

On the dual structure of the Schrödinger dynamics

Kazuo Takatsuka^{a)}

(Dated: 3 April 2025)

This paper elucidates the dual structure of the Schrödinger dynamics in two correlated stages: (1) We first derive the real-valued Schrödinger equation from scratch without referring to classical mechanics, wave mechanics, nor optics, and thereby attain a concrete and clear interpretation of the Schrödinger (wave) function. Beginning with a factorization of the density distribution function of the particles to two component vectors in configuration space, we impose very simple conditions on them such as translational invariance of space-time and the conservation of flux under a given potential function. Then the Dirac-Frenkel variational principle linearizes the equation of continuity to give the Schrödinger equation, which effectively works to pick the most probable one among the possible densities that are compatible with the space-time translational invariance and flux conservation under a given initial condition. A real-valued path-integral is formulated as a Green function for the real-valued Schrödinger equation. (2) We then study a quantum stochastic path dynamics in a manner compatible with the Schrödinger equation. The relation between them is like the Langevin dynamics with the diffusion equation. Each quantum path describes a “trajectory” in configuration space representing, for instance, a singly launched electron in the double-slit experiment that leaves a spot one by one at the measurement board, while accumulated spots give rise to the fringe pattern as predicted by the absolute square of the Schrödinger function. We start from the relationship between the Ito stochastic differential equation, the Feynman-Kac formula, and the associated parabolic partial differential equations, to one of which the Schrödinger equation is transformed. The physical significance of the quantum intrinsic stochasticity and the indirect correlation among the quantum paths and so on are discussed. The self-referential nonlinear interrelationship between the Schrödinger functions (regarded as a whole) and the quantum paths (as its parts) is identified as the ultimate mystery in quantum dynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION

Even one hundred years after the birth, understanding and interpretation about quantum mechanics^{1–8} remain unsettled, with no tight consensus to this day.^{9–12} The controversy often centers around the mysterious nature of the Schrödinger (wave) function. Besides, it is a common practice to rest on the Schrödinger equation alone in the study of quantum dynamics. In reality, however, the Schrödinger dynamics has a dual structure; the dynamics described by the Schrödinger equation and the dynamics subjected to quantum path dynamics. The dual structure is analogous to the diffusion theory, where the Langevin dynamics coexists with the diffusion equation. To comprehend the entire Schrödinger dynamics, therefore, it is essential to study not only the Schrödinger equation but also quantum path dynamics and the various properties arising from them.

The critical role of the dual structure is well illustrated in terms of the double-slit experiment. The so-called interference fringe patterns formed by repeated launch of electrons one-by-one are described by the absolute square of the Schrödinger function. Yet, the Schrödinger equation does not necessarily care about the dynamics of individual particles. It is the theory of quantum path dynamics that is responsible for it. In this paper, we clarify the dual structure of the Schrödinger dynamics along with the accompanying physical phenomena and

concepts. Our goal is to fill in the gaps in the framework of Schrödinger dynamics that cannot be fully understood through the Schrödinger equation alone.

The issues addressed in this paper are as follows. (1) Rederivation of the real-valued Schrödinger equation from scratch to reexamine its physical meaning. Although the Schrödinger equation is already well established, we need to start from the very bottom in order to link to the quantum path dynamics. (2) Then follows the derivation of quantum stochastic path dynamics based on the Ito stochastic differential equation and the Feynman-Kac formula of statistical mechanics. (3) Finally, outcomes from the self-referential nonlinear relations between the Schrödinger function and quantum stochastic paths will be discussed.

The above three items are described a little more precisely as follows.

(1) To begin with, the presence of the imaginary number unit $i = \sqrt{-1}$ in the Schrödinger equation seems to make its physical meaning and foundation rather obscure and biased. In fact, the imaginary numbers do not appear in the quantum stochastic path dynamics. We therefore rebuild the real-valued Schrödinger equation in a manner free from any of the historical interpretations.^{9–12} For instance, we deny the idea that the Schrödinger function represents some kind of “wave”, since it will not lead to the notion of quantum stochastic paths. Moreover, as Schrödinger originally did, deriving the Schrödinger equation from other mechanics such as the Hamilton-Jacobi equation does not seem to be appropriate, simply because the Schrödinger equation itself should be more fundamental than others. We start from the vec-

^{a)}kaztak@fukui.kyoto-u.ac.jp

tor factorization of the real-space distribution function for particle distribution and impose the minimal physical requirements to reach the Schrödinger equation. The “local velocity field” obtained in this process turns out to correspond to the velocity drift term in the Ito stochastic differential equation for quantum dynamics. A path-integral in real configuration space is formulated as the Green function of the real-valued Schrödinger equation, which is a quantum mechanical extension of the Feynman-Kac formula.

(2) Our derivation of quantum stochastic path dynamics follows the pioneering work by Nagasawa,^{13,14} who established a quantum theory based on the one-to-one correspondence between parabolic real-valued partial differential equations and the Ito stochastic equations. Here in this work, we start from the relationship between the Feynman-Kac formula,^{15–17} Ito stochastic differential equation, and the Schrödinger equation. The attained stochastic differential equation consists of the velocity drift term and the Wiener process of “quantum diffusion constant”. It turns out that the velocity drift terms appear to be a function of the Schrödinger function.

(3) The total ensemble of thus generated quantum stochastic paths should reproduce the overall dynamics of the Schrödinger function, and therefore the individual quantum paths and the Schrödinger function are in a self-referential nonlinear relationship. There is no coherent interaction among the quantum paths. Yet, through the nonlinear relationship the individual quantum paths are indirectly correlated with each other, explaining why one-by-one electron launching in the double-slit experiment leads to the fringe pattern after accumulation of all.

(4) Based on the above findings we discuss the physical consequences of the dual structure. First we clarify that the quantum-mechanical Wiener process serves as an intrinsic element to quantum path dynamics. To illustrate it, we show that the scaling law in the Wiener process reproduces the energy eigenvalues of the hydrogen atom and the Bohr radius with no use of the Bohr model or the de Broglie wavelength. The stochasticity is also regarded as one of the physical origins of the uncertainty relation. In an effort to clarify the physical meaning of the velocity drift term, we derive the quantum-mechanical canonical equations of motion and the Newtonian equation for quantum stochastic path dynamics, highlighting the fundamental differences between the quantum paths and classical trajectories. With respect to the quantum entanglement and associated symmetry, we suggest that the Wiener process breaks the entanglement (detangles) even in case where the Schrödinger equation has no mechanism to do so.

The discussion on the entanglement and detanglement could provide critical insights into the well-known discussions initiated by the EPR paper¹⁸ such as reality and non-locality along with hidden variables.^{9–12} However, this paper does not address the theory of quantum measurement. Various postulates and hypotheses intro-

duced from outside the Schrödinger equation, such as the instantaneous collapse of the wave packet and the wave function of universe, may be commented only when relevant, but the philosophical discussion will not be made.

This paper is structured as follows: In Sec. II we derive the real-valued Schrödinger equation and study the relevant properties. Section III follows with the quantum stochastic path dynamics. Some significant properties arising from the quantum stochasticity are shown in Sec. IV. The properties of the quantum stochastic paths are featured in Sec. V. The present paper concludes with some remarks in Sec. VI.

II. REAL-VALUED SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION FROM SCRATCH AND THE SCHRÖDINGER VECTORS AS A COHERENT DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION

It is widely documented^{9–11,19} that Schrödinger assumed his function $\psi(q, t)$ in the form $W = K \log \psi(q, t)$, and substituted it into the Hamilton-Jacobi equation and then applied a variational method to arrive at the stationary-state Schrödinger equation $\hat{H}\tilde{\psi}(q) = E\tilde{\psi}(q)$. Later he noticed the correspondence $\hat{p} \leftrightarrow \hbar/i\nabla$ and $\hat{H} \leftrightarrow i\hbar\partial/\partial t$, thereby “creating” the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. The constant K is afterward identified to be the Planck constant \hbar by comparison with the experimental discoveries like the Compton effect⁴. The similarity of the Schrödinger equation with the geometrical optics has been also widely pointed out.²⁰ The “derivation” led Schrödinger himself to an interpretation that $\psi(q, t)$ should represent a physical wavepacket. However, this view was quickly refuted by Lorentz and later by Schrödinger himself.¹² After all of much controversy, the Schrödinger equation is now safely regarded as an axiom. Besides, $\psi(q, t)$ is not observable in itself. And, M. Born later asserted $\psi(q, t)^*\psi(q, t)$ to be a “probability density” for the relevant states to be found.^{9–12}

Knowing that various theories have been proposed to back the Schrödinger equation,^{1–12} we here attempt to derive the real-valued Schrödinger equation in a simple yet purely mathematical manner, starting from the particle distribution function $\rho(q, t)$ and its factorization in a matrix form.

A. Real-valued Schrödinger equation

1. From the configuration-space density distribution function

We start with $\rho(q, t)$, a density distribution function of particles in configuration space q . First, we recall the physical interpretation of its classical counterpart. The classical Liouville phase-space distribution function $\Gamma(q, p, t)$ can be represented in classical trajectories (ray solutions), each never mutually crossing in (q, p, t) -space. *It represents an ensemble of independent*

dynamics of different initial conditions. This property of $\Gamma(q, p, t)$ already reminds us of some interpretation of the Schrödinger function. Note however that $\Gamma(q, p, t)$ is not necessarily a probability distribution function. As a simple example of classical dynamics, we consider an ensemble of free particles on a zero (or constant) potential function $V(q)$. The related Liouville distribution function (unnormalized) is assumed to be

$$\Gamma(q, p, 0) = \delta(p - p_0) \text{ in } q \in [q_1(t), q_2(t)]. \quad (1)$$

The position–momentum uncertainty relation inherent to quantum mechanics basically requires the classical phase-space view of particle dynamics to be abandoned. We also discuss in Section IV that the stochasticity of the quantum paths leads to a divergence in classical velocity, that is, $\lim_{\Delta q \rightarrow 0, \Delta t \rightarrow 0} \Delta q / \Delta t$ does not necessarily exist and $q(t)$ is not differentiable almost everywhere. We are hence forced to give up the phase-space description (we are not talking about the phase-space quantum mechanics like the Wigner phase-space representation^{21,22} in this stage). However, the configuration space distribution function $\rho(q, t)$ reduced by

$$\rho(q, t) = \int dp \Gamma(q, p, t) \quad (2)$$

remains as a meaningful quantity as an observable. It is natural to suppose that $\rho(q, t)$ induces an incompressible flow in q -space due to the particle number conservation, which gives rise to the equation of continuity.

2. Factorization of $\rho(q, t)$ and its dynamics

Suppose a distribution $\rho(q, t)$ is present at hand. We then factorize it in such a manner as

$$\rho(q, t) = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) & \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} = \bar{\psi}(q, t)^T \bar{\psi}(q, t) \quad (3)$$

with

$$\bar{\psi}(q, t) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Since $\rho(q, t)$ is positive semidefinite everywhere, we may choose both $\phi_r(q, t)$ and $\phi_c(q, t)$ to be real-valued functions and they can be negative. The configuration space distribution $\rho(q, t)dq$ in a small volume element is also factored to

$$\rho(q, t)dq = \left[\bar{\psi}(q, t)^T dq^{1/2} \right] \left[\bar{\psi}(q, t) dq^{1/2} \right] \quad (5)$$

with the half density $dq^{1/2}$, the implication of which will be discussed in the context of semiclassical mechanics.^{23–25} It would be appropriate to refer to $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$

as a quantum distribution amplitude function. The corresponding dimensionality of momentum is retrieved in the vector space as in Eq. (4).

The dimensionality of the factorizing vectors $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ is not mathematically limited to two. However, it will actually turn out later that the very basic Schrödinger dynamics emerges from this frame.

3. A simple example

Back to the trivial example of Eq. (1) we may consider a “pure distribution”

$$\rho(q, t) = 1.0 \text{ in } q \in [q_1(t), q_2(t)], \quad (6)$$

after integration over p in Eq. (2). The information about classical momentum therefore seems totally lost. Here in this example, we may choose $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$, among others, with no loss of generality as

$$\phi_r(q, t) = \cos\left(\frac{p_0}{K}q + \chi\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_c(q, t) = \sin\left(\frac{p_0}{K}q + \chi\right), \quad (7)$$

in $q \in [q_1(t), q_2(t)]$ and zero otherwise, since $\phi_r^2(q, t) + \phi_c^2(q, t) = \rho(q, t) = 1.0$. K is an arbitrary constant having the physical dimension of action, and χ is an arbitrary constant. K will be determined later.

B. Basic conditions to establish the dynamics of $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$

To capture the dynamics of $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ in the real-value field, we impose the following basic and universal constraints on $\rho(q, t)$ of Eq. (3).

- 1) The translational invariance of configuration space q in the Euclidean space.
- 2) Translational invariance of time. The Lorentz invariance is not imposed.
- 3) Conservation of the number of particles. The creation-annihilation process in vacuum is out of the scope in this paper.

