Universal Aspects of Barrier Crossing Under Bias

Sudeep Adhikari$^1$ and K. S. D. Beach$^1$

Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA

(Dated: March 30, 2022)

The thermal activation process by which a system passes from one local energy minimum to another is a recurring motif in physics, chemistry, and biology. For instance, biopolymer chains are typically modeled in terms of energy landscapes, with folded and unfolded conformations represented by two distinct wells separated by a barrier. The rate of transfer between wells depends primarily on the height of the barrier, but it also depends on the details of the shape of the landscape along the trajectory. We consider the case of bias due to an external force, analogous to the pulling force applied in optical tweezer experiments on biopolymers. Away from the Arrhenius-law limit and well out of equilibrium, somewhat idiosyncratic behavior might be expected. Instead, we identify universal behavior of the biased activated-barrier-crossing process and demonstrate that data collapse onto a universal curve can be achieved for simulated data over a wide variety of energy landscapes having barriers of different height and shape and for loading rates spanning many orders of magnitude.

Thermally activated barrier crossing [1–4] is a ubiquitous and highly consequential process in physics, chemistry, and biology. An understanding of the factors that influence the rate of barrier crossing [5–8] is necessary for the interpretation of experiments that attempt to infer barrier height and shape from measurements of the escape rate. An important specialization is the case in which the barrier is diminished by an applied force, with the escape rate enhanced accordingly.

Experimental access to escape rate information in the biochemistry context has been revolutionized by the development of single-molecule force spectroscopy [9–13], in which a mechanical load is applied across a single molecule using an atomic force microscope or optical tweezers. In the energy landscape picture [14–17], molecular motion is viewed as a Brownian diffusion process over a free energy surface [18], parameterized by the conformational degrees of freedom. The landscapes for biologically relevant sequences contain distinct, barrier-separated wells corresponding to various folded and unfolded conformations. The rate of transition [19–21] from one well to another depends primarily on the height of the intervening barrier but also depends on its shape.

In pulling experiments, where molecular extension serves as a natural reaction coordinate, the multidimensional energy landscape covering the full conformational space is projected onto an effective one-dimensional energy profile that encodes some features of the full landscape and that reproduces the folding dynamics [22–27]. Numerous studies have been carried out to explore the unfolding process under the application of constant and time-varying pulling forces [4, 28–33, 35–38]. A key experimental goal is to be able to reliably reconstruct the effective one-dimensional free energy profile from measurements of an ensemble of escape events [39–44].

The purpose of this Letter is to describe universal aspects of the biased activated-barrier-crossing process that we have uncovered in numerical simulations of various one-dimensional potentials. Our work points the way to an alternative data analysis technique that would allow for the determination of otherwise unknown landscape details by overlaying data from multiple experiments and adjusting free parameters until the scattered data align along a common curve.

The concept of universality comes to us from the study of critical phenomena [45]. In that context it allows us to understand how phase transitions can be characterized and grouped into families according to common critical exponents, wholly independent of the microscopic details of the underlying models; it also explains the existence of scaling relations that govern how thermodynamic quantities behave in the vicinity of criticality. An important mark of universality is that data from different models or different physical systems can be plotted in reduced variables so that they collapse onto a single universal curve [46–48].

Criticality has previously been invoked by Singh, Krishnan, and Robinson in the context of the unbiased-activated-barrier crossing problem [49, 50]. They considered the non-Markovian crossing of a quadratic barrier, where the frictional term in the Langevin equation includes a memory kernel with a long time scale. The authors proposed a scaling hypothesis, making analogy with the criticality of the Ising model, and were able to derive scaling relations for the reduced rate near a critical value of the memory kernel time scale.

Our approach here is rather different. We focus on the relative change in the escape rate as a function of an applied pulling force—both for uniform pulling ($F$ constant) and steady loading ($F = KVt$ with $KV$ constant). We propose that $F$ exists alongside two other important force scales and that the two independent ratios that can be formed serve as arguments to a scaling function. We have carried out Langevin-type simulations of a particle in a one-dimension energy potential, coupled to a heat bath. Many thousands of instantiations provide us with a large data set that offers good coverage of the model space. What is so striking is the almost unreasonable effectiveness of the scaling ansatz, which appears to be valid over a huge variety of well shapes and barrier heights and over loading rates spanning many orders of magnitude.

