

# The statistical origin of quantum mechanics

U. Klein

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Linz, A-4040 Linz-Auhof, Austria  
e-mail: ulf.klein@jku.at*

---

## Abstract

It is shown that Schrödinger's equation may be derived from three postulates. The first is a kind of statistical metamorphosis of classical mechanics, a set of two relations which are obtained from the canonical equations of particle mechanics by replacing all observables by statistical averages. The second is a local conservation law of probability. The third is energy conservation in the mean. The fact that Schrödinger's equation may be derived from these premises, which are all purely statistical in character, is interpreted as an argument in favour of the statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics.

*Key words:* Foundations quantum theory, Entanglement, Classical ensembles

*PACS:* 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud, 05.20.Gg

---

## 1. Introduction

The interpretation of quantum theory does neither influence its theoretical predictions nor the experimentally observed data. Nevertheless it is extremely important because it determines the direction of future research. One of the many controversial interpretations of quantum mechanics is the so-called "statistical interpretation" [3]. It presents a minority point of view, which is in opposition to most variants of the Copenhagen interpretation [1], but has been advocated by a large number of eminent physicists, including Einstein. It claims that quantum mechanics is incomplete with regard to the description of single events and that all its dynamic predictions are of a purely statistical nature. This means that, in general, a large number of measurements on identically prepared systems have to be performed in order to verify a prediction of quantum theory.

The origin of the (time-dependent) Schrödinger equation is of course an essential aspect for the interpretation of quantum mechanics. Recently a number of derivations of Schrödinger's equation have been reported which use as a starting point not a particle Hamiltonian but a statistical ensemble. The basic assumptions underlying these works include special postulates about the structure of momentum fluctuations [2], the principle of minimum Fisher information [7], a linear time-evolution law for a complex state variable [5], or the assumption of a classical stochastic force of unspecified form [4]. The work reported in this letter belongs to this class of theories, which do not "quantize" a single particle but a statistical ensemble. It is shown that Schrödinger's equation may be derived from a small number of very general and simple assumptions - which are all of a purely statistical nature. In a first step

an infinite class of statistical theories is derived, containing a classical statistical theory as well as quantum mechanics. In a second step quantum mechanics is singled out as "most reasonable statistical theory" by imposing an additional requirement. This last requirement is conservation of energy in the mean.

## 2. On probability

With regard to the role of probability, three types of physical theories may be distinguished.

1. Theories of type 1 are deterministic. Single events are completely described by their known initial values and deterministic laws (differential equations). Classical mechanics is obviously such a theory. We include this type of theory, where probability does not play any role, in our classification scheme because it provides a basis for the following two types of theories.
2. Theories of type 2 have deterministic laws but the initial values are unknown. Therefore, no predictions on individual events are possible, despite the fact that deterministic laws describing individual events are valid. In order to verify a prediction of a type 2 theory a large number of identically prepared experiments must be performed. We have no problems to understand or to interpret such a theory because we know its just our lack of knowledge which causes the uncertainty. An example is given by classical statistical mechanics. Of course, in order to construct a type 2 theory one needs a type 1 theory providing the deterministic laws.

3. It is possible to go one step further in this direction increasing the relative importance of probability even more. We may not only work with unknown initial values but with unknown laws as well. In these type 3 theories there are no deterministic laws describing individual events, only probabilities can be assigned (so there is no need to mention initial values any more).

Type 2 theories could also be referred to as classical (statistical) theories. Type 3 theories are most interesting because we recognize here characteristic features of quantum mechanics. Of course, we do not expect the yet raw description given under point 3 to cover the whole of quantum mechanics.

Comparing type 2 and type 3 theories, one finds two remarkable aspects. The first is a subtle kind of “inconsistency” of type 2 theories: If we are unable to know the initial values of our observables (at a particular time), why should we be able to know these values during the following time interval (given we know them at a fixed time). In other words, in type 2 theories the two factors determining the final outcome of a theoretical prediction (namely initial values and laws) are not placed on the same (realistic) footing. Type 3 theories do not show this kind of inconsistency.

