

Adaptive Ensemble Biomolecular Applications at Scale

Vivek Balasubramanian
Department of ECE, Rutgers
University

Travis Jensen
Department of ChBE, University of
Colorado Boulder

Matteo Turilli
Department of ECE, Rutgers
University

Peter Kasson
Biomedical Engineering, University of
Virginia

Michael Shirts
Department of ChBE, University of
Colorado Boulder

Shantenu Jha
ECE, Rutgers University and
Brookhaven National Laboratory

ABSTRACT

Recent advances in both theory and methods have created opportunities to simulate biomolecular processes more efficiently using adaptive ensemble simulations. Ensemble-based simulations are used widely to compute a number of individual simulation trajectories and analyze statistics across them. Adaptive ensemble simulations offer a further level of sophistication and flexibility by enabling high-level algorithms to control simulations based on intermediate results. Novel high-level algorithms require sophisticated approaches to utilize the intermediate data during runtime. Thus, there is a need for scalable software systems to support adaptive ensemble-based applications. We describe the operations in executing adaptive workflows, classify different types of adaptations, and describe challenges in implementing them in software tools. We enhance Ensemble Toolkit (EnTK) – an ensemble execution system – to support the scalable execution of adaptive workflows on HPC systems, and characterize the adaptation overhead in EnTK. We implement two high-level adaptive ensemble algorithms – expanded ensemble and Markov state modeling, and execute upto 2^{12} ensemble members, on thousands of cores on three distinct HPC platforms. We highlight scientific advantages enabled by the novel capabilities of our approach. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt at describing and implementing multiple adaptive ensemble workflows using a common conceptual and implementation framework.

KEYWORDS

Adaptivity, Ensemble Applications

ACM Reference Format:

Vivek Balasubramanian, Travis Jensen, Matteo Turilli, Peter Kasson, Michael Shirts, and Shantenu Jha. 2019. Adaptive Ensemble Biomolecular Applications at Scale. In *ICPP '19: ACM International Conference on Parallel Processing, Aug 5–8, 2019, Kyoto, Japan*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

ICPP '19, Aug 5–8, 2019, Kyoto, Japan

© 2019 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM... \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Current computational methods for solving scientific problems in biomolecular science are at or near their scaling limits using traditional parallel architectures [1]. Computations using straightforward molecular dynamics (MD) are inherently sequential processes, and parallelization is limited to speeding up each individual, serialized, time step. Consequently, *ensemble-based* computational methods have been developed to address these gaps [2, 3]. In these methods, multiple simulation tasks are executed concurrently, and various physical or statistical principles are used to combine the tasks together with longer time scale communication (seconds to hours) instead of the microsecond to milliseconds required for standard tightly coupled parallel processing.

Existing ensemble-based methods have been successful for addressing a number of questions in biomolecular modeling [4]. However, studying systems with multiple-timescale behavior extending out to microseconds or milliseconds, or studying even shorter timescales on larger physical systems will not only require tools that can support $100\times$ – $1000\times$ greater degrees of parallelism but also exploration of *adaptive* algorithms. In adaptive algorithms, the intermediate results of simulations are used to alter following simulations. Adaptive approaches can increase simulation efficiency by greater than a thousand-fold [5] but require a more sophisticated software infrastructure to encode, modularize, and execute complex interactions and execution logic.

We define *adaptivity* as the capability to change attributes that influence execution performance or domain specific parameters, based on runtime information. The logic to specify such changes can rely on a simulation within an ensemble, an operation across an ensemble, or external criteria, such as resource availability or experimental data. In most cases, adaptive algorithms can be expressed at a high level, such that the adaptive logic itself is independent of simulation details (i.e., external to MD kernels like NAMD [6] or GROMACS [7]). Adaptive operations that are expressed independent of the internal details of tasks facilitate MD software package agnosticism and simpler expression of different types of adaptivity and responses to adaptivity. This promotes easy development of new methods while facilitating scalable system software and its optimization and performance engineering [8].

Adaptivity enables study of longer simulation durations to investigate larger physical systems and to efficiently explore high dimensional energy surfaces in finer detail. The execution trajectory of such applications cannot be fully determined *a priori*, but depends upon intermediate results. Adaptive algorithms “steer” execution towards interesting phase space or parameters and thus

improve sampling quality or sampling rate. To achieve scalability and efficiency, such adaptivity cannot be performed via user intervention and hence automation of the control logic and execution becomes critical.

To guide the design and implementation of capabilities to encode and execute adaptive ensemble applications in a scalable and adaptive manner, we identify two such applications from the biomolecular science domain as shown in Figs. 1 and 2. Although each of these biomolecular applications have distinct execution requirements, and coordination and communication patterns among their ensemble members, they are united by their need for adaptive execution of a large number of tasks.

This paper makes five contributions: (i) identifies types of ensemble adaptivity; (ii) enhances Ensemble Toolkit [9] (EnTK), an ensemble execution system, with adaptive capabilities; (iii) characterizes the cost of adaptive capabilities in EnTK; (iv) implements two high-level adaptive ensemble algorithms and executes upto 2^{12} ensemble members, on thousands of cores on three distinct HPC platforms; and (v) discusses scientific insight from these adaptive ensemble applications.

It is important to note that these contributions do not depend upon a specific simulation package – MD kernel, or otherwise. As a consequence, the capabilities and results apply uniformly to adaptive ensemble applications from multiple domains. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first reported framework that supports the specification and implementation of general-purpose adaptive ensemble applications.

Section 2 describes existing and related approaches. Section 3 presents two science drivers that motivate the need for large-scale adaptive ensemble biomolecular simulations. We discuss different types and challenges in supporting adaptivity in Section 4. In Section 5, we describe the design and implementation of EnTK, and the enhancements made to address the challenges of adaptivity. In Section 6, we characterize the overheads in EnTK as a function of adaptivity types, validate the implementation of the science drivers, and discuss scientific insight derived from executing at scale.

2 RELATED WORK

Adaptive ensemble applications span several science domains including, but not limited to, climate science, seismology, astrophysics, and bio-molecular science. For example, Ref. [10] studies adaptive selection and tuning of dynamic RNNs for hydrological forecasting; Ref. [11] presents adaptive modeling of oceanic and atmospheric circulation; Ref. [12] studies adaptive assessment methods on an ensemble of bridges subjected to earthquake motion; and Ref. [13] discusses parallel adaptive mesh refinement techniques for astrophysical and cosmological applications. In this paper, we focus on biomolecular applications, as examples, employing algorithms to simulate biophysical events.

