NCU-HEP-k084
Jan 2020

arXiv:2002.07083v1 [physics.gen-ph] 4 Feb 2020

Covariant Quantum Mechanics and Quantum Spacetime

Suzana Bedić,

ICRANet, P.le della Repubblica 10, 65100 Pescara, Italy,

and ICRA and University of Rome "Sapienza",

Physics Department, P.le A. Moro 5, 00185 Rome, Italy

Otto C. W. Kong, and Hock King Ting

Department of Physics and Center for High Energy and High Field Physics,

National Central University,

Chung-li, Taiwan 32054

Abstract

We present in the article the formulation of a version of Lorentz covariant quantum mechanics based on a group theoretical construction from a Heisenberg-Weyl symmetry with position and momentum operators transforming as Minkowski four-vectors under the Lorentz symmetry. The basic representation is identified as a coherent state representation, essentially an irreducible component of the regular representation, with the matching representation of an extension of the group C^*-algebra giving the algebra of observables. The key feature of the formulation is that it is not unitary but pseudo-unitary, exactly in the same sense as the Minkowski spacetime representation. Explicit wavefunction description is given without any restriction of the variable domains, yet with a finite integral inner product. The associated covariant harmonic oscillator Fock state basis has all the standard properties in exact analog to those of a harmonic oscillator with Euclidean position and momentum operators of any 'dimension'. Galilean limit of the Lorentz symmetry and the classical limit of the Lorentz covariant framework are retrieved rigorously through appropriate symmetry contractions of the algebra and its representation, including the dynamics described through the symmetry of the phase space, given both in terms of real/complex number coordinates and noncommutative operator coordinates. The latter gives an explicit picture of the (projective) Hilbert space as a quantum/noncommutative spacetime.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

The formulation of a fully Lorentz covariant version of quantum mechanics with position and momentum operators $\hat{X}_\mu$ and $\hat{P}_\mu$ transforming as Minkowski four-vectors has been around since the early days of quantum mechanics. A naive thinking would be to take the representation of those operators as x_μ and $-i\hbar\partial_{x^\mu}$, acting on the wavefunctions $\psi(x^\mu)$ with the simple inner product giving the squared integral norm and a unitary Schrödinger evolution under the Einstein proper time τ. Explicit group theoretical picture of that, under what we called $H_R(1,3)$ symmetry, has been available since the sixties [1, 2]. There are numerous studies on such a theory and its variants which we refrained from quoting. The results are not quite satisfactory. Here, we revisit the subject matter with very different perspectives, and give a formulation based on a pseudo-unitary representation which, in our opinion, beautifully resolves all the problems.

The difficulties of the usual unitary approach are particularly well illustrated in the analysis of the covariant harmonic oscillator system. The importance of the harmonic oscillator problem in any setting can hardly be overstated. In the standard 'non-relativistic' quantum mechanics, the Fock states are one of the most useful orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space and the latter, as the space of rapidly decreasing functions spanned by their wavefunctions, rigorously gives the states on which the position and momentum operators can be truly Hermitian [3]. However, solutions to the covariant harmonic oscillator problem, under a unitary or non-unitary formulation, have difficulties with less than nice expected Lorentz transformation properties or wavefunctions with divergence issues [1, 4]. We just revisit the problem with the idea of taking a pseudo-unitary representation, which is like a natural extension of the Minkowski spacetime, as a representation of the Lorentz symmetry, seeing the lack of full unitarity as a basic signature of spacetime physics [5]. Our solutions, given in terms of $\hat{X}_a$ and $\hat{P}_a$ as x_a and $-i\hbar\partial_{x^a}$, $a = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and the anti-Hermitian $\hat{X}_0 = i\hat{X}_4$ and $\hat{P}_0 = i\hat{P}_4$, have been established to have the desirable Lorentz transformation properties while being free from any divergence issue [6]. The usual inner product is not the right, Lorentz invariant, one though. The right one introduced is pseudo-unitary, giving norms that can be spacelike (+ve), timelike (-ve), or lightlike (0).

With the lesson learned from our solutions to the covariant harmonic oscillator problem, here we look at the exact formulation of the covariant quantum mechanics itself from a

coherent state point of view. The current study targets two important aspects, and achieves the results we want.

Firstly, our group had implemented a quantum relativity symmetry group theoretical perspective to formulate the full dynamical theory of the familiar quantum mechanics with rigorous classical limit given as a Newtonian theory, obtained through a contraction of the relativity symmetry applied to the specific representation. The latter is taken as essentially an irreducible component of the regular representation of $H(3)$, the Heisenberg-Weyl group. The full quantum relativity symmetry, denoted $\tilde{G}(3)$, can naturally be seen as a $U(1)$ central extension of the Galilean symmetry. $H_{_R}(3)$ is (or is isomorphic to) its subgroup, left after the 'time-translation' is taken out. A $H(3)$ representation is a spin zero, time independent, representation of $\tilde{G}(3)$. The representation is really the one of the canonical coherent states. The matching representation of the group C^*-algebra, further extended to a proper class of distributions, gives the observable algebra as functions, and distributions, of $\hat{X}_i$ and $\hat{P}_i$, essentially as given by the Weyl-Wigner-Groenewold-Moyal(WWGM) formulation. The operators $\alpha(p_i\star, x_i\star) = \alpha(p_i, x_i)\star$ act as differential operators on the coherent state wavefunctions $\phi(p^i, x^i)$ by the Moyal star-product $\alpha \star \phi$; $\alpha \star \beta\star = (\alpha \star \beta)\star$. A detailed study emphasizing on a quantum space model is given in Ref. [7], and on the noncommutative geometric perspectives in Ref.[8]. We want to give the analogous formulation for $H_{_R}(1,3)$ as an upper level quantum relativity symmetry along the contraction chain [9, 10], and hence give also the first quantum/noncommutative spacetime model solidly based on the known physics.

Secondly, we want to look at the covariant theory of Ref.[6] in relation to the group theoretical formulation from $H_{_R}(1,3)$ group symmetry to understand a more physical picture of it in terms of the Minkowski four-vector variables x^μ and p^μ and operators $x_\mu\star$ and $p_\mu\star$, hence circumventing the difficulties of a description based on wavefunctions of the type $\phi(x^a)$ or $\phi(p^a, x^a)$.

The current paper reports the success of the work we set out to do. To follow the formulation presented in Ref.[6], we start with the unitary representation of $H_{_R}(4)$, illustrating the irreducible component of the regular representation of $H(4)$, in Sec.II. quite some details are given, with somewhat complicated-looking notation, since the parallel details for $H(3)$ had not been explicitly shown in Ref.[8], which have direct analogs in the case of $H(1,3)$ and are needed to understand the contraction of the Lorentz symmetry to the Galilean one. The

explicit $H_R(1,3)$ picture is presented in Sec.III, in which we go all the way to present also the coherent states for the $H_R(1,3)$ in the same abstract Hilbert space, showing the representation as essentially the one corresponding to the regular representation of $H(1,3)$, which is hence still pseudo-unitary with the Lorentz invariant physical inner product. Without going through the path via $H_R(4)$, it is difficult to see that important pseudo-unitarity and its consequence. In particular, we get the wavefunctions $\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu, x^\mu)$ with the finite integral inner product, all having nice enough analytical properties otherwise difficult to obtain. Sec.IV deals with the Lorentz to Galilean contraction of the representation. Sec.V is devoted to the WWGM framework or the observable algebra, focusing on the symmetry transformations and the dynamics as a specific case such a symmetry flow with the real parameter characterizing transformation corresponding to an evolution parameter which is taken as the proper time in the case. Sec.VI gives the direct contraction at the Lorentz covariant level to a classical limit. Discussions and conclusions are given in the last section. In the appendix we summarize the results obtained in the Fock state basis, some of which are used in Sec.III.

II. THE REPRESENTATION FROM IRREDUCIBLE REPRESENTATIONS OF $H_R(4)$

We give the Lie algebra for $H_R(1,3)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
&[J_{\mu\nu}, J_{\rho\sigma}] = 2i\left(\eta_{\nu\sigma}J_{\mu\rho} + \eta_{\mu\rho}J_{\nu\sigma} - \eta_{\mu\sigma}J_{\nu\rho} - \eta_{\nu\rho}J_{\mu\sigma}\right) \ , \\
&[J_{\mu\nu}, Y_\rho] = 2i\left(\eta_{\mu\rho}Y_\nu - \eta_{\nu\rho}Y_\mu\right) \ , \\
&[J_{\mu\nu}, E_\rho] = 2i\left(\eta_{\mu\rho}E_\nu - \eta_{\nu\rho}E_\mu\right) \ , \\
&[Y_\mu, E_\nu] = 2i\eta_{\mu\nu}I \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}\{-1,1,1,1\}$. The choice of notation with Y_μ corresponding essentially to spacetime position observables and E_μ to energy-momentum observables is somewhat unusual. The reason for it should be clear from the analysis below. Notice that the generators are all taken to have no physical dimension, and the factor 2 corresponds to $\hbar$ in the chosen units, which is at least convenient for the coherent state formulation [8]. In terms of the group element $g(p^\mu, x^\mu, \theta, \Lambda^\mu_\nu)$, we have (with the indices suppressed)

$$\begin{aligned}
&g(p', x', \theta', \Lambda')g(p, x, \theta, \Lambda) \\
&\quad = g\left(p' + \Lambda' p, x' + \Lambda' x, \theta' + \theta - x'\Lambda' p + p'\Lambda' x, \Lambda'\Lambda\right) .
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The story is an extension of what has been done in Ref.[7, 8] for $H_{\scriptscriptstyle R}(3) = H(3) \rtimes SO(3)$ to the framework of

$$H_{\scriptscriptstyle R}(1,3) = H(1,3) \rtimes SO(1,3) \ , \tag{3}$$

the focus of which, for the spin zero case here, is only on the irreducible representation of the Heisenberg-Weyl symmetry $H(1,3)$ and $H(3)$. A key point of difference between the two cases is that $SO(1,3)$ is noncompact, the finite dimensional representations of which, as direct extension of those compact ones of $SO(3)$, are pseudo-unitary instead of unitary. The basis of that pseudo-unitarity is the indefinite Minkowski norm associated with the metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ extending the Euclidean δ_{ij} [5, 6]. In the case of $H_{\scriptscriptstyle R}(3)$, the representation is naturally an irreducible component of the regular representation of $H(3)$, which all can be seen actually as physically equivalent. The regular representation for a Lie group is however unitary, at least in the sense that the generators of the Lie algebra represented as invariant vector fields are naively Hermitian, *i.e.* with respect to the usual inner product on the functional space. Inspired by the analysis of the corresponding Lorentz covariant harmonic oscillator problem [6], we take here a simple approach used there to construct the pseudo-unitary representation, however, in a coherent state basis with the wavefunctions naturally serving as the description of the states under the WWGM formalism, as has been done for the case of $H(3)$ group [8].

Our basic approach to the proper pseudo-unitary representation is essentially that of the 'Weyl trick' [11], using the relation between the representations of $SO(1,3)$ and that of $SO(4)$ sharing the same complexification. We first present the results from a harmonic analysis of Heisenberg-Weyl groups adopted to our case of $H(4)$ [12]. The left regular representation is written, in $\hbar = 2$ units, as $U(p^a, x^a, \theta) = e^{i(p^a Y^{\scriptscriptstyle L}_a - x^a E^{\scriptscriptstyle L}_a + \theta I^{\scriptscriptstyle L})}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{\scriptscriptstyle L}_a &= ix_a\partial_\theta + i\partial_{p^a} \ , \\ E^{\scriptscriptstyle L}_a &= ip_a\partial_\theta - i\partial_{x^a} \ , \\ I^{\scriptscriptstyle L} &= i\partial_\theta \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

are the left-invariant vector fields. In a unitary irreducible representation, all of which are contained in the regular representation, the central generator I has to be represented by a real multiple of identity. We write the one parameter series U_ς ($\varsigma \neq 0$) of representations for the generators as Hermitian operators as $\{\hat{Y}^{\scriptscriptstyle L}_\varsigma, \hat{E}^{\scriptscriptstyle L}_\varsigma, \varsigma\hat{I}\}$, where $\hat{I}$ is the identity operator

and $[\hat{Y}^L_{\varsigma a}, \hat{E}^L_{\varsigma b}] = 2i\varsigma\delta_{ab}\hat{I}$. The U^L_ς set can be considered the set of equivalence classes of irreducible unitary representations with nonzero Plancherel measure. The limit of U^L_ς as $\varsigma \to 0$ gives the whole set of irreducible one dimensional representations. The latter set has zero Plancherel measure and together with the U^L_ς exhausts all equivalence classes of irreducible representations. Based on the measure, one should consider the expansion

$$\alpha(p^a, x^a, \theta) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int d\varsigma \, \alpha_\varsigma(p^a, x^a) \, e^{-i\varsigma\theta} |\varsigma|^n \, , \tag{5}$$

$n = 1 + 3$ here, given as the inverse Fourier-Plancherel transform. The actions of the left-invariant vector fields on $\alpha(p, x, \theta)$ in the form of Eq.(5) are given by their actions on $\alpha_\varsigma(p, x)e^{-i\varsigma\theta}$ parts as $\varsigma x + i\partial_p$, $\varsigma p - i\partial_x$, and ς, respectively. Here, and below, we suppress the indices wherever it is unambiguous. We can see that the action at each $\varsigma \neq 0$ corresponds exactly to the U^L_ς representation with the generators represented by $\{\hat{Y}^L_\varsigma, \hat{E}^L_\varsigma, \varsigma\hat{I}\}$. That is the reduction of the regular representation into irreducible components. For positive values of ς, one can introduce the ς independent operators