Scaling ansatz—We argue that the barrier-crossing process is controlled by the relative magnitudes of three intrinsic force scales: the typical thermal force that provides the kick out of the well ($F_T \approx 1/\beta x^3$); the larger applied force required to fully extinguish the barrier ($F_B \approx k^2 x^3$); and the pulling force used as an external bias ($F$). In our notation, $\beta$ is the inverse temper-
up to subleading corrections (characterized by an exponent $\omega > 0$), the escape behaviour is controlled by a universal function $\Upsilon(x, y)$ that satisfies $\Upsilon(x, 0) = x + O(x^2)$. Further justification for this form is presented in the Supplemental Material. The implication of Eq. (1) is that a plot of $(F_T / F_B)Y$ versus $f = F / F_B$ should produce data collapse regardless of the microscopic details of the simulation.

In the context of dynamical pulling, there is another useful analysis. A population of particles trapped in the originating well is depleted according to $-dn/\hat{t} = k(KV)t)n(t)$, a product of the instantaneous escape rate and the current population. The half-life of such a population is characterized by $\hat{t} = \int_0^1 dt = (1/KV) \int_0^{\hat{F}} dF k(F)$. Here, $\hat{F} = KV\hat{t}$ is the typical applied force that is in effect during barrier transit, and $\hat{t}$ is the median elapsed time for escape. It follows from Eq. (1) that $\hat{F}$ (measured with respect to the thermal force $F_T$) must be a monotonic, universal function of $\hat{F} = KV$ (measured with respect to $k_0F_T$, a loading rate threshold defined by the thermal processes in the potential well). Hence, there is an additional data collapse analysis that can be used to independently test the validity of the scaling hypothesis.

In our numerical experiments, the external bias is applied in two ways: (i) as a time-invariant pulling force of constant strength and (ii) as a linearly time-varying force with a constant loading rate. In the case of constant pulling, the system is prepared in the equilibrium state of the tilted energy profile [viz. $\bar{U}(x) = U(x) − Fx$] and remains in thermal equilibrium throughout the simulation. In the case of steady loading, the system is prepared in the equilibrium state of the unbiased profile ($F = 0$ for all $t \leq 0$), but as time elapses it is driven away from equilibrium ($F = KV$ for all $t > 0$) in proportion to how much $KV$ exceeds $k_0F_T$.

In both cases, the role of $\hat{F}$ is to gently tilt the landscape (statically or dynamically), as depicted in the upper panel of Fig. 1. There, the purple curve depicts the potential profile in its unbiased state; the green curve shows the profile after application of the external bias. Generically, the force-dependent values of the barrier distance $x^\perp(F)$ and barrier height $\Delta G^\perp(F)$ are monotonic decreasing in $F$, and hence the barrier crossing process becomes energetically less costly (and crossing events more frequent) as the external bias is ramped up.

**Numerical results**—We carried out a thorough and comprehensive Langevin simulation study. At the start of each run, the system was prepared in a properly equilibrated state: an initial position and velocity were drawn from the heat bath distribution of the appropriate energy profile, with the constraint that the particle be situated on the originating-well side of the barrier. Forward evolution was carried out with adaptive time steps taken small enough that the discretization error could be shown to be negligible. The simulation made use of a high-quality, long-period pseudorandom number generator that guaranteed the statistical independence of the instantaneous thermal forces.

We considered seven different potentials having shape parameter $[1] \nu = 0.66, 0.75, 0.83, 0.9, 1, 1.1, 1.2$; these values
FIG. 2. The upper and lower panels show plots of $(F_T/F_B)Y(F) = (F_T/F_B)\log (k(F)/k_0)$ versus $f = F/F_B$ and offer different views of the same underlying data set. Black circles correspond to simulations executed in the constant-force mode, and the green line is a low-order Padé approximant fit through these data points. Colored solid circles denote data from steady-loading runs. (a) The horizontal axis uses a log scale. Color intensity increases with the relative pulling rate, $r_T = KV/(k_0F_T)$. Numbers on the palette legend show the order of magnitude, log $r_T$. (b) Both axes are linear. Colors now represent $F_T/F_B \approx 1/\beta x^2 \approx \sqrt{2\beta \Delta G^2}$, which characterizes the barrier regime.

