

Crossed products and quantum reference frames: on the observer-dependence of gravitational entropy

Julian De Vuyst^{1,a}, Stefan Eccles^{1,b}, Philipp A. Höhn,^{1,c} and Josh Kirklin^{1,2,d}

¹*Qubits and Spacetime Unit,
Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology (沖縄科学技術大学院大学),
1919-1 Tancha, Onna-son, Kunigami-gun, Okinawa, Japan 904-0495*

²*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics,
31 Caroline Street North, Waterloo, ON, N2L 2Y5, Canada*

^ajulian.devuyst@oist.jp

^bstefan.eccles@oist.jp

^cphilipp.hoehn@oist.jp

^djkirklin@pitp.ca

Abstract

A significant step towards a rigorous understanding of perturbative gravitational entropy was recently achieved by a series of works showing that a proper accounting of gauge invariance and observer degrees of freedom converts the Type III algebra of QFT observables in a gravitational subregion to a Type II crossed product, whose entropy reduces to the generalized entropy formula in a semiclassical limit. The observers thus used are also known as quantum reference frames (QRFs); as noted in our companion work [1], using different QRFs result in different algebras, and hence different entropies – so gravitational entropy is observer-dependent. Here, we provide an in-depth analysis of this phenomenon, with full derivations of many new results. Using the perspective-neutral QRF formalism, we extend previous constructions to allow for arbitrarily many observers, each carrying a clock with possibly degenerate energy spectra. We consider a semiclassical regime characterized by clocks whose energy fluctuations dominate over the fluctuations of the energy of the QFT. Unlike previous works, we allow the clocks and fields to be arbitrarily entangled. At leading order the von Neumann entropy still reduces to the generalized entropy, but linear corrections are typically non-vanishing and quantify the degree of entanglement between the clocks and fields. We also describe an ‘antisemiclassical’ regime as the opposite of the semiclassical one, with suppressed fluctuations of the clock energy; in this regime, we show how the clock may simply be ‘partially traced’ out when evaluating the entropy. Four explicit examples of observer-dependent entropy are then given, involving a gravitational interferometer, degenerate clock superselection, a semiclassical approximation applying to some clocks but not others, and differences between monotonic and periodic clocks.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Quantum clocks as quantum reference frames	7
2.1	Modelling clocks with covariant POVMs	8
2.2	Constraints, relational observable algebras and crossed products	10
2.3	The physical Hilbert space	11
2.4	Physical representation of the algebra	14
2.5	“Jumping into a clock frame”: the Page-Wootters formalism	15
2.5.1	Relational Schrödinger picture	16
2.5.2	Observable reduction	18
2.6	QRF transformations: changing to a different clock	19
2.7	Subsystem relativity	21
2.8	Kinematical vs. physical von Neumannness	24
3	Realization in perturbative quantum gravity: $PW = CLPW$	25
3.1	Subregions and constraints in perturbative quantum gravity	25
3.2	$PW = CLPW$	29
3.2.1	Map to coinvariant representation is Page-Wootters reduction	30
3.2.2	Reduction of observable algebras	32
4	Subregion density operators with non-degenerate clocks	33
4.1	Trace on the observable algebra	35
4.2	Density operator	37
4.3	Partial trace over a clock	38
4.4	Comparison with previous work	39
4.5	The need for a complementary frame	40
5	Subregion density operators with degenerate clocks	41
5.1	Degenerate quantum clocks as QRFs	41
5.1.1	Covariant POVMs for degenerate clocks	41
5.1.2	Decomposition of Hilbert spaces and observable algebras	42
5.1.3	Operational superselection	43
5.1.4	Page-Wootters formalism for degenerate clocks	45
5.1.5	Changing degenerate clocks	45
5.1.6	Subsystem relativity for degenerate clocks	46
5.2	Density operators	47
5.2.1	No superselection	47
5.2.2	Superselection for all clocks	48
5.2.3	Fixing the sector for one clock	50

6	Semiclassical regime	50
6.1	Shannon entropy contribution from energy of complementary clocks	53
6.2	Generalised entropy	54
6.3	Special case: separable QFT and frames	55
6.4	Linear order correction and entanglement	57
6.5	Comparison with previous work	59
7	Antisemiclassical regime	60
8	Observer-dependence of gravitational entropy	63
8.1	Case study: gravitational interferometer	63
8.2	Degenerate clocks	67
8.3	Semiclassical vs. non-semiclassical clocks	69
8.4	Periodic vs. monotonic clocks	70
9	Conclusion	71
	Acknowledgements	73
A	Additional derivations concerning non-ideal clocks	73
A.1	Fourier transform for non-ideal clocks	73
A.2	Algebra of gauge-invariant clock-system observables	74
A.3	Bounded physical operators from bounded kinematical ones	75
A.4	Reduced Hilbert space decomposition for non-ideal clocks	76
B	Constraint implementation via the T-map	77
C	Details of derivation of density operator	77
D	Details of semiclassical approximations	81
D.1	Linear corrections	83
E	Comparing density operators to prior work	85
F	Details of the gravitational interferometer example	90
G	Linear expansion of the symmetric BCH-formula	93
	References	94

1 Introduction

Geometry and information are deeply intertwined. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the generalized entropy formula, which says that the entropy of a gravitational subregion is equal to $\frac{A}{4G_N} + S_{\text{inside}}$, where A is the area of the boundary of the subregion, G_N is Newton’s constant, and S_{inside} is the entropy of any degrees of freedom contained inside the subregion. Since its thermodynamical conceptions [2, 3], this formula has been a guiding principle in quantum gravity (see [4–9] for a very small selection of results it has inspired). But it is misleadingly simple, for two reasons:

- S_{inside} is not well-defined, because the UV modes of the fields inside of the subregion contribute infinitely to it. More precisely, the von Neumann algebra of field operators with support in a subregion is Type III₁, and thus has no well-defined von Neumann entropy functional [10–12]. One may impose a UV cutoff to convert this algebra to something of Type I, which has well-defined von Neumann entropies. But a simple UV cutoff would ultimately be incompatible with general covariance in a full theory of gravity, and the UV cutoff cannot be removed without S_{inside} diverging. On the other hand, it was shown in [13–16] that a renormalization of G_N would allow the generalized entropy itself to be UV finite – the divergent piece of the S_{inside} term would be canceled by a similar divergence in the area term. This strongly indicates that the generalized entropy can be rigorously formulated without imposing a UV cutoff. But the underlying mechanism dictating how the appropriate renormalization would be done has remained unclear.
- Perhaps more fundamentally, a proper definition of the physical subsystem associated with a gravitational subregion must take into account diffeomorphism invariance. Indeed, if one is not careful about this, diffeomorphisms could move degrees of freedom in and out of the subregion, which would be incompatible with the notion of a definite physical subsystem comprised of such degrees of freedom. The generalized entropy formula must ultimately be interpreted as giving the entropy of such a subsystem – but much of the time it is employed without being very precise about this subtlety.

Resolving these issues is crucial not only for making sense of entropy in gravitational systems, but also for understanding the fundamental structure of spacetime in a quantum context. At first glance, the two problems seem to be more or less independent, but recent progress has shown that they are in fact tightly linked together by the notion of *quantum reference frames* (QRFs), which simultaneously regularize the entropy and account for diffeomorphism invariance. Let us give a brief account of how this came about.

First, in [17, 18], it was shown how an effective Type III₁ algebra emerges from the large N limit of the set of single trace operators acting on one of two copies of a holographic CFT in a thermofield double state; this was interpreted as the algebra of effective field theory operators with support on one side of the bulk dual black hole. Then, [19] demonstrated that one may consistently also include the CFT Hamiltonian in the set of operators, and that doing so modifies the emergent algebra to be Type II_∞. The bulk interpretation of this construction is that one is taking the so-called *crossed product* of the field theory algebra by the action of a Killing boost preserving the black hole horizon. This boost corresponds to the ‘modular flow’ of the bulk vacuum state, which is what is responsible for the type conversion [12, 20]. Unlike Type III algebras, Type II algebras *do* have a well-defined entropy functional.

Next, it was explained in [21] how this construction extends beyond the holographic context; in particular, that paper considered a system consisting of an *observer* carrying a clock inside of a static patch of de Sitter spacetime. The algebra of operators which act on the clock and the fields in the

static patch, and which are invariant under the global de Sitter time evolution (which is a gravitational gauge symmetry) was shown to be given by the crossed product of the Type III₁ static patch field algebra with respect to the action of this time evolution. Again, this is Type II_∞, which renders the entropy well-defined (it was also shown that imposing a lower bound on the allowed energy of the clock further reduces the algebra to be Type II₁, which can be understood as the condition that the algebra admits a maximally entangled state). Remarkably, it was then shown that (in a certain class of states consistent with a semiclassical approximation) the entropy functional for this algebra *agrees* with the generalized entropy formula. Since [17–19, 21], there has been a flurry of follow-up works exploring extensions and applications of these results (see [22–39] for a selection).

Thus, accounting for invariance under certain gravitational gauge symmetries kills two birds with one stone. One gets a rigorous and well-defined entropy functional that reproduces the generalized entropy, and one has a physical subsystem that is invariant under (a restricted set¹ of) diffeomorphisms.

In this paper, we will study how this construction depends on the properties of the clock used in the crossed product. As we first pointed out in [1] (see also [54, 55]), such a clock is a QRF. These are dynamical objects constructed out of quantum degrees of freedom. They are essential for understanding subsystems in quantum theories with local symmetries, such as quantum gravity, where the archetypal QRFs are quantum clocks and rods [38, 54, 56–61]. Various formalisms for working with QRFs have emerged [59, 60, 62–85]. There is not a one-fits-all formalism because QRFs may have different meaning and roles in different contexts, e.g. the role a QRF assumes in an operational quantum information scenario with agents is typically a distinct one from their role in gauge systems. These approaches thus differ in scope and this is reflected in differences in how they implement the relevant symmetries. The particular context of a given problem should dictate which formalism is employed. Here, we are interested in computing entropies of quantum states satisfying the gravitational constraints; for this purpose the perspective-neutral formalism [1, 66–78] is the appropriate one, as it is distinguished by imposing constraints on states as well as operators, and it is the one we will use. This formalism encodes the physics of the full theory independently of any particular chosen reference frame, enabling a ‘perspective-neutral’ description of subsystems. At the same time, it provides an explicit way to describe physics from ‘the perspective of’ a QRF, via a so-called Page-Wootters reduction map, going back to [86, 87]. The approach parallels the description of an abstract manifold in terms of local coordinate patches, where the manifold itself is perspective-neutral, and each set of local coordinates is a different frame perspective. There is a natural version of ‘quantum covariance’, implemented by unitary maps switching between each of the frame perspectives. The formalism as we employ it here is thus a (simplified) version of quantum geometry, which is another reason why it is particularly suited to quantum gravity.

In gravity, diffeomorphism invariance prevents a naïve formulation of physical subsystems associated with fixed spacetime subregions. Gravitational QRFs allow us to evade this problem – instead of focusing on fixed subregions, one instead defines *dressed, covariant, dynamical* subregions, in terms of the quantum coordinates provided by the QRFs. The degrees of freedom inside the subregion are also defined relative to these quantum coordinates. An immediate consequence of this is that such a physical subsystem depends heavily on which QRF is used to define it – and there are very many possible choices one can make for the QRF [56–58]. For example, one could give an observer a clock,

¹ In this paper, we will focus only on a single diffeomorphism, as was also done in the previous works we have described. The question of what should be done with the other diffeomorphisms is an important one. The situation simplifies somewhat when one considers perturbations around a spatially compact background with Killing symmetries which fix the subregion under consideration (such as the static patch in de Sitter spacetime), where, as we explained in [40], linearization stability conditions [41–53] play a key role. But, in the case of a general subregion in a general spacetime, this issue has not yet been fully addressed (though see [24, 40] for some discussion).

as in [21]. But one could use any other covariant dynamical degrees of freedom as a QRF: for example, the location at which a certain field takes on a particular value would give a quantum coordinate, and thus a QRF (for example as in [88], or in [23, 89] where a slow-rolling inflaton field was used). One can also think of edge modes [90–93] as QRFs [55, 57, 58, 60, 94]. As we will explain, it is also possible to use multiple QRFs to define a physical subsystem. Since using different QRFs (or different combinations of QRFs) results in different physical subsystems, it also leads to different values for entropies [67]. It is our aim to explore various manifestations of these phenomena, which we refer to respectively as subsystem relativity [1, 66, 67, 71, 85, 95], and the observer-dependence of gravitational entropy.

This paper extends previous work by generalizing the construction of subsystem algebras to systems with multiple quantum clocks, including those with degenerate energy spectra, and (briefly) periodic clocks. We analyse the observer-dependence of the entropy and its manifestation in various regimes, providing new insights into subsystem and entropy relativity in quantum gravity. We have already presented a selection of our findings in the companion paper [1]. However, one of the main goals of that paper was to also provide a useful pedagogical meeting point between the QRF and quantum gravity communities. In that spirit, we refer to it the reader who is taking their first steps in this burgeoning area. By contrast, the present paper will be much more technical and in-depth, with full derivations, and many novel results, examples and details. These are structured across the remaining sections, which we now outline to provide a roadmap for the reader.

In **Section 2** we review the pertinent details of the perspective-neutral formalism as it applies to quantum clocks, and how they should be employed as temporal QRFs. First, we cover how to model clocks using covariant positive operator valued measures (POVMs) and coherent states, and describe the difference between ideal and non-ideal clocks (which are distinguished by whether or not they have the ability to record time with arbitrary precision). Then, we explain how to impose the gauge constraints on operators; in particular, the gauge-invariant operators of a clock and a subsystem decompose into so-called dressed observables and reorientations, and together these form a crossed product (or subalgebra thereof). We describe how to also impose the gauge constraints on states, by means of a so-called group-averaging inner product. There are two important equivalent formulations of this procedure: the first, using refined algebraic quantization (RAQ), has historically been more often used by proponents of QRFs, while the latter, using ‘coinvariants’, was employed in [21]; we describe both and explain how they are related. Then we explain how the Page-Wootters formalism may be used to ‘jump into the perspective’ of a clock, and how one may transform between the perspectives of different clocks. We use these insights to then describe the notion of subsystem relativity that will cause the observer-dependence of gravitational entropy later. We also comment on how the algebra of gauge-invariant operators is represented at both the perspective-neutral and clock perspective levels, and describe subtleties related to the properties of this representation, in particular when the von Neumann nature of a gauge-invariant algebra survives the step from the kinematical to the gauge-invariant Hilbert space. Various technical details relevant to this Section may be found in Appendices **A** and **B**.

We then describe how the perspective-neutral formalism for quantum clocks applies to perturbative quantum gravity in **Section 3**, describing how the Page-Wootters (PW) framework was implicitly used by Chandrasekaran-Longo-Penington-Witten (CLPW) [21] when describing states and observables on which constraints have been imposed, a fact which we summarize with the informal slogan

$$\text{PW} = \text{CLPW}. \tag{1.1}$$

This emphasizes the role of QRFs in the definition of subsystems in quantum gravity. In particular, we reproduce the construction of a gauge-invariant gravitational subregion algebra as the crossed product of a type III QFT algebra with its modular flow.

Next, in **Section 4**, we obtain the density operator in this algebra corresponding to an arbitrary physical state of the full system. This proceeds by first constructing a trace on the algebra, and then deriving the appropriate density operator. In the interest of clarity, several details of the derivation are confined to Appendix C, and we focus at first on clocks with non-degenerate energy spectra. Unlike previous approaches (except for the companion work [1]), we allow for arbitrary entanglement between the clocks and the fields, and we also allow the use of multiple clocks in the definition of the subsystem. If one is using more than one clock, we explain how one may ‘partial trace’ out a given clock to obtain the density operator of the subsystem that would be obtained by removing that clock. We also show how our formula reduces to that of previous work [21, 24], in the case of a ‘classical-quantum’ state as used in that work (although our formula applies much more generally). And we comment on a subtlety that arises when there are no ‘complementary clocks’, i.e. clocks outside of the subsystem under consideration.

In **Section 5**, we extend the analysis to degenerate clocks, i.e. those whose energy spectra are degenerate. In the interest of simplicity, we restrict attention to the case where the multiplicity of the energy is independent of the energy. We review how the perspective-neutral framework, including dressed observables and reorientations, extends to this case as described in [69]. As we will explain, defining a physical subsystem in the presence of these degeneracies necessitates some extra operational input. In particular, in many physical scenarios, *superselection* over the different degeneracy sectors of the clocks can occur. In different settings, this superselection either will or will not apply to each of the clocks. Depending on this, the physical subsystem one should consider is associated with different algebras of observables, and hence different density operators (and eventually different entropies). We show how to derive the density operators in a variety of different such cases.

Having found the density operators for the physical subsystems corresponding to gravitational subregions relative to quantum clocks, one can in principle compute the von Neumann entropies of these subsystems. However, for a general state this calculation is somewhat intractable, and to make progress it helps to restrict to states within certain regimes. The most powerful of these in the present context is the *semiclassical* regime, which we describe in **Section 6**. This regime is characterized by a clock which behaves almost classically relative to the QFT, in the sense that the time it reads is very sharply peaked at a certain value, with negligible physical fluctuations. An alternative way to state this is that the fluctuations of the QFT Hamiltonian are suppressed relative to fluctuations of the clock Hamiltonian. We explain how the von Neumann entropy of the density operators found in the previous sections reduces to the generalised entropy of the gravitational subregion, at leading order in the semiclassical approximation. Unlike previous works such as [21, 24], we do not require the clocks and fields to be in a product state; rather we allow arbitrary entanglement (so long as this is consistent with the semiclassical assumptions). We also explain how our result reduces to that of [21, 24] in the special case of the states investigated in those papers. We furthermore compute the linear corrections to the semiclassical approximation, finding that these do not vanish in general (but they do for states with no entanglement between the fields and the clocks, in agreement with [27]). In the interest of clarity, many details of the derivations of these results are confined to Appendix D.

Of course, semiclassical states form only a small subset of the full Hilbert space, and it is worth also considering states that fall under other regimes. One simple scenario, which we dub the ‘anti-semiclassical’ regime, is the opposite of the semiclassical regime in that it is characterised by clocks whose times are subject to such large fluctuations that they cannot be meaningfully used to aid in observations of the fields. In **Section 7** we discuss this regime, and derive the density operators and von Neumann entropies of corresponding states. In particular, we show how these may be computed by formulae that involve simply partially tracing out the antisemiclassical clock.

Section 8 employs all of the results previously established in the paper to demonstrate several

examples of the observer-dependence of gravitational entropy. First, we explore an explicit case study involving a superposition of clocks experiencing Shapiro time delay after moving past a massive body at different distances. This ‘gravitational interferometer’ example was also discussed in the companion work [1]; here we give more details on it. Some mathematical technicalities may be found in Appendix G. We then describe an example of how superselection over clock degeneracy sectors can lead to observer-dependence in the entropy, via a mechanism which is independent of those explored with the gravitational interferometer. Next, in a given system, some clocks may be subject to semiclassical approximation, while others are subject to an antisemiclassical approximation, while still others fall somewhere in between. This again leads to observer-dependent entropies: for the semiclassical clocks the generalised entropy formula applies, while for the others it does not. Up to this point in the paper, we focus on monotonic clocks, meaning those whose times are always strictly increasing. Our final example of observer-dependence in the entropy comes from introducing *periodic* clocks, which were recently investigated in the perspective-neutral framework in [70]. As we will discuss, periodic clocks dress field degrees of freedom in different ways to monotonic clocks, and this leads to different entropy functionals, with different statistical dependences on these degrees of freedom.

Two aspects regarding entropy relativity are worthwhile to emphasize. First, the observer-dependence of gravitational entropy for a subregion does *not* mean that the entropy for a black hole or a cosmological horizon depends on the QRF. Gravitational entropy relativity pertains to what different QRFs describe as the *field* degrees of freedom and it turns out that these correspond to distinct gauge-invariant subalgebras. Horizon entropy, on the other hand, includes the entropy of *all* degrees of freedom (in particular also the other clocks) in- or outside the horizon and this turns out not to depend on the QRF. It is the entropy associated with gauge-invariant algebra that all observers agree on.

Second, an observer-dependence of entropy can also arise for *classical* reference frames, which are external in the sense that their dynamics is not included in the description. For instance, inertial and Rindler observers in Minkowski space assign different entropies to, say, the vacuum and this observation can be extended to general spacetimes [96–98]. There is a key difference to the present case, however: for the classical, non-dynamical observers, the entropy relativity arises because they have access to *distinct* spacetime regions and thus field degrees of freedom. By contrast, the entropy relativity we will present in Sec. 8 is qualitatively very different: the different QRFs access the *same* spacetime region and field degrees of freedom and the entropy relativity rather traces back to the fact that the QRFs themselves are quantum subsystems contained in the region they describe.

We end the paper in **Section 9** with a summary of its achievements, and brief discussion of some open questions. In particular, we speculate on the consequences of accounting for a larger group of gravitational gauge symmetries, the inclusion of QRFs that transform under them, and how this will lead to more intricate manifestations of subsystem relativity and the observer-dependence of gravitational entropy.

2 Quantum clocks as quantum reference frames

In the remainder of this work, we will focus on monotonic quantum clocks as temporal QRFs associated with the (one-dimensional) translation group. This provides for a simple entry setting for the discussion of QRFs in quantum gravity and, as we shall see in Sec. 3, encompasses recent studies of the type conversion of local quantum field algebras in perturbative quantum gravity, e.g. see [21, 24, 27, 30–32, 36, 99, 100]. In the absence of boundaries, these studies invoke local observers equipped with quantum clocks to “dress” the QFT degrees of freedom with those of the clocks to deparametrize the QFT modular flow. When there is a boundary, an ADM Hamiltonian appears that is conjugate to

a boundary time variable that similarly serves as a clock for dressing. The resulting dressed algebras are so-called crossed products and admit well-defined density matrices and entropies.

We will see that such observers with clocks are nothing but QRFs and hence that the discussion of crossed products in gravity has a natural interpretation in terms of QRFs. This perspective will also permit us to generalize this construction to arbitrarily many observers and to explore the observer dependence of subregion density operators and entropies already summarized in [1]. In our exposition of quantum clocks as temporal QRFs, we will largely follow [68, 69]. Invoking the generalization of that formalism to QRFs associated with general symmetry groups [66] to extend our results on crossed products, density operators and entropies to more general QRFs will be left for future work.²

2.1 Modelling clocks with covariant POVMs

Taken as a temporal QRF, a monotonic clock will be modeled by a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_C on which its Hamiltonian H_C generates a unitary representation of the translation group $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ via $U_C(t) = \exp(-itH_C)$. The clock’s frame orientations are its readings τ and our main concern will be to construct suitable orientation states and observables. For monotonic clocks $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ so that its orientations take value in the translation group. Ideally, we would like to construct an orientation observable conjugate to the clock Hamiltonian, $[T, H_C] = i$, so that we can think of the latter as generating monotonic “reorientations” of the clock. Of course, if H_C is bounded, Pauli’s argument tells us that such a T cannot be self-adjoint [101]. Unruh and Wald [102] refined this observation (dropping canonical conjugacy), showing that bounded clock Hamiltonians do not admit self-adjoint monotonic time operators. The way out is to drop insisting on self-adjointness and invoking covariant positive operator-valued measures (POVMs) to build clock observables and a consistent probability interpretation for its readings [68, 69, 82, 103–107].

For simplicity, we shall assume in the remainder that the spectrum $\sigma_C := \text{Spec}(H_C)$ is purely continuous and for clarity we begin with the case when the spectrum is further nondegenerate. Degenerate clock Hamiltonians, such as $H_C = p^2$ for some momentum p , will be discussed separately in Sec. 5.³ Following [68], the clock states can then be constructed via⁴

$$|t\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon e^{ig(\epsilon)} e^{-it\epsilon} |\epsilon\rangle, \quad (2.1)$$

where $g(\epsilon)$ is an arbitrary phase, accounting for the fact that an operator conjugate to H_C is unique only up to addition of arbitrary functions of H_C . They are covariant

$$U_C(\tau) |t\rangle = |t + \tau\rangle, \quad (2.2)$$

and furnish a resolution of the identity

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} dt |t\rangle\langle t| = \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon |\epsilon\rangle\langle\epsilon| = I_C. \quad (2.3)$$

We may thus think of them as generalized (and distributional) coherent states associated with the translation group.

² More general crossed product constructions have already been explored in [54, 55], however using an inequivalent approach to QRFs that does not impose constraints on states unlike here and e.g. in [21, 24, 27, 30].

³ Periodic clocks (U(1) reference frames) can be treated similarly, however, the ensuing relational dynamics is somewhat more subtle [70]. We comment on this case in Subsec. 8.4.

⁴ We are using the symmetric convention for 2π factors in Fourier transformations in contrast to [68, 69].

In order to construct a probability measure, we define effect operators

$$E_C(X) = \int_{X \subset \mathbb{R}} dt |t\rangle\langle t| \geq 0 \quad (2.4)$$

for any (Borel) subset X of the set of possible clock readings \mathbb{R} (e.g. some time interval). Thanks to the normalization in Eq. (2.3) and the fact that $E_C(\cup_i X_i) = \sum_i E_C(X_i)$ for any disjoint X_i (σ -additivity), the effect operators form an operator-valued probability measure over the subsets of clock readings. For example, $\langle \varphi | E_C(X) | \varphi \rangle$ is the probability that the clock reading lies in X for the state $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_C$. Further thanks to Eq. (2.2), we have for all X

$$U_C(\tau) E_C(X) U_C^\dagger(\tau) = E_C(X + \tau), \quad (2.5)$$

and so the POVM is covariant with respect to the translation group generated by H_C .

The clock states need not be perfectly distinguishable

$$\langle t | t' \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon e^{i\epsilon(t-t')} =: \chi(t-t'), \quad (2.6)$$

since, when σ_C is just an interval, their overlap reads

$$\chi(t-t') = \begin{cases} \delta(t-t') & \sigma_C = \mathbb{R}, \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{i\epsilon_{\min}(t-t')} \left(\pi \delta(t-t') + i \mathcal{P} \frac{1}{t-t'} \right) & \sigma_C = [\epsilon_{\min}, \infty), \\ \frac{i}{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\epsilon_{\min}(t-t')} - e^{i\epsilon_{\max}(t-t')}}{t-t'} & \sigma_C = [\epsilon_{\min}, \epsilon_{\max}], \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

where \mathcal{P} denotes the Cauchy principal value [68]. When σ_C is given by a collection of disjoint intervals, the overlap will be given by a corresponding sum over these intervals of expressions as in the third line. Clock readings are thus only perfectly distinguishable when the Hamiltonian is unbounded, $\sigma_C = \mathbb{R}$, a case sometimes referred to as an *ideal* (or *perfect*) *clock*. Unless σ_C is bounded in both directions, clock states are also distributional. For later purpose, we explain in App. A.1 that a Fourier transform continues to exist even when σ_C is bounded.

We can define the moment operators associated with the covariant clock POVM as

$$T^{(n)} := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt t^n |t\rangle\langle t|. \quad (2.8)$$

Unless the clock is ideal, we have $T^{(n)} \neq (T^{(1)})^n$ and these operators are not self-adjoint but only symmetric [68, 103, 104]. In particular, the clock states $|t\rangle$ are only eigenstates of the moment operators when the clock is ideal. Nevertheless, they satisfy canonical commutation relations with the Hamiltonian [68, Proof of Lemma 2]

$$[T^{(n)}, H_C] = inT^{(n-1)}, \quad (2.9)$$

and are thus conjugate to it.

The sought-after clock orientation observable is given by the covariant POVM and all its moments. While these moments need not be self-adjoint, the effect operators $E_C(X)$ are, thereby yielding well-defined probabilities over the clock readings, even though the latter need not be perfectly distinguishable. Specifically, the non-monotonicity issue for clocks with bounded Hamiltonian reported by Unruh and Wald [102] is sidestepped thanks to the covariance of the POVM [68].

2.2 Constraints, relational observable algebras and crossed products

Let us now add some system S that may evolve relative to quantum clock C . The total (kinematical) Hilbert space is thus taken to be $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$. The system S may itself be composite and its Hilbert space given by a tensor product of a collection of Hilbert spaces. In particular, later S will contain additional clocks and it may also contain QFT Hilbert spaces.

Evolution relative to C means that we are considering relational dynamics. This entails that we treat the total Hamiltonian, for simplicity assumed to be free of interactions between clock and system,⁵ as a gauge constraint

$$H = H_S + H_C. \quad (2.10)$$

At this stage, we make no further assumption about the system Hamiltonian H_S . Thanks to our above assumptions on the clock Hamiltonian H_C , the constraint H is a translation group generator on \mathcal{H}_{kin} . We may interpret it as corresponding to time evolution of the combined CS system in some (possibly fictitious) external time. By treating this as a gauge symmetry, we are taking this external time evolution to be physically inaccessible, instead aiming for an *internal* evolution.

While this perspective can be applied to laboratory systems where external time is not fictitious, in gravitational systems without boundary (and more generally reparametrization invariant systems) as discussed later, this perspective is forced upon us by diffeomorphism invariance. The latter leads to Hamiltonian constraints and to what is sometimes known as the infamous problem of time [110–112]. It means nothing else than that in gravity degrees of freedom do not evolve relative to some background time, but relative to one another.

The translation group $U_{SC}(t) = \exp(-itH)$ generated by the constraint can be viewed as corresponding to reorientations of an external clock frame, while Eqs. (2.2) and (2.9) entail that the one generated by H_C implements reorientations of the internal clock C . The former are gauge, the latter are physical since $[U_{SC}(t), I_S \otimes U_C(t')] = 0$ and change the relation between clock and system.

Let us now consider the algebra of gauge-invariant observables. Let $\mathcal{A}_S \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$ be some algebra acting on the system such that time evolution $U_S(t) = \exp(-itH_S)$ constitutes a group of automorphisms of it. In particular, H_S need not necessarily be part of \mathcal{A}_S in which case these automorphisms are outer; this will be the case in perturbative quantum gravity below. In appendix A.2, we show that the gauge-invariant algebra of observables of the clock and system on \mathcal{H}_{kin} is given by relational observables and clock reorientations:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}} := (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C))^H = \left\langle O_C^r(a), I_S \otimes U_C(t) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S, t \in \mathbb{R} \right\rangle. \quad (2.11)$$

Let us explain the notation: $\langle A, B \rangle$ denotes the algebra generated by operators of the form A, B . For the moment, we leave implicit what the topology is in which this algebra is closed. When \mathcal{A}_S is a general C^* -algebra, closure will be with respect to the C^* -norm of the tensor product of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_R \otimes \mathcal{H}_S$ yielding the C^* -tensor product on the left. When \mathcal{A}_S is more specifically a von Neumann algebra,⁶ the main focus later, closure will be defined in terms of the double commutant and we will highlight this by writing $\langle A, B \rangle''$ for the von Neumann algebra generated by A, B .⁷ $\{U_C(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ are the clock reorientations. Furthermore, the relational observables describing the system property a

⁵ Relational dynamics in the presence of interactions is challenging and has been touched upon in [106, 108, 109].

⁶ Hence, $\mathcal{A}_S'' = \mathcal{A}_S$, where $''$ denotes the bicommutant on \mathcal{H}_S .

⁷ \mathcal{A}_S could also be the algebra of polynomials in some basic set of generators and may thereby not be contained in the algebra of bounded operators, in which case the tensor product is an algebraic one.

conditioned on the clock reading τ are given by a G -twirl (incoherent group averaging) over the gauge group:

$$O_C^\tau(a) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt U_{SC}(t) (a \otimes |\tau\rangle\langle\tau|) U_{SC}^\dagger(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt |t\rangle\langle t| \otimes \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{i^n}{n!} (t - \tau)^n [a, H_S]_n, \quad (2.12)$$

where $|\tau\rangle$ are the clock states in Eq. (2.1) and $[\cdot, \cdot]_n$ denotes the n th nested commutator with $[a, H_S]_0 = a$; note that the latter expression is an expansion in the moments of the clock POVM. As shown in [68], these are quantizations of the classical relational observables for Hamiltonian constrained systems in [113].⁸ For ideal clocks, the relational observables take a particularly simple form [68]

$$O_C^\tau(a) = e^{-i(T-\tau)H_S} a e^{i(T-\tau)H_S}, \quad (2.13)$$

since in this case the first moment operator $T = T^{(1)}$ is self-adjoint and the clock states are its eigenstates.

For later purpose we note in appendix A.2 that if \mathcal{A}_S is a von Neumann algebra, then so is the gauge-invariant algebra $(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C))^H$. In particular, if in addition the clock C is ideal (and hence $\mathcal{H}_C = L^2(\mathbb{R})$), then this algebra equals the crossed product of \mathcal{A}_S by the translation group generated by H_S (e.g., see [19, 21, 24]):

$$\mathcal{A}_S \rtimes_{U_S} \mathbb{R} \simeq \left\langle e^{-iTH_S} a e^{iTH_S}, e^{-itH_C} \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S, t \in \mathbb{R} \right\rangle'' = \left(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R})_C) \right)^H. \quad (2.14)$$

More generally, from the point of view of QRFs, we can give crossed products the following interpretation:

The crossed product of a von Neumann algebra \mathcal{A} by a locally compact group G is the von Neumann algebra of relational observables describing \mathcal{A} relative to an ideal QRF associated with G and its reorientations.

We can thus think of the gauge-invariant clock-system algebra in Eq. (2.11) as a generalization of the crossed product to encompass non-ideal clocks, as well as the case when \mathcal{A}_S is a C^* algebra, but not necessarily von Neumann. We emphasize that, at this stage, the von Neumann nature of these algebras (i.e. their closure) is defined in terms of the kinematical Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{kin} . We will be discussing the construction of the physical Hilbert space shortly and will later investigate whether the action of these algebras on this space remains von Neumann.

Below, we shall be mostly concerned with such generalized crossed products of a type III₁ von Neumann factor \mathcal{A}_S ,⁹ interpreted as an algebra containing regional QFT and graviton degrees of freedom (and possibly additional clocks), by a group associated with its modular flow. That is, we will focus on the case that H_S is the modular Hamiltonian of a cyclic separating vector $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$ for \mathcal{A}_S . This is the case in which a conversion to type II factors with well-defined density operators and entropies occurs [19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 30–32, 36–38, 89]. But for now the discussion remains more general.

2.3 The physical Hilbert space

Next, let us implement constraints also on states to construct the physical Hilbert space of gauge invariant states in line with our interpretation that the external evolution generated by H is physically

⁸ For the generalization of relational observables to QRFs associated with general symmetry groups, see [66, 81], and for a related approach to relational observables associated with clocks see also [114–117].

⁹ \mathcal{A}_S being a factor means it has a trivial center, i.e. only c -numbers commute with all other elements in \mathcal{A}_S .

inaccessible. While this step is standard in gauge theories, gravity and string theory, it singles out the *perspective-neutral approach* [66–69, 71–79, 109, 118] we employ here from within the approaches to QRFs.¹⁰ We can view the kinematical Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{kin} as the space of externally distinguishable states and the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ as the one of internally distinguishable states from which all external frame information has been removed [67, Sec. II]. We thus seek to implement a form of Dirac constraint quantization [120, 121] and states formally satisfying a version of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation:

$$U_{SC}(t)|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \Rightarrow \quad H|\Psi\rangle = 0. \quad (2.15)$$

In the sequel, we shall be using round bras and kets, $|\cdot\rangle$, to denote such physical states, while we reserve the standard bra-ket notation for kinematical or gauge reduced states.

A word of caution on the meaning of Eq. (2.15) for the case of a noncompact gauge group as the translation group here: as zero will lie in the continuous spectrum of H , a state such as $|\Psi\rangle$ corresponds to an improper eigenstate and thus cannot be normalizable in the original \mathcal{H}_{kin} . To address this normalization issue, we have to build a new inner product to turn the space of states formally obeying Eq. (2.15) into a Hilbert space. Here, we will briefly recall two equivalent ways of constructing such a new Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ that will be convenient below: the procedure of co-invariants, also invoked by CLPW [21], and Refined Algebraic Quantization (RAQ) [122–126], usually employed in the perspective-neutral approach to QRFs [66, 68]. Rather than viewing $|\Psi\rangle$ as an element of \mathcal{H}_{kin} , RAQ takes it as a distribution on it.

The space of co-invariants is the space of gauge-equivalent kinematical states, i.e. $|\psi\rangle \sim |\phi\rangle$ iff $|\psi\rangle = U_{SC}(t)|\phi\rangle$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This space of equivalence classes does not possess a linear structure, unless we impose the *additional* relation that the differences between gauge-equivalent states are equivalent to null states, i.e. $(I - U_{SC}(t))|\psi\rangle \sim 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$. This means in particular $H|\psi\rangle \sim 0$ for all $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$. Quotienting the space of co-invariants by these null vectors yields a vector space, whose elements we denote by $|\Psi\rangle$ and it is clear that gauge translations act trivially on this space, in that sense realizing Eq. (2.15). An inner product on this space is given by group averaging

$$\langle \Psi_1 | \Psi_2 \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \langle \psi_1 | U_{SC}(t) | \psi_2 \rangle, \quad (2.16)$$

where $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$ resides in the equivalence class $|\Psi_i\rangle$ and the inner product under the integral is the standard one on \mathcal{H}_{kin} .¹¹ The physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ is then given by completing in norm. This is essentially the route taken by CLPW [21, App. B.1]. Abstractly, this procedure defines a linear map $M : \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ that implements the constraint in the sense that $MH = 0$, and the core question is how to explicitly construct it. CLPW provide a method within their setup [21, Sec. 4.2] (see also Example 1 and Sec. 3.2.1).

To prepare the grounds for establishing its equivalence with a Page-Wootters reduction of gauge-invariant states constructed via RAQ, we note that we can think of the inner product as $\langle \Psi_1 | \Psi_2 \rangle =$

¹⁰ See [67, Sec. II] for a discussion of how this step distinguishes the perspective-neutral approach from the quantum information one [84, 85] (going back to [62, 119]), the purely perspective-dependent one [65, 80] and the operational one [81, 82], which do not implement constraints on states. The purely perspective-dependent one turns out to be equivalent to the perspective-neutral one for ideal QRFs (perfectly distinguishable orientation states), however, not for general non-ideal ones [66]. Within quantum information theory and the foundations of quantum theory there exist varying aims for the use of QRFs, which is why several approaches have developed, and there is not a one-fits-all approach. Here, we employ the one which applies to gauge theories and gravity.

¹¹ Whether or not this physical inner product is positive semi-definite is in general unknown, as is convergence of the integral, though see [51, 52, 122, 123, 126, 127] for some discussion on this. In what follows, we shall simply assume convergence and semi-definiteness.

$\langle \psi_1 | M^\dagger M | \psi_2 \rangle = \langle \psi_1 | \Pi_{\text{phys}} | \psi_2 \rangle$, where (assuming we can take the integral inside the inner product)

$$\Pi_{\text{phys}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt U_{SC}(t) \quad (2.17)$$

is sometimes informally referred to as a coherent group averaging ‘projector’, though it is not literally a projector (it is essentially $\delta(H)$). This formally defines an anti-linear ‘rigging map’ [122], the core ingredient of RAQ,

$$\eta(|\psi\rangle) := \langle \psi | \Pi_{\text{phys}} \quad (2.18)$$

from kinematical states into kinematical distributions. Their key property is that, thanks to the translation invariance of the integral measure, states in the image of η are gauge-invariant, $U_{SC}(t)\eta(|\psi\rangle) := \eta(U_{SC}(t)|\psi\rangle) = \eta(|\psi\rangle)$.¹² It is for this reason that the states in the image also correspond to equivalence classes of kinematical states. We can thus set $(\Psi' | = \eta(|\psi\rangle)$ for representatives of physical states, where for distinction from the co-invariant case we equip them with a ‘, and their inner product is given as before by group averaging, so¹³

$$(\Psi'_1 | \Psi'_2) := \eta(|\psi_1\rangle) (|\psi_2\rangle) = \langle \psi_1 | \Pi_{\text{phys}} | \psi_2 \rangle = (\Psi_1 | \Psi_2). \quad (2.19)$$

Quotienting by null vectors and completing in norm then yields an equivalent representation of $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ of the physical Hilbert space.

Example 1. A simple example is given by the constraint $H = p_S + p_C$ for two ideal clocks on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, with p_S, p_C two momentum operators. Defining $q_{\pm} := q_C \pm q_S$, any kinematical state can be written as $|\psi\rangle = \int dq_+ dq_- \psi(q_+, q_-) |q_+, q_-\rangle$, where $|q_+, q_-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |q_C = 1/2(q_+ + q_-), q_S = 1/2(q_+ - q_-)\rangle$ are eigenstates of q_{\pm} .

Following the co-invariant way, we notice that $|\psi\rangle \sim U_{SC}(t)|\psi\rangle$ entails $|q_+, q_-\rangle \sim |q_+ + t, q_-\rangle$ and $(I - U_{SC}(t))|\psi\rangle \hat{=} 0$ implies $|q_+, q_-\rangle - |q_+ + t, q_-\rangle \hat{=} 0$. As $U_{SC}(t)$ acts ergodically on the q_+ label and trivially on q_- , the conjunction of these relations means that for each fixed q_- , there is (up to normalization) a unique surviving equivalence class of basis states; let us denote it by $|q_-\rangle$. By Eq. (2.16), we have $(q_- | q'_-) = \delta(q_- - q'_-)$. Physical states can thus be written as $|\Psi\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dq_- \Psi(q_-) |q_-\rangle$ with Ψ square-integrable, so $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \simeq L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

On the other hand, in momentum representation the ‘rigging map’ Eq. (2.18) of RAQ reads

$$(\Psi' | = \eta(|\psi\rangle) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp_- \psi^*(0, p_-) \langle p_+ = 0, p_- |. \quad (2.20)$$

While such improper null eigenstates of $H = p_+$ are clearly not normalizable in \mathcal{H}_{kin} , we have

$$(\Psi'_1 | \Psi'_2) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp_- \psi_1^*(0, p_-) \psi_2(0, p_-), \quad (2.21)$$

whose absolute value is bounded if ψ_1, ψ_2 are bounded around $p_+ = 0$. Null states are those with $\psi(0, p_-) = 0$ (i.e., by Fourier transformation states such that $\int dq_+ \psi(q_+, q_-) = 0$). Quotienting by these, we again have $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}} \simeq L^2(\mathbb{R})$ in agreement with the construction via co-invariants.

¹² Somewhat more accurately, we have $\eta : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^*$, where $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$ is a linear dense subspace closed under gauge transformations and \mathcal{D}^* is its algebraic dual (space of all linear functionals as opposed to only continuous ones). This leads to the triple $\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}^*$, which inspires the name ‘rigging map’. \mathcal{D}^* inherits an action of the gauge group via $U_{SC}(t)\xi[\phi] = \xi[U_{SC}^\dagger(t)\phi]$, for any $\xi \in \mathcal{D}^*$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$. Gauge invariance should be understood in the sense that $U_{SC}(t)\eta(\psi_1)[\psi_2] = \eta(\psi_1)[U_{SC}^\dagger(t)\psi_2] = \eta(\psi_1)[\psi_2]$ for all $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. See [122, 123, 126] for details.

¹³ We could also define an inner product on the image of η as $(\eta(|\psi_2\rangle), \eta(|\psi_1\rangle)) := \eta(|\psi_1\rangle) (|\psi_2\rangle) = \langle \psi_1 | \Pi_{\text{phys}} | \psi_2 \rangle$. Relative to the left inner product, we can again interpret $\eta^\dagger \eta = \Pi_{\text{phys}}$ as in the case of the co-invariant map M .

The observation that the co-invariant construction and RAQ lead to equivalent physical Hilbert spaces was also noted in the context of Jackiw-Teitelboim gravity in [128].

In this section, we shall at times operate with the co-invariant and RAQ representations of physical states in parallel, emphasizing how certain maps and expressions appear in the two. This is to facilitate exhibiting the relation between the subjects of gravitational crossed product algebras and QRFs, where the former so far invoked co-invariants and the latter RAQ. In later sections, for definiteness, we shall mostly invoke the co-invariant scheme and only sometimes comment on how expressions change in the equivalent RAQ formulation.

Henceforth, when pursuing the RAQ formalism, we shall abuse notation somewhat, writing, as is standard in much of the physics literature on relational dynamics,

$$|\Psi'\rangle = \Pi_{\text{phys}} |\psi\rangle, \quad (2.22)$$

instead of Eq. (2.18), keeping in mind however that physical states can be understood as distributions on \mathcal{H}_{kin} . As Π_{phys} is formally symmetric in the kinematical inner product, this does not cause problems. In particular, decomposing kinematical states in the clock and system energy bases, $|\psi\rangle = \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon \int_{\sigma_S} \sum_{\lambda_E} \psi(\epsilon; E, \lambda_E) |\epsilon\rangle \otimes |E, \lambda_E\rangle$, where λ_E is a possible degeneracy label for system energy E and σ_S denotes the spectrum of H_S , we can then write physical states formally as [68]

$$|\Psi'\rangle = \Pi_{\text{phys}} |\psi\rangle = 2\pi \int_{\sigma_S \cap (-\sigma_C)} \sum_{\lambda_E} \psi(-E; E, \lambda_E) |-E\rangle \otimes |E, \lambda_E\rangle, \quad (2.23)$$

while the inner product becomes

$$\langle \Psi'_1 | \Psi'_2 \rangle = 2\pi \int_{\sigma_S \cap (-\sigma_C)} \sum_{\lambda_E} \psi_1^*(-E, E, \lambda_E) \psi_2(-E; E, \lambda_E). \quad (2.24)$$

2.4 Physical representation of the algebra

Although our gauge-invariant algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}} := (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C))^H \subseteq (\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}))^H \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})$ has been originally defined on the kinematical Hilbert space, we will be interested in its representation on the space of physical states $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ (see App. A.2 for detail). While the latter is a different Hilbert space, this action is defined because gauge-invariant observables “commute” with the co-invariant map M above in the sense that

$$MO |\psi\rangle = r(O)M |\psi\rangle = r(O)|\Psi\rangle, \quad \forall O \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H \text{ and } |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}, \quad (2.25)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H := (\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}))^H. \quad (2.26)$$

$r : \mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}})$ defines here the physical representation of the kinematical gauge-invariant algebra on the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ defined the co-invariant way. Equivalently, kinematical gauge-invariant observables formally commute with the RAQ rigging map η [122, 123, 126]:

$$\langle \Psi' | r'(O^\dagger) := \eta(O |\psi\rangle) = \langle \psi | O^\dagger \Pi_{\text{phys}} = \langle \psi | \Pi_{\text{phys}} O^\dagger, \quad (2.27)$$

where r' now denotes the physical representation of kinematical gauge-invariant operators defined the RAQ way. Using the slightly sloppy notation from Eq. (2.22), this becomes

$$r'(O) |\Psi'\rangle = \Pi_{\text{phys}} O |\psi\rangle = O \Pi_{\text{phys}} |\psi\rangle \quad (2.28)$$

and is formally consistent with the inner product:

$$\langle \Psi'_1 | r'(O) \Psi'_2 \rangle = \langle \psi_1 | O \Pi_{\text{phys}} |\psi_2\rangle = \eta(O^\dagger |\psi_1\rangle)(|\psi_2\rangle) = (r'(O^\dagger) \Psi'_1 | \Psi'_2). \quad (2.29)$$

Formally we can thus write $r'(O) = O$ when it is clear that we mean that O acts on physical states. One has to be careful with this, however, as r' (equivalently r) is not faithful: there exist $O_1, O_2 \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H$, such that $O_1 \neq O_2$ on \mathcal{H}_{kin} , but $r'(O_1) = r'(O_2)$ [68, Lemma 1]. For instance, any observable in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H$ that has exclusively support on energies inconsistent with solving the constraints will be mapped to zero under r' (equivalently r).¹⁴ For the relational observables in Eq. (2.12) $r'(O) = O$ on physical states formally trades the incoherent for coherent group averaging since

$$O_C^\tau(a)\Pi_{\text{phys}} = \Pi_{\text{phys}}(a \otimes |\tau\rangle\langle\tau|)\Pi_{\text{phys}}. \quad (2.30)$$

For notational simplicity, we shall henceforth write $r'(O) = O$ with the implicit understanding that this holds on physical states. While the formulations in Eqs. (2.25) and (2.27) are cleaner, expressions such as Eqs. (2.23) and (2.30) are somewhat more explicit.

