

The reform of hydrodynamic Schrödinger equation and Lagrangian field theory for barotropic inviscid potential flow

Yi-Sian Ciou¹

¹Cross-College Elite Program, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan

September 19, 2024

Abstract

This paper presents a reformed framework to address key issues in the existing hydrodynamic Schrödinger equation (HSE) framework. By disengaging the dependence on particle mass and introducing a correction term to eliminate quantum potential, the framework achieves better alignment with classical fluid mechanics. We define a new operator, designated as “specific Hamiltonian operator,” which ensures that a reformed hydrodynamic Schrödinger equation (RHSE) is derivable from Lagrangian field theory. The RHSE for barotropic inviscid potential flow is developed and validated through Noether’s theorem, demonstrating that the correction imposes the conservation of classical energy. While the resulting equations are highly nonlinear, this approach offers an effective pathway for bridging quantum mechanics and classical fluid mechanics.

Announcement

This is the version of the article before peer review or editing, as submitted by an author to *Fluid Dynamics Research*. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at [INSERT DOI]. The author welcomes constructive feedback and potential collaboration with experts to further refine and enhance this work.

1 Introduction

Quantum computing is not limited to simulations of quantum systems [1]; its application to classical fluid systems has also been explored [2, 3]. However, due to the inherent linearity of quantum mechanics [4], quantum computing is currently constrained to solving linear problems [5]. This limitation has prompted efforts to translate classical problems into forms compatible with quantum mechanics. Through the Madelung transformation [6], the Schrödinger equations (SE) is reformulated into a pair of equations resembling those in fluid mechanics. Subsequently, this has led to the development of various derivative Schrödinger-like equations (e.g., [7, 8]), collectively referred to as the family of hydrodynamic Schrödinger equation (HSE). A key issue in these HSEs is the presence of quantum potential terms (i.e., terms involving the reduced

Planck constant \hbar), which are embedded in their equations of motion. These terms are typically not eliminated but instead analyzed for their physical meaning and effects (e.g., [9, 10]). Consequently, the resulting equations of motion fail to describe classical fluids behavior, as classical fluid mechanics does not contain any term involving \hbar . This discrepancy motivates us to investigate alternative method to eliminate quantum potential terms, without resorting to the classical limit [11, p.96] (i.e., $\hbar \rightarrow 0$). Another issue lies in the dependence of particle mass in these HSEs. In fluid mechanics, matter is generally treated as a continuous medium rather than as discrete molecules, emphasizing a fundamental incompatibility that needs to be addressed within the current HSE framework. The aim of this paper is to address these issues and propose a reformed framework for HSEs that better aligns with the principles of classical fluid mechanics.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Sec. 2, we briefly introduce the Madelung transformation and identify the key limitations of the current HSE framework, which motivate our purposed reform. Then, using barotropic inviscid potential flow as an example, we derive the corresponding “reformed hydrodynamic Schrödinger equation” (RHSE), which is corrected to align with classical fluid mechanics. Sec. 3 demonstrates how to construct the corresponding Lagrangian density for the RHSE derived previously, and applies Noether’s theorem to identify the correction term needed to eliminate the quantum potential term. Finally, Sec. 4 concludes the paper with a summary of our findings and a discussion of future perspectives.

2 Reformed hydrodynamic Schrödinger equation

2.1 The dimension issue and reform

From the perspective of equation structure, the Madelung transformation serves as the bridge between quantum mechanics and fluid mechanics. The Schrödinger equation (SE) reads

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + V \right) \psi. \quad (2.1)$$

By expressing $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) \doteq \sqrt{\rho} \exp(iS/\hbar)$ with real-valued $\rho(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $S(\mathbf{x}, t)$, the SE can be transformed into a pair of equations resembling those in fluid mechanics, namely,

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2(\sqrt{\rho})}{\sqrt{\rho}} - \frac{1}{2m} |\nabla S|^2 - V, \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

which are the Hamilton-Jacobi equation [11, 12] and the continuity equation, respectively. Note that the “velocity” \mathbf{v} is cast as [11]

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{\mathbf{J}}{\rho} = \frac{i\hbar}{2m} \frac{\psi \nabla \psi^* - \psi^* \nabla \psi}{\psi \psi^*} = \frac{\nabla S}{m}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\rho = \psi \psi^*$ denotes the probability density of a particle found in space [7]. The procedure outlined above is known as the Madelung transformation. Later, the physical meaning of ρ was extended to mass density [13–15]. However, such direct transition has led to certain issues. Firstly, while the dimension of wave functions change to $M^{1/2}L^{-3/2}$, the Hamiltonian operator \hat{H} retains its original dimensionality, leading to the dimensional inconsistencies when calculating

expectation values of observables and constructing Lagrangian densities (i.e., functionals' dimension do not align with energy density). Secondly, the phase¹ is, in fact, *Hamilton's principal function* [11, p.96], rather than the *velocity potential* in fluid mechanics. Also, even rescaling the phase (i.e., redefining it to incorporate m) fails to disengage the dependence of mass in the equation of motion, deviating from the nature of formulations in fluid mechanics. Given these key issues, we are motivated to reform the current HSE framework.

