

Complex Stochastic Optimal Control Foundation of Quantum Mechanics

Vasil Yordanov

v.yordanov@phys.uni-sofia.bg

Faculty of Physics, Sofia University,

5 James Bourchier blvd., 1164 Sofia, Bulgaria

May 10, 2024

Abstract

Recent studies have extended the use of the stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation to include complex variables for deriving quantum mechanical equations. However, these studies often assume that it is valid to apply the HJB equation directly to complex numbers, an approach that overlooks the fundamental problem of comparing complex numbers to find optimal controls. This paper explores how to correctly apply the HJB equation in the context of complex variables. Our findings significantly reevaluate the stochastic movement of quantum particles within the framework of stochastic optimal control theory. We derived the complex diffusion coefficient in the stochastic equation of motion using the Cauchy-Riemann theorem, considering that the particle's stochastic movement is described by two perfectly correlated real and imaginary stochastic processes. We demonstrated that the derived diffusion coefficient took a form that allowed the HJB equation to be linearized, thereby leading to the derivation of the Dirac equations. These insights deepen our understanding of quantum dynamics and enhance the mathematical rigor of the framework for applying stochastic optimal control to quantum mechanics.

1 Introduction

Using stochastic processes to explain quantum mechanics can be traced back to the works of Fürth [1, 2], Fényes [3], and the stochastic mechanics of Nelson [4, 5]. Nelson's foundational ideas inspired many researchers to expand upon them. Yasue [6] formulated a variational principle in stochastic mechanics. Guerra and Morato [7, 8] were the first to apply Stochastic Optimal Control theory by utilizing two control parameters: current velocity and osmotic velocity. Papiez [9, 10] was among the first authors to apply Stochastic Optimal Control theory and to introduce the concept of complex-valued stochastic processes and an imaginary diffusion coefficient, although his work lacked rigorous mathematical methods. Pavon [11, 12] further expanded on the concept of complex stochastic processes. In his work, he introduced the term "quantum velocity" and described the stochastic component in the equations of motion as "quantum noise".

In his recent works [13, 14], Kuipers also employs complex-valued stochastic processes in Stochastic Mechanics. Recent research by Lindgren [15] has derived non-relativistic quantum mechanical equations from the stochastic HJB equation. Although not explicitly stated in his work, the use of complex diffusion coefficients necessitates that the stochastic equations of motion incorporate complex coordinates and velocities of the particle, while the intermediate action is a complex function of these coordinates. Yang et al. [16], in their work, introduced the concept of complex quantum mechanics, which also relies on the HJB equation. Their study explicitly defines complex stochastic equations of motion and incorporates complex functions and variables within the stochastic HJB framework. In my previous research [17], I extended these ideas by deriving the Dirac equation, assuming a complex equation of motion and applying the HJB equation to complex functions and variables.

Despite the innovative approaches in these papers, all assume that the four-coordinates and the intermediate actions can be straightforwardly replaced with their complex counterparts in the stochastic HJB equation.

This paper mathematically clarifies the correctness of using complex numbers in the HJB equation, as suggested in previous studies. It demonstrates that the formal replacement of real numbers with complex ones in the HJB equation is indeed valid. However, this formal replacement needs to be considered as a system of two HJB equations: one for the real part and one for the imaginary part of the intermediate action J .

We provide mathematical proof that the equations for finding the optimal control policy are consistent with those in the real-valued framework. However, for the complex-valued case, these equations require taking a complex derivative on the intermediate action J . This proof depends on the crucial assumption that both the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ and the intermediate action J can be analytically continued into the complex plane.

During the derivation of the complex HJB equation, we establish that, due to the Cauchy-Riemann equations and the assumption of perfect correlation between the stochastic increments of the real and imaginary coordinates of the particle, the diffusion coefficient in this case is purely imaginary. Moreover, it equals the diffusion coefficient required to linearize the HJB equation to the Dirac equation.

The derivation of the complex HJB equation is based on methodologies outlined in previous research [18, 19, 20, 21]. These works, which derive the HJB equation without considering complex numbers, establish a starting point for extending the equation to incorporate complex variables, as demonstrated in this paper.

2 Derivation of the complex stochastic HJB equation

According to the first postulate of the Stochastic Optimal Control Theory of Quantum Mechanics [17], we assume that the particle moves as a Brownian particle in four-dimensional spacetime, influenced by an external random spacetime force. However, this motion occurs within the complex plane of each four-coordinate component. The complex stochastic equation of motion governing this behavior is given by:

$$dz^\mu = w^\mu ds + \sigma^\mu dW^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.1)$$

where w^μ represents the complex velocity and σ^μ denotes the complex-valued diffusion coefficients, with dW^μ being the increments of a Wiener process that encapsu-

lates the stochastic nature of the particle's trajectory.

