Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Frame Interface Operators in Quantum Mechanics and NUVO Theory: Clarifying the Role of Observer-Dependent Structure in Physical Measurement Part 14 of the NUVO Theory Series

Rickey Austin *

Posted Date: 11 June 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.0941.v1

Keywords: NUVO theory; Measurement Theory; uncertainty; Frame Interface Operators; conformal scalar field; scalar field dynamics; energy-momentum tensor; time-dilation; relativistic correspondence; Newtonian mechanics; conformal coupling

Article

Frame Interface Operators in Quantum Mechanics and NUVO Theory: Clarifying the Role of Observer-Dependent Structure in Physical Measurement Part 14 of the NUVO Theory Series

Rickey W. Austin

St Claire Scientific, Albuquerque, NM; rickeywaustin@stclairescientific.com

Abstract: In conventional quantum mechanics, measurement and uncertainty are treated as intrinsic aspects of quantum systems, with little attention paid to the geometric structure of the observer's frame. NUVO theory offers a new interpretation: quantum systems evolve within modulated frames defined by a conformal scalar field $\lambda(t, r, v)$, while observers typically operate from a distinct reference frame. This paper introduces the concept of *frame interface operators*—operators that act across the boundary between a system's internal λ-modulated frame and the observer's external frame. We identify key operators in standard quantum mechanics that implicitly function at this interface, including the time evolution operator, boost generators, gauge transformations, geometric phase connections, basis transformations, and projective measurements. We show that many quantum phenomena, including the canonical commutator and Heisenberg uncertainty, already reflect inter-frame effects and need no further modification in NUVO. By rigorously distinguishing between frame-internal and frame-interface behavior, NUVO resolves longstanding interpretive ambiguities and establishes a foundation for a covariant operator formalism rooted in geometric modulation. This reinterpretation enables a consistent unification of quantum theory and conformal dynamics, providing new insight into measurement, decoherence, and observer-relative quantum structure.

Keywords: NUVO theory; Measurement Theory; uncertainty; Frame Interface Operators; conformal scalar field; scalar field dynamics; energy–momentum tensor; time-dilation; relativistic correspondence; Newtonian mechanics; conformal coupling

---

1. Introduction

Quantum mechanics (QM) has long stood as one of the most successful predictive frameworks in physics, yet its foundational structure remains conceptually opaque. In particular, the act of measurement—and the distinction between the quantum system and the observer—continues to provoke interpretive challenges. Standard formulations treat quantum operators as acting within a single, fixed Hilbert space, without explicit recognition of the geometric or physical frame in which the observer resides.

In contrast, NUVO theory introduces a geometric structure to the observer–system relationship. Central to NUVO is the scalar field $\lambda(t, r, v)$ [1], which defines a modulated measurement frame for every point in spacetime. Within each λ-modulated frame, physical quantities such as distance, time, and inertia are rescaled in a coherent and internally consistent manner. This reframes the act of measurement as a comparison between two distinct frames: the internal λ-frame of the quantum system and the external frame of the observer.

This paper introduces and formalizes the concept of *frame interface operators*—operators that do not act solely within a single Hilbert space, but rather mediate between distinct measurement frames. We show that several core operators in quantum mechanics, including the time evolution operator, boost generators, gauge transformations, geometric phase connections, basis transformations, and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0941.v1

projective measurements, inherently act across this frame boundary. When viewed through the lens of NUVO, these operators reveal a hidden geometric structure behind quantum uncertainty, time evolution, and wavefunction collapse.

Our goal is to identify the boundary between internal and external descriptions, and to show that the canonical commutator $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar$ is already a manifestation of the NUVO frame interaction. We argue that no deformation or modification of this structure is required; rather, the uncertainty principle itself emerges as a projection effect between differently modulated frames. By developing a rigorous operator-level interpretation of frame boundaries, NUVO provides a geometric foundation for unifying observer-relative quantum behavior with conformal field dynamics.

2. The Scalar Field and Frame Modulation

At the foundation of NUVO theory is the conformal scalar field $\lambda(t, r, v)$ [1], which assigns to each point in spacetime a local modulation factor that governs how physical units are measured in that region. This scalar field is not a dynamical field in the traditional sense of a quantum potential, but a geometric construct that modulates time, space, and inertial parameters in a consistent, locally defined manner. In effect, λ determines the measurement frame in which a quantum system resides.

