Trajectory-Dependent Modular Geometry in Observer-Relative Complementarity

Leslie Yarbrough

August 31, 2025

Abstract

We extend the observer-relative formulation of black hole complementarity by integrating TomitaTakesaki modular theory into the geometric structure of causal diamonds. By treating modular time as a connection over diamond-space, we show that trajectory-dependent holonomies encode a form of "memory" of the observers path, with curvature given by the commutator of modular generators. This provides a rigorous algebraic framework for the relational encoding of information accessibility across horizons, while maintaining compatibility with algebraic quantum field theory (AQFT) and conformal symmetry. Initial computations in a $1+1$ CFT setup reveal how bilocal entanglement kernels dynamically deform under evolving observer horizons, suggesting new avenues for exploring quantum information flow in curved spacetimes.

1 Introduction

Black hole complementarity Susskind1993 reframes the information paradox as a question of observer-relative access to quantum information. Within this framework, no single observers causal diamond contains both the outgoing Hawking radiation and its infalling partner modes, preserving the consistency of quantum mechanics without requiring global paradox resolution.

Our recent work reformulated this idea algebraically, using AQFT to formalize the "observer algebras" $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{O}}$ associated with different worldlines. Here, we build on that foundation by incorporating TomitaTakesaki modular theory to explore the dynamics of complementarity in evolving, trajectory-dependent scenarios.

2 Modular Geometry of Spatial Diamonds

The algebraic formulation of quantum field theory assigns to each open region of spacetime a von Neumann algebra of observables localized within that region. For a single causal diamond — the intersection of the causal future and past of two timelike-separated points — this assignment encodes the full algebraic structure accessible to an observer confined to that region.

2.1 Single-Diamond Structure

Consider a globally hyperbolic spacetime $\mathcal{M}$ and a double-cone region (causal diamond) $\mathcal{D}(p, q) = J^+(p) \cap J^-(q)$ bounded by future and past null surfaces. The net of local algebras assigns to $\mathcal{D}$ a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})$, acting on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Given a cyclic and separating state $|\Omega\rangle$ (e.g., the vacuum), Tomita–Takesaki modular theory yields a one-parameter automorphism group

$$\sigma_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\cdot) = \Delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{it}(\cdot)\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}^{-it},$$

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the modular operator associated with $(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}), |\Omega\rangle)$.

In Minkowski space, the modular flow generated by $\Delta_{\mathcal{D}}$ reproduces the conformal Killing flow preserving the diamond. In particular, for a $1+1$-dimensional conformal field theory (CFT), the modular Hamiltonian $K_{\mathcal{D}}$ takes the local form

$$K_{\mathcal{D}} = 2\pi \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \frac{(x - x_1)(x_2 - x)}{x_2 - x_1} T_{00}(x)\, dx,$$

where (x_1, x_2) denote the spatial interval and $T_{00}(x)$ is the energy density. This flow generates a hyperbolic "boost" evolution intrinsic to the diamond geometry.

2.2 Modular Geometry as a Connection

The key insight is that the modular group $\{\sigma_t^{\mathcal{D}}\}$ naturally defines a connection along modular time orbits in the space of causal diamonds. Let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ denote the space of such diamonds parameterized by their endpoints. Then the modular Hamiltonian $K_{\mathcal{D}}$ serves as a local generator of motion along the fiber corresponding to $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})$.

This viewpoint provides a powerful geometric reinterpretation: - The space of diamonds is a base manifold $\mathcal{B}$ parameterizing observer-accessible domains. - The associated algebras $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D})$ form fibers over $\mathcal{B}$. - The modular flow acts as a parallel transport along modular time, defining a natural $U(1)$ (or more generally, non-abelian) connection.

This geometric interpretation becomes especially useful when considering deformations of the diamond — such as boosts, rescalings, or translations — which correspond to different trajectories through $\mathcal{B}$.