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)} &\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varsigma}} \hat{Y}^L_\varsigma = x_{(\varsigma)} + i\partial_{p_{(\varsigma)}} \, , \\ \hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)} &\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varsigma}} \hat{E}^L_\varsigma = p_{(\varsigma)} - i\partial_{x_{(\varsigma)}} \, , \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where we have $x_{(\varsigma)} = \sqrt{\varsigma}x$ and $p_{(\varsigma)} = \sqrt{\varsigma}p$. $U^L_\varsigma(p, x, \theta)$ is then given by $e^{i(p_{(\varsigma)}\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)} - x_{(\varsigma)}\hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)} + \theta_{(\varsigma)}\hat{I})}$, with $\theta_{(\varsigma)} = \varsigma\theta$, hence in a form formally independent of ς. $\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)}$ and $\hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)}$ are still $SO(4)$ vectors, and so are $p_{(\varsigma)}$ and $x_{(\varsigma)}$. The (ς) index becomes completely dummy and analysis based on the new operators and the parameters would be independent of ς so long as we are looking only at a particular irreducible representation. One can even simply drop it. From a physics perspective, we have absorbed the value of ς by a choice of physical unit for measuring the observables corresponding to Y and E, here all in unit of $\sqrt{\varsigma}$. For ς being negative[1], we

[1] From the physical point of view, the representations corresponding to different value of ς can be seen as describing the same physics. The parameter ς may then be taken as the physical constant $\frac{\hbar c^2}{2}$. And for that matter, ς cannot be negative. Physicists identify the symmetry algebra from a relevant representation with $\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)}$ and $\hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)}$ as the position and momentum observables satisfying $[\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)a}, \hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)b}] = 2i\delta_{ab}$, in the $\hbar = 2$ units. However, the mathematical the case of a product of two representations with different ς values may have interesting physics implications if composite physical system corresponding to that exists in nature.

should switch $\hat{Y}^L_\varsigma$ with $\hat{E}^L_\varsigma$ first; *i.e.* we take

$$\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\varsigma|}}\hat{E}^L_\varsigma = x_{(\varsigma)} + i\partial_{p_{(\varsigma)}} \ ,$$
$$\hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\varsigma|}}\hat{Y}^L_\varsigma = p_{(\varsigma)} - i\partial_{x_{(\varsigma)}} \ ,$$

achieved by taking $x_{(\varsigma)} = -\sqrt{|\varsigma|}p$ and $p_{(\varsigma)} = -\sqrt{|\varsigma|}x$. The result still maintains $U^L_\varsigma(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)}) = e^{i(p_{(\varsigma)}\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)} - x_{(\varsigma)}\hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)} + \theta_{(\varsigma)}\hat{I})}$ with $[\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)a}, \hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)b}] = 2i\delta_{ab}\hat{I}$. ς can actually be seen as the eigenvalue of I, essentially the Casimir operator. The semidirect product structure of the $H_R(4) = H(4) \rtimes SO(4)$ says that with each irreducible unitary representation of the subgroup $H(4) \rtimes S_{\hat{O}}$, where $S_{\hat{O}} \subseteq SO(4)$ is the stability subgroup for an orbit $\hat{O}$ of $SO(4)$ in the space of equivalent classes of irreducible unitary representations of $H(4)$, one can associate an induced representation which is irreducible [13]. We have seen that, apart from the set of measure zero, each of which only gives one-dimensional representations, the irreducible unitary representations are characterized by the nonzero value of ς and the representations (though mathematically inequivalent) can be casted in the same form as $U^L_\varsigma(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)})$. It is obvious that the representation is invariant under the $SO(4)$ transformations, hence each is an independent orbit. That is to say $S_{\hat{O}} = SO(4)$. The fact is of paramount importance for unambiguously identifying the nature of the coherent states below. In view of the discussion above, we can see that for any of the $U^L_\varsigma(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)})$ representation, we can simply write it in the simple notation $U^L(p, x, \theta)$, like taking the $\varsigma = 1$ case as a representative. That is essentially what has been done in Ref.[8] for the $H(3)$ or $H_R(3)$ case. However, for the reason to be clear below, we keep the explicit ς-notation here.

Consider the $H(4)$ group product as

$$W(p'^a_{(\varsigma)}, x'^a_{(\varsigma)}, \theta'_{(\varsigma)})W(p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)}) = W\big(p'^a_{(\varsigma)} + p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x'^a_{(\varsigma)} + x^a_{(\varsigma)}, \theta'_{(\varsigma)} + \theta_{(\varsigma)} - (x'_{(\varsigma)a}p^a_{(\varsigma)} - p'_{(\varsigma)a}x^a_{(\varsigma)})\big) \ . \tag{7}$$

Following the basic approach [7, 8], we introduce the canonical coherent states defined as

$$\left|p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle \equiv U_\varsigma(p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)})\left|0\right\rangle \equiv e^{-i\theta_{(\varsigma)}}U_\varsigma(p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)})\left|0_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle \ , \tag{8}$$

where

$$U_\varsigma(p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)}) \equiv e^{i(p^a_{(\varsigma)}\hat{X}_{(\varsigma)a} - x^a_{(\varsigma)}\hat{P}_{(\varsigma)a} + \theta_{(\varsigma)}\hat{I})} \tag{9}$$

is the representation of the group element coordinated by $(p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)})$ on the group manifold, and $\hat{X}_{(\varsigma)}$, and $\hat{P}_{(\varsigma)}$ are Hermitian operators on the abstract Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$ spanned by the

$\left|p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle$ vectors; $|0\rangle \equiv |0,0\rangle$ being a fiducial normalized vector. $(p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)})$ is a general element of $H(4)$, and it can be identified with a point in the coset space of $H_R(4)/SO(4)$ [7, 10]. The cyclic vector $|0_{(\varsigma)}\rangle$ corresponds to the points $(0,0,\theta_{(\varsigma)})$ in the coset space, each of which is fixed under $SO(4)$ transformations. Assuming the state $|0_{(\varsigma)}\rangle$ has zero expectation values of the $\hat{X}_{(\varsigma)}$ and $\hat{P}_{(\varsigma)}$ operators, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)} \left| \hat{X}_{(\varsigma)b} \right| p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)} \right\rangle &= 2x_{(\varsigma)b} \ , \\ \left\langle p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)} \left| \hat{P}_{(\varsigma)b} \right| p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)} \right\rangle &= 2p_{(\varsigma)b} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

We have the wavefunctions on the coherent state manifold $\phi(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}) \equiv \langle p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}|\phi\rangle$ (indices suppressed) with

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)} \left| \hat{X}_{(\varsigma)} \right| \phi \right\rangle &= \hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)} \phi(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}) \ , \\ \left\langle p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)} \left| \hat{P}_{(\varsigma)} \right| \phi \right\rangle &= \hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)} \phi(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)} &= x_{(\varsigma)} + i\partial_{p_{(\varsigma)}} \ , \\ \hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)} &= p_{(\varsigma)} - i\partial_{x_{(\varsigma)}} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

for the unitary representation on the $\phi(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)})$ functional space satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} U^L_\varsigma(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)})\phi(p'_{(\varsigma)}, x'_{(\varsigma)}) &\equiv \left\langle p'_{(\varsigma)}, x'_{(\varsigma)} \left| U_\varsigma(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}) \right| \phi \right\rangle \\ &= \phi(p'_{(\varsigma)} - p_{(\varsigma)}, x'_{(\varsigma)} - x_{(\varsigma)}) e^{i(p_{(\varsigma)}x'_{(\varsigma)} - x_{(\varsigma)}p'_{(\varsigma)})} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

With the indices suppressed, the last expression has exactly the same form as in the $H(3)$ case, with the understanding that $p_{(\varsigma)}x'_{(\varsigma)}$, for example, stands for $p^a_{(\varsigma)}x'_{(\varsigma)a} = \delta_{ab}p^a_{(\varsigma)}x'^b_{(\varsigma)}$. The abstract formulation from the set of canonical coherent states based on the $H(4)$ manifold and the one from the irreducible component of the regular representation are hence really the same one.

In correspondence with the case of $H(3)$, we can take $|0_{(\varsigma)}\rangle$ as the zero eigenstate of $\hat{X}_{(\varsigma)a} + i\hat{P}_{(\varsigma)a}$ operator, *i.e.* $\left(\hat{X}_{(\varsigma)a} + i\hat{P}_{(\varsigma)a}\right)|0_{(\varsigma)}\rangle = 0$, with its wavefunction

$$\phi_o(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}) = \langle p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}|0,0\rangle = e^{-\frac{p^2_{(\varsigma)} + x^2_{(\varsigma)}}{2}} \ ,$$

the symmetric Gaussian. The function corresponds to the $n = 0$ state wavefunction of the covariant harmonic oscillator and is actually invariant under the Lorentz transformations

of $SO(1,3)$, which really has the boosts part nonunitarily represented, as to be explicitly shown below. The representation space spanned by the overcomplete set of coherent states is the same as that of the span of all the harmonic oscillator Fock states with the quite standard mathematical relationship between the two sets of bases, which we present in the appendix. The wavefunction for the $|p_{(\varsigma)A}, x_{(\varsigma)A}\rangle$ state can be given by $\phi_A(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)}) = U^L_\varsigma(p_{(\varsigma)A}, x_{(\varsigma)A})\phi_o(p_{(\varsigma)}, x_{(\varsigma)})$. Explicitly, we have

$$\phi_A \equiv \left\langle p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)} | p^a_{(\varsigma)A}, x^a_{(\varsigma)A} \right\rangle = e^{i\left(x_{(\varsigma)a}p^a_{(\varsigma)A} - p_{(\varsigma)a}x^a_{(\varsigma)A}\right)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\left(x_{(\varsigma)} - x_{(\varsigma)A}\right)^2 + \left(p_{(\varsigma)} - p_{(\varsigma)A}\right)^2\right]} . \tag{14}$$

III. EXPLICIT $H_R(1,3)$ PICTURE

Let us illustrate explicitly how the above $H_R(4)$ representation picture serves as a pseudo-unitary irreducible representation of the $H_R(1,3)$ we are really after. The spinless pseudo-unitary representation for the latter can be seen as built from the representations of Y_μ and E_μ with the $H_R(3)$ part, Y_i and E_i, being Hermitian. The matching to the unitary representation of $H_R(4)$ is through

$$Y_0 \leftrightarrow iY_4 , \qquad E_0 \leftrightarrow iE_4 .$$

That is to say, Y_0 and E_0 are represented explicitly by

$$\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)0} \equiv i\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)4} , \qquad \hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)0} \equiv i\hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)4} . \tag{15}$$

The relation $J_{\mu\nu} = Y_\mu E_\nu - Y_\nu E_\mu$ completes the representation. The representation space is essentially the same as the Hilbert space spanned by the Fock states of the corresponding covariant harmonic oscillator [5], or equivalently the space of the wavefunctions within the class of rapidly decreasing functions formulated as $\psi(x^a_{(\varsigma)})$ in Ref.[6]. Here we have a formulation of the wavefunctions based on the coherent state basis though, and a sketch of its relation to the Fock state basis formulation is given in the appendix.

The most important point to note is that the above used inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$, which for the wavefunction representation corresponds to the usual squared-integral, though convenient to be used in most of the analysis including the above basis definition of the wavefunctions in relation to the abstract state vectors, is not the inner product of physical interest. It is not preserved by the Lorentz transformations. The physical, Lorentz invariant, inner product is

given in terms of the parity operator $\mathcal{P}_4$, which sends $x^4_{(\varsigma)}$ to $-x^4_{(\varsigma)}$ and $p^4_{(\varsigma)}$ to $-p^4_{(\varsigma)}$ [6], as

$$\langle\langle\phi|\phi'\rangle\rangle = \langle\phi|\mathcal{P}_4|\phi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\pi^4}\int d^4p_{(\varsigma)}d^4x_{(\varsigma)}\ \bar{\phi}(p_{(\varsigma)_i}, -p_{(\varsigma)_4}, x_{(\varsigma)_i}, -x_{(\varsigma)_4})\,\phi'(p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)})\ . \tag{16}$$

In fact, all our $H_R(1,3)$ generators are pseudo-Hermitian with respect to $\mathcal{P}_4$, *i.e.*[2]

$$\hat{A}^\dagger = \mathcal{P}_4\hat{A}\mathcal{P}_4^{-1}\ . \tag{17}$$

For our Lorentz invariant inner product, introduced first in Ref.[6], we take $|\phi\rangle\rangle \equiv |\phi\rangle$, and the new functional (bra) as $\langle\langle\phi| \equiv \langle\phi|\,\mathcal{P}_4$. The pseudo-Hermitian nature is exactly the self-adjointness with respect to the invariant inner product, *i.e.* $\langle\langle\hat{A}\,\cdot\,| = \langle\langle\cdot|\hat{A}$, hence may be called $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian. That is exactly in line with the more general studies of pseudo-Hermitian quantum mechanics [14][3]. Note that the usual studies of the latter focus on systems with pseudo-Hermitian physical Hamiltonians while we are talking here about pseudo-Hermitian generators of a pseudo-unitary representation of the background (relativity) symmetry group without specifying a Hamiltonian. We want to emphasize that quantum dynamics is symplectic dynamics and the physical Hamiltonian is just a one among the many general Hamiltonians with the generated Hamiltonian flows as symmetries of the phase space. It is the symplectic structure of the latter as fixed by the invariant inner product that is really the key.