As assumed either implicitly or explicitly in referenced above works, it is consider a particle moving within a complex plane. The four-coordinates of this particle are defined as complex numbers, enabling the inclusion of both real and imaginary components to fully describe its position in spacetime. We express these coordinates as follows:

$$z^\mu = x^\mu + iy^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.2)$$

where x^μ and y^μ represent the real and imaginary parts, respectively, and the index μ spans the four dimensions of spacetime, aligning with the notation used in relativistic mechanics.

The velocity of the particle is similarly complexified to account for motions in both the real and imaginary dimensions of the spacetime:

$$w^\mu = u^\mu + iv^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.3)$$

where u^μ and v^μ denote the real and imaginary components of the four-velocity, respectively.

The real and imaginary parts of the stochastic equation of motion of the particle are represented as follows:

$$dx^\mu = u^\mu ds + \sigma_x^\mu dW_x^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.4)$$

$$dy^\mu = v^\mu ds + \sigma_y^\mu dW_y^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.5)$$

where σ_x^μ and σ_y^μ denote the diffusion coefficients, with dW_x^μ and dW_y^μ representing the increments of a Wiener process. These stochastic terms encapsulate the stochastic nature of the particle's trajectory, associated respectively with the stochastic dynamics of the real and imaginary components of the coordinates.

According to the third postulate of Stochastic Optimal Control Theory in Quantum Mechanics, as outlined by [17], Nature tries to minimize the expected value for the action, in which the particle's velocity is consider to be a control parameter of the optimization. Formally the complex action is defined as the minimum of the expected value of stochastic action:

$$S(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{w}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f)) = \min_{\mathbf{w}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f)} \left\langle \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f} ds \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}(s), \mathbf{w}(s), s) \right\rangle_{\mathbf{z}_i}. \quad (2.6)$$

However, this formal definition encounters difficulties because it is not possible to directly find a minimum of a complex-valued function. To address this issue, we redefine the complex action by separating its real and imaginary components, which are then independently optimized:

$$S(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{w}) = S_R(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + iS_I(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), \quad (2.7)$$

where the real and imaginary parts of the action are defined respectively as follows:

$$S_{R,I}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{u}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f), \mathbf{v}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f)) = \min_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f) \\ \mathbf{v}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f)}} \left\langle \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f} ds \mathcal{L}_{R,I}(\mathbf{x}(s), \mathbf{y}(s), \mathbf{u}(s), \mathbf{v}(s), s) \right\rangle_{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, s)$ and $\mathcal{L}_I(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, s)$ are the real and imaginary parts of the Lagrangian of the test particle. These functions depend on the real and imaginary components of the control policies $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$, the and four-coordinates $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ at proper time s . The subscripts $\mathbf{x}_i$ and $\mathbf{y}_i$ on the expectation value indicate that the expectation is calculated over all stochastic trajectories that originate at the complex coordinate $\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{x}_i + i\mathbf{y}_i$.

We define the complex Lagrangian of the particle as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}, s) = \mathcal{L}_R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, s) + i\mathcal{L}_I(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, s), \quad (2.9)$$

such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}, s)$ is the analytic continuation of the Lagrangian of the particle.

The task of optimal control theory [22] is to find the controls $\mathbf{u}(s)$ and $\mathbf{v}(s)$, $\tau_i < s < \tau_f$, denoted as $\mathbf{u}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f)$ and $\mathbf{v}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f)$, that minimizes the expected value of the action $S_{R,I}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{u}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f), \mathbf{v}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f))$.

We introduce the optimal cost-to-go function for any intermediate proper time τ , where $\tau_i < \tau < \tau_f$:

$$J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) = \min_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f) \\ \mathbf{v}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f)}} \left\langle \int_{\tau}^{\tau_f} ds \mathcal{L}_{R,I}(\mathbf{x}(s), \mathbf{y}(s), \mathbf{u}(s), s) \right\rangle_{\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau}. \quad (2.10)$$

We define the complex cost-to-go function as:

$$J(\tau, \mathbf{z}) = J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + iJ_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \quad (2.11)$$

assuming that it is also an analytic function in the complex plane.

