

GEOMETRY OF MECHANICS

MIGUEL C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA ¹,

NARCISO ROMÁN-ROY ²

Department of Mathematics.

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC).

E-08034 Barcelona, Spain.

23 Jan 2024

¹*e-mail:* miguel.carlos.munoz@upc.edu / ORCID: 0000-0002-7037-0248.

²*e-mail:* narciso.roman@upc.edu / ORCID: 0000-0003-3663-9861.

Abstract

We study the geometry underlying mechanics and its application to describe autonomous and nonautonomous conservative dynamical systems of different types; as well as dissipative dynamical systems. We use different geometric descriptions to study the main properties and characteristics of these systems; such as their Lagrangian, Hamiltonian and unified formalisms, their symmetries, the variational principles, and others. The study is done mainly for the regular case, although some comments and explanations about singular systems are also included.

Keywords:

Symplectic manifolds, cosymplectic manifolds, Hamiltonian systems, Riemannian manifolds, Newtonian systems, contact manifolds, dissipative systems, Lagrangian formalism, Hamiltonian formalism, symmetries, conservation laws, actions of Lie groups, fiber bundles, variational principles.

MSC 2020 codes:

Primary: 53B20, 53D05, 53D10, 70H03, 70H05, 70H33.

Secondary: 53B21, 53D20, 53D22, 53Z05, 58A30, 70A05, 70F20, 70F25, 70G10, 70G45, 70G65, 70G75, 70H15, 70H20, 70H25.

Acknowledgments

Our special thanks to Prof. Xavier Gràcia-Sabaté for the many clarifying discussions held on many of the contents of this book, and to Prof. Xavier Rivas-Guijarro for his careful reading of the entire manuscript and his very helpful comments and suggestions.

We also want to thank all our colleagues from the *Geometry, Dynamics, and Field Theory Network* for their enriching collaboration over all these years.

Finally, we would also like to acknowledge the contributions of Dr. J. Andreu Lázaro-Camí in the drafting of Sections [2.3.4](#), [2.3.5](#), and [2.3.6](#).

We acknowledge the financial support from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, grants PID2021-125515NB-C21, and RED2022-134301-T of AEI, and Ministry of Research and Universities of the Catalan Government, project 2021 SGR 00603 *Geometry of Manifolds and Applications*, GEOMVAP.

The authors both dedicate this work to our respective families for their constant support and understanding over the years.

To Arturo Echeverría-Enríquez (in memoriam).

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Symplectic mechanics (I): Autonomous Hamiltonian dynamical systems	6
2.1	Notions on symplectic and presymplectic geometry	6
2.1.1	Symplectic and presymplectic vector spaces	6
2.1.2	Subspaces of a symplectic linear space	8
2.1.3	Symplectic and presymplectic manifolds	11
2.1.4	Submanifolds of a symplectic manifold	14
2.1.5	Canonical isomorphism. Hamiltonian vector fields	15
2.1.6	Invariant forms	18
2.1.7	Poisson brackets	22
2.1.8	Canonical transformations and symplectomorphisms	24
2.1.9	Characterization of canonical transformations	26
2.1.10	Generating functions of canonical transformations	28
2.2	Hamiltonian dynamical systems	30
2.2.1	Hamiltonian systems. Hamilton equations	30
2.3	Symmetries of regular Hamiltonian systems	33
2.3.1	Conserved quantities (constants of motion)	34
2.3.2	Dynamical symmetries	35
2.3.3	Noether symmetries. Noether Theorem	37
2.3.4	Actions of Lie groups on symplectic manifolds	41
2.3.5	Comomentum and momentum maps	45
2.3.6	Reduction by symmetries	47
3	Symplectic mechanics (II): Autonomous Lagrangian dynamical systems	50
3.1	Geometric structures of the tangent and cotangent bundles	51
3.1.1	The vertical subbundle. Vertical lift	51
3.1.2	The canonical (or vertical) endomorphism	53
3.1.3	The Liouville vector field	55
3.1.4	Holonomic curves. Second Order Differential Equations	56
3.1.5	Canonical forms in the cotangent bundle	59
3.1.6	Fiber derivative of a function	62
3.2	Lagrangian formalism for Lagrangian dynamical systems	63
3.2.1	Lagrangian dynamical systems	63
3.2.2	Geometric structures induced by the dynamics	64

3.2.3	Lagrangian dynamical equations. Euler–Lagrange equations	66
3.3	Canonical Hamiltonian formalism for Lagrangian systems	69
3.3.1	Legendre map	69
3.3.2	Canonical Hamiltonian formalism. Equivalence with the Lagrangian formalism	70
3.3.3	Discussion and comparison	73
3.3.4	Geometric Hamilton–Jacobi theory	75
3.4	Skinner–Rusk unified Lagrangian–Hamiltonian formalism	81
3.4.1	Unified bundle. Unified formalism	81
3.4.2	Recovering the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms	84
3.5	Symmetries of regular Lagrangian systems	86
3.5.1	Symmetries in the canonical Hamiltonian formalism	86
3.5.2	Lagrangian formalism: Lagrangian symmetries and Noether’s Theorem	88
3.5.3	Equivalent Lagrangians and Noether’s Theorem	90
3.6	Variational formulation for Lagrangian systems	95
3.6.1	Functional associated to a Lagrangian function	95
3.6.2	Hamilton variational principle	96
3.6.3	Euler–Lagrange equations	99
3.6.4	Hamilton–Jacobi variational principle. Relation with the canonical Hamiltonian formalism	101
3.7	Examples	102
3.7.1	Harmonic oscillator	103
3.7.2	Central forces: the Kepler problem	105
4	Cosymplectic mechanics: Nonautonomous dynamical systems	111
4.1	Notions on cosymplectic geometry	112
4.1.1	Cosymplectic manifolds	112
4.1.2	Hamiltonian, gradient, and evolution vector fields	114
4.2	Nonautonomous Hamiltonian dynamical systems	117
4.2.1	Nonautonomous Hamiltonian systems	117
4.3	Nonautonomous Lagrangian dynamical systems	118
4.3.1	Geometric elements	118
4.3.2	Lagrangian formalism. Nonautonomous Lagrangian systems	119
4.3.3	Canonical Hamiltonian formalism	123
4.4	Unified Lagrangian–Hamiltonian formalism for systems	125
4.4.1	Extended unified bundle. Unified nonautonomous formalism	125
4.4.2	Recovering the nonautonomous Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms	127
4.5	Symmetries of regular nonautonomous dynamical systems	129
4.5.1	Symmetries of nonautonomous Hamiltonian systems. Noether Theorem	129
4.6	Other geometrical settings for nonautonomous dynamical systems	134
4.6.1	Contact formulation	134
4.6.2	Extended symplectic formulation	137
4.7	Examples	140
4.7.1	The forced harmonic oscillator with periodic perturbation	140
4.7.2	A nonautonomous system with central forces	142

5	Riemannian mechanics: Newtonian dynamical systems	147
5.1	Connections in manifolds. Riemannian manifolds	147
5.1.1	Connections and covariant derivatives	147
5.1.2	Covariant derivative of tensor fields	149
5.1.3	Covariant derivative along curves	151
5.1.4	Parallel transport along a curve. Geodesic curves	152
5.1.5	Torsion and curvature of a connection	154
5.1.6	Riemannian manifolds	155
5.1.7	Some natural constructions on Riemannian manifolds	157
5.1.8	The Levi-Civita connection	158
5.1.9	Submanifolds of a Riemannian manifold	159
5.1.10	Curvature and distance on a Riemannian manifold	161
5.2	Newtonian dynamical systems	162
5.2.1	Newton dynamical equations. Kinetic energy	162
5.2.2	Euler–Lagrange equations	165
5.2.3	Conservative systems: Mechanical Lagrangians and Euler–Lagrange equations	169
5.2.4	Coupled systems (systems in interaction)	171
5.3	Systems with holonomic and nonholonomic constraints	176
5.3.1	Holonomic constraints. Holonomic d’Alembert Principle	176
5.3.2	Euler–Lagrange equations	179
5.3.3	Some examples of Newtonian mechanical systems	181
5.3.4	Nonholonomic constraints. Nonholonomic d’Alembert Principle	183
5.3.5	Dynamical equations	188
5.4	Nonautonomous Newtonian systems	189
5.4.1	Mechanical systems with time-dependent forces	190
5.4.2	Time-dependent holonomic and nonholonomic constraints	191
6	An introduction to contact mechanics and dissipative dynamical systems	193
6.1	A survey on contact geometry	194
6.1.1	Contact manifolds	194
6.1.2	Hamiltonian, gradient, and evolution vector fields on a contact manifold	197
6.2	Contact Hamiltonian dynamical systems	199
6.2.1	Contact Hamiltonian systems	200
6.2.2	Properties of contact Hamiltonian systems	201
6.3	Contact Lagrangian dynamical systems	203
6.3.1	Contact Lagrangian systems	203
6.3.2	The contact Euler–Lagrange equations	207
6.3.3	Canonical Hamiltonian formalism	208
6.4	Unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism for contact systems	209
6.4.1	Extended precontact unified bundle. Unified formalism	209
6.4.2	Recovering the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms and equivalence	213
6.5	Symmetries of contact dynamical systems	214
6.5.1	Symmetries of contact Hamiltonian systems. Dissipated and conserved quantities	214

6.5.2	Symmetries for contact Lagrangian and canonical Hamiltonian systems	218
6.6	Examples	219
6.6.1	The damped harmonic oscillator	219
6.6.2	The Kepler problem with friction	222
A	Additional contents	227
A.1	Tangent and cotangent bundles	227
A.1.1	The tangent bundle of a manifold. Canonical lifts	227
A.1.2	The cotangent bundle of a manifold. Canonical lifts	232
A.2	Lie groups and Lie algebras	235
	Bibliography	240

Glossary of notation and terminology

$C^\infty(M)$ $\Omega^k(M)$ $Z^k(M)$ $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ $\mathcal{T}_k^m(M)$ $\text{Diff}(M)$ $\mathfrak{X}^{\text{V}(\pi)}(M)$ $\mathfrak{X}(M, \pi)$ $\Gamma(\pi)$ d $\beta(X) \equiv \langle X \beta \rangle$ $i(X)\beta$ $L(X)\beta$ $X(f) \equiv L(X)f$ $TQ, \tau_Q: TQ \longrightarrow Q$ $T^*Q, \pi_Q: T^*Q \longrightarrow Q$ $(q^i, v^i), (q^i, p_i)$ $\Omega \in \Omega^2(M), (M, \Omega)$ $\Theta \in \Omega^1(M)$ $b_\Omega: TM \longrightarrow T^*M$ $\sharp_\Omega = b_\Omega^{-1}: T^*M \longrightarrow TM$ $(M, \Omega, \alpha), (M, \Omega, h)$ $\{f, g\}$ $\mathfrak{X}_h(M), \mathfrak{X}_H(M)$ $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ G, \mathfrak{g} $\xi_X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $j^*: \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow C^\infty(M)$ $J: M \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ $\Delta \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $T\phi: TM \longrightarrow TN$ $Z^V \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ $Z^C \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ $\tilde{\gamma}: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ$ $T^*\phi: T^*N \longrightarrow T^*M$	<p>Smooth functions (of class C^∞) on a manifold M. Differentiable k-forms on a manifold M. Differentiable closed k-forms on a manifold M. Vector fields on a manifold M. Tensor fields of type (k, m) on a manifold M. Diffeomorphisms of the manifold M. π-vertical vector fields on a bundle $\pi: M \longrightarrow N$. Vector fields along a map π on a manifold M. Sections of the projection π on a bundle $\pi: M \longrightarrow N$. Exterior differential.</p> <p>Natural pairing between a differential 1-form β and a vector field X. Contraction of a differential k-form β with a vector field X. Lie derivative of a differential form β by a vector field X. Action of a vector field X (Lie derivative) on a function f. Tangent bundle of a manifold Q, canonical projection. Cotangent bundle of a manifold Q, canonical projection. Natural coordinates on TQ and T^*Q. (Pre)symplectic form, (pre)symplectic manifold. (Pre)symplectic potential ($\Omega = d\Theta$).</p> <p>Canonical isomorphisms on a symplectic manifold (M, Ω). Hamiltonian system on a symplectic manifold (M, Ω). Poisson bracket between the functions f and g. Local/global Hamiltonian vector fields on a symplectic manifold (M, Ω). Hamiltonian vector field of $f \in C^\infty(M)$ on a symplectic manifold (M, Ω). Lie group, Lie algebra.</p> <p>Fundamental vector field of $\Phi: G \longrightarrow \text{Diff}(M)$ associated to $X \in \mathfrak{g}$. Comomentum map associated to an action $\Phi: G \longrightarrow \text{Diff}(M)$. Momentum map associated to an action $\Phi: G \longrightarrow \text{Diff}(M)$. Liouville (dilation) vector field on a vector bundle $\pi: M \longrightarrow N$. Canonical lift of a map $\phi: M \longrightarrow N$ to the tangent bundles. Vertical lift of $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ to the tangent bundle TQ. Complete canonical lift of $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ to the tangent bundle TQ. Canonical lift of a curve $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$ to the tangent bundle TQ. Canonical lift of a map $\phi: M \longrightarrow N$ to the cotangent bundles.</p>
--	---

$Z^* \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ $\mathcal{FL}: TQ \longrightarrow T^*Q$ $J \in \mathcal{T}_1^1(TQ)$ $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ), (TQ, \mathcal{L})$ $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(TQ)$ $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(TQ)$ $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ), \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ $\Phi: Q \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow T^*Q$ $\mathcal{S}: Q \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $h \in C^\infty(T^*Q), (T^*Q, \Omega, h)$ $\mathcal{W} = TQ \times_Q T^*Q$ $\varrho_1: \mathcal{W} \longrightarrow TQ$ $\varrho_2: \mathcal{W} \longrightarrow T^*Q$ $\varrho_0: \mathcal{W} \longrightarrow Q$ $\Theta_{\mathcal{W}} \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{W})$ $\Omega_{\mathcal{W}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{W}} \in \Omega^2(\mathcal{W})$ $\mathcal{C}: \mathcal{W} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $\mathcal{H}: \mathcal{W} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $X_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{W})$ $j_0: \mathcal{W}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}$ $(\eta, \omega), (M, \eta, \omega)$ $R \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $b_{(\eta, \omega)}: TM \longrightarrow T^*M$ $\sharp_{(\eta, \omega)} = b_{(\eta, \omega)}^{-1}: T^*M \longrightarrow TM$ $X_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $\text{grad } f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $\mathcal{E}_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $\rho: \mathbb{R} \times Q \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $\tau_1: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $\tau_2: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow TQ$ $\tau_0: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow Q$ $\tau_{1,0}: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$ $\pi_1: \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $\pi_2: \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow T^*Q$ $\pi_0: \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow Q$ $\pi_{1,0}: \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$ $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$ $\hat{c}: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{T}_1^1(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ $\mathcal{FL}: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ $\theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ $\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -d\theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ $R_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$	<p>Canonical lift of $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ to the cotangent bundle T^*Q. Legendre map defined by $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$. Canonical endomorphism on TQ. Lagrangian function, Lagrangian system. Lagrangian (Cartan) 1-form associated with $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$. Lagrangian (Cartan) 2-form associated with $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$. Lagrangian/Euler-Lagrange vector field of a Lagrangian system (TQ, \mathcal{L}). Complete solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Generating function of a complete solution to the H-J eq. Canonical Hamiltonian function, Canonical Hamiltonian system. Unified (Pontryagin) bundle.</p> <p>Canonical projections of the unified bundle \mathcal{W}. Canonical 1-form on the unified bundle \mathcal{W}. Canonical 2-form on the unified bundle \mathcal{W}. Coupling function on the unified bundle \mathcal{W}. Hamiltonian function on the unified bundle \mathcal{W}. Dynamical vector field of the dynamical system $(\mathcal{W}, \Omega_{\mathcal{W}}, \mathcal{H})$. Compatibility submanifold of the dynamical system $(\mathcal{W}, \Omega_{\mathcal{W}}, \mathcal{H})$. (Pre)cosymplectic structure, (pre)cosymplectic manifold. Reeb vector field on a cosymplectic manifold (M, η, ω).</p> <p>Canonical isomorphisms on a cosymplectic manifold (M, η, ω). Hamiltonian vector field on a cosymplectic manifold (M, η, ω). Gradient vector field on a cosymplectic manifold (M, η, ω). Evolution vector field on a cosymplectic manifold (M, η, ω). Canonical projection.</p> <p>Canonical projections of the bundle $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$.</p> <p>Canonical projections of the bundle $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$. Canonical lift of a curve $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$ to $\mathbb{R} \times Q$. Canonical lift of a curve $c: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$ to $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$. Extension of the canonical endomorphism to $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$. Legendre map defined by $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$. Cartan Lagrangian 1-form associated with $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$. Cartan Lagrangian 2-form associated with $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$. Reeb vector field for the cosymplectic manifold $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, dt, \eta_{\mathcal{L}})$. Poincaré–Cartan 1-form associated with $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$. Poincaré–Cartan 2-form associated with $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$.</p>
--	--

$\Theta_h \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ $\Omega_h = -d\Theta_h \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ $v: T(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ $\omega: T(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $pr_1: T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \rightarrow T^*\mathbb{R}$ $pr_2: T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \rightarrow T^*Q$ $\mu: T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ $u: T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} \in \Omega^1(T(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$ $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} \in \Omega^2(T(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$ $\Theta_{ext} \in \Omega^1(T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$ $\Omega_{ext} = -d\Theta_{ext} \in \Omega^2(T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$ $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R} \times TQ \times_Q T^*Q$ $\kappa_1: \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ $\kappa_2: \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ $\kappa_0: \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$ $\Theta_{\mathcal{M}} \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{M})$ $\Omega_{\mathcal{M}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{M}} \in \Omega^2(\mathcal{M})$ $C: \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $H: \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ $j_0: \mathcal{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ $g \in \mathcal{T}_2(Q)$ $F \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ $\omega \in \Omega^1(Q)$ (Q, g) $(Q, g, F), (Q, g, \omega)$ ∇ ∇_X ∇_t $T \in \mathcal{T}_2^1(M)$ $R \in \mathcal{T}_3^1(M)$ $Rie \in \mathcal{T}_4(M)$ $Ric \in \mathcal{T}_2(M)$ $S \in C^\infty(M)$ $\eta, (M, \eta)$ $\mathcal{D}^C, \mathcal{D}^R$ $\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $b_\eta: TM \longrightarrow T^*M$ $\sharp_\eta = b_\eta^{-1}: T^*M \longrightarrow TM$ $X_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $grad f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $\varepsilon_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ $\tau_1: TQ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow TQ$ $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}: TQ \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$	<p>Hamilton–Cartan 1-form associated with $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$. Hamilton–Cartan 2-form associated with $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$.</p> <p>Canonical projections of the bundle $T(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$.</p> <p>Canonical projections of the bundle $T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$. Lagrangian 1-form associated with $\mathcal{L}_{ext} \in C^\infty(T(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$. Lagrangian 2-form associated with $\mathcal{L}_{ext} \in C^\infty(T(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$. Canonical 1-form on $T^*(Q \times \mathbb{R})$. Canonical 2-form on $T^*(Q \times \mathbb{R})$. Extended unified (Pontryagin) bundle.</p> <p>Canonical projections of the extended unified bundle \mathcal{M}. Canonical 1-form on the extended unified bundle \mathcal{M}. Canonical 2-form on the extended unified bundle \mathcal{M}. Coupling function on the unified bundle \mathcal{M}. Hamiltonian function on the unified bundle \mathcal{M}. Dynamical vector field of the dynamical system $(\mathcal{M}, \Omega_{\mathcal{M}}, H)$. Compatibility submanifold of the system $(\mathcal{M}, \Omega_{\mathcal{M}}, H)$. Riemannian metric on a manifold Q. Vector force field. Work differential form. Riemannian manifold. Newtonian system. Connection on a manifold (Levi-Civita). Covariant derivative by a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. Covariant derivative along a curve. Torsion tensor of a connection. Curvature tensor of a connection. Riemann’s curvature tensor of a Riemannian manifold. Ricci tensor of a Riemannian manifold. Scalar curvature of a Riemannian manifold. (Pre)contact form, (pre)contact manifold. Contact and Reeb distributions on a contact manifold (M, η). Reeb vector field on a contact manifold (M, η).</p> <p>Canonical isomorphisms on a contact manifold (M, η). Hamiltonian vector field on a contact manifold (M, η). Gradient vector field on a contact manifold (M, η). Evolution vector field on a contact manifold (M, η). Canonical projection of the bundle $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$. Legendre map defined by $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$.</p>
---	--

$\theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ $\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -d\theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ $\eta_{\mathcal{L}} = ds - \theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ $\mathfrak{M} = TQ \times_Q T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ $\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} \in \Omega^1(\mathfrak{M})$ $\mathfrak{C}: \mathfrak{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ $\mathbf{H} \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{M})$ $X_{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathfrak{M})$ $j_0: \mathfrak{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}$	<p>Cartan Lagrangian 1-form associated with $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$.</p> <p>Cartan Lagrangian 2-form associated with $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$.</p> <p>(Pre)contact Lagrangian form associated with $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$.</p> <p>Reeb vector field for the (pre)contact manifold $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_{\mathcal{L}})$.</p> <p>Extended precontact unified (or Pontryagin) bundle.</p> <p>Canonical precontact form on the precontact unified bundle \mathfrak{M}.</p> <p>Coupling function on the unified bundle \mathfrak{M}.</p> <p>Hamiltonian function on the precontact unified bundle \mathfrak{M}.</p> <p>Dynamical vector field of the dynamical system $(\mathfrak{M}, \Omega_{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{H})$.</p> <p>Compatibility submanifold of the dynamical system $(\mathfrak{M}, \Omega_{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{H})$.</p>
--	---

Chapter 1

Introduction

The study of mechanics experienced a substantial advance during the 18th and 19th centuries with the emergence of what was called *Analytical* or *Rational Mechanics*. Many relevant mathematicians contributed to its development, such as *Euler*, *Hamilton*, *Jacobi*, *Lagrange*, *Legendre*, *Poisson*, among others. Their techniques are essentially based in the application of variational methods to obtain the equations of motion of dynamical systems, and their subsequent development; and are widely collected in a lot of classical treaties, such as [153, 157, 171, 212, 220, 223, 345] or, in a more modern perspective, [8, 140, 209, 232, 303, 317, 348], among many others.

Although the dynamical equations of Analytical Mechanics had been well-established previously by *Lagrange* and others, the connection between the variational methods and Mechanics was done by the *minimum action principles* [29, 30, 151, 164, 220, 232]. Thus, the so-called *Hamilton principle* leads to the Euler–Lagrange equations and the so-called *Lagrangian formalism* of mechanics. Introducing the *Legendre transformation* and the “momentum coordinates” the dynamical equations become the *Hamilton equations*, originating in this way the *canonical* or *Hamiltonian formalism* of Mechanics. As in the Lagrangian case, these Hamiltonian equations can also be derived from the so-called *Hamilton–Jacobi variational principle*.

In the second half of the 20th century, an extensive group of mathematicians and physicists used the techniques of differential geometry to formalize analytical mechanics and physics in general, and studied the properties of dynamical systems intrinsically, giving rise to what is known today as *geometric mechanics*. Among the most relevant books and contributions, we can cite [1, 7, 64, 84, 169, 197, 204, 205, 214, 233, 235, 236, 240, 250, 276, 288, 303, 312, 342], in addition to many others.

In the geometric formulation, differentiable manifolds that model the phase spaces of dynamical systems are endowed with different kinds of geometric structures, which are used to study the properties of these systems. Thus, for *conservative systems* the *symplectic manifolds*, are used to describe *autonomous* or *time-independent*

dynamical systems [1, 7, 84, 130, 233, 235, 236, 250, 261, 312, 330, 331, 342]; meanwhile for the *nonautonomous* or *time-dependent* case also other types of manifolds can be considered, such as *jet bundles* and *contact* and *cosymplectic manifolds* [1, 49, 82, 98, 101, 146, 240, 260, 302]. In particular, for variational dynamical systems; that is, those of *Lagrangian type*, their phase spaces have the geometric structure of a tangent bundle [97, 100, 156, 169, 214, 321, 322], or a cotangent bundle in the dual canonical Hamiltonian formalism [1, 7, 84, 235, 321, 323]. These formalisms can also be described in a single unified description [307, 308]. Furthermore, for those dynamical systems which are called of *mechanical type*, their configuration spaces are also endowed with a (semi)Riemannian metric [1, 7, 42, 84, 170, 276] which is used to construct their Lagrangian functions in a canonical way. Finally, symplectic mechanics has also been used to describe *nonholonomic systems*; that is, systems subjected to constraints depending on positions and velocities, [7, 92, 119, 123, 157, 234, 267, 328]; and also *vakonomic systems* which consists in considering those systems but modifying the variational principle using only the variations allowed by the constraints [7, 30, 151, 258].

In addition, there are other more general geometric structures which are used to model some special types of dynamical systems. These are *Poisson and Jacobi manifolds* [235, 241] or also *Lie algebroids* [71, 122, 178, 182, 255, 257, 344]. Finally, *dissipative* or *nonconservative dynamical systems* are modelled using *contact manifolds* [34, 36, 86, 106, 109, 133, 160, 211, 221]. In all these cases, there are deep relations between the differential equations describing the dynamics and the underlying geometric structures.

Another very important fact that characterizes the behaviour of dynamical systems is the existence of symmetries. The interest of studying symmetries arises as a consequence of the well known fact that their existence is closely related to that of conserved quantities, and the main result comes from the work of *Emmy Noether* [268] (see [216] for a review of her results). On turn, the existence of conserved quantities facilitates the integration of the dynamical equations, applying the suitable reduction procedures. Concerning to this, it is interesting to mention the fundamental *Arnold-Liouville Theorem for integrable systems* [7] (see also [15, 262]), and also those by *J.E. Marsden* and *A. Weinstein* on the problem of the (*symplectic*) *reduction* by symmetries [251] (see also [248, 250, 252, 277–279, 279] and the references therein).

The physical systems for which these geometric approaches were initially developed had the characteristic of being *regular*¹. The dynamical systems in classical analytical mechanics are of these kind. Nevertheless, with the advent of Relativ-

¹For Lagrangian systems, this means, locally, that the Hessian matrix with respect to the generalized velocities is regular everywhere.

ity Theory and the development of field theories in modern physics, in general, many systems appear for which that property does not hold; that is, they are the *singular systems*. For autonomous systems, this feature of being regular or not manifests in the fact that the underlying geometric structure is *symplectic* or *presymplectic* [55, 58, 67, 68, 174–176, 186, 243, 265, 266, 309].

The aim of this book is to do a detailed exposition of the geometry underlying dynamical systems and how it is applied to describe the different kinds of them: conservative autonomous and nonautonomous dynamical systems in general, and Newtonian systems in particular; as well as dissipative systems. We use different geometric descriptions to study the main properties and characteristics of these systems; such as their Lagrangian, Hamiltonian and unified formalisms, their symmetries, the variational principles, and others. The study is done mainly for the regular case, although comments and explanations about singular systems are also introduced throughout the exposition.

The organization of the book is the following:

The first chapter of the exposition, Chapter 2, is devoted to present the most general geometric framework for autonomous mechanics; that is, *symplectic manifolds* and their structures and characteristics (*Poisson brackets*, *symplectomorphisms*, etc.), as well as the fundamental notion of *Hamiltonian dynamical system*. A general description of *symmetries*, *conserved quantities* and the *Noether theorem* is also done for this general situation.

In Chapter 3, we continue the exposition about *symplectic mechanics* studying, in particular, autonomous mechanical systems of variational type; that is, those which are described by means of time-independent Lagrangian functions. The phase spaces of these kinds of systems are represented by tangent and cotangent bundles of manifolds representing the configuration spaces of the systems; so the canonical geometric structures of these bundles are introduced first. Starting from the Lagrangian function and using the canonical structures of the tangent bundle, we can define a (pre)symplectic form and the *Legendre map* which allow us to establish the Lagrangian formalism, the associated canonical Hamiltonian formalism for these systems, and the equivalence between both formalisms. We also state the foundations of the *Hamilton–Jacobi theory* for Hamiltonian systems. In addition, we also give a description of the so-called Skinner-Rusk unified formalism, which combines in a single framework the two previous formalisms. The study of symmetries, conserved quantities and Noether’s theorem is also performed for Lagrangian systems in both formalisms, which lead to introduce some new types of symmetries. As these dynamical systems are of variational type, a section is devoted to introduce the variational formulation and derive the dynamical equations from the corresponding

variational principle. Finally, two of the most classic examples in mechanics, the *harmonic oscillator* and the *Kepler problem*, are analyzed.

Chapter 4 is devoted to develop one of the most interesting and generic geometric formulations for describing *nonautonomous dynamical systems*, both the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms. It is based in using *cosymplectic manifolds*, which are presented in the first section of this chapter. Then, the dynamics and symmetries for these time-dependent systems are studied and the formalism is used to describe the classical examples introduced in the previous chapter when external time-dependent forces act on the oscillator or for variable mass systems in the case of the Kepler problem. In this chapter we also give a brief presentation of two other very common formulations of nonautonomous mechanics; namely, the *contact* and the *extended symplectic formulations*, and showing their equivalence with the cosymplectic picture.

Next, Chapter 5 deals with the study of those dynamical systems whose configuration spaces are endowed with additional geometric structures, such as a *metric*. First, we review the foundations of connections in manifolds and Riemannian geometry, which are the geometric structures needed to develop what is called *Newtonian mechanics*. In particular, the existence of a metric allows us to construct what are known as *mechanical Lagrangians*. We analyze different types of them; namely, *conservative* and *coupled systems*, systems with *holonomic* and *nonholonomic constraints*; stating their dynamics and variational formulation. As a particular situation, the case of (*nonautonomous*) *Newtonian systems* is displayed along this exposition.

The last chapter, Chapter 6, is an introduction to the study of *autonomous dissipative systems*, using the *contact geometry*. After reviewing the foundations on contact manifolds, we establish the generic concepts about *contact Hamiltonian systems*. and develop the Lagrangian, Hamiltonian and unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalisms for these kinds of systems. Next, we study symmetries and the concept of *dissipated quantities* for contact Hamiltonian and Lagrangian systems; establishing the so-called “dissipation theorems”, and showing how to associate dissipated and conserved quantities to these symmetries. As in the above chapters, the examples of the damped harmonic oscillator and the Kepler problem with friction are analyzed in this context.

The exposition ends with an appendix where various contents on other geometric structures that appear throughout the exposition are collected; in particular, tangent and cotangent bundles, and Lie groups and Lie algebras.

This book is intended for readers who have completed at least the first courses of a degree on mathematics or physics, and who have a basic training on differential geometry of smooth manifolds and analytical mechanics.

Along the exposition, all the manifolds are supposed to be real, second-countable and C^∞ . All the maps and the structures are smooth. The summation criterion for

repeated crossed indices is adopted.

Chapter 2

Symplectic mechanics (I): Autonomous Hamiltonian dynamical systems

The general geometric framework for describing autonomous mechanical systems (with a finite number of degrees of freedom) uses some types of differentiable manifolds to model the phase spaces of these systems, they are the *symplectic* and *presymplectic manifolds*. This formulation is known as *symplectic mechanics*. With these kinds of manifolds as phase spaces, we have a very general setting to study dynamical systems, from which other descriptions such as the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian formalisms of Lagrangian systems can be analyzed as particular situations ¹.

The symplectic description of (autonomous) Hamiltonian systems has been exposed in many works and books (see, for instance, [1, 7, 130, 217, 235, 236, 250, 312, 342] and the references quoted therein).

In this chapter, after reviewing the fundamental concepts on symplectic geometry, we present the symplectic description of the autonomous Hamiltonian systems and we introduce several types of symmetries and their associated conserved quantities from a geometric perspective.

2.1. Notions on symplectic and presymplectic geometry

In this section, we state the fundamental concepts and properties of symplectic (and presymplectic) manifolds (see, for instance, [1, 2, 45, 197, 235, 342]).

2.1.1. Symplectic and presymplectic vector spaces

(All the vector spaces are on the field \mathbb{R}). Let \mathbf{E} be a finite dimensional vector space.

¹This general formulation allows us to describe also dynamical systems which are not of Lagrangian type, for instance, the system of a classical spin particle [312].

Definition 2.1 A *symplectic inner product*, or a *linear symplectic structure*, on E is a non-degenerate skew symmetric bilinear function ω on E .

We say that the pair (E, ω) is a *symplectic vector space*.

Non degeneracy means that, if $\omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$, for every $\mathbf{y} \in E$, then $\mathbf{x} = 0$. Let $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_r$ be a basis of E and $\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^r$ its dual basis. If $\omega_{ij} = \omega(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{e}_j)$, then the expression of ω on these bases is

$$\omega = \omega_{ij} \alpha^i \otimes \alpha^j ,$$

being $(\omega) = (\omega_{ij})$ the matrix of ω in these bases.

The linear mapping $\omega^b : E \rightarrow E^*$ is defined by

$$(\omega^b(\mathbf{x}))(\mathbf{y}) = \langle \omega^b(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} \rangle = \omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) ,$$

and its matrix relative to these bases is (ω_{ij}) , since $\omega(\mathbf{e}_i) = \omega_{ij} \alpha^j$. By the skew symmetry of the bilinear mapping ω , we have that the matrix (ω_{ij}) is skew symmetric. The non degeneracy gives us that the mapping ω^b is one-to-one, hence an isomorphism, and (ω_{ij}) is regular. As a consequence, the dimension of E is even, that is $r = 2n$, because $(\omega) = -(\omega)^t$ (the transpose matrix), and $\det(\omega) = \det(\omega)^t = (-1)^r \det(\omega)$.

A basis $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{a}_{n+1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{2n}$ of E is called *symplectic* if

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j) &= 0 ; & i, j &= 1, \dots, n ; \\ \omega(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j) &= 0 ; & i, j &= n+1, \dots, 2n . \\ \omega(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_{n+j}) &= \delta_{ij} ; & i, j &= 1, \dots, n . \end{aligned}$$

The existence of symplectic basis is given by the following Lemma:

Lemma 2.2 Let (E, ω) be a $2n$ dimensional symplectic vector space.

1. There exists a symplectic basis (\mathbf{e}_k) ($k = 1, \dots, 2n$) on E .
2. If (α^k) is the corresponding dual basis on E^* , then $\omega = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha^i \wedge \alpha^{i+n}$ or, what is the same, the matrix of ω in this basis is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0_n & I_n \\ -I_n & 0_n \end{pmatrix}$$

where I_n denotes the identity matrix of order n and 0_n the zero square matrix $n \times n$.