The second observation is simply that type 2 and type 3 theories have a number of important properties in common. Both are unable to predict the outcome of single events with certainty (only probabilities are provided). In both theories the quantities which may be actually observed - whose time dependence may be formulated in terms of a differential equation - are averaged observables, obtained with the help of a large number of single experiments. These common features lead us to suspect that a general structure might exist which comprises both types of theories.

Such a general structure should consist of a set of (statistical) conditions, which have to be obeyed by any statistical theory. In theories of this kind observables in the conventional sense do not exist. Their role is taken over by random variables. Likewise, conventional physical laws - differential equations for time-dependent observables - do not exist. They are replaced by differential equations for statistical averages. These averages of the (former) observables become the new observables, with the time  $t$  playing again the role of the independent variable. In order to construct such general conditions one needs again (as with type 2 theories) a deterministic (type I) theory as a “parent” theory. Given such a type 1 theory, we realize that a simple recipe to construct a reasonable set of statistical conditions is the following: Replace all observables (of the type 1 theory) by averaged values using appropriate probability densities. In this way the dynamics of the problem is completely transferred from the observables to the probability distributions. This program will be carried through in the next sections, using a model system of classical mechanics as parent theory.

The above construction principle describes an unusual situation, because we are used to considering determinism (concerning single events) as a very condition for doing science. Nevertheless, the physical context, which is referred to is quite simple and clear, namely that nature forbids for some reason deterministic description of single events but allows it at least “on the average”. It is certainly true that we are not accustomed to such a kind of thinking. But to believe or not to believe in such mechanisms of nature is basically a matter of intellectual habit. Also, the fact that quantum mechanics is incomplete does not necessarily imply that a complete theory exists; the opposite possibility, that no deterministic description of nature will ever be found, should also be taken into account.

### 3. Statistical conditions

We study a simple system, a particle in an externally controlled time-independent potential  $V(x)$ , whose motion is restricted to a single spatial dimension (coordinate  $x$ ). We use the canonical formalism of classical mechanics to describe this system. Thus, the fundamental observables of our theory are  $x(t)$  and  $p(t)$  and they obey the differential equations

$$\frac{d}{dt}x(t) = \frac{p(t)}{m}, \quad \frac{d}{dt}p(t) = F(x(t)), \quad (1)$$

where  $F(x) = -\frac{dV(x)}{dx}$ . We now create statistical conditions, associated with the type 1 theory (1), according to the method outlined in the last section. We replace the observables  $x(t)$ ,  $p(t)$  and the force field  $F(x(t))$  by averages  $\bar{x}$ ,  $\bar{p}$  and  $\overline{F}$ , and obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\bar{x} = \frac{\bar{p}}{m} \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}\bar{p} = \overline{F(x)}, \quad (3)$$

The averages in (2),(3) are mean values of the random variables  $x$  or  $p$ ; there is no danger of confusion here, because the symbols  $x(t)$  and  $p(t)$  will not be used any more. In (1) only terms occur, which depend either on the coordinate or the momentum, but not on both. Thus, to form the averages we need two probability densities  $\rho(x, t)$  and  $w(p, t)$ , depending on the spatial coordinate  $x$  and the momentum  $p$  separately. Then, the averages occurring in (2),(3) are given by

$$\bar{x} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \rho(x, t) x \quad (4)$$

$$\bar{p} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp w(p, t) p \quad (5)$$

$$\overline{F(x)} = - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \rho(x, t) \frac{dV(x)}{dx}. \quad (6)$$

Note that  $F(x)$  has to be replaced by  $\overline{F(x)}$  and not by  $F(\bar{x})$ . The probability densities  $\rho$  and  $w$  are positive

semidefinite and normalized to unity. They are time-dependent because they describe the dynamic behavior of this theory.

