

Stronger sum uncertainty relations for non-Hermitian operators

Xiao-Feng Song, Yi-Fang Ren, Shuang Liu, Xi-Hao Chen and Yusuf Turek*

¹*School of Physics, Liaoning University, Shenyang, Liaoning 110036, China*

(Dated: July 31, 2024)

Unlike the uncertainty relationships of two arbitrary incompatible observables represented by the product of variances in the past, representing them by the sum of variances is better as it guarantees to be nontrivial for two incompatible operators in some special cases. Although the uncertainty relation is formulated as the sum of variances for unitary operators has been confirmed, its general forms for arbitrary non-Hermitian operators have not been yet investigated in detail. Thus, this study develops four sum uncertainty relations for arbitrary non-Hermitian operators acting on system states by utilizing an appropriate Hilbert-space metric. The compatible forms of our sum inequalities with the conventional quantum mechanics are also provided via G -metric formalism. Concrete examples demonstrate the validity of the purposed sum uncertainty relations in both \mathcal{PT} -symmetric and \mathcal{PT} -broken phases. The proposed methods and results can help the reader to understand in-depth the usefulness of G -metric formalism in non-Hermitian quantum mechanics and the sum uncertainty relations of incompatible operators within.

I. INTRODUCTION

The uncertainty principle (UP) and uncertainty relations (URs) are crucial in quantum mechanics, offering insights into the behavior of microscopic systems. Initially formulated by Heisenberg [1], the principle provides a fundamental constraint on the simultaneous measurement precision of canonically conjugate observables, setting a lower bound on their product of errors and disturbances. The Heisenberg uncertainty principle is a cornerstone in quantum mechanics, fundamentally affecting the understanding of physical systems by establishing intrinsic limits on the precision of certain pairs of observables. However, Heisenberg's original statement referred to the error and disturbance in a measurement process, which depended on measurement techniques. With the development of quantum measurement theory and the related techniques, recently, the incorrectness [2], modifications [3–7], and the violations [8–10] of Heisenberg's measurement-disturbance relationship owing to weak measurements were investigated. It should be noted that Heisenberg's original proposal was different compared to its current interpretation. Kennard [11] and Weyl [12] provided the textbook forms of the position and momentum of UR based on their variances. Roberston [13] rigorously established the Heisenberg uncertainty relation for pairs over the state $|\psi\rangle$ as

$$\Delta A^2 \Delta B^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} |\langle \psi | [A, B] | \psi \rangle|^2. \quad (1)$$

where ΔA and ΔB are the variances of non-commuting Hermitian operators, defined as $\Delta A = \sqrt{\langle A^2 \rangle - \langle A \rangle^2}$ and $\Delta B = \sqrt{\langle B^2 \rangle - \langle B \rangle^2}$, and $\langle X \rangle = \langle \psi | X | \psi \rangle$ is the average of an operator X in state $|\psi\rangle$. The $[A, B] = AB - BA$ denotes the commutator of A and B . Unlike

Heisenberg's original measurement-disturbance relationship, the Roberston UR presented above is independent of any specific measurement. Notably, the inequality may become trivial even when considering that A and B are incompatible with some system states, which can be derived by applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. In 1930, Schrödinger [14] improved this relation by adding an expectation value term of an anti-commutator $\{A, B\}$ on the right-hand side (RHS). However, this improved form still suffered from the trivial cases mentioned above.

In addition to the Roberston and Schrödinger relations, many other URs have been proposed. URs are useful for a wide range of applications, including quantum foundation [15, 16], quantum random number generation [17, 18], entanglement detection [19–21], quantum spin squeezing [22–26], quantum metrology [27–30], and quantum information science [31–35], etc. Notably, most URs are formulated in conventional quantum mechanics (CQM), where the operators are assumed to be Hermitian. Nevertheless, Hermiticity is an axiom of quantum mechanics that guarantees probability preservation and a real spectrum. In 1998, Bender [36] proved that the strict Hermiticity requirement for a system to have a real spectrum can be replaced with the less restrictive condition of \mathcal{PT} symmetry. In a \mathcal{PT} symmetric system, the eigenspectrum of that system is real even though its corresponding Hamiltonian is non-Hermitian, which has gained a wide interest for non-Hermitian quantum mechanics (NHQM). In \mathcal{PT} -invariant non-Hermitian systems [37–39], a transition occurs that divides them into two phases: one where the system exhibits \mathcal{PT} symmetry with a completely real spectrum, and another where \mathcal{PT} symmetry is broken, leading to a spectrum comprising complex conjugate pairs, either entirely or partially. In recent years, URs were also investigated in NHQM theoretically [40–45] and experimentally [46–49].

As noticed, in CQM and NHQM, most URs are based on the product of variances $\Delta A^2 \Delta B^2$ of the observables. However, those products of variances can be zero even if one of the variances is nonzero, which is trivial. There-

* yusufu1984@hotmail.com

fore, these earlier uncertainty relations fail to completely capture the incompatibility among the observables in the system state. Interestingly, recent studies focus on sum URs since they are nontrivial whenever the operators are incompatible with the state. In Ref. [50], Maccone and Pati established a pair of URs for sums of variances in CQM, consistently yielding nontrivial bounds even in the case of observable eigenstates. In Ref. [45], the sum URs for general unitary operators has been investigated in detail. It is known that in open quantum systems there is a variety of non-Hermitian operators, such as unitary operators, ladder operators, and effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. Thus, the sum URs investigated in Ref. [45] only represent the special case of sum URs in NHQM. Furthermore, that study did not consider the G -metric formalism of NHQM.

