

Extended Generalized Uncertainty Principles, Liouville theorem and density of states: Snyder-De Sitter and Yang models

A. Pachol*

Department of Microsystems, University of South-Eastern Norway, Campus Vestfold, Norway

Modifications in quantum mechanical phase space lead to changes in the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, these can result in the Generalized Uncertainty Principle (GUP) or the Extended Uncertainty Principle (EUP), which introduce quantum gravitational effects at small and large distances, respectively. A combination of GUP and EUP, the Extended Generalized Uncertainty Principle (EGUP or GEUP), further generalizes these modifications by incorporating noncommutativity in both coordinates and momenta. This paper examines the impact of EGUP on the Liouville theorem in statistical physics and density of states within non-relativistic quantum mechanics framework. We find a weighted invariant phase space volume element in the cases of Snyder-de Sitter and Yang models, presenting how EGUP alters the density of states, potentially affecting physical (thermodynamical) properties.

I. INTRODUCTION

The search for the fundamental theory of Quantum Gravity has been supported by the development of phenomenological models that explore possible modifications to the known quantum mechanical or gravitational phenomena. In this context the various purely phenomenological proposals have appeared aiming to capture potential signatures of Quantum Gravity, hinting towards possible experimental set-ups which would help guide the way in the full formulation of the theory. What is known is that one needs to challenge the concepts of classical space-time. The idea that the structure of space-time should be modified is a common feature of various approaches to Quantum Gravity, such as String Theory, Loop quantum gravity, Causal Dynamical Triangulations, Asymptotically Safe Quantum Gravity, Horava-Lifshitz Gravity and Noncommutative Geometry, just to name a few [1–6]. Many of these share also the concept of minimum length [7] which appears as a low-energy effect of quantum gravity. Such minimal length can be implemented in quantum mechanics through introducing the modifications in Uncertainty Principles (UP)¹ which arise as a result of modified canonical Heisenberg commutation relations between coordinates and momenta [8, 9]:

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geq \frac{1}{2} \langle [x, p] \rangle \quad (1)$$

where Δ denotes standard deviation and $\langle \ \rangle$ the expectation value. Hence the modifications in commutation relations imply changes in the UP. The most common type of such modifications is the Generalized Uncertainty Principle (GUP), firstly derived in [8] and linked with the specific algebraic structure [9–12], where the right hand side of (1) is an expression in momenta, and may for example include quadratic terms in momenta (QGUP), see e.g. [11–13] or have linear and quadratic terms (LQGUP), see e.g. [14]. In these relations one introduces the parameter, usually denoted by β , which is related to the Planck (length) scale l_p , hence linking GUPs with Planck scale physics and quantum gravitational effects. Such phenomenological models have attracted a lot of attention due to their potential for measurable outcomes [13, 15–31], see also [32] for a recent review and more references on the topic.

On the other hand, the symmetry between the position and momenta in the canonical (quantum mechanical) commutation relations (or in other words the symmetry of the symplectic space) suggests the possibility of introducing corrections to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle by including the modifications proportional to coordinates instead, i.e. so that the RHS of (1) is quadratic or linear in coordinates. Relying on the analogy with GUPs, such coordinate dependent models have been introduced leading to different interesting physical effects. This complimentary type of uncertainty relation has been called an Extended Uncertainty Principle (EUP) [33], [34]. Here, the parameter of the model, usually denoted by α is related with the non-vanishing cosmological constant Λ and this way it can be embedded in the nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. It has been shown [35] that this type of modification to the UP is related with the (Anti-)de Sitter geometric background, and the parameter α in UP naturally related with the (Anti-)de Sitter radius. While GUP, with $\beta \sim l_p$, exposes the gravitational modifications in quantum mechanics at the small distances; EUP, with $\alpha \sim \Lambda$ introduces the idea of modifications at large distances.

Combination of GUP and EUP (i.e. considering both coordinate and momenta dependent terms on the RHS of (1)) appeared firstly in the construction of noncommutative quantum mechanics with quantum groups as a symmetry [36], with both nonzero

* anna.pachol@usn.no

¹ For simplicity, to illustrate the main points, we use 1-dimensional case throughout the introduction.

minimal uncertainties appearing in measurements of position and of momentum respectively. Later on this relation, under the name of Extended Generalized Uncertainty Principle (EGUP or alternatively GEUP), having the form of:

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} (1 + \alpha^2 (\Delta x)^2 + \beta^2 (\Delta p)^2) \quad (2)$$

was studied in various contexts, see e.g. [33–35, 37], for more recent work see e.g. [38] where Born reciprocity is also promoted. Even though the origins of GUPs, EUPs and EGUPs can be tracked to the noncommutative geometry and quantum groups [10, 36] as the underlying mathematical frameworks, mainly these models are treated as purely phenomenological. They have been used (and have been quite fruitful) in providing predictions for various phenomenological effects. Such departure from the underlying mathematical framework resulting in the specific form of GUP, EUP or EGUPs together with the non-uniqueness of the defining commutation relations between coordinates and momenta has lead to many conceptual shortcomings and ambiguities (see e.g. the recent review [32]). Moreover, it is worth to point out that the minimal length may not necessarily appear if one bases only on the modifications of the quantum mechanical phase space, see e.g. [39–42].