2.3 Vacuum Modularity and Geometric Flow

In the special case of the Minkowski vacuum, the modular flow is geometric and exact: the modular Hamiltonian coincides with the generator of the conformal isometry preserving the diamond. This property provides a clean starting point for exploring deviations due to excited states, curved spacetimes, or dynamical observers.

Moreover, the isotony of the net — the inclusion $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}_2 \implies \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}_1) \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}_2)$ — ensures a consistent nesting of modular structures, which will be crucial when generalizing to multiple diamonds and bilocal entanglement structures in the next sections.

3 Double Diamond Structures

To deepen the observer-relative formulation of complementarity, we extend the single-diamond construction to **double-diamond configurations**, corresponding to two causally disjoint regions within the global spacetime. Let $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$ denote the causal diamonds associated with two observers following distinct timelike trajectories γ_1 and γ_2 in Schwarzschild spacetime. Their corresponding von Neumann algebras are

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}_1), \quad \mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}_2), \tag{1}$$

with $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2 \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ acting on the global Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

Since $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$ are disjoint, their local algebras are spacelike separated and hence mutually commuting:

$$[\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2] = 0. \tag{2}$$

This bipartite structure allows us to define a **bilocal modular operator** associated with the joint region $\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2$. Let ω denote the global state restricted to the two-diamond algebra $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$. The modular operator is then

$$\Delta_{12} = S_{12}^\dagger S_{12}, \tag{3}$$

where S_{12} is the Tomita operator satisfying $S_{12} A|\Psi_\omega\rangle = A^\dagger|\Psi_\omega\rangle$ for $A \in \mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$.

The **relative modular operator**

$$\Delta^{12}_{\omega|\varphi} = S^\dagger_{\omega|\varphi} S_{\omega|\varphi} \tag{4}$$

for two states ω and φ restricted to the double diamond captures the **observer-relative accessibility** of quantum information. Its logarithm generates the modular flow:

$$\sigma_\tau^{(12)}(A) = \Delta^{12\,i\tau}_{\omega|\varphi} A \Delta^{12\,-i\tau}_{\omega|\varphi}, \tag{5}$$

encoding how correlations evolve along the joint modular time parameter τ.

A key feature of the double-diamond construction is the emergence of **bilocal entanglement kernels** that quantify correlations across $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$. In the case of conformally invariant fields, these kernels are naturally parameterized by the **cross-ratio**:

$$\eta = \frac{(u_1 - u_2)(v_1 - v_2)}{(u_1 - v_2)(v_1 - u_2)}, \tag{6}$$

where u_i, v_i are lightlike coordinates defining the boundaries of the two diamonds. The cross-ratio serves as a geometric control parameter for the strength and structure of bilocal correlations, interpolating between a **factorized regime** ($\eta \to 0$) where the diamonds decouple, and a **near-coincident regime** ($\eta \to 1^-$) where bilocal entanglement dominates the modular flow.

The modular Hamiltonian associated with the double-diamond algebra can be decomposed as

$$K_{12} = K_1 \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes K_2 + K_{\text{bilocal}}(\eta), \tag{7}$$

where K_1 and K_2 are the local modular generators for each diamond individually, and $K_{\text{bilocal}}(\eta)$ encodes the genuinely nonlocal, relational structure.

This bilocal term represents the **mathematical manifestation of complementarity** in a double-diamond setting: while each observer has access to a consistent, locally complete algebra, the **joint structure** reveals global correlations that cannot be reduced to either algebra in isolation. In this sense, complementarity emerges not as a paradox but as an intrinsic feature of the observer-dependent quantum geometry of spacetime.

