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Abstract

We discuss the notion about physical quantities as having values represented by real numbers, and its limiting to describe nature to be understood in relation to our appreciation that the quantum theory is a better theory of natural phenomena than its classical analog. Getting from the algebra of physical observables to their values on a fixed state is, at least for classical physics, really a homomorphic map from the algebra into the real number algebra. The limitation of the latter to represent the values of quantum observables with noncommutating algebraic relation is obvious. We introduce and discuss the idea of the noncommutative values of quantum observables and its feasibility, arguing that at least in terms of the representation of such a value as an infinite set of complex number, the idea makes reasonable sense theoretically as well as practically.

PACS numbers:
Newton presented his theory of mechanics with the hypothetical notion of a point particle which then has an unambiguous position (the point) in the physical space of assumed three dimensional Euclidean geometry as essentially products of the real number lines. Note that the latter kind of geometry was the only mathematical model for the space as a continuum in the mathematics of Newton’s time. The three independent coordinates of a particle then gives the basic observables the values of which are given by real numbers. Classical physics is then real number physics. Physical quantities or observables, of the particle in the case, are modeled by real valued variables. However, in order to allow the theory to work on all inertial frame, instead of only an absolute frame of reference with respect to which we measure all motion, the basic independent variables have to be extended to include the velocity or momentum components. We have the full six real coordinates of a point in the phase space which give a unique state of the particle. The phase space is then also essentially modeled by Euclidean geometry, though the notion of a metric or distance between two states is not considered to be of any use. The picture of a particle as occupying a fixed position in physical space is an intuitive one, a desirable if not absolutely necessary feature of a theory of particle dynamics (as versus field theories) that we have been told to have to give up in quantum mechanics. A key feature of our study on quantum spacetime is to restore that. A quantum particle sure cannot have a fixed position in the Newtonian model of the physical space. That may rather be taken as an indication that the latter model fails the intuitive notion of a model for the physical space and demands efforts to find a good enough model that works. In fact, the only physical notion of the physical space in a theory of particle dynamics is the collection of all possible positions of a free particle. Actually, the model for the physical space is such a coherent part of the theory that changing the theory assuming the model to be unchanged may not be really sensible.

The most important point of departure from classical physics in quantum mechanics is the realization that quantum observables, the necessary model description of real physical observables as seen at high enough precision beyond the classical domain, in general do not commute. In particular, the conjugate pairs of position and momentum observables each is an non-commuting pair. The position observables, however, commute among themselves. The latter might be the reason why most physicists believe it is still fine to keep the Newtonian model for the physical space. But then the quantum phase space has been realized to be very different from the Cartesian product of the three dimensional Euclidean
spaces for the position and the momentum. It is an infinite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, or better taken as the projective Hilbert space $\mathcal{P}$ (or a $U(1)$ principal bundle of it). With time comes the appreciation of the latter as a symplectic manifold with the Schrödinger equation an infinite pairs of Hamilton equation of motion on it (see our companion paper [1] and references therein). That begs the questions why we cannot take a certain Lagrangian submanifold of it, which should correspond to the notion of the configuration space for a free particle, as a model for the physical space, and how to reconcile the notion of the pairs of three position and momentum observables with the infinite dimensional phase space which could be taken as having infinite pair of position and momentum coordinates. Answer to the first question has been presented in Refs.[2, 3]. Those position and momentum coordinates are like the space and time coordinates of the Minkowski spacetime, separable only in the Newtonian approximation. In the quantum setting, there cannot be an independent notion of a configuration space, which can only be seen as part of the phase space. The phase space should be taken as the proper model for a sensible notion of something like the configuration space, hence (that for a free particle) should be taken as the model for the physical space. The current study, together with Ref.[1], is to address the second question. We will first take it as a pure theoretical/mathematical question and discuss the issues about practical implementation of the results only at the end.

