

Quantum Relativity of Subsystems

Philipp A. Höhn,^{1,2,*} Maximilian P. E. Lock,^{3,†} Shadi Ali Ahmad,^{4,‡}
Alexander R. H. Smith,^{5,4,§} and Thomas D. Galley^{6,¶}

¹*Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University, Onna, Okinawa 904 0495, Japan*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, London, United Kingdom*

³*Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI),
Austrian Academy of Sciences, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*

⁴*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755, USA*

⁵*Department of Physics, Saint Anselm College, Manchester, New Hampshire 03102, USA*

⁶*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline St N, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 2Y5 Canada*

(Dated: October 7, 2021)

One of the most basic notions in physics is the partitioning of a system into subsystems, and the study of correlations among its parts. In this work, we explore these notions in the context of quantum reference frame (QRF) covariance, in which this partitioning is subject to a symmetry constraint. We demonstrate that different reference frame perspectives induce different sets of subsystem observable algebras, which leads to a gauge-invariant, frame-dependent notion of subsystems and entanglement. We further demonstrate that subalgebras which commute *before* imposing the symmetry constraint can translate into non-commuting algebras in a given QRF perspective *after* symmetry imposition. Such a QRF perspective does not inherit the distinction between subsystems in terms of the corresponding tensor factorizability of the kinematical Hilbert space and observable algebra. Since the condition for this to occur is contingent on the choice of QRF, the notion of subsystem locality is frame-dependent.

I. INTRODUCTION

Operationally, subsystems are distinguished by physically accessible measurements. Suppose that one can measure the set of observables described by the minimal algebra \mathcal{A} containing a collection $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of commuting subalgebras, $[\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{A}_j] = 0$ for $i \neq j$. This implies that observables in \mathcal{A}_i and \mathcal{A}_j are simultaneously measurable, as expected of observables associated with distinct subsystems. When these algebras admit Hilbert space representations $\mathcal{A} \simeq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{A}_i \simeq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)$, the commuting subalgebra structure can induce a tensor product structure on the composite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \simeq \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i$, where \mathcal{H}_i is associated with the i -th subsystem. Given that this tensor product structure is induced by the distinguished sets of observables \mathcal{A}_i , entanglement and the notion of subsystem itself is defined relative to these distinguished sets [1–4].

The physically accessible observables and states of a system are dictated by the symmetries of the situation under consideration [1–5]. For example, in a gauge theory we ought to demand that the physically accessible states and observables are invariant with respect to arbitrary gauge transformations. In the canonical approach pioneered by Dirac [6], this invariance requirement is implemented by introducing a kinematical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} \simeq \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i$ that may come equipped with a kine-

matical tensor product structure. Supposing that $\hat{C} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}})$ is a generator of a gauge symmetry, the physical, *i.e.* invariant states satisfy the constraint equation $\hat{C}|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = 0$. Solutions to this equation may lie outside of \mathcal{H}_{kin} as they may not be normalizable with respect to its inner product. To overcome this issue, one introduces a new physical inner product that is used to complete the solution space of the constraint equation to form the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ (*e.g.* [7–12]). Physical observables are elements of the physical algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}} \simeq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}})$ known as Dirac observables defined as those that commute with the constraint on physical states, $[\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}, \hat{C}]|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = 0$, ensuring that $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}$ is invariant under gauge transformations generated by \hat{C} . This constraint based approach also applies to operational scenarios without *bona fide* gauge symmetry, where these constraints correspond to an agent using an internal quantum system as reference frame instead of an external classical one [13].

It is important to note that the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ does not inherit the kinematical tensor product structure $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} \simeq \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i$ and associated notion of subsystem. Instead, a notion of subsystem must be induced by commuting subalgebras of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}$, and in general, will be nonlocal with the respect to the kinematical tensor product structure.

In this article, we consider composite systems that are invariant under a gauge transformation admitting a tensor product representation across \mathcal{H}_{kin} ; that is, gauge transformations that act locally on the kinematical factors \mathcal{H}_i . We take one of these kinematical subsystems to serve as a reference frame from which the remaining subsystems are described. To do so, we make use of recent results from the theory of quantum reference

* philipp.hoehn@oist.jp; shared first authorship

† maximilian.lock@oeaw.ac.at; shared first authorship

‡ shadi.ali.ahmad.22@dartmouth.edu

§ arhsmith@anselm.edu

¶ tgalley1@perimeterinstitute.ca

frames (QRFs) to transform from the quantum theory on the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, which encodes all QRF choices, to an isomorphic theory from the perspective of a subsystem serving as a reference frame [13–23] (see also [24–28] for a related formulation without constraints). We show that subsystems encoded by a perspective-dependent tensor product structure induce a partitioning of the physical Hilbert through the construction of sets of commuting subalgebras of so-called relational Dirac observables [7, 8, 13–20, 29–36] associated with different reference frame perspectives. In general, different reference frames induce different partitions of the physical Hilbert space, and thus the associated notion of subsystems is reference frame-dependent. We identify the necessary and sufficient condition for when the physical Hilbert space inherits (some of) the kinematical subsystem partitioning in terms of the spectrum of the relevant constraint, and this condition is contingent on the choice of QRF. This allows us to develop a description of subsystems and entanglement in terms of physical Hilbert space structures that is manifestly gauge invariant and reference frame-dependent.

II. FROM PHYSICAL STATES TO QRF PERSPECTIVES

Consider a kinematical Hilbert space that partitions into three factors $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$, and a single constraint of the form $\hat{C} = \hat{C}_A + \hat{C}_B + \hat{C}_C$, where each \hat{C}_i is self-adjoint and acts only on \mathcal{H}_i . For simplicity, we assume that each \hat{C}_i is nondegenerate, and treat degeneracies in Appendix A. Each \hat{C}_i thus generates a unitary representation of either the translation group \mathbb{R} or $U(1)$ on \mathcal{H}_i [37]. Consequently, \hat{C} generates a one-parameter unitary representation of either \mathbb{R} or $U(1)$ on \mathcal{H}_{kin} , depending on the combination of the \hat{C}_i [20]. The constraint \hat{C} may be a Hamiltonian constraint as in gravitational systems, generating temporal reparametrization invariance and dynamics [7, 8, 16–20, 29–36, 38–42], or it may be the generator of a spatial symmetry, such as spatial translation invariance [14, 15]. For simplicity, we do not consider interactions between the subsystems A, B, C in the constraint.

As noted above, physical states satisfy $\hat{C}|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = 0$, and together they constitute $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. This induces a redundancy with respect to \mathcal{H}_{kin} , which can be removed by identifying the choice of redundant subsystem with the choice of QRF relative to which the other systems will be described. A physical state encodes each choice of QRF, therefore assuming the role of a *perspective-neutral* state, linking all the different perspectives [14–20]. Letting $i, j, k \in \{A, B, C\}$, we denote the chosen reference system by k and the remaining kinematical factors by i and j . We then define

$$\sigma_{ij|k} := \text{spec}(\hat{C}_i + \hat{C}_j) \cap \text{spec}(-\hat{C}_k), \quad (1)$$

allowing us to write an arbitrary physical state as

$$|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = \int_{c_i+c_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}} \psi(c_i, c_j) |-c_i - c_j\rangle_k \otimes |c_i\rangle_i \otimes |c_j\rangle_j \quad (2)$$

for some $\psi(c_i, c_j)$, where $|c_i\rangle_i$ is the eigenstate of \hat{C}_i with eigenvalue c_i (likewise for j and k). Thus if $\psi(c_i, c_j)$ has non-trivial support over various values of the eigenvalues c_i, c_j , then k is entangled with i, j relative to the *kinematical* tensor product structure. However, due to the redundancy, this entanglement is not gauge-invariant [18].

We can then describe physics from k 's perspective via either of two paths [18–20]: a “relational Schrödinger picture” (known in the context of Hamiltonian constraints as the Page-Wootters formalism [39, 40]), and a “relational Heisenberg picture” [14–17]. In both cases, observables on i, j are described relative to outcomes of an observable on k , namely an element of a positive operator-valued measure (POVM). The elements of this POVM can be constructed via projectors onto *orientation* states of the reference frame:

$$|g\rangle_k := \int_{c_k} e^{i(\theta(c_k) - c_k g)} |c_k\rangle_k, \quad (3)$$

where $\theta(c_k)$ are arbitrary phases and g is a coordinate on G_k , the group generated by \hat{C}_k . These orientation states transform covariantly under G_k , $|g'\rangle = e^{-i(g'-g)\hat{C}_k} |g\rangle$ [18–20, 41–44]. The QRF perspective corresponding to k is obtained by conditioning physical states on k being in the orientation g , thus fixing the gauge, leading to a *reduced physical Hilbert space* $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$. In the relational Schrödinger picture, this proceeds via the reduction map $\mathcal{R}_k^{(S)}(g) : \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ given by $\mathcal{R}_k^{(S)}(g) := \langle g|_k \otimes \mathbf{1}_{ij}$ (with its domain restricted to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$). This leads to the orientation-dependent relational Schrödinger state $|\psi_{ij|k}(g)\rangle := \mathcal{R}_k^{(S)}(g)|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ and the decomposition $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = \mu \int_{G_k} dg |g\rangle_k \otimes |\psi_{ij|k}(g)\rangle$ exhibiting the kinematical entanglement between k and i, j , where μ is a normalization factor.

On the other hand, in the relational Heisenberg picture one first transforms $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle$ to shift the non-redundant information into the i, j partition with a *frame disentangler* (“trivialization”) that is a shift conditional on frame k , $\mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon} := \mu \int_{G_k} dg e^{i\varepsilon_k g} |g\rangle_k \otimes e^{i(\hat{C}_i + \hat{C}_j)g}$. This factors out the QRF, removing the kinematical entanglement between k and i, j (see Appendix A):

$$\mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = |\varepsilon_k\rangle_k \otimes |\psi_{ij|k}\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where \otimes denotes the kinematical tensor product between k and i, j , $|\psi_{ij|k}\rangle = e^{i(\hat{C}_i + \hat{C}_j)g} |\psi_{ij|k}(g)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ is the corresponding “relational Heisenberg state”, and $|\varepsilon_k\rangle_k = \mu \int_{G_k} dg e^{i\varepsilon_k g} |g\rangle_k$. Here, $-\varepsilon_k$ must be a fixed, but arbitrary element of $\sigma_{ij|k}$ in which case Eq. (4) satisfies the transformed constraint $\mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon} \hat{C} \mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon}^{-1} \sim (\hat{C}_k - \varepsilon_k \mathbf{1})$, which fixes the now-redundant QRF k and preserves gauge-invariance. One then conditions on the reference frame




FIG. 1. The change from perspective A to perspective B takes the compositional form of a ‘quantum coordinate transformation’, $\Lambda_{A \rightarrow B} := \mathcal{R}_B^{(H)} \circ (\mathcal{R}_A^{(H)})^{-1}$ [14–20]. This induces a transformation on the algebra observables from the perspective of A to the perspective of B , namely $\Lambda_{A \rightarrow B} \mathcal{A}_{BC|A} \Lambda_{A \rightarrow B}^{-1} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{AC|B}$, where $\mathcal{A}_{ij|k} \simeq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k})$.

being in a given orientation of k , leading to the relational Heisenberg picture reduction map $\mathcal{R}_k^{(H)} : \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ given by

$$\mathcal{R}_k^{(H)} := \mathcal{R}_k^{(S)}(g) \mathcal{N}(g, \varepsilon_k) \mathcal{T}_{k, \varepsilon}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(g, \varepsilon_k)$ is a normalization factor such that $\mathcal{R}_k^{(H)} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = |\psi_{ij|k}\rangle$, which is (weakly) independent of g and ε , and we therefore do not include these labels in $\mathcal{R}_k^{(H)}$. This reduction is unitarily equivalent to acting with $\mathcal{R}_k^{(S)}(g)$ on *physical states* [18–20]. We will use the relational Heisenberg picture in what follows, denoting the reduction map by $\mathcal{R}_k \equiv \mathcal{R}_k^{(H)}$ for simplicity.