Each $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian generator generates a one-parameter group of transformations, the $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary transformations which preserve the invariant inner product. In fact, the latter was constructed from that requirement [6]. It is important to note that the $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitarity is certainly not unitarity in any sense as the inner product is not positive definite, which can be seen explicitly in the eigenstate basis of the covariant Harmonic oscillator problem. In fact, exactly as in Minkowski spacetime, we have positive norm spacelike states, negative norm timelike states, as well as lightlike states with vanishing norm, which is the basic feature of the representation we want [5, 6].

---

[2] In particular, the operators corresponding to Y_0 and E_0, and therefore also to the Lorentz boost generators J_{0i}, given by $i\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)4}$, $i\hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)4}$ and $i\left(\hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)4}\hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)i} - \hat{X}^L_{(\varsigma)i}\hat{P}^L_{(\varsigma)4}\right)$, respectively, are anti-Hermitian satisfying $\hat{A}^\dagger = -\hat{A}$, while the rest of the generators are Hermitian and commute with $\mathcal{P}_4 = \mathcal{P}_4^{-1}$.

[3] Note that in the literature, the term $\mathcal{P}_4$-pseudo-Hermitian is commonly used for operators $\hat{A}$ satisfying (17), while $\mathcal{P}_4$-pseudo-unitary used for operators satisfying $V^{-1} = \mathcal{P}_4^{-1}V^\dagger\mathcal{P}_4$, like those of the one-parameter group $V_{(s)} = e^{is\hat{A}}$.

Normalization of states with respect to two different inner products are of course different, and our coherent states $\left|p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle$ are only normalized with respect to the unphysical inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$. It is then easy to see that

$$\left\langle\left\langle p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)} | p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\right\rangle = e^{-2\left(x^4_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 - 2\left(p^4_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2} \ . \tag{18}$$

In fact, the true $H(1,3)$ coherent states can be introduced within the same Hilbert space using the $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary operator representing its element. They are given by

$$\left|p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\right\rangle \equiv V_\varsigma(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})\ |0,0\rangle\!\rangle \equiv e^{-i\theta_{(\varsigma)}} V_\varsigma(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)})\ |0,0\rangle\!\rangle \ , \tag{19}$$

with $|0,0\rangle\!\rangle = |0_{(\varsigma)}\rangle$, where

$$V_\varsigma(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)}) \equiv e^{i(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)} \hat{X}_{(\varsigma)\mu} - x^\mu_{(\varsigma)} \hat{P}_{(\varsigma)\mu} + \theta_{(\varsigma)} \hat{I})} \ , \tag{20}$$

represents the group element $\widetilde{W}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)})$ satisfying

$$\widetilde{W}(p'^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x'^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, \theta'_{(\varsigma)})\widetilde{W}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, \theta_{(\varsigma)}) = \widetilde{W}\Big(p'^\mu_{(\varsigma)} + p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x'^\mu_{(\varsigma)} + x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, \theta'_{(\varsigma)} + \theta_{(\varsigma)} - (x'_{(\varsigma)_\mu} p^\mu_{(\varsigma)} - p'_{(\varsigma)_\mu} x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})\Big) \ . \tag{21}$$

As $V_\varsigma(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})$ preserves the $\langle\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle\rangle$ inner product, we have $\left\langle\!\left\langle p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)} | p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\right\rangle = 1$, hiding the nature of the norm as non-positive definite, in the same way as all the $\left\langle\!\left\langle p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)} | p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\right\rangle$ norms are positive. As given in Ref.[6] and summarized in the appendix, the orthonormal basis states of the Fock space, based on which the invariant inner product and the $\mathcal{P}_4$ operator were first defined, satisfy $\langle\langle m|n\rangle\rangle = (-1)^{n_4}\delta_{mn}$. Actually, we have just the usual coherent state representation, with

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle\!\left\langle p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)} | \hat{X}_\nu | p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\right\rangle &= 2x_\nu \ , \\ \left\langle\!\left\langle p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)} | \hat{P}_\nu | p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\right\rangle &= 2p_\nu \ , \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

which would naively be thought of as being unitary. The $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian nature of $\hat{X}_\mu$ and $\hat{P}_\mu$ and $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary nature of $V_\varsigma(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})$ are completely hidden. They look as good as Hermitian and unitary in the naive sense.

The wavefunctions in this basis can be introduced as $\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}) \equiv \left\langle\!\left\langle p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)} | \phi\right\rangle\!\right\rangle$ on which we have again

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle\!\left\langle p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)} \left| \hat{X}_{(\varsigma)\nu} \right| \phi\right\rangle\!\right\rangle &= \hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)\nu} \tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}) \ , \\ \left\langle\!\left\langle p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)} \left| \hat{P}_{(\varsigma)\nu} \right| \phi\right\rangle\!\right\rangle &= \hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)\nu} \tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

with

$$\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)\mu} \;=\; x_{(\varsigma)\mu} + i\partial_{p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}} \;,$$
$$\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)\mu} \;=\; p_{(\varsigma)\mu} - i\partial_{x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}} \;, \tag{24}$$

and

$$V^{\tilde{L}}_{\varsigma}(p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)})\tilde{\phi}(p'^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x'^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}) \equiv \langle\!\langle p'^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x'^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)} \left| V_{\varsigma}(p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}) \right| \phi \rangle\!\rangle$$
$$= \tilde{\phi}(p'^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)} - p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x'^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)} - x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}) e^{i(p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)} x'_{(\varsigma)\mu} - x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)} p'_{(\varsigma)\mu})} \;. \tag{25}$$

One can also write $\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)\mu} = x_{(\varsigma)\mu}\star$ and $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)\mu} = p_{(\varsigma)\mu}\star$ with the Moyal star product for the Minkowski four vectors. We have also

$$\tilde{\phi}_A(p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}) \equiv \langle\!\langle p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)} | p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)A}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)A} \rangle\!\rangle = e^{i\left(x_{(\varsigma)\mu} p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)A} - p_{(\varsigma)\mu} x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)A}\right)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\left(x_{(\varsigma)} - x_{(\varsigma)A}\right)^2 + \left(p_{(\varsigma)} - p_{(\varsigma)A}\right)^2\right]} \;, \tag{26}$$

where $(x_{(\varsigma)} - x_{(\varsigma)A})^2$ and $(p_{(\varsigma)} - p_{(\varsigma)A})^2$ here are the Minkowski vector magnitude squares. It is important to distinguish $\left|p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\rangle$ from $\left|p^{a}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{a}_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\rangle$ and $\tilde{\phi}(p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)})$ from $\phi(p^{a}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{a}_{(\varsigma)})$, the relations between which are not easy to see from the results here. However, based on the analysis in the Fock state basis, given in the appendix, they can easily be understood. Note that $V_{\varsigma}(p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)})$ and $U_{\varsigma}(p^{a}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{a}_{(\varsigma)})$ cannot be identified for all real $p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}$, $x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}$, $p^{a}_{(\varsigma)}$, and $x^{a}_{(\varsigma)}$, just for the trivial case with nonzero only $p^{i}_{(\varsigma)}$ and $x^{i}_{(\varsigma)}$. Otherwise, $V_{\varsigma}(p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)})$ is not unitary and $U_{\varsigma}(p^{a}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{a}_{(\varsigma)})$ not $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary. We are not interested in imaginary values of the parameters.

The representation based on $\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)\mu}$ and $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)\mu}$ can obviously be obtained as an irreducible component of the regular representation of $H(1,3)$, seen as a subgroup of $H_R(1,3)$, along the same line as described for the $H_R(4)$ case in the previous section. However, a naive analysis of the formulation along that line would completely hide the pseudo-unitary nature of the representation and give the $\tilde{\phi}_n(p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)})$ wavefunctions of the Fock states as having various divergence issues [1, 6], as well as suggest restriction to the spacelike or timelike domains of the variables. The latter is not compatible with the coherent state picture itself. Here, the problems are resolved, and all $\tilde{\phi}_n(p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)})$ without restricting the domain have the proper norm ± 1. To illustrate the feature explicitly, we first note that from the analysis in the appendix, we have the identification of $\left|p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\rangle$ with $e^{\left(x^4_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 + \left(p^4_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2} \left|p^{a}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{a}_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\rangle$, under the parameter relations $x^0 = p^4$ and $p^0 = -x^4$. That gives the resolution of the identity

$$\hat{I} \;=\; \int \frac{d^3p_{(\varsigma)} d^3x_{(\varsigma)} dp^4_{(\varsigma)} dx^4_{(\varsigma)}}{\pi^4} \left|p^{a}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{a}_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle \left\langle p^{a}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{a}_{(\varsigma)}\right|$$
$$= \int d^3p_{(\varsigma)} d^3x_{(\varsigma)} dp^0_{(\varsigma)} dx^0_{(\varsigma)} \frac{e^{-2\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 - 2\left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}}{\pi^4} \left|p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\rangle \langle\!\langle p^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}, x^{\mu}_{(\varsigma)}\right| \mathcal{P}_4 \;. \tag{27}$$

We have hence the functional $\langle\langle\psi|$ represented on the space of $\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})$ as

$$\int d^3p_{(\varsigma)} d^3x_{(\varsigma)} dp^0_{(\varsigma)} dx^0_{(\varsigma)} \frac{e^{-2\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 - 2\left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}}{\pi^4} \tilde{\psi}^*(p^i_{(\varsigma)}, x^i_{(\varsigma)}, -p^0_{(\varsigma)}, -x^0_{(\varsigma)}) \left(\cdot \right) ,$$

with the very nontrivial integration measure. The inner product $\langle\langle\psi|\phi\rangle\rangle$ is then given by

$$\frac{1}{\pi^4} \int d^3p_{(\varsigma)} d^3x_{(\varsigma)} dp^0_{(\varsigma)} dx^0_{(\varsigma)} \frac{\tilde{\psi}^*(p^i_{(\varsigma)}, x^i_{(\varsigma)}, -p^0_{(\varsigma)}, -x^0_{(\varsigma)})}{e^{\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 + \left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}} \frac{\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})}{e^{\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 + \left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}} . \tag{28}$$

Each of the basis functions $\tilde{\phi}_n(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})$, and hence any general $\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})$ in the spanned space, is formally divergent at timelike infinity of the four-vector variables. On the other hand, all $\frac{\tilde{\phi}_n(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})}{e^{\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 + \left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}}$, and hence all $\frac{\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})}{e^{\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 + \left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}}$, are rapidly decreasing functions like the corresponding $\phi_n(p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)})$ and $\phi(p^a_{(\varsigma)}, x^a_{(\varsigma)})$. The factor $e^{-\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 - \left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}$ takes the $e^{\frac{\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 + \left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}{2}}$ factor in all $\tilde{\phi}_n(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})$ back to $e^{-\frac{\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 + \left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}{2}}$, which characterizes the class of functions. The integral is finite for all wavefunctions as finite linear combinations of the Fock state basis $\tilde{\phi}_n$. Using $\frac{\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})}{e^{\left(x^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2 + \left(p^0_{(\varsigma)}\right)^2}}$ as the wavefunctions cannot be correct, though. That would, for example, make the wavefunction for $|0\rangle\rangle$ not Lorentz invariant and mess up the right transformation properties of all those for the Fock states, described in Ref.[6]. Thinking further about $\tilde{\psi}^*(p^i_{(\varsigma)}, x^i_{(\varsigma)}, -p^0_{(\varsigma)}, -x^0_{(\varsigma)})$ as $\tilde{\psi}^*(p_{(\varsigma)\mu}, x_{(\varsigma)\mu})$, one can see in hindsight that the inner product expression is indeed exactly what it should be. Of course we have that here rigorously established.

IV. LORENTZ TO GALILEAN CONTRACTION

A contraction of the Lorentz symmetry $SO(1,3)$, sitting inside the $H_R(1,3)$, to the Galilean $ISO(3)$ has been discussed in Ref.[10], together with the corresponding coset spaces of interest. The full (quantum) relativity symmetry group obtained by contraction is named $H_{GH}(3)$, with commutators among generators essentially given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&[J_{ij}, J_{hk}] = 2i(\delta_{jk}J_{ih} + \delta_{ih}J_{jk} - \delta_{ik}J_{jh} - \delta_{jh}J_{ik}) ,\\
&[J_{ij}, X_k] = -2i(\delta_{jk}X_i - \delta_{ik}X_j) , \qquad [J_{ij}, P_k] = -2i(\delta_{jk}P_i - \delta_{ik}P_j) ,\\
&[J_{ij}, K_k] = -2i(\delta_{jk}K_i - \delta_{ik}K_j) , \qquad [K_i, K_j] = 0 ,\\
&[K_i, H] = 2iP_i , \qquad [K_i, P_j] = 0 , \qquad [X_i, P_j] = 2i\delta_{ij}I' ,\\
&[T, H] = -2iI' , \qquad [K_i, T] = 0 , \qquad [K_i, X_j] = 2i\delta_{ij}T .
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Note that the full result for the other commutators beyond the J_{ij} and K_i set, originated from $SO(1,3)$, is essentially fixed by the requirement of having the Galilean K_i-H and the Heisenberg X-P commutators. However, for the purpose here, the explicit contraction is to be implemented a bit differently. It is taken as the $c\to\infty$ limit of $K_i=\frac{1}{c}J_{0i}$, $P_i=\frac{1}{c}E_i$, $X_i=\frac{1}{c}Y_i$,$T=\frac{-1}{c^2}Y_0$, $I'=\frac{1}{c^2}I$, with the renaming $H\equiv -E_0$. In the contraction, K_i as generators for the Galilean boosts are the basic starting point and we would like to be able to trace physics, including the relative physical dimensions of quantities, by considering the speed of light c as having a physical dimension. Introducing $X_i=\frac{1}{c}Y_i$ is to keep the same physical dimensions for X_i and P_i. However, the essence of the contraction scheme as a formulation to retrieve an approximate physical theory from a more exact one is really to implement the contraction at a representation level.