Algorithms consisting of one or more MD simulations, provide quantitative and qualitative information about the structure and stability of molecular systems, and the interactions among them. Specialized computer architectures enable single MD simulations at the millisecond scale [14] but alternative approaches are motivated by the higher availability of general-purpose machines and the need to investigate biological processes at the scales from milliseconds

to minutes. Importantly, although we discuss mostly biological applications, there are many applications of MD in material science, polymer science, and interface science [15, 16].

Statistical estimation of thermodynamic, kinetic, and structural properties of biomolecules requires multiple samples of biophysical events. Algorithms with ensembles of MD simulations have been shown to be more efficient at computing these samples than single, large and long-running MD simulations [2, 3, 17, 18]. Adaptive ensemble algorithms use runtime data to guide the progression of the ensemble, achieving up to a thousand-fold increase in efficiency compared to non-adaptive alternatives [19, 20].

Several adaptive ensemble algorithms have been formulated. For example, replica exchange [21] consists of ensembles of simulations where each simulation operates with a unique value of a sampling parameter, such as temperature, to facilitate escape from local minima. In generalized ensemble simulation methods, different ensemble simulations employ distinct exchange algorithms [22] or specify diverse sampling parameters [23] to explore free-energy surfaces that are less accessible to non-adaptive methods. In metadynamics [24] and expanded ensemble [25], simulations traverse different states based on weights “learned” adaptively. Markov State Model [18] (MSM) approaches adaptively select initial configurations for simulations to reduce uncertainty of the resulting model.

Current solutions to encode and execute adaptive ensemble algorithms fall into two categories: monolithic workflow systems that do not fully support adaptive algorithms and MD software packages where the adaptivity is embedded within the executing kernels. Several workflow systems [26], including Kepler, Taverna and Pegasus support adaptation capabilities only as a form of fault tolerance and not as a way to enable decision-logic for changing the workflow at runtime.

Well known MD software packages such as Amber, GROMACS and NAMD offer capabilities to execute adaptive ensemble algorithms. However, these capabilities are tightly coupled to the MD package, preventing users from easily adding new adaptive algorithms or reusing the existing ones across packages.

Domain-specific workflow systems such as Copernicus [27] have also been developed to support Markov state modeling algorithms to study kinetics of bio-molecules. Although Copernicus provides an interactive and customized interface to domain scientists, it requires users to manage the acquisition of resources, the deployment of the system and the configuration of the execution environment. This hinders Copernicus uptake, often requiring tailored guidance from its developers.

Encoding the adaptive ensemble algorithm, including its adaptation logic within MD software packages or workflow systems locks the capabilities to those individual tools. In contrast, the capability to encode the algorithm and adaptation logic as an user application promises several benefits: separation between algorithm specification and execution; flexible and quick prototyping of alternative algorithms; and extensibility of algorithmic solutions to multiple software packages, science problems and scientific domains [28, 8]. To realize these promises, we develop the abstractions and capabilities to encode adaptivity at the ensemble application level, and execute adaptive ensemble applications at scale on high performance computing (HPC) systems.

3 SCIENCE DRIVERS

In this paper, we discuss two representative adaptive ensemble applications from the biophysical domain: Expanded Ensemble and Markov State Modeling. Prior to discussing the implementation of these applications, we describe the underlying algorithms.

3.1 Expanded Ensemble

Metadynamics [24] and expanded ensemble (EE) dynamics [25] are a class of adaptive ensemble biomolecular algorithms, where individual simulations jump between simulation conditions. In EE dynamics, the simulation states take one of N discrete states of interest, whereas in metadynamics, the simulation states are described by one or more continuous variables. In both algorithms, each simulation explores the states independently. Additional weights are required to force the simulations to visit desired distributions in the simulation condition space, which usually involves sampling in all the simulation conditions. These weights are learned adaptively using a variety of methods [25].

Since the movement among state spaces is essentially diffusive, the larger the simulation state spaces, the more time the sampling takes. “Multiple walker” approaches can improve sampling performance by using more than one simulation to explore the same state space [2]. Further, the simulation condition range can be partitioned into individual simulations as smaller partitions decrease diffusive behavior [29]. The “best” partitions to spend time sampling may not be known until after simulation. These partitions can be determined adaptively, based on runtime information about partial simulation results.

In this paper, we implement two versions of EE consisting of concurrent, iterative ensemble members that analyze data at regular intervals. In the first version, we analyze data local to each ensemble member; in the second version we analyze data global to all the ensemble members by asynchronously exchanging data among members. In our application, each ensemble member consists of two types of task: simulation and analysis. The simulation tasks generate MD trajectories while the analysis tasks use these trajectories to generate simulation condition weights for the next iteration of simulation in its own ensemble member. Every analysis task operates on the current snapshot of the total local or global data. Note that in global analysis, EE uses any and all data available and does not explicitly “wait” for data from other ensemble members. Fig. 1 is a representation of these implementations.

3.2 Markov State Modeling

Markov state modeling (MSM) is another important class of biomolecular simulation algorithms for determining kinetics of molecular models. Using an assumption of separation of time scales of molecular motion, the rates of first-order kinetic processes are learned adaptively. In a MSM simulation, a large ensemble of simulations, typically tens or hundreds of thousands, are run from different starting points and similar configurations are clustered as states. MSM building techniques include kinetic information but begin with a traditional clustering method (eg k-means or k-centers) using a structural metric. Configurations of no more than 2Å to 3Å RMSDs are typically clustered into the same “micro-state” [30].




Figure 1: Schematic of the expanded ensemble (EE) science driver. Two versions of EE are implemented: (1) local analysis where analysis only data local to its ensemble member; and (2) global analysis where analysis uses data from other ensemble members (represented by dashed lines)

The high degree of structural similarity implies a kinetic similarity, allowing for subsequent kinetic clustering of microstates into larger “macro-states”. The rates of transitions among these states are estimated by observing which entire kinetic behavior can be inferred, even though individual simulations perform no more than one state transition. However, the choice of where new simulations are initiated to best refine the definition of the states, improve the statistics of the rate constants, and discover new simulation states requires a range of analyses of previous simulation results, making the entire algorithm highly adaptive.

