

# Games with Quantum Analogues

J. M. A. Figueiredo

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais - Dept. de Física

Caixa Postal 702 - Belo Horizonte - 30.123-970

Brazil

email: josef@fisica.ufmg.br

October 30, 2018

## Abstract

A new class of stochastic variables, governed by a specific set of rules, is introduced. These rules force them to lose some properties usually assumed for this kind of variables. We demonstrate that stochastic processes driven by these random sources must be described using a probability amplitude formalism in a close resemblance to Quantum Theory. This fact shows, for the first time, that probability amplitudes are a general concept and is not exclusive to the formalism of Quantum Theory. Application of these rules to a noisy, one-dimensional motion, leads to a probability structure homomorphic to Quantum Mechanics.

Stochastic Models, Game Theory, Quantum Theory

The understanding that noise drives a wide variety of phenomena in Nature brought to many branches of Science the conviction that randomness is a fundamental property that must be considered in any real modeling of the physical world. In fact, all theories yet developed that include noise as an element driving an otherwise deterministic process still remain making use of this concept even when specific changes on its mathematical modeling may eventually be refined. The only exception is Quantum Theory, which makes use of probabilistic tools without specific reference to any noise source. In its early developments Einstein, Hopf and Stern [1] tried to explain some electrodynamic phenomena using a noisy electromagnetic field, in addition to the usual deterministic one, in the dynamical equations describing particle motion. However, later developments of the Quantum Theory led to a noiseless model, that acts as a noise source but not depending, on its fundamental epistemological components, of a noise source. Despite this very important exception we can assert, without doubt, that stochastic physical theories are epistemologically robust and confident.

It is clear, from the above arguments, that two general classes of probability theories exist. The classical ones make use of probabilities or probability densities and is used to describe stochastic processes. On the other hand quantum probabilities must be determined from a probability amplitude and do not describe a stochastic process. In fact quantum probability is considered an intrinsic

property of Nature; this way it is strongly believed that probability amplitudes are exclusive to quantum phenomena which drives any other macroscopic manifestation of physical phenomena. No other manifestation of statistical phenomena, in any field, may have, in principle, the characteristics of the quantum probability. That is the point we want to discuss in this work. We present a new model for the random variable itself thus affecting all existing stochastic theories whenever the novelties introduced here are applicable. Stochastic processes driven by this kind of variable make use of a probability amplitude formalism even though no reference to quantum phenomena is made.

Usual stochastic processes present two main components: a determinist law plus an additional stochastic term depending on the value of a random variable. This variable assumes its values in a unpredictable way but once its instantaneous fluctuating value is defined the system responds to it in a predictable way. No doubt concerning the "reading" process is introduced. A causal relation exists between the actual value assumed by the random variable and the one in fact used by the system in its deterministic response to noise. This reading process then has a property, borrowed from similar concept, usual in Quantum Theory, we call "realism" because the actual value of the random variable may, at least in principle, be known.

We want to deny the necessity of realism in a stochastic theory by introducing the concept of *incomplete* random variable. A system responds to this kind of variable in a two steps process. In the first one the variable fluctuates in the usual way but its value is not readily available to the system that must read it. In this second step some errors may occur. Two types of errors will be considered here. They are as defined by the Q-rules set postulated below:

- rule one: the fluctuating value is not read; the fluctuation is lost. System's state is frozen until the next round. A clear breakdown of causality is introduced at this point.
- rule two: some readings are wrong. Another value for the fluctuating variable, not the real one, is used by the system to drive its dynamics. The value is lost but not the reading.

Before an explicitly mathematical formalization of these rules it is worth to stress that all them are algorithmic even though they break causality and realism. In fact, we can't assert to an incomplete random variable any criteria of realism because it is impossible to know its exact value; at the same time the relation between the system and the noise source is not causal because nobody can guarantee system's dynamics will be dictated by a given fluctuation. In some sense, however, reality cannot be completely discarded because fluctuations itself are real. Notwithstanding, realism, as defined above, definitively does not exist. More formally, let us consider a discrete random variable  $Y$  that can have  $M$  values, and its associated probability distribution  $P(y)$ . For definiteness assume that  $P(y_j) > 0$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ . If  $Y$  is an incomplete random variable then its value is not directly accessible to the system. The actual histogram for  $Y$  is not any more given by  $P(y)$ . Instead, a modified one that takes

into account the Q-rules must be used. This modified probability distribution, the non-classical one, will be written as  $p_j = P_j + C_j$  where  $P_j \equiv P(y_j)$  and  $C_j$  is the non-classical term. This term has contributions from both Q-rules. From the first one we have the probability of lost readings given by  $\gamma_j P_j$ . Thus,  $P_j(1 - \gamma_j)$  is the probability of successful readings. Two kinds of contributions arise from rule two. The probability of reading state  $j$  may be enhanced by a wrong reading of another state; on the other hand this probability may be decreased by a wrong reading that converts state  $j$  to another one. If  $\Gamma_{j,l}$  ( $j \neq l$ ) is the probability that a realization giving the value  $y_l$  be read as  $y_j$  then we write rule two as  $\sum_{l=1, l \neq j}^M (\Gamma_{j,l} P_l - \Gamma_{l,j} P_j)$ . Defining  $\tilde{C}_{j,l} \equiv \Gamma_{j,l} P_l - \left(\Gamma_{l,j} + \frac{\gamma_j}{M-1}\right) P_j$  ( $j \neq l$ ) we get the histogram effectively read for variable  $Y$