Within this framework, each quantum system is embedded in a locally modulated frame defined by its specific λ value. Time intervals, spatial lengths, energy scales, and even rest mass are interpreted relative to the local value of λ. For instance, if λ is greater than unity at a given location, time flows more slowly, distances appear longer, and effective inertia is reduced—relative to a global or coordinate-based frame.

This modulation is not applied selectively to individual observables, but coherently across all physical quantities in the frame. Thus, λ cannot be viewed as a traditional operator acting within a Hilbert space. Instead, it serves as a structural scalar field on the spacetime manifold M, modulating the local geometry and defining the inner product and operator algebra for the Hilbert space associated with each point.

To formalize this concept, NUVO employs the structure of a *Hilbert bundle*, in which each point $p \in M$ is associated with a distinct Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_p$ governed by the local modulation $\lambda(p)$. The total space of quantum mechanics becomes a fiber bundle $\pi : \mathcal{E} \to M$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is the union of all modulated Hilbert spaces and π is the projection onto the base spacetime manifold.

This geometric formalism lays the groundwork for defining operators that act not within a single Hilbert space, but across fibers—that is, between observers operating in different λ-defined frames. These operators, which we identify as *frame interface operators*, are the subject of the next section.

3. Definition: Frame Interface Operators

In standard quantum mechanics, operators such as $\hat{x}$ (position), $\hat{p}$ (momentum), and $\hat{H}$ (Hamiltonian) are defined within a single Hilbert space, with fixed units and a uniform spacetime background. These operators are interpreted as intrinsic to the quantum system itself and are assumed to act entirely within the system's reference frame.

In NUVO theory, however, the situation is more nuanced. Since each quantum system resides in a modulated frame defined by a local value of the scalar field $\lambda(t, r, v)$, any attempt to compare, measure, or evolve quantum observables from an external observer's perspective inherently involves a transition between frames. Operators that mediate this transition—by transforming observables, states, or dynamics from one λ-defined frame to another—are referred to as *frame interface operators*.

3.1. Formal Definition

A **frame interface operator** is any operator $\hat{O}$ whose domain and codomain lie in distinct local Hilbert spaces associated with different λ values:

$$\hat{O} : \mathcal{H}_p \to \mathcal{H}_q, \quad \lambda(p) \neq \lambda(q)$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 11 June 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0941.v1

Such operators inherently encode the differential modulation between two frames, rather than acting strictly within a single $\mathcal{H}_p$.

Alternatively, in the case of infinitesimally close points, a frame interface operator may be viewed as a connection-induced transformation acting along a section of the Hilbert bundle $\mathcal{E}$:

$$\hat{O}_\lambda = \nabla^\lambda_\mu : \Gamma(\mathcal{E}) \to \Gamma(T^*M \otimes \mathcal{E})$$

Here, ∇^λ represents the covariant derivative induced by the scalar field λ, serving as a geometric connection that defines how states and observables are transported between adjacent modulated frames.

3.2. Key Properties

- Frame interface operators preserve physical invariants under λ modulation but may alter local representations (e.g., rescaling time or energy units).
- They generally cannot be represented as self-adjoint operators within a single Hilbert space, since their action involves comparison across distinct metric structures.
- Their algebra may include nontrivial curvature or holonomy if λ varies nontrivially over spacetime.

3.3. Distinction from Frame-Internal Operators

Frame-internal operators, such as position $\hat{x}$ or momentum $\hat{p}$ within a single $\mathcal{H}_p$, act exclusively within a fixed λ frame and respect the local conformal structure. They do not encode any information about how that frame compares to others.

By contrast, frame interface operators act across frames, and their observable consequences—such as measurement outcomes, phase shifts, and apparent decoherence—only manifest when viewed from a frame with a different λ.

This distinction is essential for understanding which quantum operators should be reinterpreted or held invariant in NUVO theory, and it forms the operational foundation for the remainder of this paper.

4. Examples in QM Revisited Through NUVO

To understand the practical significance of frame interface operators, we revisit several core operator classes from standard quantum mechanics and reinterpret them through the lens of NUVO. In each case, we identify whether the operator acts purely within a local λ-modulated frame or whether it implicitly crosses frames, and therefore should be reclassified as a frame interface operator.