This study investigates the URs in non-Hermitian systems by considering the G -metric formalism. As investigated in [51–53], directly applying the axioms and theorems of CQM to non-Hermitian systems may conflict with certain theoretical principles, which are fundamental in quantum physics. Therefore, a modified non-Hermitian quantum mechanics (NHQM) formulation has been developed [54] based on Hilbert space geometry. This formulation is consistent with the CQM for Hermitian systems by employing the Hermitian positive definite matrix G alongside generalized operators, to ensure the probability is time-invariant. For every nonzero $|\psi(t)\rangle$, one chooses $\langle\psi(t)|G(t)|\psi(t)\rangle > 0$, so that G is positive definite and the probability is time invariant. It was shown that the NHQM does not violate the theorems in CQM, including the no-go theorems if the state and adjoint operators are modified by G -metric construction. Additionally, unlike the Dirac inner product used in CQM, \mathcal{PT} -symmetric quantum theory can effectively utilize the G -inner product. Indeed, CQM emerges as a particular instance within the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric NHQM, specifically under the G -metric inner product formalism. As a fundamental cornerstone of quantum mechanics, URs should also preserve their validity in NHQM. In Ref. [44], the researchers presented a very elegant form of UR of two non-compatible non-Hermitian operators using the G -metric formalism. Nevertheless, its corresponding sum relation has not yet been investigated. Thus, reassessing the sum URs of NHQM by taking the G -metric formalism into account is mandatory.

This paper investigates the nontrivial lower bound for the sum of the variances applied to general non-Hermitian observables in NHQM. Additionally, this work provides rigorous proof for it. Then, the bounds of the proposed sum URs are strengthened within the G -inner product framework. We also employ the general good observable condition to construct the modified compatible forms of URs with CQM. Additionally, we observed similarities in their mathematical forms by comparing the derived URs with their counterparts in CQM. The theoretical results are verified numerically by employing two distinct examples.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Sec. II provides explicit details on the derivations of the four sum URs developed for arbitrary two non-Hermitian operators and presents the modified forms in terms of G -metric formalism. Sec. III, presents two different examples to prove the validity of our sum URs in all NHQM realms, including \mathcal{PT} -symmetric and \mathcal{PT} -symmetry broken phases, and discusses the results. Sec. IV, gives some discussions and concludes this work.

II. SUM URs FOR NON-HERMITIAN OPERATORS

This section introduces four URs for two incompatible non-Hermitian operators. These relations are discussed within the NHQM framework and in its G -metric formalism. This section also provides the form of these inequalities under the condition of good observables [44].

First and second inequalities: Let A and B be two arbitrary non-Hermitian operators in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , i.e. $A^\dagger \neq A$ and $B^\dagger \neq B$. In this Hilbert space, the scalar product of the arbitrary state vector φ and its related norm are defined as $\langle\varphi, \varphi\rangle = \int \varphi^* \varphi d\tau$ and $\|\varphi\| = \sqrt{\langle\varphi, \varphi\rangle}$, respectively. The self-adjoint of an operator X in the Hilbert space is denoted as X^\dagger and defined by $\langle\varphi, X\psi\rangle = \langle X^\dagger\varphi, \psi\rangle$, $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$. Then, for $\hat{X} = X - \langle X\rangle$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{X}\varphi\|^2 &= \|(X - \langle X\rangle)\varphi\|^2 \\ &= \langle X^\dagger X\rangle - \langle X^\dagger\rangle\langle X\rangle = \Delta X^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\langle X\rangle = \langle\varphi, X\varphi\rangle = \langle\varphi|X|\varphi\rangle$ and ΔX is the variance of the operator X over $|\varphi\rangle$.

Let the new operator be $X_\alpha = \hat{A} - i\alpha\hat{B}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. From Eq. (2) one can obtain [43]

$$\|X_\alpha\varphi\|^2 = \alpha^2\|\hat{B}\varphi\|^2 + \alpha C_{A,B;\varphi} + \|\hat{A}\varphi\|^2, \quad (3)$$

where $\|\hat{A}\varphi\|^2 = \Delta A^2$ and $\|\hat{B}\varphi\|^2 = \Delta B^2$, and $C_{A,B;\varphi} = -i\langle\hat{A}^\dagger\hat{B} - \hat{B}^\dagger\hat{A}\rangle$ is real, satisfied for all values of α . Since $\|X_\alpha\varphi\|^2 \geq 0$, if $\alpha = -1$, the sum of the variances of A and B obeys the UR presented below

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq 2\Im[Cov(A, B)]. \quad (4)$$

Here, the covariance of A and B is defined as $Cov(A, B) = \langle\hat{A}^\dagger\hat{B}\rangle = \langle A^\dagger B\rangle - \langle A^\dagger\rangle\langle B\rangle$. Another new operator can be defined $Y_\alpha = \hat{A} + \alpha\hat{B}$, which is a linear combination of \hat{A} and \hat{B} . For this operator, the relation presented below is held as

$$\|Y_\alpha\varphi\|^2 = \alpha^2\|\hat{B}\varphi\|^2 + \alpha D_{A,B;\varphi} + \|\hat{A}\varphi\|^2 \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

where $D_{A,B;\varphi} = \langle\hat{A}^\dagger\hat{B} + \hat{B}^\dagger\hat{A}\rangle$, which has a real value. Notably, Eq. (5) is invariant under various α values,

where α may take any arbitrary values. Specifically, for $\alpha = -1$, it brings the sum UR as

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq 2\Re[Cov(A, B)]. \quad (6)$$

Since the left-hand sides (LHS) of Ineqs. (4) and (6) are the real and imaginary parts of same quantity, we can rewrite them as

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq 2\max\{\Re[Cov(A, B)], \Im[Cov(A, B)]\}. \quad (7)$$

This is the proof of our first and second inequalities.

For a given non-Hermitian system described by the Hamiltonian $H \neq H^\dagger$, the above relations can be expressed in the G -metric formalism [54]. The G -metric is necessary for NHQM to guarantee the probability conservation in time. $G(t)$ has to be Hermitian, positive definite, and satisfy the motion equation for the conserved probability [54]:

$$\partial G_t(t) = i[G(t)H(t) - H^\dagger(t)G(t)]. \quad (8)$$

Thus, for a given $H(t)$ of a system, there is always a corresponding G -metric. In this new formalism of NHQM, the state and adjoint operators have some modifications. For the G -metric, the bra vector $\langle\psi(t)|$ has no distinction between the conventional $\langle\psi(t)|$. However, the dual corresponding vectors are not just the Hermitian conjugate of the conventional vectors but are also subject to a linear map as $\langle\langle\psi(t)| = \langle\psi(t)|G(t)$. Hence, in the G -metric formalism, the inner product and expectation value of A under the state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ in CQM, $\langle\psi|\psi\rangle$ and $\langle A \rangle = \langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle$, can be expressed as