The numerical simulations were carried out using a modified version [53] of the standard Verlet algorithm [54]. In each run, a critical time $t_c$, taken to be either the first-passage time of the particle over the barrier or the moment at which the barrier vanished, was recorded. For each energy potential profile and simulation mode, 3000 instantiations were generated.

In the constant-force mode, the rate $k(F)$ was computed from the mean escape time: $k(F) = 1/t_{avg}$, where $t_{avg} = (1/3000) \sum_{i=1}^{3000} t_c^{(i)}$. In the steady-loading mode, the linear correspondence $F_c = KVt_c$ gave rise to 3000 critical force values, on the basis of which further analyses were performed. First, the $F_c$ values were sorted to identify their median value, which corresponds to the half-life force $\bar{F}$ (the force at which half of a population of independent particles would have escaped the well). Second, the $F_c$ values were bootstrapped [55] to obtain the cumulative probability distribution $P(F_c) = \int_{0}^{F_c} dF p(F)$ and probability density $p(F_c) = P'(F_c)$. Finally the value of $k(F_c) = k(KVt_c)$, the instantaneous rate of barrier crossing at a particular bias strength, was obtained using the relation $k(F_c) = KVp(F_c)/(1 - P(F_c))$ [1].

The next step was to test the universality proposition by graphical means. We found strong evidence in its favor: the data collapse predicted by Eq. (1) is revealed in Fig. 2. In order to perform the conversion to reduced variables, each data point was associated with an individualized value of $F_B$ and $F_T$. The former was obtained numerically, simply by solving for the applied force required to extinguish the barrier; the latter was estimated according to

$$
\frac{1}{F_T} = \beta x^2 + \frac{R_{1,2}}{2k_T^2} = \beta(x_b - x_l) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{R_b}{k_b^2} + \frac{R_l}{k_l^2} \right)
$$

The new symbols here refer to the curvature and skew at the bottom of the left well and at the top of the barrier: $\kappa_l = U''(x_l)$.
and \( \kappa_b = -U'''(x_b); R_l = -U'''(x_l) \) and \( R_b = -U'''(x_b) \). A full rationale for Eq. (2) is given in the Supplemental Material.

Figure 2(a) presents a linear-log plot of \((F_T/F_B)Y(F) = (F_T/F_B)\log(k(F)/k_0)\) versus \( f = F/F_B \). The data points for the steady-loading analysis are colored according to the simulation-specific loading rate, and one can observe the smooth progression of data-point placement, weak loading to strong, tracing out the universal curve from left to right.

The constant-force data (black circles) show considerably less scatter, but the two data sets are remarkably consistent. What makes this result so compelling is that the data collapse holds over a huge diversity of energy profiles and simulation conditions. We also remark that the steady-loading and constant-force approaches require quite different styles of simulation and analysis, but both yield the same underlying curve; Padé approximants fit to one or the other data set produce nearly identical functions.

Figure 2(b) shows the same data plotted on a linear scale. This view highlights the behavior at large forces, a regime in which the barrier is already substantially reduced at the time of barrier traversal. Here, the false color emphasizes the diversity in barrier height regimes, and we can see that data collapse holds over a wide range of ratios \( F_T/F_B \).

Figure 3 presents a wholly different data collapse scheme, based only on simulations performed in the steady-loading mode. There, the reduced half-life force \( f_T = F/F_T \) is plotted versus the reduced loading rate \( r_T = KV/(k_0F_T) \). It is worth emphasizing again that the complete data set comes from simulations with seven different potential landscapes covering the full range of plausible \( \nu \) values, \( \beta \Delta G^\pm \) ranging from 0.2 to 0.6, and loading rates running from \( r_T = 10^{-8} \) to 100. Despite encompassing a large collection of different systems in distinct physical regimes, these data show an astonishing degree of collapse.

Conclusion—We have argued for universality in the biased activated-barrier-crossing problem and presented strong numerical evidence in favor of the existence of some underlying scaling function for \( Y(F) = \log[k(F)/k_0] \). Our simulated data show collapse onto a single curve when recast into suitably reduced coordinates. This is true for data generated in simulations operating over a wide range of bath temperatures, applied forces, and loading rates and over a family of potential landscapes with different underlying barrier shapes.

