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The knowingly angular uncertainty principle (UP) holds the orbital angular momentum (OAM) is precisely defined in an optical vortex with angular position (AP) of $2\pi$ azimuthal coordinate ($\phi$) range. However, the pair of their uncertainties is discretely selected, not correspondent to the unselected linear momentum and position by $\hbar/2$. Herein, we demonstrate the less difference between mean OAM and the product of azimuthal phase-gradient and $\hbar$, the larger $\phi$ range of one periodically helical wavefront in a set of numerous singular lights for both their infinitesimal and infinity. This is another angular UP for any pair of unselected OAM and AP by a stronger constant product 0.186$\hbar$ on their underlying uncertainties. Moreover, there is no difference of known-AP uncertainties between these lights for the infinitely proposing AP uncertainty of their set. This UP would enhance existing OAM researches by its infinitely and certainly proposing- and known-AP uncertainties and stronger constant correlation.
Introduction

The Heisenberg uncertainty principle (UP) states that the more precise is the linear momentum, the more uncertain is the position in a particle by an lower bound $\hbar/2$ on the product of their underlying uncertainties\textsuperscript{1,2}. This lower bound is unselected for any pair of observables of either nearly precise linear momentum (nearly infinite position) or nearly precise position (nearly infinite linear momentum).

The orbital angular momentum (OAM) and angular position (AP) are the Fourier pair variables\textsuperscript{3}. The knowingly angular UP states the more precise is the OAM, the more uncertain is the AP in a light beam by a variously lower bound on the product of their underlying uncertainties from $\hbar/2$ for nearly precise AP to zero for precise OAM\textsuperscript{4}. Indeed, this nonzero bound presents the uncertain OAM and AP that is with sub-$2\pi$ azimuthal angle coordinate ($\phi$) range in a sector light beam, whereas this zero bound presents the precise OAM and the uncertain AP that is with $2\pi \phi$ range in a round or doughnut beam. However, only the latter pair are discretely selected for the lowest bound, which is not correspondent to the any pair of continuously unselected linear momentum and position. This non-correspondence is attributed to that both the linear momentum and position spaces are nearly infinite, whereas the OAM space is discretely infinite and AP space is the periodic $2\pi$ range. The linear OAM operator in the Hilbert space $H_x$ results in the limited OAM resolution $\hbar$ for a light beam of being with the non-eigen quantum state that consists of OAM eigenstates $|m\in\mathbb{Z}\rangle$\textsuperscript{5}, and the linear AP operator in the conjugated Fourier space results in the limited $\phi$ range of $2\pi$\textsuperscript{3,6}. Almost all of the existing topics with optical OAM, are studied or applied with the limited 2$\pi$-range AP and limited OAM resolution $\hbar$, such as optical spanner\textsuperscript{7,8}, communications\textsuperscript{9,10}, structured light\textsuperscript{11}, quantum information\textsuperscript{12,13}, microscopy\textsuperscript{14}, astronomy\textsuperscript{15}, interferometry\textsuperscript{16}, tomography\textsuperscript{17}, nonlinear optics\textsuperscript{18,19} and singular optics\textsuperscript{20}. 
Otherwise, Leach et al. demonstrated that the correlation of entangled photon pairs on the underlined variances of OAM and AP is one order of magnitude stronger than that of independent photons at the limit of precise AP\textsuperscript{21}.

The OAM intrinsically accompanies the azimuthally phase-gradient (PG) of the helical wavefront of a light beam\textsuperscript{22}. A singular light beam with the fractionally azimuthal PG, denoted by a proper fraction $M$, has the phase-singularity at \(n\) azimuthally symmetric APs\textsuperscript{23}. This is termed as the \(n\)-sectional fractional vortex (FV\(n\)) owing to \(n\) periodically helical wavefront per \(2\pi \phi\) range, where \(n\) is a positive integer. Its quantum state is the fractional OAM state \(|Mn(M \in \mathbb{Q})\rangle\) and consists of OAM eigenstates. Based on its high probability in a small range of OAM and low intensity in a tiny range of AP\textsuperscript{23,24}, there should be the uncertainties of OAM (\(\Delta\text{OAM}\)) and AP uncertainty (\(\Delta\text{AP}\)), defined by the known UP\textsuperscript{4} (known-\(\Delta\text{OAMs}\) and \(\Delta\text{APs}\)), in an FV\(n\). The known-\(\Delta\text{OAMs}\) and \(\Delta\text{APs}\) of numerous FV\(n\)s are different due to the \(n\) number and various phase-jumps that is related to \(M\) of their phase-singularities. However, they are not readily determined except the eigenstate \(|Mn(M \mod m = 0)\rangle = |m\rangle\)\textsuperscript{4,23}, because the mean square OAMs are divergent\textsuperscript{24,25}.