In the first step, we assign a velocity potential $\phi(\mathbf{x}, t)$ to the phase of the wave function such that the velocity is precisely expressed by $\nabla\phi$. Next, we introduce a new constant, \hbar_0 , which shares the same dimension as the velocity potential, ensuring that ϕ/\hbar_0 is dimensionless. Accordingly, the wave function in hydrodynamic representation now reads $\psi = \sqrt{\rho} \exp(i\phi/\hbar_0)$. Incidentally, to distinguish \hbar_0 from the reduced Planck constant \hbar , we refer to \hbar_0 as *hydrodynamic Planck constant*. With this changes, we propose the reformed hydrodynamic Schrödinger equation (RHSE)

$$i\hbar_0 \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = \hat{H}\psi, \quad (2.5)$$

where \hat{H} is defined as *specific Hamiltonian operator*, with a dimension of energy per unit mass. The term “specific” is borrowed from thermodynamics, where energy per unit mass is referred to as *specific energy* [16, p.37]. Similar to the Hamiltonian operator, the specific Hamiltonian operator can be decomposed into

$$\hat{H} \equiv -\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \nabla^2 + \frac{\mathcal{V}}{\rho}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ represents the potential energy density which may incorporate nonlinear components. The term “nonlinear” refers to the components that depend on the associated wave function. Notably, the nonlinear potentials incorporated in a given \hat{H} do not accord with their respective counterparts in the corresponding Lagrangian density. However, this discrepancy is reasonable and also appears in the case of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation (GPE), as will be demonstrated in Sec. 3.

Another important aspect about the RHSE framework is that \hbar_0 is a mass-independent quantity satisfying the postulate above. Albeit \hbar_0 and \hbar are related by $[\hbar_0] = [\hbar]M^{-1}$, they cannot be directly linked up by $\hbar_0 = \hbar/m$, as particle mass has no utility in this framework. The RHSE is deliberately formulated without dependence on particle mass, making it more “hydrodynamic” in nature.

2.2 RHSE for barotropic inviscid potential flow

We choose barotropic inviscid potential flow as the focus of our study, as this fluid condition provides a relatively simple “environment” for investigating the compatibility between the proposed framework and Lagrangian field theory. Specifically, the pressure field of a barotropic fluid depends solely on mass density, meaning that it is coupled with the given wave function. While this coupling introduces nonlinearity into the RHSE, the pressure term is not, in fact, the most complex term in either the specific Hamiltonian operator or the corresponding Lagrangian density, as will be demonstrated in the following sections.

¹In the current HSE framework, some authors tend to use the common symbols for velocity potential (e.g., ϕ or θ) to denote the phase of the wave function [13, 15]; however, the dimension of phase matches that of action, i.e., ML^2T^{-1} ; thus, it is more commonly represented by S (a common symbol for action) in the literature [7, 9, 10].

In analogy with the derivation of probability current (detailed in Appendix A), the linear momentum density is cast as

$$\mathbf{J} = \frac{\hbar_0}{2i} (\psi^* \nabla \psi - \psi \nabla \psi^*). \quad (2.7)$$

With $\psi = \sqrt{\rho} \exp(i\phi/\hbar_0)$, we have

$$\nabla \psi = e^{i\phi/\hbar_0} \left(\nabla(\sqrt{\rho}) + \frac{i}{\hbar_0} \sqrt{\rho} \nabla \phi \right), \quad (2.8a)$$

and

$$\nabla \psi^* = e^{-i\phi/\hbar_0} \left(\nabla(\sqrt{\rho}) - \frac{i}{\hbar_0} \sqrt{\rho} \nabla \phi \right). \quad (2.8b)$$