By definition, the action $S_{R,I}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{u}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f), \mathbf{v}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f))$ is equal to the cost-to-go function $J_{R,I}(\tau_i, \mathbf{x}_{\tau_i}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau_i})$ at the initial proper time and spacetime coordinate:

$$S_{R,I}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{u}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f), \mathbf{v}(\tau_i \rightarrow \tau_f)) = J_{R,I}(\tau_i, \mathbf{x}_{\tau_i}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau_i}). \quad (2.12)$$

We can rewrite recursive formula for $J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau)$ for any intermediate time τ' , where $\tau < \tau' < \tau_f$:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) &= \\ &= \min_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f) \\ \mathbf{v}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f)}} \left\langle \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} ds \mathcal{L}_{R,I}(s, \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{y}_s, \mathbf{u}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) + \int_{\tau'}^{\tau_f} ds \mathcal{L}_{R,I}(s, \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{y}_s, \mathbf{u}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) \right\rangle_{\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau} \\ &= \min_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f) \\ \mathbf{v}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f)}} \left\langle \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} ds \mathcal{L}_{R,I}(s, \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{y}_s, \mathbf{u}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) + \min_{\mathbf{u}(\tau' \rightarrow \tau_f)} \left\langle \int_{\tau'}^{\tau_f} ds \mathcal{L}_{R,I}(s, \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{y}_s, \mathbf{u}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) \right\rangle_{\mathbf{x}_{\tau'}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau'}} \right\rangle_{\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau} \\ &= \min_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f) \\ \mathbf{v}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f)}} \left\langle \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} ds \mathcal{L}_{R,I}(s, \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{y}_s, \mathbf{u}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) + J(\tau', \mathbf{x}_{\tau'}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau'}) \right\rangle_{\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

In above equation we split the minimization over two intervals. These are not independent, because the second minimization is conditioned on the starting value $x_{\tau'}$, $y_{\tau'}$, which depends on the outcome of the first minimization.

If τ' is a small increment of τ , $\tau' = \tau + d\tau$ then:

$$J_{R,I}(\tau, x_\tau, y_\tau) = \min_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_{\text{f}}) \\ \mathbf{v}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_{\text{f}})}} \langle \mathcal{L}_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau, \mathbf{u}_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau) d\tau + J_{R,I}(\tau + d\tau, \mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) \rangle_{\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau}. \quad (2.14)$$

We must perform a Taylor expansion of J_R and J_I in $d\mathbf{x}$, $d\mathbf{y}$ and $d\tau$. By applying Itô's lemma [23], since $\langle (dx^\mu)^2 \rangle = (\sigma_x^\mu)^2 d\tau$ and $\langle (dy^\mu)^2 \rangle = (\sigma_y^\mu)^2 d\tau$, both of which are of order $d\tau$, we must expand up to the second order in $d\mathbf{x}^2$ and $d\mathbf{y}^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle J_{R,I}(\tau + d\tau, \mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) \rangle_{\mathbf{x}_\tau} = \\ &= \int d\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau} d\mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau} \mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau) J_{R,I}(\tau + d\tau, \mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) = \\ &= \int d\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau} d\mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau} \mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau) \times \\ & \times (J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + d\tau \partial_\tau J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + dx^\mu \partial_{x^\mu} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + dy^\mu \partial_{y^\mu} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + \\ & + dx^\mu dx^\nu \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x^\mu x^\nu} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + dy^\mu dy^\nu \frac{1}{2} \partial_{y^\mu y^\nu} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + dx^\mu dy^\nu \partial_{x^\mu y^\nu} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau)) = \\ &= J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + d\tau \partial_\tau J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + \langle dx^\mu \rangle \partial_{x^\mu} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + \langle dy^\mu \rangle \partial_{y^\mu} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \langle dx^\nu dx^\mu \rangle \partial_{x^\nu x^\mu} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + \frac{1}{2} \langle dy^\nu dy^\mu \rangle \partial_{y^\nu y^\mu} J_{R,I}(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

Here $\mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau)$ is the conditional probability starting from state $(\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau)$ to end up in state $(\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau})$. The integration is over the entire spacetime for $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$.

