

Comments on Bouda and Djama's "Quantum Newton's law"

Edward R. Floyd
10 Jamaica Village Road, Coronado, CA 92118, USA
floyd@mailaps.org

March 31, 2022

Abstract

Discussion of the differences between the trajectory representation of Floyd and that of Bouda and Djama [Phys. Lett. **A 285** (2001) 27] renders insight: while Floyd's trajectories are related to group velocities, Bouda and Djama's are not. Bouda and Djama's reasons for these differences are also addressed.

PACS: 03.65.Bz; 03.65.Ca

Key Words: quantum law of motion, Lagrangian, quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation, Jacobi's theorem, trajectory.

Bouda and Djama have recently presented trajectories for non-relativistic quantum mechanics and have noted that their trajectories differ with mine. [1] Bouda and Djama have offered two explanations why these trajectories differ. [1] Herein, I comment on the findings of Bouda and Djama, present insight into the differences between the trajectory representations, and offer a different explanation why these trajectories differ.

The insight between the trajectory representations is manifested in Bouda and Djama's application to the free particle in one dimension in Ref. 1. Let us now examine their application. Their equation of motion for the free particle is their Eq. (34), which they cite as "quantum time equation for the free particle." [1] Equation (34) may be manipulated so that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hbar}{(2mE)^{1/2}} \arctan[a \tan(2Et/\hbar) + b] &= x(t) - x_0 & (\text{B\&D's 34}) \\ a \tan(2Et/\hbar) + b &= \tan \left[\frac{(2mE)^{1/2}}{\hbar} (x(t) - x_0) \right] \\ 2Et &= \underbrace{\hbar \arctan \left[\frac{1}{a} \tan \left(\frac{(2mE)^{1/2}}{\hbar} (x(t) - x_0) \right) - \frac{b}{a} \right]}_{S_0} \end{aligned}$$

where an intermediate step has been included for clarity. We use the notation of Bouda and Djama: (E, a, b, x_0) are constants of the motion where E is also energy; S_0 is the quantum reduced action. What Bouda and Djama have done in Ref. 1 is to turn the quantum reduced action inside out. By Eq. (B\&D's 34), $S_0 = 2Et$. Then, Bouda and Djama's Eq. (B\&D's 34) is not only their equation of motion but also the quantum reduced action, S_0 , a generator of the motion. Bouda and Djama have presented S_0 , for discussing my trajectories, by their Eq. (35) as

$$S_0 = \hbar \arctan \left[a_{35} \tan \left(\frac{(2mE)^{1/2} x}{\hbar} \right) + b_{35} \right] + \hbar \lambda \quad (\text{B\&D's 35})$$

where for explicitness the integration constants a and b for their Eq. (B\&D's 35) have been subscripted by 35. For consistency between Bouda and Djama's Eqs. (B\&D's 34) and (B\&D's 35), we must set $a_{35} = 1/a$ and $b_{35} = -b/a$.

On the other hand, Bouda and Djama have presented the equation of motion for my corresponding trajectory for the free particle by their Eq. (36). Their Eq. (36) may be presented in terms of (a, b) rather than (a_{35}, b_{35}) as

$$t - t_0 = a \frac{(2m/E)^{1/2} x}{(a^2 + b^2 + 1) + \sigma \cos[2(2mE)^{1/2} x/\hbar - \gamma]} \quad (\text{i})$$

where

$$\sigma = (a^4 + b^4 + 1 + 2a^2b^2 + 2b^2 - 2a^2)^{1/2}, \quad \gamma = \arctan \left(\frac{-2b}{a^2 + b^2 - 1} \right).$$