(Proof) By induction on the dimension of \mathbf{E} . Let $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_{n+1} \in \mathbf{E}$ with $\omega(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_{n+1}) \neq 0$. We can choose two such vectors unless $\omega = 0$. Dividing \mathbf{e}_1 by a scalar, we have that $\omega(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_{n+1}) = 1$. Then, on the plane \mathbf{P}_1 spanned by $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_{n+1}$ the matrix of ω is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let \mathbf{E}_1 the ω -orthogonal complement of \mathbf{P}_1 in \mathbf{E} , that is:

$$\mathbf{E}_1 = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{E} \mid \omega(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}_1) = 0, \forall \mathbf{a}_1 \in \mathbf{P}_1\}.$$

Observe that $\mathbf{E}_1 \cap \mathbf{P}_1 = \{0\}$ and $\mathbf{E}_1 + \mathbf{P}_1 = \mathbf{E}$. If $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{E}$, we have

$$\mathbf{a} - \omega(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{e}_{n+1})\mathbf{e}_1 + \omega(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{e}_1)\mathbf{e}_{n+1} \in \mathbf{E}_1.$$

Then, $\mathbf{E}_1 \oplus \mathbf{P}_1 = \mathbf{E}$ and we can repeat the process on \mathbf{E}_1 , with dimension less than $2n$, and we have finished the proof.

The result on the expression of ω as $\omega = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha^i \wedge \alpha^{i+n}$ is immediate. ■

Remark 2.3 • The non degeneracy condition is equivalent to say that $\omega^n = \underbrace{\omega \wedge \dots \wedge \omega}_n \equiv \wedge^n \omega$ is a volume form on \mathbf{E} .

- If we take out the non degeneracy condition, then the mapping ω^\flat is not one-to-one. In this case, we need to add the basis $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_h$ of $\ker \omega^\flat$ to the given basis for the decomposition of \mathbf{E} . Then the corresponding matrix is,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0_n & I_n & 0_{n \times h} \\ -I_n & 0_n & 0_{n \times h} \\ 0_{h \times n} & 0_{h \times n} & 0_h \end{pmatrix}$$

being $2n + h$ the dimension of \mathbf{E} and denoting by $0_{n \times h}$ the zero matrix of n rows and h columns. We say that $2n$ is the rank of ω .

2.1.2. Subspaces of a symplectic linear space

Associated to a linear symplectic structure we have a notion of orthogonality in parallel to the ideas related to the Euclidean scalar product, but the results are very different. In the next lines, we develop these ideas that are necessary to understand our later description of Lagrangian and Hamiltonian systems.

Let (E, ω) be a $2n$ -dimensional symplectic vector space and $F \subset E$ a linear subspace. The ω -**orthogonal complement** of F is defined as

$$F^\perp = \{\mathbf{u} \in E \mid \omega(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}') = 0, \text{ for every } \mathbf{u}' \in F\}.$$

Observe that, in general, $F \cap F^\perp \neq 0$ (for example, if $F = \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}\}$, then $F \subset F^\perp$).

Definition 2.4 Let F be a subspace of a linear symplectic $2n$ -dimensional vector space (E, ω) .

1. F is **isotropic** if $F \subset F^\perp$; that is, $\omega(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}') = 0$, for every $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}' \in F$.
2. F is **coisotropic** if $F \supset F^\perp$; that is, if $\omega(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}') = 0$, for every $\mathbf{u}' \in F$, then $\mathbf{u} \in F$.
3. F is **Lagrangian** if F is isotropic and there exists an isotropic complement F' ; that is, an isotropic subspace $F' \subset E$ such that $F \oplus F' = E$.
4. F is **symplectic** if ω restricted to F is non degenerate; that is, $(F, \omega_F = \omega|_F)$ is a symplectic vector space.

These notions have several associated properties that we resume in the following two propositions, with some proofs and indications.

Proposition 2.5 Let (E, ω) be a symplectic vector space and F, G subspaces of E .

1. If $F \subset G$, then $F^\perp \supset G^\perp$.
2. $F^\perp \cap G^\perp = (F + G)^\perp$.
3. $\dim E = \dim F + \dim F^\perp$.
4. $F = F^{\perp\perp}$.
5. $(F \cap G)^\perp = F^\perp + G^\perp$.

(Proof)

3. Consider the linear map $\omega^\flat: E \longrightarrow E^*$. Observe that, if $\mathbf{u} \in F$, then $\omega^\flat(\mathbf{u}) \in E^*$ annihilates the subspace F^\perp . Hence, the restricted linear map $\omega_F^\flat: F \longrightarrow E^*$ induces another one $\hat{\omega}_F^\flat: F \longrightarrow (E/F^\perp)^*$. This last map is injective, but not necessarily onto. Thus, we have

$$\dim F \leq \dim (E/F^\perp)^* = \dim (E/F^\perp) = \dim E - \dim F.$$

Conversely, consider the map $\mathbf{F} \xrightarrow{\omega^b} \mathbf{E}^* \xrightarrow{j} \mathbf{F}^*$, where j is the restriction from \mathbf{E} to \mathbf{F} . Let $\bar{\omega}_{\mathbf{F}}^b = \omega^b \circ j$ and observe that $\ker \bar{\omega}_{\mathbf{F}}^b = \mathbf{F}^\perp$. Hence,

$$\dim \mathbf{F} = \dim \mathbf{F}^* \geq \dim(\text{img } \bar{\omega}_{\mathbf{F}}^b) = \dim \mathbf{E} - \dim \mathbf{F}^* = \dim \mathbf{E} - \dim \mathbf{F}.$$

From both expressions, we obtain the result we wanted.

4. It is clear that $\mathbf{F} \subset \mathbf{F}^{\perp\perp}$. If we apply the previous result to \mathbf{F} and to \mathbf{F}^\perp we have

$$\dim \mathbf{E} = \dim \mathbf{F} + \dim \mathbf{F}^\perp = \dim \mathbf{F}^\perp + \dim \mathbf{F}^{\perp\perp};$$

that is, $\dim \mathbf{F} = \dim \mathbf{F}^{\perp\perp}$, hence $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^{\perp\perp}$ as we wanted.

5. From 2. and 4. we have

$$(\mathbf{F} \cap \mathbf{G})^\perp \stackrel{4.}{=} (\mathbf{F}^{\perp\perp} \cap \mathbf{G}^{\perp\perp})^\perp \stackrel{2.}{=} (\mathbf{F}^\perp \cap \mathbf{G}^\perp)^{\perp\perp} \stackrel{4.}{=} \mathbf{F}^\perp \cap \mathbf{G}^\perp.$$

■

And the next proposition gives alternative definitions for a subspace to be Lagrangian.

Proposition 2.6 *Let (\mathbf{E}, ω) be a symplectic vector space (\mathbf{E}, ω) and \mathbf{F} a subspace of \mathbf{E} . The following statements are equivalent:*

1. \mathbf{F} is Lagrangian.
2. $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^\perp$.
3. \mathbf{F} is isotropic and $\dim \mathbf{F} = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathbf{E}$.

(Proof) (1. \implies 2). As \mathbf{F} is Lagrangian it is isotropic, hence $\mathbf{F} \subset \mathbf{F}^\perp$, and there exists another isotropic subspace \mathbf{F}' with $\mathbf{F} \oplus \mathbf{F}' = \mathbf{E}$.

Suppose now that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{F}^\perp$ and put $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$ with $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{F}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{F}'$. We prove that $\mathbf{b} = 0$. In fact, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{F}'^\perp$ since \mathbf{F}' is isotropic. We also have that $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{F}^\perp$ since $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{F}$ and \mathbf{F} is isotropic. Then

$$\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{F}'^\perp \cap \mathbf{F}^\perp = (\mathbf{F}' + \mathbf{F})^\perp = \mathbf{E}^\perp = \{0\},$$

because ω is non-degenerate. Then we have that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{F}$ and $\mathbf{F}^\perp \subset \mathbf{F}$.

(2. \implies 3). The hypothesis and the item 3 of the above proposition give the result.

(3. \implies 2). From 3 and the above proposition we obtain that $\dim \mathbf{F} = \dim \mathbf{F}^\perp$ and being \mathbf{F} isotropic, we have that $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^\perp$; that is, the statement 2.

(2. \implies 1). We have $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^\perp$, hence \mathbf{F} is isotropic. We need to construct a subspace \mathbf{F}' . Let $\mathbf{a}_1 \notin \mathbf{F}$ and $\mathbf{F}_1 = \text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1\}$. Then $\mathbf{F} \cap \mathbf{F}_1 = \{0\}$, hence $\mathbf{F}^\perp + \mathbf{F}_1^\perp = \mathbf{F} \oplus \mathbf{F}_1^\perp = \mathbf{E}$, that is $\mathbf{F} \oplus \mathbf{F}_1^\perp = \mathbf{E}$ by the above proposition. Now let $\mathbf{a}_2 \notin \mathbf{F} + \mathbf{F}_1$, $\mathbf{a}_2 \in \mathbf{F}_1^\perp$. We have two alternatives:

1. This vector \mathbf{a}_2 does not exist. In this case $\mathbf{F}_1^\perp \subset \mathbf{F} + \mathbf{F}_1$, hence $\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{F}_1 = \mathbf{E}$ and

$$\mathbf{F}_1^\perp = (\text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1\})^\perp \supset \text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1\} = \mathbf{F}_1 ,$$

then \mathbf{F}_1 is isotropic and we can take $\mathbf{F}' = \mathbf{F}_1$.

2. There exists such \mathbf{a}_2 . Let $\mathbf{F}_2 = \mathbf{F}_1 + \text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_2\}$, following the same procedure as above, we have that $\mathbf{F} \cap \mathbf{F}_2 = \{0\}$, hence $\mathbf{F}^\perp + \mathbf{F}_2^\perp = \mathbf{F} \oplus \mathbf{F}_2^\perp = \mathbf{E}$, that is $\mathbf{F} \oplus \mathbf{F}_2^\perp = \mathbf{E}$. But

$$\mathbf{F}_2^\perp = (\text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2\})^\perp \supset \text{span}\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2\} = \mathbf{F}_2 ,$$

hence \mathbf{F}_2 is isotropic and we can take $\mathbf{F}' = \mathbf{F}_2$.

Inductively we can continue and, as $\dim \mathbf{E}$ is finite, we arrive to some \mathbf{F}_k such that $\mathbf{F}' = \mathbf{F}_k$ and we have finished the proof. ■

This last proposition says that a Lagrangian subspace is a *maximal isotropic subspace*.

2.1.3. Symplectic and presymplectic manifolds

Definition 2.7 (a) Let M be a differentiable manifold. A **symplectic form** ² in M is a differential 2-form $\Omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ such that:

1. It is closed: $d\Omega = 0$, (we write $\Omega \in Z^2(M)$).
2. It is non-degenerated at every point of M ; that is, Ω_p is a linear symplectic structure in $T_p M$ for every $p \in M$.

If the form Ω is closed but degenerated it is said to be a **presymplectic form**, and if Ω is nondegenerated but not closed it is an **almost-symplectic form**.

- (b) A **symplectic** (resp. **presymplectic**) **manifold** is a pair (M, Ω) where M is a differentiable manifold and Ω is a symplectic (resp. presymplectic) form.

If the symplectic (resp. presymplectic) form is exact; that is, there exists $\Theta \in \Omega^1(M)$ such that $d\Theta = \Omega$, then Ω is an **exact symplectic** (resp. **exact presymplectic**) **form**, and (M, Ω) is an **exact symplectic** (resp. **exact presymplectic**) **manifold**. The form Θ is called a **symplectic** (resp. **presymplectic**) **potential**.

²The word *symplectic* comes from the Greek word “σμπλεκτικό” which means “what unites”. It was introduced by H. Weyl, who substituted the Latin root of the term “complex”, to refer to a structure of the group $\mathbf{Sp}(n, \mathbb{C})$. Although the structure of the symplectic manifolds had been implicitly considered before, it is not until the decade of 1950 when the symplectic geometry appears as a differentiated branch of Differential Geometry, being A. Lichnerowicz the first in introducing the term *symplectic manifold*.

Remark 2.8 • As a consequence of the second condition of the definition, a non-degenerated differential 2-form can only be defined in manifolds of even dimension, thus we write $\dim M = 2n$.

- As, since *Poincaré's Lemma*, every closed form is locally exact, if Ω is a symplectic or a presymplectic form, for every point $p \in M$, there is an open neighbourhood $U \subset M$, $p \in U$, and $\vartheta \in \Omega^1(U)$ such that $\Omega|_U = d\vartheta$. Every 1-form ϑ satisfying this condition is called a *local symplectic* (or *presymplectic*) *potential*.

Observe that if $\vartheta \in \Omega^1(U)$ and $\vartheta' \in \Omega^1(U')$ are two different symplectic (or presymplectic) potentials, then $\vartheta' = \vartheta + df$ in $U \cap U'$, for some $f \in C^\infty(U \cap U')$.

- In the case of a presymplectic form, the dimension of $\ker \omega_p^b$, for $p \in M$, may depend on the chosen point $p \in M$. Usually, we demand that this dimension does not depend on the point and say that the presymplectic form is *regular*.

The following theorem describes the local structure of the symplectic manifolds [102].

Theorem 2.9 (Darboux) Let (M, Ω) be a $2n$ -dimensional symplectic manifold. For every point $p \in M$ there exists an open neighbourhood $U \subset M$, $p \in U$, which is the domain of a local chart $(U; x^i, y_i)_{i=1\dots n}$, such that Ω has the expression

$$\Omega|_U = dx^i \wedge dy_i .$$

These local charts are called *symplectic charts* and their coordinates are the *canonical coordinates* or *Darboux coordinates* of the symplectic manifold in this chart.

(Proof) (This proof is taken from [1]. For other different proofs, see for example [40, 100, 135]). The proof is organized in several parts:

1. As this is a local result, we can suppose that M is \mathbb{R}^{2n} and $p = 0$.
2. Let Ω be a symplectic form in \mathbb{R}^{2n} and $\Omega_0 = \Omega(p)$ the constant symplectic form in \mathbb{R}^{2n} equal to Ω at p .

It is enough to prove that there exists a neighbourhood U of p , and a diffeomorphism $\phi : U \rightarrow U$ such that $\phi^* \Omega_0 = \Omega$ on U . This is true since, by the above Lemma, we can choose a global coordinate system in \mathbb{R}^{2n} such that the symplectic form Ω_0 take the expression we need.

3. Consider the 2-form $\omega_t \equiv \Omega + t(\Omega_0 - \Omega)$ in \mathbb{R}^{2n} for $t \in [0, 1]$. We have that

$$(a) \ \omega_0 = \Omega, \ \omega_1 = \Omega_0, \ d\omega_t = 0, \text{ for every } t \in [0, 1].$$

- (b) $\omega_t(p) = \Omega(p) + t(\Omega_0(p) - \Omega(p)) = \Omega(p) = \Omega_0(p)$ is non-degenerated.
 - (c) As the interval $[0, 1]$ is compact, there exists an open set $U_0 \subset U$ with $p \in U_0$ such that $\omega_t|_{U_0}$ is non-degenerate for every $t \in [0, 1]$.
 - (d) Being $\Omega_0 - \Omega$ closed, we can suppose that U_0 is a ball with center in p such that there exists $\alpha \in \Omega^1(U_0)$ with $\Omega_0 - \Omega = d\alpha$, by Poincaré Lemma.
4. Let $X_t \in \mathfrak{X}(U_0)$ be defined by $i(X_t)\omega_t = -\alpha$. This time-dependent vector field is well-defined because ω_t is non-degenerated. Observe that $X_t(p) = 0$ since $\alpha(p) = 0$.
5. Let $F_{t,s}$ be the time-dependent flux of X_t , satisfying $F_{t,s} \circ F_{s,r} = F_{t,r}$ and $F_{t,t} = I$, and we can consider it is defined in U_0 , or reduce it if necessary. Let $F_t = F_{t,0}$ the associated diffeomorphic flux with $F_{t+h} = F_{t+h,t} \circ F_{t,0}$. Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} F_t^* \omega_t &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{F_{t+h}^* \omega_t - F_t^* \omega_t}{h} + F_t^* (\Omega_0 - \Omega) \\
&= F_t^* (L(X_t) \omega_t) + F_t^* (\Omega_0 - \Omega) \\
&= F_t^* (d i(X_t) \omega_t + \Omega_0 - \Omega) = F_t^* (0) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

that is $F_t^* \omega_t$ is constant, hence $F_1^* \omega_1 = F_0^* \omega_0$. Then,

$$F_1^* \Omega_0 = F_1^* \omega_1 = F_0^* \omega_0 = \Omega,$$

and F_1 is the diffeomorphism transforming the constant symplectic form Ω_0 into our given symplectic form Ω . ■

Remark 2.10 For presymplectic manifolds there is a similar result (see, for instance, [100, 135]).

Finally, as a straightforward consequence of the definition, we have:

Proposition 2.11 *Every symplectic manifold is an oriented manifold.*

(Proof) In fact, using the symplectic form we can define the volume form $\Omega^n := \bigwedge^n \Omega \in \Omega^{2n}(M)$, which is called the *Liouville volume form* on M . ■

Some examples of symplectic manifolds:

1. The cotangent bundle T^*Q of a manifold Q is an example of symplectic manifold which, moreover, is the canonical model of these kinds of manifolds (see Theorem 3.16 in the Appendix A.1.2 for all the details). Here we do a short survey: We have a canonical 1-form $\Theta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$ which, in natural coordinates (q^i, p_i) of T^*Q , is $\Theta = p_i dq^i$. Then $\Omega = -d\Theta = dq^i \wedge dp_i$ is a symplectic form. Observe that the natural coordinates of T^*Q are Darboux coordinates for Ω .
2. \mathbb{R}^{2n} with the usual Cartesian coordinate system, $(x^1, \dots, x^n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$, and the 2-form $\Omega = dx^i \wedge dy_i$ is a symplectic manifold.
3. The 2-sphere $S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ as a Riemannian submanifold with the induced area 2-form is a symplectic manifold.
4. Another relevant example which will be used later is given by the following:

Proposition 2.12 *Let (M_1, Ω_1) , (M_2, Ω_2) be symplectic manifolds with $\dim M_1 = \dim M_2$, and $\pi_j: M_1 \times M_2 \rightarrow M_j$, $j = 1, 2$ be the natural projections. Then the product manifold $(M_1 \times M_2, \Omega_{12} = \pi_1^* \Omega_1 - \pi_2^* \Omega_2)$ is a symplectic manifold.*

2.1.4. Submanifolds of a symplectic manifold

As in the case of linear symplectic structures, in a symplectic manifold there exist some interesting kinds of submanifolds. They are associated to the idea of orthogonality in the tangent space at every point with respect to the induced linear symplectic structure at this point. Lagrangian submanifolds play an important role in the study of dynamics of Hamiltonian systems.

Definition 2.13 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold and $j: L \rightarrow M$ an immersion.*

1. L is an **isotropic immersed submanifold** of (M, Ω) if $T_p j(T_p L) \subset T_{j(p)} M$ is an isotropic subspace of $(T_{j(p)} M, \Omega_{j(p)})$ as a linear symplectic space, for every $p \in L$;
2. L is a **coisotropic immersed submanifold** of (M, Ω) if $T_p j(T_p L) \subset T_{j(p)} M$ is a coisotropic subspace of $(T_{j(p)} M, \Omega_{j(p)})$ as a linear symplectic space, for every $p \in L$;
3. L is a **symplectic immersed submanifold** of (M, Ω) if $T_p j(T_p L) \subset T_{j(p)} M$ is a symplectic subspace of $(T_{j(p)} M, \Omega_{j(p)})$ as a linear symplectic space, for every $p \in L$;

This same terminology is used for subbundles of TM over submanifolds of M .

Definition 2.14 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold and $L \subset M$ a submanifold. We say that L is a **Lagrangian submanifold** if it is isotropic and $\dim L = (1/2) \dim M$.*

Remark 2.15 • A submanifold $j: L \rightarrow M$ is isotropic if, and only if, $j^*\Omega = 0$.

- From the above study about linear Lagrangian subspaces, we have that, if $L \subset M$ is Lagrangian, then $\dim L = (1/2) \dim M$ and $(T_p L)^\perp = T_p L$.

Examples of Lagrangian submanifolds:

1. We know that \mathbb{R}^{2n} with elements denoted by $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and coordinates $(x, y) = (x^i, y_j)$ has a natural symplectic form given by $\omega = dx^i \wedge dy_i$. Examples of Lagrangian submanifolds are the following:

$$L_1 = \{(x, y) | x = 0\}, \quad L_2 = \{(x, y) | y = 0\}, \quad L_3 = \{(x, y) | x = y\}.$$

2. Taking the cotangent bundle of a manifold Q , we have a symplectic manifold, (T^*Q, ω) . Then Lagrangian submanifolds are the fibers of the bundle, that is $q = \text{constant}$, or the section zero, that is the manifold Q as a submanifold of T^*Q .
3. In the symplectic manifold (T^*Q, ω) , let $\alpha: Q \rightarrow T^*Q$ be a differential form and $N = \{(q, p) \in T^*Q \mid p = \alpha(q)\}$ the graph of α . Then N is a Lagrangian submanifold of T^*Q if, and only if, α is a closed form. In fact, we have

$$d\alpha = d(\alpha^*\theta) = \alpha^*d\theta = -\alpha^*\omega,$$

by the properties defining the canonical forms in T^*Q . You can see the corresponding section in the coming chapters for a detailed account of all this.

4. As a particular case, given a function $f: Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the graph of df is a Lagrangian submanifold of T^*Q .

2.1.5. Canonical isomorphism. Hamiltonian vector fields

The fact that a symplectic form is non-degenerated has important consequences. One of the main ones is the following: every differential form $\Omega \in \Omega^k(M)$ defines a linear map

$$\begin{aligned} b_\Omega : TM &\longrightarrow \wedge^{k-1} T^*M \\ (p, X_p) &\mapsto (p, i(X_p)\Omega_p) \end{aligned}$$

and its natural extension (which we denote with the same notation)

$$\begin{aligned} b_\Omega : \mathfrak{X}(M) &\longrightarrow \Omega^{k-1}(M) \\ X &\mapsto i(X)\Omega \end{aligned}$$

The inverse of this isomorphism is denoted $\sharp_\Omega := \flat_\Omega^{-1}$.

Given a differentiable manifold M and a form $\Omega \in \Omega^2(M)$; it is obvious that Ω is non-degenerated (symplectic) if, and only if, \flat_Ω is an isomorphism between TM and T^*M . Then:

Definition 2.16 *If (M, Ω) is a symplectic manifold, the map \flat_Ω is called the **canonical isomorphism** induced by Ω .*

Given a symplectic manifold (M, Ω) , every function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ has associated a unique vector field $X_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ by means of the map

$$\sharp_\Omega \circ d: C^\infty(M) \xrightarrow{d} \Omega^1(M) \xrightarrow{\sharp_\Omega} \mathfrak{X}(M) ;$$

that is, defined as $X_f := \sharp_\Omega(df)$ or, what is equivalent, given implicitly by

$$i(X_f)\Omega := df . \quad (2.1)$$

Remark 2.17 Observe that the map $\sharp_\Omega \circ d$ is not surjective. This means that, although the canonical isomorphism allows us to associate to every vector field X a differential 1-form $i(X)\Omega$, it is not always possible to associate a function since, in order to do this, the form would be exact necessarily; but that form is not even closed, in general. Neither is the map $\sharp_\Omega \circ d$ injective, since functions differing in an additive constant have the same vector field associated by this map.

Bearing in mind this comment, we define:

Definition 2.18 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold. A vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is a **(global) Hamiltonian vector field** if $i(X)\Omega$ is an exact form. In this case, the function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $i(X)\Omega = df$ is called a **(global) Hamiltonian function** of the vector field X .*

The set of global Hamiltonian vector fields in M is denoted $\mathfrak{X}_H(M)$.

Observe that, taking into account the comment before Equation (2.1), every function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is a Hamiltonian function of a global Hamiltonian vector field X_f .

Nevertheless, the requirement in this definition is too restrictive and, for the physical interest, it is sufficient to demand that:

Definition 2.19 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold. A vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is a **local Hamiltonian vector field** if $i(X)\Omega$ is a closed form.*

*In this case, for every point $p \in M$, Poincaré's Lemma assures the existence of a neighbourhood $U \subset M$, $p \in U$, and a function $f \in C^\infty(U)$ such that $i(X)\Omega = df$, in U . This function is called a **local Hamiltonian function** of the vector field X , in U .*

The set of local Hamiltonian vector fields in M is denoted $\mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$.

Remark 2.20 • Obviously $\mathfrak{X}_H(M) \subset \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$. Thus, all we state for local Hamiltonian vector fields holds also for global Hamiltonian vector fields.

- The above definitions are also valid for presymplectic manifolds. The difference is that, in this case, the map \flat_Ω is not an isomorphism because it is not injective, thus not exhaustive, and, hence, not every function in the manifold is associated to a Hamiltonian vector field.

Remember that a curve $c: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ is an *integral curve* of a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ if $\dot{c}(t) = (X \circ c)(t)$, for $t \in I$; where $\dot{c}(t)$ denotes the *derivative* of c at t (i.e, the *tangent vector* of the curve at $c(t)$). Let $\tilde{c}: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow TM$ the canonical lift of c to the tangent bundle TM ; that is, $\tilde{c}(t) = (c(t), \dot{c}(t))$, for $t \in I$ (see Definition A.10). Then, bearing in mind these definitions and equation (2.11), it is immediate to prove that:

Theorem 2.21 *A vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ in a symplectic manifold (M, Ω) , is the (local) Hamiltonian vector field corresponding to the function $f \in C^\infty(M)$, that is $X = X_f$, if, and only if, the integral curves $c: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ of X are the solutions to the equation*

$$i(\tilde{c})(\Omega \circ c) = df \circ c ; \quad (2.2)$$

Equation (2.2) is the **Hamilton equation** for the integral curves of X .

Remember that equation (2.2) is a straightforward consequence of equation (2.1), of the definitions of integral curve of a vector field, and of the contraction $i(\tilde{c})(\Omega \circ c)$ (see Remark A.11).

Local expressions: If $(U; x^i, y_i)$ is a symplectic chart, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} X_f|_U &= A^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + B_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} , \\ df|_U &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} dx^i + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} dy_i , \end{aligned}$$

then, for X_f , the solution to equation (2.1), we have that

$$0 = (i(X_f)\Omega - df)|_U = \left(-B_i - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i}\right) dx^i + \left(A^i - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i}\right) dy_i ;$$

that is,

$$A^i = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i}, \quad B_i = -\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} , \quad (2.3)$$

and then

$$X_f|_U = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}, \quad (2.4)$$

therefore, the integral curves $c(t) = (x^i(t), y_i(t))$ of X_f are the solutions to the system of first-order differential equations

$$\frac{dy_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i}(c(t)), \quad \frac{dx^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i}(c(t)). \quad (2.5)$$

Equations (2.3) and (2.5) are the local expression of equations (2.1) and (2.2) respectively, and are called the *Hamilton equations* of the (local) Hamiltonian vector field X_f and its integral curves, respectively.

An important result which is later used is:

Lemma 2.22 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold. For every point $p \in M$, there exist vector fields $X_j \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$, $j = 1, \dots, 2n$, such that $\{X_j(p)\}$ is a basis of $T_p M$ ³.*

(Proof) It is immediate using symplectic charts, since the local coordinate vector fields $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}$ are locally Hamiltonian vector fields associated to the Hamiltonian functions y_i and $-x^i$, respectively. ■

2.1.6. Invariant forms

The properties of Hamiltonian vector field are closely related with the properties of the symplectic form. Originally, this relationship was established by studying the so-called *integral invariants* of mechanics [72, 142, 157]. Next, we explore this relation. First, we introduce the following concept:

Definition 2.23 *Let M be a differentiable manifold and $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. A form $\beta \in \Omega^p(M)$ is an **absolute invariant form** for X if $L(X)\beta = 0$.*

Remark 2.24 Reminding the interpretation of the Lie derivative, to be an absolute invariant form for X means that β is invariant along the integral curves of X , and, if F_t denotes the flux of the vector field X , this is equivalent to demand that $F_t^* \beta = \beta$ for every t .

Now we can state the following result, which is usually taken as an alternative definition of Hamiltonian vector field:

³That is, local Hamiltonian vector field expand locally the tangent bundle of M .

Theorem 2.25 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic (resp. presymplectic) manifold. The vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is a local Hamiltonian vector field if, and only if, Ω is an absolute invariant form for X .*

(Proof) As Ω is a closed form, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} L(X)\Omega &= i(X)d\Omega + d i(X)\Omega = d i(X)\Omega = 0 \\ &\iff i(X)\Omega \in Z^1(M) \iff X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M) . \end{aligned}$$

■

Remark 2.26 This result relates the Hamiltonian vector fields with the fact that Ω is closed, although it is less precise than Definition 2.19, since it does not allow us to distinguish the global Hamiltonian vector fields inside the set of the local Hamiltonian ones.

From this theorem we deduce:

Theorem 2.27 (Liouville): Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold and Ω^n the Liouville volume form in M . Then $L(X)\Omega^n = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$.

(Proof) It is immediate since, as the Lie derivative is a derivation,

$$L(X)\Omega^n = n (L(X)\Omega) \wedge \overbrace{\Omega \wedge \dots \wedge \Omega}^{(n-1 \text{ times})} = 0 .$$

■

Proposition 2.28 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic (resp. presymplectic) manifold. The set $\mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$ is closed for the Lie bracket of vector fields and it is a real Lie algebra.*

(Proof) We have to prove that $[X, Y] \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$, for every $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$. Taking into account the relation

$$i([X, Y])\Omega = L(X) i(Y)\Omega - i(Y) L(X)\Omega$$

and Theorem 2.25, we have that, if $i(Y)\Omega|_U = df$, on an open set U , we have

$$i([X, Y])\Omega = L(X) i(Y)\Omega|_U = L(X)df = d L(X)f ,$$

that is, in U , the local Hamiltonian function for $[X, Y]$ is $L(X)f$.

Linearity, skew symmetry and the Jacobi identity of the Lie bracket complete the proof. ■

So, given a symplectic manifold (M, Ω) , we have proven that the symplectic and the Liouville volume forms are invariant by the local Hamiltonian vector fields; that is, by the groups of local diffeomorphisms generated by their fluxes. Actually, there is a more general property stating that some geometrical structures, such as those defined by a volume or a symplectic form on a differentiable manifold, are determined by their automorphism groups (i.e.; the groups of volume-preserving and symplectic diffeomorphisms), as it was shown by A. Banyaga [12–14].

Now we can try to characterize all the elements in $\Omega^k(M)$ with the above property. The answer to this problem was established by Lee Hwa Chung [229], who studied the uniqueness of the *integral invariant forms* by local transformations generated by the flux of the local Hamiltonian vector fields. Next, we state the geometrical version of this theorem and prove a partial result of it ⁴.

Theorem 2.29 (Lee Hwa Chung). Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold and $\alpha \in \Omega^k(M)$ an absolute invariant form for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$. Then:

1. If k is odd, that is $k = 2r - 1$ with $r \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\alpha = 0$.

2. If k is even, that is $k = 2r$ with $r \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\alpha = c \overbrace{\Omega \wedge \dots \wedge \Omega}^{(r \text{ times})} \equiv c \bigwedge^r \Omega$, where $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

(Proof) We prove the statement for the case $k \leq 2$, which is the only we need later (for the proof of the general case, see [238]).

As α is invariant under the action of every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$, we have that

$$0 = L(X)\alpha = d i(X)\alpha + i(X)d\alpha \iff d i(X)\alpha = -i(X)d\alpha. \quad (2.6)$$

Consider now $X, X' \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$ and $p \in M$; there exist $U \subset M$, $p \in U$, and $f, g \in C^\infty(U)$ such that $i(X)\Omega|_U = df$ and $i(X')\Omega|_U = dg$ (from now on we write $X|_U \equiv X_f$ y $X'|_U \equiv X_g$). The vector field X_h given in U as $X_h|_U = fX_g + gX_f$, is locally Hamiltonian and, in U , its local Hamiltonian function is $h = fg \in C^\infty(U)$, since:

$$i(X_h)\Omega|_U = i(fX_g + gX_f)\Omega = f i(X_g)\Omega + g i(X_f)\Omega = f dg + g df \equiv dh.$$

Thus we have

$$i(X_h)\alpha|_U = f i(X_g)\alpha + g i(X_f)\alpha,$$

⁴The original proof of this theorem is local, using Darboux coordinates.

and taking the exterior differential

$$d i(X_h)\alpha|_U = df \wedge i(X_g)\alpha + f d i(X_g)\alpha + dg \wedge i(X_f)\alpha + g d i(X_f)\alpha .$$

But, having in mind (2.6),

$$d i(X_h)\alpha = -i(X_f h) d\alpha|_U = -f i(X_g) d\alpha - g i(X_f) d\alpha = f d i(X_g)\alpha + g d i(X_f)\alpha ,$$

and comparing the last two equations, we conclude that

$$(df \wedge i(X_g)\alpha + dg \wedge i(X_f)\alpha)|_U = 0 . \quad (2.7)$$

Putting now $X_f = X_g$ in this expression, that is, $f = g$, we obtain that, for every $f \in C^\infty(U)$,

$$df \wedge i(X_f)\alpha|_U = 0 .$$

Now, we have two options:

1. If $k = 1$, then $i(X_f)\alpha \in C^\infty(M)$, and this last equality leads to $i(X_f)\alpha = 0$, for every $X_f \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$. Taking into account that, by Lemma 2.22, local Hamiltonian vector fields span locally TM, we obtain that $i(X)\alpha|_U = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$, and this implies necessarily that $\alpha|_U = 0$ (for every U) and then $\alpha = 0$.
2. If $k = 2$, we have to conclude:
 - either $i(X_f)\alpha = 0$,
 - or $i(X_f)\alpha|_U = \eta_{X_f} df$, where $\eta_{X_f} \in C^\infty(U)$.

In the first case, reasoning as in the above item, we conclude that $\alpha = 0$. In the second case, going to the expression (2.7), we obtain

$$(df \wedge dg \eta_{X_g} + dg \wedge df \eta_{X_f})|_U = 0 ;$$

that is

$$(df \wedge dg)(\eta_{X_g} - \eta_{X_f})|_U = 0 ,$$

for every $f, g \in C^\infty(U)$. Then it must be $\eta_{X_f} = \eta_{X_g} \equiv \eta$; that is, the function η does not depend on the local Hamiltonian vector field.