The properties of this physical representation $r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}})$ (equivalently r') may be quite different from those of \mathcal{A}_{inv} on \mathcal{H}_{kin} . For example, as we shall see below in Sec. 2.8, while \mathcal{A}_{inv} is von Neumann provided \mathcal{A}_S is, the same is no longer guaranteed for $r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}})$ because the notion of algebraic closure is now defined with respect to different structures (though in many cases of interest it will be von Neumann). Related to this, r (equivalently r') is not faithful as noted above. (It may be faithful on *subalgebras* of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H$, cf. Sec. 2.8). This has repercussions for whether or not the frame reorientations $I_S \otimes U_C(\tau)$ in \mathcal{A}_{inv} (cf. Eq. (2.11)) survive as independent observables on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ (respectively $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}}$): when $H_S \in \mathcal{A}_S$ and $U_S(\tau)$ are inner automorphisms (standard QRF setup), then H_C and H_S are not independent operators in $r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}})$ and so the clock reorientations are contained in (the representation of) the relational observables on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. By contrast, when $H_S \notin \mathcal{A}_S$ and $U_S(\tau)$ are outer automorphisms (case of perturbative quantum gravity and QFT below), then the clock reorientations remain independent within $r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}})$ and are not included in the relational observables.

For the physical representation of relational observables and reorientations, we shall henceforth write

$$O_C^\tau(a) := r(O_C^\tau(a)), \quad V_C(\tau) := r(U_C(\tau)), \quad (2.31)$$

in the language of co-invariants. By contrast, we continue to use $O_C^\tau(a), U_C(\tau)$ in the physical representation of the RAQ method, in line with our conventions above.

2.5 “Jumping into a clock frame”: the Page-Wootters formalism

Now that we have a QRF, we would like to “jump into its perspective” and describe the remaining degrees of freedom, hence the system S , relative to it. For clocks this means nothing else than describing the evolution of S relative to C . There are two equivalent ways of doing so, both of which will be useful later on:

gauge-invariant: The first amounts to simply evaluating the relational observables $O_C^\tau(a)$ in Eq. (2.12) in physical states $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ and letting the clock reading parameter τ run.

gauge-fixed: The second conditions physical states on the clock reading, yielding a relational Schrödinger picture in which states of S evolve in τ . This is the Page-Wootters formalism [86, 87] (see [68–70, 77, 106, 109, 129–133] for some later developments).

We have essentially already seen the first path, so we introduce here briefly the Page-Wootters (PW) formalism. We will see in Sec. 3.2 that the procedure considered by CLPW [21] (and adopted by JSS in [24]) to implement the constraint is equivalent to it. To this end, we will follow the formulation of

¹⁴ Examples of such observables can be built diagonally in the energy bases of clock and system with exclusive support in the complement of the spectral intersection $\sigma_S \cap (-\sigma_C)$ in Eq. (2.23).

the PW-formalism in [68–70],¹⁵ which establishes its equivalence with the gauge-invariant formulation and thereby resolves three fundamental criticisms that Kuchař had raised against the formalism [110], disrupting research on the topic for some time.¹⁶ It also connects it with the QRF paradigm.

2.5.1 Relational Schrödinger picture

We will first exhibit the traditional formulation of the PW-formalism, which invokes solutions to the constraints and thus is best expressed in RAQ. We will then translate it into the equivalent language of co-invariants.

The aim of PW was to construct a conditional probability interpretation of “timeless” physical states. This can be achieved by defining a reduction map $\mathcal{R}'_C(\tau) : \mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{|C}$, conditioning physical states on clock C reading τ (the primes highlight that we are invoking the RAQ imposition of constraints):

$$\mathcal{R}'_C(\tau) := \langle \tau | \otimes I_S, \quad (2.32)$$

where $|\tau\rangle$ is a clock state (2.1) and $\mathcal{H}_{|C} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_S$ is the system subspace consistent with implementing the constraint (it is spanned by eigenstates of H_S residing in the overlap $\sigma_S \cap (-\sigma_C)$, cf. (2.23)). It is the space of system states “seen” by clock C . For later, we note that the orthogonal projector onto this subspace is formally given by [68]

$$\Pi_{|C} = \langle \tau | \Pi_{\text{phys}} | \tau \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \chi^*(t) U_S(t) = \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon \delta(H_S + \epsilon), \quad (2.33)$$

where $\chi(t)$ is the clock state overlap distribution (2.7) and Π_{phys} was defined in Eq. (2.17). Note that we have $\Pi_{|C} = I_S$ only for ideal clocks. In the case that the clock spectrum is an interval $\sigma_C = [\epsilon_{\min}, \epsilon_{\max}]$, this takes the more explicit form

$$\Pi_{|C} = \Theta(\epsilon_{\max} + H_S) \Theta(-\epsilon_{\min} - H_S). \quad (2.34)$$

It is well-known that the conditional states

$$|\psi_{|C}(\tau)\rangle := \mathcal{R}'_C(\tau) |\Psi'\rangle \quad (2.35)$$

solve the Schrödinger equation in the clock readings

$$i \frac{d}{d\tau} |\psi_{|C}(\tau)\rangle = i \frac{d}{d\tau} \langle \tau' | U_C^\dagger(\tau - \tau') \otimes I_S |\Psi'\rangle = - \langle \tau | H_C \otimes I_S |\Psi'\rangle = H_S |\psi_{|C}(\tau)\rangle. \quad (2.36)$$

This remains true regardless of whether $H_S \in \mathcal{A}_S$. This time evolution is an internal, gauge-invariant one, as the derivation invokes the clock reorientations $I_S \otimes U_C(\tau)$ and their equivalence with the system time evolution $I_C \otimes U_S(-\tau)$ on $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}}$.

¹⁵ For generalizations of the PW-formalism to QRFs associated with general symmetry groups and first steps in quantum field theory, see [66] and [109], respectively.

¹⁶ Kuchař argued that the PW-formalism would yield (a) conditional probabilities that are incompatible with the constraint, (b) incorrect transition probabilities, and (c) wrong localisation probabilities in relativistic settings [110]. (a) and (b) were resolved in [68] through the equivalence with the gauge-invariant formulation, while (c) was resolved in [69] using the covariant clock POVMs for quadratic Hamiltonians exhibited in Sec. 5.1. Giovannetti et al. [131] proposed an earlier resolution of (b), which does lead to correct transition probabilities, however, modifies the constraint by including measurement interactions and ancilla systems and further relies on ideal clocks. The resolution in [68] is not restricted to ideal clocks and solves the problem in a more general form than originally posed by Kuchař. The qualitative differences between the two resolutions of (b) have been further investigated in [134].

The observation in [68–70] is that the conditioning on clock readings in Eq. (2.32) is nothing but a gauge fixing and its inverse, $\mathcal{R}'_C(\tau) : \mathcal{H}_{|C} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}}$, is formally given by averaging over the gauge

$$\mathcal{R}'_C(\tau)[\cdot] = \Pi_{\text{phys}}([\cdot] \otimes |\tau\rangle) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt U_S(t - \tau)[\cdot] \otimes |t\rangle. \quad (2.37)$$

The reduction map and its inverse are unitary and we have¹⁷

$$(\Psi'_1 | \Psi'_2) = (\Psi'_1 | (I_S \otimes |\tau\rangle\langle\tau|) | \Psi'_2)_{\text{kin}} = \langle \psi^1_{|C}(\tau) | \psi^2_{|C}(\tau) \rangle, \quad (2.38)$$

where the right expression is the standard inner product on $\mathcal{H}_{|C}$ (inherited from \mathcal{H}_S). By the intermediate expression, we mean the matrix element of $I_S \otimes |\tau\rangle\langle\tau|$ in the physical states $|\Psi'_i\rangle$ viewed as kinematical distributions and thus evaluated in the kinematical inner product. This expression follows from the left hand side, using the definitions in Eqs. (2.16) and (2.17) and the formal identity $\Pi_{\text{phys}}(I_S \otimes |\tau\rangle\langle\tau|) \Pi_{\text{phys}} = \Pi_{\text{phys}}$ [66, 68], which follows from the resolution of the identity in Eq. (2.3). This intermediate expression highlights that the right side is just a gauge-fixing of the physical inner product. We can interpret the reduction map $\mathcal{R}'_C(\tau)$ as a “quantum coordinate map” into the perspective of the temporal QRF C . The subscript $|C$ for objects in its image thus stands for “relative to clock C ”.

Given that the conditioning on the clock reading is a gauge fixing, one might now be worried that the Schrödinger evolution in τ described by Eq. (2.36) is one tangential to a gauge orbit and hence unphysical. At the same time, we argued above that this same evolution should be physical, and so transversal to a gauge orbit, because it invokes the clock reorientations. While at first these statements seem to contradict one another, both are in fact correct. To see this, we note that Eq. (2.37) implies that physical states can also be written as

$$|\Psi'\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt |\psi_{|C}(t)\rangle \otimes |t\rangle. \quad (2.39)$$

This is behind the slogan “time from entanglement”, though we emphasize that this entanglement is defined with respect to a tensor product structure on \mathcal{H}_{kin} as opposed to one on $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}}$ [68, 71, 109]. This way of writing physical states makes transparent that the full Schrödinger trajectory $\{|\psi_{|C}(\tau)\rangle \mid \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is encoded both tangentially along a gauge orbit, as well as transversally to it, see Fig. 2.1. It is encoded tangentially because we can obtain the full trajectory from the same physical state $|\Psi'\rangle$ (which corresponds to one gauge orbit) just by running through all gauges τ in $\mathcal{R}'_C(\tau) |\Psi'\rangle$. Conversely, it is encoded transversally also because the same trajectory can be obtained by gauge fixing every state in the *physical* Hilbert space trajectory $\{(U_S(\tau) \otimes I_C) |\Psi'\rangle \mid \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$ (which satisfies the Schrödinger equation on $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}}$) in the same way, e.g. with $\mathcal{R}'_C(0)$. When we say that the Schrödinger evolution is physical, we have this transversal evolution in mind.

Let us now translate the Page-Wootters formalism into the language of co-invariants. To this end, we recall that $|\Psi\rangle = M |\psi\rangle$, $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$, and $M^\dagger M = \Pi_{\text{phys}}$. Hence, to obtain the same relational Schrödinger picture on $\mathcal{H}_{|C}$ via a reduction $\mathcal{R}_C(\tau) : \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{|C}$ with

$$|\psi_{|C}(\tau)\rangle = \mathcal{R}_C(\tau) |\Psi\rangle, \quad (2.40)$$

where the unprimed notation now clarifies that we are working with co-invariants, we must have

$$\mathcal{R}_C(\tau) M = \mathcal{R}'_C(\tau) \Pi_{\text{phys}}. \quad (2.41)$$

¹⁷ Physical states are here taken in the form (2.22). If the more precise Eq. (2.18) was used instead, the reduction and its inverse would have to be taken in “dagged” form. The relation of the inner products would be unaffected.




Figure 2.1: The Schrödinger evolution of $|\psi_{|C}(\tau)\rangle$ stemming from $|\Psi'\rangle$ can be obtained in two ways. The **tangential decoding** is achieved by acting with $\mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau)$ on $|\Psi'\rangle$ for different values of τ . Alternatively, the **transversal decoding** first requires the trajectory $U_S(\tau)|\Psi'\rangle$ for different values of τ on which we then act with the same $\mathcal{R}'_{|C}(0)$.

The “dagger” of this relation has to be defined with respect to the appropriate inner product. Since we have $\langle \Psi'_1 | \Psi'_2 \rangle = \langle \psi_1 | \Pi_{\text{phys}} | \psi_2 \rangle = \langle \psi_1 | \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau) \mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau) \Pi_{\text{phys}} | \psi_2 \rangle = \langle \psi_{|C}^2(\tau) | \psi_{|C}^2(\tau) \rangle$ and this must be equal to $\langle \psi_1 | M^\dagger \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau) \mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau) M | \psi_2 \rangle = \langle \psi_1 | M^\dagger M | \psi_2 \rangle = \langle \Psi_1 | \Psi_2 \rangle$ and Π_{phys} is not a projector, this leads to the inverse relation for $\mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau) : \mathcal{H}_{|C} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ with

$$M^\dagger \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau) = \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger. \quad (2.42)$$

The inner product is then preserved and it is clear that the two formulations of the PW-formalism are equivalent.

2.5.2 Observable reduction

Let us now clarify how the physical Hilbert space representation of gauge-invariant observables reduces into C 's perspective. It was shown in [68] that relational observables gauge fix as follows for $a \in \mathcal{A}_S$:

$$\mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau) \mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a) \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau) = \Pi_{|C} a \Pi_{|C}. \quad (2.43)$$

Using Eqs. (2.41), (2.42) and (2.31), as well as $r(O)M = MO$ for $O \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H$, the left hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau) \mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a) \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau) &= \mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau) \mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a) M^\dagger \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau) = \mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau) M^\dagger \mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a) \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau) \\ &= \mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau) \mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a) \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

so that we have an equivalent reduction result in co-invariant and RAQ language. The gauge-invariant algebra therefore reduces equivalently in both languages as

$$\mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau) r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}) \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau) = \Pi_{|C} \mathcal{A}_{S|C} \Pi_{|C} = \mathcal{R}'_{|C}(\tau) \mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}} \mathcal{R}'_{|C}{}^\dagger(\tau), \quad (2.45)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{S|C}$ is generated by $a \in \mathcal{A}_S$ and $U_S(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\Pi_{|C} \in \mathcal{A}_{S|C}$ because it is a bounded function of H_S .

Returning to the original motivation by Page and Wootters to define a conditional probability interpretation for physical states, it is now clear from Eqs. (2.38), (2.43) and (2.44) that the evolution of a system observable $a \in \mathcal{A}_S$ in relational Schrödinger states $|\psi_{|C}(\tau)\rangle$ is equivalent to that of the relational observable $\mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a)$ (respectively $O_C^\tau(a)$) in the “timeless” physical state $|\Psi\rangle$ (respectively $|\Psi'\rangle$) corresponding to $|\psi_{|C}(\tau)\rangle$ via Eqs. (2.35) and (2.40),

$$(\Psi|\mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a)|\Psi) = \langle\psi_{|C}(\tau)|a|\psi_{|C}(\tau)\rangle = (\Psi'|\mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a)|\Psi'). \quad (2.46)$$

This can in particular be used to formulate consistent conditional probabilities that have an equivalent gauge-invariant and gauge-fixed form [66, 68].

For later, we note that even when C is ideal (and so $\Pi_{|C} = I_S$) and \mathcal{A}_S von Neumann, so that \mathcal{A}_{inv} is isomorphic to the crossed product $\mathcal{A}_S \rtimes_{U_S} \mathbb{R}$, the intermediate expression $\Pi_{|C}\mathcal{A}_S\Pi_{|C}$ in Eq. (2.45) is not unitarily equivalent to the crossed product algebra. Since \mathcal{R}_C is unitary, this means that r is not faithful for \mathcal{A}_{inv} . Indeed, a standard ‘gauge-fixed’ form of the crossed product is generated by a and bounded functions of $H' - H_S$ for some unbounded Hamiltonian H' (e.g., see [21, 24]), i.e. one of an ideal clock. Such an H' is missing from the right hand side in Eq. (2.45), which already tells us that an additional complementary ideal clock will be needed to render r faithful. This is related to a puzzle discussed by CLPW in [21], and we will come back to this subtlety below.

Since the reduction map is unitary, the relations in Eqs. (2.43) and (2.44) tell us that the representation of relational observables on physical states, $\mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a)$, always constitutes a unital $*$ -homomorphism from $\Pi_{|C}\mathcal{A}_S\Pi_{|C}$ into $r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}})$, *regardless* of whether C is ideal (see [66, 68] for further discussion). By contrast, $O_C^\tau(a)$ only constitutes a homomorphism from \mathcal{A}_S (and even $\Pi_{|C}\mathcal{A}_S\Pi_{|C}$) into the kinematical gauge-invariant algebra \mathcal{A}_{inv} when the clock C is ideal because otherwise the G -twirl does not preserve products [66, 68]. In other words, relational observables only preserve algebraic structure on physical states.

In appendix A.3, we use the reduction result in Eqs. (2.43) and (2.44) to further show that relational observables are complete on the physical Hilbert space. Specifically, we show that every bounded operator on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ can be obtained from a bounded kinematical or system operator via the relational observable construction in Eq. (2.12) and that this relational observable is also kinematically bounded.

2.6 QRF transformations: changing to a different clock

A core output of the recent wave of QRF research is the formulation of a quantum frame covariance of physical properties. This relies on transformations between different QRFs and their “internal perspectives” on the physics. The key difference to classical frame transformations is that one is now able to transform between reference frames that may be in relative superposition or entangled with other systems and this leads to interesting physical consequences. Such transformations have appeared in somewhat different contexts and formulations [59, 65–69, 71, 74–77, 79–81, 85, 108]. Here, we briefly review the QRF transformations of the perspective-neutral approach [66–69, 71, 74–77], as it is the one applicable to the present case of gauge systems with constraints. For our purposes, we restrict to the special case of clock transformations [68–70] (with precursors [77, 108, 118, 135]) and refer to [66] for general symmetry groups.

The sought-after clock transformations are not related to the clock reorientations $I_S \otimes U_C(\tau)$. The latter change the orientation of the given temporal QRF C , i.e. the reading of the clock, and thus the relation between the clock and evolving system. This is a physical transformation and changes the state in the physical Hilbert space. Instead, we would now like to change to a *different* clock subsystem and “jump into its new internal perspective”. This transformation will amount to a change of *description* of any state in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ (respectively $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}}$), but not a change of state itself. Indeed, it will take the form of a change of gauge.

To this end, we will assume additional structure in the system S , namely that it contains at least an additional clock subsystem. Thus, we replace $C \rightarrow C_1$ and $S \rightarrow SC_2$ and consider now

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2, \quad \text{with} \quad H = H_S + H_1 + H_2, \quad (2.47)$$

henceforth simplifying the notation by writing just i instead of C_i in subscripts. The argument in App. A.2 entails that we can write the gauge-invariant algebra

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}} := (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2))^H \quad (2.48)$$

on \mathcal{H}_{kin} equivalently as being generated by relational observables and reorientations relative to either C_1 or C_2 (cf. Eq. (2.11))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}} &= \left\langle O_{C_1}^{\tau_1}(a), I_S \otimes U_1(t) \otimes I_2 \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2), t \in \mathbb{R} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle O_{C_2}^{\tau_2}(a), I_S \otimes I_1 \otimes U_2(t) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1), t \in \mathbb{R} \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (2.49)$$

where relational observables are defined as before in Eq. (2.12), but now also include the ones describing the two clocks relative to one another. Again, when \mathcal{A}_S is von Neumann, then so is \mathcal{A}_{inv} , and when \mathcal{A}_S is a Type III₁ factor, then so is $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i) \otimes \mathcal{A}_S$, $i = 1, 2$, in which case \mathcal{A}_{inv} is also a factor (cf. appendix A.2). In the special case of an ideal clock C_1 , \mathcal{A}_{inv} is the crossed product of $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ by the translation group.

We begin again in RAQ language, before translating the observation into the language of co-invariants. The “quantum coordinate map” into the perspective of clock C_1 when it reads τ_1 becomes

$$\mathcal{R}'_1(\tau_1) = \langle \tau_1 |_1 \otimes I_2 \otimes I_S. \quad (2.50)$$

It is a unitary $\mathcal{R}'_1(\tau_1) : \mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{|1}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{|1} := \Pi_{|1}(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ is the Hilbert space of SC_2 relative to clock C_1 . It is the subspace of the kinematical Hilbert space factors $\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_S$ consistent with the constraint H and the corresponding projector is given via Eq. (2.33)

$$\Pi_{|1} := \Pi_{|C_1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \chi_1^*(t) U_S(t) \otimes U_2(t), \quad (2.51)$$

where $\chi_1(t) = \langle t | 0 \rangle_1$. When σ_1 is just an interval $\sigma_1 = [\epsilon_{\min}^1, \epsilon_{\max}^1]$, we have explicitly

$$\Pi_{|1} = \Theta(\epsilon_{\max}^1 + H_S + H_2) \Theta(-\epsilon_{\min}^1 - H_S - H_2). \quad (2.52)$$

The reduction into C_2 -perspective is defined analogously.

The transformation from the perspective of C_1 into that of C_2 is thus given by [68]

$$V'_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\tau_1, \tau_2) := \mathcal{R}'_2(\tau_2) \circ \mathcal{R}'_1{}^\dagger(\tau_1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt |t + \tau_1\rangle_1 \otimes \langle \tau_2 - t |_2 \otimes U_S(t). \quad (2.53)$$

It is clear that $|\psi_{|2}(\tau_2)\rangle = V'_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\tau_1, \tau_2) |\psi_{|1}(\tau_1)\rangle$, where $|\psi_{|i}(\tau_i)\rangle = \mathcal{R}'_i(\tau_i) |\Psi'\rangle$ is the state of $C_j S$ relative to C_i , $i \neq j$, which evolves in τ_i according to the Schrödinger equation with Hamiltonian $H_S + H_j$. The compositional form of the temporal QRF change is reminiscent of how one changes between different coordinate systems on a manifold – they are “quantum coordinate changes”:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}} & \\ \mathcal{R}'_1(\tau_1) \swarrow & & \searrow \mathcal{R}'_2(\tau_2) \\ \mathcal{H}_{|1} = \Pi_{|1}(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_2) & \xrightarrow{V'_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \mathcal{R}'_2(\tau_2) \circ \mathcal{R}'_1{}^\dagger(\tau_1)} & \mathcal{H}_{|2} = \Pi_{|2}(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1) \end{array} \quad (2.54)$$

In analogy to how a manifold is an intrinsic object independent of what coordinates we choose, we can likewise view $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}}$ as an intrinsic state space encoding the internal physics independently of the choice of QRF. $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}}$ (and similarly the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}'_{\text{phys}})$) is thus a QRF perspective-neutral structure, encoding and linking all internal QRF perspectives. This provides this approach to QRF covariance with its name. It can be argued that this covariance structure constitutes a quantum extension of classical covariance structures akin to those underlying special covariance [67, Sec. II] and [66].

From the preceding discussion in Sec. 2.5 it is clear that the same structure appears in co-invariant language, where the QRF transformations now read

$$V_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \mathcal{R}_2(\tau_2) \circ \mathcal{R}_1^\dagger(\tau_1) \stackrel{(2.41)}{=} \mathcal{R}'_2(\tau_2) M^\dagger \mathcal{R}'_1(\tau_1) \stackrel{(2.42)}{=} V'_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \quad (2.55)$$

and yield the same diagram as Eq. (2.54) with all primes dropped.

$V'_{1 \rightarrow 2}$ is a controlled, hence nonlocal unitary. This can also be seen by its action on observables, e.g. for $a \in \mathcal{A}_S$, we have [68]

$$\begin{aligned} V'_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \Pi_{|1} (a \otimes I_2) \Pi_{|1} (V'_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\tau_1, \tau_2))^\dagger &= \mathcal{R}'_2(\tau_2) O_{C_1}^{\tau_1} (I_2 \otimes a) \mathcal{R}'_2{}^\dagger(\tau_2) \\ &= \Pi_{|2} O_{C_1}^{\tau_1} (a) = \Pi_{|2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt U_{S1}(t) (a \otimes |\tau_1\rangle \langle \tau_1|_{|1}) U_{S1}^\dagger(t). \end{aligned} \quad (2.56)$$

Note that $O_{C_1}^{\tau_1}(a)$ commutes with $\Pi_{|2}$ as the latter is a function of $H_1 + H_2$. Thus, when C_1 is ideal and so $\Pi_{|1} = I_{S2}$, a local system operator relative to C_1 transforms into a composite $C_1 S$ operator relative to C_2 . This is a reflection of subsystem relativity, which we will discuss in the next section, and which is at the heart of all QRF relative physical properties. Thus, more generally

$$\mathcal{R}'_2(\tau_2) \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H \mathcal{R}'_2{}^\dagger(\tau_2) = \Pi_{|2} \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H = \mathcal{R}_2(\tau_2) r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H) \mathcal{R}_2^\dagger(\tau_2), \quad (2.57)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H = (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \otimes I_2)^H$ and an identity factor I_2 has been implicitly dropped in $\Pi_{|2} \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$.

We noted above that the PW reduction map constitutes a gauge fixing. The clock frame transformation therefore takes the form of a change of gauge. This does not mean, however, that a choice of clock frame is equivalent to a choice of gauge or that the QRF dependence of physical properties is a gauge artifact. Indeed, we saw above that there also exists an equivalent manifestly gauge-invariant manner to “jump” into a QRF perspective, namely to dress kinematical operators with the chosen clock frame. In Sec. 2.7, we will see that these lead to distinct gauge-invariant algebras¹⁸ and that a QRF transformation amounts to a change of tensor product structure on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. Rather, the choice of QRF is a choice of convention to split the kinematical degrees of freedom into redundant and non-redundant ones. For a gauge fixing procedure this means a convention for which kinematical degrees of freedom one may fix, however, not yet *how* to fix them; a choice of QRF thus corresponds to an entire family of possible gauge fixings but it is not a gauge itself. This is linked to our discussion above that the Schrödinger evolution is physical.

2.7 Subsystem relativity

We started with an assumed tensor product structure (TPS) on the kinematical Hilbert space, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$. Given that this is the space of states that are distinguishable relative to an external (possibly fictitious) frame, the TPS on it corresponds to an externally distinguishable

¹⁸ There also exists an equivalent gauge-invariant version of QRF transformations that acts on these algebras of observables and transforms them into one another [66, 67] (see also [56, 58] for their formulation in classical gauge theory and gravity). This is a manifestation of a certain equivalence between gauge-fixings and dressings. However, we will not be using this version of QRF transformations in this work and hence do not review them here.

subsystem structure. But our internal physics happens on the space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ of internally distinguishable states, and as we have seen this is a distinct Hilbert space that in the present case is also not a subspace of \mathcal{H}_{kin} ; it thus does not inherit the kinematical TPS. We are now interested in an internally distinguishable subsystem structure and TPS on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. Such a structure is crucial for defining a gauge-invariant notion of entanglement and entropies, but, as we will see, it depends on the choice of QRF and corresponds to its internal perspective [66, 67, 71, 85].

This can be seen in two equivalent ways [67, Sec. III]. For later purpose, we will formulate everything here in the co-invariant language; from the preceding sections it is clear that all following statements take an equivalent form in RAQ language. Let us first consider the case that C_1, C_2 are both ideal, so that $\Pi_{|1}$ and $\Pi_{|2}$ are each equal to the identity. Since the “quantum coordinate maps” are unitary, the diagram (2.54) tells us that each reduction map $\mathcal{R}_i(\tau_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, is nothing but a TPS on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ and, because $V_{1 \rightarrow 2}$ is a nonlocal unitary, the change of clock amounts to a change of TPS on the physical Hilbert space.¹⁹ In other words, an *ideal* internal QRF perspective is a TPS on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$.

Suppose now that C_1, C_2 are non-ideal with $\sigma_i := \sigma_{C_i} = [\epsilon_{\min}^i, \epsilon_{\max}^i]$ so $\Pi_i \neq I_{jS}$. We show in appendix A.4 that the reduced Hilbert space in C_1 -perspective of diagram (2.54) admits the following decomposition

$$\mathcal{H}_{|1} = \mathcal{H}_{S2}^- \oplus (\Pi_S(\mathcal{H}_S) \otimes \mathcal{H}_2) \oplus \mathcal{H}_{S2}^+, \quad (2.58)$$

where Π_S is the projector onto the subspace of \mathcal{H}_S spanned by eigenstates with $-\epsilon_{\max}^1 - \epsilon_{\min}^2 \leq E_S \leq -\epsilon_{\min}^1 - \epsilon_{\max}^2$ and \mathcal{H}_{S2}^\pm are direct sums/integrals of tensor products between C_2 and S subspaces when $\sigma_S := \text{Spec}(H_S)$ is discrete/continuous. (Later, H_S will be a QFT modular Hamiltonian and thus feature a continuous spectrum.) That is, for non-ideal clocks, $\mathcal{R}_i(\tau_i)$ defines instead a direct sum/integral of TPSs on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ and the clock change amounts to a change of such a direct sum/integral of TPSs.

Second, the QRF relativity of the internal subsystem structure can also be seen at the gauge-invariant, algebraic level. To this end, we can ask which observables can be measured relative to both clock frames. These reside in the intersection of the two gauge-invariant kinematical subalgebras, describing S and the clock C_1 or C_2 , respectively,

$$\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H := (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \otimes I_2)^H, \quad \mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H := (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes I_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2))^H. \quad (2.59)$$

We have, using that $\mathcal{A}^H = \mathcal{A} \cap \langle H \rangle'$, where $\langle H \rangle' \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})$ denotes the commutant of (bounded functions of) the constraint,

$$\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H \cap \mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H = (\mathcal{A}_{SC_1} \cap \mathcal{A}_{SC_2})^H = (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes I_1 \otimes I_2)^H. \quad (2.60)$$

Thus, the algebra of observables accessible to both clock frames is equal to the algebra of gauge-invariant observables that are *internal* to the system. The intuition behind this is simple [67]: $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ does not contain reorientations of C_2 but commutes with them and vice versa with C_1 and C_2 interchanged. Hence, observables in the intersection must commute with reorientations of both clocks, but cannot include reorientations of either. This means that the intersection is given by relational observables such that a in Eq. (2.12) already commutes with H_S and so $O_{C_i}^{\tau_i}(a \otimes I_j) = a \otimes I_1 \otimes I_2$, $i = 1, 2$, $i \neq j$. These are also the only observables that are purely S -local relative to both frames [67].

¹⁹ More precisely, a TPS on an abstract Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is an equivalence class of unitaries, $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \bigotimes_{\alpha} \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}$, such that $U_1 \sim U_2$ if $U_2 U_1^{-1}$ is a product of local unitaries $\otimes_{\alpha} U_{\alpha}$ (and possibly permutations of subsystem factors). Since $\mathcal{R}_i(\tau_i + t) = (U_j(t) \otimes U_S(t)) \mathcal{R}_i(\tau_i)$ via the equivalence of reorientations and subsystem evolution on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, we have that $\mathcal{R}_i(\tau_i)$ defines the same equivalence class (and so TPS on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$) for all $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, the TPS depends only on the choice of QRF, but not on its orientation to which we might gauge fix.

The two subalgebras in Eq. (2.59) are thus distinct. An extreme example is provided when \mathcal{A}_S is a type III₁ von Neumann algebra and H_S is a modular Hamiltonian for it with an ergodic action, a situation that will appear in perturbative quantum gravity (e.g. in de Sitter space [21, 89]) below. Then the only S observables that commute with the constraint are c -numbers. In other words, in that case, the two frames do not share *any* common QFT observables and we have

$$\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H \cap \mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H = \mathbb{C}I_{S12}. \quad (2.61)$$

Nevertheless, the two subalgebras (2.59) are isomorphic when C_1 and C_2 have identical spectra. For example, when both clocks are ideal, both algebras are isomorphic to the crossed product $\mathcal{A}_S \rtimes_{U_S} \mathbb{R}$ and hence also isomorphic to one another. However, they are not isomorphic in general. As noted in Sec. 2.5.2, when the clock is ideal, relational observables constitute a homomorphism from the system algebra \mathcal{A}_S into \mathcal{A}_{inv} , while this is not true when the clock is non-ideal. Thus, for instance, when C_1 is ideal, but C_2 is not, the two subalgebras are not isomorphic.

Moreover, note that $[\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H, \mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H] \neq 0$ because the dressed S operators in one algebra do not commute with the dressed S operators in the other. Hence, even in the extreme case that the algebras overlap trivially – as they sometimes do in QFT, Eq. (2.61) – the two gauge-invariant algebras describing S relative to the two clocks do not define independent subsystems and acting with operators from one algebra will affect the outcomes of measurements from the other.

It is clear that these observations carry over to the representation of these algebras on the physical Hilbert space, i.e.

$$r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H) \cap r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H) = r((\mathcal{A}_S \otimes I_1 \otimes I_2)^H). \quad (2.62)$$

It is in particular somewhat simpler to see that $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)$ and $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H)$ are isomorphic only when C_1 and C_2 have identical spectra. Owing to the unitarity of \mathcal{R}_i , the relation in Eq. (2.45) applied to this case tells us that

$$r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_i}^H) \simeq \Pi_{|i} \mathcal{A}_{S|i} \Pi_{|i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (2.63)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{S|i}$ is generated by $a \in \mathcal{A}_S$ and $U_{Sj}(t)$ with $j \neq i$. Since $\mathcal{A}_{S|1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{S|2}$ are isomorphic and $\Pi_{|i} \in \mathcal{A}_{S|i}$, we have that the physical representations $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)$ and $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H)$ are isomorphic only provided the projectors $\Pi_{|1}$ and $\Pi_{|2}$ are identical functions of $H_S + H_2$ and $H_S + H_1$, respectively.²⁰ By Eq. (2.51) this means that the spectra of C_1, C_2 coincide. Thus, the system (later the QFT degrees of freedom) will appear differently relative to a fuzzy clock than it does to a sharp one.

In the special case when the clock C_j is ideal and $\mathcal{A}_S = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$ is the full system algebra (hence a Type I factor), we have $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1 C_2}^H) = \mathcal{O}_{i|j} \vee \mathcal{O}_{S|j}$ ²¹ with $[\mathcal{O}_{i|j}, \mathcal{O}_{S|j}] = 0$, for either $j = 1$ or $j = 2$ and $i \neq j$, where $\mathcal{O}_{i|j} = \langle \mathcal{O}_{C_j}^{T_j}(a) | a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i) \otimes I_{Sj} \rangle$ is the algebra of relational observables on the physical Hilbert space describing C_i relative to C_j , and similarly $\mathcal{O}_{S|j} = \langle \mathcal{O}_{C_j}^{T_j}(a) | a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes I_{12} \rangle$ is the algebra of relational observables on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ describing S relative to C_j . In this case, $\mathcal{O}_{i|j}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{S|j}$ induce the TPS $\mathcal{R}_j(\tau)$ associated with C_j on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ (e.g., see [67] for the finite-dimensional case). When C_j is non-ideal, then $\mathcal{O}_{i|j}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{S|j}$ do not close as algebras²² and typically do not commute [71].

The fact that different QRFs associate different gauge-invariant subalgebras and Hilbert space tensor factors with the same (kinematical) system S means that the notions of subsystem and subsystem locality depend on the choice of QRF and with it essentially all physical properties that derive from a

²⁰ Otherwise, suppose $\Pi_{|1} = f(H_S + H_2)$ and $\Pi_{|2} = g(H_S + H_1)$ for f, g distinct. Then the projector $I - f \in \mathcal{A}_{S|i}$ maps to zero in one representation, but not the other, i.e. $\Pi_{|1}(I_{S2} - f(H_S + H_2))\Pi_{|1} = 0$, but $\Pi_{|2}(I_{S1} - f(H_S + H_1))\Pi_{|2} \neq 0$.

²¹ $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$ denotes the smallest algebra containing both \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 .

²² For $\mathcal{O}_{S|j}$ this can be seen from Eq. (2.63), by noting that $\Pi_{|j} \mathcal{A}_S \Pi_{|j}$ is not closed under products because $\Pi_{|j} \notin \mathcal{A}_S$.

subsystem partition. For example, in quantum mechanics it was shown that not only entanglement and superpositions (originally observed in [65]), but also entropies, interactions, and thermodynamical properties depend on the choice of QRF [67]; in particular, subsystem thermality and temperature are affected by QRF changes in a way that is independent of classical frame changes in quantum field theory, which lead to phenomena such as the Unruh effect. Subsystem relativity can further be understood as a generalization of the relativity of simultaneity in special relativity [67]; much like the latter explains the *a priori* counter-intuitive phenomena of special relativity, so too is subsystem relativity the source of the novel QRF dependent physics. Our observation in Sec. 6 (expanding on [1]) that entanglement entropy associated with gravitational subregions is observer-dependent is a manifestation and (perturbative) quantum gravity extension of this.

2.8 Kinematical vs. physical von Neumannness

Let us assume again that \mathcal{A}_S is a von Neumann algebra. We noted before that then so are both $\mathcal{A}_{SC_i}^H$, $i = 1, 2$, and $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H$. This statement refers to the gauge-invariant kinematical level, i.e. the closure²³ of the algebra is defined in terms of the structure of \mathcal{H}_{kin} . What about the representations of these algebras on the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, which is not a subspace of \mathcal{H}_{kin} and so closure will be defined differently? To answer this question, we will here again invoke the setting of co-invariants for later purpose, but it is clear that the conclusions are equivalent in RAQ language. We will now argue that, while $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_i}^H)$ remains a von Neumann algebra, this is not necessarily true for $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H)$ when \mathcal{A}_S is a Type III₁ factor. In other words, for the physical von Neumannness of the observable algebras under consideration it is crucial that there is a (kinematically) complementary clock on which this algebra has trivial support. Indeed, later the system S will contain many more clocks.

To see that $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)$ (and similarly $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H)$) remains von Neumann, we can invoke Eq. (2.57) which entails that reduction into the complementary clock C_2 's perspective gives

$$\mathcal{R}_2(\tau_2) r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H) \mathcal{R}_2^\dagger(\tau_2) = \Pi_{|2} \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H \quad (2.64)$$

with $\Pi_{|2}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ commuting. Note that $\Pi_{|2}$ is only contained in $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ when H_S generates inner automorphisms of it; otherwise $\Pi_{|2} \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ is not a subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$. However, the right-hand side is clearly a subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{|2})$ and since this constitutes a *-homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{|2})$ it is a representation of $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ on $\mathcal{H}_{|2}$. \mathcal{R}_2 is unitary and so our physical representation is isomorphic to it, $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H) \simeq \Pi_{|2} \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$. But we also have that $\Pi_{|2} \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ is (ultra-)weakly closed in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{|2})$.²⁴ Indeed, since $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ is a von Neumann algebra, it is (ultra-)weakly closed on $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$, as well as on any subspace that it leaves invariant, like $\mathcal{H}_{|2} = \Pi_{|2}(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1)$. Hence, $\Pi_{|2} \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ is a von Neumann algebra and therefore also $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)$.

We conclude that r is an ultraweakly continuous representation of $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ (and similarly $\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H$) on the physical Hilbert space. The projector $\Pi_{|2}$ on the right hand side of Eq. (2.64) might at first suggest that this representation may not be faithful²⁵ when C_2 is non-ideal, so that the projector is non-trivial. However, it turns out that every non-trivial ultraweakly continuous representation of a von Neumann factor is faithful [136, Lecture 22, Proposition 3].

In the remainder of this work, we shall be interested in the case when \mathcal{A}_S is a Type III₁ von

²³ Thanks to the bicommutant theorem, this can be any of the bicommutant, weak or strong closure.

²⁴ Let $a_i \in \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a net of operators. It converges weakly to the limit operator $a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ if the matrix elements $\langle \phi | a_i | \psi \rangle \rightarrow \langle \phi | a | \psi \rangle$ converge for all $\phi \in \mathcal{H}^*$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$. \mathcal{A} is weakly closed in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ if it contains the limit operator of every net of operators in \mathcal{A} that converges in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. It is ultraweakly closed if tensoring in an identity factor $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathbb{1}$ on an additional infinite dimensional (separable) Hilbert space does not change these convergence and closure properties.

²⁵ The representation is faithful when its kernel is $\{0\}$.

Neumann factor, associated with the quantum field and graviton observables inside a gravitational subregion, and when H_S generates modular flow. We noted before that in this case both $\mathcal{A}_{SC_i}^H$, $i = 1, 2$, are Type II factors. Thus, the physical representation $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)$ (and similarly $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H)$) is faithful regardless of whether the complementary clock is ideal or non-ideal, and in particular it remains a factor.

Let us now explain why the physical representation r of $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H$ fails to be von Neumann when H_S acts ergodically on \mathcal{A}_S and its commutant \mathcal{A}'_S on \mathcal{H}_S (as for the Type III₁ static patch algebras in de Sitter space [21, 89]). The full commutant $(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H)'$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})$ is generated by $a' \in \mathcal{A}'_S$ and bounded functions of the constraint H . Only the latter are gauge invariant because the ergodic action of H_S means that only c -numbers from \mathcal{A}'_S commute with the constraint. The physical representation r of the gauge-invariant component²⁶ of $(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H)'$ thus coincides with the identity factor $\mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$. The double commutant on the physical Hilbert space then returns the full Type I factor $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H)'' = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}})$. That is, $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H) \subsetneq r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H)''$ is not closed under the bicommutant and therefore not a von Neumann algebra.

This observation links with challenges exhibited by CLPW in [21, Sec. 4.3] when discussing a single observer with a clock in de Sitter space. We will return to this topic in Sec. 4.5.

3 Realization in perturbative quantum gravity: PW = CLPW

The quick reader mainly interested in our derivations of density operators and entropies for arbitrarily many observers/clock QRFs can skip to Sec. 4.

Thus far we have not been specific about the system S . It could have been another mechanical system or it could in fact have been a quantum field subsystem. We will now become more concrete and inquire under which conditions we can realize Hamiltonian constraints of the type in Eq. (2.47)

$$H = H_S + H_1 + H_2 \tag{3.1}$$

in quantum gravity. (Below we will generalize this to an arbitrary number of clocks.) While such constraints and clocks arise naturally in minisuperspace, e.g. see [137–139],²⁷ we are here after the more interesting case when S is a QFT encoding graviton, as well as possibly several species of matter degrees of freedom. Specifically, we are interested in scenarios in which H_S is a modular Hamiltonian and a type transition of the S -algebra occurs along with an intrinsic UV-regularization of entanglement entropies. In this regard, we have to clarify suitable conditions under which

- (a) it is legitimate to consider only a single constraint, where the gauge diffeomorphism group of gravity is infinite-dimensional, and
- (b) modular flow aligns with a temporal spacetime diffeomorphism.

This will thus be a hybrid scenario of quantum mechanical clock QRFs and a field-theoretic system. For a full account of the bulk diffeomorphism group also field-theoretic frames are needed [56, 57, 109].

3.1 Subregions and constraints in perturbative quantum gravity

The fact that there are no interactions between the clocks and S in Eq. (3.1) already suggests that, in a gravitational setting, we must be ignoring backreaction and thus considering a perturbative

²⁶ By this we mean $(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H)' \wedge \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})^H$, the largest gauge invariant algebra whose elements are in both $(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1C_2}^H)'$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})^H$

²⁷ For the use of clock QRFs in that case, see for example [69, 108, 118].

regime. The background spacetime will also permit us to associate the system S with the field degrees of freedom inside some subregion defined relative to that background structure in the spirit of the algebraic approach [10, 140] (though see [31] for a background-independent proposal).

In the remainder of this work, we thus consider quantum gravity around a background in the $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ limit, where $\kappa = \sqrt{32\pi G_N}$. Accordingly, we shall be mostly interested in the degrees of freedom of the linearized theory, though, as we explain below, the crossed product generating constraints are of second-order in κ [24, 30, 40, 88]. This background can be a vacuum spacetime, or one sourced by matter, and the gravity theory may be general relativity or some more general gravity theory [40]. For the moment, we assume that this background possesses a Killing horizon as this is the case when it is known that the modular flow of a KMS state of the QFT has a geometric interpretation as a spacetime diffeomorphism, addressing (b) above, namely the one corresponding to the boost Killing vector field generating the horizon [10, 140–143]. We comment on more general proposals below.

In this background, we consider two subregions \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{U}' that are causal complements of one another. For example, in [21], $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}'$ are two complementary static patches in de Sitter space or the left and right exterior region in a maximally extended asymptotically flat Schwarzschild spacetime. In [30] this was extended to several other types of black hole spacetimes and in [24] it was proposed that \mathcal{U} could be a general subregion in a generic spacetime.

We denote the QFT Hilbert space of the global spacetime encoding gravitons and matter degrees of freedom with \mathcal{H}_S and identify the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$ generated by all the bounded QFT operators with exclusive support in \mathcal{U} and invariant under *linearized* bulk diffeomorphisms, as well as any matter gauge symmetry, with the system algebra, i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}_S = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}. \quad (3.2)$$

At leading order in κ , only the graviton field will transform non-trivially under spacetime diffeomorphisms if the background is a vacuum one [24, 40]. In that case, one can extract the gauge-invariant graviton data via standard methods, such as transverse-traceless modes. When the background is sourced by a non-trivial matter content, typically both matter and gravitons will transform non-trivially under linearized diffeomorphisms [40], and gauge-invariant observables can in this case be formulated using dressing methods such as in [144–147]. In line with the general expectation for asymptotically scale invariant quantum field theories, we shall henceforth assume that \mathcal{A}_S is a Type III₁ von Neumann factor [140, 148–151]. Hence, its commutant \mathcal{A}'_S is also a Type III₁ factor and Haag duality [10, 140] tells us that we can identify it with the corresponding algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}'}$ associated with the causal complement \mathcal{U}' .

So far the linearized theory in κ . In order to obtain the modular crossed product algebra, we in fact have to go one order higher because on-shell of the background equations of motion, the first-order constraint associated with any Killing field is identically a boundary term

$$C^{(1)}[\kappa\xi] = \int_{\Sigma} C_{\kappa\xi}^{(1)} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} B_{\kappa\xi}^{(1)}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $C_{\kappa\xi}^{(1)}$ is the first-order constraint current associated with Killing field ξ , $B_{\kappa\xi}^{(1)}$ is some boundary term (the first-order ADM Hamiltonian in general relativity) and Σ is a global Cauchy slice [40] (see also [48, 152] for the case of pure vacuum general relativity). In particular, for spatially compact spacetimes, $C^{(1)}[\kappa\xi]$ vanishes *identically*.

The constraint associated with ξ only has a non-trivial bulk contribution at second order in κ

$$C^{(2)}[\kappa\xi] = H_{\xi} - \int_{\partial\Sigma} B_{\kappa\xi}^{(2)}, \quad (3.4)$$




Figure 3.1: Depicted is the maximally extended Schwarzschild spacetime together with its time Killing flow lines. The Killing boost Hamiltonian H_ξ simultaneously maps the Cauchy slice Σ forwards in time in the right region and backwards in time in the left region. The role of the clocks can here be played by the ADM Hamiltonian defined the right and left asymptotic boundary $H_{\text{ADM}}^{(2)} = H_R - H_L$ with the relative minus sign accounting for the opposite directions of the Killing vector ξ in both regions.

where (on-shell of the first-order equations of motion and boundary conditions) H_ξ is given by the Killing boost Hamiltonian

$$H_\xi = \int_\Sigma (\epsilon^0)^\mu T_{\mu\nu} \xi^\nu, \quad (3.5)$$

with ϵ^0 the volume form of the background metric g_0 and $T_{\mu\nu}$ a stress-energy tensor of all fields, including gravitons [40]. The crux is that βH_ξ for some $\beta \geq 0$ is the modular Hamiltonian associated with some global QFT state $|\psi\rangle_S \in \mathcal{H}_S$ that is cyclic and separating for $\mathcal{A}_S = \mathcal{A}_U$ [10, 140–143], and we identify it as the system Hamiltonian:

$$H_S = H_\xi. \quad (3.6)$$

The boundary piece can be interpreted as the second-order ADM Hamiltonian [27, 30, 40],

$$H_{\text{ADM}}^{(2)} = \int_{\partial\Sigma} B_{\kappa\xi}^{(2)}, \quad (3.7)$$

and it is given by a sum of Hamiltonians, one for each disconnected piece of the asymptotic boundary. For example, in the maximally extended asymptotically flat Schwarzschild spacetime, there is a left and a right asymptotic boundary and $H_{\text{ADM}}^{(2)} = H_R - H_L$ [21], so that the constraint reads

$$C^{(2)}[\kappa\xi] = H_S - H_R + H_L \quad (3.8)$$

and reproduces the form Eq. (3.1) with the left and right ADM Hamiltonians assuming the role of the clock Hamiltonians. The relative minus sign between H_R and H_L traces back to the fact that the Killing flow generated by the boost field ξ is future pointing in the right region and past directed in the left one (see Fig. 3.1). It is important that $H_{R,L}$ is *linear* in the second-order metric perturbations [30, 40], which means that its spectrum is unbounded in both directions and so H_L, H_R correspond to *ideal* clock QRFs on the boundary.²⁸

When the spacetime is spatially compact, such as de Sitter space, on the other hand, no intrinsic gravitational ADM boundary clocks are present and the second-order constraint would just be given

²⁸ More precisely, this requires a regularization of the ADM Hamiltonians, $H_{R,L} \rightarrow H_{R,L} - M_0$ to account for the diverging black hole mass M_0 as $G_N \rightarrow 0$. $H_{R,L}$ are not necessarily non-degenerate on the Hilbert space of second-order fluctuation variables. However, one can refactorize the Hilbert space of the second-order fluctuations such that $H_{R,L}$ act only on a $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ factor of it, thereby turning it into an ideal clock Hamiltonian. See [21, Sec. 5] for discussion.