Substitution into Eq. (2.7) gives $\mathbf{J} = \rho \nabla \phi$ so that the velocity is precisely $\nabla \phi$. Next, we shall verify whether Eq. (2.5) would yield the continuity equation and the Bernoulli equation for inviscid potential flow. With

$$\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = e^{i\phi/\hbar_0} \left(\frac{\partial(\sqrt{\rho})}{\partial t} + \frac{i}{\hbar_0} \sqrt{\rho} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} \right), \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 \psi &= \nabla \cdot (e^{i\phi/\hbar_0} \nabla(\sqrt{\rho})) + \frac{i}{\hbar_0} \nabla \cdot (\sqrt{\rho} e^{i\phi/\hbar_0} \nabla \phi) \\ &= e^{i\phi/\hbar_0} \left[\frac{i}{\hbar_0} (2\nabla \phi \cdot \nabla(\sqrt{\rho}) + \sqrt{\rho} \nabla^2 \phi) + \nabla^2(\sqrt{\rho}) - \frac{1}{\hbar_0^2} \sqrt{\rho} |\nabla \phi|^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

substitution of Eq. (2.9) and Eq. (2.10) into Eq. (2.5) leads to

$$i\hbar_0 \frac{\partial(\sqrt{\rho})}{\partial t} = -\frac{i\hbar_0}{2} (2\nabla \phi \cdot \nabla(\sqrt{\rho}) + \sqrt{\rho} \nabla^2 \phi), \quad (2.11)$$

$$-\sqrt{\rho} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \left(\nabla^2(\sqrt{\rho}) - \frac{1}{\hbar_0^2} \sqrt{\rho} |\nabla \phi|^2 \right) + \frac{\mathcal{V}}{\rho} \sqrt{\rho}. \quad (2.12)$$

Multiplying Eq. (2.11) with $2\sqrt{\rho}/i\hbar_0$ and replacing $\nabla \phi$ with \mathbf{v} , we obtain the continuity equation (cf. Eq. 2.3). Dividing Eq. (2.12) by $-\sqrt{\rho}$ leads to

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \phi|^2 + \frac{\mathcal{V}}{\rho} - \frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \frac{\nabla^2(\sqrt{\rho})}{\sqrt{\rho}} = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

which closely resembles the desired Bernoulli equation but involves a quantum potential term. To eliminate it, one may consider the classical limit [11, p.96], namely, in the limit $\hbar_0 \rightarrow 0$, the quantum potential term vanishes. Furthermore, we can also introduce a correction term to eliminate it, assigning

$$\mathcal{V} := \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - 1} p + \rho \Phi + \frac{\rho \hbar_0^2}{2} \frac{\nabla^2(\sqrt{\rho})}{\sqrt{\rho}}, \quad (2.14)$$

where Φ denotes the gravitational potential, and $\mathbf{g} \equiv -\nabla\Phi$ represents the gravitational field; p denotes pressure and γ is the polytropic index, linking up by the polytropic equation of state $p = K\rho^\gamma$ [17, 18]. Substitution of Eq. (2.14) into Eq. (2.13) yields

$$\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\phi|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\frac{p}{\rho} + \Phi = 0. \quad (2.15)$$

Then, taking gradient of Eq. (2.13) and replacing $\nabla\phi$ by \mathbf{v} , we obtain the Euler equation

$$\frac{\partial\mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{v} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\nabla p + \mathbf{g}. \quad (2.16)$$

Note that

$$\nabla\left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\frac{p}{\rho}\right) = \frac{K}{\rho}\gamma\rho^{\gamma-1}\nabla\rho = \frac{1}{\rho}\nabla p. \quad (2.17)$$

In conclusion, we can regard the quantum potential term as an “intermediate” in the process forming the equation of motion for irrotational fluids, namely, it does not hinder us from using RHSE to describe classical fluids. Finally, we obtained the RHSE for barotropic inviscid potential flow:

$$i\hbar_0\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = \left(-\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2}\nabla^2 + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\frac{p}{\rho} + \Phi + \frac{\hbar_0^2}{2}\frac{\nabla^2(\sqrt{\rho})}{\sqrt{\rho}}\right)\psi. \quad (2.18)$$

Incidentally, if the mass density is constant, Eq. (2.18) simply reduces to

$$i\hbar_0\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = \left(-\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2}\nabla^2 + \frac{p}{\rho_0} + \Phi\right)\psi, \quad (2.19)$$

where ρ_0 denotes the constant mass density.

From the above derivation, two key considerations emerge in deriving equations of motion within the RHSE framework: (1) eliminating the resultant terms involving \hbar_0 , as such terms do not exist in classical fluid mechanics; (2) expressing external forces in the form of a potential. While the first requirement can be straightforwardly addressed, as demonstrated earlier, the second presents a significant challenge, particularly in describing compressible viscous flow. In fact, the viscous term in the Navier-Stokes equation can be expressed in terms of Clebsch variables under the constraint of constant mass density, as demonstrated in [19–21]. Meanwhile, the HSEs for rotational flow have been developed in [13–15], utilizing the two-component wave function (or two-component spinor). Building on these foundations, it may be possible to derive the RHSE for *classical* incompressible viscous flow, implying the potential focus of this framework’s development.