These observations suggest the utility of data collapse as a practical tool for analysis. While the original motivation for this work was the mechanical unfolding of biopolymers, the universality we have identified is widely relevant. It applies to situations across many branches of science, wherever the energy landscape picture is germane and the experimental setup involves barrier traversal assisted by active pulling. Our recommendation is that measurements of well-escape statistics be transformed to identify best values of the intrinsic force scales (from which can be inferred some combination of \( x^\pm, k^\pm, \Delta G^\pm \), and \( \nu \)). \( F_T \) and \( F_B \) are to be treated as free parameters and tuned until data collapse is achieved and the universal curve emerges.


SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL TO "UNIVERSAL ASPECTS OF BARRIER CROSSING UNDER BIAS"

Locally quadratic approximation

We consider a one-dimensional, double-well energy landscape \( U(x) \) with minima on the left and right, at positions \( x_1 \) and \( x_r \), separated by a barrier at \( x_b \). A barrier of height \( \Delta G^\perp = U(x_b) - U(x_1) \) impedes transitions from left to right.

By definition \( U'(x_1) = U'(x_b) = U'(x_r) = 0 \). In the locally quadratic approximation, we assume

\[
U(x) = \begin{cases} 
U(x_1) + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_1(x - x_1)^2 & \text{for } x \approx x_1, \\
U(x_b) - \frac{1}{2} \kappa_b(x - x_b)^2 & \text{for } x \approx x_b, 
\end{cases} \tag{S.3}
\]

where \( \kappa_1 = U''(x_1) \) and \( \kappa_b = -U''(x_b) \) are measures of the curvature at the bottom of the well and at the top of the barrier.

With the application of a bias force \( F \), the extrema of the tilted landscape \( \tilde{U}(x) = U(x) - Fx \) are found as follows:

\[
0 = U'(x) = \tilde{U}'(x) = \begin{cases} 
+\kappa_1(x - x_1) - F, & \text{for } x \approx x_1, \\
-\kappa_b(x - x_b) - F, & \text{for } x \approx x_b. 
\end{cases} \tag{S.4}
\]

At this level of approximation, the bias-induced shifts in the extrema are linear in \( F \). In response to the applied force \( F > 0 \), the well basin moves to the right and the barrier peak moves to the left:

\[
\tilde{x}_l = x_l + \frac{F}{\kappa_1}, \quad \tilde{x}_b = x_b - \frac{F}{\kappa_b}. \tag{S.5}
\]

The two points eventually coalesce when \( \tilde{x}_l = \tilde{x}_b \); i.e., when

\[
x^\perp = x_b - x_l = \left( \frac{1}{\kappa_1} + \frac{1}{\kappa_b} \right) F = \frac{F}{k^\perp}. \tag{S.6}
\]

The particular force value at which Eq. (S.6) holds is the barrier extinction force \( k^\perp x^\perp \). We follow the usual practice of decorating with a double-dagger superscript any quantity that is defined with respect to the barrier and the originating well. This includes the barrier distance \( x^\perp = x_b - x_l \) and the effective curvature

\[
k^\perp = \left( \frac{1}{\kappa_1} + \frac{1}{\kappa_b} \right)^{-1} = \frac{\kappa_1 \kappa_b}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_b}. \tag{S.7}
\]

In order to find an expression for the barrier height that is consistent with the approximation in Eq. (S.3), we must match the two piecewise quadratic curves. We do so at the point of common slope, where

\[
U'(x^\perp) = \kappa_1(x^\perp - x_1) = -\kappa_b(x^\perp - x_b). \tag{S.8}
\]

The reference position

\[
x^\perp = \frac{\kappa_1 x_1 + \kappa_b x_b}{\kappa_1 + \kappa_b}. \tag{S.9}
\]

is a weighted average satisfying \( x_l \leq x^\perp \leq x_b \). The height of the barrier in the untilted landscape \( (F = 0) \) is estimated to be

\[
\Delta G^\perp = U(x_b) - U(x_1) + U(x^\perp) - U(x_1) \approx \frac{1}{2} \kappa_b(x^\perp - x_b)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_1(x^\perp - x_1)^2 = \frac{1}{2} k^\perp x^\perp. \tag{S.10}
\]

Formally, the barrier extinction force is given by the derivative of the barrier height with respect to the barrier position. At the level of approximation of Eq. (S.10), we have

\[
\frac{\partial \Delta G^\perp}{\partial x^\perp} = k^\perp x^\perp. \tag{S.11}
\]