The reduced physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ and observables on it encode the physics of i, j as described from the internal perspective of QRF k . When $G_k = \text{U}(1)$, $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ need not be a subspace of the kinematical factors $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$ [20]. Furthermore, thanks to the redundancy in describing $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, the reduction is invertible on physical states (but not on \mathcal{H}_{kin}), so that $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ is isometric to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ [14–20]. Hence, the algebraic properties of observables are preserved. This permits us to change QRF: the change from k to i takes the compositional form of a ‘quantum coordinate transformation’, $\Lambda_{k \rightarrow i} := \mathcal{R}_i \circ \mathcal{R}_k^{-1}$, transforming both states and observables via the structure on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ which is *a priori* neutral with respect to QRF perspectives [14–20], see Fig. 1. The same physical situation, encoded in the perspective-neutral state $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle$, is thus described from different internal QRF perspectives. We shall now exploit this gauge-invariant, perspective-neutral framework to explain dependence of, first, subsystem locality and correlations and, second, tensor factorizability on the choice of QRF.

III. FRAME-DEPENDENT SUBSYSTEMS AND CORRELATIONS

The QRF dependence of correlations has been observed in [24], with the conclusion that superposition in one frame manifests as entanglement in another frame. Later, the formalism for changing QRFs introduced in [24] was shown to be equivalent to the frame-change map in Fig. 1 [14], and the frame dependence of correlations was studied in a variety of contexts [13, 14, 18, 21, 26]. Here, we use the perspective-neutral architecture to describe the QRF relativity of subsystems and correlations.

The Heisenberg-picture reduction illustrates why a fixed perspective-neutral state $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle$ generally leads to different properties, such as correlations, in A ’s and B ’s perspective (see Fig. 1): when going to A ’s perspective, the now-redundant A becomes kinematically disentangled from the non-redundant B, C , while B becomes disentangled from A, C when proceeding to B ’s perspective. Which kinematical tensor factor in $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle$ is chosen as redundant and which as independent changes. In other words, the non-redundant (physical) information in $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle$ is shifted among different kinematical tensor factors when going to different QRF perspectives. Indeed, the wave function $\psi(c_i, c_j)$ will look different for different choices of i, j . As we shall see later, $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ may not even be factorizable across i and j .

However, when there *is* a physical tensor product structure this generically leads to different correlations in different frames. This can be understood by examining the observables that probe the respective tensor factorizations. Suppose the reduced physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{BC|A} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{B|A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C|A}$ admits a tensor factorization across the subsystems B, C from A ’s perspective, induced from the original tensor product structure of \mathcal{H}_{kin} , and similarly that $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{A|B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C|B}$ so that we can consider entanglement across these subsystems. The subsystem physical Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{i|k}$ may be different from their kinematical counter-parts \mathcal{H}_i of which they may [18, 19] or may not be [20] subspaces. We consider the algebra generated by local subsystem observables on $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$, namely $\mathcal{A}_{ij|k} := \mathcal{A}_{i|k} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{j|k}$, where $\mathcal{A}_{i|k} := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{i|k})$ (hence a type I factor), so that $[\mathcal{A}_{i|k} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{j|k}, \mathbf{1}_{i|k} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{j|k}] = 0$. Since $\mathcal{A}_{ij|k}$ is dense in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k})$ with respect to the strong operator topology [45, 46], we can treat $\mathcal{A}_{ij|k}$ for all practical purposes as the observable algebra of the tensor product space $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ (in finite dimensions the algebras are isomorphic).

Using the fact that \mathcal{R}_k is an invertible isometry, these observable algebras can be embedded into the algebra of relational Dirac observables $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}} := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}})$ as $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{i|k} := \mathcal{R}_k^{-1} (\mathcal{A}_{i|k} \otimes \mathbf{1}_j) \mathcal{R}_k \subset \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}$. This yields $[\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{i|k}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{j|k}] = 0$. Since the properties of \mathcal{R}_k thus imply that $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{i|k}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{j|k}$ are commuting type I factors, and that moreover $\mathcal{R}_k^{-1} \mathcal{A}_{ij|k} \mathcal{R}_k = \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{i|k} \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{j|k}$ is dense in

$\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}$, it follows [45] that these factors induce a *physical* tensor product on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{i|k} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{j|k}$. The following theorem shows this to be QRF-dependent in general (see Appendix B, also for the degenerate case).

Theorem 1. *The algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A}$ of relational observables of C relative to A , is distinct from the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B}$ of relational observables of C relative to B , $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A} \neq \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B}$.*

However, note that $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B}$ when $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B}$. The two tensor factorizations $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{B|A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{A|B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B}$ therefore constitute *different* physical tensor factorizations. It is therefore clear that a given physical state $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ exhibits different correlations in the two different factorizations.

Put differently, transforming the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{C|A}$ from A 's to B 's perspective, does *not* yield C 's algebra relative to B , $\Lambda_{A \rightarrow B}(\mathbf{1}_B \otimes \mathcal{A}_{C|A})\Lambda_{A \rightarrow B}^{-1} \neq \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \mathcal{A}_{C|B}$. The tensor factorization between B, C relative to A thus does not map under QRF transformations into the tensor factorization between A, C relative to B . Instead, since $\Lambda_{A \rightarrow B}$ is an invertible isometry too, it maps into a different tensor factorization relative to B , namely one between combinations of A and C degrees of freedom. Consequently, *the notion of subsystem locality is QRF dependent*, as are the correlations inherited from a given physical state. We illustrate this observation in an example in Appendix C.

IV. WHEN ARE KINEMATICAL SUBSYSTEMS PHYSICAL?

As noted above, it is in general not the case that the reduced physical Hilbert space and the observable algebra can be factorized into the same subsystems that constitute tensor factors of the kinematical Hilbert space. In other words, imposing a given symmetry can remove the distinction between what might have been expected to be physical subsystems.

To see this, note that one can also obtain the reduced physical Hilbert space from k 's perspective *directly* from the kinematical i, j tensor factors via the (possibly improper) projector $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}} : \mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ given by [18–20]

$$\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}} := \int_{c_i, c_j | c_i + c_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}} |c_i\rangle \langle c_i|_i \otimes |c_j\rangle \langle c_j|_j. \quad (6)$$

Observe that $\sigma_{ij|k}$ is symmetric in i and j but not in i and k . Furthermore, defining $\sigma_i := \text{spec}(\hat{C}_i)$, note that $\sigma_{ij|k} = \text{spec}(\hat{C}_i + \hat{C}_j)$ whenever $\sigma_k = \mathbb{R}$. The projector $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}$ is improper if $\sigma_{ij|k}$ is discrete, while at least one of \hat{C}_i, \hat{C}_j has continuous spectrum [20]. The reduced physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ factorizes into i and j subsystems $\mathcal{H}_{i|k}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{j|k}$ if and only if $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}$ does as well. This is

only the case if there exists a $\tilde{\sigma}_i \subseteq \sigma_i$ (likewise $\tilde{\sigma}_j$) such that

$$\sigma_{ij|k} = M(\tilde{\sigma}_i, \tilde{\sigma}_j), \quad (7)$$

where $M(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes Minkowski addition, defined by $M(X, Y) := \{x + y | x \in X, y \in Y\}$. When this is satisfied, then the projector defined in Eq. (6) becomes

$$\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}} = \left(\int_{c_i \in \tilde{\sigma}_i} |c_i\rangle \langle c_i|_i \right) \otimes \left(\int_{c_j \in \tilde{\sigma}_j} |c_j\rangle \langle c_j|_j \right), \quad (8)$$

and thus $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}(\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j) = \mathcal{H}_{i|k} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{j|k}$. Here, $\mathcal{H}_{i|k} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_i$, unless \hat{C}_k has discrete and \hat{C}_i continuous spectrum [18–20] (likewise for $\mathcal{H}_{j|k}$). Note that when $\tilde{\sigma}_i = \sigma_i$, then $\mathcal{H}_{i|k} = \mathcal{H}_i$. This holds for both i and j if $\sigma_k = \mathbb{R}$. We give an example of non-factorizability of the physical Hilbert space in Appendix D.

To understand this more explicitly, let $\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j$ be a kinematical basis element of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_j)$. Condition (7) must be satisfied in order for the physical representation of this operator from k 's perspective to factorize across i and j . Otherwise, the degrees of freedom of i and j become combined indivisibly into $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}(\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j)$. This includes the case when $\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j$ is diagonal in the eigenbases of \hat{C}_i and \hat{C}_j , and thus commutes with $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}$ (see Appendix E). Specifically, kinematical i subsystem observables of the form $\hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j$ will *not* translate into a product form on $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$. In fact (see Appendix F):

Theorem 2. *There exist $\hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j$ and $\mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_j)$ whose images under $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k})$ do not commute unless condition (7) is met.*

By linearity, these conclusions extend to an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_j)$. Consequently, when condition (7) is not satisfied, the algebra of observables loses its distinction between parties i and j from the perspective of k 's reference frame.

V. FRAME-DEPENDENT FACTORIZABILITY

When Eq. (7) holds in one frame but not in another, the preservation of the kinematical factorization on $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}$ likewise depends on the frame, as we now illustrate. For concreteness, consider any constraint such that $\sigma_A = \mathbb{R}_+$, $\sigma_B = \mathbb{R}_+$, and $\sigma_C = \mathbb{R}$. Considering first C 's perspective, we have that $\sigma_{AB|C} = \mathbb{R}_+ = M(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$, *i.e.* condition (7) is satisfied, with $\tilde{\sigma}_A = \sigma_A$ (likewise $\tilde{\sigma}_B$), and $\Pi_{\sigma_{AB|C}}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. From B 's perspective, on the other hand, one can prove by contradiction that condition (7) is not satisfied (see Appendix G), and therefore the reduced physical Hilbert space does not factor into A and C parts. This latter fact, does not however imply that there exists no tensor factorization of $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}$. Indeed, one can use the tensor factorization of $\mathcal{H}_{AB|C}$ to construct one on $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}$ via the frame-change map

$\Lambda_{C \rightarrow B}$, as in our discussion of frame-dependent correlations above. In this case the algebra of local observables from C 's perspective, namely $\mathcal{A}_{A|C} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{B|C}$, maps to a tensor factorization between *combinations* of A and C degrees of freedom, and therefore does not correspond to a partitioning into subsystems A and C .

As a particular example, consider a reparameterization-invariant system consisting of two free (non-relativistic) unit-mass particles, A and B , and an ideal clock C (*i.e.* one whose Hamiltonian is equivalent to a momentum operator [16, 21, 41, 47–49]). This corresponds to the constraint

$$\hat{C} = \frac{\hat{p}_A^2}{2} + \frac{\hat{p}_B^2}{2} + \hat{p}_C. \quad (9)$$

Thus $\sigma_A = \mathbb{R}_+$, $\sigma_B = \mathbb{R}_+$, as above, and therefore the distinction between kinematical subsystems survives on $\mathcal{H}_{AB|C}$, but not on $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{d_B}$, where $d_B = \pm 1$ labels the degeneracy of \hat{p}_B^2 (see Appendix A for a discussion of degeneracies). In Appendix G, we illustrate this by examining how the kinematical canonical pairs (\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_i) on \mathcal{H}_i and (\hat{x}_j, \hat{p}_j) on \mathcal{H}_j appear from B 's and C 's perspectives. We show that their commutation relations are preserved on $\mathcal{H}_{AB|C}$, but not on $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{d_B}$, where they yield mutually non-commuting canonical pairs, in line with Theorem 2, explaining the absence of a tensor factorization across A and C relative to B . The same conclusion holds for the corresponding relational observables on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. This further highlights the distinction between local observables on \mathcal{H}_{kin} and the observables in a given physical reference frame.