3 Lagrangian field theory

3.1 The effective Lagrangian density

It is worthwhile to discuss Lagrangian field theory in this context. Since SE has its corresponding Lagrangian density, it is possible to construct an analogous effective Lagrangian density for the specific RHSE. Given a known RHSE, the introduced correction term complicates the construction of a corresponding Lagrangian density, since its counterpart is unknown and cannot be easily deduced. To address this challenge, we utilize the energy-momentum tensor from

Noether's theorem as a tool to identify the essential counterpart of the correction term. Lastly, the Euler-Lagrange equation (ELE) is applied to verify whether the derived Lagrangian density reproduces the RHSE. Since a detailed interpretation of the underlying principle of Noether's theorem and ELE would need considerable length, we refer the interested readers to the relevant literature [22–24]. In the following, we will not elaborate on these principles but will instead apply them directly to derive the effective Lagrangian density for barotropic inviscid potential flow.

The Lagrangian density for the SE (cf. Eq. (2.1)) reads [22, Eq. (8)]

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{-\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla \psi \cdot \nabla \psi^* + \frac{i\hbar}{2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - \psi \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial t} \right) - \psi^* V \psi. \quad (3.1)$$

Via the ELE for fields given by [23]

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \psi_A} - \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla \psi_A)} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_t \psi_A)} \right) = 0, \quad A = 1, 2, 3, \dots, \quad (3.2)$$

inserting Eq. (3.1) into Eq. (3.2) leads to the SE after some algebra. In the first step, we rewrite the polytropic equation of state $p = K\rho^\gamma$ as

$$p = K|\psi|^{2\gamma} = K(\psi\psi^*)^\gamma. \quad (3.3)$$

Next, in analogy to Eq. (3.1), we assume an effective Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{-\hbar_0^2}{2} \nabla \psi \cdot \nabla \psi^* + \frac{i\hbar_0}{2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - \psi \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial t} \right) - \psi^* \left(\frac{K}{\gamma - 1} |\psi|^{2(\gamma-1)} + \Phi - G \right) \psi, \quad (3.4)$$

where G is an unknown function introduced to eliminate the quantum potential term. To find G , we resort to the energy-momentum tensor

$$T^\mu{}_\nu = \sum_A \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial \psi_A / \partial x^\mu)} \frac{\partial \psi_A}{\partial x^\nu} - \mathcal{L} \delta^\mu{}_\nu, \quad \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (3.5)$$

where we use the contravariant four-vector² $x^\mu = (x^0, x^i) \equiv (t, x, y, z)$, and $\delta^\mu{}_\nu$ is the Kronecker symbol. The component “00” gives the energy density (i.e., Hamiltonian density)

$$\begin{aligned} T^0{}_0 &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_t \psi)} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_t \psi^*)} \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial t} - \mathcal{L} \\ &= \frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} |\nabla \psi|^2 + \frac{K}{\gamma - 1} |\psi|^{2\gamma} + \Phi |\psi|^2 - G |\psi|^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho |\mathbf{v}|^2 + \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} + \rho g z \right) + \frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} |\nabla(\sqrt{\rho})|^2 - G |\psi|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where the second term is recognized as the internal energy density [17, 25], and the last two terms should cancel out. Hence, we assume

$$G |\psi|^2 = \frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} |\nabla(\sqrt{\rho})|^2 = \frac{\hbar_0^2}{8} \frac{|\nabla \rho|^2}{\rho}. \quad (3.7)$$

²Here we adopt the notation in [22] where speed of light is set to 1 so that $x^0 \equiv t$.

To verify this assumption, we substitute Eq. (3.7) into Eq. (3.4), and then insert Eq. (3.4) into the ELE, which, after some algebra (detailed in Appendix B), yields Eq. (2.18). Finally, we derived the effective Lagrangian density for barotropic inviscid potential flow:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{-\hbar_0^2}{2} \nabla\psi \cdot \nabla\psi^* + \frac{i\hbar_0}{2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} - \psi \frac{\partial\psi^*}{\partial t} \right) - \psi^* \left(\frac{K}{\gamma-1} |\psi|^{2(\gamma-1)} + \Phi - \frac{\hbar_0^2}{8} \frac{|\nabla(|\psi|^2)|^2}{|\psi|^4} \right) \psi. \quad (3.8)$$

Notably, expanding Eq. (3.8) using $\psi = \sqrt{\rho} \exp(i\phi/\hbar_0)$ yields a compact expression, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L} = -\rho \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{v}|^2 + \Phi + \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} \right) - \frac{p}{\gamma-1} = p. \quad (3.9)$$

In fact, this surprising result has been discovered in [17]. However, such an expression involving only the pressure is not in a useful form for deriving the equation of motion; one may neglect the gravitational effect so that Eq. (3.9) becomes a functional of the single field ϕ , i.e., [17, Eq. (12)]

$$\mathcal{L} = p = K \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{K\gamma} \right)^{\gamma/\gamma-1} \left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla\phi|^2 \right)^{\gamma/\gamma-1}, \quad (3.10)$$

following an elaborate transformation (detailed in Appendix C). Substituting Eq. (3.10) into the ELE results in a more complex equation of motion, known as the Von Mises equation [17, 18, 26].

