

# Uncertainty relation for angle from a quantum-hydrodynamical perspective

J.-P. Gazeau\*

*APC, Université Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, 75205 Paris, France and  
Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, 22290-180, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil*

T. Koide†

*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro,  
C.P. 68528, 21941-972, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil*

We revisit the problem of the uncertainty relation for angle by using quantum hydrodynamics formulated in the stochastic variational method (SVM), where we need not define the angle operator. We derive both the Kennard and Robertson-Schrödinger inequalities for canonical variables in polar coordinates. The inequalities have state-dependent minimum values which can be smaller than  $\hbar/2$  and then permit a finite uncertainty of angle for the eigenstate of the angular momentum. The present approach provides a useful methodology to study quantum behaviors in arbitrary canonical coordinates.

PACS numbers: 02.50.Ey, 03.65.Ca, 11.10.Ef

Keywords: variational principle, stochastic calculus, uncertainty relation

## I. INTRODUCTION

The uncertainty relation is known as one of the important features of quantum physics and its comprehension requires unceasing improvement. For example, its error-disturbance generalization proposed by Ozawa [1] was experimentally tested [2]. The error quantifies the deviation between intended and effective measurements, and the disturbance concerns accuracy in the successive determinations of the value of two non-commuting observables. As a matter of fact, the concept of uncertainty relation is crucial for experimental requirements in the detection of the gravitational waves [3, 4].

In this work, we consider a long-standing problem, that is, the uncertainty relation for the angular coordinate viewed as the canonically conjugate variable to the angular momentum. As is discussed in the standard textbooks of quantum mechanics [5], if one defines an angle operator  $\theta$  such that its commutation rule with the angular momentum operator  $L$  is canonical, i.e.,  $[\theta, L] = i\hbar$ , then the ensuing Kennard inequality reads:

$$\sigma_\theta \sigma_L \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma_A$  is the standard deviation of operator  $A$ . This is however not acceptable; the uncertainty of the angle  $\sigma_\theta$  becomes infinite for the eigenstate of  $L$ , while the maximum value of  $\sigma_\theta$  should be finite due to the bounded domain of the spectrum  $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$ .

This paradox is usually attributed to the definition of the angle operator: there is no self-adjoint multiplicative operator which is periodic and satisfies the canonical commutation rule. Therefore the uncertainty relation for

angle has been discussed exclusively by violating one of the two conditions. See Ref. [6] and the recent Refs. [7–9] for survey and discussion. To avoid the problem of the periodicity, for example, the non-hermitian multiplicative operator with spectrum  $e^{i\theta}$  is considered instead of the angular coordinate itself [10, 11]. For the latter, the commutation rule is modified by

$$[\theta, L] = i\hbar \left\{ 1 - 2\pi \sum_{N=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(\theta - 2N\pi) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where  $N$  indicates an integer [12, 13].

We investigate this problem from a different point of view which pertains to quantum hydrodynamics. Although such an approach gives an alternative point of view for quantum behaviors [14], one could argue that quantum hydrodynamics does not offer an advantage over the formalism of operators acting in Hilbert spaces of quantum states. However, with the help of the stochastic variational method (SVM) [15, 16], quantum hydrodynamics provides a useful methodology to study quantum behaviors in arbitrary canonical coordinates. In fact, one of the present authors developed a systematic procedure to define the uncertainty relation within the framework of quantum hydrodynamics with Cartesian coordinates [16]. Observables are described by using probability distributions and fluid velocity fields. Hence it is not necessary to work with position and momentum operators. Moreover this framework was recently generalized to be applied to general coordinate systems in Ref. [17]. Therefore the quantum-hydrodynamical approach is expected to cast the question of uncertain relation in a new light. The purpose of this work is to examine the uncertainty relations for canonical variables in polar coordinates by using the quantum-hydrodynamical approach formulated in terms of the generalized SVM.

\*Electronic address: jeanpierregazeau@mac.com , gazeau@apc.in2p3.fr

†Electronic address: tomoikoide@gmail.com, koide@if.ufrj.br

## II. STOCHASTIC VARIATION

The formulation developed here is the same as that in Refs. [17, 18]. We denote Cartesian coordinates by  $z^a = (x, y)$  and polar coordinates by  $q^i = (r, \theta)$ . Cartesian coordinates are function of polar coordinates,  $z^a = z^a(r, \theta)$ . In the following,  $(\widehat{\phantom{x}})$  represents a stochastic quantity and the Einstein notation of the summation is employed. For the Euclidean SVM, see also review papers Refs. [19, 20].