The velocity of the particle that has been described by the equation of motion, Eq. (i), is given by $\dot{x} = dx/dt = (dt/dx)^{-1} = (\partial t/\partial x)^{-1}$ as the right side of Eq. (i) does not contain t explicitly. The particle velocity can be expressed by Eq. (i) as $\dot{x} = (\partial^2 S_0/\partial E \partial x)^{-1}$. We can change the order of differentiation between x and E . Thus, the particle velocity is given by $\dot{x} = [\partial(\partial S_0/\partial x)/\partial E]^{-1}$. [2-4] For the case at hand, the velocity for the free particle is given by

$$\dot{x} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial(\partial S_0/\partial x)} = \frac{1}{a} \frac{\mathcal{A}^2}{(2m/E)^{1/2} \mathcal{A} + 2m\sigma \sin\{[(2mE)^{1/2}(x - x_0)/\hbar] - \gamma\} (x - x_0)/\hbar} \quad (\text{ii})$$

where $\mathcal{A} = 1 + a^2 + b^2 + \sigma \cos\{[(2mE)^{1/2}(x - x_0)/\hbar] - \gamma\}$.

Let us examine Eq. (ii). The form $\partial E/\partial(\partial S_0/\partial x)$ is reminiscent of the canonical equation of Hamilton for \dot{x} as given by Bouda and Djama's Eq. (12). We recall that Hamilton's principal function, S , propagates like a wave in configuration space [5] with angular frequency E and wave number S_0 . We see that \dot{x} as

given by Eq. (ii) is a group velocity because it is rendered by the partial derivative of angular frequency, E , with respect to the wave number or conjugate momentum, $\partial S_0/\partial x$. (Lest we forget, the conjugate momentum is not the mechanical momentum, i.e., $\partial S_0/\partial x \neq m\dot{x}$.) The group velocity describes the particle's velocity as well as the propagation of the envelop of the S -wave in configuration space. We note that, for a given energy E , the group velocity is dependent on the particular trajectory or microstate specified by (a, b) . The coefficients (a, b) are determined by the initial conditions for the quantum stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (QSHJE), Bouda and Djama's Eq. (3), and for the particular set of independent solutions (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) of the stationary Schrödinger equation chosen by Bouda and Djama. On the other hand, Bouda and Djama's particle velocity, \dot{x}_{bd} is given by their Eq. (17) as

$$\frac{\partial S_0}{\partial x} = \frac{2(E - V)}{\dot{x}_{bd}}. \quad (\text{B\&D's 17})$$

For the free particle in terms of (a, b) and not (a_{35}, b_{35}) , \dot{x}_{bd} is given by

$$\dot{x}_{bd} = \frac{2E}{\partial S_0/\partial x} = \frac{1}{a} \left(\frac{E}{2m} \right)^{1/2} \mathcal{A},$$

which is neither a group nor a phase velocity. Herein, phase or wave velocity describes the propagation of the wave fronts of constant S in configuration space. [5] For $a = 1$ and $b = 0$, \dot{x} and \dot{x}_{bd} both reduce to the classical particle velocity $(2E/m)^{1/2}$ for the free particle.

Nonlocality is also manifested by Eq. (ii). For $a \neq 1$ or $b \neq 0$, as the value $(x - x_0)$ becomes large, \dot{x} becomes infinite at certain locations. This and other related implications of nonlocality in Eq. (ii) have been previously reported. [6] Nevertheless, \dot{x} remains integrable as manifested by Eq. (i). This nonlocal effect is not as great as the nonlocal effect that exists in the classically forbidden region of bound states. [7] For the free particle, the measure of where $\dot{x} = \infty$ is sufficiently small so that the particle transverses only a finite distance over any duration that includes when $\dot{x} = \infty$. For bound states the particle transverses an infinite distance in a finite duration when it transverses from the classical WKB turning point out to $x = \pm\infty$ where it reverses and returns to the classical WKB turning point. [7,8]

Bouda and Djama offer two arguments why the two trajectory representations should differ. In their first argument, Bouda and Djama reported that in my approach, it is only in the classical limit, $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, that $S_0 = 2E(t - t_0)$ from which S manifests the integration of the Lagrangian over time. This is a misunderstanding. For clarity, I only showed in my examination of the classical limit in Ref. 9 that in the classical limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ one has $S_0 = 2E(t - t_0)$. I did not examine whether S was the integral of the Lagrangian for $\hbar \neq 0$. Nevertheless, my findings can be generalized. The quantum Lagrangian, L , is defined to be the time derivative of the quantum Hamilton's principal function, which is a generator of motion in (x, t) space. The quantum Lagrangian may be formally constructed, in principle, from the quantum Hamilton's principal function by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS}{dt} &= \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \dot{x} + \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} \\ &= \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \dot{x} - \frac{1}{2m} \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)^2 - V(x) - \frac{\hbar^2}{4m} \left[\frac{\partial^3 S/\partial x^3}{\partial S/\partial x} - \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 S/\partial x^2}{\partial S/\partial x} \right)^2 \right] \equiv L. \end{aligned}$$