3.2 The features arising from nonlinear potentials

From the example above, it is evident that the nonlinear potentials incorporated in the \hat{H} do not accord with their respective counterparts in the corresponding Lagrangian density. To be explicit, consider the pressure term (see from Eq. (2.18), (3.8)), for instance,

$$\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} \frac{p}{\rho} \neq \frac{K}{\gamma-1} |\psi|^{2(\gamma-1)} = \frac{K}{\gamma-1} \frac{\rho^\gamma}{\rho} = \frac{1}{\gamma-1} \frac{p}{\rho}.$$

Note that this discrepancy is reasonable since the partial derivative (i.e., $\partial/\partial\psi^*$) is applied to $|\psi|^n$ when deriving an RHSE via the ELE. A similar feature is also observed in the Gross-Pitaevskii equation (GPE) given by [27, Eq. (1)]

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = \left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + V + \frac{4\pi a\hbar^2}{m} |\psi|^2 \right) \psi \quad (3.11)$$

whose corresponding Lagrangian density reads [28, p.166]

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla\psi \cdot \nabla\psi^* + \frac{i\hbar}{2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} - \psi \frac{\partial\psi^*}{\partial t} \right) - \psi^* \left(V + \frac{2\pi a\hbar^2}{m} |\psi|^2 \right) \psi. \quad (3.12)$$

Apparently, the nonlinear potential energy, $4\pi a\hbar^2 |\psi|^2/m$, partially differs from its counterpart in Eq. (3.12). In addition, this feature causes the expectation value of potential energy to disagree with the actual magnitude of potential energy, e.g.,

$$\int_{\Omega(t)} \psi^* \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} \frac{p}{\rho} \right) \psi d^3\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega(t)} \frac{\gamma p}{\gamma-1} d^3\mathbf{x} \neq \int_{\Omega(t)} \frac{p}{\gamma-1} d^3\mathbf{x},$$

where $\Omega(t)$ denotes the control volume. Similarly, within a control volume, the expectation value of kinetic energy disagrees with the magnitude of classical kinetic energy, namely,

$$\int_{\Omega(t)} \psi^* \left(-\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \nabla^2 \right) \psi \, d^3 \mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega(t)} \frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} |\nabla \psi|^2 \, d^3 \mathbf{x} - \int_{\partial\Omega(t)} \frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} (\psi^* \nabla \psi) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d^2 \mathbf{x}, \quad (3.13)$$

where the first integral on the right-hand side is an analogue of “quantum kinetic energy” within the control volume; $\partial\Omega(t)$ denotes the control surface. Recognizing that $\psi^* \nabla \psi$ in the surface integral contributes to the momentum density (cf. Eq. (2.7)), it becomes evident that the surface integral does not necessarily vanish; instead, its magnitude depends on the specified boundary conditions. Additionally, the absence of the correction term makes the first integral on the right-hand side disagree with the classical kinetic energy. To summarize, in general,

$$\int_{\Omega(t)} \psi^* \hat{H} \psi \, d^3 \mathbf{x} \neq \int_{\Omega(t)} H \, d^3 \mathbf{x}. \quad (3.14)$$

These distinctions highlight the disparity between quantum mechanics and its application to fluid mechanics. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of Noether’s theorem in deriving accurate magnitudes of physical quantities, as opposed to calculating expectation values.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, our goal was to modify the current HSE framework to derive the equations of motion for classical fluids. In Sec. 2.1, we proposed a reformed framework of HSE that disengages dependence on particle mass, aligning it with the nature of continua. Additionally, we defined a new operator, specific Hamiltonian operator \hat{H} , with a dimension of energy per unit mass. These modifications allow Lagrangian field theory to derive the RHSE for specific types of fluids and facilitate identifying the correction term through energy conservation, as demonstrated in Sec. 3. In Sec. 2.2, we demonstrated that introducing a correction term into RHSE produces the Bernoulli equation for barotropic inviscid potential flow without violating energy conservation.

