

Boundaries, frames and gravitational limits to objectivity

Henrique Gomes^{*1}, Simon Langenscheidt ^{†2}, and Daniele Oriti ^{‡3}

¹Oriel College, Oxford, UK OX1 4EW

²Arnold Sommerfeld Center for Theoretical Physics and MCQST, Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich, Germany, EU

³Depto. de Física Teórica and IPARCOS, Facultad de Ciencias Físicas, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain, EU

December 3, 2024

Abstract

We focus on three distinct lines of recent developments: edge modes and boundary charges in gravitational physics, relational dynamics in classical and quantum gravity, and quantum reference frames. We argue that these research directions are in fact linked in multiple ways, and can be seen as different aspects of the same research programme. This research programme has two main physical goals and one general conceptual aim. The physical goals are to move beyond the two idealizations/approximations of asymptotic or closed boundary conditions in gravitational physics and of ideal reference frames (coded in coordinate frames or gauge fixings), thus achieving a more realistic modeling of (quantum) gravitational physical phenomena. The conceptual aim is to gain a better understanding of the influence of observers in physics and the ensuing limits of objectivity.

Introduction

In this contribution, we focus on two kinds of idealizations that we routinely employ when modeling physics systems in a gravitational context, namely that of negligible spacetime boundaries (often associated with the restriction to closed systems) and that of ideal reference frames, and discuss what happens upon their removal, i.e. when we make our models more realistic, and the broader conceptual implications of this step.

Our conclusion, and the argument leading to it, result from an attempt to think more carefully about the modeling process itself, but also from taking seriously recent developments in classical and quantum gravitational physics as well as quantum foundations. These have to do with gravitational (more generally, gauge) systems in fine spacetime regions, relational dynamics in classical and quantum gravity, and quantum reference frames. We tie together the main lessons we gather from such developments and conclude that, when the above idealizations are removed, we are left with a description of gravitational systems which is necessarily perspectival and dependent on the adopted physical reference frame, which in turn is the (partial) embodiment of the observer/agent observing/modeling

*henrique.deandradegomes@philosophy.ox.ac.uk

†S.Langenscheidt@physik.lmu.de

‡doriti@ucm.es

the system. This points to a fundamental limitation to strong objectivity in (quantum) gravitational physics.

Before we delve into our main claim and the argument for it, we introduce a bit of context and a general perspective motivating our reasoning and our attention to the issue of boundaries and frames in physics, and gravitational theory in particular.

We are sympathetic to operational attitudes toward physical modelling, and share the conviction that physical models should reflect as much as possible the realistic conditions of our interactions with the physical systems we consider, when potentially relevant. We consider this an important component, albeit not the only relevant one, of scientific methodology.

We understand the modeling of the system as an activity performed by a variety of types of agents (Barzegar, Margoni, & Oriti, 2023). For this activity to make sense, there must be an initial separation between the agent, which we take to include any equipment relevant to the modeling activity (recording devices, etc.), and the system that is being modeled by the agent, and such a split must be reasonably stable under the dynamics of both agent and modeled system.

Particularly, among their equipment, we focus on anything used to define a reference frame: other physical systems that the agent uses to project properties of the modeled system into a form that could encode its spacetime localization, e.g. a set of chosen clock and rods.

These reference frames serve, of course, also the purpose of contextualising the agent itself within the larger system it constitutes together with the modeled system. It is through their reference frame that an agent acquires a perspective on the full system, and its properties; one issue we will discuss is whether this affects said perspective in ways that are ultimately non-negligible.

Indeed, one can (and, we will argue, should) include such a reference frame explicitly within the model of the system of interest. The issue becomes then how this inclusion, when performed in less idealized terms, changes the description of the modeled system and what the conceptual implications of these changes are.

A second, related way in which the adoption of an agent/observer-based perspective influences our modelling of gravitational systems has to do with the localization of the modeled system in spacetime.

We model systems as occupying a specific portion of spacetime, and this portion does not include the observer/agent herself, i.e. it is not the same portion of spacetime that the observer/agent occupies (as she does not appear in the model of the system). The observer/system split, therefore, is also reflected in the existence of a boundary region of spacetime, separating the two. Neglecting the role of agents/observers and the existence of such split translates, in our models, into the treatment of the system as closed and also in its description as occupying a closed region of spacetime, a region with no boundary.

We then consider the issue of what happens when, in our models (of gravitational systems, in particular), we do not neglect the presence of spacetime boundaries. Their presence is relevant as they do affect sensibly the physics of the systems of interest. Their role, we will argue, is closely tied to the issue of physical reference frames. The inclusion of spacetime boundaries in our models, moreover, can be done in more realistic or more idealized terms, and the ensuing question is, again, how removing idealizations affects the act of modeling itself.

In this case, the idealizations involved are of two types. The more drastic one is to simply neglect the existence of boundaries and treat the system of interest as closed even in its spacetime and gravitational properties, as we discussed. Less drastic, but still an

idealization, is the assumption that the spacetime boundary (thus, the observer) can be ‘pushed to infinity’, i.e. the imposition of asymptotic boundary conditions and of infinite distance/volume limits. In a gravitational context, this is often accompanied by the switching off the gravitational interaction between the system of interest and the system ‘outside the boundary’, when one imposes flat or weak gravity data at the asymptotic boundary. The growing interest in gravitational systems in finite regions has resulted in a large number of recent developments, which in turn have improved also our understanding of the asymptotic setting, with both foundational and possibly observational consequences. Moreover, the physics of gravitational systems in finite regions ties closely to the physics of reference frames and relational dynamics, as we will discuss in the following.

We therefore arrive at our main point. A more realistic understanding of coupling of (gravitational) systems, going beyond typical idealizations, and the construction of physical questions, as represented by invariant (with respect to gauge symmetries) observables, points to a key, non-negligible role of physical frames (as partial embodiment of observers) in the understanding of gravitational systems, at classical and even more so at quantum levels. Furthermore, this has implications on what we should expect in terms of comparison and translation of statements made by different observers, it suggests an irreducible perspectival nature of such a physical understanding and, correspondingly, irreducible limitations to strong notions of objectivity.

We will summarize our main claim resulting from our reasoning in the next section, and then present in more detail the argument leading to it, before discussing briefly some of the conclusions we draw from it.

The central thesis and an argument for it

Drawing on a solid body of results from mathematical gravitational physics, quantum gravity and foundations of physics, the main conclusion we want to argue for, in this contribution, is the following:

Central thesis

Once we remove these two standard idealizations from our models of gravitational systems (more generally, our gauge field theories), whether classical or quantum, and in particular, once we take seriously the distinction between open and closed systems (encoded in the presence of finite spacetime boundaries), as well as the need for physical reference frames (encoded in gauge invariance and nonlocality with respect to the supporting manifold), we are led to the conclusion that there are serious obstacles to a framework that is completely intersubjective, and there are fundamental limits to strong objectivity. This conclusion suggests a necessary role for observers in our accounts of the physical world.

Before presenting the main steps in our argument, and their supporting evidence, we state the basic presuppositions we are starting from.

- I. Modeling starts with a system/agent or system/observer split. Modeling a physical system requires one to first identify all the data and observables referring to the system and setting up an epistemic boundary between the system itself and the cognitive agent performing the modeling. This leaves the agent out of the model itself, to the greatest extent possible, i.e. for all properties whose exclusion does not impair the explanatory or predictive accuracy of the model. If the system is to be also modeled in its spatiotemporal properties—and this is clearly necessarily the case for gravitational systems and, in fact, extends to any dynamical system—its spacetime localization is

encoded by assigning it a determined portion of the manifold we conventionally use to represent spacetime. The existence of a system/observer split is encoded then in the presence of a boundary for such region, with this boundary being finite in realistic models (and before any further approximation). This is the case both if the model represents the observer as occupying a finite spacetime region, with the system constituting whatever is 'left over'; or, more customary, if it is the system that is being modelled as occupying a finite spacetime region (the observer being ascribed as part of 'the environment').