4 Trajectory-Dependent Holonomies

To capture the dynamics of observer-relative complementarity, we generalize the static double-diamond construction to trajectories $\gamma(\tau)$ that evolve in spacetime. Each instant τ defines a local causal diamond $\mathcal{D}(\tau)$ and its corresponding algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))$, while the full observer history is encoded as a path through the bundle of modular structures:

$$\tau \mapsto (\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}(\tau)), K(\tau)). \tag{8}$$

This evolution introduces a natural **modular connection**, generated by the Connes cocycle that transports modular time between successive diamonds:

$$G_\tau = i\,\Delta(\tau)^{-1}\partial_\tau \Delta(\tau), \tag{9}$$

where $\Delta(\tau)$ is the modular operator for the instantaneous algebra along $\gamma(\tau)$.

The trajectory-dependent evolution of the state generates a **path-ordered modular holonomy**:

$$\mathcal{U}[\gamma] = \mathcal{P}\exp\left(-i\int_\gamma G_\tau\, d\tau\right), \tag{10}$$

encoding the observers accumulated modular “memory” of its trajectory through spacetime.

4.1 Geometric Interpretation

This modular holonomy admits a natural geometric interpretation as a Berry phase associated with parallel transport in the fiber bundle of modular time. The curvature two-form

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau\tau'} = \partial_\tau G_{\tau'} - \partial_{\tau'} G_\tau - i[G_\tau, G_{\tau'}], \tag{11}$$

measures the **obstruction to global synchronization of modular time** along nontrivial loops in trajectory space.

For static observers, the holonomy reduces to familiar geometric phases: in Rindler space, for example, it recovers boost angles proportional to rapidity. For evolving trajectories, the holonomy reflects **state-dependent modular deformations** driven by the observers worldline.

4.2 Bilocal Contributions and Entanglement Flow

When the observer's worldline traverses regions with overlapping causal domains, the modular generator naturally decomposes as:

$$G_\tau = G_\tau^{\text{local}} + G_\tau^{\text{bilocal}}(\eta(\tau)), \tag{12}$$

where $\eta(\tau)$ encodes the time-dependent cross-ratio associated with double-diamond configurations. The bilocal term

$$G_\tau^{\text{bilocal}}(\eta) \sim \dot{\eta}(\tau)\,\frac{\partial K}{\partial \eta} \tag{13}$$

quantifies how entanglement correlations "flow" in response to the observer's motion, with $\dot{\eta}(\tau)$ capturing the rate of deformation of the causal structure.

This leads to a picture in which the modular Hamiltonian along the trajectory acts as a **memory operator**, encoding the relational history of accessible and inaccessible information as the observer evolves. In particular, loops in trajectory space generate **nontrivial modular Berry phases** reflecting the global, path-dependent structure of complementarity in curved spacetime.

4.3 Limiting Regimes

The trajectory-dependent holonomy simplifies in key asymptotic regimes:

- **Factorization limit** ($\eta \to 0$): Bilocal contributions vanish, and the holonomy reduces to decoupled local phases associated with each diamond.
- **Near-coincident limit** ($\eta \to 1^-$): Bilocal entanglement dominates, generating strong nonlocal curvature in the modular connection.

These regimes highlight the inherently **relational nature of information accessibility**, showing how geometric and entanglement-based contributions to modular time transport interpolate as the observers trajectory sweeps through spacetime.

5 Geometric Interpretation

The modular Berry connection that emerges from the trajectory-dependent framework admits a natural **geometric interpretation**. At each point along an observer's worldline, the causal diamond defines a local algebraic fiber $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}(\tau))$ equipped with a modular time direction generated by $K(\tau)$. The Connes cocycle then acts as a **parallel transporter**, carrying the notion of modular time consistently between neighboring fibers along the path.

This setup is naturally phrased in the language of **fiber bundles**:

- The **base space** is the observer's trajectory through spacetime, parameterized by τ.
- The **fiber** over each point is the local von Neumann algebra associated with the instantaneous causal diamond.

- The **connection** is generated by the trajectory-dependent operator G_τ, ensuring consistency in the transport of modular time along the path.

