and  ${\tt W}$ , respectively, is only strictly valid if uctuations in

$$X = \exp(W)$$
 and  $X = \exp(W)$  (44)

are statistically independent. This supposition cannot be assumed a priori to be the case. For the two models treated num erically in this study we have calculated the correlation

$$C \qquad \frac{h X X i}{h(X)^2 i h(X)^2 i}; \qquad (45)$$

where X X hX i and X X hX i. This coe cient quanti es correlations between the two variables X and X. W hile in the absence of correlations C = 0, perfect correlation (anticorrelation) leads to C = 1 (C = 1). Correlations com puted num erically for the Sun m odel are depicted in Fig. 9 as a function of the time step t. For all time step sizes X and X are only weakly (anti)correlated. The assumption of statistical independence is justi ed in these cases.



FIG.9: Correlations C between control parameter work and integration error work as a function of the step size for the Sun model.

Under the same assumption the statistical error of a fast switching free energy calculation with large time steps can also be written as the sum of two distinct contributions. A basent correlations between W and W, Equ. (30) becomes

$${}_{\rm N}^2 = \frac{{}_{\rm B}^2 {}_{\rm T}^2}{{}_{\rm N}} \frac{{}_{\rm h}({}_{\rm X}{}_{\rm r})^2 {}_{\rm i}}{{}_{\rm h}{}_{\rm X}{}_{\rm i}^2} + \frac{{}_{\rm h}({}_{\rm X}{}_{\rm r})^2 {}_{\rm i}}{{}_{\rm h}{}_{\rm X}{}_{\rm i}^2} :$$
 (46)

Thus, the total mean squared error is the sum of the mean squared errors of the free energies related to the control parameter work and the integration error work, respectively. One potentially substantial di erence between these two error contributions is their dependence on system size. Offen, the control parameter acts only on a small subset of the system 's degrees of freedom. In calculating the chem ical potential of an electrically neutral species by particle insertion, for instance, the solute interacts on ly with a small num ber of other particles near the insertion point. Similarly, the transform ation of a residue of a protein into another one mainly a ects only a local group of interactions. In such cases, the work W resulting directly from changes in the control parameter

quickly saturates with growing system size. The work W, originating in the inaccuracy of the integration algorithm, has a di erent system size dependence. Since all degrees of freedom contribute to the integration error, W is expected to grow linearly with the system size. Thus, for su ciently large system s the second term on the right hand side of Equ. (46) m ight become dom inating for long time steps, thus limiting the maxim ally possible ef-

ciency gain. (It is for sim ilar reasons that hybrid M onte C arlo-m olecular dynam ics sim ulations decline e ciency for large system s [18].) But as long as the integration error is sm all com pared to work done by changes in control param eter, using large tim e steps should rem ain advantageous.

In our discussion of the e ciency of the large time step fast switching approach we have so far neglected the com – putational cost associated with generating initial conditions. O flen, starting points for the fast switching trajectories are generated with an appropriately therm ostatted m olecular dynam ics simulation. It is important that these simulations are carried out with a time step of conventionally small size. O therw ise the distribution of initial conditions can dier from the necessary canonical one. Thus, the large time step approach can reduce only the computational cost associated with generating the non-equilibrium trajectories. This latter contribution is dominant by far in most cases.

The issues discussed in this paper have some interesting implications for molecular dynamics simulations carried out at equilibrium as well. If the control param – eter is not changed as the system evolves in time, no work W is done on the system. In this case the free energy di erence F also vanishes, since initial and nal Ham iltonians are identical. N evertheless, due to the im – perfection of a nite time step integration algorithm, the energy is not strictly conserved, and som e \error" work W is perform ed. A coording to Equ. (15) the statistics of such energy errors obeys

hexp(
$$W$$
)i = 1: (47)

This result in plies that the distribution of integration errors cannot be symmetric about W = 0. Rather, positive errors are in loose term smore likely than negative ones. For a Gaussian error distribution, Equ. (47) relates the average error to the width of the error distribution,

$$hW \quad i = \frac{1}{2} \, {}^{2} \, {}^{2} : \tag{48}$$

For m ore complicated error distributions, this same result is obtained from a cumulant expansion of Equ. (47) truncated after the second term. Thus, for an error distribution that is G aussian and/or su ciently narrow, the average error is positive. This demonstration that the average energy of a simulated canonical ensemble drifts upward with time makes no reference to the details of m olecular interactions.