MSM provides a way to encode dynamic processes such as protein folding into a set of metastable states and transitions among them. In computing MSM from simulation trajectories, the metastable state definitions and the transition probabilities have to be inferred. Refs. [20, 19] show that “adaptive sampling” can lead to more efficient MSM construction as follows: provisional models are constructed using intermediate simulation results, and these models are then used to direct the placement of further simulation trajectories. Different from other approaches, in this paper we encode this algorithm as an application where the adaptive code is independent from the software packages used to perform the MD simulations and MSM construction.

Fig. 2 offers a diagrammatic representation of the adaptive ensemble MSM approach. The application consists of an iterative pipeline with two stages: (i) ensemble of simulations and (ii) MSM construction to determine optimal placement of future simulations. The first stage generates sufficient amount of MD trajectory data for an analysis. The analysis—i.e., the second stage—operates over the cumulative trajectory data to adaptively generate a new set of simulation configurations, used in the next iteration of the simulations. The pipeline is iterated until the resulting MSM converges.




Figure 2: Schematic of the Markov State Model science driver.

4 WORKFLOW ADAPTIVITY

Adaptive ensemble applications discussed in §3 involve two computational layers: at the lower level each simulation or analysis is performed via MD software package; at the higher level, an **algorithm** codifies the coordination and communication among simulations and between simulations and analyses. Different adaptive ensemble applications and adaptive algorithms might have varying coordination and communication patterns, yet are amenable to common adaptations and similar types of adaptations.

We implement each simulation and analysis instance of these applications as a **task**, while representing the full set of task dependencies as task graph (TG) of a **workflow**. A workflow may be fully specified a priori, or may be adapted, changing in specification, during runtime. For the remainder of the paper, we refer to alterations in the task graph as workflow adaptivity.

4.1 Execution of Adaptive Workflows

Executing adaptive workflows at scale on HPC resources presents several challenges [8]. Execution of adaptive workflows can be decomposed into four operations as represented in Fig. 3: (a) creation of an initial TG, encoding known tasks and dependencies; (b) traversal of the initial TG to identify tasks ready for execution in accordance with their dependencies; (c) execution of those tasks on the compute resource; and (d) notification of completed tasks (control-flow) or generation of intermediate data (data-flow) which invokes adaptations of the TG.




Figure 3: Adaptivity Loop: Sequence of operations in executing an adaptive workflow

Operations (b)–(d) are repeated till the complete workflow is determined, and all its tasks are executed. This sequence of operations is called an Adaptivity Loop: in an adaptive scenario, the workflow “learns” its future TG based on the execution of its current TG; in a pre-defined scenario, the workflow’s TG is fully specified and only operations (a)–(c) are necessary.

Encoding of adaptive workflows requires two sets of abstractions: one to encode the workflow; and the other to encode the adaptation methods (A) that, upon receiving a signal x , operate on the workflow. The former abstractions are required for creating the TG, i.e., operation (a), while the latter are required to adapt the TG, i.e., operation (d).

4.2 Types of Adaptations

Adaptivity Loop applies an adaptation method (Fig. 3d) to a TG. We represent a TG as $TG = [V, E]$, with the set V of vertices denoting the tasks of the workflow and their properties (such as executable, required resources, and required data), and the set E of directed edges denoting the dependencies among tasks. For a workflow with $TG = [V, E]$, there exist four parameters that may change during execution: (i) set of vertices; (ii) set of edges; (iii) size of the vertex set; and (iv) size of the edge set. We analyzed the 2^4 permutations

of these four parameters and identified 3 that are valid and unique. The remaining permutations represent conditions that are either not possible to achieve or combinations of the 3 valid permutations.

Task-count adaptation. We define a method A_{tc} (operator) as a task-count adaptation if, on receiving a signal x , the method performs the following adaptation (operation) on the TG (operand):

$$\begin{aligned} TG_{i+1} &= A_{tc}(TG_i, x) \\ \implies size(V_i) &\neq size(V_{i+1}) \wedge size(E_i) \neq size(E_{i+1}) \\ \text{where } TG_i &= [V_i, E_i] \wedge TG_{i+1} = [V_{i+1}, E_{i+1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Task-count adaptation changes the number of TG’s tasks, i.e., the adaptation method operates on a TG_i to produce a new TG_{i+1} such that at least one vertex and one edge is added or removed to/from TG_i .

Task-order adaptation. We define a method A_{to} as a task-order adaptation if, on a signal x , the method performs the following adaptation on the TG:

$$\begin{aligned} TG_{i+1} &= A_{to}(TG_i, x) \implies E_i \neq E_{i+1} \wedge V_i = V_{i+1} \\ \text{where } TG_i &= [V_i, E_i] \wedge TG_{i+1} = [V_{i+1}, E_{i+1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Task-order adaptation changes the dependency order among tasks, i.e., the adaptation method operates on a TG_i to produce a new TG_{i+1} such that the vertices are unchanged but at least one of the edges between vertices is different between TG_i and TG_{i+1} .

Task-property adaptation. We define a method A_{tp} as a task-property adaptation if, on a signal x , the method performs the following adaptation on the TG:

$$\begin{aligned} TG_{i+1} &= A_{tp}(TG_i, x) \\ \implies V_i &\neq V_{i+1} \wedge size(V_i) = size(V_{i+1}) \wedge E_i = E_{i+1} \\ \text{where } TG_i &= [V_i, E_i] \wedge TG_{i+1} = [V_{i+1}, E_{i+1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Task-property adaptation changes the properties of at least one task, i.e., the adaptation method operates on a TG_i to produce a new TG_{i+1} such that the edges and the number of vertices are unchanged but the properties of at least one vertex is different between TG_i and TG_{i+1} .