Figure 3.2: The static patch of de Sitter space depicted with its Killing flow lines. The killing flow generated by H_ξ moves the cauchy slice Σ forwards in time in the right patch but backwards in time in its complement, the left patch. The clocks measuring the boost time would be H_1 in the right patch and H_2 in the left patch respectively. One can think of them being localized along the $r = 0$ worldlines. The backwards evolution in the complement leads to a relative minus sign between the two clock Hamiltonians.

by $H = H_S$. It turns out that the modular flow generated by H_S acts ergodically on $\mathcal{A}_U = \mathcal{A}_S$ [21, 89] and this means that the content of \mathcal{U} that is invariant under this constraint is trivial

$$\mathcal{A}_S^H = \mathbb{C}. \quad (3.9)$$

To remedy this issue, CLPW introduced an observer equipped with a quantum clock in each of the two complementary static patches $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}'$ such that each timelike worldline connects the past with the future tip of the respective static patch [21]. This shifts the stress-energy tensor in Eq. (3.5) by the clock contributions, $H_\xi \rightarrow H_\xi + H_1 - H_2$, where $i = 1, 2$ labels the clock Hamiltonians in the two patches. In this case, there is no reason for H_i to be unbounded or non-degenerate and so the clocks need not be ideal. When the worldlines coincide with Killing flow lines generated by the cosmological horizon boost vector field, these clocks measure that boost time and the relative minus sign between the clock Hamiltonians again accounts for the relative orientation between the direction of time evolution in the two patches [21, 24, 31, 40] (see Figure 3.2). This once more reproduces a Hamiltonian constraint of the form Eq. (3.1) and in this case one does obtain non-trivial boost-invariant algebras for both $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}'$ from the crossed product construction. Clearly, the observers' clocks are QRFs of exactly the type we described in Sec. 2.

Operationally, we can assume that each observer can probe the observables in the vicinity of their worldline. The timelike tube theorem [153–157] asserts that they can then also access the entire algebra associated with the ‘timelike envelope’ of their worldline. This is the causal region defined by all the events that can be reached by deforming the original worldline, while keeping its endpoints fixed and preserving the timelike nature of the worldline. For an observer in de Sitter space, this envelope will agree with its entire static patch. The timelike tube theorem thereby supports an operational interpretation of the entropies that will be associated with such regions.

Let us now come to two related questions, namely (a) above and:

- (c) why should one impose second-order constraints, Eqs. (3.1) and (3.4), when we are taking the $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ limit and are thus interested in the linear order theory?

We have discussed these questions and answer options at length in [40] and we refer to that work for details. In a nutshell, there is an essentially unambiguous answer for spatially compact spacetimes in general relativity with isometries: a linearized solution is a valid approximation to an exact solution

if and only if all second-order Killing symmetry generators, called Taub charges [158, 159], vanish [48, 49, 160]. The boost constraint happens to be one of those and crucially there is just a *finite number* of them, one for each independent Killing field. When the first-order in κ fields do not satisfy these constraints, the linearized solution cannot be integrated to an exact one. However, we can safely ignore all other infinitely many second-order diffeomorphism constraints as far as a consistent embedding of the linearized theory into the full non-linear theory is concerned. The constraints Eqs. (3.1) and (3.5) are thus to be understood as one of a finite number of necessary and sufficient stability conditions for perturbation theory to avoid spurious solutions. This is the output of the subject of linearization instabilities [41–43, 46, 47, 50, 161]. While these are classical results, there are strong arguments for also imposing these constraints as stability conditions in the quantum theory [44, 45, 51–53, 88]. Furthermore, the original instability theorems pertain to general relativity, however, it appears likely that similarly strong results hold in arbitrary generally covariant theories in spatially compact spacetimes [40]. Finally, the isometries are now typically broken down by the presence of the observers to a form $\mathbb{R} \times G$, for some compact group G [21], where \mathbb{R} corresponds to the boost translations. Given the compactness of G and the direct product structure, expanding the QRFs to account for G [66] will however not affect the crossed product type transition or the discussion qualitatively otherwise. In that sense, it is legitimate to ignore them here.²⁹

In the absence of isometries or the presence of boundaries (with interesting boundary conditions), no instabilities arise and no second-order constraint is necessary in order to ensure consistency of the first-order theory [40, 48, 49, 160, 163, 164]. One must thus argue differently why one would still want to consider second-order constraints of the form Eq. (3.1) and why considering only a single constraint or finite number of them, as done in practice, is legitimate. As we argue in [40], this will depend on whether one is also interested in certain second-order observables, such as in [27, 29, 30], though strictly speaking this case still stands on arguably less robust grounds than the spatially compact one with isometries.

It is also not known in general under which conditions modular flow of a QFT algebra admits a geometric interpretation. However, there is a ‘geometric modular flow conjecture’ asserting that the diffeomorphism generated by a vector field that appears boost-like near the boundary of a general subregion in a spacetime with or without isometries will agree infinitesimally with the modular flow of *some* KMS state and so can be used for building crossed products [24, 143].

In the sequel, we shall simply work with constraints of the form Eq. (3.1), without further specifying whether we work in a spacetime with or without boundary and whether or not an exact boost Killing field exists. We note the various levels of justification for considering such constraints mentioned above (with an essentially unambiguous justification for spatially compact spacetimes with boost isometries). Henceforth, we also assume that H_S is a modular Hamiltonian, while H_i could thus be an internal or ADM boundary clock Hamiltonian, depending on the situation.

3.2 PW = CLPW

Let us now clarify more precisely that what CLPW [21] and follow-up works such as JSS [24] call an observer is precisely a temporal QRF according to the perspective-neutral approach reviewed in the previous section. We will briefly demonstrate that the description of constrained states and observables used in these works is equivalent to the (expanded form of the) Page-Wootters (PW) formalism underlying that approach, as reviewed in Sec. 2.5. This is the basis for the informal slogan

²⁹ In the operational approach to QRFs, which does not impose constraints on states, these isometries have been encompassed in the crossed products of [54]; such crossed products were also considered in [162]. Encompassing them in an approach that does impose constraints on states also, as likely appropriate in gravity, would build upon [66].




Figure 3.3: Commutative diagram showing two orders in which constraints may be imposed. CLPW [21] and JSS [24] move counterclockwise from the top, imposing non-idealness (bounded energy) of the clocks only after the constraint is implemented. Our approach starts with the kinematical Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{kin} , where clocks already have the final restriction on their energy spectra in place, and imposes the constraint on this. This diagram shows a comparison at the gauge invariant level, culminating on the physical Hilbert space. An analogous diagram instead implements the gauge constraint via gauge fixing, for instance culminating in the reduced perspective of frame C_2 , as we do in the main text below. The diagram on the right shows the similar two orders of imposing the constraints on the algebras.

in the title of this section. We will build upon this observation in subsequent sections to generalise the construction to arbitrarily many observers/QRFs.

3.2.1 Map to coinvariant representation is Page-Wootters reduction

In both [21, 24] the clocks are first treated as ideal, and only after deriving the relevant density operators are projectors included to enforce the energy bounds of the observer Hamiltonian (in their case, reducing the spectra from the full real line to values on a half line). The perspective-neutral approach reviewed in Sec. 2, by contrast, directly begins with a kinematical Hilbert space on which the clock frames already have their final energy restrictions and thus may already be non-ideal (having limited spectral ranges), and then implements the constraint by mapping states and operators to the physical Hilbert space and/or gauge-fixed ‘reduced’ Hilbert spaces corresponding to the internal frame perspectives. Relative to us, we therefore say that [21, 24] consider an ‘extended’ kinematical Hilbert space and constraint operator to start with, which we indicate with the label ‘ext’:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}} := \mathcal{H}_S \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R})_1 \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R})_2, \quad (3.10)$$

$$H^{\text{ext}} := H_S + H_1^{\text{ext}} - H_2^{\text{ext}}. \quad (3.11)$$

The relative minus sign again accounts for the different relative direction of time evolution in $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}'$, assuming clock C_2 lives in \mathcal{U}' . H_1^{ext} and H_2^{ext} are therefore unbounded ideal clock frame Hamiltonians. The final output of both routes coincides, as we now explain, see Fig. 3.3.

The relation to our Hamiltonians is given by

$$H_i = \Pi_i H_i^{\text{ext}} \quad (3.12)$$

with projector onto the ultimately permitted energy intervals of clock C_i

$$\Pi_i = \sum_{\alpha} \Theta(\epsilon_{\max}^{i,\alpha} - H_i) \Theta(-\epsilon_{\min}^{i,\alpha} + H_i), \quad (3.13)$$

where α sums over the different possible non-overlapping intervals (in [21] only a single interval was used). Similarly, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \Pi_1 \Pi_2 (\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}) = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \quad (3.14)$$

with $\mathcal{H}_i = \bigoplus_{\alpha} L^2(\sigma_i^{\alpha})$, where $\sigma_i^{\alpha} = [\epsilon_{\min}^{i,\alpha}, \epsilon_{\max}^{i,\alpha}]$, and for the clock states

$$|t\rangle_i = \Pi_i |t\rangle_i^{\text{ext}}. \quad (3.15)$$

Note that the projection does not affect the covariance properties in Eq. (2.2), but is responsible for the clock state fuzziness in Eqs. (2.6) and (2.7).

In the case of ideal frames, the Hilbert space of coinvariants, as discussed in [21, Sec. 4.2] is isomorphic to a simple tensor product of the QFT Hilbert space and one frame factor, say that of clock C_1 ; it thus removes clock C_2 in the complementary patch \mathcal{U}' . This is implemented via a certain T map from (extended) kinematical states to a representation of coinvariants. Let us directly generalize it to non-ideal clocks and show that it is equivalent to Page-Wootters reduction. The map is

$$T_2 : \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1, \quad (3.16)$$

reading in our notation and conventions [21, Eq. (4.10)]

$$T_2 |\psi\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt e^{-it(H_S+H_1)} |\psi(t)\rangle, \quad (3.17)$$

where $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$ and $|\psi(t)\rangle = (\langle t|_2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_{S1}) |\psi\rangle$. Clearly, using the clock covariance in Eq. (2.2)

$$T_2 |\psi\rangle = \mathcal{R}'_2(0) \Pi_{\text{phys}} |\psi\rangle \stackrel{(2.41)}{=} \mathcal{R}_2(0) M |\psi\rangle, \quad (3.18)$$

where Π_{phys} is the coherent group averaging map Eq. (2.17) (updated in the obvious way to accommodate two clocks) and $\mathcal{R}'_2(0)$ is the Page-Wootters reduction map as in Eq. (2.50), however, for clock C_2 reading $\tau_2 = 0$. The ideal case of CLPW is recovered by setting $\Pi_i = \mathbb{1}_i$. Hence, the T map from the (extended) kinematical Hilbert space to a coinvariant representation invoked by CLPW [21, Eq. (4.10)] is equivalent to first going perspective-neutral via group averaging (or M) and then “jumping into the clock C_2 ’s perspective when it reads $\tau_2 = 0$ ” via a Page-Wootters reduction.

Written this way, it is clear that the action of T_2 implements the constraint Eq. (3.1) in the form $H = H_S + H_1 - H_2$. Nevertheless, it is somewhat instructive to double check that this also holds for non-ideal clocks,

$$T_2 H |\psi\rangle = 0, \quad \forall |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}, \quad (3.19)$$

which we briefly do in App. B. Hence,

$$T_2 H_2 |\psi\rangle = T_2 (H_S + H_1) |\psi\rangle = (H_S + H_1) T_2 |\psi\rangle. \quad (3.20)$$

Now $\Pi_2 = \mathbb{1}$ on \mathcal{H}_{kin} . However, by Eq. (3.20), this turns into a non-trivial projector for the internal frame perspective

$$T_2 \Pi_2 |\psi\rangle = \Pi_2 T_2 |\psi\rangle, \quad (3.21)$$

where we recover Eqs. (2.51) and (2.52) (with the appropriate minus signs for $H = H_S + H_1 - H_2$)

$$\Pi_2 = \sum_{\alpha} \Theta(\epsilon_{\max}^{2,\alpha} - H_S - H_1) \Theta(-\epsilon_{\min}^{2,\alpha} + H_S + H_1). \quad (3.22)$$

In other words, we recover the reduced Hilbert space in C_2 -perspective of Sec. 2.6

$$\mathcal{H}_{|2} \equiv T_2(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}) = \mathcal{R}_2(\tau)(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}) = \Pi_{|2}(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1) , \quad (3.23)$$

i.e. a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$ when C_2 is non-ideal and so $\Pi_{|2}$ is a non-trivial projector. By contrast, when C_2 is ideal, $\Pi_{|2} = I_{S1}$, and we recover the *initial* result of [21, Sec. 4.2].

In particular, had we started like CLPW with \mathcal{H}_{ext} , first implemented the constraint H^{ext} via T_2^{ext} (defined in the obvious way) and *then* imposed the restrictions Π_i on the clock energy spectra, we would find in place of Eq. (3.21)

$$T_2^{\text{ext}} \Pi_1 \Pi_2 |\psi\rangle_{\text{ext}} = \Pi_1 \Pi_{|2} T_2^{\text{ext}} |\psi\rangle_{\text{ext}} , \quad (3.24)$$

where Π_i is now a non-trivial projector on \mathcal{H}_{ext} . However, thanks to Eq. (3.15),

$$T_2^{\text{ext}} \Pi_1 \Pi_2 |\psi\rangle_{\text{ext}} = T_2 |\psi\rangle , \quad (3.25)$$

with $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$, and so it is clear that the two routes in Fig. 3.3 give the same end result. Thus, CLPW's and JSS's observers are nothing but clock QRFs according to the perspective-neutral formalism.

3.2.2 Reduction of observable algebras

Let us briefly consider the reduction of the crossed observable algebras $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H = (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \otimes I_2)^H$ and $\mathcal{A}_{S'C_2}^H := (\mathcal{A}'_S \otimes I_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2))^H = (\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)'$, corresponding to \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{U}' , respectively, which are commutants within $\mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H$, and check that the procedure by CLPW agrees with the procedure of the perspective-neutral formalism. To determine the representation on the space of coinvariants, CLPW set [21, Sec. 4.2]

$$\mathcal{A} T_2 |\psi\rangle := T_2 \mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H |\psi\rangle , \quad (3.26)$$

which we have adapted to our conventions and notation and extended to clocks that are not necessarily ideal. Using Eq. (2.25), we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} T_2 |\psi\rangle &= \mathcal{R}_2(0) M \mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H |\psi\rangle = \mathcal{R}_2(0) r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H) |\psi\rangle \\ &= \mathcal{R}_2(0) r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H) \mathcal{R}_2^\dagger(0) \mathcal{R}_2(0) |\psi\rangle , \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{R}_2(0) r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{kin}}^H) \mathcal{R}_2^\dagger(0) \quad (3.28)$$

agrees with the Page-Wootters reduced algebras as in [68, Thm. 3]. Hence, by Eqs. (2.64):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{SC_1|2} &:= \mathcal{R}_2(0) r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H) \mathcal{R}_2^\dagger(0) \\ &= \Pi_{|2} \mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H \\ &= \Pi_{|2} \left\langle O_{C_1}^{\tau_1}(a), e^{isH_1} \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S, s \in \mathbb{R} \right\rangle'' \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

and by Eq. (2.57):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{S'C_2|2} &:= \mathcal{R}_2(0) r(\mathcal{A}_{S'C_2}^H) \mathcal{R}_2^\dagger(0) \\ &= \Pi_{|2} \left\langle a', e^{is(H_S+H_1)} \mid a' \in \mathcal{A}'_S, s \in \mathbb{R} \right\rangle'' \Pi_{|2} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

Both algebras now act on the reduced space in C_2 -perspective $\mathcal{H}_{|2}$. From the arguments in App. A.2 and Sec. 2.8 it follows that both $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1|2}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{S'C_2|2}$ are Type II von Neumann factors; they are of Type II₁ if the respective clock has an energy bound from below, otherwise they are Type II_∞, see

[21] and Sec. 4. Furthermore, Haag duality (including the clocks) is preserved by reduction: on $\mathcal{H}_{|2}$ we have

$$\mathcal{A}_{SC_1|2} = \left(\mathcal{A}_{S'C_2|2} \right)' \quad (3.31)$$

because the commutant of $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ on $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$ is $\langle a', e^{is(H_S+H_1)} \mid a' \in \mathcal{A}_S, s \in \mathbb{R} \rangle''$ and these commutant relations are preserved by projection with $\Pi_{|2}$, yielding $\mathcal{H}_{|2}$ via Eq. (3.23) [165, EP7, p. 21].

Thanks to Eqs. (3.24) and (3.25) it can be easily checked that the reduced algebras $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1|2}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{S'C_2|2}$ coincide with the reduced algebras in CLPW upon implementing the clock energy restrictions [21, Sec. 4.2].³⁰

We will now move on to generalize the construction by CLPW in [21] and JSS in [24] to arbitrarily many observers with clocks using the perspective-neutral framework. We will later demonstrate in Sec. 4.4 how to recover the density operators and entropies obtained in these references from our more general formalism.

4 Subregion density operators with non-degenerate clocks

Let us now consider a system consisting of quantum fields living in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_S , and some arbitrary number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of observers carrying clocks C_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, each with non-degenerate continuous spectra $\sigma_i \subset \mathbb{R}$, and so Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_i = L^2(\sigma_i)$. We focus initially on the case where the clocks are non-degenerate. Thus the total kinematical Hilbert space is

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i. \quad (4.1)$$

From here onward, we will now mostly invoke the language of co-invariants when describing constrained states and observables, but, as described in Sec. 2, using RAQ would lead to an equivalent formulation.

We will assume in this section that all the observers have access to field observables in some fixed spacetime subregion \mathcal{U} or its complement \mathcal{U}' . Heuristically, one may imagine that the observers are traveling along some worldlines in \mathcal{U} or \mathcal{U}' , and that they are somehow able to measure the fields in the vicinities of their worldlines. The timelike tube theorem [153, 156, 157, 166] is then what permits them to measure the fields in the rest of \mathcal{U} or \mathcal{U}' (under certain conditions), as briefly mentioned in Subsec. 3.1.

Each observer will also be assumed to have some amount of access to the degrees of freedom of the clocks of the other observers. At the present level of abstraction, exactly how much access is essentially just an operational specification. But we can use physical and heuristic principles to motivate this specification (although note that the following is non-rigorous and should be taken with a grain of salt). Indeed, suppose we continue to use the picture of observers traveling along worldlines. If an observer Alice can act with the fields in the vicinity of another observer Bob's worldline (invoking the timelike tube theorem), then she also ought to be able to act on Bob with his Hamiltonian – because the local gravitational constraints allow us to rewrite this Hamiltonian as a field operator supported in Bob's neighborhood. Also, Alice ought to be able to measure time differences of Bob's clock – because such time differences can be written in terms of the metric proper time along his worldline (again ultimately due to the gravitational constraints). At the kinematical level, we can just allow her to measure the absolute time of his clock, which will reduce to time differences after imposing gauge invariance. So, Alice can, at the kinematical level, act with all operators on Bob's clock's Hilbert space.

³⁰ In fact, CLPW perform another unitary conjugation in C_2 -perspective to put $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1|2}$ into a standard crossed product form, a step we refrain from here.

More generally, we will assume each observer can act with the full set of operators on some subset R of the available clocks (including their own).³¹ Despite the heuristic reasoning given here, in the interest of generality we will not make any assumptions about whether the clocks in R are located inside or outside \mathcal{U} .

We assume that there is a gauge constraint of the form $H = H_S + \sum_{i=1}^n H_i$, where H_S is the generator of some diffeomorphism acting on the fields and preserving \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{U}' , and H_i is the Hamiltonian of clock C_i . Overall H should be understood as the generator of the diffeomorphism acting on the fields and the clocks simultaneously. While H_S throughout Sect. 2 could have been arbitrary, in particular here we will take it to be the generator of a boost ξ as described in Sect. 3, which we will take to correspond to the modular flow of some state of the fields in \mathcal{U} ; since the algebra of the fields is Type III, this is necessarily an outer automorphism, so H_S cannot be expressed in terms of an operator localized to \mathcal{U} .

Let $R \subset \{C_i | i = 1, \dots, n\}$ be some subset of the available clocks (which could be for example the set of clocks contained in the region \mathcal{U}), and let $R^c = \{C_i | i = 1, \dots, n\} \setminus R$ be its complement. We are interested in the observables accessible with the clocks $C_i \in R$. As in the previous sections, the algebra of such observables may be formulated as the gauge-invariant subalgebra of kinematical operators acting on the clocks and the fields in \mathcal{U} :

$$\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H = (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_R))^H, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_R = \bigotimes_{C_i \in R} \mathcal{H}_i$, and \mathcal{A}_S is the algebra of field observables with support in \mathcal{U} . Picking any particular $C_i \in R$, we can decompose this algebra as

$$\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H = \{O_i^\tau(a), U_i(t) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}}), \tau \in \mathbb{R}, t \in \mathbb{R}\}'', \quad (4.3)$$

where $R_{\bar{i}} = R \setminus C_i$, $\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}} = \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}} \mathcal{H}_j$, and

$$O_i^\tau(a) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{-iHt} (a \otimes |\tau\rangle\langle\tau|_i) e^{iHt}, \quad U_i(t) = e^{-iH_i t}, \quad (4.4)$$

with $|\tau\rangle_i$ being the clock states for C_i , and we are omitting identity factors and often rearranging tensor factors to simplify the notation.

The corresponding algebra of physical observables is $r(\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H)$, acting on the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, obtained by imposing the constraint $H = 0$ as described previously.

We will assume H_S generates the modular flow with respect to \mathcal{A}_S of some cyclic and separating QFT state $|\psi_S\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$; more precisely, we assume its modular operator is of the form $\Delta_{\psi_S} = e^{-\beta H_S}$, for some inverse temperature β . We will also take R^c to be non-empty. As described previously in Sec. 2.8 (whose argument extends to arbitrarily many clocks), these assumptions guarantee that

$$r : \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H \rightarrow r(\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H) \quad (4.5)$$

is a faithful representation, and that $r(\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H)$ is a Type II factor which we will confirm later. Our aim in this section is to compute the density operator in the algebra $r(\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H)$ corresponding to a physical state $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. In the interest of readability, some key details are reserved for Appendix C.

³¹ It should be noted that this line of reasoning will *not* necessarily lead to the same structure in the case of *degenerate* clocks, which we explore further in Sec. 5.

4.1 Trace on the observable algebra

Our goal is to create a trace using the basic property of a modular operator Δ_Ψ , namely

$$\langle \Psi | ab | \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi | b \Delta_\Psi a | \Psi \rangle. \quad (4.6)$$

If we can find a $|\Psi\rangle$ for which Δ_Ψ acts as an identity on a, possibly projected, Hilbert space, then we propose the trace to be the expectation value of any operator in this state $\text{Tr}(\cdot) := \langle \Psi | \cdot | \Psi \rangle$. This will define a good trace for the type II algebra $r(\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H)$ due to faithfulness of the representation (4.5) and the uniqueness of the trace up to scaling. To make the extension to multiple clocks, it will be necessary to introduce auxiliary Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_j^* for every $C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}$ to be able to build $|\Psi\rangle$. Afterwards, we can map back from this extended Hilbert space to the physical Hilbert space by making use of the relative modular operator.

The first step is to write down a trace on \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H . To this end, let us define a ‘thermofield double’ for the clocks in $R_{\bar{i}}$:

$$|\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}\rangle = \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}} \int_{\sigma_j} d\epsilon_j e^{-\beta\epsilon_j/2} |\epsilon_j\rangle \otimes \langle \epsilon_j | \in \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}} \mathcal{H}_j \otimes \mathcal{H}_j^*. \quad (4.7)$$

This is a (non-normalisable – so technically speaking it is an abuse of notation to write $|\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}\rangle \in \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}} \mathcal{H}_j \otimes \mathcal{H}_j^*$) state for two copies of each of the clocks in $R_{\bar{i}}$. It is cyclic and separating for $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}})$ (unless otherwise stated we always take operators to act on the first copy of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_j , rather than \mathcal{H}_j^*), with Tomita operator given by (as confirmed in App. C)

$$S_{\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}}(|\varphi\rangle \otimes \langle \zeta |) = e^{\beta H_{R_{\bar{i}}}/2} |\zeta\rangle \otimes \langle \varphi | e^{-\beta H_{R_{\bar{i}}}/2}. \quad (4.8)$$

One then finds the modular operator

$$\Delta_{\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}} = S_{\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}} = \exp\left(-\beta(H_{R_{\bar{i}}} - H_{R_{\bar{i}}}^*)\right), \quad (4.9)$$

where the * denotes that the operator acts on the second copy of the clocks. We then set $|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}\rangle = |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}\rangle$. The state $|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}\rangle$ is cyclic and separating for $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}})$. It has a Tomita operator

$$S_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} = S_{\psi_S} \otimes S_{R_{\bar{i}}}, \quad (4.10)$$

where S_{ψ_S} is the Tomita operator associated with the QFT state $|\psi_S\rangle$, and modular operator

$$\Delta_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} = \exp\left(-\beta(H_S + H_{R_{\bar{i}}} - H_{R_{\bar{i}}}^*)\right). \quad (4.11)$$

Consider the state

$$|\Psi\rangle = |\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}\rangle \otimes e^{-\beta H_i/2} |0\rangle_i \in \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}} (\mathcal{H}_j \otimes \mathcal{H}_j^*) \otimes \mathcal{H}_i. \quad (4.12)$$

\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H acts on the Hilbert space containing this state.

As shown in Appendix C, $|\Psi\rangle$ is separating for this action, and it is cyclic over a subspace

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{SR_{\bar{i}}R_{\bar{i}}^*C_i} = \tilde{\Pi}(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}} (\mathcal{H}_j \otimes \mathcal{H}_j^*) \otimes \mathcal{H}_i), \quad (4.13)$$

where

$$\tilde{\Pi} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_{\bar{i}}} - H_{R_{\bar{i}}}^* + H_i)\tau\right) \langle \tau | 0 \rangle_i \equiv \tilde{\Pi}[H_S + H_{R_{\bar{i}}} - H_{R_{\bar{i}}}^* + H_i, \sigma_i]. \quad (4.14)$$

This is a projector similar to the Page–Wootters one (2.52); it enforces the condition that when acting on a state, the value of $H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*} + H_i$ must lie in the spectrum σ_i of clock C_i .

Due to these properties, there is a Tomita operator for $|\Psi\rangle$, defined on a dense subspace of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{SR_i R_i^* C_i}$; it may be written explicitly as

$$S_\Psi = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{\beta H_i/2} |t\rangle_i \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})t\right) S_{\psi_{SR_i}} \langle -t|_i e^{-\beta H_i/2}. \quad (4.15)$$

From this, the modular operator of $|\Psi\rangle$ may be derived:

$$\Delta_\Psi = S_\Psi^\dagger S_\Psi = \tilde{\Pi}. \quad (4.16)$$

Upon restriction to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{SR_i R_i^* R_i}$, one observes that Δ_Ψ is just the identity operator. A direct confirmation of these formulae may be found in Appendix C.

These properties suffice to show that

$$\text{Tr}(A) = e^{S_{0,R}} \langle \Psi|A|\Psi\rangle \quad (4.17)$$

defines a trace on \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H , where $S_{0,R}$ is some normalisation constant of which the notation will become clear later. Indeed, this functional is clearly normal, since it is the expectation value in a Hilbert space state. It is faithful because $|\Psi\rangle$ is separating. It obeys the cyclicity property because Δ_Ψ is the identity on the subspace over which $|\Psi\rangle$ is cyclic:

$$\text{Tr}(AB) = e^{S_{0,R}} \langle \Psi|AB|\Psi\rangle = e^{S_{0,R}} \langle \Psi|A\Delta_\Psi B|\Psi\rangle = e^{S_{0,R}} \langle \Psi|BA|\Psi\rangle = \text{Tr}(BA). \quad (4.18)$$

Finally, it is semifinite; for an example of a finite trace operator, consider

$$A = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \bigotimes_{C_j \in R} \theta(H_j) |t\rangle_j \langle t|_j \theta(H_j) \in \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H. \quad (4.19)$$

Then one may show that

$$\text{Tr}(A) = e^{S_{0,R}} \prod_{C_j \in R} \int_{\sigma_j \cap \mathbb{R}_+} d\epsilon_j e^{-\beta \epsilon_j}, \quad (4.20)$$

and all the integrals converge. Given Tr , we can define also a trace Tr_r on $r(\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H)$ by using the fact that the representation r restricted to \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H is faithful (cf. Sec. 2.8):

$$\text{Tr}_r(r(A)) = \text{Tr}(A). \quad (4.21)$$

The trace of the identity is given by

$$\text{Tr}(1) = \text{Tr}_r(1) = e^{S_{0,R}} \langle \Psi|\Psi\rangle = e^{S_{0,R}} \langle \psi_{R_i} | \psi_{R_i} \rangle \langle 0|_i e^{-\beta H_i} |0\rangle_i. \quad (4.22)$$

If R includes more than one frame, then this is infinite, because the thermofield double state is not normalisable. However, if R contains only a single frame, then we have

$$\text{Tr}(1) = e^{S_{0,R}} \langle 0|_i e^{-\beta H_i} |0\rangle_i = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{S_{0,R}} \int_{\sigma_i} d\epsilon_i e^{-\beta \epsilon_i}. \quad (4.23)$$

We see that $\text{Tr}(1)$ is then finite if and only if σ_i is bounded below. It is convenient in this case to set

$$S_{0,R} = -\log\left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_i} d\epsilon_i e^{-\beta \epsilon_i}\right), \quad (4.24)$$

so that $\text{Tr}(1) = 1$.

4.2 Density operator

Next, given a physical state $|\phi\rangle$, we wish to find the density matrix ρ_ϕ in the algebra $r(\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H)$. The density operator is defined to obey

$$e^{S_{0,R}} \langle \Psi | r^{-1}(\rho_\phi) A | \Psi \rangle = \text{Tr}(r^{-1}(\rho_\phi) A) = \text{Tr}_r(\rho_\phi r(A)) = (\phi | r(A) | \phi). \quad (4.25)$$

In fact, the density operator is given by

$$r^{-1}(\rho_\phi) = e^{-S_{0,R}} \Delta_{\phi|\Psi}, \quad (4.26)$$

i.e. the relative modular operator from $|\Psi\rangle$ to $|\phi\rangle$, intertwined through the representation r , scaled by $e^{-S_{0,R}}$. Indeed, one may easily verify that such an operator suffices for equality between the left hand and right hand sides in (4.25). Moreover, it is generally true that for any two states ϕ, Ψ with Ψ cyclic and separating for an algebra, $\Delta_\Psi^{-1/2} \Delta_{\phi|\Psi} \Delta_\Psi^{-1/2}$ is an element of the algebra — in our case Δ_Ψ is the identity, which confirms that the $r^{-1}(\rho_\phi)$ given above is an element of \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H .

So to derive the density operator, let us first give the relative Tomita operator; it is

$$S_{\phi|\Psi} = \Pi_{\text{phys}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt |t\rangle_i S_{\phi_i(0)|\psi_{SR_i}} \langle 0|_i \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*} + H_i)(t + i\beta/2)\right), \quad (4.27)$$

where $|\phi_i(\tau)\rangle = \mathcal{R}_i(\tau) |\phi\rangle$ is the reduced state when clock C_i reads τ , and $S_{\phi_i(0)|\psi_{SR_i}}$ is a relative Tomita operator for the algebra $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$. One may employ this formula to obtain

$$\Delta_{\phi|\Psi} = S_{\phi|\Psi}^\dagger S_{\phi|\Psi} = e^{\beta H_i/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{-iH_i t} \mathcal{O}_i^\dagger(\Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi_i(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2}) e^{\beta H_i/2}, \quad (4.28)$$

which holds for any τ . A full derivation is given in Appendix C. The density operator is thus given by

$$\rho_\phi = e^{-S_{0,R}} r(\Delta_{\phi|\Psi}) = e^{-S_{0,R}} V_i(i\beta/2) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt V_i(t) \mathcal{O}_i^\dagger(\Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi_i(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2}) V_i(i\beta/2). \quad (4.29)$$

Note that the unusual combination of Tomita and modular operators appearing inside $\mathcal{O}_i^\dagger(\dots)$ is in fact an element of $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$, which is also shown in Appendix C.

The ρ_ϕ we have just found is the density operator at the perspective-neutral level. To find the density operator in the perspective of a particular $C_i \in R$, we can simply conjugate ρ_ϕ with the reduction map $\mathcal{R}_i(\tau)$. To be precise, because $\mathcal{R}_i(\tau)$ is an isometry, we can define a trace on the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{R_i^* S | C_i}$ via

$$\text{Tr}_{|i}(\cdot) = \text{Tr}_r(\mathcal{R}_i(\tau)^\dagger(\cdot)\mathcal{R}_i(\tau)), \quad (4.30)$$

and it is easy to verify that the density operator of the perspective-reduced state $|\phi_i(\tau)\rangle$ with respect to this trace is given by $\rho_{\phi|i}(\tau) = \mathcal{R}_i(\tau) \rho_\phi \mathcal{R}_i(\tau)^\dagger$. In Appendix C, it is shown that

$$\rho_{\phi|i}(\tau) = \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_i^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} S_{\phi_i(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}. \quad (4.31)$$

Note that the $H_{R_i^*}$ that appears in this formula will be cancelled out by contributions from the relative Tomita operators, and there will be no overall action on the second copy of the clocks in R_i . To confirm this let us decompose the reduced state $|\phi_i(\tau)\rangle$ as

$$|\phi_i(\tau)\rangle = \sum_I |\phi_S^I(\tau)\rangle \otimes |\tilde{\phi}^I(\tau)\rangle, \quad (4.32)$$

where I is some continuous or discrete label, $|\phi_S^I(\tau)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$, and $|\tilde{\phi}^I(\tau)\rangle \in \bigotimes_{i \neq j} \mathcal{H}_j$. Then one has

$$\rho_{\phi|i}(\tau) = \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta H_{R^c}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} \sum_{I,J} S_{\phi_S^I(\tau+t)|\psi_S}^\dagger S_{\phi_S^J(\tau)|\psi_S} \otimes \text{tr}_{R^c}(|\tilde{\phi}^I(\tau+t)\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}^J(\tau)|). \quad (4.33)$$

This is explicitly shown in Appendix C. As claimed, the $H_{R_i^*}$ has dropped out.

4.3 Partial trace over a clock

Suppose the set R contains at least two clocks. We can imagine removing one particular clock $C_i \in R$ from this set, and asking how this affects our observations. We clearly have $r(\mathcal{A}_{S_{R \setminus C_i}}^H) \subset r(\mathcal{A}_{S_R}^H)$, so the set of operators we are allowed to act with is reduced – since we can no longer dress to C_i , or reorient it.

A good way to understand the effect of removing C_i is to consider the consequences for the density operator. One may note that the density operator $\rho^R \in r(\mathcal{A}_{S_R}^H)$ uniquely determines the density operator $\rho^{R \setminus C_i} \in r(\mathcal{A}_{S_{R \setminus C_i}}^H)$ for the set of clocks $R \setminus C_i$, via the condition that the expectation values agree. Indeed, let Tr^R and $\text{Tr}^{R \setminus C_i}$ denote the traces for the two sets of clocks; then we have

$$\text{Tr}^R(\rho^R a) = \text{Tr}^{R \setminus C_i}(\rho^{R \setminus C_i} a) \quad \text{for all } a \in r(\mathcal{A}_{S_{R \setminus C_i}}^H). \quad (4.34)$$

This equation determines a map from density matrices in $r(\mathcal{A}_{S_R}^H)$ to the corresponding density matrices in $r(\mathcal{A}_{S_{R \setminus C_i}}^H)$. This map should be understood as a generalised partial trace (in the same way in which the traces constructed above are generalised matrix traces), which integrates out the degrees of freedom of C_i .

We may explicitly write down the partial trace. Indeed, pick a $C_j \in R$ with $C_i \neq C_j$, and let

$$\rho^R = r(\tilde{\rho}^R), \quad \rho^{R \setminus C_i} = r(\tilde{\rho}^{R \setminus C_i}) \quad (4.35)$$

denote the density operators for R and $R \setminus C_i$ respectively (note that since r is faithful on each algebra, each of $\tilde{\rho}^R, \tilde{\rho}^{R \setminus C_i}$ are uniquely determined by $\rho^R, \rho^{R \setminus C_i}$ respectively). Then for $a = r(\tilde{a}) \in r(\mathcal{A}_{S_{R \setminus C_i}}^H)$ we have

$$\text{Tr}^R(\rho^R a) = e^{S_{0,R}} (\langle \psi_{S_{R_{\bar{j}}}} | \otimes \langle 0 |_j e^{-\beta H_j / 2} \tilde{\rho}^R \tilde{a} (| \psi_{S_{R_{\bar{j}}}} \rangle \otimes e^{-\beta H_j / 2} | 0 \rangle_j) \quad (4.36)$$

$$= e^{S_{0,R}} (\langle \psi_{S_{R_{\bar{j}}}} | \otimes \langle 0 |_j e^{-\beta H_j / 2} \text{tr}_i(e^{-\beta H_i} \tilde{\rho}^R) \tilde{a} (| \psi_{S_{R_{\bar{j}}}} \rangle \otimes e^{-\beta H_j / 2} | 0 \rangle_j) \quad (4.37)$$

$$= e^{S_{0,R} - S_{0,R \setminus C_i}} \text{Tr}^{R \setminus C_i} \left(r(\text{tr}_i(e^{-\beta H_i} \tilde{\rho}^R)) a \right), \quad (4.38)$$

where $R_{\bar{j}} = R \setminus \{C_i, C_j\}$, and tr_i denotes the ordinary Hilbert space trace for \mathcal{H}_i . Therefore, the partial trace over clock C_i is given by

$$\text{Tr}_{C_i}^R : \rho^R \mapsto e^{S_{0,R} - S_{0,R \setminus C_i}} r \left(\text{tr}_i(e^{-\beta H_i} r^{-1}(\rho^R)) \right). \quad (4.39)$$

One observes that the constants $S_{0,R}$ and $S_{0,R \setminus C_i}$ are related to the overall normalisation of the partial trace. In some circumstances, we can use this relationship to constrain these constants in a canonical way, by considering the partial traces of certain operators.

Consider, for example, the operator $\mathcal{O}_j^{\tau_j} (|\tau_i\rangle\langle\tau_i|_i)$, which conditions on the difference in times of clock C_i and C_j being $\tau_j - \tau_i$. Then one may show that

$$\text{Tr}_{C_i}^R(\mathcal{O}_j^{\tau_j} (|\tau_i\rangle\langle\tau_i|_i)) = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{S_{0,R} - S_{0,R \setminus C_i}} \mathbb{1} \int_{\sigma_i} d\epsilon_i e^{-\beta \epsilon_i}. \quad (4.40)$$

If the spectrum of H_i is bounded below, we see that this is finite and proportional to the identity. This is independent of the particular time difference $\tau_j - \tau_i$ that we condition on, which, physically speaking, makes intuitive sense: if we trace out the clock C_i , then it should not matter how we condition on its time relative to the other clocks. If we pick $S_{0,R}$ and $S_{0,R \setminus C_i}$ such that

$$S_{0,R} - S_{0,R \setminus C_i} = -\log \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_i} d\epsilon_i e^{-\beta \epsilon_i} \right), \quad (4.41)$$

then we in fact have

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{C_i}^R(\mathcal{O}_j^{\tau_j}(|\tau_i\rangle\langle\tau_i|_i)) = \mathbf{1}. \quad (4.42)$$

This provides a canonical way to pick the constants $S_{0,R}$ and $S_{0,R\setminus C_i}$.

In particular, suppose all the clocks in R have spectrum bounded below, and let us enforce the following conditions: the trace on the algebra $r(\mathcal{A}_{S_{C_i}}^H)$ obeys $\mathrm{Tr}^{C_i}(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ for all $C_i \in R$; and the partial traces all obey (4.42). Then this uniquely determines

$$S_{0,R} = - \sum_{C_i \in R} \log \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_i} d\epsilon_i e^{-\beta\epsilon_i} \right). \quad (4.43)$$

4.4 Comparison with previous work

We now pause to compare our density operator expressions (4.33) to those obtained in [21] (CLPW) and [24] (JSS) in similar settings. To some extent this amounts to a mere translation between conventions, and where the treatments overlap we use this as a consistency check. However we also comment on some differences of methodology and generalizations available in our construction (aside from the primary generalization to include an arbitrary numbers of reference frames, which we here eschew for sake of comparison). Some details are placed in appendix E.

We wish to compare our density operator expressions to the those of CLPW and JSS in the case that there are only two frames, which we denote C_1 and C_2 . We will consider the kinematical algebra $\mathcal{A}_{S_{C_1}}^H$ and its physical or gauge-fixed representations. The first major methodological difference in our approach was noted already in section 3.2 and illustrated in figure 3.3. This is that both JSS and CLPW always begin with ideal clocks (having unbounded spectrum). After computing density operators for semiclassical states, they then implement projections to limit the spectra of one or both clocks to the positive real line, effectively turning these from ideal to nonideal clocks. Our approach, by contrast, has been to begin with a kinematical Hilbert space on which the clocks are already non-ideal, and then implement the gauge-constraint by mapping states and operators to the physical Hilbert space and/or gauge-fixed ‘reduced’ Hilbert spaces.

Another hindrance to direct comparison of our density operator expressions is that we have written ours, by default, in the perspective of a frame whose reorientations are *part of* the algebra under consideration, which in this case means taking the perspective of clock C_1 and not C_2 . This can be thought of as an alternate choice of gauge-fixing, via a map that is unitarily related to the T_2 map of (3.16) (which was introduced in Eq. 4.10 of [21]). In our language, the T_2 map is a reduction ‘to the perspective’ of frame C_2 in orientation $|\tau_2 = 0\rangle$, which leaves the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{S_{C_1}}^H$ intact in its usual form, apart from stripping the identity factor on \mathcal{H}_2 and, in the case of nonideal C_2 , implementing an additional projection for compatibility with the bounds of the C_2 spectrum (compare equations (3.29) and (3.30)). Note that regardless of which clock perspective we adopt, we are presently considering the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{S_{C_1}}^H$ and its representation under different gauge fixings, as opposed to alternative choices of algebra (e.g. $\mathcal{A}_{S_{C_1}}^H$ versus $\mathcal{A}_{S_{C_2}}^H$ or $(\mathcal{A}_{S_{C_1}}^H)'$). Both CLPW and JSS consider states of the form

$$|\hat{\Phi}\rangle_{C_2} = |\Phi\rangle \otimes |f\rangle_{C_1}, \quad (4.44)$$

which are completely unentangled.³² We therefore proceed by mapping states of this form to the perspective of frame C_1 , at which point we can apply our density operator expressions from section 4.2. Another frame change map then returns this density operator to the perspective of clock C_2 , at

³² More specifically, we would say such states are unentangled between factors S and C_1 , as seen from the perspective of clock C_2 , at least up to the affect of the projector $\Pi_{|_2}$ which must ultimately be implemented if C_2 is nonideal.

which point we will have expression directly analogous to those of CLPW and JSS. The details of this computation are shown in appendix E. The result (equation (E.19)) can be written

$$\rho_{\hat{\Phi}|C'} = 2\pi N f(H_C) \Pi_{|C'} \Pi_C^{(\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \sigma_C)} e^{-iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} S_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^\dagger \Pi_{|C'}^{\text{ext}} S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} e^{iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} \Pi_C^{(\sigma_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R})} f^*(H_C) e^{\beta(H_S + H_C)}. \quad (4.45)$$

The operators in the center of this expression all act on the extended/ideal Hilbert space for clock C , and the operators $\Pi_C^{\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \sigma_C} := \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon |\epsilon\rangle \langle \epsilon|^{\text{ext}}$ and $\Pi_C^{\sigma_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} := \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon |\epsilon\rangle^{\text{ext}} \langle \epsilon|$ return this extended operator to the nonideal clock C Hilbert space. In the case that clock C' is ideal, 4.45 can be written

$$\rho_{\hat{\Phi}|C'}^{(\sigma_{C'} = \mathbb{R})} = 2\pi N \times \Pi_C^{(\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \sigma_C)} e^{\beta H_C^{\text{ext}}/2} f(H_C^{\text{ext}}) e^{-iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} \Delta_{\Psi_S}^{-1/2} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S} \Delta_{\Psi_S}^{-1/2} e^{iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} f^*(H_C^{\text{ext}}) e^{\beta H_C^{\text{ext}}/2} \Pi_C^{(\sigma_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R})}. \quad (4.46)$$

Up to conventional normalization constant, and swapping $H_C^{\text{ext}} \rightarrow \hat{q}$ and $T_C^{\text{ext}} \rightarrow -\hat{p}$ ³³, this is seen to be equivalent to JSS [24, equation 5.13]. On the other hand, when C' is not ideal, equation (4.45) represents a nontrivial generalization. An important asymmetry between the clock frames is that when only clock C is nonideal, the density operator for the algebra \mathcal{A}_{SC}^H can be obtained directly by projection (with Π_C) from the ideal case. This is the method employed by both JSS and CLPW, and it is essentially what equation (4.46) expresses. By contrast, when C' is nonideal, direct projection with $\Pi_{|C'}$ would not result in the correct density matrix. This stems from the fact that this projector is an element of the commutant algebra rather than the algebra itself, and the projected algebra is not a subalgebra of the ideal algebra. This is discussed in more detail in appendix E, where we further verify expression (4.45) by giving an alternate derivation of the density operator, essentially modifying the method employed by JSS in [24, appendix E].

While both JSS and CLPW discuss the possibility of nonideal complementary frames, they only report explicit density operator expressions for states that are approximate product states, meaning they satisfy $(\Pi_{|C'} |\Phi_S\rangle \otimes |f\rangle_C) \approx |\Phi_S\rangle \otimes |f\rangle_C$. Thus their results are not incorrect, but our expressions are more general in the case of nonideal complementary frame.

4.5 The need for a complementary frame

In [21, Sec. 4.3], when considering the algebra of observables in a static patch of de Sitter, it was noted that there is a stark difference between the case of including only a single observer to dress the patch algebra, versus including an additional observer associated with the complement patch. In either case, the original subsystem algebra is a type III₁ factor. When both observers are included, the dressed algebra becomes a type II von Neumann factor on the physical Hilbert space. If the complement observer is absent, this transition to type II occurs for the the gauge-invariant algebra at the kinematical level, but the representation of this algebra on the physical Hilbert space fails altogether to be von Neumann. Our technical summary of the reason for this was given already in Sec. 2.8, but we here review that discussion in the present context, in view of our generalizations to an arbitrary number of reference frames.

All of the kinematical gauge-invariant algebras $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1 \dots C_n}^H$ are von Neumann by construction. In particular, they are closed under a bicommutant on the kinematical Hilbert space. To discern whether they remain von Neumann in their representation on the physical Hilbert space, it is useful to consider their bicommutant with respect to the set of gauge-invariant kinematical operators.³⁴ None of these algebras are closed under this restricted bicommutant, because at least the bounded functions of the

³³ The minus sign on p here comes from the fact that when \hat{q} is the frame contribution to the constraint instead of H_C , algebra elements are dressed as $e^{i\hat{p}H_S} a e^{-i\hat{p}H_S}$ instead of $e^{-iT_C^{\text{ext}} H_S} a e^{iT_C^{\text{ext}} H_S}$.