- II. It is possible, interesting, and often necessary, to include aspects of the observers/agents in the model of the system of interest. One could then say that the abstract observer/agent has been 'embodied' in specific physical systems or mathematical conditions (e.g. boundary conditions, external potentials, etc) appearing in the model of the system of interest. In particular, observers/agents come with reference frames on which they project the state of the system, for example a set of clock and rods used to localize the physical system of interest in space and time (in fact, one could say that these devices *define* such localization).
- III. If reference frames are to be considered part of physical reality, their physical properties, including their interaction with other physical systems and backreaction on spacetime geometry, should be carefully modeled and quantified (in particular if they are to be modeled within a theory of quantum gravity and quantum spacetime). At the quantum level, the quantum properties of the physical systems used as reference frames should also be accounted for in the model.

Now, on the basis of these presuppositions, let us present our argument leading to the central thesis.

0. Starting point: the routine

The localization of physical systems in spacetime and their dynamical evolution through it are modeled in terms of points and trajectories in a differentiable manifold, and made explicit, in each region of such a manifold, by their expression in terms of coordinate frames. Such coordinate systems are taken to refer to specific reference frames and observers, and their domain of definition identifies the spacetime regions which can constitute the domain of the physical systems, often assumed to run up to infinity in time and/or space.

Both the association of coordinate frames with observers and their extending to infinity encode two important idealizations, on whose removal from our models we focus in the following. Steps 1 and 2 will contain most of the technical details required to make the remaining arguments, and are for that reason longer and more detailed.

1. Diffeomorphism invariance implies that coordinate frames are unphysical.

Conceptually, the gauge symmetries of gravitational theories, specifically diffeomorphism invariance, leads to the view that coordinate frames are entirely unphysical: they are elements of the formalism that do not affect physical results and that have no physical significance. Of course, the use of coordinates has enormous practical advantages but should be recognized as not developing a foundational role in our understanding of gravitational systems (and by extension, of the physical world). In fact, full invariance under active diffeomorphisms runs deeper than just coordinate invariance (Gaul & Rovelli, 2000), and it has important consequences for the dynamical aspects of spacetime in GR-like theories (Giulini, 2007).

Whether this lack of physical status of coordinate reference frames extends to points and trajectories in the manifold, and thus to the manifold itself, is more subtle. One could hold the view that what is physical must be gauge-invariant: a view that Dasgupta calls ‘the symmetry-to-reality-inference’ (Dasgupta, 2016). In this light, one concludes that bare manifold points (thus directions, subregions) carry no physical significance, since there are diffeomorphisms which are symmetries of the theory and won’t preserve the given subregions.

However, this view of invariance is incomplete, since it is silent about the status of quantities that enter into the definition of gauge-invariant observables; for instance, field values whose relations to other field values may together constitute a gauge-invariant observable (Rovelli, 2002a). Since no function that carries manifold points as free (or unbound) variables is, in itself, a gauge-invariant observable (diffeomorphisms map points to other points and thus transform non-trivially such functions), and this includes any set of field values, such parts of an invariant observable need not be themselves invariant: they only need to have the right covariance property. Thus all invariant observables need to be instantiated by suitable diffeomorphism-invariant functions of field values (Dittrich, 2006); functions in which the bare manifold points either don’t appear or figure only as bound variables. Such functions could be the relational observables we discuss in what follows.

Another, related view, would agree on the above at the technical level, but hold that allusion to manifold points is unproblematic as long as one interprets these points ‘antihaeceustically’: that is, as being numerically distinct but stripped of any primitive identity, being only possibly individuated by the web of properties and relations in which they participate.

In any case, it is conceivable that manifold points, directions, paths etc may altogether disappear from the formulation of our models, and may not feature at all in more fundamental theories, i.e. in quantum gravity. Explicit examples of such a disappearance are given in classical GR, when this is deparametrized in terms of special material frames (J. D. Brown & Kuchar, 1995; Giesel & Thiemann, 2010), and in a handful of approaches to quantum gravity, in various approximations (Marchetti & Oriti, 2022; Giesel & Thiemann, 2015), and in toy models like those that appear in quantum cosmology (Banerjee, Calcagni, & Martin-Benito, 2012).

Technically, we can associate these issues regarding observables to the mathematical formulation of gauge theories as follows. In gauge theories and in gravity, dynamical symmetries of the basic variables involve spatiotemporal derivatives of arbitrary functions. It follows that the symmetry-invariant content of the initial state can be extracted only non-locally from the basic variables, from procedures that involve spacetime points only as bound variables, e.g. as variables being integrated over. In more detail, a local symmetry implies, via Noether’s second theorem (cf. (Brading & Brown, 2000) for a conceptual exposition), that the equations of motion of the theory are not all independent: the full set of Euler-Lagrange equations is not linearly independent, or, alternatively, it obeys constraints. Thus this set of equations only *uniquely* determines the evolution of a subset of the original degrees of freedom. This subset can be interpreted as made of ‘composite’ variables: it is described by relations between the original degrees of freedom. The evolution of the remaining degrees of freedom is arbitrary. These remaining degrees of freedom are usually taken to not describe any physical feature of the system and are called *gauge*. There is thus a certain freedom in choosing which composites of, or relations between, the original fields will be uniquely propagated, or will evolve deterministically—each choice corresponds to a *choice of gauge*.

In the Hamiltonian phase space formalism, this indeterminism comes in the form of first-class constraints that physical observables have to satisfy. A choice of physical degrees

of freedom is a choice of canonical degrees of freedom that satisfy the constraints, which amount to choices of phase space functions that completely fix the gauge freedom (and, in Hamiltonian analysis, are phase space functions that form a 'second-class' system together with the constraints). In the next item, we will see how these technical features are associated to a (benign) form of non-locality.

2. Localization in space and relational time requires physical frames.

The implication of gauge symmetries for observables aligns, in fact, with a more realistic (and operational) description of spacetime localization and evolution. Observers use physical (material) clocks and rods to define them, so physical observables are best understood as relations between dynamical fields and the (material) clock and rods used for their localization in spacetime. This is the relational strategy for the definition of physical, thus diffeomorphism-invariant, observables in gravitational physics (Rovelli, 2002a; Dittrich, 2006). Their construction is often difficult, but their in principle availability is a fact. It is a fact, that is, provided one seeks them to be defined on subregions of the supporting differentiable manifold only, and not globally, and accepts the need to use several physical frames for a global description of physical systems throughout space and time.

One way to find such descriptions in practice involves *gauge fixing*. Gauge-fixing functions can often be interpreted as characterising a *reference frame*. This is like in more familiar examples involving straightforward spatiotemporal relations, e.g. in Newtonian mechanics, a gauge-fixing of translations is given by fixing the center of mass to be immobile, and this fixes the frame to be the center of mass frame, which is a thoroughly relational entity.

Note that this example does not illustrate the main feature that we are describing here: indeterminism. The reason is that classical non-relativistic particle mechanics does not admit time-dependent symmetries and so does not suffer from indeterminism (see, e.g., (Wallace, 2002)). Nonetheless, the example is similar in the relevant aspects to gauge-fixing in general relativity in Yang-Mills theory.