$$p_j = P_j + \sum_{l=1, l \neq j}^M \tilde{C}_{j,l} \quad (1)$$

Observe that the non-classical terms  $\tilde{C}_{j,l}$  may have any sign; consequently they cannot be seen as a truly probability term. Only the non classical distribution  $p$ , that possesses the desired positiveness, is accessible to the system. That means we cannot write  $p$  as the sum of two independent process, one driven by  $P$  and the other by the non-classical terms. At this point we explicitly break realism because the observed histogram corresponds to  $p$ , not to  $P$ . So we cannot directly measure or observe the noise source. This way we see that incomplete random variables present a simple algorithm in their realization, although their conception are more complicated than the usual ones. For instance, consider a roulette with  $M$  stops and an imperfect camera that reads pointer's position at each round. The roulette drives a game but pointer's position is only accessible to players through the camera that may generate wrong readings (or no readings at all), according to the Q-rules. The roulette is real but this reality is only conceptual, since the actual value used in the game comes from camera readings.

We are now in position to study a stochastic process driven by a incomplete random variable. Let us initially consider a discrete time process (a game) [2], of the following general form

$$f(x_{n+1}, x_n) = g(x_n) w_n \quad (2)$$

where  $W$  is the (uncorrelated) stochastic variable and  $\varphi(w)$  its associated probability distribution. For  $g(x) = 0$  the game evolves according a deterministic rule, defining player's strategy. A noise source includes a chance ingredient, that makes best strategy choices non-trivial. We regard eqn(2) as defining the value the stochastic variable  $x_{n+1}$  will take at round  $n + 1$ , considering that it takes the value  $x_n$  at round  $n$ . The joint probability density  $\Pi(x_N, x_{N-1}, \dots, x_1)$  completely describe this process and for a given sampling sequence of  $W$  it is given by [3]:

$$\Pi(x_N, x_{N-1}, \dots, x_1) = \int \prod_{n=1}^N \delta(f(x_{n+1}, x_n) - g(x_n) w_n) \varphi(w_n) dw_n$$

which in the discretized model assumes the form

$$\Pi(x_N, x_{N-1}, \dots, x_1) = \sum_{j_1=1} \dots \sum_{j_N=1} \prod_{n=1}^N \delta(f(x_{n+1}, x_n) - g(x_n) w_{j_n}) \varphi(w_{j_n}) \quad (3)$$

The product  $\prod_{n=1}^N \varphi(w_{j_n})$  defines a ordered sampling sequence  $\{w_{j_1} \dots w_{j_N}\}$  of the bare random variable  $W$  which we will call a "path"; it is easy to see that in the above summation there are  $M^N$  paths. Path concept in stochastic processes was used initially by Onsager and Machlup [4] in order to describe the effect of fluctuations on non-equilibrium systems. Later Graham [5] developed a more general formalism to include sophisticated dynamics satisfying the Liouville equation which successfully allowed works in systems subject to colored noise [6]. We shall adopt eqn(3) as a strong support to later developments in the present work.

Now it is natural to introduce the effects of the Q-rules on stochastic processes by imposing that  $W$  be an incomplete random variable  $Y$  and studying how incompleteness affects eqn(3). Histogram of  $Y$  is given by eqn(1) and at round  $n$  it assumes the value  $y_{j_n}$ . Then to any path there is an associated product of the form

$$\prod_{n=1}^N P(y_{j_n}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \left( P_{j_n} + \sum_{l=1, l \neq j}^M \tilde{C}_{j_n, l} \right) \quad (4)$$

which, for a incomplete variable, branches in a sum having  $M^N$  terms, as seen from the left side of the above equation. There are  $M^N$  paths so the sum over all paths, involved in eqn(3), has  $M^{2N}$  terms. The set of all paths,  $\Xi$ , may be represented as the union of two disjoint subsets:  $\Xi = \Omega \cup \Lambda$  where  $\Omega$  is the set of all paths containing only  $P$ -terms and  $\Lambda$  contains elements with at least one non-classical contribution. Thus  $\Omega$  consists in the set of all "classical" paths, those valid for a complete random variable, and has  $M^N$  elements.

In sequence we make a simplification in the model, assuming that

$$\tilde{C}_{j,l} = \tilde{C}_{l,j} \implies \tilde{C}_{j,l} = -\frac{\gamma_j P_j + \gamma_l P_l}{2(M-1)} \leq 0 \quad (5)$$

This means that vacuum losses ( $\gamma$ ) completely dominate the chance of non-classical effects during the reading process. The number of elements in  $\Lambda$  is reduced due to this symmetry as shown below. Writing  $M^{2N} = (M^2 - M + M)^N$  we get

$$M^{2N} = \sum_{l=0}^N \binom{N}{l} M^{(N-l)} (M^2 - M)^l$$

showing that there are  $\binom{N}{l} M^{(N-l)} (M^2 - M)^l$  paths with  $l$  non-classical contributions. The symmetry expressed by eqn(5) demands this number be reduced

to  $\binom{N}{l} M^{(N-l)} \left(\frac{M^2-M}{2}\right)^l$  terms, generating a total number of independent non-classical paths equal to

$$\sum_{l=1}^N \binom{N}{l} M^{(N-l)} \left(\frac{M^2-M}{2}\right)^l = \left(\frac{M^2+M}{2}\right)^N - M^N$$

caused by the existence of twin paths, those having labels in the non-classical contributions exchanged. This result reduces the number of elements in  $\Xi$  to  $\left(\frac{M^2+M}{2}\right)^N$ .