We have veri ed Equ. (47) both for the Sun model and for the Lennard-Jones uid. In both cases we have determ ined the distribution P (W ) of the integration error W for a large integration step t and constant . The averages were carried out in the respective canonical ensembles corresponding to = 0. Two typical distributions are shown in Fig. 10. For the Sun model (solid line) P (W ) is strongly non-G aussian and asymmetric about W = 0, with positive errors more likely than negative ones. W hile the average error of hW i = 0:041 is clearly positive, the exponential average hexp ( W ) i is unity with high accuracy. For the Lennard-Jones uid with one particle in a xed trap the distribution of integration errors is approximately Gaussian, with an average of M i = 0:064. A loo in this case the exponential work average is unity.

Formulating changes in control parameter as a sequence of discrete steps is also convenient for dem onstrating the equivalence between our identity for stochastic mappings, Equ. (20), and Jarzynski's original identity.



FIG.10: Distributions P (W) of the integration error W at constant control parameter. Solid line: Sun model for = 0, = 10, and t = 4=30; dashed line: Lennard-Jones uid with one particle in xed trap, = 1.2 (=m)<sup>2-2</sup>, t = 0.015 (=m)<sup>1-2</sup>.

During periods when is xed, stochastic evolution subject to a suitable uctuation-dissipation relation, such as Equ. (21), satis es detailed balance in the small time step limit. Speci cally,

$$_{i}(x)p(x ! x^{0}) = _{i}(x^{0})p(x^{0} ! x)$$
 (49)

where  $_{i}(x) / \exp[H(x;i)]$  is the canonical distribution corresponding to the Ham iltonian H(x;i) at step i, and  $p_{i}(x ! x^{0})$  is the noise-averaged probability for a phase space point x at the beginning of a constantinterval to evolve into phase space point  $x^{0}$  at the end of the interval. The caret in Equ. (49) indicates time reversal, so that  $p(x^{0} ! x)$  is the probability for  $x^{0}$  to evolve into x under dynam ics running backward in time. For Langevin dynam ics, time reversal can be achieved sim – ply by inverting the signs of all momenta contained in phase space points x and  $x^{0}$ . For a given noise history, such transition probabilities are specified by the deterministic map [x; (t)]. We can thus rewrite Equ. (49) as

$$e^{H(x;i)}h(x^{0} [x; (t)])i =$$

$$e^{H(x^{0};i)}(x^{0} [x; (t)])\frac{\theta[x; (t)]}{\theta x}; (50)$$

where angled brackets with a subscript denote an average over realizations of the noise history.

From the condition of detailed balance, we now obtain a general identity for averages involving the Jacobian determ inant. We begin by multiplying Equ. (50) by an arbitrary function  $f(x;x^0)$  of two phase space points, and then integrate over  $x^0$ , yielding

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{hf } (x; \ [x; \ (t)]) i = \text{hf } (x; \ [x; \ (t)]) \\ e^{-\left[H \left( \ [x; \ (t)]; i \ \right) \ H \left( x; i \ \right) \right]} \frac{0}{0} \frac{[x; \ (t)]}{0} \end{array}$$
(51)

This result holds for any period during which the control parameter is held constant, i.e., while no physical work is done on a system. Since we have assumed here that equations of motion are integrated with an in nitesim ally small time step, the \error" work vanishes as well. The energy change H ( [x; (t)]; i ) H (x; i )] in Equ. (51) is thus identically the heat  $Q_i$  absorbed from the bath during the ith time interval. Equation (51) states that the Jacobian determ inant and e Q negate one another in averages over noise history.

This proof is completed by decomposing the total change in energy along a trajectory into contributions from physicalwork W (accumulated overmany discrete steps in control parameter at xed phase space point) and heat (accumulated overmany intervals during which the phase space point evolves at xed ):

H ( 
$$[x; (t)]; B$$
) H  $(x; A) = W + Q$  (52)  
 $X^{1}$ 
(52)

$$Q = H [k_{i+1}; i] H [k_i; i]$$
(53)  
$$i= 0$$

We have retained the de nition of physical work from Equ. (40). Note that heat in the case of stochastic dynam ics is de ned in precisely the same way as \error" work was de ned for determ inistic dynam ics propagated in an approximate way. Recalling the generalized de nition of work W and applying the identity (51) with  $f(x;x^0) = expf$  (H  $[x^0; i]$  H  $[x^0; (i 1)]$ )g for each constant- interval, we nally have

$$e^{W} = e^{W} e^{Q} \frac{@[x; (t)]}{@x}$$
$$= e^{W} :$$
(54)

This equivalence, together with Equ. (20), completes an alternative route to Jarzynski's identity for systems evolving stochastically under the constraint of detailed balance.