Relations (2),(3), with the definitions (4)-(6) are, to the best of my knowledge, new. They will be referred to as “statistical conditions”. There is obviously a formal similarity of (2),(3) with Ehrenfest’s relations of quantum mechanics, but the differential equations to be fulfilled by  $\rho$  and  $w$  are still unknown and may well differ from those of quantum theory. Relations (2)-(6) represent general conditions for theories which are deterministic only with respect to statistical averages of observables and not with respect to single events. They cannot be associated to either the classical or the quantum mechanical domain of physics. Many concrete statistical theories (differential equations for the probability distributions) obeying these conditions may exist (see the next section).

These conditions should be supplemented by a local conservation law of probability. Assuming that the probability current is proportional to the gradient of a function  $S$  (this is the simplest possible choice and the one realized in Hamilton-Jacobi theory) this conservation law is for our one-dimensional situation given by the continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(x, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\rho(x, t)}{m} \frac{\partial S(x, t)}{\partial x} = 0. \quad (7)$$

The derivative of  $S(x, t)$  defines a momentum field

$$p(x, t) = \frac{\partial S(x, t)}{\partial x}. \quad (8)$$

In the course of the following calculations the behaviour of  $\rho$  and  $S$  at infinity will frequently be required. We know that  $\rho(x, t)$  is normalizable and vanishes at infinity. More specifically, we shall assume that  $\rho(x, t)$  and  $S(x, t)$  obey the following conditions:

$$\rho A \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } x \rightarrow \pm\infty, \quad (9)$$

where  $A$  is anyone of the following factors

$$1, \quad V, \quad \frac{\partial S}{\partial t}, \quad x \frac{\partial S}{\partial x}, \quad \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)^2. \quad (10)$$

Roughly speaking, condition (9) means that  $\rho$  vanishes faster than  $1/x$  and  $S$  is nonsingular at infinity. Whenever in the following an integration by parts will be performed, one of the conditions (9) will be used to eliminate the resulting boundary term. For brevity we shall not refer to (9) any more; it will be sufficiently clear in the context of the calculation which one of the factors in (10) will be referred to.

We look for differential equations for our three fields  $\rho$ ,  $w$ ,  $S$  which are compatible with (2)-(7). We first try to identify the momentum density  $w(p, t)$ . We replace in (2) the derivative with respect to  $t$  with the help of (7) by a derivative with respect to  $x$  and perform an integration by parts. Then, (2) takes the form

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \rho(x, t) p(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp w(p, t) p. \quad (11)$$

The left hand side of (11) defines the averaged value of the momentum in terms of a spatial integral. In order to solve (11) for  $w(p, t)$  it is convenient to replace the variables  $\rho$ ,  $S$  by new variables  $\psi_1$ ,  $\psi_2$  by

$$\psi_1 = \sqrt{\rho} \cos \frac{S}{s} \quad \psi_2 = \sqrt{\rho} \sin \frac{S}{s}. \quad (12)$$

We may as well introduce the imaginary unit and define the complex field  $\psi = \psi_1 + i\psi_2$ . Then, the last transformation and its inverse may be written as

$$\psi = \sqrt{\rho} e^{i \frac{S}{s}} \quad (13)$$

$$\rho = \psi \psi^*, \quad S = \frac{s}{2i} \ln \frac{\psi}{\psi^*}. \quad (14)$$

We note that so far no new condition or constraint has been introduced; choosing one of the sets of real variables  $\{\rho, S\}$ ,  $\{\psi_1, \psi_2\}$ , or the set  $\{\psi, \psi^*\}$  of complex fields is just a matter of mathematical convenience. Using  $\{\psi, \psi^*\}$  the integrand on the left hand side of (11) takes the form

$$\rho \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} = \psi^* \frac{s}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \psi + \frac{s}{2i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} |\psi|^2. \quad (15)$$

The derivative of  $|\psi|^2$  may be omitted under the integral sign and (11) takes the form