$$\langle\langle\psi|\psi\rangle\rangle = \langle\psi|G|\psi\rangle, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\langle A \rangle_G = \langle\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle\rangle = \langle\psi|GA|\psi\rangle, \quad (10)$$

respectively. On the other hand, the adjoint operator A^\dagger of A changed to $A^\dagger \rightarrow G^{-1}A^\dagger G$. Thus, in the G -metric, the arbitrary new operator $\hat{X} = X - \langle X \rangle$ and its adjoint one are modified to

$$\hat{X} \rightarrow \hat{X}_G = X - \langle X \rangle_G, \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{X}^\dagger \rightarrow \hat{X}_G^\dagger = G^{-1}X^\dagger G - \langle\psi|X^\dagger G|\psi\rangle. \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, in the G -metric formalism, the conventional covariance function $Cov(A, B)$ is modified to $Cov_g(A, B) = \langle\hat{A}^\dagger\hat{B}\rangle_g = \langle A^\dagger GB \rangle - \langle A^\dagger G \rangle \langle GB \rangle$. Thus, by using the above modifications of the state vector and adjoint operators corresponding to the G -metric formalism in NHQM, the sum of the variances of ΔA^2 and ΔB^2 [see Ineqs. (4) and (6)] are modified as

$$\Delta A_g^2 + \Delta B_g^2 \geq 2\Im[Cov_g(A, B)], \quad (13)$$

and

$$\Delta A_g^2 + \Delta B_g^2 \geq 2\Re[Cov_g(A, B)], \quad (14)$$

respectively. Here, the LHS terms of the above relations represent the variances of the incompatible non-Hermitian operators A and B in the G -metric formalism, which is defined as

$$\Delta A_g^2 = \langle A^\dagger GA \rangle - \langle A^\dagger G \rangle \langle GA \rangle, \quad (15)$$

and

$$\Delta B_g^2 = \langle B^\dagger GB \rangle - \langle B^\dagger G \rangle \langle GB \rangle, \quad (16)$$

respectively.

In the G -metric formalism of quantum mechanics, the Hermiticity condition on the operator X can be replaced by a more general and convenient condition, called “*good observable*” [54]. Thus, if $X^\dagger G = GX$, then X is a *good observable*. As investigated in previous studies, the *good observable* can be either Hermitian or non-Hermitian [38, 44]. Eq. (8) infers that all Hermitian operators are good observables under the Dirac product when G is a unit operator, i.e., $G = \mathbb{I}$. However, for non-Hermitian systems, the determination of a good observable depends on the G -metric, which exhibits distinct characteristics in the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric and \mathcal{PT} -broken phases. Thus, if the operators A and B adhere to the condition of good observables, $A^\dagger G = GA$ and $B^\dagger G = GB$, the URs in Ineqs. (13) and (14) can be further expressed as

$$\Delta A_G^2 + \Delta B_G^2 \geq i\langle [B, A] \rangle_G, \quad (17)$$

and

$$\Delta A_G^2 + \Delta B_G^2 \geq \langle \{A, B\} \rangle_G - 2\langle B \rangle_G \langle A \rangle_G, \quad (18)$$

respectively. Here, the variances of A and B in G -metric after the *good observable* constraint are given as

$$\Delta A_G^2 = \langle A^2 \rangle_G - \langle A \rangle_G^2 \quad (19)$$

and

$$\Delta B_G^2 = \langle B^2 \rangle_G - \langle B \rangle_G^2, \quad (20)$$

The anti-commutation relation between A and B is written as $\{A, B\} = AB + BA$. The above relations can be used both in the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric and \mathcal{PT} -broken phases. In Ref. [44], the authors presented the modified Robertson UR using the good observable condition, with its form being similar to the conventional. This also proves that the above two modified sum URs have similar forms as CQM. Further details are provided in the discussion section of this paper.

Third and fourth inequalities: Next, we present two sum URs for two incompatible operators in NHQM. In

quantum mechanics, the formula below is valid for any kind (Hermitian and non-Hermitian) of operator X [55]

$$X|\psi\rangle = \langle X \rangle |\psi\rangle + \Delta X |\psi_X^\perp\rangle, \quad (21)$$

This study assumes that X is a non-Hermitian operator. ΔX is the standard deviation of non-Hermitian operator X defined in Eq. (2), and $\langle X \rangle = \langle \psi | X | \psi \rangle$ is a expectation value of X over $|\psi\rangle$. $|\psi_X^\perp\rangle$ representing a state vector, which is orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$ and it is dependent on the operator X . This expression is called the Aharonov–Vaidman identity. If we have two incompatible non-Hermitian operators, A and B , then the above expression also applies to their combinations, $A \pm iB$, and we have

$$(A \pm iB) |\psi\rangle = (\langle A \rangle \pm i \langle B \rangle) |\psi\rangle + \Delta (A \pm iB) |\psi_{A \pm iB}^\perp\rangle, \quad (22)$$

where $|\psi_{A \pm iB}^\perp\rangle$ represents the state vector orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$, which is dependent on the operators $A \pm iB$, and $\Delta (A \pm iB)$ denotes the standard deviations of the operators $A \pm iB$ over $|\psi\rangle$. By taking the inner product with any vector $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$, the Eq. (22) becomes as

$$\langle \psi^\perp | (A \pm iB) | \psi \rangle = \Delta (A \pm iB) \langle \psi^\perp | \psi_{A \pm iB}^\perp \rangle. \quad (23)$$

In the equation above, the first term vanishes due to $\langle \psi^\perp | \psi \rangle = 0$. The squared modulus of Eq. (23) is gotten as

$$|\langle \psi^\perp | (A \pm iB) | \psi \rangle|^2 = (\Delta (A \pm iB))^2 |\langle \psi^\perp | \psi_{A \pm iB}^\perp \rangle|^2. \quad (24)$$

where $\langle \psi^\perp | \psi_{A \pm iB}^\perp \rangle$ is the inner product of two state vectors $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ and $|\psi_{A \pm iB}^\perp\rangle$, and its squared modulus must be less than one, i.e., $|\langle \psi^\perp | \psi_{A \pm iB}^\perp \rangle|^2 \leq 1$. Thus,

$$(\Delta (A \pm iB))^2 \geq |\langle \psi^\perp | (A \pm iB) | \psi \rangle|^2. \quad (25)$$