1. Translational invariance of free configuration space

By shifting the coordinate $q \rightarrow q + \Delta q$, $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ results in

$$\bar{\psi}(q, t) \rightarrow \tilde{\psi}(q + \Delta q, t). \quad (8)$$

Since each vector has a freedom of rotation in addition to the space shifting, $\tilde{\psi}(q + \Delta q, t)$ is demanded to undergo the following transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\psi}(q + \Delta q, t) &= \exp\left(\Delta q \mathbf{A} \vec{\nabla}_q\right) \bar{\psi}(q, t) \\ &= \left(\mathbf{I} + \Delta q \mathbf{A} \vec{\nabla}_q\right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} + (\text{higher}), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where \mathbf{A} is a 2×2 real matrix, and

$$\tilde{\psi}(q + \Delta q, t)^T = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) & \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \exp\left(\Delta q \mathbf{A}^T \vec{\nabla}_q\right), \quad (10)$$

with T indicates the matrix transposition. Then the identity

$$\tilde{\psi}(q + \Delta q, t)^T \tilde{\psi}(q + \Delta q, t) = \bar{\psi}(q, t)^T \bar{\psi}(q, t) \quad (11)$$

demands that

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\psi}(q + \Delta q, t)^T \tilde{\psi}(q + \Delta q, t) - \bar{\psi}(q, t)^T \bar{\psi}(q, t) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) & \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \left[\mathbf{A}^T \vec{\nabla}_q + \mathbf{A} \vec{\nabla}_q \right] \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \Delta q = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The invariance requires

$$\mathbf{A}^T = -\mathbf{A}, \quad (13)$$

and therefore we may set

$$\mathbf{A} = c_p \mathbf{J}, \quad (14)$$

where \mathbf{J} is a 2×2 unit symplectic matrix (or called the standard symplectic matrix)^{26,27} defined as

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

The basic property of \mathbf{J} is

$$\mathbf{J}^2 = -\mathbf{I}, \quad (16)$$

already reminding of $i^2 = -1$ and

$$\mathbf{J}^{-1} = -\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{J}^T. \quad (17)$$

The constant c_p is to be determined later.

According to the spirit of Noether theorem²⁶ and more precisely to the discussion about the displacement operator and linear momentum by Dirac,¹ we may define the momentum operator as

$$\hat{p} = c_p \mathbf{J} \vec{\nabla}_q. \quad (18)$$

Equation (12) suggests that \hat{p} should be operated in such a manner that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) & \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \hat{p} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

The constant c_p is to be determined using the example presented back in Eq. (7). The sine-cosine factorization along with the definition Eq. (18) gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) & \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \hat{p} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{p_0}{K} c_p. \quad (20)$$

It is natural that this value is made equivalent to p_0 , that is, $-\frac{p_0}{K} c_p = p_0$ and therefore $c_p = -K$. Further, the quantum experiments like the Compton effect⁴ demands that

$$K = \hbar \quad (21)$$

and we have

$$\hat{p} = -\hbar \mathbf{J} \nabla. \quad (22)$$

2. Translational invariance in time

As for the translational invariance in time

$$\tilde{\psi}(q, t + \Delta t)^T \tilde{\psi}(q, t + \Delta t) = \bar{\psi}(q, t)^T \bar{\psi}(q, t), \quad (23)$$

the similar procedure in Eq. (12) to Eq. (18) is applied and after all gives a quantum energy (Hamiltonian) \hat{H} in the form

$$\hat{H} = c_t \mathbf{J} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad (24)$$

where \hat{H} is to be operated as in

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_r & \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \left(c_t \mathbf{J} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r & \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \hat{H} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

The explicit form of \hat{H} along with the constant value of c_t will be determined later.

3. The equation of continuity for $\rho(q, t) = \bar{\psi}(q, t)^T \bar{\psi}(q, t)$

We next scrutinize the direct consequence of incompressibility of $\rho(q, t)$ in terms of the equation of continuity. Consider an analogy to classical incompressible flow

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho(q, t) = -\nabla \cdot \vec{j}(q, t) \quad (26)$$

with the flux being defined

$$\vec{j} = \vec{v} \rho, \quad (27)$$

with the local velocity $\vec{v}(q, t)$. Equation (19) suggests that the quantum flux should be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{j} &= \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) & \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \frac{\hat{p}}{m} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -\frac{\hbar}{m} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) & \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{J} \begin{pmatrix} \vec{\nabla} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \vec{\nabla} \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{\hbar}{m} \left(\phi_r \vec{\nabla} \phi_c - \phi_c \vec{\nabla} \phi_r \right) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

with the help of Eq. (22). The continuity equation (26) in this context, which is referred to also as the law of flux conservation, is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_r \ \phi_c) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} &= -\frac{\hbar}{2m} \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\phi_r \vec{\nabla} \phi_c - \phi_c \vec{\nabla} \phi_r) \\ &= -\frac{\hbar}{2m} (\phi_r \ \phi_c) \vec{\nabla}^2 \begin{pmatrix} \phi_c \\ -\phi_r \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (\phi_r \ \phi_c) \left(-\mathbf{J} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m\hbar} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where we have used

$$\hat{p}^2 = -\hbar^2 \mathbf{J}^2 \nabla^2 = \hbar^2 \nabla^2 \mathbf{I}. \quad (30)$$

C. The real-valued Schrödinger equation to pick the most likely state

1. Case of free field

Among those $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ satisfying Eq. (29), we aim at the robust (stable) ones that are subject to the following variational condition

$$(\phi_r + \delta\phi_r \ \phi_c + \delta\phi_c) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{J} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m\hbar} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r + \delta\phi_r \\ \phi_c + \delta\phi_c \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (31)$$

This is equivalent to imposing the so-called Dirac-Frenkel variational principle with respect to ϕ_r and ϕ_c , giving rise to the left variation

$$(\delta\phi_r \ \delta\phi_c) \left(\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{J} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (32)$$

and the right counterpart. Due to the arbitrariness of $(\delta\phi_r \ \delta\phi_c)$, the above condition for the the dynamics of $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ reads

$$\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = -\mathbf{J} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

Or multiplying \mathbf{J} on the both sides, we have

$$\hbar \mathbf{J} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (34)$$

which is a prototype of the Schrödinger equation in the present representation.

Since Eq. (29) is quadratic in $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$, the stationary state point of Eq. (31) is located at the point where the relevant density of states appears with the highest possibility in the functional space, and therefore $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ satisfying Eq. (34) should represent the most likely state under a given initial condition. The Schrödinger function thus optimizes to orchestrate the possible internal states in a coherent manner.

2. Case of the presence of the finite potential function ($V(q, t) \neq 0$)

Suppose we have a scalar function $f(q)$. Back in Eq. (29), we notice that the presence of $f(q)\mathbf{J}$ does not affect it

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_r \ \phi_c) \left(\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \\ = (\phi_r \ \phi_c) \left(-\mathbf{J} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \mathbf{J} f(q, t) \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

due to the skew orthogonality

$$(\phi_r \ \phi_c) (\mathbf{J} f(q, t)) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = f(q, t) (\phi_r \ \phi_c) \mathbf{J} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = 0 \quad (36)$$

for any scalar function $f(q, t)$. A natural choice of $f(q, t)$ is

$$f(q, t) = -V(q, t) \quad (37)$$

with $V(q, t)$ being a relevant system potential function, because

$$\hat{H} = \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + V(q, t) \quad (38)$$

should represent the system energy. Therefore the variational condition is extended such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta\phi_r \ \delta\phi_c) \left(\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \\ = (\delta\phi_r \ \delta\phi_c) \mathbf{J} \left(-\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} - \mathbf{V}(q, t) \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

which imposes an external condition $V(q, t)$ on the flux. Thus the variational principle demands the following expression

$$\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = -\mathbf{J} \hat{H} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (40)$$

or

$$\hbar \mathbf{J} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = \left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + V \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}. \quad (41)$$

By comparing this expression with Eq. (24), we find $c_t = 1$.

The Schrödinger equation in the present representation is summarized as follows:

$$\hat{H} = \mathbf{J} \hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{p} = -\mathbf{J} \hbar \vec{\nabla} \quad (42)$$

for the real-valued vector

$$\bar{\psi}(q, t) = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (43)$$

$\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ is referred to as the Schrödinger vector in what follows and should be distinguished from the Dirac state vector $|\Psi\rangle$.¹

D. Some relevant properties of the real-valued Schrödinger equation

1. The Heisenberg dynamics

From Eq. (40) it follows that for an arbitrary time-independent operator \hat{A}

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) & \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \hat{A} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\hbar} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r & \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \left(\mathbf{J}^T \hat{H} \hat{A} + \hat{A} \hat{H} \mathbf{J} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{\hbar} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r & \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \left[\hat{H}, \hat{A} \right] \mathbf{J} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

with $[\hat{H}, \hat{A}] = \hat{H}\hat{A} - \hat{A}\hat{H}$, where the Hamiltonian \hat{H} of Eq. (38) is assumed to be Hermitian for the square integrable (L^2) functions $(\phi_r \ \phi_c)^T$. Equation (44) gives just the Heisenberg equation of motion in the real-valued space. Putting $\hat{A} = \hat{H}$, the conservation of energy is readily seen. The extension to time dependent operators $\hat{A}(t)$ is obvious.

2. Time reversal equation

Rewrite Eq. (41) in the form

$$\mathbf{P}_3 \hbar \mathbf{J} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{P}_3 \left(-\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + V(q, t) \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (45)$$

where

$$\mathbf{P}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (46)$$

Since

$$\mathbf{P}_3 \mathbf{J} = -\mathbf{J} \mathbf{P}_3, \quad (47)$$

we can proceed to

$$-\hbar \mathbf{J} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{P}_3 \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} = \left(-\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + V(q, t) \right) \mathbf{P}_3 \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

which is

$$-\hbar \mathbf{J} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ -\phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} = \left(-\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + V(q, t) \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ -\phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (49)$$

By replacing $t \rightarrow -t$, we have the time-reversal form of the Schrödinger equation

$$\hbar \mathbf{J} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, -t) \\ -\phi_c(q, -t) \end{pmatrix} = \left(-\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + V(q, -t) \right) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, -t) \\ -\phi_c(q, -t) \end{pmatrix} \quad (50)$$

In looking at Eq. (50), it would be instructive to recall that the time reversal in a classical path $(q(t), p(t))$ is $q_{rev}(-t) = q(t)$ and $p_{rev}(t) = -p(-t)$.

3. Shift to the complex number field: The canonical Schrödinger equation

The symplectic form of two component vectors in the real number field is essentially equivalent to the complex scalar field (see Eq. (16)), under setting

$$\mathbf{J} \rightarrow i. \quad (51)$$

Then the Hamiltonian and the momentum in Eq. (42) respectively read

$$\hat{H} = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \quad (52)$$

and

$$\hat{p} = -i\hbar \vec{\nabla}, \quad (53)$$

which are to be operated on a scalar function

$$\psi(q, t) = \phi_r(q, t) + i\phi_c(q, t), \quad (54)$$

with $\bar{\psi}(q, t) \leftrightarrow \psi(q, t)$. The real-valued vector Schrödinger equation (40) is transformed to the canonical Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(q, t) &= \hat{H} \psi(q, t) \\ &= \left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + V \right) \psi(q, t). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Conversely, the separation of Eq. (55) to the real and imaginary parts gives back Eq. (41). Also from the expression of Eq. (50), we have the time-reversal counterpart

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi^*(q, -t) = \hat{H} \psi^*(q, -t). \quad (56)$$

It is obvious that the complex-valued equation of motion, Eq. (55) is far easier to handle both mathematically and numerically. In particular, the extension of the Schrödinger vector to the Dirac equation with the higher order vector factorization is technically far more tedious than the complex algebra. Nevertheless, the present representation is more than instructive to understand what the Schrödinger equation and function are.