Higher-order corrections

We can do better by including further contributions to the energy landscape expansion:

\[
U(x) = \begin{cases} 
U(x_1) + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_1(x - x_1)^2 - \frac{1}{4} R_1(x - x_1)^4 + \cdots, \\
U(x_b) - \frac{1}{2} \kappa_b(x - x_b)^2 - \frac{1}{4} R_b(x - x_b)^4 + \cdots, \\
\end{cases} \tag{S.12}
\]

As in Eq. (S.3), the upper expression in Eq. (S.6) is for \( x \approx x_l \); the lower corresponds to \( x \approx x_b \). In addition to the two local curvatures, \( \kappa_1 \) and \( \kappa_b \), we have also defined measures of the skew \( R_1 = -U'''(x_1) \) and \( R_b = -U'''(x_b) \) and the kurtosis \( Q_1 = U^{(4)}(x_l) \) and \( Q_b = -U^{(4)}(x_b) \).

The positions of the shifted extrema are once again determined by \( 0 = \tilde{U}'(x) = F \). This demands that the expression

\[
s \kappa_\alpha (x - x_\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} R_\alpha (x - x_\alpha)^2 + \frac{s}{6} Q_\alpha (x - x_\alpha)^3 + \cdots - F \tag{S.13}
\]

vanish for both \( \alpha = l, s = +1 \) and \( \alpha = b, s = -1 \). Ensuring that it does so leads to

\[
\tilde{x}_\alpha = x_\alpha + \frac{s F}{\kappa_\alpha} + \frac{s R_\alpha F^2}{2 \kappa_\alpha^2} + \frac{s(3R_\alpha^2 - Q_\alpha \kappa_\alpha)F^3}{6 \kappa_\alpha^5} + \cdots. \tag{S.14}
\]

and hence to an expression for \( \tilde{x}_b - \tilde{x}_l \), the barrier distance in the tilted energy landscape:

\[
x^\perp - \frac{F}{k^\perp} = \frac{R_{l,1}^2 F^2}{2 k^\perp^3} - \frac{3(3R_{l,1}^2 - Q_{l,1} )}{k^\perp^4} F^3 + \cdots. \tag{S.15}
\]

As a convenience, we have adopted the notation

\[
A_{m,n} = k_{1}^{m} k_{b}^{n} \left( \frac{A_{m}^{n}}{k_{1}^{m}} + \frac{A_{m}^{n}}{k_{b}^{n}} \right) = \frac{A_{m}^{n} k_{b}^{n} + A_{m}^{n} k_{1}^{n}}{(k_{1} + k_{b})^{n}}. \tag{S.16}
\]

If we then repeat the analysis used previously, we can produce expressions for the barrier height and barrier extinction
force that are analogs of Eqs. (S.10) and (S.11):
\[
\Delta G^{\ddagger} = \frac{1}{2!} k^x x^2 - \frac{1}{3!} R_{1,3}^x x^3 + \cdots \\
+ \frac{1}{4!} \left( \frac{3}{k^x} \left[ \left( R_{1,3}^x \right)^2 - R_{2,5}^x \right] + Q_{1,4}^x \right) x^4 + \cdots \quad (S.17)
\]
and
\[
\frac{\partial \Delta G^{\ddagger}}{\partial x^3} = k^x x^2 - \frac{1}{2} R_{1,3}^x x^2 \\
+ \left( \frac{R_{1,3}^x}{2 k^x} - R_{2,5}^x + \frac{5}{2} Q_{1,4}^x \right) x^3 + \cdots \quad (S.18)
\]

It is helpful to distinguish the barrier height expressions in Eqs. (S.10) and (S.17) by the labels \( \Delta G_{\text{quad}}^{\ddagger} \) and \( \Delta G^{\ddagger} \). Their ratio is simply the shape parameter defined by Dudko, Hummer, and Szabo [1]:
\[
\nu = \frac{\Delta G_{\text{quad}}^{\ddagger}}{\Delta G^{\ddagger}} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} k^x x^2 - \frac{1}{6} R_{1,3}^x x^3 + \cdots}{\frac{1}{2} k^x x^2} \\
= 1 - \frac{R_{1,3}^x}{3 k^x} + \left( \frac{R_{2,5}^x}{4 k^x} \right) x^2 + \cdots \quad (S.19)
\]