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi^* \frac{s}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \psi = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp w(p, t) p. \quad (16)$$

In order to solve (16) for  $w(p, t)$  we introduce the Fourier transform of  $\psi$ , defined by

$$\psi(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi a}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\bar{p} \phi(\bar{p}, t) e^{\frac{i}{a} \bar{p} x} \quad (17)$$

$$\phi(\bar{p}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi(x, t) e^{-\frac{i}{a} \bar{p} x}. \quad (18)$$

We assign the dimension of an action to the otherwise arbitrary constant  $a$ , which means that  $\bar{p}$  has the dimension of momentum. Performing the Fourier transform one finds that the solutions of (16) are given by

$$w(p, t) = \frac{s}{a^2} |\phi(p, t)|^2 + h(p, t), \quad (19)$$

where the integral over  $ph(p, t)$  has to vanish. If we require, that  $\rho(x, t) = 0$  everywhere (no particles present) implies  $w(p, t) = 0$  for all  $p$ , we may restrict ourselves to the homogeneous solution with  $h(p, t) = 0$ . Finally, using Parseval’s formula and the fact that both  $\rho(x, t)$  and  $w(p, t)$  are normalized to unity we find that  $a = s$ . Thus, there is only a single freely adjustable parameter, say  $s$ , and the momentum probability density we were looking for is given by

$$w(p, t) = \frac{1}{s} |\phi(p, t)|^2. \quad (20)$$

Using the continuity equation (7) and the first statistical condition (2) we found two results which are usually considered as characteristic features of the quantum mechanical formalism. The first is the fact that momentum  $p$  is

represented in coordinate space by a “hermitian operator” as in equation (16). The second is the relation between configuration-space and momentum-space probability density as defined by (14), (20) and the fourier transform (18).

Since  $w(p, t)$  may now be calculated from  $\rho$  and  $S$  we need only one more differential equation for  $\rho$  and  $S$ , (or equivalently for  $\psi$  und  $\psi^*$ ) besides the continuity equation (7) in order to have a statistical theory.

#### 4. Statistical theories

We study now the implications of the second statistical condition (3). Using the variables  $\rho$ ,  $S$  it takes the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \rho \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} = - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \rho \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}. \quad (21)$$

Making again use of (7), we replace in (21) the derivative of  $\rho$  with respect to  $t$  by a derivative with respect to  $x$ . Then, after an integration by parts, the left hand side of (21) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \rho \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} = \\ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \left[ -\frac{1}{2m} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \rho \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Performing two more integrations by parts, a second one in (22) substituting the term with the time-derivative of  $S$ , and a third one on the right hand side of (21), condition (3) takes the final form

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + V \right] = 0. \quad (23)$$

Equation (23) can be considered as an integral equation for the real function  $L(x, t)$  defined by

$$L(x, t) = \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S(x, t)}{\partial x} \right)^2 + V(x, t). \quad (24)$$

Obviously, (23) admits an infinite number of solutions for  $L(x, t)$ , which are given by

$$\frac{\partial \rho(x, t)}{\partial x} L(x, t) = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}, \quad (25)$$

The function  $Q(x, t)$  in (25) has to vanish at  $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$  but is otherwise completely arbitrary.

Equation (25), with fixed  $Q$  and  $L$  as defined by (24), is the second differential equation for our variables  $S$  and  $\rho$  we were looking for, and defines - together with the continuity equation (7) - a statistical theory. The dynamic behavior is completely determined by these differential equations for  $S$  and  $\rho$ . On the other hand, the dynamic equation - in the sense of an equation describing the time-dependence of observable quantities - is given by (2) and (3).