³⁴ The von Neumann nature of these kinematical algebras refers explicitly to their representation on the kinematical

constraint itself are appended by the operation. If these are the *only* operators which this bicommutant appends, then the representation on the physical Hilbert space will remain von Neumann, since the bounded functions of the constraint map trivially to the identity component (*c*-numbers) on the physical Hilbert space. When the action of H_S is ergodic on \mathcal{A}' , as is true in the case of de Sitter patches [21, 89], the gauge invariant commutant of $\mathcal{A}_{S_{C_1 \dots C_n}}^H$ will contain none of the elements $a' \in \mathcal{A}'$, or dressed versions thereof, unless at least one clock C_{n+1} is left over. With an additional clock present, elements of the form $\mathcal{O}_{C_{n+1}}^r(a')$, $a' \in \mathcal{A}'$ are part of the gauge-invariant commutant, so that dressed elements of \mathcal{A}' are excluded from the gauge-invariant bicommutant. In the absence of this additional clock, the bicommutant always adds elements of the form $\mathcal{O}_{C_1}^r(a')$ (for example). Thus it is apparent that algebras of the form $\mathcal{A}_{S_{C_1 \dots C_n}}^H$ will never be von Neuman when represented on the physical Hilbert space unless there is at least one complementary clock. It has been observed [88] that the need for a complement observer is likely connected to the failure of convergence of all single-particle states in a de Sitter group-averaging inner product [127]. Both are the result of pathologically ‘unbalanced’ de Sitter configurations, which at the classical level manifest as a linearization instability [40].

It is perhaps not surprising that the properties of a local algebra for an observer depends on the contents of the rest of the universe in gauge theory – after all the gauge constraints are non-local conditions on the theory (although we note that the authors of [21] took an alternative viewpoint, and a complete interpretation of the discussion above remains open).

5 Subregion density operators with degenerate clocks

So far, we have been dealing with clocks whose Hamiltonian is non-degenerate when computing the density operators in Sec. 4. Let us now generalise our construction to the case where the clock Hamiltonians have degenerate spectra, in order to investigate the consequences of this degeneracy for density operators and later entropies. The case that is of most physical importance is when $H_C \propto p^2$ as it arises for free particles or in relativistic dispersion relations, but for now we will take the degeneracy to be more general.

5.1 Degenerate quantum clocks as QRFs

We start by ‘replicating’ Sec. 2 for degenerate clocks, following some of the discussion in [69], before constructing density operators in their presence in Sec. 5.2.

5.1.1 Covariant POVMs for degenerate clocks

Let us summarize the necessary modifications of Sec. 2.1 when H_C has a degenerate continuous spectrum, but the degeneracy does not depend on the energy (except possibly for a set of measure zero). Clock states (2.1) now read

$$|t, \lambda\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon e^{ig(\epsilon)} e^{-it\epsilon} |\epsilon, \lambda\rangle, \quad (5.1)$$

where λ labels the degeneracy sectors. Since these sectors are orthogonal, we further have

$$\langle t, \lambda | t', \lambda' \rangle = \delta_{\lambda\lambda'} \chi(t - t'), \quad (5.2)$$

where $\chi(t - t')$ is the overlap distribution in Eq. (2.7). Clearly, per λ -sector, all the previous properties apply and the clock states give rise to a covariant clock POVM per λ -sector. In particular, the

Hilbert space, with the relevant commutant being with respect to the full set of bounded operators $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})$. However we are free to consider other commutant operations, such as that with respect to a restricted set of operators like the gauge-invariant kinematical operators $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})^H$.

normalization takes the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} dt |t, \lambda\rangle\langle t, \lambda| = \Pi_{\lambda}, \quad (5.3)$$

with Π_{λ} the projector onto the λ -degeneracy sector of \mathcal{H}_C and $\sum_{\lambda} \Pi_{\lambda} = I_C$. A covariant clock POVM for the full Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_C is thus obtained by summing over the degeneracy sectors.

A relevant example is a clock Hamiltonian of the form $H_C = sp^2/2m$ with $s = \pm 1$, as they appear in many relativistic and non-relativistic examples. Its spectrum $\sigma_C = s[0, \infty)$ is doubly degenerate, except for its zero eigenvalue, and clock states can be written as [69, 105]

$$|t, \lambda\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dp \sqrt{|p|} \Theta(-\lambda p) e^{ig(p)} e^{-itsp^2/2m} |p\rangle, \quad (5.4)$$

where $\lambda = \pm 1$ labels positive and negative frequency (or left and right moving) sectors. We have $\Pi_{\pm} = \Theta(\mp p)$ and, since $|t, \lambda\rangle$ has zero support on $p = 0$, also $\Pi_{\pm} |t, \mp\rangle = 0$. It can be shown [69, 103, 167] that the first moment operator of the corresponding POVM is a symmetric quantization of the classically conjugate time variable $T = s \frac{mq}{2p}$, which thus is monotonic along the flow generated by H_C regardless of the frequency sector, i.e.

$$T^{(1)} = \sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} T_{\lambda}^{(1)} = \sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt t |t, \lambda\rangle\langle t, \lambda| = s \frac{m}{4} (qp^{-1} + p^{-1}q). \quad (5.5)$$

5.1.2 Decomposition of Hilbert spaces and observable algebras

Let us analyze the equivalent of Secs. 2.2 and 2.3 for the case when the clock spectrum is degenerate in an energy-independent way (except possibly for a set of measure zero). This discussion will somewhat generalize the one in [69], which was restricted to quadratic Hamiltonians. From the above, we know that if clock C has degenerate spectrum, then its Hilbert space can be decomposed into a direct sum over the degeneracy sectors labeled by λ

$$\mathcal{H}_C = \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathcal{H}_C^{\lambda}, \quad (5.6)$$

where each single \mathcal{H}_C^{λ} is a copy of $L^2(\sigma_C)$. This means that the total kinematical Hilbert space decomposes as (where we collect all remaining degrees of freedom in a single system S)

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathcal{H}_C^{\lambda}. \quad (5.7)$$

Alternatively, we can write the clock Hilbert spaces as

$$\mathcal{H}_C = L^2(\sigma_C) \otimes \mathbb{C}^m, \quad (5.8)$$

where m is the number of degeneracy sectors, i.e. the multiplicity. The first tensor factor above gives the energy wavefunction, while the latter accounts for the different sectors. We then have

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes L^2(\sigma_C) \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \quad (5.9)$$

The factor \mathbb{C}^m may be viewed as a Hilbert space for a set of internal degrees of freedom of clock C .

The decomposition (5.7) carries over to the physical Hilbert space [69] as well

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} = \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathcal{H}_{\lambda}. \quad (5.10)$$

One can see this by defining the charge operator $Q := \sum_{\lambda} c_{\lambda} \Pi_{\lambda} \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}$ for some $c_{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$ with $c_{\lambda} \neq c_{\lambda'}$, whose eigenspace with eigenvalue c_{λ} corresponds to the λ -degeneracy sector. Then one observes that Π_{λ} and the charge Q commute with H , leading to the decomposition.

As for the algebra, on the kinematical Hilbert space we have the following algebra of observables prior to imposing gauge-invariance

$$\mathcal{A}_{SC} = \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(L^2(\sigma_C)) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^m). \quad (5.11)$$

Compared to the non-degenerate case, we now also have access to operators which swap between the different degeneracy sectors of the clocks. These are contained in the tensor factor $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^m)$. The gauge-invariant subalgebra may then be written as (rearranging tensor factors for convenience)

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}} = \left(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(L^2(\sigma_C)) \right)^H \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^m). \quad (5.12)$$

The first factor is equivalent to the algebra in the non-degenerate case, consisting of the relational observables $O_C^r(a)$ (2.12) and clock reorientations $U_C(t)$, while the latter factor is just a matrix algebra and encodes the sector dependency. Thus, when \mathcal{A}_S is von Neumann, then so is \mathcal{A}_{inv} ; the latter will again be a Type II factor when \mathcal{A}_S is a Type III₁ factor and H a modular Hamiltonian.

5.1.3 Operational superselection

Suppose the system S contains multiple degenerate clocks. There are then various subalgebras of \mathcal{A}_{inv} one can consider, corresponding to subtly different subsystems. To see this, let us recall the motivations we gave at the beginning of Sec. 4 for the degrees of freedom accessible to a certain observer traveling along a worldline. The basic assumption is that the observer can act on all of the degrees of freedom in the vicinity of the worldline. By the timelike tube theorem, it can then also act on the fields in the timelike envelope of the worldline, which (under certain assumptions [157]) may be identified with the region \mathcal{U} . Using the gravitational constraints we then argued that the observer may have access to the times and energies of some subset of other clocks C_i . Thus, the observer may act with arbitrary operators on the $L^2(\sigma_i)$ factor of the clock Hilbert space. But it is not necessarily true that the observer can act on the internal degrees of freedom i.e. the \mathbb{C}^{m_i} factor – unless such degrees of freedom can be related to the fields via the gravitational constraints. Whether this is true in practice changes depending on the exact nature of the clock, and at the present level of abstraction it should be viewed as operational input. If an observer *cannot* act on the internal degrees of freedom, then from the observer’s perspective clock C_i undergoes superselection – since any of the operators the observer uses to act on C_i must be block-diagonal in the degeneracy sectors.

Another way in which the subsystem can change is purely internal to the observer itself. There may be a good physical reason why an observer would be restricted to acting within some subset of its own degeneracy sectors. For example, for the quadratic Hamiltonian observer described in Sec. 5.1.1, the two degeneracy sectors correspond to positive and negative frequency modes of the clock, and it may be desirable to restrict to the positive frequency mode sector (see for example [61]).

In any case, it is clear that there are various scenarios one can consider, and one needs operational input to choose between them. What should be clear is that, depending on the particular scenario, we will get different algebras of observables, and hence differing manifestations of the observer-dependence of entropy (see Sec. 8.2).

In Sec. 5.1.2, we have assumed there is no superselection and therefore we need to take the sector-swapping operators into account. Here, we discuss what happens if we take the gauge-invariant algebra to be superselected across the λ -sectors.

Recalling from Sec. 5.1.1 that the covariant clock POVM decomposes across the λ -degeneracy sectors of clock C , $E_C(X) = \sum_\lambda \int_{X \subset \mathbb{R}} dt |t, \lambda\rangle \langle t, \lambda|$, we see that the relational observables in Eq. (2.12) decompose across the λ -sectors:

$$O_C^\tau(a) = \sum_\lambda O_{C,\lambda}^\tau(a) = \sum_\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt U_{SC}(t) (a \otimes |\tau, \lambda\rangle \langle \tau, \lambda|) U_{SC}^\dagger(t), \quad (5.13)$$

where $O_{C,\lambda}^\tau(a) = (I_S \otimes \Pi_\lambda) O_C^\tau(a) = O_C^\tau(a) (I_S \otimes \Pi_\lambda)$. Clearly, the clock reorientations decompose similarly and thereby give rise to a reducible representation of the translation group on \mathcal{H}_C ,

$$U_C(\tau) \otimes I_S = \sum_\lambda U_{C,\lambda}(\tau) \otimes I_S, \quad U_{C,\lambda}(\tau) := \exp(-i\tau \Pi_\lambda H_C). \quad (5.14)$$

In other words, the entire gauge-invariant algebra (2.11) for the superselected situation decomposes across the degeneracy sectors

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{ss} = \bigoplus_\lambda \mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^\lambda = \bigoplus_\lambda \left\langle O_{C,\lambda}^\tau(a), I_S \otimes U_{C,\lambda}(t) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S, t \in \mathbb{R} \right\rangle. \quad (5.15)$$

In particular, note that $I_S \otimes \Pi_\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{ss}$, so $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^\lambda$ is a proper subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{ss}$.

The gauge-invariant algebra is superselected across the λ -sectors and thus reducibly represented on \mathcal{H}_{kin} . Indeed, since the charge $Q = \sum_\lambda c_\lambda \Pi_\lambda$ commutes with every element in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{ss}$, it is part of its center. Hence, no observable in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{ss}$ can map between the λ -sectors, leading to the superselection rule

$$O_C^\tau(a) = \bigoplus_\lambda O_{C,\lambda}^\tau(a), \quad I_S \otimes U_C(\tau) = I_S \otimes \bigoplus_\lambda U_{C,\lambda}(\tau). \quad (5.16)$$

Interactions will ruin this superselection rule if they do not commute with the projectors Π_λ .

For instance, in the case of a quadratic clock Hamiltonian $H_C = -p_t^2$, as briefly discussed in Sec. 5.1.1 and as they appear in relativistic dispersion relations $H = -p_t^2 + |\vec{p}|^2 + m^2$ and minisuperspace models, the observables will get superselected across the positive and negative frequency sectors [69]. Interactions can lift this superselection; e.g. in a closed FRW model with massive scalar field, positive and negative frequency modes mix [108].

Invoking the argument in appendix A.2 per λ -sector entails that, if \mathcal{A}_S is von Neumann, then so are $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{ss}$ and each of the $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^\lambda$. The individual $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^\lambda$ may be factors, depending on some conditions. For example, they are when \mathcal{A}_S is a type III₁ factor and H_S is a modular Hamiltonian as in the case of perturbative quantum gravity below.

Moreover, due to the decomposition (5.10), we obtain a reducible physical representation r of the gauge-invariant algebra (here expressed in co-invariant language)

$$r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{ss}) = \bigoplus_\lambda r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^\lambda). \quad (5.17)$$

Hence, coherent superpositions across Q charge sectors in the physical Hilbert space are indistinguishable from corresponding classical mixtures when probed with observables from $r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}})$.

While we started with one clock C , we can think of the different charge sectors as corresponding to different quantum clocks C_λ . The covariant POVM $E_{C,\lambda}(X) = \Pi_\lambda E_C(X)$ models C_λ on the clock Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_C^λ . The λ -sector \mathcal{H}_λ of the physical Hilbert space can thus be viewed as the sector of the theory in which this clock C_λ exists. A given observer may only have access to a clock with fixed charge λ , e.g. a clock with only positive frequencies in relativity. Such an observer can then only probe the λ -sector and will be oblivious to what happens outside it.

5.1.4 Page-Wootters formalism for degenerate clocks

When the clock spectrum is degenerate, a reduction map like Eq. (2.32) can be defined making use of the decomposition of the physical Hilbert space in its degeneracy sectors (5.10) through $\mathcal{R}_C(\tau) : \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathcal{H}_{|C,\lambda}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{|C,\lambda}$ are the reduced Hilbert spaces of the λ -sector and

$$\mathcal{R}_C(\tau) := \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}(\tau), \quad \mathcal{R}_C^{\dagger}(\tau) := \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}^{\dagger}(\tau). \quad (5.18)$$

Sector-wise everything works as before and so

$$\mathcal{R}_C(\tau) \mathcal{R}_C^{\dagger}(\tau) = \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}(\tau) \mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}^{\dagger}(\tau) = \bigoplus_{\lambda} \Pi_{|C,\lambda}, \quad \mathcal{R}_C^{\dagger}(\tau) \mathcal{R}_C(\tau) = \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}^{\dagger}(\tau) \mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}(\tau) = I_{\text{phys}}, \quad (5.19)$$

where $\Pi_{|C,\lambda} = \langle \tau, \lambda | \Pi_{\text{phys}} | \tau, \lambda \rangle = \Pi_{|C}$ for all λ , as all reduced spaces are isomorphic copies. So far, we have invoked the setting of co-invariants. Using Eq. (2.41), it is related to the PW-reduction in RAQ language

$$\mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}(\tau) = \mathcal{R}'_{C,\lambda}(\tau) M^{\dagger}, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{R}'_{C,\lambda}(\tau) := \langle \tau, \lambda | \otimes I_S. \quad (5.20)$$

Thus, only the reduction maps per λ -superselection sector $\mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}(\tau)$ are invertible [69]. Specifically, the reduction theorems in Eqs. (2.43) and (2.45) only hold per λ -sector,

$$\mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}(\tau) r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{\lambda}) \mathcal{R}_{C,\lambda}^{\dagger}(\tau) = \Pi_{|C} \langle a, U_S(t) | a \in \mathcal{A}_S, t \in \mathbb{R} \rangle \Pi_{|C}. \quad (5.21)$$

Since the clock states (5.1) satisfy the same covariance property (2.2) as in the non-degenerate case, the reduced form of this algebra will be the same for each superselection sector.

Every λ -sector also has its own relational Schrödinger equation Eq. (2.36), but again it will take the same form in each sector. For example, for quadratic Hamiltonians, τ -time will run forward in *both* the positive and negative frequency sectors [69].

The reduction maps also act on the sector swaps, i.e. elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^m)$ in (5.12). Taking a single sector swap as $S_{\lambda'\lambda}^C$ of the same clock, we have that due to orthogonality when we reduce with respect to the same clock that

$$R_{C,\lambda_1}(\tau) S_{\lambda_2\lambda_3}^C R_{C,\lambda_4}^{\dagger}(\tau) = \delta_{\lambda_1\lambda_2} \delta_{\lambda_3\lambda_4} \Pi_{|C}. \quad (5.22)$$

Hence, sector swaps of the clock we reduce to vanish under the reduction to a single degeneracy sector due to them being λ -block off-diagonal. Nevertheless, they will generally not vanish when we perform a global reduction as in (5.18), as this can lead to sector-wise off-diagonal conjugation with the reduction maps. In this case, the reduced algebra will still have swap operators between sectors of the clock we reduce to.

In contrast, if we reduce a sector swap of some other clock C' for instance, then

$$R_{C,\lambda}(\tau) S_{\sigma'\sigma}^{C'} R_{C,\lambda}^{\dagger}(\tau) = S_{\sigma'\sigma}^{C'} \Pi_{|C}. \quad (5.23)$$

Sector swaps of other clocks than the one we reduce to do not vanish, regardless of whether we perform a sector-wise or global reduction.

5.1.5 Changing degenerate clocks

Let us discuss how we can perform QRF transformations, as in Sec. 2.6, between degenerate clocks. Since the reduction maps (5.18) are invertible per sector, QRF transformations can be defined on a combined sector (λ_1, λ_2) of the two degenerate clocks. We will restrict the coming discussion to this situation, which can be thought of as a superselection case of Sec. 5.1.3. One can define a larger QRF transformation by taking direct sums of the ones we will discuss. This larger transformation is invertible because they are sector-wise invertible, in the same way as (5.19).

Suppose Alice has access to the superselection sector λ_1 of clock C_1 , while Bob only has access to superselection sector λ_2 of C_2 . They can then only compare observables in the subalgebra

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_1} &:= (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{1, \lambda_1}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{2, \lambda_2}))^H \\ &= \left\langle O_{C_i, \lambda_i}^{\tau_i}(a), I_S \otimes U_{i, \lambda_i}(t) \otimes I_j \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{j, \lambda_j}), t \in \mathbb{R} \right\rangle \quad i, j = 1, 2, i \neq j, \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

as it contains all those observables which can be written as relational observables and reorientations relative to either of the clocks C_{1, λ_1} and C_{2, λ_2} . This is a subalgebra of both $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{\lambda_1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{\lambda_2}$, in fact, it is their overlap $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} = \mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{\lambda_1} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{\lambda_2}$. This will become important later when Alice and Bob with different clocks cannot compare the full density operators they have respectively access to, but only the part residing in the overlap of the algebras.

The physical Hilbert space splits into superselection sectors (5.10) relative to both clocks [69]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} = \bigoplus_{\mu_1} \mathcal{H}_{\mu_1} = \bigoplus_{\mu_2} \mathcal{H}_{\mu_2}, \quad (5.25)$$

where we use μ_i as the dummy summation variable over the superselection sectors of clock C_i , to distinguish it from the specific sectors λ_i . The domain of the physical representation $r(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2})$ is the overlap of the two sectors $\mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} := \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1} \cap \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_2}$, i.e. the subsector where both clocks C_{1, λ_1} and C_{2, λ_2} exist and we can thus compare and relate their corresponding relational descriptions.

As the ‘‘quantum coordinate maps’’ in Eq. (5.20) are now defined per superselection sector for each clock, we also have that the two observers can only compare states in the sector overlap $\mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}$, i.e. clock changes are defined here [69] (see also [118, 135]):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} & \\ \mathcal{R}_{1, \lambda_1}(\tau_1) \swarrow & & \searrow \mathcal{R}_{2, \lambda_2}(\tau_2) \\ \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_2|1} = \Pi_{|1}(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{2, \lambda_2}) & \xrightarrow{V_{1, \lambda_1 \rightarrow 2, \lambda_2}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \mathcal{R}_{2, \lambda_2}(\tau_2) \circ \mathcal{R}_{1, \lambda_1}^\dagger(\tau_1)} & \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1|2} = \Pi_{|2}(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{1, \lambda_1}) \end{array}$$

The doubly superselected clock change transformation (2.53) thus becomes

$$V_{1, \lambda_1 \rightarrow 2, \lambda_2}(\tau_1, \tau_2) := \mathcal{R}_{2, \lambda_2}(\tau_2) \circ \mathcal{R}_{1, \lambda_1}^\dagger(\tau_1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt |t + \tau_1, \lambda_1\rangle_1 \otimes \langle \tau_2 - t, \lambda_2|_2 \otimes U_S(t). \quad (5.26)$$

As before, it is a controlled, hence non-local unitary.

By combining sectors in the reduction maps appropriately, one can also transform sector swaps from one perspective to another. Furthermore, a full QRF transformation could be carried out by summing over all sector-wise ones.

5.1.6 Subsystem relativity for degenerate clocks

Suppose again that Alice has access to superselection sector λ_1 of clock C_1 , while Bob only has access to superselection sector λ_2 of C_2 . As they can only compare observables in the subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inv}}^{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}$ (5.24), we consider subsystem relativity within it. Defining for $i = 1, 2, i \neq j$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{SC_i, \lambda_i}^H := \left(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{i, \lambda_i}) \otimes I_{j, \lambda_j} \right)^H \quad (5.27)$$

with I_{j, λ_j} the identity on the subspace $\mathcal{H}_{j, \lambda_j}$, we clearly have

$$\mathcal{A}_{SC_1, \lambda_1}^H \cap \mathcal{A}_{SC_2, \lambda_2}^H = (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes I_{1, \lambda_1} \otimes I_{2, \lambda_2})^H. \quad (5.28)$$

That is, Alice and Bob can again only compare internal relational observables of S and, as before, when \mathcal{A}_S is a Type III₁ von Neumann factor on which the modular Hamiltonian H_S acts ergodically (as in de Sitter space [21, 89]), then this overlap contains only c -numbers. It is also clear that this conclusion carries over to physical representations of these algebras, similarly to Eq. (2.62).

We noted in Sec. 2.7 that internal QRF perspectives $\mathcal{R}_i(\tau)$ are (direct sums/integrals of) TPSs on the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ and that changing QRF changes such a TPS. Perspective maps $\mathcal{R}_{i,\lambda_i}$ of degenerate clocks are similarly (direct sums/integrals of) TPSs, however, only on the corresponding superselection sector $\mathcal{H}_{\lambda_i} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. Since changes from Alice's to Bob's clock are defined on intersections $\mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2} = \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1} \cap \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_2}$, the clock change means that we switch from understanding the subsystem structure of $\mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}$ in terms of the TPS of its ambient space \mathcal{H}_{λ_1} to understanding it in terms of the TPS of the distinct ambient space \mathcal{H}_{λ_2} .

5.2 Density operators

In comparison to Sec. 4, each clock C_i is now assigned a label λ_i for its degeneracy sectors. Similarly to Sec. 5.1.2, we can extend those results to include multiple degenerate clocks. For instance, the total kinematical Hilbert space decomposes as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \bigoplus_{\Lambda} \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i^{\lambda_i} \quad (5.29)$$

where Λ denotes the collection of degeneracy sector labels $\{\lambda_i\}$ for all clocks. Through (5.8) per clock this can alternatively be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^n L^2(\sigma_i) \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_i} \quad (5.30)$$

Again, each factor \mathbb{C}^{m_i} may be viewed as a Hilbert space for a set of internal degrees of freedom of clock C_i .

As explained in Sec. 5.1.3, there are multiple subalgebras one can consider. In the rest of this subsection we will explore what happens in the different cases. First, we will treat the case where there is no superselection whatsoever. Then we will see what happens when all the clocks are subjected to superselection. There are of course a multitude of intermediate cases where only some clocks are superselected, but to avoid overcomplicating the narrative we will not explicitly study these. It is straightforward to see how these intermediate cases mix the properties of two cases we study. Finally, we will see what happens when we additionally *restrict* the sector of a particular clock.

5.2.1 No superselection

Let us first consider the case where there is no superselection. Then the algebra of observables for a set of clocks R may then be written (without yet imposing gauge-invariance)

$$\mathcal{A}_{SR} = \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R} \mathcal{B}(L^2(\sigma_j)) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^{m_j}). \quad (5.31)$$

The gauge-invariant subalgebra may then be written (rearranging tensor factors for convenience)

$$\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H = \left(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R} \mathcal{B}(L^2(\sigma_j)) \right)^H \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R} \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^{m_j}). \quad (5.32)$$

The first factor is equivalent to the algebra in the non-degenerate case, while the latter factor is just a matrix algebra. The trace on the full \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H may be constructed as the tensor product of the traces on

the two tensor factors. Since the latter tensor factor is a finite Type I algebra, the Type of \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H is the same as in the non-degenerate case, i.e. if R contains only a single clock of energy bounded below, then \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H is Type II₁, otherwise it is Type II_∞.

As previously, the trace may be written as the expectation value in a state $|\Psi\rangle$. This state may be constructed like (4.12), except we have to additionally include maximally mixed states over two copies of the multiplicity Hilbert spaces \mathbb{C}^{m_j} . Thus,

$$|\Psi\rangle = |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}\rangle \otimes e^{-\beta H_i/2} |0\rangle_i \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R} \sum_{\lambda_j=1}^{m_j} |\lambda_j\rangle_j \otimes |\lambda_j\rangle_j, \quad (5.33)$$

where $|\lambda_j\rangle_j$, $a\lambda_j = 1, \dots, m_j$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{C}^{m_j} labelling the degeneracy sectors. Let us now set

$$|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}\rangle = |\psi_S\rangle \otimes |\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}\rangle \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}} \sum_{\lambda_j=1}^{m_j} |\lambda_j\rangle_j \otimes |\lambda_j\rangle_j, \quad (5.34)$$

so that

$$|\Psi\rangle = |\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}\rangle \otimes e^{-\beta H_i/2} |0\rangle_i \otimes \sum_{\lambda_i=1}^{m_i} |\lambda_i\rangle_i \otimes |\lambda_i\rangle_i. \quad (5.35)$$

One then finds that a relative Tomita operator for \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H from $|\Psi\rangle$ to a physical state $|\phi\rangle$ may be written

$$S_{\phi|\Psi} = \Pi_{\text{phys}} \sum_{\lambda_i, \lambda'_i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt |t\rangle_i \otimes |\lambda_i\rangle_i S_{\phi|i(0, \lambda'_i)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} \langle 0|_i \otimes \langle \lambda'_i|_i \otimes \langle \lambda_i|_i \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_{\bar{i}}} - H_{R_{\bar{i}}}^* + H_i)(t + i\beta/2)\right), \quad (5.36)$$

Here, $S_{\phi|i(0, \lambda'_i)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}$ is a relative Tomita operator for

$$\mathcal{A}_{R_{\bar{i}}S} = \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}} \mathcal{B}(L^2(\sigma_j)) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^{m_j}), \quad (5.37)$$

from $|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}\rangle$ to

$$|\phi|_i(0, \lambda'_i)\rangle = \langle \lambda'_i|_i \mathcal{R}_i(0) |\phi\rangle = \mathcal{R}_{i, \lambda'_i}(0) |\phi\rangle. \quad (5.38)$$

As before, we may use (5.36) to deduce the density operator. One finds

$$\rho_\phi = \sum_{\lambda_i, \lambda'_i} e^{-S_{0,R} V_i(i\beta/2)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt V_i(t) \mathcal{O}_i^T(\Delta_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi|i(\tau+t, \lambda'_i)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi|i(\tau, \lambda_i)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}) V_i(i\beta/2) \otimes r(|\lambda'_i\rangle \langle \lambda_i|). \quad (5.39)$$

In computing the entropy of such a density operator, one would have to account for the correlations between the different degeneracy sectors.

5.2.2 Superselection for all clocks

Suppose now that we are in a situation where superselection occurs for all the clocks, just like in Sec. 5.1.3. This means that we are not allowed to act with operators which change the degeneracy sectors of the clocks.

In this case the gauge-invariant algebra of the QFT and a set of clocks R decomposes:

$$\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H = \bigoplus_{\Lambda_R} \mathcal{A}_{RS, \Lambda_R}^H, \quad (5.40)$$

where $\Lambda_R = \{\lambda_i \mid C_i \in R\}$. Each $\mathcal{A}_{RS,\Lambda_R}^H$ is the gauge-invariant algebra within a degeneracy sector of the clocks in R . Each $\mathcal{A}_{RS,\Lambda_R}^H$ is structurally equivalent to the algebra \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H for non-degenerate clocks.

Due to the degeneracy, \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H is not a factor. However, each $\mathcal{A}_{RS,\Lambda_R}^H$ is a Type II factor, and thus has a unique trace up to a constant factor. For simplicity, we will choose this constant factor to be the same in each sector, which amounts to imposing that the constant $S_{0,R}$ in (4.17) is sector-independent. Then (4.17) defines the trace on the full algebra \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H .

A direct sum of algebras of the same Type, also has that Type. Thus if R contains only a single clock of energy bounded below, then \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H is Type II₁, otherwise it is Type II_∞.

The direct sum structure descends also to the physical Hilbert space:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} = \bigoplus_{\Lambda_R} \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{\Lambda_R}, \quad (5.41)$$

Here for convenience we are choosing only to decompose relative to the degeneracy sector labels of R , but each $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{\Lambda_R}$ may of course be further decomposed relative to the degeneracy sector labels of R^c . Each $\mathcal{A}_{RS,\Lambda_R}^H$ has a physical representation $r(\mathcal{A}_{RS,\Lambda_R}^H)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{\Lambda_R}$.

The point now is that we can exploit this direct sum structure to compute the density operator sector by sector. In particular, let us decompose the physical state as

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_{\Lambda_R} \sqrt{p^{\Lambda_R}} |\phi^{\Lambda_R}\rangle, \quad (5.42)$$

where $p^{\Lambda_R} \geq 0$ is chosen such that $|\phi^{\Lambda_R}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{\Lambda_R}$ is normalised. Explicitly, we have

$$p^{\Lambda_R} = (\phi | \Pi^{\Lambda_R} | \phi), \quad \text{and} \quad |\phi^{\Lambda_R}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p^{\Lambda_R}}} \Pi^{\Lambda_R} |\phi\rangle \quad (5.43)$$

where $\Pi^{\Lambda_R} = \bigotimes_{C_i \in R} \Pi_{\lambda_i}$ is the projector onto the Λ_R degeneracy sector. Then, working sector by sector, the density matrix corresponding to $|\phi\rangle$ is given by

$$\rho_\phi = \sum_{\Lambda_R} p^{\Lambda_R} \Pi^{\Lambda_R} \rho_\phi^{\Lambda_R}, \quad (5.44)$$

where

$$\rho_\phi^{\Lambda_R} = e^{-S_{0,R}} V_i(i\beta/2) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt V_i(t) \mathcal{O}_i^\tau (\Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi_i^{\Lambda_R}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi_i^{\Lambda_R}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2}) V_i(i\beta/2). \quad (5.45)$$

Here,

$$|\phi_i^{\Lambda_R}(\tau)\rangle = \mathcal{R}_i(\tau) |\Phi^{\Lambda_R}\rangle \quad (5.46)$$

is the state in the perspective of C_i , in the Λ_R sector.

The entropy may now similarly be decomposed sector by sector. Indeed, we have

$$\log \rho_\phi = \sum_{\Lambda_R} \Pi^{\Lambda_R} (\log p^{\Lambda_R} + \log \rho_\phi^{\Lambda_R}), \quad (5.47)$$

which implies that

$$S[\phi] = -(\phi | \log \rho_\phi | \phi) = - \sum_{\Lambda_R} p^{\Lambda_R} \log p^{\Lambda_R} + \sum_{\Lambda_R} p^{\Lambda_R} S^{\Lambda_R}[\phi], \quad (5.48)$$

where $S^{\Lambda_R}[\phi] = -(\phi^{\Lambda_R} | \log \rho_\phi^{\Lambda_R} | \phi^{\Lambda_R})$ is the entropy in the Λ_R sector. The first term on the right hand side above is a Shannon entropy for the probability distribution of the sectors, while the second term is the entropy *averaged over* the sectors.

To go further with the computation of the entropy amounts to evaluating $S^{\Lambda_R}[\phi]$. However, within each sector this is just equivalent to evaluating the entropy in the non-degenerate case. Thus, the entropy in the superselecting case may be computed by applying non-degenerate arguments sector by sector, and then applying (5.48).

5.2.3 Fixing the sector for one clock

Let us suppose we fix the sector of a single clock C_i to λ_i . This amounts to restricting to the Hilbert space

$$\Pi_{\lambda_i} \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_i^{\lambda_i} \otimes \bigotimes_{j \neq i} \mathcal{H}_j. \quad (5.49)$$

Similarly, the algebra of operators (in both the no superselection and superselection cases) is restricted to $\Pi_{\lambda_i} \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H \Pi_{\lambda_i}$. The trace on this algebra may be simply constructed as the restriction of the trace on the original larger algebra \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H . Similarly, if ρ is the density operator on the larger algebra then $\Pi_{\lambda_i} \rho \Pi_{\lambda_i}$ is the density operator on the restricted algebra.

Thus, we can straightforwardly write down the density operator in either of the two cases, using the previous results (5.39) and (5.44). In the case of no superselection for the other clocks, we obtain:

$$\rho_\phi = e^{-S_{0,R}} \Pi_{\lambda_i} V_i(i\beta/2) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt V_i(t) \mathcal{O}_i^\tau (\Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}^-}^{-1/2} S_{\phi_i(\tau+t, \lambda_i) | \psi_{SR_i^-}}^\dagger S_{\phi_i(\tau, \lambda_i) | \psi_{SR_i^-}}) V_i(i\beta/2). \quad (5.50)$$

In the case of superselection, we simply restrict the sum in (5.44) to those Λ_R consistent with λ_i . The $\rho_\phi^{\Lambda_R}$ are still given by (5.45).

6 Semiclassical regime

For a general state $|\phi\rangle$, it does not seem possible to go further than the implicit expression

$$S[\phi] = - \langle \phi_i(\tau) | \log \rho_{\phi_i}(\tau) | \phi_i(\tau) \rangle \quad (6.1)$$

for the entropy. To make progress we will consider a restricted (but physically important) class of states: those falling within a semiclassical regime defined by the following two assumptions. (We will focus on the case of non-degenerate clocks, but the results of this section may be straightforwardly generalised to the density operators for degenerate clocks given in Section 5.)

- First, we assume that there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any $a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{C_j})$

$$\left| \langle \phi | \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a) V_i(t) | \phi \rangle \right| \ll \left| \langle \phi | \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a) | \phi \rangle \right| \quad \text{if } |t| > \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (6.2)$$

In other words, the expectation values of dressed observables are peaked when no overall reorientation of C_i is being done. One can roughly speaking think of this as a condition that “the state $|\phi\rangle$ is peaked around a particular orientation for C_i ”. Of course, unlike the above equation, this naïve statement is not gauge-invariant. The correct and more precise statement is that there is some degree of freedom (or collection of degrees of freedom) in the state $|\phi\rangle$ which is capable of keeping track of reorientations of C_i , and which is peaked around ‘no reorientation’. This is easiest to see if we set $a = 1$; the above equation then means that reorienting the clock by a little bit ϵ results in an almost orthogonal state. Allowing a to be general means that this happens independently of the action of any dressed operators.

- Second, consider the operator $r(e^{iHst})$, i.e. the physical representation of evolution by the QFT Hamiltonian. Then we assume

$$r(e^{iHst}) |\phi\rangle \approx e^{i\mathcal{E}t} |\phi\rangle \quad \text{if } |t| < \mathcal{O}(\epsilon), \quad (6.3)$$

for some constant

$$\mathcal{E} = (\phi|r(H_S)|\phi). \quad (6.4)$$

Thus, within times of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, the QFT degrees of freedom only evolve by an overall phase. Put another way, the system is in an approximate eigenstate of H_S (of course, it could also be an exact eigenstate of H_S , such as the vacuum).

In combination, by (6.2) there is an effectively fixed time (the orientation of C_i), which, by (6.3), acts as a *classical* parameter on which the *quantum* state of the fields depends. This is why we call this a *semiclassical* regime.

An alternative formulation of these assumptions is as follows:

$$(\Delta H_S)_\phi^2 \ll (\Delta H_i)_\phi^2, \quad (6.5)$$

i.e. the variance of the QFT Hamiltonian is suppressed relative to the variance of the clock Hamiltonian. Indeed, by the first assumption above we have $(\Delta H_i)_\phi^2 \sim 1/\epsilon^2$, and if we define

$$\eta = \|\epsilon(r(H_S) - \mathcal{E})|\phi\rangle\| = (\Delta H_i)_\phi^{-1}(\Delta H_S)_\phi, \quad (6.6)$$

then the second assumption amounts to taking $\eta \ll 1$, which reduces to (6.5). Another equivalent way to state these assumptions is that the orientation of C_i must be sufficiently peaked that fluctuations in the QFT Hamiltonian are suppressed.

With these assumptions in place, we are basically allowed to ignore (in a controlled manner) the QFT Hamiltonian H_S in certain places, when computing the entropy $S[\phi]$. To heuristically set the stage for justifying this statement (and indeed for explaining what it means), consider the algebra whose entropy we are computing:

$$\mathcal{A}_{R_{\bar{i}}S|C_i} = \{a, H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}})\}. \quad (6.7)$$

Suppose we were to remove H_S from the right hand side. Then what we would end up with would be a rather different algebra, which (since the modified reorientation operator would now commute with field operators, and since the Hamiltonians of the frames in $R_{\bar{i}}$ may be absorbed into the $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\bar{i}})$ factor) can be written as

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \{a, \sum_{j \neq i} H_j \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}})\} = \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\bar{i}}) \otimes \{H_{R^c}\}''. \quad (6.8)$$

The approximation for the entropy $S[\phi]$ that we will give will have the interpretation of a kind of entropy with respect to this algebra (but not a von Neumann entropy – indeed the algebra is Type III, being the tensor product of the Type III algebra \mathcal{A}_S with some other algebra).

Suppose we were to also take the formula (4.31) for the density operator in the perspective of C_i , and remove H_S wherever it appears. We would end up with³⁵

$$\hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau) = e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_{\bar{i}}^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i \sum_{j \neq i} H_j t} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}, \quad (6.9)$$

where

$$|\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)\rangle = e^{-i \sum_{j \neq i} H_j t} |\phi|_i(\tau)\rangle \quad (6.10)$$

³⁵ Here, in writing $\hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau)$ we leave off any remnant of the projector $\Pi|_i$, because for reasons discussed in appendix D, we can ignore this in the following discussion of the semiclassical entropy.

is the state we would get by evolving the reduced state $|\phi_i(\tau)\rangle$ with the ‘modified reorientation operator’ $\sum_{j \neq i} H_j$. Under the semiclassical assumptions made above, the entropy may be approximated as follows (a derivation is given in Appendix D):

$$S[\phi] = -\langle \phi_i(\tau) | \log \rho_{\phi_i}(\tau) | \phi_i(\tau) \rangle \approx -\langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | \log \hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau) | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle. \quad (6.11)$$

As alluded to above, the QFT Hamiltonian H_S has more or less been eliminated from the right hand side.

Let us now consider the quantum information theoretic meaning of this approximate result. To this end, consider the Hilbert space

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}}^* \otimes L^2(\sigma_{R^c}). \quad (6.12)$$

This includes field degrees of freedom in \mathcal{H}_S , and degrees of freedom of two copies of the frames in $R_{\bar{i}}$ — but it also contains an additional degree of freedom for the total energy of the frames in R^c . Any element of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ may be written as a $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}})$ valued function of H_{R^c} . Writing such an element as $a(H_{R^c})$ where $a : \sigma_{R^c} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}})$, we can define a faithful, normal representation of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ on $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ as follows:

$$a(H_{R^c})(|\varphi\rangle \otimes |E\rangle) = a(E) |\varphi\rangle \otimes |E\rangle, \quad (6.13)$$

where $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}}^*$, operators are taken to act on the first copy of the frames in $\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}}$ and $|E\rangle$ is an energy E eigenstate in $L^2(\sigma_{R^c})$. It is easy to verify that the following (non-normalisable) state is cyclic/separating for this representation:

$$|\hat{\Psi}\rangle = |\psi_S\rangle \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\bar{i}}} \int_{\sigma_j} dE_j |E_j\rangle \otimes \langle E_j| \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE |E\rangle. \quad (6.14)$$

The expectation value in this state gives a faithful normal weight on the algebra:

$$\hat{\Psi} : \hat{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad a(H_{R^c}) \mapsto \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \langle \psi_S | \text{tr}_{R_{\bar{i}}}(a(E)) | \psi_S \rangle. \quad (6.15)$$

This weight may be thought of as one in which the fields are in the KMS ‘vacuum’ $|\psi_S\rangle$, the frames in $R_{\bar{i}}$ are maximally mixed, and the energy of the complementary frames R^c is uniformly distributed.

In Appendix D, it is shown that the modular operator of $|\hat{\Psi}\rangle$ is $\Delta_{\hat{\Psi}} = e^{-\beta H_S}$, and that moreover the relative modular operator from $|\hat{\Psi}\rangle$ to $|\hat{\phi}(\tau)\rangle$ is related to (6.9) by

$$\Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\hat{\Psi}} = e^{S_{0,R} + \beta H_{R^c}} \hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau). \quad (6.16)$$

Using these results in the formula for the entropy, we find

$$S[\phi] \approx S_{0,R} + \beta \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | H_{R^c} | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle - \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | \log \Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\hat{\Psi}} | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle \quad (6.17)$$

$$= S_{0,R} + \beta \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | (H_S + H_{R^c}) | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle + \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | \log \Delta_{\hat{\Psi}|\hat{\phi}(\tau)} | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle, \quad (6.18)$$

where the second line holds when $|\hat{\phi}(\tau)\rangle$ is separating for the algebra above, and then follows from $\log \Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\hat{\Psi}} = \log \Delta_{\hat{\Psi}} + \log \Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)} - \log \Delta_{\hat{\Psi}|\hat{\phi}(\tau)}$. The first term in this entropy formula reflects an overall state-independent ambiguity, coming from the choice of normalisation in the trace. The second term may be rewritten as the expectation of $-\beta H_R$ in the state $|\phi\rangle$. The final term may be recognised as a relative entropy between $|\hat{\Psi}\rangle$ and $|\hat{\phi}(\tau)\rangle$ with respect to the algebra above. Overall, the entropy in the semiclassical regime may be written

$$S[\phi] \approx S_{0,R} - \beta \langle H_R \rangle_\phi - S_{\text{rel}}(\hat{\phi}(\tau) || \hat{\Psi}). \quad (6.19)$$

6.1 Shannon entropy contribution from energy of complementary clocks

The algebra $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ has a non-trivial center generated by H_{R^c} , the total Hamiltonian of the complementary clocks. It turns out that the relative modular operator $\Delta_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\widehat{\Psi}}$ commutes with H_{R^c} , and thus may be decomposed as a direct integral over the eigenspaces of H_{R^c} . This results in a contribution to the entropy $S[\phi]$ that takes the form of a classical Shannon entropy for the probability distribution corresponding to measurements of H_{R^c} .

More precisely, the projection-valued measure for measurements of H_{R^c} is $P(E) dE$, where

$$P(E) = \delta\left(E - \sum_{C_j \in R^c} H_j\right) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i(E - \sum_{C_j \in R^c} H_j)t} dt. \quad (6.20)$$

From this, we may write down the Born probability distribution for measurements of H_{R^c} :

$$p_E = \langle \widehat{\phi}(\tau) | P(E) | \widehat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle. \quad (6.21)$$

Furthermore, the expectation values of operators $a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(H_{R_i})$ may be written

$$\langle \widehat{\phi}(\tau) | a | \widehat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle = \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E \phi_E(a), \quad (6.22)$$

where³⁶

$$p_E \phi_E(a) = \langle \widehat{\phi}(\tau) | P(E) a | \widehat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle \quad (6.23)$$

This functional ϕ_E defines a state on $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(H_{R_i})$, and it may be straightforwardly confirmed that the relative modular operator from

$$|\bar{\psi}\rangle = |\psi_S\rangle \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} \int_{\sigma_j} dE_j |E_j\rangle \otimes \langle E_j| \quad (6.24)$$

to ϕ_E takes the form

$$\Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}} = \frac{1}{p_E} e^{-\beta H_{R_i}^*} S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger P(E) S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}. \quad (6.25)$$

Note that $\bar{\psi}$ is the tensor product of the QFT KMS state $|\psi_S\rangle$ with a maximally mixed state for the frames in R_i .

Using the identity

$$S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}} = e^{-iH_{R^c}t} S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} e^{iH_{R_i}t}, \quad (6.26)$$

we may also write

$$\Delta_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\widehat{\Psi}} = e^{-\beta H_{R_i}^*} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i \sum_{j \neq i} H_j t} S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \quad (6.27)$$

$$= e^{-\beta H_{R_i}^*} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{iH_{R^c}t} S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger e^{iH_{R^c}t} S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \quad (6.28)$$

$$= 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE P(E) e^{-\beta H_{R_i}^*} S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger P(E) S_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}. \quad (6.29)$$

Recognising the integrand as $P(E)p_E \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}$, and using the facts that the integrand commutes with H_{R^c} , and $P(E)P(E') = \delta(E - E')P(E)$, we may write

$$\log \Delta_{\widehat{\phi}(\tau)|\widehat{\Psi}} = \int dE P(E) \log\left(2\pi p_E \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}\right) \quad (6.30)$$

$$= \log(2\pi) + \int dE P(E) \left(\log p_E + \log \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}\right). \quad (6.31)$$

³⁶ Here we are assuming for simplicity that $p_E \neq 0$ for all $E \in \sigma_{R^c}$. It is straightforward to account for the case where this does not hold, by simply excluding values of E for which $p_E = 0$ in the following arguments.

Substituting this into the entropy formula, we find

$$S[\phi] \approx S_{0,R} - \log(2\pi) + \beta \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | H_{R^c} | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle - \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E \log p_E - \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E \phi_E (\log \Delta_{\phi_E | \bar{\psi}}). \quad (6.32)$$

The third term appearing above is the promised Shannon entropy of H_{R^c} . In the case that ϕ_E is separating for $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(H_{R_i})$, we may rewrite the final term in terms of relative entropies as we have done previously. The result is

$$S[\phi] \approx S_{0,R} - \log(2\pi) - \beta \langle H_R \rangle_\phi - \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E \log p_E - \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E S_{\text{rel}}(\phi_E || \bar{\psi}). \quad (6.33)$$

The final term now readily can be identified as the relative entropy from $\bar{\psi}$ of the state ϕ_E , *averaged over E*, according to the probability distribution p_E . The structure of this formula is reminiscent of the entropies in [168, 169], as is to be expected for algebras with non-trivial center.