The $(\Delta (A \pm iB))^2$ can be expanded as

$$(\Delta (A \pm iB))^2 = \Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \pm i \langle \hat{A}^\dagger \hat{B} \rangle \mp i \langle \hat{B}^\dagger \hat{A} \rangle, \quad (26)$$

where $\hat{A} = A - \langle A \rangle$ and $\hat{B} = B - \langle B \rangle$ and $Cov(A, B) = \langle \hat{A}^\dagger \hat{B} \rangle = \langle A^\dagger B \rangle - \langle A^\dagger \rangle \langle B \rangle$. By substituting the Eq. (26) into Ineq. (25), we obtain a sum UR as

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq \pm 2\Im[Cov(A, B)] + |\langle \psi^\perp | (A \pm iB) | \psi \rangle|^2. \quad (27)$$

Here, $|\langle \psi^\perp | (A \pm iB) | \psi \rangle|^2 = |\langle \psi | (A^\dagger \mp iB^\dagger) | \psi^\perp \rangle|^2$. This is the third sum UR, and it is valid for all non-Hermitian operators. In the derivation of the above relation, it is assumed that $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ and $|\psi_{A \pm iB}^\perp\rangle$ should be simultaneously orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$. Those states can be chosen using the Aharonov–Vaidman identity, $|\psi_A^\perp\rangle = \hat{A}/\Delta A |\psi\rangle$ or $|\psi_B^\perp\rangle = \hat{B}/\Delta B |\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi_{A \pm iB}^\perp\rangle = (\hat{A} \pm i\hat{B})/\Delta (A \pm iB) |\psi\rangle$.

Next, the fourth sum UR is provided. Assuming that the sum operator $A + B$ applies to the Aharonov–Vaidman identity, we have

$$(A + B) |\psi\rangle = (\langle A \rangle + \langle B \rangle) |\psi\rangle + \Delta (A + B) |\psi_{A+B}^\perp\rangle. \quad (28)$$

When the orthogonal state $\langle \psi_{A+B}^\perp |$ to $|\psi\rangle$ is multiplied from the left side of the relation presented above, the result is obtained as

$$\langle \psi_{A+B}^\perp | (A + B) | \psi \rangle = \Delta (A + B), \quad (29)$$

and its squared modulus is read as

$$|\langle \psi_{A+B}^\perp | (A + B) | \psi \rangle|^2 = \Delta (A + B)^2. \quad (30)$$

Applying the parallelogram law of vectors, $2\Delta A^2 + 2\Delta B^2 \geq (\Delta (A + B))^2$, which holds for arbitrary operator A and B , another sum UR of the two non-Hermitian operators A and B is obtained as

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle \psi_{A+B}^\perp | (A + B) | \psi \rangle|^2. \quad (31)$$

The lower bound will not be zero unless it is a special case where state $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $A + B$. Based on the equality $2\Delta A^2 + 2\Delta B^2 = (\Delta (A + B))^2 + (\Delta (A - B))^2$, and since $(\Delta (A \pm B))^2$ are non-negative, another inequality can be derived for the minus sign. Therefore, the fourth inequality is obtained in the following form as

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq \max\left\{\frac{1}{2} |\langle \psi_{A \pm B}^\perp | (A \pm B) | \psi \rangle|^2\right\}. \quad (32)$$

This is the fourth sum UR, which is also valid for any kind of non-Hermitian operators. It is observed that there is a finite degree of uncertainty, except in the trivial scenario where $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $A \pm B$, indicating that the RHS effectively measures the incompatibility between A and B on a given state. The Hermitian counterpart of the third and fourth URs has been investigated in Ref. [50], and the derivation presented in this paper is a generalization of that relation in the NHQM realm.

Next, the above inequalities of Eq. (27) and Eq. (32) can be obtained in terms of the G -metric formalism. By

considering the modifications of the state vector and adjoint operators in the G -metric, the third and fourth sum URs are reformulated into:

$$\Delta A_g^2 + \Delta B_g^2 \geq \pm 2\Im[Cov_G(A, B)] + |\langle \psi^\perp | G(A \pm iB) | \psi \rangle|^2, \quad (33)$$

$$\Delta A_g^2 + \Delta B_g^2 \geq \max \left[\frac{1}{2} |\langle \psi_{A \pm B}^\perp | G(A \pm B) | \psi \rangle|^2 \right], \quad (34)$$

where ΔA_g^2 and ΔB_g^2 are defined according to Eq. (15) and Eq. (16), respectively, and $|\langle \psi^\perp | G(A \pm iB) | \psi \rangle|^2 = |\langle \psi | (A^\dagger G \mp iB^\dagger G) | \psi^\perp \rangle|^2$. Note that $|\langle \psi_{A \pm B}^\perp | G(A \pm B) | \psi \rangle|^2 = \langle \psi_{A \pm B}^\perp | G(A \pm B) | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | (A^\dagger \pm B^\dagger) G | \psi_{A \pm B}^\perp \rangle$. Furthermore, in the context of *good observable* conditions, the above two inequalities are transformed into:

$$\Delta A_G^2 + \Delta B_G^2 \geq \pm i\langle [A, B] \rangle_G + |\langle \psi | G(A \pm iB) | \psi^\perp \rangle|^2, \quad (35)$$

$$\Delta A_G^2 + \Delta B_G^2 \geq \max \left[\frac{1}{2} |\langle \psi_{A \pm B}^\perp | G(A \pm B) | \psi \rangle|^2 \right], \quad (36)$$

Here, $|\langle \psi_{A \pm B}^\perp | G(A \pm B) | \psi \rangle|^2 = \langle \psi_{A \pm B}^\perp | G(A \pm B) | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | G(A \pm B) | \psi_{A \pm B}^\perp \rangle$. The above inequalities represent the sum URs that are proposed in the context of the modified NHQM. Notably, the relations presented in the G -metric are more elegant than the general forms and fit with the inner product and probability conservation in time of NHQM.