Another example of the above class of constraints is obtained by replacing systems A and B in Eq. (9) with the nondegenerate Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hat{p}^2/2m + a_1 e^{a_2 \hat{q}}$ with $a_1, a_2 > 0$. This observation can also be easily extended to the case when A, B are harmonic oscillators.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have established a gauge invariant and quantum frame dependent notion of subsystems, locality and correlations using relational observables. We have exploited the perspective-neutral approach to QRF covariance [13–23], showing algebraically how different QRF choices necessarily induce distinct tensor factorizations of the physical Hilbert space when the latter admits such structures. Further, we have identified the necessary and sufficient condition for QRF perspectives to inherit the kinematical partitioning of subsystems. Specifically, we have illustrated that the kinematical definition of subsystems may survive in some QRF perspectives, but dissolve in others.

The ensuing QRF dependence of subsystems and entanglement is a particular realization of the proposal for an observer-dependent notion of generalized entanglement put forward in [1, 2, 4] in terms of relational observables and QRFs. It is also related to the generic feature of

the dependence of entanglement on classical coordinate choices [50]. However, here, as in previous work on QRFs [13, 14, 18, 21, 24, 26], specific choices of coordinates are associated to the internal perspectives of different systems to form quantum reference systems and these may be in superpositions of “orientations”. This provides a physical interpretation to the coordinate choices, and in turn the *quantum* relativity of subsystems and entanglement.

Note that the notion of QRF here is physically distinct from one sometimes used in the context of quantum information theory [5, 51–55] (see, e.g. the discussion in [13]), where entanglement must be operationally defined relative to observables that are independent of the choice of an external frame not shared by two parties, for example by appending an ancilla system. This approach also resonates with the proposal in [1, 2, 4], but does not involve the adoption of an internal perspective relative to a subsystem through the reduction maps employed here. In particular, the aim in that context is to define an *external*-frame-independent notion of entanglement, in contrast with our investigation of an *internal*-frame-dependent entanglement.

In the relativistic case, the entanglement between spin and momentum degrees of freedom for relativistic particles [56, 57], as well as the momentum mode decomposition in quantum field theory [58], leading to the Unruh effect [59], Hawking radiation [60], and particle creation due to the expansion of the universe [61], are also dependent on the choice of spacetime frame. In contrast to QRFs, these coordinate frames are not associated to dynamically evolving quantum systems, but are idealised non-interacting classical entities external to the physics being considered.

The frame dependence of factorizability demonstrated in this work implies that frameworks for general physical theories which take system composition as a primitive concept [62–67] are not currently able to describe fully general physical scenarios with multiple frames.

Finally, it will be fruitful to connect our observations with the currently widely explored notions of local subsystems and entanglement in gauge theories and gravity [68–79]. For example, defining local subsystems in gravity non-perturbatively in terms of commuting subalgebras of relational observables can complement the perturbative investigation of subsystems in terms of dressed observables in [69–71]. Conversely, the possible non-factorizability of the physical Hilbert space observed here calls for a revision of the notion of subsystems. This question seems to be related to the construction of entangling products using edge modes and extended Hilbert spaces in gauge theories [73, 79–83].

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

PAH thanks Isha Kotecha, Fabio Mele and Markus Müller for helpful discussions and is grateful for sup-

port from the Foundational Questions Institute through Grant number FQXi-RFP-1801A. MPEL acknowledges financial support by the ESQ (Erwin Schrödinger Center for Quantum Science & Technology) Discovery programme, hosted by the Austrian Academy of Sciences (ÖAW). This work was supported in part by funding from Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University. This research was supported by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada

through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science. This work was supported in part by a Kaminsky Undergraduate Research Award. ARHS wishes to acknowledge many productive and enjoyable conversations with Lorenza Viola on applications of generalized entanglement in various relational contexts. ARHS is grateful for support from Saint Anselm College and Dartmouth College.

-
- [1] Howard Barnum, Emanuel Knill, Gerardo Ortiz, and Lorenza Viola, “Generalizations of entanglement based on coherent states and convex sets,” *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 032308 (2003).
- [2] Howard Barnum, Emanuel Knill, Gerardo Ortiz, Rolando Somma, and Lorenza Viola, “A Subsystem-Independent Generalization of Entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 107902 (2004).
- [3] Paolo Zanardi, Daniel A. Lidar, and Seth Lloyd, “Quantum Tensor Product Structures are Observable Induced,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 060402 (2004).
- [4] Lorenza Viola and Howard Barnum, “Entanglement and subsystems, entanglement beyond subsystems, and all that,” in *Philosophy of Quantum Information and Entanglement*, edited by Alisa Bokulich and Gregg Jaeger (Cambridge University Press, 2010) p. 16–43.
- [5] Stephen D. Bartlett, Terry Rudolph, and Robert W. Spekkens, “Reference frames, superselection rules, and quantum information,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **79**, 555 (2007).
- [6] Paul Adrien Maurice Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, Belfer Graduate School Sci. Mono. (Belfer Graduate School of Science, New York, NY, 1964).
- [7] Carlo Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- [8] Thomas Thiemann, *Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- [9] D. Marolf, “Group averaging and refined algebraic quantization: Where are we now?” in *The Ninth Marcel Grossmann Meeting* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002) pp. 1348–1349.
- [10] Donald Marolf, “Refined Algebraic Quantization: Systems with a single constraint,” arXiv:9508015 [gr-qc] (1995).
- [11] Domenico Giulini and Donald Marolf, “On the generality of refined algebraic quantization,” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16**, 2479 (1999).
- [12] Domenico Giulini and Donald Marolf, “A Uniqueness theorem for constraint quantization,” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16**, 2489 (1999).
- [13] Marius Krumm, Philipp A. Höhn, and Markus P. Müller, “Quantum reference frame transformations as symmetries and the paradox of the third particle,” arXiv:2011.01951 [quant-ph] (2020).
- [14] Augustin Vanrietvelde, Philipp A. Höhn, Flaminia Giacomini, and Esteban Castro-Ruiz, “A change of perspective: switching quantum reference frames via a perspective-neutral framework,” *Quantum* **4**, 225 (2020).
- [15] Augustin Vanrietvelde, Philipp A. Höhn, and Flaminia Giacomini, “Switching quantum reference frames in the N-body problem and the absence of global relational perspectives,” arXiv:1809.05093 [quant-ph] (2018).
- [16] Philipp A. Höhn and Augustin Vanrietvelde, “How to switch between relational quantum clocks,” *New J. Phys.* **22**, 123048 (2020).
- [17] Philipp A. Höhn, “Switching Internal Times and a New Perspective on the ‘Wave Function of the Universe’,” *Universe* **5**, 116 (2019).
- [18] Philipp A. Höhn, Alexander R. H. Smith, and Maximilian P. E. Lock, “The Trinity of Relational Quantum Dynamics,” arXiv:1912.00033 [quant-ph] (2019).
- [19] Philipp A. Höhn, Alexander R. H. Smith, and Maximilian P. E. Lock, “Equivalence of approaches to relational quantum dynamics in relativistic settings,” arXiv:2007.00580 [gr-qc] (2020).
- [20] Leonardo Chataignier, Philipp A. Höhn, and Maximilian P. E. Lock, “Relational dynamics with periodic clocks,” to appear (2021).
- [21] Esteban Castro-Ruiz, Flaminia Giacomini, Alessio Belenchia, and Časlav Brukner, “Quantum clocks and the temporal localisability of events in the presence of gravitating quantum systems,” *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 2672 (2020).
- [22] Flaminia Giacomini and Časlav Brukner, “Einstein’s Equivalence principle for superpositions of gravitational fields,” arXiv:2012.13754 [quant-ph] (2020).
- [23] Flaminia Giacomini, “Spacetime Quantum Reference Frames and superpositions of proper times,” arXiv:2101.11628 [quant-ph] (2021).
- [24] Flaminia Giacomini, Esteban Castro-Ruiz, and Časlav Brukner, “Quantum mechanics and the covariance of physical laws in quantum reference frames,” *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 494 (2019).
- [25] Flaminia Giacomini, Esteban Castro-Ruiz, and Časlav Brukner, “Relativistic Quantum Reference Frames: The Operational Meaning of Spin,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 090404 (2019).
- [26] Anne-Catherine de la Hamette and Thomas D. Galle, “Quantum reference frames for general symmetry groups,” *Quantum* **4**, 367 (2020).
- [27] Lucas F. Streiter, Flaminia Giacomini, and Časlav Brukner, “A relativistic bell test within quantum reference frames,” arXiv:2008.03317 [quant-ph] (2020).
- [28] Angel Ballesteros, Flaminia Giacomini, and Giulia Gubitosi, “The group structure of dynamical transformations between quantum reference frames,” arXiv:2012.15769 [quant-ph] (2020).