In this paper, following the point of view that the noncommutative geometry is the underlying framework (mathematical language) of the possible fundamental theory, we assume that the quantization process of general relativity, includes the quantization of space-time [43, 44], i.e. requiring the space-time coordinates to become noncommutative $[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] \neq 0$. The noncommutativity of space-time introduces corrections to the canonical quantum-mechanical phase space relations. Hence modifications to the UP appear as a natural consequence. In this view, quadratic GUPs have been mainly linked with the Snyder model [10, 31, 45], with noncommuting coordinates and commuting momenta. EUPs, on the other hand can be linked with the (anti)-de Sitter geometric background and algebraic structure with commuting coordinates but noncommuting momenta [35]. The main aim of this paper is to show how noncommutativity of both coordinates and momenta, leading to EGUP (and the appearance of the nonzero minimal uncertainties in both positions and momenta separately) affects the Liouville theorem in statistical mechanics and density of states, hence we limit ourselves to the case of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. We find the new form of an invariant phase space volume element in the presence of EGUP in the specific cases of Snyder-de Sitter (SdS) and Yang models. As a result we show that EGUP requires introducing the modification in the density states and this may impact various physical effects and thermodynamical properties (as it has been shown in the case of GUP for example).

In the next section, we summarise the framework generalized to the case where both coordinates and momenta do not commute and present the general formulae for the Jacobian arising from the variable change under the infinitesimal time evolution. Then we specify the model to the Snyder-de Sitter algebra, as only then we can identify the required weight, depending on both coordinates and momenta, correcting the phase-space volume element. The factor we obtain looks the same in any dimension D . We also discuss, as in certain limits we can obtain special case and how the phase-space volume element will look like in the cases of GUP and EUP (by reducing the starting SdS algebra to Snyder or dS algebras, respectively). Then we discuss the Yang model case and consider specific realizations of its generators on the canonical phase space.

II. PRELIMINARIES

To set up the most general framework for investigating the effects of noncommuting coordinates and noncommuting momenta (and in principle the appearance of the nonzero length and momentum uncertainties), on the density of states in the phase space as the consequences of the Liouville theorem, will not fix the specific choice of the noncommutative (quantum) space-time model at this point yet. We will use the general description, which then can be specified to the chosen model. We start with the following set of commutation relations describing the noncommutative quantum mechanical phase space algebra:

$$[\hat{x}_i, \hat{x}_j] = i\hbar a_{ij}, \quad [\hat{p}_i, \hat{p}_j] = i\hbar b_{ij} \quad (3)$$

$$[\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_j] = i\hbar c_{ij}, \quad (4)$$

where a_{ij}, b_{ij}, c_{ij} are not constants but may include all kinds of terms (linear, quadratic etc.) in space-time coordinates and momenta. We will focus on the non-relativistic general case in any dimension D , $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, D$. When none of the commutators are zero, this will lead to the interesting types of the uncertainty relations (1) with the specific form of RHS depending on the concrete choice of the algebra (3), (4) and in some cases this will result in EGUP (2).

In the phenomenological approaches, it is common to consider the right hand side of (4) and define a new “effective” value of \hbar which could depend on both coordinates and momenta. This means that the size of the unit cell that each quantum state occupies in the phase space can be thought of as being also coordinates and momenta dependent. This will have an effect on the density of states and as a consequence affect physical, for example thermodynamical, properties. For this interpretation to be valid, the volume of phase space must evolve in such a way that the number of states does not change with time, in other words we are looking for the analogue of the Liouville theorem in statistical physics. Similar interpretation has been used in the case of the quadratic GUP, see e.g. [12, 13]. Note that here we assume that both coordinates and momenta do not commute,

although this general framework and later the final result can be reduced to the special cases, with some commutative ingredients which we will discuss in detail later on.

Starting with the quantum mechanical commutation relations (3), (4), these will correspond to the Poisson brackets in classical mechanics:

$$\frac{1}{i\hbar}[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \xrightarrow{\text{classical limit}} \{A, B\}. \quad (5)$$

Therefore, in the classical limit² we obtain (in our shortcut notation):

$$\{x_i, x_j\} = a_{ij}, \quad \{p_i, p_j\} = b_{ij}, \quad (6)$$

$$\{x_i, p_j\} = c_{ij}. \quad (7)$$

The time evolution of the coordinates and momenta are governed by

$$\dot{x}_i = \{x_i, H\} = \{x_i, p_j\} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} + \{x_i, x_j\} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} = c_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} + a_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j}, \quad (8)$$

$$\dot{p}_i = \{p_i, H\} = -\{x_j, p_i\} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} + \{p_i, p_j\} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \delta t = -c_{ji} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} + b_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j}. \quad (9)$$

The Liouville theorem requires that the weighted phase space volume is invariant under time evolution. Hence we consider an infinitesimal time interval δt and the evolution of the coordinates and momenta during δt is:

$$x'_i = x_i + \delta x_i, \quad p'_i = p_i + \delta p_i \quad (10)$$

where

$$\delta x_i = \dot{x}_i \delta t = \left(c_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} + a_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \right) \delta t, \quad (11)$$

$$\delta p_i = \dot{p}_i \delta t = \left(-c_{ji} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} + b_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \right) \delta t. \quad (12)$$

The infinitesimal phase space volume after this infinitesimal time evolution will be:

$$d^D x' d^D p' = J d^D x d^D p \quad (13)$$

with the Jacobian

$$J = \left| \frac{\partial (x'_1, \dots, x'_D, p'_1, \dots, p'_D)}{\partial (x_1, \dots, x_D, p_1, \dots, p_D)} \right|. \quad (14)$$

To find the Jacobian, we use:

$$\frac{\partial x'_i}{\partial x_j} = \delta_{ij} + \frac{\partial \delta x_i}{\partial x_j}, \quad \frac{\partial x'_i}{\partial p_j} = \frac{\partial \delta x_i}{\partial p_j}, \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{\partial p'_i}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial \delta p_i}{\partial x_j}, \quad \frac{\partial p'_i}{\partial p_j} = \delta_{ij} + \frac{\partial \delta p_i}{\partial p_j}. \quad (16)$$