Let us focus first on the observables. Like the classical case, we think about all quantum observables as functions of the basic set of independent observables, the position and momentum ones. Each such classical observable is then a real variable in itself, while in the quantum case it is an element of a noncommutative observable algebra which has been modeled by operators on $\mathcal{H}$. What about the values for such operators on a state? In the classical case, the value of an observable $a(p^i, x^i)$ on a state $(p^i_o, x^i_o)$ is the real number $a(p^i_o, x^i_o)$. For that to work for all observables, the evaluation map for a state that map the variables $a(p^i, x^i)$ to the real number values of $a(p^i_o, x^i_o)$ for all physically sensible functions as $a$ has to be a homomorphism between the observable algebra and the algebra of real numbers as the values, which is obviously fine with any such an evaluation map for the algebra of functions. Push that reasoning to the algebra of quantum observables, we need only a picture of the values for $\hat{x}^i$ and $\hat{p}^i$ satisfying the commutation relation $[\hat{x}^i, \hat{p}^j] = i\hbar\delta^{ij}$ as the image of an evaluation map for a state here denoted by $[\phi]$. However, the algebra as the image of such a map has then to be a noncommutative algebra, for which the a subalgebra of
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the real number algebra certainly cannot do. That in itself does not necessarily imply that
we cannot have such maps, that we cannot have fixed values for the quantum observables on
a state. We cannot have the fixed real number values. So long as we are willing to consider
using some noncommutative algebraic system to represent those values, it is plausible to
have the definite values. The key purpose of this letter is to give an explicit description of
the kind of algebraic modeling, one we may call an algebra of noncommutative numbers.
Actually, an isomorphic description of the observable algebra with reference to a definite
state has been presented in a 1996 Ph.D. dissertation [4], though the author(s) did not seem
to have the idea of that being the algebra of noncommutative (number) values for the ob-
servables. What the author(s) called the algebra of symmetry data, with a particular set of
infinite number of complex numbers as an element, is really the candidate for the algebra of
noncommutative values, may be called the noncommutative number values, of the observables
in a quantum theory, that is the key proposition in this letter. We aim at presenting below
a more direct picture of that algebraic story and start to seek a better understanding and
depiction of physics in terms of such noncommutative number values of the observables.

To prepare for the appreciation of the mathematics, we first want to note that an operator
has really the information content of an infinite number of real/complex numbers. Take an
orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}$, like the eigenstates of the ‘three dimensional’ harmonic oscillator
for example, an operator is then completely characterized by the infinite set of matrix
elements. However, the picture is independent of any state. The symmetry data on a
state for each noncommutative observable/variable is exactly a state specific set of infinite
number of complex numbers characterizing the observable hence giving the noncommutative
value of it, and such sets for the various observables have a noncommutative product that
gives the set for the value of the product observable from the values, i.e. the two sets of
complex numbers, for the two observables composing it. Of course such a set of complex
numbers is only one mathematical to represent the noncommutative value as an element of
a noncommutative algebra. It is the way that kind of gives it more ‘concrete’ realization
for us familiar with the real/complex number values. Yet, the real numbers themselves as
mathematical symbols are not really fundamentally any less abstract than elements of other
algebras.

To sketch the story of the symmetry data in Ref.[4] and present our formulation, we have
to first introduce two isomorphic descriptions of the observable algebra, which are more or
less given in the reference, but actually has its origin in a very important earlier paper by Cirelli, P. Lanzavecchia, and A. Manià [5] we owe much for our current understanding of the geometric structures behind quantum mechanics. Ref. [4] takes it quite a bit further, clarifying the geometric relations between $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ from the perspective of quantum mechanics and presenting the notion of the symmetry data. Apart from advancing the idea of the latter as candidates for the noncommutative values of observables, we will also present more explicit results in terms of standard complex coordinates to give readers easy comprehension of the key mathematics. Some details are left to Ref. [1] though. The algebraic isomorphisms are $H : \beta \rightarrow H_\beta(z^n, \bar{z}^n)$ and $f : \beta \rightarrow f_\beta(z^n, \bar{z}^n)$ with

\[ H_\beta(z^n, \bar{z}^n) = \frac{1}{2\hbar} \langle \phi|\beta|\phi \rangle = \frac{1}{2\hbar} \sum m z^m z^n \langle z_m|\beta|z_n \rangle , \tag{1} \]

and

\[ f_\beta(z^n, \bar{z}^n) = \frac{2\hbar}{|z|^2} H_\beta(z^n, \bar{z}^n) = \frac{1}{|z|^2} \sum m z^m z^n \langle z_m|\beta|z_n \rangle , \tag{2} \]