- [29] B. Dittrich, “Partial and complete observables for canonical general relativity,” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23**, 6155 (2006).
- [30] B. Dittrich, “Partial and complete observables for Hamiltonian constrained systems,” *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **39**, 1891 (2007).
- [31] Carlo Rovelli, “Time in quantum gravity: An hypothesis,” *Phys. Rev. D* **43**, 442 (1991).
- [32] Carlo Rovelli, “What is observable in classical and quantum gravity?” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **8**, 297 (1991).
- [33] Carlo Rovelli, “Quantum reference systems,” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **8**, 317 (1991).
- [34] Carlo Rovelli, “Quantum mechanics without time: a model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 2638 (1990).
- [35] Leonardo Chataignier, “Relational observables, reference frames, and conditional probabilities,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 026013 (2021).
- [36] Leonardo Chataignier, “Construction of quantum Dirac observables and the emergence of WKB time,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 086001 (2020).
- [37] C. Procesi, *Lie Groups: An Approach through Invariants and Representations*, Universitext (Springer New York, 2007).
- [38] Martin Bojowald, *Canonical Gravity and Applications: Cosmology, Black Holes and Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010).
- [39] Don N. Page and William K. Wootters, “Evolution without evolution: Dynamics described by stationary observables,” *Phys. Rev. D* **27**, 2885 (1983).
- [40] William K. Wootters, “‘Time’ replaced by quantum correlations,” *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **23**, 701 (1984).
- [41] Alexander R. H. Smith and Mehdi Ahmadi, “Quantizing time: Interacting clocks and systems,” *Quantum* **3**, 160 (2019).
- [42] Alexander R. H. Smith and Mehdi Ahmadi, “Quantum clocks observe classical and quantum time dilation,” *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 5360 (2020).
- [43] Paul Busch, Marian Grabowski, and Pekka J. Lahti, *Operational Quantum Physics*, Lecture Notes in Physics Monographs, Vol. 31 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995).
- [44] Alexander S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*, Statistics and Probability, Vol. 1 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982).
- [45] Masamichi Takesaki, *Theory of Operator Algebras I*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 124 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2002).
- [46] Kalyanapuram R. Parthasarathy, *An introduction to quantum stochastic calculus*, Vol. 85 (Birkhäuser, 2012).
- [47] Wolfgang Pauli, “Die allgemeinen prinzipien der wellenmechanik,” *Handbuch der Physik* **5**, 1–168 (1958).
- [48] MD Srinivas and R Vijayalakshmi, “The ‘time of occurrence’ in quantum mechanics,” *Pramana* **16**, 173 (1981).
- [49] Mischa P. Woods, Ralph Silva, and Jonathan Oppenheim, “Autonomous quantum machines and finite-sized clocks,” in *Annales Henri Poincaré*, Vol. 20 (Springer, 2019) pp. 125–218.
- [50] N. L. Harshman and S. Wickramasekara, “Galilean and dynamical invariance of entanglement in particle scattering,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 080406 (2007).
- [51] Matthew C. Palmer, Florian Girelli, and Stephen D. Bartlett, “Changing quantum reference frames,” *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 052121 (2014).
- [52] Alexander R. H. Smith, Marco Piani, and Robert B. Mann, “Quantum reference frames associated with non-compact groups: The case of translations and boosts and the role of mass,” *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 012333 (2016).
- [53] L. Loveridge, P. Busch, and T. Miyadera, “Relativity of quantum states and observables,” *EPL* **117**, 40004 (2017).
- [54] Leon Loveridge, Takayuki Miyadera, and Paul Busch, “Symmetry, Reference Frames, and Relational Quantities in Quantum Mechanics,” *Found. Phys.* **48**, 135 (2018).
- [55] Alexander R. H. Smith, “Communicating without shared reference frames,” *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 052315 (2019).
- [56] Asher Peres, Petra F. Scudo, and Daniel R. Terno, “Quantum entropy and special relativity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 230402 (2002).
- [57] Asher Peres and Daniel R. Terno, “Quantum information and relativity theory,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 93 (2004).
- [58] Nicholas David Birrell and Paul Charles William Davies, *Quantum fields in curved space* (Cambridge university press, 1984).
- [59] W. G. Unruh, “Notes on black hole evaporation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 870 (1976).
- [60] S. W. Hawking, “Black hole explosions,” *Nature* **248**, 30 (1974).
- [61] L. Parker, “Particle creation in expanding universes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 562 (1968).
- [62] Lucien Hardy, “Quantum Theory From Five Reasonable Axioms,” arXiv:quant-ph/0101012 (2001).
- [63] Jonathan Barrett, “Information processing in generalized probabilistic theories,” *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 032304 (2007).
- [64] Giulio Chiribella, Giacomo Mauro D’Ariano, and Paolo Perinotti, “Probabilistic theories with purification,” *Phys. Rev. A* **81** (2010).
- [65] Stefano Gogioso and Carlo Maria Scandolo, “Categorical probabilistic theories,” *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* **266**, 367 (2018).
- [66] Markus P. Müller, “Probabilistic Theories and Reconstructions of Quantum Theory (Les Houches 2019 lecture notes),” arXiv:2011.01286 [quant-ph] (2020).
- [67] Philipp Andres Höhn, “Toolbox for reconstructing quantum theory from rules on information acquisition,” *Quantum* **1**, 38 (2017).
- [68] William Donnelly and Laurent Freidel, “Local subsystems in gauge theory and gravity,” *JHEP* **09**, 102 (2016).
- [69] William Donnelly and Steven B. Giddings, “Observables, gravitational dressing, and obstructions to locality and subsystems,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 104038 (2016).
- [70] William Donnelly and Steven B. Giddings, “How is quantum information localized in gravity?” *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 086013 (2017).
- [71] Steven B. Giddings, “Quantum-first gravity,” *Found. Phys.* **49**, 177 (2019).
- [72] Laurent Freidel, Marc Geiller, and Daniele Pranzetti, “Edge modes of gravity. Part I. Corner potentials and charges,” *JHEP* **11**, 026 (2020).
- [73] Marc Geiller and Puttarak Jai-akson, “Extended actions, dynamics of edge modes, and entanglement entropy,” *JHEP* **20**, 134 (2020).
- [74] Henrique Gomes and Aldo Riello, “Unified geometric framework for boundary charges and particle dressings,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 025013 (2018).
- [75] Henrique Gomes and Aldo Riello, “The quasilocal degrees of freedom of Yang-Mills theory,” arXiv:1910.04222 [hep-th] (2019).

- [76] Wolfgang Wieland, “Fock representation of gravitational boundary modes and the discreteness of the area spectrum,” *Ann. Henri Poincare* **18**, 3695 (2017).
- [77] Wolfgang Wieland, “New boundary variables for classical and quantum gravity on a null surface,” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **34**, 215008 (2017).
- [78] Ted Jacobson and Phuc Nguyen, “Diffeomorphism invariance and the black hole information paradox,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 046002 (2019).
- [79] Gabriel Wong, “A note on entanglement edge modes in Chern Simons theory,” *JHEP* **08**, 020 (2018).
- [80] William Donnelly, “Decomposition of entanglement entropy in lattice gauge theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 085004 (2012).
- [81] P. V. Buividovich and M. I. Polikarpov, “Entanglement entropy in gauge theories and the holographic principle for electric strings,” *Phys. Lett. B* **670**, 141–145 (2008).
- [82] Horacio Casini, Marina Huerta, and Jose Alejandro Rosabal, “Remarks on entanglement entropy for gauge fields,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 085012 (2014).
- [83] Clement Delcamp, Bianca Dittrich, and Aldo Riello, “On entanglement entropy in non-Abelian lattice gauge theory and 3D quantum gravity,” *JHEP* **11**, 102 (2016).
- [84] Samuel L. Braunstein, Carlton M. Caves, and G. J. Milburn, “Generalized Uncertainty Relations: Theory, Examples, and Lorentz Invariance,” *Ann. Phys.* **247**, 135–173 (1996).
- [85] Thomas Thiemann, “Reduced phase space quantization and Dirac observables,” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23**, 1163 (2006).
- [86] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*, 10th ed. (Cambridge University Press, USA, 2011).

Appendix A: From physical states to Quantum Reference Frames (QRFs), including degeneracy

Here we describe how the formalism introduced in the main text generalizes to the case where any of the terms in the constraint $\hat{C} = \hat{C}_A + \hat{C}_B + \hat{C}_C$ may have an (eigenvalue-independent) degeneracy. For example, in relativistic cases, the degeneracy sectors may correspond to positive and negative frequency modes [16, 17, 19, 35, 42]. In the following sections, all proofs of statements in the main text will be given in a form including the possibility of degeneracies.

First note that solving $\hat{C} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = 0$ for reference system k yields physical states in the form $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = \sum_{d_k} |\psi_{\text{phys}}^{d_k}\rangle$ [18–20], with

$$|\psi_{\text{phys}}^{d_k}\rangle = \sum_{d_i, d_j} \int_{c_i + c_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}} \psi_{d_i, d_j}^{d_k}(c_i, c_j) | -c_i - c_j, d_k \rangle_k \otimes |c_i, d_i\rangle_i \otimes |c_j, d_j\rangle_j, \quad (\text{A1})$$

for some $\psi_{d_i, d_j}^{d_k}(c_i, c_j)$, where d_i is a degeneracy label for \hat{C}_i . The physical Hilbert space thus decomposes into superselection sectors $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} = \bigoplus_{d_k} \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{d_k}$ [10, 11, 19]. The orientation states of the reference frame, introduced in Eq. (3), transform covariantly under the group G_k generated by \hat{C}_k , *i.e.* $\exp(-ig'\hat{C}_k) |g, d_k\rangle_k = |g + g', d_k\rangle_k$. They can therefore be rewritten here as [18–20, 41–44, 84]

$$|g, d_k\rangle_k := \int_{c_k} e^{i(\theta(c_k) - c_k g)} |c_k, d_k\rangle_k, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\theta(c_k)$ is an arbitrary phase function. Taken together, the set of all orientation states define a positive operator-valued measure (POVM) over all degeneracy sectors

$$E_k(X) := \int_{X \subset G_k} E_k(dg) \quad \text{with} \quad E_k(dg) = \mu \sum_{d_k} dg |g, d_k\rangle \langle g, d_k|, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where X is a Borel subset of G_k and μ is a normalization constant such that $\int_G E_k(dg) = \mathbf{1}$; if $G_k = \mathbb{R}$ or $G_k = \text{U}(1)$, we have $\mu = 1/2\pi$ and $\mu = 1/t_{\text{max}}$, respectively, where t_{max} is the period of the $\text{U}(1)$ representation [18–20]. This POVM is said to be covariant with respect to G_k .

This orientation POVM can be employed to construct the n^{th} -moment operators for the QRF frame orientation

$$\hat{O}_k^{(n)} := \int_{G_k} E_k(dg) g^n, \quad (\text{A4})$$

which give rise to a generalization of canonical conjugacy

$$[\hat{O}_k^{(n)}, \hat{C}_k] = in \hat{O}_k^{(n-1)} - \frac{iS_{G_k}}{\mu^{(n-1)}} \sum_{d_k} |e, d_k\rangle \langle e, d_k|, \quad (\text{A5})$$

where $s_{\mathbb{R}} = 0$ and $s_{\text{U}(1)} = 1$ and e labels the origin/identity of G_k [18–20]. The outcome of the POVM then provides a parameterization of the group G generated by \hat{C} . It can be used to gauge-fix the G -orbits and as a reference degree of

freedom for i, j . In the case where $G = \mathbb{R}$ and $G_k = \text{U}(1)$, the QRF orientations cannot parametrize the full orbit of G , but there the constraint forces all physical degrees of freedom of i, j to be periodic so that this is not an issue [20].

To move from $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ to the perspective of k , we condition upon the degeneracy label as well as the value g of the orientation observable, which are commuting observables due to the eigenvalue-independence of the degeneracy (see *e.g.* [19]). The resulting reduction maps then lead to reduced physical Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ and observables on it, encoding the physics of i, j as described from the internal perspective of QRF k within the d_k superselection sector. In particular, the relational Schrödinger picture reduction map $\mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{(S)}(g) : \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ is defined by $\mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{(S)}(g) := \langle g, d_k|_k \otimes \mathbf{1}_{ij}$ (acting only on elements of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$), and writing $|\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}(g)\rangle := \mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{(S)}(g) |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle$, we have

$$|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = \mu \sum_{d_k} \int_{G_k} dg |g, d_k\rangle_k \otimes |\psi_{ij|k}(g)\rangle \quad (\text{A6})$$

The relational Heisenberg picture reduction map $\mathcal{R}_{d_k} : \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ is obtained by first acting with the frame disentangler (or trivialization) of the QRF k , defined by [14–20]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon} &:= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{i^n}{n!} \hat{O}_k^{(n)} \otimes (\hat{C}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j + \mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{C}_j + \varepsilon_k \mathbf{1}_{ij})^n = \mu \sum_{d_k} \int_{G_k} dg e^{i\varepsilon_k g} |g, d_k\rangle \langle g, d_k|_k \otimes e^{i(\hat{C}_i + \hat{C}_j)g} \\ &\equiv \sum_{d_k} \mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon}^{d_k}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

where each $\mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon}^{d_k}$ is a d_k -sector-wise disentangler, *i.e.*

$$\mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon}^{d_k} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = |\varepsilon_k, d_k\rangle_k \otimes |\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle, \quad (\text{A8})$$

with $|\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ (*cf.* Eq. (4) in the main text), and where $-\varepsilon_k$ is a fixed, but arbitrary element of $\sigma_{ij|k}$. Note that ε_k must be such that $|\varepsilon_k, d_k\rangle \neq |\varepsilon_k, d'_k\rangle \forall d_k \neq d'_k$, so that superselection sectors are still distinguishable upon the action of the disentangler, as required for the latter to be invertible on physical states. As a second step, one conditions on the QRF k being in orientation g , as in the relational Schrödinger picture reduction, so that altogether

$$\mathcal{R}_{d_k} := \mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{(S)}(g) \mathcal{N}(g, \varepsilon_k) \mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

where $\mathcal{N}(g, \varepsilon_k)$ is a normalization factor so that $\mathcal{R}_{d_k} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = |\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle$ is a relational Heisenberg picture state which neither depends on g nor ε_k . Note that this is unitarily equivalent to the relational Schrödinger picture state above, *i.e.* $\mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{(S)}(g) |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = e^{-i(\hat{C}_i + \hat{C}_j)g} \mathcal{R}_{d_k}(g) |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle$ [18–20].