That is to say, \( 1 - \nu \) encodes deviations from the behaviour of the purely quadratic model (in which \( R_1 = R_5 = 0 \), etc.). Insofar as Eq. (S.19) is a fast-converging power-series in \( x^4 \), with each subsequent term much smaller than the previous, it makes sense to view the subleading term on the right-hand-side of Eq. (S.19) as a proxy for those deviations:
\[
\frac{R_{1,3}^x}{3 k^x} = \frac{(R_k^x + R_b^x)(x_b - x_t)}{3 k^x(b_k + k_t)} \quad (S.20)
\]
Hence, via Eq. (S.18), the extinction force can be approximated by its quadratic-model value [Eq. (S.11)] up to rescaling by a shape-dependent factor:
\[
\frac{\partial \Delta G^{\ddagger}}{\partial x^3} = k^x x^2 - \frac{3}{2} \left( 1 - \nu \right) + \cdots \approx k^x x^2 \left( \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (S.21)
\]

Typical values for smooth energy profiles (2/3 \( \leq \nu \leq 6/5 \)) suggest 0.5 \( \leq (3 \nu - 1)/2 \leq 1.3 \), so we expect the true extinction force value to be never more than a factor of two away from \( k^x x^2 \). Of course, when \( U(x) \) is known, it is straightforward to compute the extinction force numerically.

**Universality of the biased escape rate**

The calculations in this section are meant merely as a motivation for the two-force-scale arguments we make in the paper.

We assume Langevin behaviour with moderate to strong friction and ignore the complications of non-Markovian dynamics. Following Kramers, the escape rate from the left well of the tilted energy landscape is
\[
k_0 \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_T k_b}} \exp(-\beta \Delta G^{\ddagger}) \\
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{-U''(x_b) U''(x_h)}} \exp(-\beta [U(x_b) - U(x_l)]) \quad (S.22)
\]
The corresponding expression for the tilted case can be produced by substituting \( U(x) \rightarrow U(x_t) \). If we expand around the \( F = 0 \) case and collect terms order by order within the argument of the exponential, we arrive at
\[
k(F) = k_0 \exp \left[ F \left( \beta x^2 + \frac{R_{1,2}^x}{2 k^x} \right) \right] \\
- F^2 \left( \frac{\beta}{2 k^x} - \frac{R_{1,3}^x}{2 k^x} + \frac{Q_{1,4}^x}{4 k^x} \right) \\
- F^3 \left( \frac{\beta R_{1,3}^x}{6 k^x} - \frac{2 R_{1,6}^x}{3 k^x} + \cdots \right) + O(F^4) \quad (S.23)
\]

We expect the largest terms to be those proportional to \( \beta \), which come from the exponential in Eq. (S.22); the contributions originating under the radical in the prefactor are smaller.

An important insight is that the logarithmic relative rate can be written in the form
\[
Y(F) = \frac{\log k(F)}{k_0} = \frac{F}{F_T} - \frac{F^2}{2 F_T F_B} - \frac{C F^3}{2 F_T F_B^2} + \cdots \quad (S.24)
\]

In this expression we have introduced two new dimensionful coefficients (with units of force), defined according to
\[
\frac{1}{F_T} = \beta x^2 + \frac{R_{1,2}^x}{2 k^x} \\
= \beta x^2 \left( 1 + \frac{R_{1,2}^x}{2 \beta k^x} \right) \equiv 1 + \frac{4 \lambda_T}{F_T} \\
\frac{1}{F_T F_B} = \frac{\beta}{k^x} - \frac{R_{2,4}^x}{k^x} + \frac{Q_{1,3}^x}{2 k^x} \\
= \frac{\beta x^2}{k^x} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \frac{R_{2,4}^x}{k^x} \right) \frac{Q_{1,3}^x}{2 k^x} \right) \equiv 1 - \frac{4 \lambda_{TB}}{F_T (F_B)^{0.5}} \quad (S.25)
\]
along with a dimensionless constant \( C \). Matching the \( O(F^3) \) terms in Eqs. (S.23) and (S.24) and invoking Eq. (S.20), we identify \( C = 1 - \nu - \cdots \), with the elision hiding additional terms that are shape- and temperature-dependent but small; specifically,
\[
C = \frac{R_{1,3}^x}{3 k^x} \left( 1 + \lambda_T \right) \left( 1 - \frac{4 \lambda_{TB}}{3 \beta R_{1,3}^x} \right) \quad (S.26)
\]
The advantage of the rewriting in Eq. (S.24) is that we have picked out two force scales, $F_T$ and $F_B$, whose magnitude is determined—up to modest renormalization by $\lambda_T$ and $\lambda_T B$—by $F_T^{(0)} = 1/\beta x^4$ and $F_B^{(0)} = \kappa x^4$. Equation (S.25) implies

$$F_T = F_T^{(0)} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_T} \right), \quad F_B = F_B^{(0)} \left( \frac{1 + \lambda_T}{1 - \lambda_T B} \right).$$