Technically, the composite or relational quantities that emerge from gauge-fixing are usually non-local because, in general relativity and Yang-Mills theory, choices of initial data must satisfy elliptic equations, whose solutions require integrals over an initial spacelike surface. In practice, ellipticity means that boundary value problems require only the boundary configuration of the field, i.e. they do not also require the field's rate of change at the boundary. Thus the solution of these equations exists *on each simultaneity surface*; and so the solution does not describe the propagation of a field, as would a solution to a hyperbolic equation. Thus non-locality may arise because the function that takes the original local degrees of freedom to a uniquely propagated subset is, generally, non-local: the value of an element in the subset at point x depends on the values of the original degrees of freedom at other points.

But this non-locality can also often be understood as emerging from relations to a reference frame: for instance, geodesic distance relative to a boundary in a geodesically convex region, would instantiate non-locality, and would also fix the spatial diffeomorphisms of the initial surface relative to fixed boundary cf. (Carrozza & Hhn, 2022). Once we describe all fields relative to such a reference frame, they are better seen as 'composite' or 'dressed' by functions of all of the fields: they can be then expressed as gauge-invariant functions. But we can bypass the mention of reference frames and obtain a straightforward equivalence between gauge-fixings and invariant, composite or 'dressed' functions by following (Gomes, 2024b), as we now illustrate.

Let Φ denote the space of kinematically possible models of the theory. Essentially, these are models that can be represented as sections of vector or tensor bundles—and so include

both general relativity and Yang-Mills theories—and so are 'freely-recombinable', or are not constrained to satisfy differential equations, which are assigned a dynamical role.

Suppose, moreover, for simplicity, that there exists a (possibly infinite-dimensional) Lie group \mathcal{G} which acts on the models (these include diffeomorphisms and gauge transformations of Yang-Mills theory):

$$\mathcal{G} \times \Phi \rightarrow \Phi \tag{1}$$

$$(g, \phi) \mapsto \phi^g \tag{2}$$

The models that are related by such an action are gauge-symmetry-related.

A function \mathcal{C} on field space Φ is a gauge-fixing:

$$\text{iff } \forall \varphi \in \Phi \quad \exists \gamma \in \mathcal{G}, \quad \mathcal{C}(\varphi^\gamma) = 0, \tag{3}$$

From this equation, we find a functional $\gamma(\varphi)$ that enforces the solution. This functional is usually called *the dressing*, and in the case of gauge-fixing functions that involve derivatives it usually involves integrals and is therefore non-local.¹ Now, from mere existence, consider one such φ and φ^g . It follows that there will be a value of $\gamma(\varphi^g)$ such that:

$$\mathcal{C}((\varphi^g)^{\gamma(\varphi^g)}) = 0. \tag{6}$$

And since $(\varphi^g)^{\gamma(\varphi^g)} \equiv \varphi^{g\gamma(\varphi^g)}$, it follows from uniqueness that

$$g\gamma(\varphi^g) = \gamma(\varphi), \tag{7}$$

and so $\gamma(\varphi^g) = g^{-1}\gamma(\varphi)$. So dressings inherit a particular type of equivariance under gauge transformations, that is solely determined by uniqueness and existence of the solutions of the gauge fixing.²

For each gauge-fixing, we obtain a projection of the field into its dressed, invariant description:

$$\begin{aligned} h : \Phi &\rightarrow \Phi \\ \varphi &\mapsto h(\varphi) := \varphi^{\gamma(\varphi)}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Now, from it is a trivial matter from (7) to verify that the *dressed* fields, $\varphi^{\gamma(\varphi)}$ are gauge-invariant:

$$h(\varphi^g) = (\varphi^g)^{\gamma(\varphi^g)} = \varphi^{\gamma(\varphi)} = h(\varphi). \tag{10}$$

Now, one can also understand the dressing $\gamma(\varphi)$ as implicitly tied to a reference frame as follows: it is the transformation—e.g. the diffeomorphism—that takes an arbitrary

¹A simple example: Coulomb gauge in gauge theory in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ with suitable asymptotic fall off conditions (cf. (Gomes & Butterfield, 2022) for a conceptual analysis of this gauge in the context of dressings and reference frames, and more about boundary conditions). Here $\varphi = A$, the gauge potential, $g \in C^\infty(M)$, a smooth function, and $\varphi^g = A + \mathbf{grad}(g)$, and $\mathcal{C}(A) = \mathbf{div}(A)$. We find:

$$\mathbf{div}(A^\gamma) = \mathbf{div}(A + \mathbf{grad}(\gamma)) = 0, \tag{4}$$

from which we obtain

$$\gamma(A)(x) = \nabla^{-2}(\mathbf{div}(A))(x) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dy \frac{\mathbf{div}(A)(y)}{|x-y|^2} \tag{5}$$

²Conversely, given a dressing with these transformation properties, we can find the gauge-fixing surface as:

$$\varphi \in \Phi, \quad \gamma(\varphi) = \text{Id}. \tag{8}$$

representation of the state to the representation according to the reference frame. To illustrate, suppose we have four scalar fields that are linearly independent in some region; say, four solutions of Klein-Gordon equations for different initial values, call these $\phi^{(I)}$, where $I = 1, \dots, 4$. Thus, putting the four together into a four-tuple, we have local diffeomorphism, for $U \subset M, \bar{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^4$, $\phi^{(I)} : U \rightarrow \bar{U}$. Of course, since these are physical fields, they will appropriately covary under the action of the diffeomorphisms: this is the property required of γ above. Now, using this map, we can write: $g_{IJ}(\phi) := [(\phi^{(I)})^{-1}]^* g_{ab}$, where with $[\cdot]^*$ we denote the pullback and with $g_{IJ}(\phi)$ the components in the frame $\{\phi^{(I)}\}$ of the abstract metric tensor g_{ab} . Such a quantity is commonly defined a ‘*relational observable*’ and it is clearly invariant under the active diffeomorphisms. See (Gomes et al., 2024; Bamonti, 2023; Bamonti & Gomes, 2024) for more about such examples and their relation to gauge-fixings and dressings).

In sum, gauge-fixings or dressed representations generally require a particular (rather benign) type of holism, or non-separability, that applies to theories with elliptic initial value constraints, such as general relativity and Yang-Mills theories; but does not apply to theories like Klein-Gordon in a fixed Minkowski background, nor to any ‘gauge theory’ whose gauge transformations involve no derivatives. Dressed variables can be understood as gauge-invariant variables, that correspond to a description of the states according to a physical reference frame.

From this treatment relating gauge-fixing, reference frames, and dressings, we can abstract two further conclusions:

- (i) Since both gravitational or material degrees of freedom can be used in describing the function(al) \mathcal{C} in equation (3), both types of degrees of freedom can be employed in the construction of reference frames/dressings/observables;
- (ii) Reference frames, or a choice of relational observables, etc, will in both general relativity and Yang-Mills theory only be available *locally* in field space. In the gauge-fixing language, this is a consequence of the *Gribov obstruction* (Gribov, 1978; Singer, 1978). Conceptually, the obstruction emerges from the physical nature of the reference frame: for some field values, the configuration that made up the reference frame simply won’t have sufficient structure to serve its role as a reference frame.