The quantum Lagrangian has not yet been brought into the form $L(\ddot{x}, \dot{x}, x)$. We suspend development of a Lagrangian representation of quantum motion here. I do not recommend reverting to a Lagrangian representation to resolve quantum motion. A Lagrangian representation implies using a variational principle to minimize transit time for the propagation of S in accordance with Fermat's principle. As such, it does not render group motion. Instead, it renders phase motion developed from phase velocities, accelerations and jerks. We shall give more on this later. Furthermore, as noted by Bertoldi, Faraggi and Matone for time independence, the quantum equivalence principle (QEP) is implemented in a Hamilton-Jacobi representation rather than at the level of equations of motions. [10]

Since S_0 is explicitly the quantum reduced action and not the classical reduced action, Bouda and Djama, in their second argument, express some reservation about the validity of using Jacobi's theorem with S_0 to furnish the constant time coordinate, t_0 , while rendering time parameterization. Carroll previously put their reservation to rest elsewhere for he had shown that Jacobi's theorem is applicable to

the quantum reduced action as the quantum reduced action is a Legendre transformation of the negative of the quantum Hamilton's principal function. [3,4] Let us now illustrate. Following Carroll, we consider a stationary state where t does not explicitly appear in the quantum Hamiltonian. We may then separate Hamilton's principal function, S , so that $S = S_0 - Et$. Then $\partial S/\partial t = -E$ so that $t = t(E)$. We let $\mathcal{S} = -S$ where $\partial \mathcal{S}/\partial t = E$. It follows that $S_0 = Et - \mathcal{S}$ or

$$S_0 = t \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial t} - \mathcal{S} \quad (\text{iii})$$

where S_0 is the Lagrangian transformation of \mathcal{S} . With t the active variable and x the passive variable as expressed by Lanczos [11], we hold the passive x variable fixed to give $\partial S_0/\partial E = t + E(\partial t/\partial E) - (\partial \mathcal{S}/\partial t)(\partial t/\partial E) = t$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{S} = E \frac{\partial S_0}{\partial E} - S_0, \quad (\text{iv})$$

where \mathcal{S} is the Lagrangian transform of S_0 . Equations (iii) and (iv) form the Lagrangian dual transformations between \mathcal{S} and S_0 . The quantum reduced action, S_0 , is a function of E instead of t , so Jacobi's theorem is applicable to render time parameterization.

I now offer two explanations why the two trajectory representations differ. First, for my trajectory representation, the propagation of Hamilton's principal function, S , in configuration space is determined by Fermat's principle where the time for the surface of constant S to transit between two points is an extremum. As discussed by Park [12], the transit time for phase wave, and not the signal, is stationary (usually minimized). The phase wave propagates with the phase velocity while the signal (the wave envelope) propagates with group velocity, which is developed from Jacobi's theorem. The fundamental reason that the equations of motion, Eqs. (i) and (B&D's 17), differ is that Bouda and Djama's \dot{x} is not a group velocity while mine is. Hence, different quantum phenomena are predicted by the two representations.

This first explanation is also supported by Bertoldi, Faraggi and Matone. [10] They noted that, as the QEP is implemented in a Hamilton-Jacobi representation and not at a level of the equations of motion, the QSHJE must be solved before time parameterization may be introduced. Time parameterization, consistent with QEP, is generated by Jacobi's theorem. [10] Bouda and Djama's Lagrangian formulation is effectively an attempt to introduce QEP at a level of the equations of motion.