6.2 Generalised entropy

By arguing as in [24], one may view (6.19) as a kind of gravitational generalised entropy, with an expected area term. However, our formula holds more generally than has been previously considered. First, we are allowing the state $|\phi_i(\tau)\rangle$ to be arbitrarily entangled between the QFT and the clocks (whereas for example [21, 24] considered only the case where $|\phi_i(\tau)\rangle$ factorises as a product state between the QFT and the clocks). Second, we are computing the entropy one gets with respect to arbitrary subsets R of clocks (whereas previously only a single clock has been involved). The resulting entropy then in fact differs from the generalised entropy, depending on which clocks R we use. To see this, let us proceed with a rough outline of the arguments of [24]; for further details of the assumptions involved we refer the reader to that paper. We introduce some kind of UV regulator on the fields, such that the QFT algebra \mathcal{A}_S is no longer Type III. Then $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ itself is no longer Type III, which means that it has well-defined density operators for states (and weights). In terms of these density operators, the modular and relative modular operators factorise as follows:

$$\Delta_{\hat{\Psi}} = \rho_{\hat{\Psi}} (\rho'_{\hat{\Psi}})^{-1}, \quad \Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau) | \hat{\Psi}} = \rho (\rho'_{\hat{\Psi}})^{-1}. \quad (6.34)$$

Here $\rho_{\hat{\Psi}}$ and ρ are the UV regulated density operators of $\hat{\Psi}$ and $\hat{\phi}$ respectively, while $\rho'_{\hat{\Psi}}$ is the UV regulated density operator of $\hat{\Psi}$ with respect to the commutant of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$. Since $\Delta_{\hat{\Psi}} = e^{-\beta H_S}$ we can determine these operators in terms of H_S . As specified at the beginning of Section 4, H_S is the generator of a diffeomorphism acting on the fields, and as such may be written in terms of the energy momentum tensor of the fields T^{ab} as follows:

$$H_S = H_\xi - H'_\xi, \quad \text{where} \quad H_\xi = \int_\Sigma d\Sigma_a \xi_b T^{ab} \quad \text{and} \quad H'_\xi = - \int_{\Sigma'} d\Sigma_a \xi_b T^{ab}. \quad (6.35)$$

Here, Σ, Σ' are Cauchy surfaces for \mathcal{U} and its causal complement \mathcal{U}' , and ξ is the vector field corresponding to the diffeomorphism generated by H_S . Thus we may write

$$\rho_{\hat{\Psi}} = \frac{e^{-\beta H_\xi}}{Z_\xi}, \quad \rho'_{\hat{\Psi}} = \frac{e^{-\beta H'_\xi}}{Z_\xi}, \quad (6.36)$$

where we have introduced a normalisation constant Z_ξ . We thus have

$$\log \Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau) | \hat{\Psi}} = \log \rho + \beta H'_\xi + \log Z_\xi. \quad (6.37)$$

Using this in (6.17), one finds

$$S[\phi] \approx S_{0,R} - \log Z_\xi + \beta \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | (H_{R^c} - H'_\xi) | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle - \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | \log \rho | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle. \quad (6.38)$$

We may use the freedom in the factor $e^{-S_{0,R}}$ appearing in the trace (4.17) to set $S_{0,R} = \log Z_\xi$, thus eliminating the first two terms. The last term is the (UV regulated) von Neumann entropy $S_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}[\hat{\phi}(\tau)]$ of the state $|\hat{\phi}(\tau)\rangle$ with respect to the algebra $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$, i.e. of the fields in \mathcal{U} , the frames $R_{\tilde{i}}$, and the complementary frame energy H_{R^c} . To address the middle term, we use the conjecture of [24] that ξ essentially behaves as a boost near the boundary of \mathcal{U} , from which it follows that

$$\beta H'_\xi = \beta H_{R_{\text{out}}} - \frac{A}{4G_N} \quad (6.39)$$

is a constraint in the gravitational theory. Here, $H_{R_{\text{out}}} = \sum_{C_j \in R_{\text{out}}} H_j$ is the total Hamiltonian of all the frames R_{out} outside \mathcal{U} , while A is the area of the boundary of Σ , i.e. the codimension 2 corner of \mathcal{U} , and G_N is Newton's constant. Note that under our present assumptions, R^c and R_{out} need not be the same set of clocks. Putting this all together (and using also the fact that $H_{R^c} - H_{R_{\text{out}}} = H_{R_{\text{in}}} - H_R$, where $H_{R_{\text{in}}}$ is the total Hamiltonian of the frames *inside* of \mathcal{U}), we get

$$S[\phi] \approx \left\langle \frac{A}{4G_N} \right\rangle_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)} + S_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}[\hat{\phi}(\tau)] - \beta \langle H_{R_{\text{in}}} - H_R \rangle_\phi. \quad (6.40)$$

Thus, we obtain something very much like a gravitational generalized entropy, with a couple of frame-dependent caveats. The most obvious caveat is in the final term, which gives the difference in energies between the frames located in \mathcal{U} , and the frames making up the set R . This term disappears in the case $R = R_{\text{in}}$, although of course the above formula holds more generally than this. The other caveat is that the second term is not just an entropy of the QFT, but also of the frames. As such, it is sensitive to the way in which the frames are entangled with each other, and with the QFT.

6.3 Special case: separable QFT and frames

A special case occurs when the state $|\hat{\phi}(\tau)\rangle$ is approximately separable between the fields and the frames:

$$|\hat{\phi}(\tau)\rangle \approx |\phi_S(\tau)\rangle \otimes |\tilde{\phi}(\tau)\rangle, \quad \text{where} \quad |\phi_S(\tau)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S, \quad |\tilde{\phi}(\tau)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{R_{\tilde{i}}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R^c}. \quad (6.41)$$

Our results apply in the presence of arbitrary entanglement, but previous works such as [21, 24] exclusively employed states of this product form in the semiclassical limit. However, even though the semiclassical assumptions restrict the kind of entanglement allowed, such product states (6.41) only make up a small subset of the full set of semiclassical states, for which generically the fields and the frames will be non-trivially entangled. In the interest of making contact with these earlier papers, let us show how our results specialize to the case (6.41).

In a product state, the relative entropy term in the entropy may be further decomposed into contributions from $|\phi_S(\tau)\rangle$ and $|\tilde{\phi}(\tau)\rangle$. Indeed, the state $|\hat{\Psi}\rangle$ is also separable, which allows us to decompose the relative modular operator as

$$\Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\hat{\Psi}} \approx \Delta_{\phi_S(\tau)|\psi_S} \otimes \Delta_{\tilde{\phi}(\tau)|\tilde{\Psi}}, \quad (6.42)$$

where

$$|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle = \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_{\tilde{i}}} \int_{\sigma_j} dE_j |E_j\rangle \otimes \langle E_j| \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE |E\rangle. \quad (6.43)$$

We can explicitly confirm this by using a decomposition as in (4.33) to write

$$\Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\hat{\Psi}} = e^{S_{0,R} + \beta H_{R^c}} \hat{\rho}_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)} \quad (6.44)$$

$$\approx \Delta_{\phi_S(\tau)|\psi_S} \otimes \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i \sum_{j \neq i} H_j t} \text{tr}_{R^c}(|\tilde{\phi}(\tau+t)\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}(\tau)|), \quad (6.45)$$

and we may identify the latter factor as $\Delta_{\tilde{\phi}(\tau)|\tilde{\Psi}}$. Actually, it may be confirmed that expectation values in $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle$ is a trace on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i}) \otimes \{H_{R^c}\}''$ (although certainly not the only one since this is not a factor). Since $\Delta_{\tilde{\phi}(\tau)|\tilde{\Psi}}$ is an element of this algebra, it is thus actually the density operator of the state $|\hat{\phi}(\tau)\rangle$ with respect to this trace and algebra. We write this as $\rho_{\phi, R_i}(\tau) = \Delta_{\tilde{\phi}(\tau)|\tilde{\Psi}}$ to denote that it is the density operator of the frames. Using these results in the formula for the entropy (6.19), one finds

$$S[\phi] \approx S_{0,R} + \beta \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | H_{R^c} | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle - \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | \log \Delta_{\phi_S(\tau)|\psi_S} | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle + S_R[\phi] \quad (6.46)$$

$$= S_{0,R} - \beta \langle H_R \rangle_\phi - S_{\text{rel}}(\phi_S(\tau) || \psi_S) + S_R[\phi], \quad (6.47)$$

where the second line holds if $|\phi_S(\tau)\rangle$ is separating with respect to \mathcal{A}_S , and

$$S_R[\phi] = - \langle \tilde{\phi}(\tau) | \log \rho_{\phi, R_i}(\tau) | \tilde{\phi}(\tau) \rangle \quad (6.48)$$

is the entropy of the frames.

It should be noted that $S_R[\phi]$, as written above, appears to depend on a choice of $C_i \in R$ – but it is actually independent of this choice, to leading order in the semiclassical approximation. To see this, consider the (Type I) algebra

$$r(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_R)^H) = \{\mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a), V_i(t) \mid a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i}), t \in \mathbb{R}\}'', \quad (6.49)$$

which acts at the perspective-neutral level. On the right-hand side, we have decomposed this algebra with respect to a particular $C_i \in R$, but clearly the algebra itself is independent of the choice of C_i . By the semiclassical and separability assumptions, the expectation value of a general element of this algebra may be approximated as:

$$\langle \phi | \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a) V_i(t) | \phi \rangle \approx \langle \phi | \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a) r(e^{-i(H_S+H_i)t}) | \phi \rangle = \langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) | a e^{i \sum_{j \neq i} H_j t} | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle \quad (6.50)$$

The operators $a e^{i \sum_{j \neq i} H_j t}$ span the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i}) \otimes \{H_{R^c}\}''$. Thus the density operator for $r(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_R)^H)$ may be obtained by pulling back the density operator $\rho_{\phi, R_i}(\tau)$ for $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i}) \otimes \{H_{R^c}\}''$ through the homomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a) r(e^{-i(H_S+H_i)t}) \leftrightarrow a e^{i \sum_{j \neq i} H_j t}. \quad (6.51)$$

One obtains

$$\rho_{\phi, R} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt r(e^{-iH_R t}) \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau \left(\text{tr}_{SR^c} (e^{-iH_{R^c} t} | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle \langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) |) \right). \quad (6.52)$$

Moreover, the von Neumann entropies of the density operators $\rho_{\phi, R}$ and $\rho_{\phi, R_i}(\tau)$ will be approximately equal. Now,

$$\mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau \left(\text{tr}_{SR^c} (e^{-iH_{R^c} t} | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle \langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) |) \right) = \text{tr}_{SR^c} (\mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau (e^{-iH_{R^c} t} | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle \langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) |)), \quad (6.53)$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau (e^{-iH_{R^c} t} | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle \langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) |) = \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau (e^{-iH_{R^c} t} V_{j \rightarrow i}(\tau, \tau) | \phi_{|j}(\tau) \rangle \langle \phi_{|j}(\tau) | V_{j \rightarrow i}(\tau, \tau)^\dagger) \quad (6.54)$$

$$= \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau (V_{j \rightarrow i}(\tau, \tau) e^{-iH_{R^c} t} | \phi_{|j}(\tau) \rangle \langle \phi_{|j}(\tau) | V_{j \rightarrow i}(\tau, \tau)^\dagger) \quad (6.55)$$

$$= \mathcal{O}_{C_j}^\tau (e^{-iH_{R^c} t} | \phi_{|j}(\tau) \rangle \langle \phi_{|j}(\tau) |) \quad (6.56)$$

for any $C_j \in R$, so $\rho_{\phi, R}$ is independent of the choice of C_i . Therefore, $S_R[\phi]$, which was above formulated as the von Neumann entropy of $\rho_{\phi, R_i}[\phi]$, may be alternatively formulated as the von Neumann entropy of $\rho_{\phi, R}$, which is independent of the choice of C_i .

Note also that the Shannon entropy of H_{R^c} is contained within the frame entropy $S_R[\phi]$. Indeed, one may decompose the frame density operator as follows:

$$\rho_{\phi, R_{\bar{i}}}(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i \sum_{j \neq i} H_j t} \text{tr}_{R^c} (|\tilde{\phi}(\tau + t)\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}(\tau)|) \quad (6.57)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i H_{R^c} t} \text{tr}_{R^c} (e^{-i H_{R^c} t} |\tilde{\phi}(\tau)\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}(\tau)|) \quad (6.58)$$

$$\approx 2\pi \int_{H_{R^c}} dE P(E) p_E \rho_{R_{\bar{i}}, E}, \quad (6.59)$$

where

$$p_E = \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | P(E) | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle \approx \langle \tilde{\phi}(\tau) | P(E) | \tilde{\phi}(\tau) \rangle \quad (6.60)$$

is the probability distribution of H_{R^c} , and

$$p_E \rho_{R_{\bar{i}}, E} = \text{tr}_{R^c} (P(E) |\tilde{\phi}(\tau)\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}(\tau)|). \quad (6.61)$$

Note that $\rho_{R_{\bar{i}}, E}$ is the reduced density operator of the frames in $R_{\bar{i}}$, conditioned on the energy of the frames in R^c being E . Using this decomposition, one finds

$$S_R[\phi] = - \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \langle \tilde{\phi}(\tau) | P(E) \log(2\pi p_E \rho_{R_{\bar{i}}, E}) | \tilde{\phi}(\tau) \rangle \quad (6.62)$$

$$= - \log(2\pi) - \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E \log p_E + \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E S_{R_{\bar{i}}, E}[\phi], \quad (6.63)$$

where

$$S_{R_{\bar{i}}, E}[\phi] = - \text{tr}_{R_{\bar{i}}} (\rho_{R_{\bar{i}}, E} \log \rho_{R_{\bar{i}}, E}) \quad (6.64)$$

is the entanglement entropy of the frames in $R_{\bar{i}}$, conditioned on $H_{R^c} = E$. Thus the total frame entropy $S_R[\phi]$ contains a term corresponding to the Shannon entropy of H_{R^c} , as well as an average of H_{R^c} -conditioned entanglement entropies of the frames in $R_{\bar{i}}$.

After UV regularisation, an approximate product state of the form (6.41) has an approximate product density operator $\rho = \rho_S \otimes \rho_{\phi, R_{\bar{i}}}(\tau)$, where ρ_S is the density operator of the fields in \mathcal{U} , and $\rho_{\phi, R}(\tau)$ is the density operator of the frames. The term $S_{\mathcal{A}}[\hat{\phi}(\tau)]$ in the generalised entropy (6.40) then may be written as the sum of the von Neumann entropies of these two density operators, and one finds

$$S[\phi] \approx \left\langle \frac{A}{4G_N} \right\rangle_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)} + S_{\text{QFT}}[\hat{\phi}(\tau)] + S_R[\phi] - \beta \langle H_{R_{\text{in}}} - H_R \rangle_{\phi}. \quad (6.65)$$

Here $S_{\text{QFT}}[\hat{\phi}(\tau)]$ is the von Neumann entropy of ρ_S , i.e. the entanglement entropy of the fields in \mathcal{U} . One may observe that the frame dependence of this formula has been entirely relegated to the final two terms.

6.4 Linear order correction and entanglement

All of the formulas for the entropy discussed above hold to leading order in the semiclassical approximation; at higher orders in η there are corrections to these formulas. In Appendix D.1, it is shown that, to $\mathcal{O}(\eta)$, the entropy receives corrections of the following form:

$$S[\phi] = S_0[\phi] - 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_0^{\infty} d\lambda \phi_E \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + \Delta_{\phi_E | \bar{\psi}}} (H_S - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \Delta_{\phi_E | \bar{\psi}}) \frac{1}{\lambda + \Delta_{\phi_E | \bar{\psi}}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2), \quad (6.66)$$

where $S_0[\phi]$ is the leading order contribution discussed above, and $p_E, \phi_E, \bar{\psi}$ were defined in Section 6.1.

The nature of this linear order correction is a little difficult to decipher from this expression. To get something a bit easier to digest, let us introduce again a UV regulator on the fields as in Subsec. 6.2, such that all algebras have well-defined density operators. Then we can write

$$\Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}} = \rho_E(\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}, \quad (6.67)$$

where ρ_E is the density operator for ϕ_E in the algebra $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$, and $\rho'_{\bar{\psi}}$ is the density operator for $\bar{\psi}$ in its complement; as in Subsec. 6.2, we have $\rho'_{\bar{\psi}} = e^{-\beta H'_\xi}/Z_\xi$. With this decomposition, it is shown in Appendix D.1 that one may perform the λ integral in (6.66) to obtain

$$S[\phi] = S_0[\phi] - 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \left[\partial_E \left(p_E(\phi_E(H_\xi) - \mathcal{E}) \right) - p_E \phi_E \left(H'_\xi \partial_E \log(p_E \rho_E) \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2). \quad (6.68)$$

Thus, the linear order correction depends in a non-trivial way on the correlations between the energies of the QFT degrees of freedom and the complementary clocks, and other statistical properties of the state.

In the special case in Subsec. 6.3, the state is assumed to exactly factorize between the QFT and clocks, as in (6.41). We then have that ϕ_E factorizes as $\phi_E = \phi_S \otimes \tilde{\phi}_E$, where ϕ_S is the state on \mathcal{A}_S given by

$$\phi_S(a) = \langle \phi_S(\tau) | a | \phi_S(\tau) \rangle, \quad (6.69)$$

and $\tilde{\phi}_E$ is the frames part of the state, conditioned on the complementary frame energy being E . Similarly, with a UV cutoff in place, the density operator factorizes $\rho_E = \rho_S \otimes \tilde{\rho}_E$, with $\rho_S \in \mathcal{A}_S$ and $\tilde{\rho}_E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$. The integrand in (6.68) may then be written³⁷

$$\phi_S(H_S - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E p_E. \quad (6.70)$$

But the first factor on the right hand side vanishes by the definition of $\mathcal{E} = \phi(H_S) = \phi_S(H_S)$. So the linear order correction to the entropy vanishes, if we use a UV regulator. Because the QFT algebra is hyperfinite, this continues to be true even without the UV regulator.³⁸ Thus there are no linear order corrections for a separable state of the form considered in Subsec. 6.3. This is in agreement with [27].

On the other hand, if the state is non-trivially entangled, there will generically be a non-zero linear correction. To make this a bit more obvious, let us assume that p_E vanishes at the boundary of σ_{R^c} (this is compatible with the semiclassical assumptions; indeed, if $\sigma_{R^c} = \mathbb{R}$, then a normalisable state requires this assumption to hold). Then the first term in (6.68) can be integrated and seen to vanish. Let's also assume the state is such that ρ_E is independent of E . Then, integrating by parts, one may verify that

$$S[\phi] = S_0[\phi] - 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E \partial_E \phi_E(H'_\xi) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2). \quad (6.71)$$

Now note that $\phi_E(H'_\xi)$ can now depend arbitrarily on E , so long as

$$\mathcal{E} = \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E \phi_E(H_\xi - H'_\xi). \quad (6.72)$$

The semiclassical approximation remains valid if $\partial_E \phi_E(H'_\xi) = \mathcal{O}(\eta)$ (so that the second term in (6.71) is $\mathcal{O}(\eta)$). Clearly, these conditions allow for a non-zero contribution at linear order.

³⁷ To show this one needs to use $\tilde{\phi}_E(\partial_E \log \tilde{\rho}_E) = 0$.

³⁸ Indeed, the von Neumann entropy is a relative entropy with respect to the trace, and the relative entropy on a hyperfinite algebra is the limit of the relative entropies on its approximating algebras [154] (which are the UV regulated algebras in this case).

One may thus in principle use the linear order part of the entropy as a diagnostic for whether there is entanglement between the QFT and clocks. It should also be noted that for non-ideal clocks, exactly factorizing states are much harder to come by, due to the non-trivial projection operator $\Pi_{|i}$ defining the reduced Hilbert space. In any case we should typically expect linear corrections to the entropy.

6.5 Comparison with previous work

At this stage, we may directly specialise our entropy formula to the states studied in [21, 24]. As described in Section 4.4, in those works there were only two clocks C_1, C_2 present. In the perspective of one of the clocks (without loss of generality C_1) a product state of the form

$$|\phi_{|1}(\tau)\rangle = |\phi_S\rangle \otimes |f_2\rangle \quad (6.73)$$

was assumed, where $|\phi_S\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$ and $|f\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2$. The entropies of the algebras $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)$ and $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H)$ were then studied.

It was also assumed in [21, 24] that the energy wavefunction $f_2(E) = \langle E|_2 |f_2\rangle$ of the clock C_2 is slowly varying as a function of E . This implies that its time wavefunction $\tilde{f}_2(t) = \langle t|_2 |f_2\rangle$ is rapidly varying. Changing to the perspective of clock C_2 , we have

$$|\phi_{|2}(\tau)\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \tilde{f}_2(t) e^{iH_S t} |\phi_S\rangle \otimes |-t\rangle_1. \quad (6.74)$$

Another assumption of [21, 24] was that H_S approximately commutes with the relative modular Hamiltonian from ψ_S to ϕ_S . For us, this translates to our second semiclassical assumption, that $|\phi_S\rangle$ is in an approximate eigenstate of H_S , i.e. $e^{iH_S t} |\phi_S\rangle \approx e^{i\mathcal{E}t} |\phi_S\rangle$. To be a bit more precise about the nature of the wavefunction $\tilde{f}_2(t)$, we are assuming that it is rapidly varying enough that this approximate H_S eigenstate assumption is reliable in integrals of the above form. Alternatively expressed in terms of energies, the assumption is that the variance of H_2 is much larger than the variance of H_S . We can then write

$$|\phi_{|2}(\tau)\rangle \approx |\phi_S\rangle \otimes |f_1\rangle, \quad \text{where} \quad |f_1\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \tilde{f}_2(t) e^{i\mathcal{E}t} |-t\rangle_1. \quad (6.75)$$

Thus, we see that the assumption of approximate separability applies to the state in the perspective of both C_1 and C_2 . Note that the energy wavefunctions of the two clocks are related by

$$f_1(E) = \langle E|_1 |f_1\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \tilde{f}_2(t) e^{i(\mathcal{E}+E)t} = f_2(E + \mathcal{E}) \quad (6.76)$$

(we set $f_{1,2}(E) = 0$ if $E \notin \sigma_{1,2}$). So $f_1(E)$ is also slowly varying.

The first part of our semiclassical assumption can now be seen to apply to either clock. Indeed, for any $a \in \mathcal{A}_S$,

$$\langle \phi | \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a) V_i(t) | \phi \rangle \approx \langle \phi_S | a e^{iH_S t} | \phi_S \rangle \langle f_j | e^{iH_j t} | f_j \rangle \approx \langle \phi_S | a | \phi_S \rangle \int_{\sigma_{C_j}} dE |f_j(E)|^2 e^{i(E+\mathcal{E})t}, \quad (6.77)$$

where $(i, j) \in \{(1, 2), (2, 1)\}$. Due to $f_j(E)$ being slowly varying, the right hand side is sharply peaked at $t = 0$, as required. Thus, both of our semiclassical assumptions are satisfied, and we can apply the semiclassical entropy formulae.

In particular, the entropy of the algebra $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_i}^H)$ may be written (invoking (6.47) and (6.63), using $H_{R^c} = H_j$ so $p_E = |f_j(E)|^2$, and noting $R_{\bar{i}} = \emptyset$)

$$S[\phi] \approx S_{0, C_i} - \beta \langle H_i \rangle_\phi - S_{\text{rel}}(\phi_S | \psi_S) - \log(2\pi) + S_{\text{obs}}, \quad (6.78)$$

where

$$S_{\text{obs}} = - \int_{\sigma_i} dE |f_i(E)|^2 \log |f_i(E)|^2 = - \int_{\sigma_j} dE |f_j(E)|^2 \log |f_j(E)|^2 \quad (6.79)$$

(the second equality holds because of (6.76)). In the case where the spectrum of C_i is bounded below, the algebra is Type II_1 , and we may normalise the trace such that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{1}) = 1$; as described in Section 4.1, this amounts to fixing the constant S_{0,C_i} such that it obeys (4.24). In the particular case that the spectrum is of the form $\sigma_i = [0, \infty)$, we have $S_{0,C_i} = \log \beta + \log(2\pi)$. Writing $H_i = H_{\text{obs}}$, we then have

$$S[\phi] \approx -\beta \langle H_{\text{obs}} \rangle_\phi - S_{\text{rel}}(\phi_S || \psi_S) + S_{\text{obs}} + \log \beta, \quad (6.80)$$

which agrees with, for example, [24, Eq. (5.30)].

7 Antisemiclassical regime

In the previous section, we described a semiclassical regime in which the fluctuations of a given clock C_i are much smaller than the fluctuations of the QFT. In this regime, the von Neumann entropy for the algebra of $r(\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H)$ was shown to agree with the expected gravitational generalised entropy formula (after imposing a UV cutoff).

However, this semiclassical regime only concerns a very small corner of the Hilbert space. For most physical states, the clocks will fluctuate to roughly the same degree as the fields. The generalised entropy formula (6.40) should not be expected to hold non-semiclassically, but it is interesting to ask how to extrapolate it away from this regime. In Subsec. 6.4, we described how the entropy changes at linear order away from the semiclassical regime.

In contrast, in this section we will describe a regime which is very far away from the semiclassical one. In particular, we will consider states for which the fluctuations of the time of C_i are much *larger* than the fluctuations of the other degrees of freedom. This is precisely the opposite of the semiclassical case, and for this reason we call this the ‘antisemiclassical’ regime. Since the time of the clock is fluctuating so much, it turns out to be of rather little use for making observations of the other degrees of freedom (we make this more precise below). This enables a simplification of the entropy formula – but a different simplification to the semiclassical one.

Thus, in this paper we will have described two regimes, semiclassical and antisemiclassical. It would be very useful to understand how to interpolate between them, a task we leave to future work.

As in the case of the semiclassical regime, we can more precisely define the antisemiclassical regime by examining expectation values of operators in the algebra. In particular, let $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{C_j})$, and consider the expectation value of $\mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a)V_i(t)$. The antisemiclassical assumption is that this expectation value is well-approximated by taking $|\phi\rangle$ to be an approximate eigenstate of the clock Hamiltonian $r(H_i)$, with energy \bar{E} :

$$\langle \phi | \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a)V_i(t) | \phi \rangle \approx e^{-i\bar{E}t} F(t) \langle \phi | \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(a) | \phi \rangle. \quad (7.1)$$

Here, $F(t)$ is some real slowly varying function of t , reflecting the fact that $|\phi\rangle$ is not an exact eigenstate. Since $|\phi\rangle$ is in an approximate eigenstate of $r(H_i)$, the time read by the clock has very large fluctuations, as required. Note that if we set $a = 1$, and consider the complex conjugate of both sides in combination with $t \rightarrow -t$, we can observe that $F(t) = F(-t)$.

There has to be a timescale involved in the above assumption; it turns out to be given by β . In particular, we assume that (7.1) holds for $t < \beta$, and that for $t > \beta$ the left hand side of (7.1) is very close to vanishing. This timescale will be required to obtain a simplified entropy formula.

Recall that the semiclassical regime can be understood as applying when the fluctuations of the QFT Hamiltonian are sufficiently suppressed relative to those of the clock Hamiltonian, as in (6.5). The antiseiclassical regime will hold when instead

$$(\Delta H_i)_\phi^2 \ll \beta^{-2}. \quad (7.2)$$

Thus, the fluctuations of the clock Hamiltonian should be less than thermal vacuum fluctuations of the QFT Hamiltonian.

The assumption (7.1) then implies that

$$S_{\phi_i(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \approx e^{i\bar{E}t} F(t) \Delta_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}, \quad (7.3)$$

as can be confirmed by considering matrix elements of both sides in between states of the form a for $a \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{C_j})$, and using the fact that $|\psi_{SR_i}\rangle$ is cyclic.

Using this in (4.31), we find

$$\rho_{\phi_i}(\tau) \approx \Pi_i e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_i}^*)} W \Delta_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}, \quad (7.4)$$

where

$$W = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j + \bar{E})t} F(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{-i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} (\phi|V_i(t)|\phi). \quad (7.5)$$

Due to the slowly varying nature of $F(t)$, the support of W is sharply peaked around states for which $H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j + \bar{E} = 0$.

Note that $\Delta_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}$ is approximately gauge-invariant; indeed

$$e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j + \bar{E})t} F(t) \Delta_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \approx e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} S_{\phi_i(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \quad (7.6)$$

$$= S_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi_i(\tau-t)|\psi_{SR_i}} e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} \quad (7.7)$$

$$\approx \Delta_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j + \bar{E})t} F(t). \quad (7.8)$$

where to get the last line we used the Hermitian conjugate of (7.3) with $t \rightarrow -t$. Thus, mapping back to the perspective-neutral level, the density operator is given by $\rho_\phi^R = \mathcal{R}_i(\tau)^\dagger \rho_{\phi_i}(\tau) \mathcal{R}_i(\tau) = r(\tilde{\rho}_\phi^R)$, where

$$\tilde{\rho}_\phi^R \approx e^{-S_{0,R} + \beta(H_S + H_R - H_{R_i}^*)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{iH_i t} (\phi|V_i(t)|\phi) \Delta_{\phi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}. \quad (7.9)$$

This is the density operator of the system relative to a set of clocks R .

At this stage let us consider two cases. Suppose first that R contains at least one other clock than C_i , and recall from Subsec. 4.3 that the corresponding density operator $\rho_\phi^{R \setminus C_i}$ of the system relative to the set of clocks $R \setminus C_i$ may be found as the partial trace of ρ_ϕ^R as follows:

$$\rho_\phi^{R \setminus C_i} = e^{S_{0,R} - S_{0,R \setminus C_i}} r \left[\text{tr}_i (e^{-\beta H_i} \tilde{\rho}_\phi^R) \right] \quad (7.10)$$

$$\approx e^{-S_{0,R \setminus C_i} + \beta(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i}^*)} \text{tr}_i \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{iH_i t} (\phi|V_i(t)|\phi) \right) \Delta_{\psi_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}}. \quad (7.11)$$

Noting that

$$\text{tr}_i \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{iH_i t} (\phi|V_i(t)|\phi) \right) = 2\pi \int_{\sigma_i} dE (\phi|\delta(r(H_i) - E)|\phi) = 2\pi, \quad (7.12)$$

we can substitute (7.11) back into (7.9) to obtain

$$\rho_\phi^R \approx \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{S_{0,R \setminus C_i} - S_{0,R} + \beta H_i} \rho_\phi^{R \setminus C_i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt V_i(-t) (\phi|V_i(t)|\phi). \quad (7.13)$$

In the other case, where R contains only a single clock, we have that $\Delta_\psi^{-1/2} \Delta_{\psi_i(\tau)|\psi_S} \Delta_\psi^{-1/2}$ is an approximately gauge-invariant element of \mathcal{A}_S , and therefore (under the assumption that gauge transformations act ergodically on \mathcal{A}_S) at leading order a multiple of the identity. Moreover, its expectation value in the state $|\psi_S\rangle$ is 1 – so we must have $\Delta_\psi^{-1/2} \Delta_{\psi_i(\tau)|\psi_S} \Delta_\psi^{-1/2} \approx \mathbf{1}$. Substituting this in to (7.9) yields

$$\rho_\phi^R \approx \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-S_{0,R} + \beta H_i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt V_i(-t) (\phi | V_i(t) | \phi). \quad (7.14)$$

The two cases are rather similar, and can be treated on equal grounds if we set $S_{0,\emptyset} = 0$ and $\rho_\phi^\emptyset = \mathbf{1}$. Let us do so in the following.

Note that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt V_i(-t) (\phi | V_i(t) | \phi) = r \left[\int_{\sigma_i} dE |E\rangle\langle E|_i p_i(E) \right], \quad (7.15)$$

where $|E\rangle_i$ are energy eigenstates for C_i , and $p_i(E) = (\phi | r(|E\rangle\langle E|_i) | \phi)$ is the probability density for the energy of C_i in the state $|\phi\rangle$. Thus, the density operator may be written

$$\rho_\phi^R \approx e^{S_{0,R \setminus C_i} - S_{0,R} + \beta H_i} r \left[\int_{\sigma_i} dE |E\rangle\langle E|_i p_i(E) \right] \rho_\phi^{R \setminus C_i}, \quad (7.16)$$

Thus, the density operator for the system relative to R can essentially be computed in terms of the density operator for the system relative to $R \setminus C_i$, and the probability density for the energy of the clock C_i . The clock C_i and the rest of the degrees of freedom are separable in this density operator; indeed, all but the last factor above make up an operator acting on C_i . This means there are no additional correlations between the system and C_i which need to be taken into account.

This is a direct way to see that the antisemiclassical clock C_i is fairly useless for observing the system; the state of the system relative to R is basically determined by the state of the system relative to $R \setminus C_i$, so we do not gain any new information by using C_i (other than its own energy's probability density).

The entropy of ρ_ϕ^R has a similar decomposition. Indeed the logarithm of the density operator may be written (here we use the assumption that (7.1) holds on timescales less than β , so that $e^{\beta H_i}$ approximately commutes with the other contributions to the density operator)

$$\log \rho_\phi^R \approx S_{0,R \setminus C_i} - S_{0,R} + \beta H_i + r \left[\int_{\sigma_i} dE |E\rangle\langle E|_i \log p_i(E) \right] + \log \rho_\phi^{R \setminus C_i}, \quad (7.17)$$

and with this, we can compute the entropy as

$$S^R[\phi] = -(\phi | \log \rho_\phi^R | \phi) \approx S_{0,R} - S_{0,R \setminus C_i} - \beta \bar{E} - \int_{\sigma_i} dE p_i(E) \log p_i(E) + S^{R \setminus C_i}[\phi] \quad (7.18)$$

(note that $S^\emptyset[\phi] = 0$). Thus, the entropy decomposes as the sum of $-\beta \bar{E}$, a Shannon entropy for the energy of the clock C_i and the entropy of the system relative to $R \setminus C_i$, plus some constants.

In the particular case where $R = \{C_i\}$ contains only one clock, the formula simplifies to

$$S^R[\phi] \approx S_{0,R} - \beta \bar{E} - \int_{\sigma_i} dE p_i(E) \log p_i(E). \quad (7.19)$$

This (leading order contribution to the) entropy does not depend on the state of the fields at all. If σ_i is bounded below such that the algebra of operators is Type II_1 as described earlier, then it is interesting to comment on what happens if we substitute in the canonical normalization (4.24). One finds

$$S^R[\phi] \approx - \int_{\sigma_i} dE p_i(E) (\log p_i(E) - \log s_i(E)), \quad (7.20)$$

where

$$s_i(E) = e^{-\beta E} / \int_{\sigma_i} dE e^{-\beta E} \quad (7.21)$$

is the Boltzmann distribution for the clock at inverse temperature β . We may recognise $S^R[\phi]$ as (minus) the classical relative entropy between this Boltzmann distribution and the actual probability distribution of the clock’s energies.

8 Observer-dependence of gravitational entropy

We have described how to use clock QRFs to define gravitational subregion algebras with well-defined von Neumann entropies. But depending on which set of clocks R one uses, one gets different von Neumann algebras, and therefore different entropies. Thus, entropy is observer-dependent. These differences are ultimately manifestations of the subsystem relativity discussed on Sect. 2.7.

Any comparison of entropies between different algebras will be sensitive to how we normalise the traces of these algebras. For the algebras discussed in this paper, the normalisations are parametrised by the numbers $S_{0,R}$, and these contribute overall state-independent constants to the entropies, as previously discussed. Thus, in order to technically speaking have a full comparison of the entropies for different choices of R , one needs to have fixed these constants. In special cases there are canonical ways to do so; for example, when R contains a single clock whose energy spectrum is bounded below, we may pick $S_{0,R}$ such that the trace of the identity is 1, as discussed at (4.24). One may also in certain cases use the partial trace to relate the trace normalisations of different algebras, as described in Sec. 4.3. But in the general case, there does not seem to be any canonical way to pick these normalisations.

One might therefore be concerned that the ambiguity in the constants $S_{0,R}$ will muddy our proposed picture of observer-dependence in the entropy. The reason this is not the case is that these constants are necessarily *state-independent*. Thus, even if one does not have a canonical way to fix these constants, the entropy functionals one gets for different sets of clocks R will depend on the state in fundamentally different ways, and this dependence cannot be absorbed into the constants. Thus, the state-dependence of the entropies is unambiguous, and it is strictly speaking this state-dependence that we will now discuss.

In this section, we will explore several examples of this phenomenon: a physically motivated setup involving a gravitational interferometer, a scenario involving superselection and degenerate clocks, and a situation where only some clocks satisfy the conditions necessary for a semiclassical approximation. We will also comment on what happens to entropies when we have *periodic* clocks [70], and how these compare to the monotonic clocks we have so far discussed in this paper.

8.1 Case study: gravitational interferometer

We first consider an example which we dub the “gravitational interferometer” for reasons explained below, which was also discussed in section 4.2 of [1]. Technical details such as the density matrix computations will be relegated to App. F. With this case study we want to explicitly show a feasible setup in which we can identify a manifestation of subsystem relativity, as explained in Sect. 2.7, namely the observer-dependence of gravitational entropy. This relativity refers to what different observers would attribute to the QFT degrees of freedom alone. Concretely, we will work with two clocks C_1, C_2 in the same subregion \mathcal{U} and one clock C_3 in the complementary region \mathcal{U}' . These regions could be complementary static patches of a de Sitter space, the left and right exteriors of a maximally extended Schwarzschild spacetime, or possibly the more general regions as suggested by JSS [24]. With this in mind, we will use the words “patch” and “subregion” interchangeably, while acknowledging that the latter scenario is on less rigorous footing regarding assumptions about the constraint and QFT

modular flow [40]. For purposes of this discussion we take for granted that the necessary ingredients are in place.

We will consider the algebra of field operators in subregion \mathcal{U} , dressed with respect to one or the other clock. On the perspective-neutral level, these are $r(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}C_1}^H)$ and $r(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}C_2}^H)$. These algebras encode the gauge-invariant degrees of freedom that each observer ascribes to the QFT degrees of freedom alone. The entropy associated with these will thus correspond to the entropy each observer assigns to the QFT (including graviton) degrees of freedom within \mathcal{U} . It may be that they each only have access to these degrees of freedom. This is the minimum they are guaranteed by the timelike tube theorem [153, 155, 156, 166]; it depends on operational assumptions whether they may also have access to other clocks in the same patch. Even if they do, these algebras account for what they each assign to the QFT alone. Crucially, although these pertain to the fields in the same subregion, they are inequivalent gauge-invariant algebras

$$r(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}C_1}^H) \neq r(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}C_2}^H) \quad (8.1)$$

whose overlap is described by Eq. (2.62) and may be trivial as in Eq. (2.61) when the modular Hamiltonian H_S has an ergodic action on the regional QFT algebra. Consequently, since the density operators are defined with respect to distinct algebras, so will the entropy turn out to be unequal under the same global state. At the reduced level, this means that operators, in particular the density operators, cannot be transformed into each other by conjugation with a unitary QRF transformation (2.53).

As emphasized in the introduction 1, the usual *horizon entropy* contribution that arises in a decomposition of the entropy in semiclassical states is associated with the full dressed algebra of all fields and all clocks within the same patch. In this context, this means $r(\mathcal{A}_{S C_1 C_2}^H)$ rather than either of the two subalgebras (8.1). Thus we emphasize that the relativity of gravitational entropy discussed here is not a statement about relativity of horizon area or horizon entropy. Though the reduced density operators associated to the full patch algebra $r(\mathcal{A}_{S C_1 C_2}^H)$ would take different expressions in the perspectives of C_1 and C_2 , these are always unitarily related. Thus the *total* generalized entropy of the same patch (or other region) is not frame-dependent. To be more explicit about the differences that *do* occur between the algebras (8.1), we will design our setup to highlight two possible causes of disparity between these dressed QFT entropies: the clocks are not isomorphic, i.e. their spectra differ, and the entanglement structure differs.

We now describe the setup. We take the three clocks to be nonideal, such that individual clock states are normalizable. We will first consider a situation where, from the perspective of clock C_1 , the state on the other factors is entirely unentangled (i.e. a product state). This will decidedly *not* be the case from the perspective of clock C_2 , so with this class of wavefunctions it will be easy to emphasize the role of differing entanglement structure between the two perspectives. We will then consider a more specific state within this class in which the second clock is in a simple superposition of clock orientation states when seen from the perspective of the first clock. The third, complementary clock will also be taken to be a simple clock state. Regarding the configuration of states on C_1 and C_2 , this situation can be achieved by a gravitational interferometer experiment where we have a clock split into two branches where in one branch the clock has a flyby to a massive object. Due to the stronger gravitational field close to the massive object, the time reading of the flyby clock will be dilated. Bringing both branches together then results in the desired superposition (see Fig. 8.1). In effect, this is just a quantum version of Shapiro time delay [170].

We start with a state which from C_1 -perspective is in a full product state between all components

$$|\phi_{|1}\rangle = \sqrt{N} \Pi_{|1} (|\phi_S\rangle \otimes |f\rangle_2 \otimes |g\rangle_3). \quad (8.2)$$




Figure 8.1: Clock C_2 starts at time reading 0 and is then split into two branches where one branch makes a flyby encounter with a massive object while the other is kept far away (or we accelerate them by different amounts). Due to time dilation, the flyby branch will lack behind in time by an amount $\Delta\tau$ w.r.t. the other branch. After recombination of both branches, we thus achieve a superposition of two clock states. Meanwhile, clock C_1 just evolves as is without splitting into multiple branches.

In this expression, $|f\rangle_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$ and $|g\rangle_3 \in \mathcal{H}_3$ are both normalised on their respective factors, with overall normalisation constant N such that the perspectival state is also normalised. Furthermore, without loss of generality we will set the gauge parameters to zero: $\tau_i = 0 = \tau_j$. Eventually we will take $|f\rangle_2$ to be the superposition and $|g\rangle_3$ to be a pure clock state, but we will leave it general for now. We also let f and g represent the energy-basis wavefunctions on their respective factors. In App. F it is shown that a frame change (2.53) to the perspective of clock C_2 results in the reduced state

$$|\phi_{|2}\rangle := V_{1 \rightarrow 2}(0, 0) |\phi_{|1}\rangle = \sqrt{2\pi N} f(-H_S - H_1 - H_3) \Pi_{|2}(|\phi_S\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_1 \otimes |g\rangle_3). \quad (8.3)$$

Using these two expressions for the same global state, the reduced density operators for the algebras \mathcal{A}_{SC_1} and \mathcal{A}_{SC_2} are likewise computed in App. F. The results are reported together in equation (F.13), in the perspectives of C_1 and C_2 , respectively. We report these here with the simplifying assumption that ϕ_S lies in the canonical cone of ψ_S , such that consequently $J_{\phi_S|\psi_S} = J_{\psi_S}$ and we obtain the polar decomposition $S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} = J_{\psi_S} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{1/2}$. With these choices, we obtain the reduced density operators

$$\rho_{\phi_{|1}} = 2\pi N e^{-S_{0,1} - \beta(H_2 + H_3)} \Pi_{|1} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{1/2} \int_{\sigma_2} d\epsilon_2 \Pi(-\bar{H}_1 - \epsilon_2, \sigma_3) |f(\epsilon_2)|^2 |g(-\bar{H}_1 - \epsilon_2)|^2 \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{1/2} \Pi_{|1}, \quad (8.4)$$

$$\rho_{\phi_{|2}} = 2\pi N e^{-S_{0,2} - \beta(H_1 + H_3)} f(\bar{H}_2) \Pi_{|2} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{1/2} \int_{\sigma_1} d\epsilon_1 \Pi(-\bar{H}_2 - \epsilon_1, \sigma_3) |g(-\bar{H}_2 - \epsilon_1)|^2 \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{1/2} \Pi_{|2} f^*(\bar{H}_2). \quad (8.5)$$

In the expressions above, $\bar{H}_i := H_i - H$ denotes the constraint-equivalent of H_i on $\mathcal{H}_{|i}$, and as usual the non-trivial projectors $\Pi(-\bar{H}_i - \epsilon_j, \sigma_k)$ restrict $-\bar{H}_i - \epsilon_j$ to eigenspaces in the spectral range σ_k .

The two non-trivial projectors within the integrals will generally render entropy computations difficult. Therefore, to have both of them act approximately trivially we take clock C_3 to be effectively ideal. There are situations in which an ideal clock in the complement does appear naturally. For instance, when the spacetime has a boundary in the complement, then H_3 could be the second order ADM boundary Hamiltonian which is unbounded, cf. Sec. 3.1. We also now take the wave function of this clock to be a simple clock state $|g\rangle_3 = \sqrt{2\pi/\|\sigma_3\|} |\tau_3\rangle$, with $\|\sigma_3\| := \int_{\sigma_3} d\epsilon_i$ the spectral range. Then the modulus just becomes a constant: $|g(E_3)|^2 = \|\sigma_3\|^{-1}$. With these simplifications, the integral between the relative modular operators in (8.4) gives $\|\sigma_3\|^{-1}$, while that in (8.5) gives $\|\sigma_1\| \|\sigma_3\|^{-1}$.

We acquire the two density operators

$$\rho_{\phi|1} \approx 2\pi N \|\sigma_3\|^{-1} e^{-S_{0,1} - \beta(H_2 + H_3)} \Pi_{|1} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S} \Pi_{|1}, \quad (8.6)$$

$$\rho_{\phi|2} \approx 2\pi N \|\sigma_1\| \|\sigma_3\|^{-1} e^{-S_{0,2} - \beta(H_1 + H_3)} f(\bar{H}_2) \Pi_{|2} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S} \Pi_{|2} f^*(\bar{H}_2). \quad (8.7)$$

These density operators (8.6) and (8.7) are very similar, but still indicate some aspects of subsystem relativity. The wavefunction f has disappeared from (8.6) altogether while it is still present in (8.7). This is appropriate considering that the former pertains to an algebra containing the reorientations C_2 , and so is sensitive to that wavefunction. Also, the two projectors $\Pi_{|1}$ and $\Pi_{|2}$ indicate different ‘course-grainings’ of the dressed QFT degrees of freedom, which are essentially represented by the relative modular operator $\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}$.

At this point, one might object that taking the limit that C_3 becomes ideal leads to unreasonable clock states as these are not normalisable. However, this limit does not cause trouble because the reduced states $|\phi_{|1}\rangle$ and $|\phi_{|2}\rangle$ are normalized as states on their respective reduced Hilbert spaces (not necessarily on each individual kinematical factor). The projectors $\Pi_{|1}$ and $\Pi_{|2}$ keep the unbounded σ_3 integral in check and the normalization constant N can be adapted accordingly.