Therefore, for every $X_f \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$, we have that $i(X_f)\alpha|_U = \eta df$, with $\eta \in C^\infty(M)$, then

$$i(X_f)\alpha|_U = \eta df = \eta i(X_f)\Omega = i(X_f)(\eta\Omega) ;$$

but, taking into account Lemma 2.22, this equality leads to

$$i(X)(\alpha - \eta\Omega)|_U = 0 ,$$

for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, and we conclude that $\alpha = \eta \Omega$. Finally, as α is invariant for every local Hamiltonian vector field, we have that, for every $Y \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$,

$$0 = L(Y)\alpha = L(Y)(\eta\Omega) = (L(Y)\eta)\Omega + \eta L(Y)\Omega = (L(Y)\eta)\Omega ,$$

then $L(Y)\eta = 0$ and, by Lemma 2.22, this result holds for every $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$; therefore $\eta = c$ (constant) and thus $\alpha = c \Omega$. ■

- Remark 2.30** • So that, the absolute invariant forms for every local Hamiltonian vector field are multiple of exterior products of the symplectic form and hence they are of degree even necessarily. The above proof is for 2-forms only.
- A similar result can be proved also for presymplectic manifolds [172] (See also [144] for another interesting generalization of this theorem).

2.1.7. Poisson brackets

The symplectic form allows us to introduce certain well known operations in Analytical Mechanics in a natural way.

Definition 2.31 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold. The **Lagrange bracket** of two vector fields $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is the bilinear map*

$$\begin{aligned} (,) & : \mathfrak{X}(M) \times \mathfrak{X}(M) \longrightarrow C^\infty(M) \\ X, Y & \longmapsto (X, Y) \end{aligned}$$

defined by

$$(X, Y) := \Omega(X, Y) := i(Y) i(X) \Omega .$$

Remark 2.32 • This bracket is not an internal operation in $\mathfrak{X}(M)$, as is the *Lie bracket*, whose result is another vector field.

- From the skew symmetry of Ω we deduce immediately that the Lagrange bracket is also skew symmetric; that is, $(X, Y) = -(Y, X)$.

Taking into account (2.1), from this concept we obtain:

Definition 2.33 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold. The **Poisson bracket** of two functions $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$ is the Lagrange bracket of their associated Hamiltonian vector fields, that is, the bilinear map*

$$\begin{aligned} \{ , \} & : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) \longrightarrow C^\infty(M) \\ f, g & \longmapsto \{f, g\} \end{aligned}$$

defined by

$$\{f, g\} := \Omega(X_f, X_g) := i(X_g) i(X_f) \Omega .$$

Local expressions: If $(U; x^i, y_i)$ is a symplectic chart and

$$X|_U = A^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + B_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \quad , \quad Y|_U = C^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + D_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \quad ,$$

then

$$(X, Y)|_U = -B_i C^i + A^i D_i \quad .$$

Furthermore,

$$\{f, g\}|_U = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial y_i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^i} \quad .$$

In particular, for the canonical coordinates x^i, y_i we have that

$$\{x^i, x^j\} = 0 \quad , \quad \{y_i, y_j\} = 0 \quad , \quad \{x^i, y_j\} = \delta_j^i \quad .$$

The main properties of the Poisson bracket are collected in the following:

Proposition 2.34 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold and $\{, \}$ the associate Poisson bracket. Then*

1. $\{f, g\} = -\{g, f\}$ (skew symmetry).
2. $\{f, \{g, h\}\} + \{g, \{h, f\}\} + \{h, \{f, g\}\} = 0$ (Jacobi identity).
3. $\{f, g\} = L(X_g)f = -L(X_f)g$
4. $X_{\{f, g\}} = [X_g, X_f]$.

(Proof)

1. Immediate from the definition.
2. It is a consequence of Ω being closed.
3. Bearing in mind the Cartan formula for the Lie derivative:

$$\{f, g\} = i(X_g) i(X_f) \Omega = i(X_g) df = L(X_g)f \quad .$$

In an analogous way, we have that $\{f, g\} = -L(X_f)g$.

4. The statement is equivalent to $i([X_g, X_f])\Omega = d\{f, g\}$, and remembering Proposition 2.28 we obtain

$$i([X_g, X_f])\Omega = L(X_g) i(X_f)\Omega = L(X_g)df = dL(X_g)f = d\{f, g\} \quad . \quad (2.8)$$

■

Remark 2.35 • The first two properties establish that $C^\infty(M)$ with the Poisson bracket is a real Lie algebra.

- The third property allows us to give a geometric interpretation of the Poisson bracket between two functions: it measures the variation of one of them along the integral curves of the Hamiltonian vector field associated to the other.
- The fourth property tells us that the map $C^\infty(M) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$ given by $f \mapsto X_f$, is a Lie algebra (anti)–homomorphism between $(C^\infty(M), \{ , \})$ and $(\mathfrak{X}(M), [,])$.

Using again the canonical isomorphism, and taking into account (2.8), we can establish the following generalization:

Definition 2.36 Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold. The Poisson bracket of two 1-forms $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega^1(M)$ is the bilinear map

$$\begin{aligned} \{ , \} : \Omega^1(M) \times \Omega^1(M) &\longrightarrow \Omega^1(M) \\ \alpha, \beta &\longmapsto \{ \alpha, \beta \} \end{aligned}$$

defined by

$$\{ \alpha, \beta \} := i([X_\alpha, X_\beta])\Omega ,$$

where $X_\alpha = \sharp_\Omega(\alpha)$ and $X_\beta = \sharp_\Omega(\beta)$.

It is evident that:

Proposition 2.37 Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic manifold. Then, for every $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$,

$$d\{f, g\} = -\{df, dg\} .$$

The properties of the Poisson bracket of 1-forms are obviously analogous to those of the Poisson bracket of functions.

2.1.8. Canonical transformations and symplectomorphisms

In the previous section we have seen how the properties of the symplectic structure allow us to introduce the concept of local Hamiltonian vector field and how the integral curves of these fields are obtained as solutions to the Hamilton equations. We will see also that this kind of vector fields is suitable to describe dynamical systems. This means that there is a deep relation between the dynamics of physical systems and the geometric properties of their phase spaces.

In this way, from a dynamical perspective, it is reasonable to suppose that the more relevant transformations among dynamical systems are those preserving the dynamical equations which, in our case, means geometrically that they transform Hamiltonian vector fields into Hamiltonian vector fields. Consequently, we define:

Definition 2.38 Let (M_1, Ω_1) and (M_2, Ω_2) be symplectic manifolds and $\Phi : M_1 \longrightarrow M_2$ a diffeomorphism. We say that Φ is a **canonical transformation** if it maps local Hamiltonian vector fields into local Hamiltonian vector fields biunivocally; that is, $\Phi_*(\mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_1)) = \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_2)$.

Concerning the geometrical aspects, the more interesting transformations between symplectic manifolds are the following:

Definition 2.39 Let (M_1, Ω_1) and (M_2, Ω_2) be symplectic manifolds and $\Phi : M_1 \longrightarrow M_2$ a diffeomorphism. We say that Φ is a **symplectomorphism** (or also a **symplectic transformation**) if it preserves their symplectic structures; that is, $\Phi^*\Omega_2 = \Omega_1$.

As Hamiltonian vector fields are defined using the symplectic form, we can expect that there is some relation between both kinds of transformations. In fact, Lee Hwa Chung's Theorem allows us to prove that both concepts are essentially the same:

Theorem 2.40 Let (M_1, Ω_1) and (M_2, Ω_2) be symplectic manifolds and $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(M_1, M_2)$. The necessary and sufficient condition for Φ to be a canonical transformation is that $\Phi^*\Omega_2 = c\Omega_1$, with $c \in \mathbf{R}$.

(Proof) Suppose that Φ is a canonical transformation. For every $X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_1)$, we have that $X_2 = \Phi_*X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_2)$ and, as we know from Theorem 2.25, $L(X_2)\Omega_2 = 0$, hence

$$0 = \Phi^*(L(X_2)\Omega_2) = L(\Phi_*^{-1}X_2)(\Phi^*\Omega_2) = L(X_1)(\Phi^*\Omega_2) .$$

But this means that $\Phi^*\Omega_2$ is invariant by any element of $\mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_1)$ and, from Lee Hwa Chung's Theorem, we conclude that $\Phi^*\Omega_2 = c\Omega_1$, $c \in \mathbf{R}$ and Φ is a symplectomorphism.

Conversely, suppose that Φ is a symplectomorphism, $\Phi^*\Omega_2 = c\Omega_1$. Given $X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_1)$ we have that $L(X_1)\Omega_1 = 0$. Then

$$0 = \Phi^{*-1}(L(X_1)\Omega_1) = L(\Phi_*X_1)(\Phi^{*-1}\Omega_1) = \frac{1}{c}L(\Phi_*X_1)\Omega_2 ;$$

hence, by Theorem 2.25, $\Phi_*X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_2)$, that is Ω_2 is invariant by every element of $\mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_2)$, and Φ is a canonical transformation. ■

Remark 2.41 • The constant c that appears in this last theorem is called the *valence* of the canonical transformation. It is usual to consider transformations with $c = 1$ (that is, symplectomorphisms), and they are called *univalent* or *restricted canonical transformations*. Another terminology is also used, calling canonical transformations to those with valence $c = 1$, and then call *generalized canonical transformations* to the rest [298].

- Observe that a diffeomorphism is an *univalent canonical transformation* if, and only if, it is a *symplectomorphism*.
- All these definitions and properties are also valid for presymplectic manifolds. In this case we talk about *presymplectomorphisms* (the study of this case is done in [24, 58, 59]).

Another fundamental result is:

Proposition 2.42 *Let (M, Ω) be a symplectic (resp. presymplectic) manifold. A vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is a local Hamiltonian vector field if, and only if, its flux is a group of local symplectomorphisms (resp. local presymplectomorphisms).*

(Proof) Let F_t be the flux of a vector field X . We know that $L(X)\Omega = 0$ is equivalent to $F_t^*\Omega = \Omega$, hence the result follows directly. ■

Finally, it is easy to prove that:

Proposition 2.43 *The set of canonical transformations of a symplectic (resp. presymplectic) manifold (M, Ω) , with the operation of composition, is a group.*

The group of the symplectomorphisms (resp. presymplectomorphisms) of a symplectic (resp. presymplectic) manifold is denoted by $\mathbf{Sp}(M, \Omega)$, and it has a crucial relevance in the study of *symmetries* of dynamical systems.

2.1.9. Characterization of canonical transformations

The last theorem has some important corollaries, which give alternative characterizations for a transformation to be canonical (or a symplectomorphism). The most important of them uses the Poisson bracket of functions. Previously, we have to specify how the Hamiltonian functions associated to Hamiltonian vector fields are transformed under these kinds of transformations.

Proposition 2.44 *Let (M_1, Ω_1) and (M_2, Ω_2) be symplectic manifolds and $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(M_1, M_2)$ a canonical transformation of valence c . If $X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_1)$, let $X_2 := \Phi_* X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_2)$, and $h_1 \in C^\infty(U_1)$ and $h_2 \in C^\infty(U_2)$ local Hamiltonian functions of X_1 and X_2 on $U_1 \subset M_1$ and $U_2 := \Phi(U_1) \subset M_2$, respectively. Then*

$$ch_1 = \Phi^* h_2 + k, \quad k \in \mathbf{R}.$$

(Proof) Following the previous theorem, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d(\Phi^{*-1}h_1) &= \Phi^{*-1}dh_1 = \Phi^{*-1}(i(X_1)\Omega_1)|_{U_1} \\ &= i(\Phi_*X_1)(\Phi^{*-1}\Omega_1)|_{\Phi(U_1)} = \frac{1}{c}i(X_2)\Omega_2|_{U_2} = \frac{1}{c}dh_2 = d\left(\frac{1}{c}h_2\right), \end{aligned}$$

that is $d(ch_1) = d(\Phi^*h_2)$, and the result follows. ■

Bearing this in mind, we state:

Theorem 2.45 *Let (M_1, Ω_1) and (M_2, Ω_2) be symplectic manifolds. A diffeomorphism $\Phi : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is a canonical transformation of valence c if, and only if*

$$\Phi^*\{f_2, g_2\} = \frac{1}{c}\{\Phi^*f_2, \Phi^*g_2\}.$$

for every $f_2, g_2 \in C^\infty(M_2)$,

(Proof) Let $f_2, g_2 \in C^\infty(M_2)$ and $X_{f_2}, X_{g_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_h(M_2)$ be the corresponding Hamiltonian vector fields.

If Φ is a canonical transformation, then $\Phi_*^{-1}X_{g_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_h(M_1)$ and, by the above proposition we know that $i(\Phi_*^{-1}X_{g_2})\Omega_1 = d(\frac{1}{c}\Phi^*g_2)$; that is, $\Phi_*^{-1}X_{g_2} = X_{\frac{1}{c}\Phi^*g_2}$, and then

$$\Phi^*\{f_2, g_2\} = \Phi^*(L(X_{g_2})f_2) = L(\Phi_*^{-1}X_{g_2})\Phi^*f_2 = L(X_{\frac{1}{c}\Phi^*g_2})\Phi^*f_2 = \frac{1}{c}\{\Phi^*f_2, \Phi^*g_2\}.$$

Conversely, if the condition holds, first we have that, given $f_2, g_2 \in C^\infty(M_2)$,

$$\Phi^*\{f_2, g_2\} = L(\Phi_*^{-1}X_{g_2})\Phi^*f_2,$$

and, on the other hand,

$$\frac{1}{c}\{\Phi^*f_2, \Phi^*g_2\} = L(X_{\frac{1}{c}\Phi^*g_2})\Phi^*f_2;$$

hence, combining these two last equalities,

$$\Phi_*^{-1}X_{g_2} = X_{\frac{1}{c}\Phi^*g_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_1); \forall X_{g_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M_2).$$

Therefore, Φ is a canonical transformation with valence c as a consequence of Lee Hwa Chung's Theorem. ■

Remark 2.46 This result states that a transformation is canonical if, and only if, the Poisson bracket is invariant, up to a multiplicative constant, by its action. Really, this is an alternative way to say that the symplectic structure is invariant by the transformation.

From the local point of view, if $\Phi : M_1 \longrightarrow M_2$ is a canonical transformation with valence $c = 1$, and we have Darboux coordinates (x^i, y_i) in M_1 and $(\tilde{x}^i, \tilde{y}_i)$ in M_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\{\Phi^* \tilde{x}^i, \Phi^* \tilde{x}^j\} &= \Phi^* \{\tilde{x}^i, \tilde{x}^j\} , \\ \{\Phi^* \tilde{y}_i, \Phi^* \tilde{y}_j\} &= \Phi^* \{\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_j\} , \\ \{\Phi^* \tilde{y}_i, \Phi^* \tilde{x}^j\} &= \Phi^* \{\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{x}^j\} ,\end{aligned}$$

that is: $(\Phi^* \tilde{x}^i, \Phi^* \tilde{y}_i)$ is a symplectic coordinate system in M_1 if, and only if, $(\tilde{x}^i, \tilde{y}_i)$ is a symplectic coordinate system in M_2 .

2.1.10. Generating functions of canonical transformations

Another characterization of canonical transformations is by means of the so called *generating functions*.

Proposition 2.47 *Let (M_1, Ω_1) and (M_2, Ω_2) be symplectic manifolds and $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(M_1, M_2)$. Let $U_1 \subset M_1$ and $U_2 := \Phi(U_1) \subset M_2$, and $\Theta_i \in \Omega^1(U_i)$ such that $\Omega_i|_{U_i} = d\Theta_i$, ($i = 1, 2$). Then Φ is a canonical transformation, with valence c , if, and only if, there exists a function $F_1 \in C^\infty(U_1)$ such that*

$$(\Phi^* \Theta_2 - c\Theta_1 - dF_1)|_{U_1} = 0 ,$$

or, equivalently, that there exists a function $F_2 \in C^\infty(U_2)$ such that

$$(\Phi^{*-1} \Theta_1 - \frac{1}{c} \Theta_2 - dF_2)|_{U_2} = 0 .$$

These functions F_1, F_2 are called **(Poincaré) generating functions** of the canonical transformation, and the relation between them is $F_1 = c\Phi^* F_2 + k$, $k \in \mathbf{R}$.

(Proof) From Theorem 2.40, Φ is a canonical transformation if, and only if,

$$0 = (\Phi^* \Omega_2 - c\Omega_1)|_{U_1} = d(\Phi^* \Theta_2 - \Theta_1) ,$$

then Poincaré's Lemma leads to the result.

The statement concerning F_2 is obtained in an analogous way, and comparing both results we arrive to the relation between these functions.

■

In classical texts of Mechanics (see, for example, [157, 171, 223]) a more general concept of generating function, which include the above ones, is studied. In the geometrical context, they are introduced as follows [1] (without loss of generality, we will restrict ourselves to the case $c = 1$; that is, symplectomorphisms or univalent canonical transformations).

First, taking into account Proposition 2.12, we have that:

Proposition 2.48 *Let (M_1, Ω_1) , (M_2, Ω_2) be symplectic manifolds with $\dim M_1 = \dim M_2$, $\Phi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ a diffeomorphism, and $j: \text{graph } \Phi \hookrightarrow M_1 \times M_2$ the natural embedding.*

The map Φ is a symplectomorphism if, and only if, $\text{graph } \Phi$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of the symplectic manifold $(M_1 \times M_2, \Omega_{12} := \pi_1^ \Omega_1 - \pi_2^* \Omega_2)$.*

(Proof) Remember that *Lagrangian submanifolds* of a symplectic manifold (\mathcal{M}, Ω) are *maximal isotropic submanifolds* $j: S \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ or, equivalently, such that S verify that $\dim S = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathcal{M}$ and $j^* \Omega = 0$. Obviously $\dim(\text{graph } \Phi) = \frac{1}{2} \dim(M_1 \times M_2)$, and as $\Phi^* \Omega_2 = \Omega_1$, the other condition holds trivially. ■

If $\Omega_j = -d\theta_j$, $j = 1, 2$, and Θ_j are local symplectic potentials for Ω_j ; being $\text{graph } \Phi$ a Lagrangian submanifold we have

$$0 = j^*(\pi_1^* \Omega_1 - \pi_2^* \Omega_2) = dj^*(\pi_2^* \Theta_2 - \pi_1^* \Theta_1) \quad (2.9)$$

which, given a point in $\text{graph } \Phi$, is locally equivalent to

$$j^*(\pi_2^* \Theta_2 - \pi_1^* \Theta_1)|_W = -d\mathcal{S} . \quad (2.10)$$

where \mathcal{S} is a function defined in an open neighbourhood of the given point, $W \subset \text{graph } \Phi$. This function depends on the choice of Θ_1 and Θ_2 .

Definition 2.49 \mathcal{S} is called a **Weinstein generating function** of the Lagrangian submanifold $\text{graph } \Phi$ and hence of the symplectomorphism Φ .

If $(U_1; x^i, y_i)$, $(U_2; \tilde{x}^i, \tilde{y}_i)$ are Darboux charts such that $W \subset U_1 \times U_2$, local coordinates in W can be chosen in several ways. This leads to six different possible choices for \mathcal{S} . Thus, for instance, if $(W; x^i, \tilde{x}^i)$ is a chart, then (2.10) gives the symplectomorphism explicitly as

$$\tilde{y}_i d\tilde{x}^i - y_i dx^i = -d\mathcal{S}(x, \tilde{x}) \iff \tilde{y}_i = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial \tilde{x}^i}(x, \tilde{x}) , y_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial x^i}(x, \tilde{x}) .$$

Of course, the *Poincaré generating functions* are two particular choices of *Weinstein generating functions*.

2.2. Hamiltonian dynamical systems

Once the foundations of symplectic geometry are established, we are ready to use it for describing the autonomous Hamiltonian dynamical systems. As we will see in the next chapter, this geometric formulation includes, as particular cases, the Lagrangian and the canonical Hamiltonian formalisms of variational dynamical systems; that is, those which are described by Lagrangian functions.

2.2.1. Hamiltonian systems. Hamilton equations

Some of the authors who developed geometric mechanics chose an axiomatic manner in their exposition (see, for instance, [312]). Following their ideas, first, we state the postulates for the geometric study of autonomous Hamiltonian dynamical systems.

The first postulate concerns the physical states:

Postulate 2.50 (First Postulate of Hamiltonian mechanics): The state space, or phase space, of a dynamical system is a differentiable manifold M endowed with a closed form $\Omega \in Z^2(M)$ such that:

- If Ω is nondegenerate; that is *symplectic*, the system is *regular* and the dimension of M is twice the number of degrees of freedom of the system. In this case, every point of this manifold represents a physical state of the system.
- If Ω is degenerate, that is *presymplectic*, the system is *singular* (and the manifold M is not even-dimensional necessarily).

The second Postulate refers to the *observables*, that is, the *physical magnitudes*:

Postulate 2.51 (Second Postulate of Hamiltonian mechanics): The observables or physical magnitudes of a dynamical system are functions of $C^\infty(M)$.

The result of the measure of an observable is the value that the function which represents it takes at a point in the phase space M (that is, in a given state, according to the first postulate).

If, according to the Postulate 2.50, a (symplectic or presymplectic) manifold (M, Ω) constitutes the phase space of a dynamical system, there is a very natural way of introducing the dynamics. Thus, we state:

Postulate 2.52 (Third Postulate of Hamiltonian mechanics): The dynamics of a dynamical system is given by a closed 1-form $\alpha \in Z^1(M)$ which is called the *Hamiltonian 1-form* of the system ⁵.

⁵In some cases, the 2-form Ω can also contain dynamical information as it happens, for instance, in the Lagrangian formalism of the Lagrangian systems (see Chapter 3).

And, finally, the dynamical equations are stated in:

Postulate 2.53 (Fourth Postulate of Hamiltonian mechanics): The dynamical trajectories of the system are the integral curves of a vector field $X_\alpha \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, if it exists, associated with the form α by the map \flat_Ω ; that is, of the vector field solution to the equation

$$i(X_\alpha)\Omega = \alpha . \quad (2.11)$$

Then, the integral curves $c: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ of X_α are solutions to the equation

$$i(\tilde{c})(\Omega \circ c) = \alpha \circ c . \quad (2.12)$$

The vector field X_α is called a (local or global) **Hamiltonian vector field** of the Hamiltonian system, and equations (2.11) and (2.12) are the **Hamilton equation** for X_α and its integral curves.

These equations can be obtained from a variational principle called the *minimal action Principle of Hamilton–Jacobi*⁶.

Then, we define:

Definition 2.54 1. A **regular or symplectic Hamiltonian dynamical system** is a triple (M, Ω, α) , where (M, Ω) is a symplectic manifold and $\alpha \in Z^1(M)$ is the Hamiltonian 1-form of the system. If (M, Ω) is a presymplectic manifold, then (M, Ω, α) is said to be a **singular or presymplectic Hamiltonian dynamical system**.

2. By Poincaré’s Lemma, for every $m \in M$, there exists $U \subset M$, with $m \in U$, and $h \in C^\infty(U)$, such that $\alpha|_U = dh$, which is called a **local Hamiltonian function** of the system, and the abovementioned triple is said to be a **local Hamiltonian system**.

If α is an exact form, then there exist $h \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $\alpha = dh$, which is called a **global Hamiltonian function** of the system, and the triple (M, Ω, h) is said to be a **global Hamiltonian system**.

Given a Hamiltonian dynamical system (M, Ω, α) , the **Hamiltonian problem** posed by the system consists in finding a vector field $X_\alpha \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ verifying equations (2.11).

For the case of regular systems, we have

Proposition 2.55 If (M, Ω, α) is a regular Hamiltonian system, then there exists a unique vector field $X_\alpha \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ which is a solution to equation (2.11)

⁶As we will see in Section 3.6.4.

(Proof) If the system is regular, b_Ω is the canonical isomorphism of the symplectic manifold (M, Ω) and the existence and uniqueness of X_α is assured. ■

Remark 2.56 If (M, Ω, α) is a presymplectic Hamiltonian system, the Hamilton equations are not necessarily compatible everywhere on M and we need to look for the maximal subset of M where there exists solution. This subset is obtained by a procedure called the *constraint algorithm* which, in the most favourable cases, leads to find a *final constraint submanifold* $P_f \hookrightarrow M$, where there are Hamiltonian vector fields $X_\alpha \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, tangent to P_f , which are solutions to the Hamilton equations on P_f ; although these vector fields solution are not necessarily unique. Functions vanishing on the final constraint submanifold are called *constraints*. Singular (presymplectic) Hamiltonian systems and the corresponding constraint algorithms have been widely studied in the literature. The interested reader can see, for instance, [55, 58, 141, 176, 186, 199, 206, 243, 265, 309] and others papers cited therein. Apart from some examples in the problems, in this book we only work with regular Hamiltonian systems.

Local expressions: If (M, Ω, α) is a regular Hamiltonian system, in a symplectic chart $(U; x^i, y_i)$ of M with $\alpha = dh$, if $X|_U = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + g_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ then, according to (2.4), we have that

$$X_\alpha|_U = \frac{\partial h}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial h}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i},$$

and the integral curves $c(t) = (x^i(t), y_i(t))$ of X_α are the solution to the Hamilton equations (2.2) whose local expression is

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial y_i}(c(t)), \quad \frac{dy_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial h}{\partial x^i}(c(t)).$$

- Remark 2.57**
- In a Hamiltonian dynamical system, the physical observable represented by the Hamiltonian function is associated with the energy of the system.
 - This presentation of dynamical systems is called *Hamiltonian formalism of Mechanics* because the dynamical trajectories are given by the integral curves of a Hamiltonian vector field.

2.3. Symmetries of regular Hamiltonian systems

In this section we introduce the ideas of *constants of motion*, or *conserved quantities*, and the *symmetries* of a dynamical system and the relationship between both notions. Noether's theorem will be proved and actions of Lie group on Hamiltonian systems together with reduction theory will be introduced and developed in detail.

The adequate way of doing this study is by means of the theory of *actions of Lie groups* on symplectic and presymplectic manifolds (see, for instance, [1, 100, 148, 168, 196, 235, 245, 275]). Within this theory, the associated concept of *momentum map* plays a crucial role in order to introduce conserved quantities and the subsequent *Marsden–Weinstein reduction theorem*. Although this theorem was initially stated for regular autonomous Hamiltonian systems, the Marsden–Weinstein technique has been applied and generalized to many different situations. For instance, for time-dependent regular Hamiltonian systems (with regular values of the momentum map) in the framework of cosymplectic manifolds [3] and for autonomous and nonautonomous Hamiltonian systems with singular values of the momentum map [6, 132, 305], also for singular systems in the autonomous (presymplectic) case [46, 148] and in the nonautonomous case [128, 207]. Further generalizations are reduction on Poisson and Jacobi manifolds [56, 183, 239, 249, 269, 270], on Lie algebroids [69, 70], on cotangent bundles of Lie groups [253], Lagrangian reduction [79, 254], Euler–Poincaré reduction [73, 78], Routh reduction for regular and singular Lagrangians [75, 225], reduction of nonholonomic systems [23, 32, 50, 242], reduction of optimal control systems [31, 256, 318, 325], and in the context of Dirac structures and implicit Hamiltonian systems [27, 259]. Finally, although symmetries and conservation laws in field theories have been studied in several geometric frameworks (see, for instance, [125, 173, 195, 246, 297] and the references quoted therein), the problem of reduction by symmetries of classical field theories has been solved only for particular situations such as Lagrangian and Poisson reduction [76], Euler–Poincaré reduction in principal fiber bundles [74, 77], reduction in multisymplectic and poly(co)symplectic manifolds [136, 138, 150, 247], and for discrete field theories [327]. Of course, this list of references is far from being complete.

To develop our study we follow approximately the historical order: we begin by introducing the basic notions about conserved quantities and symmetries, paying particular attention to the case of *Noether symmetries* and *Noether's theorem*. The primitive ideas were the constants of motion, the linear momentum and the angular momentum, and their relation with symmetries as global transformation of the space of positions of a system, and after that the infinitesimal symmetries and the Noether theorem. The modern approach comes from the action of Lie groups on the space

of states of the system and the reduction theory, hence we review this theory, the notions of comomentum and momentum maps and the subsequent *Marsden–Weinstein reduction theorem*. We consider only the case of regular dynamical systems (although some results can be generalized to the singular case).

Throughout this section (M, Ω, α) will be a regular Hamiltonian dynamical system and $\alpha = dh$, where the Hamiltonian function h is locally or globally defined. Usually we will write (M, Ω, h) . Then, $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$ denotes the dynamical vector field solution to the system.

2.3.1. Conserved quantities (constants of motion)

Let (M, Ω, h) a regular Hamiltonian system and $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$ the dynamical vector field.

The dynamical evolution of an observable which is represented by a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$, is the variation of this function along the integral curves $c(t) = (q^i(t), y_i(t))$ of the vector field X_h ; that is, is given by

$$\frac{d(f \circ c)(t)}{dt} = ((L(X_h)f) \circ c)(t) = (X_h(f) \circ c)(t) ,$$

and, bearing in mind the definition of Poisson bracket, it can be written as

$$\frac{d(f \circ c)}{dt} = \{f, h\} \circ c .$$

Or, in a symplectic chart $(U; x^i, y_i)$ of M ,

$$L(X_h)f|_U = X_h(f)|_U = \frac{\partial h}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial h}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} .$$

Then, we define:

Definition 2.58 A function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is a *conserved quantity* or a *constant of motion* if

$$L(X_h)f = 0 ;$$

that is, it is invariant by the dynamical vector field.

To say that $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is a conserved quantity of the system (M, Ω, h) means the following: if $p \in M$ and X_h is the Hamiltonian vector field of the system, let $c: (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ be the integral curve of X_h with initial condition $c(0) = p$. Then, if f is a conserved quantity, we have that $f(c(t)) = f(p)$, for every $t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$; that is, the image of c by f is contained in $S_p = \{q \in M \mid f(q) = f(p)\}$, the level surface of f passing through p .

One of the fundamental properties of the autonomous Hamiltonian dynamical systems is the *conservation of the Hamiltonian*. Remember that for the physical systems, the Hamiltonian is the energy of the system. Now, we can state this result in a geometric way:

Proposition 2.59 (Conservation of energy): Let (M, Ω, h) be a Hamiltonian system. The (local or global) Hamiltonian function h is a conserved quantity.

(Proof) It is immediate since, as Ω is skew symmetric, we have

$$L(X_h)h = i(X_h)dh = \Omega(X_h, X_h) = 0 .$$

■

Remark 2.60 We have seen how the fundamental properties of the symplectic form are essential to describe geometrically physical systems: the *non degeneracy* allows us to assure the existence (and uniqueness) of the dynamical Hamiltonian vector field, and hence, to determine the dynamical evolution of the system, and from skew symmetry and the fact to be closed we obtain the conservation of the energy.

2.3.2. Dynamical symmetries

Let (M, Ω, h) be a regular Hamiltonian system and $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}_h(M)$ the dynamical vector field.

When talking about symmetries, it is usual to refer to the idea that “a symmetry of a dynamical system lets invariant the solutions to the differential equations describing the dynamics of the system”. In this way we define:

Definition 2.61 A *dynamical symmetry* of the Hamiltonian dynamical system (M, Ω, h) is a diffeomorphism $\Phi: M \rightarrow M$ satisfying that,

$$\Phi_* X_h = X_h .$$

That is, the dynamical vector field X_h is invariant by Φ . Observe that if Φ is a dynamical symmetry, then so is Φ^{-1} .

Let $c: (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ be an integral curve of X_h , that is $\dot{c} = X_h \circ c$, then $\dot{c} = X_h \circ c = \Phi_* X_h \circ c$. If X_h is invariant by Φ we have:

$$X_h \circ (\Phi \circ c) = \Phi_* X_h \circ \Phi \circ c = T\Phi \circ X_h \circ \Phi^{-1} \circ \Phi \circ c = T\Phi \circ X_h \circ c = T\Phi \circ \dot{c} = \overline{\dot{\Phi \circ c}}$$

hence Φ transforms integral curves of X_h into integral curves of X_h . The converse is also true; that is: if Φ transforms integral curves of X_h into integral curves of X_h then

Φ lets invariant the vector field X_h . This is another equivalent version of a dynamical symmetry.

The diffeomorphism Φ can be considered as locally generated by a vector field, by means of the local group of diffeomorphisms generated by its flux. In this way, the above definition leads to the infinitesimal version of symmetries:

Definition 2.62 *An **infinitesimal dynamical symmetry** of a Hamiltonian system (M, Ω, h) is a vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that the local diffeomorphisms generated by its flux are dynamical symmetries of the system; that is,*

$$L(Y)X_h = [Y, X_h] = 0 . \quad (2.13)$$

Recall that this definition is equivalent to say that the flux of Y is made of dynamical symmetries of X_h . Thus, if Φ_t is the flux of Y and c is an integral curve of X_h , the $\Phi_t \circ c$ is also an integral curve of X_h .

Remark 2.63 In the above definition, sometimes the condition (2.13) is relaxed by setting

$$[Y, X_h] = gX_h , \quad g \in C^\infty(M) , \quad (2.14)$$

(and the original condition is recovered taking $g = 0$). This allows us to consider also as symmetries the reparametrizations of the integral curves of the dynamical vector field.

The infinitesimal dynamical symmetries of (M, Ω, h) have a natural structure of real Lie algebra. Clearly they are closed by real linear combinations and we have the following proposition:

Proposition 2.64 *If $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ are infinitesimal dynamical symmetries, then $[Y_1, Y_2]$ is an infinitesimal dynamical symmetry.*

(Proof) Using the Jacobi identity, we have

$$[[Y_1, Y_2], X_h] = [Y_2, [X_h, Y_1]] + [Y_1, [Y_2, X_h]] = 0 .$$

■

A first result relating symmetries with conserved quantities is:

Proposition 2.65 *1. Let $\Phi: M \rightarrow M$ be a dynamical symmetry of (M, Ω, h) . If $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is a constant of motion of the system, then Φ^*f is also a conserved quantity.*

2. Let $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ be an infinitesimal dynamical symmetry of (M, Ω, h) . If $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is a constant of motion of the system, then $L(Y)f$ is also a conserved quantity.

(Proof)

1. Directly we have

$$L(X_h)(\Phi^* f) = \Phi^*(L(\Phi_* X_h)f) = 0 .$$

2. The same proof holds taking the flux Φ_t of Y as a dynamical symmetry. Alternatively,

$$\begin{aligned} L(X_h) L(Y)f &= i(X_h) d L(Y)f = i(X_h) L(Y) df \\ &= L(Y) i(X_h) df - i([Y, X_h]) df = L(Y) L(X_h)f = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

■

2.3.3. Noether symmetries. Noether Theorem

In the above study of symmetries of the Hamiltonian system $(M, \Omega, \alpha = dh)$ we have not used the specific structure of the system. In fact, the only element we have considered is the dynamical vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. No mention have been made to the symplectic structure of M , the Hamiltonian function h , or the Hamiltonian form α . We have studied symmetries of the dynamical vector field independently of its origin.