4.1. Time Evolution Operator

The time evolution operator in standard quantum mechanics is given by:

$$\hat{U}(t) = e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}$$

This operator evolves a state forward in coordinate time. However, in NUVO, time flows at a locally modulated rate governed by $\lambda(t, r, v)$. Thus, the true internal clock of the system experiences:

$$dt' = \lambda(t, r, v)\, dt$$

Accordingly, $\hat{U}(t)$ bridges the system's internal time frame with the coordinate frame of the observer, making it a frame interface operator in any scenario involving time comparison or synchronization.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0941.v1

4.2. Boost Operators

In non-relativistic quantum mechanics, the Galilean boost generator is:

$$\hat{G} = m\hat{x} - t\hat{p}$$

This operator explicitly transforms between inertial frames moving at different velocities. Since such transformations compare distinct spacetime coordinate systems (and thus distinct λ modulations in NUVO), boost operators naturally qualify as frame interface operators.

Clarification:

It is important to note that while boost operators change the observer's velocity relative to the system, they do not necessarily modify the system's own λ value. In NUVO, λ is sensitive to the gravitational potential and the system's kinetic energy arising from acceleration. Pure inertial boosts, which change velocity without affecting acceleration or gravitational potential, leave λ invariant within the system's own frame. However, the observer's perception of λ may differ due to relative motion, and thus boost operators still function as frame interface operators from the standpoint of observational comparison, even if they do not generate internal λ modulation.

4.3. Gauge Transformations

Standard gauge transformations of the wavefunction:

$$\psi'(x) = e^{i\chi(x)}\psi(x)$$

reflect a change in local phase convention, typically associated with a shift in the vector or scalar potential. In NUVO, the analogy deepens: just as $\chi(x)$ generates local phase shifts, $\lambda(x)$ generates local unit modulations. Both are scalar fields that define how observables transform under local changes of frame. Therefore, general gauge transformations can be reinterpreted in NUVO as unit-adjusting frame interface operations.

4.4. Geometric Phase and Berry Connection

The Berry connection is defined as:

$$A_i = i\langle\psi|\partial_{\theta_i}\psi\rangle$$

where θ_i are slow-varying parameters. When a quantum system evolves around a closed loop in parameter space, it accumulates a geometric phase. This phase arises due to **transport across a curved base space**, making the Berry connection an archetype of a frame interface operator.

In NUVO, if λ varies along a path, a similar phase-like effect may appear due to nontrivial parallel transport in the Hilbert bundle. Thus, Berry phases in QM may have an exact geometric analog in NUVO, with λ replacing the adiabatic parameter manifold.

4.5. Basis Transformations

Transformations between representations (e.g., position and momentum bases):

$$\psi(p) = \int dx\,\langle p|x\rangle\psi(x)$$

are commonly treated as purely mathematical operations. However, each representation implicitly defines a coordinate frame. In NUVO, if different bases correspond to differently modulated measurements, such basis changes become inter-frame comparisons and should be treated as frame interface operators.

4.6. Measurement Operators (POVMs and Projectors)

Perhaps the most critical class of frame interface operators are measurement operators. Projection operators or positive operator-valued measures (POVMs) are used to model the extraction of classical information from a quantum system. However, measurement is inherently an act of comparison—between the system's internal state and the observer's measuring device.

In NUVO, this interaction necessarily bridges two frames: the λ-modulated frame of the quantum system, and the observer's reference frame, often assumed to be classical. The projection operator, therefore, acts as a *transition map between frames*, and its outcomes are shaped by the mismatch between those frames.

4.7. Summary

The examples above demonstrate that many central operators in quantum mechanics are not purely internal but implicitly act across frames. NUVO theory brings this hidden structure to the surface, providing a geometric language to formally distinguish between operators that live within a single frame and those that span multiple λ-defined domains. In the next section, we revisit the canonical commutator in this context.

5. The Commutator Clarification

NUVO theory offers a geometric reinterpretation of one of the most foundational structures in quantum mechanics: the canonical commutator [2]

$$[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar.$$

While this expression is treated in standard quantum mechanics as an axiomatic feature of nature, NUVO proposes that it arises from the geometric mismatch that occurs when observables are compared across different measurement frames. This section introduces a hypothesis about how commutators behave in NUVO and shows how quantum uncertainty can be recast in terms of frame geometry.