III. EXAMPLES

This section numerically verifies the validity of the four inequalities presented in Section II using two examples.

Example 1: Let A and B be two incompatible non-Hermitian operators such that $A \neq A^\dagger$ and $B \neq B^\dagger$. Any non-Hermitian operator A and B can be expressed as $A = S_A U_A$ and $B = S_B U_B$, respectively, using polar decomposition [40], where S is a positive-semidefinite operator and U is the corresponding unitary operator. This study illustrates the behavior of uncertainty relations following the experimental work of [49]. The initial quantum state of the system is considered as $|\psi\rangle = \cos 2\theta_0 |0\rangle + \sin 2\theta_0 |1\rangle$, with $|0\rangle = |H\rangle$ and $|1\rangle = |V\rangle$ being the horizontal and the vertical polarization states. Following [49], the polar decomposition parts of the non-Hermitian operators A and B are

$$U_A = \begin{bmatrix} \cos 2(\theta_1 - \theta_0) & \sin 2(\theta_1 - \theta_0) \\ \sin 2(\theta_1 - \theta_0) & -\cos 2(\theta_1 - \theta_0) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

$$S_A = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos 2\theta_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (38)$$

$$U_B = \begin{bmatrix} \cos 2(\theta_5 - \theta_0) & \sin 2(\theta_5 - \theta_0) \\ \sin 2(\theta_5 - \theta_0) & -\cos 2(\theta_5 - \theta_0) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (39)$$

$$S_B = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos 2\theta_7 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (40)$$

As investigated in [49], these real non-Hermitian operators (both A and B) can be realized by a phase-adjustable Sagnac ring interferometer and beam displacer (BD) crystals. From the experimental point of view, θ_k can denoted as the angle of the k -th half wave plate. The operators A and B with the above decomposition parts reads as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\sin 2\theta_0 & \frac{1}{2}\cos 2\theta_0 \\ \cos 2\theta_0 & -\sin 2\theta_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \cos 2\theta_0 & -\sin 2\theta_0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (41)$$

This aims to check that the operators A and B are real non-Hermitian. To analyze our method concretely, the angles chosen to construct the non-Hermitian operators following with Ref. [49] as $\theta_1 = \pi/4$, $\theta_3 = \pi/3$, $\theta_5 = \pi/4$ and $\theta_7 = 3\pi/4$. Then, the quantities of the left and right-hand sides of the proposed four sum URs can be calculated. Fig. 1 illustrates the analytic numerical results, where the horizontal axis is the angle θ_0 required to prepare the initial state $|\psi\rangle$ and the vertical axis is the difference D between the LHS and RHS of the URs corresponding to Ineqs. (4), (6), (27) and (32). Fig. 1 highlights that the four relations introduced are valid for all parameter regions of state $|\psi\rangle$ except $\theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}$. Since at $\theta_0 = \frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\theta_0 = \frac{3\pi}{4}$, the operators A and B are commute, $[A, B] = 0$, and then $D = 0$. This study assumes that A and B are incompatible operators, therefore, the above two points are trivial cases. When comparing with other bounds, the numerical results demonstrated that this particular bound of UR 3 and UR 4 outperforms the competitor in specific regions of the state space.

Example 2: The first example demonstrates the validity of the four improved URs proposed in Section II in a general non-Hermitian system. The second example aims to confirm the validity of these four URs within the G -inner product and good observables, considering both the \mathcal{PT} broken and unbroken phases. This example assumes two non-Hermitian operators A and B in the simplest one-parameter \mathcal{PT} -invariant system described by the Hamiltonian [37]

$$H(\gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} i\gamma & 1 \\ 1 & -i\gamma \end{pmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

The Hamiltonian varies continuously with parameter γ , and adjustments to this real parameter influence the \mathcal{PT} -symmetry of the system. Specifically, when $\gamma^2 < 1$, the




Figure 1. Difference D between the LHS and RHS of four distinct uncertainty relations as a function of θ_0 . The dot-dashed curve denotes Ineq. (4), the solid line curve is for Ineq. (6), the dashed curve for Ineq. (27), and the dotted curve for Ineq. (32). It is considered that $\theta_1 = \pi/4, \theta_3 = \pi/3, \theta_5 = \pi/4$, and $\theta_1 = \pi/4, \theta_3 = \pi/3, \theta_5 = \pi/4$ and $\theta_7 = 3\pi/4$.

system resides within the \mathcal{PT} preserving region. Accordingly, for $\gamma^2 > 1$, the system is in the \mathcal{PT} breaking region. The eigenvalues are $E_{1,2} = \pm\sqrt{1-\gamma^2}$ signifying the occurrence of a phase transition precisely at the exceptional point (EP) $\gamma^2 = 1$. Furthermore, we can deduce that the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $H(\gamma)$ serves as a good observable in the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric phase but not in the \mathcal{PT} -broken phase, suggesting the existence of an exceptional point in the system. The exceptional point in a non-Hermitian system refers to a unique point in the parameter space where both eigenvalues and eigenvectors merge into a single value and state [56].

The proposed scheme assumes that the arbitrary initial state is prepared into a general superposition of the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian $H(\gamma)$ in the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric phases, expressed as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \mathcal{N} (|E_1\rangle + pe^{i\alpha}|E_2\rangle), \quad (43)$$

where p and α are real parameters and \mathcal{N} is the normalization coefficient. The initial state is set to be normalized for the G -inner product $\langle\psi|G|\psi\rangle = 1$. The right eigenstates of $H(\gamma)$ in the \mathcal{PT} -preserving region of the Hamiltonian, i.e., $H(\gamma)|E_i\rangle = E_i|E_i\rangle$ are

$$|E_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\cos\theta}} \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\theta/2} \\ e^{-i\theta/2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (44)$$

$$|E_2\rangle = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2\cos\theta}} \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\theta/2} \\ -e^{i\theta/2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (45)$$

In this context, $\cos\theta = \sqrt{1-\gamma^2}$. The $|E_1\rangle$ and $|E_2\rangle$ are the right eigenvalues of H , and the matrix of G for this system is $G_s = [\sum_i |E_i\rangle\langle E_i|]^{-1}$. Thus, for the \mathcal{PT} -unbroken phase, the matrix of G can be chosen as the

follows, despite G not being uniquely defined for a given $H(\gamma)$ [54].