We can represent the workflow of the two science drivers using the notations presented. Expanded ensemble (EE) consists of N ensemble members executing independently for multiple iterations till convergence is reached in any ensemble member. We represent one iteration of each ensemble members as a task graph TG and the convergence criteria with x . An adaptive EE workflow can then be represented as:

```

parallel_for i in [1 : N]:
  while (condition on x):
    TG_i = A_tp(A_to(A_tc(TG_i)))
  
```

Markov State Modeling (MSM) consists of one ensemble member which iterates between simulation and analysis till sufficient trajectory data is analyzed. We represent one iteration of the ensemble member as a task graph TG and its termination criteria as x . An adaptive MSM workflow can then be represented as:

```

while (condition on x):
  TG = A_to(A_tc(TG))
  
```

4.3 Challenges in Encoding Adaptive Workflows

Supporting adaptive workflows poses three main challenges. The first challenge is the expressibility of adaptive workflows as their encoding requires APIs that enable the description of the initial state of the workflow and the specification of how the workflow adapts on the base of intermediate signals. The second challenge is determining when and how to instantiate the adaptation. Adaptation is described at the end of the execution of tasks wherein a new TG is generated. Different strategies can be employed for the instantiation of the adaptation [31]. The third challenge is the implementation of the adaptation of the TG at runtime. We divide this challenge into three parts: (i) propagation of adapted TG to all components; (ii) consistency of the state of the TG among different components; and (iii) efficiency of adaptive operations.

5 ENSEMBLE TOOLKIT

EnTK is an ensemble execution system, implemented as a Python library, that offers components to encode and execute ensemble workflows on HPC systems. EnTK decouples the description of ensemble workflows from their execution by separating three concerns: (i) specification of tasks and resource requirements; (ii) resource selection and acquisition; and (iii) management of task execution. EnTK sits between the user and the HPC system, abstracting resource and execution management complexities from the user.

EnTK is developed based on requirements elicited by use cases spanning several scientific domains, including biomolecular, climate, and earth sciences. The design, implementation and performance of EnTK is discussed in detail in Ref. [32]. We present a schematic representation of EnTK in Fig. 4, summarize its design and implementation, and detail the enhancements made to EnTK to support the encoding and execution of the three types of adaptation discussed in §4.2.




Figure 4: Schematic of EnTK representing its components and sub-components.

5.1 Design

EnTK exposes an API with three user-facing constructs: Pipeline, Stage, and Task; and one component, AppManager. Pipeline, Stage, and Task are used to encode the workflow in terms of concurrency and sequentiality of tasks. We define the constructs as:

- **Task:** an abstraction of a computational process consisting of the specification of an executable, software environment, resource and data requirement.
- **Stage:** a set of tasks without mutual dependencies that, therefore, can be concurrently executed.
- **Pipeline:** a sequence of stages such that any stage i can be executed only after stage $i-1$.

Ensemble workflows are described by the user as a set or sequence of pipelines, where each pipeline is a list of stages, and each stage is a set of tasks. A set of pipelines executes concurrently whereas a sequence executes sequentially. All the stages of each pipeline execute sequentially, and all the tasks of each stage execute concurrently. In this way, we describe a workflow in terms of the concurrency and sequentiality of tasks, without requiring the explicit specification of task dependencies.

AppManager is the core component of EnTK, serving two broad purposes: (i) exposing an API to accept the encoded workflow and a specification of the resource requirements from the user; and (ii) managing the execution of the workflow on the specified resource via several components and a third-party runtime system (RTS). AppManager abstracts complexities of resource acquisition, task and data management, heterogeneity, and failure handling from the user. All components and sub-components of EnTK communicate via a dedicated messaging system that is set up by the AppManager.

AppManager instantiates a WorkflowProcessor, the component responsible for maintaining the concurrent and sequential execution of tasks as described by the pipelines and stages in the workflow. WorkflowProcessor consists of two components, Enqueue and Dequeue, that are used to: enqueue sets of executable tasks, i.e., tasks with all their dependencies satisfied; and dequeue executed tasks, to and from dedicated queues.

AppManager also instantiates an ExecutionManager, the component responsible for managing the resources and the execution of tasks on these resources. ExecutionManager consists of two sub-components: ResourceManager and TaskManager. Both sub-components interface with a RTS to manage the allocation and deallocation of resources, and the execution of tasks, received via dedicated queues, from the WorkflowProcessor.

EnTK manages failures of tasks, components, computing infrastructure (CI) and RTS. Failed tasks can be resubmitted or ignored, depending on user configuration. EnTK, by design, is resilient against components failure as all state updates are transactional: failed components can simply be re-instantiated. Both the CI and RTS are considered black boxes and their partial failures are assumed to be handled locally. Upon full failure of the CI or RTS, EnTK assumes all the resources and the tasks undergoing execution are lost, restarts the RTS, and resumes execution from the last successful pipeline, stage, and task.

5.2 Implementation

EnTK is implemented in Python, uses the RabbitMQ message queuing system [33] and the RADICAL-Pilot (RP) [34] RTS. All EnTK components are implemented as processes, and all subcomponents as threads. AppManager is the master process spawning all the other processes. Tasks, stages and pipelines are implemented as objects, copied among processes and threads via queues and transactions. Process synchronization uses message-passing via queues.

Using RabbitMQ offers several benefits: (i) producers and consumers are unaware of topology, because they interact only with the server; (ii) messages are stored in the server and can be recovered upon failure of EnTK components; (iii) messages can be pushed and pulled asynchronously because data can be buffered by the server upon production; and (iv) $\geq O(10^6)$ tasks are supported.


```

from radical.entk import Task, Stage
s = Stage()
t = Task()
<add task properties>
s.add_tasks(t)
s.post_exec = {
    'condition': <function_1 name>,
    'on_true': <function_2 name>,
    'on_false': <function_3 name>
}

```

Code 1: Post execution properties of a Stage consisting of one Task. At the end of the Stage, 'function_1' (boolean condition) is evaluated to return a boolean value. Depending on the value, 'function_2' (true) or 'function_3' (false) is invoked.

EnTK uses RP, a pilot system, as the RTS. Pilot systems enable the submission of "pilot" jobs to the resource manager of an HPC system. The defining capability is the decoupling of resource acquisition from task execution. Pilot systems allow for queuing a single job via the batch system and, once this job becomes active, it executes a system application that enables the direct scheduling of tasks on the acquired resources, without waiting in the batch system's queue. RP does not attempt to 'game' the resource manager of the HPC system: Once queued, the resources are managed according to the system's policies. RP provides access to several HPC systems, including XSEDE, ORNL, and NCSA resources, and can be configured to use other HPC systems.