5.1 Hypothesis: Frame Interface Operators and the NUVO Commutator

NUVO distinguishes between two types of operators:

- **Frame-internal operators**: Act entirely within a single λ-modulated frame. Their measurement and interpretation do not involve comparing across geometrically distinct domains.
- **Frame interface operators**: Act across or between frames with differing λ values. Their definition or measurement requires integration or comparison over modulated geometry.

We propose the following:

Hypothesis: In NUVO theory, a commutator $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]_\lambda$ is nonzero if at least one of the operators is a frame interface operator *and* the measurement spans regions where λ differs between frames. That is, non-commutativity arises from the presence of a frame-crossing operator evaluated across a non-uniform scalar geometry.

Formally, if $\hat{A}$ or $\hat{B}$ is a frame interface operator, then

$$[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]_\lambda \neq 0.$$

This provides a geometric rule for when commutators carry physical meaning: non-commutativity arises from measuring across modulated geometries rather than from intrinsic indeterminacy.

5.2 Canonical Commutator as a Special Case

Consider the canonical commutator $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}]$ in this framework. Position $\hat{x}$, when interpreted in a local λ frame, is purely frame-internal—it measures geometric displacement without crossing frames.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0941.v1

Momentum $\hat{p}$, however, is inherently a frame interface operator when it refers to wave-like or oscillatory motion. Measuring momentum requires sampling a finite Δt or Δx, during which λ may vary due to acceleration or curvature. Thus, the measurement implicitly spans multiple λ frames.

By our hypothesis, this frame crossing results in a nonzero NUVO commutator:

$$[\hat{x}, \hat{p}]_\lambda \neq 0.$$

The value $i\hbar$ in standard quantum mechanics may therefore be interpreted not as fundamental, but as a projection of the geometric residue of this frame mismatch. NUVO provides a mechanism by which this residue arises. A full derivation of $i\hbar$ from first principles in NUVO geometry is deferred to future work.

5.3 NUVO Interpretation of Uncertainty

In this view, the Heisenberg uncertainty principle is not an expression of intrinsic indeterminacy, but a statement about the impossibility of simultaneously comparing incompatible quantities across modulated frames. Within its own frame, a quantum system has full knowledge of both position and momentum.

Uncertainty arises only when an observer samples observables across distinct values of λ. The commutator becomes a diagnostic of frame mismatch rather than an inherent limitation of nature.

5.4 Wave Momentum and Modulation Closure

This insight becomes more powerful when considering wave momentum. Unlike inertial motion, wave-like behavior always involves acceleration—either through curvature of the path or oscillatory dynamics. In NUVO, acceleration modifies the scalar field $\lambda(t, r, v)$ even within the particle's own frame. Therefore, wave-based momentum is always defined across evolving λ, introducing geometric inconsistency even from an internal perspective.

To measure wave momentum, an observer must sample over a finite interval Δt, during which λ changes. This makes uncertainty unavoidable. However, NUVO introduces the concept of *modulation closure*—a condition where the scalar modulation completes a full cycle or reaches a resonance. At such points, coherence may be restored, and quantities like momentum may become sharply defined.

Modulation closure may also trigger physical events, such as particle creation, annihilation, or state transitions, as the system exits or enters new geometric domains. These possibilities point to a deeper link between scalar geometry, discreteness, and physical evolution.

5.5 Conclusion

In summary, NUVO reinterprets the commutator

$$[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar$$

as a geometric artifact of frame mismatch. It arises only when comparing across modulated frames, and reflects the observer's interaction with a non-uniform scalar geometry. Within a single λ frame, the commutator vanishes: $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}]_{\text{internal}} = 0$.

NUVO thus offers a powerful hypothesis: nonzero commutators signal the presence of frame interface operators, and the associated uncertainty reflects geometric structure—not fundamental randomness. This framework provides a clear path to deriving Planck's constant and quantum uncertainty from conformal geometry. It may be possible that NUVO theory naturally produces the value of i, not as a mathematical axiom, but as a geometric consequence of attempting to measure across frames or in a non-coherent scalar state. A formal investigation into the geometric origin of complex structure in quantum commutators will be the subject of a future paper.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 11 June 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0941.v1

6. When to Use NUVO vs QM Operators

The reinterpretation of commutators and uncertainty in NUVO raises an important practical and philosophical question: when should one use standard quantum mechanical (QM) operators, and when should one instead apply the NUVO operator framework?