In Sec. 3, during the process of identifying the correction term (see from Eq. (3.6)), we observed that the counterpart of the quantum potential term arises from the quantum kinetic energy, namely,

$$\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} |\nabla \psi|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \rho |\mathbf{v}|^2 + \frac{\hbar_0^2}{8} \frac{|\nabla \rho|^2}{\rho}. \quad (4.1)$$

Designating a term arising from the kinetic term as a potential is conceptually puzzling. Although the physical significance of quantum potential terms has been explored in the literature (e.g., [9, 10]), we prefer to set it aside rather than propose a new interpretation, as the primary goal in our scheme is to eliminate any term involving \hbar_0 . Our approach is effective; however, even under the simplified fluid condition, the RHSE remains highly nonlinear (see from Eq. (B.13)). Before delving into the derivation of a Lagrangian density for more complex flow, we recommend first assessing whether simulations with quantum computing still benefit from the highly nonlinear RHSE. Such an exploration could provide valuable insights into the practical applicability of our framework for solving classical fluid dynamics problems. Ultimately, this approach highlights the potential of bridging quantum mechanics and classical fluid mechanics through the reform and the introduction of correction terms.

Acknowledgment

The author thanks Professor Alessandro Rizzo for his willingness to engage in discussions on the material presented in this paper, and deeply appreciates his generosity in sharing his time and expertise.

A Appendix: The momentum density

For the sake of rigor, this appendix demonstrates the reform yields the correct momentum density. In fact, to derive the momentum density, a known RHSE under specific fluid condition is required, analogous to how calculating the probability current needs the known SE (see [29, p.29-30]).

Recalling the continuity equation (cf. Eq. (2.3)), we expand $\partial\rho/\partial t$ to give

$$\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} = \psi \frac{\partial\psi^*}{\partial t} + \psi^* \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Replacing $\partial\psi/\partial t$ and $\partial\psi^*/\partial t$ by Eq. (2.5) and its complex conjugate, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} &= \psi \left[\frac{-1}{i\hbar_0} \left(-\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \nabla^2 + \frac{\mathcal{V}}{\rho} \right) \psi^* \right] + \psi^* \left[\frac{1}{i\hbar_0} \left(-\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \nabla^2 + \frac{\mathcal{V}}{\rho} \right) \psi \right] \\ &= \frac{\hbar_0}{2i} (\psi \nabla^2 \psi^* - \psi^* \nabla^2 \psi). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Consider

$$\psi \nabla^2 \psi^* = \nabla \cdot (\psi \nabla \psi^*) - \nabla \psi^* \cdot \nabla \psi, \quad (\text{A.3a})$$

$$\psi^* \nabla^2 \psi = \nabla \cdot (\psi^* \nabla \psi) - \nabla \psi \cdot \nabla \psi^*. \quad (\text{A.3b})$$

With these changes, the continuity equation becomes

$$0 = \frac{\hbar_0}{2i} \nabla \cdot (\psi \nabla \psi^* - \psi^* \nabla \psi) + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

so

$$\mathbf{J} = \frac{\hbar_0}{2i} (\psi^* \nabla \psi - \psi \nabla \psi^*) = \rho \nabla \phi. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Incidentally, using the momentum-energy tensor also leads to the same result, i.e.,

$$T^0_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_t \psi)} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x^i} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_t \psi^*)} \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial x^i} = -\rho \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x^i}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

which corresponds to the *negative* momentum density in the i -th direction.

B Appendix: From the Lagrangian density to the RHSE

Recall the assumed Lagrangian density (cf. Eq. (3.4))

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{-\hbar_0^2}{2} \nabla \psi \cdot \nabla \psi^* + \frac{i\hbar_0}{2} \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - \psi \frac{\partial \psi^*}{\partial t} \right) - \frac{K}{\gamma - 1} |\psi|^{2\gamma} - \Phi |\psi|^2 + \frac{\hbar_0^2}{8} \frac{|\nabla \rho|^2}{\rho}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Note that we have replaced $G|\psi|^2$ by $\hbar_0^2|\nabla\rho|^2/8\rho$ (cf. Eq. (3.7)). Calculate

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\psi^*} = \frac{i\hbar_0}{2}\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} - \left(\frac{K\gamma}{\gamma-1}|\psi|^{2(\gamma-1)} + \Phi\right)\psi + \frac{\partial}{\partial\psi^*}\left(\frac{\hbar_0^2}{8}\frac{|\nabla\rho|^2}{\rho}\right), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial\psi^*}\left(\frac{\hbar_0^2}{8}\frac{|\nabla\rho|^2}{\rho}\right) &= \frac{\hbar_0^2}{8}\left(-\frac{|\nabla\rho|^2}{\rho^2}\psi + \frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial(\nabla\rho\cdot\nabla\rho)}{\partial\psi^*}\right) \\ &= -\frac{\hbar_0^2}{8}\frac{|\nabla\rho|^2}{\rho^2}\psi + \frac{\hbar_0^2}{4}\frac{(\nabla\rho\cdot\nabla\psi)}{\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

by

$$\nabla\rho = \nabla(\psi\psi^*) = \psi\nabla\psi^* + \psi^*\nabla\psi. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