Therefore, up to the first order in δt we get:

$$J = \left| \frac{\partial (x'_1, \dots, x'_D, p'_1, \dots, p'_D)}{\partial (x_1, \dots, x_D, p_1, \dots, p_D)} \right| = 1 + \left(\frac{\partial \delta x_i}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial \delta p_i}{\partial p_i} \right) \delta t + \dots \quad (17)$$

² It is worth to note that the classical limit in GUP models may be more involved than just applying the above transformation, see e.g. [46] where a possible way out is suggested to derive the GUP relations from the (explicitly state dependent) deformed commutators between coordinates and momenta. Here, on the contrary to the phenomenological GUP approaches, we are starting from the noncommutative model as a possible description of the quantization of space-time, hence the starting algebra is fixed from the beginning and modified uncertainty relations and all effects are a consequence of the starting choice of quantum-deformed phase space.

and (based on (11) and (12)):

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial \delta x_i}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial \delta p_i}{\partial p_i} \right) \frac{1}{\delta t} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(c_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} + a_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \right) \delta t + \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \left(-c_{ji} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} + b_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \right) \delta t \\ &= \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} a_{ij} - \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} c_{ji} \right) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} c_{ij} + \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} b_{ij} \right) \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \right] \delta t \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the the terms with mixed derivatives have cancelled each other and the antisymmetry of the Poisson brackets was used to cancel the remaining terms. Therefore, we have found an expression for the time evolved infinitesimal phase space volume (in the first order of δt) as:

$$d^D x' d^D p' = d^D x d^D p \left(1 + \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} a_{ij} - \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} c_{ji} \right) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} c_{ij} + \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} b_{ij} \right) \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \right] \delta t + O(\delta t^2) \right) \quad (19)$$

valid for any Poisson algebra (6), (7) obtained as the classical limit of a noncommutative model (3), (4). Since in general the terms in the brackets will not cancel out, already here we see the need to introduce the weight to the phase space volume element so that the analogue of the Liouville theorem is satisfied. The specific factor has to be chosen in such a way that the weighted phase space volume is invariant under the time evolution, i.e:

$$\frac{d^D x' d^D p'}{F(x', p')} \sim \frac{d^D x d^D p}{F(x, p)}. \quad (20)$$

Note the noncanonical Poisson brackets between the coordinates and momenta, as well as the ones between coordinates and those among momenta (6), (7) are crucial in the choice of the weighted phase space volume, hence the underlying noncommutative geometry (and the choice of (3), (4) is the intrinsic feature of such models. To be able to investigate the time evolution of the weight factor $F(x, p)$ in the phase space volume element, we need to consider the concrete noncommutative model, which we shall do in the next section.

III. SNYDER-DE SITTER MODEL AND THE WEIGHTED PHASE SPACE VOLUME

Snyder-de Sitter (SdS) model includes the noncommutative space-time coordinates and the noncommutative momenta. Non-commutativity among space-time coordinates corresponds to the curved momentum space, and vice-versa noncommutative momenta lead to a curved space-time. Since we are interested in investigating how the noncommutativity of both coordinates and momenta affects the density of states we choose Snyder-de Sitter model which exhibits these features. It was proposed [47] as a generalization of the Snyder model [48] to a space-time background of constant curvature and then it was investigated in many contexts, see e.g. [49], [50]. The defining set of commutation relations for SdS algebra is as follows:

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = i\hbar\beta^2 \hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \quad [\hat{p}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\hbar\alpha^2 \hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \quad (21)$$

$$[\hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \hat{x}_\rho] = i\hbar(\eta_{\mu\rho}\hat{x}_\nu - \eta_{\nu\rho}\hat{x}_\mu), \quad (22)$$

$$[\hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \hat{p}_\rho] = i\hbar(\eta_{\mu\rho}\hat{p}_\nu - \eta_{\nu\rho}\hat{p}_\mu), \quad (23)$$

$$[\hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \hat{M}_{\rho\tau}] = i\hbar(\eta_{\mu\rho}\hat{M}_{\nu\tau} - \eta_{\mu\tau}\hat{M}_{\nu\rho} + \eta_{\nu\tau}\hat{M}_{\mu\rho} - \eta_{\nu\rho}\hat{M}_{\mu\tau}), \quad (24)$$

with the modified quantum mechanical phase space relation:

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\hbar \left(\eta_{\mu\nu} + \alpha^2 \hat{x}_\mu \hat{x}_\nu + \beta^2 \hat{p}_\mu \hat{p}_\nu + \alpha\beta(\hat{x}_\mu \hat{p}_\nu + \hat{p}_\mu \hat{x}_\nu - \hat{M}_{\mu\nu}) \right), \quad (25)$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ is the flat metric with Lorentzian signature and $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, \dots, D$. Depending on the sign³ of α^2 the Lorentz generators $\hat{M}_{\mu\nu}$ and momenta \hat{p}_μ generate a de Sitter (dS) or Anti-de Sitter (AdS) subalgebras. This model involves, besides the speed of

³ For the Jacobi identities to be satisfied both coupling constants α^2 and β^2 must have the same sign. Following the convention of [49] when α^2 and β^2 are negative then $\alpha\beta$ is negative.

light⁴, two other observer-independent constants⁵, the Planck length (contained in the parameter β) as well as the de Sitter radius which is related to the cosmological constant (contained in the parameter α). More precisely, the deformation parameter $|\alpha^2|$ has the dimension of the inverse of the square of length and it can be identified with the (Anti-)de Sitter radius and a cosmological constant as the inverse thereof, while the parameter $|\beta^2|$ has the dimension of the inverse square of mass and it can be identified with $1/M_P^2 = l_P^2$, where M_P is the Planck mass. In general, α^2 and β^2 can take positive or negative value, which generates models with very different properties [49]. In the following we focus on the nonrelativistic quantum mechanical counterpart (which in $D = 3$ would be the Snyder model restricted to a three-dimensional sphere) however we keep unspecified dimension D .