5.3 Enhancements for Adaptive Execution

In §4.3, we described three challenges for supporting adaptive workflows: (i) expressibility of adaptive workflows; (ii) when and how to trigger adaptation; and (iii) implementation of adaptive operations. EnTK does not support these adaptation requirements, nor can algorithms cannot be expressed. Therefore, we engineered EnTK with three new capabilities: expressing an adaptation operation, executing the operation, and modifying a TG at runtime.

Adaptations in ensemble workflows follow the Adaptivity Loop described in §4.1. Execution of one or more tasks is followed by some signal x that triggers an adaptation operation. In EnTK, this signal is currently implemented as a control signal triggered at the end of a stage or a pipeline. We added the capability to express this adaptation operation as post-execution properties of stages and pipelines. In this way, when all the tasks of a stage or all the stages of a pipeline have completed, the adaptation operation can be invoked to evaluate based on the results of the ongoing computation, whether a change in the TG is required. This is done asynchronously without effecting any other executing tasks.

The adaptation operation is encoded as a Python property of the Stage and Pipeline objects. The encoding requires the specification of three functions: one function to evaluate a boolean condition over x , and two functions to describe the adaptation, depending on the result of the boolean evaluation.

Users define the three functions specified as post-execution properties of a Stage or Pipeline, based on the requirements of their application. As such, these functions can modify the existing TG or extend it as per the three adaptivity types described in §4.2.

Ref. [31] specifies multiple strategies to perform adaptation: forward recovery, backward recovery, proceed, and transfer. In EnTK, we implement a non-aggressive adaptation strategy, similar

to 'transfer', where a new TG is created by modifying the current TG only after the completion of part of that TG. The choice of this strategy is based on the current science drivers where tasks that have already executed and tasks that are currently executing are not required to be adapted but all forthcoming tasks might be.

Modifying the TG at runtime requires coordination among EnTK components to ensure consistency in the TG representation. AppManager holds the global view of the TG and, upon instantiation, Workflow Processor maintains a local copy of that TG. The dequeue sub-component of Workflow Processor acquires a lock over the local copy of the TG, and invokes the adaptation operation as described by the post-execution property of stages and pipelines. If the local copy of the TG is modified, Workflow Processor transmits those changes to AppManager that modifies the global copy of TG, and releases the lock upon receiving an acknowledgment. This ensures that adaptations to the TG are consistent across all components, while requiring minimal communication.

Pipeline, stage, and task descriptions alongside the specification of an adaptation operation as post-execution for pipelines and stages enable the expression of adaptive workflows. The 'transfer' strategy enacts the adaptivity of the TG, and the implementation in EnTK ensures consistency and minimal communication in executing adaptive workflows. Note how the design and implementation of adaptivity in EnTK does not depend on specific capabilities of the software package executed by each task of the ensemble workflow.

6 EXPERIMENTS

We perform three sets of experiments. The first set characterizes the overhead of EnTK when performing the three types of adaptation described in §4.2. The second set validates our implementation of the two science drivers presented in §3 against reference data. The third set compares our implementation of adaptive expanded ensemble algorithm with local and global analysis against results obtained with a single and an ensemble of MD simulations.

We use four application kernels in our experiments: `stress-ng` [35], GROMACS [7], OpenMM [36] and Python scripts. `stress-ng` allows to control the computational duration of a task for the experiments that characterize the adaptation overhead of EnTK, while GROMACS and OpenMM are the simulation kernels for the expanded ensemble and Markov state modeling validation experiments.

We executed all experiments from the same host machine but we targeted three HPC systems, depending on the amount and availability of the resources required by the experiments, and the constraints imposed by the queue policy of each machine. NCSA Blue Waters and ORNL Titan were used for characterizing the adaptation overhead of EnTK, while XSEDE SuperMIC was used for the validation and production scale experiments.

6.1 Characterization of Adaptation Overhead

We perform five experiments to characterize the overhead of adapting ensemble workflows encoded using EnTK. Each experiment measures the overhead of a type of adaptation as a function of the number of adaptations. In the case of task-count adaptation, the overhead is measured also as a function of the number of tasks and of their type, single- or multi-node. This is relevant because with the growing of the size of the simulated molecular system and

Table 1: Parameters of the experiments plotted in Fig. 5

ID	Figure	Adaptation Type	Experiment variable	Fixed parameters
I	5i	Task-count	Number of adaptations	Number of tasks added per adaptation = 16, Type of tasks added = single-node
II	5ii	Task-count	Number of tasks added per adaptation	Number of adaptations = 2, Type of tasks added = single-node
III	5iii	Task-count	Type of tasks added	Number of adaptations = 2, Number of tasks added per adaptation = $2^{10} * 2^s$ (s=stage index)
IV	5iv	Task-order	Number of adaptations	Number of re-ordering operations per adaptation = 1, Type of re-ordering = uniform shuffle
V	5v	Task-property	Number of adaptations	Number of property modified per adaptation = 1, Property adapted = Number of cores used per task

of the duration of that simulation, multi-node tasks may perform better than single-node ones.

Each experiment measures EnTK Adaptation Overhead and Task Execution Time. The former is the time taken by EnTK to adapt the workflow by invoking user-specified algorithms; the latter is the time taken to run the executables of all tasks of the workflow. Consistent with the scope of this paper, the comparison between each adaptation overhead and task execution time offers a measure of the efficiency with which EnTK implements adaptive functionalities. Ref. [32] has a detailed analysis of other overheads of EnTK.

Table 1 describes the variables and fixed parameters of the five experiments about adaptivity overheads in EnTK. In these experiments, the algorithm is encoded in EnTK as 1 pipeline consisting of several stages with a set of tasks. In the experiments I–III about task-count adaptation, the pipeline initially consists of a single stage with 16 tasks of a certain type. Each adaptation, at the completion of a stage, adds 1 stage with a certain number of tasks of a certain type, thereby increasing the task-count in the workflow.

In experiments IV–V, the workflow is encoded as 1 pipeline with 17, 65, or 257 stages with 16 tasks per stage. Each adaptation occurs upon the completion of a stage and, in the case of task-order adaptation, the remaining stages of a pipeline are shuffled. In the case of task-property adaptation, the number of cores used by the tasks of the next stage is set to a random value below 16, keeping the task type to single-node. The last stage of both experiments are non-adaptive, resulting in 16, 64, and 256 total adaptations.