(S.27)

To give a more physical picture, we interpret $F_T$ as the typical thermal force that provides the kick out of the well and $F_B$ as the applied force required to fully extinguish the barrier. The ratio of the two force scales is

$$\frac{F_B}{F_T} = \beta \kappa x^2 \frac{(1 + \lambda_T)^2}{(1 - \lambda_T B)} \frac{2 \beta \Delta G^\perp}{v} (1 + \cdots).$$

(S.28)

A key observation is that if we view the escape rate as a function of a reduced applied force $f = F/F_B$, measured in units of the barrier extinction force scale, then Eq. (S.24) transforms to

$$Y(F) \xrightarrow{F \to F_B f} \frac{F_B f}{F_T} \frac{(F_B f)^2}{2 F_T F_B} \frac{C (F_B f)^3}{2 F_T F_B^2} + \cdots$$

$$= \frac{F_B}{F_T} \left( \frac{f - f^2/2 - 1/2 C f^3}{f + f^2/2 - 1/2 C f^3} \right).$$

(S.29)

Note that the terms at order $f$ and $f^2$ are wholly independent of the details of the system. $(C/2) f^3$ is the leading nonuniversal term, but even there [as per Eq. (S.26)] the shape dependence is quite weak and the temperature dependence almost negligible. This means that truly idiosyncratic contributions do not show up until order $f^4$, and those we expect to be heavily suppressed just by power reduction; in practice, $f = F/F_B < 1$, since escape almost always precedes complete elimination of the barrier.

Moreover, since physical considerations demand that the escape rate increase with $F$, it is legitimate to apply a series acceleration transformation by which Eq. (S.29) is expanded in terms of some function of $f$ that is monotonic increasing but slower-growing than the monomial $f$ itself; one might consider $f/(1 + f/2)$ (as in Ref. 2) or log $(1 + f)$, say. Then $f - (1/2) f^2 - (C/2) f^3 + \cdots$ can be recast as

$$\frac{f}{1 + f/2} - \left( \frac{C}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \right) \left( \frac{f}{1 + f/2} \right)^3 + \cdots$$

(S.30)

or

$$\log (1 + f) - \left( \frac{C}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \right) \log (1 + f)^3 + \cdots.$$  

(S.31)

Since we expect $-1/5 \leq C \leq 1/3$ (and often $|C| \ll 1$), Eqs. (S.31) and (S.30) are close to being universal even up to order three. This leads us to posit that the logarithmic relative escape rate has a form reminiscent of the finite-size scaling ansatz of a critical state:

$$Y(F) = \log \frac{k(F)}{k_0} = \left( \frac{F_T}{F_B} \right)^{-1} \left[ \frac{F_Y(F/F_B, F_T/F_B)}{F_Y(F/F_B, 0)} + \left( \frac{F_T}{F_B} \right)^\omega Y(F/F_B) + \cdots \right].$$

(S.32)

Here, $\omega > 0$ is the exponent for the subleading corrections to scaling. Since $F_T/F_B \approx 1/(\beta \kappa x^2) = \nu/(2 \beta \Delta G^\perp) \ll 1$, the quantity $(F_T/F_B) Y(F)$ should collapse onto a universal curve when plotted against $f = F/F_B$:

$$\frac{F_T}{F_B} Y(F) = \frac{F_T}{F_B} \log \frac{k(F)}{k_0} \approx Y(f, 0).$$

(S.33)

Other combinations of $(F_T/F_B) Y(F)$ may bring about an even cleaner coincidence. For example,

$$\log (1 + f) = \frac{F_T}{F_B} Y(F) + \left( \frac{C}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \right) \left( \log (1 + f)^3 + \cdots \right)$$

$$= \frac{F_T}{F_B} Y(F) \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{C}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \right) \left( \frac{F_T}{F_B} Y(F) \right)^2 + \cdots \right].$$

(S.34)

Imagine that there is a set of escape rate measurements but the underlying $U(x)$ is unknown. Even without knowledge of a fitting form such as Eqs. (S.33) and Eq. (S.34), graphical collapse onto a common curve can be engineered by careful adjustment of the free parameters $F_T$ and $F_B$.