The EGUP corresponding to (25) has the form of (2)[35]⁶, but additional (mixed) terms may appear on the RHS depending on the choice of the representation of the angular momentum used, see e.g. [49]. For both $\alpha^2 > 0$ and $\beta^2 > 0$ the bounds on the localization in position and momentum space arise, while $\alpha^2 < 0$ and $\beta^2 < 0$ a combination of spatial and momentum coordinates becomes bounded instead [49].

The classical (nonrelativistic) Snyder–de Sitter Poisson algebra⁷ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \{x_i, x_j\} &= \beta^2(x_i p_j - x_j p_i) \equiv a_{ij}, & \{p_i, p_j\} &= \alpha^2(x_i p_j - x_j p_i) \equiv b_{ij}, \\ \{x_i, p_j\} &= \delta_{ij} + \alpha^2 x_i x_j + \beta^2 p_i p_j + 2\alpha\beta p_i x_j \equiv c_{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

supplemented by the relations with Lorentz generators. By using the general set up from the previous section and now the explicit form of SdS model (26) we obtain that the phase space volume after the infinitesimal time evolution is:

$$d^D x' d^D p' = d^D x d^D p \left(1 + 2 \left[(\alpha^2 x_j + \alpha\beta p_j) \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} - (\beta^2 p_j + \alpha\beta x_j) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \right] \delta t + O(\delta t^2) \right) \quad (27)$$

where we explicitly used (26) in (19) with the following:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} a_{ij} = \beta^2 (D-1) p_j, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} c_{ij} = \alpha^2 (D+1) x_j + 2\alpha\beta p_j, \quad (28)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} b_{ij} = \alpha^2 (1-D) x_j = -\alpha^2 (D-1) x_j, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} c_{ji} = \beta^2 (D+1) p_j + 2\alpha\beta x_j. \quad (29)$$

In the remaining part of this section we will show that for the SdS Poisson algebra (26) the analogue of the Liouville theorem is satisfied when we consider the following weighted phase space volume

$$\frac{d^D x d^D p}{(1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta x \cdot p)} \quad (30)$$

which is invariant under the infinitesimal time evolution.

To show this, we consider the time evolution of each of the terms in the proposed factor $F(x, p) = 1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta x \cdot p$ during the infinitesimal time interval δt . At first we keep all the formulae as general as possible and express them in terms of a_{ij} , b_{ij} and c_{ij} and only at the end we will specify to SdS case (26). We get the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} x'^2 &= (x_i + \delta x_i)^2 \\ &= x^2 + 2x_i \delta x_i + O(\delta t^2) \\ &= x^2 + 2x_i \left(c_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} + a_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \right) \delta t + O(\delta t^2), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p'^2 &= (p_i + \delta p_i)^2 \\ &= p^2 + 2p_i \delta p_i + O(\delta t^2) \\ &= p^2 + 2p_i \left(-c_{ji} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} + b_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \right) \delta t + O(\delta t^2), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

⁴ We set $c = 1$ throughout the paper.

⁵ SdS is also known as doubly special relativity (DSR) in de Sitter space[51] or triply special relativity (TSR) model[47].

⁶ Note that the same EGUP can be realized by a different deformed Heisenberg algebras, see e.g. [52].

⁷ where we used the fact that the above algebra (and relation (41)) can be implemented on the canonical phase space with Lorentz generators defined as $M_{\mu\nu} = x_\mu p_\nu - x_\nu p_\mu$.

and for the last term

$$\begin{aligned}
x' \cdot p' &= x' p' = (x_i + \delta x_i)(p_i + \delta p_i) \\
&= x \cdot p + p_i \delta x_i + x_i \delta p_i + O(\delta t^2) \\
&= x \cdot p + p_i \left(c_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} + a_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \right) \delta t + x_i \left(-c_{ji} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} + b_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \right) \delta t + O(\delta t^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Therefore the time evolution of the whole factor $F(x, p)$ can be first written generally as (where for simplicity we use $2\alpha\beta = \gamma$):

$$\begin{aligned}
1 + \alpha^2 x'^2 + \beta^2 p'^2 + \gamma x' p' &= 1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + \gamma x \cdot p + \\
&\quad + \left[2\alpha^2 x_i c_{ij} + 2\beta^2 p_i b_{ij} + \gamma (p_i c_{ij} + x_i b_{ij}) \right] \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \delta t + \\
&\quad + \left[2\alpha^2 x_i a_{ij} - 2\beta^2 p_i c_{ji} + \gamma (p_i a_{ij} - x_i c_{ji}) \right] \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \delta t + O(\delta t^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Now specialising this to the case of SdS (26), after plugging in the expressions for a_{ij} , b_{ij} and c_{ij} , we obtain (in the first order of δt):