To implement the contraction on a U^L_ς, or the matching U_ς as a representation of the original $H(1,3)$, it is important to note that the original central charge generator I represented by $\varsigma\hat{I}$ in U_ς would give the representation of the contracted I', which remains central, as $\frac{\varsigma}{c^2}\hat{I}$. For a sensible result, one needs to consider $\varsigma=c^2\chi$ with χ staying finite at the contraction limit, hence I' represented by $\chi\hat{I}$ (recall: $\hat{I}$ is the identity operator). Hence, U_ς contracts into U_χ. In another words, the U_ς representation of the original $H(1,3)$, and the full $H_{\scriptscriptstyle R}(1,3)$, survives as the U_χ ($\chi=\frac{\varsigma}{c^2}>0$) representation of the $H(3)$ in the contracted $H_{\scriptscriptstyle GH}(3)$, as well as of the full group.

With the results from the last section, however, we can and prefer to work on the equivalent $V^{\tilde{L}}_\varsigma$ representation, as well as using V_ς, instead of U_ς, and the $\left|p^\mu_{(\varsigma)},x^\mu_{(\varsigma)}\right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle$ basis. In any case, all representations should be taken with the physical invariant inner product. We have the exact parallel of V_ς contracting to V_χ. For the $c\to\infty$ limit of $V^{\tilde{L}}_\chi(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)},x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})$, we have to consider first

$$\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{\chi i}=\frac{1}{c}\hat{E}^{\tilde{L}}_{\varsigma i}\ ,\quad \hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{\chi i}=\frac{1}{c}\hat{Y}^{\tilde{L}}_{\varsigma i}\ ,\quad \hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{\chi}=-\hat{E}^{\tilde{L}}_{\varsigma 0}\ ,\quad \hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{\chi}=-\frac{1}{c^2}\hat{Y}^{\tilde{L}}_{\varsigma 0}\ ,$$

and take that to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\chi)i}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\chi}}\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{\chi i}=\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)i}\ ,\qquad \hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\chi)i}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\chi}}\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{\chi i}=\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)i}\ ,\\
&\hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\chi)}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\chi}}\hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{\chi}=-\frac{1}{c}\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)0}\ ,\qquad \hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\chi)}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\chi}}\hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{\chi}=-c\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)0}\ ,
\end{aligned}\tag{30}$$

(with $\varsigma=c^2\chi$). The above are the basic set of operators acting on the functional space of $\phi(p_{(\varsigma)},x_{(\varsigma)})$, with the variables properly rescaled to a new set of variables to match with the

operators. There is also the exactly corresponding set of operators, $\hat{X}_{(\wp)i}$, $\hat{P}_{(\wp)i}$, $\hat{T}_{(\wp)}$, and $\hat{H}_{(\wp)}$, and V_χ on the abstract Hilbert space which are helpful for tracing the proper description. The proper labels for the states $\left|p^\mu_{(\wp)}, x^\mu_{(\wp)}\right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle$ at the contraction limit should be $\left|p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)}\right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle$, satisfying

$$
\begin{aligned}
2x_{(\wp)i} &= \left\langle\!\!\left\langle p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)} \left| \hat{X}_{(\wp)i} \right| p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)} \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle \ , \\
2p_{(\wp)i} &= \left\langle\!\!\left\langle p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)} \left| \hat{P}_{(\wp)i} \right| p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)} \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle \ , \\
2t_{(\wp)} &= \left\langle\!\!\left\langle p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)} \left| \hat{T}_{(\wp)} \right| p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)} \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle \ , \\
2e_{(\wp)} &= \left\langle\!\!\left\langle p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)} \left| \hat{H}_{(\wp)} \right| p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)} \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle \ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{31}
$$

and hence giving

$$
\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\wp)}, x^\mu_{(\wp)}) \quad \longrightarrow \quad \tilde{\phi}(p^i_{(\wp)}, e_{(\wp)}, x^i_{(\wp)}, t_{(\wp)})
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{(\wp)i} &= x^i_{(\wp)} = x^i_{(\wp)} \ , & p_{(\wp)i} &= p^i_{(\wp)} = p^i_{(\wp)} \ , \\
t_{(\wp)} &= \frac{1}{c}\, x^0_{(\wp)} \ , & e_{(\wp)} &= c\, p^0_{(\wp)} \ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{32}
$$

We have then, at least formally,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wp)} &= x_{(\wp)} + i\partial_{p_{(\wp)}} \ , & \hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wp)} &= p_{(\wp)} - i\partial_{x_{(\wp)}} \ , \\
\hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wp)} &= t_{(\wp)} - i\partial_{e_{(\wp)}} \ , & \hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wp)} &= e_{(\wp)} + i\partial_{t_{(\wp)}} \ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{33}
$$

The crucial quantity controlling the nature of the representation is

$$
\left\langle\!\!\left\langle p^i_{(\wp)B}, e_{(\wp)B}, x^i_{(\wp)B}, t_{(\wp)B} | p^i_{(\wp)A}, e_{(\wp)A}, x^i_{(\wp)A}, t_{(\wp)A} \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle \ .
$$

From the original $\left\langle\!\!\left\langle p^\mu_{(\wp)B}, x^\mu_{(\wp)B} | p^\mu_{(\wp)A}, x^\mu_{(\wp)A} \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle$, given in Eq.(26), we have it as

$$
e^{i\left(e_{(\wp)B}t_{(\wp)A} - t_{(\wp)B}e_{(\wp)A} + \delta_{ij}x^i_{(\wp)B}p^j_{(\wp)A} - \delta_{ij}p^i_{(\wp)B}x^j_{(\wp)A}\right)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\left(x^i_{(\wp)B} - x^i_{(\wp)A}\right)^2 - c^2\left(t_{(\wp)B} - t_{(\wp)A}\right)^2 + \left(p^i_{(\wp)B} - p^i_{(\wp)A}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{c^2}\left(e_{(\wp)B} - e_{(\wp)A}\right)^2\right]}
$$

to be taken at the $c \to \infty$ limit. It holds $e^{\frac{1}{2c^2}\left(e_{(\wp)B} - e_{(\wp)A}\right)^2} \to 1$, but the $e^{\frac{c^2}{2}\left(t_{(\wp)B} - \tilde{t}_{(\wp)A}\right)^2}$ factor diverges in the limit, except for $t_{(\wp)B} = t_{(\wp)A}$, which indicates that we should consider only the latter case. The magnitude of the overlap being independent of $e_{(\wp)B}$ and $e_{(\wp)A}$ is still puzzling. The answer to that comes from a more careful thinking about the nature of the variables $e_{(\wp)}$. Unlike $t_{(\wp)} = \frac{x^0_{(\wp)}}{c}$, which is to be taken to be finite as in the general spirit of symmetry

contraction, $e_{(\lambda)} = cp^0$ is of quite different nature. The Lie algebra contraction to begin with only has a relabeling $H = -E_0$ involving no c. One may wonder if the c in $\hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\lambda)} = -c\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)0}$ should be taken as giving a diverging energy observable $\hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\lambda)}$ for any finite $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\varsigma)0}$. Furthermore, for an Einstein particle of the rest mass m,

$$e = mc^2 + \frac{p^i p_i}{2m} + \cdots$$

where the neglected terms involve negative powers of c^2. At the $c \to \infty$ limit, it is indeed diverging. Even p^0 is diverging. That is the result of the rest mass as an energy. Hence, it sure suggests that we should take our variable $e_{(\lambda)}$ as infinite, and the 'non-relativistic' energy we are interested in is the kinetic energy $\frac{p^i p_i}{2m}$ given by the limit of $e - mc^2$. Taking that feature into our consideration, the Hilbert space of interest under the contraction is really only the space spanned by the $H(3)$ coherent states $\left|p^i_{(\lambda)}, x^i_{(\lambda)}\right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle$ for a fixed time $t_{(\lambda)}$ and a formally infinite $e_{(\lambda)}$. To be exact, we should be implementing that logic from an Einstein particle to our quantum observables $\hat{H}_{(\lambda)}$, $\hat{P}^0_{(\lambda)}$, and $\hat{P}_{(\lambda)i}$ or their expectation values, but the conclusion is the same. Readers will see below in our analysis of the dynamics that we naturally have an extended situation with an admissible interaction potential or potential energy, and the Einstein particle corresponds to the case where the latter vanishes. Any finite potential energy obviously does not change the story here. The coherent state wavefunction $\tilde{\phi}_A(p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)})$ is equal to $\left\langle\!\!\left\langle p^\mu_{(\varsigma)}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)} | p^\mu_{(\varsigma)A}, x^\mu_{(\varsigma)A}\right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle$, hence at the contraction limit there is no more dependence on $t_{(\lambda)}$ and $e_{(\lambda)}$ reducing it essentially to just $\tilde{\phi}_A(p^i_{(\lambda)}, x^i_{(\lambda)})$. The operator $\hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\lambda)}$ acts on the Hilbert space of wavefunctions only as a multiplication by $t_{(\lambda)}$ and is just like classical, while $\hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\lambda)}$ is not physically relevant. Note that the full contracted representation is then simply unitary. The part of the inner product $\left\langle\!\!\left\langle \cdots | \cdots \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle$ independent of $p^0_{(\varsigma)}$ and $x^0_{(\varsigma)}$, hence $t_{(\lambda)}$ and $e_{(\lambda)}$, is exactly the usual one.

V. GROUP THEORETICALLY BASED WWGM FRAMEWORK WITH WAVEFUNCTIONS IN COHERENT STATE BASIS

The above analysis gives a successful picture of the phase space of the $H_R(1,3)$ theory, giving in the Galilean limit the phase space of the $H_R(3)$ theory at each fixed 'time' value. The phase spaces, or more exactly the corresponding projective Hilbert spaces, are to be seen as the quantum models of the spacetime [5, 7, 8]. The infinite dimensional manifolds

give, at the proper relativity symmetry contraction limit, the familiar finite dimensional classical models as approximation. The explicit results of the classical limit for the present case is presented in the section below. The merit of our group theoretical approach is that it gives a full dynamical theory associated with the corresponding spacetime model for each relativity symmetry, mutually connected through the contraction/deformation pattern. The dynamical theory is naturally a Hamiltonian theory from the symmetry of the phase space as symplectic geometry, while the phase space is the space(time) at the quantum level, splitting into the (configuration) space(time) and momentum space only at the classical limit, with the Heisenberg commutator trivialized. The dynamics is better described on the algebra of observables as the matching representation of the group C*-algebra [8], which for a quantum theory can be seen as a noncommutative geometric picture of the phase space with the position and momentum operators as coordinates, otherwise identified as the infinite dimensional (projective) Hilbert space [15, 16].

A. The Algebra of Observables, Symmetries, and Dynamics

The algebra of observables is depicted essentially as the one from a WWGM formalism, as functions and distributions of the position and momentum operators $\hat{X}_\mu$ and $\hat{P}_\mu$. The basic dynamical variables of our representation on the space of wavefunctions $\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu_{(\S)}, x^\mu_{(\S)})$ are $\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}} = x + i\partial_p = x\star$ and $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}} = p - i\partial_p = p\star$, where we have dropped the μ indices and the subscript $_{(\S)}$. We may also write a general function of $(p^\mu_{(\S)}, x^\mu_{(\S)})$ as simply $\alpha(p, x)$, and the $\star$ is as in the Moyal star product

$$\alpha \star \beta(p, x) = \alpha(p, x) e^{-i(\overleftarrow{\partial}_p \vec{\partial}_x - \overleftarrow{\partial}_x \vec{\partial}_p)} \beta(p, x) \ , \tag{34}$$

with $\alpha(p, x)\star = \alpha(p\star, x\star)$. The simplified notation is what we use in this and the next section without any reference to the material from the $H_R(4)$ picture above. Under such notation, the story looks quite the same as the case for $H_R(3)$ with only $\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_i$, and $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_i$ as $x_i\star$ and $p_i\star$, given in details in Ref.[8]. Hence, we present here only a summary of the results, leaving the readers to consult the latter paper and references therein.

Let us take a little detour first to clarify our theoretical perspective. What we have is rather like the WWGM put up-side-down [8]. We start with the quantum theory as an irreducible representation of a (quantum) relativity symmetry, including the Heisenberg-Weyl

symmetry. With the wavefunction in the coherent state basis as the natural reduction of the representation of the group algebra, the corresponding representation of the latter properly extended serves as the algebra of observables. The latter can be seen as a collection of functions and tempered distribution of the position and momentum operators represented as differential operators by $x\star$ and $p\star$. The real variables x and p are not quite the coordinates of the classical phase space. Only their rescaled counterparts under the contraction of the symmetry to the classical relativity symmetry are. Contrary to a deformation quantization, a contraction is a de-quantization procedure. From the algebraic point of view, the deformation of an observable algebra as in WWGM is really a result of a deformation of the classical relativity symmetry to the quantum one, pushed onto the group C*-algebra of the symmetry. The contraction is exactly the inverse of the deformation [17], at a Lie algebra level. On the Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ of wavefunctions $\phi(p,x)$, symmetries are represented in a form of unitary and antiunitary operators, factored by its closed center of phase transformations. On the set $\mathcal{P}$ of pure state density operators $\rho_\phi(p,x)\star$, corresponding to the abstract projection operator $\hat{\rho}_\phi = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ for normalized $|\phi\rangle$, the automorphism group $Aut(\mathcal{P})$ is characterized by the subgroup of the group of real unitary transformations $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{_R})$ compatible with the star product, $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{_R}$ being the real span of all $\rho_\phi(p,x)\star$, the complex extension of which is the Hilbert space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators, as in the Tomita representation. We write the unitary transformations in the form

$$\tilde{U}_\star \alpha\star = \mu(\alpha)\star = U_\star\star\, \alpha \star \bar{U}_\star\star \ ,$$

with $\mu \in Aut(\mathcal{P})$, where $U_\star\star \equiv U_\star(p,x)\star$ is a unitary operator on $\mathcal{K}$, generated by the Hermitian operator in the form of a real function $G_s(p\star, x\star)$, and $\bar{U}_\star\star$ is its inverse obtained by the complex conjugation and $\tilde{U}_\star \in \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{_R})$. We refer to the $U_\star\star$ as star-unitary, in particular whenever necessary to highlight it being a function of the $p\star$ and $x\star$ operators.