4. Velocity and energy fields with vector rotation

The normalization of the Schrödinger vector $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ is rather straightforward. It satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} -(\mathbf{J} \bar{\psi}(q, t))^T \wedge \bar{\psi}(q, t) &= \begin{vmatrix} \phi_c(q, t) & -\phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_r(q, t) & \phi_c(q, t) \end{vmatrix} \\ &= \phi_r(q, t)^2 + \phi_c(q, t)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Hence, it is normalizable as

$$\int dq \bar{\psi}(q, t)^T \wedge (\mathbf{J}\bar{\psi}(q, t)) = 1, \quad (58)$$

the functional form of Eq. (58) reminds of the Poincaré-Cartan theorem of integral invariance in classical mechanics.²⁶

There are basically two ways of normalization. One is to resort to the usual average (expectation value), for instance,

$$E^{\text{av}} = \langle \hat{H} \rangle = \frac{\int dq (\phi_r(q, t) \ \phi_c(q, t)) \hat{H} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix}}{\int \rho(q, t) dq}. \quad (59)$$

The other is a space-time local distribution

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\text{local}}(q, t) &= \frac{1}{\rho} (\phi_r(q, t) \ \phi_c(q, t)) \hat{H} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{\hbar}{\rho} (\phi_r \partial_t \phi_c - \phi_c \partial_t \phi_r) \\ &= \text{Re} \frac{\hat{H}\psi}{\psi}, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

from which the energy eigenvalue problem is already seen. Likewise the space-time distribution of the velocity is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}^{\text{local}}(q, t) &= \frac{1}{\rho} (\phi_r(q, t) \ \phi_c(q, t)) \frac{\hat{p}}{m} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{\hbar}{m\rho} (\phi_r \vec{\nabla} \phi_c - \phi_c \vec{\nabla} \phi_r) \\ &= \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Im} \frac{\vec{\nabla}\psi}{\psi}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

This class of normalization arises because the physical quantities like E^{av} and $\bar{v}^{\text{local}}(q, t)$ should be homogeneous of degree zero in $\bar{\psi}$.

The last line of Eq. (61) will appear in the relationship between the Feynman-Kac formula, the diffusion equation, and Ito stochastic differential equation later in Sec. III. The comparison of Eq. (60) and Eq. (61) under setting $\phi_c(q, t) \equiv 0$ suggests why the real-valued Schrödinger function must be a two component vector and equivalently why the original Schrödinger function has to be complex-valued.

We next consider the physical meaning of the local velocity of Eq. (61) and local energy of Eq. (60). Let us write the Schrödinger vector $\bar{\psi}(q, t) = (\phi_r \ \phi_c)^T$ in a polar coordinate with the length and rotation angle such that

$$\bar{\psi}(q, t)^T = \rho(q, t)^{1/2} (\cos \theta(q, t) \ \sin \theta(q, t)), \quad (62)$$

which is equivalent to the complex-valued Schrödinger function represented as

$$\psi(q, t) = \rho(q, t)^{1/2} \exp(i\theta(q, t)) \quad (63)$$

as in the Bohm representation.^{3,28–30} (Note that the Bohm representation is not about the derivation of the Schrödinger equation but its alternative expression.) Then it holds that

$$\bar{v}^{\text{local}}(q, t) = \frac{\hbar}{m} \vec{\nabla} \theta(q, t) \quad (64)$$

and

$$E^{\text{local}}(q, t) = \hbar \partial_t \theta(q, t). \quad (65)$$

Therefore, the local velocity is essentially equivalent to the rate of the vector rotation in q space at a given time, while the local energy is proportional to the speed of angular rotation at a given q . Therefore it is rational to imagine that an implicit “vector rotation” is equipped as an intrinsic machinery in the Schrödinger dynamics. Since this “vector rotation” is defined at each point (q, t) , it may be referred to as “internal rotation” of the Schrödinger vector. Thus a particle at a point q is to be sent forward to a next point with the velocity of the local rotation. Indeed, $\bar{v}^{\text{local}}(q, t)$ will appear in the next section as a drift velocity to drive a quantum stochastic dynamics. Equation (65) shows that the stationary states are materialized when the conditions

$$E^{\text{local}}(q, t) = \hbar \partial_t \theta(q, t) = E \quad (\text{constant}) \quad (66)$$

with

$$\hat{H}\psi = E\psi. \quad (67)$$

Equations (64) and (65), suggest that $\hbar \vec{\nabla} \theta(q, t)$ looks similar to the classical action. This fact partly underlies the “derivation” of the Schrödinger equation by himself. We will study the role of $\theta(q, t)$ in a great detail in the context of the dynamics of quantum stochastic paths and the associated quantum canonical equation of motion in Secs. III and V.

E. $\rho(q, t)$ and $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$

The density $\rho(q, t)$ is generally a mixture of innumerable “possible physical phenomena”, which cannot necessarily be unfolded into independent ones in principle. Likewise, $\psi(q, t)$ represents a “coherent” distribution amplitude for an ensemble of theoretically possible events to happen in quantum level and is natural to be referred to as quantum distribution amplitude function. It is therefore inappropriate to regard that a single Schrödinger function describes a singly isolated phenomenon or event. It is also wrong to regard a Schrödinger function as a dynamical function materializing a physical substance. Instead, the above derivation of the Schrödinger equation allows us to regard $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ as a “back-ground mathematical machinery” to materialize the most probable $\rho(q, t)$ among those satisfying the space-time translational invariance and the flux conservation under a given initial

condition. Thus the Schrödinger equation is not a given axiom. It bears the mechanical role and function.

As for the wave-particle duality, it is now widely denied to regard $\psi(q, t)$ as a representation of a wave of any physical substance.^{9–12} The wave-like nature of $\psi(q, t)$ emerges from the linearity of the Schrödinger equation, which was born by the variational principle of Eq. (31). The linearity in turn naturally brings about the superposition principle. However, it should be noted that the linearity does not always lead to the properties deduced from the Huygens principle, such as diffraction, bifurcation, specific interference, and so on. As for the Huygens-like principle in the Schrödinger wavepacket dynamics, we refer to ref. 31 and 32.

We confirm that the dynamics of the Schrödinger vector $\bar{\psi}(q, t)$ does not have the internal mechanism of instantaneous collapse. (See, however, ref. 33 for a review on this matter in different perspectives.) It is well known that the semiclassical wavepacket can diverge to a delta-function at caustics and turning points. However the mechanism of quantum smoothing of those divergences are well analyzed²⁵ and the seeming divergence has nothing to do with the instantaneous collapse claimed by the so-called Copenhagen interpretation.^{9–12} The quantum path dynamics denies the necessity of such collapse in the reality of dynamics, as will be discussed in the next section.

F. Quantum path integrals in the real-valued configuration space

We close this section by formulating an extension of the Feynman-Kac formula as the Green function of the real-valued Schrödinger equation, thereby suggesting the existence of stochastic path dynamics behind quantum mechanics.

We first revisit the Feynman path integrals for the kernel,^{6,34–36} which is

$$\begin{aligned} K(q, t) &= \left\langle q \left| \exp\left(\frac{1}{i\hbar}\hat{H}t\right) \right| 0 \right\rangle \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int d^3 q_1 \cdots \int d^3 q_N \left(\frac{m}{2\pi i \hbar \Delta t}\right)^{3(N+1)/2} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \sum_{k=0}^N \left(\frac{m}{2} \frac{(q_{k+1} - q_k)^2}{\Delta t} - V(q_k) \Delta t\right)\right] \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

with $\Delta t = t/(N+1)$. As seen in Eq. (68), it is expressed in term of the democratic summation of continuous polylines (broken lines), each connecting two neighboring positions q_k and q_{k+1} of an infinitesimal distance. This kernel is somewhat similar to the Wiener path-integrals for the Brownian motion (shown later in order in Eq. (72)). However, the integral measure is not well defined as is in Eq. (68),^{37,38} and the convergence after summation is not mathematically secured. No dynamics is

imposed on each line or “path”. Therefore each path may be regarded as a “basis function” to expand the kernel.³⁹ The simultaneous interference among the paths through the coherent summation is the very core of the theory. For instance, the stationary-phase paths often play a predominant role leading to a semiclassical mechanics.^{4,35,36}

We next briefly outline the path integrals in statistical mechanics. The time propagation of the diffusion equation of a diffusion constant D

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(q, t) = (D\nabla^2 - \lambda V(q))\Phi(q, t) \quad (69)$$

is well known to have the following coordinate representation as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(x, t + \Delta t) &= \frac{1}{(4\pi D \Delta t)^{1/2}} \\ &\times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \exp\left[-\Delta t \left(\frac{1}{4D} \left(\frac{x-y}{\Delta t}\right)^2 + \lambda V(y, t)\right)\right] \Phi(y, t), \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

and accordingly the path integral representation for a finite time propagation^{15–17} gives the Green function of Eq. (69), which is

$$\begin{aligned} G(q, t) &= \int_{\Omega(q, t; 0, 0)} \exp\left[-\lambda \int_0^t V(s, X_s(\omega)) ds\right] dP_{W(q, t; 0, 0)}(\omega), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where $\Omega[q, t; 0, 0]$ is a set of paths reaching from $(0, 0)$ to (q, t) , and ω specifies as a member of Ω , and $dP_{W(q, t; 0, 0)}(\omega)$ is the Wiener measure of the Brownian motion, or more explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} G(q, t) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(4\pi D \Delta t)^{N/2}} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_k \\ &\quad \times \exp\left[-\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \Delta t \left(\frac{1}{4D} \frac{(\Delta q_k)^2}{\Delta t} + \lambda V(q_k, t_k)\right)\right] \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

with $t_k = k\Delta t$, $q_k = q(t_k)$, $q_0 = 0$, $q_n = q$, $\Delta q_k = q_{k+1} - q_k$, and with $G(q, 0) = \delta(q)$. The mathematical similarity between $G(q, t)$ in Eq. (72) and the Feynman kernel of Eq. (68) is obvious. Indeed, Kac was inspired by Feynman’s path integrals to construct his formula.¹⁵ However, the Feynman-Kac path integral is mathematically rigorous, but not necessarily so is the Feynman path integration due to the lack of a well-defined integral measure.

Our problem of Eq. (73) is the real-valued Schrödinger equation Eq. (41), which is rewritten as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} = \left(D\nabla^2 - \frac{V(q)}{\hbar}\right) \mathbf{J} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (73)$$

or shortly

$$\frac{d}{dt}\bar{\psi}(q, t) = \left(D\nabla^2 - \frac{1}{\hbar}V(q) \right) \mathbf{J}\bar{\psi}(q, t), \quad (74)$$

for the Schrödinger vector. It is immediately noticed that the quantum dynamics Eq. (73) is formally very similar to the statistical counterpart Eq. (69) with a correspondence $D = \hbar/2m$ and $\lambda = 1/\hbar$. Formally Eq. (73) is integrated as

$$\bar{\psi}(t + \Delta t) = \exp \left[(D\nabla^2 - \lambda V(q)) \mathbf{J}\Delta t \right] \bar{\psi} \quad (75)$$

for a short time Δt . We take the first order expansion of this exponential operator such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\psi}(t + \Delta t) &\simeq (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{J}) \bar{\psi}(t) \\ &+ \mathbf{J} \exp \left[(D\nabla^2 - \lambda V(q)) \Delta t \right] \bar{\psi}(t) \\ &= (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{J}) \bar{\psi}(t) + \mathbf{J} \frac{1}{(4\pi D\Delta t)^{1/2}} \\ &\times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \exp \left[-\Delta t \left(\frac{1}{4D} \left(\frac{x-y}{\Delta t} \right)^2 + \lambda V(y, t) \right) \right] \bar{\psi}(y, t), \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

where \mathbf{I} denotes the 2×2 unit matrix. Further, we may proceed with the Gaussian representation of the Dirac delta function

$$\delta(x-y) = \frac{1}{(4\pi D\Delta t)^{1/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \exp \left[-\Delta t \left(\frac{1}{4D} \left(\frac{x-y}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \right) \right] \quad (77)$$

with $\Delta t \rightarrow +0$ to rewrite $\bar{\psi}(x, t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\psi}(x, t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \delta(x-y) \bar{\psi}(y, t) \\ &= \frac{1}{(4\pi D\Delta t)^{1/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \exp \left[-\Delta t \left(\frac{1}{4D} \left(\frac{x-y}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \right) \right] \bar{\psi}(y, t). \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

Putting Eq. (78) back into Eq. (76), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\psi}(x, t + \Delta t) &= \frac{1}{(4\pi D\Delta t)^{1/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \exp \left[-\Delta t \left(\frac{1}{4D} \left(\frac{x-y}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \right) \right] \\ &\times [(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{J}) + \mathbf{J} \exp(-\Delta t \lambda V(y, t))] \bar{\Phi}(y, t) \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Once again., the exponential function is expanded to the first order and bring it back into another exponential form as

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{J}) + \mathbf{I} \exp \left(-\Delta t \frac{1}{\hbar} V(y, t) \right) \\ &\simeq (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{J}) + \mathbf{J} \left[1 - \Delta t \frac{1}{\hbar} V(y, t) \right] \\ &\simeq \mathbf{I} - (\Delta t \lambda V(y, t)) \mathbf{J} \simeq \exp[-\Delta t \lambda V(y, t) \mathbf{J}]. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