In this article, we demonstrate the uncertainty relation of OAM and AP by a proportionality constant \(0.186\hbar\) on the product of their underlying uncertainties in a set of numerous singular lights, each of which is with the superposition made up of two FV\(n\) with different PGs \(M_1\) and \(M_2 = M_1 + \delta\). We propose another angular UP to state this relation for any pair of either precise OAM (infinite AP) or precise AP (infinite OAM). This \(\Delta\text{OAM}\) (proposing-\(\Delta\text{OAM}\)) presents the nonmatching degree between numerous phase shifts (PSs) of one periodically helical wavefront and the two multiples of integer and periodical number of PS of half wave by the value of
\( \frac{M_1 + M_2}{2} \mod n \cos(\delta\pi/n)/2 \), and this \( \Delta\text{AP} \) (proposing-\( \Delta\text{AP} \)) presents the \( \phi \) range of one periodically helical wavefront by \( 1.83\pi/n|\cos(\delta\pi/n)| \). All the correlations of lights ensemble in these arbitrary pair variables are 2.86 times of magnitude stronger than that of single light at the limit of precise \( \text{AP} \). This proportionality constant between the unselected OAM and \( \text{AP} \) can be correspondent to the constant Robeson bound of unselected linear momentum and position\(^2\). Therefore, a set of numerous singular light beams is the observation system of the angular \( \text{UP} \) that is correspondent to a particle that is the observation system of linear \( \text{UP} \). Moreover, two deviations of the known-\( \Delta\text{APs} \) and \( \Delta\text{OAMs} \) between these singular lights are zero for the infinitely proposing-\( \Delta\text{AP} \), as well as zero proposing-\( \Delta\text{OAM} \), of their set. These infinitely and certainly proposing- and known-\( \Delta\text{APs} \) and stronger constant product relation may give rise to more applicable for the existing topics\(^7\)\(^-\)\(^{20}\). We experimentally witness the property of super-\( 2\pi \) \( \text{AP} \) of showing the azimuthally sinusoidal square decrease in their intensity images by an interference device with single photon level. We produce an optical speckle of illustrating a macroscopy example for the argument of infinite \( \text{AP} \) in the Euclidean system.

**UP for singular light with one PG**

In a cylindrical system, the OAM eigenstate \( |m\rangle \) is associated with the eigenvalue \( mh \) by \( \hat{L}|m\rangle = m|m\rangle \) in an optical vortex with the helical wavefront, where \( \hat{L} \) is OAM operator and \( m \) is the azimuthal PG of this wavefront\(^5\). The OAM mean of an \( \text{FV} n \) is evaluated as follows\(^{23,24}\):

\[
\overline{Mn}(M) = M - \left( \frac{n}{2\pi} \right) \sin \left( M \frac{2\pi}{n} \right). \tag{1}
\]

In Eq. (1), the \( n \) times amplitude fluctuations compared between various \( \text{FV} n s \) is owing
to the OAM resolution of discrete nature $n\hbar$ in $H_{\omega/n}$. Let an OAM be observed in an individual-$n$ set of numerous FVs with respect to $M$ and in referring to $M_\hbar$, where the referring indicates the precise OAM is on the base of equaling mean OAM and $M_\hbar$. That is, an OAM observation, made on the fractional OAM state $|Mn\rangle$, is collapsed to the basis state as $\hat{L}|M\rangle = \left[ M - (\frac{\pi}{2\pi}) \sin\left( M \frac{2\pi}{n} \right) \right]|m'\rangle$. This observation in referring to $M|m'\rangle$ is sinusoidal by $\hat{L}|M\rangle - M|m'\rangle = -\left( \frac{n}{2\pi} \right) \sin\left( M \frac{2\pi}{n} \right)|m'\rangle$. Equation (1) indicates an equal between OAM mean and $M$ can be realised when $M \bmod n/2 = 0$, which presents the exactly matching between the PS of one periodically helical wavefront and two multiples of integer and periodical number of PS of half wave. It is significantly associated with the nature of wave (see Supplementary I.). In contrast, the others with $M \bmod n/2 \neq 0$ are not as equal and matching as those with $M \bmod n/2 = 0$. The OAM is not precise in a set that includes both cases for various $M$, for which the uncertainty is defined by the root mean square (RMS) of this sinusoidal fluctuation:

$$\text{RMS}\left[ \overline{Mn}(M) - M \right] = \frac{n}{2\pi} \times \text{RMS}\left[ -\sin\left( M \frac{2\pi}{n} \right) \right] = \frac{n}{2\pi} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{n}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \left[ \hbar \right], \quad (2)$$

where the departure amplitude $n\hbar/2\pi$ represents the proposing-OAM range. This definition is intrinsic, which is consistent to the known-UP in the way below. A set means the ensemble of light beams those are with the continuously variated phase-gradients gives an $\Delta$OAM (proposing-$\Delta$OAM) by Eq. (2). In other word, the average of all known-$\Delta$OAMs of numerous FVs is equal to a proposing-$\Delta$OAM for the individual $n$ set. However, owing to the discrete nature of OAM eigenmodes, the proposing-$\Delta$OAM is discrete, and its lower bound is limited as $\hbar/2\sqrt{2\pi}$ when $n = 1$.

Two functional relations between $\overline{Mn}(M) - M$ and $M$ are obtained for FV1 and FV3, as shown by blue curves in Fig. 1a, where green markings indicate the quantized
amplitudes and red points those are intersected between the blue curve and the $M$ axis present the exact PS matching and the equal mean OAM and $M\hbar$. In Fig. 1b, four symmetry spectra with OAM eigenmodes resolutions of $\hbar$ and $3\hbar$ are obtained for FV1 with $M = 0$ and $1/2$ and FV3 with $M = 0$ and $3/2$, respectively, using equations obtained from ref.23.