The disentangler $\mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon}$ transforms the constraint \hat{C} in such a way that it only acts on the QRF k and fixes its now-redundant degrees of freedom $(\mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon} \hat{C} \mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon}^{-1}) \mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = ((\hat{C}_k - \varepsilon_k) \otimes \mathbf{1}_{ij}) \mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle, \forall |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, when acting on ‘trivialized’ physical states [18–20]. Here,

$$\mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon}^{-1} := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-i)^n}{n!} \hat{O}_k^{(n)} \otimes (\hat{C}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j + \mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{C}_j + \varepsilon_k \mathbf{1}_{ij})^n,$$

which in general is only the inverse of the disentangler when acting on *physical states* [18–20], but this is all we need.

The reduction is invertible on each d_k -sector in both pictures when acting on *physical states* and $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ is isometric to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{d_k}$ [14–20]. In addition, as we shall see, the $\{\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}\}_{d_k}$ are isometric for different values of d_k . The choice of the degeneracy sector in which to carry out the reduction is then arbitrary, as they are in some sense equivalent. One must, however, keep track of the chosen degeneracy sector(s) in order to maintain invertibility. For example, the frame change map in the relational Heisenberg picture is now defined by [14–20]

$$\Lambda_{k \rightarrow i}^{d_k, d_i} := \mathcal{R}_{d_i} \circ \mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{-1}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{-1} := \mathcal{N}'(\varepsilon_k) (\mathcal{T}_{k,\varepsilon}^{d_k})^{-1} (|\varepsilon_k, d_k\rangle_k \otimes \mathbf{1}_{ij})$, and $\mathcal{N}'(\varepsilon_k)$ is a normalization factor such that $\mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{-1} |\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle = |\psi_{\text{phys}}^{d_k}\rangle$. This is to be understood as appending the tensor factor $|\varepsilon_k, d_k\rangle_k \otimes$ to the reduced state in $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ (which no longer contains any k degrees of freedom) and then performing the kinematical ‘re-entangling’, *i.e.* inverse of the disentangling

operation. This map is only an invertible isometry between $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}|_{d_i}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{jk|i}^{d_i}|_{d_k}$, where $|_{d_i}$ denotes restriction to the d_i -degeneracy sector in $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ (and likewise for $|_{d_k}$), and not when acting on arbitrary kinematical states in $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$. In other words, we can only invertibly transform states with support in the overlap of the d_k - and d_i -sectors, *i.e.* in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{d_k} \cap \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{d_i}$ at the perspective-neutral level, from k 's to i 's perspective, and *vice versa* [16, 17, 19, 20].

To incorporate degeneracies, the (possibly improper) projector from the kinematical i, j tensor factors onto the reduced physical Hilbert space from k 's perspective given in Eq. (6) of the main text must be replaced by $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} : \mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$, with

$$\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} := \sum_{d_i, d_j} \int_{c_i, c_j | c_i + c_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}} |c_i, d_i\rangle \langle c_i, d_i|_i \otimes |c_j, d_j\rangle \langle c_j, d_j|_j. \quad (\text{A11})$$

Note that the form of this projector is independent of d_k , and consequently so too is the projection of a kinematical state onto $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$. The $\{\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}\}_{d_k}$ therefore have identical structure (as do the observable algebras thereon). When the factorizability condition given in Eq. (7) of the main text is satisfied, namely when there exists a $\tilde{\sigma}_i \subseteq \sigma_i$ (likewise $\tilde{\sigma}_j$) such that

$$\sigma_{ij|k} = \text{M}(\tilde{\sigma}_i, \tilde{\sigma}_j), \quad (\text{A12})$$

where $\text{M}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes Minkowski addition, then this projector can be written

$$\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} = \left(\sum_{d_i} \int_{c_i \in \tilde{\sigma}_i} |c_i, d_i\rangle \langle c_i, d_i|_i \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{d_j} \int_{c_j \in \tilde{\sigma}_j} |c_j, d_j\rangle \langle c_j, d_j|_j \right). \quad (\text{A13})$$

Appendix B: Commuting subalgebras of relational observables

Suppose that the reduced physical Hilbert space admits a tensor factorization across the subsystems i, j from k 's perspective, *i.e.* $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{i|k}^{d_k} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{j|k}^{d_k}$. We denote the algebra generated by local subsystem observables on $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ by $\mathcal{A}_{ij|k}^{d_k} := \mathcal{A}_{i|k}^{d_k} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{j|k}^{d_k}$, where $\mathcal{A}_{i|k}^{d_k} := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{i|k}^{d_k})$ (hence a type I factor). All statements in the main body pertaining to observable algebras remain true superselection sector-wise in the presence of degeneracies; hence, in the corresponding statements the algebras should be equipped with the superselection sector label d_k .

Before proving Theorem 1, we recall a few properties of relational observables. The algebra of relational observables of i relative to the QRF k is given by $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{i|k, d_k} = \mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{-1} \left(\mathcal{A}_{i|k}^{d_k} \otimes \mathbf{1}_j \right) \mathcal{R}_{d_k}$. Its elements are thus of the form $\mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{-1} \left(\hat{f}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j \right) \mathcal{R}_{d_k}$ for some $\hat{f}_i \in \mathcal{A}_{i|k}^{d_k}$. As shown in [18–20], given our assumptions on the constraint \hat{C} , the embedded observables can be written as,¹

$$\mathcal{R}_{d_k}^{-1} \left(\hat{f}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j \right) \mathcal{R}_{d_k} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = \hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle, \quad (\text{B1})$$

$\forall |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k} &= \int_{G_k} E_k^{d_k}(dg) \otimes \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{i^n}{n!} g^n [\hat{f}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, \hat{C}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j + \mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{C}_j]_n \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{i^n}{n!} \hat{O}_{d_k}^{(n)} \otimes [\hat{f}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, \hat{C}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j + \mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{C}_j]_n, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

where $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]_n = [[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]_{n-1}, \hat{B}]$ is the n^{th} -order nested commutator with the convention $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]_0 = \hat{A}$, G_k is the group generated by \hat{C}_k , and $E_k^{d_k}(dg) = \mu dg |g, d_k\rangle \langle g, d_k|$ and $\hat{O}_{d_k}^{(n)}$ are the effect density and n^{th} -QRF-moment of the

¹ In [18–20], the relational observables are given in slightly different form as $\hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}(g)$ and correspond to the value of \hat{f}_i when the QRF k is in ‘orientation’ g . These are equal to the expression here if one replaces f_i by the Heisenberg observable $\hat{f}_i(g) = e^{ig\hat{C}_i} \hat{f}_i e^{-ig\hat{C}_i}$, *i.e.* $\hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}(g) \equiv \hat{F}_{f_i(g) \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}$. Here, we drop the frame orientation label g for simplicity.

d_k -sector. This expression can also be written in terms of a so-called G -twirl, *i.e.* an incoherent group averaging, over G_k [18–20]. However, the G -twirl form will look slightly differently in the $G_k = \text{U}(1)$ and $G_k = \mathbb{R}$ cases which is why here we work with the power series which is valid for both. These observables are indeed invariant (Dirac) observables, satisfying [18–20]

$$[\hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}, \hat{C}] |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = 0, \quad \forall |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

In particular, these expressions constitute a quantization of the systematic power-series expansion of classical relational observables developed in [29, 30, 85], here for the case of a single constraint (see also [35, 36]).

By the arguments in the main body, the assumption on the tensor factorization of the reduced physical Hilbert spaces from the beginning of this section implies that we also have, for example, the two tensor factorizations $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{d_A} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{B|A, d_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A, d_A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{d_B} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{A|B, d_B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B, d_B}$ in the superselection sectors of A and B . The following result shows that these constitute *different* physical tensor factorizations, including in the overlap of the d_A - and d_B -superselection sectors, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{d_A} \cap \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{d_B}$. The reason we have to focus on overlaps has to do with the observation above that Eq. (A10) is only invertible for such overlaps.

Theorem 1. *The algebra of relational observables of C relative to A , is distinct from that of C relative to B , *i.e.* $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A, d_A}|_{d_B} \neq \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B, d_B}|_{d_A}$, where $|_{d_k}$ denotes restriction to the d_k -sector.*

While the restrictions of these algebras to an overlap of superselection sectors are thus distinct, note that they will be isomorphic when $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A, d_A}|_{d_B} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B, d_B}|_{d_A}$. This will, however, not always be the case, especially when the number of degeneracy sectors for A is different from B (see [16] for an example).

Proof. We will use the power series expansion of relational observables to show that $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{i|k, d_k}$ does not commute with $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{k|j, d_j}$ from which we then infer the claim. Since

$$\hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k} = \hat{F}_{f_i, k}^{d_k} \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, \quad (\text{B4})$$

where $\hat{F}_{f_i, k}^{d_k}$ is the same expression as in Eq. (B2), except with the j -tensor factor removed, we also have from Eq. (B3)

$$[\hat{F}_{f_i, k}^{d_k}, \mathbf{1}_k \otimes \hat{C}_i + \hat{C}_k \otimes \mathbf{1}_i] \otimes \mathbf{1}_j |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = 0. \quad (\text{B5})$$

When \hat{f}_i is a constant of motion, $[\hat{f}_i, \hat{C}_i] = 0$, Eqs. (B2) and (B4) imply $\hat{F}_{f_i, k}^{d_k} = \mathbf{1}_k \otimes \hat{f}_i$ because for the zeroth moment, $\hat{O}_k^{(0)} = \mathbf{1}_k$. Specifically, we have $\hat{F}_{\hat{C}_i, k}^{d_k} = \mathbf{1}_k \otimes \hat{C}_i$ and clearly the restriction $\hat{C}_i|_{d_k}$ of \hat{C}_i to the d_k -sector lies in $\mathcal{A}_{i|k}^{d_k}$. As shown in [18–20], the map $\hat{f}_i \mapsto \hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}$ defines a (weak) algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{A}_{i|k}^{d_k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{d_k}$, which here implies that for all $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$

$$\hat{F}_{[f_i, C_i] \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = [\hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}, \hat{F}_{C_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}] |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = [\hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}, \mathbf{1}_k \otimes \hat{C}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j] |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle,$$

where on the left hand side we mean with the commutator $[\hat{f}_i, \hat{C}_i]$ its restriction to $\mathcal{A}_{i|k}^{d_k}$. Now $\mathcal{A}_{i|k}^{d_k}$ must contain operators \hat{f}_i that are not constants of motion if $\hat{C}_i|_{d_k}$ is non-trivial, *i.e.* that satisfy $[\hat{f}_i, \hat{C}_i] \neq 0$ when restricted to $\mathcal{A}_{i|k}^{d_k}$. In particular, if \hat{f}_i is *not* a constant of motion, then also

$$[\hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}, \mathbf{1}_k \otimes \hat{C}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j] |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \neq 0 \quad (\text{B6})$$

for general physical states because only the relational observable corresponding to zero satisfies $\hat{F}_{0 \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = 0$, $\forall |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. Hence, thanks to Eq. (B5) we also have

$$[\hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k}, \hat{C}_k \otimes \mathbf{1}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j] |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \neq 0 \quad (\text{B7})$$

for general physical states. But $\hat{F}_{f_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j, k}^{d_k} \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{i|k, d_k}$, while clearly (an appropriate restriction of) $\hat{C}_k \otimes \mathbf{1}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j$ is an element of *both* $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{k|i, d_i}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{k|j, d_j}$. For $k = A$, $i = C$ and $j = B$, we thus find $[\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A, d_A}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{A|B, d_B}] \neq 0$. Then, since $[\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B, d_B}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{A|B, d_B}] = 0$, we have that $\mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|A, d_A}|_{d_B} \neq \mathcal{A}_{\text{phys}}^{C|B, d_B}|_{d_A}$, where $|_{d_k}$ denotes restriction to the d_k -sector. \square

Appendix C: Example: QRF dependent subsystem locality and correlations

Here we illustrate Theorem 1 and the observation of the main text that subsystem locality and correlations are dependent on the choice of QRF in a simple example: three particles on a line subject to global translation invariance $\hat{C} = \hat{p}_A + \hat{p}_B + \hat{p}_C$ [14, 15].