$$\begin{aligned}
1 + \alpha^2 x'^2 + \beta^2 p'^2 + \gamma x' p' &= 1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + \gamma x p \\
&\quad + \left[2\alpha^2 (x_j + \alpha^2 x^2 x_j + \beta^2 (xp) p_j + \gamma (xp) x_j) + 2\beta^2 \alpha^2 (xp) p_j - 2\beta^2 \alpha^2 x_j p^2 + \gamma (p_j + \alpha^2 x^2 p_j + \beta^2 p^2 p_j + \gamma p^2 x_j) \right] \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \delta t + \\
&\quad + \left[-2\beta^2 (p_j + \alpha^2 x_j (xp) + \beta^2 p_j p^2 + \gamma (xp) p_j) + 2\alpha^2 \beta^2 x^2 p_j - 2\alpha^2 \beta^2 x_j (xp) - \gamma (x_j + \alpha^2 x^2 x_j + \beta^2 p^2 x_j + \gamma x^2 p_j) \right] \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \delta t.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Since the aim is to factorise the whole expression $(1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + \gamma x \cdot p)$ on the right hand side of this equality, we need to rearrange all the terms in the square brackets in such a way so that we can recognize the whole factor. In this way we obtain (once we returned to the notation $\gamma = 2\alpha\beta$):

$$\begin{aligned}
1 + \alpha^2 x'^2 + \beta^2 p'^2 + 2\alpha\beta x' p' &= \\
&= 1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta (xp) \\
&\quad + \left[2\alpha^2 (1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta (xp)) x_j + 2\alpha\beta (1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta xp) p_j \right] \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \delta t + \\
&\quad + \left[-2\beta^2 (1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta (xp)) p_j - 2\alpha\beta (1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta x \cdot p) x_j \right] \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \delta t + O(\delta t^2) \\
&= (1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta (xp)) \left[1 + (2\alpha^2 x_j + 2\alpha\beta p_j) \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} \delta t - (2\beta^2 p_j + 2\alpha\beta x_j) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \delta t \right] + O(\delta t^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Therefore we can see that the weighted volume element will stay invariant since the weight factor we introduced produces the same terms as the Jacobian in (27) under the infinitesimal time evolution (up to the first order in δt):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d^D x' d^D p'}{1 + \alpha^2 x'^2 + \beta^2 p'^2 + 2\alpha\beta x' \cdot p'} = \\
&= \frac{d^D x d^D p \left(1 + 2 \left[(\alpha^2 x_j + \alpha\beta p_j) \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} - (\beta^2 p_j + \alpha\beta x_j) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \right] \delta t + O(\delta t^2) \right)}{(1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta x \cdot p) \left(1 + 2 \left[(\alpha^2 x_j + \alpha\beta p_j) \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j} - (\beta^2 p_j + \alpha\beta x_j) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j} \right] \delta t + O(\delta t^2) \right)} \\
&= \frac{d^D x d^D p}{(1 + \alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2 p^2 + 2\alpha\beta x \cdot p)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We point out this result holds to any order of parameters α and β (as we have not done any approximations for the noncommutative parameters).

We note that from the SdS model considered above we can obtain two well known special cases. Namely:

- Snyder model [48]⁸, when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ in SdS algebra (21)-(25), i.e. model with noncommutative coordinates and commutative momenta:

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = i\hbar\beta^2 \hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \quad [\hat{p}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = 0, \quad [\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\hbar(\eta_{\mu\nu} + \beta^2 \hat{p}_\mu \hat{p}_\nu). \quad (37)$$

supplemented by the Lorentz covariance conditions (22) - (24). This deformation of quantum mechanical phase space relations leads, in the nonrelativistic case, to the quadratic GUP (QGUP):

$$\Delta x_i \Delta p_j \geq \frac{\hbar \delta_{ij}}{2} (1 + \beta^2 (\Delta p_i^2)). \quad (38)$$

We note that this is only one possible realization of the Snyder model and more general realizations may be considered, see e.g. [31, 45].

The nonrelativistic classical Poisson algebra:

$$\{x_i, x_j\} = \beta^2 (x_i p_j - x_j p_i), \quad \{p_i, p_j\} = 0, \quad \{x_i, p_j\} = \delta_{ij} + \beta^2 p_i p_j \quad (39)$$

will result in the following weighted phase space volume:

$$\frac{d^D x d^D p}{(1 + \beta^2 p^2)} \quad (40)$$

(in any dimension D), obtained as the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ in (30).

- (Anti-)de Sitter model (dual Snyder model), when $\beta \rightarrow 0$ in (21)-(25), i.e. model with commutative coordinates but noncommutative momenta:

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = 0, \quad [\hat{p}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\hbar\alpha^2 \hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \quad [\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\hbar(\eta_{\mu\nu} + \alpha^2 \hat{x}_\mu \hat{x}_\nu). \quad (41)$$

with the Lorentz covariance (22) - (24). The nonrelativistic case results in the quadratic EUP (QEUP):

$$\Delta x_i \Delta p_j \geq \frac{\hbar \delta_{ij}}{2} (1 + \alpha^2 (\Delta x_i^2)). \quad (42)$$

The nonrelativistic classical Poisson algebra is:

$$\{x_i, x_j\} = 0, \quad \{p_i, p_j\} = \alpha^2 (x_i p_j - x_j p_i), \quad \{x_i, p_j\} = \delta_{ij} + \alpha^2 x_i x_j. \quad (43)$$

And the weighted phase space volume (in any dimension D), obtained as the limit $\beta \rightarrow 0$ in (30), is:

$$\frac{d^D x d^D p}{(1 + \alpha^2 x^2)}. \quad (44)$$

On the other hand, one can also consider various generalizations of the SdS model. For example in [53] the following generalization of the last relation in SdS algebra (21)-(25) was proposed:

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\hbar(\eta_{\mu\nu}\varphi_1 + (\alpha^2 \hat{x}_\mu \hat{x}_\nu + \beta^2 \hat{p}_\mu \hat{p}_\nu + \alpha\beta \hat{x}_\mu \hat{p}_\nu + \alpha\beta \hat{p}_\mu \hat{x}_\nu)\varphi_2 - \alpha\beta \hat{M}_{\mu\nu}) \quad (45)$$

where the functions φ_1 and φ_2 need to satisfy specific conditions (due to Jacobi identities). When $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = 1$ we get back the original SdS model (25). Various choices of φ_1 , φ_2 are discussed in [53]. For example, one choice could be $\varphi_1 = \sqrt{1 - \beta^2 p^2}$ and $\varphi_2 = 0$ which gives:

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\hbar\eta_{\mu\nu} \sqrt{1 - (\alpha^2 \hat{x}^2 + \beta^2 \hat{p}^2 + \alpha\beta \hat{x} \cdot \hat{p} + \alpha\beta \hat{p} \cdot \hat{x})} - \alpha\beta \hat{M}_{\mu\nu}. \quad (46)$$

Such generalizations would be interesting to investigate further in the context of EGUP and the density of states.

⁸ Snyder model was the first noncommutative space-time model and it preserves the Lorentz symmetry.

Before completing this section, since the effects of modifications of UPs on the density of states have been investigated by many authors few comments are in order. In [12, 13], in the case of GUP (38)⁹ the invariant weighted phase space volume element is obtained as: $\frac{d^D x d^D p}{(1+\beta p^2)^D}$, where the power D (dimension) is necessary since the Jacobian obtained is: $d^D x' d^D p' = d^D x d^D p (1 - 2\beta D p_k \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_k} \delta t + O(\delta t^2))$. This is different than the case considered here (in the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$). The difference arises from the fact that commutation relations used in [12] for $[x_i, p_j]$ have the term proportional to p^2 while here we have the terms with $p_i p_j$ instead, cf. (39). In the case of the Snyder model with (39) the terms with D cancel out, hence the power D is not appearing in the weight of the volume form (40).

Other important point is that often in the context of modified UP (1) also the inner product on the Hilbert space¹⁰ becomes modified with appropriately chosen measure so that the observables (satisfying the modified commutation relations) stay symmetric on the dense domain of functions decaying faster than any power [54], see also [12, 13] for the inner product modifications in the case of GUP and for the relativistic case, see e.g. [55]. The inner product modifications in the case of EUP, i.e. in AdS and dS spaces were investigated e.g. here [56]. Subsequently the modified inner product can be used to study effects on solutions of Schrödinger equation, see e.g. [12, 13, 56]. Such modifications in the measure in the inner product have not been the purpose of this paper.

IV. YANG MODEL

The Yang model introduced in [57] is a Lorentz invariant model incorporating noncommutative space-time coordinates as well as noncommutative momenta, depending on the pair of dimensionful parameters α and β related with the curvatures of quantum space-time and momentum spaces (in similarity to SdS model). The defining relations are as follows:

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = i\hbar\beta^2 \hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \quad [\hat{p}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\hbar\alpha^2 \hat{M}_{\mu\nu} \quad (47)$$

$$[\hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \hat{x}_\rho] = i\hbar(\eta_{\mu\rho}\hat{x}_\nu - \eta_{\nu\rho}\hat{x}_\mu), \quad (48)$$

$$[\hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \hat{p}_\rho] = i\hbar(\eta_{\mu\rho}\hat{p}_\nu - \eta_{\nu\rho}\hat{p}_\mu), \quad (49)$$

$$[\hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \hat{M}_{\rho\tau}] = i\hbar(\eta_{\mu\rho}\hat{M}_{\nu\tau} - \eta_{\mu\tau}\hat{M}_{\nu\rho} + \eta_{\nu\tau}\hat{M}_{\mu\rho} - \eta_{\nu\rho}\hat{M}_{\mu\tau}). \quad (50)$$

However, the quantum phase space is described by an additional generator \hat{r} (central charge):

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{p}_\nu] = i\hbar\eta_{\mu\nu}\hat{r}, \quad (51)$$

which needs to be supplemented by the remaining relations:

$$[\hat{r}, \hat{x}_\mu] = i\hbar\beta^2 \hat{p}_\mu, \quad [\hat{r}, \hat{p}_\mu] = -i\hbar\alpha^2 \hat{x}_\mu, \quad [\hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \hat{r}] = 0. \quad (52)$$

Therefore the uncertainty principle corresponding to the Yang model, in the nonrelativistic case, can be written in general as:

$$\Delta x_i \Delta p_j \geq \frac{\hbar \delta_{ij}}{2} \langle \hat{r} \rangle. \quad (53)$$

It is also worth to mention that the Yang model is covariant (self-dual) under the Born reciprocity:

$$B: \quad x_\mu \rightarrow p_\mu, \quad p_\mu \rightarrow -x_\mu, \quad \hat{M}_{\mu\nu} \leftrightarrow \hat{M}_{\mu\nu}, \quad \hat{r} \leftrightarrow \hat{r}, \quad \alpha \leftrightarrow \beta. \quad (54)$$

The similarity between Yang model and SdS model considered in the previous section is not coincidental and it has been shown [58] that SdS (21)-(25) can be viewed as a nonlinear realization of Yang model (47)-(52).