If we consider the other elements defining the system, we arrive to different types of dynamical symmetries depending on whether they leave invariant the geometric structure; that is, the symplectic form or the dynamical elements (i.e., the Hamiltonian function). For a more complete analysis of all these kinds of symmetries and how they generate conserved quantities, see, for instance, [80, 81, 295, 299, 300].

The following kind of symmetries has a special relevance as generators of constants of motion:

Definition 2.66 A diffeomorphism $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ is a **Noether symmetry** of the Hamiltonian system (M, Ω, h) if:

1. Φ is a symplectomorphism in M : that is, $\Phi^* \Omega = \Omega$.
2. Φ lets the dynamics invariant ; that is, $\Phi^* h = h$.

Remark 2.67 The second condition can also be expressed in the form $\Phi^*h = h + c$ (with $c \in \mathbb{R}$). This means that it transforms a Hamiltonian function into another Hamiltonian function of the same dynamical vector field X_h . More generically, if $\alpha = dh$ is the Hamiltonian 1-form, this is equivalent to say that $\Phi^*\alpha = \alpha$.

Definition 2.68 A vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is an *infinitesimal Noether symmetry* of the system if the local diffeomorphisms generated by the flux of Y are dynamical symmetries of the system; that is,

1. $L(Y)\Omega = 0$; that is, $Y \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$.
2. $L(Y)h = 0$.

Remark 2.69 In the infinitesimal case, as every infinitesimal Noether symmetry $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is a locally Hamiltonian vector field, by the first item of the definition, we have that, for every $p \in M$, there exists an open set $U_p \ni p$ and $f_Y \in C^\infty(U_p)$ such that $i(Y)\Omega = df_Y$, in U_p . The local Hamiltonian f is unique, up to the sum of constant functions.

A first relevant result is:

Proposition 2.70 1. Every Noether symmetry of (M, Ω, h) is a dynamical symmetry.

2. Every infinitesimal Noether symmetry of (M, Ω, h) is an infinitesimal dynamical symmetry.

(Proof)

1. Let $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ be a Noether symmetry. If $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is a solution to the dynamical equations, then $0 = i(X_h)\Omega - dh$, and as $\Phi^*\Omega = \Omega$ and $\Phi^*h = h$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Phi^*(i(X_h)\Omega - dh) = i(\Phi_*^{-1}X_h)\Phi^*\Omega - \Phi^*dh \\ &= i(\Phi_*^{-1}X_h)\Omega - dh = i(\Phi_*^{-1}X_h)\Omega - dh ; \end{aligned}$$

but as the system regular, the vector field solution is unique, then $\Phi_*^{-1}X_h = X_h$, and the result holds.

2. If $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is an infinitesimal Noether symmetry, then $Y \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$ and $L(Y)h = 0$, hence

$$i([Y, X_h])\Omega = L(Y)i(X_h)\Omega - i(X_h)L(Y)\Omega = L(Y)dh = dL(Y)h = 0 ,$$

but being Ω nondegenerated, this implies that $[Y, X_h] = 0$, and therefore Y is an infinitesimal dynamical symmetry.

■

Clearly, the set of infinitesimal Noether symmetries is a real vector space. Moreover, it is easy to prove that it is real Lie algebra:

Proposition 2.71 *If $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ are infinitesimal Noether symmetries, then $[Y_1, Y_2]$ is also an infinitesimal Noether symmetry.*

(Proof) First we have that $L([Y_1, Y_2])\Omega = 0$, since $[Y_1, Y_2] \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$, because $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} L([Y_1, Y_2])h &= i([Y_1, Y_2])dh = L(Y_1)i(Y_2)dh - i(Y_2)L(Y_1)dh \\ &= L(Y_1)L(Y_2)h - i(Y_2)dL(Y_1)h = 0. \end{aligned}$$

■

In addition, we get:

Proposition 2.72 *Let $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ be an infinitesimal Noether symmetry of (M, Ω, h) . For every $p \in M$, there exists an open set $U_p \ni p$ such that, if $\vartheta \in \Omega^1(U_p)$ is a symplectic potential of Ω in U_p , that is $d\vartheta = \Omega$, then:*

1. *There exists $\zeta_Y \in C^\infty(U_p)$ verifying that $L(Y)\vartheta = d\zeta_Y$.*
2. *If $f_Y \in C^\infty(U_p)$ is a local Hamiltonian function of Y , then in U_p , we have that,*

$$f_Y = \zeta_Y - i(Y)\vartheta \quad (\text{up to the sum of a constant function}) . \quad (2.15)$$

(Proof)

1. Observe that $L(Y)\vartheta$ is a closed form in U_p since

$$d(L(Y)\vartheta) = L(Y)d\vartheta = L(Y)\Omega = 0 ,$$

Then, by Poincaré's Lemma, there exists $\zeta_Y \in C^\infty(U_p)$ such that $L(Y)\vartheta = d\zeta_Y$, in an open subset of U_p and, reducing the initial domain if necessary, we can suppose it is in U_p .

2. If $i(Y)\Omega = df_Y$ in U_p , we obtain that

$$d\zeta_Y = L(Y)\vartheta = d i(Y)\vartheta + i(Y)d\vartheta = d i(Y)\vartheta + i(Y)\Omega = d\{i(Y)\vartheta + f_Y\} ,$$

and the result holds.

■

Finally, the fundamental result related with Noether-type symmetries is the classical *Noether's Theorem*, whose geometric Hamiltonian version is the following:

Theorem 2.73 (Noether). If $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is an infinitesimal Noether symmetry of a Hamiltonian system (M, Ω, h) , then its Hamiltonian function f_Y is a conserved quantity; that is,

$$L(X_h)f_Y = 0 .$$

(Proof) In fact, as $i(Y)\Omega = df_Y$ we have

$$L(X_h)f_Y = i(X_h)df_Y = i(X_h)i(Y)\Omega = -i(Y)i(X_h)\Omega = -i(Y)dh = -L(Y)h = 0 .$$

■

Noethers's Theorem is very relevant, since it gives a way to associate a constant of motion to every Noether symmetry. The converse statement of Noether's theorem also holds, and it allows associating a (Noether) symmetry to every conserved quantity:

Theorem 2.74 (Inverse Noether): For every conserved quantity $f \in C^\infty(M)$, its Hamiltonian vector field $Y_f \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$ is an infinitesimal Noether symmetry.

(Proof) As $Y_f \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$, then $L(Y_f)\Omega = 0$. Furthermore, as f is a conserved quantity, then $L(X_h)f = 0$ and therefore

$$L(Y_f)h = i(Y_f)dh = i(Y_f)i(X_h)\Omega = -i(X_h)i(Y_f)\Omega = -i(X_h)df = -L(X_h)f = 0 .$$

■

In general, for symmetries which are not of Noether-type, there is not a so direct way of obtaining constants of motion, except in some particular cases like in the following:

Theorem 2.75 If $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is an infinitesimal dynamical symmetry such that $L(Y)h \neq 0$, then the function $f = L(Y)h$ is a conserved quantity.

(Proof) We have that

$$L(X_h)f = L(X_h)L(Y)h = L([X_h, Y])h + L(Y)L(X_h)h = 0 .$$

■

For other kinds of symmetries, the way to obtain conserved quantities is, in general, more complicated (see, for instance, [96, 295] and the references quoted therein).

2.3.4. Actions of Lie groups on symplectic manifolds

In this section, we analyze the transformations (i.e., diffeomorphisms) of a dynamical system which are generated by Lie groups. In fact, a family of diffeomorphisms in a differentiable manifold endowed with the operation of composition has the structure of group and when the variations of these transformations are considered, the set of these variations has a smooth differentiable structure. In this case, the corresponding group of transformations is a Lie group. (For more information about actions of Lie groups, see, for instance, [1, 7, 84, 100, 168, 196, 235, 245, 275, 312, 341]. See also the appendix A.2 for a review about Lie groups).

Definition 2.76 *Let G be a Lie group and M a differentiable manifold. A **left-action** of G on M is a map $\phi: G \times M \rightarrow M$ verifying the following properties:*

- (i) $\phi(g_1 g_2, p) = \phi(g_1, \phi(g_2, p))$; for $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $p \in M$.
- (ii) If $e \in G$ denotes the neutral element, then $\phi(e, p) = p$.

A **right action** is defined in an analogous way, changing the operation law in G by the opposite. In any case, M is said to be a **left G -manifold** (resp., a **right G -manifold**).

Since, for every $g \in G$ and $p \in M$, the map $\Phi_g: p \mapsto \phi(g, p)$ is a diffeomorphism in M , we have that a left-action of G in M is also a homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Phi & : & G \longrightarrow \text{Diff}(M) \\ & & g \longmapsto \Phi_g \end{array} .$$

From now on, we only consider left-actions.

Definition 2.77 *let G be a Lie group, M a differentiable manifold, Φ an action of G on M , and $p \in M$.*

1. The **isotropy group** of p (with respect to Φ) is the set (subgroup of G)

$$G_p := \{g \in G \mid \Phi_g(p) = p\} .$$

2. The **orbit** of p (with respect to Φ) is the set

$$\mathcal{O}_p := \{p' \in M \mid p' = \Phi_g(p) , \text{ for every } g \in G\}$$

3. The action is **effective** or **faithful** if $\bigcap_{p \in M} G_p = \{e\}$ or, what is equivalent, if $\Phi_g = \text{Id}_M \iff g = e$ (that is, Φ is injective).

4. The action is **free** if the following map, defined for a fixed $p \in M$,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G & \longrightarrow & M \\ g & \mapsto & \Phi_g(p) \end{array}$$

is injective, for every $p \in M$ (this means that there are no invariant points in M under the action).

5. The action is **transitive** if, for every $p_1, p_2 \in M$, there exists $g \in G$ such that $\Phi_g(p_1) = p_2$ or, what is the equivalent, if $O_p = M$, for every $p \in M$ (that is, Φ has only one orbit). In this case, M is said to be a **homogeneous G -space**.

6. The action is **proper** if the anti-image of every compact set by the map $(g, p) \mapsto (\Phi_g(p), p)$, for every $g \in G$ and $p \in M$, is also a compact set.

Definition 2.78 Let M_1, M_2 be differentiable manifolds, G a Lie group and $\Phi_1: G \times M_1 \rightarrow M_1$, $\Phi_2: G \times M_2 \rightarrow M_2$ actions of G on M_1 and M_2 . A map $F: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is **equivariant** with respect to these actions if, for every $g \in G$, the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} M_1 & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{1g}} & M_1 & & \\ F \downarrow & & \downarrow & F & \\ M_2 & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{2g}} & M_2 & & \end{array}$$

Remember that the *Lie algebra* of a Lie group G is $\mathfrak{g} := T_e G$ or, equivalently, the set of *left-invariant vector fields* of $\mathfrak{X}(G)$ (that is, the set of vector fields which are invariant by the action induced on $\mathfrak{X}(G)$ by the left-action Φ of G on G). Then, every action of G on M induces a Lie algebra-homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \zeta & : & \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M) \\ & & X \mapsto \zeta_X \end{array}$$

defined as follows: the uniparametric subgroup of G generated by X determines another uniparametric subgroup of transformations in M

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma_t & : & M \longrightarrow M \\ p & \mapsto & \Phi_{\exp(-tX_e)}(p) := \Phi_{\exp(-tX_e)}(p) \end{array} \quad ,$$

where $\exp: T_e G \rightarrow G$ denotes the *exponential map* of the group. Then, the map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma & : & \mathbb{R} \times M \longrightarrow M \\ (t, p) & \mapsto & \sigma_t(p) \end{array}$$

is the flux of some vector field $\xi_X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$; that is, for $p \in M$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma(t, p)$ is the integral curve of ξ_X passing through p . This vector field is given by

$$\xi_X(p) = \frac{d}{dt}\sigma(t, p) = \frac{d}{dt}\sigma_t(p) = \frac{d}{dt}\Phi_{\exp(-tX_e)}(p) \Big|_{t=0}.$$

Hence, for every $f \in C^\infty(M)$, we have that

$$(\xi_X(f))(p) = \frac{d}{dt}f(\Phi_{\exp(-tX_e)}(p)) \Big|_{t=0}.$$

Definition 2.79 For $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, the vector field $\xi_X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is the **infinitesimal generator** or **fundamental vector field** of the action Φ associated to X .

Definition 2.80 Let Φ be an action of G on M .

1. A k -form $\vartheta \in \Omega^k(M)$ is **G -invariant** by Φ if $\Phi_g^*\vartheta = \vartheta$, for every $g \in G$; or what is equivalent, if $L(\xi_Z)\vartheta = 0$, for every $Z \in \mathfrak{g}$.
2. A vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is **G -invariant** by Φ if $\Phi_{g*}Z = Z$, for every $g \in G$; or what is equivalent, if $L(\xi_X)Z = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$.

Proposition 2.81 Let $\psi: G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ be a Lie group homomorphism. Then the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & G_1 & \xrightarrow{\psi} \\ \exp \uparrow & & \uparrow \exp \\ T_{e_1}G_1 \simeq \mathfrak{g}_1 & \xrightarrow{\psi_*} & T_{e_2}G_2 \simeq \mathfrak{g}_2 \end{array}$$

that is, $\psi(\exp(tX_{e_1})) = \exp(t(\psi_*X)_{e_2})$.

(Proof) Immediate observing that $t \mapsto \exp(t(\psi_*X)_{e_2})$ is the only uniparametric subgroup of G_2 whose tangent vector field at $t = 0$ is $(\psi_*X)_{e_2}$. ■

A very relevant type of group actions are the following:

Definition 2.82 Let G be a Lie group, (M, Ω) a symplectic manifold, and $\Phi: G \times M \rightarrow M$ an action of G on M . We say that Φ is a **symplectic action** of G on M (also that G **acts symplectically** on M by Φ) if Φ_g is a symplectomorphism, for every $g \in G$; that is, $\Phi_g^*\Omega = \Omega$. Then M is said to be a **symplectic G -space**.

According to this definition, if G acts symplectically on M by Φ , then the fundamental vector field ξ_X associated to X by Φ is a locally Hamiltonian vector field and, conversely, if $\xi_X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, then Φ is a symplectic action of G on M . Therefore:

Proposition 2.83 *Let $\xi: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$ be the map such that $\xi(X) := \xi_X$, for $X \in \mathfrak{g}$. Then, Φ is a symplectic action of G on M if, and only if, $\text{Im } \xi \subseteq \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$.*

This means that $L(\xi_X)\Omega = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, (that is, $i(\xi_X)\Omega$ is a closed form).

Definition 2.84 *Let G be a Lie group, (M, Ω) a symplectic manifold and $\Phi: G \rightarrow M$ a symplectic action of G on M . We say that Φ is a **strongly symplectic action** of G on M if $\xi_X \in \mathfrak{X}_h(M)$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$; or, what is equivalent, $i(\xi_X)\Omega$ is an exact form.*

*In this case M is said to be a **strongly symplectic G -space** and Φ is a **Hamiltonian action** of G on M . Otherwise, it is a **locally Hamiltonian action** of G on M .*

In order to discuss the obstruction for a symplectic action to be strongly symplectic, let $\mathfrak{g}_h := \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \xi(X) = \xi_X \in \mathfrak{X}_h(M)\}$ and consider the following sequences of Lie algebras:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{g}_h & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{g} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_h \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \xi & & \downarrow \xi & & \downarrow \tilde{\xi} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X}_h(M) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X}_{lh}(M) & \longrightarrow & H^1(M) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}, \quad (2.16)$$

where $H^1(M)$ denotes the first de Rham's cohomology group of M , and $\tilde{\xi}$ is a Lie algebra homomorphism which makes the diagram commutative. Then, the image of \mathfrak{g} by ξ is in $\mathcal{X}_h(M)$ (that is, the action is strongly symplectic) if, and only if, $\tilde{\xi} = 0$.

There are two specially relevant cases for which every symplectic action is strongly symplectic: when M is simply connected (then every closed form is exact and, therefore, $\mathcal{X}_{lh}(M) = \mathcal{X}_h(M)$) and if G is semisimple (then $\mathfrak{g} = [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ and $[\mathcal{X}_{lh}(M), \mathcal{X}_{lh}(M)] \subset \mathcal{X}_h(M)$).

As a particular case, we have:

Definition 2.85 *Let G be a Lie group, (M, Ω) an exact symplectic manifold (that is, $\Omega = d\Theta$ for some $\Theta \in \Omega^1(M)$) and $\Phi: G \rightarrow M$ an action of G to M . Φ is said to be an **exact action** of G on M if, $\Phi_g^*\Theta = \Theta$, for every $g \in G$.*

Of course, every exact action is strongly symplectic.

2.3.5. Comomentum and momentum maps

Next, we introduce new geometric elements which are very relevant in the theory of symplectic group actions. First, following [312] we define:

Definition 2.86 *Let G a Lie group which acts symplectically on a symplectic manifold (M, Ω) . A **comomentum map** associated to this action is every Lie algebra linear application (if it exists)*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} j^* : & \mathfrak{g} & \longrightarrow C^\infty(M) \\ & X & \mapsto f_X := j^*(X) \end{array} ,$$

such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & \mathfrak{g} & & & \\ & & \swarrow j^* & \downarrow \tilde{\xi} & \searrow & & \\ 0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & C^\infty(M) & \xrightarrow{\sharp_\Omega \circ d} & \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M) & \longrightarrow & H^1(M) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

or, what is equivalent,

$$i(\tilde{\xi}_X)\Omega = df_X .$$

The obstruction to the existence of comomentum maps is given in the following:

Proposition 2.87 *Let G be a Lie group which acts symplectically on (M, Ω) . A comomentum map associated to this action exists if, and only if, the map $\tilde{\xi}: \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_h \longrightarrow H^1(M)$ in (2.16) reduces to be $\tilde{\xi} = 0$.*

(Proof) By definition, if a comomentum map exists, then $\sharp_\Omega \circ d \circ j^* = \tilde{\xi}$. But, as $\text{Im } \tilde{\xi} \subset \text{Im } \sharp_\Omega$, this implies that $\tilde{\xi} = 0$.

Conversely, if $\tilde{\xi} = 0$, then $\text{Im } \tilde{\xi} := \tilde{\xi}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{X}_h(M)$ and, for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, there exists $f_X \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $i(\tilde{\xi}_X)\Omega = df_X$. ■

Observe that this is also the obstruction for a symplectic action to be strongly symplectic. Hence:

Proposition 2.88 *Let G be a Lie group which acts symplectically on (M, Ω) . A comomentum map associated to this action exists if, and only if, the action is strongly symplectic.*

Remark 2.89 If a comomentum map exists, it is not unique. In fact, if $f_C: \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous linear function, then $f_C \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ and then $f_C(X) = \text{ctn.}$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$. Therefore, if j^* is a comomentum map, so is $j'^* = j^* + f_C$.

Furthermore, if a comomentum map exists, it is not a Lie algebra homomorphism necessarily since, for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$, we have that

$$\sharp_{\Omega} \circ d\{f_X, f_Y\} = \sharp_{\Omega} i([\xi_X, \xi_Y])\Omega = -\sharp_{\Omega} i(\xi_{[X, Y]})\Omega = -\sharp_{\Omega} df_{[X, Y]}$$

therefrom $d\{f_X, f_Y\} = -df_{[X, Y]}$ and then $\{f_X, f_Y\} = -f_{[X, Y]} + \sigma(X, Y)$ where $\sigma: \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a skew symmetric bilinear function whose existence measures the obstruction for the comomentum map to be a Lie algebra homomorphism. This leads to state:

Definition 2.90 Let G be a Lie group which acts symplectically on (M, Ω) . The action is said to be a **Poissonian action** or also a **strongly Hamiltonian action** if

- (i) There exists a comomentum map for this action.
- (ii) The comomentum map is a Lie algebra (anti)homomorphism.

Then the triple (M, Ω, j^*) is called a **Hamiltonian G -space**.

As a particular case, we have that:

Proposition 2.91 If (M, Ω) is an exact symplectic manifold and the action of G on M is exact, then it is Poissonian.

(Proof) Let $\Omega = d\Theta$. Defining $f_X := -\Theta(\xi_X)$, then $j^*: X \mapsto f_X$ is a comomentum map and

$$\begin{aligned} f_{[X, Y]} &= -\Theta(\xi_{[X, Y]}) = \Theta([\xi_X, \xi_Y]) \\ &= i([\xi_X, \xi_Y])\Theta = L(\xi_X) i(\xi_Y)\Theta = -L(\xi_X)f_Y = -\{f_X, f_Y\}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Definition 2.92 [312]. Let G be a Lie group which acts in a strongly symplectic way on a symplectic manifold (M, Ω) . A **momentum map** associated to this action is the dual map of a comomentum map; that is, a map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J & : & M \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^* \\ p & \mapsto & \mu \end{array}$$

such that, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and for $p \in M$,

$$\langle X, J(p) \rangle := j^*(X)(p) = f_X(p).$$

(Observe that the map $\mu := J(p): \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $X \mapsto f_X(p)$, for $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, is, in fact, an element of \mathfrak{g}^*).

Obviously, the obstruction to the existence of momentum maps is the same that for the comomentum maps. In particular, as an immediate corollary of Proposition 2.91 we have:

Proposition 2.93 *If (M, Ω) is an exact symplectic manifold and the action of G on M is exact, then a momentum map exists. It is given by $\langle X, J(p) \rangle := -\Theta(\xi_X)(p)$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, for $p \in M$.*

Remark 2.94 As a more general result, if G is a connected Lie group and Φ a strongly symplectic action of G on (M, Ω) , then the action is Poissonian if, and only if, the momentum maps associated to this action are Ad^* -equivariant, that is, for every $g \in G$, we have that $Ad^* \circ J = \Phi_g \circ J$; where $Ad^*: \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ is the coadjoint action of G . (See [312] for the proof).

2.3.6. Reduction by symmetries

Finally, we introduce the concept of *group of symmetries* of a Hamiltonian system, its relation with the momentum map, and give the main insights about the theory of reduction by symmetries.

Definition 2.95 *Let G be a Lie group, (M, Ω, h) a Hamiltonian system, and $\Phi: G \rightarrow M$ an action of G on M . We say that G is a **symmetry group** of the Hamiltonian system if*

- (i) Φ is a symplectic action.
- (ii) For every $g \in G$, we have $\Phi_g^* h = h$.

The diffeomorphism Φ_g , for every $g \in G$, is called a **symmetry** of the Hamiltonian system.

From this definition, it is obvious that G is a symmetry group of a Hamiltonian system (M, Ω, h) if, and only if, $L(\xi_X)h = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$.

In this context, the Noether Theorem is stated as follows::

Theorem 2.96 (Noether's theorem). *Let G be a symmetry group which acts in a strongly symplectic way on the Hamiltonian system (M, Ω, h) . Then, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, the functions f_X are constants of motion; that is, $L(X_h)f_X = 0$.*

(Proof) We have that $i(X_h)\Omega = dh$, then

$$\begin{aligned} L(X_h)f_X &= i(X_h)df_X = i(X_h)i(\xi_X)\Omega \\ &= -i(\xi_X)i(X_h)\Omega = -i(\xi_X)dh = -L(\xi_X)h = 0. \end{aligned}$$

■

One of the most important features on the study of Hamiltonian systems with symmetry is the so-called *reduction theory*. Now we are going to state the main results on this topic (see, for instance, [99, 248, 250–252, 277–279, 342] for deeper explanations and details).

First, we have to introduce the following concept:

Definition 2.97 Let G be a Lie group and a strongly symplectic action of G on (M, Ω) . Let J be a momentum map associated to this action. Then, $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ is a **weakly regular value** of J if:

- (i) $J^{-1}(\mu)$ is a submanifold of M .
- (ii) For every $p \in J^{-1}(\mu)$, $T_p(J^{-1}(\mu)) = \ker T_p J$.

If $T_p J$ is surjective, then μ is said to be a **regular value**. (Of course, every regular value is weakly regular).

Then we have:

Theorem 2.98 Let G be a Lie group acting on a symplectic manifold (M, Ω) such that the action is Poissonian, free and proper. Let μ be a weakly regular value of the momentum map associated to this action, and let G_μ be the isotropy group of $J^{-1}(\mu)$ for the action of G on M . Then:

1. The submanifold $J^{-1}(\mu)$ is stable under the action of G_μ and so the quotient $J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$ is well-defined (it is called the **orbit space** of $J^{-1}(\mu)$).
2. (Marsden–Weinstein’s theorem). Denote by $\pi: J^{-1}(\mu) \rightarrow J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$ the canonical projection and by $\iota: J^{-1}(\mu) \hookrightarrow M$ the embedding. Then, $J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$ is a differentiable manifold which is endowed with a (unique) symplectic structure $\hat{\Omega}$ such that $\iota^* \Omega = \pi^* \hat{\Omega}$.
3. If G is a symmetry group of the Hamiltonian system (M, Ω, h) , then $(J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu, \hat{\Omega}, \hat{h})$ is a Hamiltonian system, where $\iota^* h = \pi^* \hat{h}$.

(Proof)

1. In fact, if $g \in G_\mu$, for all $p \in J^{-1}(\mu)$ we have

$$\Phi_g(p) = \Phi_g(J^{-1}(\mu)) = J^{-1}(g\mu) = J^{-1}(\mu) ,$$

then $J^{-1}(\mu)$ is invariant under the action of G_μ and the quotient is well-defined.

2. We omit the proof of this statement because it is long and heavy. It can be found in the above-mentioned references.
3. It is evident, since h is G -invariant (and hence it is also G_μ -invariant), therefore it projects onto $J^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$.

■

Chapter 3

Symplectic mechanics (II): Autonomous Lagrangian dynamical systems

The aim of this chapter is to state a geometrical formalism for a particular kind of dynamical systems, those which are described by Lagrangian functions and that, consequently, are *variational*. These systems admit a description as Hamiltonian dynamical systems, but they present relevant particular characteristics. This formulation gives rise to two formalisms: the so-called *Lagrangian formalism* and its associated *canonical Hamiltonian formalism*. These kinds of systems include, as particular cases, a wide range of mechanical systems which are very relevant in physics: the *conservative Newtonian systems*, which are those whose configuration space is endowed with a metric (they are studied in Chapter 5).

There are several alternative ways to state the geometric description for these kinds of systems. The geometric framework where the theory is developed is the tangent bundle of a manifold, TQ , which represents the phase space of the system. A selected function on it, the *Lagrangian* \mathcal{L} , is a depository of the physical information of the system. Then, a first formulation consists in using \mathcal{L} to define the so-called *Legendre transformation* which connects TQ and T^*Q and, if this map is a (local) diffeomorphism, use it to translate the Hamiltonian description previously stated in T^*Q to TQ (see, for instance, [1]).

The second and more general approach consists in using the canonical structures of the tangent bundle to construct, starting from \mathcal{L} , the geometrical objects needed to establish the dynamics of the system. This is the so-called *Klein* or *Cartan formulation* of the Lagrangian formalism, which was stated in the classical references [156, 169, 190, 191, 214] and developed later by many other authors [53, 95, 97, 100, 130, 301]. It has the advantage that is more direct and does not need any previously established Hamiltonian formalism (in fact, the existence of this Hamiltonian formalism is not assured for some singular Lagrangian systems). This is the procedure that we follow

in this exposition.

Another elegant alternative was developed in [322,323], using the concept of *special symplectic manifold* and of *Lagrangian submanifold*, and obtaining both the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms for Lagrangian systems and their equivalence. Finally, another unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism for these systems is given in [307]. These two approaches have subsequently been generalized and applied in many physical contexts.

The structure of the chapter is as follows: first, we introduce the mathematical framework which is needed to state the Lagrangian formalism and its associated canonical Hamiltonian formalism; that is, the canonical geometric structures of the tangent and the cotangent bundles of a manifold. Next, we develop the Lagrangian formalism for *dynamical Lagrangian systems* and its associated *canonical Hamiltonian formalism*, their equivalence, and the *Hamilton–Jacobi theory* for the Hamiltonian formalism. Furthermore, we describe the *Skinner–Rusk formalism*, which is a nice formulation that unifies both the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian formalism. We also discuss the symmetries and conserved quantities in both formalisms, paying special attention to those which are canonical lifts of diffeomorphisms and vector fields (which are called *natural*), and studying the equivalence of Lagrangians in this context. Finally, we study the variational formulation introducing the *Hamilton* and the *Hamilton–Jacobi variational principles* for the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian formalisms, respectively. Some relevant physical systems (the harmonic oscillator and the Kepler problem) are analyzed using this geometric treatment.

3.1. Geometric structures of the tangent and cotangent bundles

(See [95,97,100,130,156,169,190,191,214,301]).

The tangent bundle of a manifold Q , denoted as TQ (whose construction and main characteristics are reviewed in the appendix A.1) is endowed with three canonical geometric structures: the *vertical subbundle*, the *vertical endomorphism* and the *Liouville vector field*. Furthermore, there are some characteristic vector fields in TQ , those whose integral curves are obtained as solutions to *second-order differential equations* in Q . Similarly, the *cotangent bundle* of Q , denoted as T^*Q is endowed with some canonical differential forms. Next, we present and discuss all these topics in detail.

Along this section, Q is a differentiable manifold with $\dim Q = n$.

3.1.1. The vertical subbundle. Vertical lift

Considering the canonical projection $\tau_Q: TQ \rightarrow Q$, and its tangent map $T\tau_Q: TTQ \rightarrow TQ$.

Definition 3.1 Let $(q, u) \in TQ$ and $V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q) := \ker T_{(q,u)}\tau_Q$. The *vertical subbundle* of TTQ is the vector bundle (of rank n) $V(\tau_Q) \longrightarrow TQ$, where

$$V(\tau_Q) := \bigcup_{(q,u) \in TQ} V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q) .$$

The sections of this bundle $V(\tau_Q) \longrightarrow TQ$ are called *vertical vector fields*, and the set of all these vector fields is denoted by $\mathfrak{X}^{V(\tau_Q)}(TQ)$.

It is immediate to prove that, in natural coordinates of TQ , the expression of these vector fields is $f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$; that is, $\mathfrak{X}^{V(\tau_Q)}(TQ)$ is locally generated by the set $\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \right\}$.

Another interpretation of the fibers of $V(\tau_Q)$ is the following: for every $q \in Q$, consider the n -dimensional vector space T_qQ , as a differentiable manifold and the natural immersion

$$\begin{array}{ccc} j_q: & T_qQ & \longrightarrow & TQ \\ & u & \mapsto & (q, u) \end{array} .$$

Observe that $\tau_Q \circ j_q$ is the constant map equal to q . If $u \in T_qQ$, we have that

$$T_u j_q: T_u T_qQ \longrightarrow T_{(q,u)} TQ ;$$

but, as $\tau_Q \circ j_q$ is a constant map, then $T_u(\tau_Q \circ j_q) = T_{(q,u)}\tau_Q \circ T_u j_q = 0$. This is equivalent to say that $\text{Im } T_u j_q \subseteq \ker T_{(q,u)}\tau_Q = V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q)$ and, as j_q is an immersion,

$$\dim \text{Im } T_u j_q = \dim (T_u T_qQ) = n = \dim V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q) ,$$

hence $\text{Im } T_u j_q = V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q)$, (since both of them have the same dimension and the first one is a subset of the second one).

As a consequence of the above discussion, $V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q)$ is identified naturally with $T_u T_qQ$, through the isomorphism induced by $T_u j_q$ onto its image. Furthermore, as T_qQ is a vector space, if $u \in T_qQ$, we have that T_qQ is canonically identified with $T_u(T_qQ)$ by means of the directional derivative¹. Thus, $V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q)$ can also be

¹Remember that, if F is an n -dimensional real vector space and $u \in F$, the natural identification between F and $T_u F$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \longrightarrow & T_u F \\ v & \mapsto & D_v(u) , \end{array}$$

where $D_v(u)$ denotes the directional derivative with respect to the vector v at the point u ; that is, if $f: \mathbb{R}^n \simeq F \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is any differentiable function, then

$$(D_v(u))f \equiv D_v f(u) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(u + tv) - f(u)}{t} .$$

identified with $T_q Q$. In other words, $V(\tau_Q)$ is the pull-back to TQ of the bundle TQ over Q by means of the map τ_Q ; that is:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V(\tau_Q) & \simeq & \tau_Q^*(TQ) \longrightarrow TQ \\ & \tau_{TQ} \downarrow & \downarrow \tau_Q \\ & TQ & \xrightarrow{\tau_Q} Q \end{array} .$$

In this way, we have constructed the isomorphism of vector spaces

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_q Q & \longrightarrow & T_u T_q Q \simeq V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q) \subset T_{(q,u)} TQ \\ v & \mapsto & D_v(q, u) , \end{array}$$

where, if $f \in C^\infty(TQ)$, then

$$(D_v(q, u))f \equiv D_v f(q, u) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(q, u + tv) - f(q, u)}{t} .$$

Definition 3.2 The vector $D_v(q, u)$ is called the **vertical lift** of v to the point (q, u) , and the map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \lambda_q^{(q,u)} & : & T_q Q \longrightarrow T_{(q,u)} TQ \\ v & \mapsto & D_v(q, u) \end{array}$$

which implements the above isomorphism is called the **vertical lift**.

In natural coordinates, if $v = \lambda^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_{(q,u)}$, then $\lambda_q^{(q,u)}(v) = \lambda^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{(q,u)}$.

The vertical lift is extended in a natural way to the vector fields of $\mathfrak{X}(Q)$ and the mapping $\lambda^V : \mathfrak{X}(Q) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{V(\tau_Q)}(TQ)$, is $C^\infty(Q)$ -lineal.

In natural coordinates, if $X = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}$, then its vertical lift is $\lambda^V(X) \equiv X^V = \tau_Q^* f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$.

3.1.2. The canonical (or vertical) endomorphism

Definition 3.3 Let $(q, u) \in TQ$. The map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J_{(q,u)} : & T_{(q,u)} TQ & \longrightarrow T_{(q,u)} TQ \\ Y & \mapsto & D_{(T_{(q,u)} \tau_Q)Y}(q, u) = \lambda_q^{(q,u)}(T_{(q,u)} \tau_Q(Y)) \end{array}$$

is called the **canonical or vertical endomorphism** (at (q, u)).

If x^1, \dots, x^n are coordinates in F and $v = (\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^n)$, then $(D_v(u))f = \lambda^i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \Big|_u$; hence $D_v(u) = \lambda^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \Big|_u$, and the identification is immediate.