Let us add a couple of remarks. The non-locality we have been referring to in the above discussion is with respect to the manifold supporting fields. This non-locality could be seen as a further suggestion that manifold points have indeed no direct physical significance, albeit they may enter indirectly in the construction of physical (diffeo-invariant) quantities. Indeed, in the relational strategy, spacetime localization is always with respect to field values, i.e. those fields used as reference frames, and local physics is actually to be defined with respect to such field values. One could say that local physics takes place in field space, not the supporting manifold. This is one motivation to consider dynamics in such field space as the relevant arena for extracting physical effects from quantum gravity models (Oriti, 2024).

3. Truly physical frames are (very) different from coordinate frames:

The endpoint of the relational strategy for the construction of diffeomorphism-invariant observables and a physical definition of spacetime localization is that this requires the use of truly physical reference frames, constituted by dynamical entities (fields) in the model. Obviously, this is not only in line with the formal requirements of the gauge invariance, but also with the lesson of background independence.

It is important to realize that this step brings truly novel features in our models of gravitational systems, and not just a formal adequacy to mathematical requirements. Physical

reference frames possess properties that coordinate frames do not possess, and such properties have to be carefully accounted for in our models, otherwise we will pay the price of missing out a number of potentially crucial physical effects.

Let us illustrate these properties marking the difference with coordinate frames.

Physical frames, in general, can be adopted only ‘locally’, i.e. for limited range of values of the field values we interpret as temporal and spatial distances, just like coordinate charts only make sense locally on the manifold, in general. This is generally the case on manifolds with non-trivial topology and/or compact, like it is for standard coordinate charts. Unlike coordinate charts, the limitations of applicability of physical reference frames can also be due to dynamical considerations, eg a certain set of fields can be only used as a reference frame for a subset of solutions of its equations of motion, or for a restricted region in field space.

More crucially, they are themselves fully dynamical, thus interacting with other dynamical entities in the model. In particular, they are coupled to geometry via the Einstein’s equations (or those of other diffeo-invariant gravitational theory), thus they backreact on such geometry in a way that depends on their own energy-momentum tensor. This backreaction may not be negligible, in general.

In general, these and other physical effects affect the gravitational dynamics of spacetime and matter described in terms of physical reference frames (Giesel, Li, & Singh, 2021)

The above is the most immediate (interesting) complication arising from using physical frames, in the classical domain. Being truly physical, however, dynamical reference frames are also quantum systems.

This means that, in a truly realistic model of our gravitational systems, taking account diffeo-invariance via the relational strategy, our clock and rods should be described as any other physical system in the mode, with their own Hilbert space of states, their algebra of observables etc. It is intuitively clear that this brings a whole new set of complications, which are not merely formal, and which are being carefully addressed in recent research (see (Kabel et al., 2024; de la Hamette & Galley, 2020) and references therein). To list a few: quantum reference frames will generically be in a superposition of the states corresponding to definite values of the observable we identified as our clock or rod reading, thus such reading will be subject to quantum fluctuations; quantum reference frames will be entangled with other physical systems; quantum reference frames will be subject to contextuality conditions. In particular, as soon as one considers *multiple* observables relating to a given frame, one cannot in general make all of them sharp in a given state (as opposed to a single observable, where this is always possible). The above is generic, but it has immediate implications for spacetime localization. For example, we may expect that incompatibility conditions will affect those observables that we define such spatiotemporal localization (generically requiring multiple observables), resulting in some form of spacetime non-commutativity.

Moreover, quantum uncertainty could well make neglecting the backreaction of physical frames on geometry even less reasonable.

Take the simple example of a scalar field ϕ used as a clock, in a Hamiltonian framework. Its conjugate variable, the momentum π_ϕ , can be understood as a contributor to the energy density of the field.³ Therefore, at a classical level, one must keep said momentum as small as possible, in order to allow for a suitable evolution of the value of the clock field while keeping gravitational backreaction to a minimum. However, if the field is quantum, this is no longer an option. Due to the uncertainty principle, there is complementarity between

³Of course, in suitably engineered situations, one might devise a clock whose conjugate variable only indirectly couples to gravity. The general issue, however, remains.

the two variables and one cannot specify them both in *any* state to an arbitrary degree of sharpness. Particularly, naively making the determination of the clock value sharper and sharper induces large uncertainties in the value of the momentum. This means that it is no longer accurate to neglect the backreaction caused by the field (because a small expectation value of the clock value is overwhelmed by fluctuations, which involve possibly quite large energy densities participating in the quantum interaction of the clock with the gravitational field, and which could induce similarly large fluctuations in geometry too).

All the above has to be taken into account in models of quantum gravity where gravitational dynamics is studied (and extracted) in relation to physical frames (Marchetti & Oriti, 2022).

4. Coordinate frames are physical only in (useful) idealizations, which have to be ultimately removed

Coordinate frames are the result of an idealization (which is technically implemented by various approximations). They correspond to specific physical frames and thus physical degrees of freedom, in the idealized case in which they are modeled as not gravitating, not interacting with other physical systems either and classical (Dittrich, 2006; Giesel & Thiemann, 2015). Removing this idealization requires one to further develop the construction and analysis of physical (diffeomorphism invariant, relational) observables in classical and quantum gravity, and the construction and analysis of quantum reference frames. It also requires gaining proper control over the coupled dynamics of such physical reference frames and other systems, including spacetime itself.

The success of the routine use of coordinate frames in physics (including gravitational physics) shows that the approximations leading to idealized frames are applicable and robust in most regimes of interest. The point remains however, and we should consider carefully and critically such approximations in the context of models in which they are not assumed from the start, to see if we are missing interesting new physics when we take them. In particular, in regimes in which quantum gravity is relevant, we should not expect such approximations to be valid, in general.

There are two cases, however, in which coordinate frames are not shown as unphysical by diffeomorphism invariance. In the first, the spacetime geometries being considered possess special isometries. They thus carry a notion of preferred observers and spacetime directions. In the other case, the gravitational system is modelled in terms of spacetime with boundaries at infinity and corresponding special asymptotic boundary conditions. While these situations are indeed special cases, and therefore do not alter the conceptual significance of the above conclusion, which applies to the general case, it is important to realize that another crucial idealization is in place in the second type of situation.

Indeed, to assume that the gravitational system under consideration occupies an infinite region of spacetime, and that the observer studying it can sit at an asymptotically safe distance from it, it is clearly another (useful) idealization. It corresponds to the case in which we consider a system that is actually localized in some finite spacetime region that just happens to be big enough to be idealized as infinite.

Removing this idealization and thus making our models of gravitational systems more realistic, means tackling a number of challenges and developing further a research direction that has recently gained much attention, i.e. that of gravitational physics in finite regions, and the novel features that are brought into relevance by the presence of finite boundaries.

A general result is that such boundaries should be endowed with dynamical edge modes, also in order to preserve full gauge invariance, when diffeos are taken to act on boundary degrees of freedom. A second result is that edge modes of such regions can be seen as

providing a physical reference frame, so that defining a physical spacetime boundary in all its dynamical aspects is equivalent to selecting a physical frame. These two results form the basis for the next two steps in our argument.

5. Considering gravitational physics in finite regions brings further physical features

Gauge symmetries in a bounded subsystem are quite subtle. Dynamical structures for the subsystem, such as its intrinsic Hamiltonian, symplectic structure, and variational principles in general, acquire terms that must be carefully dealt with.

The conceptual reason for the subtle treatment of gauge symmetry in subsystems is that gauge theories manifest a type of non-locality, as we described above. Thus the global, physical phase space (or the corresponding global physical Hilbert space, in the quantum theory) is not factorizable into the physical phase spaces over the composing regions.⁴

The technical reason is that, setting aside very stringent physical boundary conditions—such as vanishing field-strength in the case of Yang-Mills theory—the variation of the action functional produces boundary terms that are not gauge-invariant. This is easy to see: any Lagrangian that employs variables that are not gauge-invariant—and this includes both general relativity and gauge theory—will, upon variation, produce boundary terms that depend on the variation of these variables. On the initial value surface, such terms are innocuous, and will merely inform us of the symplectic structure of the theory: which variables are canonically conjugate. But for spatial boundaries, we obtain non-invariant terms. How should we interpret these?

