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#### Abstract

The paper "Physics without determinism: Alternative interpretations of classical physics" [Phys. Rev. A, 100:062107, Dec 2019] defines finite information quantities (FIQ). A FIQ expresses the available information about the value of a physical quantity. We show that a change in the measurement unit does not preserve the information carried by a FIQ, and therefore that the definition provided in the paper is not complete.


The expression of the state of knowledge about a measurand as a probabilitiy distribution (or some summary of it, such as its mean and standard deviation) is the conventional approach for expressing a measurement result [1-4]. However, it does not intuitively parallel the much more immediate concepts of "certain" and "uncertain digits" that every experimentalist feels when taking note of a measurement outcome in the lab notebook.

In [5], Del Santo and Gisin introduce the concept of finite information quantities (FIQ). A FIQ ranging in the interval $[0,1]$ is expressed by the binary number $Q=0 . Q_{1} Q_{2} Q_{3} \ldots$, where the individual bits $Q_{k}$ are Bernoulli random variables having propensities $q_{k}$ for the realisation of the case $Q_{k}=1$. A specific FIQ $Q$ is thus defined by the vector of propensities $\boldsymbol{q}=\left[q_{1}, q_{2}, \ldots, q_{k}, \ldots, q_{M}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \ldots\right]$ of its bits $Q_{k}$; it is assumed that $q_{k}=\frac{1}{2}$ for $k>M$, i.e., all bits beyond position $M$ have a $50 \%$ propensity of being either 0 or 1 and therefore carry no information. Only a finite number $M$ of propensities are needed to specify $Q$.

The FIQ concept is very appealing and it is tempting to adopt it to express the value and uncertainty of a quantity as an alternative to probability distributions. However, for the concept of FIQ to become a practical alternative to the current way of representing the state of knowledge about a quantity, it is mandatory that calculations with them be possible and, hopefully, simple.

Consider for example the expression of the value of a quantity, traditionally written as $Q=\{Q\}[U]$, where $\{Q\}$ is the numerical value and $[U]$ is the unit. Changing the unit to $U^{\prime}=U / L, L$ being a constant, implies $Q=\left\{Q^{\prime}\right\}\left[U^{\prime}\right]$, with $\left\{Q^{\prime}\right\}=L\{Q\}$. So, even such an elementary tranformation as the change of measurement unit implies the multiplication of a FIQ by a constant.

Indeed, the FIQ definition suggests that it is possible to identify simple, practical calculation rules operating on the finite (and, intuitively, small) number of indeterminate bits and their propensities; rules suitable to be converted in efficient computation algorithms.

The arithmetic relevant to a unit change (Appendix A) shows that the transformation $Q^{\prime}=L Q$ generates bits $Q_{k}^{\prime}$ of $Q^{\prime}$ which are not mutually independent even if the original $Q_{k}$ bits are independent. Therefore, expressing $Q^{\prime}$ by providing only the propensities $q_{k}^{\prime}$ of its individual bits deletes some of the original information.

Random variables $Q$ with independent binary digits $Q_{k}$ have been considered in mathematical literature [6-8]. In general, $Q$ has a 'reasonable' probability density function (pdf) only if the $q_{k}$ satisfy strict conditions, and in that case the pdf is necessarily an exponential [6]; otherwise, it becomes a fractal [7], hence difficult to associate with a physical quantity.

In conclusion, it appears that a specification of the state of knowledge about a quantity $Q$ by means of a FIQ should also include information on the dependencies among the $Q_{k}$, and therefore that, although the FIQ concept might be physically sound and useful, its definition as given in [5] is not complete, and deserves further development.

## Appendix A: Minimal FIQ maths

A FIQ arithmetics can be established by generalizing operations on binary numbers. The sum $S=Q+R=0 . S_{1} S_{2} S_{3} \ldots$ of two FIQs, $Q=0 . Q_{1} Q_{2} Q_{3} \ldots$ and $R=0 . R_{1} R_{2} R_{3} \ldots$, is given by the full adder rule, Tab. II.

| $Q_{k}$ | $R_{k}$ | $C_{k+1}$ | $S_{k}$ | $C_{k}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

TABLE I. Binary full adder truth table. $C_{k}$ is the carry bit.

If $\boldsymbol{q}$ is the vector of propensities associated with $Q$, and $\boldsymbol{r}$ with $R$, then under the as-
sumption of independence of $q_{k}$ and $r_{k}$, the propensity $s_{k}$ of each sum bit $S_{k}$ can be written as the sum of the four propensities of the $S_{k}=1$ cases in Tab. If:

$$
\begin{align*}
s_{k}= & \left(1-q_{k}\right)\left(1-r_{k}\right) c_{k+1}+\left(1-q_{k}\right) r_{k}\left(1-c_{k+1}\right) \\
& +q_{k}\left(1-r_{k}\right)\left(1-c_{k+1}\right)+q_{k} r_{k} c_{k+1} \\
= & q_{k}+r_{k}+c_{k+1} \\
& -2\left(q_{k} r_{k}+q_{k} c_{k+1}+r_{k} c_{k+1}\right)+4 q_{k} r_{k} c_{k+1} \tag{A1}
\end{align*}
$$

and similarly the propensity $c_{k}$ of the carry bit $C_{k}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{k}=q_{k} r_{k}+q_{k} c_{k+1}+r_{k} c_{k+1}-2 q_{k} r_{k} c_{k+1} \tag{A2}
\end{equation*}
$$

For example for the case $c_{k+1}=\frac{1}{2}$, we have $s_{k}=\frac{1}{2}$ and $c_{k}=\frac{1}{2}\left(q_{k}+r_{k}\right)$ : the information provided by $q_{k}$ and $r_{k}$ is transferred, through the carry bit $C_{k}$, to bit $S_{k-1}$.

Multiplication by a deterministic constant $L$ can be performed by repeated shifting and addition. Table 【I gives a simple example. If $P=L Q$, where $\boldsymbol{q}=\left[0,0, q_{3}, \frac{1}{2} \ldots\right]$ and

| 0. | 0 | 0 | $Q_{3}$ | $\ldots$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\times$ |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| 0. | 0 | 0 | $Q_{3}$ | $\ldots$ |
| +0. | 0 | $Q_{3}$ | $Q_{4}$ | $\ldots$ |
| $=0$. | $P_{1}$ | $P_{2}$ | $P_{3}$ | $\ldots$ |

TABLE II. Multiplication table, $P=L Q$ where $Q=0.0 Q_{2} Q_{3} \ldots$ and $L=(11)_{2}=(3)_{10}$.
$L=(11)_{2}=(3)_{10}$, then

$$
\begin{align*}
& p_{1}=\frac{1}{2} q_{3}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} q_{3}, \\
& p_{2}=q_{3}-q_{3}^{2}+\frac{1}{4}, \\
& p_{3}=\frac{1}{2}, \quad \ldots \tag{A3}
\end{align*}
$$

The propensity of occurrence of specific digit couples can also be computed. For example, denoting as $p_{12}$ the propensity of the event $\left\{P_{1}=1, P_{2}=1\right\}$ we have $p_{12}=0$ (to have $P_{1}=1$, it should occur that $Q_{3}=1$ and $C_{3}=1$ at the same time, hence $C_{2}=1$. However,
the case $\left\{Q_{3}=1, C_{3}=1\right\}$ always generates $P_{2}=0$, so $\left\{P_{1}=1, P_{2}=1\right\}$ is never possible). Since $p_{12}=0 \neq p_{1} p_{2}$, bits $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ are not independent.
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