for an operator $\beta$, which we prefer to think about as a function of the coordinate operator $\beta(\hat{p}^i, \hat{x}^i)$, with state vector $|\phi\rangle = \sum_n z^n |z_n\rangle; |z_n\rangle$ with $n$ from 0 to $\infty$ denote an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$ and $z^n$ the complex coordinates of a point in $\mathcal{H}$ as a Kähler manifold. $f_\beta$ can be taken as functions on $\mathcal{H}$ or functions on $\mathcal{P}$ here in homogeneous coordinates. The algebras of $H_\beta$ or $f_\beta$ functions of course each need to have a noncommutative product to match that of the operator product. They are the Kähler products given by

\[ H_\beta \star_\kappa H_\gamma = \hbar \partial_m H_\beta G^{\bar{m}n} \partial_n H_\gamma , \tag{3} \]

and

\[ f_\beta \star_\kappa f_\gamma = f_\beta f_\gamma + \hbar \partial_m f_\beta \tilde{g}^{\bar{m}n} \partial_n f_\gamma , \tag{4} \]

where $G^{\bar{m}n} = 2\delta^{\bar{m}n}$ is the inverse metric of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\tilde{g}^{\bar{m}n}$ that of $\mathcal{P}$. The metric of $\mathcal{P}$ is the standard Fubini-Study metric. When expressed in terms of the homogeneous coordinates, the latter is degenerate. However, we still can have $\tilde{g}^{\bar{m}n}$ from Killing reduction of $\mathcal{H} - \{0\}$ [1, 4], given as $\frac{1}{\hbar}(|z|^2\delta^{\bar{m}n} - z^m \bar{z}^n)$ which can be used in the Kähler product calculation. We can also think about $\mathcal{H} - \{0\}$ as a fiber bundle with $\mathcal{P}$ as the base manifold and the degenerate metric which is independent of the fiber coordinates. The Kähler product may otherwise be given for the $f_\beta$ functions expressed in terms of a set of affine coordinates, for
example $w^n = \frac{w^n}{z^n}$ for $n \neq 0$ with the non-degenerate Fubini-Study metric \([1]\). In that case, we have $f_\beta \star_\kappa f_\gamma = f_\beta f_\gamma + \hbar \partial_m f_\beta g^{m\bar{n}} \partial_{\bar{n}} f_\gamma$, with $g^{m\bar{n}} = \frac{1}{\hbar} (1 + |w|^2) (\delta^{m\bar{n}} + w^m \bar{w}^n)$. We have $H_{\beta \gamma} = H_\beta \star_\kappa H_\gamma$ and $f_\beta f_\gamma = f_\beta \star_\kappa f_\gamma$, which can be easily verified explicitly in terms of generic matrix elements for the operators based on the coordinate.

The symmetry data for an operator $\beta$ at a point $[\phi]$ on $\mathcal{P}$ is given in Ref.\([4]\) as triples $(f_\beta, X_\beta, K_\beta)$ with $X_\beta$ being a covector of the Hamiltonian vector field for $f_\beta$, and $K_\beta$ a 2-form as the covariant derivative of $X_\beta$ all taken with values at $[\phi]$. Explicit expressions for the symmetry data for the Poisson bracket and Riemann bracket of two $f_\beta$ functions, corresponding to commutator and anticommutator of the operators \([1, 4, 5]\), in terms of the two sets of $(f_\beta, X_\beta, K_\beta)$ for the operators are presented \([4]\). We present here below our reformulation of the basic notion which we believe gives a more transparent picture of all that otherwise hidden in the abstract mathematics. And we give directly the symmetry data at $[\phi]$ for the Kähler product for the original $f_\beta$ functions. The Kähler product among the $f_\beta$ functions represents the operator product, to which the Poisson and Riemann brackets are simply the antisymmetry and symmetric parts.