We can easily illustrate this with the Yang-Mills action in vacuum:

$$S(A) := \int_{M \times \mathbb{R}} F_{\mu\nu}^I F_I^{\mu\nu}. \quad (11)$$

On a bounded submanifold, say, $R \times \mathbb{R}$, where $R \subset M$ is a spatial submanifold of M , a variation of the action yields, after integration by parts:

$$\delta S(A) = - \int_{M \times \mathbb{R}} \delta A_I^\nu (D^\mu F_{\mu\nu}^I) + \oint_{S \times \mathbb{R}} s^\mu F_{\mu\nu} \delta A^\nu, \quad (12)$$

where s^μ is the normal to the hypersurface $S \times \mathbb{R}$ in $M \times \mathbb{R}$. Now, for the first term of (12) to vanish for arbitrary variations of the gauge potential it suffices that the gauge potential satisfies the Yang-Mills equations. But the second term vanishes only if either (the normal component of) the field tensor vanishes along the boundary or δA_μ^I vanishes at the boundary. The first condition is severely limiting; the second is not a gauge-invariant condition.⁵

⁴This type of holism, or non-locality is a well-known issue for theories with elliptic initial value problems: e.g. Yang-Mills theory and general relativity. For a reference that explores non-factorizability in the context of the holonomy formalism, see (Buividovich & Polikarpov, 2008). For the relation between different symmetries and locality in gauge theory, see (Berghofer et al., 2023), and for the non-locality of gravitational invariants see e.g. (Torre, 1993; Donnelly & Giddings, 2016); for more recent use of this non-factorizability in the black hole information paradox, see (Jacobson & Nguyen, 2019). For a discussion of the relation between the factorizability of Hilbert spaces and the augmentation of the phase space with ‘edge-modes’, which we will shortly discuss, see (Ramirez & Teh, 2019; Geiller & Jai-akson, 2020; Carrozza & Hhn, 2022).

⁵It is important here that these are time-like boundaries; for the spacelike initial and final surfaces, one can implement whatever initial conditions one likes. For this reason, most other work deals with non-covariance in the Hamiltonian or symplectic formalism. And the boundary term gives rise to the symplectic potential: $\theta = \int E^i \delta A_i$, which defines the symplectic structure of the theory, $\Omega := \delta\theta$. This is done with much greater care in (Carrozza & Hhn, 2022, Secs. 4-7). But the fact remains that the origin of the problems with boundaries in gauge theories is agreed throughout the literature to be of the form δg ; and the above example serves as an illustration.

The standard approach to non-asymptotic spatial boundaries treats the lack of invariance of the subsystem similarly to the one of asymptotic boundaries. That is to say that the usual response is to pare down gauge symmetries at the boundary: as in the asymptotic case, not all isomorphisms are to count as symmetries. In this way, the boundary conditions and the boundary contributions to the dynamics remain symmetry-invariant, but only in this pared down way (see e.g. (Regge & Teitelboim, 1974) for the first paper to enforce this approach explicitly, and, e.g. (Harlow & Wu, 2019, Section 2) and (Geiller & Jai-akson, 2020, Section 2) for recent treatments).

Many authors endorse this treatment of gauge on subsystems (cf. e.g. (Wallace, 2022, p. 11)) because they take subsystems as sufficiently isolated so as to warrant an asymptotic-like treatment. But here we want to track the consequences of removing such an idealisation.

First, it is important to note that imposing gauge variant boundary conditions implies a mismatch between the intrinsic dynamical symmetries and the intrinsic kinematical isomorphisms of the region. Thereby, the restriction of an arbitrary dynamical symmetry of the total system—consisting of environment and subsystem—to the subsystem would not be counted among the subsystem’s dynamical symmetries.

Indeed, a lot of our intuitions and uses of subsystems in gauge theory are excluded by this definition. Hence the recent flurry of papers on subsystems in gauge theory, which calls the pared-down treatment of internal boundaries of subsystems into question (cf. e.g. (Ramirez & Teh, 2019; Geiller, 2017; Donnelly & Freidel, 2016; Gomes & Riello, 2021; Riello, 2021; Gomes, 2019; Geiller & Jai-akson, 2020; Carrozza & Hhn, 2022) and references therein). New mechanisms, for instance, ‘edge-modes’, have been devised to maintain the gauge invariance of the internal boundary under all isomorphisms (e.g. even ones that don’t preserve states at the boundary).

6. Edge modes are themselves physical frames.

Using representational schemes consisting of physical reference frames or gauge-fixings, one can find gauge-invariant regional dynamical structures labeled by the (equivalence classes of the) fluxes at the boundary; see (Riello, 2021, Sec. 4) and (Gomes & Riello, 2021, Sec. 3). In a similar fashion, in (Carrozza & Hhn, 2022) these dynamical structures are obtained by stipulating a representational scheme solely at the boundary; they call such conventions *boundary reference-frames*.

Although these approaches vary to a certain extent, here we can try to describe their common core. The main idea is to find a physical representation of the symmetry-variant variables, e.g. which we called $h(\varphi) := \varphi^{\gamma(\varphi)}$, and correspond to the projection of the field along the corresponding gauge-fixing surface. Variation will then act not only on the bare variable φ , but also on the dressing, $\gamma(\varphi)$. This variation cancels the troublesome non-gauge-invariant boundary terms.

In a bit more detail, here is the rough idea why this works (see especially (Gomes & Riello, 2017; Gomes, 2019)): the problem with the extra term in the variation of the action in (12) is essentially a lack of gauge-covariance under the variation δ .

To correct for this lack of covariance, we can use analogies between finite and infinite-dimensional geometry. Using these analogies, we can relate δ and spacetime derivative operators, d . And similarly, for theories with symmetries, there is an analogy between the infinite-dimensional space of models Φ and finite-dimensional principal bundles, P . In the finite-dimensional case, to get around a lack of gauge-covariance under spacetime-dependent gauge transformations, we introduce the connection ω on P through minimal coupling, i.e. so that, schematically, quantities acted on by the *horizontal* derivatives

$d \rightarrow d_h := d - \omega$ (where h stands for ‘horizontal’) remain covariant under spacetime-dependent gauge transformations. So too, in the infinite-dimensional case, we can justify the introduction of a connection-form ϖ , such that $\delta \rightarrow \delta_h := \delta - \varpi$ becomes a fully covariant operator. These ‘connection-forms’ are the infinitesimal versions of the dressing function $\gamma(\varphi)$, described in (9). That is, the ϖ generalise the dressing of the fields that one would obtain via gauge-fixing to an infinitesimal setting; because they are (group-valued) functionals of the fields, they are relational constructions. Each choice of ϖ gives a decomposition of field variations in terms of ‘pure gauge’ and ‘physical’: but again, what is ‘physical’ depends on a choice.⁶

In a similar spirit, (Carrozza & Hhn, 2022) demand a decoupling of the variational action principles of complementary spacetime regions separated by a timelike boundary (as in (12)). This is done in two steps: (i) restricting the state space by physical boundary conditions, such as fixing the electromagnetic field at a boundary, i.e. fixing a supers-election, or, in their words, post-selected sector; and (ii) adding boundary terms to the action functional so that, within the physically restricted state space, the regional variational principles—such as in (12)—fully decouple. As we have described in this Section, point (i) has a subtlety: in gauge theory, it is a non-trivial matter to fix physical, or gauge-invariant, boundary conditions. To accomplish that, (Carrozza & Hhn, 2022) help themselves to reference frames at the boundary. Relative to these reference frames we can fix gauge-invariant boundary conditions for the gauge potential or the metric.