In SVM, we consider the optimization of the non-differentiable trajectory for a (virtual) particle [16]. To describe such a trajectory as Brownian motion, we introduce stochastic differential equations (SDE's), which are obtained from Eqs. (2) and (7) in Ref. [17] by substituting the metric (vielbein) of polar coordinates. In this approach, we introduce four unknown  $u_{\pm}^i(r, \theta, t)$  ( $i = r, \theta$ ) to be determined through stochastic variational principle. These are requested to fulfill the periodicity conditions:

$$u_{\pm}^i(r, \theta, t) = u_{\pm}^i(r, \theta + 2N\pi, t), \text{ for integer } N. \quad (3)$$

Then the evolutions forward in time are described by the forward SDE's ( $dt > 0$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} d\widehat{r}_t &= u_+^r(\widehat{r}_t, \widehat{\theta}_t, t)dt + \frac{\nu}{\widehat{r}_t}dt + \sqrt{2\nu}d\widehat{W}_t^r, \\ d\widehat{\theta}_t &= u_+^\theta(\widehat{r}_t, \widehat{\theta}_t, t)dt + \frac{\sqrt{2\nu}}{\widehat{r}_t}d\widehat{W}_t^\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here  $d\widehat{A}_t = \widehat{A}_{t+dt} - \widehat{A}_t$  and  $\nu$  is a parameter which characterizes the stochasticity. In the SVM application to quantum mechanics,  $\nu$  is determined by the Planck constant  $\hbar$ , while it is described by the coefficient of viscosity in hydrodynamics [16, 18, 21]. The stochastic variables  $\widehat{W}_t^r$  and  $\widehat{W}_t^\theta$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} d\widehat{W}_t^r &\equiv \cos\widehat{\theta}_t d\widehat{W}_t^x + \sin\widehat{\theta}_t d\widehat{W}_t^y, \\ d\widehat{W}_t^\theta &\equiv -\sin\widehat{\theta}_t d\widehat{W}_t^x + \cos\widehat{\theta}_t d\widehat{W}_t^y, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where,  $\widehat{W}_t^x$  and  $\widehat{W}_t^y$  describe the Wiener processes in Cartesian coordinates satisfying the standard correlation properties (a,b=x,y),

$$E[d\widehat{W}_t^a] = 0, \quad E[(d\widehat{W}_t^a)(d\widehat{W}_{t'}^b)] = dt \delta^{ab} \delta_{t,t'}. \quad (6)$$

The stochastic ensemble average is denoted by  $E[\ ]$ . Note that the second term on the right-hand side of the radial component of Eq. (4) is induced by the correlations between  $\widehat{W}_t^{x(y)}$  and the metric (vielbein) of polar coordinates, and prevents  $\widehat{r}_t$  from being negative. See Refs. [17, 18, 22]

In the variational method, we fix not only the initial but also the final distributions of particles. Then we need also to consider the evolutions backward in time, which are defined by the backward SDE's ( $dt < 0$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} d\widehat{r}_t &= u_-^r(\widehat{r}_t, \widehat{\theta}_t, t)dt - \frac{\nu}{\widehat{r}_t}dt + \sqrt{2\nu}d\widehat{W}_t^r, \\ d\widehat{\theta}_t &= u_-^\theta(\widehat{r}_t, \widehat{\theta}_t, t)dt + \frac{\sqrt{2\nu}}{\widehat{r}_t}d\widehat{W}_t^\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Here  $d\widehat{W}_t^r$  and  $d\widehat{W}_t^\theta$  satisfy the same correlation properties as  $d\widehat{W}_t^r$  and  $d\widehat{W}_t^\theta$ , respectively, through replacing  $dt$  with  $|dt|$ .