The above, illustrated for the case of $H_{_R}(3)$ formulation of standard quantum mechanics in Ref. [8], can be applied to our $H_{_R}(1,3)$ case with a slight modification. We need to use the invariant inner product with $\hat{\rho}_\phi = |\phi\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle\phi|$ for normalized $|\phi\rangle\!\rangle$, and replace the Hermitian and unitary requirements by $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian and $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary ones. Our relevant symmetry transformations are to be given by $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary operator $V_{\star(s)}\star$ generated by $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian $G_s(p\star, x\star)$, which are real functions of the basic $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian operators $(p\star, x\star)$, *i.e.* $G_s(\hat{P}^{_L}_\mu, \hat{X}^{_L}_\mu) = \overline{G_s}(\hat{P}^{_L}_\mu, \hat{X}^{_L}_\mu)$, and we use the $\bar{\alpha}$ to denote the 'complex conjugate' of α as a

function which correspond to $\bar{\alpha}\star$ as the $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian conjugate of $\alpha\star$ as an operators as an element of observable algebra. The conjugation is the involution of the latter as a *-algebra. $\overline{V}_{\star(s)}\star$ of a $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary $V_{\star(s)}\star$ is to be interpreted in the same manner. The feature of $\overline{V}_{\star(s)}\star$ to be the inverse of $V_{\star(s)}\star$ is exactly a $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitarity.

Generators of our relativity symmetry $H_R(1,3)$ are to be represented as a subgroup of $Aut(\mathcal{P})$ of the observable algebra. Formally, all expressions look the same as if the $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian and $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary nature is not different from the usual Hermitian and unitary case. Again, the pseudo-unitary nature of the inner product does not quite reveal itself in the essential coherent state representation. All $H_R(1,3)$ generators are $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian, hence each is given by a real G_s, generating (star-)$\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary $V_{\star(s)}\star = e^{\frac{-is}{2}G_s\star}$ as one-parameter groups of symmetry transformations. Note that the factor 2 is really $\hbar$. We have $\tilde{V}_{\star(s)} = e^{\frac{-is}{2}\tilde{G}_s}$,

$$\tilde{V}_\star\alpha\star = \mu(\alpha)\star = V_\star\star\,\alpha\star\overline{V}_\star\star \tag{35}$$

with

$$\tilde{G}_s\rho = G_s\star\,\rho - \rho\star G_s = 2i\{G_s,\rho\}_\star\ , \tag{36}$$

where $\rho(p,x)\in\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_\star$ is the Moyal bracket. Hence, with $\rho(s) = \tilde{V}_{\star(s)}\rho(s=0)$,

$$\frac{d}{ds}\rho(s) = \{G_s,\rho(s)\}_\star\ . \tag{37}$$

The equation is the Liouville equation of motion for a mixed state ρ in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$, the self-dual cone of $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$. The class of operators on $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ representing symmetry generators are important, especially for tracing the symmetries to the classical limit where all $G_s\star$ reduce essentially to the commutative G_s, as multiplicative operators on the functional space of classical observables. We can write $\tilde{G}_s = \hat{G}_s^{\tilde{L}} - \hat{G}_s^{\tilde{R}}$, where $\hat{G}_s^{\tilde{L}}\equiv G_s(p,x)\star = G_s(\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}},\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}})$ is a left action and $\hat{G}_s^{\tilde{R}}$ is the corresponding right action defined by $\hat{G}_s^{\tilde{R}}\alpha\equiv\alpha\star G_s(p,x) = G_s(\hat{P}^{\tilde{R}},\hat{X}^{\tilde{R}})\alpha$. Analogously to $\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}$ and $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}$ coming from the left-invariant vector fields of the Heisenberg-Weyl group, there are those from the right-invariant ones given by

$$\hat{X}^{\tilde{R}} = x - i\partial_p\ , \qquad \hat{P}^{\tilde{R}} = p + i\partial_x\ . \tag{38}$$

From Eq.(25) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\star(-x'^\mu)}\star\,\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu,x^\mu) &= e^{\frac{-ix'^\mu}{2}(-p_\mu\star)}\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu,x^\mu) = \tilde{\phi}\left(p^\mu,x^\mu+\frac{x'^\mu}{2}\right)e^{\frac{ix'_\mu p^\mu}{2}}\ , \\ V_{\star(p'^\mu)}\star\,\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu,x^\mu) &= e^{\frac{-ip'^\mu}{2}(x_\mu\star)}\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu,x^\mu) = \tilde{\phi}\left(p^\mu+\frac{p'^\mu}{2},x^\mu\right)e^{\frac{-ip'_\mu x^\mu}{2}}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

In the above, for the wavefunctions, we show only the involved pair of variables in each case, and there is always no summation over indices. The other variables are simply not affected by the transformations. In terms of the parameters x^μ and p^μ, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{-x^\mu}\star &= p_\mu\star\,, & \tilde{G}_{-x^\mu} &= -2i\partial_{x^\mu}\,, \\ G_{p^\mu}\star &= x_\mu\star\,, & \tilde{G}_{p^\mu} &= 2i\partial_{p^\mu}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

all in the same form as in the $H_R(3)$ case. The factors of 2 in the translations $V_{\star(x)}\star$ and $V_{\star(p)}\star$, though somewhat suspicious at the first sight, are related to the fact that the arguments of the wavefunction correspond to half of the expectation values, due to our coherent state labeling. Thus, $x_\mu\star$ and $p_\mu\star$ generate translations of the expectation values, which is certainly the right feature to have. For the Lorentz transformations, we have $G_{\omega^{\mu\nu}} = (x_\mu p_\nu - x_\nu p_\mu)$,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}\star &= (x_\mu p_\nu - ix_\mu\partial_{x^\nu} + ip_\nu\partial_{p^\mu} + \partial_{x^\nu}\partial_{p^\mu}) - (\mu\leftrightarrow\nu)\,, \\ \tilde{G}_{\omega^{\mu\nu}} &= -2i(x_\mu\partial_{x^\nu} - p_\nu\partial_{p^\mu}) - (\mu\leftrightarrow\nu)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

with the explicit action (no summation over the indices)

$$V_{\star(\omega^{\mu\nu})}\star\,\tilde{\phi}(p,x) = e^{\frac{-i\omega^{\mu\nu}}{2}(G_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}\star)}\tilde{\phi}(p,x) = \tilde{\phi}\Big(e^{\frac{i\omega^{\mu\nu}}{2}\widehat{G}_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}}[p,x]\Big)\,, \tag{42}$$

where $\widehat{G}_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}$ are the infinitesimal $SO(1,3)$ transformation operators corresponding to the coset space action to be obtained from Eq.(2). The results are again in the same form as those for the $H_R(3)$ case.

All the G_{-x^μ}, G_{p^μ} and $G_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}$ (and $G_\theta = 1$) make the full set of operators for the generators $\hat{G}^L_s = G_s\star$ of the $H_R(1,3)$ group representing the symmetry on $\mathcal{K}$, and constitute a Lie algebra within the algebra of physical observables. $\hat{G}^R_s$ set does the same as a right action, and $\hat{G}^L_s$ always commute with $\hat{G}^R_{s'}$ since, in general, $[\hat{\alpha}^{\tilde{L}}, \hat{\gamma}^{\tilde{R}}] = 0$. These fourteen G_s as multiplicative operators, of course, all commute among themselves. The commutators for $\tilde{G}_s$ are same as those for $\hat{G}^L_s$, with however the vanishing $\tilde{G}_\theta$ giving a vanishing $[\tilde{G}_{p^\mu}, \tilde{G}_{-x^\nu}]$. For any function $\alpha(p^\mu, x^\mu)$, there are four associated operators on $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$. Those are $\alpha, \hat{\alpha}^{\tilde{L}}, \hat{\alpha}^{\tilde{R}}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}$, but only two of them are linearly independent. For our relativity symmetry operators, the independent set $\{G_{-x^\mu}, G_{p^\mu}, G_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}, \tilde{G}_{-x^\mu}, \tilde{G}_{p^\mu}, \tilde{G}_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}\}$ has the only non-vanishing commutators among them

given by (we also have $G_\theta = 1$, the identity, and $\tilde{G}_\theta = 0$)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[G_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}, \tilde{G}_{\omega^{\alpha\beta}}] = 2i(\eta_{\nu\beta}G_{\omega^{\mu\alpha}} - \eta_{\nu\alpha}G_{\omega^{\mu\beta}} + \eta_{\mu\alpha}G_{\omega^{\nu\beta}} - \eta_{\mu\beta}G_{\omega^{\nu\alpha}}) \ , \\
&[G_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}, \tilde{G}_{-x^\alpha}] = -2i(\eta_{\nu\alpha}G_{-x^\mu} - \eta_{\mu\alpha}G_{-x^\nu}) \ , \\
&[G_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}, \tilde{G}_{p^\alpha}] = -2i(\eta_{\nu\alpha}G_{p^\mu} - \eta_{\mu\alpha}G_{p^\nu}) \ , \\
&[\tilde{G}_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}, G_{-x^\alpha}] = -2i(\eta_{\nu\alpha}G_{-x^\mu} - \eta_{\mu\alpha}G_{-x^\nu}) \ , \\
&[\tilde{G}_{\omega^{\mu\nu}}, G_{p^\alpha}] = -2i(\eta_{\nu\alpha}G_{p^\mu} - \eta_{\mu\alpha}G_{p^\nu}) \ , \\
&[G_{p^\mu}, \tilde{G}_{-x^\nu}] = -[G_{-x^\mu}, \tilde{G}_{p^\nu}] = 2i\eta_{\mu\nu} \ , \\
&[G_{p^\mu}, \tilde{G}_{p^\nu}] = [G_{-x^\mu}, \tilde{G}_{-x^\nu}] = 0 \ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{43}
$$

Quantum dynamics is completely symplectic, whether described in the Schrödinger picture in terms of real/complex coordinates of the (projective) Hilbert space or the Heisenberg picture which can be seen as noncommutative coordinates description of the same phase space [16]. The explicit dynamical equation of motion is to be seen as the transformations generated by a physical Hamiltonian characterized by an evolution parameter. In the $H_R(3)$ case of the usual ('non-relativistic') quantum mechanics, it is $G_t = \frac{p_i p^i}{2m} + v(x^i)$. For our $H_R(1,3)$ case, we consider a $G_\tau = \frac{p_\mu p^\mu}{2m} + v(x^\mu)$ with the parameter τ being the Einstein proper time, which is expected to give Einstein particle dynamics in the 'free particle' case of vanishing potential $v(x^\mu)$, as we see explicitly below.

For some s-dependent operator $\alpha(p^\mu(s), x^\mu(s))\star$ and a general Hamiltonian G_s, Heisenberg equation of motion is given by

$$
\frac{d}{ds}\alpha\star = \frac{1}{2i}\left[\alpha\star, G_s\star\right] \ . \tag{44}
$$

The right-hand side of the equation is simply the Poisson bracket of $\alpha(p\star, x\star)$ and $G_s(p\star, x\star)$, functions of the noncommutative canonical variables $p^\mu\star$ and $x^\mu\star$. The equation can simply be written as

$$
\frac{d}{ds}\alpha = \{\alpha, G_s\}_\star = \frac{-1}{2i}\tilde{G}_s\alpha \ , \tag{45}
$$

and is exactly the differential version of the automorphism flow given in Eq.(35), here with our $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary symmetry flows $V_{\star(s)} = e^{\frac{-is}{2}G_s\star}$ generated by a $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian $G_s\star$. $\frac{-1}{2i}\tilde{G}_s$ is really a Hamiltonian vector field for a Hamiltonian function $G_s(p\star, x\star)$ [16].

Our physical Hamiltonian operator $G_\tau(p\star, x\star)$ is such a $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian $G_s\star$ provided that $v(x^\mu\star)$ is a real function of the four $x^\mu\star$ operators. The corresponding Heisenberg equation

gives, in particular,

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}x_\mu\star = \frac{1}{2i}\frac{1}{2m}[x_\mu\star, p^\mu\star p_\mu\star] = \frac{p_\mu\star}{m} = \frac{\partial G_\tau(p\star, x\star)}{\partial(p^\mu\star)} ,$$
$$\frac{d}{d\tau}p_\mu\star = \frac{1}{2i}[p_i\star, v(x^\mu\star)] = -\frac{\partial v(x^\mu\star)}{\partial(x^i\star)} = -\frac{\partial G_\tau(p\star, x\star)}{\partial(x^\mu\star)} . \qquad (46)$$

which are exactly

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_\mu = \frac{\partial G_\tau(\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_\nu, \hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_\nu)}{\partial \hat{X}^{\tilde{L}\mu}} , \qquad \frac{d}{d\tau}\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_\mu = -\frac{\partial G_\tau(\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_\nu, \hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_\nu)}{\partial \hat{P}^{\tilde{L}\mu}} , \qquad (47)$$

in the standard form of Hamilton's equations of motion for the canonical $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian operator coordinate pairs $\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_\mu$-$\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_\mu$. With the vanishing potential, we have $G_\tau\star = \frac{1}{2m}[-(\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_0)^2 + \sum_i(\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_i)^2]$ resulting in $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_\mu$ being τ independent and $\frac{d\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_\mu}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{m}\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_\mu$, which is the Einstein relation of four-momentum being equal to the Einstein four-velocity multiplied by the particle mass.