We can calculate the expected values of dx^μ using Equation (2.4):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle dx^\mu \rangle &= \int d\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau} d\mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau} \mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau) dx^\mu \\ &= \int d\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau} d\mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau} \mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau) (\mathbf{u}^\mu d\tau + \sigma_x^\mu dW^\mu) \\ &= \mathbf{u}^\mu d\tau \int d\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau} d\mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau} \mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau) + \\ & + \int d\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau} d\mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau} \mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau) \sigma_x^\mu dW^\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

From this, we derive that:

$$\langle dx^\mu \rangle = u^\mu d\tau. \quad (2.17)$$

Similarly, we can find the expected value for dy^μ as follows:

$$\langle dy^\mu \rangle = v^\mu d\tau. \quad (2.18)$$

Similarly, the calculation of $\langle dx^\nu dx^\mu \rangle$ is performed using:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle dx^\nu dx^\mu \rangle &= \int d\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau} d\mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau} \mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau) dx^\mu dx^\nu \\
&= \int d\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau} d\mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau} \mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau) (u^\mu d\tau + \sigma_x^\mu dW^\mu) (u^\nu d\tau + \sigma_x^\nu dW^\nu) \\
&= \int d\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau} d\mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau} \mathcal{N}((\mathbf{x}_{\tau+d\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau+d\tau}) | (\mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau), \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \sigma_y^\mu d\tau) \times \\
&\times (u^\mu u^\nu d^2\tau + u^\mu \sigma_x^\mu d\tau dW^\nu + \sigma_x^\mu dW^\mu u^\nu d\tau + \sigma_x^\mu dW^\mu \sigma_x^\nu dW^\nu).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

From the fact that the sum $\sum_{\mu, \nu=0}^3 g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu$ is Lorentz invariant, it is logical to require that the sum $\sum_{\mu, \nu=0}^3 g_{\mu\nu} \langle dx^\mu dx^\nu \rangle$ also remains invariant under Lorentz transformations. Consequently, the integration of this expression will not depend on the choice of the reference frame.

From which we derive:

$$\langle dx^\nu dx^\mu \rangle = 0, \quad \mu \neq \nu; \quad g_{\mu\mu} \langle dx^\mu dx^\mu \rangle = \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_x^\mu d\tau, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \tag{2.20}$$

Respectively, for the imaginary components:

$$\langle dy^\nu dy^\mu \rangle = 0, \quad \mu \neq \nu; \quad g_{\mu\mu} \langle dy^\mu dy^\mu \rangle = \sigma_y^\mu \sigma_y^\mu d\tau, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \tag{2.21}$$

In case there is perfect correlation (correlation coefficient of $\epsilon = \pm 1$) between the stochastic terms dW_x^μ and dW_y^μ of the real (2.4) and imaginary (2.5) stochastic equations of motion, we obtain the following expression for the expected value of the mixed term $dx^\nu dy^\mu$:

$$\langle dx^\nu dy^\mu \rangle = 0, \quad \mu \neq \nu; \quad g_{\mu\mu} \langle dx^\mu dy^\mu \rangle = \epsilon \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_y^\mu d\tau, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \tag{2.22}$$

After substituting the above equations into equation (2.15), we derive the stochastic HJB equation for the real part of our system:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\partial_\tau J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \min_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} (\mathcal{L}_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + u^\mu \partial_{\mathbf{x}^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + v^\mu \partial_{\mathbf{y}^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) + \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \left(\sigma_x^\mu \sigma_x^\mu \partial_{x^\mu}^2 J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + 2\epsilon \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_y^\mu \partial_{x^\mu}^2 \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + \sigma_y^\mu \sigma_y^\mu \partial_{y^\mu}^2 J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

note that in the equation above, we raised the first index of the second derivative of J_R due to the metric tensor used in equations (2.20) and (2.22).

In a similar manner, the equation for the imaginary part is derived:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\partial_\tau J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \min_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} (\mathcal{L}_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + u^\mu \partial_{\mathbf{x}^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + v^\mu \partial_{\mathbf{y}^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) + \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \left(\sigma_x^\mu \sigma_x^\mu \partial_{x^\mu}^2 J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + 2\epsilon \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_y^\mu \partial_{x^\mu}^2 \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + \sigma_y^\mu \sigma_y^\mu \partial_{y^\mu}^2 J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

The optimal control policies $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$, which minimize the expected cost, can be determined from the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{u^\mu} \text{Re}(\mathcal{L}(w^\mu, z)) + \partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= 0, \\
\partial_{v^\mu} \text{Re}(\mathcal{L}(w^\mu, z)) + \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

For the imaginary part of the action, the minimization conditions are obtained from:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{u^\mu} \text{Im}(\mathcal{L}(w^\mu, z)) + \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= 0, \\ \partial_{v^\mu} \text{Im}(\mathcal{L}(w^\mu, z)) + \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= 0.\end{aligned}\tag{2.26}$$

These conditions ensure that the stochastic HJB equations for both the real and imaginary actions are satisfied, leading to the minimum expected value of the action across all possible trajectories of the system. Later, we will prove that the equations derived for the optimal control policies, specifically equations (2.25) and (2.26), are equivalent.