For x^0 :

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_t\psi^*)} = -\frac{i\hbar_0}{2}\psi, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_t\psi^*)}\right) = -\frac{i\hbar_0}{2}\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

For x^i :

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla\psi^*)} = -\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2}\nabla\psi + \frac{\partial}{\partial(\nabla\psi^*)}\left(\frac{\hbar_0^2}{8}\frac{|\nabla\rho|^2}{\rho}\right), \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial(\nabla\psi^*)}\left(\frac{\hbar_0^2}{8}\frac{|\nabla\rho|^2}{\rho}\right) = \frac{\hbar_0^2}{4}\frac{1}{\rho}\psi\nabla\rho. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Accordingly,

$$\nabla\cdot\left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla\psi^*)}\right) = -\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2}\nabla^2\psi + \nabla\cdot\left(\frac{\hbar_0^2}{4}\frac{\psi}{\rho}\nabla\rho\right), \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\cdot\left(\frac{\hbar_0^2}{4}\frac{\psi}{\rho}\nabla\rho\right) &= \frac{\hbar_0^2}{4}\left[\nabla\left(\frac{\psi}{\rho}\right)\cdot\nabla\rho + \frac{\psi}{\rho}\nabla^2\rho\right] \\ &= \frac{\hbar_0^2}{4}\left(\frac{\nabla\rho\cdot\nabla\psi}{\rho} - \frac{|\nabla\rho|^2}{\rho^2}\psi\right) + \frac{\hbar_0^2}{4}\frac{\nabla^2\rho}{\rho}\psi. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Finally, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\psi^*} - \nabla\cdot\left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla\psi^*)}\right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_t\psi^*)}\right) \\ &= i\hbar_0\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} - \left(-\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2}\nabla^2 + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\frac{p}{\rho} + \Phi\right)\psi - \frac{\hbar_0^2}{4}\left(\frac{\nabla^2\rho}{\rho} - \frac{|\nabla\rho|^2}{2\rho^2}\right)\psi. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Note that

$$\frac{K\gamma}{\gamma-1}|\psi|^{2(\gamma-1)} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\frac{K\rho^\gamma}{\rho} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\frac{p}{\rho}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Next, since

$$\frac{\hbar_0^2}{4} \left(\frac{\nabla^2 \rho}{\rho} - \frac{|\nabla \rho|^2}{2\rho^2} \right) = \frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \frac{\nabla^2(\sqrt{\rho})}{\sqrt{\rho}}, \quad (\text{B.12})$$

substitution of this into Eq. (B.10) leads to

$$0 = i\hbar_0 \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - \left(-\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \nabla^2 + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} \frac{p}{\rho} + \Phi + \frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \frac{\nabla^2(\sqrt{\rho})}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right) \psi,$$

which reproduces Eq. (2.18). To stress its nonlinearity, we can rewrite it as

$$i\hbar_0 \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar_0^2}{2} \nabla^2 \psi + \Phi \psi + \left[\frac{K\gamma}{\gamma-1} |\psi|^{2(\gamma-1)} + \frac{\hbar_0^2}{4} \left(\frac{\nabla^2(|\psi|^2)}{|\psi|^2} - \frac{|\nabla(|\psi|^2)|^2}{2|\psi|^4} \right) \right] \psi. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

C Appendix: The reformulation of the Lagrangian density

We first rewrite Eq. (2.15) as

$$\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} \frac{p}{\rho} = \frac{K\gamma\rho^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma-1} = - \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \phi|^2 \right), \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where the gravitational potential Φ is intentionally neglected here. Consider the local sound speed c given by [18, Eq. (12)]

$$c^2 = \frac{dp}{d\rho} = K\gamma\rho^{\gamma-1}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Substitution of $K\gamma\rho^{\gamma-1}$ into Eq. (C.1) results in [18, Eq. (13)]

$$c^2 = -(\gamma-1) \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \phi|^2 \right). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

We then rewrite Eq. (C.2) as

$$\rho = \left(\frac{c^2}{K\gamma} \right)^{\gamma-1} = \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{K\gamma} \right)^{\gamma-1} \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \phi|^2 \right)^{\gamma-1}, \quad (\text{C.4})$$

by Eq. (C.3). Consequently, the Lagrangian density becomes [17, Eq. (12)]

$$\mathcal{L} = p = K \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{K\gamma} \right)^{\gamma/\gamma-1} \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \phi|^2 \right)^{\gamma/\gamma-1}. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

References

- [1] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [2] Jeffrey Yepetz. Quantum computation of fluid dynamics. In *NASA International Conference on Quantum Computing and Quantum Communications*, pages 34–60. Springer, 1998.
- [3] Antonio Mezzacapo, M Sanz, L Lamata, IL Egusquiza, S Succi, and E Solano. Quantum simulator for transport phenomena in fluid flows. *Scientific reports*, 5(1):13153, 2015.