To compute the entropy beyond semiclassical order, we now consider the specific example of Shapiro time delay under consideration. We thus let $|f\rangle_2$ be a superposition of two clock states, i.e.

$$|f\rangle_2 = \sqrt{N_2} (|\tau_2\rangle_2 + |\tau_2 + \Delta\tau\rangle_2), \quad f(E) = \sqrt{\frac{N_2}{2\pi}} e^{-i\tau_2 E} (1 + e^{-i\alpha E/\|\sigma_2\|}), \quad (8.8)$$

with the dimensionless parameter $\alpha := \Delta\tau\|\sigma_2\|$ and the α -dependent normalisation constant

$$N_2 := \frac{\pi}{\|\sigma_2\| \left(1 + \frac{\sin(\alpha\epsilon_2^{\max}/\|\sigma_2\|)}{\alpha} - \frac{\sin(\alpha\epsilon_2^{\min}/\|\sigma_2\|)}{\alpha} \right)}, \quad (8.9)$$

which reduces to $\pi/(2\|\sigma_2\|)$ when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. We also note down the expression for the state in the other perspective (8.3)

$$|\phi_{|2}\rangle \propto \Pi_{|2} e^{iH_S\tau_2} \left(|\phi_S\rangle \otimes |-\tau_2\rangle_1 \otimes |\tau_3 - \tau_2\rangle_3 + e^{iH_S\Delta\tau} |\phi_S\rangle \otimes |-\tau_2 - \Delta\tau\rangle_1 \otimes |\tau_3 - \tau_2 - \Delta\tau\rangle_3 \right) \quad (8.10)$$

to show that generally superposition in one perspective (C_1) leads to entanglement under a QRF transformation (to C_2 perspective) [65, 67–69, 71, 77, 80]. The density operator associated to this state is (8.7)

$$\rho_{\phi|2} \approx \frac{N N_2 \|\sigma_1\|}{\|\sigma_3\|} e^{-S_{0,2} - \beta(H_1 + H_3)} e^{-i\tau_2 \bar{H}_2} (1 + e^{-i\alpha \bar{H}_2/\|\sigma_2\|}) \Pi_{|2} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S} \Pi_{|2} (1 + e^{i\alpha \bar{H}_2/\|\sigma_2\|}) e^{i\tau_2 \bar{H}_2}. \quad (8.11)$$

While the entropy for (8.6) can be computed straightforwardly, namely the f -independent

$$S[\phi_{|1}] = S_{0,1} - \log(2\pi N \|\sigma_3\|^{-1}) + \beta \langle H_2 + H_3 \rangle_{\phi_{|1}} - \langle \log(\Pi_{|1} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S} \Pi_{|1}) \rangle_{\phi_{|1}}, \quad (8.12)$$

this is not true for (8.11) owing to the non-commutativity between H_S and $\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}$. Nevertheless, the non-commutative part can be written in the form $e^Y e^X e^{Y^\dagger}$ on which we need to apply the BCH-formula. In general, this leads to an infinite series of terms unless we have more specific information about the commutator. Luckily, there is a way to expand this into a small parameter if such one appears in Y , which is here the case when we take $\alpha \ll 1$. The details are worked out in App. G. By letting $\alpha \ll 1$ we let the superimposed clock be close to a single clock state. We thus find

$$\rho_{\phi|2} \approx \frac{2\pi N \|\sigma_1\|}{\|\sigma_2\| \|\sigma_3\|} e^{-S_{0,2} - \beta(H_1 + H_3)} e^{-i\tau_2 \bar{H}_2} \left(1 - i \frac{\alpha}{2\|\sigma_2\|} \bar{H}_2 \right) \Pi_{|2} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S} \Pi_{|2} \left(1 + i \frac{\alpha}{2\|\sigma_2\|} \bar{H}_2 \right) e^{i\tau_2 \bar{H}_2}. \quad (8.13)$$

We can now make use of formula (G.6) by making the identification

$$X \equiv \log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right), \quad Y \equiv \log\left(1 - i\frac{\alpha}{2\|\sigma_2\|}\bar{H}_2\right) = -i\frac{\alpha}{2\|\sigma_2\|}\bar{H}_2 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2). \quad (8.14)$$

This specific piece up to first order in α is hence determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \log\left(e^Y e^X e^{Y^\dagger}\right) &= \log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right) + i\frac{\alpha}{2\|\sigma_2\|}\left[H_S, \log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right)\right] + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2) \\ &= \log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\Delta\tau\frac{d}{dt}\log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S(t)|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right)\Big|_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right) + \log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S(-\Delta\tau)|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right)\right) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2). \end{aligned} \quad (8.15)$$

Technically, this does not capture all the non-commutativity since there is also the conjugation by the unitary $e^{i\tau_2\bar{H}_2}$, but this can simply be taken outside the log as $\log(U(\cdot)U^\dagger) = U\log(\cdot)U^\dagger$. This leads to the entropy

$$\begin{aligned} S[\phi_{|2}] &= S_{0,2} - \log\left(2\pi N\|\sigma_1\|\|\sigma_2\|^{-1}\|\sigma_3\|^{-1}\right) + \beta\langle H_1 + H_3 \rangle_{\phi_{|2}} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\left(\langle \log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S(-\tau_2)|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right) \rangle_{\phi_{|2}} + \langle \log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S(-\tau_2-\Delta\tau)|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right) \rangle_{\phi_{|2}}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2). \end{aligned} \quad (8.16)$$

The f -dependence in this expression creeps in through the dependence on $\Delta\tau$. Also note that by taking the expectation value in the state (8.10), the result is in fact not dependent on τ_2 .

Given expressions (8.12) and (8.16) we can discuss the two sources of entropy relativity in more detail:

1. $\alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$: in the limit that $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, with $\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\sigma_2\|$ fixed, we have that $|f\rangle_2$ (8.8) becomes a pure clock state with constant modulus. The density operator $\rho_{\phi_{|2}}$ (8.7) then becomes of the same form as $\rho_{\phi_{|1}}$ (8.6), and the same holds for their respective entropies (8.16) and (8.12). The only difference in entropy in this case then stems from the different fuzzinesses of the clocks. In the case the clocks are non-isomorphic, i.e. $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$, the terms $\log\left(\Pi_{|1}\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}\Pi_{|1}\right)$ and $\log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right)$ functionally differ in the sense that the QFT degrees of freedom are coarse-grained in different ways;
2. $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$: when the clocks are isomorphic, then the projected modular operators will be functionally the same. When we let $|f\rangle_2$ be a superposition $\alpha \neq 0$, the entropy associated to $|\phi_{|2}\rangle$ (8.10) has an extra term proportional to a commutator $i\alpha\langle [\log\left(\Pi_{|2}\Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}\Pi_{|2}\right), H_S] \rangle_{\phi_{|2}}$ (8.15) as a consequence of the different entanglement structure from the product state $|\phi_{|1}\rangle$ (8.2).

In conclusion, by studying the quantum version of Shapiro time delay we exemplified two possible sources for entropy relativity. The first one is the case when the clocks are non-isomorphic, which also shows up at the semiclassical level. For the second one with different entanglement structures in the reduced states, we had to go beyond the semiclassical level and looked at an expansion to first order in a small parameter to see the different entropy contributions.

8.2 Degenerate clocks

Let us now discuss the case in which the two observers, Alice and Bob, occupy the same spacetime region and carry each a degenerate clock described by a Hamiltonian $H_C \propto p^2$, as also considered in [69]. We will illustrate that in this case subsystem relativity also applies across degeneracy sectors when we consider the full patch algebra, i.e. including *all* clocks in their subregion – provided we make an operational restriction as described in Sec. 5.1.3. We thus have a constraint of the form

$$H = H_S + \frac{p_A^2}{2m_A} + \frac{p_B^2}{2m_B} - H_3, \quad (8.17)$$

where H_3 is a non-degenerate, non-ideal clock and the minus sign reflects the opposite time direction in the complementary region, in which we assume clock C_3 to be located.

As explained in Secs. 5.1.2 and 5.1.5, the physical Hilbert space decomposes into a direct sum of degeneracy sectors. Since Alice's clock C_A and Bob's clock C_B are both doubly degenerate, having each a positive and negative frequency sector, the physical Hilbert space consists of four sectors

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} = \mathcal{H}_{++} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{+-} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{-+} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{--}, \quad (8.18)$$

where the first label refers to the sector of C_A and the second one to that of C_B . Starting with a physical state $|\Phi\rangle$, this can be reduced to either observer's perspective in one of the four sectors through the PW reduction maps $\mathcal{R}_i^{\lambda\lambda'}(\tau)$ leading to four states $|\phi_{|i}^{\lambda\lambda'}\rangle$. QRF transformations are then performed within one sector overlap, i.e. $V_{i,\lambda\rightarrow j,\lambda'}(\tau_i, \tau_j)$ within $\Lambda_R = \lambda\lambda'$ (cf. Sec. 5.1.5).

For the algebras, we will consider the case where $R = \{C_A, C_B\}$ and $R^c = \{C_3\}$ where each observer only has access to the full +-sector of their own clock R_i , $i = A, B$, which means they have access to the parts of both sectors of the other clock $R_{\bar{i}}$ that overlap with their own +-sector. Thus, we will operationally restrict the gauge-invariant algebras associated to each observer and it is quite common to only permit one frequency sector each. Namely, we impose that each observer only has access to their clock's positive frequency/right moving modes and does not have access to the degeneracy sector swap operators in $\bigotimes_{C_j \in R} \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^{m_j})$ for neither of the clocks; this restriction thus entails an operational superselection that may be justified in different ways, as we described in Sec. 5.1.3. We emphasize that this is not a necessary restriction, but we want to see what the repercussions for entropy relativity are.

In this case, the operationally restricted gauge-invariant algebras can be written as a direct sum over the superselection sectors, as in Eq. (5.40). They are of the form

$$\mathcal{A}_A = \mathcal{A}_{SR,++}^H \oplus \mathcal{A}_{SR,+ -}^H, \quad \mathcal{A}_B = \mathcal{A}_{SR,++}^H \oplus \mathcal{A}_{SR,- +}^H. \quad (8.19)$$

With this decomposition of the algebra, the entropy can then be calculated according to (5.48) by looking at the contributions per sector $S^{\Lambda_R}[\phi]$. Notice that we are dealing with an algebra of type Π_∞ because we have more than one clock in R (4.22) despite the clock spectra being bounded from below $\sigma_A = \sigma_B = \mathbb{R}_+$. Our above assumption also means that Alice and Bob do not have access to the identity component $\mathbb{C}I_{\lambda\lambda'}$ on the remaining sectors, as otherwise they could rescale states and observables there. This has important consequences for the probabilities p^{Λ_R} in (5.48) which will have to be reinterpreted as conditional probabilities, as we explain below.

The algebras on the physical level are then obtained by acting with $r(\cdot)$ which is ensured to be faithful since R^c is non-empty, containing clock C_3 , cf. Sec. 2.8. Density matrices and entropies are to be computed per sector, as explained in Sec. 5.2.2, in the same way as the nondegenerate case. Note that the nontrivial overlap between both only consists of one overlap sector

$$r(\mathcal{A}_A) \cap r(\mathcal{A}_B) = r(\mathcal{A}_{SR,++}^H). \quad (8.20)$$

This situation thus differs from the gravitational interferometer example in Sec. 8.1, where R contained only one clock for each observer's perspective and the overlap between the two happened to be trivial (when H_S has an ergodic action, see Eq. (2.61)), unlike here.

As a consequence, Alice and Bob can only meaningfully compare states/observables on this overlap. The density matrix ρ_ϕ will have a part ρ_ϕ^{++} that lies in this algebra and can be probed by both Alice and Bob. While the two will use distinct observables from $r(\mathcal{A}_{SR,++}^H)$ to probe this state, their description of it will be related by a unitary QRF transformation $V_{A,+ \rightarrow B,+}(\tau_A, \tau_B)$, and so the entropy contribution of the ++-sector will be the same for both observers

$$S_A^{++}[\phi] = S_B^{++}[\phi]. \quad (8.21)$$

The situation changes on the other halves of their respective algebras. Alice will be able to access the ρ_ϕ^{+-} part of the full density matrix whilst Bob will have access to ρ_ϕ^{-+} . There is no a priori reason for these density matrices to be the same or even lead to the same entropies. It is easy to engineer setups in which this is indeed true, such that

$$S_A^{+-}[\phi] \neq S_B^{-+}[\phi]. \quad (8.22)$$

Thence, this case of observer dependence is sourced by what we may call subsystem relativity across the degeneracy sectors, cf. Sec. 5.1.6. The easiest example of such an engineered setup is if one chooses C_3 to be nearly ideal, just as we did for the interferometer Eqs. (8.6, 8.7), and picks reduced states of the form

$$|\phi_i^{\Lambda_R}\rangle \propto \Pi_i(|\phi_S^{\Lambda_R}\rangle \otimes |\tau_i\rangle \otimes |\tau_3\rangle), \quad \Lambda_R \in \{+-, -+\}. \quad (8.23)$$

Recall that an ideal clock C_3 is not necessarily an entirely unreasonable assumption, as the ADM boundary Hamiltonian (for second-order metric perturbations) is the Hamiltonian of an ideal clock as mentioned in Sec. 3.1. As C_3 is, by assumption, in the causal complement of the current region of interest, we may thus simply assume that the complementary region is one with an asymptotic boundary such that C_3 is an ADM boundary clock.

The states (8.23) can be mapped back to the gauge-invariant level through the inverse PW-reduction maps (5.46). For this simple state it can be shown that $S^{\Lambda_R}[\phi]$ only depends on the chosen QFT-state $|\phi_S^{\Lambda_R}\rangle$. To have a different entropy one just chooses a QFT-state with differing properties in the distinct sector overlaps, $|\phi_S^{+-}\rangle \neq |\phi_S^{-+}\rangle$.

Finally, let us consider the coefficients p^{Λ_R} in (5.48). Since Alice and Bob both only have access to two out of four sectors, they can only access two out of four coefficients through (5.43). These probabilities can only be probed ‘relative to their existence’, so they will rather be conditional probabilities $p_i^{\Lambda_R}$ instead. By this we mean that, for example, Alice needs to renormalize as

$$p_A^{\Lambda_R} = \frac{p^{\Lambda_R}}{p^{++} + p^{+-}}, \quad \Lambda_R \in \{++, +-\}, \quad (8.24)$$

with the p^{Λ_R} from (5.43). These are the conditional probabilities relative to Alice and Bob and should be thought of as what they would measure, given what they have access to by assumption. They will generally differ per observer: $\{p_A^{++}, p_A^{+-}\}$ for Alice and $\{p_B^{++}, p_B^{-+}\}$ for Bob. Even though they both have full access to the $++$ -sector, their conditional probabilities need not be equal $p_A^{++} \neq p_B^{++}$ since the weights given by the other sector need not be equal $p_A^{+-} \neq p_B^{-+}$ either, and for most global states will not be. This leads to additional operational differences in the entropy (5.48): the conditional Shannon entropy, the first contribution, will be different because their conditional probability distributions will generally differ. There will also be a difference in the second piece of (5.48), where the entropy contributions per sector are multiplied by these conditional probabilities. Hence, the last piece can be reinterpreted as a conditional expectation value of the overall von Neumann entropy of the state accessible to either observer.

This examples serves to illustrate that there can be several sources of entropy relativity, depending on the exact operational assumptions to which we subject the different observers with clocks.

8.3 Semiclassical vs. non-semiclassical clocks

It is entirely possible in a given state for a semiclassical regime to apply to one clock, but not to another; indeed it could be that an antisemiclassical regime applies to the other clock. One would have to apply two different entropy formulas for the two clocks (one would be the generalised entropy (6.40), and the other would be (7.18)), and the two formulas would not agree with each other. Indeed, the generalised entropy clearly depends on the state of the fields, whereas (7.19) does not.

Let us now give a slightly more explicit demonstration of this phenomenon. Consider a system with three ideal clocks C_1, C_2, C_3 , and suppose the state $|\phi\rangle$ in the perspective of clock C_3 is a product state of a QFT state $|\phi_S\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S$, and clock states $|\phi_1\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $|\phi_2\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2$:

$$|\phi_3(0)\rangle = |\phi_S\rangle \otimes |\phi_1\rangle \otimes |\phi_2\rangle. \quad (8.25)$$

The variances of the Hamiltonians H_S, H_1, H_2 may be computed in this state as the variances in the respective factors $|\phi_S\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, |\phi_2\rangle$:

$$(\Delta H_S)^2 = \left\langle (H_S - \langle H_S \rangle_{\phi_S})^2 \right\rangle_{\phi_S}, \quad (8.26)$$

$$(\Delta H_1)^2 = \left\langle (H_1 - \langle H_1 \rangle_{\phi_1})^2 \right\rangle_{\phi_1}, \quad (8.27)$$

$$(\Delta H_2)^2 = \left\langle (H_2 - \langle H_2 \rangle_{\phi_2})^2 \right\rangle_{\phi_2}. \quad (8.28)$$

Now, let us choose these states such that

$$(\Delta H_2)^2 \ll \beta^{-2}, \quad (\Delta H_S)^2 \ll (\Delta H_1)^2. \quad (8.29)$$

This is of course possible, because the spectra of each of H_S, H_1, H_2 are unbounded above and below. Moreover, these imply that a semiclassical regime applies to clock C_1 , but an antisemiclassical regime applies to clock C_2 , as required.

8.4 Periodic vs. monotonic clocks

In this paper we have so far considered only *monotonic* clocks, i.e. those which record distinct times for any value of \mathbb{R} . We shall now briefly consider instead *periodic* clocks, i.e. those with times cyclically evolving through some finite interval $[0, t_{\max})$. Such clocks were thoroughly investigated in [70], and below we shall quickly review some of the relevant details.

A periodic clock C_{per} is not a complete reference frame for a full group \mathbb{R} of time evolutions. Rather, it can only be used to fix the gauge up to some discrete subgroup \mathbb{Z} generated by evolution in time by the amount t_{\max} . As such, the periodic clock is a QRF for the quotient group $U(1) = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Its Hamiltonian $H_{C_{\text{per}}}$ is the quantisation of the generator of a representation of $U(1)$, and so must have a discrete spectrum of eigenvalues, which may be written in the form

$$\sigma_{C_{\text{per}}} = \left\{ \omega \left(n_\mu + \frac{\varphi}{2\pi} \right) \mid n_\mu \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}, \quad (8.30)$$

where $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega = \frac{2\pi}{t_{\max}}$, and μ ranges over some finite or infinite set of labels. A non-trivial phase φ means that the clock transforms under a *projective* unitary representation of $U(1)$, since we have $e^{-iH_{C_{\text{per}}}t_{\max}} = e^{-i\varphi}$. For simplicity, let us restrict to the case where $\varphi = 0$, so that the representation is genuinely unitary (this restriction may be relaxed as described in [70]). We shall also assume without loss of generality that $t = t_{\max}$ is the smallest non-zero value for which $e^{-iH_{C_{\text{per}}}t} = 1$, which in terms of the spectrum means that the $\{n_\mu\}$ are coprime. As a further simplifying assumption, we take the spectrum to be non-degenerate, so that the Hilbert space of C_{per} is $\mathcal{H}_{C_{\text{per}}} = L^2(\sigma_{C_{\text{per}}})$.

As in the monotonic case, one may then define clock states as follows (setting the arbitrary phase, as in Eq. (2.1), to $g(\epsilon_\mu) = 0$):

$$|t\rangle_{\text{per}} = \sum_{\epsilon_\mu \in \sigma_{C_{\text{per}}}} e^{-i\epsilon_\mu t} |\epsilon_\mu\rangle, \quad (8.31)$$

where $|\epsilon_\mu\rangle$ is the $H_{C_{\text{per}}} = \epsilon_\mu$ eigenstate. We have $e^{-iH_{C_{\text{per}}}t'} |t\rangle_{\text{per}} = |t+t'\rangle_{\text{per}}$ and $|t\rangle_{\text{per}} = |t+t_{\max}\rangle_{\text{per}}$. These states form a resolution of the identity

$$\mathbb{1} = \frac{1}{t_{\max}} \int_0^{t_{\max}} dt |t\rangle\langle t|_{\text{per}}, \quad (8.32)$$

thus furnishing a $U(1)$ -covariant clock POVM. A general operator acting on the fields and the periodic clock, i.e. an $a \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{C_{\text{per}}})$, may be written in the form

$$a = \frac{1}{t_{\text{max}}} \int_0^{t_{\text{max}}} dt a(t, t') \otimes |t'\rangle\langle t'|_{\text{per}}, \quad a(t, t') \in \mathcal{A}_S. \quad (8.33)$$

Much of the discussion then proceeds similarly to the case of the monotonic clock; we refer the reader to [70] for more details.

Let us in particular give an outline of some relevant properties of the invariant subalgebra $(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{C_{\text{per}}}))^{H_S + H_{C_{\text{per}}}}$. It is instructive to note that we can construct this subalgebra in three steps. First, we can impose invariance under the group \mathbb{Z} of evolutions by integer multiples of t_{max} . Since the clock is invariant under this group, we can restrict our attention to the QFT, for which we go to the subalgebra

$$\mathcal{A}_S^{t_{\text{max}}} := (\mathcal{A}_S)^{e^{-iH_S t_{\text{max}}}} \subset \mathcal{A}_S, \quad (8.34)$$

As a second step, we can take the crossed product of $\mathcal{A}_S^{t_{\text{max}}}$ with its modular flow. To this end, let us for the moment assume that C_{per} is an *ideal* periodic clock, which means that we allow all $n_\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ in Eq. (8.30) with the consequence that $\langle t|t'\rangle_{\text{per}} \propto \delta(t - t')$ and $\mathcal{H}_{C_{\text{per}}} \simeq L^2(U(1))$, as appropriate for a $U(1)$ -crossed product. Indeed, note that now modular flow is a representation of the leftover $U(1) = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ of period t_{max} , so this crossed product may be written $\mathcal{A}^{t_{\text{max}}} \rtimes U(1)$. This algebra is semifinite, because the crossed product makes modular flow inner, and likely Type II.

This crossed product would thus correspond to employing a periodic clock whose spectrum is given by $\omega\mathbb{Z}$. The third step in the construction of $(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{C_{\text{per}}}))^{H_S + H_{C_{\text{per}}}}$ is therefore to project the spectrum of the clock down to $\sigma_{C_{\text{per}}} \subseteq \omega\mathbb{Z}$ (analogous to the projection onto the spectrum employed when considering non-ideal monotonic clocks).

One should then also represent this on a physical Hilbert space (which may be constructed as demonstrated in [70]). For reasons that are essentially analogous to the case of a monotonic clock explained earlier (and so whose details we skip), one would end up with a normal and faithful (so long as there is at least one other clock in the full system) representation of a Type II_1 (if $\sigma_{C_{\text{per}}}$ is bounded below) or Type II_∞ (if not) von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}_{S C_{\text{per}}}^H$. As such, one can construct density operators and traces by similar formulae to those we have given in this paper for the monotonic case.

Having explained how to generalise the results of the paper to periodic clocks, let us now qualitatively and briefly explain how the entropies will differ when using a periodic clock vs a monotonic clock. The essential point is that in the intermediate algebra $\mathcal{A}^{t_{\text{max}}} \rtimes U(1)$ used in the construction of $\mathcal{A}_{S C_{\text{per}}}^H$, we must restrict to periodic QFT observables before ever involving the clock. This will clearly change the way in which the entropy functional for a monotonic clock depends on the state, relative to that of a monotonic clock. This is a clear source of entropy relativity.

9 Conclusion

The basic idea underlying this paper has been that the apparent importance of QRFs in a rigorous definition of entropy in quantum gravity [17–19, 21–39] leads one to an inevitable conclusion: gravitational entropy is observer-dependent. Our goal has been to explore this phenomenon. We have built upon and given a much more detailed and technical exposition of the methods used in our shorter companion paper [1]. We argued that many parts of the framework [21] introduced coincide with the perspective-neutral framework for QRFs [1, 66–77], which generalises the Page-Wootters formalism [86, 87], and we summarised this coincidence with the informal equation “PW = CLPW”. We considered observers carrying clocks of a more general nature than previously considered, in the sense that they can have degenerate energies, they can be periodic or monotonic, and they can be arbitrarily entangled

with other degrees of freedom. Furthermore, we showed how the entropies of a subregion relative to arbitrarily many clocks reproduces the generalized entropy formula in a semiclassical regime, and we also considered corrections to this regime. We also explored its opposite, the antisemiclassical regime. Finally, we investigated several explicit examples of the phenomenon of observer-dependent entropies, explaining how it can manifest from using different kinds of clocks, but also from using clocks whose states have different properties (such as the degree of their entanglement with other degrees of freedom, or the magnitude of their energy fluctuations).

Our main tools were the perspective-neutral QRF formalism and the mathematical theory of von Neumann algebras. To that end, we have explained how these two frameworks fit together. We have given full, detailed derivations of algebras, traces, density operators, and entropies for the gravitational subsystems defined using quantum clocks.

Before ending, let us speculate on three other possible sources of observer-dependence in the entropy.

First, in this paper we have made the simplifying assumption that the clocks and fields are non-interacting (since we are taking the total Hamiltonian to decompose as a sum of QFT Hamiltonian and clock Hamiltonians). More realistic clocks would have backreact non-negligibly on the fields; depending on the kinds of interactions, one would thus have modified notions of physical subsystems and thus different entropies. Interacting QRFs have not been studied in much detail in the literature (see [77, 106, 108, 109, 133, 171] for some exceptions). It would be interesting to see whether much headway can be made in the gravitational setting, though there are challenges [108, 109, 171, 172].

Next, when considering degenerate clocks, we have for simplicity restricted to the case where the multiplicity of each energy level is independent of the energy. This again will not be the case for more realistic clocks. The first law of thermodynamics relates the energy-dependence of this multiplicity (via the canonical ensemble entropy of the clock) to its *temperature*. Thus, allowing for a non-trivial dependence of this kind could allow one to derive an observer-dependence of the entropy arising from the temperature of the clocks. Again, this would be interesting to investigate.

Finally, in this paper we considered QRFs transforming only under a single gauge transformation – the modular boost of the subregion. We moreover only implemented only the single constraint corresponding to this particular gauge symmetry. We emphasize that we did not give a concrete justification for why this makes sense, although we did discuss it briefly in Sec. 3.1. Of course, the gravitational gauge group is *much* larger than one-dimensional; it is the full spacetime diffeomorphism group. Moreover, observers will typically not just carry clocks – they will also carry other objects such as (for example) rods and Lorentz frames. These will transform non-trivially under other diffeomorphisms, and are required for dressing more complicated field observables. Thus, at some point one will need to address these other gauge symmetries and their corresponding constraints. An intermediate step to the full diffeomorphism group would be to impose constraints generating a larger subgroup than the boost \mathbb{R} considered in this paper. An obvious question is how the setup we have explored can be generalized to crossed products and QRFs for more general locally compact groups, and for more general higher-dimensional symmetry groups as investigated in [54, 66, 162]. See [29] for an application of the perspective-neutral formalism to perturbative quantum gravity with a *two*-dimensional group of diffeomorphisms, which allowed for an extension of the generalized second law beyond the semiclassical regime.

If one is able to carry out this generalization, then a natural expectation would be that the entropy of a subsystem relative to different observers would now continue to be sensitive to the nature of the QRFs carried by those observers. In general, such QRFs transform in a representation of a subgroup of diffeomorphisms. A basic example would be a QRF transforming under $SO(3)$ (which is natural for example in the case of the de Sitter static patch, whose symmetry group is $\mathbb{R} \times SO(3)$, with \mathbb{R} being

the boost). Representations of $SO(3)$ are labeled by their spin j , and it is natural to expect that the entropy depends on the value of the observer spin.

Somewhat related to this, the trajectory of the observer carrying the quantum clock is usually taken as classical in most works on gravitational crossed product algebras. There is an interesting recent development [100], where this setting was generalized to also describing the location of the observers in a quantum manner in three-dimensional de Sitter space. This allows their associated subregions to overlap. Such an expanded description of a quantum observer also constitutes a QRF (with additional degrees of freedom than just the clock) and it would be interesting to extend our observations to that case. We leave investigation of this and related questions to future work.

Acknowledgments

We thank Gonalo Araujo Regado, Wissam Chemissany, smund Folkestad, Laurent Freidel, Elliot Gesteau, Ted Jacobson, Fabio Mele, Federico Piazza, Gautam Satishchandran and Antony Speranza for helpful discussions. This work was supported in part by funding from the Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University. It was also made possible through the support of the ID# 62312 grant from the John Templeton Foundation, as part of the ‘*The Quantum Information Structure of Spacetime*’ Project (QISS) from the John Templeton Foundation. The opinions expressed in this project/publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

A Additional derivations concerning non-ideal clocks

A.1 Fourier transform for non-ideal clocks

While the clock states in Eq. (2.1) need not be orthogonal and the clock energy may not range over the full reals, a Fourier transform still exists [68]. Indeed,

$$|\epsilon\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt e^{-ig(\epsilon)} e^{it\epsilon} |t\rangle \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with overlap

$$\langle\epsilon|t\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{ig(\epsilon)} e^{-it\epsilon}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Hence, for a state $|\psi\rangle$ with wave function $\psi(t)$

$$|\psi\rangle = \int dt \psi(t) |t\rangle \quad (\text{A.3})$$

we get by making use of (2.6) that

$$\tilde{\psi}(\epsilon) := \langle\epsilon|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt e^{ig(\epsilon)} e^{-it\epsilon} \psi(t). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Conversely, the inverse Fourier transformation returns a “filtered version” of the function $\psi(t)$, with energy support only on the spectrum, which describes an equivalent state on the clock Hilbert space.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\psi}(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon e^{-ig(\epsilon)} e^{it\epsilon} \tilde{\psi}(\epsilon) = \int dt' \psi(t') \langle t|t'\rangle, \\ \int dt \bar{\psi}(t) |t\rangle &= \int dt \psi(t) |t\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

A.2 Algebra of gauge-invariant clock-system observables

Here, we prove Eq. (2.11) from Sec. 2.2, i.e. that the algebra of gauge-invariant clock-system observables is comprised of relational observables, describing S relative to C , and reorientations of C :

$$(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C))^H = \langle O_C^\tau(a), I_S \otimes U_C(t) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S, t \in \mathbb{R} \rangle. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

To this end, consider any $O \in (\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C))^H$ and consider its ‘partial matrix elements’ in the clock states Eq. (2.1)

$$O(t, t') := \langle t \mid O \mid t' \rangle. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Gauge invariance, i.e. $[U_{SC}(t), O] = 0$ for all t , implies

$$O(t, t') = U_S(t) O(0, t' - t) U_S^\dagger(t). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Since any such $O(0, t' - t)$ can be written as a linear combination (or integral) of objects of the form $f(t' - t)a$, where $f(t)$ is some function and $a \in \mathcal{A}_S$, we have that a basis for such partial matrix elements is given by

$$\{O_{\tilde{t}, a}(t, t') = \chi(t + \tilde{t} - t') U_S(t) a U_S^\dagger(\tilde{t}) \mid \tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}, a \in \mathcal{A}_S\}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where $\chi(t)$ is the clock state overlap distribution in Eq. (2.7). To see this, consider an arbitrary function $f(t)$ and recall the Fourier transforms in appendix A.1, setting $g(\epsilon) = 0$ for simplicity,

$$\begin{aligned} f(t' - t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon e^{i(t' - t)\epsilon} \tilde{f}(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\tilde{t} e^{i(t' - t - \tilde{t})\epsilon} f(\tilde{t}) \\ &\stackrel{(2.6)}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\tilde{t} \chi(t' - t - \tilde{t}) f(\tilde{t}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Now integrating the basis elements and recalling Eq. (2.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt dt' O_{\tilde{t}, a}(t, t') \mid t \rangle \langle t' \mid &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt dt' \langle t + \tilde{t} \mid t' \rangle \mid t \rangle \langle t' \mid \otimes U_S(t) a U_S^\dagger(t) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \mid t \rangle \langle t + \tilde{t} \mid \otimes U_S(t) a U_S^\dagger(t) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} dt' \mid t' \rangle \langle t' \mid \otimes I_S \right) \\ &\stackrel{(2.12)}{=} O_C^{\tau=0}(a) \left(U_C^\dagger(\tilde{t}) \otimes I_S \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where we made use of the clock state covariance (2.2) in the last line. This suffices for the claim since

$$O_C^\tau(a) = (I_S \otimes U_C(\tau)) O_C^0(a) \left(U_C^\dagger(\tau) \otimes I_S \right), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

i.e. clock reorientations change the τ label at which the relational observable is evaluated.

Next, we prove the statement in Sec. 2.2 that if \mathcal{A}_S is a von Neumann algebra, then so is the gauge-invariant clock-system algebra $(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C))^H$. We begin with the case that \mathcal{H}_C features a non-degenerate spectrum. We can then extend the clock to an auxiliary ideal clock if it is not already ideal. We extend the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_C to a new Hilbert space $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_C = \mathcal{H}_C \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\text{add}}$ by adding all the missing energy eigenstates to extend σ_C over the full real line. In particular, by spectral decomposition, we extend the clock Hamiltonian to a new operator \tilde{H}_C on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_C$ which has a nondegenerate spectrum covering all of \mathbb{R} . At this stage the clock is ideal and we have $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_C \simeq L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Extending the constraint to the extended kinematical Hilbert space $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{kin}} := \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_S$, $H \rightarrow \tilde{H}_C + H_S$, the gauge-invariant algebra becomes a crossed product of \mathcal{A}_S by the translation group generated by the system Hamiltonian H_S :

$$(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R})_C))^{\tilde{H}_C + H_S} = \mathcal{A}_S \rtimes_{U_S} \mathbb{R} = \left\langle e^{-i\tilde{T}H_S} a e^{i\tilde{T}H_S}, e^{-it\tilde{H}_C} \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_S, t \in \mathbb{R} \right\rangle'', \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where \tilde{T} is the self-adjoint operator conjugate to \tilde{H}_C on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_C$. This is a von Neumann algebra when \mathcal{A}_S is one (e.g., see the appendices of [21, 24] for a summary of crossed products). The crossed product is not necessarily a factor, even if \mathcal{A}_S is. However, it is one when \mathcal{A}_S is a type III₁ factor and H_S is the modular Hamiltonian associated with a cyclic and separating vector in \mathcal{H}_S for \mathcal{A}_S . In this case, the crossed product is a von Neumann factor of type II_∞, hence possesses a trace, but not all operators are trace class (e.g., see [11] for an accessible review).

To show that also the gauge-invariant clock-system algebra for the original clock Hamiltonian is a von Neumann algebra, we first note that $H_C = \tilde{\Pi}_{|C} \tilde{H}_C$, where $\tilde{\Pi}_{|C}$ is the orthogonal projector on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_C$ onto its subspace \mathcal{H}_C . When σ_C is just an interval, it is given by $\tilde{\Pi}_{|C} := \Theta(\epsilon_{\max} - \tilde{H}_C)\Theta(\tilde{H}_C - \epsilon_{\min})$, where $\epsilon_{\max/\min}$ are the spectral limits of the original H_C ; otherwise, it is given by a sum over such products of theta functions over the respective intervals. Since the extended clock reorientations $e^{-it\tilde{H}_C}$ constitute a basis of bounded functions of \tilde{H}_C , we have that $\tilde{\Pi}_{|C}$ is contained in the crossed product algebra in Eq. (A.13).

Next, we note that the clock states of the two Hamiltonians according to Eq. (2.1) are related by $|\tau\rangle = \tilde{\Pi}_{|C} |\tilde{\tau}\rangle$. Hence,

$$O_C^0(a) = \tilde{\Pi}_{|C} \left(e^{-i\tilde{T}H_S} a e^{i\tilde{T}H_S} \right) \tilde{\Pi}_{|C}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

For the original gauge-invariant clock-system algebra, we thus have that it is a subalgebra of the crossed product

$$(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C))^H = \tilde{\Pi}_{|C} (\mathcal{A}_S \rtimes_{U_S} \mathbb{R}) \tilde{\Pi}_{|C}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

In general, $\Pi\mathcal{A}\Pi$ is a von Neumann algebra if \mathcal{A} is a von Neumann algebra containing the projection Π [165, statement EP7, p. 21]; $\Pi\mathcal{A}\Pi$ is further a factor, if \mathcal{A} is [21, footnote 7]. This proves the claim. In particular, if \mathcal{A}_S is a type III₁ factor and H_S an associated modular Hamiltonian, then $(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C))^H$ is a type II factor. We emphasize that the von Neumann structure is at this stage defined in terms of the kinematical Hilbert space. In Sec. 2.8, we explore the von Neumann nature of the action of these algebras on the physical Hilbert space.

The case when H_C has a degenerate spectrum, but the degeneracy is energy-independent (except possibly in a set of measure zero) follows from this and is discussed in Sec. 5.1.3; when there is also an operational superselection, $(\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C))^H$ is then still a von Neumann algebra when \mathcal{A}_S is, but decomposes across degeneracy sectors and can thus not be a factor.

A.3 Bounded physical operators from bounded kinematical ones

In this appendix, we use the reduction theorem

$$\mathcal{R}_C(\tau) \mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a) \mathcal{R}_C^{-1}(\tau) = \Pi_{|C} a \Pi_{|C}, \quad a \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_S) \quad (\text{A.16})$$

from [68] in Eqs. (2.43) and (2.44) to briefly prove the statement in Sec. 2.5.2 that every element in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}})$ can be obtained from an element in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})$ via the relational observable construction in Eq. (2.12) and that this relational observable is also bounded, hence an element of $(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}))^H$. Relational observables are thus complete on the physical Hilbert space.

We begin with the case that H_C is non-degenerate. Since $\mathcal{R}_C(\tau)$ is unitary and $\Pi_{|C}$ is bounded, we have that $r(\mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a)) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}})$ if and only if $a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$, where we recall that r is the representation of \mathcal{A}_{inv} on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. Similarly, $I_C \otimes a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})$ if and only if $a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$. We will now also demonstrate that $\mathcal{O}_C^\tau(a) \in (\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}))^H$ if and only if $a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$. To see this, we again extend C to an auxiliary ideal clock if it is not already ideal, as in appendix A.2. On the extended kinematical Hilbert space $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{kin}}$ we can then write, as in Eq. (A.14),

$$O_C^\tau(a) = \tilde{\Pi}_{|C} \left(e^{-i(\tilde{T}-\tau)H_S} a e^{i(\tilde{T}-\tau)H_S} \right) \tilde{\Pi}_{|C}. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Since $e^{-i(\tilde{T}-\tau)H_S}$ is unitary on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{kin}}$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{|C}$ is bounded, we see that $O_C^\tau(a) \in \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{kin}})$ if and only if a is bounded. But if $O_C^\tau(a)$ is bounded on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{kin}}$, it clearly is also bounded in the subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \tilde{\Pi}_{|C}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{kin}})$ on which it has support. Since the argument holds for any $a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$ and since the unitarity of \mathcal{R}_C entails $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}) \simeq \Pi_{|C}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)\Pi_{|C}$, this proves the claim.

In the case of a clock with energy-independent H_C -degeneracy (except possibly in a set of measure zero), this argument holds per λ -superselection sector, cf. Sec. 5.1.2.

A.4 Reduced Hilbert space decomposition for non-ideal clocks

Here, we explain the decomposition in Eq. (2.58) of the main text, establishing that nonideal clocks induce a direct sum/integral of TPSs on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$.

Consider the projector $\Pi_{|1}$ in Eq. (2.51). It restricts the eigenvalues of $H_2 + H_S$ on the physical Hilbert space to

$$-\epsilon_1^{\max} \leq E_S + E_2 \leq -\epsilon_1^{\min}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Let us first investigate which system energies are compatible with *any* eigenvalue of H_2 . Employing the extrema of σ_2 in the bounds (A.18) implies that for system energies in the range

$$-\epsilon_1^{\max} - \epsilon_2^{\min} \leq E_S \leq -\epsilon_1^{\min} - \epsilon_2^{\max}, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

any eigenvalue of H_2 can occur and remain consistent the constraint. This range is nonempty if σ_1 contains σ_2 . Denoting by Π_S the projector onto this energy range, we have that the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_{C_2} \otimes \Pi_S(\mathcal{H}_S)$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{|1}$.

Next, let us consider the energy range

$$-\epsilon_1^{\min} - \epsilon_2^{\max} < E_S \leq -\epsilon_1^{\min} - \epsilon_2^{\min}. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

System energies cannot be larger than the upper bound on the right while still satisfying $E_S + E_2 \in -\sigma_1$ for *some* $E_2 \in \sigma_2$. For any fixed E_S , the compatible C_2 energies are

$$\epsilon_2^{\min} \leq E_2 \leq -\epsilon_1^{\min} - E_S. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

For any E_S in the range (A.19), this imposes no restriction on E_2 . However, for E_S in the range (A.20) this is different. Parametrizing such system energies as $E_S = -\epsilon_1^{\min} - \epsilon_2^{\max} + \delta$ with $0 < \delta \leq +\epsilon_2^{\max} - \epsilon_2^{\min}$, Eq. (A.21) entails

$$\epsilon_2^{\min} \leq E_2 \leq \epsilon_2^{\max} - \delta, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

and so the admissible C_2 energies becomes squashed from above in an E_S -dependent manner. Assuming $\sigma_S := \text{Spec}(H_S)$ to be purely continuous, we can thus write these contributions to $\mathcal{H}_{|1}$ as

$$\mathcal{H}_{SC_2}^+ := \int_{-\epsilon_1^{\min} - \epsilon_2^{\max}}^{-\epsilon_1^{\min} - \epsilon_2^{\min}} dE_S \Pi_{C_2}^{[\epsilon_2^{\min}, -\epsilon_1^{\min} - E_S]} (\mathcal{H}_{C_2}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_S^{E_S}, \quad (\text{A.23})$$

where $\Pi_{C_2}^{[\epsilon_2^{\min}, -\epsilon_1^{\min} - E_S]}$ is the projector onto the subspace of \mathcal{H}_{C_2} compatible with Eq. (A.21) and $\mathcal{H}_S^{E_S}$ is the improper subspace spanned by states with fixed energy E_S . When H_S is degenerate, as will typically be the case for modular Hamiltonians of QFTs with multiple species, the tensor product under the integral will be nontrivial. Hence, $\mathcal{H}_{SC_2}^+$ is a direct integral of TPSs. When σ_S is discrete, this will turn into a direct sum instead.

Similarly, one treats system energies in the range

$$-\epsilon_1^{\max} - \epsilon_2^{\max} \leq E_S < -\epsilon_1^{\max} - \epsilon_2^{\min}, \quad (\text{A.24})$$

resulting in another direct integral/sum of TPSs

$$\mathcal{H}_{SC_2}^- := \int_{-\epsilon_1^{\max} - \epsilon_2^{\max}}^{-\epsilon_1^{\max} - \epsilon_2^{\min}} dE_S \Pi_{C_2}^{[-\epsilon_1^{\max} - E_S, \epsilon_2^{\max}]} (\mathcal{H}_{C_2}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_S^{E_S}. \quad (\text{A.25})$$

This establishes the decomposition in Eq. (2.58).

B Constraint implementation via the T -map

Here we briefly check that the T -map in Eq. (3.17) implements the constraint Eq. (3.1) (with relative minus sign between the clock Hamiltonians as in Eq. (3.11)) also for non-ideal clocks as used in the main body ([21, Sec. 4.2] used ideal clocks in their implementation).

We have

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 H |\psi\rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt e^{-it(H_S + H_1)} |H\psi(t)\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt e^{-it(H_S + H_1)} ((H_S + H_1) |\psi(t)\rangle - |H_2\psi(t)\rangle) \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt e^{-it(H_S + H_1)} (i\partial_t |\psi(t)\rangle + |H_2\psi(t)\rangle), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where we used partial integration and that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} |\psi(t)\rangle = 0$, coming from $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$ being square integrable. Now

$$|H_2\psi(t)\rangle = \langle t | H_2 |\psi\rangle = -i\partial_t |\psi(t)\rangle, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where we invoked Eq. (2.1). Hence, reduced states solve the constraint in the sense that

$$T_2 H |\psi\rangle = 0, \quad \forall |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

C Details of derivation of density operator

We first demonstrate that

$$S_{\psi_{R_i}}(|\varphi\rangle \otimes \langle\zeta|) = e^{\beta H_{R_i}/2} |\zeta\rangle \otimes \langle\varphi| e^{-\beta H_{R_i}/2}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

is the Tomita operator of $|\psi_{R_i}\rangle$. For any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$, one has

$$S_{\psi_{R_i}} A |\psi_{R_i}\rangle = S_{\psi_{R_i}} A \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} \int_{\sigma_j} d\epsilon_j |\epsilon_j\rangle \otimes \langle\epsilon_j| e^{-\beta H_{R_i}/2} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

$$= \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} \int_{\sigma_j} d\epsilon_j |\epsilon_j\rangle \otimes \langle\epsilon_j| A^\dagger e^{-\beta H_{R_i}/2} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$= \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} \int_{\sigma_j} d\epsilon_j \int_{\sigma_j} d\epsilon'_j |\epsilon_j\rangle \otimes \langle\epsilon_j| A^\dagger |\epsilon'_j\rangle \langle\epsilon'_j| e^{-\beta H_{R_i}/2} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

$$= \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} \int_{\sigma_j} d\epsilon_j \int_{\sigma_j} d\epsilon'_j |\epsilon_j\rangle \langle\epsilon_j| A^\dagger |\epsilon'_j\rangle \otimes \langle\epsilon'_j| e^{-\beta H_{R_i}/2} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

$$= \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} \int_{\sigma_j} d\epsilon'_j A^\dagger |\epsilon'_j\rangle \otimes \langle\epsilon'_j| e^{-\beta H_{R_i}/2} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

$$= A^\dagger |\psi_{R_i}\rangle, \quad (\text{C.7})$$

as required.

Next, let us show that the state $|\Psi\rangle$ defined in (4.12) is separating for the algebra \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H . Consider the map

$$\gamma : \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} (\mathcal{H}_j \otimes \mathcal{H}_j^*) \otimes \mathcal{H}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \bigotimes_{C_j \in R_i} (\mathcal{H}_j \otimes \mathcal{H}_j^*) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i) \quad (\text{C.8})$$

defined by

$$\gamma : |\alpha\rangle \mapsto \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*} + H_i)t\right) |\alpha\rangle \langle t|_i e^{\beta H_i/2}, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

where $H_{R_i} = \sum_{C_j \in R_i} H_j$, and the $*$ in $H_{R_i^*}$ denotes that it is the same operator but acting on the second copy of the frames R_i , i.e. on \mathcal{H}_j^* . Then one may confirm, using the resolution of the identity in terms of the clock states $|t\rangle_i$, and the fact that $(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*}) |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle = 0$,

$$\gamma A |\Psi\rangle = A(|\psi_{SR_i}\rangle \otimes \mathbb{1}_{C_i}), \quad (\text{C.10})$$

Since $|\psi_{SR_i}\rangle$ is separating, we can have $\gamma A |\Psi\rangle = 0$ only if $A = 0$, which implies $|\Psi\rangle$ is separating.

Let us also show that the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is cyclic over the image $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{SR_i R_i^* C_i}$ of the projection operator $\tilde{\Pi}$ defined in (4.14). Consider a general operator in the algebra, which may be written in the form

$$A = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt U_i(t) O_i^0(a(t)) e^{\beta H_i/2} \in \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H, \quad (\text{C.11})$$

with $a : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$. Then we have

$$A |\Psi\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{-iH\tau} a(t) \otimes |t\rangle_i \langle 0|_i e^{iH\tau} |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_i \quad (\text{C.12})$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*} + H_i)\tau\right) \langle \tau|0\rangle_i a(t) |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle \otimes |t\rangle_i \quad (\text{C.13})$$

$$= \tilde{\Pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt a(t) |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle \otimes |t\rangle_i, \quad (\text{C.14})$$

where in the second line we used $\langle 0|_i e^{iH\tau} |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle = \langle \tau|_i e^{iH_{R_i^*}\tau} |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle$ since $(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*}) |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle = 0$. Since $|\psi_{SR_i}\rangle$ is cyclic for $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$, we can vary over all states in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{SR_i R_i^* C_i}$ in this way, so $|\Psi\rangle$ is cyclic over this subspace.

Next, we demonstrate that (4.15) is the Tomita operator of $|\Psi\rangle$:

$$S_{\Psi} A |\Psi\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{\beta H_i/2} |t\rangle_i \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})t\right) S_{\psi_{SR_i}} \langle -t|_i e^{-\beta H_i/2} A e^{-\beta H_i/2} |0\rangle_i |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle \quad (\text{C.15})$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{\beta H_i/2} |t\rangle_i \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})t\right) \langle 0|_i e^{-\beta H_i/2} A^\dagger e^{-\beta H_i/2} |-t\rangle_i |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle \quad (\text{C.16})$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{\beta H_i/2} |t\rangle_i \langle t|_i e^{-\beta H_i/2} A^\dagger e^{-\beta H_i/2} |0\rangle_i |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle \quad (\text{C.17})$$

$$= A^\dagger |\Psi\rangle, \quad (\text{C.18})$$

as required. We then have the modular operator

$$\Delta_{\Psi} = S_{\Psi}^\dagger S_{\Psi} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' e^{-\beta H_i/2} |-t\rangle_i S_{\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger \quad (\text{C.20})$$

$$\exp\left(i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})(t - t')\right) \langle t|_i e^{\beta H_i} |t'\rangle_i S_{\psi_{SR_i}} \langle -t'|_i e^{-\beta H_i/2} \quad (\text{C.21})$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' e^{-\beta H_i/2} |-t\rangle_i \Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}} \exp\left(i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})(t - t')\right) \langle t'|_i e^{\beta H_i} |t\rangle_i \langle -t'|_i e^{-\beta H_i/2} \quad (\text{C.22})$$

$$= \tilde{\Pi}. \quad (\text{C.23})$$

where in the third line we used that

$$\exp\left(i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})(t - t')\right) S_{\psi_{SR_i}} \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})(t - t')\right) = S_{\psi_{SR_i}}, \quad (\text{C.24})$$

and in the fourth line we changed variables $t \rightarrow t' - t - i\beta$. Thus Δ_Ψ is the identity (on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{SR_i R_i^* C_i}$).