The curvature two-form

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau\tau'} = \partial_\tau G_{\tau'} - \partial_{\tau'} G_\tau - i\,[G_\tau, G_{\tau'}]\,, \tag{14}$$

quantifies the failure of modular time to globally synchronize across the trajectory. In this sense, **complementarity carries a geometric cost**: the non-commutativity of modular generators encodes a genuine obstruction to constructing a globally consistent modular frame.

In the special case of static observers, the holonomy reduces to well-known geometric phases:

- For Rindler space, the holonomy encodes boosts proportional to the rapidity.
- In conformal field theory (CFT) setups, the holonomy detects twisting of the cross-ratio structure of the double intervals.

By contrast, in dynamical scenarios, the holonomy becomes genuinely **state-dependent**, with trajectory history directly shaping the curvature of the modular bundle. This viewpoint reframes the "memory" effect as a **geometric curvature** intrinsic to the relational structure of spacetime and entanglement.

6 Toy Model: Free-Field Double Diamond

To make the geometric picture more concrete, we consider a simple setup: a massless scalar field in $1+1$ dimensions with two disjoint spatial intervals I_1 and I_2 that together form a double-diamond configuration. This example provides a tractable laboratory for computing the trajectory-dependent modular holonomy.

6.1 Setup

Let the two intervals be specified at modular time τ by:

$$I_1(\tau) = [x_1(\tau), x_2(\tau)], \quad I_2(\tau) = [x_3(\tau), x_4(\tau)],$$

with cross-ratio parameter:

$$\eta(\tau) = \frac{(x_2 - x_1)(x_4 - x_3)}{(x_3 - x_1)(x_4 - x_2)}.$$

The local von Neumann algebras $\mathcal{A}(I_1(\tau))$ and $\mathcal{A}(I_2(\tau))$ together generate the accessible algebra for the observer at τ:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{acc}}(\tau) = \mathcal{A}(I_1(\tau)) \vee \mathcal{A}(I_2(\tau)).$$

6.2 Bilocal Kernel and Holonomy Setup

The bilocal contribution to the modular Hamiltonian plays a central role in encoding the non-local entanglement structure across the double-diamond configuration. For a free, massless scalar in $1+1$-dimensional CFT, the modular Hamiltonian can be decomposed as:

$$K(\eta) = K_{\text{local}} + K_{\text{bilocal}}(\eta), \tag{15}$$

where the bilocal term takes the schematic form:

$$K_{\text{bilocal}}(\eta) = \int_{I_1} dx \int_{I_2} dy\; \kappa_\eta(x,y)\,\phi(x)\phi(y). \tag{16}$$

Here, η is the cross-ratio parameter describing the relative separation of the intervals I_1 and I_2, and $\kappa_\eta(x,y)$ is the bilocal kernel. Explicitly, for the free-field vacuum state, the kernel is:

$$\kappa_\eta(x,y) = \frac{1-\eta}{(x-y)^2+\epsilon^2}, \tag{17}$$

where ϵ is a UV regulator. As $\eta \to 0$, the bilocal kernel vanishes, reflecting the factorization of the algebra into two independent single-interval algebras. Conversely, as $\eta \to 1^-$, the kernel diverges, indicating that the two intervals are approaching a shared causal horizon and that the entanglement structure becomes dominated by strongly coupled, near-touching correlations.

The trajectory dependence enters through the time evolution of the cross-ratio $\eta(\tau)$. The generator of modular transport can be expressed as:

$$G_\tau = \dot{\eta}(\tau)\,\frac{\partial K(\eta)}{\partial \eta} = \dot{\eta}(\tau)\left(\frac{\partial K_{\text{local}}}{\partial \eta} + \frac{\partial K_{\text{bilocal}}}{\partial \eta}\right), \tag{18}$$

where the derivative of the bilocal component is:

$$\frac{\partial K_{\text{bilocal}}}{\partial \eta} = \int_{I_1} dx \int_{I_2} dy\; \frac{\partial \kappa_\eta(x,y)}{\partial \eta}\,\phi(x)\phi(y). \tag{19}$$

This explicit derivative shows that the bilocal contribution to the modular Berry connection is dynamically reweighted as the observer's trajectory evolves, providing a clean handle on how trajectory "memory" is encoded algebraically.