This section clarifies the conditions under which each approach is appropriate, based on the relationship between the observer and the system, and the degree of scalar modulation present in the measurement context.

6.1 Frame-Coherence Criteria

In NUVO, the choice of operator framework depends on whether the observer and the system share the same scalar field environment. Specifically:

- **Use standard QM operators** when:
  - The observer and system are approximately in the same λ frame.
  - Scalar modulation across the domain of interest is negligible (i.e., $\nabla\lambda \approx 0$).
  - The measurement can be treated as occurring in flat space with constant units.
- **Use NUVO operators** when:
  - The measurement involves observable acceleration or gravitational potential gradients.
  - Scalar field variation across time or space is non-negligible.
  - The system and observer reside in different λ frames (including measurement across wave cycles or extended quantum configurations).

6.2 Summary of Operator Roles

Operator	Frame Role	Appropriate Formalism
$\hat{x}$ (position)	Frame-internal	QM or NUVO
$\hat{p}$ (inertial)	Frame-internal	QM or NUVO
$\hat{p}$ (wave/cyclic)	Frame interface	NUVO
$\hat{U}(t)$ (time evolution)	Frame interface if $\lambda(t)$ varies	NUVO
Boost generators	Frame interface	NUVO
Measurement operators	Frame interface	NUVO
Gauge transforms (involving units)	Frame interface	NUVO
Berry connection / geometric phase	Frame interface	NUVO

6.3 Interpretive Guidance

NUVO does not reject standard quantum mechanics. Rather, it provides a broader geometric context in which quantum mechanics emerges as a limiting case. Observables that lie entirely within a uniform scalar environment can be safely treated using standard quantum mechanical operators and commutation rules.

However, when observables are defined across geometries—such as in accelerating frames, evolving wave states, or measurements across boundaries—NUVO requires a geometric correction. The use of NUVO commutators, transport-based measurement theory, and scalar-aware evolution operators becomes essential.

In this way, NUVO offers a clear and principled framework for determining when quantum observables should be interpreted geometrically, and when conventional formalism remains valid.

7. Implications and Interpretive Power

The frame-based structure introduced in NUVO theory not only explains quantum uncertainty and commutator structure in geometric terms, but also offers a wide-ranging reinterpretation of many

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0941.v1

foundational aspects of quantum mechanics. This section outlines key implications of adopting the NUVO perspective, both conceptually and operationally.

7.1 Rethinking Quantum Uncertainty

In NUVO, uncertainty does not arise from the indeterminacy of physical states, but from the act of measurement across geometrically distinct frames. The Heisenberg uncertainty principle becomes a statement about the inability to define two frame-sensitive observables—such as position and wave momentum—simultaneously in a regime of nonuniform scalar modulation.

This reframing resolves many historical paradoxes in quantum theory. For example, the question of whether a particle "really has" a momentum and a position is replaced by a question of geometric coherence: are these quantities being measured from the same λ frame, or across a transition? NUVO shows that within its own frame, the system retains full knowledge of all observables.

7.2 Decoherence and Wavefunction Collapse

Measurement in NUVO is inherently a frame-crossing event. Projective collapse is not a mysterious non-unitary process, but rather a natural geometric transition in which an observer projects the state of a λ-modulated system onto their own scalar frame.

The decoherence of superpositions, then, arises from accumulated mismatch across frames, especially when extended interactions occur over spatially or temporally varying λ. Collapse is the geometric alignment of one frame with another—eliminating the uncertainty generated by prior mismatches.

7.3 Discreteness and Quantization as Geometric Closure

NUVO provides a geometric mechanism for discreteness in physical systems. When scalar modulation undergoes periodic closure, as hypothesized in wave states, it defines natural points of geometric coherence. At these points, observables may transition from uncertain to definite, or trigger physical events like particle creation or state transitions.

This suggests that quantization itself is a side effect of geometry—arising not from imposed postulates or boundary conditions, but from scalar field harmonics and modulation closure. NUVO thus aligns with a growing perspective in theoretical physics that geometry, not probability, underlies the discreteness of physical reality.