From the subset of functions  $Q$  compatible with Galilei invariance we list the following three possibilities for  $Q$  and the corresponding  $L$ . The simplest solution is

$$Q = 0, \quad L = 0. \quad (26)$$

The second  $Q$  depends only on  $\rho$ ,

$$Q \sim \rho^n, \quad n \geq 1, \quad L \sim n\rho^{n-1}. \quad (27)$$

The third  $Q$  depends also on the derivative of  $\rho$ ,

$$Q \sim \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \sqrt{\rho} \right)^2, \quad L \sim \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\partial x^2}. \quad (28)$$

We discuss first (26). The statistical theory defined by (26) consists of the continuity equation (7) and [see (24)] the Hamilton-Jacobi equation,

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S(x, t)}{\partial x} \right)^2 + V(x, t) = 0. \quad (29)$$

The fact that (29) agrees with the Hamilton-Jacobi equation does not imply that this theory is a type 1 theory (making predictions about individual events). This is not the case; many misleading statements concerning this limit may be found in the literature. It is a statistical theory whose observables are statistical averages. However, Eq. (29) becomes a type 1 theory if it is considered separately - and embedded in the theory of canonical transformations. The crucial point is that (29) does not contain  $\rho$ ; otherwise it could not be considered separately. This separability - or equivalently the absence of  $\rho$  in (29) - implies that this theory is a classical (type 2) statistical theory [8]. The function  $S$  may be interpreted as describing the individual behavior of particles in the given environment (potential  $V$ ). The identity of the particles described by  $S$  is not influenced by statistical correlations because there is no coupling to  $\rho$  in (29). The classical theory defined by (7) and (29) may also be formulated in terms of the variables  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$  (but not as a single equation containing only  $\psi$ ). In this form it has been discussed in several works [9, 8, 6].

All theories with nontrivial  $Q$ , depending on  $\rho$  or its derivatives, should be classified as “nonclassical” (or type 3) according to the above analysis. In nonclassical theories any treatment of single events (calculation of trajectories) is impossible due to the coupling between  $S$  and  $\rho$ . The problem is that single events are nevertheless real and observable. There must be a kind of dependence (correlation of nonclassical type, entanglement) between these single events. But this dependence cannot be described by concepts of deterministic theories like “interaction”.

The theory defined by Eq. (27) is a type 3 theory. We will not discuss it in detail because it may be shown (see the next section) to be unphysical. It has been listed here in order to have a concrete example from the large set of insignificant type 3 theories.

The theory defined by Eq. (28) is also a type 3 theory. Here, the second statistical condition takes the form

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)^2 + V - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\partial x^2} = 0, \quad (30)$$

if the free proportionality constant in (28) is fixed according to  $\hbar^2/m$ . The two equations (7) and (30) may be rewritten in a more familiar form if the transformation (14) (with  $s = \hbar$ ) to variables  $\psi$ ,  $\psi^*$  is performed. Then, both equations are contained (as real and imaginary parts) in the single equation

$$-\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} + V\psi, \quad (31)$$

which is the one-dimensional version of Schrödinger's equation [10]. Thus, quantum mechanics belongs to the class of theories defined by the above conditions. We see that the statistical conditions (2), (3) comprise both quantum mechanics and classical mechanics; these relations express a “deep-rooted unity” [11] of these fields.

Of course, Eq. (31) may also be derived using the variables  $\psi$ ,  $\psi^*$  from the beginning. We give an outline of this calculation which is quite instructive in some respects. Using  $\psi$ ,  $\psi^*$  the continuity equation (7) takes the form

$$\left[ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - i \frac{s}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} + iW(x,t)\psi \right] \psi^* + c.c. = 0. \quad (32)$$

This looks similar to (31) [the function  $W(x,t)$  is arbitrary and could be set equal to  $V(x)$ ] but (32) is a one-component relation which yields only the real part of (31). In a second step, Eq. (3) is rewritten in terms of  $\psi$ ,  $\psi^*$  and a number of rearrangements are performed. These include an integration by parts, which requires the boundary condition

$$\frac{1}{\psi\psi^*} \left( \frac{\partial \psi \psi^*}{\partial x} \right)^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } x \rightarrow \pm\infty \quad (33)$$

to be valid, and lead to the conclusion that (3) is fulfilled provided the condition

$$\left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - i \frac{s}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} + i \frac{V}{s} \psi \right) \frac{s}{2} \psi^* - c.c. = 0 \quad (34)$$

holds. Eqs. (34) and (32) together imply (31). Roughly speaking, the continuity equation and the second statistical condition provide the real and imaginary parts respectively of Schrödinger's equation.