The classical (nonrelativistic) limit of the Yang-Poisson model (cf. [59], see also [60]) is:

$$\{x_i, x_j\} = \beta^2 (x_i p_j - x_j p_i), \quad \{p_i, p_j\} = \alpha^2 (x_i p_j - x_j p_i) \quad (55)$$

⁹ In [12, 13] more general case of noncommutative model is considered with two parameters β, β' . In the comparison here we take $\beta' = 0$ since this is the most similar option to the Snyder model discussed here. Nevertheless, the case with $\beta' \neq 0$ can also be associated with the Snyder model, but requires different (more general) realization and is valid up in the expansion up to the second order in the deformation parameter β , see e.g. [31, 45].

¹⁰ The Heisenberg algebra (3), (4) is represented on the space of states in which one usually chooses a basis of position or momentum eigenvectors. In the case of GUP (38) one usually chooses the momentum space.

and one of the possible realizations for the \hat{r} generator on the canonical phase space [59], for example, is:

$$\{x_i, p_j\} = \delta_{ij} \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 x^2 - \beta^2 p^2 - \alpha^2 \beta^2 (x^2 p^2 - (xp)^2)}. \quad (56)$$

The remaining relations are obtained in a straightforward way. The 1 dimensional case would simplify to:

$$\{x, p\} = \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 x^2 - \beta^2 p^2}. \quad (57)$$

with the corresponding EGUP¹¹:

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 (\Delta x)^2 - \beta^2 (\Delta p)^2}. \quad (58)$$

We see that in such 1 dimensional case a higher order terms would appear, see e.g. [61] for similar feature arising in the case of GUP. Expanding the RHS of (57) in deformation parameters we can see that the results of the previous section (30) can be applied and the invariant phase space volume element would amount to:

$$\frac{dx dp}{\left(1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{2} x^2 - \frac{\beta^2}{2} p^2\right)} \quad (59)$$

when considered up to α^2 and β^2 order. The D-dimensional case of Yang model in the context of density of states will be investigated in future work.

It is also worth to mention that in [62] generalizations of the Snyder algebra to a curved space-time background with de Sitter symmetry were considered where the SdS model and Yang model were obtained as special cases. The realizations of these algebras were considered in terms of canonical phase space coordinates, up to fourth order in the deformation parameters. Therefore the results of the present paper could be generalized to these type of models and realizations as well.

V. FINAL REMARKS

In this paper we have focused on models exhibiting noncommutativity in both space-time coordinates and in momenta (i.e. models with curved space-time and momentum space), such that in the quantum phase space relations both the Planck length l_p and the cosmological constant Λ appear as fundamental parameters on equal footing. The modified Heisenberg commutation relations lead to EGUPs where the symmetry between position and momentum is preserved (which is not the case in the usual GUPs or EUPs). Such symmetric EGUPs may be seen as an indication of quantum gravity deviations from the classical space-time at both very small and very large scales.

In general since the canonical commutation relations are modified, one expects that thermodynamics and statistical mechanics will be affected by the introduced modifications, possibly leading to some new effects. As a consequence of the EGUP arising from the cases of Snyder-de Sitter and Yang models we have shown that the Liouville theorem in statistical physics requires considering the weighted phase space volume and introduces modification in the density of states, with the weight factor depending on both coordinates and momenta. Since EGUP requires modification of the density states this may influence the statistical and thermodynamic properties of physical systems. Various applications can now be studied and the effects of both noncommutativity in coordinates and momenta (or the presence of Planck length and the cosmological constant in modified UPs) on atomic physics, condensed matter physics, preheating phase of the universe and black holes etc. can now be investigated.

Acknowledgements

AP thanks A. Wojnar and S. Zonetti for interesting discussions and acknowledges the support of the Polish NCN grant 2022/45/B/ST2/01067 and COST Action CA23130 BridgeQG.

[1] N. Seiberg, E. Witten, JHEP **09**, 032 (1999). doi:10.1088/1126-6708/1999/09/032