The resolution of the failure of gauge covariance at the boundary is pursued differently in (Donnelly & Freidel, 2016) and follow-up papers (see e.g. (Geiller & Jai-akson, 2020) for a more complete list). These papers add new degrees of freedom at the boundary with appropriate gauge-variance properties so as to cancel out the unwanted terms. In some circumstances the two approaches are related through a suitable interpretation of the new degrees of freedom: (see e.g. (Riello, 2021, Section 5), (Regge & Teitelboim, 1974, Section 5) (Carrozza & Hhn, 2022, Section 4), and (Ramirez & Teh, 2019)). But many find the introduction of new degrees of freedom problematic; (see (Gomes & Riello, 2021, Sec. 7), (Riello, 2021, 5.6) and (Gomes, 2019, Sec. 3.2) for critiques).

7. We are left with only physical reference frames, but a more realistic (and closer to operational) local physics

The end result of removing both kinds of idealizations, i.e. that of frames being expressed by coordinate choices and that of infinite spacetime regions, leaves us with models of gravitational systems defined on (collections of) finite regions of spacetime with geometric (thus gravitational) observables expressed as relations between field values (including the metric field).

Of course, it is difficult to explicitly realize such constructions. Classical deparametrization of GR in terms of material frames has been achieved globally only in terms of not-entirely-physical material systems. A patchwise construction of generic gravitational dynamics with realistic matter frames is yet to be developed. Quantum reference frames, as studied so

⁶In the language of (Rovelli, 2002b), they become *partial observables*. The subscript h is appropriate since ϖ is associated with a horizontal projection operator on Φ . The difference between a horizontal projection operator mentioned here and a projection onto a gauge-fixing surface is that the former only needs to be ‘distributional’: it acts as a projection only within each $T_\varphi\Phi$. When such a distribution is integrable, meaning that the associated infinite-dimensional connection form ϖ has no associated curvature, then the horizontal spaces foliate the space of models, and each leaf will correspond to the range of a particular choice of σ , and each initial value selects an entire leaf: this will be equivalent to a gauge-fixing. The infinite-dimensional connection-forms generically have curvature; but the curvature vanishes in the Abelian theory, i.e. electromagnetism (cf. (Gomes, Hopfmiller, & Riello, 2019) for a comprehensive account).

far, neglect entirely the gravitational coupling and most dynamical aspects. Constructions within full quantum gravity, thus both fully dynamical and fully quantum, have been only achieved in spatial approximations (Marchetti & Oriti, 2022). Quantum gravitational toy models, such as those employed in quantum cosmology in which relational dynamics is extensively studied, are indeed just toy models. The general point, though, remains, and, we maintain, it is conceptually crucial.

8. Gravitational (spacetime) physics is intrinsically perspectival

As we have argued, a proper modeling of a (quantum) gravitational system must invoke descriptions involving relations between subsystems, and such relations are expressed relative to reference frames of some general kind of observers. In general, now, these reference frames may be of totally different structure, validity and quality. Therefore, their corresponding descriptions of a system are a priori very different as well. According to the correspondence of realistic agents and their physical reference frames, any set of relational observables is then expressed, by definition, in the perspective of some agent participating in the dynamics of spacetime. Given this issue, one has already on the purely formal level an attachment of modeling activity to the concrete (and fuzzy) perspective of some agent. Modeling is no longer objective in a strict sense.

Furthermore, existing models for these situations, such as different choices of physical clocks in quantum cosmology (Gielen & Menéndez-Pidal, 2022; Giesel, Li, & Singh, 2023), show that even at a practical level, this can be a nontrivial issue. We, therefore, have to assert, when no further qualification is present, that concrete physical models associated with different physical frames are unrelated. Thus, since the description is contingent on a physical frame whose qualities influence the modeling process, we can call it *perspectival*.

9. We may have no general covariance, and even less invariance, in the more realistic context

At this point, it should be clear that for any model of gravitational physics (as well as gauge physics), we have at our disposal, in principle, several possible physical frames. But the standard notion of general covariance (the standard independence of non-physical coordinate charts or diffeomorphism invariance) of general relativity is made irrelevant (because already accounted for) by the use of physical frames in the relational framework. Depending on their physical (dynamical) properties, including quantum features, one frame may be obviously more practically useful than another, but in a realist reading of the theory, this practical aspect would not point to a more fundamental ontological status for one frame over another.

The question arises, then, of whether we have any new notion of *physical* general covariance among the physical frames. That is, are there conservative maps between the different relational descriptions defined in terms of different physical frames, and what, if anything, is conserved or invariant under such mappings?

One could argue that some form of physical covariance is expected, and we have both general mathematical arguments as well as explicit examples of such physical covariance, which are robust at the classical level. On the other hand, one should not expect, generically, invariance of all physical properties or dynamical features. Again, we have examples pointing to these types of exceptions.

As a relevant further complication, we have the issue that our understanding of general reference frame transformations at the quantum level is still a work in progress, with all available results concerning very much simplified settings (Krumm, Hoehn, & Mueller, 2021; Vanrietvelde, Hoehn, & Giacomini, 2023). The possibility of switching between quantum

reference frames in a full dynamical context passing through a (redundant) perspective-neutral formulation, like in classical GR, is a promising avenue (Vanrietvelde, Hoehn, Giacomini, & Castelli, 2020).

In the cases where such an understanding is under control, such as that of finite dimensional quantum reference frames, we witness several salient, interesting features. Important properties of quantum systems like superpositions and entanglement of subsystems become, to a notable degree, perspectival. The same state of system and agents, as viewed from one particular agent's perspective, may be sharp or entangled in a certain observable, or it may be perfectly smeared out or disentangled in another agent's perspective (cf. (Gomes et al., 2024) for examples). While this may simply hint at more complicated rules of quantum covariance, it is striking as it implies the sharpness of the frame—as linked, by the argument we made earlier, to the strength of backreaction—is further contextualised. Sharpness may be relative to the view of the system from an agent's perspective. Flipped on its head, taking the perspective of *any* one agent makes their reference frame (including any boundaries) sharp; but this then leads to a backreaction with possibly infinite strength due to fluctuations in conjugate variables. Therefore, quantum effects also put limitations on how strictly one can switch from one agent's perspective to another.

10. We can interpret this as a challenge to complete intersubjectivity and an irreducible limitation to strong objectivity

To sum up, we have argued that the adoption of a physical frame is necessary to define localization in space and time when gravitational systems are modeled as occupying finite regions; and that such a frame is implicitly tied to a choice of perspective associated with a specific observer, all of which are embodied within a given model (and epistemic boundary). The conclusion is that removing standard idealizations from gravitational physics makes a more fundamental (quantum) understanding of it necessarily perspectival. The lack of generic and exact invariance under frame changes leaves us, at best, with intersubjective agreement on physical properties but no possibility of maintaining, a priori, a stronger notion of objectivity.