For the Schrödinger picture, as $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary flows on $\mathcal{K}$, we have the equation

$$\frac{d}{ds}\tilde{\phi} = \frac{1}{2i}G_s\star\tilde{\phi} , \qquad (48)$$

which, for $G_\tau\star$ with a vanishing potential, is in the exact form of the Klein-Gordon equation and gives the τ-independent solution for $\tilde{\phi}$, provided that the $G_\tau\star$ eigenvalue is taken to be $-\frac{mc^2}{2}$. Explicitly, in terms of the basic variables p^μ and x^μ, we have

$$G_\tau\star\tilde{\phi}(p,x) = \frac{1}{2m}p_\mu\star p^\mu\star\tilde{\phi}(p,x) = \frac{1}{2m}\left(p^\mu p_\mu - \eta^{\mu\nu}\partial_{x^\mu}\partial_{x^\nu} - 2ip^\mu\partial_{x^\mu}\right)\tilde{\phi}(p,x) , \qquad (49)$$

giving the free-particle wavefunctions $\tilde{\phi}(p,x) = e^{i(2k_\mu - p_\mu)x^\mu}$ for eigenvalues $2k^\mu k_\mu$. Eigenvalues of the momentum operators $p_\mu\star$ are $2k_\mu$, satisfying $(2k^\mu)(2k_\mu) = -m^2c^2$. The factor of 2 really corresponds to $\hbar$, as in the standard textbook expression. Finally, the τ-dependence is then given by $\frac{d}{d\tau}\tilde{\phi} = -\frac{mc^2}{2i}\tilde{\phi}$, as expected.

We have studied in details the covariant harmonic oscillator problem under the same $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitarity, though on the wavefunction formulated in the 'position eigenstate' basis,[6]. Some of the corresponding results under the wavefunction in coherent state basis, $\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu, x^\mu)$, can be found in the appendix. Solution to the problem, as well as for the Einstein particle described above, shows a successful applications and hence the validity of the theoretical construction.

B. Lorentz to Galilean Contraction

Contraction to Galilean limit has been presented in Sec. IV for algebra of operators on the Hilbert space and the group representation in a form of wavefunctions in the coherent state basis. In this section, we present the corresponding contraction in the observable algebra given in the WWGM formalism, described above. Recall that the original Hilbert space under the contraction becomes reducible into a sum of essentially identical irreducible components, each being spanned by the wavefunctions $\tilde{\phi}(p^i, x^i) \equiv \tilde{\phi}(p^i_{(\wr)}, x^i_{(\wr)})$ for a particular value of 'time' $t_{(\wr)}$. A general operator $\alpha(\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_\mu, \hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_\mu)$ should then be seen as $\alpha(\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_i, \hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_i, \hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)}, \hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)})$ with $\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_i \equiv \hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)i}$ and $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_i \equiv \hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)i}$, from results of Eq.(33). Hence, on $\tilde{\phi}(p^i, x^i)$ we have effectively Hermitian actions of operators $\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_i = x_i + i\partial_{p^i}$, $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_i = p_i - i\partial_{x^i}$, $\hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)} \to t_{(\wr)}$, and $\hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)} \to e_{(\wr)}$, with the last two reduced to a simple multiplication by the 'variables' $t_{(\wr)}$ and (formally infinite) $e_{(\wr)}$, respectively. All $\alpha(p^\mu\star, x^\mu\star)$ operators on $\tilde{\phi}(p^i, x^i)$ reduce to $\alpha(p^i\star, x^i\star, t_{(\wr)}, e_{(\wr)})$, or rather simply to $\alpha(p^i\star, x^i\star)$ like in the basic quantum mechanics, a unitary representation theory of $H_{\scriptscriptstyle R}(3)$. The $\star$ should now be seen as the one involving only variables p^i and x^i.

The transformations generated by the Hermitian $G_{-x^i}\star, G_{p^i}\star$ and $G_{\omega^{ij}}\star$ obviously do not change. They represent generators of the $H_{\scriptscriptstyle R}(3)$ subgroup of $H_{\scriptscriptstyle R}(1,3)$ to begin with. $\tilde{G}_{-x^i}, \tilde{G}_{p^i}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\omega^{ij}}$ are also unchanged. $G_{-x^0}\star$ and $G_{p^0}\star$, representing $\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)0}$ and $\hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)0}$, are to be replaced under the contraction by $\hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)}$ and $\hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)}$, respectively, with $V_{\star(-x^0)} = e^{\frac{ix^0}{2}G_{-x^0}}$ and $V_{\star(p^0)} = e^{\frac{-ip^0}{2}G_{p^0}}$ re-expressed as $V_{\star(t)} = e^{-\frac{it}{2}G_t}$ and $V_{\star(e)} = e^{\frac{ie}{2}G_{-e}}$, where $G_t\star = \hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)}$ and $G_{-e}\star = \hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)}$. On the wavefunction $\tilde{\phi}(p^i, x^i)$, we have the infinite $G_t\star = e_{(\wr)}$ and finite $G_{-e}\star = t_{(\wr)}$. We also have $\tilde{G}_t = 2i\partial_{t_{(\wr)}}$ and $\tilde{G}_{-e} = -2i\partial_{e_{(\wr)}}$. None of the four operators are of interest, so long as their action on the observable algebra for an irreducible representation $\tilde{\phi}(p, x)$ is concerned.

The other interesting ones to check are the Lorentz boosts under the contraction. The generator J_{0i} in the Lie algebra is replaced by the finite $K_i = \frac{1}{c}J_{0i}$. The group elements $e^{i\omega^{0i}J_{0i}}$ are to be re-expressed as $e^{i\beta^i K_i}$ with $\beta^i = c\,\omega^{0i}$. In the original representation, the J_{0i} action is given by $G_{\omega^{0i}}\star = \hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)0}\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)i} - \hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)i}\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)0}$, from which follows the action of K_i as

$$G_{\beta^i} = -\hat{T}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)}\hat{P}^{\tilde{L}}_i - \hat{X}^{\tilde{L}}_i\left(\frac{-1}{c^2}\hat{H}^{\tilde{L}}_{(\wr)}\right) \to -t_{(\wr)}p_i\star = t_{(\wr)}G_{-x^i}$$

with $V_{\star(\beta^i)} = e^{\frac{-i\beta^i}{2}G_{\beta^i}}$ (no summation over i), a re-writing of $V_{\star(\omega^{0i})}$ with the new finite parameter β^i. We have seen, in Eq.(39) explicitly, that $V_{\star(-x^i)}\star$ gives a translation in the variable x^i of the wavefunction. $V_{\star(\beta^i)}\star$ is then a time variable $t_{(\wr)}$-dependent translation, a

Galilean boost exactly as the Lie algebra contraction promised, and is now unitary. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{G}_{\beta^i} = \frac{1}{c}\tilde{G}_{\omega^{0i}} &= -2i(-t_{\langle\rangle}\partial_{x^i} - p_i\partial_{e_{\langle\rangle}}) + \frac{2i}{c^2}(x_i\partial_{t_{\langle\rangle}} + e\partial_{p^i}) \\ &\to 2i(t_{\langle\rangle}\partial_{x^i} + p_i\partial_{e_{\langle\rangle}}) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

We keep the $\partial_{e_{\langle\rangle}}$ since the $\tilde{G}_{\beta^i}$ may act on the mixed states. We have the newly relevant nonzero commutators involving a G_{β^i}, G_t, or G_{-e}, and a $\tilde{G}_s$ as well as those involving a $\tilde{G}_{\beta^i}$, $\tilde{G}_t$, or $\tilde{G}_{-e}$ and a G_s, all from the generators of the Lie algebra, as

$$\begin{aligned}&[G_{\beta^i}, \tilde{G}_{\omega^{jk}}] = -2i\left(\delta_{ij}G_{\beta^k} - \delta_{ik}G_{\beta^j}\right) \ , \\ &[G_{\omega^{ij}}, \tilde{G}_{\beta^k}] = 2i\left(\delta_{ik}G_{\beta j} - \delta_{jk}G_{\beta^i}\right) \ , \\ &[G_{\beta^i}, \tilde{G}_t] = [\tilde{G}_{\beta^i}, G_t] = 2iG_{-x^i} \ , \\ &[G_{\beta^i}, \tilde{G}_{p^j}] = [\tilde{G}_{\beta^i}, G_{p^j}] = 2i\delta_{ij}G_{-e} \ , \\ &[G_{-e}, \tilde{G}_t] = -[G_t, \tilde{G}_{-e}] = -2i \ . \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Since on the Hilbert space of the contracted theory we have only $\tilde{\phi}(p^i, x^i)$ and the corresponding observable algebra as $\alpha(p_i\star, x_i\star)$, the loss of $p_0\star$ and $x_0\star$, the quantum observables of energy and time, means that the Heisenberg equation of motion, in the form of a differential equation in τ, effectively corresponds to the part of $G_\tau\star$ involving only $p^i\star$ and $x^i\star$. We have

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\alpha\star = \frac{1}{2i}[\alpha\star, G_\tau\star] = \frac{1}{2i}[\alpha\star, G_{t_{\langle\rangle}}\star] \tag{52}$$

where $G_{t_{\langle\rangle}} = \frac{p^ip_i}{2} + v(x^i)$, giving the right time evolution in the 'non-relativistic', or $H_R(3)$, quantum theory, as expected. At the $c \to \infty$ limit, the proper time is just the Newtonian time. One can also see that the quantum Poisson bracket $\frac{1}{2i}[\cdots, \cdots]$ does suggest that the now multiplicative operators $t_{\langle\rangle}$ and $e_{\langle\rangle}$, from the original $p_0\star$ and $x_0\star$, are to be dropped from the canonical coordinates of the noncommutative symplectic geometry, in line with the Hilbert space picture.

VI. CONTRACTION TO CLASSICAL THEORY IN BRIEF

In this section we look at the corresponding classical theory at the Lorentz covariant level through the contraction along the line of the one performed in the 'non-relavitistic',

$H_R(3)$, case presented in Ref.[8]. Only a sketch will be presented where the mathematics is essentially the same with the latter. The contraction trivializing the commutators between the position and momentum operators is obtained by rescaling the generators as

$$X_\mu^c = \frac{1}{k_x} X_\mu \qquad \text{and} \qquad P_\mu^c = \frac{1}{k_p} P_\mu \ , \tag{53}$$

and taking the limit $k_x, k_p \to \infty$. The only important difference between k_x and k_p parameters is their physical dimensions, giving the X_μ^c and P_μ^c observables with their different classical units. For the corresponding operators we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}^{cL} &= x^c + i\frac{1}{k_x k_p}\partial_{p^c} \longrightarrow x^c \ , \\ \hat{P}^{cL} &= p^c - i\frac{1}{k_x k_p}\partial_{x^c} \longrightarrow p^c \ , \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

and the Moyal star-product reduces to a simple commutative product. Functions $\alpha(p\star, x\star)$, representing quantum observables, reduce to multiplicative operators $\alpha(p^c, x^c)$, the classical observables acting on the contracted representation space of the original pure and mixed states.

For the Hilbert space of pure states, the coherent state basis is taken with the new labels as $|p^c, x^c\rangle$, where $2p_\mu^c$ and $2x_\mu^c$ characterize the expectation values of $\hat{X}_\mu^c$ and $\hat{P}_\mu^c$ operators. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle\!\!\left\langle p_\mu'^c, x_\mu'^c | \hat{X}_\mu^c | p_\mu^c, x_\mu^c \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle &= [(x_\mu'^c + x_\mu^c) - i(p_\mu'^c - p_\mu^c)] \left\langle\!\!\left\langle p_\mu'^c, x_\mu'^c \,\middle|\, p_\mu^c, x_\mu^c \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle \ , \\ \left\langle\!\!\left\langle p_\mu'^c, x_\mu'^c | \hat{P}_\mu^c | p_\mu^c, x_\mu^c \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle &= [(p_\mu'^c + p_\mu^c) + i(x_\mu'^c - x_\mu^c)] \left\langle\!\!\left\langle p_\mu'^c, x_\mu'^c \,\middle|\, p_\mu^c, x_\mu^c \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle \ , \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

with $\left\langle\!\!\left\langle p_\mu'^c, x_\mu'^c \,\middle|\, p_\mu^c, x_\mu^c \right\rangle\!\!\right\rangle$ at the contraction limit going to zero for two distinct states. The Hilbert space, as a representation for the contracted symmetry, as well as a representation of the now commutative algebra of observables, reduces to a direct sum of one-dimensional representations of the ray spaces of each $\left|p_\mu^c, x_\mu^c\right\rangle$. The only admissible pure states are the exact coherent states, and not any linear combinations. The obtained coherent states can be identified as classical states, on the space of which the $\tilde{G}_s$-type operators act as generators of symmetries. $G_s\star$-type operators, as general $\alpha\star$ in the original observable algebra, contract to commuting multiplicative operators corresponding to classical observables. Results suggest that the projective Hilbert space, the true quantum phase space, in classical limit gives exactly the classic phase space with p_μ^c and x_μ^c coordinates. The Hilbert space, or Schrödinger

picture otherwise, at the classical limit serves rather as the Koopman-von Neumann formulation in a broader setting of mixed state, *i.e.* statistical mechanics. We do not intend to explore that aspect further in this article. The observable algebra, or Heisenberg picture, gives a much more direct way of examining the full dynamical theory at that contraction limit. It also gives a direct and intuitive picture of the phase space geometry too. The original position and momentum operators, $x_\mu\star$ and $p_\mu\star$, can be seen as noncommutative coordinates of the noncommutative symplectic geometry which is nothing other than the projective Hilbert space itself [16], described in a different way. The contracted versions as x^c_μ and p^c_μ are the classical phase space coordinates with no noncommutativity left.