As usual, mathematics about quantum mechanics is easier to present on $\mathcal{H}$. Let us first look at a picture of the symmetry data for the $H_\beta$ functions given as $(H_\beta, \bar{X}_m, \bar{X}_m, \bar{K}_{m\bar{n}} = \nabla_m \bar{X}_n)$, $\bar{X}_n$ the Hamiltonian vector field of $H_\beta$. Note that we include $\beta(\hat{p}^i, \hat{x}^i)$ as ‘complex functions’ hence non-Hermitian operators, like complex linear combinations of Hermitian operators, to have the observable algebra as a $C^*$-algebra. Hence $H_\beta$ is in general complex. The real ones correspond to Hermitian operators. The same holds for the $f_\beta$ functions.\(^1\) We have, for the Kähler manifold with $H_\beta$ functions generating Hamiltonian flows as isometries,

\(^1\) For the preferred formulation within our perspective of quantum relativity \([3]\), we have representation of the coordinate operators $\hat{p}_i$ and $\hat{x}_i$ as $p_i \star = p_i - i\partial_{\hat{x}_i}$ and $x^i \star = x^i + i\partial_{\hat{p}_i}$, respectively, on the space of coherent state wavefunctions $\phi(p^i, x^i)$ with $\beta(p^i, \hat{x}^i)$ given by $\beta(p^i, x^i) \star$. The latter is Hermitian for a real function $\beta(p^i, x^i)$ and non-Hermitian for complex $\beta(p^i, x^i)$. Actually, the operator product $\beta(p^i, x^i) \star \gamma(p^i, x^i) \star$ is then exactly $[\beta(p^i, x^i) \star, \gamma(p^i, x^i) \star]$ as in Moyal star product.
\[ \tilde{K}_{\beta\gamma\mu} = -\bar{K}_{\gamma\beta\mu} = -i\partial_{\beta}\partial_{\mu}H_{\beta} \text{ and } \tilde{K}_{\beta\gamma\mu} = \bar{K}_{\gamma\beta\mu} = 0. \] The Kähler product gives

\[ H_{\beta} = \hbar\bar{X}_{\beta\gamma}G^{\mu\nu}\bar{X}_{\gamma\mu} = 2\hbar \sum_{n} \bar{X}_{\beta n} \bar{X}_{\gamma\mu}, \]

\[ \bar{X}_{\beta\gamma\mu} = 2i\hbar \sum_{m} \bar{X}_{\beta m} \bar{K}_{\gamma\mu}, \]

\[ \bar{X}_{\beta\gamma\mu} = 2i\hbar \sum_{m} \bar{K}_{\beta\gamma m} \bar{X}_{\mu}, \]

\[ \bar{K}_{\gamma\beta\mu} = 2i\hbar \sum_{l} \bar{K}_{\gamma l} \bar{K}_{\beta\mu l}. \] (5)

The set \( \{\bar{X}_{\beta n}, \bar{X}_{\beta\delta}, \bar{K}_{\beta m}\} \) is really all independent nonzero derivatives of \( H_{\beta} \); \( \bar{X}_{\beta n} \) being the conjugate of \( \bar{X}_{\beta n} \) only for Hermitian \( \beta \). The second order derivatives give really the matrix elements, as \( \bar{K}_{\beta n} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} \langle \bar{z}_{n} | \beta | z_{n} \rangle \). They are not dependent on the state at all, and the \( \bar{K}_{\gamma\beta\mu} \) expression above simply gives the matrix elements of \( \beta_{\gamma} \) in terms of matrix elements of \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \). The latter alone would have hence given an isomorphic description of the observable algebra. The first order derivatives however are linear functions of the state coordinates, like \( \bar{X}_{\beta n} = \frac{i}{\hbar} \sum_{m} z^{m} \langle \bar{z}_{m} | \beta | z_{n} \rangle \). Putting together the values of the first derivatives and the second derivatives, say \( \bar{X}_{\beta n} \) and \( \bar{K}_{\gamma\beta m} \) may allow us to solve for the values of the coordinates and hence determine the state vector \( |\phi\rangle \) up to an overall phase to which the \( H_{\beta} \) functions have no dependence on. That is feasible for any invertible operator in itself.