$$G_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma^2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i\gamma \\ i\gamma & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (46)$$

In the \mathcal{PT} -broken phases, the normalized right eigenstates of $H(\gamma)$ are

$$|e_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\gamma\lambda - 2\lambda^2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -i(\gamma - \lambda) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (47)$$

$$|e_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\gamma\lambda - 2\lambda^2}} \begin{bmatrix} i(\gamma - \lambda) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

where $\lambda = \sqrt{\gamma^2 - 1}$. In this case, $1 - \gamma^2 \leq 0$. Then the corresponding arbitrary initial state in the \mathcal{PT} broken region is $|\Phi\rangle = \mathcal{N} (|e_1\rangle + pe^{i\alpha}|e_2\rangle)$. By using $G_b = [\sum_i |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|]^{-1}$, the matrix of G for the \mathcal{PT} broken phase is

$$G_b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 - 1}} \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & -i \\ i & \gamma \end{pmatrix}. \quad (49)$$

Notably, selecting good observables in non-Hermitian systems depends on the G metric, exhibiting different characteristics in \mathcal{PT} -symmetric and \mathcal{PT} -broken phases. In this example, $H(\gamma)$ is effective as a good observable in the unbroken phase but not in the broken phase. Hence, to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed URs, we choose two incompatible good observables, $H(\gamma)$ and σ_y for the \mathcal{PT} unbroken phase, with the numerical results depicted in Fig. 2 (a). Considering the \mathcal{PT} -broken phase, we choose $H(1/\gamma)$ and σ_y as good observables. Fig. 2 (b) depicts the differences D of LHS and RHS of our sum URs for that region. As indicated in Fig. 2, our sum URs hold well for all parameter regions.

In both regions, to illustrate the preceding uncertainty relations, it is necessary to identify the state $|\psi^\perp\rangle$, which is orthogonal to the system state $|\psi\rangle$. In a non-Hermitian system, the orthogonality is expressed through the G -inner product $\langle\psi^\perp|G|\psi\rangle = \langle\langle\psi^\perp|\psi\rangle\rangle = 0$. Employing eigenvectors that constitute a complete biorthogonal set satisfying $\langle L_i|R_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}$, allows designating the corresponding left eigenvectors $\langle L_i|$ of the Hamiltonian to define state $\langle\langle\psi^\perp|$. Moreover, based on the definition derived from the Aharonov-Vaidman identity, $|\psi_{A\pm B}^\perp\rangle$ should be modified as

$$|\psi_{A\pm B}^\perp\rangle_G = \frac{(A \pm B) - \langle A \pm B \rangle_G}{\Delta(A \pm B)_G} |\psi\rangle. \quad (50)$$

In our analysis, the difference between the LHS and RHS of the URs is defined as D . When $D = 0$, the uncertainty relation is satisfied with equality, corresponding to a minimum UR. The D for two incompatible observables




Figure 2. Difference D between the LHS and RHS for four distinct URs as a function of state parameter α . The dot-dashed curves refer to Ineq. (17), the solid line curves to Ineq. (18), the dashed curves to Ineq. (35), and the dotted curves to Ineq. (36), which are plotted for two non-Hermitian operators in the second example, in the range of $0 \leq \alpha \leq 2\pi$. (a) Inequalities for two good observables $H(\gamma)$ and σ_y in \mathcal{PT} -symmetric phase ($\gamma = 0.9$, $p = 0.5$). (b) Inequalities for two good observables $H(1/\gamma)$ and σ_y in \mathcal{PT} -broken phase ($\gamma = 1.2$, $p = 1.5$).

are plotted to compare the four proposed URs under the modified NHQM while using separately the Hermitian G metric operator for \mathcal{PT} -symmetric and broken phases. For the second example, a comparison is made in Fig. 2, with the plots revealing that the lower bound of the third and fourth URs are tighter than the others for the \mathcal{PT} -unbroken and \mathcal{PT} -broken regions. When $\alpha = \pm 1$, the first UR is given by Ineq. (17) implies that one has $\Delta A_G^2 + \Delta B_G^2 \geq \pm i \langle \psi | G[A, B] | \psi \rangle$, while the third UR given by Ineq. (35) is stronger, and the numerical examples can test this. Furthermore, the plot reveals that the bound of UR3 is consistently tighter than UR1, even when adjusting other parameters.

IV. DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

This section focuses on the significance of correctly applying the NHQM formalism for the URs on non-Hermitian \mathcal{PT} -symmetric systems.

First, we derive the URs 1 and 2 as presented above in CQM. Initially, a new operator is defined $X_\alpha = \hat{A} - i\alpha\hat{B}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\hat{A} = A - \langle A \rangle$, $\hat{B} = B - \langle B \rangle$ and A, B are two Hermitian operators. For an all-normalized state ψ , we have

$$\|X_\alpha\psi\|^2 = \Delta A^2 + \alpha^2 \Delta B^2 + i\alpha \langle [\hat{B}, \hat{A}] \rangle \geq 0. \quad (51)$$

Note that $\langle [\hat{B}, \hat{A}] \rangle = \langle [B, A] \rangle$, and assigning $\alpha = -1$, the corresponding sum UR in CQM for the first UR proposed is given as

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq i \langle [B, A] \rangle. \quad (52)$$

Similarly, let a new operator be $Y_\alpha = \hat{A} + \alpha\hat{B}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus,

$$\|Y_\alpha\psi\|^2 = \Delta A^2 + \alpha^2 \Delta B^2 + \alpha \langle \{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\} \rangle \geq 0, \quad (53)$$

where $\langle \{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\} \rangle = \langle [A, B] \rangle - 2\langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle$. In CQM, the sum UR that corresponds to the second UR proposed is written as

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq \langle \{A, B\} \rangle - 2\langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle. \quad (54)$$

Referring to Table I, it becomes evident that through correctly applying the NHQM formalism with G -metric formalism, the previously derived uncertainty relations exhibited a similar structure to Ineq. (52) and Ineq. (54) in CQM.