**Fig. 1 | Wave nature and two linearly conjugated spaces of OAM and AP.**

a, Periodic functions of $M$ produced by the difference between $\overline{M}_n$ and $M\hbar$ for FV1 and FV3 (blue curves), where green markings indicate the amplitudes of these periodic functions as $\hbar/2\pi$ and $3\hbar/2\pi$, and red points presents the PS matching and the equal between the mean OAM and $M\hbar$ for $M \mod 1/2$ and $3/2 = 0$, respectively.

b, Left: two OAM spectra of FV1 with $M = 0$ and $1/2$, where the interval between modes of nonzero weights is one; right: two OAM spectra FV3 with $M = 0$ and $3/2$, where the interval between modes of nonzero weights is three.

c, Two intensity images of FV1 with $M = 1/2$ and FV3 with $M = 3/2$, whose AP ranges of one periodically helical wavefront are equal to $\phi$ ranges between APs of the phase-singularity $2\pi b$ and $2\pi b/3$, respectively. Both products of two pairs of proposing-OAM and AP ranges for two sets of FV1 and FV3 are $b\hbar$, $b = 0.915$.

The known-AP range of an FV1, the range of one periodically helical wavefront, is $2\pi b$, where $b \leq 1$ is used of considering the low intensity at the $\phi$ region, or phase jump, of its phase-singularity. The $n$ sections of FV$n$ indicate that the range of one
periodically helical wavefront is $2\pi b/n$. Our goal is to be able to identify this periodicity so that we define the AP range of a FV$n$ by $2\pi b/n$. $b$ is unknown, except $\pi/\sqrt{3}$ is obtained for $M \mod n = 0$, $b = 1^4$. Large degree of phase-singularity $d\overline{M}n/dM = 1 - \cos(2\pi M/n)$, or large phase jump, implies small $b^{23}$. $\Delta b$ denotes the range of $b$ in one periodicity, and $n$ periodicity means $n$ times of $\Delta b$ by $n\Delta b$. The proposing-AP range of a set of numerous FV$n$s, or the average of all known-AP ranges of FV$n$s, is $2\pi b/n$. The proposing-AP range is conjugated with the proposing-OAM range $nh/2\pi$ and resolution $nh$, as well as their two linearly conjugated spaces. As another consistence between the known- and proposing-UPs, the proposing-$\Delta$AP in $n = 1$ set can be obtained as 1.66 radian by substituting Eq. (2) in Eq. (7) of ref.4. Then, $\overline{b} = 0.915$ by comparing 1.66 with $\pi/\sqrt{3}$ from $b = 1$. The proposing-$\Delta$AP for any $n$ set is $1.66/n$ by $\Delta \text{OAM} = n^2 \lambda \Delta \text{AP}$, where $\lambda$ is a real constant and $n^2$ applying is from two linearly conjugated spaces of OAM and AP in Eq. (7) of ref.4. The low intensity in each of the $n$-sectional is in a tiny range of $\phi$ since $\Delta b$ is small, such that $n\Delta b$ is small for small $n$. Small $n\Delta b$ implies small difference of the known-$\Delta$APs between numerous FV$n$s those are in a set. Two known-AP ranges of $2\pi b$ and $2\pi b/3$ are obtained for a FV1 with $M = 1/2$ and a FV3 with $M = 3/2$, respectively, as segregated by the phase-singularities shown in Fig. 1c.

This applying of linear AP space with integer $n$ is exactly conjugated to that of linear OAM space in $H_{e/n}$, such that the two uncertainties in OAM and AP are inversely proportional with a proportionality constant $0.186 \hbar$, as well as the proportionality constant $\overline{b}\hbar$ in each set on their observation ranges. This is a discretely quantified uncertainty relation in a set of numerous FV$n$s, whose principle (proposing-UP) is associated with the nature of waves and relied on the two linearly
conjugated spaces of OAM and AP. Its upper bound of OAM and lower bound of AP uncertainties are infinite large and small, respectively, for the infinite large $n$.

**UP for singular light with two PGs**

The proposing-$\Delta$OAM is not necessarily restrained by a discrete quantity of $\pi h/2\sqrt{2}\pi$.

A singular light beam with a superposition of two FVns with $M_1$ and $M_2$ is expressed as $|Mn(M_1, M_2)| = |Mn(M_1)| + |Mn(M_2)|$. Its mean OAM is the average of the two OAM means of $|Mn(M_1)|$ and $|Mn(M_2)|$, given by,

$$\overline{Mn}(M_1, M_2) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} m' P_{m'} [Mn(M_1, M_2)] = \frac{M_1 + M_2}{2} - \frac{n}{4\pi} \left[ \sin \left( \frac{M_1 2\pi}{n} \right) + \sin \left( \frac{M_2 2\pi}{n} \right) \right].$$

(3)

Let this singular beam have an equivalently azimuthal PG $M_{12} = (M_1 + M_2)/2$.