We found an infinite number of statistical theories which are all compatible with our basic conditions and are all on equal footing so far. However, only one of them, quantum mechanics, is realized by nature. This situation leads us to ask which further conditions are required to single out quantum mechanics from this set. Knowing such condition(s) would allow us to have premises which imply quantum mechanics.

The above analysis shows that (31) can be derived from the condition that the dynamic law for the probabilities takes the form of a *single* equation for  $\psi$  (instead of two equations for  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$  as is the case for all other theories). This may be considered an answer [5], but we are not satisfied with this formal criterion and would like to replace it by a different condition which leads to the same conclusion but may be formulated in more physical terms.

## 5. Energy conservation

In deterministic theories conservation laws - and in particular the energy conservation law which will be considered exclusively here - are a logical consequence of the basic equations; there is no need for separate postulates in this case. In statistical theories energy conservation with regard to time-dependence of single events is of course meaningless. However, a statistical analog of this conservation law may be formulated as follows: “The statistical average of the random variable energy is time-independent”. In the present framework it is expressed by the relation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp w(p,t) \frac{p^2}{2m} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \rho(x,t) V(x) \right] = 0. \quad (35)$$

We will use the abbreviation  $\overline{E} = \overline{T} + \overline{V}$  for the bracket where  $\overline{T}$  denotes the first and  $\overline{V}$  denotes the second term respectively. Here, in contrast to the deterministic case, the fundamental laws [namely (2), (3), (7)] do not guarantee the validity of (35). It has to be implemented as a separate statistical condition. In fact, Eq. (35) is very simple and convincing; it seems reasonable to keep only those statistical theories which obey the statistical version of the fundamental energy conservation law.

Eq. (35) will be considered as a condition for the unknown function  $Q$ . More precisely, we consider variables  $\rho$  and  $S$  which are solutions of the two basic equations (25) and (7). The quantity  $Q$  in (25) may be a function of  $\rho$ ,  $S$ , its derivatives and/or of  $x$ ; there is no restriction at all as far as its functional form is concerned. We calculate the probability functions defined by the solutions  $\rho$  and  $S$  and look which functional forms of  $Q$  are compatible with the requirement (35).

In a first step we rewrite the statistical average of  $p^2$  in (35) as an integral in configuration space. The result is

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp w(p,t) p^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi^* \left( \frac{s}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right)^2 \psi, \quad (36)$$

as may be verified using (20) and (18). Using (36) and transforming to  $\rho$ ,  $S$ , the first term in the bracket in (35) takes the form

$$\overline{T} = -\frac{s^2}{2m} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \left\{ -\frac{1}{4\rho} \left( \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\rho}{s^2} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \frac{i}{s} \left[ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} + \rho \frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial x^2} \right] \right\}. \quad (37)$$

The imaginary part of the integrand as well as the second derivative of  $\rho$  do not contribute to the integral. We next calculate the time derivative of the remaining two terms and perform an integration by parts. Then, the first part of (35) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{T}}{dt} = \frac{1}{2m} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \left\{ \left[ \frac{s^2}{4\rho^2} \left( \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x} \right)^2 - \frac{s^2}{2\rho} \frac{\partial^2\rho}{\partial x^2} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right] \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} - 2 \left[ \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} + \rho \frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial x^2} \right] \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

If we add the time derivative of  $\bar{V}$  to (38) we obtain the time derivative of  $\bar{E}$ , as defined by the left hand side of (35). In the integrand of the latter expression the following term occurs

$$\left[ \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)^2 + 2mV \right] \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} - 2 \left[ \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} + \rho \frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial x^2} \right] \frac{\partial S}{\partial t}. \quad (39)$$