The particle probability distribution is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(r, \theta, t) &= \frac{1}{r} \int_0^\infty r_i dr_i \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta_i \rho_0(r_i, \theta_i) \\ &\times \sum_{N=-\infty}^{\infty} E[\delta(r - \widehat{r}_t) \delta(\theta + 2N\pi - \widehat{\theta}_t)], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the factor  $1/r$  comes from the Jacobian and  $\rho_0(r_i, \theta_i)$  denotes the initial distribution of  $\widehat{r}_t$  and  $\widehat{\theta}_t$  at an initial time  $t_i$ . It is easy to see the normalization,  $\int_0^\infty r dr \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \rho(r, \theta, t) = 1$ .

The time evolution of  $\rho$  satisfies two Fokker-Planck equations. We do not make them explicit here (See Refs. [17, 18]), but just indicate that they derive from the two sets of SDE's (4) and (7), respectively. For these equations to describe the same phenomenon, the following consistency conditions should be satisfied,

$$u_+^i(r, \theta, t) - u_-^i(r, \theta, t) = 2\nu g^{ij} \partial_j \ln \rho(r, \theta, t), \quad (9)$$

where  $i, j = r, \theta$  and  $g^{ij}$  the metric of polar coordinates. Then the two Fokker-Planck equations are reduced to the common equation of continuity,

$$\partial_t \rho = -\nabla_i \left( \rho \frac{u_+^i + u_-^i}{2} \right) \equiv -\nabla_i (\rho v^i), \quad (10)$$

where  $\nabla_i$  is the covariant derivative in polar coordinates.

The action for the stochastic variation is defined by

$$I = \int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt E[L], \quad (11)$$

with the stochastic Lagrangian defined by

$$L = \frac{m}{4} \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{a=x,y} (D_s \widehat{z}_t^a) (D_s \widehat{z}_t^a) - V. \quad (12)$$

Here  $m$  is the particle mass,  $V$  is a potential energy and  $\widehat{z}_t^a = z^a(\widehat{r}_t, \widehat{\theta}_t)$ . See Refs. [16, 18, 21] for other choices of the stochastic Lagrangian. The stochastic trajectory is non-differentiable and, following Nelson [23], we can introduce at least two different time derivatives; the mean forward derivative,

$$D_+ f(\widehat{q}_t^i) = \lim_{dt \rightarrow 0^+} E \left[ \frac{f(\widehat{q}_{t+dt}^i) - f(\widehat{q}_t^i)}{dt} \middle| \mathcal{P}_t \right], \quad (13)$$

and the mean backward derivative,

$$D_- f(\widehat{q}_t^i) = \lim_{dt \rightarrow 0^-} E \left[ \frac{f(\widehat{q}_{t+dt}^i) - f(\widehat{q}_t^i)}{dt} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right]. \quad (14)$$

These expectation values are conditional averages, where the condition  $\mathcal{P}_t$  ( $\mathcal{F}_t$ ) fixes the values of  $\widehat{q}_{t'}^i$  for  $t' \leq t$  ( $t' \geq$

t). The trajectory becomes smooth and  $D_+$  and  $D_-$  coincide in the vanishing limit of  $\nu$ . Then the above stochastic Lagrangian reproduces the classical particle Lagrangian in polar coordinates.

We require that the action is optimized, not only for any variation of the stochastic trajectory, but also for any distribution of the stochastic canonical coordinates. Then the stochastic variation of the action determines the equations for the velocity field  $v^i(r, \theta, t)$  (or equivalently  $u_{\pm}^i(r, \theta, t)$ ) and leads to the following quantum hydrodynamics,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\partial_t + v^r \partial_r + v^\theta \partial_\theta) v^r - r v^\theta v^\theta + \frac{\partial_r V}{m} \\ &= 2\nu^2 \partial_r \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \left( \frac{1}{r} \partial_r r \partial_r + \frac{1}{r} \partial_\theta^2 \right) \sqrt{\rho}, \\ & (\partial_t + v^r \partial_r + v^\theta \partial_\theta) v^\theta + \frac{2}{r} v^r v^\theta + \frac{\partial_\theta V}{mr^2} \\ &= \frac{2\nu^2}{r^2} \partial_\theta \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \left( \frac{1}{r} \partial_r r \partial_r + \frac{1}{r} \partial_\theta^2 \right) \sqrt{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

All quantum effects are produced by the terms on the right-hand side which are given by the gradient of the so-called quantum potential [14].