We are more interested in results for the \( f_{\beta} \) functions. Using the \( z^{n} \) coordinates with \( \bar{w}^{\mu} = -i\bar{g}^{\mu\nu} \), we have

\[ \bar{X}_{\beta n} = i\partial_{n}f_{\beta} = \frac{-i}{|z|^{2}} \left[ f_{\beta} z_{n} - \sum_{m} z^{m} \langle \bar{z}_{m} | \beta | z_{n} \rangle \right], \]

\[ \bar{X}_{\beta\delta} = -i\partial_{\delta}f_{\beta} = \frac{i}{|z|^{2}} \left[ f_{\beta} z_{\delta} - \sum_{m} z^{m} \langle \bar{z}_{m} | \beta | z_{\delta} \rangle \right], \]

\[ \bar{K}_{\beta m\delta} = -\bar{K}_{\delta m\beta} = -i\partial_{m}\partial_{\delta}f_{\beta} \]

\[ = \frac{i}{|z|^{2}} \left[ f_{\beta} \delta_{m\delta} + iz_{m} \bar{X}_{\beta n} - i\bar{z}_{n} \bar{X}_{\beta m} - \langle \bar{z}_{m} | \beta | z_{n} \rangle \right]. \] (6)

Using the \( w^{n} \) coordinates (no \( n = 0 \)) with \( \omega^{\mu\nu} = -ig^{\mu\nu} \), we have

\[ X_{\mu n} = i\partial_{n}f_{\beta} = \frac{-i}{(1 + |w|^{2})} \left[ f_{\beta} \bar{w}_{n} - \sum_{m} \bar{w}^{m} \langle \bar{z}_{m} | \beta | z_{n} \rangle \right], \]

\[ X_{\mu\delta} = -i\partial_{\delta}f_{\beta} = \frac{i}{(1 + |w|^{2})} \left[ f_{\beta} w_{\delta} - \sum_{m} w^{m} \langle \bar{z}_{m} | \beta | z_{\delta} \rangle \right], \]

\[ K_{\mu\delta} = -K_{\delta\mu} = -i\partial_{\delta}\partial_{\mu}f_{\beta} \]

\[ = \frac{i}{(1 + |w|^{2})} \left[ f_{\beta} \delta_{\mu\delta} + i\bar{w}_{m} X_{\mu n} - i\bar{w}_{n} X_{\mu m} - \langle \bar{z}_{m} | \beta | z_{n} \rangle \right]. \] (7)
where the index for the components, as the coordinates, has no 0 but the summations includes \( m = 0 \) with \( w^0 = \bar{w}^0 = 1 \). The similar form of the two sets of results is deceiving. Apart from the different coordinate derivatives, denoted here by the same \( \partial_n \) symbol for simplicity, with a pair less for the second case, the Hamiltonian vector field \( \tilde{X}_\beta \) is obtained from the symplectic form \(-ig^m\bar{m}\) both of which as tensors are really the horizontal lifts of the corresponding \( X_\beta \) obtained from \(-ig^m\bar{m}\), though for the same function \( f_\beta \). Their covectors are identical, \textit{i.e.} \( \tilde{X}_{\beta_n} \) \( dz^n = X_{\beta_n} dw^n \) (sum without \( n = 0 \) for the right hand side) \[1\]. Applying the Kähler product, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
&f_{\beta\gamma} = f_\beta f_\gamma + |z|^2 \sum_n \tilde{X}_{\beta_n} \tilde{X}_{\gamma_n}, \\
&\tilde{X}_{\beta\gamma n} = f_\beta \tilde{X}_{\gamma n} + \tilde{X}_{\beta_n} f_\gamma + i |z|^2 \sum_m \tilde{X}_{\beta_m} \tilde{K}_{\gamma m n}, \\
&\tilde{X}_{\beta\gamma n} = f_\beta \tilde{X}_{\gamma n} + \tilde{X}_{\beta_n} f_\gamma + i |z|^2 \sum_m \tilde{K}_{\beta m n} \tilde{X}_{\gamma n}, \\
&\tilde{K}_{\beta\gamma m n} = f_\beta \tilde{K}_{\gamma m n} + \tilde{K}_{\beta m n} f_\gamma + i |z|^2 \sum_l \tilde{K}_{\beta l m n} - i \tilde{X}_{\beta n} \tilde{X}_{\gamma m} + \frac{i |z|^2 g_{m n}}{\hbar} \sum_l \tilde{X}_{\beta l} \tilde{X}_{\gamma l}, \quad (8)
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
&f_{\beta\gamma} = f_\beta f_\gamma + \hbar X_{\beta n} g^m\bar{m} X_{\gamma m}, \\
&X_{\beta\gamma n} = f_\beta X_{\gamma n} + X_{\beta_n} f_\gamma + i \hbar X_{\beta l} g^m\bar{m} K_{m \gamma n}, \\
&X_{\beta\gamma n} = f_\beta X_{\gamma n} + X_{\beta_n} f_\gamma + i \hbar K_{\beta l n} g^m\bar{m} X_{\gamma m}, \\
&K_{\beta\gamma m n} = f_\beta K_{\gamma m n} + K_{\beta m n} f_\gamma + i \hbar K_{\beta l n} g^l\bar{m} K_{m \gamma o} - i X_{\beta n} X_{\gamma m} + ig_{m n} g^l\bar{m} X_{\beta l} X_{\gamma o}. \quad (9)
\end{align*}
\]