In the experiments I, IV and V, where the number of adaptations varies, each task of the workflow executes the `stress-ng` kernel for 60 seconds. For the experiments II and III with $O(1000)$ tasks, the execution duration is set to 600 seconds so to avoid performance bottlenecks in the underlying runtime system and therefore interferences with the measurement of EnTK adaptation overheads. All experiments have no data movement as the performance of data operations is independent from that of adaptation.

Figs. 5(i), 5(iv), and 5(v) show that EnTK Adaptation Overhead and Task Execution Time increase linearly with the increasing of the number of adaptations. EnTK Adaptation Overhead increases due to the time taken to compute the additional adaptations and its linearity indicates that the computing time of each adaptation is constant. Task Execution Time increases due to the time taken to

execute the tasks of the stages that are added to the workflow as a result of the adaptation.

Figs. 5(i), 5(iv), and 5(v) also show that task-property adaptation (v) is the most expensive, followed by task-order adaptation (iv) and task-count (i) adaptation. These differences depend on the computational cost of the Python functions executed during adaptation: in task-property adaptation, the function parses the entire workflow and invokes the Python `random.randint` function 16 times per adaptation; in task-order adaptation, the Python function shuffles a Python list of stages; and in task-count adaptation, the Python function creates an additional stage, appending it to a list.

In Fig. 5(ii), EnTK Adaptation Overhead increases linearly with an increase in the number of tasks added per task-count adaptation, explained by the cost of creating additional tasks and adding them to the workflow. The Task Execution Time remains constant at ≈ 1200 s, since sufficient resources are acquired to execute all the tasks concurrently.

Fig 5(iii) compares EnTK Adaptation Overhead and Task Execution Time when adding single-node and multi-node tasks to the workflow. The former is greater by ≈ 1 s when adding multinode tasks, whereas the latter remains constant at ≈ 1200 s in both scenarios. The difference in the overhead, although negligible when compared to Task Execution Time, is explained by the increased size of a multi-node task description. As in Fig. 5(ii), Task Execution Time remains constant due to availability of sufficient resources to execute all tasks concurrently.

Experiments I–V show that EnTK Adaptation Overhead is proportional to the computing required by the adaptation algorithm and is not determined by the design or implementation of EnTK. In absolute terms, EnTK Adaptation Overhead is orders of magnitude smaller than Task Execution Time. Thus, EnTK advances the practical use of adaptive ensemble workflows.

6.2 Validation of Science Driver Implementations

We implement the two science drivers of §3 using the abstractions developed in EnTK. We validate our implementation of Expanded Ensemble (EE) by calculating the binding of the cucurbit[7]uril 6-ammonio-1-hexanol host-guest system, and our implementation of Markov State Modeling (MSM) by simulating the Alanine dipeptide




Figure 5: EnTK Adaptation Overhead and Task Execution Time for task-count (i, ii, and iii), task-order (iv), and task-property (v) adaptations.

system and comparing our results with the reference data of the DESRES group [37].

6.2.1 Expanded Ensemble. We execute the EE science driver described in §3.1 on XSEDE SuperMIC for a total of 2270ns MD simulation time. To validate the process, we carry out a set of simulations of the binding of cucurbit[7]uril (host) to 6-amino-1-hexanol (guest) in explicit solvent for a total of 29.12ns per ensemble member, and compare the final free energy estimate to a reference calculation. Each ensemble member is encoded in EnTK as a pipeline of stages of simulation and analysis tasks, where each pipeline uses 1 node for 72 hours. With 16 ensemble members (i.e., pipelines) for the current physical system, we use $\approx 1K/23K$ node/core-hours of computational resources.

The EE simulates the degree of coupling between the guest and the rest of the system (water and host). As the system explores the coupling using EE dynamics, it binds and unbinds the guest to and from the host. The free energy of this process is gradually estimated over the course of the simulation, using the Wang-Landau algorithm [38]. However, we hypothesize that we can speed convergence by allowing parallel simulations to share information with each other, and estimate free energies using the potential energy differences among states and the Multistate Bennett Acceptance Ratio (MBAR) algorithm [39].

We consider four variants of the EE method:

- **Method 1:** one continuous simulation, omitting *any* intermediate analysis.
- **Method 2:** multiple parallel simulations without *any* intermediate analysis.
- **Method 3:** multiple parallel simulations with local intermediate analysis, i.e., using current and historical simulation information from only its own ensemble member.
- **Method 4:** multiple parallel simulations with global intermediate analysis, i.e., using current and historical simulation information from all ensemble members.

In each method, the latter 2/3 of the simulation data available at the time of each analysis is used for free energy estimates via the MBAR algorithm. In methods 3 and 4, adverse effects of the Wang-Landau algorithm are eliminated due to the intermediate analyses. These provide a better estimate of the weights that are used to force simulations to visit desired distributions in the simulation condition space (see §3.1). Note that in methods 3 and 4, where intermediate analysis is used to update the weights, the intermediate analysis is always applied at 320ps intervals.




Figure 6: Validation of EE implementation: Observed variation of free energy estimate for methods 1–4. Reference is the MBAR estimate and standard deviation of four 200ns fixed weight expanded-ensemble simulations.

The reference calculation consisted of four parallel simulations that ran for 200ns each and with fixed weights, i.e., using a set of estimated weights and not using the Wang-Landau algorithm. MBAR was used to estimate the free energy for each of these simulations.

Fig. 6 shows the free energy estimates obtained through each of the four methods with the reference calculation value. Final estimates of each method agree within error to the reference value. Validating that the four methods used to implement adaptive ensembles converge the free energy estimate to the actual value.

6.2.2 Markov State Modeling. We execute the MSM science driver described in §3.2 on XSEDE SuperMIC for a total of 100ns MD simulation time over multiple iterations. Each iteration of the TG is encoded in EnTK as one pipeline with 2 stages consisting of 10 simulation tasks and 1 analysis task. Each task uses 1 node to simulate 1ns.