The consequence of detailed balance expressed in this way has interesting in plications for energy uctuations of stochastic system s at equilibrium (i.e., with xed control parameter). With the choice  $f(x;x^0) = 1$ , we have for the speci c case of Langevin dynamics (see Equ. (22))

$$e^{Q} = e^{n_{f}}$$
(55)

along trajectories of length . This identity stands in stark constrast to the corresponding exponential average of energy uctuations under nom -conserving determ inistic m appings, Equ. (47). The long-time divergence in Equ. (55) would be expected for a system which asymptotically loses all mem ory of its initial conditions. In that case, the exponential average factorizes in the long-time limit:

$$e^{Q} e^{H(x_{0})} e^{H(x)} :$$
(56)

The set factor on the right hand side of Equ. (56) averages a quantity that negates the elect of Boltzm ann

weighting, and is proportional to the entire phase space volume. Since the range of possible momenta is unbound even in a system with nite volume, a divergent result is inevitable once correlations have decayed completely. We anticipate similarly unbounded growth of exponentially averaged energy uctuations form any classes of stochastic dynamics, such as M onte C arb sampling. That the analogous average is xed at unity for deterministic propagation rules with unit Jacobian such as the Verlet algorithm indicates that errors arising from nite time step size do not disrupt substantial correlations with initial conditions.

# VI. CONCLUSION

By considering general invertible phase space mappings we have demonstrated that the Jarzynski relation remains exactly valid for non-equilibirum trajectories generated with large time steps, provided the work performed on the system is de ned appropriately. For integration algorithms that conserve phase space volume, such as the Verlet algorithm, this de nition is particularly simple. Here, the work just equals the energy di erence between the nal and the initial state of the trajectory. Simulating dynamics with a larger time step

- [L] H.B.Callen, Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Therm ostatistics, 2nd edition, John W iley and Sons, New York (1985).
- [2] C. Jarzynski, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 2690 (1997).
- [3] G.E.Crooks, J.Stat. Phys. 90, 1481 (1998).
- [4] B. Ilan, E. Tajkhorshid, K. Schulten, and G. A. Voth Prot.: Struct., Funct., and Bioinf. 55 223 (2004).
- [5] D.A. Hendrix and C. Jarzynski, J. Chem. Phys. 114, 5974 (2001).
- [6] G.Hummer, J.Chem. Phys. 114, 7330 (2001).
- [7] Sean X. Sun, J. Chem. Phys. 118, 5769 (2003).
- [8] F. M. Ytreberg and D. M. Zuckerman, J. Chem. Phys.120, 10876 (2004).
- [9] M. P. Allen and D. J. Tildesley, \Computer Simulation of Liquids", Oxford University Press, Oxford (1987).
- [10] D .Frenkel and B .Sm it,  $\U$  nderstanding M olecular Sim –

requires fewer integration steps to generate a trajectory of given length, and therefore lower computational cost. Numerical simulations indicate that optimum e ciency is achieved for time steps just short of the stability limit. C om pared to simulations with time steps of conventional size, the long time step approach can yield in provements in e ciency of one or more orders of magnitude.

Recently, Sun has shown how work-biased path sam – pling can be used to improve the e ciency of fast sw itching simulations [7]. However, it seem sthat this path sam – pling approach does not outperform conventional methods for calculating free energy dierences. It will be interesting to see if the fast sw itching approach can be im – proved, by combining the long time step approach of this paper with biased path samping methodologies [7, 8, 11], to the point that it is computationally competitive with other free energy calculation techniques, such as um brella sampling, therm odynam ic integration, or at histogram sampling.

#### A cknow ledgm ents

This work was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FW F) under G rant No. P17178-N02.

ulation", A cadem ic P ress, San D iego (2002).

- [11] H.Oberhofer, C.Dellago, P.L.Geissler, J.Phys.Chem., in print (2005).
- [12] C. Jarzynski, Phys. Rev. E 65, 046122 (2002).
- [13] R. Zwanzig, \Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics", Oxford University Press, Oxford (2001).
- [14] H.C.Andersen, J.Chem. Phys. 72 2384 (1980).
- [15] C. Jarzynski, Phys. Rev. E 56, 5018 (1997).
- [16] J.G ore, F.R itort, and C.Bustam ante, Proc.Natl.Acad. Sci. 100, 12564 (2003).
- [17] D. Zuckerm an and T.W oolf, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 180602 (2002).
- [18] S.Duane, A.Kennedy, B.J.Pendleton, and D.Roweth, Phys. Lett. B 61, 216 (1987).