By multiplying equation (2.24) by the imaginary unit i and adding it to equation (2.23), we obtain the combined formal form of the stochastic HJB equation for the complex action.

$$\begin{aligned}-\partial_\tau J(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \min_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} (\mathcal{L}(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + u^\mu \partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + v^\mu \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \\ &+ i u^\mu \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + i v^\mu \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \left(\sigma_x^\mu \sigma_x^\mu \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + 2\epsilon \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_y^\mu \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + \sigma_y^\mu \sigma_y^\mu \partial^{y^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \left(i \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_x^\mu \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + 2i\epsilon \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_y^\mu \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + i \sigma_y^\mu \sigma_y^\mu \partial^{y^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) \right) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \left(\sigma_x^\mu \sigma_x^\mu (\partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) + i \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau)) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \left(-\sigma_y^\mu \sigma_y^\mu (-\partial^{y^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) - i \partial^{y^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau)) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \left(2i\epsilon \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_y^\mu (\partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau) - i \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_\tau)) \right).\end{aligned}\tag{2.27}$$

In the above equation (2.27) we introduce the following notation for the complex minimum. When the operator min is applied to a complex function, we refer to this operator as the complex minimum, which we define using the following equation:

$$A(x, y) + iB(x, y) = \min_{u, v} (C(x, y, u, v) + iD(x, y, u, v)) \iff \begin{cases} A(x, y) = \min_{u, v} (C(x, y, u, v)) \\ B(x, y) = \min_{u, v} (D(x, y, u, v)) \end{cases},\tag{2.28}$$

note that this notation is only applicable if the u and v minimize both functions C and D simultaneously. Later, we will prove that this condition is satisfied for the HJB equation, which justifies the correctness of the above notation.

Since the complex intermediate action $J(\tau, \mathbf{z})$ is analytic, the equation below explicitly defines its complex derivative:

$$\partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z}) = \partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + i \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - i \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\tag{2.29}$$

Furthermore, the Cauchy-Riemann equations, essential for confirming the analyticity of the function, are given by:

$$\partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \quad \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = -\partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}). \quad (2.30)$$

The second complex derivative of the intermediate action is expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^{z^\mu} \partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z}) &= \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + i \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \\ &= -\partial^{y^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - i \partial^{y^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \\ &= \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - i \partial^{x^\mu} \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

Using the above equations, we can simplify the HJB equation:

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_\tau J(\tau, \mathbf{z}) &= \min_{\mathbf{w}} (\mathcal{L}(\tau, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) + w^\mu \partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + i w^\mu \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 (\sigma_x^\mu \sigma_x^\mu - i \sigma_y^\mu \sigma_y^\mu + 2i \epsilon \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_y^\mu) \partial^{z^\mu} \partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z}_\tau) = \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{w}} (\mathcal{L}(\tau, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) + w^\mu \partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu \partial^{z^\mu} \partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z}_\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

Finally, we can formally write the complex HJB equation:

$$-i \partial_\tau J(\tau, \mathbf{z}) = \min_{\mathbf{w}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f)} \left(\mathcal{L}(\tau, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) + w^\mu \partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu \partial^{z^\mu} \partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z}_\tau) \right), \quad (2.33)$$

where the complex diffusion coefficient satisfies

$$\sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu = \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_x^\mu - \sigma_y^\mu \sigma_y^\mu + 2i \epsilon \sigma_x^\mu \sigma_y^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.34)$$

It is crucial to emphasize again that this formal form of the HJB equation is conceptually meaningful only when considering the distinct equations for its real (2.23) and imaginary (2.24) parts.

It is clear from its definition that the boundary condition for $J(\tau, \mathbf{z}_\tau)$ is:

$$J(\tau_f, \mathbf{z}_{\tau_f}) = 0. \quad (2.35)$$

Since $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})$ is an analytic function, the derivative operator and the operator for taking the real part commute. Consequently, equation (2.25) can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(\partial_{u^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})) + \partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= 0, \\ \text{Re}(\partial_{v^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})) + \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

Similarly, from equation (2.26), we can derive the equations for the optimal control that result from minimizing the imaginary part of the intermediate action:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}(\partial_{u^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})) + \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= 0, \\ \text{Im}(\partial_{v^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})) + \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