7.4 Toward a Covariant Quantum Geometry

The operator reinterpretation in NUVO lays the groundwork for a fully covariant quantum framework in which both the geometry of space and the rules of quantum measurement evolve coherently. Frame interface operators become connections across a Hilbert bundle; scalar modulation becomes a gauge-like field encoding local measurement structure.

This opens the door to a rich landscape of extensions: λ-dependent gauge theory, conformal tensor quantization, geometric unification of unit systems, and even a reinterpretation of entanglement as geometric coherence across separated but modulated domains.

7.5 The Broader View

Perhaps most importantly, NUVO offers a language for identifying when quantum mechanics is a complete description and when it is merely an approximation. In scalar-flat regions, standard QM applies. In regions of high curvature or acceleration, NUVO governs.

This approach unifies classical, quantum, and gravitational domains through a single geometric principle: the modulation of the scalar field λ. Quantum mechanics is not wrong—it is simply incomplete in environments where geometry cannot be neglected.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0941.v1

8. Conclusion and Future Work

This paper has introduced and developed the concept of frame interface operators within the framework of NUVO theory. By recognizing that certain quantum operators inherently act across modulated scalar geometries, we have reinterpreted canonical structures—such as the commutator and the uncertainty principle—as artifacts of geometric frame mismatch rather than intrinsic indeterminacy.

We began by formally distinguishing between frame-internal and frame interface operators, leading to the hypothesis that any NUVO commutator becomes nonzero when at least one operator spans differing λ frames. This insight reframes the canonical commutator $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar$ as a consequence of scalar modulation geometry, and offers a path to deriving Planck's constant from first principles.

The role of momentum in wave systems, and its connection to evolving λ within a single frame, introduces a new source of geometric uncertainty that persists even without external observation. The concept of modulation closure was proposed as a mechanism for the emergence of quantum discreteness, coherence, or even particle transitions—all rooted in the scalar field's behavior.

Practical criteria were presented to guide the choice between using standard QM operators or NUVO operators, depending on the scalar coherence of the measurement context. This clarified how conventional quantum mechanics arises as a limiting case of a broader conformal geometry.

Finally, we explored how NUVO theory provides a natural reinterpretation of wavefunction collapse, decoherence, and quantization as geometric transitions. It establishes the foundation for a future covariant formulation of quantum theory based on scalar field modulation and Hilbert bundle transport.

Future Work

Several directions naturally follow from this work:

- A formal derivation of $i\hbar$ from NUVO scalar geometry and frame interface commutators, see Appendix A.
- Development of λ-covariant quantum dynamics.
- Exploration of particle creation, annihilation, and transitions as outcomes of modulation closure.
- Tensor bundle formalism to generalize NUVO operators across curved conformal space.
- Investigation into whether the imaginary unit i in quantum mechanics arises naturally from geometric properties of λ-modulated transitions.

These efforts aim to elevate NUVO from a geometric reinterpretation to a predictive, self-consistent theoretical framework. The geometry of measurement, not probability, may yet reveal the deeper structure of quantum reality.

"Why is it that the imaginary unit i enters the basic laws of quantum mechanics?" [3]
— Wolfgang Pauli

Appendix A. Geometric Origin of the Imaginary Unit in Quantum Commutators

Wolfgang Pauli once observed that the imaginary unit i, which appears in the foundational commutators of quantum mechanics, might not merely be a mathematical convenience, but a symbol of the rupture introduced by the observer [3]. He speculated that its presence signaled a structural asymmetry—an expression of the unknowable interaction between observer and system. NUVO theory offers a concrete resolution to this conceptual puzzle: the imaginary unit i is not algebraic, but geometric. It emerges from scalar mismatch between reference frames—specifically, when a modulated quantum system is measured from an external frame with a different scalar field value λ. The result is an energy discrepancy that, under certain conditions, produces a negative value under square root—thus giving rise to i as a physical signature of the measurement interface.

In this appendix, we present a hypothesis within NUVO theory for the emergence of the imaginary unit i in quantum mechanics. Rather than treating i as an abstract algebraic constant, NUVO offers a

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 11 June 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0941.v1

geometric mechanism by which i naturally arises when comparing energy quantities across modulated scalar frames.

Appendix A.1. Energy–Momentum Structure in Modulated Frames

We begin with a relativistic-like energy relation written in scalar-flat coordinates ($c = 1$):

$$E^2 = p^2 + E_0^2$$

Here, E_0 is the rest energy (invariant under NUVO frame transformations), and p is the instantaneous momentum, which may vary under modulation due to scalar curvature, local acceleration, or frame mismatch.