Furthermore, in the CQM realm, the correspondent of the third and fourth URs are expressed as [50]

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq \pm i \langle \psi | [A, B] | \psi \rangle + |\langle \psi | A \pm iB | \psi^\perp \rangle|^2, \quad (55)$$

$$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle \psi_{A+B}^\perp | A + B | \psi \rangle|^2. \quad (56)$$

Comparing the above two relations with the findings presented in Sec. II for the NHQM realm [refer to Ineq. (27) and Ineq. (31)], it is found that they are different from the conventional ones. However, in the G -metric formalism, the above-modified relations for non-Hermitian operators within a special inner product framework [refer to Ineq. (35) and Ineq. (36)] have a similar form to the conventional Hermitian expressions.

It is evident that if $G = 1$ (Dirac inner product), the UR 1-4 trivially reduces to Hermitian-type correspondences. As discussed above, the generalized expression

Table I. Four sum URs in NHQM (left) and their modified forms with G-metric formalism (right).

	Non-Hermitian quantum mechanics	Modified Non-Hermitian quantum mechanics
UR 1	$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq 2\Im[Cov(A, B)]$	$\Delta A_G^2 + \Delta B_G^2 \geq i\langle[B, A]\rangle_G$
UR 2	$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq 2\Re[Cov(A, B)]$	$\Delta A_G^2 + \Delta B_G^2 \geq \langle\{A, B\}\rangle_G - 2\langle B\rangle_G\langle A\rangle_G$
UR 3	$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq \pm 2\Im[Cov(A, B)] + \langle\psi^\perp (A \pm iB) \psi\rangle ^2$	$\Delta A_G^2 + \Delta B_G^2 \geq \pm i\langle[A, B]\rangle_G + \langle\psi G(A \pm iB) \psi^\perp\rangle ^2$
UR 4	$\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2 \geq \max\left[\frac{1}{2} \langle\psi_{A\pm B}^\perp (A \pm B) \psi\rangle ^2\right]$	$\Delta A_G^2 + \Delta B_G^2 \geq \max\left[\frac{1}{2} \langle\psi_{A\pm B}^\perp G(A \pm B) \psi\rangle ^2\right]$

of uncertainty relations in a non-Hermitian system are different from the conventional ones. Hence, it is necessary to provide the corresponding modifications for the relations using a proper Hilbert-space metric.

This section also discusses the nontrivial lower bounds of the four sum URs in NHQM. It is clear that ΔX^2 depends on the state of the system $|\psi\rangle$, for a non-Hermitian operator X , and $\Delta X^2 = 0$, if $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenvector of X [57]. An interesting case is if state $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenvector of either A or B , and the lower bound of the first and second URs can be zero. For the third UR, the lower bound depends on the incompatibility of the two non-Hermitian operators on the special states and the optimization of $|\psi^\perp\rangle$. By optimizing $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ and the corresponding initial state, the third UR can be saturated to equality. For example, if $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenstate of B , then $|\psi^\perp\rangle = \frac{(A-\langle A\rangle)|\psi\rangle}{\Delta A}$ should be chosen to maximize the lower bound, where both sides of the inequality become ΔA^2 . Moreover, the lower bound can be nonzero even if the state $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenvector of A (B), i.e., just choose $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$ but not orthogonal to the state $A|\psi\rangle$ ($B|\psi\rangle$). If the incompatible operators lack a common eigenstate, the fourth UR will have a nontrivial bound, except for the trivial case when $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $A \pm B$. The form of $|\psi_{A\pm B}^\perp\rangle$ implies that even if $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenvector of A or B , the RHS always yields a nonzero value as $\frac{1}{2}\Delta A^2$ or

$\frac{1}{2}\Delta B^2$, respectively.

Next, we delve into the nontrivial lower bounds of four modified sum URs within the G -metric formalism. If $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenvector of A or B , constraining the condition of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry on the other operator, the RHS of first and second URs are zero. Otherwise, the RHS will be proportional to the imaginary part of the eigenvalue of the corresponding operator for the first and second URs. For the same case, if it is considered to optimize the orthogonal states, the third UR can be transformed into an equality. For example, if $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ is an eigenstate of B , by choosing $|\psi^\perp\rangle = \frac{(A-\langle GA\rangle)|\psi\rangle}{\Delta A_G}$, the RHS becomes $\pm 2\Im(E_B^*)\langle GA\rangle + \Delta A_G^2$, which maximizes the lower bound for \mathcal{PT} -symmetric phase, where E_B denotes the eigenvalue of B operator in state $|\psi\rangle$. While in the \mathcal{PT} -broken phase, unless there is a common eigenstate of A and B , the above term reveals a remnant uncertainty in the lower bound. For the fourth UR, in the example where $|\psi\rangle$ is the eigenvalue of B , the RHS is $\max\left[\frac{1}{2}\left|\frac{\langle AGA\rangle_G - \langle GA\rangle_G\langle A\rangle_G \pm E_B(\langle AG\rangle_G - \langle G\rangle_G\langle A\rangle_G)}{\Delta A_G}\right|^2\right]$. Suppose the operators do not share a common eigenstate. In that case, there is a nonzero amount of uncertainties shown by the lower bound, even if the state is the eigenstate of one of the operators in both the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric and \mathcal{PT} -broken phases.

In summary, the previous URs, which are based on the product of variances $\Delta A^2\Delta B^2$, do not fully capture the incompatibility of the observables on the system state. In addition, the sum variances of $\Delta A^2 + \Delta B^2$ have not been given and modified in non-Hermitian quantum mechanical systems within the G -metric formalism. Directly applying the theorem and axioms of conventional quantum mechanics to NHQM might cause some violations [51–53, 58, 59]. Therefore, this study establishes nontrivial lower bounds for the sum of variances of two arbitrary incompatible operators, which apply to the general non-Hermitian observables in NHQM. This study derives four lower bounds of Ineq. (4), Ineq. (6), Ineq. (27), and Ineq. (32) for the sum variances, which are applicable when the observables are incompatible concerning the system's state. Besides, this research presents the tight bounds of those URs for two good observables within the