Solving the constraint for p_k , physical states read $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dp_i dp_j \psi_{ij|k}(p_i, p_j) | -p_i - p_j \rangle_k \otimes |p_i\rangle_i \otimes |p_j\rangle_j$, where the wave function $\psi_{ij|k}(p_i, p_j) := \psi_{\text{kin}}(p_k = -p_i - p_j, p_i, p_j)$, corresponding to the *same* kinematical state in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} \simeq L^2(\mathbb{R})_A \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R})_B \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R})_C$, will look different for different choices of k and hence feature different correlations structures for different QRF choices. For example, as shown below, any physical state which from C 's perspective is separable in A and B , is from B 's perspective necessarily entangled across A and C . Indeed, the tensor factors of i, j correspond to the translation-invariant canonical pairs $(\hat{q}_i - \hat{q}_k, \hat{p}_i), (\hat{q}_j - \hat{q}_k, \hat{p}_j)$ and these generate the algebra of observables on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. Owing to the Stone-von Neumann theorem, we have the tensor factorization $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} \simeq L^2(\mathbb{R})_i \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R})_j$. Since the canonical pairs will be different for different choices of k , so will be this physical tensor factorization. This translates into the internal QRF perspectives: the reduction from Eq. (5) reads $\mathcal{R}_k = \sqrt{2\pi} (\langle q_k = 0 | \otimes \mathbf{1}_{ij}) \mathcal{T}_{k,0}$ with unitary disentangler $\mathcal{T}_{k,0} = \exp[i\hat{q}_k(\hat{p}_i + \hat{p}_j)]$ and has the inverse $\mathcal{R}_k^{-1} = \mathcal{T}_{k,0}^\dagger (|p_k = 0\rangle \otimes \mathbf{1}_{ij})$ [14]. The translation-invariant canonical pairs become the standard canonical pairs of i, j : $\mathcal{R}_k(\hat{q}_i - \hat{q}_k, \hat{p}_i) \mathcal{R}_k^{-1} = (\hat{q}_i, \hat{p}_i)$ and similarly for j , inducing the tensor factorization $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k} = \mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$ with the original kinematical i, j Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_i, \mathcal{H}_j = L^2(\mathbb{R})$. However, the QRF transformation maps the canonical pairs from A 's to B 's perspective as $\Lambda_{A \rightarrow B}(\hat{q}_B, \hat{p}_B) \Lambda_{A \rightarrow B}^{-1} = (-\hat{q}_A, -\hat{p}_A - \hat{p}_C)$ and $\Lambda_{A \rightarrow B}(\hat{q}_C, \hat{p}_C) \Lambda_{A \rightarrow B}^{-1} = (\hat{q}_C - \hat{q}_A, \hat{p}_C)$ [14, 24]. That is, the tensor factorization between B and C from A 's perspective transforms into a tensor factorization between combinations of A and C degrees of freedom relative to B .

Using a different (but equivalent [14]) formalism without constraints and physical states and only the internal perspective states, it was already stated in [24] that in general product states map to entangled states under the above QRF transformations. Here, we give a full proof of this observation.

Consider a physical state which from C 's perspective is separable in A and B , *i.e.* $\psi_{AB|C}(p_A, p_B) = \psi_{A|C}(p_A) \psi_{B|C}(p_B)$ for some $\psi_{A|C}, \psi_{B|C} \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Transforming to B 's perspective [14, 24], one finds

$$\psi_{AC|B}(p_A, p_C) = \psi_{A|C}(p_A) \psi_{B|C}(-p_A - p_C). \quad (\text{C1})$$

This is clearly a product state across the factorization defined by the mixed canonical pairs $(\hat{q}_A - \hat{q}_C, \hat{p}_A)$ and $(-\hat{q}_C, -\hat{p}_A - \hat{p}_C)$ mentioned in the main text. However, we now prove by contradiction that the right hand side is necessarily unequal to $\psi_{A|B}(p_A) \psi_{C|B}(p_C)$ for any $\psi_{A|B}, \psi_{C|B} \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Any state from C 's perspective which is separable across A and B is therefore, from B 's perspective, necessarily entangled across A and C . Due to the invariance of entanglement under local unitary operations [86], this fact is independent of which observable-representation the wavefunction is expressed in.

Indeed, in order for there to exist $\psi_{A|B}, \psi_{C|B} \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\psi_{AC|B}(p_A, p_C) = \psi_{A|B}(p_A) \psi_{C|B}(p_C)$, then from Eq. (C1) we must have that $\psi_{B|C}(p + p') = \psi_{B|C}(p) \psi_{B|C}(p')$. This, however, implies that $\psi_{B|C}(p) \notin L^2(\mathbb{R})$, as we now prove by contradiction. Assume that there exists a continuous wavefunction $\psi_{B|C}(p)$ satisfying the relation $\psi_{B|C}(p + p') = \psi_{B|C}(p) \psi_{B|C}(p')$. Its modulus, $|\psi_{B|C}|(p)$ must then satisfy the same relation. Note that if there exists $p_* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\psi_{B|C}|(p_*) = 0$, then $|\psi_{B|C}|(p) = 0 \forall p \in \mathbb{R}$ since $|\psi_{B|C}|(p_* + p) = |\psi_{B|C}|(p_*) |\psi_{B|C}|(p) = 0 \forall p \in \mathbb{R}$. Assuming the wavefunction is non-zero, we may define an auxiliary function $g(p) := \log[|\psi_{B|C}|(p)]$ which is continuous on \mathbb{R} and obeys Cauchy's functional equation, $g(p + p') = g(p) + g(p')$. It follows from the fact that $g(0 + 0) = g(0) + g(0) = g(0)$ that $g(0) = 0$, from $g(p - p) = g(p) + g(-p) = g(0) = 0$ that $g(-p) = -g(p)$, and by induction that $g(np) = ng(p) \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Given $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $n \neq 0$, we have $g(\frac{m}{n}) = ng(\frac{m}{n}) = mg(1)$, where we have used the previous identity twice. This implies that $g(p) = g(1)p \forall p \in \mathbb{Q}$. Since the continuous functions g and $p \mapsto g(1)p$ agree on \mathbb{Q} , a dense subset of \mathbb{R} , then they must be equal on the reals. This means that $g(p) = Kp$ for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$, which then implies that $|\psi_{B|C}|(p) = e^{Kp}$. This is a contradiction, and thus $\psi_{B|C}(p)$ is not square-integrable.

Appendix D: Example: two kinematical qubits can be one physical qutrit

As an example of factorizability condition of Equation (7), consider a system consisting of two identical qubits and a free particle subject to the Hamiltonian constraint

$$\hat{C} = -\frac{\hat{\sigma}_A^{(z)}}{2} - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_B^{(z)}}{2} + \frac{\hat{p}_C^2}{2m} \quad (\text{D1})$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_j^{(z)} := |0\rangle\langle 0|_j - |1\rangle\langle 1|_j$ is the Pauli z matrix corresponding to system j . Choosing C as a temporal reference frame (*i.e.* a clock), we have $\sigma_{AB|C} = \{0, -1\}$. There are then no subsets of σ_A and σ_B satisfying the factorization condition, Eq. (7), thus $\mathcal{H}_{AB|C}^{d_C}$, where $d_C = \pm 1$, does not factorize into a subset of \mathcal{H}_A and a subset of \mathcal{H}_B , though we can combine certain elements of \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B to label the states of $\mathcal{H}_{AB|C}^{d_C}$.

The kinematical space of the two qubits, $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, is 4-dimensional. On the other hand, the reduced physical Hilbert space corresponding to conditioning on clock C , *i.e.* $\Pi_{\sigma_{AB|C}}^{d_C}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$, is three dimensional, with a basis constructed from the kinematic states $\{|0_A 1_B\rangle, |1_A 0_B\rangle, |0_A 0_B\rangle\}$. The first two states correspond to \hat{C}_C taking the value 0, and the third state corresponds to \hat{C}_C taking the value 1. In this reference frame, the system evolves according to the Hamiltonian [18] $\hat{H}_{AB}^{\text{phys}} := \Pi_{\sigma_{AB|C}}^{d_C}(\hat{C}_A + \hat{C}_B)$, whose three eigenstates correspond to eigenvalues $\{0, 0, -1\}$, and does not separate into two subsystems with additive energies. The system thus evolves not as two qubits, but rather as a single qutrit.

Appendix E: (Non-)factorizability of the observable algebra in frame perspectives

In the main body, we discussed that projecting kinematical basis elements $\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_j)$ with the (possibly improper) projector $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$ into k 's perspective necessarily yields observables for i and j that are not of product form across these subsystems, unless condition (7) is fulfilled. Here, we discuss a subtlety that arises in this argument when $\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j$ is diagonal in the eigenbases of \hat{C}_i, \hat{C}_j ,

$$\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j = \sum_{d_i, d_j} \prod_{c_i, c_j} A_i^{d_i}(c_i) A_j^{d_j}(c_j) |c_i, d_i\rangle_i \langle c_i, d_i| \otimes |c_j, d_j\rangle_j \langle c_j, d_j| \quad (\text{E1})$$

for some coefficients $A_i^{d_i}(c_j)$ (and likewise for j), in which case it will commute with $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$. As we shall now see, the argument remains valid also in this case.

First note that the projection of such a basis element,

$$\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} (\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j) = (\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j) \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} = \sum_{d_i, d_j} \prod_{c_i, c_j | c_i + c_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}} A_i^{d_i}(c_i) A_j^{d_j}(c_j) |c_i, d_i\rangle_i \langle c_i, d_i| \otimes |c_j, d_j\rangle_j \langle c_j, d_j|, \quad (\text{E2})$$

cannot be written in product form across i and j , unless condition (7) is met because of the condition $c_i + c_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}$ in the integral-sum.

At this point, we have to distinguish the case in which

- (i) $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$ is a proper projector, $\left(\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}\right)^2 = \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ is a proper subspace of $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$, from the case in which
- (ii) it is an improper projector and applying it twice leads to a divergence, formally $\left(\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}\right)^2 = \infty \cdot \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$, such that $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ is not a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$, but should rather be understood as a space of densities over $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$ in a rigged Hilbert space construction.

Case (i) arises, unless $\sigma_{ij|k}$ is discrete while $\hat{C}_i + \hat{C}_j$ has continuous spectrum, in which case (ii) occurs [18–20].

In case (i), Eq. (E2) constitutes an element of the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k})$.

In case (ii) the integral-sum in Eq. (E2) is a discrete sum and a subtlety arises: the operator in this form is *not* an element of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k})$. It *cannot* act on reduced physical states, for otherwise it generates a divergence. Indeed, recall that we can write for any reduced physical state in k 's perspective $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k} \ni |\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle = \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} |\psi_{ij}\rangle$ for some $|\psi_{ij}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$. Hence, $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} (\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j) |\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle = (\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j) \left(\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}\right)^2 |\psi_{ij}\rangle$, which diverges due to the square of the improper projector. We can circumvent this issue by simply using the *kinematical* form of this basis observable when acting on reduced physical states. This is consistent because $\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j$ leaves $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ invariant, seeing that it commutes with $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$. Notwithstanding, although the kinematical form of such a basis observable is of product form, it is clear that its action on reduced physical states is determined by the terms appearing in Eq. (E2). As such, the action of this observable on reduced physical states is also *not* of product form across i and j , except when condition (7) is fulfilled.