After all it results that

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\psi}(x, t + \Delta t) \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{(4\pi D\Delta t)^{1/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \exp \left[-\Delta t \left(\frac{1}{4D} \left(\frac{x-y}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \right) \right] \\ &\times \exp[-\Delta t \lambda V(y, t) \mathbf{J}] \bar{\psi}(y, t) \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

to the first order of the very short Δt . As usual, we repeat this short time propagation to a finite time expression as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}(q, t : 0, 0) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Delta q_1 \cdots \Delta q_{N-1} \left(\frac{m}{2\pi\hbar\Delta t} \right)^{N/2} \\ &\times \exp \left[-\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{\Delta t}{\hbar} \left(\frac{m}{2} \left(\frac{\Delta q_k}{\Delta t} \right)^2 + V(q_k, t_k) \mathbf{J} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

with $\Delta q_k = q_{k+1} - q_k$, $q_N = q$, $q_0 = 0$, returning to $D \rightarrow \hbar/2m$, $\lambda \rightarrow 1/\hbar$. We thus define the Green function for Eq. (73) and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}(q, t : 0, 0) &= \int_{\Omega[q, t; 0, 0]} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^t V(s, X(s, \omega)) ds \right] \mathbf{J} \\ &\times dP_{W[q, t; 0, 0]}(\omega) \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

with the Wiener measure

$$\begin{aligned} dP_{W[q(s+\Delta s, \omega), s+\Delta s; q(s, \omega), s]}(\omega) &= dq \left(\frac{m}{2\pi\hbar\Delta s} \right)^{N/2} \\ &\exp \left[-\Delta s \left(\frac{m}{2\hbar} \left(\frac{q(s+\Delta s, \omega) - q(s, \omega)}{\Delta s} \right)^2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Note that the symplectic unit matrix \mathbf{J} is associated only with the potential function $V(q_k, t_k)$ but is not involved in the Wiener measure. After all it holds

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q, t) \\ \phi_c(q, t) \end{pmatrix} = \int dq \mathbf{G}(q, t : q_0, 0) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r(q_0, 0) \\ \phi_c(q_0, 0) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (85)$$

Equations (82) or formally equivalent (83) is an extension of the Feynman-Kac formula to the system of coupled diffusion equation, Eq. (73), and a real-valued realization of the Feynman path integrals. In the Feynman path integrations each path bears a finite amplitude arising from $\left(\frac{m}{2\pi i \hbar \Delta t}\right)^{3(N+1)/2}$ as in Eq. (68) and the most of unphysical paths are to be cancelled in the summation over the highly oscillatory phases (according to the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma). Hence even paths that break the relativity limit are “mathematically” allowed. It is thus hard to make a clear-cut statement that the path integration in complex number space practically converge as the sampled paths are added one by one into the summation, unless additional conditions or mathematical tricks are imposed.^{37,38} In the Wiener measure of Eq. (84), on the other hand, the contribution from those paths are nullified automatically, and the Green function of Eq. (83) secures the convergence in the path summation.

The most significant aspect of Eqs. (82) and (83) to the present work is that “scalar paths” should serve as a track of the Schrödinger vectors. This does not go without proof. Moreover, the present extension of the Feynman-Kac formula suggests that there should exist stochastic paths behind the real-valued Schrödinger equation. In the next section, we find the actual quantum paths in an Ito stochastic differential equation.

III. QUANTUM STOCHASTIC PATH DYNAMICS

We study the quantum stochastic path dynamics in this section as the second pillar of the Schrödinger dynamics.

A. Dynamical path concepts

We first briefly review three quantum-path theories, which are relevant to the present work.

1. Nelson theory with the stochastic Newtonian equation

It is natural to start from the theory of Nelson.^{40,41} The outline is as follows. He first defines the forward and backward derivatives of a position $q(t)$ with a “conditional average (expectation)”, denoted by $E_t[\cdot]$, such that

$$DX_t = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow +0} E_t \left[\frac{q(t + \Delta t) - q(t)}{\Delta t} \right] \quad (86)$$

and

$$D_*X_t = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow +0} E_t \left[\frac{q(t) - q(t - \Delta t)}{\Delta t} \right], \quad (87)$$

which are applied to define the mean forward velocity and backward velocity

$$DX_t = b(X_t, t) \quad \text{and} \quad D_*X_t = b_*(X_t, t), \quad (88)$$

where X_t indicates the stochastic variable corresponding to the position q . Then $b(X_t, t)$ and $b_*(X_t, t)$ are naturally regarded as the drift terms in the stochastic differential equations^{42–45}

$$dX_t = b(X_t, t)dt + dW \quad (89)$$

and

$$dX_{t*} = b_*(X_t, t)dt + dW_* \quad (90)$$

respectively, with W and W_* being the Wiener process. Remarkable is his definition of the (stochastic) Newtonian equation

$$\frac{1}{2}(DD_* + D_*D)X_t = -\frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial V}{\partial q}. \quad (91)$$

This equation is significant because it is followed by a pair of nonlinear differential equations for two new variables

$$v \equiv \frac{1}{2}(b + b_*) \equiv \frac{\hbar}{m} \nabla S \quad (92)$$

and

$$u \equiv \frac{1}{2}(b - b_*), \quad (93)$$

both of which are supposed to appear in the equation of continuity

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho = -\nabla \cdot (v\rho) \quad (94)$$

and

$$u \equiv \frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla \rho, \quad (95)$$

respectively, where ρ is the density. He shows that the nonlinear equations for u and v are transformed to a single Schrödinger function by combining them in the form of^{3,28–30}

$$\psi \equiv \rho^{1/2} \exp(iS). \quad (96)$$

Nelson thus claims that the Schrödinger equation could be derived only with classical mechanics and that the probabilistic nature of the Schrödinger dynamics emerges in a natural manner. The title of his paper⁴⁰ “Derivation of the Schrödinger equation from Newton mechanics” seems to assert that the Newton mechanics sets a foundation of quantum mechanics, or at least, the both mechanics can be derived from a single physical origin. Yet, a question remains as to what is the physical origin of the stochastic Newton equation.

Yasue sets his stochastic variational theory applying to the stochastic control theory under the following stationary condition of the energy^{46,47}

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{m}{2} b^2 + \frac{m}{2} b_*^2 \right) + V(q) \right] \rho(q, t) = 0. \quad (97)$$

He was also successful in “quantization”, reaching the Schrödinger equation without use of the stochastic Newtonian equation Eq. (91).

2. Nagasawa theory based on the Kolmogorov and Ito theorems

In contrast to Nelson, Nagasawa^{13,14} established his concrete theory based on the rigorous theories in statistics by Kolmogorov and stochastic differential equation by Ito: A Markov process having the transition probability density for the following parabolic partial differential equation (or a backward Fokker-Planck equation)

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\nabla^2 u + b(q, t) \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad (98)$$

is associated with the stochastic process satisfying

$$X_t = X_0 + \sigma B_t + \int_0^t b(X_s, s) ds, \quad (99)$$

with B_t being the Brownian process. Nagasawa transforms Eq. (98) to a set of

$$\frac{\partial \psi_N}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\nabla^2 \psi_N + V(q, t)\psi_N = 0 \quad (100)$$

and

$$-\frac{\partial \tilde{\psi}_N}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\nabla^2 \tilde{\psi}_N + V(q, t)\tilde{\psi}_N = 0. \quad (101)$$

ψ_N and $\tilde{\psi}_N$ are a pair of real-valued solutions in the functional forms

$$\psi_N(q, t) = \exp(R(q, t) + S(q, t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\psi}_N = \exp(R - S), \quad (102)$$

where the real-valued functions $R(q, t)$ and $S(q, t)$ are equivalent to those in the complex valued Schrödinger function

$$\psi = \exp(R + iS), \quad (103)$$

(note the position of R in Eqs. (102) and (103)). Nagasawa calls $\psi_N(x, t)$ and $\tilde{\psi}_N(x, t)$, respectively, the evolution function and the backward evolution function, neither of which is the direct solution of the Schrödinger equation. Then, after Eq. (99), he gives the following stochastic process

$$dX_t = \frac{\hbar}{m}\nabla(R + S)dt + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}}dW. \quad (104)$$

Note again that this process is to represent his $\psi_N = \exp(R + S)$ of Eq. (102) but not the Schrödinger function itself. He has thus established the (indirect) relationship between stochastic theory and quantum dynamics in a mathematically rigorous context, having attained insights beyond the Schrödinger framework.^{13,14} Thus, the Nagasawa theory highlights that the stochasticity in quantum dynamics is mathematically intrinsic and is not a property introduced externally.

B. Stochastic paths consistent with the Schrödinger equation

We below consider a quantum stochastic path dynamics in our own way, which is based on the relationship between the Feynman-Kac formula for statistical physics, the corresponding diffusion equation, and the Ito stochastic differential equation.^{15,16} The aim is not “quantization” but to find the quantum paths in the Schrödinger dynamics.

1. Feynman-Kac formula and stochastic differential equation: Preparation

To single out dynamical paths from quantum dynamics, we outline the well-known standard relationship between the stochastic process and the associated forward diffusion equation under a potential function $V(q, t)$ in configuration space. Resume the diffusion equation on a potential function on $V(q, t)$ of Eq. (69)

$$\frac{\partial \psi_f(q, t)}{\partial t} = (D\nabla^2 - \lambda V(q, t)) \psi_f(q, t), \quad (105)$$

and the associated Feynman-Kac formula Eq. (72). It has been well established¹⁵⁻¹⁷ that the Ito stochastic differential equation⁴⁵ for a stochastic path $X_t = X(t, \omega)$ of a statistical sample ω

$$dX_t = \alpha(X_t, t)dt + dW(t, \omega), \quad (106)$$

behind the diffusion equation of Eq. (105) should satisfy

$$\alpha(X_t, t) = 2D \frac{\nabla \psi_f}{\psi_f} \quad (107)$$

to be consistent with the Feynman-Kac formula. $W(t, \omega)$ denotes the Wiener process. Therefore, back in the Ito equation for the Markov process, Eq. (106), is more explicitly expressed as

$$dX_t = 2D \frac{\nabla \psi_f}{\psi_f} dt + dW(t, \omega) \quad (108)$$

and gives the time propagation of stochastic paths behind Eq. (105).

It is interesting to compare the velocity drift term of Eq. (108) and the quantum local velocity of Eq. (61)

$$\frac{1}{\rho} v(q, t) = \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Im} \frac{\nabla \psi}{\psi}, \quad (109)$$

where ψ in the latter equation is the Schrödinger function. Here again, Eq. (107) and (109) together suggest an intrinsic relationship between stochastic and quantum dynamics with the correspondence

$$D \leftrightarrow \hbar/2m. \quad (110)$$

2. Quantum stochastic paths

We now intend to implant the information of the Schrödinger equation into the drift term of the stochastic process, $\alpha(X_t, t)$ of Eq. (108). The real-valued Schrödinger equation Eq. (41) in the form of Eq. (73) seems to be fine to apply Eq. (69). However, Eq. (73) is actually composed of a pair of coupled equations, and therefore we detour to formally uncouple them via the complex-valued Schrödinger equations as

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\phi_r + i\phi_c) = \left(\frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 - \frac{V}{\hbar} \right) (\phi_r + i\phi_c) \quad (111)$$

and its complex conjugate

$$-i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\phi_r - i\phi_c) = \left(\frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 - \frac{V}{\hbar}\right)(\phi_r - i\phi_c). \quad (112)$$

These are further transformed so to mimic the form of Eq. (69) by the rotation of time coordinate to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s^+}\psi^+(q, s^+) = \left(\frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 - \frac{V}{\hbar}\right)\psi^+(q, s^+) \quad (113)$$

with

$$s^+ = -it \quad (114)$$

and $\psi^+ = \phi_r + i\phi_c$. Likewise we have another one from Eq. (112)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s^-}\psi^-(q, s^-) = \left(\frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 - \frac{V}{\hbar}\right)\psi^-(q, s^-) \quad (115)$$

by time rotation to the opposite direction s^+

$$s^- = it \quad (116)$$

and $\psi^- = \phi_r - i\phi_c$. The rotations of time coordinate as in Eqs. (114) and (116) are to be made at each real time t . $\psi^+(q, s^+)$ and $\psi^-(q, s^-)$ are yet complex functions. Hence, the direct application of Eq. (107) ends up with

$$\alpha^+(X_t, s^+)ds^+ = 2D\frac{\nabla\psi^+}{\psi^+}ds^+ \quad (117)$$

and

$$\alpha^-(X_t, s^-)ds^- = 2D\frac{\nabla\psi^-}{\psi^-}ds^-, \quad (118)$$

which are complex valued, too, and necessarily make X_t in Eq. (106) complex-valued.