We will prove that Equations (2.40) and (2.37) are equivalent. To do this, we find the derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{u^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) &= \partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \frac{\partial w^\mu}{\partial u^\mu} = \partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}), \\ \partial_{v^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) &= \partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \frac{\partial w^\mu}{\partial v^\mu} = i \partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}).\end{aligned}\tag{2.38}$$

If we substitute the above derivatives into Equation (2.40), multiply the second equation by the imaginary unit, and add it to the first equation, we obtain:

$$\text{Re}(\partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})) + i \text{Re}(i \partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})) + \partial_{x^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + i \partial_{y^\mu} J_R(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0. \tag{2.39}$$

Similarly, if we substitute the above derivatives into Equation (2.37), multiply the second equation by the imaginary unit, and subtract it from the first equation, we obtain

$$\text{Im}(\partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})) - i \text{Im}(i \partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})) + \partial_{x^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - i \partial_{y^\mu} J_I(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0. \tag{2.40}$$

From the Cauchy-Riemann equation (2.30), the definition of the complex derivative (2.29), and the identities $\text{Re}(Z) + i \text{Re}(iZ) = Z$ and $-\text{Im}(iZ) + i \text{Im}(Z) = Z$, where Z is any complex number, we prove that both equations can be written as:

$$\partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) + \partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0. \tag{2.41}$$

The equation for the optimal control policy, $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u} + i\mathbf{v}$, maintains the same form as that of the real-valued HJB equation. However, it requires taking a complex derivative of the intermediate action, as can be observed.

Once we identify the complex optimal control w_μ^* that satisfies equation (2.41) and substitute it into the complex stochastic HJB equation (2.33), we can eliminate the minimization function. To determine the validity of this operation, it is important to remember that the complex stochastic HJB equation is conceptually meaningful only when considering the distinct equations for its real (equation (2.23)) and imaginary (equation (2.24)) components. By substituting the real $u_\mu^* = \text{Re}(w_\mu^*)$ and the imaginary $v_\mu^* = \text{Im}(w_\mu^*)$ parts of the optimal control into equations (2.23) and (2.24) respectively, this allows us to remove the minimization from these equations. After integrating both equations into a single complex equation, one can verify that the same result is achieved if we formally replace the complex optimal control in equation (3.7).

In the following section, we will illustrate this concept through a specific example by applying a concrete Lagrangian to a relativistic particle in an electromagnetic field.

3 Analytic continuation of the Covariant Relativistic Lagrangian

As an illustration and application of Complex Stochastic Optimal Control theory to a simple relativistic quantum system, we consider the relativistic Lagrangian for a particle in an electromagnetic field, given by:

$$\Lambda = \tilde{\sigma} mc \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma} u^\mu u_\mu} + q A_\mu u^\mu, \tag{3.1}$$

where q represents the charge of the particle and A_μ denotes the 4-vector potential. The symbol $\tilde{\sigma}$ indicates the sign convention for the metric tensor: it takes the value of $+1$ for the metric with diagonal elements $(1, -1, -1, -1)$ and -1 for the metric $(-1, 1, 1, 1)$, as elaborated in [24].

The components of the four-velocity of the particle are related to the speed of light by the equation:

$$u^\mu u_\mu = \tilde{\sigma} c^2. \quad (3.2)$$

This relation, referred to as the “weak equation” by Dirac, allows us to treat u^μ as unconstrained quantities until all differentiation operations have been carried out, at which point we impose the condition of equation (3.2) (see [25] Chapter 7.10). This will be the approach we employ as we seek to minimize the expected value of the stochastic action.

The Lagrangian in equation (3.1) is a real-valued function of real arguments – the coordinates and velocity of the particle. In complex stochastic optimal control, we assume that this Lagrangian is the analytic continuation of the real-valued Lagrangian referenced in equation (3.1).

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}, w^\mu) = \tilde{\sigma} mc \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma} w^\mu w_\mu} + q A_\mu(\tau, \mathbf{z}) w^\mu. \quad (3.3)$$

The “weak equation” should be also analytically continued:

$$w^\mu w_\mu = \tilde{\sigma} c^2. \quad (3.4)$$

The derivative of the complex Lagrangian can be calculated using the “weak equation” (3.4):

$$\partial_{w^\mu} \mathcal{L}(w^\mu, z) = \partial_{w^\mu} (\tilde{\sigma} mc \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma} w^\mu w_\mu} + q A_\mu(\tau, \mathbf{z}) w^\mu) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma} w^\mu w_\mu}} 2w_\mu + q A_\mu(\tau, \mathbf{z}). \quad (3.5)$$