This last observation can also be understood via the inner product on $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ which in this cases is given by $(\phi_{ij|k}^{d_k}|\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}) := \langle \phi_{ij}|\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k} \rangle$, where $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product on the kinematical tensor factors $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$ and $|\phi_{ij}\rangle$ is any state in that space which projects under $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$ to $|\phi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ [20]. In other words, also in the reduced physical inner product one acts with kinematical “bra”-states on physical “ket”-states and this, of course, is relevant for the spectral decomposition of an observable in the \hat{C}_i, \hat{C}_j eigenstates on $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$; we can just use its kinematical decomposition.

In conclusion, for both cases (i) and (ii) the reduced physical observable from k 's perspective corresponding to a kinematical basis observable $\hat{A}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j$ that commutes with the (possibly improper) projector $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$ also leads to an action on $\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ that is *not* of product form across i and j , unless condition (7) is satisfied.

Appendix F: Kinematically commuting subsystem pairs can reduce to physically non-commuting subsystem pairs

Here we prove Theorem 2 of the main body which states that, unless condition (7) is satisfied, there will exist kinematical observables $\hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j$ and $\mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j$, which obviously commute but whose image under reduction with $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$ does *not* commute. In other words, *kinematically commuting subalgebras, can map into non-commuting observable sets in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k})$* . To avoid the technical subtleties surrounding case (ii) of the previous subsection, we first focus on case (i) in Lemma 1 and return to (ii) in Lemma 2 below. The conjunction of Lemmas 1 and 2 yields the statement of Theorem 2.

Lemma 1. *If $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$ is a proper projector and condition (7) is not satisfied, there will exist $\hat{A}_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ and $\hat{A}_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_j)$ such that $[\hat{A}_{i|k}, \hat{A}_{j|k}] \neq 0$, where $\hat{A}_{i|k} := \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} (\hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j) \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k})$ and $\hat{A}_{j|k} := \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} (\mathbf{1}_j \otimes \hat{A}_j) \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k})$. By contrast, if condition (7) is satisfied, then $[\hat{A}_{i|k}, \hat{A}_{j|k}] = 0$ for all $\hat{A}_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ and $\hat{A}_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_j)$.*

Proof. It is clear that if at least one of $\hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j$ or $\mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j$ commutes with $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$, then $[\hat{A}_{i|k}, \hat{A}_{j|k}] = 0$. We thus consider the situation in which neither commutes with the projector and there certainly exist $\hat{A}_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ and $\hat{A}_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_j)$ such that this is true if \hat{C}_i, \hat{C}_j are not just multiples of the identity. We can decompose both observables in the eigenbases of \hat{C}_i and \hat{C}_j :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j &= \sum_{d_i, d'_i} \not\int_{c_i, c'_i} A_i(c_i, d_i, c'_i, d'_i) |c_i, d_i\rangle_i \langle c'_i, d'_i| \otimes \not\int_{c_j} \sum_{d_j} |c_j, d_j\rangle_j \langle c_j, d_j|, \\ \mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j &= \not\int_{c_i} \sum_{d_i} |c_i, d_i\rangle_i \langle c_i, d_i| \otimes \sum_{d_j, d'_j} \not\int_{c_j, c'_j} A_j(c_j, d_j, c'_j, d'_j) |c_j, d_j\rangle_j \langle c'_j, d'_j|, \end{aligned}$$

for some coefficients A_i, A_j . Using Eq. (6), this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_{i|k} &= \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} (\hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j) \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} = \sum_{d_i, d'_i, d_j} \not\int_{c_i, c'_i, c_j} \bigg|_{c_i+c_j, c'_i+c_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}} A_i(c_i, d_i, c'_i, d'_i) |c_i, d_i\rangle_i \langle c'_i, d'_i| \otimes |c_j, d_j\rangle_j \langle c_j, d_j|, \\ \hat{A}_{j|k} &= \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} (\mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j) \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} = \sum_{d_i, d_j, d'_j} \not\int_{c_i, c_j, c'_j} \bigg|_{c_i+c_j, c_i+c'_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}} A_j(c_j, d_j, c'_j, d'_j) |c_i, d_i\rangle_i \langle c_i, d_i| \otimes |c_j, d_j\rangle_j \langle c'_j, d'_j|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in conjunction,

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{A}_{i|k}, \hat{A}_{j|k}] &= \sum_{d_i, d'_i, d_j, d'_j} \not\int_{c_i, c'_i, c_j, c'_j} \bigg|_{c_i+c_j, c'_i+c_j, c'_i+c'_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}} A_i(c_i, d_i, c'_i, d'_i) A_j(c_j, d_j, c'_j, d'_j) |c_i, d_i\rangle_i \langle c'_i, d'_i| \otimes |c_j, d_j\rangle_j \langle c'_j, d'_j| \\ &\quad - \sum_{d_i, d'_i, d_j, d'_j} \not\int_{c_i, c'_i, c_j, c'_j} \bigg|_{c_i+c_j, c_i+c'_j, c'_i+c'_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}} A_i(c_i, d_i, c'_i, d'_i) A_j(c_j, d_j, c'_j, d'_j) |c_i, d_i\rangle_i \langle c'_i, d'_i| \otimes |c_j, d_j\rangle_j \langle c'_j, d'_j|. \end{aligned} \tag{F1}$$

The only difference between the two terms on the right hand side is that the first term includes the summing condition $c'_i + c_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}$, which the second term *a priori* does not encompass, while the second term includes the summing condition $c_i + c'_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}$, which the first term *a priori* does not contain.

Now when $\sigma_{ij|k} = M(\tilde{\sigma}_i, \tilde{\sigma}_j)$, *i.e.* condition (7) is satisfied, it is clear that, in the first term, the three summing conditions combined also imply the additional summing condition $c_i + c'_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}$ of the second term. Likewise, in this case the summing condition of the first term $c'_i + c_j \in \sigma_{ij|k}$ is implied by the three summing conditions of the second term. Thus, when condition (7) is met, the commutator vanishes.

By contrast, when condition (7) is not fulfilled, *i.e.* $\sigma_{ij|k} \neq M(\tilde{\sigma}_i, \tilde{\sigma}_j)$, then, in the first term, the sum will include terms with c_i, c'_j such that $c_i + c'_j \notin \sigma_{ij|k}$ and similarly, the sum of the second term will include terms with c'_i, c_j such that $c'_i + c_j \notin \sigma_{ij|k}$. Note that these are always conditions on pairs of variables such that one of them is contained in the coefficient function A_i and the other in A_j , both of which can be chosen independently as they correspond to $\hat{A}_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ and $\hat{A}_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_j)$, respectively. It is clear that A_i and A_j can be chosen such that $A_i(c_i, d_i, c'_i, d'_i)A_j(c_j, d_j, c'_j, d'_j) \neq 0$ when $c_i + c'_j \notin \sigma_{ij|k}$ and/or $c'_i + c_j \notin \sigma_{ij|k}$ and in this case, the commutator does *not* vanish. This proves the claim. \square

Next, we also discuss the more subtle case (ii). In this case, we cannot act with the $\hat{A}_{i|k}, \hat{A}_{j|k}$ on reduced physical states as this generates a divergence. We thus have to take the improper nature of the projector into account and redefine $\hat{A}_{i|k}, \hat{A}_{j|k}$.

Lemma 2. *If $\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}$ is an improper projector and condition (7) is not satisfied, there will exist $\hat{A}_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)$, $\hat{A}_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_j)$ and $|\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ such that $[\hat{A}'_{i|k}, \hat{A}'_{j|k}] |\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle \neq 0$, where $\hat{A}'_{i|k} := \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} (\hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k})$ and $\hat{A}'_{j|k} := \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} (\mathbf{1}_i \otimes \hat{A}_j) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k})$. Note that this requires $[\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}, \hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j] \neq 0$ and similarly for \hat{A}_j . By contrast, if condition (7) is fulfilled, $[\hat{A}'_{i|k}, \hat{A}'_{j|k}] |\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle = 0$ for all $|\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k}$ for such $\hat{A}'_{i|k}, \hat{A}'_{j|k}$.*

Proof. On account of the improper nature of the projector, it follows that that $[\Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k}, \hat{A}_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_j] \neq 0$ for $\hat{A}'_{i|k}$ defined in the statement of the Lemma to be contained in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{ij|k}^{d_k})$ and likewise for $\hat{A}'_{j|k}$. The statement then follows by recalling that $|\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle = \Pi_{\sigma_{ij|k}}^{d_k} |\psi_{ij}\rangle$ for some $|\psi_{ij}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$, noting that

$$[\hat{A}'_{i|k}, \hat{A}'_{j|k}] |\psi_{ij|k}^{d_k}\rangle = [\hat{A}_{i|k}, \hat{A}_{j|k}] |\psi_{ij}\rangle,$$

where $[\hat{A}_{i|k}, \hat{A}_{j|k}]$ coincides with the expression given in Eq. (F1), and the proof of Lemma 1. \square

In conjunction, this proves Theorem 2.

Appendix G: Frame-dependent factorizability

In the main text, we considered constraints of the form where $\sigma_A = \mathbb{R}_+$, $\sigma_B = \mathbb{R}_+$, and $\sigma_C = \mathbb{R}$. From C 's perspective, the kinematical factorizability of A and B is unchanged, *i.e.* $\Pi_{\sigma_{AB|C}}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. From B 's perspective, on the other hand, the reduced physical Hilbert space does not factor into A and C parts, as we now prove by contradiction. First assume that condition (7) is satisfied, namely that there exists $\tilde{\sigma}_A \subseteq \sigma_A$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_C \subseteq \sigma_C$ such that $\sigma_{AC|B} = M(\tilde{\sigma}_A, \tilde{\sigma}_C)$. Note that $\sigma_{AC|B} = \mathbb{R}_-$ (*i.e.* the negative reals) for the class of constraints considered. Now consider some positive eigenvalue a of \hat{C}_A and the corresponding negative eigenvalue $-a$ of \hat{C}_C . Their sum, 0, is in $\sigma_{AC|B}$, and thus $a \in \tilde{\sigma}_A$ and $-a \in \tilde{\sigma}_C$. Then consider a smaller positive eigenvalue $a' < a$ of \hat{C}_A , and the corresponding negative eigenvalue $-a'$ of \hat{C}_C . Their sum, again 0, is in $\sigma_{AC|B}$, and thus $a' \in \tilde{\sigma}_A$ and $-a' \in \tilde{\sigma}_C$. Finally, consider the positive eigenvalue a of \hat{C}_A , and the negative eigenvalue $-a'$ of \hat{C}_C . Now their sum is greater than zero, and thus not an element of $\sigma_{AC|B}$. Yet their sum is by definition an element of $M(\tilde{\sigma}_A, \tilde{\sigma}_C)$, and by hypothesis $\sigma_{AC|B} = M(\tilde{\sigma}_A, \tilde{\sigma}_C)$. We thus arrive at a contradiction, and there therefore does not exist $\tilde{\sigma}_A \subseteq \sigma_A$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_C \subseteq \sigma_C$ such that $\sigma_{AC|B} = M(\tilde{\sigma}_A, \tilde{\sigma}_C)$, and consequently, taking possible degeneracies of \hat{C}_B into account,

$$\Pi_{\sigma_{AC|B}}^{d_B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_C) \neq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_A^{d_B} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_C^{d_B} \quad (\text{G1})$$

for some $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_A^{d_B} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_A$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_C^{d_B} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_C$. Therefore, the kinematical factorizability into an A part and a C part does not survive on the reduced physical space in B 's perspective.