Substituting this gradient in its state and Eq. (3) gives, respectively,

$$|Mn(M_1, M_2)| = |Mn(M_{12})|$$

and

$$\overline{Mn}(M_{12}) = M_{12} - \cos \left( \frac{\pi n}{M_{12}} \right) \left[ \frac{n}{2\pi} \sin \left( \frac{M_{12} 2\pi}{n} \right) \right].$$

(4)

Equation (4) reveals an additional factor $\cos (\delta \pi/n)$ (compared to Eq. (1)), to the fluctuating amplitude of the sinusoidal function. Similarly, an OAM is observed with referring to the equivalently azimuthal PG by

$$\hat{L} |Mn(M_{12})| - M_{12} |m'\rangle = -\cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \left[ \frac{n}{\pi^2} \sin \left( \frac{M_{12} 2\pi}{n} \right) \right] |m'\rangle$$

in a set of numerous singular lights with respect to $M_{12}$:

$$\text{RMS} [\overline{Mn}(M_{12}) - M_{12}] = \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \text{RMS} [\overline{Mn}(M) - M] = \left| \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \frac{n}{2\sqrt{2}\pi} \right| [h].$$

(5)
This observation presents the difference between OAM mean and $M_{12} \hbar$, as well as the nonmatching degree between numerous PSs of one periodically helical wavefront for various $M$ and two multiples of integer and $n|\cos(\delta \pi/n)|$ of PS of half wave, where $n|\cos(\delta \pi/n)|$ is realised the periodical number of the helical wavefront of singular light per $2\pi \phi$ round. By comparing between Eqs. (2) and (5), the equivalent OAM resolution for the set with $M_{12}$ is $n\hbar|\cos(\delta \pi/n)|$ while this is $n\hbar$ for that with $M$. According to Eq. (5), the proposing-ΔOAM can be quantified continuously, and its lower bound is unlimited to zero when $\delta \mod n = n/2$ for the zero equivalent OAM resolution. Based on the consistence between proposing- and known-UPs, known-ΔOAMs of its composed singular lights all are zero. All states with arbitrary $M_{12}$, i.e. those which are either asymmetrical or symmetrical OAM spectra, have the equal of mean OAM and PS matching by $M_{12} \mod 0$. In the scenario of fractional OAM light, the OAM is precisely defined to arbitrarily fractional state $|Mn(M_{12} \in \mathbb{Q})|$ with value $M_{12}\hbar$, $\delta \mod n = n/2$. This precise state is unselected, therefore correspondent to the linear momentum that is nearly precise for any unselected state, but neither is $|m' \in \mathbb{N}|$, discretely precise by the known-UP. Furthermore, this zero bound leads to a singularity because, in contrast, only those states with symmetric OAM spectra are equal and matching in the case of nonzero proposing-ΔOAM.

Figure 2 illustrates the superposition principle applied to a singular light with two PGs for three $n = 1$ cases of $\delta = 1/3$, 1/2 and 1. In Fig. 2a, the two functions of $\overline{M}(M_1) - M_1$ versus $M_1$ and $\overline{M}(M_2) - M_2$ versus $M_2$ are averaged to a function $\overline{M}(M_{12}) - M_{12}$ versus $M_{12}$, where the red and green markings indicate
these three $\delta$s and three amplitudes of the sinusoidal fluctuation by $\hbar|\cos(\delta\pi)|/2\pi$, respectively. Similarly, the equal between mean OAM and $M_{12}\hbar$, as well as the PS matching of $M_{12} \mod n \cos(\delta\pi/n)/2 = 0$, presents the wave nature of demonstrating the precise state $|Mn(M_{12})|$ with symmetric OAM spectra (see Supplementary II.).

Fig. 2 | Precisely fractional OAM and infinite AP. a, Top and middle panels: three pairs of OAM mean deviations with PSs = 1/3, 1/2 and 1; bottom panel: three OAM mean deviations, each of which results from the average of the corresponding above two deviations; green markings indicate amplitudes of periodic functions of these deviations for $\hbar/4\pi$, 0 and $\hbar/2\pi$. b, Left, middle and right: three simulated intensity images with superpositions of the respective two FVs with (1/3,2/3), (1/3,5/6) and (1/3,4/3), respectively. They vary smoothly with $\phi$ and result in one-half, completely vanishing and identical intensities compared at two edges of respective PS-singularities.

Another important problem is how to define the known-$\Delta$AP for this singular light. The charge difference $\delta$ is such that this singular light is with the helical PS-front and having the PS-singularity at $n$ azimuthally symmetric orientations (see Supplementary
III. According to the proposing-UP, proposing-ΔAP is inversely proportional to proposing-ΔOAM. Because proposing-ΔOAM ratio is \( n \cos(\delta\pi/n) \) with a linear decrease (Eq. (5)) in \( H_{\phi\mu} \), the ratios of proposing-ΔAP and AP range are both \( 1/n \cos(\delta\pi/n) \) with a linear increase, based on a comparison of the singular light with \( M_{12} \) and FV1. Therefore, the proposing-AP range of a set, or the average of all known-AP ranges of its composed singular lights with \( M_{12} \) of \( 2\pi b_{12}/n \cos(\delta\pi/n) \) is \( 2\pi \bar{b}_{12}/n \cos(\delta\pi/n) \), where \( b_{12} \leq 1 \) is used of considering the low intensity at the region of both phase- and PS-singularities. \( b_{12} \) is unknown, but \( \bar{b}_{12} = \bar{b} = 0.915 \) by the constant proportional product. \( 2\pi b_{12}/n \cos(\delta\pi/n) \) is the \( \phi \) range of one periodically helical wavefront of this singular light, based on the concept of which is used in FVn. Small \( (\delta \mod n) - n/2 \) implies bad periodicity. \( 2\pi b_{12}/n \cos(\delta\pi/n) \) can be large that \( 2\pi \), surprised by comparing to the isotropic image intensity whose AP is within in \( 2\pi \) in terms of sector light beam and FVn, but is not surprised for the concept of helical wavefront. This enlarged range results in the image intensity decreases in a sinusoidal square form with respect to \( \phi \). The intensity ratio between two \( \phi \)s those are differenced by \( \Delta \phi \) (\( \in [0, 2\pi] \)) in this beam is evaluated as \( \cos^2(\delta \Delta \phi/2n) \). For two \( \phi \)s at two edges of a section of periodically helical wavefront, its value is \( \cos^2(\delta\pi/n) \).