- [4] Matt Wilson and Nick Ormrod. On the origin of linearity and unitarity in quantum theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20063*, 2023.
- [5] Romina Yalovetzky, Pierre Minssen, Dylan Herman, and Marco Pistoia. Solving linear systems on quantum hardware with hybrid hhl++. *Dental science reports*, 14(1), 2024. doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-69077-0.
- [6] E. Madelung. Quantentheorie in hydrodynamischer form. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 40(3):322–326, 1927. doi: 10.1007/BF01400372. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01400372>.
- [7] Pierre-Henri Chavanis. Derivation of a generalized schrödinger equation from the theory of scale relativity. *The European Physical Journal Plus*, 132:1–48, 2017.
- [8] Firas Dhaouadi, Nicolas Favrie, and Sergey Gavriluk. Extended lagrangian approach for the defocusing nonlinear schrödinger equation. *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, 142(3): 336–358, 2019.
- [9] David Bohm. A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of" hidden" variables. i. *Physical review*, 85(2):166, 1952.
- [10] M Schönberg. On the hydrodynamical model of the quantum mechanics. *Il Nuovo Cimento (1943-1954)*, 12:103–133, 1954.
- [11] Jun John Sakurai and Jim Napolitano. *Modern quantum mechanics*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [12] Leslie E Ballentine. *Quantum mechanics: a modern development*. World Scientific Publishing Company, 2014.
- [13] Zhaoyuan Meng and Yue Yang. Quantum computing of fluid dynamics using the hydrodynamic schrödinger equation. *Physical Review Research*, 5(3):033182, 2023.
- [14] Albert Chern, Felix Knöppel, Ulrich Pinkall, Peter Schröder, and Steffen Weißmann. Schrödinger’s smoke. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 35(4):1–13, 2016.
- [15] Albert Chern. *Fluid dynamics with incompressible Schrödinger flow*. California Institute of Technology, 2017.
- [16] William Graebel. *Advanced fluid mechanics*. Academic Press, 2007.
- [17] Christian Cherubini and Simonetta Filippi. Classical field theory of the von mises equation for irrotational polytropic inviscid fluids. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 46(11):115501, 2013.
- [18] C Cherubini and S Filippi. Von mises’ potential flow wave equation and nonlinear analog gravity. *Physical Review D—Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology*, 84(12): 124010, 2011.
- [19] Markus Scholle and Florian Marner. The clebsch transformation and its capabilities towards fluid and solid mechanics. *PAMM*, 15(1):483–484, 2015.
- [20] M. Scholle and F. Marner. A generalized clebsch transformation leading to a first integral of navier–stokes equations. *Physics Letters A*, 380(40):3258–3261, 2016. ISSN 0375-9601. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physleta.2016.07.066>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0375960116305205>.

- [21] Markus Scholle, Florian Marner, and Philip H. Gaskell. Potential fields in fluid mechanics: A review of two classical approaches and related recent advances. *Water*, 12(5), 2020. ISSN 2073-4441. doi: 10.3390/w12051241. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/12/5/1241>.
- [22] C Cherubini and S Filippi. Lagrangian field theory of reaction-diffusion. *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, 80(4):046117, 2009.
- [23] Walter Greiner et al. *Relativistic quantum mechanics*, volume 2. Springer, 2000.
- [24] Hans C Ohanian and Remo Ruffini. *Gravitation and spacetime*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [25] R. Von Mises. *Mathematical Theory of Compressible Fluid Flow*. Academic Press, 2012. ISBN 9780323146999. URL <https://books.google.com.tw/books?id=ckoibWfZLAYC>.
- [26] Christian Cherubini and Simonetta Filippi. The hamiltonian field theory of the von mises wave equation: Analytical and computational issues. *Communications in Computational Physics*, 19(3):758–769, 2018. ISSN 1991-7120. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4208/cicp.101114.140715a>. URL http://global-sci.org/intro/article_detail/cicp/11108.html.
- [27] Victor M Perez-Garcia, Humberto Michinel, JI Cirac, M Lewenstein, and P Zoller. Dynamics of bose-einstein condensates: Variational solutions of the gross-pitaevskii equations. *Physical Review A*, 56(2):1424, 1997.
- [28] C. J. Pethick and H. Smith. *Theory of the condensed state*, pages 159–181. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [29] David J Griffiths and Darrell F Schroeter. *Introduction to quantum mechanics*. Cambridge university press, 2019.