We compare the results obtained from execution of the EnTK implementation against reference data by performing the clustering of the reference data and deriving the mean eigenvalues of two levels of the metastable states, i.e., macro- and micro-states. The reference data was generated by a non-adaptive workflow consisting of 10 tasks, each simulating 10ns.

Eigenvalues attained by the macro-states (top) and micro-states (bottom) in the EnTK implementation and reference data are plotted as a function of the state index in Fig. 7. Final eigenvalues attained by the implementation agree with the reference data within the error bounds. The validation of the implementation warrants that similar implementations should be investigated for larger molecular systems and longer durations, where the aggregate duration is unknown and termination conditions are evaluated during runtime.




Figure 7: Mean eigenvalue attained by the macro-states (top) and micro-states (bottom) by Alanine dipeptide after aggregate simulation duration of 100ns implemented using EnTK compared against reference data.

6.3 Evaluation of Methodological Efficiency using Adaptive Capabilities in EnTK

We analyzed the convergence properties of the free energy estimate using the data generated for the validation of EE. The convergence behavior of Method 1 observed in Fig. 8 implies that the current method converges faster than ensemble based methods but does not represent the average behavior of the non-ensemble based approach. The average behavior is depicted more clearly by Method 2 because this method averages the free energy estimate of 16 independent single simulations.

The most significant feature of Fig. 8 is that all three ensemble based methods converge at similar rates to the reference value. We initially hypothesized that adding adaptive analysis to the estimate of the weights would improve convergence behavior but we see no significant change in these experiments. However, the methodology described here gives researchers the ability to implement additional adaptive elements and test their effects on system properties. Additionally, these adaptive elements can be implemented on relatively short time scales, giving the ability to test many implementations.

Analysis of these simulations revealed a fundamental physical reason that demonstrates a need for additional adaptivity to successfully accelerate these simulations. Although expanded ensemble simulations allowed the ligand to move in and out of the binding pocket rapidly, the slowest motion, occurring on the order of 10s of nanoseconds, was the movement of water out of the binding pocket, allowing the ligand to bind as water backs into a vacant binding pocket. Simulation biases that equilibrate on shorter timescales may stabilize either the waters out or the waters in configurations, preventing the sampling of both configurations. Additional biasing variables are needed to algorithmically accelerate this slow motions, requiring a combination of metadynamics and expanded ensemble simulations, with biases both in the protein interaction variable and the collective variable of water occupancy in the binding pocket. Changes in the PLUMED2 metadynamics code are being coordinated with the developers to make this possible.

Analysis of the slow motions of the system suggests the potential power of more complex and general adaptive patterns. Simulations




Figure 8: Convergence of expanded ensemble implementation: Observed convergence behavior in methods 1–4. Reference is the MBAR estimate of the pooled data and the standard deviation of the non-pooled MBAR estimates of four 200ns fixed weight expanded ensemble simulations.

with accelerated dynamics along the hypothesized degrees of freedom can be carried out, and resulting dynamics can be analyzed, automated and monitored for degrees of freedom associated with remaining slow degrees of motion [40]. Accelerated dynamics can be adaptively adjusted as the simulation process continues. Characterization experiments suggest that EnTK can support the execution of this enhanced adaptive workflow with minimal overhead.

7 CONCLUSION

Scientific problems across domains such as biomolecular science, climate science and uncertainty quantification require ensembles of computational tasks to achieve a desired solution. Novel approaches focus on adaptive algorithms that leverage intermediate data to study larger problems, longer time scales and to engineer better fidelity in the modeling of complex phenomena. In this paper, we described the operations in executing adaptive workflows, classified the different types of adaptations, and described challenges in implementing them in software tools. We enhanced EnTK to support the execution of adaptive workflows on HPC systems. We characterized the adaptation overhead in EnTK, validated the implementation of the two science drivers and executed expanded ensemble at production scale, evaluating its sampling capabilities. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt at describing and implementing multiple adaptive ensemble workflows using a common conceptual and implementation framework.

REFERENCES

- [1] Thomas E. Cheatham and Daniel R. Roe. 2015. The impact of heterogeneous computing on workflows for biomolecular simulation and analysis. English. *Computing in Science and Engineering*, 17, 2, 30–39. ISSN: 1521-9615.
- [2] Jeffrey Comer, James C Phillips, Klaus Schulten, and Christophe Chipot. 2014. Multiple-replica strategies for free-energy calculations in namd: multiple-walker adaptive biasing force and walker selection rules. *Journal of chemical theory and computation*, 10, 12, 5276–5285.