According to the known-UP\(^4\), the isotropic intensity of round light (\( 2\pi \phi \) range) has the larger known-ΔAP compared with the anisotropic one of sector light (sub-\( 2\pi \phi \) range), because the intensity presents the probability (large \( \phi \) range of image intensity implies large known-AP range). However, the intensity of this singular light is of the property of periodically helical wavefront, not that of slices of sector. In having this periodical
property, the varying intensity of the azimuthally sinusoidal square decrease \( (\delta \neq 0) \) has
the larger known-\( \Delta \text{AP} \) and AP range of \( 2\pi b_{12}/n \left| \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \right| \) compared with the
isotropic intensity \( (\delta = 0) \). As the parameter of \( \phi \) range of intensity to sector light so are
those of \( n \) and \( \delta \) to this singular light. The other viewpoint for the enlarged known-AP
range is provided by the PS-singularity, or an unintegrated phase-singularity (see
Supplementary IV.). Figure 2b shows three intensity images of singular lights made up
of two FVs with PG-pairs of \((1/3,2/3), (1/3,5/6)\) and \((1/3,4/3)\). They are anisotropic,
attributing to the azimuthally varying PSs, or PS-gradient.

Large phase-singularity degree \( d\bar{M}n(M_{12})/dM_{12} = 1 - \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi M_{12}}{n} \right) \)
implies small \( b_{12} \). The visibility of \( d\bar{M}n(M_{12})/dM_{12} \) is the maximum of
\( \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi M_{12}}{n} \right) \), which presents the range of \( b_{12} \), denoted by \( \Delta b_{12} \). This is
smaller than that of \( d\bar{M}n/dM \), the maximum of \( \cos \left( \frac{2\pi M_{12}}{n} \right) \), by \( \left| \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \right| \)
multiple. Small \( \left| \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \right| \) implies small deviation of the known-\( \Delta \text{APs} \) in a set.

\( d\bar{M}n(M_{12})/dM_{12} \) versus \( M_{12} \) for two parameters of \( n \) and \( \delta \) are shown in Fig. S3.
When \( \delta \mod n = n/2 \), both \( d\bar{M}n(M_{12})/dM_{12} = 1 \) and \( b_{12} = \bar{b}_{12} = \bar{b} = 0.915 \) are fixed.
Namely, all the singular lights, having identically infinity known-AP ranges, in a set
gives an infinity proposing-AP range identically by \( 1.83\pi/(n \times 0) \). Cases for the items
of PS, intensity ratio between two edge sides of PS-singularity, and proposing-OAM
and AP ranges, and their products are displayed in Table S1. The superposition made
of three or more FVs with numerous PGs is reduced to that of two in the OAM mean
and PS considered by the equivalently azimuthal PG based on superposition principle.
The proposing-UP reveals that the set of numerous singular lights witnesses a
continuously quantified uncertainty relation with the proportionality constant \( 0.186\hbar \).
on the product of their two underlying uncertainties. The linear OAM operator in $H_n$ results in the unlimited OAM resolution $n\hbar \left| \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \right|$ for a set that consists of numerous singular lights of being with $|Mn(M_{1,1})|$, and the conjugately linear AP space results in each of these lights the unlimited $\phi$ range of $2\pi \hbar_{12}/n \left| \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) \right|$. Large OAM accuracy (better equivalent OAM resolution) implies small AP accuracy (large proposing-AP range), for which the lower and upper bounds of the two uncertainties are zero and infinity, respectively.

Figure 3 shows four uncertainty relations of comparing the four UPs of Heisenberg (red dashed curve), known- (blue curve), proposing- (green curve) and quantum (deep blue point). The deep blue point is made by the product $\hbar/2\sqrt{10}$ on the two underlined uncertainties of OAM and AP of the entangled photon pairs, the square root of an order of magnitude stronger than that is allowed by the known-UP for independent photons at the limit of small known-\(\Delta\text{AP}\). The pink point presents a pair of observables that is held by both known- and proposing-UPS as $\Delta\text{AP} = 1.66$ radian and $\Delta\text{OAM}\Delta\text{AP} = 0.186 \hbar$. All the correlations of OAM and AP with the unselected proposing-\(\Delta\text{AP}\) in a set of numerous singular lights is 2.68 times of magnitude stronger than that at the limit of small known-\(\Delta\text{AP}\) in a sector light beam. The red dashed and green curves are parallel, which presents the correspondence of unselected proposing-\(\Delta\text{AP}\) and unselected position uncertainty $\Delta x$ between two correlations in a set of numerous singular light beams and in a particle, respectively.
**Fig. 3 | Correspondence between the proposing- and Heisenberg UPs.** Robertson bound of $\Delta x$ (red), three angular uncertainty relation bounds of known-$\Delta AP$s for a light beam (blue), the entangled photon pairs (deep blue) and proposing-$\Delta AP$ for a set of numerous light beams (green). One pink point is intersected between the blue and green curves.