Conclusions

In this contribution, we have argued that there exist fundamental limits, coming from (quantum) gravitational physics, to a strong notion of objectivity and there may be irreducible limitations also to complete intersubjectivity in the physical understanding of the world, of the same origin. They follow from the conclusion that spacetime physics is irreducibly perspectival since it has to be phrased in terms of physical frames (constituted by realistic dynamical systems), embodying (partially) cognitive agents or observers, and that perfect and complete covariance across such physical frames may not be valid nor, when valid, admit a rich enough set of invariant 'facts'. This perspectival nature, we argue, becomes evident once we remove two main idealizations routinely used in our modeling of the world: that of perfect clocks and rods and that of physics taking place in infinite spacetime regions (or closed universes). Both have to do with taking more seriously the role of observers and the open nature of physical systems. The argument leading to this conclusion is based on three areas of recent developments in (quantum) gravitational theory and foundations of physics: relational dynamics in classical and quantum gravity, edge modes and symmetries in gravitational physics in finite regions, and quantum reference

frames.

In this paper, for concreteness, we have mostly focused on the gravitational case. This case is specially clear, because it is visualisable: we have in our minds what clocks and rods are, and what could generalise their functions. But all the general conclusions we have reached here applies also to gauge theory. For gauge symmetry can also be construed relationally, or geometrically (cf. (Gomes, 2024a)), and reference frames are there also necessary for invariant descriptions. The main difference is that such reference frames concern internal vector spaces, as opposed to spacetime, but that distinction is orthogonal to the force and relevance of our arguments.

Nonetheless, even if based on a large number of solid results, and regardless of how much we may be personally convinced, our conclusion is, to a large extent, mostly a pointer and an encouragement to further research. Each of the three research directions our argument builds on is a work in progress, with much left to be understood or established more rigorously. Some important open issues are: the quantum counterpart of the recent work on gravity in finite regions and edge modes; the definition and control over (relational) spacetime observables within quantum gravity approaches; the extraction of an effective gravitational dynamics within the same approaches; the extension of treatments of quantum reference frames to the dynamical gravitational context; the analysis of symmetries in field space that could represent (or contribute to) a physical counterpart of general covariance at both classical and quantum level, to name but a few.

Conversely, there are other research directions that can be seen as supporting our general conclusion but which we did not mention. In particular, we have in mind the issues raised by Wigner’s friend scenario and its many modern generalizations, for example, the Frauchiger-Renner thought experiment (Frauchiger & Renner, 2018). In our reading, these scenarios suggest, in different ways, that indeed quantum physics may be intrinsically perspectival and that (quantum) facts are ultimately relative, in subtle and interesting ways (Brukner, 2020, 2018). In turn, this aligns with a number of interpretations of the quantum formalism (pragmatist, relational, subjective, in different forms (Barzegar & Oriti, 2024; Cabello, 2017; Healey, 2012, 2023; Dieks, 2022)) that are based on a relational, when not epistemic, approaches to quantum states and observables.

More generally, our physical reasoning is inspired by and lends support to the many philosophical viewpoints (in the philosophy of physics and philosophy of science more generally) that have advocated for some perspectivalism in our epistemology, for a weakening of the notion of attainable objectivity, and in general for a greater role for agents and observers (some examples are (Giere, 2006; Massimi, 2017; M. J. Brown, 2009; Fraassen, 2008)).

Acknowledgements

DO acknowledges support through the Grant PR28/23 ATR2023-145735 (funded by MCIN/AEI /10.13039/501100011033). SL thanks E. Telali for pointing out that single observables can still be made sharp in QRFs, and thanks the Perimeter Institute for hospitality. Research at the Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through NSERC and by the Province of Ontario through MEDT. SL and DO acknowledge funding from the Munich Center for Quantum Science and Technology. HG acknowledges the British Academy for support.

References

- Bamonti, N. (2023). *What is a reference frame in general relativity?*
- Bamonti, N., & Gomes, H. (2024). What Reference Frames Teach Us About Symmetry Principles and Observability.
- Banerjee, K., Calcagni, G., & Martin-Benito, M. (2012). Introduction to loop quantum cosmology. *SIGMA*, 8, 016. doi: 10.3842/SIGMA.2012.016
- Barzegar, A., Margoni, E., & Oriti, D. (2023, July). *A minimalist account of agency in physics*. arXiv. Retrieved 2024-11-30, from <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.16054> (arXiv:2307.16054) doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2307.16054
- Barzegar, A., & Oriti, D. (2024). Epistemic–Pragmatist Interpretations of Quantum Mechanics: A Comparative Assessment. *Found. Phys.*, 54(5), 66. doi: 10.1007/s10701-024-00804-3
- Berghofer, P., Francois, J., Friederich, S., Gomes, H., Hetzroni, G., Maas, A., & Sondenheimer, R. (2023). *Elements in the Foundations of Physics: Gauge Symmetries, Symmetry Breaking, and Gauge-Invariant Approaches*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brading, K., & Brown, H. R. (2000). Noether’s theorems and gauge symmetries.
- Brown, J. D., & Kuchar, K. V. (1995). Dust as a standard of space and time in canonical quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 51, 5600–5629. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.51.5600
- Brown, M. J. (2009). Models and perspectives on stage: Remarks on giere’s scientific perspectivism. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 40(2), 213–220. doi: 10.1016/j.shpsa.2009.03.001
- Brukner, C. (2018, May). A No-Go Theorem for Observer-Independent Facts. *Entropy*, 20(5), 350. doi: 10.3390/e20050350
- Brukner, C. (2020, August). Facts are relative. *Nature Physics*, 16(12), 1172–1174. doi: 10.1038/s41567-020-0984-8
- Buividovich, P., & Polikarpov, M. (2008, Dec). Entanglement entropy in gauge theories and the holographic principle for electric strings. *Physics Letters B*, 670(2), 141145. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2008.10.032> doi: 10.1016/j.physletb.2008.10.032
- Cabello, A. (2017, April). Interpretations of quantum theory: A map of madness. In *What is quantum information?* (p. 138144). Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/9781316494233.009> doi: 10.1017/9781316494233.009
- Carrozza, S., & Hhn, P. A. (2022, feb). Edge modes as reference frames and boundary actions from post-selection. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2022(2). doi: 10.1007/jhep02(2022)172
- Dasgupta, S. (2016). Symmetry as an Epistemic Notion (Twice Over). *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 67(3), 837–878. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/axu049> doi: 10.1093/bjps/axu049
- de la Hamette, A.-C., & Galley, T. D. (2020). Quantum reference frames for general symmetry groups. *Quantum*, 4, 367. doi: 10.22331/q-2020-11-30-367
- Dieks, D. (2022, August). Perspectival quantum realism. *Foundations of Physics*, 52(4). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10701-022-00611-8> doi: 10.1007/s10701-022-00611-8
- Dittrich, B. (2006). Partial and complete observables for canonical general relativity. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 23, 6155–6184. doi: 10.1088/0264-9381/23/22/006
- Donnelly, W., & Freidel, L. (2016). Local subsystems in gauge theory and gravity. *JHEP*, 09, 102. doi: 10.1007/JHEP09(2016)102
- Donnelly, W., & Giddings, S. B. (2016, Jan). Diffeomorphism-invariant observables and their nonlocal algebra. *Physical Review D*, 93(2). Retrieved from

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.024030> doi: 10.1103/physrevd.93.024030