To see the relation to quantum mechanics, we introduce the velocity potential through

$$v^i(r, \theta, t) = 2\nu g^{ij} \partial_j \Theta(r, \theta, t), \quad (16)$$

and define the complex function  $\Psi = \sqrt{\rho} e^{i\Theta}$ . By choosing  $\nu = \hbar/(2m)$ , one can easily show that  $\Psi$  satisfies the Schrödinger equation in polar coordinates and thus  $\Psi$  is viewed as a wave function. See also Eq. (48) in Ref. [21]. That is, this approach enables us to quantize directly classical systems represented in terms of canonical variables. This is a remarkable feature which is not held in the canonical quantization.

The quantum potential term become singular when  $\sqrt{\rho}$  crosses zero which corresponds to the node of the wave function. Then we need an additional condition to connect the solutions around the singularity. This is indeed associated with the criticism by Takabayasi and Wallstrom, as we will show below [24, 25].

For the sake of simplicity in the following discussions, we consider that the potential is a function of  $r$ ,  $V = V(r)$  only and put  $\nu = \hbar/(2m)$ . For the SVM formulation of hydrodynamics, see Refs. [16, 18, 21] for details.

### III. EIGENSTATE OF ANGULAR MOMENTUM

Before deriving the uncertainty relation, we comment how the eigenstate of the angular momentum is described in this scheme.

The eigenstate is interpreted as the stationary solution of quantum hydrodynamics,

$$v_r(r, \theta, t) = 0, \quad v_\theta(r, \theta, t) = \frac{\hbar \alpha}{m}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\alpha$  is still an arbitrary adimensional real constant. We consider the covariant component  $v_i$ , not the contravariant component  $v^i$ . Substituting these into Eq. (10) and into the second line of Eq. (15), we find  $\rho(r, \theta, t) = \rho(\theta)$ . Then the first line in Eq. (15) becomes the time-independent Schrödinger equation in polar coordinates,

$$\left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left( \frac{1}{r} \partial_r r \partial_r - \frac{\alpha^2}{r^2} \right) + V(r) \right] \sqrt{\rho} = E \sqrt{\rho}, \quad (18)$$

where  $E$  is a real constant, that is, the energy eigenvalue. The same equation can be derived from the Bernoulli theorem of quantum hydrodynamics.

Note however that  $\alpha$  is not yet quantized. In fact, the quantum potential becomes singular around  $\sqrt{\rho} = 0$  and thus we need additional condition to connect the solutions for the left and right sides of the singularity. In quantum hydrodynamics, the standard procedure amounts to employ the Bohr-Sommerfeld type condition [14, 24, 25],

$$\oint v_\theta(r, \theta) d\theta = \frac{2\pi N \hbar}{m}, \quad (19)$$

where the loop integral path is chosen to be around  $r = 0$ . Then one can easily find the quantization of the angular momentum  $\alpha = N$ . See discussions in Ref. [14] for more details.

### IV. UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS

Following Ref. [16], we define the stochastic momenta by

$$\hat{p}_{it}^\pm = 2 \frac{\partial L}{\partial (D_\pm \hat{q}_t^i)} = m g_{ij} u_\pm^j(\hat{r}_t, \hat{\theta}_t, t), \quad (20)$$

where, in the present case,  $\hat{q}_t^r = \hat{r}_t$  and  $\hat{q}_t^\theta = \hat{\theta}_t$ . The factor 2 is just a convention to reproduce the classical result in the vanishing limit of  $\hbar$  (or equivalently  $\nu$ ). It is easy to show that the expectation value of the quantum-canonical momentum is given by the average of the two expectation values of the two momenta,

$$\begin{aligned} E[\hat{p}_{it}] &\equiv E \left[ \frac{\hat{p}_{it}^+ + \hat{p}_{it}^-}{2} \right] \\ &= m \int_0^\infty r dr \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta v_i(r, \theta, t) \rho(r, \theta, t). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

On the other hand, the stochastic momenta  $\hat{p}_{it}^+$  and  $\hat{p}_{it}^-$  contribute to the stochastic Newton (or Newton-Nelson) equation on an equal footing as is shown in Ref. [16] and thus it is natural to define the standard deviation of the quantum-mechanical momentum by the average of the two contributions,

$$\sigma_{p_i}^2 \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( \Delta_{\hat{p}_i^+}^2 + \Delta_{\hat{p}_i^-}^2 \right), \quad (22)$$

where  $\Delta_A^2 = E[(\delta\hat{A})^2]$  with  $\delta\hat{A} = \hat{A} - E[\hat{A}]$ .