Finally, by substituting Equation (3.5) into Equation (2.41), we obtain the expression for the complex optimal control:

$$w_\mu^* = -\frac{1}{m} (\partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z}) + q A_\mu(\tau, \mathbf{z})). \quad (3.6)$$

If we substitute the analytically continued Lagrangian from Equation (3.3) into the complex HJB equation referenced in Equation (2.33), we obtain:

$$-i\partial_\tau J(\tau, \mathbf{z}) = \min_{\mathbf{w}(\tau \rightarrow \tau_f)} \left(\tilde{\sigma} mc \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma} w^\mu w_\mu} + w^\mu (q A_\mu(\tau, \mathbf{z}) + \partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=0}^3 \sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu \partial^{z^\mu} \partial_{z^\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{z}) \right). \quad (3.7)$$

As noted at the end of Section 2, we can formally remove the minimization function from the above equation by substituting in the complex optimal control policy from equation (3.6). This demonstrates the validity of the formal approach to the complex stochastic HJB equations used to derive the Dirac equation in [17].

4 Stochastic equation of motion for quantum particle

In section 2, we derived equation (2.34) for the complex diffusion coefficient. We would like to emphasize that the imaginary term in this equation results from the assumption of perfect correlation (correlation coefficient of ± 1) between the stochastic terms dW_x and dW_y in the stochastic equation of motion. The concept of correlating the real and imaginary stochastic processes is similar to that introduced in [13].

If we also assume that the real and imaginary diffusion coefficients are equal, and are given by:

$$\sigma_x^\mu \sigma_x^\mu = \sigma_y^\mu \sigma_y^\mu = \frac{\hbar}{m}, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (4.1)$$

note that a similar diffusion coefficient was used by Nelson [4], though he considered forward and backward stochastic processes in time.

Substituting equation (4.2) into equation (2.34), we obtain that the complex diffusion coefficient is purely imaginary:

$$\sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu = 2i\epsilon \frac{\hbar}{m}, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\epsilon = 1$ if the real and imaginary stochastic processes are perfectly positively correlated, and $\epsilon = -1$ if these processes are perfectly negatively correlated.

This leads to the stochastic equations of motion for the particle:

$$dx^\mu = u^\mu ds + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} dW^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (4.3)$$

$$dy^\mu = v^\mu ds + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} dW^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \quad (4.4)$$

In my previous work [17], I demonstrated that to linearize the HJB equation, the diffusion coefficient must satisfy the following equation: $g_{\mu\mu} \sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu = -\frac{2i\epsilon_r \hbar}{m}$, $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$, $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where $\epsilon_r = 1$, $r = 1, 2$ for the particle and $\epsilon_r = -1$, $r = 3, 4$ for the anti-particle. I must acknowledge that the inclusion of the metric tensor term in the above equation was unnecessary. This error stemmed from a mistake in the initial formulation of the HJB equation, where the stochastic term was incorrectly expressed as: $\frac{1}{2} \sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu \partial_{\mu\mu} J(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau)$. It should instead have been $\frac{1}{2} \sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu \partial^\mu \partial_\mu J(\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau)$, to maintain the Lorentz invariance of the sum $\sum_{\mu,\nu=0}^3 g_{\mu\nu} \langle dx^\mu dx^\nu \rangle$ as shown in equations (2.20) and (2.22).

Additionally, I must also correct a second error related to the sign of the complex diffusion coefficient. A detailed examination of the equations in [17] reveals that the sign of the diffusion coefficient should actually be positive. It is important to note that although these errors affect only the stochastic equations of motion for the particle, they do not impact the validity of the derivation of the Dirac equation in [17].

The corrected equations for the diffusion coefficients, derived in [17] from requirements to linearize the HJB equation, are as follows:

$$\sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu = 2i\epsilon_r \frac{\hbar}{m}, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad r = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (4.5)$$

This result demonstrates that the HJB equation can be linearized to obtain the Dirac equation, not by assuming the specific form of the diffusion coefficient in equation (4.5), but by assuming perfect correlation of the real and imaginary stochastic processes that describe the particle’s complex stochastic equation of motion.

Another observation is that, for particles, perfect positive correlation must be assumed, while for antiparticles, perfect negative correlation is necessary.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we demonstrated that it was possible to formally substitute real variables, such as the four-coordinates, control policy, and cost-to-go function, in the HJB equation with complex-valued ones. However, this substitution could only be performed if the complex-valued Lagrangian was defined as an analytical continuation of the system’s real-valued Lagrangian.