- Fraassen, B. C. V. (2008). *Scientific representation: Paradoxes of perspective*. Oxford, GB: Oxford University Press UK.
- Frauchiger, D., & Renner, R. (2018, September). Quantum theory cannot consistently describe the use of itself. *Nature Communications*, 9(1). doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-05739-8
- Gaul, M., & Rovelli, C. (2000). Loop quantum gravity and the meaning of diffeomorphism invariance. *Lect. Notes Phys.*, 541, 277–324.
- Geiller, M. (2017). Edge modes and corner ambiguities in 3d ChernSimons theory and gravity. *Nucl. Phys.*, B924, 312-365. doi: 10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2017.09.010
- Geiller, M., & Jai-akson, P. (2020, Sep). Extended actions, dynamics of edge modes, and entanglement entropy. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2020(9). Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09\(2020\)134](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2020)134) doi: 10.1007/jhep09(2020)134
- Gielen, S., & Menéndez-Pidal, L. (2022). Unitarity, clock dependence and quantum recollapse in quantum cosmology. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 39(7), 075011. doi: 10.1088/1361-6382/ac504f
- Giere, R. N. (2006). *Scientific perspectivism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Giesel, K., Li, B.-F., & Singh, P. (2021). Relating dust reference models to conventional systems in manifestly gauge invariant perturbation theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(2), 023501. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.104.023501
- Giesel, K., Li, B.-F., & Singh, P. (2023). A comparison of different choices of clocks in a reduced phase space quantization in loop quantum cosmology with an inflationary potential using effective techniques. In *16th Marcel Grossmann Meeting on Recent Developments in Theoretical and Experimental General Relativity, Astrophysics and Relativistic Field Theories*. doi: 10.1142/9789811269776_0352
- Giesel, K., & Thiemann, T. (2010). Algebraic quantum gravity (AQG). IV. Reduced phase space quantisation of loop quantum gravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 27, 175009. doi: 10.1088/0264-9381/27/17/175009
- Giesel, K., & Thiemann, T. (2015). Scalar Material Reference Systems and Loop Quantum Gravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 32, 135015. doi: 10.1088/0264-9381/32/13/135015
- Giulini, D. (2007). Some remarks on the notions of general covariance and background independence. *Lect. Notes Phys.*, 721, 105–120. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-71117-9_6
- Gomes, H. (2019, August). Gauging the boundary in field-space. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, Volume 67, 89–110. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1355219818302144> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsb.2019.04.002>
- Gomes, H. (2024a). Gauge theory as the geometry of internal vector spaces.
- Gomes, H. (2024b). Representational Schemes for theories with symmetries.
- Gomes, H., & Butterfield, J. (2022, August). How to Choose a Gauge? The Case of Hamiltonian Electromagnetism. *Erkenntnis*, 89, 15811615. doi: 10.1007/s10670-022-00597-9
- Gomes, H., Hopfmüller, F., & Riello, A. (2019). A unified geometric framework for boundary charges and dressings: Non-abelian theory and matter. *Nuclear Physics B*, 941, 249 - 315. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0550321319300483> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2019.02.020>
- Gomes, H., Kabel, V., de la Hamette, A.-C., Apadula, L., Cepollaro, C., Butterfield, J., & Brukner, C. (2024). *Identification is Pointless: Quantum Reference Frames*,

Localisation of Events, and the Quantum Hole Argument.

- Gomes, H., & Riello, A. (2017). The observers ghost: notes on a field space connection. *Journal of High Energy Physics (JHEP)*, 05, 017. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/JHEP0528201729017> doi: 10.1007/JHEP05(2017)017
- Gomes, H., & Riello, A. (2021). The quasilocal degrees of freedom of Yang-Mills theory. *SciPost Phys.*, 10, 130. Retrieved from <https://scipost.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.10.6.130> doi: 10.21468/SciPostPhys.10.6.130
- Gribov, V. N. (1978). Quantization of Nonabelian Gauge Theories. *Nucl. Phys.*, B139, 1. ([,1(1977)]) doi: 10.1016/0550-3213(78)90175-X
- Harlow, D., & Wu, J.-Q. (2019). Covariant phase space with boundaries.
- Healey, R. (2012, December). Quantum Theory: A Pragmatist Approach. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 63(4), 729–771. doi: 10.1093/bjps/axr054
- Healey, R. (2023). Quantum-Bayesian and Pragmatist Views of Quantum Theory. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Winter 2023 ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2023/entries/quantum-bayesian/>.
- Jacobson, T., & Nguyen, P. (2019, Aug). Diffeomorphism invariance and the black hole information paradox. *Physical Review D*, 100(4). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.100.046002> doi: 10.1103/physrevd.100.046002
- Kabel, V., de la Hamette, A.-C., Apadula, L., Cepollaro, C., Gomes, H., Butterfield, J., & Brukner, C. (2024, 2). Identification is Pointless: Quantum Reference Frames, Localisation of Events, and the Quantum Hole Argument.
- Krumm, M., Hoehn, P. A., & Mueller, M. P. (2021). Quantum reference frame transformations as symmetries and the paradox of the third particle. *Quantum*, 5, 530. doi: 10.22331/q-2021-08-27-530
- Marchetti, L., & Oriti, D. (2022). Effective dynamics of scalar cosmological perturbations from quantum gravity. *JCAP*, 07(07), 004. doi: 10.1088/1475-7516/2022/07/004
- Massimi, M. (2017). Perspectivism. In J. Saatsi (Ed.), *The routledge handbook of scientific realism* (pp. 164–175). Routledge.
- Oriti, D. (2024). Hydrodynamics on (Mini)superspace or a Non-linear Extension of Quantum Cosmology: An Effective Timeless Framework for Cosmology from Quantum Gravity. *Fundam. Theor. Phys.*, 216, 221–252. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-61860-4_11
- Ramirez, S., & Teh, N. (2019). Abandoning galileo’s ship: The quest for non-relational empirical significance. *preprint*.
- Regge, T., & Teitelboim, C. (1974). Role of Surface Integrals in the Hamiltonian Formulation of General Relativity. *Annals Phys.*, 88, 286. doi: 10.1016/0003-4916(74)90404-7
- Riello, A. (2021). Symplectic reduction of Yang-Mills theory with boundaries: from superselection sectors to edge modes, and back. *SciPost Phys.*, 10, 125. Retrieved from <https://scipost.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.10.6.125> doi: 10.21468/SciPostPhys.10.6.125
- Rovelli, C. (2002a). Partial observables. *Phys. Rev. D*, 65, 124013. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.65.124013
- Rovelli, C. (2002b, Jun). Partial observables. *Physical Review D*, 65(12). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.65.124013> doi: 10.1103/physrevd.65.124013

- Singer, I. M. (1978). Some Remarks on the Gribov Ambiguity. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 60, 7-12. doi: 10.1007/BF01609471
- Torre, C. G. (1993, Sep). Gravitational observables and local symmetries. *Phys. Rev. D*, 48, R2373–R2376. Retrieved from <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.48.R2373> doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.48.R2373
- Vanrietvelde, A., Hoehn, P. A., & Giacomini, F. (2023). Switching quantum reference frames in the N-body problem and the absence of global relational perspectives. *Quantum*, 7, 1088. doi: 10.22331/q-2023-08-22-1088
- Vanrietvelde, A., Hoehn, P. A., Giacomini, F., & Castro-Ruiz, E. (2020). A change of perspective: switching quantum reference frames via a perspective-neutral framework. *Quantum*, 4, 225. doi: 10.22331/q-2020-01-27-225
- Wallace, D. (2002). Time-Dependent Symmetries: The Link Between Gauge Symmetries and Indeterminism. In K. Brading & E. Castellani (Eds.), *Symmetries in physics: Philosophical reflections* (pp. 163–173). Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace, D. (2022). Isolated systems and their symmetries, part II: Local and global symmetries of field theories. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 92, 249-259. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0039368122000267> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2022.01.016>