The above results illustrate what we said above, that the symmetry data for any two observables have a product which gives the symmetry data of the product observable – almost but not exactly. Something else, the elements of the metric and the inverse metric tensor are involved too. Upon a more careful thinking, however, that feature is not unreasonable, in fact quite normal. In a non-Euclidean space, or even an Euclidean space like the Newtonian but depicted in coordinates in terms of which the metric has nontrivial expressions, even the algebraic relation between classical observables commonly involves the metric. For example, the expression for the energy of a free Newtonian particle is to be given by \( E = \frac{1}{2m}(p_i^2 + \frac{1}{r^2}p_r^2 + \frac{1}{r^2 \sin^2 \theta} p_\theta^2) \) for momentum components \( p_i \), \( p_r \), and \( p_\theta \) under the spherical coordinate; and if the physical space is a curved manifold with metric \( g_{ab} \), it is \( E = \frac{1}{2m} g_{ab} p^a p^b \). The metric is in fact always there, only that for the case of an Euclidean
geometry in the standard Cartesian coordinates, its values are simply $\delta_{ab}$ at every point and hence we can write the expression without showing it explicitly. Here for calculating the symmetry data for any operator product through the $f_\beta$ functions, however, we always need the values of the metric and inverse metric tensor elements at the phase space point. The truth is the metric tensor elements are also all over Eqs. (5) and (6) implicitly, as in much the same form as they explicitly show up in Eq. (7). The other apparent problem is the expressions in terms of the $z^n$ coordinates also depend on $|z|^2$, which we can easily avoid by looking only at normalized $|\phi\rangle$. Under our formulation with $z^n$ bearing the physical dimension of length, the preferred normalization is actually $|z|^2 = 2\hbar$ at which $f_\beta = H_\beta[1]$. The next thing we want to look at is if the symmetry data for an observable on a fix state $[\phi_0]$ can be determined experimentally at least in principle. We look at Hermitian $\beta$ and the part about the $H_\beta$ functions first. $f_\beta([\phi_0])$, and hence $H_\beta([\phi_0])$ for the normalized state, is essentially just the familiar expectation value of operator $\beta$. $\tilde{K}_{\beta m\bar{n}}$ are the matrix elements on a supposed known set of orthonormal states, hence have no problem either. With those, determining $\tilde{X}_\beta\bar{n}(|\phi_0\rangle)$ means determining $\tilde{X}_\beta\bar{n}(\phi_0)$ for the normalized $|\phi_0\rangle$ up to an overall phase factor as the one among the $z^n$ coordinates. The phase is certainly not to be determined. More specifically, if we take as the basis $|z_n\rangle$ the set of eigenstates for $\beta$, assuming no degeneracy, the nonzero $\tilde{K}_{\beta m\bar{n}}$ are exactly $\tilde{K}_{\beta n\bar{n}} = \frac{i\lambda_n}{2\hbar}$ with $\lambda_n$ the eigenvalues; then we have simply $\tilde{X}_\beta\bar{n} = \frac{i\lambda_n}{2\hbar}z^n$ (no sum). Gone are the days people