G -metric formalism in NHQM. Several illustrative examples demonstrate the validity of the proposed sum URs, highlighting that our four sum URs are adequate for all the parameter regions of the given system states. This paper can help the reader understand the sum URs for NHQM in depth. Furthermore, this study proves the usefulness of the G -metric in providing the correct counterparts of formulas, theorems, and axioms of CQM into the NHQM realm. Finally, we anticipate that the sum URs relations could be tested in experiment for both \mathcal{PT} -symmetric and \mathcal{PT} -broken phases in the near future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12365005)

-
- [1] W. Heisenberg, *Z. Phys.* **43**, 172 (1927).
- [2] L. E. BALLENTINE, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **42**, 358 (1970).
- [3] M. Ozawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 042105 (2003).
- [4] M. Ozawa, *Ann. Phys.* **311**, 350 (2004).
- [5] R. Mir, J. S. Lundeen, M. W. Mitchell, A. M. Steinberg, J. L. Garretson, and H. M. Wiseman, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 287 (2007).
- [6] A. P. Lund and H. M. Wiseman, *New J. Phys.* **12**, 093011 (2010).
- [7] J. Erhart, S. Sponar, G. Sulyok, G. Badurek, M. Ozawa, and Y. Hasegawa, *Nat. Phys.* **8**, 185 (2012).
- [8] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, *Science* **306**, 1330 (2004).
- [9] L. A. Rozema, A. Darabi, D. H. Mahler, A. Hayat, Y. Soudagar, and A. M. Steinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 100404 (2012).
- [10] S.-Y. Baek, F. Kaneda, M. Ozawa, and K. Edamatsu, *Sci. Rep.* **3**, 2221 (2013).
- [11] E. H. Kennard, *Z. Phys.* **44**, 326 (1927).
- [12] H. Weyl, *Gruppentheorie Und Quantenmechanik* (Hirzel, Leipzig, 1928).
- [13] H. P. Robertson, *Phys. Rev.* **34**, 163 (1929).
- [14] E. Schrödinger, *Commun Math Phys* **87**, 567 (1930).
- [15] J. Oppenheim and S. Wehner, *Science* **330**, 1072 (2010).
- [16] L. Catani, M. Leifer, G. Scala, D. Schmid, and R. W. Spekkens, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 240401 (2022).
- [17] G. Vallone, D. G. Marangon, M. Tomasin, and P. Villoresi, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 052327 (2014).
- [18] Z. Cao, H. Zhou, X. Yuan, and X. Ma, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 011020 (2016).
- [19] H. F. Hofmann and S. Takeuchi, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 032103 (2003).
- [20] O. Gühne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 117903 (2004).
- [21] M. Berta, P. J. Coles, and S. Wehner, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 062127 (2014).
- [22] D. F. Walls and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 709 (1981).
- [23] K. Wodkiewicz and J. H. Eberly, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **2**, 458 (1985).
- [24] D. J. Wineland, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, F. L. Moore, and D. J. Heinzen, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, R6797 (1992).
- [25] M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 5138 (1993).
- [26] J. Ma, X. Wang, C. Sun, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rep.* **509**, 89 (2011).
- [27] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 3439 (1994).
- [28] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, and G. Milburn, *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **247**, 135 (1996).
- [29] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 010401 (2006).
- [30] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, *Nat. Photonics* **5**, 222 (2011).
- [31] C. A. Fuchs and A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2038 (1996).
- [32] M. Koashi, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser* **36**, 98 (2006).
- [33] B. M., C. M., C. R., R. J. M., and R. R., *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 659 (2010).
- [34] A. S. Majumdar and T. Pramanik, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **14**, 1640022 (2016).
- [35] Y. H. N, B. A., and P. J., *Commun. Phys.* **2**, 92 (2019).
- [36] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5243 (1998).
- [37] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody, and H. F. Jones, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 270401 (2002).
- [38] D.-J. Zhang, Q.-h. Wang, and J. Gong, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 062121 (2019).
- [39] T. Ohlsson and S. Zhou, *J. Math. Phys.* **61**, 052104 (2020).
- [40] A. K. Pati, U. Singh, and U. Sinha, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 052120 (2015).
- [41] M. J. W. Hall, A. K. Pati, and J. Wu, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 052118 (2016).
- [42] X. Zhao and C. Zhang, *Front. Phys.* **10** (2022), 10.3389/fphy.2022.862868.
- [43] F. Bagarello, *J Phys A: Math Theor* **56**, 425201 (2023).
- [44] N. Shukla, R. Modak, and B. P. Mandal, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 042201 (2023).
- [45] S. Bagchi and A. K. Pati, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 042104 (2016).
- [46] L. Xiao, K. Wang, X. Zhan, Z. Bian, J. Li, Y. Zhang, P. Xue, and A. K. Pati, *Opt. Express* **25**, 17904 (2017).
- [47] K.-W. Bong, N. Tischler, R. B. Patel, S. Wollmann, G. J. Pryde, and M. J. W. Hall, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 230402 (2018).
- [48] D. Qu, K. Wang, L. Xiao, X. Zhan, and P. Xue, *Opt. Express* **29**, 29567 (2021).
- [49] X. Zhao, X. Yu, W. Zhou, C. Zhang, J.-S. Xu, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 070203 (2024).
- [50] L. Maccone and A. K. Pati, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 260401 (2014).
- [51] Y.-C. Lee, M.-H. Hsieh, S. T. Flammia, and R.-K. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 130404 (2014).
- [52] S.-L. Chen, G.-Y. Chen, and Y.-N. Chen, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 054301 (2014).
- [53] A. K. Pati, *arXiv: Quantum Physics* (2014), [arXiv:1404.6166](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.6166).
- [54] C.-Y. Ju, A. Miranowicz, G.-Y. Chen, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 062118 (2019).
- [55] Y. Aharonov and L. Vaidman, *Phys. Rev. A* **41**, 11 (1990).
- [56] W. D. Heiss, *J.Phys.A: Math.Theor.* **45**, 444016 (2012).
- [57] B. C. Hall, *Quantum Theory for Mathematicians*, Vol. 267 (2013).
- [58] D. C. Brody, *J.Phys.A: Math.Theor.* **49**, 10LT03 (2016).
- [59] M. Znojil, *Acta Polytech.(Prague)* **56**, 254 (2016).