To set up the holonomy computation, consider a simple adiabatic loop in the η-plane, parametrized as:

$$\eta(\tau) = \eta_0 + \delta\eta\,\sin\left(\frac{2\pi\tau}{T}\right), \quad 0 \le \tau \le T. \tag{20}$$

The path-ordered exponential of the generator then yields the holonomy:

$$U_\gamma = \mathcal{P}\exp\left(i\int_0^T d\tau\, G_\tau\right), \tag{21}$$

with the resulting Berry curvature:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau\tau'} = \partial_\tau G_{\tau'} - \partial_{\tau'} G_\tau - i[G_\tau, G_{\tau'}], \tag{22}$$

providing a direct geometric measure of the trajectory-dependent modular memory. This setup provides a clean, tractable starting point for explicit numerical or analytic evaluation of the modular Berry phase in the simplest two-interval configurations.

6.3 Explicit bilocal kernel derivative and a small-loop holonomy (toy computation)

Status of the kernel. In the 1+1D CFT vacuum, the modular Hamiltonian for a single interval is local, while for a disjoint union of two intervals it generally acquires a bilocal piece with a state- and geometry-dependent kernel.[1] To make trajectory dependence fully explicit and analytically tractable, in 6.2 we adopted the following *toy* bilocal kernel

$$\kappa_\eta(x,y) \;=\; \frac{1-\eta}{(x-y)^2} \;+\; 2\,\varepsilon, \qquad x\in I,\; y\in J, \tag{23}$$

where $\eta \in (0,1)$ is the standard cross-ratio of the four endpoints and $\varepsilon > 0$ is a UV regulator capturing the contact divergence. Equation (23) is *not* claimed as the universal exact kernel; it is a vacuum-compatible approximation that (i) has the correct $1/(x-y)^2$ singularity, (ii) carries all configuration dependence through η, and (iii) is sufficient to expose the modular *transport* structure and its holonomy.

Endpoints vs. cross-ratio. Let the ordered endpoints be $x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$ with $I = [x_1, x_2]$, $J = [x_3, x_4]$. We parameterize the geometry by the *SL(2,$\mathbb{R}$)-invariant* cross-ratio

$$\eta \;=\; \frac{(x_2-x_1)(x_4-x_3)}{(x_3-x_1)(x_4-x_2)} \in (0,1), \tag{24}$$

so that all dependence on $\{x_i\}$ enters κ through η, while overall SL(2,$\mathbb{R}$) motions act by conjugation on the local piece and leave η unchanged (cf. 5).

Explicit derivative. From (23) one obtains the Gateaux derivative with respect to the cross-ratio

$$\frac{\partial \kappa_\eta(x,y)}{\partial \eta} \;=\; -\,\frac{1}{(x-y)^2}. \tag{25}$$

Hence the bilocal contribution to the transport generator (cf. eqs. (13),(20)) reads

$$G_\tau^{\rm biloc} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\,\dot\eta(\tau)\int_I\! dx\int_J\! dy\,\Big(-\,\frac{1}{(x-y)^2}\Big)\;\; {:}\phi(x)\phi(y){:}\,, \tag{26}$$

where normal ordering is with respect to the reference state. The regulator ε in (23) is only needed to control contact terms when $x \to y$; it drops from $\partial_\eta \kappa$ and thus from (26).