Second, underlying Bouda and Djama's equation of motion, Eq. (B&D's 17), is Faraggi and Matone's quantum transform [2]

$$\hat{x} = \int^x \frac{\partial S_0/\partial q}{\{2m[E - V(q)]\}^{1/2}} dq = \int^{S_0} \frac{ds}{[2m(E - V)]^{1/2}}, \quad (\text{v})$$

which shows that the QSHJE admits a classical representation. Based on the QEP, Faraggi and Matone noted that the QSHJE is well-defined if and only if the ratio of the independent real solutions of the associated stationary Schrödinger equation, $\phi_2(x)/\phi_1(x)$, is a local self-homeomorphism of the extended (includes $\pm\infty$) real line. We note that latent ratio, $\hat{\phi}_2(\hat{x})/\hat{\phi}_1(\hat{x})$, is not defined over the extended real line for the classical mechanics because classical trajectories may have turning points at finite values of x and because the classical stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation is a first-order differential equation. In presenting the quantum transform, Faraggi and Matone noted that the integrand in Eq. (v) becomes purely imaginary in the classical forbidden region and warn that classically forbidden regions correspond to critical regions for quantum coordinates. The quantum transform is not a homeomorphism between x and \hat{x} over the extended real line. This is another manifestation that QEP is incompatible with classical mechanics. Lest we forget, classical mechanics innately cannot be consistent with the QEP. Nevertheless, Bouda and Djama explicitly identified the quantum transform, Eq. (v), as a coordinate transform and tacitly assumed it were consistent with the QEP by extending Eq. (B&D's 17) into the classically forbidden region. [1] Had the quantum transformation, Eq. (v), been a QEP-preserving coordinate transformation, then classical mechanics would be consistent with the QEP because two different classical systems, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{classical}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{classical}}$, could be mapped into each other in four steps by QEP-preserving coordinate transformations. First, the associated quantum systems $\mathcal{A}_{\text{quantum}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{quantum}}$ are already consistent with QEP by coordinate transformations. Second, the would-be QEP-preserving coordinate transformation, Eq. (v) would relate $\mathcal{A}_{\text{quantum}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\text{classical}}$ consistent with QEP. Third, the would-be QEP-preserving transformation, Eq. (v) would likewise relate $\mathcal{B}_{\text{quantum}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{classical}}$ consistent with

QEP. And fourth, by the associative law, the relationship between the classical systems $\mathcal{A}_{\text{classical}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{classical}}$ would be consistent with QEP. But this is a contradiction. The resolution is that the second and third steps are invalid: Eq. (v) is not a QEP-preserving coordinate transformation. Bouda and Djama's Eq. (8) corresponds to the quantum transform, Eq. (v).

All discussions herein about phase and group velocities do not imply a pilot wave representation of quantum mechanics because analogous discussions are applicable to classical mechanics.

I thank A. Bouda and T. Djama for their prompt and cordial council. While we may still disagree on quantum trajectories, our discussions have been most fruitful in making our differences precise.

1. A. Bouda and T. Djama, Phys. Lett. **A 285** (2001.) 27, quant-ph/0103071.
2. A. Faraggi and M. Matone, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 15** (2000) 1869, hep-th/9809127.
3. R. Carroll, *Quantum Theory, Deformation and Integrability* (Elsevier, 2000, Amsterdam) p. 54.
4. R. Carroll, Can. J. Phys. **77** (1999) 319, quant-ph/9903081.
5. H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, 2nd ed. (Addison-Wesley, 1980, Reading, MA) pp. 482–487.
6. E. R. Floyd, Phys. Essays **7** (1994) 135.
7. E. R. Floyd, Found. Phys. Lett. **13** (2000) 235, quant-ph/9708007.
8. E. R. Floyd, Phys. Rev. **D 26** (1982) 1339.
9. E. R. Floyd, J. Mod. Phys. **A 15** (2000) 1363, quant-ph/9909072.
10. G. Bertoldi, A. E. Faraggi, and M. Matone, Clas. Quantum Grav. **17** (2000) 3965, hep-th/9909201.
11. C. Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics*, 4th ed. (Dover Publications, 1970, New York) pp. 161–164.
12. D. Park, *Classical Dynamics and Its Quantum Analogues*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, 1990, New York) p. 13.