**Generation of singular light with $M_{12}$ and macroscopy example**

We employ the concept of light beams superimposition as a direct superposition manner for generating a singular light beam with $M_{12}$. We add the concept of photons statistic into this superimposition of demonstrating the image is photonically accumulated. These two concepts are achieved by using an interference device, as depicted in the top of Fig. 4a\(^2\) (see Supplementary V.). Three images of singular light beams with (0, 1/3), (0, 1/2) and (0, 1) are shown in the bottom of Fig 4a. The property of fractional OAM with $\delta$ is achieved of showing their intensities by the azimuthally sinusoidal square decrease, which are comparable to those in Fig. 2b.

A system having the simultaneous and same-$\phi$ coordinate phase-singularity and PS-singularity is not restrained to a cylinder. As shown in Fig. 4b, the optical speckle is a far-field intensity image (right) obtained by passing a laser through a diffuser (left). This system belongs to the plane but is without the mechanical effect of OAM instead (see Supplementary VI.). It is a macroscopy level example of proposing-UP in addition to the microscopy level example of photon OAM mentioned earlier. The proposing-UP presents the physics meaning of higher image contrast whereas the Heisenberg UP presents that of larger object scale for another correspondence of revealing the particle-like behavior of wave-particle duality.
**Fig. 4** | **Experimental witness and illustration.** *a,* Top panel: the setup used to superpose a Gaussian beam and FV; bottom panel: experimentally obtained images of three near-field singular light beams with \((0,1/3), (0,1/2)\) and \((0,1)\). *b,* Top: the setup used to generate far-field image of the light after passing through a diffuser; bottom: the optical speckle, which is a Euclidean system with both phase- and PS-singularities.

**Conclusion and Discussion**

The proposing-UP with the scenario of fractional OAM states the uncertainty relation between the OAM and AP in a set of numerous singular light beams, associated with the nature of waves and relied on two linearly conjugated states of OAM and AP. This UP is meaningful in the correspondence with the Heisenberg UP by demonstrating the any pairs of either precise OAM or precise AP and a macroscopy example of particle-like behavior. All the correlations of the OAM and AP in this set is stronger than that at the limit of precise AP in a sector light by 2.86 times. Table S2 compares numerous characteristics for these two angular UPs.

A generalized version of known-UP should state the OAM and AP in a singular light with \(M_{12}\) for the nonlimited OAM resolution\(^{28}\). The difference is small in both the known-\(\Delta\)AP and \(\Delta\)OAM between these singular lights for the large proposing-\(\Delta\)AP, or small proposing \(\Delta\)OAM, of their set, which is for the facilitation of their applying. Table S3 compares the known- and proposing-\(\Delta\)APs and \(\Delta\)OAMs for the singular light.
The \( n \)-sectional periodically helical wavefront embedded with the twofold PS functions (see Supplementary III.), as well as the gained AP escaped from convention \( 2\pi \), promises the wider OAM degree of freedom, thereby extending the existing topics to make them applicable in various fields of science\(^7\text{-}^20\). Namely, the realization and verification of these topics with the utilization of fractional OAM light will be accompanied by proposing-UP.
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I. OAM association with wave nature
The states with $M \text{ mod } n/2 = 0$ present an equal between OAM mean and $M\hbar$ and a matching between the PS of one periodically helical wavefront and two multiples of integer and periodical number of PS of half wave. One part of $M \text{ mod } n = 0$ is with the phase-singularity of minimum phase-jump zero, and the other part of $M \text{ mod } n = n/2$ is with the phase-singularity of maximum phase-jump $\pi$. While the former is the OAM eigenstate, it is noteworthy in the latter since its non-eigenstate. These eigenstate and non-eigenstate have equal shifts in the phase of a wave. Namely, in sine wave, $\pi$ phase departs the equal PS between two phases of zero and $2\pi$, and vice versa, which results in the symmetric OAM spectra for $FV_{ns}$ with phase-singularities of zero and $\pi$ phase-jumps and the equaling of their mean OAM and $M\hbar$.

II. Symmetric OAM spectrum for precise OAM state
The left, middle, and right plots, shown in Fig. S1, show six symmetric spectra obtained for six states with $M_{12}$ composed of the PG-pairs $(M_1, M_2)$ of $(-1/6, 1/6)$, $(1/3, 2/3)$, $(-1/4, 1/4)$, $(1/4, 3/4)$, $(-1/2, 1/2)$ and $(0, 1)^{23}$. The 1st, 3rd and 5th and 2nd, 4th and 6th terms correspond to $M_{12} = 0$ and $1/2$, respectively. They have the max and min phase-jumps of presenting the wave nature by the PS matching of $M_{12} \text{ mod } n \cos(\delta\pi/n)/2 = 0$ and the equal OAM mean and $M_{12}\hbar$.