Like for the uncertainty relation of the quantum-canonical variables, we consider the product of the standard deviation of the *contravariant* components of canonical coordinates and that of the *covariant* components of canonical momenta. For the radial component, we obtain

$$\sigma_r^2 \sigma_{p_r}^2 \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4} |2 - E[\hat{r}_t] E[\hat{r}_t^{-1}]|^2 + |E[\delta\hat{r}_t \delta\hat{p}_{r_t}]|^2, \quad (23)$$

where  $\sigma_r^2 \equiv \Delta_r^2$ . In this derivation, the CauchySchwarz inequality was utilized. This represents the Robertson-Schrödinger inequality for  $r$ . When the second term of the right-hand side is dropped, it becomes the corresponding Kennard inequality. Because  $E[\hat{r}_t]E[\hat{r}_t^{-1}] \geq 1$ , the right-hand side can be smaller than the standard minimum value of the uncertainty.

Similarly the inequality for the angular component is

$$\sigma_\theta^2 \sigma_{p_\theta}^2 \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \left| 1 - 2\pi \int_0^\infty r dr \rho(r, 2\pi, t) \right|^2 + |E[\delta\hat{\theta}_t \delta\hat{p}_{\theta_t}]|^2, \quad (24)$$

where  $\sigma_\theta^2 \equiv \Delta_\theta^2$ . This is the Robertson-Schrödinger inequality for  $\theta$  which reduces to the corresponding Kennard inequality by ignoring the second term. For the eigenstate of the angular momentum, the distribution is

homogeneous in the angle variable,  $\int_0^\infty r dr \rho(r, 2\pi, t) = 1/(2\pi)$ , and then the right-hand side vanishes,  $\sigma_\theta^2 \sigma_{p_\theta}^2 \geq 0$ . That is, the standard deviation of the angle can be finite even for the eigenstate of the angular momentum, as is expected.

## V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Interestingly, the well-known minimum of the uncertainty  $\hbar/2$  is not a universal value for arbitrary canonical variables. This fact may be useful to improve the resolutions of experiments on the microscopic level.

Judge considered a wave function on a circle and derived an uncertainty relation for angle which is the same as our Kennard inequality by ignoring the radial distribution and redefining  $\sigma_\theta$  appropriately [6, 12, 13]. In this derivation, the commutation rule is modified as was mentioned in the introduction. Unfortunately the systematic procedure of such a modification is not known for arbitrary canonical variables.

On the other hand, the present derivation of the uncertainty relation is easily generalized to any canonical variables in a non-relativistic curved spacetime systems. In fact, the most general representation of the Robertson-Schrödinger inequality in the spatial  $D$ -dimensional system is expressed as

$$\sigma_{q^i}^2 \sigma_{p_j}^2 \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \left| \delta_j^i - \int d^D q \partial_j \{J \rho (q^i - E[\hat{q}_t^i])\} + \int J d^D q \rho (q^i - E[\hat{q}_t^i]) \sum_{\alpha=0}^D \Gamma_{j\alpha}^\alpha \right|^2 + |E[(\delta\hat{q}_t^i)(\delta\hat{p}_{j_t})]|^2, \quad (25)$$

where  $J$  is the Jacobian,  $\Gamma_{\beta\gamma}^\alpha$  is the Christoffel symbol and  $\hat{p}_{i_t}$  is defined by Eq. (21). The Kennard inequality is obtained by dropping the second term on the right-hand side. The term next to  $\delta_j^i$  on the right-hand side gives a finite contribution for periodic variables as is the case of Eq. (24), and the term including the Christoffel symbol can reduce the standard minimum value of uncertainty as is seen in Eq. (23).

The present quantum-hydrodynamical approach and the standard operator formulation are complementary. Our approach provides a systematic procedure to find quantum behaviors in general coordinates while the operator formulation is based on a more tractable equation, the Schrödinger equation, within the framework of Hilbertian functional analysis. Therefore, the studies on quantum hydrodynamics will contribute also to improve our understanding for the operator formulation of quantum mechanics.