We will now show that classical paths may index all non-classical ones as well, in a very specific way. To this end we rewrite

$$\tilde{C}_{j,l} = -\frac{\sqrt{P_l P_j}}{2(M-1)} \left( \gamma_l \sqrt{\frac{P_l}{P_j}} + \gamma_j \sqrt{\frac{P_j}{P_l}} \right) \equiv \sqrt{P_j} \sqrt{P_l} d_{j,l} \quad (6)$$

and  $P_j = \sqrt{P_j} \sqrt{P_j}$ , in such a way that each non-classical path has the structure of a product of  $2N$  factors of the type  $\sqrt{P}$ , followed by a product of  $d$ 's, in the same number of the existing non-classical terms in the considered path. Note that classical paths can also be rewritten as a sequence of type  $\sqrt{P}$  having, obviously, no  $d$ -terms. Since all  $d$ 's are negative the value of a non-classical path may have any sign. In considering this type of sequences, another marked difference between elements in  $\Omega$  and  $\Lambda$  is that each non-classical contribution has necessarily cross terms like  $\sqrt{P_j} \sqrt{P_l}$ , with  $l \neq j$ . However, note that non-classical paths may have classical-like segments with the same structure of elements in  $\Omega$ . We call *radix* ( $R$ ) of a sequence its non- $d$  terms part. That is, the radix is a sequence of terms like  $\sqrt{P_j} \sqrt{P_l}$  (for all  $l$  and  $j$ ). Consequently all elements in  $\Lambda$  have the structure  $R \prod d$ . The product runs over the number  $L_{path}$  of non-classical terms in the considered sequence. Thus we define an auxiliary set  $\Delta$  composed by all possible radices. It's easy to see that  $\Omega$  is a subset of  $\Delta$  which have the same number of elements of  $\Xi$ . In what follows we shall use these facts in order to construct a unified structure for that set.

Let us consider the set  $\tilde{H}$  of all classical-like paths of type  $\sqrt{P}$ ; that is, paths in  $\tilde{H}$  are just those sequences in  $\Omega$  where  $P$ 's are substituted by the corresponding  $\sqrt{P}$ 's. Thus each element  $R_{\tilde{H}}$  in  $\tilde{H}$  may be written as  $R_{\tilde{H}} = \sqrt{R_{\Omega}}$ , where  $R_{\Omega}$  is the corresponding path in  $\Omega$ . On the other hand since  $\Delta$  consists of all combinations of ordered sequences of  $\sqrt{P}$ -type we may write each element there as a cross-product of some elements in  $\tilde{H}$ . That is, we always can write each element  $R_{\Delta}$  in  $\Delta$  as  $R_{\Delta} = R_{\tilde{H}} R'_{\tilde{H}}$  for two carefully chosen elements in  $\tilde{H}$ . As a result we write the important result that  $\Delta = \tilde{H} \otimes \tilde{H}$ . Now we define an extended set  $H$  by assigning to each element in  $\tilde{H}$  a "phase", a complex number  $\exp(i\varphi_{\Omega})$ , in such a way that the  $M^N$  elements in  $H$  have the general form  $S_H = R_{\tilde{H}} \exp(i\varphi_{\Omega}) = \sqrt{R_{\Omega}} \exp(i\varphi_{\Omega})$ . Consequently, since  $S_H (S_H)^* = R_{\Omega}$ , we see that  $\Omega \supset H \otimes H^*$ . On the other hand the radix of an element in  $H$  is just the corresponding element in  $\tilde{H}$ . This way we see that elements of  $H \otimes H^*$

have the general form  $R_\Delta \exp(i(\varphi_\Omega - \varphi_\Omega))$  or  $R_\Delta \exp(-i(\varphi_\Omega - \varphi_\Omega))$ . The sum  $\tilde{\Xi} = \sum H \otimes H^*$  has  $M^N + M^N (M^N - 1) / 2$  terms (all them real numbers); out of these there are  $M^N$  terms having no phase contribution. They correspond to the classical paths belonging to  $\Omega$ ; the remaining ones can be collected into  $\left(\frac{M^2+M}{2}\right)^N - M^N$  independent radices  $R_\Delta$  times a linear combination of phase terms, each one expressed as a  $2 \cos(\varphi_\Omega - \varphi_\Omega)$ . This last term is symmetric under exchange of argument indices, in as much as eqn(6) is. Hence the same argument used to count the twin paths is applicable. This reduces the number of terms in  $\tilde{\Xi}$  to  $\left(\frac{M^2+M}{2}\right)^N$  which is the same number as the sum over all paths in  $\Xi$ . The above results allow us to write the main result of this work:

$$\sum_{\Xi} = \left| \sum_H \right|^2 \quad (7)$$

valid if we make the association

$$\sum_{L_{path}} \prod^{L_{ph}} d_{ji} \equiv \sum_{L_{path}} \prod^{L_{ph}} \cos(\varphi_i - \varphi_j) \quad (8)$$