It is obvious that the quantities in Eqs. (117) and (118) are mutually complex conjugate, and we may define

$$\alpha^+(X_t, s^+)ds^+ = [\alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t) + i\alpha^{\text{Imag}}(X_t, t)] dt \quad (119)$$

and

$$\alpha^-(X_t, s^-)ds^- = [\alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t) - i\alpha^{\text{Imag}}(X_t, t)] dt. \quad (120)$$

$\alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t)$ and $\alpha^{\text{Imag}}(X_t, t)$ are readily obtained such that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t)dt &= \frac{1}{2}2D\left(\frac{\nabla\psi^+}{\psi^+}ds^+ + \frac{\nabla\psi^-}{\psi^-}ds^-\right) \\ &= D\left(\frac{\nabla\psi^+}{\psi^+}(-idt) + \frac{\nabla\psi^-}{\psi^-}(idt)\right) \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

which is followed by a simple manipulation

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t)dt &= -idtD\left(\frac{\nabla\psi^+}{\psi^+} - \frac{\nabla\psi^-}{\psi^-}\right) \\ &= \frac{2D}{\rho}dt(\phi_r(\nabla\phi_c) - \phi_c(\nabla\phi_r)) \\ &= -\frac{2D}{\rho}(\phi_r \ \phi_c)\mathbf{J}\nabla\begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}dt, \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

with $\rho = \phi_r^2 + \phi_c^2$. Noting the expression $\hat{p} = -\mathbf{J}\hbar\nabla$ as found in Eq. (22) and Eq. (28), we see that the physical meaning of α^{Real} turns out to be the locally normalized velocity at X_t and t (see Eq. (61)). We also note that α^{Real} thus attained is invariant with respect to any rotation of the vector $(\phi_r(q, t) \ \phi_c(q, t))^T$. Therefore it turns out that

$$X_t = \alpha^+(X_t, s^+)ds^+ + dW(t, \omega) \quad (123)$$

both for $\psi^+(q, s^+)$ and

$$X_t = \alpha^-(X_t, s^-)ds^- + dW(t, \omega) \quad (124)$$

for $\psi^-(q, s^-)$, the real part of the velocity term $\alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t)dt$ is commonly given by Eq. (122), which keeps driving the path X_t in the real space.

Besides, defining the normalized Wiener process

$$dW_0(t, \omega)dW_0(t, \omega) = 2Ddt = \frac{\hbar}{m}dt \quad (125)$$

with

$$D = \frac{\hbar}{2m} \quad (126)$$

(recall Eq. (110)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= \alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t)dt + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}}dW_0(t, \omega) \\ &= -\frac{\hbar}{\rho m}(\phi_r \ \phi_c)\mathbf{J}\nabla\begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix}dt + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}}dW_0(t, \omega). \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

The stochastic path X_t thus remains to run in the real-valued space. Notice however that the drift term thus found is nonlocal in that no direct interaction potential determines it but instead the Schrödinger function is involved in.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t)dt &= \frac{\hbar}{m\rho}dt(\phi_r\nabla\phi_c - \phi_c\nabla\phi_r) \\ &= \hat{v}^{\text{local}}(q, t)dt \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

Eq. (127) is also written as

$$dX_t = \bar{v}^{\text{local}}(X_t, t)dt + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}}dW_0(t, \omega). \quad (129)$$

A precise study shows that the drift term of Eq. (127) and Nagasawa's one in Eq. (104) are essentially the same, since both represent the quantum mechanical velocity locally normalized at (q, t) . (See again Eq. (61).) We note however that the two expressions have been derived through the different pathways. In particular, Nagasawa's real-valued evolution functions defined in Eq. (102) are not the Schrödinger functions in themselves. Equation (127) seems rather compact and more intuitively appealing.

By the way, the imaginary part of the velocity term results in

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{\text{Imag}}(X_t, t)dt &= \frac{1}{2i}2D \left(\frac{\nabla\psi^+}{\psi^+}ds^+ - \frac{\nabla\psi^-}{\psi^-}ds^- \right) \\ &= -\frac{2D}{\rho}dt(\phi_r(\nabla\phi_r) + \phi_c(\nabla\phi_c)) \\ &= -\frac{D}{\rho}(\nabla\rho)dt. \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

α^{Imag} is supposed to disappear from the practice in the stochastic paths. We have currently no idea whether it plays no role at all. For instance, the imaginary part of X_t , say X_t^{Imag} to be determined by

$$dX_t^{\text{Imag}} = i\alpha^{\text{Imag}}(X_t, t)dt \quad (131)$$

might serve as a part of a dynamics that is not imagined thus far.

C. Time irreversibility

The Schrödinger equation has a time reversal symmetry. However, each quantum path does not have the time-reversal property due to the presence of the Wiener process in it. Yet, since an average over the Wiener process leads to

$$\left\langle \frac{dW_0}{dt} \right\rangle = 0, \quad (132)$$

resulting in

$$\left\langle \frac{dX_t}{dt} \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{1}{\rho} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r & \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \frac{\hat{p}}{m} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad (133)$$

and of course we have

$$\left\langle \frac{dP_{X_t}}{dt} \right\rangle = -[\vec{\nabla}V]_{X_t}. \quad (134)$$

from Eq. (161). Therefore this dynamics as an average over the accumulated quantum paths turns out to be time-reversal. This in turn suggests that one cannot pick (separate to single out) a physical path from the Schrödinger equation directly.

D. Local velocity as a field for the quantum stochastic paths: Bohm trajectory and Nagasawa path revisited

Let us recall the de Broglie-Bohm theory claiming that the Schrödinger function serves as a pilot wave to guide particle paths. In the Bohm representation,²⁸ the Schrödinger function reads

$$\psi(q, t) = R(q, t) \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar}S_B(q, t)\right), \quad (135)$$

and the quantum Hamilton-Jacobi (HJ) equation

$$\frac{\partial S_B}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2m}(\nabla S_B)^2 + V - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 R}{R} = 0, \quad (136)$$

is derived along with the equation of continuity for $R(q, t)^2$. If $\psi(q, t)$ is given beforehand,^{3,28-30,48,49} the quantum local velocity is given by⁵⁰

$$v_B = \frac{1}{m}\nabla S_B = \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Im} \frac{\nabla\psi}{\psi}. \quad (137)$$

Therefore, v_B is exactly the same as the drift velocity of Eq. (127) at a common point q , provided that a common Schrödinger function is resorted to (see also Eq. (61)). Hence, the presence of the Wiener process or not makes the mathematical difference between the Bohmian trajectories and the quantum paths; a quantum path wanders from one Bohmian trajectory to another in a stochastic manner to the extent of $\sqrt{\hbar/m}$. The Bohmian trajectories represent a set of integral curves of Eq. (136). Sanz and Miret-Artés describe that each Bohmian trajectory represents the dynamics of a probe on the flow-lines of $R(q, t)^2$ induced by S_B .³⁰

The quantum potential $-\hbar^2/2m(\nabla^2 R/R)$ highlights the very quantum nature extracted from the Schrödinger equation, and yet it seems logically hard for the Bohm representation to make an essentially novel interpretation beyond the limit of the Schrödinger equation, although it has shed much new light on the hidden properties of the Schrödinger dynamics as in Eq. (137).

Instead of the de Broglie-Bohm pilot wave postulate, we may regard the local velocity or the velocity drift term of Eq. (128) as a “guiding field in configuration space” on which the paths run (or guided, led, directed). In fact, we have already seen the relation

$$\alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t) = \bar{v}^{\text{local}}(q, t) = \frac{\hbar}{m} \vec{\nabla}\theta(q, t) \quad (138)$$

in the polar-coordinate representation of the real-valued Schrödinger vector as in Eq. (64). Notice that $\theta(q, t)$ is not determined without the help of $\rho(q, t)$. Besides, it holds $\vec{\nabla}\theta(q, t) = \vec{\nabla}S_B/\hbar$ at a common point q . Thus, in our language, an implicit “vector rotation” is equipped as an intrinsic machinery in the dynamics of the Schrödinger vector.

Wyatt and his colleague have figured out how to numerically integrate the Bohmian paths without solving the Schrödinger equation and have found interesting applications.^{29,30} Meanwhile, it is already well known

that the interference (fringe intensity) pattern in the double-slit experiment is numerically realized by the set of the Bohmian trajectories.^{30,51} Therefore a sufficient large set of the present quantum stochastic paths should reproduce the similar interference pattern (with stochastic fluctuation), unless the Wiener process wipes away the pattern.

We also confirm that the v_B in Eq. (137) is essentially the same as the velocity drift term $\frac{\hbar}{m}\nabla(R+S)dt$ in the Ito scholastic differential equation derived by Nagasawa, Eq. (104), even though his stochastic equation has a correspondence with his own forward parabolic differential equations, Eq. (100), but not the Schrödinger equation. Therefore the paths of Nagasawa and our quantum stochastic paths presented here must mutually coincide, provided that the initial condition and the Wiener process are the same at each time. A notable aspect of the Nagasawa coupled equations, Eqs. (100) and (101), and associated concepts may exceed the Schrödinger dynamics,^{13,14} while ours remains within the realm.

IV. $(dX_t)^2 = (\hbar/m)dt$ AS AN INTRINSIC PROPERTY OF QUANTUM DYNAMICS

A. Scaling law as a mathematical consequence of the Schrödinger dynamics

In case where $\Delta q \rightarrow 0$ and $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ cannot be taken independently due to a constraint

$$F(\Delta q, \Delta t) = 0, \quad (139)$$

it can follow that a derivative

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0, \Delta q \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta q}{\Delta t}$$

may not exist. It is well known that the resultant lack of the smoothness almost everywhere can give birth to a novel mathematics like the fractal geometry,⁵² and the stochastic calculus and their associated stochastic differential equations by Ito and Stratonovich,⁴⁵ and so on. The stochasticity in the quantum path dynamics that appeared rather intuitively in Nelson's theory and on the rigorous mathematical basis in the Nagasawa theory, is associated with a scaling law as a specific case of Eq. (139). This constraint is mathematically of the same form as that of the Brownian motion, but it does not mean that there are random kickers surrounding a quantum particle. We below study some consequences from the quantum Wiener process, which suggest that the present stochasticity is intrinsic to quantum mechanics.

In the Feynman-Kac formula, Eq. (72), it is a usual practice that the exponent is scaled such that

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{4D} \frac{\Delta q^2}{\Delta t} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (140)$$

leading to the well-known expression $\langle \Delta q^2 \rangle = 2D\Delta t$. This scaling law is applied to quantum dynamics, since exactly the same scaling rule holds for the Wiener measure Eq. (84) in the quantum mechanical extension of the Feynman-Kac formula Eq. (82). The exponent in the Feynman path integrals, Eq. (68), can also be scaled such that

$$\left\langle \frac{m}{2\hbar} \frac{\Delta q^2}{\Delta t} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (141)$$

which leads to $\langle \Delta q^2 \rangle = \hbar/m\Delta t$, where $\langle (q_{k+1} - q_k)^2 \rangle = \langle \Delta q^2 \rangle$. Equation (141) is consistent with $D = \hbar/2m$ of Eq. (126). Hence Eq. (141) tells that the two limiting processes $\Delta q \rightarrow 0$ and $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ cannot be taken independently.

Since there is no explicit Brownian motion behind quantum dynamics, we need to study a little further about the implication of the scaling relation $\langle \Delta q^2 \rangle = \hbar/m\Delta t$ or $(dX_t)^2 = (\hbar/m)dt$. Let us look back at Eq. (141) in the form

$$\left\langle \Delta q \times \left(m \frac{\Delta q}{\Delta t} \right) \right\rangle = \hbar. \quad (142)$$

This expression implies that the convergence in the limit

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0, \Delta q \rightarrow 0} \left\langle m \frac{\Delta q}{\Delta t} \right\rangle = \bar{p}, \quad (143)$$

is not compatible with $\Delta q \rightarrow 0$. Hence we must give up the simultaneous determination of the momentum and the exact positioning (meaning $\Delta q = 0$) in the average sense. This has been one of the underlying reasons why we had to abandon the momentum as an independent coordinate at the outset in the discussion prior to Eq. (3). We also lose the conventional notion of smoothness in $q(t)$ with respect to t .