Strictly speaking, the definitions of the canonical momenta in Eq. (20) are fully justified when the Hamiltonian formalism is constructed in stochastic analytical mechanics. Moreover, the uncertainty relation can be introduced to viscous fluids in curved geometries, as was done for Euclidean hydrodynamics [16]. These generalizations are possible and will be reported in a forthcoming paper [26].

The authors thank T. Kodama and D. Noguera for useful discussions and comments. T. K. acknowledges the financial support by CNPq (303468/2018-1). A part of the work was developed under the project INCT-FNA Proc. No. 464898/2014-5. J.-P. G. thanks the Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Física for hospitality and the Programa de Capacitação Institucional - PCI for financial support.

[1] M. Ozawa, “Universally valid reformulation of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle on noise and distur-

bance in measurement”, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 042105 (2003).

- [2] B. Demirel, “Experimental Test of Residual Error-Disturbance Uncertainty Relations for Mixed Spin-1/2 States”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 140402 (2016).
- [3] J. Maddox, “Beating the Quantum Limits”, *Nature* **18**, 559 (1988).
- [4] J. Cripe et al., “Measurement of quantum back action in the audio band at room temperature”, *Nature* **568**, 365 (2019).
- [5] L. I. Schiff, *Quantum Mechanics*, (3rd edition, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968).
- [6] P. Carruthers and M. M. Nieto, “Phase and angle variables in quantum mechanics”, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **40**, 411 (1968).
- [7] H. A. Kastrup, “Quantization of the canonically conjugate pair angle and orbital angular momentum”, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 052104 (2006).
- [8] J.-P. Gazeau and F. H. Szafraniec “Three paths toward the quantum angle operator”, *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **375**, 16 (2016).
- [9] R. Fresneda, J.-P. Gazeau and D. Noguera, “Quantum localisation on the circle”, *J. Math. Phys.* **59**, 052105 (2018).
- [10] Y. Ohnuki and S. Kitakado, “Fundamental algebra for quantum mechanics on  $S^D$  and gauge potentials”, *J. Math. Phys.* **34**, 2827 (1993).
- [11] S. Tanimura, “Gauge field, parity and uncertainty relation of quantum mechanics on  $S^1$ ”, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **90**, 271 (1993).
- [12] D. Judge, “On the uncertainty relation for  $L_z$  and  $\phi$ ”, *Phys. Lett.* **5**, 189 (1963).
- [13] D. Judge and J. T. Lewis, “On the commutator  $[l_z, \varphi_-]$ ”, *Phys. Lett.* **5**, 190 (1963).
- [14] P. R. Holland, *The Quantum Theory of Motion: An Account of the de Broglie-Bohm Causal Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995).
- [15] K. Yasue, “Stochastic calculus of variation”, *J. Funct. Anal.* **41**, 327 (1981).
- [16] T. Koide and T. Kodama, “Generalization of uncertainty relation for quantum and stochastic systems”, *Phys. Lett.* **A382**, 1472 (2018).
- [17] T. Koide and T. Kodama, “Novel effect induced by space-time curvature in quantum hydrodynamics”, *Phys. Lett.* **A383**, 2713 (2019).
- [18] T. Koide and T. Kodama, “Variational formulation of compressible hydrodynamics in curved spacetime and symmetry of stress tensor”, arXiv:1911.01798 [gr-qc].
- [19] J. C. Zambrini, “Stochastic Dynamics: A Review of Stochastic Calculus of Variations”, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **24**, 277 (1985).
- [20] T. Koide, T. Kodama and K. Tsushima, “Unified description of classical and quantum behaviours in a variational principle”, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **626**, 012055 (2015).
- [21] T. Koide and T. Kodama, “NavierStokes, GrossPitaevskii and generalized diffusion equations using the stochastic variational method”, *J. Phys. A* **45**, 255204 (2012).
- [22] See Feller’s test in M. Nagasawa, “Schrödinger Equations and Diffusion Theory”, (Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1993).
- [23] E. Nelson, “Derivation of the Schrödinger Equation from Newtonian Mechanics”, *Phys. Rev.* **150**, 1079 (1966).
- [24] T. Takabayasi, “On the Formulation of Quantum Mechanics associated with Classical Pictures” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **8**, 143 (1952).
- [25] T. C. Wallstrom, “On the derivation of the Schrödinger equation from stochastic mechanics” *Found. Phys. Lett.* **2**, 113 (1989).
- [26] T. Koide, in preparation.