where  $i$  and  $j$  are classical paths used to index the corresponding common radix  $R_\Delta$  of elements in  $\tilde{H}$ . That is the sum over all paths in  $\Xi$  may be written as a squared sum over all paths in  $H$ . In analogy to quantum theory we call amplitudes the elements in  $H$ . Thus, in order to sum up the right result in  $\Xi$  sample paths in  $H$  (which consists of classical paths for the amplitudes) must "interfere"; that is, in this space, paths, not single realizations of the random variable, are the basic objects. Notice that the phase of a path is a non-local object in the sense we cannot assign to it a single specific process, once it is defined for combinations of  $d$ -terms. In fact, even when  $Y$  is uncorrelated, the phase depends on the whole sequence in a path. In this space realism breaks down since amplitudes cannot be observed in any particular realization of  $Y$ . In the same way it will be shown below that causality is not present as well. Therefore, in the context of this work probability amplitudes describe in a unified way the whole effects of incomplete random variables in such way that interference of these amplitudes means that cross-effects on probabilities due to the Q-rules are relevant.

In order to obtain values for the  $M^N$  phases we expand them in a (truncated) path-dependent power series, each one having a number of terms equal to the integer part of  $[(M+1)/2]^N$ , as follows

$$\varphi_l = \varphi_N + \sum_{nl=1}^N A_{nl} y_{nl} + \sum_{nl=1}^N \sum_{ml=1}^N \tilde{B}_{nl}^{ml} y_{nl} y_{ml} + \dots \quad (9)$$

where  $l \in [1, M^N]$  and  $\varphi_N$  is zero if  $M^N$  is odd. The sequence of values the random variable takes in a given path may be rescaled by incorporation of

the linear coefficients  $\{A_{nl}\}$  once a similar renormalization in the high order coefficients is consistently performed. This way we get a new set of (path-dependent) values for  $Y$ . This new set is obtained by linearization of eqn(8) and does not represent any restriction on the formulation of the problem since, as seen from eqn(3), their elements are dummy variables. As a result it is possible to rewrite eqn(9) as

$$\varphi_l = \varphi_N + \sum_{nl=1}^N \tilde{y}_{nl} + \sum_{nl=1}^N \sum_{ml=1}^N B_{nl}^{ml} \tilde{y}_{nl} \tilde{y}_{ml} + .. \quad (10)$$

where now it is implicit that the set of sampling variables  $\tilde{y}$  is path-dependent. For each path we have chosen the truncation schema carefully by collecting exactly  $[(M+1)/2]^N$  coefficients in the above series. This sums up to a set of  $M^N [(M+1)/2]^N$  elements in the whole set  $H$ . Then just make use of the same number of equations displayed in eqn(8) to solve for these coefficients, completing this way the construction of  $H$ . Now we have at hand a space consisting of classical paths, homomorphic to  $\Omega$ , but whose elements are probability amplitudes. These amplitudes are the mathematical objects used to treat incomplete random variables.

To the phase of a path it is not possible to assign any single realization of the stochastic variable. However it is possible to assign a phase to a segment of a path although single-event association still remains invalid. To define the phase of a segment we rewrite eqn(10) as a sum of  $N$  terms:

$$\varphi_l = \sum_{n=1}^N \left[ \frac{\varphi_{Nl}}{N} + y_{nl} \left( 1 + \sum_{m=1}^N B_{nl}^{ml} y_{ml} + \dots \right) \right] \equiv \sum_{n=1}^N \phi_{nl} \quad (11)$$

allowing us to write an element in  $H$  as  $S_H = \prod_{n=1}^N \sqrt{P_{jn}} e^{i\phi_{nl}}$ . That is, incomplete random variables must be described by a probability amplitude

$$U(j, n, N) \equiv \sqrt{P_j} e^{i\varphi(j, n, N)} \quad (12)$$

in such a way that  $|U(j, n, N)|^2 = P_j$ . The phase of this probability amplitude is process-dependent and cannot be observed in any single realization of the variable, which always results on its effective histogram  $p$ . In this case we say that the bare distribution  $P$  is *hidden*. Furthermore, the phase value, for a given path, depends on all realizations of  $y$  that closes the considered path, including those chosen at future rounds (in the considered path). This property breaks down causality in the phase definition for individual realizations in the sense that future rounds define the present. However this fact does not configure a violation of causality for the whole process once the paths, which form the basic blocks in constructing the transition amplitudes, are causal.

Returning back to the continuum, we must then describe an incomplete random variable  $y$  by a probability amplitude  $U(y, n, N) = \sqrt{P(y)} e^{i\varphi(y, n, N)}$  that must be considered in any stochastic process it drives. We cannot measure the phase of a probability amplitude in any single event measurement; thus it

is not possible to assign to it an element of reality. This is the main difference from usual (classic) stochastic variables that are completely described by their bare probability distribution  $P(y)$ . Now we are in position of analyze how the Q-rules affect a specific game.