Next, we show that (4.27) is the relative Tomita operator from $|\Psi\rangle$ to a physical state $|\phi\rangle$ with $|\phi|_i(\tau)\rangle = \mathcal{R}_i(\tau)|\phi\rangle$. This may be confirmed as follows:

$$S_{\phi|\Psi} A |\Psi\rangle = \Pi_{\text{phys}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt |t\rangle_i S_{\phi|_i(0)|\psi_{SR_i}} \langle 0|_i A |t\rangle_i |\psi_{SR_i}\rangle \quad (\text{C.25})$$

$$= \Pi_{\text{phys}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt |t\rangle_i \langle t|_i A^\dagger |0\rangle_i |\phi|_i(0)\rangle \quad (\text{C.26})$$

$$= \Pi_{\text{phys}} A^\dagger |\phi|_i(0)\rangle |0\rangle_i \quad (\text{C.27})$$

$$= r(A)^\dagger \Pi_{\text{phys}} |\phi|_i(0)\rangle |0\rangle_i = r(A)^\dagger |\phi\rangle. \quad (\text{C.28})$$

Using the identity

$$\exp\left(-i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t\right) S_{\phi|_i(0)|\psi_{SR_i}} \exp\left(i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})t\right) = S_{\phi|_i(t)|\psi_{SR_i}}, \quad (\text{C.29})$$

we thus have the relative modular operator (naïvely in computing this object we might get a Π_{phys}^2 , but the target space of the relative Tomita operator is the physical Hilbert space, whose inner product we should use when contracting $S_{\phi|\Psi}^\dagger$ with $S_{\phi|\Psi}$ – this removes one factor of Π_{phys} , as described in Sec. 2.2)

$$\Delta_{\phi|\Psi} = S_{\phi|\Psi}^\dagger S_{\phi|\Psi} \quad (\text{C.30})$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \exp\left(i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*} + H_i)(t - i\beta/2)\right) |0\rangle_i S_{\phi|_i(0)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger \langle t|_i \quad (\text{C.31})$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' \exp\left(-i(H_S + \sum_{j=1}^n H_j)t'\right) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt'' |t''\rangle_i S_{\phi|_i(0)|\psi_{SR_i}} \langle 0|_i \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*} + H_i)(t'' + i\beta/2)\right) \\ = e^{\beta H_i/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt'' \exp\left(i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})(t - t')\right) |t\rangle_i \langle t''|_i |t - t'\rangle_i \quad (\text{C.32})$$

$$\Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi|_i(-t')|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi|_i(0)|\psi_{SR_i}} \Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2} \langle -t''|_i \exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})t''\right) e^{\beta H_i/2} \\ = e^{\beta H_i/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \exp\left(i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*} + H_i)t\right) \langle 0|_i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt'' \quad (\text{C.33})$$

$$\exp\left(-i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})t''\right) \Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi|_i(t')|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi|_i(0)|\psi_{SR_i}} \Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2} \\ \otimes e^{-iH_i t'} |t''\rangle_i \langle t''|_i \exp\left(i(H_S + H_{R_i} - H_{R_i^*})t''\right) e^{\beta H_i/2} \\ = \tilde{\Pi} e^{\beta H_i/2} \int dt' e^{-iH_i t'} O_i^0(\Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi|_i(t')|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi|_i(0)|\psi_{SR_i}} \Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2}) e^{\beta H_i/2}. \quad (\text{C.34})$$

In the fourth line we changed variables $t \rightarrow t + t' + t''$, $t' \rightarrow -t'$, and $t'' \rightarrow -t''$. Note that we can get rid of the $\tilde{\Pi}$ at the front, if we treat this as an operator acting on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{SR_i R_i^* C_i}$. To summarise the above, we have

$$\Delta_{\phi|\Psi} = e^{\beta H_i/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{-iH_i t} O_i^\tau(\Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi|_i(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\phi|_i(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \Delta_{\psi_{SR_i}}^{-1/2}) e^{\beta H_i/2}, \quad (\text{C.35})$$

where we have also used covariance of the dressed observable to include an additional τ parametrisation.

We have

$$\Delta_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi_{|i}(t')}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(0)} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle \Delta_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^{-1/2} \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}}), \quad (\text{C.36})$$

which is what justifies writing the term in the integrand above as a dressed observable. To see this, suppose $a, b, c \in \mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}})$. Then

$$\langle \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} | a S_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^{\dagger} S_{\phi_{|i}(t')}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(0)} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} bc | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle \quad (\text{C.37})$$

$$= \langle \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} | bc S_{\phi_{|i}(0)}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(t')} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle a | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle \quad (\text{C.38})$$

$$= \langle \phi_{|i}(t') | abc | \phi_{|i}(0) \rangle \quad (\text{C.39})$$

$$= \langle \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} | ab S_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^{\dagger} S_{\phi_{|i}(t')}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(0)} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} c | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle. \quad (\text{C.40})$$

Since $|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}\rangle$ is cyclic, we may conclude that

$$S_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^{\dagger} S_{\phi_{|i}(t')}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(0)} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} \in (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}}))'. \quad (\text{C.41})$$

But we have

$$\Delta_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^{-1/2} S_{\phi_{|i}(t')}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(0)} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle \Delta_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^{-1/2} = J_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} (S_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^{\dagger} S_{\phi_{|i}(t')}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(0)} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}) J_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}, \quad (\text{C.42})$$

where $J_{\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}$ is the modular conjugation of $|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}\rangle$. Since the modular conjugation gives an isomorphism between the algebra and its commutant, we have (C.36).

Within the perspective of a clock $C_i \in R$, at time τ , the density operator is given by (4.31). We can show this as follows:

$$\rho_{\phi_{|i}}(\tau) = \mathcal{R}_i(\tau) \rho_{\phi} \mathcal{R}_i(\tau)^{\dagger} \quad (\text{C.43})$$

$$= e^{-S_{0,R}} e^{-\beta(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} \quad (\text{C.44})$$

$$= e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_i^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} \Pi_{|i} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle \Pi_{|i}. \quad (\text{C.45})$$

Note that

$$S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle \Pi_{|i} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle e^{-i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t'} \langle 0 | t' \rangle_i \quad (\text{C.46})$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' e^{-i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t'} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t-t')}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\langle t'|0 \rangle_i \phi_{|i}(\tau-t')} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle. \quad (\text{C.47})$$

Using this in the formula for $\rho_{\phi_{|i}}(\tau)$, and changing variables $t \rightarrow t + t'$, we get

$$\rho_{\phi_{|i}}(\tau) = e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_i^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} \Pi_{|i} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle \int dt' S_{\langle t'|0 \rangle_i \phi_{|i}(\tau-t')} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle. \quad (\text{C.48})$$

But

$$\int dt' S_{\langle t'|0 \rangle_i \phi_{|i}(\tau-t')} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle = S_{\Pi_{|i} \phi_{|i}(\tau) | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} = S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau) | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}, \quad (\text{C.49})$$

since $\phi_{|i}(\tau)$ is in the image of $\Pi_{|i}$. So

$$\rho_{\phi_{|i}}(\tau) = \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_i^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)}^{\dagger} | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau) | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}, \quad (\text{C.50})$$

as required.

Finally, suppose we decompose the reduced state $|\phi_{|i}(\tau)\rangle$ as in (4.32). Then one has

$$S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} = \sum_I S_{\phi_S^I(\tau)|\psi_S} \otimes S_{\tilde{\phi}^I(\tau)|\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}}, \quad (\text{C.51})$$

so

$$S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} = \sum_{I,J} S_{\phi_S^I(\tau+t)|\psi_S}^\dagger S_{\phi_S^J(\tau)|\psi_S} \otimes S_{\tilde{\phi}^I(\tau+t)|\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\tilde{\phi}^J(\tau)|\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}} \quad (\text{C.52})$$

Using

$$\langle \psi_{R_{\bar{i}}} | a S_{\tilde{\phi}^I(\tau+t)|\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\tilde{\phi}^J(\tau)|\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}} b | \psi_{R_{\bar{i}}} \rangle = \langle \tilde{\phi}^J(\tau) | ba | \tilde{\phi}^I(\tau+t) \rangle, \quad (\text{C.53})$$

for any $a, b \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}})$, we may identify

$$S_{\tilde{\phi}^I(\tau+t)|\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\tilde{\phi}^J(\tau)|\psi_{R_{\bar{i}}}} = e^{\beta H_{R_{\bar{i}}}^*} \text{tr}_{R^c}(|\tilde{\phi}^I(\tau+t)\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}^J(\tau)|). \quad (\text{C.54})$$

Substituting this into the formula for the density matrix, one has

$$\rho_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)} = \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta H_{R^c}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} \sum_{I,J} S_{\phi_S^I(\tau+t)|\psi_S}^\dagger S_{\phi_S^J(\tau)|\psi_S} \otimes \text{tr}_{R^c}(|\tilde{\phi}^I(\tau+t)\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}^J(\tau)|), \quad (\text{C.55})$$

as reported in the main text, equation (4.33). A related expression will prove useful when the state decomposition between QFT and frame factors is expressed in terms of a continuous parameter instead of a discrete sum:

$$|\phi_{|i}(t)\rangle := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu |\phi_S^\mu(t)\rangle \otimes |\tilde{\phi}_{R_{\bar{i}}R^c}^\mu(t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{|R_i}, \quad (\text{C.56})$$

The direct analogue of equation (C.55) for this state is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\phi_{|i}} &= \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta H_{R^c}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt d\mu d\nu e^{i(H_S + H_{R_{\bar{i}}} + H_{R^c})t} S_{\phi_S^\nu(t)|\psi_S}^\dagger S_{\phi_S^\mu(0)|\psi_S} \\ &\quad \otimes \text{Tr}_{R^c} \left(|\tilde{\phi}_{R_{\bar{i}}R^c}^\nu(t)\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}_{R_{\bar{i}}R^c}^\mu(0)| \right) \\ &= \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta H_{R^c}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu d\nu S_{\phi_S^\nu(0)|\psi_S}^\dagger \\ &\quad \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S - H_{R_{\bar{i}}} - H_{R^c})t} \text{Tr}_{R^c} \left(|\tilde{\phi}_{R_{\bar{i}}R^c}^\mu(0)\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}_{R_{\bar{i}}R^c}^\nu(t)| \right) \right) S_{\phi_S^\mu(0)|\psi_S}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.57})$$

In the second expression we have isolated the t -integral between the relative Tomita operators, which are taken to act as complex conjugation in the energy bases of the frames. Finally, if we are interested in cases where the set $R_{\bar{i}}$ is empty (so that the algebra considered is just the QFT subregion algebra dressed by a single frame), then the trace in the above expression becomes an inner product, and we have

$$\rho_{\phi_{|i}} = \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta H_{R^c}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu d\nu S_{\phi_S^\nu(0)|\psi_S}^\dagger \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S - H_{R^c})t} \langle \tilde{\phi}_{R^c}^\nu(t) | \tilde{\phi}_{R^c}^\mu(0) \rangle \right) S_{\phi_S^\mu(0)|\psi_S}. \quad (\text{C.58})$$

This expression will be referred to in several computations.

D Details of semiclassical approximations

Let us write $\rho_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)} = \Pi_{|i} \tilde{\rho}_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)}$, where

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)} = e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_{\bar{i}}}^*)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

One may confirm that $\tilde{\rho}_{\phi|i}(\tau)$ is Hermitian; since $\rho_{\phi|i}(\tau)$ is also Hermitian, we have

$$\Pi_{|i}\tilde{\rho}_{\phi|i}(\tau) = \rho_{\phi|i}(\tau) = \rho_{\phi|i}(\tau)^\dagger = \tilde{\rho}_{\phi|i}(\tau)\Pi_{|i}, \quad (\text{D.2})$$

so $\tilde{\rho}_{\phi|i}(\tau)$ commutes with $\Pi_{|i}$, and so we may write

$$\log \rho_{\phi|i}(\tau) = \Pi_{|i} \log \tilde{\rho}_{\phi|i}(\tau). \quad (\text{D.3})$$

The entropy of the density matrix may therefore be written

$$S[\phi] = -(\phi | \log \rho_\phi | \phi) = -\langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) | \log \rho_{\phi|i}(\tau) | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle = -\langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) | \log \tilde{\rho}_{\phi|i}(\tau) | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

We will show now that (6.11) holds in the semiclassical regime. First, note that, for any $a, b \in \mathcal{A}_U \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_{\bar{i}}})$, by the definition of the relative Tomita operators, we have

$$\langle \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} | b S_{\phi_{|i}(t+\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} a | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle = (\phi | \mathcal{O}_{C_i}^\tau(ab) V_i(t)^\dagger | \phi), \quad (\text{D.5})$$

so (6.2) implies

$$\left| \langle \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} | b S_{\phi_{|i}(t+\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} a | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle \right| \ll \left| \langle \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} | b S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} a | \psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}} \rangle \right| \quad \text{if } |t| > \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Since $|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}\rangle$ is cyclic, it must be that the operator $S_{\phi_{|i}(t+\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}$ is itself sharply peaked within $|t| < \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. Thus, one may ignore contributions outside of this window in the integral in (D.1). Consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) | (\tilde{\rho}_{\phi|i}(\tau))^n | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) | \left(e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_{\bar{i}}^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} \right)^n | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

By (6.3), for $|t'| < \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-iH_S t'} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} e^{iH_S t'} \\ = S_{e^{-iH_S t'} \phi_{|i}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{e^{-iH_S t'} \phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} \approx S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Since each of the t integrals that appears in (D.7) is peaked around $|t| < \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, we can use this to (approximately) commute all the $e^{iH_S t}$ factors to the right, where we can then use $e^{iH_S t} |\phi_{|i}(\tau)\rangle \approx e^{i\mathcal{E}t} |\phi_{|i}(\tau)\rangle$. We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) | (\tilde{\rho}_{\phi|i}(\tau))^n | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle \\ & \approx \langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) | \left(e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_{\bar{i}}^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(\mathcal{E} + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}} \right)^n | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Moreover, by (6.3), in the window $|t| < \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ we can write $|\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)\rangle \approx e^{-i\mathcal{E}t} |\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)\rangle$, where

$$|\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)\rangle = e^{-i\sum_{j \neq i} H_j t} |\phi_{|i}(\tau)\rangle. \quad (\text{D.10})$$

One therefore has the approximation

$$\langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) | (\tilde{\rho}_{\phi|i}(\tau))^n | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle \approx \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | (\hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau))^n | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle \quad (\text{D.11})$$

where (using $S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger \approx e^{-i\mathcal{E}t} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger$)

$$\hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau) = e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_{\bar{i}}^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\sum_{j \neq i} H_j t} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}^\dagger S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_{\bar{i}}}}. \quad (\text{D.12})$$

Finally, taking an n derivative of (D.11), and then setting $n = 0$, one finds

$$S[\phi] = -\langle \phi_{|i}(\tau) | \log \tilde{\rho}_{\phi_{|i}}(\tau) | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle \approx -\langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | \log \hat{\rho}_{\phi}(\tau) | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle. \quad (\text{D.13})$$

In combination with (D.4), this implies (6.11).

Consider the state $|\hat{\Psi}\rangle$ defined in (6.14), and let $a(H_{R^c}), b(H_{R^c})$ be any two elements of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ (written as $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i^*})$ -valued functions of H_{R^c}). Then we have

$$\langle \hat{\Psi} | a(H_{R^c}) e^{-\beta H_S} \hat{\rho}_{\phi}(\tau) b(H_{R^c}) | \hat{\Psi} \rangle \quad (\text{D.14})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \langle \psi_S | \text{tr}_{R_i^*} (a(E) \Delta_{\psi} b(E)) | \psi_S \rangle \quad (\text{D.15})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \langle \psi_S | \text{tr}_{R_i^*} (b(E) a(E)) | \psi_S \rangle \quad (\text{D.16})$$

$$= \langle \hat{\Psi} | b(H_{R^c}) a(H_{R^c}) | \hat{\Psi} \rangle, \quad (\text{D.17})$$

so $e^{-\beta H_S} = \Delta_{\hat{\Psi}}$ is the modular operator of $\hat{\Psi}$. Similarly, we have

$$\langle \hat{\Psi} | a(H_{R^c}) e^{S_{0,R} + \beta H_{R^c}} \hat{\rho}_{\phi}(\tau) b(H_{R^c}) | \hat{\Psi} \rangle \quad (\text{D.18})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \langle \psi_S | \text{tr}_{R_i^*} \left(a(E) e^{-\beta H_{R_i^*}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_{R_i^*} + E)t} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i^*}}^{\dagger} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i^*}} b(E) \right) | \psi_S \rangle \quad (\text{D.19})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \langle \psi_{SR_i^*} | a(E) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_{R_i^*} + E)t} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i^*}}^{\dagger} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i^*}} b(E) | \psi_{SR_i^*} \rangle \quad (\text{D.20})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \langle \psi_{SR_i^*} | a(E) e^{i(H_{R_i^*} + E)t} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i^*}}^{\dagger} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i^*}} b(E) | \psi_{SR_i^*} \rangle \quad (\text{D.21})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | b(E) a(E) e^{i(H_{R_i^*} + E)t} | \hat{\phi}(\tau + t) \rangle \quad (\text{D.22})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | b(E) a(E) e^{i(E - H_{R^c})t} | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle \quad (\text{D.23})$$

$$= \langle \hat{\phi}(\tau) | b(H_{R^c}) a(H_{R^c}) | \hat{\phi}(\tau) \rangle \quad (\text{D.24})$$

which shows that (6.16) holds.

D.1 Linear corrections

Let us now consider the corrections to (D.13). We start by writing the exact density operator as

$$\rho_{\phi_{|i}}(\tau) = \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_i^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} \left(e^{-i\mathcal{E}t} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i^*}}^{\dagger} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i^*}} + Y(t) \right), \quad (\text{D.25})$$

where

$$Y(t) = S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i^*}}^{\dagger} S_{\phi_{|i}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i^*}} - S_{e^{-i\mathcal{E}t}\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i^*}}^{\dagger} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i^*}}. \quad (\text{D.26})$$

The small parameter in which we are expanding is $\eta = \|\epsilon(H_S - \mathcal{E}) | \phi_{|i}(\tau) \rangle\|$. By the semiclassical assumption, for $|t| < \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, we have $Y(t) = \mathcal{O}(\eta)$, so we can write the exact density operator as a dominant part $\rho_{\phi_{|i}}^{(0)}(\tau)$ plus an $\mathcal{O}(\eta)$ correction $\rho_{\phi_{|i}}^{(Y)}(\tau)$:

$$\rho_{\phi_{|i}}(\tau) = \rho^{(0)} + \delta^{(Y)}\rho, \quad (\text{D.27})$$

where

$$\rho^{(0)} = \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_i^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S - \mathcal{E} + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i^*}}^{\dagger} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i^*}}, \quad (\text{D.28})$$

$$\delta^{(Y)}\rho = \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_i^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} Y(t). \quad (\text{D.29})$$

We may further expand $e^{i(H_S - \mathcal{E})t} = 1 + i(H_S - \mathcal{E})te^{i(H_S - \mathcal{E})t} + \dots$ in $\rho_{\phi|i}^{(0)}(\tau)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{(0)} &= \Pi_{|i} \hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau) \\ &+ \Pi_{|i} e^{-S_{0,R} - \beta(H_{R^c} + H_{R_i^*})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt i e^{i(H_S - \mathcal{E} + \sum_{j \neq i} H_j)t} (H_S - \mathcal{E}) t S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.30})$$

The second term is $\mathcal{O}(\eta)$ (because the integral is dominated by $|t| < \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$), and the remaining terms in the ellipsis are $\mathcal{O}(\eta^2)$ (here these approximations hold when one computes expectation values of functions of these operators, in the state $|\phi_{|i}(\tau)\rangle$).

Using the integral formula

$$\frac{d}{ds} \log X(s) = \int_0^\infty d\lambda \frac{1}{\lambda + X(s)} \frac{dX(s)}{ds} \frac{1}{\lambda + X(s)}, \quad (\text{D.31})$$

we may then Taylor expand to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \log \rho_{\phi|i}^{(0)}(\tau) &= \Pi_{|i} \left[\log \hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau) \right. \\ &+ \left. \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \int_0^\infty d\lambda \frac{1}{\lambda + \Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\hat{\Psi}}} i(H_S - \mathcal{E}) t e^{i \sum_{j \neq i} H_j t} S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau+t)|\psi_{SR_i}}^\dagger S_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\psi_{SR_i}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \Delta_{\hat{\phi}(\tau)|\hat{\Psi}}} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.32})$$

By inserting an integral over the projection-valued measure for the energy of the complementary frames defined in (6.20), and using (6.25), with similar techniques to those used in Section 6.1 this may be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \log \rho_{\phi|i}^{(0)}(\tau) &= \Pi_{|i} \left[\log \hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau) \right. \\ &+ \left. 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE P(E) \int_0^\infty d\lambda \frac{1}{\lambda + p_E \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}} (H_S - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}) \frac{1}{\lambda + p_E \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.33})$$

After a change of variables $\lambda \rightarrow p_E \lambda$, this takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \log \rho_{\phi|i}^{(0)}(\tau) &= \Pi_{|i} \left[\log \hat{\rho}_\phi(\tau) \right. \\ &+ \left. 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE P(E) \frac{1}{p_E} \int_0^\infty d\lambda \frac{1}{\lambda + \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}} (H_S - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}) \frac{1}{\lambda + \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.34})$$

Taking an expectation value in the state $|\phi_{|i}(\tau)\rangle = |\hat{\phi}(\tau)\rangle$ thus yields the entropy

$$S[\phi] = S_0[\phi] - 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_0^\infty d\lambda \phi_E \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}} (H_S - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}) \frac{1}{\lambda + \Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2), \quad (\text{D.35})$$

where $S_0[\phi]$ is the leading order semiclassical contribution.

To make progress, we will now impose a UV cutoff on the fields, such that we may decompose $H_S = H_\xi - H'_\xi$, and all algebras have well-defined density operators. Then we can write

$$\Delta_{\phi_E|\bar{\psi}} = \rho_E (\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}, \quad (\text{D.36})$$

where ρ_E is the density operator for ϕ_E in the algebra $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$, and $\rho'_{\bar{\psi}}$ is the density operator for $\bar{\psi}$ in its complement; as in 6.2, we have $\rho'_{\bar{\psi}} = e^{-\beta H'_\xi} / Z_\xi$. With this, we can decompose the entropy as

$$S[\phi] = S_0[\phi] - \delta S + \delta' S + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2), \quad (\text{D.37})$$

where

$$\delta S = 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_0^\infty d\lambda \phi_E \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E(\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}} (H_\xi - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \rho_E (\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}) \frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E(\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}} \right), \quad (\text{D.38})$$

$$\delta' S = 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_0^\infty d\lambda \phi_E \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E(\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}} H'_\xi \partial_E (p_E \rho_E (\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}) \frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E(\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}} \right). \quad (\text{D.39})$$

Recognising the dE integrand in δS as

$$\frac{d}{ds} \log \left((\rho_E + s(H_\xi - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \rho_E)) (\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1} \right) = \frac{d}{ds} \log (\rho_E + s(H_\xi - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \rho_E)), \quad (\text{D.40})$$

we can write it as

$$\delta S = 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_0^\infty d\lambda \phi_E \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E} (H_\xi - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \rho_E) \frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E} \right). \quad (\text{D.41})$$

Every operator that appears here is now an element of $\mathcal{S}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$, so we can write $\phi_E(\cdot)$ as $\text{Tr}(\rho_E(\cdot))$, where Tr is the trace on $\mathcal{A}_S \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{R_i})$. Then, using the cyclic property of the trace we have

$$\delta S = 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_0^\infty d\lambda \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E} \rho_E \frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E} (H_\xi - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \rho_E) \right) \quad (\text{D.42})$$

$$= 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \text{Tr} \left((H_\xi - \mathcal{E}) \partial_E (p_E \rho_E) \right) \quad (\text{D.43})$$

$$= 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \partial_E (p_E (\phi_E(H_\xi) - \mathcal{E})). \quad (\text{D.44})$$

In the second line, we just did the λ integral.

For $\delta' S$, we note that H'_ξ commutes with $\rho_E(\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}$, so

$$\delta' S = 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \int_0^\infty d\lambda \phi_E \left(H'_\xi \frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E(\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}} \partial_E (p_E \rho_E (\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}) \frac{1}{\lambda + \rho_E(\rho'_{\bar{\psi}})^{-1}} \right) \quad (\text{D.45})$$

$$= 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \phi_E \left(H'_\xi (\partial_E p_E + p_E \partial_E \log \rho_E) \right) \quad (\text{D.46})$$

$$= 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE p_E \phi_E \left(H'_\xi \partial_E \log (p_E \rho_E) \right). \quad (\text{D.47})$$

So overall we have

$$S[\phi] = S_0[\phi] - 2\pi \int_{\sigma_{R^c}} dE \left[\partial_E (p_E (\phi_E(H_\xi) - \mathcal{E})) - p_E \phi_E (H'_\xi \partial_E \log (p_E \rho_E)) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2). \quad (\text{D.48})$$

E Comparing density operators to prior work

For the sake of comparing to works [21] (CLPW) and [24] (JSS), we consider the case of two clock frames, which we label C and C' , both possibly nonideal. Suppose that in reduced perspective of clock C' at orientation $\tau_{C'} = 0$, the state is unentangled (up to the affect of the projector) between the QFT and clock C factors. A frame change map $V_{C' \rightarrow C} := \int dt e^{-itH_S} |t\rangle_C \langle -t|_{C'}$ takes this state to the perspective of frame C at orientation $\tau_C = 0$, which we write in terms of an integral decomposition between QFT and frame C' factor:

$$|\hat{\Phi}\rangle_{|C'} := \sqrt{N} \Pi_{|C'} |\Phi\rangle \otimes |f\rangle_C \quad (\text{E.1})$$

$$|\hat{\Phi}\rangle_{|C} = V_{C' \rightarrow C} |\hat{\Phi}\rangle_{|C'} = \int dt (|\phi_S^\mu(t)\rangle) \otimes (|\tilde{\phi}_{C'}^\mu(t)\rangle) \quad (\text{E.2})$$

$$|\phi_S^\mu(t)\rangle := |\phi_S(t + \mu)\rangle, \quad (\text{E.3})$$

$$|\tilde{\phi}_{C'}^\mu(t)\rangle := \sqrt{N} \langle -\mu | f \rangle_C |\mu + t\rangle_{C'} \quad (\text{E.4})$$

In (E.1) we have included a projector, $\Pi_{|C'}$, which is necessary if clock C' is nonideal, and a normalization constant, $N := \left(\langle \Phi | \otimes \langle f |_C \Pi_{|C'} | \Phi \rangle \otimes | f \rangle_C \right)^{-1}$. In terms of the decomposition (E.2), the general density matrix for the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{S_C}^H$ in the perspective of clock C is (see equation (C.58))

$$\rho_{\hat{\Phi}|C} = \Pi_{|C} e^{-S_0, C - \beta H_{C'}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu d\nu S_{\phi_S^\nu(0)|\psi_S}^\dagger \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S - H_{C'})t} \langle \tilde{\phi}_{C'}^\nu(t) | \tilde{\phi}_{C'}^\mu(0) \rangle \right) S_{\phi_S^\mu(0)|\psi_S}. \quad (\text{E.5})$$

Plugging in states (E.4) to the central t -integral gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S - H_{C'})t} \langle \tilde{\phi}_{C'}^\nu(t) | \tilde{\phi}_{C'}^\mu(0) \rangle &= N \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(H_S - H_{C'})t} \langle f | -\nu \rangle_C \langle -\mu | f \rangle_C \langle \nu + t | \mu \rangle_{C'} \\ &= \frac{N}{2\pi} \left(\int_{\sigma_{C'}} d\epsilon' e^{-i\nu(H_S - H_{C'} - \epsilon')} f^*(\epsilon') \right) \Pi(H_S - H_{C'}, -\sigma_{C'}) \left(\int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon e^{i\mu(H_S - H_{C'} - \epsilon)} f(\epsilon) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.6})$$

Recall that $\Pi(A, \sigma) := \Theta(A - \sigma_{\min})\Theta(\sigma_{\max} - A)$ denotes a projector that limits the operator A to the spectral range σ . The density operator thus becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\hat{\Phi}|C} &= \frac{N}{2\pi} \Pi_{|C} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu \int_{\sigma_{C'}} d\epsilon' e^{-i\nu(H_S + H_{C'} + \epsilon')} f(\epsilon') \right) S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S}^\dagger \Pi(H_S - H_{C'}, -\sigma_{C'}) S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S} \\ &\quad \times \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon e^{i\mu(H_S + H_{C'} + \epsilon)} f^*(\epsilon) \right) \Pi_{|C} e^{-S_0, C - \beta H_{C'}} \\ &= 2\pi N \Pi_{|C} f(-H_S - H_{C'}) S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S}^\dagger \Pi(H_S - H_{C'}, -\sigma_{C'}) S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S} f^*(-H_S - H_{C'}) \Pi_{|C} e^{-S_0, C - \beta H_{C'}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.7})$$

In writing the first line we used the convenient fact that the continuous index μ on the QFT contribution (E.3) can be expressed written as a time translation (because we started with a simple product state): $|\phi_S^\mu(t)\rangle = |\phi_S(t + \mu)\rangle$. Equation (E.7) gives the density operator in the perspective of frame C . Conjugating with the inverse of the above frame change map returns from the perspective of clock C at orientation $\tau_C = 0$ to that of clock C' at orientation $\tau_{C'} = 0$, providing the density operator relevant for comparison to CLPW and JSS:

$$\rho_{\hat{\Phi}|C'}(\tau' = 0) := V_{C \rightarrow C'} \rho_{\hat{\Phi}|C}(\tau = 0) V_{C' \rightarrow C}. \quad (\text{E.8})$$

We use the fact that

$$V_{C \rightarrow C'} \mathcal{F}(H_S + H_{C'}) \Pi_{|C} \Pi_{C'} = \mathcal{F}(-H_C) \Pi_C \Pi_{|C'} V_{C \rightarrow C'}, \quad (\text{E.9})$$

and

$$V_{C \rightarrow C'} \mathcal{F}(H_{C'}) \Pi_{|C} \Pi_{C'} = \mathcal{F}(-H_S - H_C) \Pi_C \Pi_{|C'} V_{C \rightarrow C'}, \quad (\text{E.10})$$

where \mathcal{F} is any bounded function of its argument, and similar identities for $V_{C' \rightarrow C}$. This leads to the following expression for the C -perspective density operator:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\hat{\Phi}|C'} &= 2\pi N \Pi_{|C'} f(H_C) V_{C \rightarrow C'} S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S}^\dagger \Pi(H_S - H_{C'}, -\sigma_{C'}) S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S} \\ &\quad V_{C' \rightarrow C} f^*(H_C) \Pi_{|C'} e^{-S_0, C + \beta(H_S + H_C)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.11})$$

This looks rather different from the expressions of JSS and CLPW. We can find an alternative expression by manipulating the central terms as follows:

$$V_{C \rightarrow C'} S_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^\dagger \Pi(H_S - H_{C'}, -\sigma_{C'}) S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} V_{C' \rightarrow C} = \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{-itH_S} |t\rangle_C \langle -t|_{C'} \right) S_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^\dagger \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' e^{-it'(H_S - H_{C'})} \langle 0|t'\rangle_{C'} \right) S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} \quad (\text{E.12})$$

$$\left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt'' e^{it''H_S} |t''\rangle_{C'} \langle t''|_C \right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt dt' dt'' e^{-itH_S} |t\rangle_C \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-it'\tilde{H}_S} \langle 0|t'\rangle_{C'} \langle t'' + t'|t\rangle_{C'} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{it''H_S} \langle t''|_C \quad (\text{E.13})$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt dt' dt'' d\alpha e^{-itH_S} |t\rangle_C \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-it'\tilde{H}_S} \langle 0|t'\rangle_{C'} \langle \alpha|t\rangle_{C'} \quad (\text{E.14})$$

$$\delta(t'' + t' - \alpha) \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{it''H_S} \langle t''|_C = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt dt' dt'' d\alpha e^{-i(t+\alpha)H_S} |t+\alpha\rangle_C \langle 0|t\rangle_{C'} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-it'\tilde{H}_S} \langle 0|t'\rangle_{C'} \quad (\text{E.15})$$

$$\delta(t'' + t' - \alpha) \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{it''H_S} \langle t''|_C = \Pi_{|C'} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\alpha dt' dt'' e^{-i\alpha H_S} |\alpha\rangle_C \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-it'\tilde{H}_S} \langle 0|t'\rangle_{C'} \langle \alpha|t'' + t'\rangle_C^{\text{ext}} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{it''H_S} \langle t''|_C \quad (\text{E.16})$$

$$= \Pi_{|C'} \Pi_C^{(\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \sigma_C)} e^{-iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' e^{-it'(\tilde{H}_S + H_C^{\text{ext}})} \langle 0|t'\rangle_{C'} \Delta_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} \Pi_C^{(\sigma_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R})} \quad (\text{E.17})$$

$$= \Pi_{|C'} \Pi_C^{(\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \sigma_C)} e^{-iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} S_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^\dagger \Pi_{|C'}^{\text{ext}} S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} e^{iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} \Pi_C^{(\sigma_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R})}. \quad (\text{E.18})$$

In (E.12) we have just written out integrals explicitly. In (E.13) we replaced the relative Tomitas with relative modular operators using $S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} = J_{\phi|\psi} \Delta_{\phi|\psi}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and letting the relative conjugation operators act via complex conjugation in the energy basis on the intermediate frame factors. We also introduced the notation $\tilde{H}_S := J_{\phi|\psi} H_S J_{\phi|\psi}$. In (E.14), we introduced an additional integral over α and a delta function $\delta(t'' + t' - \alpha)$. In (E.15), we shifted $t \rightarrow t + \alpha$ and then isolated t -dependent terms to the left. In line (E.16), further isolating the t -dependence allows us to replace the t -integral with the projector $\Pi_{|C'}$ on the left. We also write the delta function as if it arises from a bra and ket on an extended/ideal clock C Hilbert space $\langle \alpha|t'' + t'\rangle_C^{\text{ext}}$. This makes the following steps more clear. In line (E.17) we rewrite the α and t'' integrals in terms of $e^{\pm H_S T_C^{\text{ext}}}$, with extended clock operators acting on an extended/ideal frame C Hilbert space. This requires the inclusion of the projectors $\Pi_C^{(\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \sigma_C)} := \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon |\epsilon\rangle_C \langle \epsilon|_C^{\text{ext}}$ and $\Pi_C^{(\sigma_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R})} := \int_{\sigma_C} d\epsilon |\epsilon\rangle_C^{\text{ext}} \langle \epsilon|_C$ on the outer sides of these operators, mapping back to the nonideal clock C Hilbert space. In line (E.18) we again replace the relative modular operators with relative Tomitas, which results in the t' integral giving the projector $\Pi_{|C'}^{\text{ext}} := \Pi(H_S + H_C^{\text{ext}}, -\sigma')$. Finally, employing this expression in (E.11), we arrive at an expression for the density operator which is more amenable to comparison with the JSS and CLPW expressions:

$$\rho_{\hat{\Phi}|C'} = 2\pi N f(H_C) \Pi_{|C'} \Pi_C^{(\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \sigma_C)} e^{-iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} S_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^\dagger \Pi_{|C'}^{\text{ext}} S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} e^{iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} \Pi_C^{(\sigma_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R})} f^*(H_C) e^{-S_{0,C} + \beta(H_S + H_C)}. \quad (\text{E.19})$$

Alternative derivation

We now give an alternate derivation of the density operator (E.19). We first recall the method of JSS for deriving density operators in the case of two frames that are both ideal. In this case, the relevant algebra is

$$\mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}} = \{e^{-iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}} a e^{iH_S T_C^{\text{ext}}}, e^{isH_C^{\text{ext}}}\}'' \text{ for } a \in \mathcal{A}_S, s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (\text{E.20})$$

where the superscript ‘‘ext’’ again indicates the extension to ideal clock Hilbert spaces and operators. For any state $|\hat{\Phi}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{QFT}} \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R})$ that is cyclic and separating for this algebra, the density operator may be found by a two step process. First, the modular operator for this state and algebra, $\Delta_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}}$, is identified by ‘solving’ its defining equation:

$$\langle \hat{\Phi} | \hat{a} \hat{b} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle = \langle \hat{\Phi} | \hat{b} \Delta_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}} \hat{a} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle, \quad \hat{a}, \hat{b} \in \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}. \quad (\text{E.21})$$

For von Neumann factors of type I and II, the modular operator can be written as a product of elements affiliated with $\mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}$ and elements affiliated with $(\mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}})'$. The former piece is (up to normalization) the density operator $\rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}}$ for the algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}} &= \rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}} (\rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\prime \text{ext}})^{-1}, \quad \rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}} \in \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}, \quad \rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\prime \text{ext}} \in (\mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}})', \\ \text{Tr} \left(\rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}} \hat{a} \right) &= \langle \hat{\Phi} | \hat{a} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle, \quad \forall \hat{a} \in \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.22})$$

If we now consider a nonideal clock C , with C' still ideal, the relevant algebra is then $\Pi_C \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}} \Pi_C$, where Π_C is the projector onto the finite spectral range of the nonideal clock Hamiltonian H_C . Since $\Pi_C \in \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}$, this is a proper subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}$. This implies that $\Delta_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}}$ continues to satisfy equation (E.21) and $\rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}}$ continues to give the correct expectation values for all $\hat{a}, \hat{b} \in \Pi_C \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}} \Pi_C$. Projecting the latter as $\Pi_C \rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}} \Pi_C$ renders it an element of $\Pi_C \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}} \Pi_C$, which then serves as the density operator for this projected algebra.

If we instead take the case that C' is nonideal while C is ideal, the relevant algebra is then $\Pi_{|C'} \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}$. The projector $\Pi_{|C'}$ restricts $-(H_S + H_C)$ to the spectral range of $H_{C'}$, since this is the constraint-equivalent of $H_{C'}$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_{|C'}$. Since $\Pi_{|C'} \in (\mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}})'$, this projected algebra is not a subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}$, and the same modular operator $\Delta_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\text{ext}}$ is not guaranteed to satisfy (E.21) for elements of this modified algebra. We might instead try to seek a new modular operator $\tilde{\Delta}_{\hat{\Phi}}$ for this projected algebra. This would entail satisfying

$$\langle \hat{\Phi} | \hat{a} \Pi_{|C'} \hat{b} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle = \langle \hat{\Phi} | \hat{b} \Pi_{|C'} \tilde{\Delta}_{\hat{\Phi}} \Pi_{|C'} \hat{a} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle, \quad \hat{a}, \hat{b} \in \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}. \quad (\text{E.23})$$

However the state $|\hat{\Phi}\rangle$ cannot be separating for a projected algebra of this form. In the absence of a cyclic-separating state, we cannot hope to find the modular operator $\tilde{\Delta}_{\hat{\Phi}}$. Instead, we determine to find a relative modular operator $\Delta_{\Pi_{|C'} \hat{\Phi} | \hat{\Phi}}$ for the unprojected algebra. This would entail satisfying

$$\langle \hat{\Phi} | \hat{a} \Pi_{|C'} \hat{b} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle = \langle \hat{\Phi} | \hat{b} \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'} \hat{\Phi} | \hat{\Phi}} \hat{a} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle, \quad \hat{a}, \hat{b} \in \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}} \quad (\text{E.24})$$

This relative modular operator will be decomposable as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'} \hat{\Phi} | \hat{\Phi}} &= \rho_{\Pi_{|C'} \hat{\Phi}} (\rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\prime})^{-1}, \quad \rho_{\Pi_{|C'} \hat{\Phi}} \in \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}, \quad \rho_{\hat{\Phi}}^{\prime} \in (\mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}})', \\ \text{Tr} \left(\rho_{\Pi_{|C'} \hat{\Phi}} \hat{a} \right) &= \langle \hat{\Phi} | \Pi_{|C'} \hat{a} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle, \quad \forall \hat{a} \in \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}} \text{ or } \Pi_{|C'} \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.25})$$

The projected operator $\Pi_{|C'} \rho_{\Pi_{|C'} \hat{\Phi}} \in \Pi_{|C'} \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H^{\text{ext}}}$ will then serve as the density matrix for the projected algebra, continuing to give the right expectation values for all its elements. To find $\rho_{\Pi_{|C'} \hat{\Phi}}$ we therefore first find $\Delta_{\Pi_{|C'} \hat{\Phi} | \hat{\Phi}}$ satisfying equation (E.24). Using the notation $a_x := e^{-ixH_S} a e^{ixH_S}$, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{a} &= a_{T_C^{\text{ext}}} e^{iuH_C^{\text{ext}}}, \\ \hat{b} &= a_{T_C^{\text{ext}}} e^{ivH_C^{\text{ext}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.26})$$

with $a, b \in \mathcal{A}_S$ and $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$, so that \hat{a} and \hat{b} are elements of the unprojected/ideal algebra. For readability we will hereafter drop the superscript ‘ext’ in the remainder of this section, but all H_C and T_C below should be understood as the ideal operators. Elements of the form $\Pi_{|C'}\hat{a}$ and $\Pi_{|C'}\hat{b}$ additively generate the algebra $\Pi_{|C'}\mathcal{A}_{SC}$, so we only need to seek $\Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}}$ satisfying equation (E.24) for arbitrary such elements. We first consider the left hand side of that equation. For the frame, we employ bras and kets in the clock basis unless otherwise specified, and we let f denote the energy-basis wavefunction while \tilde{f} denotes the time-basis wavefunction.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \hat{\Phi} | \hat{a} \Pi_{|C'} \hat{b} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle &= \int ds' ds dt \chi_{C'}(-t) \tilde{f}^*(s') \tilde{f}(s) \langle \Phi | \langle s' |_C a_{T_C} e^{iuH_C} e^{-it(H_S+H_C)} b_{T_C} e^{ivH_C} | \Phi \rangle | s \rangle_C \\
&= \int ds' ds dt \chi_{C'}(-t) \tilde{f}^*(s') \tilde{f}(s) \langle s' + u | s - v + t \rangle_C \langle \Phi | a_{s'} e^{-itH_S} b_{s-v} | \Phi \rangle \\
&= \int ds' ds dt \chi_{C'}(-t) \tilde{f}^*(s') \tilde{f}(s) \langle s' + u | s - v + t \rangle_C \langle \Psi | b_{s-v} S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger e^{itH_S} S_{\Phi|\Psi} a_{s'} | \Psi \rangle \\
&= \int ds' ds dt \chi_{C'}(-t) \tilde{f}^*(s') \tilde{f}(s) \langle \Psi | \langle -s + v |_C b_{-v} e^{isH_S} S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger e^{it(H_S+H_C)} S_{\Phi|\Psi} e^{-is'H_S} a | -s' - u \rangle_C | \Psi \rangle \\
&= \langle \Psi, v | b_{-v} \left(\int ds \tilde{f}(s) e^{is(H_S-H_C)} \right) S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \\
&\quad \left(\int dt e^{it(H_S+H_C)} \chi_{C'}(t) \right) S_{\Phi|\Psi} \left(\int ds' dt \tilde{f}^*(s') e^{-is'(H_S-H_C)} \right) a | \Psi, -u \rangle \\
&= 2\pi \langle \Psi, v | b e^{-iT_C H_S} f(H_C - H_S) S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \Pi_{|C'} S_{\Phi|\Psi} f^*(H_C - H_S) a | \Psi, -u \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{E.27}$$

In going from the second to third line, we used $\langle \Phi | a_{s'} e^{-itH_S} b_{s-v} | \Phi \rangle = \langle \Psi | b_{s-v} S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger e^{itH_S} S_{\Phi|\Psi} a_{s'} | \Psi \rangle$. Next we turn to the right hand side of equation (E.24):

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \hat{\Phi} | \hat{b} \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}} \hat{a} | \hat{\Phi} \rangle &= \int ds' ds \tilde{f}^*(s') \tilde{f}(s) \langle \Phi | \langle s' |_C b_{T_C} e^{ivH_C} \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}} a_{T_C} e^{iuH_C} | \Phi \rangle | s \rangle_C \\
&= \int ds' ds \tilde{f}^*(s') \tilde{f}(s) \langle \Phi | \langle s' + v |_C b_{s'} \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}} a_{s-u} | \Phi \rangle | s - u \rangle_C \\
&= \int ds' ds \tilde{f}^*(s') \tilde{f}(s) \langle \Psi | \langle s' + v |_C S_{\Psi}^\dagger S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger b_{s'} \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}} a_{s-u} S_{\Phi|\Psi} S_{\Psi} | \Psi \rangle | s - u \rangle_C \\
&= \int ds' ds \tilde{f}^*(s') \tilde{f}(s) \langle \Psi | \langle s' + v |_C b_{s'} S_{\Psi}^\dagger S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}} S_{\Phi|\Psi} S_{\Psi} a_{s-u} | \Psi \rangle | s - u \rangle_C \\
&= \int ds' ds \tilde{f}^*(s') \tilde{f}(s) \langle \Psi, v | b e^{is'(H_C+H_S)} S_{\Psi}^\dagger S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}} S_{\Phi|\Psi} S_{\Psi} e^{-is(H_C+H_S)} a_{-u} | \Psi, -u \rangle \\
&= 2\pi \langle \Psi, v | b f^*(H_C + H_S) S_{\Psi}^\dagger S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}} S_{\Phi|\Psi} S_{\Psi} f(H_C + H_S) e^{-iT_C H_S} a | \Psi, -u \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{E.28}$$

We have used that $S_{\Phi|\Psi} S_{\Psi}$ is an element affiliated with \mathcal{A}'_S . Putting together equations (E.27) and (E.28) allows us write $\Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}\hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}} &= S_{\Psi|\Phi}^\dagger S_{\Psi}^\dagger \frac{1}{f^*(H_C + H_S)} e^{-iT_C H_S} f(H_C - H_S) S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \\
&\quad \Pi_{|C'} S_{\Phi|\Psi} f^*(H_C - H_S) e^{iT_C H_S} \frac{1}{f(H_C + H_S)} S_{\Psi} S_{\Psi|\Phi} \\
&= S_{\Psi|\Phi}^\dagger S_{\Psi}^\dagger \frac{e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}(H_C+H_S)}}{f^*(H_C + H_S)} \left[e^{\frac{\beta}{2}H_C} f(H_C) e^{-iT_C H_S} \Delta_{\Psi}^{-1/2} \Delta_{\Phi|\Psi}^{1/2} J_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \right. \\
&\quad \left. \Pi_{|C'} J_{\Phi|\Psi} \Delta_{\Phi|\Psi}^{1/2} \Delta_{\Psi}^{-1/2} e^{iT_C H_S} f^*(H_C) e^{\frac{\beta}{2}H_C} \right] \frac{e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}(H_C+H_S)}}{f(H_C + H_S)} S_{\Psi} S_{\Psi|\Phi}
\end{aligned} \tag{E.29}$$

The second expression is arranged so that terms inside brackets are affiliated with \mathcal{A}_{SC} while those outside the brackets are affiliated with \mathcal{A}'_{SC} . This is straightforward to see for the terms outside the

brackets, by recalling that $S_\Psi S_{\Psi|\Phi}$ is affiliated with \mathcal{A}'_{SC} , as are any functions of the combination $H_C + H_S$. To see that the terms inside the brackets are affiliated with \mathcal{A}_{SC} , note that although $\Pi_{|C'}$ is itself affiliated with \mathcal{A}'_{SC} , it can be written as

$$\Pi(H_S + H_C, -\sigma_{C'}) = e^{-iT_C H_S} \Pi(H_C, -\sigma_{C'}) e^{iT_C H_S} = J_\Psi e^{iT_C H_S} \Pi(H_C, -\sigma_{C'}) e^{-iT_C H_S} J_\Psi \quad (\text{E.30})$$

The terms in brackets in (E.29) may then be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\frac{\beta}{2} H_C} f(H_C) e^{-iT_C H_S} \Delta_\Psi^{-1/2} \Delta_{\Phi|\Psi}^{1/2} J_{\Psi|\Phi} J_\Psi e^{iT_C H_S} \\ & \times \Pi(H_C, -\sigma_{C'}) e^{-iT_C H_S} J_\Psi J_{\Phi|\Psi} \Delta_{\Phi|\Psi}^{1/2} \Delta_\Psi^{-1/2} e^{iT_C H_S} f^*(H_C) e^{\frac{\beta}{2} H_C}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.31})$$

The combinations $J_\Psi J_{\Phi|\Psi} \Delta_{\Phi|\Psi}^{1/2} \Delta_\Psi^{-1/2}$ and $\Delta_\Psi^{-1/2} \Delta_{\Phi|\Psi}^{1/2} J_{\Psi|\Phi} J_\Psi$ are both affiliated with \mathcal{A} (see, e.g. [24] appendix C), so conjugating them with $e^{\pm iT_C H_S}$ results in operators affiliated \mathcal{A}_{SC}^H . All the other terms, including the projector in the middle, are now functions of H_C and are therefore affiliated with \mathcal{A}_{SC} . Given that the full term in brackets in (E.29) is affiliated with \mathcal{A}_{SC} , the relative modular operator may be completely factorized between \mathcal{A}_{SC} and \mathcal{A}'_{SC} :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\Pi_{|C'}, \hat{\Phi}|\hat{\Phi}} &= S_{\Psi|\Phi}^\dagger S_\Psi^\dagger \frac{e^{-\beta(H_C + H_S)}}{|f(H_C + H_S)|^2} S_\Psi S_{\Psi|\Phi} \\ & \times e^{\frac{\beta}{2}(H_S + H_C)} f(H_C) e^{-iT_C H_S} S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \Pi_{|C'} S_{\Phi|\Psi} e^{iT_C H_S} f^*(H_C) e^{\frac{\beta}{2}(H_S + H_C)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.32})$$

After some minor simplifications we therefore find

$$\rho'_{\hat{\Phi}} = S_{\Phi|\Psi} J_\Psi |f(H_C + H_S)|^2 e^{\beta H_C} J_\Psi S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \quad (\text{E.33})$$

as the density matrix for the commutant algebra, which equivalent to JSS equation 5.21. The second line of (E.32) gives the density operator for $\mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H_{\text{ext}}}$ in the state $\Pi_{|C'} |\hat{\Phi}\rangle$, which upon projection with $\Pi_{|C'}$ acts as the density matrix for the algebra $\Pi_{|C'} \mathcal{A}_{SC}^{H_{\text{ext}}}$:

$$\rho_{\Pi_{|C'}, \hat{\Phi}} = \Pi_{|C'} e^{\frac{\beta}{2}(H_S + H_C)} f(H_C) e^{-iT_C H_S} S_{\Phi|\Psi}^\dagger \Pi_{|C'} S_{\Phi|\Psi} e^{iT_C H_S} f^*(H_C) e^{\frac{\beta}{2}(H_S + H_C)}. \quad (\text{E.34})$$

Recalling that all operators in this expression are extended/ideal operators, conjugating this density operator with projectors $\Pi_C, \Pi_{|C'}$, to the appropriate reduced Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{|C'}$ then gives an expression equivalent to equation (E.19) from the previous subsection.