B. Hydrogen atom energy from the stochasticity

As an illustrative example of the physical significance of Eq. (142), we consider a one-dimensional hydrogen-like atom of nuclear charge $+Ze$. We immediately notice that the electron is prohibited to fall down to rest at the position of the nucleus, since $\Delta q = 0$ at the nuclear position leads to $\Delta q/\Delta t = \infty$. Suppose then that the electron is at a position of a distance Δq (in average) from the nucleus. Take $\Delta q/\Delta t$ as a classical velocity (also in the average sense). Then the classical Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2}m \left(\frac{\Delta q}{\Delta t} \right)^2 - \frac{Ze^2}{\Delta q}. \quad (144)$$

is constrained by Eq. (142) in such a manner as

$$\frac{\Delta q}{\Delta t} = \frac{\hbar}{m} \frac{1}{\Delta q}, \quad (145)$$

resulting in the form

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar^2}{m} \Delta q^{-2} - Ze^2 \Delta q^{-1}. \quad (146)$$

The condition of force balance (seeming stationarity) or the lowest energy gives

$$\frac{dH}{d(\Delta q)} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{m} \Delta q^{-3} + Ze^2 \Delta q^{-2} = 0, \quad (147)$$

the solutions of which are $|\Delta q| = \infty$ and

$$\Delta q = \frac{\hbar^2}{Zme^2} = \frac{a_0}{Z}. \quad (148)$$

This Δq is exactly the same as the radius of the ground state hydrogen-like atom in the Bohr model, and a_0 is the Bohr radius.⁴ Likewise, the total energy E turns out to be

$$E = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{Z^2 me^4}{\hbar^2}, \quad (149)$$

which is the ground-state energy of the hydrogen-like atom,⁴ and the corresponding average velocity is

$$\frac{\Delta q}{\Delta t} = \frac{Ze^2}{\hbar}. \quad (150)$$

Note that the notion of the wavelength of matter wave has not been adopted in this “quantization”.⁴

Further, since the exponent in the Feynman path integrals Eq. (68) is pure imaginary, one can consider the effect of harmonics of those oscillatory integrals by modifying Eq. (141) with an integer n such that

$$\left\langle \frac{m}{2\hbar} \frac{\Delta q^2}{\Delta t} \right\rangle i = \frac{1}{2} ni, \quad (151)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\left\langle m \left(\frac{\Delta q}{\Delta t} \right) \Delta q \right\rangle = n\hbar. \quad (152)$$

This is a specific form of the Bohr quantization condition for hydrogen-like atom

$$mvr = n\hbar, \quad (153)$$

where r is the radius of electron motion around the nucleus, and n is the quantum number.⁴ The term \hbar should be accordingly replaced with $n\hbar$ in the quantities like Eq. (148), (149), and (150). (For the canonical theory of the semiclassical quantization for integrable system^{4,53,54} and for nonintegrable and/or chaotic systems.^{36,55-60})

Incidentally, Eq. (142) can be a little modified to

$$\left\langle \Delta t \times \frac{m}{2} \left(\frac{\Delta q}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \right\rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2}, \quad (154)$$

which implies if we forcefully put $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, the corresponding kinetic energy goes to infinity.

The above primitive example suggests a deep relationship between quantum dynamics and stochastic dynamics and reminds of the question from Einstein to Heisenberg, “You can see and track the orbit of an electron in the cloud chamber. Nevertheless, you intend to entirely deny the notion of orbit in an atom, don’t you?” and Heisenberg replies, “We cannot observe any orbit of an electron in an atom. . . . Only the observable quantities should be treated by a theory.” (W. Heisenberg in “Der teil und das ganze”) Note again that the condition of Eq. (142) has not been brought in by an external noise. Also, it is not merely a matter of scaling or a simple analogy to the Brownian motion. We regard the Wiener process in the dynamics of the quantum path Eq. (127) as a manifestation of the essential quantum nature, which is smoothed away from the Schrödinger equation.

In the Brownian motion of Eq. (140), Δq is regarded as a displacement of the position in an interval Δt by random kicks from surrounding molecules. Since we have no such random kickers surrounding the quantum particles, it is inappropriate to interpret Δq as a displacement by an impulse. In classical mechanics, the position of a particle is an intrinsic property inherent to each one. However, in quantum mechanics, the deviation (fluctuation) of the position is not directly measured in terms of an arbitrary time length. Therefore, (in a situation of no potential $V = 0$ and average velocity $\bar{v} = 0$ at a given point) it would be more appropriate to regard Δq as an average length of an area, in the outside of which the particle is not found during the interval Δt . Note that as Δt is made smaller to specify the position, the associated Δq can become smaller only “more slowly” according to Eq. (141). That is, making $\Delta q \rightarrow \Delta q/2$ requires $\Delta t \rightarrow \Delta t/4$. The shutter speed of camera must be made faster by 4 times to capture it in a two times narrower space. This situation may be expressed symbolically in such a way that a quantum particle cannot be located at a given point by an operation of $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$.

In a long range of Δt , on the other hand, the Wiener process in Eq. (161) should be the origin of the spontaneous broadening of possible range for a quantum particle to reach. Meanwhile, as $\hbar/m \rightarrow 0$, the classical way of identification of the particle position is retrieved.

C. Uncertainty relations from the stochasticity

It is quite natural to expect that the present quantum stochasticity should result in an uncertainty relation between the relevant quantities.^{4,12,61} First, we suppose a

particle residing at (q_0, p_0) in classical phase space. Consider a width Δq in configuration space q . In the expression of Eq. (142), we may conceive that the stochastic dynamics can induce an additional momentum $m\Delta q/\Delta t$ in this interval Δq . And, this additional momentum, say, Δp gives an uncertainty to the momentum to p_0 , or, $p_0 \rightarrow p_0 + \Delta p$. In this sense, Eq. (142) may read

$$\langle \Delta p \Delta q \rangle = \hbar. \quad (155)$$

Since the particle may make a zigzag motion before getting out of the space interval Δq , Δp can be larger, and therefore we expect

$$\langle \Delta p \Delta q \rangle \geq \hbar. \quad (156)$$

The above description may cause a misunderstanding that a shorter space range Δq at a given time interval Δt should give a smaller Δp against Eq. (155). However, the reality is that if Δq is scaled such that $\Delta q \rightarrow \Delta q/N$, the stochasticity relation scales the time $\Delta t \rightarrow \Delta t/N^2$ and $\Delta p \rightarrow N\Delta p$. Therefore small range Δq makes a larger stochastic momentum Δp . The uncertainty Eq. (156) claims that the stochasticity prevents specifying precise information in the cell smaller than the size $\langle \Delta p \Delta q \rangle = \hbar$, which is already a common sense in quantum mechanics.

Likewise we consider Δq and rewrite the stochastic relation as

$$\left\langle \frac{m}{2} \left(\frac{\Delta q}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \Delta t \right\rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2}. \quad (157)$$

The stochasticity may bring about an additional kinetic energy $m(\Delta q/\Delta t)^2/2 = \Delta E_K$, and ΔE_K is subject to

$$\langle \Delta E_K \Delta t \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2}. \quad (158)$$

Since the particle can move in a zigzag motion, the stochastically induced kinetic energy can be larger than this ΔE_K , and we have

$$\langle \Delta E_K \Delta t \rangle \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}. \quad (159)$$

Again we note that if $\Delta t \rightarrow \Delta t/N$, then $\Delta q \rightarrow \Delta q/\sqrt{N}$ and $\Delta E_K \rightarrow N\Delta E_K$. Thus the shorter time interval induces a larger stochastically uncertain kinetic energy.

We note that the present uncertainty has arisen in a manner different from the Heisenberg's one, which reflects the operational disturbance inevitably introduced to an observation process, the Kennard-Robertson-Schrödinger principles, which originate from the property of the Schrödinger function such as the universal relationship between a configuration-space distribution function and its Fourier transform,^{1,4,9,12} and the Ozawa's principle unifying them.^{61,62} Meanwhile, the present uncertainty comes from the quantum property that is not represented directly in the Schrödinger function.

V. INDIRECT CORRELATION AMONG THE QUANTUM PATHS

We next study the properties related mainly to the velocity drift term in the quantum stochastic path dynamics.

A. Quantum canonical equations of motion

To better understand the role of the velocity drift term of Eq. (127), we first build the quantum canonical equations of motion. First, the dynamics of the momentum part $(\phi_r \ \phi_c) \hat{p} (\phi_r \ \phi_c)^T$ in it can be tracked with the Heisenberg equation of motion of Eq. (44) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (\phi_r \ \phi_c) \hat{p} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} &= \frac{1}{\hbar} (\phi_r \ \phi_c) [\hat{H}, \hat{p}] \mathbf{J} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \\ &= - (\phi_r \ \phi_c) [V, \mathbf{J}\vec{\nabla}] \mathbf{J} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (\phi_r \ \phi_c) (-\vec{\nabla}V) \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (\vec{\nabla}V) \rho, \end{aligned} \quad (160)$$

where the momentum operator \hat{p} is taken from Eq. (53). Equation (160) is an alternative expression of the Ehrenfest theorem⁴ (notice however that the integration over the q -coordinates is not taken). Therefore, we may formally combine Eqs. (127) and (160) into a set of the quantum canonical equations of motion

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = \frac{1}{m\rho} P_{X_t} dt + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} dW_0(t, \omega) \\ dP_{X_t} = - (\vec{\nabla}V) \rho dt \end{cases} \quad (161)$$

with definitions

$$P_{X_t} = (\phi_r \ \phi_c) \hat{p} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_r \\ \phi_c \end{pmatrix} \Big|_{X_t} \quad (162)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{m\rho} P_{X_t} = \alpha^{\text{Real}}(X_t, t) = \vec{v}^{\text{local}}(q, t) \quad (163)$$

B. Quantum Newtonian equation

The coupled equation in Eq. (161) is further combined into a one piece of expression, that is

$$\begin{aligned} d^2 X_t &= \frac{1}{m\rho} dP_{X_t} dt - \frac{P_{X_t}}{m\rho^2} d\rho dt + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} d^2 W_0(t, \omega) \\ &= -\frac{1}{m} \vec{\nabla}V (dt)^2 - \frac{1}{\rho} \vec{v}^{\text{local}} d\rho dt + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} d^2 W_0(t, \omega), \end{aligned} \quad (164)$$

which we may refer to as the quantum Newtonian equation. Notice that this expression is not the Nelson's postulated equation of Eq. (91).

To proceed further, we recall Eq. (28) and Eq. (61) such that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} &= -\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{j} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot \frac{\hbar}{m} \left(\phi_r \vec{\nabla} \phi_c - \phi_c \vec{\nabla} \phi_r \right) \\ &= -\vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v}^{\text{local}}(q, t))\end{aligned}\quad (165)$$

giving rise to

$$d\rho = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v}^{\text{local}}(q, t)) dt, \quad (166)$$

and therefore the quantum Newtonian equation is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}d^2 X_t &= -\frac{1}{m} \vec{\nabla} V(dt)^2 - \frac{1}{\rho} \vec{v}^{\text{local}} d\rho dt + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} d^2 W_0(t, \omega) \\ &= -\frac{1}{m} \vec{\nabla} V(dt)^2 + \frac{1}{\rho} \vec{v}^{\text{local}} \left(\vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v}^{\text{local}}) \right) (dt)^2 \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} d^2 W_0(t, \omega)\end{aligned}\quad (167)$$

It is clear that the genuine quantum terms are the last two terms in this expression.

C. Classical limit of the quantum canonical equations of motion

1. Hamilton canonical equations of motion and Newtonian equation

Let us consider the classical limit in the sense of $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in the quantum canonical equations of motion of Eq. (161). First, since the Wiener process is simply linear in $\sqrt{\hbar}$, it can be simply reduced to zero as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. We then rewrite Eq. (162) in the polar coordinate as in Eq. (62), finding

$$P_{X_t} = \hbar \rho \nabla \theta(X_t, t). \quad (168)$$

Since the Wiener process is nullified, a quantum path is now a smooth path that does not have a chance of branching in its direction. This implies that X_t is determined uniquely as X_0 is prepared under an initial velocity field. Therefore, the magnitude of $\rho(X_0, 0)$ should be maintained constant along the path such that

$$\rho(X_t, t) = \rho(X_0, 0) \equiv \rho_0. \quad (169)$$

Then we have

$$P_{X_t} = \hbar \rho_0 \nabla \theta(X_t, t) \quad (170)$$

in Eq. (168). (Note that $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ should not be taken in this stage, because $\nabla \theta(X_t, t)$ gives a term proportional to \hbar^{-1} .) Further, we may define the classical momentum $p_{cl}(X_t, t)$ as

$$p_{cl}(X_t, t) \equiv \hbar \nabla \theta(X_t, t), \quad (171)$$

which gives

$$P_{X_t} = \hbar \rho_0 \nabla \theta(X_t, t) = \rho_0 p_{cl}(X_t, t) \quad (172)$$

and

$$dP_{X_t} = \rho_0 dp_{cl}(X_t, t). \quad (173)$$

Insertion of Eq. (172) into the first equation of Eq. (161) gives

$$dX_t = \frac{1}{m} p_{cl}(X_t, t) dt. \quad (174)$$

On the other hand, Eq. (173) leads the second equation in Eq. (161) to

$$dP_{X_t} = -\rho_0 \vec{\nabla} V(X_t) dt. \quad (175)$$

The combination of Eqs. (173) and (175) gives

$$dp_{cl}(X_t, t) = -\vec{\nabla} V(X_t) dt. \quad (176)$$

The coupled equations of (174) and (176) are just the Hamilton canonical equations of motion. Because there is no stochastic term in these expressions, we can take the simple limit $dX_t \rightarrow 0$ and $dp_{cl}(X_t, t) \rightarrow 0$ as $dt \rightarrow 0$, and thereby the Hamilton canonical equations of motion follows

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dX_t}{dt} = \frac{1}{m} p_{cl}(X_t, t) \\ \frac{dp_{cl}(X_t, t)}{dt} = -\vec{\nabla} V(X_t). \end{cases} \quad (177)$$

It is well known that the Schrödinger equation converges to (more precisely, correspond to) the Hamilton-Jacobi equation through WKB theory^{4,5} and also through the Bohm representation as in Eq. (136). The equation of motion for the Wigner phase-space distribution function is reduced to the classical Liouville equation.^{21,22,63} These are the classical limit for the distribution functions. Likewise the classical limit of the quantum path dynamics should naturally be the Hamilton canonical equations of motion.