As a specific example of this type of constraint, we considered

$$\hat{C} = \frac{\hat{p}_A^2}{2} + \frac{\hat{p}_B^2}{2} + \hat{p}_C. \quad (\text{G2})$$

To demonstrate that the distinction between kinematical subsystems carries over to $\mathcal{H}_{AB|C}$, but not to $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{dB}$, where $d_B = \pm 1$, we considered the kinematical canonical pairs $(\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_i), (\hat{x}_j, \hat{p}_j)$ on \mathcal{H}_i and \mathcal{H}_j . From C 's perspective, we have $i, j = A, B$ and these appear unaltered as

$$\Pi_{\sigma_{AB|C}}(\hat{x}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B, \hat{p}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B) \Pi_{\sigma_{AB|C}} = (\hat{x}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B, \hat{p}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B) \quad (\text{G3})$$

$$\Pi_{\sigma_{AB|C}}(\mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{x}_B, \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{p}_B) \Pi_{\sigma_{AB|C}} = (\mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{x}_B, \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{p}_B), \quad (\text{G4})$$

since in this case $\Pi_{\sigma_{AB|C}} = \mathbf{1}_{AB}$. By contrast, from B 's perspective, we have $i, j = A, C$ and would like to compute

$$(\hat{x}_{A|B}, \hat{p}_{A|B}) := \Pi_{\sigma_{AC|B}}^{dB}(\hat{x}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_C, \hat{p}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_C) \Pi_{\sigma_{AC|B}}^{dB} \quad (\text{G5})$$

$$(\hat{x}_{C|B}, \hat{p}_{C|B}) := \Pi_{\sigma_{AC|B}}^{dB}(\mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{x}_C, \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{p}_C) \Pi_{\sigma_{AC|B}}^{dB}. \quad (\text{G6})$$

$\Pi_{\sigma_{AC|B}}^{dB}$ is a proper projector in this case. In order to compute these expressions, first note that due to the degeneracy of the operator \hat{p}^2 , a complete eigenbasis for the single particle Hilbert space is given by $|\mathbf{p}^2, d\rangle$, where $\mathbf{p}^2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $d = \pm 1$. This basis is related to the momentum eigenbasis by $|p\rangle = |\mathbf{p}^2, d\rangle$ with $d = \text{sign}(p)1$ and permits us to write the identity

$$\hat{p} = \int p|p\rangle\langle p|dp = \sum_{d=\pm 1} \int_{\mathbf{p}^2=0}^{\infty} d\sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2} |\mathbf{p}^2, d\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}^2, d| d\mathbf{p}^2 \quad (\text{G7})$$

in a form which is useful in the calculation. For the constraint in Eq. (G2), this yields

$$\hat{x}_{A|B} = \sum_{d_A, d'_A = \pm 1} \int_{\mathbf{p}_A^2=0}^{\infty} \int_{(\mathbf{p}_A^2)'=0}^{\infty} \int_{p_C=-\infty}^{\min(-\mathbf{p}_A^2, -(\mathbf{p}_A^2)')/2} \langle p_A | \hat{x} | p'_A \rangle |\mathbf{p}_A^2, d_A\rangle\langle (\mathbf{p}_A^2)', d'_A| \otimes |p_C\rangle\langle p_C| d\mathbf{p}_A^2 dp_C d(\mathbf{p}_A^2)', \quad (\text{G8})$$

$$\hat{p}_{A|B} = \sum_{d_A = \pm 1} \int_{\mathbf{p}_A^2=0}^{\infty} \int_{p_C=-\infty}^{-\mathbf{p}_A^2/2} d_A \sqrt{\mathbf{p}_A^2} |\mathbf{p}_A^2, d_A\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_A^2, d_A| \otimes |p_C\rangle\langle p_C| d\mathbf{p}_A^2 dp_C, \quad (\text{G9})$$

$$\hat{x}_{C|B} = \sum_{d_A = \pm 1} \int_{\mathbf{p}_A^2=0}^{\infty} \int_{p_C=-\infty}^{-\mathbf{p}_A^2/2} \int_{p'_C=-\infty}^{\mathbf{p}_A^2/2} |\mathbf{p}_A^2, d_A\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_A^2, d_A| \otimes \langle p_C | \hat{x} | p'_C \rangle |p_C\rangle\langle p'_C| d\mathbf{p}_A^2 dp_C dp'_C, \quad (\text{G10})$$

$$\hat{p}_{C|B} = \sum_{d_A = \pm 1} \int_{\mathbf{p}_A^2=0}^{\infty} \int_{p_C=-\infty}^{-\mathbf{p}_A^2/2} |\mathbf{p}_A^2, d_A\rangle\langle \mathbf{p}_A^2, d_A| \otimes p_C |p_C\rangle\langle p_C| d\mathbf{p}_A^2 dp_C. \quad (\text{G11})$$

As one can check, in accordance with Lemma 1, the canonical commutation relations between the kinematical observables $\hat{x}_A, \hat{p}_A, \hat{x}_C$, and \hat{p}_C are not preserved for their corresponding physical observables on $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{dB}$. While all brackets involving $\hat{p}_{A|B}, \hat{p}_{C|B}$ are left invariant, $[\hat{p}_{A|B}, \hat{p}_{C|B}] = [\hat{x}_{A|B}, \hat{p}_{C|B}] = [\hat{p}_{A|B}, \hat{x}_{C|B}] = 0$, since \hat{p}_A, \hat{p}_C commute with the constraint, and therefore with $\Pi_{AC|B}^{dB}$, one now finds that $[\hat{x}_{A|B}, \hat{x}_{C|B}] \neq 0$. Indeed,

$$\hat{x}_{A|B} \hat{x}_{C|B} = \sum_{d_A, d'_A = \pm 1} \int_{\mathbf{p}_A^2=0}^{\infty} \int_{(\mathbf{p}_A^2)'=0}^{\infty} \int_{p_C=-\infty}^{p_C = \min(-\mathbf{p}_A^2, -(\mathbf{p}_A^2)')/2} \int_{p'_C=-\infty}^{\mathbf{p}_A^2/2} \langle p_A | \hat{x} | p'_A \rangle |\mathbf{p}_A^2, d_A\rangle\langle (\mathbf{p}_A^2)', d'_A| \otimes \langle p_C | \hat{x} | p'_C \rangle |p_C\rangle\langle p'_C| d\mathbf{p}_A^2 d(\mathbf{p}_A^2)' dp_C dp'_C, \quad (\text{G12})$$

$$\hat{x}_{C|B} \hat{x}_{A|B} = \sum_{d_A, d'_A = \pm 1} \int_{\mathbf{p}_A^2=0}^{\infty} \int_{(\mathbf{p}_A^2)'=0}^{\infty} \int_{p_C=-\infty}^{-\mathbf{p}_A^2/2} \int_{p'_C=-\infty}^{\min(-\mathbf{p}_A^2, -(\mathbf{p}_A^2)')/2} \langle p_A | \hat{x} | p'_A \rangle |\mathbf{p}_A^2, d_A\rangle\langle (\mathbf{p}_A^2)', d'_A| \otimes \langle p_C | \hat{x} | p'_C \rangle |p_C\rangle\langle p'_C| d\mathbf{p}_A^2 d(\mathbf{p}_A^2)' dp_C dp'_C. \quad (\text{G13})$$

$[\hat{x}_{A|B}, \hat{x}_{C|B}]$ will not be zero because both terms contain factor elements $|p_C\rangle\langle p'_C|$ but the values of p_C and p'_C are not identical for both terms. For instance consider the case where $\mathbf{p}_A^2 = 2$ and $(\mathbf{p}_A^2)' = 4$. Then the term $\hat{x}_{C|B} \hat{x}_{A|B}$ will

contain an element $|p_C = -1\rangle\langle p'_C = -2|$ whereas the term $\hat{x}_{A|B}\hat{x}_{C|B}$ will not, since for this term $|p_C\rangle\langle p'_C|$ is such that the value of p_C is bounded above by -2 .

Hence, the transformed canonical pairs no longer commute with one another and as such $(\hat{x}_{A|B}, \hat{p}_{A|B}), (\hat{x}_{C|B}, \hat{p}_{C|B})$ do *not* induce a tensor factorization across A and C in the reduced physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{d_B}$ for both $d_B = \pm 1$, thereby elucidating Eq. (G1).

As mentioned in the main body, this does not imply, however, that $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{d_B}$ does not admit a tensor factorization. Indeed, it is simple to construct one by translating the canonical pairs $(\hat{x}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B, \hat{p}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B), (\mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{x}_B, \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{p}_B)$ from C 's perspective via the QRF transformation $\Lambda_{C \rightarrow B}^{d_B}$ into B 's perspective. The latter, being an invertible isometry when acting on reduced physical states, will preserve commutation relations. Hence, the images of the canonical pairs from C 's perspective will again be mutually commuting canonical pairs in B 's perspective and thereby induce a corresponding tensor factorization of $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{d_B}$. However, these new canonical pairs in B 's perspective will be combinations of A and C degrees of freedom; for example, using the maps constructed in [16, 19] one can check that $\Lambda_{C \rightarrow B}^{d_B}(\hat{x}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B, \hat{p}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B) \Lambda_{B \rightarrow C}^{d_B} = \Pi_{\sigma_{AC|B}}^{d_B}(\hat{x}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_C - 2\hat{p}_A \otimes \hat{x}_C, \hat{p}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_C)$.² Consequently, the thus induced tensor factorization of $\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{d_B}$ is *not* one between A and C .

All of this can also be understood at the level of the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. For example, using the reduction map (and its inverse) one can embed the canonical pairs $(\hat{x}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B, \hat{p}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B), (\mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{x}_B, \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{p}_B)$ from C 's perspective into the perspective-neutral setting as the relational observables explicitly given in [16] (here corresponding to clock C reading $\tau = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{F}_{x_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B, C} &= \hat{x}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B \otimes \mathbf{1}_C - 2\hat{p}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B \otimes \hat{x}_C, \\ \hat{F}_{p_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B, C} &= \hat{p}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_B \otimes \mathbf{1}_C, \\ \hat{F}_{\mathbf{1}_A \otimes x_B, C} &= \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{x}_B \otimes \mathbf{1}_C - 2\mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{p}_B \otimes \hat{x}_C, \\ \hat{F}_{\mathbf{1}_A \otimes p_B, C} &= \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{p}_B \otimes \mathbf{1}_C.\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, these are mutually commuting canonically conjugate pairs and thereby induce a corresponding physical tensor factorization of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ via the Stone-von Neumann theorem.

By contrast, the modified canonical pairs $(\hat{x}_{A|B}, \hat{p}_{A|B}), (\hat{x}_{C|B}, \hat{p}_{C|B}) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{d_B})$ correspond to the relational observables $\hat{F}_{x_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_C, B}^{d_B}, \hat{F}_{p_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_C, B}^{d_B}$ and $\hat{F}_{\mathbf{1}_A \otimes x_C, B}^{d_B}, \hat{F}_{\mathbf{1}_A \otimes p_C, B}^{d_B}$ (here corresponding to clock B reading $\tau = 0$) [19]. These actually define equivalence relations on physical states

$$\hat{F}_{x_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_C, B}^{d_B} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = \hat{F}_{x_{A|B}, B}^{d_B} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle,$$

(likewise for the other canonical variables) and satisfy a homomorphism in the form [19]

$$\hat{F}_{[f, g], B}^{d_B} |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = \left[\hat{F}_{f, B}^{d_B}, \hat{F}_{g, B}^{d_B} \right] |\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle, \quad (\text{G14})$$

for any $\hat{f}, \hat{g} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{AC|B}^{d_B})$ and $|\psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. Hence, since as we have shown $[\hat{x}_{A|B}, \hat{x}_{C|B}] \neq 0$, already these relational Dirac observables form mutually non-commuting canonical pairs on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$. Accordingly, the relational observables relative to B corresponding to the kinematical operators $(\hat{x}_A, \hat{p}_A), (\hat{x}_C, \hat{p}_C)$ also do *not* induce a physical tensor factorization of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}}$ in terms of these observables.

² Note that both operators actually commute with $\Pi_{\sigma_{AC|B}}^{d_B}$ since they commute with $\hat{C}_A \otimes \mathbf{1}_C + \mathbf{1}_A \otimes \hat{C}_C$.