The two brackets in (39) may be rewritten with the help of (7) and (25). Then, the term (39) takes the much simpler form

$$2m \left( \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t}. \quad (40)$$

Using (38) and (40) our statistical condition (35) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{E}}{dt} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \left[ \frac{s^2}{8m\rho^2} \left( \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right. \\ \left. - \frac{s^2}{4m\rho} \frac{\partial^2\rho}{\partial x^2} + \left( \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} \right] \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The bracket in Eq. (41) has to vanish because (41) must hold for arbitrary  $\rho$ . Finally, combining the first two terms in (41) to a single one, we find that (35) is fulfilled provided the derivative of  $Q$  is given by

$$\left( \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} = \frac{s^2}{2m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2\sqrt{\rho}}{\partial x^2}. \quad (42)$$

This result agrees with our previous guess (28) and leads (for  $s = \hbar$ ) to Schrödinger's equation (31). Thus, we have shown that quantum mechanics is the *only* statistical theory which fulfills the statistical energy conservation law (35).

## 6. Concluding remarks

We discussed a class of theories which are not based on special postulates concerning stochastic forces or probability distributions, but on the general assumption that dynamical predictions are only possible for statistical averages and not for single events - leaving completely open the question *why* predictions on single events are impossible. This concept, which has been realized here for a simple model system but can without any doubt be applied

to more general situations, leads to so called “statistical conditions”. The latter admit a large number of different theories, i.e. differential equations for the basic variables  $\rho$  and  $S$ . We found a classical theory and an infinite number of nonclassical theories. The terms “classical” and “nonclassical” have been defined in terms of the coupling between  $S$  and  $\rho$ . One of the nonclassical theories is quantum mechanics. If in addition conservation of energy in the mean is required the only surviving theory is quantum mechanics. This requirement, which seems quite natural, eliminates, in particular, the classical theory. Considered from this point of view, quantum mechanics seems “more reasonable” than its classical limit. We believe that the present results are important for questions of interpretation of the quantum mechanical formalism. The fact that Schrödinger's equation may be derived from three postulates which are all of a purely statistical nature, seems to be a strong argument in favour of an ensemble interpretation of quantum mechanics [3].

## References

- [1] J. A. Barrett. *The Quantum Mechanics of Minds and Worlds*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999.
- [2] M. J. Hall and M. Reginatto. Schrödinger equation from an exact uncertainty principle. *J. Phys. A*, 35:3289–3303, 2002.
- [3] D. Home and M. A. B. Whitaker. Ensemble interpretations of quantum mechanics. a modern perspective. *Physics Reports*, 210(4):223–317, May 1992.
- [4] G. Kaniadakis. Statistical origin of quantum mechanics. *Physica A*, 307(1):172–184, 2002.
- [5] U. Klein. Schrödinger's equation with gauge coupling derived from a continuity equation. e-print <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/0810.2394>.
- [6] H. Nikolic. Classical mechanics without determinism. *Found. Phys. Lett.*, 19:553–566, 2006.
- [7] M. Reginatto. Derivation of equations of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics using the principle of minimum fisher information. *Phys. Rev. A*, 58:1775–1778, 1998.
- [8] N. Rosen. The relation between classical and quantum mechanics. *Am. J. Phys.*, 32:597–600, 1964.
- [9] R. Schiller. Quasi-classical theory of the nonspinning electron. *Phys. Rev.*, 125(3):1100–1108, February 1962.
- [10] Erwin Schrödinger. Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem, Erste Mitteilung. *Annalen der Physik*, 79:361, 1926.
- [11] D. Sen, S. K. Das, A. N. Basu, and S. Sengupta. Significance of Ehrenfest theorem in quantum-classical relationship. *Current Science*, 80:536–541, 2001.