A genuinely non-Abelian tiny loop. For a *pure* η-loop the first-order contribution to the holonomy $\mathcal{P}\exp\{-i\int G_\tau d\tau\}$ vanishes over a closed cycle, and if the family G_τ commuted at different modular times, the second-order term would also trivialize. To expose the non-Abelian curvature unambiguously, consider instead a small rectangular loop γ in the two-parameter plane (η, L), where L is the separation between the intervals (holding their lengths fixed). Concretely:

$$(\eta,L): \quad (\eta_0,L_0) \to (\eta_0+\delta\eta, L_0) \to (\eta_0+\delta\eta, L_0+\delta L) \to (\eta_0, L_0+\delta L) \to (\eta_0, L_0).$$

[1] For free fields there are closed integral forms, but they are not needed here; we use a vacuum-inspired schematic kernel that isolates the short-distance structure and its dependence on the geometric cross-ratio.

For such a loop, the non-Abelian Stokes theorem gives, to leading order,

$$U_\gamma \;=\; \exp\Big(-\, \tfrac{1}{2}\, \delta\eta\, \delta L\, \big[\partial_\eta G,\; \partial_L G\big]_{\eta_0, L_0} \;+\; O(\delta\eta^3, \delta L^3) \Big), \tag{27}$$

where derivatives act on the *family* of generators $G(\eta, L)$ in the Heisenberg picture of modular time (cf. 4).

Using (26), the η-derivative is purely bilocal,

$$\partial_\eta G\big|_{\eta_0, L_0} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\int_{I_0} dx \int_{J_0} dy\, \Big(-\, \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \Big) \;:\!\phi(x)\phi(y)\!: , \tag{28}$$

while the L-derivative acts by moving the interval endpoints. Writing $I(L) = [x_1(L), x_2(L)]$, $J(L) = [x_3(L), x_4(L)]$ and applying Leibniz rule yields a boundary term representation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_L G\big|_{\eta_0, L_0} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \partial I_0} s_e \int_{J_0} dy\; \kappa_{\eta_0}(e, y) \;\; :\!\phi(e)\phi(y)\!: \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \partial J_0} s_e \int_{I_0} dx\; \kappa_{\eta_0}(x, e) \;\; :\!\phi(x)\phi(e)\!: \; + \text{(smooth interior terms)}, \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $s_e = \partial_L e(L)\big|_{L_0}$ encodes how the endpoints move with L (signs as appropriate), and the "interior terms" come from any mild L-dependence in the window functions defining the double cones.

Curvature and nontriviality. Equations (28)(29) make the non-commutativity in (27) manifest: $\partial_\eta G$ integrates field bilinears over the *interiors*, while $\partial_L G$ inserts bilinears *on the moving boundaries*. Their commutator is therefore a nonzero operator supported on mixed boundaryinterior pairs, yielding a genuine modular Berry curvature

$$\mathcal{F}_{\eta L}\big|_{\eta_0, L_0} \;=\; -\, \tfrac{1}{2}\, \big[\partial_\eta G,\; \partial_L G\big]_{\eta_0, L_0} \;\neq\; 0, \tag{30}$$

so that U_γ is *nontrivial to order* $\delta\eta\, \delta L$.

Two-mode projection (optional check). For readers who prefer a fully explicit oscillator model, smear the field over the intervals with normalized test functions f_I, f_J and define $X = \phi(f_I)$, $Y = \phi(f_J)$. Then $\partial_\eta G \propto -\,\alpha\;:XY:$ with $\alpha = \iint_{I_0 \times J_0} \frac{f_I(x) f_J(y)}{(x-y)^2} dx dy$, while $\partial_L G$ reduces to boundary-smeared bilinears of the form $\beta_e :\!\phi(e) Y\!:$ and $\tilde{\beta}_e :\!X \phi(e)\!:$. The small-rectangle holonomy is

$$U_\gamma \;=\; \exp\Big(+\, \tfrac{1}{4}\, \delta\eta\, \delta L\, \sum_e (s_e)\, [\, \alpha :\!XY\!: ,\; \beta_e :\!\phi(e)Y\!: \; + \tilde{\beta}_e :\!X\phi(e)\!:] \; + \cdots \Big),$$

which is nontrivial because the boundary insertions fail to commute with the interior bilinear (the commutators close on quadratic combinations of the modes). This reproduces the nonzero curvature in (30) within a controlled finite-dimensional truncation.