- [3] Alessandro Laio and Michele Parrinello. 2002. Escaping free-energy minima. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 99, 20.
- [4] Brooke E. Husic and Vijay S. Pande. 2018. Markov state models: from an art to a science. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 140, 7, 2386–2396.
- [5] Gregory R. Bowman, Daniel L. Ensign, and Vijay S. Pande. 2010. Enhanced modeling via network theory: adaptive sampling of markov state models. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 6, 3, 787–794.
- [6] James C Phillips, Rosemary Braun, Wei Wang, James Gumbart, Emad Tajkhorshid, Elizabeth Villa, et al. 2005. Scalable molecular dynamics with namd. *Journal of computational chemistry*, 26, 16, 1781–1802.
- [7] Mark James Abraham, Teemu Murtola, Roland Schulz, Szilárd Páll, Jeremy C Smith, Berk Hess, and Erik Lindahl. 2015. Gromacs: high performance molecular simulations through multi-level parallelism from laptops to supercomputers. *SoftwareX*, 1, 19–25.
- [8] Peter M Kasson and Shantenu Jha. 2018. Adaptive ensemble simulations of biomolecules. *Current opinion in structural biology*, 52, 87–94.
- [9] V. Balasubramanian, A. Treikalis, O. Weidner, and S. Jha. 2016. Ensemble toolkit: scalable and flexible execution of ensembles of tasks. In *2016 45th International Conference on Parallel Processing (ICPP)*. Volume 00, 458–463. DOI: 10.1109/ICPP.2016.59.
- [10] Paulin Coulibaly and Connely K Baldwin. 2005. Nonstationary hydrological time series forecasting using nonlinear dynamic methods. *Journal of Hydrology*, 307, 1-4, 164–174.
- [11] Jörn Behrens, Natalja Rakowsky, Wolfgang Hiller, Dörthe Handorf, Matthias Läuter, Jürgen Pöpke, et al. 2005. Amatos: parallel adaptive mesh generator for atmospheric and oceanic simulation. *Ocean Modelling*, 10, 1-2, 171–183.
- [12] Chiara Casarotti and Rui Pinho. 2007. An adaptive capacity spectrum method for assessment of bridges subjected to earthquake action. *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*, 5, 3, 377–390.
- [13] Zhiling Lan, Valerie E Taylor, and Greg Bryan. 2001. Dynamic load balancing for structured adaptive mesh refinement applications. In *Parallel Processing, 2001. International Conference on*. IEEE, 571–579.
- [14] David E Shaw, Martin M Deneroff, Ron O Dror, Jeffrey S Kuskin, Richard H Larson, John K Salmon, et al. 2008. Anton, a special-purpose machine for molecular dynamics simulation. *Communications of the ACM*, 51, 7, 91–97.
- [15] Harry A. Atwater and Albert Polman. 2010. Plasmonics for improved photovoltaic devices. *Nat. Mater.*, 9, 205–213.
- [16] Simone Napolitano, Emmanouil Glynos, and Nicholas B. Tito. 2017. Glass transition of polymers in bulk, confined geometries, and near interfaces. *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 80, 3.
- [17] Luca Maragliano, Benoît Roux, and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. 2014. Comparison between mean forces and swarms-of-trajectories string methods. *Journal of chemical theory and computation*, 10, 2, 524–533.
- [18] John D Chodera, William C Swope, Jed W Pitner, and Ken A Dill. 2006. Long-time protein folding dynamics from short-time molecular dynamics simulations. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 5, 4, 1214–1226.
- [19] Nina Singhal Hinrichs and Vijay S Pande. 2007. Calculation of the distribution of eigenvalues and eigenvectors in markovian state models for molecular dynamics. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 126, 24, 244101.
- [20] Nina Singhal and Vijay S Pande. 2005. Error analysis and efficient sampling in markovian state models for molecular dynamics. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 123, 20, 204909.
- [21] Ayori Mitsutake and Yuko Okamoto. 2004. Replica-exchange extensions of simulated tempering method. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 121, 6, 2491–2504.
- [22] Yuko Okamoto. 2004. Generalized-ensemble algorithms: enhanced sampling techniques for monte carlo and molecular dynamics simulations. *Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling*, 22, 5, 425–439.
- [23] Volodymyr Babin, Christopher Roland, and Celeste Sagui. 2008. Adaptively biased molecular dynamics for free energy calculations. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 128, 13, 134101.
- [24] Alessandro Barducci, Massimiliano Bonomi, and Michele Parrinello. 2011. Metadynamics. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Comput. Mol. Sci.*, 1, 5, 826–843. ISSN: 17590876. DOI: 10.1002/wcms.31.
- [25] Riccardo Chelli and Giorgio F. Signorini. 2012. Serial Generalized Ensemble Simulations of Biomolecules with Self-Consistent Determination of Weights. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 8, 3, (March 2012), 830–842. ISSN: 1549-9618.
- [26] Marta Mattoso, Jonas Dias, Kary ACS Ocaña, Eduardo Ogasawara, Flavio Costa, Felipe Horta, et al. 2015. Dynamic steering of hpc scientific workflows: a survey. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 46, 100–113.
- [27] Sander Pronk, Iman Pouya, Magnus Lundborg, Grant Rotskoff, Bjorn Wesen, Peter M Kasson, and Erik Lindahl. 2015. Molecular simulation workflows as parallel algorithms: the execution engine of copernicus, a distributed high-performance computing platform. *Journal of chemical theory and computation*, 11, 6, 2600–2608.
- [28] Philip K McKinley, Masoud Sadjadi, Eric P Kasten, and Betty HC Cheng. 2004. Composing adaptive software. *Computer*, 37, 7, 56–64.
- [29] Lorant Janosi and Manolis Doxastakis. 2009. Accelerating flat-histogram methods for potential of mean force calculations. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 131, 5, 054105. ISSN: 1089-7690.
- [30] Vijay S Pande, Kyle Beauchamp, and Gregory R Bowman. 2010. Everything you wanted to know about markov state models but were afraid to ask. *Methods*, 52, 1, 99–105.
- [31] Wil MP van der Aalst and Stefan Jablonski. 2000. Dealing with workflow change: identification of issues and solutions. *Computer systems science and engineering*, 15, 5, 267–276.
- [32] Vivek Balasubramanian, Matteo Turilli, Weiming Hu, Matthieu Lefebvre, Wenjie Lei, Ryan T. Modrak, Guido Cervone, Jeroen Tromp, and Shantenu Jha. 2018. Harnessing the power of many: extensible toolkit for scalable ensemble applications. In *2018 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium, IPDPS 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, May 21-25, 2018*, 536–545. DOI: 10.1109/IPDPS.2018.00063.
- [33] [n. d.] Rabbitmq. <https://www.rabbitmq.com/> (accessed 03/2018). ().
- [34] Andre Merzky, Matteo Turilli, Manuel Maldonado, Mark Santcroos, and Shantenu Jha. 2018. Using pilot systems to execute many task workloads on supercomputers. *Job Scheduling Strategies for Parallel Processing - 22nd International Workshop, JSSPP 2018, Vancouver, 2018*, 61–82. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-10632-44.
- [35] [n. d.] Stress-ng. <http://kernel.ubuntu.com/~cking/stress-ng/stress-ng.pdf> (accessed March 2018). ().
- [36] [n. d.] Openmm. <https://github.com/pandegroup/openmm> (accessed March 2018). ().
- [37] [n. d.] Md trajectories of ala2. https://figshare.com/articles/new_fileset/1026131 (accessed March 2018). ().
- [38] Fugao Wang and D. P. Landau. 2001. Efficient, multiple-range random walk algorithm to calculate density of states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 86, 2050–2053.
- [39] M. R. Shirts and J. D. Chodera. 2008. Statistically optimal analysis of samples from multiple equilibrium states. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 129, 124105.
- [40] Pratyush Tiwary and B. J. Berne. 2016. Spectral gap optimization of order parameters for sampling complex molecular systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. ISSN: 0027-8424. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1600917113. eprint: <http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2016/02/24/1600917113.full.pdf>.