Observe that $J_{(q,u)}Y$ is the vertical lift of $(T_{(q,u)}\tau_Q)Y$ to the point (q,u) (that is, $J_{(q,u)}$ consists in projecting to T_qQ and to lift vertically).

It is clear that the image of $J_{(q,u)}$ is in $V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q)$ and, as $T_{(q,u)}\tau_Q$ is a surjective map, it coincides with $V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q) = \ker J_{(q,u)}$. Therefore:

Proposition 3.4 *The canonical endomorphism has the following properties: for $(q,u) \in T_qQ$,*

1. $\text{Im } J_{(q,u)} = V_{(q,u)}(\tau_Q) = \ker J_{(q,u)}$.
2. $(J_{(q,u)})^2 = 0$.

The action of J is extended in a natural way to vector fields:

$$J: \mathfrak{X}(TQ) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{V(\tau_Q)}(TQ) \subset \mathfrak{X}(TQ) ,$$

and to differential forms:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J^* & : & \Omega^k(TQ) \longrightarrow \Omega^k(TQ) \\ & & \alpha \longmapsto i(J)\alpha \end{array} ,$$

where $J^*\alpha = i(J)\alpha$ is defined as

$$[i(J)\alpha](X_1, \dots, X_k) := \alpha(J(X_1), \dots, J(X_i), \dots, J(X_k)) .$$

In particular, if $k = 1$, then we have that $i(J)\alpha = \alpha \circ J$, which is a 1-form verifying that $i(X)(i(J)\alpha) = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}^{V(\tau_Q)}(TQ)$. These kinds of differential forms are called τ_Q -semibasic forms.

Local expressions: If (q^i, v^i) are natural coordinates in TQ , we have

$$J_{(q,u)} \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_{(q,u)} = D_{\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q} (q, u) = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{(q,u)} , \quad J_{(q,u)} \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{(q,u)} = D_0(q, u) = 0 ;$$

then, the local expression of $J_{(q,u)}$ is

$$J_{(q,u)} = dq^i \Big|_{(q,u)} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{(q,u)} ,$$

and, by extension,

$$J = dq^i \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} .$$

Observe that J is a tensor field of type $(1,1)$ in TQ .

3.1.3. The Liouville vector field

Definition 3.5 Let $q \in Q$ and $(q, v) \in TQ$. Consider the vertical lift of the vector $v \in T_q Q$ to the point (q, v) ; that is, $D_v(q, v)$. This operation allows us to construct a vertical vector field $\Delta \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$, which is called the **Liouville vector field**, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta: TQ &\longrightarrow TTQ \\ (q, v) &\mapsto ((q, v), D_v(q, v)) \end{aligned}$$

Local expression: In local coordinates (q^i, v^i) on TQ ; let $f: TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function and $(q, v) \in TQ$; then we have that

$$\Delta_{(q,v)} f = D_v(q, v) f = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(q, v + tv) - f(q, v)}{t} ;$$

therefore

$$\Delta_{(q,v)} q^i = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{q^i(q, v + tv) - q^i(q, v)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{q^i(q) - q^i(q)}{t} = 0 ,$$

$$\Delta_{(q,v)} v^i = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{v^i(q, v + tv) - v^i(q, v)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{(v + tv)(q^i) - v(q^i)}{t} = v(q^i) = v^i(q, v) ,$$

and hence, the local expression of Δ is

$$\Delta = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} .$$

Bearing in mind that the fibers $T_q Q$ of the tangent bundle are vector spaces, and that $\Delta_{(q,v)} = v \in T_q Q$, for every $(q, v) \in TQ$, it is usual to say that Δ is the vector field that generates the dilatations along the fibers of TQ . Another way to see this interpretation is considering the local expression of Δ and its associated system of differential equations

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = 0, \quad \frac{dv^i}{dt} = v^i ,$$

whose general solution is

$$q^i(t) = A^i, \quad v^i(t) = B^i e^t ; \quad (A^i, B^i \text{ ctns.}) .$$

Thus, the flux of Δ is

$$\begin{aligned} F^\Delta : \mathbb{R} \times TQ &\longrightarrow TQ \\ (t, q^i, v^i) &\mapsto (q^i, v^i e^t) . \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the elements of the uniparametric local group of diffeomorphisms generated by Δ are

$$\begin{aligned} F_t^\Delta : TQ &\longrightarrow TQ \\ (q^i, v^i) &\mapsto (q^i, v^i e^t) ; \end{aligned}$$

that is, they are homothetics on the fibers with positive reason.

3.1.4. Holonomic curves. Second Order Differential Equations

A curve in TQ is not necessarily the canonical lift of a curve in the base manifold Q ². Then we define:

Definition 3.6 A curve $\sigma: (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ$ is **holonomic** if there exists $\gamma: (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$ such that $\sigma = \tilde{\gamma}$.

In natural coordinates, $\sigma(t) = (q^i(t), v^i(t))$, is a canonical lift if, and only if, $v^i(t) = \dot{q}^i(t)$.

Definition 3.7 Let $\sigma: (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ$ a curve in TQ . Then $\tau_Q \circ \sigma: (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$ is a curve in Q , which is called the **curve in the base manifold** associated with σ .

Using this, we can characterize holonomic curves as follows:

Proposition 3.8 A curve $\sigma: (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ$ is holonomic if, and only if, $\widetilde{(\tau_Q \circ \sigma)} = \sigma$.

(Proof) (\implies) If σ is holonomic then there exists $\gamma: (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$ such that $\sigma = \tilde{\gamma}$; therefore

$$\tau_Q \circ \sigma = \tau_Q \circ \tilde{\gamma} = \gamma \implies \widetilde{(\tau_Q \circ \sigma)} = \tilde{\gamma} = \sigma.$$

(\impliedby) The converse is immediate. ■

Finally, we have the following fundamental result:

Proposition 3.9 1. Let $\varphi: Q \longrightarrow Q$ be a diffeomorphism and $T\varphi: TQ \longrightarrow TQ$ its canonical lift to TQ . Then

$$(T\varphi)^* J = J, \quad (T\varphi)_* \Delta = \Delta.$$

2. Let $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ and $Z^C \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ its canonical lift to TQ . Then the canonical endomorphism J and the Liouville vector field Δ are invariant by the uniparametric group of local diffeomorphisms generated by Z^C .

(Proof)

- The result for J is a straightforward consequence of the local expressions of J and $T\varphi$.

The result for Δ is a straightforward consequence of the property $T\varphi \circ F_t^\Delta = F_t^\Delta \circ T\varphi$, where F_t^Δ is an element uniparametric group of local diffeomorphisms generated by Δ .

²See the Appendix [A.1.1](#)

- It is immediate from the above result, taking the uniparametric group of local diffeomorphisms generated by Z and Z^C .

■

This means that the canonical lifts of diffeomorphisms and vector fields to the tangent bundle preserve the canonical structures of this bundle.

Definition 3.10 A vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is a **Second Order Differential Equation** (SODE) or also a **holonomic vector field**³ if its integral curves are holonomic.

The local interpretation of this definition is as follows:

Proposition 3.11 The necessary and sufficient condition for a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ to be a SODE is that its local expression in any natural system of coordinates in TQ is

$$X = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + g^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} ; \quad (3.1)$$

that is, $X_{(q,v)} = (v^i, g^i(q, v))$, for every $(q, v) \in TQ$.

(Proof) (\implies) In natural coordinates, the general expression of $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is $X = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + g^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$. Let $\sigma: (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ$ be an integral curve of X , with $\sigma(t) = (q^i(t), v^i(t))$; then

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = (f^i \circ \sigma)(t) = f^i(q^j(t), v^j(t)), \quad \frac{dv^i}{dt} = (g^i \circ \sigma)(t) = g^i(q^j(t), v^j(t)) . \quad (3.2)$$

Furthermore, if X is a SODE, by definition there exists $\gamma: (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$, with $\gamma(t) = (q^i(t))$, such that $\sigma = \tilde{\gamma}$; that is, $\sigma(t) = (q^i(t), \dot{q}^i(t))$. Therefore, we have that $\dot{q}^i(t) = v^i(t)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$; and hence, going to the first group of equations (3.2), we obtain that

$$v^i(t) = \frac{dq^i}{dt} = f^i(q^j(t), v^j(t)), \quad t \in (a, b) ,$$

and the result follows.

(\impliedby) If $X = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + g^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$, then its integral curves $\sigma: (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ$, with $\sigma(t) = (q^i(t), v^i(t))$, are determined by the system

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = (v^i \circ \sigma)(t) = v^i(t), \quad \frac{dv^i}{dt} = (g^i \circ \sigma)(t) = g^i(q^j(t), v^j(t)) ;$$

that is, $\sigma(t) = (q^i(t), \dot{q}^i(t))$. Therefore, they are holonomic curves and X is a SODE.

■

³It is also said that X satisfies the **second-order condition**.

Remark 3.12 Observe that, with the above conditions, the second group of equations (3.2) is written as

$$\frac{d^2 q^i}{dt^2} = f^i(q^j, \dot{q}^j) ,$$

which is a system of second order ordinary differential equations, whose solution completely determines the integral curves of X . This fact justifies the name SODE for this kind of vector fields.

From this result, we obtain the following intrinsic characterization:

Proposition 3.13 *The necessary and sufficient condition for $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ to be a SODE is that*

$$J(X) = \Delta .$$

(Proof) In natural coordinates, the general expression of $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is $X = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + g^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$; then

$$J(X) = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \equiv \Delta \iff f^i = v^i ,$$

and the result follows from the above proposition. ■

There is another intrinsic characterization as follows: the bundle TTQ has two natural projections

$$\begin{array}{ccc} TTQ & \xrightarrow{T\tau_Q} & TQ \\ \tau_{TQ} \downarrow & & \downarrow \tau_Q \\ TQ & \xrightarrow{\tau_Q} & Q \end{array} .$$

Taking natural coordinates in the bundles TQ and TTQ , and reminding the expression (A.1), for every $((q, v), Y_{(q,v)}) \equiv (q^i, v^i; u^i, w^i) \in TTQ$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{TQ}((q, v), Y_{(q,v)}) &= \tau_{TQ}(q^i, v^i; u^i, w^i) = (q^i, v^i) \\ T\tau_Q((q, v), Y_{(q,v)}) &= \tau_{TQ}(q^i, v^i; u^i, w^i) = (\tau_Q(q^i, v^i), T_{(q^i, v^i)}\tau_Q(u^i, w^i)) = (q^i, u^i) . \end{aligned}$$

By definition, $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is a section of the projection τ_{TQ} ; that is, a map $X: TQ \rightarrow TTQ$ such that $\tau_{TQ} \circ X = \text{Id}_{TQ}$. Then:

Proposition 3.14 *The necessary and sufficient condition for a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ to be a SODE is that X is a section of the projection $T\tau_Q$; that is, a map $X: TQ \rightarrow TTQ$ such that*

$$T\tau_Q \circ X = \text{Id}_{TQ}$$

(Proof) In natural coordinates, the general expression of $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is $X = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + g^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$; that is, for every $(q, v) \equiv (q^i, v^i) \in TQ$, it is a map

$$X(q, v) = X(q^i, v^i) = (q^i, v^i; f^i(q, v), g^i(q, v)) .$$

Therefore

$$(T\tau_Q \circ X)(q, v) = (T\tau_Q \circ X)(q^i, v^i) = T\tau_Q(q^i, v^i; f^i(q, v), g^i(q, v)) = (q^i, f^i(q, v)) ;$$

and, as $\text{Id}_{TQ}(q, v) = (q^i, v^i)$, we have that

$$(T\tau_Q \circ X)(q, v) = \text{Id}_{TQ}(q, v) \iff f^i = v^i ,$$

and the result follows. ■

Remark 3.15 Summarizing, we have proved that the following assertions are equivalent:

1. A vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is a SODE.
2. The integral curves of X are canonical lifts of curves in Q .
3. The expression of X in a system of natural coordinates in TQ , is (3.1).
4. $J(X) = \Delta$.
5. $T\tau_Q \circ X = \text{Id}_{TQ}$.

3.1.5. Canonical forms in the cotangent bundle

An essential characteristic of the cotangent bundle is the following:

Theorem 3.16 *The cotangent bundle T^*Q is endowed with a canonical 2-form which is closed and nondegenerate and, hence, it is a symplectic manifold.*

(Proof) As we know, $T^*Q := \{p = (q, \xi) \mid q \in Q, \xi \in T_q^*Q\}$. As T^*Q is a differentiable manifold, we can consider its tangent bundle TT^*Q and the tangent structure induced by $\pi_Q: T^*Q \rightarrow Q$, which must be understood as a fiber map $T_{(q, \xi)}\pi_Q: T_{(q, \xi)}T^*Q \rightarrow T_qQ$. Now, we prove the theorem constructively using the fiber projection.

1. We construct the differential 1-form $\Theta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$ as follows: for every $p = (q, \xi) \in T^*Q$ and $X_p \in T_p T^*Q$,

$$\Theta_p(X_p) := \xi(T_p \pi_Q(X_p)) .$$

Its expression in a natural chart of coordinates of T^*Q is obtained in the following way: as we have seen in proposition A.13 of the Appendix A.1.2, $\xi = p_i(p) dq^i|_q$; furthermore, every $X_p \in T_p(T^*Q)$ has the local expression $X_p = A^j \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \Big|_p + B_j \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} \Big|_p$, and the general expression of Θ_p is $\Theta_p = a_i dq^i|_p + b^i dp_i|_p$, then

$$\Theta_p(X_p) = a_i A^i + b^i B_i ;$$

but, from the definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_p(X_p) &:= \xi(T_p \pi_Q(X_p)) = (p_i(m) dq^i|_q) \left[T_p \pi_Q \left(A^j \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \Big|_p + B_j \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} \Big|_p \right) \right] \\ &= (p_i(p) dq^i|_x) \left(A^j \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \Big|_q \right) = p_i(p) A^j \delta_j^i = p_i(p) A^i , \end{aligned}$$

and as this holds for every X_p (that is, for every A^i, B_i), from the above expressions we obtain that $a_i = p_i(m)$ and $b^i = 0$; that is, the final local expression of Θ is

$$\Theta = p_i dq^i .$$

2. We define the differential 2-form

$$\Omega := -d\Theta ,$$

whose local expression in a natural chart is

$$\Omega = dq^i \wedge dp_i .$$

Obviously Ω is closed (because it is exact) and nondegenerate (as we can see from its local expression in coordinates).

■

Then, cotangent bundles of manifolds are the canonical models of symplectic manifolds, since they carry a canonical symplectic form. Furthermore, their natural coordinates are also the Darboux coordinates for this canonical symplectic form.

Definition 3.17 *The forms $\Theta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$ and $\Omega \in \Omega^2(T^*Q)$ are the 1 and 2 canonical forms of the cotangent bundle ⁴.*

⁴The 1-form Θ is also called the *tautological form* of T^*Q .

From Proposition 2.11 we have that:

Proposition 3.18 *The cotangent bundle of a differentiable manifold is an oriented manifold.*

The canonical lift of a vector field in Q to the cotangent bundle T^*Q ⁵ can be characterized using the canonical forms. First we define:

Definition 3.19 *Every vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ induces a function $F_Z \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$ defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} F_Z &: T^*Q \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ p \equiv (q, \xi) &\mapsto \xi(Z_q) \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the definition of the canonical 1-form Θ of T^*Q and Proposition A.19 we have that, for every $p \equiv (q, \xi) \in T^*Q$,

$$F_Z(p) \equiv F_Z(q, \xi) = \xi(Z_q) = \xi(T\pi_Q(Z_p^*)) = \Theta_p(Z_p^*),$$

and thus we have proved that:

Proposition 3.20 *If $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$, then $F_Z = \Theta(Z^*)$.*

Bearing this in mind, we obtain that:

Proposition 3.21 *If $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$, then the canonical lift of Z to T^*Q is the only vector field $Z^* \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ such that $i(Z^*)\Omega = dF_Z$ ⁶.*

(Proof) In fact, using the Cartan formula and taking into account Proposition A.17,

$$i(Z^*)\Omega = -i(Z^*)d\Theta = d i(Z^*)\Theta - L(Z^*)\Theta = d(\Theta(Z^*)) = dF_Z$$

since, according to Proposition A.17, as the local uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms of Z^* are canonical lifts, they let the canonical forms of T^*Q invariant, and then $L(Z^*)\Theta = 0$. ■

Local expression: Bearing in mind this characterization, it is easy to obtain the local expression of Z^* in a chart of canonical coordinates $(U; q^i, p_i)$ of T^*Q . So, if $Z|_{\pi_Q(U)} = f^i(q) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}$, we have that $F_Z(q^i, p_i) = p_i f^i(q^j)$, and then

$$Z^*|_U = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} - p_j \frac{\partial f^j}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}. \quad (3.3)$$

Finally, from Proposition A.17 we obtain:

⁵See the Appendix A.1.2.

⁶That is, with the terminology of Section 2.1.5, Z^* is the (global) Hamiltonian vector field associated with the function F_Z .

Proposition 3.22 *If $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$, then*

$$L(Z^*)\Theta = 0, \quad L(Z^*)\Omega = 0.$$

(Proof) To prove this, it suffices to take the local uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms of Z and their canonical lifts. ■

3.1.6. Fiber derivative of a function

Let $F \in C^\infty(TQ)$. Given $q \in Q$, we consider the function $F_q: T_qQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is the restriction of F to the fiber T_qQ . If $(q, u) \in TQ$, the differential of F_q at this point is an element of T_q^*Q ; so $D_{(q,u)}F_q \in T_q^*Q$. Then:

Definition 3.23 *The fiber derivative of F is the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}F : TQ &\longrightarrow T^*Q \\ (q, u) &\mapsto (q, D_{(q,u)}F_q) \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\pi_Q \circ \mathcal{F}F = \tau_Q$; that is, $\mathcal{F}F$ preserve the fibers.

Local expressions: Consider a natural chart $(U; q^i, v^i)$ of TQ and the corresponding canonical chart $(\mathcal{F}F(U); q^i, p_i)$ in T^*Q . Observe that a basis of T_qQ is $\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q \right\}$, and the coordinates in T_qQ are (v^1, \dots, v^n) . Then, the Jacobian matrix of $D_{(q,u)}F_q$ is

$$\left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial v^1} \Big|_{(q,u)} \cdots \frac{\partial F}{\partial v^n} \Big|_{(q,u)} \right),$$

and if $v = \lambda^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q \in T_qQ$, then

$$(D_{(q,u)}F_q)(v) = \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial v^1} \Big|_{(q,u)} \cdots \frac{\partial F}{\partial v^n} \Big|_{(q,u)} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^1 \\ \vdots \\ \lambda^n \end{pmatrix},$$

and therefore

$$\mathcal{F}F(x, u) = \left(q, \frac{\partial F}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{(q,u)} dq^i \Big|_q \right);$$

that is, the expression in coordinates of $\mathcal{F}F$ is

$$q^i \circ \mathcal{F}F = q^i, \quad p_i \circ \mathcal{F}F = \frac{\partial F}{\partial v^i}.$$

3.2. Lagrangian formalism for Lagrangian dynamical systems

Next we introduce the so-called *Lagrangian formalism* of the Lagrangian dynamical systems, stating first what are these kinds of systems.

3.2.1. Lagrangian dynamical systems

The physical and geometrical foundations of this formulation are the following:

Postulate 3.24 (First Postulate of Lagrangian mechanics): In a physical Lagrangian system, the n possible degrees of freedom of the system are described by the domain of variation of a set of n *generalized coordinates*⁷, which determine locally the *configuration space* of the system. The states of the system are locally described by means of generalized coordinates and their corresponding generalized velocities.

Geometrically, this means that the configuration space Q of a dynamical system with n degrees of freedom is a n -dimensional differentiable manifold, and that the phase space is the tangent bundle TQ of the configuration manifold Q , which is called the **state** or **phase space of positions-velocities** of the system.

Postulate 3.25 (Second Postulate of Lagrangian mechanics): The observables or physical magnitudes of a dynamical system are functions of $C^\infty(TQ)$.

The result of a measure of an observable is the value that the function which represents the observable takes at a point of the phase space TQ (that is, in some state, following the first postulate).

Postulate 3.26 (Third Postulate of Lagrangian mechanics): There is a function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$, called **Lagrangian function**, which carries the dynamical information of the system.

As we are going to see, from this function and using the geometrical structures of the tangent bundle, one can construct a differential form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(TQ)$ and the so-called *Lagrangian Energy function* $E_{\mathcal{L}} \in C^\infty(TQ)$, and we can set the dynamical equations of the system (Postulate 3.34).

Taking all of this into account, we define:

Definition 3.27 A **Lagrangian dynamical system** is a pair (TQ, \mathcal{L}) , where Q is a manifold representing the configuration space of a physical system and $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$ is the Lagrangian function of the system.

⁷If we have a mechanical system, the generalized coordinates correspond to degrees of freedom of “mechanical type” (for instance., position coordinates). But if we have a more generic physical system, such as an electric or a thermodynamical system, then the generalized coordinates correspond to other kinds of physical magnitudes (for instance, electric charge, temperature, etc.).

Remark 3.28 It is important to point out that the dynamical systems which are described in this way are *autonomous*; that is, *independent of time* (a geometrical description of *dynamical systems* is presented in Chapter 4). They are also *first-order* systems, which are those whose Lagrangian function depends locally on the coordinates of position and velocity, in contrast with those for which the dependence is also on the *generalized accelerations* or, in general, higher-order time-derivatives of the generalized positions. (For the geometrical description of *higher-order* systems, see, for instance, [38, 48, 66, 131, 187, 188, 217, 281–283]).

In the next section we explain how, using the canonical structures of the tangent bundle introduced in Section 3.1 and starting from the Lagrangian function, we can construct the dynamical-geometric structures which allow us to set the dynamical equations in an intrinsic way. In this way, we will complete the set of Postulates of the Lagrangian formalism.

3.2.2. Geometric structures induced by the dynamics

Given a Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$ and using the canonical structures of the tangent bundle (the vertical endomorphism $J: \mathfrak{X}(TQ) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{V(\tau_Q)}(TQ)$ and the Liouville vector field $\Delta \in \mathfrak{X}^{V(\tau_Q)}(TQ)$) we can define the following elements:

Definition 3.29 *The Cartan or Lagrangian 1-form associated with \mathcal{L} is*

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} := i(J)d\mathcal{L} = d\mathcal{L} \circ J \in \Omega^1(TQ) .$$

The Cartan or Lagrangian 2-form associated with \mathcal{L} is

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} := -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(TQ) .$$

Definition 3.30 *The Lagrangian action associated with \mathcal{L} is the function*

$$A_{\mathcal{L}} := \Delta(\mathcal{L}) \in C^\infty(TQ) .$$

The Lagrangian energy associated with \mathcal{L} is the function

$$E_{\mathcal{L}} := A_{\mathcal{L}} - \mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ) .$$

Remark 3.31 • The physical observable represented by the Lagrangian energy is the total energy of the system, and this justifies this terminology.

- There are Lagrangian functions which, being different, give the same Lagrangian form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ and the same Lagrangian energy $E_{\mathcal{L}}$. They are called *gauge-equivalent Lagrangians* (and they are studied in Section 3.5.3).

- It is important to point out that, for an arbitrary function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$, the form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ has not constant rank in TQ necessarily. The Lagrangian \mathcal{L} is said to be *geometrically admissible* when this rank is constant. The theory we are developing concerns Lagrangian systems of this kind ⁸.

Local expressions: Consider a natural chart $(U; q^i, v^i)$ in TQ . Remember that the local expression of the vertical endomorphism and the Liouville vector field on this chart are $J = dq^i \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$ and $\Delta = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$. Then, given a Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(q^i, v^i)$, the local expressions of the action and the Lagrangian energy associated with the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} are

$$A_{\mathcal{L}} = v^i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i}, \quad E_{\mathcal{L}} = v^i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} - \mathcal{L}.$$

The more general expression for a 1-form in TQ is

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = a_i(q^j, v^j) dq^i + b_i(q^j, v^j) dv^i,$$

then, for an arbitrary $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$,

$$Y = A^i(q^j, v^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + B^i(q^j, v^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i},$$

we have that

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}(Y) = a_i A^i + b_i B^i$$

and furthermore, by definition,

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}(Y) := (d\mathcal{L} \circ J)(Y) = \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} dq^i + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} dv^i \right) \left(A^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \right) = A^i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i};$$

therefore, from both expressions we obtain that $a_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i}$ and $b_i = 0$; that is

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} dq^i,$$

and, as a consequence,

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} dq^i \wedge dq^j + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} dq^i \wedge dv^j.$$

It is important to remark that, for an arbitrary function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$, although the Lagrangian 2-form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is always closed, it is not necessarily non-degenerated (since, as it is seen from the above local expression, its rank is determined by the second derivatives of the function \mathcal{L}). Then:

⁸When this is not the case, there exists a more general framework which consists in using *Poisson manifolds* as phase states for the formalism (see, for instance, [235]).

Definition 3.32 $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$ is a **regular Lagrangian function** (and (TQ, \mathcal{L}) is a **regular Lagrangian system**) if the Lagrangian 2-form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is nondegenerated. Otherwise, \mathcal{L} is a **singular Lagrangian function** (and (TQ, \mathcal{L}) is said to be a **singular Lagrangian system**)⁹.

The non degeneracy of the Lagrangian 2-form can be characterized locally as follows:

Proposition 3.33 Let (TQ, \mathcal{L}) be a Lagrangian system. Then \mathcal{L} is a regular Lagrangian if, and only if, in a natural chart $(U; q^i, v^i)$ of TQ , the Hessian matrix $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{L}} := \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} \right)$ is regular at every point of U .

(Proof) We have to prove that $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is nondegenerated if, and only if, this condition holds. Then, it suffices to take into account that $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(TQ)$ is non degenerated if, and only if, $(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}})^n$ is a volume form in TQ . Therefore,

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}^n = n! \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} \right)^n dq^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dq^n \wedge dv^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dv^n ,$$

which is a non-vanishing form at every point when $\det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} \right) \neq 0$ at every point. ■

3.2.3. Lagrangian dynamical equations. Euler–Lagrange equations

The dynamical equation in the Lagrangian formalism is stated in the following:

Postulate 3.34 (Fourth Postulate of Lagrangian mechanics): *The dynamical trajectories of a Lagrangian system (TQ, \mathcal{L}) are the integral curves of a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ such that:*

1. $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a solution to the equation

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}} . \quad (3.4)$$

2. $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE; that is,

$$J(X_{\mathcal{L}}) = \Delta . \quad (3.5)$$

Equation (3.4) is called the **Lagrangian equation for vector fields**, and a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ solution to (3.4) (if it exists) is a **Lagrangian dynamical vector field**. If, in addition, the condition (3.5) holds, then $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is called an **Euler–Lagrange vector field** of the system,

⁹In this exposition, we are mainly interested in regular Lagrangian systems.

Bearing in mind the definition of integral curve and equation (2.11), it is immediate to prove that:

Theorem 3.35 *The vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\text{TQ})$ is a Lagrangian vector field for a Lagrangian system (TQ, \mathcal{L}) if, and only if, the integral curves $c: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ of $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ are the solutions to the equations*

$$i(\tilde{c})(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \circ c) = dE_{\mathcal{L}} \circ c, \quad (3.6)$$

Equation (3.6) is the **Lagrangian equation** for the integral curves of $X_{\mathcal{L}}$. If, in addition, $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE, then c is a holonomic curve and (3.6) is the **Euler–Lagrange equation** for the integral curves of $X_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Remark 3.36 It is usual to require that the Lagrangian dynamical equations are obtained from a variational principle (as we will see in Section 3.6) and the necessary condition for it is that the integral curves of the dynamical vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ must be canonical lifts of curves in the base Q of the bundle TQ which represents the Lagrangian phase space; and hence $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ must be a SODE.

Definition 3.37 *Given a Lagrangian dynamical system (TQ, \mathcal{L}) , the **Lagrangian problem** posed by the system consists in finding a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\text{TQ})$ verifying the conditions (3.4) and (3.5).*

Local expressions: Consider a natural chart $(U; q^i, v^i)$ of TQ . Bearing in mind the local expressions of the several geometric elements appearing in the dynamical equations we obtain that, if $X_{\mathcal{L}} = A^i(q^j, v^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + B^i(q^j, v^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$, equation (3.4), written in coordinates, is:

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} B^i - \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial q^i} \right) A^i + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial q^j} v^i - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} = 0, \quad (3.7)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} (A^i - v^i) = 0. \quad (3.8)$$

As we know, condition (3.5) is locally equivalent to demand that $A^i = v^i$. Furthermore, the integral curves $\sigma: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{TQ}$ of $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ are canonical lifts of curves $\gamma: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$; therefore, if $\gamma(t) = (q^i(t))$, then $\sigma(t) = (q^i(t), \dot{q}^i(t))$ and

$$A^i = v^i = \frac{dq^i}{dt}, \quad B^i = \frac{d^2 q^i}{dt^2},$$

and the combination of these expressions with equations (3.7) and (3.8) leads to the equation of the integral curves which is

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} \circ \sigma \right) \frac{d^2 q^i}{dt^2} = - \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial q^i} \circ \sigma \right) \frac{dq^i}{dt} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} \circ \sigma,$$

and can be written as

$$(H_{\mathcal{L}})_{ji}(q^k(t), \dot{q}^k(t)) \frac{d^2 q^i}{dt^2} = F_j(q^k(t), \dot{q}^k(t)) ,$$

or also in an equivalent form as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j} \circ \sigma \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} \circ \sigma = 0 . \quad (3.9)$$

This is the classical coordinate expression of the Euler–Lagrange equation (3.6).

Therefore, for the case of regular Lagrangians we have the following result:

Theorem 3.38 *Let (TQ, \mathcal{L}) be a regular Lagrangian system. Then, there exists a unique vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ which is the solution to the Lagrangian equation (3.4) and it is a SODE.*

(Proof) The existence and uniqueness are a straightforward consequence of the fact that $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is non-degenerated.

Furthermore, if the Lagrangian is regular, the Hessian matrix $H_{\mathcal{L}}$ is regular and equation (3.8) leads to $A^i = v^i$, and thus the vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE. (Observe that, in this case, all the coefficients B^i are determined by equations (3.7)).

■

Assuming that the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} is regular, from (3.7) and (3.8), we can obtain the local expression of the Lagrangian dynamical vector field:

$$X_{\mathcal{L}} = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + W^{ik} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} - v^j \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^k} , \quad (3.10)$$

where W^{ik} is the inverse matrix of the partial Hessian of \mathcal{L} , that is $W^{ik}W_{ji} = \delta_j^k$.

Remark 3.39 • For Lagrangian systems, the triple $(TQ, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, dE_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a Hamiltonian system which is regular or singular, depending on the regularity of the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} . Thus, the Lagrangian formalism of these kinds of systems is a Hamiltonian formalism with certain additional characteristics.

- If the Lagrangian system is singular, then $(TQ, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, dE_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a presymplectic Hamiltonian system and then equation (3.4) is not necessarily compatible everywhere on TQ and, even in the case that it has solution, it is not unique and it is not necessarily a SODE. In fact, if $X_{\mathcal{L}}^0$ is a solution, then $X_{\mathcal{L}}^0 + Z$, with $Z \in \ker \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, is also a solution. Then, in order to obtain the Euler–Lagrange equations (3.6), the condition $J(X_{\mathcal{L}}) = \Delta$ must be added to the above Lagrangian

equations. In general, solutions $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ could exist only in some submanifold $S_f \hookrightarrow TQ$. and a suitable *constraint algorithm* must be implemented in order to find this *final constraint submanifold* S_f (if it exists) where there are SODE vector fields $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$, tangent to S_f , which are (not necessarily unique) solutions to the Lagrangian equations on S_f . All these problems have been also widely studied (see, for instance, [24,25,67,68,174,175,210,266]).

3.3. Canonical Hamiltonian formalism for Lagrangian systems

The *canonical Hamiltonian formalism* of Mechanics was initially introduced by *Hamilton, Lagrange, Poisson, Ostrogradsky* and *Donkin*, among others, and constitutes the dual formulation of the Lagrangian formalism. Its construction is based on the introduction of a map: the *fiber derivative* of the Lagrangian function.

3.3.1. Legendre map

Definition 3.40 Let (TQ, \mathcal{L}) be a Lagrangian dynamical system. The **Legendre map** associated with this system is the fiber derivative of \mathcal{L} ; that is the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{FL} : TQ &\longrightarrow T^*Q \\ (q, u) &\longmapsto (q, D\mathcal{L}_q(u)) \end{aligned} .$$

Local expression: Given a natural chart $(U; q^i, v^i)$ in TQ and the corresponding canonical coordinates $(\mathcal{FL}(U); q^i, p_i)$ in T^*Q , the local expression of \mathcal{FL} is

$$q^i \circ \mathcal{FL} = q^i, \quad p_i \circ \mathcal{FL} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} ,$$

the coordinates p_i are called the *generalized momenta* associated with the generalized coordinates q^i .

A relevant characteristic of the Legendre map is given by the following:

Theorem 3.41 If Θ and Ω are the canonical forms in T^*Q , $\mathcal{FL}^*\Theta = \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\mathcal{FL}^*\Omega = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$.

(Proof) The local expression of Θ is $\Theta = p_i dq^i$; therefore

$$\mathcal{FL}^*\Theta = (\mathcal{FL}^* p_i) d(q^i \circ \mathcal{FL}) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} dq^i = \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} ,$$

and, bearing in mind that \mathcal{FL}^* commutes with the exterior differential, we obtain the result for Ω . ■

Working also with local coordinates, it is immediate to prove that:

Proposition 3.42 \mathcal{L} is a regular Lagrangian if, and only if, \mathcal{FL} is a local diffeomorphism.

(Proof) As \mathcal{L} is C^∞ , the necessary and sufficient condition for \mathcal{FL} to be a local diffeomorphism is that, for all $p \in TQ$, the differential of \mathcal{L} at p , $D_p \mathcal{FL}$, is an isomorphism. Then it suffices to analyze the local expression of the Jacobian matrix of \mathcal{FL} at p , which is

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{FL}}(p) = \begin{pmatrix} (\text{Id})_{n \times n} & (0)_{n \times n} \\ \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i \partial v^j}(p) \right) & \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j}(p) \right) \end{pmatrix} ;$$

therefore, $\det \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{FL}}(p) \neq 0$ if, and only if, $\det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j}(p) \right) \neq 0$. ■

This leads to:

Definition 3.43 \mathcal{L} is a *hyperregular Lagrangian* if \mathcal{FL} is a (global) diffeomorphism.