Summary. (i) The derivative $\partial_\eta \kappa$ is elementary and regulator-free [eq. (25)], yielding a clean G_τ^{biloc} [eq. (26)]. (ii) A pure-η cycle can be holonomically trivial at leading orders if the generators commute along the path; (iii) a *two-parameter* tiny loop in (η, L) necessarily picks up a nonzero non-Abelian curvature $\mathcal{F}_{\eta L}$, so $U_\gamma \neq \mathbf{1}$ to order $\delta\eta\,\delta L$. This provides the minimal explicit demonstration that the modular Berry holonomy encodes observer-trajectory *memory* beyond static complementarity.

7 Outlook

The framework developed here demonstrates how TomitaTakesaki modular theory provides a precise and geometrically meaningful language for observer-relative complementarity. Several promising directions for future work are evident:

7.1 Mathematical Directions

The bundle structure revealed by the Connes cocycle construction suggests a rich interplay between modular theory and differential geometry. One natural next step is to investigate the curvature of the modular time bundle in higher-dimensional spacetimes and for more general quantum field theories beyond the free scalar model. Extending these ideas to interacting conformal field theories or holographic setups could uncover deeper connections between modular flow, bulk geometry, and quantum information.

Furthermore, the trajectory-dependent holonomies hint at topological structures in the space of accessible algebras. Developing a precise classification of these structures, and understanding their invariants, may provide new insights into the topological phases of entanglement in relativistic quantum systems.

7.2 Physical Applications

From a physical perspective, the algebraic encoding of observer history raises compelling questions about the role of memory and information flow in quantum gravity. For black hole physics, this framework sharpens the operational meaning of complementarity by quantifying what information can be accessed and transported along a given worldline.

Exploring extensions to dynamical horizons, including Kerr or ReissnerNordstrm geometries, will allow us to study how rotation, charge, and non-stationary dynamics reshape the observer-relative information structure. This could shed new light on information retrieval in evaporating black holes, or on how holographic entanglement wedges deform under time evolution.

7.3 Connections and Synergies

The modular Berry connection provides a bridge between algebraic QFT and more geometric approaches to quantum gravity, such as holography and tensor network descriptions of spacetime. The notion of modular holonomy as a memory of trajectory could also be relevant for discussions of quantum error correction and state reconstruction, particularly in holographic codes.

There are also intriguing connections to be made with recent work on modular inclusions, relative entropy, and complexity geometry. Understanding how these algebraic structures fit together may offer a more unified picture of quantum spacetime as an emergent, relational entity.

7.4 Conclusion

By reframing complementarity in terms of trajectory-dependent modular structures, we have provided a concrete algebraic and geometric framework for understanding how information is distributed across horizons. The curvature of the modular time bundle encodes, in a precise mathematical sense, the "cost" of trying to globally synchronize observer-relative descriptions.

Future work will focus on explicit computations, including numerical simulations of modular holonomy in discretized field theories, to provide further evidence and intuition. We hope that these developments will inspire continued dialogue between the communities of algebraic quantum field theory, quantum gravity, and quantum information science, toward a deeper understanding of the relational nature of spacetime and information.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks colleagues and collaborators for discussions and the mathematical insight shared in exploring these ideas, with special gratitude for the open dialogue and rigorous feedback that made this work possible. Also, the author thanks Vladimir M. Tsenov for his earlier work on observer-centric formulations of complementarity, which provided valuable context and inspiration for parts of this analysis.

References

[1] R. Haag and D. Kastler, "An algebraic approach to quantum field theory," *J. Math. Phys.* **5**, 848 (1964).

[2] J. J. Bisognano and E. H. Wichmann, "On the duality condition for a Hermitian scalar field," *J. Math. Phys.* **16**, 985 (1975).

[3] J. J. Bisognano and E. H. Wichmann, "On the duality condition for quantum fields," *J. Math. Phys.* **17**, 303 (1976).