In NUVO theory:

- E_0 is invariant across frames due to the commutator condition $[\hat{E}_0, \hat{A}]_\lambda = 0$.
- p is frame-dependent when derived from internal modulation (e.g., orbital advance).
- Observers situated in distinct λ frames will compute different values of E and p.

Scalar Frame Comparison and Emergence of i

Consider two frames:

- Frame A: the system's local frame where instantaneous momentum includes modulation energy.
- Frame B: the observer's frame, lacking access to the modulated p^2.

If the observer attempts to compute $E_A^2 - E_B^2$, and p^2 differs across frames due to geometric modulation, then:

$$E_A^2 - E_B^2 = p_A^2 - p_B^2 = -\Delta^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sqrt{E_A^2 - E_B^2} = i\sqrt{\Delta^2}$$

Thus, the imaginary unit arises from the square root of a frame-induced negative energy difference—representing a geometric misalignment rather than a purely algebraic necessity.

Appendix A.2. Hydrogen Modulation as a Test Case

In NUVO, the hydrogen atom exhibits a hidden energy per orbit due to scalar modulation given by:

$$E_{\text{mod}} = \alpha^2\hbar$$

and a full modulation closure after $1/\alpha^2$ orbits yields the total hidden energy:

$$E_{\text{closure}} = \hbar$$

Inserting these into the frame-variant energy relation:

$$E^2 = p^2 + E_0^2 \Rightarrow \hbar^2 = (\alpha^2\hbar)^2 + E_0^2$$

From the system's point of view, this is valid. But from the observer's perspective, the momentum term $\alpha^2\hbar$ may be inaccessible due to scalar mismatch, leading to:

$$E_{\text{obs}}^2 = E_0^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad E_{\text{sys}}^2 - E_{\text{obs}}^2 = -(\alpha^2\hbar)^2$$

Then the measurement result becomes:

$$\sqrt{E_{\text{sys}}^2 - E_{\text{obs}}^2} = i\alpha^2\hbar$$

Here, i arises as a geometric indicator that energy is being observed across a frame boundary with non-zero scalar modulation. This is the per-orbit mismatch. However, resonance with the global field does not occur until full modulation closure at $1/\alpha^2$ orbits. At that point, the total hidden energy is $\hbar$, and the transformation mismatch becomes:

$$\sqrt{-\hbar^2} = i\hbar$$

This matches the canonical quantum uncertainty scale and aligns with the minimal uncertainty limit of $(1/2)\hbar$. Thus, NUVO predicts that $i\hbar$ arises specifically at the point of modulation closure—where local hidden modulation energy becomes globally coherent.

Appendix A.3. Interpretation

This construction suggests that the imaginary unit i in quantum theory reflects a real, geometric distinction between frames of reference. It arises specifically when comparing frame-invariant quantities (like E_0) with frame-variant quantities (like p) across a scalar discontinuity.

The directionality of the transformation—from the system to the observer—determines the sign of the squared difference and thus introduces i upon taking the square root.

Hypothesis: The appearance of i in quantum commutators is a geometric consequence of comparing invariant and modulated quantities across nonuniform λ frames. The resulting energy mismatch, when negative under square root, encodes i as a scalar frame transition marker. At modulation closure in the hydrogen atom, this mismatch becomes $i\hbar$, suggesting that the canonical quantum commutator may emerge from scalar modulation dynamics in systems where geometric closure yields discrete energy transitions.

A full derivation of $i\hbar$ from this framework, including scalar energy density and angular momentum correspondence, is reserved for future work.

References

1. Austin, R.W. From Newton to Planck: A Flat-Space Conformal Theory Bridging General Relativity and Quantum Mechanics. *Preprints* **2025**. Preprint available at https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202505.1410/v1.
2. Heisenberg, W. Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik. *Zeitschrift für Physik* **1927**, *43*, 172–198. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01397280.
3. Pauli, W.; Jung, C.G. *Atom and Archetype: The Pauli/Jung Letters, 1932–1958*; Princeton University Press, 2001. Contains Pauli's reflections on the symbolic and geometric meaning of the imaginary unit i in quantum mechanics, especially in relation to symmetry and observer interaction.