To do this let us consider the process defined in eqn(2). For any given initial state  $E(x_0)$ , the probability distribution after  $N$  rounds is [7]

$$E(x_N | x_0) = \int E(x_0) \prod_{n=0}^N \delta(f(x_{n+1}, x_n) - y_n) P(y_n) dy_n dx_n$$

but as written this equation describes the classical version of  $Y$ . If the Q-rules apply up, the phase of the probability distribution should be considered. So, as it stands this equation cannot be used unless we do make the substitution  $P \rightarrow p$ ; we also perform an integration over the random variable  $y$  that results in

$$E(x_N) = \int E(x_0) \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} p(f(x_{n+1}, x_n)) dx_n$$

which is recognized as the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation for a Markov process having transition probabilities given by  $p(f(x_{n+1}, x_n))$ . After discretization this equation seems to have the same path topology of eqns(3) and (4); however, an additional sum over the state at  $n = 0$  is present. It can naturally be inserted in the paths if we define  $E(x_0) \equiv |\psi(x_0)|^2$  and use eqn(7) to get an analogous expression for the probability distribution at time  $N$  given by  $E(x_N) = |\psi(x_N)|^2$ , where

$$\psi(x_N) = \sum_H \sqrt{P(f(x_{n+1}, x_n))} e^{i\varphi(path)} \psi(x_0) \quad (13)$$

which, after recovering the continuum, may be written as

$$\psi(x_N) = \int \psi(x_0) \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{P(f(x_{n+1}, x_n))} e^{i\varphi(path)} dx_n \quad (14)$$

Notice that now the bare probability  $P$  is used in place of  $p$  as prescribed by eqn(12). We arrived at a stochastic version of the Feynman-Kac formula, generalized to any kind of (one-player) game. Note that it is possible to control intensities of each kind of bare process altering both the radix ( $\sqrt{P}$ ) and the phase ( $d's$ ) of a given path in the above cited equation.

We can use this equation in any Markovian process satisfying eqn(2) driven by incomplete random variables. Since the set of rules defining this kind of variables are algorithmic, a new generation of games may be defined and constructed, impinging new challenges to Game Theory. These new games are not the same as the incomplete games [8], those where players don't know about the decisions the others have taken. The use of incomplete variables in a game makes the reading process imperfect but this limitation does not deny the knowledge



of the readings be shared by all players. However, it may occur that players have their own reading apparatus. In this case we have a truly incomplete non-classical game. In this case decision theory and best strategy modeling must take into account the incompleteness of the random source. The possibilities opened by this approach should improve our comprehension about algorithmic probability amplitude effects through modeling and implementation of Q-rules in any specific game. Because we make use of probability amplitude formalism in these games it is reasonable to call them Quantum Games. In this work we do not develop further any general discussion about the consequences of the concepts presented here on Game Theory. Our main interest here was solely to show the existence of this class of games and how the probability amplitude formalism may arise in a truly stochastic theory. However, it would be interesting to analyze some real physical game since a similarity of eqn(14) to path integrals in Quantum Theory is unavoidable. To this end we present below an important sample-game describing the motion of a classical particle subject to a noisy environment, which is very similar to those processes considered in ref [6]. Then we will show that a probability amplitude for this game can be constructed in a way that resembles the properties of a quantum particle. A remarkable point is the evidence shown here that probability amplitude effects are not exclusive of Quantum Theory neither a mysterious fundamental working mechanism in the Universe. In fact this formalism is now trivial once infinity types of stochastic processes may use it where some basic, algorithmic rules are the fundamental assumptions, not the use of the probability amplitude formalism itself. This fact changes naturally our attention in direction to Quantum Mechanics in order to look for a more fundamental phenomena that justify its basics axioms. We shall now prove that in a restricted sense this possibility may be real.

Let us consider the one-dimensional motion modeled by a particle of mass  $m$  subject to a conservative force field plus the random effects of a vacuum field. At the present stage of our reasoning what is matter is not the physical origin of these random effects, but the way they change the particle motion. The immediate impact falls over particle's energy whose fluctuations are driven by this vacuum field. We describe this effect as

$$H(x(t), \dot{x}(t)) = E_0 + \mathcal{E}y(t)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}$  is the noise source intensity and  $y(t)$  is the realization of a (dimensionless, zero mean) incomplete random variable  $Y$ . Time discretization of this equation, with  $\Delta t \equiv \varepsilon$ , leads to

$$\frac{m(x_{n+1} - x_n)^2}{2\varepsilon^2} + V(x_n) - E_0 = \mathcal{E}y_n \quad (15)$$

We are interested in a high noise intensity limit given by  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \infty$ , but subject to the condition that  $\mathcal{E} \langle y^2 \rangle$  is finite. More specifically, we write  $\mathcal{E} \equiv \alpha/\varepsilon$  in such a way that  $\langle H - E_0 \rangle = \mathcal{E} \langle y \rangle = 0$  and

$$\sqrt{\langle (H - E_0)^2 \rangle} = \alpha \frac{\sqrt{\langle y^2 \rangle}}{\varepsilon} \equiv \frac{\alpha}{\tau} \quad (16)$$

leading to uncertainty in the energy given by  $(\Delta E)\tau \sim \alpha$ . The number  $\tau$  measures the characteristic time fluctuations taking place during system evolution. Therefore, it must be process-dependent. Its finiteness demands the limit of small fluctuations for the variable  $Y$ . In order to use eqn(14) for the probability amplitude associated to this process we use normalized volume integrals in this equation; thus, for fixed  $\varepsilon$ , we do make the substitution  $dx \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{m}{\varepsilon\alpha}}dx$  resulting in the following expression for probability amplitudes

$$\psi(x_N) = \left(\frac{m}{\varepsilon\alpha}\right)^{N/2} \int \psi(x_0) \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{P\left(\varepsilon \frac{\frac{m(x_{n+1}-x_n)^2}{2\varepsilon^2} + V - E_0}{\alpha}\right)} e^{i\varphi(\text{path})} dx_n \quad (17)$$