still debate about if the physical quantum state can be determined or observed. On the one hand, we have theoretical analyses, most notably the line of work as presented in Ref. [6], illustrating the mathematics involved; on the other there has been developed experimental efforts in quantum optics [7], especially the technique of optical homodyne tomography [8], to actually measure the state. Of course any practical measurement gives only good enough approximations. Then, the $z^n$ coordinates for a normalized $|\phi_0\rangle$ up to an overall phase factor and hence $\tilde{X}_\beta\bar{n}$ (and $\tilde{X}_\beta\bar{n}$ as the complex conjugate) can be determined in principle. For non-Hermitian $\beta$, we can take that as a ‘complex function’ with real and imaginary parts as Hermitian operators (see the above footnote), hence only an obvious extension. The symmetry data in terms of an $f_\beta$ function, as given in Eqs. (6) and (7), then clearly pose no further qualitative difficulty. $\tilde{X}_\beta\bar{n}(|\phi_0\rangle)$ and $\tilde{X}_\beta\bar{n}(|\phi_0\rangle)$ or $\tilde{X}_\beta\bar{n}(\phi_0)$ and $\tilde{X}_\beta\bar{n}(\phi_0)$ up to the overall phase factor in the $z^n$ coordinates, as well as $\tilde{K}_{\beta m\bar{n}}(|\phi_0\rangle)$, $X_{\beta n}(|\phi_0\rangle)$, $X_{\beta n}(|\phi_0\rangle)$, and $K_{\beta m\bar{n}}(|\phi_0\rangle)$ can all be determined likewise. Note that the values of $\tilde{K}_{\beta m\bar{n}}$, $X_{\beta n}$, $X_{\beta n}$, and $K_{\beta m\bar{n}}$ are in general independent of the undetermined
phase factor, same for the \( w^n \) coordinates. Moreover, knowing the coordinates, we have all the value of the elements for the metric tensors at the state, which can be considered mostly a theoretical input at this point. From the perspective of Refs.\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^3\), the metric gives a real number notion distance between two quantum particle states as points in the quantum model of the physical space, and its connection to quantum observables is explored in Ref.\(^1\). One should be able to see how the metric tensors can be measured or verified experimentally but we will not go more into that here. We want to note though in parallel to the set for an \( H_\beta \) function, \( X_{\gamma n}, X_{\bar{\gamma} \bar{n}}, \) and \( K_{\gamma m \bar{n}} \) make up the complete set of independent derivatives, or covariant derivatives. We obviously have nontrivial higher order derivatives. They have however definite relation to the first and second order ones through the metric \(^4\) as a result of the Kählerian nature of the \( f_\beta \) function. Similar applies to and \( \tilde{X}_{\gamma n}, \tilde{X}_{\bar{\gamma} \bar{n}}, \tilde{K}_{\gamma m \bar{n}} \) when the \( z \)-coordinates are used instead of the \( w \)-coordinates. The fact that the operator, or the corresponding function as its representation, be it \( f_\beta \) or \( H_\beta \), can indeed be determined, at least locally, by the values of all its derivatives at a point is simply the notion of Taylor series expansion.