Let us turn to the noncommutative Hamiltonian transformations. As mentioned above, at the quantum level, a $G_s\star = G_s(p_\mu\star, x_\mu\star)$ operator is a Hamiltonian function of the phase space coordinates $p\star$ and $x\star$, and the corresponding $\frac{-1}{2i}\tilde{G}_s$ is the Hamiltonian vector field. It is, of course, well known since Dirac that what has now been identified as a quantum Poisson bracket $\frac{1}{2i}[\cdot,\cdot]$ [15, 16] (and see references therein) reduces exactly to a classical Poisson bracket, which works in our formulation, explicitly shown in Ref.[8]; *i.e.*

$$G_s(p_\mu\star, x_\mu\star) \to G^c_s(p^c_\mu, x^c_\mu)\ , \qquad \frac{-1}{2i}\tilde{G}_s = \frac{1}{2i}[\cdot,\cdot] \to \{\cdot, G^c_s\} = \frac{-1}{2i}\tilde{G}^c_s\ .$$

The explicit expressions are in exactly the same form as those of the quantum case, namely

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{G}^c_{\omega^{\mu\nu}} = \tilde{G}_{\omega^{\mu\nu}} = -2i(x^c_\mu\partial_{x^{c\nu}} - p^c_\nu\partial_{p^{c\mu}}) - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu)\ , \\ &\tilde{G}_{-x^{c\mu}} = -2i\partial_{x^{c\mu}}\ , \qquad\qquad \tilde{G}_{p^{c\mu}} = 2i\partial_{p^{c\mu}}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Note their independence on the contraction parameter k (or k_p and k_x), even before the $k \to \infty$ limit is explicitly taken. In conclusion, from the quantum Poisson bracket in terms of the Moyal bracket, or the Hamiltonian vector field given in terms of $\tilde{G}_s$, we retrieve the Hamiltonian flow equation

$$\frac{d}{ds}\alpha(p^c, x^c) = \{\alpha(p^c, x^c), G^c_s\} = \frac{-1}{2i}\tilde{G}^c_s\alpha(p^c, x^c) \tag{57}$$

for any classical observable $\alpha(p^c, x^c)$ as a function of basic observables $x^{c\mu}$ and $p^{c\mu}$, which also serve as canonical coordinates for the phase space, with the standard expression for the classical Poisson bracket. The Hamilton's equations (47), as specific example, become

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}x^c_\mu = \frac{\partial G^c_\tau}{\partial p^{c\mu}} = \frac{p^c_\mu}{m} \qquad \frac{d}{d\tau}p^c_\mu = -\frac{\partial G^c_\tau}{\partial x^{c\mu}} = -\frac{\partial v(x^{c\nu})}{\partial x^{c\mu}}\ . \tag{58}$$

$G^c_\tau = \frac{p^{c\mu}p^c_\mu}{2m} + v(x^{c\mu})$ is the covariant classical Hamiltonian, the $v = 0$ case of which is free particle dynamics in Einstein special relativity.

VII. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

We presented above the theory of symplectic dynamics as essentially an irreducible component of the regular representation of the $H_R(1,3)$ (quantum) relativity symmetry, with a pseudo-unitary inner product obtained from that an earlier study of the covariant harmonic oscillator problem identified as a representation of the same symmetry. The explicit form of the inner product for the wavefunctions $\tilde{\phi}(p^\mu, x^\mu)$ is also given. Though the wavefunctions are divergent at timelike infinity, the inner product is always finite, without the need for domain restrictions. The quantum theory in terms of such wavefunctions is well behaved, and has no divergence for all physical quantities, again without any artificial manipulation of the integrals which may not be mathematically sound. That is a success of the presented version of Lorentz covariant quantum mechanics that other formulations failed to achieve. Here, we are talking about a fully Lorentz covariant theory with the four-vector position and momentum operators $\hat{X}_\mu$ and $\hat{P}_\mu$.

Our study is a part of our quantum relativity group-theoretically based program. The constructed quantum mechanics is the 'relativistic' version of the so-called 'non-relativistic' theory based on the $H_R(3)$ group, or on the $\tilde{G}(3)$ group, a $U(1)$ central extension of the Galileian group. $H_R(3)$ is a subgroup of the $H_R(1,3)$ group, while together with $\tilde{G}(3)$ they are both subgroup of the $c \to \infty$ approximation of the $H_R(1,3)$, obtained as a symmetry, or Lie algebra, contraction. Note that $H_R(3)$ is isomorphic to the $\tilde{G}(3)$ group with the one parameter subgroup of 'time-translation' taken out. The $H_R(3)$ picture is an exact 'time-independent' representation of $\tilde{G}(3)$ picture. Just like the earlier study of our group establishing the full Newtonian theory from the other contraction of the $H_R(3)$ quantum theory, we describe here how the 'non-relativistic' quantum theory and 'relativistic' classical theory are to be retrieved successfully from the proper contractions.

We skip the details of the reducible Tomita representation on the Hilbert space containing a self-dual cone of vectors corresponding to the mixed, statistical states, and leave it to the possible future analysis. For the Schrödinger evolution on the Hilbert space of pure states, the contraction of the quantum theory to its classical approximation is also easier to appreciate from the Tomita representation picture. Anyway, we have been very brief on the classical approximation analysis, since it is essentially an exact parallel of the earlier $H_R(3)$ case.

The focus of the paper is mostly on the formulational aspects. The key theme is our full group-theoretical construction scheme from the identified relevant relativity symmetries and the rigorous connections between theories at different levels with the lower ones as approximations to the higher ones along a symmetry contraction scheme. Our results here, together with the earlier studies, give the successful implementation of all that for the 'relativistic' quantum theory, down to its corresponding classical theory and the 'non-relativistic' quantum and classical theories. Under that key theme, all four theories are the lower levels or approximations of the top level theory with a stable quantum relativity [9, 10] symmetry, one that cannot be the contraction of another symmetry. The formulation of the current $H_{R}(1,3)$ theory, being essentially the only spin zero representation, as a theory of a Lorentz covariant quantum mechanics with the adoption of the pseudo-unitary inner product is of special interest.

We believe the construction of this kind of fundamental theory presented here, based on a non-unitary representation, has not been available in the literature. And the result is considered a great success. Going along the logic of our line of thinking [5], it is actually not a surprise at all. The bottom line is that going from the $H_{R}(3)$ theory to the $H_{R}(1,3)$ one is about going from the noncommutative geometry of the three-vectors $\hat{X}_i$ and $\hat{P}_i$ to that of the Minkowski four-vectors $\hat{X}_\mu$ and $\hat{P}_\mu$. The way the three-dimensional Euclidean space sits inside the four dimensional Minkowski spacetime as a pseudo-Euclidean space should be the basic guiding principle. And that can be seen just from the structure of the symmetry groups. The vector space spanned by the $\hat{X}_\mu$, for example, is a $1+3$ dimensional space of the Lorentz symmetry with the pseudo-Euclidean, therefore non-unitary, norm. The covariant harmonic oscillator system is a good place to start attacking the problem. In general, the harmonic oscillator problem is the most important prototype problem for any dynamical theory. For a quantum theory, the solution Fock states give one of the most useful basis for understanding the Hilbert space of pure states. The subspace spanned by the Fock states of a fixed n eigenvalue of the total number operators, under the right theory, corresponds exactly to the space of symmetric n-tensors. For the Lorentz symmetry, those are the symmetric products of the complexified basic pseudo-unitary Minkowski vector representation, as formulated and analyzed in Ref.[6] in the x-representation, namely wavefunctions $\phi(x^a)$. The anti-Hermitian operators $\hat{X}_0$ and $\hat{P}_0$ were represented as $i\hat{X}_4 \to ix_4$ and $i\hat{P}_4 \to -i\hbar\partial_{x^4}$, respectively. We adapt that here to a $H(4)$ coherent state formulation, eventually obtaining the $\tilde{\phi}(x^\mu, p^\mu)$

representation of $H_R(1,3)$ symmetry. The result is very interesting, and in hindsight quite natural to expect.

The story is again easier to understand looking at the Fock state basis now given by the $\tilde{\phi}_n(x^\mu, p^\mu)$ wavefunctions, with n being a shorthand notation for $(n_0; n_1, n_2, n_3)$. The four $n = 1$ states are described by $(x_\nu - ip_\nu)\tilde{\phi}_0$, where $\tilde{\phi}_0 = e^{-\frac{x^\mu x_\mu + p^\mu p_\mu}{2}}$ is the Lorentz invariant $n = 0$ wavefunction. We can denote those four wavefunctions as $\tilde{\phi}_{1\nu}$ and identify them as components of a four-vector. For the norm of the latter to be Minkowski, the integrand of the inner product needs to contain $\eta^{\rho\nu}\tilde{\phi}^*_{1\rho}\tilde{\phi}_{1\nu}$ which is, in particular, equal to $(x^\nu + ip^\nu)(x_\nu - ip_\nu)|\tilde{\phi}_0|^2$. The $\tilde{\psi}^*(-x^0, -p^0, x^i, p^i)\tilde{\phi}_n(x^\mu, p^\mu)$ product, instead of the usual $\tilde{\psi}^*(x^\mu, p^\mu)\tilde{\phi}_n(x^\mu, p^\mu)$, calls for taking the $\hat{X}_0$ and $\hat{P}_0$, given by $x_0 + i\partial_{p^0}$ and $p_0 - i\partial_{x^0}$ to be anti-Hermitian. The $\tilde{\phi}_0$ factor is contained in all Fock state wavefunctions $\tilde{\phi}_n$, therefore also in all wavefunctions to be given by their finite linear combinations. However, unlike in $H_R(3)$ case, the zero-state wavefunction does not dictate the rapidly decreasing nature of the wavefunctions, which would be achieved by $e^{-(x^0)^2-(p^0)^2}\tilde{\phi}_0$. Instead of having the required extra factor included as a part of the wavefunction, putting it into the definition of the inner product keeps the right Lorentz transformation properties of the $\tilde{\phi}_n$ wavefunctions. In hindsight, that can lead to the idea of replacing the usual integral expression of the inner product by the one given in expression (28). The same reasoning can be applied to obtain the analogous pseudo-unitary inner product in x-representation with $\hat{X}_\mu$ and $\hat{P}_\mu$ as x_μ and $-i\hbar\partial_{x^\mu}$.

For wavefunction representation, we usually see the operators of the form x and $-i\hbar\partial_x$, or $x + i\partial_p$ and $p - i\partial_x$, for real variables x and p as Hermitian. But it should be understood that the naive notion of Hermiticity is defined with respect to the usual integral inner product. That whole scheme does not work well for 'coordinates' of a nontrivial metric signature for the case of which the usually taken inner product does not respect the pseudo-orthogonal rotational symmetry. Under our pseudo-unitary representation, the naively anti-Hermitian starting form of the $\hat{X}_0$ and $\hat{P}_0$ operators is eventually realized in the naively Hermitian form. Either way, they are truly Hermitian, together with the $\hat{X}_i$ and $\hat{P}_i$, meaning they are self-adjoint with respect to the inner product. We have also identified that as the $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermiticity, in line with the notion of pseudo-Hermitian quantum mechanics. Again, that pseudo-Hermiticity is the true Hermiticity with respect to the proper inner product. Only the corresponding pseudo-unitarity is definitely not a unitarity in the sense that the inner

product does not give a positive definite norm.

We start by exploring the formulation without worrying much about the positivity of eigenvalues and the feasibility of a probability picture. As commented in Ref.[5, 6], we see those as unimportant, with the availability of a new perspective on quantum physics in terms of clearly defined symplectic dynamics and the noncommutative values of the observables [15, 16, 18]. The bottom line, though, is that even if the standard probability interpretation for the usual quantum theory is required, its analog for a spacetime quantum theory is not at all justified. The notion of probability for finding a particle somewhere in space at a fixed time hardly has a spacetime analog, nor do we have any solid way to understand, not to say implement, von Neumann measurement in a spacetime theory. However, the current study certainly shows that the $\hat{X}_0$ and $\hat{P}_0$ operators have the positive eigenvalues, as usually expected.