Considering the very small values of the random variable  $Y$  we may limit ourselves to first order terms in the expansion for the phase, so we have  $\varphi_l(y_0, \dots, y_N) = \varphi_{Nl} + \sum_{\text{path}} y + \mathcal{O}(y^2)$ . We also scale energy reference level choosing  $E_0$  in such a way that  $\sum \varphi_{Nl} = E_0/\mathcal{E}$ , so eqn(17) leads to

$$\psi(x_N) = \left(\frac{m}{\varepsilon\alpha}\right)^{N/2} \int \psi(x_0) \exp\left(\frac{i\varepsilon \sum_{\text{path}} H}{\alpha} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\right) \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{P\left(\varepsilon \frac{(H - E_0)}{\alpha}\right)} dx_n$$

This linearization procedure hides the particular choice of the non-classical terms present in the power series expansion for the phase. A more convenient form for this equation comes out in the phase space representation, obtained by the use of the following expression

$$\exp\left(i \frac{m(x_{n+1} - x_n)^2}{2\varepsilon\alpha}\right) = \sqrt{\frac{i\varepsilon}{2\pi m\alpha}} \int \exp\left(\frac{i\varepsilon}{\alpha} \left(\frac{p_n^2}{2m} - \frac{(x_{n+1} - x_n)}{\varepsilon} p_n\right)\right) dp_n \quad (18)$$

which after insertion on the equation for  $\psi(x_N)$  and discarding second order terms in  $\varepsilon$  results in the following naive expression

$$\psi(x_N) = \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^{N/2} \int \psi(x_0) \exp\left(\frac{-i}{\alpha} \sum_{\text{path}} \varepsilon \mathcal{L}\right) \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{P\left(\varepsilon \frac{(H - E_0)}{\alpha}\right)} \frac{dx_n dp_n}{\alpha} \quad (19)$$

where  $-\mathcal{L} \equiv \frac{p_n^2}{2m} + V(x_n) - \frac{(x_{n+1}-x_n)}{\varepsilon} p_n = H - p\dot{x}$  has to be interpreted as the ("phase space") particle's Lagrangean. Phase space Lagrangean has a dual interpretation: the kinetic energy term is partially determined by the velocity  $\frac{(x_{n+1}-x_n)}{\varepsilon}$  and partially by the independent momentum variable  $p$ . Application of Euler-Lagrange equation to this Lagrangean selects the classical path and gives directly the set of dynamical equations for the system

$$\begin{aligned} p(t) &= m\dot{x}(t) \\ \dot{p}(t) &= -\frac{dV}{dx} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

In our stochastic model noise decouples momentum and velocity so all orbits in phase space are now permitted. No deterministic relation between momentum and velocity, like that shown in eqn(20), exists any more although the velocity still is real and given by the time derivative of the position. The same effect is verified when the motion is subject to a Wiener noise and a Fokker-Planck equation, using the Ito approach, is constructed. In this case it is possible to show that the obtained Fokker-Planck equation admits a probability amplitude formalism which results from a perturbation series on a variable conjugate to the momentum. The lowest order terms are fully compatible with a quantum dynamics for the particle [9].

The above developments shows that space and momentum variables are related by the unitary transformation of the eqn(18); consequently they satisfy an equal time "uncertainty principle" since from known properties of Fourier transform we must have

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha} \left( \Delta \left[ \frac{(x_{n+1} - x_n)}{\varepsilon} \right] \Delta [p_n] \right) = \frac{1}{\alpha} (\Delta x_n) (\Delta p_n) \geq 2\pi$$

valid for fixed  $x_{n+1}$ .

Probability amplitudes are then given by eqn(19) which is a phase-space Feynman-Kac formula in a most striking resemblance to Quantum Mechanics. The difference is concentrated on the  $\sqrt{P}$  term associated to the still undefined bare probability  $P$  and in the value of the constant  $\alpha$ . In the limit of continuous time ( $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ) the condition of finite rms for the noise source, as displayed in eqn(16), demands that only vanishingly small values of the random variable are relevant at infinitely large noise intensity  $\mathcal{E}$ . This fact allows the substitution of values for  $P$  by its value at  $y = 0$  (equal to  $P_0$ ), which is then incorporated as a normalization constant in the probability amplitude. As a result a finite probability distribution is obtained, since the lost apodization induced by large fluctuations is compensated by this normalization procedure. All these considerations complete a theory for amplitudes calculated as