We provided a rigorous mathematical procedure for minimizing the expected value of the complex stochastic action of the particle. We showed that the formal structure of the complex HJB equation, as well as the equation for the velocity field (the optimal control policy), remained consistent with that of the real-valued case.

As a consequence of applying the Cauchy-Riemann theorem to the intermediate action (the cost-to-go function) J , and assuming perfect correlation between the real and imaginary stochastic processes, we demonstrated that the diffusion coefficient in the complex stochastic HJB equation took a form that allowed the HJB equation to be linearized, thereby deriving the equations of quantum mechanics.

Acknowledgments

I wish to express my gratitude to Folkert Kuipers for the valuable discussions. He also pointed out the need to consider the perfect correlation of the real and imaginary stochastic terms. I would also like to thank Markku Karhunen for his useful remarks and critical comments, as well as for verifying the mathematical correctness of all equations in this paper.

Bibliography

- [1] Reinhold Fürth. Über einige beziehungen zwischen klassischer statistik und quantenmechanik. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 81(3):143–162, 03 1933.
- [2] Luca Peliti and Paolo Muratore-Ginanneschi. R. fürth’s 1933 paper “on certain relations between classical statistics and quantum mechanics” [“über einige beziehungen zwischen klassischer statistik und quantenmechanik”, *zeitschrift für physik*, 81 143–162]. *The European Physical Journal H*, 48:1–19, 2020.
- [3] Imre Fényes. Eine wahrscheinlichkeitstheoretische begründung und interpretation der quantenmechanik. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 132(1):81–106, 1952.
- [4] Edward Nelson. Derivation of the schrödinger equation from newtonian mechanics. *Phys. Rev.*, 150:1079–1085, Oct 1966.

- [5] Edward Nelson. *Quantum Fluctuations*. Princeton Series in Physics. Princeton University Press, 1985.
- [6] Kunio Yasue. Quantum mechanics and stochastic control theory. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 22(5):1010–1020, 05 1981.
- [7] Francesco Guerra. Structural aspects of stochastic mechanics and stochastic field theory. *Physics Reports*, 77(3):263–312, 1981.
- [8] Francesco Guerra and Laura M. Morato. Quantization of dynamical systems and stochastic control theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 27:1774–1786, Apr 1983.
- [9] L Papiez. Stochastic optimal control quantization of a free relativistic particle, 1981.
- [10] Lech Papiez. Stochastic optimal control and quantum mechanics. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 23(6):1017–1019, 06 1982.
- [11] Michele Pavon. A new formulation of stochastic mechanics. *Physics Letters A*, 209(3):143–149, 1995.
- [12] Michele Pavon. Stochastic mechanics and the Feynman integral. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 41(9):6060–6078, 09 2000.
- [13] Folkert Kuipers. Stochastic mechanics: The unification of quantum mechanics with brownian motion. *Stochastic Mechanics*, 2023.
- [14] Folkert Kuipers. Analytic continuation of stochastic mechanics. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 63(4):042301, 04 2022.
- [15] Jussi Lindgren and Jukka Liukkonen. Quantum mechanics can be understood through stochastic optimization on spacetimes. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), December 2019.
- [16] Ciann-Dong Yang and Shiang-Yi Han. Extending quantum probability from real axis to complex plane. *Entropy*, 23:210, 02 2021.
- [17] Vasil Yordanov. Derivation of dirac equation from the stochastic optimal control principles of quantum mechanics. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):6507, 2024.
- [18] Hilbert J. Kappen. Path integrals and symmetry breaking for optimal control theory. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2005(11):P11011–P11011, nov 2005.
- [19] Hilbert Kappen. Optimal control theory and the linear bellman equation. *Neural Networks*, 08 2011.
- [20] Wendell H. Fleming and H.M. Soner. *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Springer, New York, NY, 2 edition, 2006. Number of Pages: XVII, 429.
- [21] Vasil Yordanov. Derivation of the stochastic hamilton-jacobi-bellman equation, 2023.

- [22] Richard Bellman. The theory of dynamic programming. *Operations Research*, 2(3):275–285, 1954.
- [23] Kiyosi Itô. On a formula concerning stochastic differentials. *Nagoya Mathematical Journal*, 3(none):55 – 65, 1951.
- [24] Alain J. Brizard. On the proper choice of a Lorentz-covariant relativistic Lagrangian. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:0912.0655, December 2009.
- [25] Herbert Goldstein and Charles Poole. *Classical mechanics*. Pearson education asia, Delhi, 3rd ed edition, 2002. Includes subject and author index, selected bibliography.