Remark 3.44 If \mathcal{L} is regular (but not hiperregular), then $\mathcal{FL}(TQ) = U \subset T^*Q$ (where U is an open set). If \mathcal{L} is hiperregular, then $\mathcal{FL}(TQ) = T^*Q$

Regarding the singular Lagrangians, the most interesting ones are:

Definition 3.45 \mathcal{L} is an *almost-regular Lagrangian* if:

1. $\mathcal{FL}(TQ) \equiv P$ is a closed submanifold of T^*Q .
2. \mathcal{FL} is a submersion onto its image.
3. The fibers $\mathcal{FL}^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}(p))$, for every $p \in TQ$, are connected submanifolds of TQ .

3.3.2. Canonical Hamiltonian formalism. Equivalence with the Lagrangian formalism

We study essentially the case of hiperregular systems. Nevertheless, all the results hold also for the case de regular systems in general, changing T^*Q by $\mathcal{FL}(TQ) \subset T^*Q$ (or locally, at least). First, as \mathcal{FL} is a diffeomorphism we have:

Proposition 3.46 Let (TQ, \mathcal{L}) be a hiperregular Lagrangian system. Then there exists a unique function $h \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$ such that $\mathcal{FL}^*h = E_{\mathcal{L}}$, which is called the **Hamiltonian function** associated with the system (TQ, \mathcal{L}) , and the triple (T^*Q, Ω, h) is the **canonical Hamiltonian system** associated with (TQ, \mathcal{L}) .

As $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ represents the energy of the system in the Lagrangian formalism, the function h represents the same observable in the canonical Hamiltonian formalism.

Therefore, we have the regular Hamiltonian system (T^*Q, Ω, dh) , where Ω is the canonical 2-form in T^*Q fulfilling the Postulates and results established in Section 2.2.1. In particular, the Hamiltonian equations for vector fields and their integral curves read

$$i(X_h)\Omega = dh \quad , \quad X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q) . \quad (3.11)$$

$$i(\tilde{c})(\Omega \circ c) = dh \circ c \quad , \quad c: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow T^*Q ; \quad (3.12)$$

Their local expressions in a natural chart of coordinates $U; q^i, p_i$ in T^*Q are the following: if $X_h|_U = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + g_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$, then,

$$f^i = \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_i} \quad ; \quad g_i = -\frac{\partial h}{\partial q^i}$$

and its integral curves $c(t) = (q^i(t), p_i(t))$ solution to (3.12) are the solutions to the system of first-order differential equations

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_i}(c(t)), \quad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial h}{\partial q^i}(c(t)) . \quad (3.13)$$

The relation between the Lagrangian and the canonical Hamiltonian formalisms of a (hyper)regular Lagrangian system is stated in the following:

Theorem 3.47 (Equivalence Theorem) Let (TQ, \mathcal{L}) be a (hyper)regular Lagrangian system.

1. If $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the Lagrangian vector field solution to equations (3.4) and (3.5), then there exists a unique vector field $\mathcal{FL}_*X_{\mathcal{L}} \equiv X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ which is the solution to equations (3.11).

Conversely, if X_h is the Hamiltonian vector field solution to equation (3.11), then there exists a unique vector field $\mathcal{FL}_*^{-1}X_h \equiv X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ which is the solution to equations (3.4) and (3.5).

2. Equivalently, if $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$ is a curve and its canonical lift $\tilde{\gamma}: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ$ is a solution to equation (3.6), then $\zeta = \mathcal{FL} \circ \tilde{\gamma}$ is a curve solution to equation (3.12).

Conversely, if $\zeta: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow T^*Q$ is a curve solution to equation (3.12), then $\tilde{\gamma} = \pi_Q \circ \zeta: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ$ is a curve solution to equation (3.6).

(Proof)

1. For the first item we have that

$$0 = i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} - dE_{\mathcal{L}} = i(X_{\mathcal{L}})(\mathcal{FL}^*\Omega) - d(\mathcal{FL}^*h) = \mathcal{FL}^*[i(X_h)\Omega - dh]$$

and as \mathcal{FL} is a diffeomorphism, this is equivalent to equation (3.11). The proof that $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE is a consequence of the regularity.


2. For the second item, if $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a solution to equations (3.6) then, by Theorem 3.35, it is an integral curve of the Euler–Lagrange vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$, and this means that $\dot{\tilde{\gamma}} = X_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \tilde{\gamma}$. Then, as $\zeta = \mathcal{FL} \circ \tilde{\gamma}$ and $\mathcal{FL}_*X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_h$, we have that

$$\dot{\zeta} = T\mathcal{FL} \circ \dot{\tilde{\gamma}} = T\mathcal{FL} \circ X_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \tilde{\gamma} = X_h \circ \mathcal{FL} \circ \tilde{\gamma} = X_h \circ \zeta ;$$

then ζ is an integral curve of the Hamiltonian vector field X_h and, by Theorem 2.21, it is a solution to equation (3.12)

Conversely, from a solution ζ to the equation (3.12), we construct the curve $\gamma = \pi_Q \circ \zeta$ and its canonical lift $\tilde{\gamma}$. Then, reasoning as above, we conclude that $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a solution to (3.6).

The following (commutative) diagram summarizes the situation



■

Remark 3.48 If (TQ, \mathcal{L}) is an almost-regular Lagrangian system and $j_0: P \hookrightarrow T^*Q$ is the natural embedding of $P \equiv \mathcal{FL}(TQ)$ in T^*Q , then it can be proved that there exists $h_0 \in C^\infty(P)$ such that $\mathcal{FL}_0^*h_0 = E_{\mathcal{L}}$, where $\mathcal{FL}_0: TQ \rightarrow P$ is defined by $\mathcal{FL} = j_0 \circ \mathcal{FL}_0$. This function is the *canonical Hamiltonian function* of the system, and has the same physical interpretation than h . Now, taking $\Omega_0 = j_0^*\Omega$, the triple (P, Ω_0, dh_0) is in this case the *canonical Hamiltonian system* associated with (TQ, \mathcal{L}) ,

which is the equivalent to (T^*Q, Ω, dh) in the regular case, and is a presymplectic Hamiltonian system, in general. In particular, the equation equivalent to (3.11) is

$$i(X_{h_0})\Omega_0 = dh_0 \quad ; \quad X_{h_0} \in \mathfrak{X}(P) ,$$

which, if Ω_0 is a presymplectic form, is incompatible in general and, in the most interesting cases, X_{h_0} exists only in some submanifold $P_f \hookrightarrow P$, and is tangent to it. Moreover, the solution is not unique, since if X_{h_0} is a solution, then $X_{h_0} + Z$, for every $Z \in \ker \Omega_0$, is also a solution.

Details on the construction of the canonical Hamiltonian formalism for almost-regular Lagrangians and a deeper study on the equivalence of both, the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms, for this case can be found, for instance, in [24, 65, 67, 68, 174, 185, 210, 307]).

3.3.3. Discussion and comparison

As a summary of the results in this section, we state the essential characteristics of the Lagrangian and canonical Hamiltonian formalisms of the Lagrangian dynamical systems.

In the Lagrangian formalism we have that:

1. Local description:

- (a) To describe locally the *states* of the system we use the *generalized coordinates* (q^i) ($i = 1, \dots, n$), representing the degrees of freedom of the system, and the *generalized velocities* (v^i) corresponding to each generalized coordinate.
- (b) The dynamical information of the system is given by the *Lagrangian function* of the system, $\mathcal{L}(q^i, v^i)$.
- (c) The dynamical evolution of the system is described by the *Euler–Lagrange equations* (3.9), which are a second-order system of n differential equations for the functions $q^i(t)$.
- (d) The dynamical system is *regular* if $\det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j}(q, v) \right) \neq 0$ in all the points (q, v) . In this case, given a set of initial conditions (that is, a state of the system), the local solution to the equations is unique.

2. In the geometrical description, the above characteristics are translated as:

- (a) The phase space of the system is the tangent bundle TQ of the manifold Q which constitutes the configuration space of the system.

- (b) The Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$ contains the dynamical information of the system.
- (c) Starting from this function and using the geometric structures of the tangent bundle (the *canonical endomorphism* and the *Liouville vector field*), one can construct the *Lagrange 2-form* $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ and the *Lagrangian energy* of the system, $E_{\mathcal{L}}$, and write the Lagrangian dynamical equations which are $i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}}$, together with the second-order condition $J(X_{\mathcal{L}}) = \Delta$. The integral curves of $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ are the dynamical trajectories of the system.
- (d) The dynamical system is *regular* if $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a non-degenerated form. In this case, the vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is unique and necessarily a SODE.

Concerning to the canonical Hamiltonian formalism, we have that:

1. Local description:

- (a) The states of the system are now described by generalized coordinates of position (q^i) and their corresponding generalized momenta (p_i) .
- (b) The dynamical information of the system is given by the *Hamiltonian function* of the system, $h(q^i, p_i)$.
- (c) The dynamical evolution of the system is obtained from the *Hamilton equations* (3.13), which are a first-order system of $2n$ differential equations.
- (d) The dynamical system is *regular* if \mathcal{FL} is a (local) diffeomorphism.
In this case, given a set of initial conditions (that is, a state of the system), the solution to the equations is unique.

2. In the geometrical description, the above characteristics are translated as::

- (a) The phase space of the system is $\mathcal{FL}(TQ)$, and is, whether the cotangent bundle T^*Q of the manifold Q which constitutes the configuration space of the system, or an open set $U \subset T^*Q$, or a submanifold $P \hookrightarrow T^*Q$ (depending on the regularity of \mathcal{L}).
- (b) The dynamical information is given by $h \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$, (resp. $h_0 \in C^\infty(P)$): the *Hamiltonian function*.
- (c) The Hamiltonian dynamical equations are obtained using this function and the canonical 2-form of the cotangent bundle Ω , and they are $i(X_h)\Omega = dh$ (resp. $i(X_{h_0})\Omega_0 = dh_0$). The integral curves of the vector field solution are the dynamical trajectories of the system.

- (d) The dynamical systems is *regular* if \mathcal{FL} is a (local) diffeomorphism, and hence $\mathcal{FL}(TQ) = U \subseteq T^*Q$.

The canonical Hamiltonian formalism is especially interesting by the following facts:

- Locally, it is manifest the asymmetry between the sets of variables q^i and v^i in the Lagrangian dynamical equations. This does not happen in the dynamical equations of the Hamiltonian formalism, with the coordinates q^i and p_i .
- Geometrically, in the Lagrangian formalism, the Lagrange 2-form and the Lagrangian energy, which appear in the dynamical equations, are obtained from the Lagrangian function and the canonical structures of the tangent bundle. This means that the dynamical information is present in both the Lagrangian 2-form and the Lagrangian energy.

On the contrary, in the canonical Hamiltonian formalism, the corresponding geometric elements appearing in the dynamical equations are the canonical 2-form of the cotangent bundle and the Hamiltonian function; the first of them contains only the geometric information and the second one only the dynamical information.

- Finally, the characteristics of the canonical Hamiltonian formalism are suitable in order to make the quantization of the physical system and, in particular, to implement the so-called *geometric quantization procedure* (see, for instance, [28, 149, 158, 197, 213, 304, 310, 312, 324, 347]).

In conclusion, a *Lagrangian dynamical system* can be thought as a triple $(TQ, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{L}})$ in the Lagrangian formalism, or as a triple (T^*Q, Ω, h) (or (P, Ω_0, h_0)), in the canonical Hamiltonian formalism. In both cases, the phase spaces are differential manifolds endowed with closed differential 2-forms (symplectic or presymplectic, depending on the regularity of the system).

3.3.4. Geometric Hamilton–Jacobi theory

One of the most relevant features of the study of Hamiltonian systems is the *Hamilton–Jacobi theory*, which gives a way to integrate Hamilton equations (and systems of first-order ordinary differential equations in general). The classical theory is based on using canonical transformations [7, 157, 209, 223, 298] and is also extended to singular systems [143] or higher-order dynamics [91]. The geometric description of the standard theory and other geometric descriptions (for autonomous Hamiltonian systems) is well-established in several texts, as [1, 7, 26, 209, 235, 244]. Following the ideas stated in [1,

218], the Hamilton–Jacobi theory has been formulated, recently, in a new more general geometric perspective both for the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian formalisms, for autonomous and nonautonomous mechanical systems [60]. This framework has been extended to many other situations; namely, to singular Lagrangian and singular Hamiltonian systems [126, 127, 230], holonomic and nonholonomic mechanics [22, 61, 121, 208, 230, 272, 274], higher-order dynamical systems [88, 89], control theory [18, 339], systems described using Poisson manifolds [127, 193] and Lie algebroids [10, 231], dissipative systems described using contact manifolds [111, 112, 194], discretization of dynamical systems [19, 273], first-order classical field theories [43, 120, 124, 129, 134] and higher-order field theories [333, 335], partial differential equations in general [334, 336], and other geometric applications and generalizations [17, 62, 192, 340]. (A review on this approach and some of its applications is given in [296]).

Next, we review the foundations of this geometric framework of the Hamilton–Jacobi theory for the Hamiltonian formalisms of autonomous dynamical systems.

Let (T^*Q, ω, h) be a Hamiltonian system and $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ the Hamiltonian vector field.

Definition 3.49 *The **generalized Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem** consists in finding a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ and a 1-form $\alpha \in \Omega^1(Q)$ such that, if $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ is an integral curve of X , then $\alpha \circ \gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q$ is an integral curve of X_h ; that is, if $X \circ \gamma = \dot{\gamma}$, then $\bar{\alpha} \circ \dot{\gamma} = X_h \circ (\alpha \circ \gamma)$. The pair (X, α) is said to be a **solution to the generalized Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem**.*

We have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & TQ & \xleftarrow{T\pi_Q} & T(T^*Q) \\
 & & \uparrow X & \searrow T\alpha & \uparrow X_h \\
 \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & Q & \xleftarrow{\pi_Q} & T^*Q \\
 & & & \searrow \alpha &
 \end{array}$$

Solutions to the generalized Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem are characterized as follows:

Theorem 3.50 *The following statements are equivalent:*

1. The pair (X, α) is a solution to the generalized Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem.

2. The vector fields X and X_h are α -related; that is, $X_h \circ \alpha = T\alpha \circ X$.

Therefore $X = T\pi_Q \circ X_h \circ \alpha$ and, as a consequence, the integral curves of X_h with initial conditions in $\text{Im } \alpha$ project onto the integral curves of X .

X is called the **vector field associated with the form α** .

3. The submanifold $\text{Im } \alpha$ of T^*Q is invariant by X_h (that is, X_h is tangent to $\text{Im } \alpha$).

4. $i(X)d\alpha = -d(\alpha^*H)$.

(Proof) The equivalence between 1 and 2 is as follows: If (X, α) satisfies the condition in Definition 3.49 then, for every integral curve of X , $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$, by definition $X \circ \gamma = \dot{\gamma}$, then

$$X_h \circ \alpha \circ \gamma = \overline{\alpha \circ \dot{\gamma}} = T\alpha \circ \dot{\gamma} = T\alpha \circ X \circ \gamma ;$$

and hence $X_h \circ \alpha = T\alpha \circ X$. The proof of the converse is immediate.

From here, composing both members of this equality with $T\pi_Q$ and taking into account that $\pi_Q \circ \alpha = \text{Id}_Q$, we obtain that $X = T\pi_Q \circ X_h \circ \alpha$. As a consequence, we conclude that the π_Q -projection of the integral curves of X_h in $\text{Im } \alpha$ are the integral curves of X .

For the equivalence between 2 and 3 we have that, if $X_h \circ \alpha = T\alpha \circ X$, then $X_h(\alpha(q)) = T\alpha(X(q))$, for every $q \in Q$ and therefore X_h is tangent to $\text{Im } \alpha$. Conversely, if $\text{Im } \alpha$ is invariant by X_h then $X_h(\alpha(q)) \in T_{\alpha(q)}\text{Im } \alpha$, which implies that there exists $u \in T_q Q$ such that $X_h(\alpha(q)) = T_q \alpha(u)$. Defining X by $T_q \alpha(X_q) = X_h(\alpha(q))$, we have that X is differentiable, since $X = T\pi_Q \circ X_h \circ \alpha$, and thus X is a vector field in Q satisfying that $X_h \circ \alpha = T\alpha \circ X$, and then α is a solution to the generalized Hamilton–Jacobi problem.

If (X, α) is a solution to the generalized Hamilton–Jacobi problem, by item 2 we have that $X = T\pi_Q \circ X_h \circ \alpha$ and

Finally, the proof of the equivalence with 4 is the following: from the Hamiltonian equation (3.11) we obtain that

$$\alpha^* i(X_h)\omega = \alpha^* dh = d(\alpha^* h) .$$

As Θ is the canonical form of T^*Q , then $\alpha^*\Theta = \alpha$, and

$$\alpha^*\Omega = -\alpha^*d\Theta = -d(\alpha^*\Theta) = -d\alpha , \quad (3.14)$$

and, as X and X_h are α -related, we have

$$\alpha^* i(X_h)\omega = i(X)\alpha^*\Omega = -i(X)d\alpha ,$$

which yields condition 4. For the converse, first define $Z_h = X_h \circ \alpha - T\alpha \circ X: Q \longrightarrow T(T^*Q)$, which is a vector field along α ; then we have to prove that $Z_h = 0$. First, we have that Z_h is π_Q -vertical since, as $\pi_Q \circ \alpha = \text{Id}_Q$,

$$\begin{aligned} T\pi_Q \circ Z_h &= T\pi_Q \circ (X_h \circ \alpha - T\alpha \circ X) = T\pi_Q \circ (X_h \circ \alpha - T\alpha \circ T\pi_Q \circ X_h \circ \alpha) \\ &= T\pi_Q \circ X_h \circ \alpha - T\pi_Q \circ X_h \circ \alpha = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

From equation (3.11) and the hypothesis, as $\alpha^*\Omega = -d\alpha$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^* i(X_h)\Omega &= \alpha^* dh = d(\alpha^*h) , \\ i(X)\alpha^*\Omega &= -i(X)d\alpha = d(\alpha^*h) , \end{aligned}$$

hence $\alpha^* i(X_h)\Omega - i(X)\alpha^*\Omega = 0$. Therefore, for every $q \in Q$ and $Y_q \in T_qQ$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (\alpha^* i(X_h)\Omega - i(X)\alpha^*\Omega)_q(Y_q) \\ &= \Omega_{\alpha(q)}(X_h(\alpha(q)), T_q\alpha(Y_q)) - \Omega_{\alpha(q)}(T_q\alpha(X_q), T_q\alpha(Y_q)) \\ &= \Omega_{\alpha(q)}(Z_h(q), T_q\alpha(Y_q)) . \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, as $V(\pi_Q)$ is a Lagrangian distribution in (T^*Q, Ω) , for every π_Q -vertical vector field $V \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ we have that $\Omega_{\alpha(q)}(Z_h(q), V(\alpha(q))) = 0$; but $T_{\alpha(q)}T^*Q = T_{\alpha(q)}(\text{Im } \alpha) \oplus V_{\alpha(q)}(\pi_Q)$, and thus we have proved that

$$\Omega_{\alpha(q)}(Z_h(q), Z(\alpha(q))) = 0 ;$$

for every $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$. Then we conclude that $Z_h = 0$, since Ω is non-degenerate; or what is equivalent, X and X_h are α -related, and thus (X, α) is a solution to the generalized Hamilton–Jacobi problem ■

To solve the generalized Hamilton–Jacobi problem is, in general, a very difficult task. Then, it is usual to state a less general version of the problem which leads to the standard version of the Hamilton–Jacobi problem:

Definition 3.51 *The **Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem** consists in finding a closed 1-form $\alpha \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$ which is a solution to the generalized Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem. This form α is said to be a **solution to the Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem**.*

As $d\alpha = 0$, for every point in Q , there exists a function S in a neighbourhood $U \subset Q$ such that $\alpha = dS$. Then, we say that S is a *local generating function* of the solution α .

Theorem 3.52 *The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The form $\alpha \in \Omega^1(Q)$ is a solution to the Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem.*
2. *$\text{Im } \alpha$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of T^*Q , which is invariant by X_h , and S is a local generating function of this Lagrangian submanifold.*
3. *The condition $d(\alpha^*h) = 0$ holds or, what is equivalent, the function $h \circ dS: Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is locally constant.*

(Proof) These statements are consequences of Theorem 3.50 and Definition 3.51. In fact, if α is a solution to the Hamilton–Jacobi problem, as a consequence of (3.14), $d\alpha = 0$ is equivalent to $\alpha^*\Omega = 0$. Then $\text{Im } \alpha$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of (T^*Q, Ω) , which is contained in a level set of h , because the condition $i(X)d\alpha = -d(\alpha^*h)$ implies that $d(\alpha^*h) = 0$. Notice that $\dim \text{Im } \alpha = n$ and, if $j_\alpha: \text{Im } \alpha \hookrightarrow T^*Q$ is the natural embedding, we have that $j_\alpha^*\Omega = 0$. ■

In natural coordinates of T^*Q , condition (3) is the classical form of the Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi equation:

$$H\left(q^i, \frac{\partial S}{\partial q^i}\right) = E \text{ (ctn.)} . \quad (3.15)$$

Until now, we have only considered particular solutions α to the (generalized) Hamilton–Jacobi problem, which are given by particular solutions to the partial differential equation (3.15). Nevertheless, we are also interested in the general solution. Then:

Definition 3.53 *Let $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. A family of solutions $\{\alpha_\lambda; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ (which depends on n parameters $\lambda \equiv (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Lambda$) is a **complete solution** to the Hamilton–Jacobi problem if the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : Q \times \Lambda &\longrightarrow T^*Q \\ (q, \lambda) &\mapsto \alpha_\lambda(q) \end{aligned}$$

is a local diffeomorphism.

Remark 3.54 • Given a complete solution $\{\alpha_\lambda; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$, since $d\alpha_\lambda = 0$, for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, there is a family of functions $\{S_\lambda\}$ defined in open sets $U_\lambda \subset Q$ such that $\alpha_\lambda = dS_\lambda$. Therefore, we have a function

$$\begin{aligned} S : \bigcap U_\lambda \times \Lambda \subset Q \times \Lambda &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (q, \lambda) &\mapsto S_\lambda(q) \end{aligned}$$

which is locally defined, and is called a *local generating function* of the complete solution $\{\alpha_\lambda; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$.

- Every complete solution defines a Lagrangian foliation in T^*Q which is transverse to the fibers, and such that X_h is tangent to the leaves. This foliation is locally defined by a family of functions which are the components of a map $F: T^*Q \xrightarrow{\Phi^{-1}} Q \times \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore, these functions are a set of constants of motion of X_h .

Conversely, from a set n first integrals f_1, \dots, f_n of X_h in involution, such that $df_1 \wedge \dots \wedge df_n \neq 0$; we can define a π -transversal Lagrangian foliation of T^*Q taking $f_i = \lambda_i$, with $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and in this way we obtain a local complete solution $\{\alpha_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$. Then, from equations $f_i = \lambda_i$, we can locally isolate $p_i = p_i(q, \lambda)$, replace them in the expression of X_h and finally project to the basis, then obtaining the family of vector fields $\{X_\lambda\}$ associated with the local complete solution. From a complete solution $\{\alpha_\lambda; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$, all the integral curves of X_h are obtained starting from the integral curves of the vector fields $\{X_\lambda\}$ associated to this complete solution.

- This geometric framework for the Hamilton–Jacobi theory can be also stated in a very natural way for the Lagrangian formalism (see [60]).

The “classical” Hamilton–Jacobi problem for a (regular) Hamiltonian system (T^*Q, Ω, h) consists in obtaining a canonical transformation which leads the system to equilibrium [7, 209, 223, 298]. This transformation is given by a generating function, which is the solution to the *Hamilton–Jacobi equation*. From a geometric point of view, this canonical transformation is associated with a foliation in the phase space of the system, T^*Q , which has the following properties: it is invariant by the dynamics, transverse to the canonical projection of the cotangent bundle, and is Lagrangian with respect to the canonical symplectic structure of T^*Q . Then, the restriction of the Hamiltonian vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ to each leaf S_λ of this foliation projects onto a vector field $X_\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$, and the integral curves of X_h and X_λ are one-to-one related. In this way, all the dynamical trajectories are recovered from the integral curves of all these vector fields $\{X_\lambda\}$. Thus, the geometric Hamilton–Jacobi problem consists in finding this foliation and the vector fields $\{X_\lambda\}$.

Bearing this in mind, the relation between the classical and the geometric Hamilton–Jacobi theories is established through the equivalence of complete solutions and canonical transformations (see [296, 336]).

Theorem 3.55 *A complete solution $\{\alpha_\lambda; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ to the Hamilton–Jacobi problem provides a canonical transformation $\Phi: T^*Q \rightarrow T^*Q$ leading the system to equilibrium, and conversely.*

(Proof) Let $\{\alpha_\lambda; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ be a complete solution, and let \mathcal{S} be a generating function of it in a neighbourhood of every point of T^*Q . As $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(q^i, \lambda^i)$, the set λ^i can

be identified with a subset of coordinates $\lambda^i \equiv \tilde{q}^i$ in $T^*Q \times T^*Q$, and therefore $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(q^i, \tilde{q}^i)$ can be thought as the local expression of a generating function of a local canonical transformation Φ , and hence of an open set W of the Lagrangian submanifold $\text{graph } \Phi \hookrightarrow T^*Q \times T^*Q$. When this construction is done in every chart, we obtain the transformation Φ and the submanifold $\text{graph } \Phi$. Finally, since (3.15) holds for every particular solution S_λ , we have that

$$E = h \left(q^i(\tilde{q}, \tilde{p}), \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial q^i}(q(\tilde{q}, \tilde{p}), \tilde{q}) \right) = h(\tilde{q}^i, \tilde{p}_i) .$$

Conversely, starting from a canonical transformation Φ and a generating function $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(q^i, \tilde{q}^i)$; if we take $\tilde{q} \equiv (\tilde{q}^i) = (\lambda^i) \equiv \lambda$, we obtain a family of functions $\{S_\lambda\}$ and then we get a local complete solution $\{\alpha_\lambda = dS_\lambda; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ to the Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem. Doing this construction in every chart, we have the complete solution. This means that, on each local chart of T^*Q , fixing the coordinates $\tilde{q}^i = \lambda^i$ of a point, we obtain a local submanifold of T^*Q whose image by Φ^{-1} is the image of a local section $\alpha_\lambda: Q \rightarrow T^*Q$ which constitutes a particular solution to the Hamiltonian Hamilton–Jacobi problem. ■

3.4. Skinner-Rusk unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism

In their seminal articles of 1983 [307, 308], *R. Skinner* and *R. Rusk* proposed a new geometric framework in order to unify the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian formalisms of first-order autonomous mechanical systems into a single one formulation. This is a simpler and elegant framework which is particularly suitable for the treatment of singular systems. Later, this nice formalism was generalized to many other types of physical systems; such as nonautonomous dynamical systems [21, 47, 184], vakonomic and nonholonomic mechanics [92] control systems [20, 87], higher-order mechanics [281, 282], dissipative systems (first and higher-order contact mechanics) [105, 106], and first-order and higher-order classical field theories [44, 51, 118, 145, 284, 290, 291, 332].

In this section, we describe the main features of this so-called *Skinner-Rusk or unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism* for autonomous dynamical systems.

3.4.1. Unified bundle. Unified formalism

This formalism is developed in the following bundle:

Definition 3.56 *The unified bundle or Pontryagin bundle is $\mathcal{W} = TQ \times_Q T^*Q$ and has natural projections*

$$\varrho_1: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow TQ, \quad \varrho_2: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow T^*Q, \quad \varrho_0: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow Q,$$

Natural coordinates in \mathcal{W} are (q^i, v^i, p_i) .

Definition 3.57 A curve $c: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ is **holonomic** in \mathcal{W} if $\varrho_1 \circ c: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow TQ$ is holonomic.

A vector field $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{W})$ is a **holonomic vector field** in \mathcal{W} if its integral curves are holonomic in \mathcal{W} .

The coordinate expressions of holonomic curves and vector fields in \mathcal{W} are the following

$$\begin{aligned} c(t) &= \left(q^i(t), \frac{dq^i}{dt}(t), p_i(t) \right), \\ \Gamma &= v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + G_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}. \end{aligned}$$

The unified bundle \mathcal{W} is endowed with the following canonical structures:

Definition 3.58 1. The **coupling function** is the map $\mathcal{C}: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} : TQ \times_Q T^*Q &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (q, v_q, \xi_q) = (q^i, v^i, p_i) &\longmapsto \langle v_q \mid \xi_q \rangle = v^i p_i. \end{aligned}$$

2. If $\Theta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$ and $\Omega = -d\Theta \in \Omega^2(T^*Q)$ are the canonical forms in T^*Q , the **canonical forms** in \mathcal{W} are

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{W}} := \varrho_2^* \Theta \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{W}), \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{W}} := -d\Theta_{\mathcal{W}} = \varrho_2^* \Omega \in \Omega^2(\mathcal{W}).$$

And using the coupling function, we introduce:

Definition 3.59 Given a Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$, if $\mathfrak{L} = \varrho_1^* \mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{W})$, the **Hamiltonian function** is defined as

$$\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{C} - \mathfrak{L} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{W}).$$

The coordinate expressions of these elements are

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{W}} = p_i dq^i, \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{W}} = dq^i \wedge dp_i, \quad \mathcal{H} = v^i p_i - \mathfrak{L}(q^i, v^i).$$

The triple $(\mathcal{W}, \Omega_{\mathcal{W}}, \mathcal{H})$ is a presymplectic Hamiltonian system since $\ker \Omega_{\mathcal{W}} = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \right\rangle$. Then, the **dynamical problem** for this system consists in finding $X_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{W})$ which is a solution to the Hamiltonian equations

$$i(X_{\mathcal{H}})\Omega_{\mathcal{W}} = d\mathcal{H}, \tag{3.16}$$

and then the integral curves $c: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ of $X_{\mathcal{H}}$ are solutions to the equations

$$i(\tilde{c})(\Omega_{\mathcal{W}} \circ c) = d\mathcal{H} \circ c. \quad (3.17)$$

As $(\mathcal{W}, \Omega_{\mathcal{W}}, \mathcal{H})$ is a presymplectic Hamiltonian system, these equations are not compatible in \mathcal{W} . In fact, for an arbitrary vector field in $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{W})$,

$$X_{\mathcal{H}} = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + G_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i},$$

equations (3.16) give

$$f^i = v^i, \quad G_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i}, \quad p_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i}. \quad (3.18)$$

- The first equations assure that $X_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a holonomic vector field in \mathcal{W} (regardless of the regularity of the Lagrangian function).
- The second equations allow us to determine the component functions G_i .
- The third equations are compatibility conditions; that is, *compatibility constraints* defining a submanifold $\mathcal{W}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}$ where vector fields $X_{\mathcal{H}}$ solution to (3.16) are defined. Observe that these constraints give the Legendre map and hence $\mathcal{W}_0 = \text{graph}(\mathcal{FL})$.

Thus, we have that

$$X_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{W}_0} = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i},$$

where the functions F^i are still undetermined. Nevertheless, the constraint algorithm for presymplectic systems continues by demanding that $X_{\mathcal{H}}$ is tangent to \mathcal{W}_0 ; that is, we have $X_{\mathcal{H}} \left(p_i - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{W}_0} = 0$, which gives the equations for the remaining coefficients F^i ,

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j} F^j + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} v^j - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} = 0 \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{W}_0). \quad (3.19)$$

If \mathcal{L} is regular, these equations are compatible and define a unique vector field $X_{\mathcal{H}}$ solution to (3.16) on \mathcal{W}_0 , and the last system of equations give the dynamical trajectories. If \mathcal{L} is singular, equations (3.19) can be compatible or not. and, eventually, new compatibility constraints can appear that define a new submanifold $\mathcal{W}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}_0$. In that case, the constraint algorithm continues by demanding the tangency of solutions to the new constraint submanifold \mathcal{W}_1 and so on. In the most favorable cases, there is a submanifold $\mathcal{W}_f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}_0$ (it could be $\mathcal{W}_f = \mathcal{W}_0$) such that there exist holonomic vector fields $X_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{W})$ defined on \mathcal{W}_0 and tangent to \mathcal{W}_f , which are solutions to equations (3.16) at support on \mathcal{W}_f .


3.4.2. Recovering the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms

Next, we study the equivalence of the unified formalism with the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian formalisms. We restrict our analysis to the hyperregular case (the regular case is the same, at least locally).

Denoting by $j_0: \mathcal{W}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}$ the natural embedding, we have that

$$(\varrho_1 \circ j_0)(\mathcal{W}_0) = TQ, \quad (\varrho_2 \circ j_0)(\mathcal{W}_0) = T^*Q,$$

and being \mathcal{W}_0 the graph of the Legendre map, the restricted projection $\varrho_1 \circ j_0$ is a diffeomorphism between \mathcal{W}_0 and TQ . The following diagram summarizes the situation:



Therefore, functions, differential forms, and vector fields in \mathcal{W} tangent to \mathcal{W}_0 can be restricted to \mathcal{W}_0 , and then they can be translated to the Lagrangian side by using this diffeomorphism, and to the Hamiltonian side using the Legendre map and the projection ϱ_2 .

In particular, if $c(t) = (q^i(t), v^i(t), p_i(t))$ is a solution to equation (3.16) (or, what is equivalent, $c(t)$ is an integral curve of the vector field $X_{\mathcal{H}}$ solution to the dynamical equations (3.16)) then equation (3.19) leads to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \circ c \right) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} \circ c, \quad (3.20)$$

and from equations (3.18) we obtain

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = v^i, \quad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} \circ c = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial q^i} \circ c, \quad p_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \circ c. \quad (3.21)$$

From the first group of equations (3.21), together with (3.20), we recover the Euler–Lagrange equations for the curves $c_{\mathcal{L}}(t) = (q^i(t), v^i(t))$. Furthermore, bearing in mind the local expression of \mathcal{H} , we have that $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial q^i}$ and hence the second group of equations (3.21) reads

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial q^i} \circ c$$

and, using again the local expression of \mathcal{H} and the first group of equations (3.21), we get

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial q^i} \circ c = v^i = \frac{dq^i}{dt};$$

finally, using the third group of equations (3.18) (that is, the Legendre map) we have that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{FL}^*h$, and these last equations become the *Hamilton equations* for the curves $c_h(t) = (q^i(t), p_i(t))$.

In this way, for the dynamical trajectories, we can state.