$$\psi(x_N) = \left( \frac{iP_0}{2\pi} \right)^{N/2} \int \psi(x_0) \exp \left( \frac{-i\mathcal{A}_{path}}{\alpha} \right) \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{dx_n dp_n}{\alpha} \quad (21)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_{path} \equiv \varepsilon \sum_{path} \mathcal{L}$  is the discrete time phase-space classical action and the value of  $P_0$  being incorporated in a proper Hilbert space normalization for  $\psi(x_N)$ . Notice that the bare probability structure is hidden in this approximation which leads to a hidden process (or variable?) theory. An important fact is that eqn(21) is fully algorithmic (e.g. using Monte Carlo) by the use of the prescriptions given here for path space construction making trivial the mystery of how an equation like the above one may naturally appear in theoretical models. The result we have obtained is a Feynman-like path integral for a quantum particle; apart from a normalization factor it seems that non-classical stochastic process, as described here, is sufficiently rich to explain the probability amplitude structure of one-dimensional Quantum Mechanics. The classical action being the Onsager-Machlup functional [4] for the underlying stochastic

process which acts not on probabilities but on amplitudes as required by the non-classical nature of this random process. However the universal character of the Planck's constant demands that the kind of noise we considered must also be universal in order to set  $\alpha = \hbar$  in the above reasoning and in particular in the eqn(19), the generalized Feynman-Kac formula. Saying differently, must exist a kind of noise field capable to couple to any elementary particle wherever its physical character. This is not a trivial task and go further in this direction now is premature considering the primitive informations we have at hand besides the possibility of incomplete nature for an existing fundamental stochastic vacuum. The converse sense is also true. Feynman and Hibbs [10] showed that the important paths for a quantum mechanical particle are those that are not differentiable. In particular they have shown that  $\langle (x_{n+1} - x_n)^2 / \epsilon^2 \rangle \sim \epsilon^{-1}$  a result compatible with fractal trajectories activated by a noise source. Thus should exist, following the prescription given here, a non-classical random variable associated to quantum processes, not available inside the limits of the Quantum Theory because it should be the linearization of some hidden incomplete stochastic process. What we have showed is how the hidden mechanism (the HV mechanism) happens, masking this subjacent stochastic process and leaving out only quantal effects, which shall depend on the linearized form of the nonclassical terms through the  $d$ -terms set. Consequently it turns out quite impossible distinguish Quantum Mechanics, at least for the simple case treated here, from a incomplete random variable process.

As strange may appear the use of the phase space Lagrangean presents no additional difficulties as well. In fact our model clearly defines the role of each dynamical concept in quantum processes, specifying its character of reality and their formal intrinsic relationship. We can advance further in this reasoning if we look for a differential equation that solves the amplitude problem. The first step is to find  $\delta\psi = \psi(x, t + \epsilon) - \psi(x, t)$  and owing to eqn(21) this configures a moving boundary variational problem since the end point of the action integral is changed. We have

$$\delta\psi = \frac{-1}{i\alpha C} \int \psi(x_0) (\delta\mathcal{A}) \exp\left(\frac{-i\mathcal{A}(y, \dot{y})}{\alpha}\right) \mathcal{D}y \mathcal{D}p$$

and to calculate  $\delta\mathcal{A}$  the effect of changing the end point due to particle's velocity must be considered. The result is [12]

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \left( \mathcal{L} - \dot{y}(t) \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{y}(t)} \right)_{y(t)=x} dt + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{y}(t)}_{y(t)=x} dx + \int^t \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial y} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{y}} \right) \delta y(t) dt$$

where the second term in the coefficient of  $dt$  corrects the time derivative of the action due to particle's motion. From this equation we get the partial derivatives

of the amplitude:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x} &= \frac{-1}{i\alpha C} \int \psi(x_0) p \exp\left(\frac{-i\mathcal{A}}{\alpha}\right) \mathcal{D}y \mathcal{D}p \\ \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} &= \frac{1}{i\alpha C} \int \psi(x_0) \left(\frac{p^2}{2m} + V(x)\right) \exp\left(\frac{-i\mathcal{A}}{\alpha}\right) \mathcal{D}y \mathcal{D}p\end{aligned}$$

Notice that information about particle's velocity is lost whilst the surviving associated variable, the momentum, has no reality content; at most a statistical interpretation of its value can be given. This view becomes more evident if we note that

$$\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x^2} = \frac{-1}{\alpha^2 C} \int \psi(x_0) p^2 \exp\left(\frac{-i\mathcal{A}}{\alpha}\right) \mathcal{D}y \mathcal{D}p$$

so a closed differential equation is obtained for the amplitude

$$i\alpha \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\alpha^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x^2} + V(x) \psi$$

defining its Hilbert space operator structure. Observe that the probability amplitude depends only on spatial variables and time. No information concerning the velocity is present although a resemblance to the (classical) momentum through spatial derivatives are permitted with some care allowing the usual association of the operator  $-\frac{\alpha^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x)$  to the classical Hamiltonian. Our formalism show how this exactly happen and to what extent this association is valid. However remember that this equation is valid for a specific noise type and its universal validity, which permits the substitution  $\alpha = \hbar$ , demands a non-trivial vacuum physics.