![Fig. S1](image)

**Fig. S1** | Wave nature in singular light with $M_{12}$. Left, middle and right: two OAM spectra for $\delta = 1/3$, 1/2 and 1, respectively, with singular light beams having $M_{12} = 0$ and 1/2. All of them are symmetric.

III. Helical PS-front
PS is one of the wave properties, which is used frequently for the Gaussian light with planar wavefront, and is equivalent to the $m$ multiple of geometry phase (Berry phase) for the optical vortex with helical wavefront. Namely, it is functional in intensity variation but none in profile for both the Gaussian light and optical vortex$^{23}$. However, PS is a function for connected the intensity and profile for $FV_{n}^{23}$. Further, a singular light beam with a superposition made of two different PGs $M_1$ and $M_2 = M_1 + \delta$ has the azimuthally continuous variation decrease in image intensity. This reveals the
second function utilization of PS, and the relation between OAM and AP of this singular light is conjugately held by the generalized version of known-UP with the equivalent OAM resolution. Similar to the phenomenon of the helical wavefront, the equal PS is helical round the beam propagation axis of this singular light beam as the helical PS-front. The gradient of this helical PS-front (named as PS-gradient), denoted \( \delta M \), is equal to the charge difference between these two PGs by \( \delta M = M_2 - M_1 = \delta \). A PS-singularity exists, termed for the discontinuity of helical PS-front, at the \( n \) APs used exactly for the phase-singularity. This presents the interference degree in its located cylindrical coordinate system, as shown in Fig. 2b.

Fig. S2 depicts the relationship of beam cross-sections between the phases of two FVs with \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) and the PS of the superposed singular light with \( M_{12} \). Three PG-pairs of \((1/3,2/3)\), \((1/3,5/6)\) and \((1/3,4/3)\) are used in three groups of respective three beam cross-sections (shown in left, middle and right columns, respectively). Each group shows six and three texts, indicated respectively by the left two and right one beam cross-sections, present the phases for two FVs and the PSs for a singular light beam at two edge sides of phase-singularity and their symmetric orientation, respectively. The three differences for PS-pairs, or PS-jump, are obtained as \( 2\pi/3, \pi \) and \( 2\pi \).

**Fig. S2 | Schematic showing helical PS-front.** Left and middle: relative phases for two beam cross-sections with PGs of \((1/3,2/3)\), \((1/3,5/6)\) and \((1/3,4/3)\). Right: relative PSs for the beam cross-section superposed with two phases of the left and middle cross-sections. The differences between two PSs at two edge sides of phase-singularity of these three cross-sections, or three PS jumps, for these three phase-pair are \( 2\pi/3, \pi \) and \( 2\pi \), respectively.

**IV. AP range viewed by phase-singularity integration**

The uncertainty ratio between two singular light beams with \( M_{12} \) and \( M \) also can be proven from the viewpoint of PS-singularity. A phase-singularity exists conventionally in FV\( n \) for the identical intensity in its two edge sides. With regarding to the conventional phase-singularity, the phase-singularity is not integrated for the inequality intensity in its two edge sides, known as the PS-singularity here, each of which
contributes a factor \( r \). Meaningfully, this ratio is equivalently to the uncertainty ratio. The product with two edge-intensities equals the product of two factors 
\[
1 \times \cos^2 \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) = r \times r \quad \text{and} \quad r = \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right).
\]
Large unintegrated phase-singularity implies large AP range, and the phase-singularity is destroyed completely as \( \delta = n/2 \). As an example of \((1/3,5/6)\) in the middle column of Fig. 2b, the intensity in one side of PS-singularity is zero whereas that in the other side remains unchanged, because of the completely destructive and constructive interferences, respectively.

V. Experimental generation of singular light with \( M_{12} \)

In Fig. 4a, the Gaussian beam \( M = 0 \) and the hologram (H) generation FV beams of \( M = 1/3 \), \( 1/2 \) and \( 1 \) are superposed by a beam splitter (BS) and then recorded using an integrable and the air-cooling charge-coupled device (CCD), respectively. Their intensities are identical, controlled by two half-wave plates and a polarized beamsplitter (PBS). Their phases are identical in \( \phi = 0 \), controlled by a piezo (PZ) stage. They are imaged from H onto the chip of CCD by using a lens\(^{29}\). The demonstration is working at the single photon level, achieved by placing neutral density (ND) filters in front of the PBS. This is to attenuate the power of laser beam \( P \) to below 0.6 \( \text{nW} \) for the distance in either one of the optical paths between the PBS and BS \( L = 16 \text{ cm} \) by \( PL/\varepsilon c < 1^{27} \), where \( \varepsilon \) and \( c \) are the photon energy and light velocity, respectively. An interference filter is used for the laser wavelength to avoid the scattering lights. The power is detected as 0.2 \( \text{nW} \) between the ND and PBS by a power meter.