¹¹ in higher dimensions additional mixed terms would be present in EGUP relation

- [2] D.J. Gross, P.F. Mende, Nucl. Phys. B **303**, 407 (1988). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(88)90390-2
- [3] C. Rovelli, L. Smolin, Nucl. Phys. B **442**, 593 (1995). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(95)00150-Q. [Erratum: Nucl.Phys.B 456, 753–754 (1995)]
- [4] J. Ambjorn, J. Jurkiewicz, R. Loll, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 171301 (2005). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.171301
- [5] O. Lauscher, M. Reuter, JHEP **10**, 050 (2005). doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2005/10/050
- [6] P. Horava, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 161301 (2009). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.161301
- [7] L.J. Garay, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **10**, 145 (1995). doi:10.1142/S0217751X95000085
- [8] M. Maggiore, Phys. Lett. B **304**, 65 (1993). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(93)91401-8
- [9] M. Maggiore, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 5182 (1994). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.49.5182
- [10] M. Maggiore, Phys. Lett. B **319**, 83 (1993). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(93)90785-G
- [11] A. Kempf, G. Mangano, R.B. Mann, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 1108 (1995). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.52.1108
- [12] L.N. Chang, D. Minic, N. Okamura, T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 125028 (2002). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.125028
- [13] L.N. Chang, D. Minic, N. Okamura, T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 125027 (2002). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.125027
- [14] E.C. Vagenas, A.F. Ali, M. Hemedda, H. Alshal, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**(5), 398 (2019). doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6908-z
- [15] F. Scardigli, Phys. Lett. B **452**, 39 (1999). doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(99)00167-7
- [16] S. Capozziello, G. Lambiase, G. Scarpetta, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **39**, 15 (2000). doi:10.1023/A:1003634814685
- [17] F. Brau, F. Buisseret, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 036002 (2006). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.036002
- [18] S. Das, E.C. Vagenas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 221301 (2008). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.221301
- [19] F. Scardigli, G. Lambiase, E. Vagenas, Phys. Lett. B **767**, 242 (2017). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.01.054
- [20] E. Harikumar, Z. Nambipunnillath Siddique, J. Phys. Comm. **2**(3), 035016 (2018). doi:10.1088/2399-6528/aaaf40
- [21] P. Wang, H. Yang, X. Zhang, JHEP **08**, 043 (2010). doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2010)043
- [22] A.F. Ali, Class. Quant. Grav. **28**, 065013 (2011). doi:10.1088/0264-9381/28/6/065013
- [23] A.F. Ali, A.N. Tawfik, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **22**, 1350020 (2013). doi:10.1142/S021827181350020X
- [24] M. Bawaj, et al., Nature Commun. **6**, 7503 (2015). doi:10.1038/ncomms8503
- [25] A. Mathew, M.K. Nandy, Annals Phys. **393**, 184 (2018). doi:10.1016/j.aop.2018.04.008
- [26] F. Tamburini, F. Feleppa, B. Thidé, Phys. Lett. B **826**, 136894 (2022). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2022.136894
- [27] A. Das, S. Das, N.R. Mansour, E.C. Vagenas, Phys. Lett. B **819**, 136429 (2021). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136429
- [28] J.P.R. Bernaldez, A.G. Abac, R.E.S. Otadoy, Annals of Physics p. 169402 (2023)
- [29] J.D.M. Tuñacao, A.G. Abac, R.E.S. Otadoy, International Journal of Modern Physics D p. 2350049 (2023)
- [30] W.M. Campbell, M.E. Tobar, S. Gallioui, M. Goryachev, (2023)
- [31] A. Pachol, A. Wojnar, Class. Quant. Grav. **40**(19), 195021 (2023). doi:10.1088/1361-6382/acf435
- [32] P. Bosso, G.G. Luciano, L. Petruzzello, F. Wagner, (2023)
- [33] B. Bolen, M. Cavaglia, Gen. Rel. Grav. **37**, 1255 (2005). doi:10.1007/s10714-005-0108-x
- [34] M.i. Park, Phys. Lett. B **659**, 698 (2008). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.11.090
- [35] S. Mignemi, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **25**, 1697 (2010). doi:10.1142/S0217732310033426
- [36] A. Kempf, J. Math. Phys. **35**, 4483 (1994). doi:10.1063/1.530798
- [37] C. Bambi, F.R. Urban, Class. Quant. Grav. **25**, 095006 (2008). doi:10.1088/0264-9381/25/9/095006
- [38] F. Wagner, Eur. Phys. J. C **83**(2), 154 (2023). doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11298-0
- [39] S. Segreto, G. Montani, Eur. Phys. J. C **83**(5), 385 (2023). doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11480-4
- [40] M. Bishop, J. Lee, D. Singleton, Phys. Lett. B **802**, 135209 (2020). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135209
- [41] M. Bishop, J. Contreras, D. Singleton, Universe **8**(3), 192 (2022). doi:10.3390/universe8030192
- [42] P. Bosso, L. Petruzzello, F. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **107**(12), 126009 (2023). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.126009
- [43] S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen, J.E. Roberts, Commun. Math. Phys. **172**, 187 (1995). doi:10.1007/BF02104515
- [44] S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen, J.E. Roberts, Phys. Lett. B **331**, 39 (1994). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(94)90940-7
- [45] A. Pachol, A. Wojnar, Eur. Phys. J. C **83**(12), 1097 (2023). doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-12286-0
- [46] R. Casadio, F. Scardigli, Phys. Lett. B **807**, 135558 (2020). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135558
- [47] J. Kowalski-Glikman, L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 065020 (2004). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.70.065020
- [48] H.S. Snyder, Physical Review **71**(1), 38 (1947)
- [49] S. Mignemi, Class. Quant. Grav. **29**, 215019 (2012). doi:10.1088/0264-9381/29/21/215019
- [50] R. Banerjee, K. Kumar, D. Roychowdhury, JHEP **03**, 060 (2011). doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2011)060
- [51] J. Kowalski-Glikman, S. Nowak, Class. Quant. Grav. **20**, 4799 (2003). doi:10.1088/0264-9381/20/22/006
- [52] F. Wagner, G. Varão, I.P. Lobo, V.B. Bezerra, Phys. Rev. D **108**(6), 066008 (2023). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.066008
- [53] T.M. Bilać, S. Meljanac, S. Mignemi, (2024)
- [54] A. Kempf, G. Mangano, R.B. Mann, Physical Review D **52**(2), 1108 (1995)
- [55] C. Quesne, V.M. Tkachuk, J. Phys. A **39**, 10909 (2006). doi:10.1088/0305-4470/39/34/021
- [56] B. Hamil, M. Merad, T. Birkandan, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **134**(6), 278 (2019). doi:10.1140/epjp/i2019-12633-y
- [57] C.N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **72**, 874 (1947). doi:10.1103/PhysRev.72.874
- [58] C. Chryssomalakos, E. Okon, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **13**, 1817 (2004). doi:10.1142/S0218271804005225
- [59] S. Meljanac, S. Mignemi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **38**(35n36), 2350182 (2023). doi:10.1142/S0217751X23501828
- [60] T.M. Bilać, S. Meljanac, S. Mignemi, SIGMA **20**, 049 (2024). doi:10.3842/SIGMA.2024.049
- [61] W.S. Chung, H. Hassanabadi, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**(3), 213 (2019). doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6718-3
- [62] S. Meljanac, S. Mignemi, Phys. Lett. B **833**, 137289 (2022). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137289