The classical limit of the quantum Newtonian equation is taken in Eq. (167) by putting

$$d\rho = 0 \quad (178)$$

along a trajectory, and the zero Wiener process. The result turns out to be

$$d^2 X_t = -\frac{1}{m} \vec{\nabla} V(dt)^2. \quad (179)$$

2. Insights from taking the classical limits

The above study of the classical limit of the quantum path dynamics highlights the intrinsic quantum effects as follows.

1. The Wiener process is found to be indeed critical to quantum mechanics as stressed in Sec. IV. Equation (169) and those following it have shown that the quantum path is immediately reduced to a classical path as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, indicating that “if a quantum path could be tracked in a deterministic manner due to the disappearance of the quantum stochasticity, it should be subjected to the law of classical mechanics.” The contraposition of this statement is that “if a quantum path does not satisfy classical mechanics, it cannot be tracked in a deterministic manner because of the presence of stochasticity.” This last statement is consistent with the reason why Nelson formulated his theory with the stochastic equations (89) and (90).^{40,41}

2. The quantum effects are expected to appear more significantly when the condition of Eq. (169) is violated and $\rho(X_t, t)$ has a broader spatial distribution around X_t , which indicates that the stochastic paths can wander about the area covered by $|\psi(q, t)|^2$.²⁵

3. The time derivative of the velocity drift term depends on $\rho(X_t, t)$ in the form $\vec{\nabla}V(X_t, t)\rho(X_t, t)$ as in Eq. (161), whereas the quantum paths contribute to the formation of $\rho(X_t, t)$. Therefore, it is confirmed that there is a self-referential nonlinear relation between the parts (the quantum path) and whole ($\rho(X_t, t)$ and $\psi(q, t)$) in the full quantum dynamics. In the classical limit, such a nonlinear dynamical relation is dissolved.

3. Interference pattern in the double slit experiment

Each quantum path should be able to pass through only one of the two slits in the double-slit experiment, because a single quantum path does not branch. On the other hand, a single Schrödinger function can bifurcate and pass through the two slits simultaneously as a coherent distribution function. Note that it is not $|\psi(q, t)|^2$ that physically makes individual spots on the measurement board, but each quantum path does one by one. Nevertheless, each quantum path is “driven and guided” by the drift velocity term, which is composed of the relevant Schrödinger function $\psi(q, t)$, and the quantum paths take the mathematically same routes as the Bohmian trajectories if the Wiener process is ignored. The density distribution of the Bohmian trajectories are well known to reproduce the interference pattern.^{30,51} It is therefore not very mysterious that the interference pattern is shaped after many launchings of single particle. It is a great mystery, however, how nature manages to materialize the nonlinear relation between the parts (quantum paths) and the whole (the Schrödinger function).

D. Quantum entanglement manifesting on a single quantum path and spontaneous detanglement

1. Persisting entanglement

It could be doubted whether the quantum entanglement can be fully taken into account by a single quantum stochastic path. This question is rather natural because the quantum entanglement is considered a superposition of plural local states to be persisted in an asymptotic region.

Suppose as an example a very simple two-particle Schrödinger function

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(q_1, \alpha_1, q_2, \beta_2, t) \\ = N(t) \left(a(q_1^\alpha) b(q_2^\beta) - b(q_1^\alpha) a(q_2^\beta) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (180)$$

in which two local spatial functions $\{a(q_1^\alpha), b(q_2^\beta)\}$ are entangled, where q_1^α (q_2^β) is the short-hand notation of spatial and spin coordinates. The density has the following permutation symmetry

$$\rho(q_1^\alpha, q_2^\beta, t) = \rho(q_2^\beta, q_1^\alpha, t). \quad (181)$$

The quantum stochastic path dynamics for the electronic coordinates (X_1^α, X_2^β) reads in this case

$$\begin{aligned} X_1^\alpha(t+dt) &= X_1^\alpha(t) + \frac{1}{m\rho} P_{X_t}^{(1)}(X_1^\alpha(t), X_2^\beta(t)) dt \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} dW_0^{(1)}(t, \omega) \end{aligned} \quad (182)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} X_2^\beta(t+dt) &= X_2^\beta(t) + \frac{1}{m\rho} P_{X_t}^{(2)}(X_1^\alpha(t), X_2^\beta(t)) dt \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} dW_0^{(1)}(t, \omega), \end{aligned} \quad (183)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X_t}^{(i)}(X_1^\alpha, X_2^\beta, t) \\ = \left(\text{Re}(\psi(X_1^\alpha, X_2^\beta, t)) \text{Im}(\psi(X_1^\alpha, X_2^\beta, t)) \right) \\ \times \hat{p}_i \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Re}(\psi(X_1^\alpha, X_2^\beta, t)) \\ \text{Im}(\psi(X_1^\alpha, X_2^\beta, t)) \end{array} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (184)$$

with $i = 1, 2$. It is obvious the two velocity drift terms are symmetric with respect to the permutation between the coordinate X_1^α and X_2^β . The Wiener processes $dW_0^{(1)}(t, \omega)$ and $dW_0^{(2)}(t, \omega)$ take place independently for each path (meaning $dW_0^{(1)}(t, \omega) \neq dW_0^{(2)}(t, \omega)$) and do not depend on the electron spin. Likewise, the force

terms working on the the coordinates X_1^α and X_2^β are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\vec{P}_{X_t}^{(i)}}{dt} &= -\vec{\nabla}_i V(X_1^\alpha, X_2^\beta) \rho(X_1^\alpha, X_2^\beta, t) \\ &= -\vec{\nabla}_i (V(X_1^\alpha, X_2^\beta) |N_\pm(t)|^2 \\ &\quad \times [|a(X_1^\alpha)|^2 |b(X_2^\beta)|^2 + |b(X_1^\alpha)|^2 |a(X_2^\beta)|^2 \\ &\quad + (a^*(X_1^\alpha)b(X_1^\alpha)b^*(X_2^\beta)a(X_2^\beta) + \text{c.c.})]), \end{aligned}$$

($i = 1, 2$) and again they are symmetric with respect to the permutation between $i = 1$ and $i = 2$. Thus the present two electron system feels a spin-free entangled force, and therefore, if the Wiener processes are ignored, X_1^α and X_2^β keep symmetric as the Schrödinger function in Eq. (180) does.

On the other hand, the Wiener process keeps randomizing the deterministic process including the above entanglement, up to an extent proportional to $(\hbar/m)^{1/2}$. Nevertheless, at each time step dt , dP_{X_t} is updated under the pure entanglement force with no quantum stochasticity. Therefore, the quantum path X_t is supposed to partly survive the randomization and maintain the effect from the entanglement.

2. Detanglement

A subtle balance between the entanglement and the stochastic dynamics can come to end when the orbital overlap between $a(q)$ and $b(q)$ becomes small, that is, $a(q)b(q) \sim 0$. This is because the energy gap between the states of $a(q_1^\alpha)b(q_2^\beta) - b(q_1^\alpha)a(q_2^\beta)$, $a(q_1^\alpha)b(q_2^\beta)$, and $b(q_1^\alpha)a(q_2^\beta)$ become small and can mix in a way to violate the permutation symmetry, if there was a symmetry breaking interaction in the Schrödinger equation. We also recall the energy-time uncertainty due to the quantum stochasticity (see Sec. IV C). Therefore, the symmetry breaking due to the stochasticity in (X_1^α, X_2^β) -space can effectively makes it possible for the quantum path to jump to one of $a(q_1^\alpha)b(q_2^\beta)$ and $b(q_1^\alpha)a(q_2^\beta)$: Even after the particles are separated far from each other to asymptotic areas, say, $q(A)$ and $q(B)$ with $|q(A) - q(B)| \sim \infty$ and thereby $a(q(A))b(q(B)) = 0$, the entanglement has no mechanism to decouple itself in the Schrödinger equation, since this is essentially a matter of symmetry. The asymptotic Schrödinger function is thus formally rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^{asymptotic}(q_1^\alpha, q_2^\beta, t) \\ = N(t) \left(a^A(q_1^\alpha(A))b^B(q_2^\beta(B)) - b^B(q_1^\alpha(B))a^A(q_2^\beta(A)) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (185)$$

where a^A and b^B are the asymptotic functions of a and b in the $q(A)$ and $q(B)$ areas, respectively. In the language of the path dynamics, on the other hand, we have two

corresponding channels

$$(X_1^\alpha(A), X_2^\beta(B)) \quad (186)$$

and

$$(X_2^\beta(A), X_1^\alpha(B)), \quad (187)$$

where $X_1^\alpha(A)$ indicates that X_1^α is found in the $q(A)$ area. Only one of the channels Eq. (186) or (187) is materialized. It is spontaneous and uncontrollable due to the quantum stochasticity. The paths of Eq. (186) and (187) are not subject to the permutation symmetry with each other. Only one of them can happen in a single event, while it is with the same probability for these two to take place in a large ensemble of the relevant experiment. Thus the quantum entanglement can be resolved spontaneously under the quantum law.

The breaking the detanglement and choosing the final channel from the entrance channel $|a(1)|^2|b(2)|^2$ can be schematically represented in the language of the Schrödinger function: starting from the fully entangled state, we track the path running in the state


$$\begin{aligned} &\pm (a^*(1)b(1)b^*(2)a(2) + a(1)b^*(1)b(2)a^*(2)) \\ &\begin{array}{l} \text{Wiener process} \nearrow |a^A(X_1^\alpha(A))|^2 |b^B(X_2^\beta(B))|^2 \\ \rightarrow \text{spontaneously} \\ \text{choosing one of} \searrow |b^B(X_1^\alpha(B))|^2 |a^A(X_2^\beta(A))|^2 \end{array} \end{aligned} \quad (188)$$

Here we notice that the statement that “the channel selection $|a^A(X_1^\alpha(A))|^2 |b^B(X_2^\beta(B))|^2$ or $|b^B(X_1^\alpha(B))|^2 |a^A(X_2^\beta(A))|^2$ is *stochastically* determined by the quantum spontaneous Wiener process” can be formally replaced with a statement that “the channel selection $|a^A(X_1^\alpha(A))|^2 |b^B(X_2^\beta(B))|^2$ or $|b^B(X_1^\alpha(B))|^2 |a^A(X_2^\beta(A))|^2$ has been made *as a result of our experimental measurement*”. This is because the appearance of $|a^A(X_1^\alpha(A))|^2 |b^B(X_2^\beta(B))|^2$ or $|b^B(X_1^\alpha(B))|^2 |a^A(X_2^\beta(A))|^2$ cannot be controlled and yet happens with the same probability.

A series of paradoxes such as the so-called nonlocality¹⁸ follows from the fact that the Schrödinger equation does not have a mechanism to decouple the entanglement and suggests that it persists indefinitely. (Conversely, there is no internal mechanism either for asymptotically non-entangled states to get entangled according to the Schrödinger equation alone.) A widely accepted interpretation or postulate to understand the nonlocality^{9–12} is that upon a physical measurement of one of the two possible asymptotic functions $a(q_1)b(q_2)$ and $b(q_1)a(q_2)$ the total Schrödinger function collapses instantly into the reality at both far remote ends q^A

and q^B simultaneously. Another postulate is that the action of observation itself determines what happens in reality. (Einstein allegedly asked “do you think is the moon there when nobody looks?”⁶⁴) These postulates seem to arise partly because of the assumption that the Schrödinger function represents a direct physics of a single event. By contrast, the quantum path approach says that the channel is selected anyway without respect to whether the experimental measurement is made or not, and instead that the intrinsic quantum stochasticity does it. The channel separation is made spontaneously within the dual structure of the Schrödinger dynamics. [We have no space to step into the discussions about Bell’s inequality^{9–12} and the hidden variables in this paper.]

Before concluding this subsection, we raise another elementary example in which the quantum stochasticity is critical in spontaneous symmetry breaking in the path solutions. Suppose a dissociation of hydrogen molecule cation H_2^+ in the following scheme



The Schrödinger equation by itself has no mechanism to determine the branching, which obviously needs to break the spatial symmetry. Otherwise the dissociation is forced to $H_A^{\frac{1}{2}+} + H_B^{\frac{1}{2}+}$ in the density ρ . There is no inconvenience in neglecting the physical process behind Eq. (189) in the class rooms of the nature of chemical bond. However, the view from quantum stochastic path dynamics accounts for such a symmetry-breaking dissociation in a natural manner.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have studied the dual structure of the Schrödinger dynamics, which is composed of the dynamics of the quantum distribution amplitude function subjected to the Schrödinger and the quantum stochastic path dynamics.