**Data collapse of the rupture force**

A population $n(t)$ of systems prepared in a well and subject to an escape rate $k(F)$ is subject to the rate equation $\dot{n} = -k n$. If the pulling force increases linearly in time, with a constant loading rate $K V$, then

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = -k(F) n(t) = -k(V t) n(t).$$

(S.35)

The time $t$ for half the population to escape is given by

$$\log 2 = \int_1^{1/2} \frac{dn}{n} = -\int_0^t dt k(V t).$$

(S.36)

In the Bell-Evans picture [3, 4], which supposes that the biased rate is simply $k(F) = k_0 \exp(\beta F x^2)$, Eq. (S.36) becomes

$$
\log 2 = \frac{k_0}{\beta K V x^2} (e^{\beta K V x^2} - 1) = \frac{F_T^{(0)} k_0}{K V} (e^{\beta F x^2} - 1).
$$

(S.37)

Then $\hat{F}$, the force at half-life, is

$$\hat{F} = F_T^{(0)} \log \left( 1 + \frac{K V \log 2}{F_T^{(0)} k_0} \right).$$

(S.38)
On the other hand, if the escape rate is represented using the universal part of Eq. (S.31), via \( \log [k(F)/k_0] = (F_B/F_T)(f - f^2/2 + \cdots) = (F_B/F_T) \log(1 + f) \), then

\[
F = k_0 \exp \left[ \frac{F_B}{F_T} \log(1 + f) \right] = k_0 \left( 1 + \frac{F}{F_B} \right)^{r_F/F_T} \tag{S.39}
\]

The omitted terms [denoted by \( \cdots \) in the exponent of the last line of Eq. (S.39)] are ones that become negligible at low temperature and large barrier height; in that same limit, we can formally take \( \kappa^2 x^2 \to \infty \), which allows us to recover the Bell-Evans expression, \( k(F) \to k_0 \exp(\beta F x^2) \).

We need not resort to such a limit, however, since the half-life can be solved analytically:

\[
\log 2 = \int_0^i dt k(F(t)) = \int_0^i dt k(KVt) = \int_0^i dt \frac{F_B}{F_T} \left[ 1 + \frac{F}{F_B} \right]^{r_F/F_T} \tag{S.40}
\]

This corresponds to an average rupture force

\[
\dot{F} = KV \ddot{t} = F_B \left[ 1 + \frac{2F_B}{F_T} \right] - \frac{1}{2} \frac{F_B^2}{F_T^2} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{F_B}{F_T} \right) \tag{S.41}
\]

A useful resummation is

\[
\dot{F} = F_T \log \left[ 1 + \frac{KV \log 2}{F_T k_0} \right] + \frac{2F_B - F_T}{6} \left( \log \left[ 1 + \frac{KV \log 2}{F_T k_0} \right] \right)^3 + \cdots, \tag{S.42}
\]

the first term of which is identical to the right-hand-side of Eq. (S.38), up to the renormalization \( F_T^{(0)} \to F_T \).

In order to put Eq. (S.42) into a scale-invariant form, we define the half-life pulling force with respect to the thermal force scale, \( \dot{F}_T = \dot{F}/F_T \), and a dimensionless loading rate, \( r_T = KV/(F_T k_0) \). This leads to

\[
\dot{F}_T = \log(1 + r_T \log 2) + \frac{(2F_B/F_T - 1)}{6} \left( \log(1 + r_T \log 2) \right)^3 \tag{S.43}
\]

In general, \( F_B/F_T \sim 2 \beta \Delta G^2/\nu \) is not small. But so long as \( (F_B/F_T) \dot{F}_T^2 = F_B F^2/F_T^3 \ll 1 \), it is appropriate to write

\[
\dot{F}_T \left( 1 - \frac{(2F_B/F_T - 1) \dot{F}_T^2}{6} \right) = \log(1 + r_T \log 2). \tag{S.44}
\]