Theorem 3.60 *Every curve $c: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$, taking values in \mathcal{W}_0 can be viewed as $c = (c_{\mathcal{L}}, c_h)$, where $c_{\mathcal{L}} = \varrho_1 \circ c: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{TQ}$ and $c_h = \mathcal{FL} \circ c_{\mathcal{L}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{T}^*Q$.*

If $c: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$, with $\text{Im } c \subset \mathcal{W}_0$, is a curve fulfilling equation (3.17), then $c_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the lift to TQ of the projected curve $c_o = \varrho_0 \circ c: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ (that is, $c_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a holonomic curve), and it is a solution to equation (3.6), where $E_{\mathcal{L}} \in C^\infty(\text{TQ})$ is such that $\mathcal{H} = \varrho_1^ E_{\mathcal{L}}$. Moreover, the curve $c_h = \varrho_2 \circ c = \mathcal{FL} \circ c_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a solution to equation (3.12), where $h \in C^\infty(\text{T}^*Q)$ is such that $\mathcal{H} = \varrho_1^* h$.*

Conversely, if $c_o: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ is a curve such that $\tilde{c}_o \equiv c_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a solution to equation (3.6), then the curve $c = (c_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{FL} \circ c_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a solution to equation (3.17) and $\mathcal{FL} \circ c_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a solution to equation (3.12).

Now, the curves $c: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ which are solution to equation (3.17) are the integral curves of a holonomic vector field $X_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{W})$ which is the solution to (3.16), the curves $c_{\mathcal{L}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{TQ}$ are the integral curves of the holonomic vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\text{TQ})$ which is the solution to (3.4), and the curves $c_h: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{T}^*Q$ are the integral curves of the vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(\text{T}^*Q)$ which is the solution to (3.11). Then, as a corollary of the above theorem, for the dynamical vector fields we have:

Theorem 3.61 *Let $X_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{W})$ be the solution to equations (3.16) (on \mathcal{W}_0), which is tangent to \mathcal{W}_0 . Then:*

The vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\text{TQ})$, defined by $X_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \varrho_1 = \text{T}\varrho_1 \circ X_{\mathcal{H}}$, is the solution to equations (3.4) and (3.5), where $E_{\mathcal{L}} \in C^\infty(\text{TQ})$ is such that $\mathcal{H} = \varrho_1^ E_{\mathcal{L}}$.*

*The vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(\text{T}^*Q)$, defined by $X_h \circ \varrho_2 = \text{T}\varrho_2 \circ X_{\mathcal{H}}$, is the solution to equations (3.11), where $h \in C^\infty(\text{T}^*Q)$ is such that $\mathcal{H} = \varrho_1^* h$. Furthermore $\mathcal{FL}_* X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_h$.*

Summarizing, the main features of the unified formalism are:

- It assures holonomy (even in the non-regular case).
- It provides the Legendre map.
- It gives the Euler–Lagrange and the Hamilton equations.

3.5. Symmetries of regular Lagrangian systems

In the case of Lagrangian dynamical systems, the phase space of the system is either $M = TQ$ in the Lagrangian formalism, or $M = T^*Q$, in the canonical Hamiltonian formalism. In these cases, there exist distinguished symplectic potentials: the Lagrangian 1-form $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(TQ)$ and the canonical 1-form $\Theta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$. Furthermore, the symmetries of the dynamical systems use to be canonical lifts of diffeomorphisms or vector fields on the base manifold Q . All of this lead to introduce new kinds of symmetries in that cases, whose properties are studied next.

3.5.1. Symmetries in the canonical Hamiltonian formalism

Consider a (regular) canonical Hamiltonian system (T^*Q, Ω, dh) , and let $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(T^*Q)$ be the Hamiltonian vector field of the system.

Obviously, all we have stated for Hamiltonian dynamical systems in Section 2.3 holds for this particular case. Nevertheless, new kinds of symmetry can be introduced for this situation. Thus, in addition to the previous symmetries already defined, we can consider the following particular cases:

Definition 3.62 *A dynamical symmetry $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(T^*Q)$ of the canonical Hamiltonian system is a **natural dynamical symmetry** if there exists $\varphi \in \text{Diff}(Q)$ such that $\Phi = T^*\varphi$ (that is, Φ is the canonical lift of a diffeomorphism in Q).*

Definition 3.63 *An infinitesimal dynamical symmetry $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ of the canonical Hamiltonian system is a **natural infinitesimal dynamical symmetry** if there exists $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ such that $Y = Z^*$ (that is, Y is the canonical lift of a vector field in Q ¹⁰).*

Remember that (T^*Q, Ω) is an exact symplectic manifold and a symplectic potential of Ω is the canonical 1-form $\Theta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$. Furthermore, for every $\varphi \in \text{Diff}(Q)$, we have that $(T^*\varphi)^*\Theta = \Theta$, and hence $(T^*\varphi)^*\Omega = \Omega$. In the same way, for every $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$, we have that $L(Z^*)\Theta = 0$, and then $L(Z^*)\Omega = 0$; therefore, if Z^* is an infinitesimal natural dynamical symmetry, then $Z^* \in \mathfrak{X}_H(T^*Q)$ and, as we saw in Proposition 3.21, the global Hamiltonian function of Z^* is $f_Z = i(Z^*)\Theta$ (up to constants). This leads to introduce the following particular type of Noether symmetries for the canonical Hamiltonian system (T^*Q, Ω, dh) : Then, for Noether symmetries, we can define:

Definition 3.64 *A diffeomorphism $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(T^*Q)$ is a **natural Noether symmetry** if:*

¹⁰The terminology “natural symmetries” refers both to the diffeomorphism φ or the vector field Z .

1. There exists a diffeomorphism $\varphi \in \text{Diff}(Q)$ such that $\Phi = T^*\varphi$.
2. $\Phi^*h = (T^*\varphi)^*h = h$.

Definition 3.65 A vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ is an *infinitesimal natural Noether symmetry* if:

1. There exists a vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ such that $Y = Z^*$.
2. $L(Y)h = L(Z^*)h = 0$.

In addition, as particular cases of Noether symmetries in this formalism, we have:

Definition 3.66 A Noether symmetry is *exact* if $\Phi^*\Theta = \Theta$.

Definition 3.67 An infinitesimal Noether symmetry is *exact* if $L(Y)\Theta = 0$.

Notice that, for infinitesimal exact Noether symmetries, we have also that their local Hamiltonian functions can be expressed as $f_Y = i(Y)\Theta$ (see Proposition 2.72).

Obviously, every (infinitesimal) natural Noether symmetry is a (infinitesimal) natural dynamical symmetry. Moreover, as every canonical lift preserves the canonical forms $\Theta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$ and $\Omega \in \Omega^2(T^*Q)$ (Propositions A.17 and 3.22), we have that:

Proposition 3.68 Every (infinitesimal) natural Noether symmetry is an (infinitesimal) exact Noether symmetry.

At this point, it is possible to state the Noether Theorem as in Theorem 2.73. In particular, for infinitesimal exact Noether symmetries, the associated conserved quantities are $f_Y = i(Y)\Theta$ (up to constants).

Summarizing, the following table recovers the relations among the several types of symmetries of the canonical Hamiltonian systems:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \{ \text{Natural Noether symmetries} \} & \subset & \{ \text{Natural dynamical symmetries} \} \\
 \cap & & \\
 \{ \text{Exact Noether symmetries} \} & & \cap \\
 \cap & & \\
 \{ \text{Noether symmetries} \} & \subset & \{ \text{Dynamical symmetries} \}
 \end{array}$$

3.5.2. Lagrangian formalism: Lagrangian symmetries and Noether's Theorem

Let $(TQ, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, dE_{\mathcal{L}})$ be a regular Lagrangian systems and $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ the Euler-Lagrange vector field solution of the system.

Also in this situation all the concepts and results about symmetries established in Section 2.3 are true and, in this way, we can also introduce the concepts of (infinitesimal) Lagrangian dynamical symmetry, (infinitesimal) Lagrangian Noether symmetry and (infinitesimal) exact Lagrangian Noether symmetry, and their properties and relations, including Noether's Theorem. But, in addition, the study of symmetries en the Lagrangian formalism presents some nuances that should be highlighted.

First, we define:

Definition 3.69 A diffeomorphism $\Phi: TQ \longrightarrow TQ$ is a *natural Lagrangian dynamical symmetry* if:

1. There exists a diffeomorphism $\varphi: Q \longrightarrow Q$ such that $\Phi = T\varphi$.
2. $\Phi_* X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Definition 3.70 A vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is an *infinitesimal natural Lagrangian dynamical symmetry* if

1. There exists $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ such that $Y = Z^C$.
2. $[Y, X_{\mathcal{L}}] = [Z^C, X_{\mathcal{L}}] = 0$ ¹¹.

As in the canonical Hamiltonian formalism, the canonical lifts of diffeomorphisms and vector fields preserve the canonical structures of TQ (Proposition 3.9). A consequence of this is the following:

Proposition 3.71 1. Let $\varphi: Q \longrightarrow Q$ be a diffeomorphism and $\Phi = T\varphi$ its canonical lift to TQ . Then

$$\Phi^* \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \Theta_{\Phi^* \mathcal{L}}, \quad \Phi^* \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \Omega_{\Phi^* \mathcal{L}}, \quad \Phi^* E_{\mathcal{L}} = E_{\Phi^* \mathcal{L}}.$$

2. Let $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ and its canonical lift Z^C to TQ . Then

$$L(Z^C) \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = 0, \quad L(Z^C) \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0, \quad L(Z^C) E_{\mathcal{L}} = 0.$$

¹¹Or, more generically, $[Y, X_{\mathcal{L}}] = [Z^C, X_{\mathcal{L}}] = gX_{\mathcal{L}}$, for some function $g \in C^\infty(TQ)$.

(Proof) It is a straightforward consequence of Proposition 3.9 and the definitions of $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$, $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, and $E_{\mathcal{L}}$. In fact:

1. For $\Phi = T\varphi$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} &= \Phi^*(d\mathcal{L} \circ J) = d(\Phi^*\mathcal{L}) \circ J = \Theta_{\Phi^*\mathcal{L}}, \\ \Phi^*\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} &= \Phi^*(-d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) = -d\Phi^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \Omega_{\Phi^*\mathcal{L}}, \\ \Phi^*E_{\mathcal{L}} &= \Phi^*(\Delta(\mathcal{L}) - \mathcal{L}) = \Delta(\Phi^*\mathcal{L}) - \Phi^*\mathcal{L} = E_{\Phi^*\mathcal{L}}.\end{aligned}$$

2. They are proved using the uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms generated by the fluxes of Z and Z^C , and the above item. ■

Nevertheless, the Lagrangian forms $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ are not canonical structures of TQ , since they depend on the choice of a Lagrangian function \mathcal{L} and hence they are not invariant by these lifts, necessarily. Thus, for Lagrangian Noether symmetries, we can state the following definitions:

Definition 3.72 A diffeomorphism $\Phi: TQ \rightarrow TQ$ is a *natural Lagrangian Noether symmetry* if there exist a diffeomorphism $\varphi: Q \rightarrow Q$ such that $\Phi = T\varphi$ and it satisfies:

1. $\Phi^*\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = (T\varphi)^*\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$.
2. $\Phi^*E_{\mathcal{L}} = (T\varphi)^*E_{\mathcal{L}} = E_{\mathcal{L}} + c$ ($c \in \mathbb{R}$)¹².

Definition 3.73 A vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is an *infinitesimal natural Lagrangian Noether symmetry* if there exists $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ such that $Y = Z^C$ and it satisfies:

1. $L(Y)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = L(Z^C)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$.
2. $L(Y)E_{\mathcal{L}} = L(Z^C)E_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$.

Obviously, every (infinitesimal) natural Lagrangian Noether symmetry is a (infinitesimal) natural Lagrangian dynamical symmetry.

Finally, as a particular case, we have:

Definition 3.74 A Lagrangian Noether symmetry is *exact* if $\Phi^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Definition 3.75 An infinitesimal Lagrangian Noether symmetry is *exact* if $L(Y)\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$.

¹²It is usual to write simply that $\Phi^*E_{\mathcal{L}} = E_{\mathcal{L}}$.

In these circumstances, it is possible to state the Lagrangian geometric version of the Noether Theorem. First, observe that, if $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is a infinitesimal natural Lagrangian Noether symmetry, then Proposition 2.72 holds for these kinds of symmetries. Thus, for every $p \in TQ$, there exists an open set $U_p \ni p$ and $f_Y \in C^\infty(U_p)$, which is unique up to the sum constant functions, such that

$$i(Z^C)\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = df_Y \quad (\text{in } U_p) . \quad (3.22)$$

Furthermore, there exists $\zeta_Y \in C^\infty(U_p)$, defined as $L(Z^C)\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = d\zeta_Y$, in U_p , and such that

$$\begin{aligned} f_Y &= \zeta_Y - i(Z^C)\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \zeta_Y - \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}(Z^C) = \zeta_Y - d\mathcal{L} \circ J(Z^C) \\ &= \zeta_Y - d\mathcal{L}(Z^V) = \zeta_Y - i(Z^V)d\mathcal{L} = \zeta_Y - Z^V(\mathcal{L}) , \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

(up to the sum of constant functions in U_p). Then:

Theorem 3.76 (Lagrangian Noether): If $Y = Z^C \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ (with $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$) is an infinitesimal natural Lagrangian Noether symmetry, then $f_Y = \zeta_Y - Z^V(\mathcal{L})$ is a conserved quantity; that is, $L(X_{\mathcal{L}})f_Y = 0$.

(Proof) The proof is the same as in Theorem 2.73, taking into account (3.22) and (3.23). ■

If the infinitesimal Noether symmetry is exact, then $Y = Z^C$ and we can take $f_Y = i(Y)\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = Z^V(\mathcal{L})$.

3.5.3. Equivalent Lagrangians and Noether's Theorem

It is evident that, if $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(TQ)$ (resp. $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$) is a canonical lift of a diffeomorphism (resp. of a vector field) of Q to TQ which, in addition, lets the Lagrangian function of the system invariant, then the symplectic form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, the Lagrangian energy $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ and hence the Euler–Lagrange vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ (that is, the Euler–Lagrange equations) are also invariant by Φ . All of this assures that the conditions of Definitions 3.72 and 3.73 hold. Nevertheless, this requirement is too strong because there are Lagrangian functions that, being different, give the same form $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ and the same Euler–Lagrange equations. This leads to the following:

Definition 3.77 Two Lagrangian functions $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2 \in C^\infty(TQ)$ are *equivalent* if

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2} \quad \text{and} \quad X_{\mathcal{L}_1} = X_{\mathcal{L}_2} .$$

For regular Lagrangians this definition is equivalent to the following:

Proposition 3.78 *Two regular Lagrangians $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2 \in C^\infty(TQ)$ are equivalent if*

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2} \quad \text{and} \quad E_{\mathcal{L}_1} = E_{\mathcal{L}_2} + c \quad (c \in \mathbb{R}).$$

(Proof) We must prove that, if $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, then $X_{\mathcal{L}_1} = X_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ is equivalent to $E_{\mathcal{L}_1} = E_{\mathcal{L}_2} + c$.

If $X_{\mathcal{L}_1} = X_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, then

$$0 = i(X_{\mathcal{L}_1})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} - dE_{\mathcal{L}_1} = i(X_{\mathcal{L}_2})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2} - dE_{\mathcal{L}_1},$$

which implies that $dE_{\mathcal{L}_1} = dE_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ and, hence, $E_{\mathcal{L}_1} = E_{\mathcal{L}_2} + c$.

Conversely, if $E_{\mathcal{L}_1} = E_{\mathcal{L}_2} + c$, then

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}_1})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} = dE_{\mathcal{L}_1} = dE_{\mathcal{L}_2} = i(X_{\mathcal{L}_2})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2},$$

and, as $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, this implies that $X_{\mathcal{L}_1} = X_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, since \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are regular Lagrangians and the solution is unique. ■

Next, we specify how equivalent Lagrangians are (see also [1]). First we find the form of Lagrangian functions leading to vanishing Cartan forms:

Proposition 3.79 *A Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$ satisfies that $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ if, and only if, there exists a closed 1-form $\alpha \in \Omega^1(Q)$ in Q and a function $f \in C^\infty(Q)$, such that $\mathcal{L} = \hat{\alpha} + \tau_Q^* f$ (up to a constant), where $\hat{\alpha} \in C^\infty(TQ)$ is the function defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\alpha} : TQ &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (q, v) &\longmapsto \alpha_q(v) \end{aligned}.$$

(Proof) Let $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$; then $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = d\mathcal{L} \circ J$ is a closed and semibasic form in TQ and, as a consequence, it is a basic form. Then, there exists $\alpha \in \Omega^1(Q)$ such that

$$d\mathcal{L} \circ J = \tau_Q^* \alpha. \tag{3.24}$$

Moreover, since $0 = d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = d(\tau_Q^* \alpha) = \tau_Q^*(d\alpha)$, then $d\alpha = 0$; that is, α is a closed 1-form in Q . Furthermore, a simple computation in local coordinates shows that $d\hat{\alpha} \circ J = \tau_Q^* \alpha$, and from (3.24) we have that

$$d\hat{\alpha} \circ J = \tau_Q^* \alpha = d\mathcal{L} \circ J.$$

Then $d(\mathcal{L} - \hat{\alpha}) \circ J = 0$, and therefore, the 1-form $d(\mathcal{L} - \hat{\alpha})$ is closed and semi-basic. As a consequence, $d(\mathcal{L} - \hat{\alpha})$ is a basic 1-form; that is, there exists $f \in C^\infty(Q)$ such that

$$d(\mathcal{L} - \hat{\alpha}) = \tau_Q^* df = d(\tau_Q^* f) ,$$

and thus $\mathcal{L} = \hat{\alpha} + \tau_Q^* f$ (up to a constant).

Conversely, let us suppose that $\mathcal{L} = \hat{\alpha} + \tau_Q^* f$ (up to a constant). We have

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = d\mathcal{L} \circ J = d(\hat{\alpha} + \tau_Q^* f) \circ J = d\hat{\alpha} \circ J = \tau_Q^* \alpha ,$$

since $d\tau_Q^* f$ vanishes on the vertical vector fields. As α is closed, $d\alpha = 0$ and we obtain

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = -d(\tau_Q^* \alpha) = -\tau_Q^*(d\alpha) = 0 .$$

■

In a local chart of natural coordinates of TQ , the local expression of a closed 1-form α is

$$\alpha = \alpha_i dq^i = \frac{\partial g}{\partial q^i} dq^i ,$$

for some local function g ; then the local expression of the function $\hat{\alpha}$ is

$$\hat{\alpha} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial q^i} v^i .$$

Now, from this result we obtain the explicit characterization of the equivalent Lagrangians:

Proposition 3.80 *Two regular Lagrangians $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2 \in C^\infty(TQ)$ are equivalent if, and only if, $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{L}_2 + \hat{\alpha}$ (up to a constant).*

(Proof) Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$ are equivalent. As $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, then $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2} = 0$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.79, there exist $\alpha \in Z^1(Q)$ and $f \in C^\infty(Q)$ such that $\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2 = \hat{\alpha} + \tau_Q^* f$ (up to a constant). From Proposition 3.78 we know that $E_{\mathcal{L}_1} = E_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, (up to a constant), or equivalently, $E_{\mathcal{L}_1} - E_{\mathcal{L}_2} = 0$ (up to a constant). Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= E_{\mathcal{L}_1} - E_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \Delta(\mathcal{L}_1) - \mathcal{L}_1 - \Delta(\mathcal{L}_2) + \mathcal{L}_2 = \Delta(\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2) - (\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2) \\ &= \Delta(\hat{\alpha} + \tau_Q^* f) - (\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2) = \hat{\alpha} - (\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2) \quad (\text{up to a constant}) . \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, suppose that $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{L}_2 + \hat{\alpha}$ (up to a constant). First, a simple computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2} - \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} &= d(\Theta_{\mathcal{L}_1} - \Theta_{\mathcal{L}_2}) = d(d(\mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2) \circ J) \\ &= d(d\hat{\alpha} \circ J) = d(\tau_Q^* \alpha) = \tau_Q^*(d\alpha) = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2}$. Furthermore, as $\Delta(\hat{\alpha}) = \hat{\alpha}$, we have

$$E_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \Delta(\mathcal{L}_1) - \mathcal{L}_1 = \Delta(\mathcal{L}_2 + \hat{\alpha}) - (\mathcal{L}_2 + \hat{\alpha}) = E_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\alpha} = E_{\mathcal{L}_2} \quad (\text{up to a constant}).$$

As $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ and $E_{\mathcal{L}_1} = E_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ (up to a constant), then \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 are equivalent (Proposition 3.78). ■

Taking this into account, one can define:

Definition 3.81 A *symmetry of the Lagrangian* is a diffeomorphism $\Phi: TQ \rightarrow TQ$ such that \mathcal{L} and $\Phi^*\mathcal{L}$ are equivalent Lagrangians; that is, $\Phi^*\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L} + \hat{\alpha}$ (up to constants), where $\hat{\alpha} \in C^\infty(TQ)$ is the function defined in Proposition 3.79.

Definition 3.82 An *infinitesimal symmetry of the Lagrangian* is a vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ such that the uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms generated by its flux are symmetries of the Lagrangian; that is, $L(Y)\mathcal{L} = \hat{\alpha}$.

A special case of these kinds of symmetries are:

Definition 3.83 A *strict symmetry of the Lagrangian* is a diffeomorphism $\Phi: TQ \rightarrow TQ$ such that $\Phi^*\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}$.

Definition 3.84 An *infinitesimal strict symmetry of the Lagrangian* is a vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ such that the uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms generated by its flux are strict symmetries of the Lagrangian; that is, $L(Y)\mathcal{L} = 0$.

And, in particular, we define:

Definition 3.85 A (strict) symmetry of the Lagrangian $\Phi: TQ \rightarrow TQ$ is said to be *natural* if there exists a diffeomorphism $\varphi: Q \rightarrow Q$ such that $\Phi = T\varphi$.

Definition 3.86 An infinitesimal (strict) symmetry of the Lagrangian $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is said to be *natural* if there exists a vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ such that $Y = Z^C$.

Remark 3.87 A symmetry of the Lagrangian $\Phi: TQ \rightarrow TQ$ is not necessarily a Lagrangian Noether symmetry since, in general, $\Phi^*\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \neq \Omega_{\Phi^*\mathcal{L}}$ and $\Phi^*E_{\mathcal{L}} \neq E_{\Phi^*\mathcal{L}}$, as a simple calculation in coordinates shows. In addition, it is not a Lagrangian dynamical symmetry. Nevertheless, the following relation holds:

Proposition 3.88 A diffeomorphism $\Phi: T_k^1Q \rightarrow T_k^1Q$ is a natural Lagrangian Noether symmetry if, and only if, it is a natural symmetry of the Lagrangian.

(Proof) If $\Phi = T\varphi$, for some diffeomorphism $\varphi: Q \rightarrow Q$, according to Lemma (3.71) we have that

$$\Phi^* \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \Omega_{\Phi^* \mathcal{L}}, \quad \Phi^* E_{\mathcal{L}} = E_{\Phi^* \mathcal{L}},$$

and then

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Phi^* \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} &= \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \\ \Phi^* E_{\mathcal{L}} &= E_{\mathcal{L}} \quad (\text{up to constants}) \end{aligned} \right\} \iff \left\{ \begin{aligned} \Omega_{\Phi^* \mathcal{L}} &= \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \\ E_{\Phi^* \mathcal{L}} &= E_{\mathcal{L}} \quad (\text{up to constants}) \end{aligned} \right. ;$$

that is, Φ is a natural Lagrangian Noether symmetry if, and only if, \mathcal{L} and $\Phi^* \mathcal{L}$ are equivalent Lagrangians and hence Φ is a natural symmetry of the Lagrangian. ■

This result holds also for infinitesimal symmetries, as can be proved taking the flux of the vector fields that generate them. Thus, we have the following immediate corollary:

Proposition 3.89 *A vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ is an infinitesimal natural Lagrangian Noether symmetry if, and only if, it is an infinitesimal natural symmetry of the Lagrangian.*

Finally, a version of Noether's Theorem for infinitesimal natural strict symmetries of the Lagrangian can be established as follows:

Theorem 3.90 (Classical Noether for Lagrangian systems). Let $Y = Z^C \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ (with $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$) be an infinitesimal natural strict symmetry of the Lagrangian. Then $\tilde{f} := Z^V(\mathcal{L})$ is a conserved quantity; that is, $L(X_{\mathcal{L}})\tilde{f} = 0$.

(Proof) As every infinitesimal natural strict symmetries of the Lagrangian is a natural symmetry of the Lagrangian and then, it is a natural Noether Lagrangian symmetry, according to the above proposition; then the result is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 3.76, since $\zeta_Y = L(Y)\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = L(Z^C)\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$. ■

The following table summarizes the relation among the different kinds of symme-

tries in the Lagrangian formalism of Lagrangian systems:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Strict} \\ \text{Lagrangian} \\ \text{symmetries} \end{array} \right\} \supset \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Strict} \\ \text{natural} \\ \text{Lagrangian} \\ \text{symmetries} \end{array} \right\} \\
 \cap \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{symmetries} \\ \text{of the} \\ \text{Lagrangian} \end{array} \right\} \supset \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Natural} \\ \text{symmetries} \\ \text{of the} \\ \text{Lagrangian} \end{array} \right\} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Natural} \\ \text{Lagrangian} \\ \text{Noether} \\ \text{symmetries} \end{array} \right\} \subset \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Natural} \\ \text{Lagrangian} \\ \text{dynamical} \\ \text{symmetries} \end{array} \right\} \\
 \cap \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Exact} \\ \text{Lagrangian} \\ \text{Noether} \\ \text{symmetries} \end{array} \right\} \cap \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Natural} \\ \text{Lagrangian} \\ \text{dynamical} \\ \text{symmetries} \end{array} \right\} \\
 \cap \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Lagrangian} \\ \text{Noether} \\ \text{symmetries} \end{array} \right\} \subset \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Lagrangian} \\ \text{dynamical} \\ \text{symmetries} \end{array} \right\}
 \end{array}$$

3.6. Variational formulation for Lagrangian systems

One of the main characteristics of the Lagrangian systems is that they are variational; that is, their dynamical equations can be obtained from a variational principle, and the same happens for Hamiltonian systems [29,30,85,139,151,164,203,220,222,232,264,271]. Next, we present the variational formulation of Lagrangian systems. In order to study this topic, we need to enlarge the phase space to include the time coordinate, and so we have to consider the trivial bundle $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ (or $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$).

3.6.1. Functional associated to a Lagrangian function

Let (TQ, \mathcal{L}) be a Lagrangian dynamical system. We can associate to the Lagrangian function a functional defined on a suitable space of curves which are taken to be possible trajectories of the system.

To get it, consider the manifolds $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$, $\mathbb{R} \times Q$, and \mathbb{R} with the canonical projections

$$\rho: \mathbb{R} \times Q \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \tau_{(1,0)} = id \times \tau_Q: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q, \quad \tau_1 = \rho \circ \tau_{(1,0)}: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

The canonical projections ρ and τ_1 define a global coordinate in \mathbb{R} which is denoted t , and is physically identified with “time”. Then we can take the natural volume element dt in \mathbb{R} and its natural lift to $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$, which is also denoted by dt .

Now, let $\gamma: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ be a curve, and let $\tilde{\gamma}: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow TQ$ be its canonical lift of γ from Q to the tangent bundle TQ . We denote $\gamma: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$ the curve given by $\gamma(t) = (t, \gamma(t))$, and by $\hat{\gamma}: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ the curve $\hat{\gamma}(t) = (t, \tilde{\gamma}(t))$.

Now, let α be a 1-form in $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$. As $\hat{\gamma}^* \alpha$ is a 1-form in \mathbb{R} , we can define

$$\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \alpha = \int_a^b \hat{\gamma}^* \alpha .$$

Finally, given a (time-dependent) Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L}: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consider the 1-form $\mathcal{L} dt \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$. Then we define

Definition 3.91 For every curve $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$, the *action* of \mathcal{L} along γ is the functional

$$L(\gamma) := \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \mathcal{L} dt .$$

Remark 3.92 Usually we take curves $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ defined on a closed interval $I = [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$, but we can extend the domain to the whole real numbers defining γ out of the interval as a constant function taking permanently the values on the two extreme points of the interval. Observe that, in this case, the extension may not be differentiable at the extreme points, but this is not a problem for the existence of the integral ¹³.

If the Lagrangian function is time-independent, it is enough to extend it from TQ to $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$.

3.6.2. Hamilton variational principle

The *variational problem* consists in optimizing the above functional; that is, to choose the curves for which the functional takes the extremal value. As this is a very complicated problem we restrict ourselves to look for the local extremal points of the functional: so we look for curves γ such that the value of $L(\gamma)$ does not change for small variations of the curve, but in first approximation. Next we are going to precise these ideas.

Definition 3.93 Let $\gamma: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ be a curve with $\gamma(a) = q_0$, $\gamma(b) = q_1$. A *variation* of γ is a map

$$\mu: (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \times [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow Q$$

such that

¹³From now on it is only necessary that the curve is of class C^2 .

1. $\mu(0, t) = \gamma(t), t \in [a, b]$.
2. $\mu(s, a) = q_0, \mu(s, b) = q_1, \text{ for } s \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$.

We denote μ_s the curve defined by $\mu_s: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$, with $\mu_s(t) = \mu(s, t)$.

Observe that, given one of these curves μ_s , we can lift it to TQ and $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ in the usual way. We denote these lifts as $\tilde{\mu}_s$ and $\hat{\mu}_s$, which are variations of $\tilde{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\gamma}$ respectively.

There is a natural way to construct different variations of that type. In fact, given $X \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ with $X(q_0) = 0, X(q_1) = 0$; if F_s is a local flux for X , a variation of the curve γ is obtained by

$$\mu(s, t) = (F_s \circ \gamma)(t) = F_s(\gamma(t)) . \quad (3.25)$$

We know that $F_s: Q \longrightarrow Q$ is a diffeomorphism, and the corresponding lift $TF_s: TQ \longrightarrow TQ$ is the local flux corresponding to the canonical lift $X^C \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ of X to TQ . In the same way that (3.25) is a variation of γ , we have that

$$\tilde{\mu}(s, t) = (TF_s \circ \tilde{\gamma})(t) = TF_s(\tilde{\gamma}(t))$$

is a variation of $\tilde{\gamma}$. Observe that X^C is naturally a vector field in $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ acting as the identity on the component \mathbb{R} . It is vertical with respect to the projection $\tau_1: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Given γ and F_s as above, the following properties hold:

1. $\mu_s(t) = (F_s \circ \gamma)(t) = F_s(\gamma(t))$
2. $\tilde{\mu}_s(t) = (TF_s \circ \tilde{\gamma})(t) = TF_s(\tilde{\gamma}(t))$
3. $\boldsymbol{\mu}_s(t) = (F_s \circ \gamma)(t) = F_s(\gamma(t)) = (t, F_s(\gamma(t)))$
4. $\hat{\mu}_s(t) = (TF_s \circ \hat{\gamma})(t) = TF_s(\hat{\gamma}(t)) = (t, TF_s(\tilde{\gamma}(t)))$

These kinds of variations obtained from specific vector fields on the manifold Q are sufficient to obtain the local extreme of the functional $\mathbf{L}(\gamma)$ as we are going to see.

Definition 3.94 A curve γ is a **local extreme** for the functional \mathbf{L} if for every variation $\mu_s = F_s \circ \gamma$, with F_s corresponding to a vector field X as above, the following condition holds:

$$\left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \int_{\hat{\mu}_s} \mathcal{L} dt = 0 .$$

This is the so-called **Hamilton variational principle**.

To obtain a more useful way to manage with this definition, first we need the following results:

Proposition 3.95 *Let $X \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ and μ_s be the corresponding variation of a curve γ . Then*

1. $\frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} \int_{\hat{\mu}_s} \mathcal{L} dt = \int_{\hat{\gamma}} (L(X^C) \mathcal{L}) dt.$
2. *If $\alpha \in \Omega^1(TQ)$, then $\frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} \int_{\tilde{\mu}_s} \alpha = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} L(X^C) \alpha.$*

(Proof) Taking into account that $\tilde{\mu}_s = \tilde{F}_s \circ \tilde{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\mu}_s = (TF_s \circ \hat{\gamma})$, we have:

1. First,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} \int_{\hat{\mu}_s} \mathcal{L} dt &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s} \left(\int_{\hat{\mu}_s} \mathcal{L} dt - \int_{\hat{\mu}_0} \mathcal{L} dt \right) \\
 &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s} \left(\int_a^b \tilde{\mu}_s^* (\mathcal{L} dt) - \int_a^b \tilde{\mu}_0^* (\mathcal{L} dt) \right) \\
 &= \int_a^b \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_s^* \mathcal{L} - \tilde{\mu}_0^* \mathcal{L}}{s} dt = \int_a^b \hat{\gamma}^* \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{TF_s^* \mathcal{L} - TF_0^* \mathcal{L}}{s} dt \\
 &= \int_a^b \hat{\gamma}^* (L(X^C) \mathcal{L}) dt = \int_{\hat{\gamma}} (L(X^C) \mathcal{L}) dt ,
 \end{aligned}$$

because $\tilde{\mu}_s^* \alpha = (\tilde{\gamma}^* \circ TF_s^*) \alpha = \tilde{\gamma}^* (TF_s^* \alpha).$

2. Second,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} \int_{\tilde{\mu}_s} \alpha &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s} \left(\int_{\tilde{\mu}_s} \alpha - \int_{\tilde{\mu}_0} \alpha \right) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s} \left(\int_a^b \tilde{\mu}_s^* \alpha - \int_a^b \tilde{\mu}_0^* \alpha \right) \\
 &= \int_a^b \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_s^* \alpha - \tilde{\mu}_0^* \alpha}{s} = \int_a^b \tilde{\gamma}^* \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{T\tilde{F}_s^* \alpha - T\tilde{F}_0^* \alpha}{s} \\
 &= \int_a^b \tilde{\gamma}^* L(X^C) \alpha = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} L(X^C) \alpha .
 \end{aligned}$$

■

Hence, the problem is to seek for the equation fulfilled by the curves $\gamma: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ satisfying that $\gamma(a) = q_0$, $\gamma(b) = q_1$, and such that

$$\frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} \int_{\tilde{\mu}_s} \mathcal{L} dt = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} L(X^C) dt = 0 ,$$

for every variation $\mu_s = F_s \circ \gamma$ of γ . Then, we need the following:

Lemma 3.96 For every curve $\gamma: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$ we have

$$\tilde{\gamma}^*(A_{\mathcal{L}} dt) = \tilde{\gamma}^*(\mathcal{L} dt) + \tilde{\gamma}^*(E_{\mathcal{L}} dt) = \tilde{\gamma}^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

(Proof) If $t_0 \in [a, b]$, let (q^i, v^i) be a canonical local coordinate system in a neighbourhood of $\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)$. On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\gamma}^*(A_{\mathcal{L}} dt))_{t_0} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t_0} \right) &= (\tilde{\gamma}^* A_{\mathcal{L}})(t_0) = A_{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)) \\ &= \left(v^i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \right) (\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)) \\ &= \left(v^i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \right) (\gamma(t_0), \dot{\gamma}(t_0)) \\ &= \dot{\gamma}(t_0) \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)}, \end{aligned}$$

and, on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\gamma}^*\Theta_{\mathcal{L}})_{t_0} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t_0} \right) &= (\Theta_{\mathcal{L}})_{t_0} \left(T_{t_0} \tilde{\gamma} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t_0} \right) \right) = (d\mathcal{L} \circ J)_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)} \left(T_{t_0} \tilde{\gamma} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t_0} \right) \right) \\ &= (d\mathcal{L} \circ J)_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)} \left(\dot{\gamma}^i(t_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)} + \ddot{\gamma}^i(t_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)} \right) \\ &= (d\mathcal{L})_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)} \left(\dot{\gamma}^i(t_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)} \right) = \dot{\gamma}^i(t_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. ■

3.6.3. Euler–Lagrange equations

Now we can obtain the equation for the curve γ solution to the variational problem.