By deriving the Schrödinger equation from scratch on the field of real number, where the Schrödinger function is defined as a factorizing vector (the Schrödinger vector) of a particle density distribution, we have clarified the minimal requirements for it to satisfy; space-time translational invariance and the flux conservation applied to the density functions. In the variational principle applied to the equation of continuity, it has been shown that the real-valued Schrödinger equation is expected to pick the most probable states among those functions whose densities satisfy the equation of continuity. After presenting the basic properties of the real-valued Schrödinger equation, we have shown that the real-valued Schrödinger equation gives an alternative form of the path integration

as its Green function, which is similar to the Feynman-Kac formula and thereby highlights the similarity between quantum and stochastic dynamics more closely than ever.

The quantum stochastic path dynamics is represented with the Ito stochastic differential equation consisting of the velocity drift term and the Wiener process having an appropriate diffusion constant. The velocity drift term drives the “particles” in a mechanical way, the resultant pathways should geometrically coincide with the Bohmian trajectory, if the background Schrödinger function applied is common, if the initial conditions are the same, and if there is no Wiener process applied to the quantum stochastic paths. Actually the Bohm representation of the complex Schrödinger function corresponds to the polar representation of the Schrödinger vector, and the Bohm trajectory is an integral curve of, or equivalently, a flow line induced by the Schrödinger function. Yet, Bohm’s theory has been recently evolved as a method for computing the Schrödinger equation in trajectory forms.^{3,28–30,48,49}

Concepts and phenomena derived from quantum stochastic path dynamics are summarized as follows.

(1) Characterization of Quantum Stochastic Paths:

1. To determine the quantum stochastic paths, the local velocity distribution as a function of the Schrödinger function is required.
2. As a result, indirect correlations arise among the independent quantum paths. The correlation among the paths should therefore depend on the context of experimental preparation and the resultant Schrödinger function.
3. Because of these properties of the velocity drift terms, the resultant quantum paths collectively form a fringe pattern in the double slit experiment, just as the ensemble of Bohm trajectories do. This is not due to an interference between quantum stochastic paths but to the presence of the Schrödinger function behind the drift term.

(2) Role of Quantum Stochasticity:

1. The energy eigenvalues of the hydrogen atom can be derived from the scaling law of the quantum stochasticity alone, without using the Bohr model or the Schrödinger equation, thereby indicating that quantum stochasticity serves as one of the foundations of quantum dynamics.
2. Quantum stochasticity also serves as an origin of uncertainty.
3. The Schrödinger equation does not bear the machinery to break the entanglement and the associated symmetry. The quantum Wiener process can spontaneously detangle.

The quantum stochasticity emerges from the mathematical constraint in taking limit $\Delta q \rightarrow 0$ and $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. Another characteristic of the quantum stochasticity is the function of its “dice” that nature seems to play with. (It

is well known that Einstein commented “God does not play dice” based on his belief in determinism.¹⁰⁾ As for the ordinary dice, one can roll a large set of dices at a time, or single dice many times. The law of large numbers indicates that the probability for a given role to appear should converge to 1/6 in both ways. In quantum dynamics we can imagine an ensemble of experimental events, but actually we cannot perform those experiments at a time. Nevertheless, the Schrödinger equation can mathematically realize the situation as a coherent superposition of the events, predicting the most likely combination of the states. Meanwhile, we can run a quantum path one after another separately, even though each relevant path cannot be tracked physically. In contrast to the ordinary dices, however, the quantum paths are not independent from one another and thereby mutually correlate in an indirect manner through the Schrödinger function behind the velocity field.

We have identified an ultimate mystery or wonder in the Schrödinger dynamics; the relationship between the whole (the Schrödinger function) and its parts (Quantum stochastic path dynamics). This relationship is self-referential and thereby nonlinear: the “parts” operate under instructions from the “whole” (through the velocity drift term), while the “whole” is composed of a set of “parts” through the path integration in the extended Feynman-Kac formula. However, it remains unclear how those individual paths can feel the overall velocity distribution function. In an effort to unravel this ultimate nonlinear relationship, we studied the Schrödinger paths in the quantum canonical equations of motion and the quantum Newtonian equation, investigating the quantum-classical correspondence, without reaching a definite conclusion.

One rather comfortable idea to accept the relationship between the whole and parts is to regard the velocity drift term as a field on which each quantum paths are guided under a given initial condition. Yet, there is another way to think about the possible role of the velocity drift term. Recall the Schrödinger vector gives the most probable ρ among the possible densities that are compatible with the space-time translational invariance and flux conservation. This implies that the Schrödinger function specifies the most probable situation for the possible quantum paths. Therefore, the quantum paths should spontaneously manage by themselves to materialize the most likely density. Theory could only mimic such quantum phenomena in terms of the velocity drift involved in the Ito equation. However, it still remains puzzling how the quantum particles can actually manage to satisfy the variational situation. This question is similar to how a classical path finds a way to satisfy the Maupertuis-Hamilton-Jacobi variational principle.

Some very brief comments on the dual structure of the Schrödinger dynamics: It could be somewhat risky and misleading if one attempts to comprehend everything solely by means of the Schrödinger function. For example, the interpretation in the double-slit experiment

that a particle passes through two slits simultaneously should be incorrect. While the Schrödinger function, as a coherent distribution amplitude function, mathematically allows for this, each quantum stochastic path can physically pass through only one. Similarly, the spots that appear on the measurement board represent the endpoints of quantum stochastic paths, and there is no physical need of the so-called instantaneous collapse of the Schrödinger function. Additionally, the many-world interpretation of the wavefunction of universe leading to the discussions of “Schrödinger’s cat” seem to stem from an attempt to describe everything solely with the Schrödinger function and Schrödinger equation. The Schrödinger function can predict experimental results that are, in principle, infinitely repeatable (or at least performable many times). Conversely, the understanding and prediction of experiments of limited performance, or the theoretical simulation of non-repeatable phenomena, should resort to the quantum stochastic path dynamics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Prof. Satoshi Takahashi and Dr. Kota Hanasaki for valuable discussions and comments. This work has been supported by JSPS KAKENHI, Grant No. JP20H00373 and JP24K01435.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

- ¹P. A. M. Dirac, *The principles of quantum mechanics* (Oxford university press, 1981).
- ²J. Schwinger, B.-G. Englert, *et al.*, *Quantum mechanics: symbolism of atomic measurements*, Vol. 1 (Springer, 2001).
- ³D. Bohm, *Quantum theory* (Courier Corporation, 1989).
- ⁴A. Messiah, *Quantum mechanics* (Courier Corporation, 2014).
- ⁵L. I. Schiff, *Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968).
- ⁶R. P. Feynman, A. R. Hibbs, and D. F. Styer, *Quantum mechanics and path integrals* (Courier Corporation, 2010).
- ⁷L. Ruetsche, *Interpreting quantum theories* (Oxford University Press, 2011).
- ⁸R. Omnes, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **64**, 339 (1992).
- ⁹G. Auletta, *Foundations and Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics: In the Light of a Critical-Historical Analysis of the Problems and of a Synthesis of the Results* (World Scientific, 2001).
- ¹⁰D. Home and A. Whitaker, *Einstein’s struggles with quantum theory: a reappraisal* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2007).
- ¹¹A. Whitaker, *The new quantum age: from Bell’s theorem to quantum computation and teleportation* (Oxford University Press, 2012).
- ¹²O. Freire Jr, G. Bacciagaluppi, O. Darrigol, T. Hartz, C. Joas, A. Kojevnikov, and O. Pessoa Jr, *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Quantum Interpretations* (Oxford University Press, 2022).

- ¹³M. Nagasawa, *Probability theory and related fields* **82**, 109 (1989).
- ¹⁴M. Nagasawa, *Schrödinger equations and diffusion theory* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2012).
- ¹⁵M. Kac, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **65**, 1 (1949).
- ¹⁶P. Del Moral and P. Del Moral, *Feynman-kac formulae* (Springer, 2004).
- ¹⁷H. Ezawa and N. Tohr, *Brownian Motion (in Japanese)* (Asakura (Tokyo), 2020).
- ¹⁸A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, *Physical review* **47**, 777 (1935).
- ¹⁹W. Yourgrau and S. Mandelstam, *Variational principles in dynamics and quantum theory* (Courier Corporation, 2012).
- ²⁰L. S. Simeonov, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03689 (2024).
- ²¹E. Wigner, *Physical review* **40**, 749 (1932).
- ²²C. Zachos, D. Fairlie, and T. Curtright, *Quantum mechanics in phase space: an overview with selected papers* (World Scientific, 2005).
- ²³K. Takatsuka, *Physical Review E* **64**, 016224 (2001).
- ²⁴S. Takahashi and K. Takatsuka, *Physical Review A* **89**, 012108 (2014).
- ²⁵K. Takatsuka and S. Takahashi, *Physical Review A* **89**, 012109 (2014).
- ²⁶V. I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 1989).
- ²⁷M. A. De Gosson, *Symplectic geometry and quantum mechanics*, Vol. 166 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2006).
- ²⁸D. Bohm, *Physical review* **85**, 166 (1952).
- ²⁹R. E. Wyatt, *Quantum dynamics with trajectories: introduction to quantum hydrodynamics*, Vol. 28 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2005).
- ³⁰Á. S. Sanz and S. Miret-Artés, *A Trajectory Description of Quantum Processes. I and II. Applications: A Bohmian Perspective* (Springer, 2013).
- ³¹A. Goussev, *Physical Review A Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics* **85**, 013626 (2012).
- ³²K. Takatsuka, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **56**, 445302 (2023).
- ³³A. Bassi, K. Lochan, S. Satin, T. P. Singh, and H. Ulbricht, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **85**, 471 (2013).
- ³⁴R. P. Feynman, *Reviews of modern physics* **20**, 367 (1948).
- ³⁵L. S. Schulman, *Techniques and applications of path integration* (Courier Corporation, 2012).
- ³⁶H. Kleinert, *Path integrals in quantum mechanics, statistics, polymer physics, and financial markets* (World Scientific Publishing Company, 2006).
- ³⁷J. R. Klauder and I. Daubechies, *Physical review letters* **52**, 1161 (1984).
- ³⁸I. Daubechies and J. R. Klauder, *Journal of mathematical physics* **26**, 2239 (1985).
- ³⁹B. Davison, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **225**, 252 (1954).
- ⁴⁰E. Nelson, *Physical review* **150**, 1079 (1966).
- ⁴¹E. Nelson, in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, Vol. 361 (IOP Publishing, 2012) p. 012011.
- ⁴²N. G. Van Kampen, *Physics reports* **24**, 171 (1976).
- ⁴³H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation* (Springer, 1996).
- ⁴⁴C. Gardiner, *Handbook of Stochastic Methods for Physics, Chemistry and the Natural Sciences* (Springer, 2004).
- ⁴⁵B. Oksendal, *Stochastic differential equations: an introduction with applications* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).
- ⁴⁶K. Yasue, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **18**, 861 (1979).
- ⁴⁷K. Yasue, *Journal of functional Analysis* **41**, 327 (1981).
- ⁴⁸C. L. Loprore and R. E. Wyatt, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, 5190 (1999).
- ⁴⁹R. E. Wyatt, *The Journal of chemical physics* **111**, 4406 (1999).
- ⁵⁰M. A. De Gosson, *The Principles Of Newtonian And Quantum Mechanics, The: The Need For Planck's Constant, H* (World Scientific, 2016).
- ⁵¹C. Philippidis, C. Dewdney, and B. J. Hiley, *Nuovo Cimento B* **52**, 15 (1979).
- ⁵²B. B. Mandelbrot, *The fractal geometry of nature/Revised and enlarged edition* (1983).
- ⁵³A. Einstein, *Verh. d. D. Physik. Ges* , 82 (1917).
- ⁵⁴M. Brack and R. Bhaduri, *Semiclassical physics* (CRC Press, 2018).
- ⁵⁵M. C. Gutzwiller, *J. Math. Phys.* **11**, 1791 (1970).
- ⁵⁶M. C. Gutzwiller, *J. Math. Phys.* **12**, 343 (1971).
- ⁵⁷L. E. Reichl, *The Transition to Chaos* (Springer, Berlin, 1992).
- ⁵⁸P. Gaspard, D. Alonso, and I. Burghardt, "New way of understanding semiclassical quantization," in *Adv. Chem. Phys. XC* (John Wiley, New York, 1995) p. 105.
- ⁵⁹E. Robnik, Marco, *Quantum Chaos. Dedicated to Professor Giulio Casati on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday* (MDPI, Basel, 2023).
- ⁶⁰K. Takatsuka, *Entropy*, **25**, 63 (2023).
- ⁶¹M. Ozawa, *Physical Review A* **67**, 042105 (2003).
- ⁶²M. Ozawa, *Current Science* , 2006 (2015).
- ⁶³A. Polkovnikov, *Annals of Physics* **325**, 1790 (2010).
- ⁶⁴N. D. Mermin, *Physics today* **38**, 38 (1985).