We have argued above that the symmetry data for an operator at a fixed physical state can in principle be experimentally determined. Note that it is actually most directly represented by the set of complex numbers \( \{ f_\beta ([\phi_0]), X_{\gamma n} ([\phi_0]), X_{\bar{\gamma} \bar{n}} ([\phi_0]), K_{\gamma m \bar{n}} ([\phi_0]) \} \). The corresponding set in terms of the homogeneous coordinates \( z^n \) and even the representation through the \( H_\beta \) function and its derivatives have the complication of having to be restricted to normalized state vectors with an unphysical overall phase factor for the \( z^n \) coordinates formally involved in the first derivatives. That does no harm. In fact, we can even take a conventional definition of the coordinates to fix it, like always taking \( z^0 \) as real. The coordinate representation has the advantage over that of the \( w^n \) coordinate in that it covers the whole space of \( P \) hence works for all physical states. All that, however, is only for theoretical interest. For the idea of the noncommutative (number) value of an observable to be of any practical use, one does not want to determine them so indirectly as like what we discuss above. We want to be able to measure it directly. We will argue below that such as idea, though going much beyond what we are familiar with, may not be as crazy as it sounds to those who never thinks about it before.

Let us look into the notion of measurement of physical quantities very carefully. A measurement is really a controlled process to inflict an interaction with the physical system we
are interested in in order to extract some information about its state before that interaction. It is actually not quite necessary to worry about how that state may be changed in the process. To actually obtain the information or the ‘values’ we are after may however be complicated issue. In general, we need to have a good (theoretical) understanding of the the physics of the measuring process and perform some calculations. The world is quantum and hence information about physical system intrinsically quantum in nature, though they may be approximated by, or rather in many cases degraded to classical information as represented by a few real numbers. Extracting a piece of quantum information from a system should really be taken as a kind of measuring process, and it is certainly not one corresponding to getting real number answers. For the kind of direct measurements in which we read answer out of the apparatus, the key is to have the right apparatus and a good calibration of the output scale. We essentially measure by comparison. We compare the ‘value’ we measure, as indicated on the reading scale, with ‘known value’ of the quantities which may be a conventionally chosen standard unit. The comparison itself never gives us the real number readings though. We put that it ourselves. The truth is nothing in nature ever point to the idea of physical quantities being real valued. In all (classical) measurements, it is our calibration of the output reading scale in the measuring device that enforces the reading as a real number, and even that we can only take as an approximate range. The bottom line is real numbers as representation of values of physical quantities is nothing more than a mathematical model we use to describe nature. Only that the model is really not good enough in the quantum regime. We should see if we can find better way to model those ‘values’, which is what our study here is about. To consider full practical implementations of what we discuss theoretically here, one may have to explore how build the appropriate measuring device and to calibrate its output with the noncommutative values.

Taking a step backward the conservative consideration of the von-Neumann measurements on a quantum observable, one must note that a single real eigenvalue outcome in itself hardly gives any information about the ‘value’ of the observable on a particular state. The best real number representation of the value is the expectation value as the mean of a sufficient statistical collection of the eigenvalue outcomes from repeated measurements. But then it has an uncertainty, which is just the standard derivation of the statistics. Well, we have more than the expectation value and the uncertainty. We have the whole distribution which contains its full information in terms of infinite number of real numbers in all the
moments. Depending on the precision one wants, we can take enough statistics and calculate a large enough number of the lower moments to get to an approximation of the full information content for the value of the observable on the fixed state. There is no reason, other than ignorance, to discard all those real number information in the all the moment and use only one or two as standard discussion about quantum observables does. The full set of infinite number of real numbers, or the whole distribution, is more like what should be taken as the value of the observable on the state. The latter has an obvious parallel with the notion of the symmetry data. Again, a quantum observable has a value on a state that should be represented by elements of a noncommutative algebra rather than the real numbers as a commutative one. Such an element can also be represented by an infinite set of real/complex numbers.

Intuitively, when the state is fixed, all physical properties should be fixed. To have the notion implementable in quantum mechanics is workable, we simply have to go beyond the idea of each simple physical properties like a position coordinate is to be described by a single real number. In our opinion, the stubborn attachment of physicists to real number values is what makes quantum theory sounding counter-intuitive. We can and should go beyond that. The mathematician Takesaki talked about operator algebras as ‘a number theory in analysis’ \[9\]. From a physics point of view, operators are observables as variables to be evaluated on a physical state. The notion of their noncommutative values may be really the missing as the noncommutative numbers. A proper representation of a $C^*$-algebra, which is what physicists should focus on as candidate for the observable algebra \[10\], gives an operator algebra on a Hilbert space. The corresponding projective Hilbert space is the state of pure states which is a mathematical object dual to (the representation of) the $C^*$-algebra \[11, 12\]. $C^*$-algebras are noncommutative geometric objects \[13\]. A $C^*$-algebra of the quantum operators as functions of the six position and momentum operators \[3\] may be taken as having the latter as coordinate observables of the geometry the noncommutative values of which for each physical state may plausibly be seen as an alternative description of the infinite number of real/complex number coordinates of the projective Hilbert space. Study of that last idea is to be reported in Ref.\[1\] which is much a companion paper to this letter.
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