As mentioned above, the $\hat{X}_\mu$ and $\hat{P}_\mu$ operators can be taken as noncommutative coordinates of the quantum phase space, which is otherwise described in real/complex number coordinates as the infinite dimensional projective Hilbert space. That picture has been solidly established in Ref. [15, 16] for the $\hat{X}_i$ and $\hat{P}_i$ operators of the 'non-relativistic' theory. The exact analog for the current 'relativistic' theory should be obvious, though there may still be particular interesting lessons to be learnt in a detailed analysis. Even though the explicit new projective Hilbert space with the pseudo-unitary inner product is no mystery, a careful study of it from a physics point of view still has to be performed. Interestingly enough, it corresponds to a Kähler manifold of negative, instead of a positive, constant holomorphic sectional curvature (see Ref. [5] and references therein). Seeing it as the noncommutative symplectic geometry, it is really a quantum model of the spacetime, instead of just of the phase space. The single particle phase space, an irreducible representation of the relativity symmetry, cannot be split into independent configuration and momentum spaces as in the classical limit, for $H_R(1,3)$ symmetry analyzed here, as well as for $H_R(3)$ group. This nonseparability is exactly analogous to that of the Minkowski spacetime representation of Lorentz symmetry (or any symmetry with Lorentz subgroup), whose space and time parts together form an irreducible representation, splitting into independent parts only in the Newtonian limit. The configuration space for a single free particle in a theory of particle dynamics is the only sensible physical notion of the model of the space behind it, as the space can only be understood as the collective of all possible positions a particle can

occupy and be observed at. When that space is only a part of an integral whole, namely of an irreducible representation of the fundamental relativity symmetry of the theory, it is full representation space that has to be considered, whether we call it is the spacetime or the phase space. So, quantum spacetime is the phase space, and we have a solid model of a quantum spacetime with little speculative element. It is just a Lorentz covariant version of the quantum physical space model, with Minkowski four-vector position observables, generalizing the classical Minkowski spacetime with x^μ as coordinate observables together with the momentum observable counterparts binded as an irreducible object at the quantum level. Hence our title.

Appendix : The coherent states as seen from the Fock state basis

The full set of Fock states as eigenstates for the covariant harmonic oscillator with the explicit wavefunction representation free from any divergence issue is given in [6] under the same pseudo-unitary representation of $H_R(1,3)$, exactly with the Hermitian $\hat{X}_a$ and $\hat{P}_a$ and $\hat{X}_0 = i\hat{X}_4$ and $\hat{P}_0 = i\hat{P}_4$ anti-Hermitian. The wavefunction given there are in the x-representation, functions of x^a on which $\hat{X}_a$ and $\hat{P}_a$ act as operators x_a and $-i\hbar\partial_{x^a}$. In the following, we present the results under the convention and units used here.

The ladder operators are defined as

$$\hat{a}_a = \hat{X}_a + i\hat{P}_a \ , \qquad \hat{a}_a^\dagger = \hat{X}_a - i\hat{P}_a \ ; \qquad \left[\hat{a}_a, \hat{a}_b^\dagger\right] = 4\delta_{ab} \ , \tag{59}$$

The Fock states are simultaneous eigenstates of $\hat{N}_a = \frac{1}{4}\hat{a}_a^\dagger\hat{a}_a$ and their sum $\hat{N} = \frac{1}{4}\hat{a}_a^\dagger\hat{a}^a$,

$$|n\rangle \equiv |n_1, n_2, n_3; n_4\rangle = \frac{1}{2^n\sqrt{n_1!\, n_2!\, n_3!\, n_4!}} \left(\hat{a}_1^\dagger\right)^{n_1} \left(\hat{a}_2^\dagger\right)^{n_2} \left(\hat{a}_3^\dagger\right)^{n_3} \left(\hat{a}_4^\dagger\right)^{n_4} |0\rangle \ . \tag{60}$$

In terms of the $|p^a, x^a\rangle$ coherent states, for which $\hat{a}_b\,|p^a, x^a\rangle = 2(x_b + ip_b)\,|p^a, x^a\rangle$, we have the wavefunctions

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n(p^a, x^a) \equiv \langle p^a, x^a|n\rangle \ = \ & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1!\, n_2!\, n_3!\, n_4!}} \left(x^1 - ip^1\right)^{n_1} \left(x^2 - ip^2\right)^{n_2} \\ & \times \left(x^3 - ip^3\right)^{n_3} \left(x^4 - ip^4\right)^{n_4} \ e^{-\frac{x^a x_a + p^a p_a}{2}} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Of course, they can also be obtained as solutions to the eigenvalue equation of the $\hat{N}$ operator represented by the differential operator based on the representation of $\hat{X}_a^L$ and $\hat{P}_a^L$.

The Lorentz covariant picture of the results can be seen with the Lorentz invariant inner product $\langle\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle\rangle$, introduced as a set of basis bras, or functionals $\langle\langle n| \equiv (-1)^{n_4}\langle n|$, on the basis states $|n\rangle\rangle \equiv |n\rangle$. With the previously introduced $|n_0; n_1, n_2, n_3\rangle \equiv i^{n_4}\,|n_1, n_2, n_3; n_4\rangle$ and $n_0 \equiv n_4$, and the language of pseudo-Hermitian quantum mechanics sketched in Sec. III, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{a}^0\,|n_0; n_1, n_2, n_3\rangle\rangle &= -i\hat{a}_4\, i^{n_4}\,|n_1, n_2, n_3; n_4\rangle\rangle = 2\sqrt{n_0}\,|n_0 - 1; n_1, n_2, n_3\rangle\rangle \ , \\
\hat{a}_0^\ddagger\,|n_0; n_1, n_2, n_3\rangle\rangle &= i\hat{a}_4^\dagger\, i^{n_4}\,|n_1, n_2, n_3; n_4\rangle\rangle = 2\sqrt{(n_0+1)}\,|n_0 + 1; n_1, n_2, n_3\rangle\rangle \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

with $\frac{1}{4}\hat{a}_0^\ddagger\hat{a}^0 = \hat{N}_0 = \hat{N}_4$ and $\hat{N} = \frac{1}{4}\hat{a}_\mu^\ddagger\hat{a}^\mu$. $\hat{a}_\mu^\ddagger$ denotes the $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian conjugate of $\hat{a}_\mu$;

$$\hat{a}_\mu = \hat{X}_\mu + i\hat{P}_\mu \ , \qquad \hat{a}_\mu^\ddagger = \hat{X}_\mu - i\hat{P}_\mu \ ; \qquad \left[\hat{a}_\mu, \hat{a}_\nu^\ddagger\right] = 4\eta_{\mu\nu} \ , \tag{63}$$

($\hat{a}_i^\ddagger$ is identical with $\hat{a}_i^\dagger$), which gives the expected form for a naive formulation of the Lorentz covariant problem since $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian conjugation is the Hermitian conjugation with respect to the inner product $\langle\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle\rangle$, and $\hat{X}_\mu$ and $\hat{P}_\mu$ are all $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian. However, the representation is really the pseudo-unitary in nature since the inner product is not positive definite. The $|n\rangle\rangle$ states of odd n_4 have timelike norm of -1; the $\mathcal{P}_4$ operator was introduced as defined by $\mathcal{P}_4\,|n\rangle = (-1)^{n_4}\,|n\rangle$ giving $\langle\langle m|n\rangle\rangle = (-1)^{n_4}\delta_{mn}$

With the $\mathcal{P}_4$-Hermitian (or $\mathcal{P}_4$-unitary formulation, one can see that the results look exactly like a usual unitary picture with the Fock states of the form

$$|n_0; n_1, n_2, n_3\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{2^n\sqrt{n_0!\,n_1!\,n_2!\,n_3!}}\left(\hat{a}_0^\ddagger\right)^{n_0}\left(\hat{a}_1^\ddagger\right)^{n_1}\left(\hat{a}_2^\ddagger\right)^{n_2}\left(\hat{a}_3^\ddagger\right)^{n_3}|0\rangle\rangle \ . \tag{64}$$

The true $H_R(1,3)$ coherent states can be introduced as

$$\begin{aligned}
|p^\mu, x^\mu\rangle\rangle \ = \ e^{-\frac{x^\mu x_\mu + p^\mu p_\mu}{2}} \sum \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0!\,n_1!\,n_2!\,n_3!}}\,(x^0 + ip^0)^{n_0}\,(x^1 + ip^1)^{n_1} \\
\times\,(x^2 + ip^2)^{n_2}\,(x^3 + ip^3)^{n_3}\,|n_0; n_1, n_2, n_3\rangle\rangle \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

satisfying $\hat{a}^\nu\,|p^\mu, x^\mu\rangle\rangle \ = \ 2\,(x^\nu + ip^\nu)\,|p^\mu, x^\mu\rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle p^\mu, x^\mu|p^\mu, x^\mu\rangle\rangle \ = \ 1$. Moreover, that is exactly the state given by $V(p^\mu, x^\mu) = e^{i(p^\mu\hat{X}_\mu - x^\mu\hat{P}_\mu)}$ acting on $|0\rangle\rangle$ as defined in the main text, or equivalently

$$V(p^\mu, x^\mu)\,|0\rangle\rangle = e^{-\frac{x^\mu x_\mu + p^\mu p_\mu}{2}} e^{\frac{(x^\nu + ip^\nu)\hat{a}_\nu^\ddagger}{2}}|0\rangle\rangle \ .$$

We have been doing nothing more than repeating some standard calculations for a unitary picture, most parts of which are not sensitive to the indefinite nature of the norm. We have,

however,

$$\langle\langle p^\mu, x^\mu | n_0; n_1, n_2, n_3 \rangle\rangle \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0!\, n_1!\, n_2!\, n_3!}} \left(x_0 - ip_0\right)^{n_0} \left(x_1 - ip_1\right)^{n_1} \times \left(x_2 - ip_2\right)^{n_2} \left(x_3 - ip_3\right)^{n_3} \; e^{-\frac{x^\mu x_\mu + p^\mu p_\mu}{2}} \;, \qquad (66)$$

which is really only about the distinction between an upper and a lower 0 index to be traced carefully. Taking that as the wavefunctions $\tilde{\phi}_n(p^\mu, x^\mu)$, they differ from those one would obtain from a naive unitary formulation exactly by having the factors of $(x^\mu - ip^\mu)$ written as $(x_\mu - ip_\mu)$, which really is about a factor of $(-1)^{n_0}$. However, the physical inner product between two such wavefunctions is very nontrivial.

It is important to note that $|p^\mu, x^\mu\rangle\rangle$ states are different from the $|p^a, x^a\rangle\rangle$ states. Recall that the latter are not normalized. But each of them is also an eigenstate of $\hat{a}^0$ with the eigenvalue $2(p^4 - ix^4)$. Comparing the normalized $|p^a, x^a\rangle\rangle$ with $|p^\mu, x^\mu\rangle\rangle$ gives the consistent identification of the two for $x^4 = -p^0$ and $p^4 = x^0$. Putting these relations into the standard resolution of identity for the $|p^a, x^a\rangle$ states gives the nontrivial inner product between wavefunctions given within the main text.

Acknowledgements S.B. thanks the Center for High Energy and High Field Physics, National Central University for hospitality while the article is being round up. O.K. and H.K.T. are partially supported by research grant number 107-2119-M-008-011 of the MOST of Taiwan.

---

[1] Zmuidizinas, S. Unitary Representations of the Lorentz Group on 4-Vector Manifolds. *J. Math. Phys.* **1966**, *7*, 764-780.

[2] Johnson, J.E. Position Operators and Proper Time in Relativistic Quantum Mechanics. *Phys. Rev.* **1969**, *181*, 1755-1764.

[3] Dubin, D.A., Hennings, M.A., Smith, T.B. *Mathematical Aspects of Weyl Quantization and Phase*; World Scientific **2000**.

[4] Bars, I. Relativistic Harmonic Oscillator Revisited. *Phys. Rev.D* **2009**, *79*, 045009

[5] O.C.W. Kong, The Case for a Quantum Theory on a Hilbert Space with an Inner Product of Indefinite Signature, *J. High Energy Phys. Gravit. Cosmo.* **2020**, *6*, 43-48.

[6] S. Bedić and O.C.W. Kong, Analysis on Complete Set of Fock States with Explicit Wavefunctions for the Covariant Harmonic Oscillator Problem, *Symmetry* **2020**, *12*, 39.

[7] C.S. Chew, O.C.W. Kong, J. Payne, A Quantum Space Behind Simple Quantum Mechanics, *Adv. in High Energy Phys.* **2017**, *2017*, 4395918.

[8] C.S. Chew, O.C.W. Kong, J. Payne, Observables and Dynamics, Quantum to Classical, from a Relativity Symmetry Perspective, *J. High Energy Phys. Gravit. Cosmo.* **2019**, *5*, 553-586.

[9] O.C.W. Kong, A deformed relativity with the quantum $\hbar$, *Phys. Lett. B* **2008**, *665*, 58-61

[10] O.C.W. Kong, J. Payne, The First Physics Picture of Contractions from a Fundamental Quantum Relativity Symmetry Including All Known Relativity Symmetries, Classical and Quantum. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **2019**, *58*, 1803-1827.

[11] R. Gilmore, Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Some of Their Applications; Dover **2005**

[12] M.E. Taylor, Noncommutative Harmonic Analysis; American Mathematical Society **1986**.

[13] A.O. Barut, R. Raczka, Theory of Group Representations and Applications; Polish Scientific Publisher, Warsaw **1980**.

[14] C.M. Bender, Introduction to PT-Symmetric Quantum Theory, *Contemporary Physics*, **2005**, *46*, 277-292. A. Das, Pseudo-Hermitian Quantum Mechanics, *J. Phys.: Conference Series* **2011**, *287*, 012002.

[15] O.C.W. Kong, An Intuitive Geometric Picture of Quantum Mechanics with Noncommutative Values for Observables, *NCU-HEP-k081* **2019**.

[16] O.C.W. Kong and W.-Y. Liu, Noncommutative Coordinate Picture of the Quantum Physical/Phase Space, *arXiv: 1903.11962, NCU-HEP-k078* **2019**.

[17] D.N. Cho and O.C.W. Kong, Relativity Symmetries and Lie Algebra Contractions, Ann. Phys. **2014**, *351*, 275-289.

[18] O.C.W. Kong and W.-Y. Liu, Noncommutative Values of Quantum Observables, *arXiv: 1903.09071, NCU-HEP-k079* **2019**.