The present theory has a quite general range and for the specific mechanical model we are considering the formalism of Quantum Mechanics, if applicable, is just the simplest description, that using the lowest order in the phase and noise probability distribution expansion. It seems reasonable that the weakest nonlinear contribution may generate corrections to eqn(19) which lies outside Quantum Theory itself while still maintaining the nonclassical character of the formalism. Expressing differently we able to predict hipper-quantum phenomena, those explicitly depending of the Q-rules (in the present mechanical model means  $d$ -dependent terms) but not explained by the use of the simple Feynman formula. This new class of quantum phenomena would be described by considering the second order correction of eqn(11) given by the set of  $B$  coefficients. Thus, at least in principle, we know how generalizations to Quantum Theory may appear and how to test if Quantum Theory is fundamental. Nobody makes no doubt about the capabilities of Quantum Mechanics in explain non-classical word. However once it is considered a fundamental theory all possible predictions of nonclassical phenomena must lie within the range of its formalism. The nonlinear correction to the phase enable us to test wether or not in fact it is fundamental as well as hopefully predict new phenomena never yet considered. We can say more. In the continuum ( $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ ) only vanishingly small values of

the fluctuating variable  $Y$  will survive and in this case the linear approximation is rigorously true if the kernel matrix  $B_{nl}^{ml}$  as well as all higher order phase coefficients are topologically dense to survive in the continuum. This means that Quantum Mechanics may be, in fact, a truly hidden-variable theory of first type [11] and any tentative of find or detect its stochastic nature be definitively unfruitful. In this case an evidence of hipper-quantum phenomena means that space-time continuity is broken at some scale thus generating information about the underground vacuum physics necessarily hidden in usual quantum processes.

On the contrary, if the weakest nonlinear term survives in the continuum the generalized Feynman-Kac formula, eqn(21), changes to

$$\psi(x, t) = \frac{1}{C} \int \psi(x_0) \exp\left(\frac{-i\mathcal{A}_{path}}{\alpha}\right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{i}{\alpha^2} \int^t B(u(\tau), \dot{u}(\tau), u(\varsigma), \dot{u}(\tau)) H(u(\tau), \dot{u}(\tau)) H(u(\varsigma), \dot{u}(\varsigma)) d\tau d\varsigma\right) \mathcal{D}u \mathcal{D}p$$

so in order to derive a differential equation for the wave function in a similar way developed above, a generalization of the moving boundary variational calculus must be done. Keeping terms linear in  $B$  this may be done yet with some involved calculations. The result presents a correction to Schrödinger equation (linear in  $B$ ) where the important fact is that vacuum terms are present. The HV mechanism is broken. This involved questions transcends, by its nature, the limits of the discussions we intend to present in this work so we deserve for the future additional tracks on this line.

Concluding, observe that the rules we introduced here for a incomplete random variable may, at first glance, be so strange as the axioms of Quantum Theory are. But once those rules are algorithmic, we are able to test them from a heuristic point of view since they must belong to the vacuum phenomenology which, at least in principle, is accessible to experiments. Breakdown of causality and determinism, as introduced here, is not a big problem too because no physical principle demands these reasonable assumptions be valid outside our common sense perception. The main result of this work still is the fact that a probability amplitude formalism is possible in describing the class of stochastic process we introduced here. This is a general result which may include physical processes as well. In this case a probability amplitude description of the motion of a particle is obtained, with properties very similar to those Quantum Theory makes use of. The price paid is the need of an universal vacuum field in order to explain the generality of Quantum Mechanics. At the present stage of our formulation we are not able to predict all properties this vacuum field must possess. The apparent advantage over existing hidden-variable theories is the algorithmic procedure and the explicit demonstration of the HV mechanism. However it is important to cite that we are not worried about justifications to Quantum Theory. If Nature truly admits incomplete random variables in its basic realm Quantum Theory shouldn't be considered as fundamental because in this case it cannot capture the basic processes physical world possesses. Its success would be consequence of fortuit epistemological and practical rules the

HV mechanism enables. This way we believe the present work opens tips to looking for new phenomenology in this field. It should be indispensable, within the present context, a serious investigation on vacuum properties, powered by an incomplete stochastic random field, as a proper source for quantum behavior in Nature.

## References

- [1] A. Einstein and L. Hopf, *Ann. d. Phys.* **33**, 1105 (1910), A. Einstein and O. Stern, *Ann. d. Phys.* **40**, 551 (1913), P. W. Milonni, *The Quantum Vacuum* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1994).
- [2] In fact a game demands more than one (competing) player so what we have defined is properly a lottery. A game concerns a multivariate process. We do not treat this case in the present work because the main ideas we intend show here are not affected by the number of players and can be easily implemented for a true game. Nevertheless we still keep game's terminology.
- [3] N. G. van Kampen, *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981).
- [4] L. Onsager and S. Machlup, *Phys. Rev.* **91**, 1505 (1953)
- [5] R. Graham, *Z. Physik B* **26**, 281 (1977)
- [6] See for example Pesquera et al, *Phys. Lett.* **94A** 287 (1983), Wio et al, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 7312 (1989), Lehmann et al, *Phys. Rev E* **62**, 6282 (2000)
- [7] C. W. Gardiner, *Handbook of Stochastic Methods* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990)
- [8] Drew Fudenberg and Jean Tirole, *Game Theory* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991)
- [9] M. S. Torres Jr. and J. M. A. Figueiredo, quant-ph/0204123 (2002)
- [10] R. P. Feynman and A. R. Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals* (MacGraw-Hill, 1965)
- [11] F. J. Belinfante, *A survey on Hidden-Variables Theory*, (Pergamon Press, 1973)
- [12] L. E. Elsgolc, *Calculus of Variations* (Pergamon Press, Mass., 1962)