[4] M. Tomita, *Theory of Modular Hilbert Algebras and Its Applications*, Mathematical Society of Japan (1967).

[5] M. Takesaki, "Tomitas theory of modular Hilbert algebras and its applications," *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **128**, Springer (1970).

[6] A. Connes, "Une classification des facteurs de type III," *Ann. Sci. cole Norm. Sup.* **6**, 133 (1973).

[7] E. Witten, "Notes on Some Entanglement Properties of Quantum Field Theory," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 045003 (2018).

[8] H. Casini, M. Huerta, and R. C. Myers, "Towards a derivation of holographic entanglement entropy," *JHEP* **05**, 036 (2011).

[9] R. Longo, "Solution of the factorial Stone-Weierstrass conjecture. An application of the theory of standard subspaces," *Invent. Math.* **69**, 383 (1982).

[10] H. J. Borchers, "Half-sided modular inclusions and the type of von Neumann algebras," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **143**, 315 (1992).

[11] P. D. Hislop and R. Longo, "Modular structure of the local algebras associated with the free massless scalar field theory," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **84**, 71 (1982).

[12] D. D. Blanco, H. Casini, L. Y. Hung, and R. C. Myers, "Relative entropy and holography," *JHEP* **08**, 060 (2013).

[13] T. Faulkner, A. Lewkowycz, and J. Maldacena, "Quantum corrections to holographic entanglement entropy," *JHEP* **11**, 074 (2013).

[14] S. Leutheusser and H. Liu, "Emergent times in holographic conformal field theory," *SciPost Phys.* **13**, 123 (2022).

[15] H. Casini, E. Teste, and G. Torroba, "Modular Hamiltonians on the null plane and the Markov property of the vacuum state," *J. Phys. A* **52**, 485401 (2019).

[16] R. Longo and P. Martinetti, "Modular theory for the von Neumann algebras of local quantum physics," *Rev. Math. Phys.* **14**, 1099 (2003).

[17] D. D. Blanco and H. Casini, "Localization of negative energy and the Bekenstein bound," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 221601 (2013).

[18] E. Witten, "Algebra, Geometry, and Quantum Field Theory," arXiv:2303.03950 [hep-th].

[19] S. Carpi and R. Weiner, "On the uniqueness of the modular Hamiltonian in conformal field theory," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **237**, 201 (2003).

[20] S. Hollands and G. Lechner, "Construction of interacting models of quantum field theory via modular localization," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **276**, 631 (2007).

[21] Y. Chen and A. C. Wall, "Modular Berry Connection and Gravitational Edge Modes," *JHEP* **04**, 196 (2021).

[22] D. Jafferis, A. Lewkowycz, J. Maldacena, and S. J. Suh, "Relative entropy equals bulk relative entropy," *JHEP* **06**, 004 (2016).

[23] H. Casini, J. M. Maldacena, and G. Torroba, "Geometric modular flow in quantum field theory," *JHEP* **02**, 231 (2023).

[24] R. Bousso, "Complementarity is not enough," *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 124023 (2013).

[25] K. Papadodimas and S. Raju, "State-Dependent Bulk-Boundary Maps and Black Hole Complementarity," *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 086010 (2014).

[26] D. Harlow, "Jerusalem lectures on black holes and quantum information," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88**, 015002 (2016).

[27] R. Longo and Y. Kawahigashi, "Modular Structure and Boundary QFT," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **295**, 469 (2010).

[28] E. Witten, "Light Rays, Singularities, and All That," arXiv:1901.03928 [hep-th].

[29] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras*, Springer (1992).

[30] H. Casini and M. Huerta, "Modular Hamiltonians in Quantum Field Theory," arXiv:2105.05879 [hep-th].

[31] V. M. Tsenov, "The Observer-Centric Reformulation of the Black Hole Information Paradox," *Zenodo*, 2025. `https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16944654`.