VI. UP in optical speckle

In Fig. 4b, all regions of the images have the various PSs those are difference between numerous wave phases those are generated by the grains of the diffuser. There are different image contrasts defined by pairs of the brighter and darker regions those are adjacent to each other in arbitrary directions and curve slopes. They respectively represent the interferences of the smaller and larger PSs, whose maximum is \( \pi \). The regions between the pairs of the brighter and darker parts presents the various PSs. All these parts together indicate the existence of PS-singularities of different degrees in a Euclidean system. In this system, these arbitrary directions and curve slopes of chaotic phase fronts doesn’t contribute to the OAM with respect to any axis. Moreover, the pairs of the brightest and darkest (vanished) intensities regions those are adjacent to each other represents the highest contrast; the difference of their PSs is equals to \( \pi \). The pair with only one region is with the brightest or darkest intensity does not present the highest contrast, because the difference of the two PSs of the pair is less than \( \pi \). As one of the statements of the proposing-UP, large difference of the two PSs of one pair, as
well as high contrast, of the adjacent regions, implies the small ΔOAM. In the extreme case, the OAM is precise, in the region pairs with the highest image contrast. The larger difference is similar to particle behavior of wave-particle duality. According to Heisenberg UP, large object scale (large position uncertainty), such as people, implies small linear momentum uncertainty, which reveals the particle behavior.

Fig. S3. Degree of phase-singularity for singular light with $M_{12}$. The degree of phase-singularity $d \ln(M_{12}) / dM_{12}$ versus $M_{12}$ for $n = 1$ and $\delta = 0, 1/3$ and $1/2$ and $n = 3$ and $\delta = 0$ are plotted in orange, green, red and blue, respectively. The visibilities of degrees of their phase-singularities are 1, 1/2, 0 and 1, respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS $\delta (n)$</th>
<th>Intensity ratio</th>
<th>OAM range $= \cos^2 \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right)$</th>
<th>AP range $= \frac{1}{n \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right)}$</th>
<th>OAM range $\times$ AP range</th>
<th>$[h, \bar{h}]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\sqrt{2}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$[2\pi \bar{h}_1, \bar{h}_1 = 0.915]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{4}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{3}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{4}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$, singularity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>0$\times\infty$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{2}{3}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{4}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{3}{4}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{2}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angular UP</td>
<td>proposing-UP</td>
<td>known-UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
<td>a set of numerous singular light beams</td>
<td>a sector light beam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensity image in near-field</strong></td>
<td>$n$-sectional and azimuthally sinusoidal square decreasing</td>
<td>slices of isotropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔOAM [h]</strong></td>
<td>the nonmatching degree between the PS of one periodically helical wavefront and either $n \cos (\delta \pi / n) \pi$ or zero;</td>
<td>the range of OAM eigenmodes; from large value to zero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\frac{n}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) = \frac{n}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \sim \frac{n}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \times 0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Precise OAM state</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Mn(M_{12}), \delta \mod n = \frac{n}{2}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>OAM eigenstate $</td>
<td>m\rangle$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔAP [radian]</strong></td>
<td>$\phi$ range of one periodically helical wavefront;</td>
<td>$\phi$ range of intensity image; from small value to $\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\frac{1.66}{n} \cos \left( \frac{\delta \pi}{n} \right) = \frac{1.66}{n} \sim \frac{1.66}{n} \times \infty$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product [h]</strong></td>
<td>from $0.186$ to $0.186 \times \infty$</td>
<td>from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S3 | Comparison between the known- and proposing-ΔAPs and ΔOAMs for singular light

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>known-defined for a singular light with $M_{12}$</th>
<th>proposing-defined for a set of numerous singular lights, or the average of known-defined for ensemble singular lights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔAP [radian]</strong></td>
<td>$\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}} h_{12} \cdot \cos\left(\frac{\delta \pi}{n}\right)$, $h_{12} \leq 1$; $h_{12}$ is unknown and deviates by $\Delta h_{12}$</td>
<td>$\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}} b_{12} = \frac{1.66}{n \cos\left(\frac{\delta \pi}{n}\right)}$, $b_{12} = 0.915$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔOAM [ℏ]</strong></td>
<td>$n \cos\left(\frac{\delta \pi}{n}\right) \frac{g_{12}}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}$, $g_{12} \geq 0$; $g_{12}$ is unknown and deviates by $\Delta g_{12}$, except zero is obtained for $M \mod n = 0$, $g_{12} = 0$</td>
<td>$n \cos\left(\frac{\delta \pi}{n}\right) \frac{\bar{g}<em>{12}}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} = n \cos\left(\frac{\delta \pi}{n}\right) \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}$, $\bar{g}</em>{12} = 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relation</strong></td>
<td>$\Delta \text{OAM} = \left[n \cos\left(\frac{\delta \pi}{n}\right)\right]^2 \lambda \Delta \text{AP}$</td>
<td>$\Delta \text{OAM} \Delta \text{AP} = 0.186 \hbar$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case of $\delta \mod n = \frac{n}{2}$</strong></td>
<td>$\Delta h_{12} = 0$, all known-ΔAPs are certain to be a known-ΔAP, a proposing-ΔAP = $\infty$;</td>
<td>$\Delta g_{12} = 0$, all known-ΔOAMs certain to be a known-ΔOAM, a proposing-ΔOAM = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$dM_n\left(M_{12}\right) = dM_{12}$, fixed
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