F Details of the gravitational interferometer example

In this appendix we will give a more detailed account of the calculations involved in section 8.1 concerning the ‘‘gravitational interferometer’’ example. Before considering that particular state, we will consider density operators associated with a broader (but still very special) class of states, namely those which appear completely or approximately unentangled from the perspective of a specified frame. Despite being very special, these states provide a paradigmatic example of the perspective-dependence of certain properties, particularly those related to entanglement. We will first consider the density operators associated with such states (for two different gauge invariant algebras) without imposing any semi-classicality conditions. Then, in order to compute entropies, we will need to further specify a state and make several approximations. Here we will make assumptions that run broadly parallel to the semiclassical assumptions of section 6, but are slightly different. Finally, we will finally restrict to the state used in the ‘‘gravitational interferometer’’ example of section 8.1, which is one such approximate product state.

Approximate product states: C_1 perspective versus C_2 perspective

Consider the case of three frames, $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$. We stipulate that in the perspective of frame C_1 , the state exhibits no explicit entanglement across factors:

$$|\phi_{|1}(0)\rangle = \sqrt{N}\Pi_{|1}|\phi_S\rangle|f\rangle_2|g\rangle_3. \quad (\text{F.1})$$

Here $N = (\langle\phi_S|\langle f|_2\langle g|_3\Pi_{|1}|\phi_S\rangle|f\rangle_2|g\rangle_3)$ is an overall normalization factor, while we take the states on each factor to be individually normalized: $\langle\phi_S|\phi_S\rangle = \langle f|f\rangle_2 = \langle g|g\rangle_3 = 1$. We will also let f and g represent the energy basis wavefunctions on the frame factors, for example $|f\rangle_2 = \int_{\sigma_2} d\epsilon f(\epsilon)|\epsilon\rangle_2$. We say that the state (F.1) exhibits no ‘‘explicit’’ entanglement because if clock 1 is nonideal, the projector $\Pi_{|1}$ is nontrivial, and the reduced Hilbert space does not have simple tensor product structure. This inhibits our ability to discuss entanglement across factors because the state space does not fully factorize (see appendix A.4 for discussion of how a projected Hilbert space can be decomposed as a direct integral or sum of tensor product factorizations). Nevertheless, considering their structure on the extended (prior to projection) Hilbert space, these states are unentangled ‘‘up to’’ the effect of the projector, and becomes completely unentangled in the limit of an ideal frame C_1 .

A state which is approximately unentangled in the perspective of one frame will generically be highly entangled from the perspective of another frame. The frame-change map (2.53) allows us to map the state (F.1) to the perspective of another frame (we consider frame C_2), meaning from the reduced Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{|1}$ to the reduced Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{|2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{|2}(0)\rangle &= V_{1\rightarrow 2}^{0,0}|\phi_{|1}(0)\rangle \\ &= \sqrt{N}\langle 0|_2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{-it(H_S+H_1+H_2+H_3)}|0\rangle_1 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' e^{-it'(H_S+H_2+H_3)}\langle 0|t'\rangle_1|\phi_S\rangle|f\rangle_2|g\rangle_3 \\ &= \sqrt{N}\langle 0|_2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' e^{-it(H_S+H_2+H_3)}|t-t'\rangle_1\langle -t|0\rangle_1|\phi_S\rangle|f\rangle_2|g\rangle_3 \\ &= \sqrt{N}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{-it(H_S+H_3)}|\phi_S\rangle|t\rangle_1\langle -t|f\rangle_2|g\rangle_3 \\ &= \sqrt{2\pi N}\Pi_{|2}f(-H_S-H_1-H_3)|\phi_S\rangle|0\rangle_1|g\rangle_3 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.2})$$

The last two lines give alternate expressions that may both be useful. These make apparent that the state is generically entangled between the QFT and remaining frame factors. The states (F.1) and (F.2) descend from the same physical state under different gauge fixings. The statement that these represent ‘‘unentangled’’ and ‘‘entangled’’ states, respectively, refers to the tensor product structure of the extended (unprojected) reduced Hilbert spaces.

Density operators: exact expressions

We will now consider the reduced density operators associated with two different gauge invariant algebras, those of the QFT subregion operators dressed with respect to frame C_1 or frame C_2 , along with reorientations of the same frame. We have elsewhere denoted these algebras $\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H$ and $\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H$. In section 4 (and appendix C), we derived a general density matrix expression for the algebra \mathcal{A}_{SR}^H (or rather its representation on the physical Hilbert space, $r(\mathcal{A}_{SR}^H)$) in the perspective of a frame R_i , where $R = R_i \cup R_{\bar{i}}$ is any subset of the frames and R_i is any one of its members. In the case that there is only one frame in R (so that $R_{\bar{i}}$ is empty) the density operator is (C.58), expressed in terms of the state decomposition (C.56). These expressions cover the cases of interest here (algebras $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)$ and $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H)$), under different interpretations of R and R^c .

We first focus on $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)$. This means taking $R = \{C_1\}$ and $R^c = \{C_2, C_3\}$. To proceed we must write the state from the perspective of C_1 , equation (F.1), in terms of the decomposition (C.56).

Explicitly writing out the projector $\Pi_{|1}$ on this state leads to:

$$|\phi_{|1}(0)\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu \left(e^{-i\mu H_S} |\phi_S\rangle \right) \otimes \left(\sqrt{N} \langle 0|\mu\rangle_1 e^{-i\mu(H_2+H_3)} |f\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 \right) \quad (\text{F.3})$$

\implies

$$|\phi_S^\mu(t)\rangle := e^{-i(\mu+t)H_S} |\phi_S\rangle = |\phi(\mu+t)\rangle_S, \quad (\text{F.4})$$

$$|\tilde{\phi}_{C_2C_3}^\mu(t)\rangle := \sqrt{N} \langle 0|\mu\rangle_1 e^{-i(\mu+t)(H_2+H_3)} |f\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3. \quad (\text{F.5})$$

It will be useful to work out the central time integral that appears in the density operator expression (C.58) using the state (F.5). With the abbreviation $\bar{H}'_1 := H_S - H_2 - H_3$, this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\bar{H}'_1 t} \langle \tilde{\phi}_{C_2C_3}^\nu(t) | \tilde{\phi}_{C_2C_3}^\mu(0) \rangle &= N \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\bar{H}'_1 t} \langle \nu|0\rangle_1 \langle 0|\mu\rangle_1 \langle f|_2 \langle g|_3 e^{i(\nu+t-\mu)(H_2+H_3)} |f\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 \\ &= \frac{N}{2\pi} \int d\epsilon_1 d\epsilon'_1 d\epsilon_2 \Pi(\bar{H}'_1 + \epsilon_2, -\sigma_3) |f(\epsilon_2)|^2 |g(-\bar{H}'_1 - \epsilon_2)|^2 e^{i\nu(\epsilon_1 - \bar{H}'_1)} e^{-i\mu(\epsilon'_1 - \bar{H}'_1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.6})$$

In the last line, $\Pi(\mathcal{O}, \sigma)$ denotes the projector that restricts the operator \mathcal{O} to the spectral range σ . Each energy integral in this expression ranges over its full spectra, implicitly specified by the subscripts on the integration parameters ϵ_i . We now insert this expression into the full density operator, leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\phi|1} &= \frac{N}{2\pi} e^{-S_{0,1} - \beta(H_2+H_3)} \Pi_{|1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu d\nu S_{\phi_S(\nu)|\psi_S}^\dagger \\ &\quad \times \left(\int d\epsilon_1 d\epsilon'_1 d\epsilon_2 \Pi(\bar{H}'_1 + \epsilon_2, -\sigma_3) |f(\epsilon_2)|^2 |g(-\bar{H}'_1 - \epsilon_2)|^2 e^{i\nu(\epsilon_1 - \bar{H}'_1)} e^{-i\mu(\epsilon'_1 - \bar{H}'_1)} \right) S_{\phi_S(\mu)|\psi_S} \\ &= \frac{N}{2\pi} e^{-S_{0,1} - \beta(H_2+H_3)} \Pi_{|1} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu \int_{\sigma_1} d\epsilon_1 e^{-i\nu(\epsilon_1 + H_S + H_2 + H_3)} \right) S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S}^\dagger \\ &\quad \times \int_{\sigma_2} d\epsilon_2 \Pi(\bar{H}'_1 + \epsilon_2, -\sigma_3) |f(\epsilon_2)|^2 |g(-\bar{H}'_1 - \epsilon_2)|^2 S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu \int_{\sigma_1} d\epsilon'_1 e^{i\mu(\epsilon'_1 + H_S + H_2 + H_3)} \right) \\ &= 2\pi N e^{-S_{0,1} - \beta(H_2+H_3)} \Pi_{|1} S_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^\dagger \int_{\sigma_2} d\epsilon_2 \Pi(\bar{H}'_1 + \epsilon_2, -\sigma_3) |f(\epsilon_2)|^2 |g(-\bar{H}'_1 - \epsilon_2)|^2 S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} \Pi_{|1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.7})$$

Moving to the second expression we've brought the μ and ν -dependent terms outside of the relative Tomita, using the fact that $e^{-iH_S\nu} S_{\phi_S(0)}^\dagger e^{iH_S\nu} = S_{\phi_S(\nu)}^\dagger$. The integrals in round brackets then reduce to projectors $\Pi_{|1} := \Pi(H_S + H_2 + H_3, -\sigma_1)$, simplifying the final expression.

We now repeat the above steps for the $r(\mathcal{A}_{C_2}^H)$ algebra. This means we now take $R = \{C_2\}$ and $R^c = \{C_1, C_3\}$. We must express the state from clock C_2 perspective, equation (F.2), in terms of a decomposition across frame and QFT factors:

$$|\phi_{|2}(0)\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu \left(e^{-i\mu H_S} |\phi_S\rangle \right) \otimes \left(\sqrt{N} |\mu\rangle_1 \langle -\mu|f\rangle_2 e^{-i\mu H_3} |g\rangle_3 \right) \quad (\text{F.8})$$

\implies

$$|\phi_S^\mu(t)\rangle := e^{-i(\mu+t)H_S} |\phi_S\rangle = |\phi(\mu+t)\rangle_S \quad (\text{F.9})$$

$$|\tilde{\phi}_{C_1C_3}^\mu(t)\rangle := \sqrt{N} |\mu+t\rangle_1 \langle -\mu|f\rangle_2 e^{-i(\mu+t)H_3} |g\rangle_3. \quad (\text{F.10})$$

Employing (F.10) in the central time integral, with the abbreviation $\bar{H}'_2 := H_S - H_1 - H_3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\bar{H}'_2 t} \langle \tilde{\phi}_{C_1C_3}^\nu(t) | \tilde{\phi}_{C_1C_3}^\mu(0) \rangle &= N \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\bar{H}'_2 t} \langle f|-\nu\rangle_2 \langle -\mu|f\rangle_2 \langle \nu+t|\mu\rangle_1 \langle g|_3 e^{i(\nu+t-\mu)H_3} |g\rangle_3 \\ &= \frac{N}{2\pi} \int d\epsilon_1 d\epsilon_2 d\epsilon'_2 \Pi(\bar{H}'_2 + \epsilon_1, -\sigma_3) f^*(\epsilon_2) f(\epsilon'_2) |g(-\bar{H}'_2 - \epsilon_1)|^2 e^{i\nu(\epsilon_2 - \bar{H}'_2)} e^{-i\mu(\epsilon'_2 - \bar{H}'_2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.11})$$

Plugging this into the density operator for the case of $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\phi|2} &= \frac{N}{2\pi} e^{-S_{0,2}-\beta(H_1+H_3)} \Pi_{|2} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu \int_{\sigma_2} d\epsilon_2 f(\epsilon_2) e^{-i\nu(\epsilon_2+H_S+H_1+H_3)} \right) S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S}^\dagger \\ &\quad \int_{\sigma_1} d\epsilon_1 \Pi(\bar{H}'_2 + \epsilon_1, -\sigma_3) |g(-\bar{H}'_2 - \epsilon_1)|^2 S_{\phi_S(0)|\psi_S} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu \int_{\sigma_2} d\epsilon'_2 f^*(\epsilon'_2) e^{i\mu(\epsilon'_2+H_S+H_1+H_3)} \right) \\ &= 2\pi N e^{-S_{0,2}-\beta(H_1+H_3)} \Pi_{|2} f(\bar{H}_2) S_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^\dagger \int_{\sigma_2} d\epsilon_1 \Pi(\bar{H}'_2 + \epsilon_1, -\sigma_3) |g(-\bar{H}'_2 - \epsilon_1)|^2 S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} f^*(\bar{H}_2) \Pi_{|2}.\end{aligned}\tag{F.12}$$

In the last line, we've also defined $\bar{H}_2 := -H_S - H_1 - H_3$ as the constraint-equivalent of H_2 on $\mathcal{H}_{|2}$.

Collecting results from (F.7) and (F.12) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\phi|1} &= 2\pi N e^{-S_{0,1}-\beta(H_2+H_3)} \Pi_{|1} S_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^\dagger \int_{\sigma_2} d\epsilon_2 \Pi(\bar{H}'_1 + \epsilon_2, -\sigma_3) |f(\epsilon_2)|^2 |g(-\bar{H}'_1 - \epsilon_2)|^2 S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} \Pi_{|1}, \\ \rho_{\phi|2} &= 2\pi N e^{-S_{0,2}-\beta(H_1+H_3)} \Pi_{|2} f(\bar{H}_2) S_{\phi_S|\psi_S}^\dagger \int_{\sigma_1} d\epsilon_1 \Pi(\bar{H}'_2 + \epsilon_1, -\sigma_3) |g(-\bar{H}'_2 - \epsilon_1)|^2 S_{\phi_S|\psi_S} f^*(\bar{H}_2) \Pi_{|2},\end{aligned}\tag{F.13}$$

where $\bar{H}'_1 := H_S - H_2 - H_3$, $\bar{H}'_2 := H_S - H_1 - H_3$, and $\bar{H}_2 := -H_S - H_1 - H_3$. Recall that these are the density operators for algebras $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_1}^H)$ and $r(\mathcal{A}_{SC_2}^H)$, respectively, for the same physical state, which is distinguished by the fact that in the perspective of clock C_1 it looks approximately unentangled (equation (F.1)).

G Linear expansion of the symmetric BCH-formula

The density operators in Subsect. 8.1 in general contain non-commuting operators. Essentially, these are the relative modular Hamiltonian $H_{\phi_S|\psi_S}$ and the modular Hamiltonian H_S related to the KMS-state ψ_S . To calculate the entropy, we need to take the logarithm of a product of exponentials of such operators, which can be done with the BCH formula. A direct application of this will involve nested commutators of H_S and $H_{\phi_S|\psi_S}$, but without further conditions on these operators, one cannot be certain that the BCH formula converges.

However, a useful expansion can be performed when one of the operators can be expanded in a small parameter, allowing us to consider corrections to the leading order/commuting piece. This is true for the second density operator in the gravitational interferometer we consider in Subsect. 8.1

For this purpose, we make use of the following well-known form of the BCH-formula for $\log(e^X e^Y)$ which one writes as a nested commutator expansion acting on powers of Y

$$\log(e^X e^Y) = X + \frac{\text{ad}_X}{1 - e^{-\text{ad}_X}} Y + \mathcal{O}(Y^2), \quad \text{ad}_X(Y) := [X, Y],\tag{G.1}$$

in which ad_X is the adjoint action by X . The second term here may be functionally expanded as

$$\frac{x}{1 - e^{-x}} = 1 + \frac{x}{2} + \frac{x^2}{12} - \dots,\tag{G.2}$$

The leading order piece here gives for commuting operators $\log(e^X e^Y) = X + Y$ as expected. In the more general case, one can omit terms in (G.1) of order Y^2 , to obtain an expansion of $\log(e^X e^Y)$ in terms of nested commutators of X with Y .

We will also need the following general formula in order to switch orders

$$\log(e^X e^Y) = -\log(e^{-Y} e^{-X}), \quad (\text{G.3})$$

which is a special case of $\log(x) = -\log(x^{-1})$.

We now turn our attention towards the structure we are interested in, namely $e^Y e^X e^{Y^\dagger}$. We start by applying (G.1) to $\log(e^X e^{Y^\dagger})$ and then switch the order through (G.3) to apply it a second time. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \log(e^Y e^X e^{Y^\dagger}) &= -\log\left(e^{-X - \frac{\text{ad}_X}{1 - e^{-\text{ad}_X}} Y^\dagger + \mathcal{O}(Y^{\dagger 2})} e^{-Y}\right) \\ &= X + \frac{\text{ad}_X}{1 - e^{-\text{ad}_X}} Y^\dagger - \frac{\text{ad}_X}{1 - e^{\text{ad}_X}} Y + \mathcal{O}(Y^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.4})$$

Where in the last line we made the approximation

$$-X - \frac{\text{ad}_X}{1 - e^{-\text{ad}_X}} Y^\dagger = -X + \mathcal{O}(Y), \quad (\text{G.5})$$

since this will act again on Y through the adjoint action. This expression can be rewritten in a slightly more useful form

$$\log(e^Y e^X e^{Y^\dagger}) \approx X + \frac{\text{ad}_X}{2} \coth\left(\frac{\text{ad}_X}{2}\right) (Y + Y^\dagger) - \frac{1}{2} \text{ad}_X (Y - Y^\dagger), \quad (\text{G.6})$$

which is the one mentioned in the main body for the gravitational interferometer in Subsect. 8.1.

References

- [1] J. De Vuyst, S. Eccles, P. A. Höhn, and J. Kirklín, *Gravitational entropy is observer-dependent*, (2024), [2405.00114].
- [2] J. D. Bekenstein, *Black holes and the second law*, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **4** (1972), 737–740.
- [3] S. W. Hawking, *Particle Creation by Black Holes*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **43** (1975), ed. by G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, [Erratum: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 46, 206 (1976)], 199–220.
- [4] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, *Holographic Derivation of Entanglement Entropy from the anti-de Sitter Space/Conformal Field Theory Correspondence*, *Physical Review Letters* **96.18** (2006), ISSN: 1079-7114.
- [5] A. Lewkowycz and J. Maldacena, *Generalized gravitational entropy*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2013.8** (2013), ISSN: 1029-8479.
- [6] T. Faulkner, A. Lewkowycz, and J. Maldacena, *Quantum corrections to holographic entanglement entropy*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2013.11** (2013), ISSN: 1029-8479.
- [7] N. Engelhardt and A. C. Wall, *Quantum extremal surfaces: holographic entanglement entropy beyond the classical regime*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2015.1** (2015), ISSN: 1029-8479.
- [8] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, *Microscopic origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy*, *Physics Letters B* **379.1–4** (1996), 99–104, ISSN: 0370-2693.
- [9] K. A. Meissner, *Black-hole entropy in loop quantum gravity*, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **21.22** (2004), 5245–5251, ISSN: 1361-6382.
- [10] E. Witten, *APS Medal for Exceptional Achievement in Research: Invited article on entanglement properties of quantum field theory*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90** (4 2018), 045003.
- [11] J. Sorce, *Notes on the type classification of von Neumann algebras*, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **36.02** (2024), 2430002, [2302.01958].

- [12] M. Takesaki, *Theory of Operator Algebras I*, Springer New York, 1979, ISBN: 9781461261889.
- [13] L. Susskind and J. Uglum, *Black hole entropy in canonical quantum gravity and superstring theory*, *Physical Review D* **50.4** (1994), 2700–2711, ISSN: 0556-2821.
- [14] T. Jacobson, *Black Hole Entropy and Induced Gravity*, 1994, [[gr-qc/9404039](#)].
- [15] V. Frolov, D. Fursaev, and A. Zelnikov, *Statistical origin of black hole entropy in induced gravity*, *Nuclear Physics B* **486.1** (1997), 339–352, ISSN: 0550-3213.
- [16] V. P. Frolov and D. V. Fursaev, *Thermal fields, entropy and black holes*, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **15.8** (1998), 2041.
- [17] S. Leutheusser and H. Liu, *Causal connectability between quantum systems and the black hole interior in holographic duality*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108.8** (2023), 086019, [[2110.05497](#)].
- [18] S. A. W. Leutheusser and H. Liu, *Emergent Times in Holographic Duality*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108.8** (2023), 086020, [[2112.12156](#)].
- [19] E. Witten, *Gravity and the crossed product*, *JHEP* **10** (2022), 008, [[2112.12828](#)].
- [20] A. Connes, *Une classification des facteurs de type III*, fr, *Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure* **4e série, 6.2** (1973), 133–252.
- [21] V. Chandrasekaran, R. Longo, G. Penington, and E. Witten, *An algebra of observables for de Sitter space*, *JHEP* **02** (2023), 082, [[2206.10780](#)].
- [22] V. Chandrasekaran, G. Penington, and E. Witten, *Large N algebras and generalized entropy*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2023.4** (2023), ISSN: 1029-8479.
- [23] J. Kudler-Flam, S. Leutheusser, and G. Satishchandran, *Algebraic Observational Cosmology*, (2024), [[2406.01669](#)].
- [24] K. Jensen, J. Sorce, and A. J. Speranza, *Generalized entropy for general subregions in quantum gravity*, *JHEP* **12** (2023), 020, [[2306.01837](#)].
- [25] M. Ali and V. Suneeta, *A local Generalized second law in crossed product constructions*, (2024), [[2404.00718](#)].
- [26] M. S. Klinger and R. G. Leigh, *Crossed products, extended phase spaces and the resolution of entanglement singularities*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **999** (2024), 116453, [[2306.09314](#)].
- [27] T. Faulkner and A. J. Speranza, *Gravitational algebras and the generalized second law*, *JHEP* **11** (2024), 099, [[2405.00847](#)].
- [28] S. Ali Ahmad and R. Jefferson, *Crossed product algebras and generalized entropy for subregions*, *SciPost Phys. Core* **7** (2024), 020, [[2306.07323](#)].
- [29] J. Kirklin, *Generalised second law beyond the semiclassical regime*, (2024), [[2412.01903](#)].
- [30] J. Kudler-Flam, S. Leutheusser, and G. Satishchandran, *Generalized Black Hole Entropy is von Neumann Entropy*, (2023), [[2309.15897](#)].
- [31] E. Witten, *A background-independent algebra in quantum gravity*, *JHEP* **03** (2024), 077, [[2308.03663](#)].
- [32] J. Kudler-Flam, S. Leutheusser, A. A. Rahman, G. Satishchandran, and A. J. Speranza, *A covariant regulator for entanglement entropy: proofs of the Bekenstein bound and QNEC*, (2023), [[2312.07646](#)].
- [33] E. Gesteau, *Large N von Neumann algebras and the renormalization of Newton's constant*, (2023), [[2302.01938](#)].
- [34] V. Balasubramanian and C. Cummings, *The entropy of finite gravitating regions*, (2023), [[2312.08434](#)].
- [35] R. M. Soni, *A type I approximation of the crossed product*, *JHEP* **01** (2024), 123, [[2307.12481](#)].

- [36] S. E. Aguilar-Gutierrez, E. Bahiru, and R. Espíndola, *The centaur-algebra of observables*, *JHEP* **03** (2024), 008, [[2307.04233](#)].
- [37] C. Gomez, *Entanglement, Observers and Cosmology: a view from von Neumann Algebras*, (2023), [[2302.14747](#)].
- [38] C. Gomez, *Clocks, Algebras and Cosmology*, (2023), [[2304.11845](#)].
- [39] M. S. Klinger and R. G. Leigh, *Crossed Products, Conditional Expectations and Constraint Quantization*, (2023), [[2312.16678](#)].
- [40] J. De Vuyst, S. Eccles, P. A. Höhn, and J. Kirklin, *Linearization (in)stabilities and crossed products*, (2024), [[2411.19931](#)].
- [41] D. Brill and S. Deser, *Instability of Closed Spaces in General Relativity*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **32** (1973), 291.
- [42] V. Moncrief, *Spacetime symmetries and linearization stability of the Einstein equations. I*, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **16.3** (1975), 493–498, ISSN: 0022-2488.
- [43] V. Moncrief, *Space-Time Symmetries and Linearization Stability of the Einstein Equations. 2.*, *J. Math. Phys.* **17** (1976), 1893–1902.
- [44] V. Moncrief, *Invariant States and Quantized Gravitational Perturbations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **18** (1978), 983–989.
- [45] V. Moncrief, *Quantum linearization instabilities*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **10** (1979), 93–97.
- [46] J. M. Arms, *Linearization stability of the Einstein–Maxwell system*, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **18.4** (1977), 830–833, ISSN: 0022-2488.
- [47] J. M. Arms, *Linearization stability of gravitational and gauge fields*, *J. Math. Phys.* **20** (1979), 443–453.
- [48] A. E. Fischer, J. E. Marsden, and V. Moncrief, *The structure of the space of solutions of Einstein’s equations. I. One Killing field*, in: *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré. Section A, Physique Théorique*, vol. 33, 2, 1980, 147–194.
- [49] J. M. Arms, J. E. Marsden, and V. Moncrief, *The structure of the space of solutions of Einstein’s equations. II. Several Killing fields and the Einstein–Yang–Mills equations*, *Annals Phys.* **144** (1982), 81–106.
- [50] R. V. Saraykar and N. E. Joshi, *Linearization stability of Einstein equations coupled with self-gravitating scalar fields*, *J. Math. Phys.* **22** (1981), 343–347.
- [51] A. Higuchi, *Quantum linearization instabilities of de Sitter space-time. 1*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **8** (1991), 1961–1981.
- [52] A. Higuchi, *Quantum linearization instabilities of de Sitter space-time. 2*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **8** (1991), 1983–2004.
- [53] B. Losic and W. G. Unruh, *On leading order gravitational backreactions in de Sitter spacetime*, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006), 023511, [[gr-qc/0604122](#)].
- [54] C. J. Fewster, D. W. Janssen, L. D. Loveridge, K. Rejzner, and J. Waldron, *Quantum reference frames, measurement schemes and the type of local algebras in quantum field theory*, (2024), [[2403.11973](#)].
- [55] S. Ali Ahmad, W. Chemissany, M. S. Klinger, and R. G. Leigh, *Quantum reference frames from top-down crossed products*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110.6** (2024), 065003, [[2405.13884](#)].
- [56] C. Goeller, P. A. Höhn, and J. Kirklin, *Diffeomorphism-invariant observables and dynamical frames in gravity: reconciling bulk locality with general covariance*, (2022), [[2206.01193](#)].
- [57] S. Carrozza, S. Eccles, and P. A. Höhn, *Edge modes as dynamical frames: charges from post-selection in generally covariant theories*, *SciPost Phys.* **17.2** (2024), 048, [[2205.00913](#)].

- [58] S. Carrozza and P. A. Höhn, *Edge modes as reference frames and boundary actions from post-selection*, *JHEP* **02** (2022), 172, [[2109.06184](#)].
- [59] V. Kabel, A.-C. de la Hamette, L. Apadula, C. Cepollaro, H. Gomes, J. Butterfield, and Č. Brukner, *Identification is Pointless: Quantum Reference Frames, Localisation of Events, and the Quantum Hole Argument*, (2024), [[2402.10267](#)].
- [60] V. Kabel, Č. Brukner, and W. Wieland, *Quantum reference frames at the boundary of spacetime*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108.10** (2023), 106022, [[2302.11629](#)].
- [61] L. Susskind, *A Paradox and its Resolution Illustrate Principles of de Sitter Holography*, (2023), [[2304.00589](#)].
- [62] Y. Aharonov and L. Susskind, *Charge Superselection Rule*, *Phys. Rev.* **155** (1967), 1428–1431.
- [63] Y. Aharonov and T. Kaufherr, *Quantum frames of reference*, *Phys. Rev. D* **30** (1984), 368.
- [64] R. M. Angelo, N. Brunner, S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and P. Skrzypczyk, *Physics within a Quantum Reference Frame*, en, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44.14** (2011), 145304, ISSN: 1751-8121.
- [65] F. Giacomini, E. Castro-Ruiz, and Č. Brukner, *Quantum mechanics and the covariance of physical laws in quantum reference frames*, *Nature Commun.* **10.1** (2019), 494, [[1712.07207](#)].
- [66] A.-C. de la Hamette, T. D. Galley, P. A. Höhn, L. Loveridge, and M. P. Müller, *Perspective-neutral approach to quantum frame covariance for general symmetry groups*, (2021), [[2110.13824](#)].
- [67] P. A. Höhn, I. Kotecha, and F. M. Mele, *Quantum Frame Relativity of Subsystems, Correlations and Thermodynamics*, (2023), [[2308.09131](#)].
- [68] P. A. Höhn, A. R. H. Smith, and M. P. E. Lock, *Trinity of relational quantum dynamics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104.6** (2021), 066001, [[1912.00033](#)].
- [69] P. A. Höhn, A. R. H. Smith, and M. P. E. Lock, *Equivalence of Approaches to Relational Quantum Dynamics in Relativistic Settings*, *Front. in Phys.* **9** (2021), 181, [[2007.00580](#)].
- [70] L. Chataignier, P. A. Höhn, M. P. E. Lock, and F. M. Mele, *Relational Dynamics with Periodic Clocks*, (2024), [[2409.06479](#)].
- [71] S. Ali Ahmad, T. D. Galley, P. A. Höhn, M. P. E. Lock, and A. R. H. Smith, *Quantum Relativity of Subsystems*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128.17** (2022), 170401, [[2103.01232](#)].
- [72] P. A. Höhn, M. Krumm, and M. P. Müller, *Internal quantum reference frames for finite Abelian groups*, *J. Math. Phys.* **63.11** (2022), 112207, [[2107.07545](#)].
- [73] A.-C. de la Hamette, S. L. Ludescher, and M. P. Müller, *Entanglement-Asymmetry Correspondence for Internal Quantum Reference Frames*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129.26** (2022), 260404, [[2112.00046](#)].
- [74] A. Vanrietvelde, P. A. Höhn, F. Giacomini, and E. Castro-Ruiz, *A change of perspective: switching quantum reference frames via a perspective-neutral framework*, *Quantum* **4** (2020), 225, [[1809.00556](#)].
- [75] A. Vanrietvelde, P. A. Höhn, and F. Giacomini, *Switching quantum reference frames in the N-body problem and the absence of global relational perspectives*, *Quantum* **7** (2023), 1088, [[1809.05093](#)].
- [76] F. Giacomini, *Spacetime Quantum Reference Frames and superpositions of proper times*, *Quantum* **5** (2021), 508, [[2101.11628](#)].
- [77] E. Castro-Ruiz, F. Giacomini, A. Belenchia, and Č. Brukner, *Quantum clocks and the temporal localisability of events in the presence of gravitating quantum systems*, *Nature Commun.* **11.1** (2020), 2672, [[1908.10165](#)].

- [78] M. Suleymanov, I. L. Paiva, and E. Cohen, *Nonrelativistic spatiotemporal quantum reference frames*, *Phys. Rev. A* **109.3** (2024), 032205, [2307.01874].
- [79] M. Krumm, P. A. Höhn, and M. P. Müller, *Quantum reference frame transformations as symmetries and the paradox of the third particle*, *Quantum* **5** (2021), 530, [2011.01951].
- [80] A.-C. de la Hamette and T. D. Galley, *Quantum reference frames for general symmetry groups*, *Quantum* **4** (2020), 367, [2004.14292].
- [81] T. Carette, J. Głowacki, and L. Loveridge, *Operational Quantum Reference Frame Transformations*, (2023), [2303.14002].
- [82] L. Loveridge and T. Miyadera, *Relative Quantum Time*, *Found. Phys.* **49.6** (2019), 549–560, [1905.08078].
- [83] L. Loveridge, T. Miyadera, and P. Busch, *Symmetry, Reference Frames, and Relational Quantities in Quantum Mechanics*, en, *Found. Phys.* **48.2** (2018), 135–198, ISSN: 1572-9516.
- [84] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens, *Reference frames, superselection rules, and quantum information*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **79** (2007), 555–609, [quant-ph/0610030].
- [85] E. Castro-Ruiz and O. Oreshkov, *Relative subsystems and quantum reference frame transformations*, (2021), [2110.13199].
- [86] D. N. Page and W. K. Wootters, *Evolution without evolution: dynamics described by stationary observables*, *Phys. Rev. D* **27** (1983), 2885.
- [87] W. K. Wootters, “Time” replaced by quantum correlations, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **23.8** (1984), 701–711.
- [88] M. Kaplan, D. Marolf, X. Yu, and Y. Zhao, *De Sitter quantum gravity and the emergence of local algebras*, (2024), [2410.00111].
- [89] C.-H. Chen and G. Penington, *A clock is just a way to tell the time: gravitational algebras in cosmological spacetimes*, (2024), [2406.02116].
- [90] W. Donnelly and L. Freidel, *Local subsystems in gauge theory and gravity*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2016.9** (2016), ISSN: 1029-8479.
- [91] A. J. Speranza, *Local phase space and edge modes for diffeomorphism-invariant theories*, *JHEP* **02** (2018), 021, [1706.05061].
- [92] L. Freidel, M. Geiller, and D. Pranzetti, *Edge modes of gravity. Part I. Corner potentials and charges*, *JHEP* **11** (2020), 026, [2006.12527].
- [93] L. Freidel, M. Geiller, and D. Pranzetti, *Edge modes of gravity. Part II. Corner metric and Lorentz charges*, *JHEP* **11** (2020), 027, [2007.03563].
- [94] Araújo Regado, Goncalo and Höhn, Philipp A. and Sartini, Francesco and Tomova, Bilyana, *Soft edges: the many links between soft and edge modes*, (2024), eprint: [\[concurrentlyontheXiv\]](#).
- [95] G. Franzmann, *To be or not to be, but where?*, (2024), [2405.21031].
- [96] D. Marolf, D. Minic, and S. F. Ross, *Notes on space-time thermodynamics and the observer dependence of entropy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004), 064006, [hep-th/0310022].
- [97] X.-X. Ju, W.-B. Pan, Y.-W. Sun, and Y.-T. Wang, *Generalized Rindler Wedge and Holographic Observer Concordance*, (2023), [2302.03340].
- [98] X.-X. Ju, B.-H. Liu, W.-B. Pan, Y.-W. Sun, and Y.-T. Wang, *Squashed Entanglement from Generalized Rindler Wedge*, (2023), [2310.09799].
- [99] D. K. Kolchmeyer, *von Neumann algebras in JT gravity*, *JHEP* **06** (2023), 067, [2303.04701].
- [100] D. K. Kolchmeyer and H. Liu, *Chaos and the Emergence of the Cosmological Horizon*, (2024), [2411.08090].

- [101] W. Pauli, *Handbuch der Physik* 5, 1, 1958.
- [102] W. G. Unruh and R. M. Wald, *Time and the Interpretation of Canonical Quantum Gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **40** (1989), 2598.
- [103] A. S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*, vol. 1, Statistics and Probability, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1982.
- [104] P. Busch, M. Grabowski, and P. J. Lahti, *Operational Quantum Physics*, vol. 31, Lecture Notes in Physics Monographs, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [105] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, and G. J. Milburn, *Generalized uncertainty relations: Theory, examples, and Lorentz invariance*, *Annals Phys.* **247** (1996), 135, [quant-ph/9507004].
- [106] A. R. H. Smith and M. Ahmadi, *Quantizing time: Interacting clocks and systems*, *Quantum* **3** (2019), 160, ISSN: 2521-327X.
- [107] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, and M. Hoge, *Time in quantum physics: From an external parameter to an intrinsic observable*, *Found. Phys.* **40** (2010), 1368–1378, [0909.1899].
- [108] P. A. Höhn, E. Kubalova, and A. Tsobanjan, *Effective relational dynamics of a nonintegrable cosmological model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012), 065014, [1111.5193].
- [109] P. A. Höhn, A. Russo, and A. R. H. Smith, *Matter relative to quantum hypersurfaces*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109.10** (2024), 105011, [2308.12912].
- [110] K. V. Kuchař, *Time and interpretations of quantum gravity*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **20** (2011), 3–86.
- [111] C. J. Isham, *Canonical quantum gravity and the problem of time*, *NATO Sci. Ser. C* **409** (1993), ed. by L. A. Ibort and M. A. Rodriguez, 157–287, [gr-qc/9210011].
- [112] E. Anderson, *The Problem of Time*, vol. 190, Fundamental Theories of Physics, Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [113] B. Dittrich, *Partial and complete observables for Hamiltonian constrained systems*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **39** (2007), 1891–1927, [gr-qc/0411013].
- [114] L. Chataignier, *Construction of quantum Dirac observables and the emergence of WKB time*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101.8** (2020), 086001, [1910.02998].
- [115] L. Chataignier, *Relational observables, reference frames, and conditional probabilities*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103.2** (2021), 026013, [2006.05526].
- [116] D. Marolf, *Quantum observables and recollapsing dynamics*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **12** (1995), 1199–1220, [gr-qc/9404053].
- [117] D. Marolf, *Observables and a Hilbert space for Bianchi IX*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **12** (1995), 1441–1454, [gr-qc/9409049].
- [118] P. A. Höhn and A. Vanrietvelde, *How to switch between relational quantum clocks*, *New J. Phys.* **22.12** (2020), 123048, [1810.04153].
- [119] Y. Aharonov and L. Susskind, *Observability of the Sign Change of Spinors under 2π Rotations*, *Phys. Rev.* **158** (1967), 1237–1238.
- [120] P. A. M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, Belfer Graduate School of Science Yeshiva University, New York, 1964.
- [121] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- [122] D. Giulini and D. Marolf, *A Uniqueness theorem for constraint quantization*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16** (1999), 2489–2505, [gr-qc/9902045].
- [123] D. Giulini and D. Marolf, *On the generality of refined algebraic quantization*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16** (1999), 2479–2488, [gr-qc/9812024].

- [124] N. P. Landsman, *Rieffel induction as generalized quantum Marsden-Weinstein reduction*, (1993), [[hep-th/9305088](#)].
- [125] A. Higuchi, *Quantum linearization instabilities of de Sitter spacetime. II*, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **8.11** (1991), 1983.
- [126] D. Marolf, *Group averaging and refined algebraic quantization: Where are we now?*, in: *9th Marcel Grossmann Meeting on Recent Developments in Theoretical and Experimental General Relativity, Gravitation and Relativistic Field Theories (MG 9)*, 2000, [[gr-qc/0011112](#)].
- [127] D. Marolf and I. A. Morrison, *Group Averaging for de Sitter free fields*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26** (2009), 235003, [[0810.5163](#)].
- [128] J. Held and H. Maxfield, *The Hilbert space of de Sitter JT: a case study for canonical methods in quantum gravity*, (2024), [[2410.14824](#)].
- [129] C. E. Dolby, *The Conditional probability interpretation of the Hamiltonian constraint*, (2004), [[gr-qc/0406034](#)].
- [130] R. Gambini, R. A. Porto, J. Pullin, and S. Torterolo, *Conditional probabilities with Dirac observables and the problem of time in quantum gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009), 041501.
- [131] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, *Quantum Time*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2015), 945933.
- [132] E. Moreva, G. Brida, M. Gramegna, V. Giovannetti, L. Maccone, and M. Genovese, *Time from quantum entanglement: an experimental illustration*, *Phys. Rev. A* **89.5** (2014), 052122.
- [133] A. R. H. Smith and M. Ahmadi, *Quantum clocks observe classical and quantum time dilation*, *Nature Commun.* **11.1** (2020), 5360, [[1904.12390](#)].
- [134] L. Hausmann, A. Schmidhuber, and E. Castro-Ruiz, *Measurement events relative to temporal quantum reference frames*, (2023), [[2308.10967](#)].
- [135] P. A. Höhn, *Switching Internal Times and a New Perspective on the ‘Wave Function of the Universe’*, *Universe* **5.5** (2019), 116, [[1811.00611](#)].
- [136] J. Lurie, *Lecture notes on von Neumann algebras (Math 261y)*, <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/261y.html>, Harvard University, 2011.
- [137] C. Kiefer, *Quantum Gravity*, International Series of Monographs on Physics, OUP Oxford, 2007, ISBN: 9780199212521.
- [138] A. Ashtekar, R. Tate, and C. Uggla, *Minisuperspaces: Observables and quantization*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **2** (1993), 15–50, [[gr-qc/9302027](#)].
- [139] M. Bojowald, *Canonical Gravity and Applications: Cosmology, Black Holes, and Quantum Gravity*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [140] R. Haag, *Local quantum physics: Fields, particles, algebras*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [141] J. J. Bisognano and E. H. Wichmann, *On the Duality Condition for a Hermitian Scalar Field*, *J. Math. Phys.* **16** (1975), 985–1007.
- [142] G. L. Sewell, *Quantum fields on manifolds: PCT and gravitationally induced thermal states*, *Annals Phys.* **141** (1982), 201–224.
- [143] J. Sorce, *Analyticity and the Unruh effect: a study of local modular flow*, *JHEP* **24** (2020), 040, [[2403.18937](#)].
- [144] W. Donnelly and S. B. Giddings, *Diffeomorphism-invariant observables and their nonlocal algebra*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93.2** (2016), [[Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 94, 029903 \(2016\)](#)], 024030, [[1507.07921](#)].
- [145] W. Donnelly and S. B. Giddings, *Observables, gravitational dressing, and obstructions to locality and subsystems*, *Phys. Rev. D* **94.10** (2016), 104038, [[1607.01025](#)].

- [146] M. B. Fröb, A. Much, and K. Papadopoulos, *Noncommutative geometry from perturbative quantum gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107.6** (2023), 064041, [2207.03345].
- [147] M. B. Fröb, A. Much, and K. Papadopoulos, *Non-commutative coordinates from quantum gravity*, *PoS CORFU2022* (2023), 307, [2303.17238].
- [148] K. Fredenhagen, *On the Modular Structure of Local Algebras of Observables*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **97** (1985), 79.
- [149] D. Buchholz, K. Fredenhagen, and C. D’Antoni, *The Universal Structure of Local Algebras*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **111** (1987), 123.
- [150] D. Buchholz and R. Verch, *Scaling algebras and renormalization group in algebraic quantum field theory*, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **7** (1995), 1195–1240, [hep-th/9501063].
- [151] J. Yngvason, *The role of type III factors in quantum field theory*, *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **55.1** (2005), 135–147, ISSN: 0034-4877.
- [152] L. F. Abbott and S. Deser, *Stability of Gravity with a Cosmological Constant*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **195** (1982), 76–96.
- [153] H. J. Borchers, *Über die Vollständigkeit lorentzinvarianter Felder in einer zeitartigen Röhre, II* *Nuovo Cimento (1955-1965)* **19.4** (1961), 787–793, ISSN: 1827-6121.
- [154] H. Araki, *Relative Entropy of States of Von Neumann Algebras*, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. Kyoto* **1976** (1976), 809–833.
- [155] A. Strohmaier and E. Witten, *Analytic States in Quantum Field Theory on Curved Spacetimes*, *Annales Henri Poincaré* **25.10** (2024), 4543–4590, [2302.02709].
- [156] A. Strohmaier and E. Witten, *The Timelike Tube Theorem in Curved Spacetime*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **405.7** (2024), 153, [2303.16380].
- [157] E. Witten, *Algebras, regions, and observers*, *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.* **107** (2024), 247–276, [2303.02837].
- [158] A. H. Taub, *Approximate Stress Energy Tensor for Gravitational Fields*, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **2.6** (1961), 787–793.
- [159] A. Taub, “Variational principles in general relativity”, in: *Relativistic Fluid Dynamics*, Springer, 2011, pp. 205–300.
- [160] J. E. Marsden, *Lectures on Geometric Methods in Mathematical Physics*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1981, eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611970326>.
- [161] J. M. Arms and I. M. Anderson, *Perturbations of conservation laws in field theories*, *Annals Phys.* **167** (1986), 354–389.
- [162] S. Ali Ahmad, M. S. Klinger, and S. Lin, *Semifinite von Neumann algebras in gauge theory and gravity*, (2024), [2407.01695].
- [163] S. Deser and Y. Choquet-Bruhat, *On the Stability of Flat Space*, *Annals Phys.* **81** (1973), 165–178.
- [164] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, A. E. Fischer, and J. E. Marsden, “Maximal hypersurfaces and positivity of mass”, in: *Isolated gravitating systems in general relativity*, 1979.
- [165] V. Jones, *Lectures on von Neumann algebras*, Vanderbilt (2015), <https://my.vanderbilt.edu/jonesvf/von-neumann-algebras-vanderbilt-2015/>.
- [166] H. Araki, *A Generalisation Of Borchers’ Theorem*, *Helvetica Physica Acta (Switzerland)* (1963).
- [167] P. Busch, M. Grabowski, and P. J. Lahti, *Time observables in quantum theory*, *Physics Letters A* **191.5-6** (1994), 357–361.

- [168] W. Donnelly, *Decomposition of entanglement entropy in lattice gauge theory*, *Physical Review D* **85.8** (2012), ISSN: 1550-2368.
- [169] W. Donnelly and A. C. Wall, *Entanglement Entropy of Electromagnetic Edge Modes*, *Physical Review Letters* **114.11** (2015), ISSN: 1079-7114.
- [170] I. I. Shapiro, *Fourth Test of General Relativity*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (26 1964), 789–791.
- [171] D. Marolf, *Solving the Problem of Time in Mini-superspace: Measurement of Dirac Observables*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009), 084016, [0902.1551].
- [172] B. Dittrich, P. A. Höhn, T. A. Koslowski, and M. I. Nelson, *Can chaos be observed in quantum gravity?*, *Phys. Lett. B* **769** (2017), 554–560, [1602.03237].