Theorem 3.97 The curves γ which are local extremes for the functional \mathbf{L} are the solutions to the Euler–Lagrange equations.

(Proof) We have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \int_{\hat{\mu}_s} (\mathcal{L} dt) = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \int_a^b \tilde{\mu}_s^* \mathcal{L} dt = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \int_a^b \tilde{\mu}_s^* \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} - \tilde{\mu}_s^* E_{\mathcal{L}} dt \\ &= \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \int_{\hat{\mu}_s} \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} - E_{\mathcal{L}} dt = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} L(X^C) \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} - L(X^C)(E_{\mathcal{L}}) dt \\ &= \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} d i(X^C) \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} + i(X^C) d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} - L(X^C)(E_{\mathcal{L}}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

But, by Stokes Theorem, being $X(q_0) = 0 = X(q_1)$ and $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ a semibasic form, we have that $\int_{\tilde{\gamma}} d i(\tilde{X}) d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$; hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} i(X^C) d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} - L(X^C)(E_{\mathcal{L}}) dt = \int_a^b \tilde{\gamma}^*(i(X^C) d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) - \tilde{\gamma}^*(L(X^C)(E_{\mathcal{L}})) dt \\ &= \int_a^b \left[d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}(X^C, (T_t \tilde{\gamma}) \frac{d}{dt}) - (L(X^C)(E_{\mathcal{L}}))(\tilde{\gamma}(t)) \right] dt , \end{aligned}$$

because

$$\left(\tilde{\gamma}^*(i(X^C) d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) \frac{d}{dt} \right) \Big|_t = (i(X^C) d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}) \left(T_t \tilde{\gamma} \frac{d}{dt} \right) = (d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}})_{\tilde{\gamma}(t)} \left(X^C, T_t \gamma \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right) \right) ,$$

and we have

$$0 = \int_a^b i(X_{\tilde{\gamma}(t)}^C) \left[-i \left(T_t \tilde{\gamma} \frac{d}{dt} \right) d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} - dE_{\mathcal{L}} \right] dt .$$

But X^C is an arbitrary vector field; then, observing that $T_t \tilde{\gamma} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right) = (\tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t))$, we have

$$-i(\tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}} ,$$

and, as $-d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, we obtain that

$$i(\tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)) \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}} .$$

(Recall that $(\tilde{\gamma}(t), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t))$ is the tangent vector to the curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ at the point $\gamma(t)$).

If we consider that the curves $\tilde{\gamma}(t)$ which are the solutions to the problem are the integral curves of a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$, observing that the curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a natural lift to TQ of the curve γ in Q , then this vector field must verify the following conditions:

1. $i(X_{\mathcal{L}}) \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}}$.
2. $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE ($J(X_{\mathcal{L}}) = \Delta$).

and, as we know, these are the geometrical expression of the Euler–Lagrange equations. ■

As a final remark, observe that we have said that the vector field X^C is arbitrary, and this is not exact. The real arbitrary vector field is X instead of X^C . But the 1-form $i \left(T\tilde{\gamma} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right) \right) d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} + dE_{\mathcal{L}}$ is semibasic and, hence, when we apply it to X^C the obtained value depends only on X and not on its canonical lift X^C from Q to TQ .

3.6.4. Hamilton–Jacobi variational principle. Relation with the canonical Hamiltonian formalism

When we studied the Hamiltonian formalism in the previous Sections, we commented about the possibility of obtaining the dynamical equations from a variational principle. Following the discussion on the equivalence between the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian formalisms, we can establish the relation between the corresponding variational formalisms.

We have studied above the variational approach to the Lagrangian formalism, then using the corresponding geometrical and dynamical elements we can relate it with the Hamiltonian one. Thus, let $\mathcal{FL}: TQ \rightarrow T^*Q$ be the Legendre map associated to the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} . If $\gamma: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ is a curve we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}(\gamma) &= \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \mathcal{L} dt = \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} - E_{\mathcal{L}} dt = \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \mathcal{FL}^* \Theta - \mathcal{FL}^* h dt \\ &= \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \mathcal{FL}^* (\Theta - h dt) = \int_{\mathcal{FL} \circ \hat{\gamma}} \Theta - h dt ; \end{aligned}$$

where we have extended the Legendre transformation $\mathcal{FL}: TQ \rightarrow T^*Q$, with the same notation, to $\mathcal{FL}: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$, as the identity on \mathbb{R} ¹⁴. Note that, if γ is a solution to the Hamilton variational problem, that is of the Lagrangian formalism, then $\mathcal{FL} \circ \hat{\gamma}$ is the solution to the following variational problem:

Definition 3.98 *The **Hamilton-Jacobi variational principle** consists in finding the curves $\zeta: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q$, with fixed extremes, such that they are extremal for the functional*

$$\mathbf{H}(\zeta) := \int_{\zeta} \Theta - h dt .$$

By a similar computation as above, although something simpler because there are no canonical lifts, we obtain that

Theorem 3.99 *The curves ζ which are local extremes for the functional \mathbf{H} are the solutions to the Hamilton equations.*

(Proof) In fact, let $\zeta: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q$ a curve with $\zeta(a) = A, \zeta(b) = B$, and $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ with $Z(A) = 0, Z(B) = 0$. Let F_s the flux of Z and consider the variation $\eta_s = F_s \circ \zeta$. We have

$$\mathbf{H}(F_s \circ \zeta) = \int_a^b (F_s \circ \zeta)^* \Theta - (h \circ F_s \circ \zeta) dt = \int_a^b \zeta^* (F_s^* \Theta) - \zeta^* (F_s^* h) dt .$$

¹⁴See Definition 4.22.

Hence:

$$\left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \mathbf{H}(F_s \circ \zeta) = \int_a^b \zeta^*(L(Z)\Theta) - \zeta^*(L(Z)h) dt = \int_{\zeta} L(Z)\Theta - (L(Z)h) dt .$$

And following the same lines as in Theorem 3.97, we conclude that the tangent vector to the curve ζ satisfies the Hamilton equations

$$i(\tilde{\zeta})\Omega = dh(\zeta(t)) ,$$

with $\Omega = -d\Theta$, the symplectic form of the cotangent bundle. If we suppose that the curve is an integral curve of a vector field X_h then

$$i(X_h)\Omega = dh .$$

■

Remark 3.100 The Hamilton–Jacobi variational principle can be stated for every Hamiltonian system (M, Ω, α) in general, taking a symplectic potential $\theta \in \Omega^1(M)$, such that $\Omega = -d\theta$, and a (local) Hamiltonian function $h \in C^\infty(M)$, such that $\alpha = dh$.

Summarizing, in the texts of classical mechanics, all the above results are collected stating the so-called:

Minimal action principles *Given a Lagrangian system (TQ, \mathcal{L}) and the corresponding associated canonical Hamiltonian system (T^*Q, Ω, h) , we have:*

Hamilton’s Principle of minimal action: *The dynamics of the Lagrangian system (TQ, \mathcal{L}) is given by the curves $\gamma: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$, with fixed extremes, such that they minimize the functional*

$$\mathbf{L}(\gamma) := \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \mathcal{L} dt .$$

Hamilton–Jacobi principle of minimal action: *The dynamics of the Hamiltonian system (T^*Q, Ω, dh) is given by the curves $\zeta: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q$, with fixed extremes, such that they minimize the functional*

$$\mathbf{H}(\zeta) := \int_{\zeta} \Theta - h dt .$$

3.7. Examples

In this last section, we study two of the most typical mechanical systems using the symplectic Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms.

3.7.1. Harmonic oscillator

The classical harmonic oscillator is a mechanical system made of a point-particle with mass m moving in \mathbb{R} , submitted to a recuperative force (*Hook's law*). The configuration bundle is $Q = \mathbb{R}$, with coordinate (q) .

Lagrangian formalism

The Lagrangian formalism takes place in $TQ \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$, with coordinates (q, v) , and the Lagrangian function is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(mv^2 - kq^2), \quad k \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

The Lagrangian elements are

$$E_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{2}(mv^2 + kq^2), \quad \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = mv dq, \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = m dq \wedge dv,$$

and the Lagrangian is regular. For $X_{\mathcal{L}} = f \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + g \frac{\partial}{\partial v}$, equation (3.4) gives

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = m(f dv - g dq) = mv dv + kq dq = dE_{\mathcal{L}},$$

which leads to

$$f = v, \quad mg = -kq.$$

So the Euler–Lagrange vector field is

$$X_{\mathcal{L}} = v \frac{\partial}{\partial q} - \frac{k}{m} q \frac{\partial}{\partial v},$$

and its integral curves $(q(t), v(t))$ are the solutions to

$$\frac{dq}{dt} = v, \quad m \frac{dv}{dt} = -kq \quad \implies \quad m \frac{d^2 q}{dt^2} = -kq,$$

which is the Euler–Lagrange equation for the system.

Hamiltonian formalism

For the Hamiltonian formalism, $T^*Q \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$, with coordinates (q, p) . First, the Legendre transformation is

$$\mathcal{FL}^* q = q, \quad \mathcal{FL}^* p = mv,$$

which is a diffeomorphism (the Lagrangian is hyperregular). The canonical Hamiltonian function is

$$h = \frac{p^2}{2m} + kq^2.$$

As $\Omega = dq \wedge dp$, for $X_h = F \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + G \frac{\partial}{\partial p}$, equation (3.11) gives

$$i(X_h)\Omega = F dp - G dq = \frac{p}{m} dp + kq dq = dh ,$$

which leads to

$$F = \frac{p}{m}, \quad G = -kq .$$

So the Hamiltonian vector field is

$$X_h = \frac{p}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial q} - kq \frac{\partial}{\partial p} ,$$

and its integral curves $(q(t), p(t))$ are the solutions to

$$m \frac{dq}{dt} = p, \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -kq ,$$

which are the Hamilton equations for the system.

Observe that, using the Legendre map, the Hamilton and the Euler-Lagrange equations of the system are, in fact, equivalent. Obviously, we have that $\mathcal{FL}_* X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_h$.

Unified Lagrangian–Hamiltonian formalism

Consider the unified bundle $\mathcal{W} = TQ \times_Q T^*Q \simeq \mathbb{R}^3$ with coordinates (q, v, p) . On it, we have the canonical presymplectic form

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{W}} = dq \wedge dp$$

and the Hamiltonian function

$$\mathcal{H} = pv - \frac{1}{2}(mv^2 - kq^2) .$$

For $X_{\mathcal{H}} = f \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + g \frac{\partial}{\partial v} + G \frac{\partial}{\partial p}$, equation (3.16) gives

$$i(X_{\mathcal{H}})\Omega_{\mathcal{W}} = f dp - G dq = kq dq + (p - mv) dv + v dp = d\mathcal{H} ,$$

which leads to

$$f = v, \quad G = -kq, \quad p = mv .$$

The last equation is a constraint which defines the submanifold $\mathcal{W}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}$ and gives the Legendre map. Therefore, the Hamiltonian vector field is

$$X_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{W}_0} = v \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + g \frac{\partial}{\partial v} - kq \frac{\partial}{\partial p} .$$

Then, the tangency condition leads to

$$X_{\mathcal{H}}(p - mv) = -kq - gm = 0 \iff g = -\frac{kq}{m} \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{W}_0)$$

and then

$$X_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{W}_0} = v \frac{\partial}{\partial q} - \frac{kq}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} - kq \frac{\partial}{\partial p} .$$

and its integral curves $(q(t), v(t), p(t))$ are the solutions to

$$\frac{dq}{dt} = v, \quad m \frac{dv}{dt} = -kq, \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -kq .$$

The first two equations are equivalent to

$$m \frac{d^2 q}{dt^2} = -kq ,$$

which is the Euler–Lagrange equation of the system. Furthermore, using the constraint $p = mv$ (the Legendre map), the first and third equations are

$$\frac{dq}{dt} = \frac{p}{m}, \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -kq ;$$

which are the Hamilton equations for the system.

3.7.2. Central forces: the Kepler problem

The *Kepler problem* consists in studying the motion of a particle of mass m under the action of *Newtonian central forces*. It is well-known that the motion of such a particle is on a plane and hence $Q = \mathbb{R}^2$. We take polar coordinates (r, ϕ) in the plane (with origin at the center of the force).

Lagrangian formalism

The Lagrangian formalism takes place in $TQ \simeq \mathbb{R}^4$, with local coordinates (r, ϕ, v_r, v_ϕ) . The Lagrangian function is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2 v_\phi^2) - \frac{K}{r}, \quad K \neq 0 ;$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathcal{L}} &= \frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2 v_\phi^2) + \frac{K}{r} , \\ \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} &= m(v_r dr + r^2 v_\phi d\phi) , \\ \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} &= m(dr \wedge dv_r + r^2 d\phi \wedge dv_\phi - 2rv_\phi dr \wedge d\phi) , \end{aligned}$$

and the Lagrangian is regular. For $X_{\mathcal{L}} = f_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + f_{\phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + g_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + g_{\phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_{\phi}}$, equation (3.4) gives

$$\begin{aligned} i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} &= m [f_r dv_r + f_{\phi} r^2 dv_{\phi} - (g_r - 2rv_{\phi}f_{\phi}) dr - (g_{\phi}r^2 + 2rv_{\phi}f_r) d\phi] \\ &= mv_r dv_r + mr^2 v_{\phi} dv_{\phi} + \left(mrv_{\phi}^2 - \frac{K}{r^2}\right) dr = dE_{\mathcal{L}}, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$f_r = v_r, \quad f_{\phi} = v_{\phi}, \quad mg_r = 2mrv_{\phi}f_{\phi} - mrv_{\phi}^2 + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad g_{\phi} = -\frac{2v_{\phi}f_r}{r},$$

and then the Euler-Lagrange vector field is

$$X_{\mathcal{L}} = v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + v_{\phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \left(rv_{\phi}^2 + \frac{K}{mr^2}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} - \frac{2v_{\phi}v_r}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_{\phi}}.$$

Then, its integral curves $(r(t), \phi(t), v_r(t), v_{\phi}(t))$ are the solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dr}{dt} &= v_r, \quad \frac{d\phi}{dt} = v_{\phi}, \quad m \frac{dv_r}{dt} = mrv_{\phi}^2 + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{dv_{\phi}}{dt} = -\frac{2v_{\phi}v_r}{r} \implies \\ &\implies m \frac{d^2r}{dt^2} = mr \left(\frac{d\phi}{dt}\right)^2 + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{d^2\phi}{dt^2} = -\frac{2}{r} \frac{d\phi}{dt} \frac{dr}{dt} \implies \\ &\implies \frac{d}{dt} \left(m \frac{dr}{dt}\right) = mr \left(\frac{d\phi}{dt}\right)^2 + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{d}{dt} \left(mr^2 \frac{d\phi}{dt}\right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which are the Euler-Lagrange equations for this system.

There is a Lagrangian exact Noether symmetry which is generated by the vector field $Y = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$, since

$$\begin{aligned} L(Y)\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} &= L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) (m(v_r dr + r^2 v_{\phi} d\phi)) \\ &= d i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) (m(v_r dr + r^2 v_{\phi} d\phi)) + i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) d(m(v_r dr + r^2 v_{\phi} d\phi)) \\ &= d(mr^2 v_{\phi}) + i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) (m(dv_r \wedge dr + r^2 dv_{\phi} \wedge d\phi - 2rv_{\phi} d\phi \wedge dr)) \\ &= m(2rv_{\phi} dr + r^2 dv_{\phi} - r^2 dv_{\phi} - 2rv_{\phi} dr) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

$$L(Y)E_{\mathcal{L}} = L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2 v_{\phi}^2) + \frac{K}{r}\right) = 0, \tag{3.27}$$

and hence its associated conserved quantity is

$$f_Y = i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = mr^2 v_{\phi};$$

that is, the angular momentum, as the last Euler-Lagrange equation shows.

Hamiltonian formalism

For the Hamiltonian formalism, $T^*Q \simeq \mathbb{R}^4$, with local coordinates (r, ϕ, p_r, p_ϕ) . First, the Legendre transformation is,

$$\mathcal{FL}^*r = r, \quad \mathcal{FL}^*\phi = \phi, \quad \mathcal{FL}^*p_r = mv_r, \quad \mathcal{FL}^*p_\phi = mr^2v_\phi,$$

which is a diffeomorphism (the Lagrangian is hyperregular). The canonical Hamiltonian function is

$$h = \frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} + \frac{K}{r}.$$

As $\Omega = dr \wedge dp_r + d\phi \wedge dp_\phi$, for $X_h = F_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + F_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + G_r \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r} + G_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi}$, equation (3.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} i(X_h)\Omega &= F_r dp_r + F_\phi dp_\phi - G_r dr - G_\phi d\phi \\ &= \frac{p_r}{m} dp_r + \frac{p_\phi}{mr^2} dp_\phi - \left(\frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2} \right) dr = dh, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$F_r = \frac{p_r}{m}, \quad F_\phi = \frac{p_\phi}{mr^2}, \quad G_r = \frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad G_\phi = 0.$$

Then, the Hamiltonian vector field is

$$X_h = \frac{p_r}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{p_\phi}{mr^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \left(\frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r},$$

and its integral curves $(r(t), \phi(t), p_r(t), p_\phi(t))$ are the solutions to

$$m \frac{dr}{dt} = p_r, \quad mr^2 \frac{d\phi}{dt} = p_\phi, \quad \frac{dp_r}{dt} = \frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{dp_\phi}{dt} = 0,$$

which are the Hamilton equations for this system.

As in the above example, using the Legendre map one can check that the Hamilton and the Euler–Lagrange equations of the system are, in fact, equivalent. Obviously $\mathcal{FL}_*X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_h$.

The Hamiltonian exact Noether symmetry is again the vector field $Y = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$, since

$$\begin{aligned} L(Y)\Theta &= L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right)(p_r dr + p_\phi d\phi) = \\ &= d i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right)(p_r dr + p_\phi d\phi) + i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right)d(p_r dr + p_\phi d\phi) \\ &= dp_\phi - dp_\phi = 0, \\ L(Y)h &= L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right)\left(\frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} + \frac{K}{r}\right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and, as the last Hamilton equation shows, its associated conserved quantity is again the angular momentum

$$f_Y = i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right)\Theta = p_\phi.$$

This Hamiltonian system is also a good and simple example to show how the geometric method of reduction by symmetries proceeds. The symmetry group G is the group of rotations on the orbit plane. The Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is spanned by the vector field $\zeta \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$ and hence $\mathfrak{g}^* = \{d\phi\}$. Thus, the set of fundamental vector fields $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is generated by the vector field $\tilde{\zeta} \equiv Y = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$. The action $\Phi: G \times T^*Q \longrightarrow T^*Q$ is effective, free, and proper, and is a strongly symplectic action on the symplectic manifold (T^*Q, Ω) , since it is exact, as we have seen. In this way, the momentum map is given by

$$(J(r, p_r, \phi, p_\phi))\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) := p_\phi \quad (\text{for every } (r, p_r, \phi, p_\phi) \in T^*Q)$$

and, for every weakly regular value $\mu = \mu_0 d\phi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, the level sets of this map are

$$J^{-1}(\mu) := \{(r, p_r, \phi, p_\phi) \in T^*Q \mid p_\phi = \mu_0\};$$

They are defined by the constraints $\zeta := p_\phi - \mu_0$; that is, the hypersurfaces of constant angular momentum in T^*Q , and hence $\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$ is tangent to all of them. On each one, we have the presymplectic Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{J}^{-1}(\mu), \Omega_\mu, h_\mu)$, where

$$\Omega_\mu := j_\mu^* \Omega = dp_r \wedge dr, \quad h_\mu = \frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{K}{r};$$

hence $\ker \Omega_\mu = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \right\rangle$. In this case, $G_\mu = G$ and, applying the Marsden–Weinstein reduction theorem, this presymplectic system reduces to another symplectic one, $(\mathcal{J}^{-1}(\mu)/G, \widehat{\Omega}, \widehat{h})$, where the local coordinate are (r, p_r) , and

$$\widehat{\Omega} = dp_r \wedge dr, \quad \widehat{h} = \frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{K}{r}.$$

The Hamiltonian equation $i(\widehat{X})\widehat{\Omega} = d\widehat{h}$, with $\widehat{X} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{J}^{-1}(\mu)/G)$, gives the Hamiltonian vector field

$$\widehat{X} = \frac{p_r}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \left(\frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r},$$

whose integral curves $(r(t), p_r(t))$ are the solutions to the Hamilton equations

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = \frac{p_r}{m}, \quad \frac{dp_r}{dt} = \frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2},$$

In order to obtain the complete set of Hamiltonian equations of the system, first, remember that the Hamiltonian vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ is tangent to the level sets $p_\phi = \text{ctn.}$, and second that, by the Legendre map, $p_\phi = mr^2 v_\phi$. Therefore, for the integral curves of $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$, we have that

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \frac{p_\phi}{mr^2}, \quad \frac{dp_\phi}{dt} = 0.$$

Unified Lagrangian–Hamiltonian formalism

Consider the unified bundle $\mathcal{W} = TQ \times_Q T^*Q \simeq \mathbb{R}^6$ with coordinates $(r, \phi, v_r, v_\phi, p_r, p_\phi)$. The canonical presymplectic form is

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{W}} = dr \wedge dp_r + d\phi \wedge dp_\phi,$$

and the Hamiltonian function is

$$\mathcal{H} = p_r v_r + p_\phi v_\phi - \frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2 v_\phi^2) + \frac{K}{r}.$$

For $X_{\mathcal{H}} = f_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + f_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + g_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + g_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} + G_r \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r} + G_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi}$, equation (3.16) gives

$$\begin{aligned} i(X_{\mathcal{H}})\Omega_{\mathcal{W}} &= f_r dp_r + f_\phi dp_\phi - G_r dr - G_\phi d\phi \\ &= -\left(\frac{K}{r^2} + mr v_\phi^2\right)dr + (p_r - mv_r)dv_r + (p_\phi - mr^2 v_\phi)dv_\phi \\ &\quad + v_r dp_r + v_\phi dp_\phi \\ &= d\mathcal{H}, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$f_r = v_r, \quad f_\phi = v_\phi, \quad G_r = \frac{K}{r^2} + mrv_\phi^2, \quad G_\phi = 0, \quad p_r = mv_r, \quad p_\phi = mr^2v_\phi.$$

The last two equations are constraints defining the submanifold $\mathcal{W}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}$ which give the Legendre map. The Hamiltonian vector field is

$$X_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{W}_0} = v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + v_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + g_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + g_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} + \left(\frac{K}{r^2} + mrv_\phi^2 \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r},$$

and the tangency condition leads to

$$X_{\mathcal{H}}(p_r - mv_r) = \frac{K}{r^2} + mrv_\phi^2 - g_r m = 0 \iff g_r = \frac{K}{mr^2} + rv_\phi^2 \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{W}_0),$$

$$X_{\mathcal{H}}(p_\phi - mr^2v_\phi) = -m(g_\phi r^2 + 2f_r rv_\phi) = 0 \iff g_\phi = -\frac{2v_r v_\phi}{r} \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{W}_0);$$

therefore

$$X_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{W}_0} = v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + v_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \left(rv_\phi^2 + \frac{K}{mr^2} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} - \frac{2v_r v_\phi}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} + \left(\frac{K}{r^2} + mrv_\phi^2 \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r},$$

and its integral curves $(r(t), \phi(t), v_r(t), v_\phi(t), p_r(t), p_\phi(t))$ are the solutions to

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = v_r, \quad \frac{d\phi}{dt} = v_\phi, \quad \frac{dv_r}{dt} = \frac{K}{mr^2} + rv_\phi^2, \quad \frac{dv_\phi}{dt} = -\frac{2v_r v_\phi}{r}, \quad \frac{dp_r}{dt} = \frac{K}{r^2} + mrv_\phi^2, \quad \frac{dp_\phi}{dt} = 0.$$

The first four equations are equivalent to

$$m \frac{d^2 r}{dt^2} = mr \left(\frac{d\phi}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{d^2 \phi}{dt^2} = -\frac{2}{r} \frac{d\phi}{dt} \frac{dr}{dt},$$

which are the Euler–Lagrange equation of the system. Furthermore, using the constraints $p_r = mv_r$ and $p_\phi = mr^2v_\phi$ (that is, the Legendre map), the first, second, fifth, and sixth equations are

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = \frac{p_r}{m}, \quad \frac{d\phi}{dt} = \frac{p_\phi}{mr^2}, \quad \frac{dp_r}{dt} = \frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{dp_\phi}{dt} = 0;$$

which are the Hamilton equations for the system.

Chapter 4

Cosymplectic mechanics: Nonautonomous dynamical systems

In the previous chapters, we have studied autonomous Hamiltonian and Lagrangian systems; that is, dynamical systems described by Hamiltonian or Lagrangian functions which are independent of time. Now we are going to analyze the case of *nonautonomous dynamical systems*, which are described by time-dependent Hamiltonian or Lagrangian functions.

The geometrical description of nonautonomous Hamiltonian and Lagrangian systems can be made using different approaches. For instance, one can use the so-called *contact formalism* [1, 101, 146, 147, 299], or a generalization of it, the *jet bundle formalism*, using *jet* and *fiber bundles* [98, 146, 240, 260, 302]. However, these kinds of systems can also be described as symplectic Hamiltonian systems by means of the *extended formalisms* [9, 146, 219, 286, 287, 316], as singular (presymplectic) dynamical systems [59, 146], or using the Lagrangian-Hamiltonian *unified formalism* [21, 93]. Nevertheless, one of the most elegant and simpler geometric description of time-dependent systems is the *cosymplectic formulation* [49, 82], and this is where we focus our attention in this chapter.

As in the above chapters, first we state the geometrical foundations on which this formulation is based, which are the *cosymplectic manifolds* and their properties. Next we introduce the concept of *cosymplectic Hamiltonian system* and we describe, in particular, the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms of nonautonomous Lagrangian dynamical systems using this formulation. Symmetries, conserved quantities and the theorem of Noether are also discussed in this context. The chapter is completed with a brief presentation of two other very common formulations of time-dependent mechanics: the *contact* and the *extended symplectic formulations*, and showing their equivalence with the cosymplectic picture. Finally, some examples of the previous chapter are analyzed for the case in which the Lagrangians are time-dependent.

4.1. Notions on cosymplectic geometry

First, we establish the basic foundations of cosymplectic geometry (see, for instance, [49, 52, 82] for details).

4.1.1. Cosymplectic manifolds

Definition 4.1 Let M be a differentiable manifold of dimension $2n + 1$. A **cosymplectic structure** on M is a couple (η, ω) , where $\eta \in \Omega^1(M)$ and $\omega \in \Omega^2(M)$ are closed forms such that $\eta \wedge \omega^n$ is a volume form. Then, (M, η, ω) is called a **cosymplectic manifold**.

If $\eta \wedge \omega^n$ is not a volume form and $\dim M$ is arbitrary, then we say that (η, ω) is a **precosymplectic structure** on M and (M, η, ω) is a **precosymplectic manifold**.

The (pre)cosymplectic structure is said to be **exact** if $\omega = d\theta$, for some $\theta \in \Omega^1(M)$.

Proposition 4.2 If (η, ω) is a cosymplectic structure on M , then there exists a unique vector field $R \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, called the **Reeb vector field**, which is characterized by the conditions

$$i(R)\eta = 1, \quad i(R)\omega = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

(Proof) Observe that, by the second condition, $R \in \ker \omega$. From the condition that $\eta \wedge \omega^n$ is a volume form, we have that $\text{rank } \omega = 2n$ and hence $\ker \omega$ is a 1-dimensional $C^\infty(M)$ -module. Therefore, the first condition allows us to select one generator of this module. ■

The local structure of cosymplectic manifolds is given by the following extension of Darboux Theorem [130, 135]:

Theorem 4.3 (Darboux) Let (M, η, ω) be a cosymplectic manifold. Then, for every $p \in M$, there exists an open neighborhood $U \subset M$, $p \in U$, which is the domain of a local chart of coordinates (t, x^i, y_i) , $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that

$$\eta|_U = dt, \quad \omega|_U = dx^i \wedge dy_i, \quad R|_U = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}.$$

These are called **Darboux** or **canonical coordinates** of the cosymplectic manifold.

(Proof) The idea of the proof is the following: in a cosymplectic manifold there is a symplectic foliation which is made of the leaves of the distribution generated by $\ker \eta$ (which are $2n$ -dimensional submanifolds and, on each one of them, the restriction of ω is a symplectic form since it has maximal rank $2n$, by the condition of the volume form). Then we take coordinates adapted to the foliation and, on each

leaf, apply the symplectic Darboux Theorem. In this way we have local coordinates (x^i, y_i, \tilde{z}) such that $\omega = dx^i \wedge dy_i$. Finally, we write η as a combination of all of these coordinates, $\eta = f(q, p, \tilde{z})d\tilde{z}$, with f a nonvanishing function, and then we can redefine the coordinate z . In these coordinates, the Reeb vector field has the expression given by the theorem. ■

Remark 4.4 For precosymplectic manifolds, there is a similar result [130]. In fact, if (M, η, ω) is a precosymplectic manifold with $\text{rank } \omega = 2r < \dim M - 1 \equiv m - 1$; then, for every point on M , there exists a local chart $(U; t, x^i, y_i, z^j)$, where $1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq j \leq m - 2r - 1$, such that

$$\eta|_U = dt, \quad \omega|_U = dx^i \wedge dy_i.$$

These local charts are the so-called *precosymplectic charts*, and their coordinates are the *canonical coordinates* or *Darboux coordinates* of the precosymplectic manifold in this chart [135]. In addition, for precosymplectic manifolds the solution to equations (4.1) is not unique and Reeb vector fields are not uniquely defined.

Canonical model: The canonical model for cosymplectic manifolds is the following: consider the manifold $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ with canonical projections

$$\pi_1: \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \pi_2: \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow T^*Q, \quad \pi_0: \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow Q, \quad \pi_{1,0}: \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q.$$

If (q^i) are local coordinates on $U \subseteq Q$, the induced local coordinates (t, q^i, p_i) on $\pi_0^{-1}(U) = \mathbb{R} \times T^*U$ are given by

$$t(t, \alpha_q) = t, \quad q^i(t, \alpha_q) = x^i(q), \quad p_i(t, \alpha_q) = \alpha_q \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q \right),$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \in Q$ and $\alpha_q \in T_q^*Q$. We define the differential forms on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$,

$$\eta = \pi_1^* dt, \quad \theta = \pi_2^* \Theta, \quad \omega = \pi_2^* \Omega,$$

where Θ and Ω are the canonical forms on T^*Q . In local coordinates we have

$$\eta = dt, \quad \theta = p_i dq^i, \quad \omega = dq^i \wedge dp_i.$$

Hence $(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q, \eta, \omega)$ is a cosymplectic manifold, and the natural coordinates of $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ are Darboux coordinates for this canonical cosymplectic structure. Furthermore, $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ is its Reeb vector field.

Almost-canonical cosymplectic manifolds: There is another kind of cosymplectic manifolds which are specially relevant: those which are of the form $M = \mathbb{R} \times N$, where (N, Ω) is a symplectic manifold. Then, denoting by

$$\pi_{\mathbb{R}}: \mathbb{R} \times N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \pi_N: \mathbb{R} \times N \rightarrow N$$

the canonical projections, we have the differential forms

$$\eta = \pi_{\mathbb{R}}^* dt, \quad \omega = \pi_M^* \Omega.$$

The conditions given in Definition 4.1 are verified and hence $\mathbb{R} \times N$ is a cosymplectic manifold. From the Darboux Theorem 4.3 we have local coordinates (t, x^i, y_i) on $\mathbb{R} \times N$. These kinds of k -cosymplectic manifolds are sometimes called *almost-canonical k -cosymplectic manifolds*. Observe that the standard model is a particular class of these kinds of k -cosymplectic manifolds, where $N = T^*Q$.

Every cosymplectic manifold (M, η, ω) is endowed with the natural vector bundle isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} b_{(\eta, \omega)}: TM &\longrightarrow T^*M \\ (p, X_p) &\longmapsto (p, i(X_p)\omega_p + ((i(X_p)\eta_p)\eta_p)). \end{aligned}$$

and its inverse $\sharp_{(\eta, \omega)} = b_{(\eta, \omega)}^{-1}: T^*M \longrightarrow TM$. Their natural extensions are the $C^\infty(M)$ -module isomorphisms which are denoted with the same notation,

$$\begin{aligned} b_{(\eta, \omega)}: \mathfrak{X}(M) &\longrightarrow \Omega^1(M) \\ X &\longmapsto i(X)\omega + (i(X)\eta)\eta \end{aligned}$$

and its inverse $\sharp_{(\eta, \omega)} = b_{(\eta, \omega)}^{-1}: \Omega^1(M) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$. In particular, for the Reeb vector field, we have that $b_{(\eta, \omega)}(R) = \eta$.

4.1.2. Hamiltonian, gradient, and evolution vector fields

Using the natural $C^\infty(M)$ -module isomorphism $b_{(\eta, \omega)}$ introduced in the above section, one can associate to every function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ some particular vector fields:

Definition 4.5 Let (M, η, ω) be a cosymplectic manifold and $f \in C^\infty(M)$.

The **Hamiltonian vector field** associated with f is the vector field $X_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ defined by $b_{(\eta, \omega)}(X_f) := df - R(f)\eta$.

The **gradient vector field** associated with f is the vector field $\text{grad } f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ defined by $b_{(\eta, \omega)}(\text{grad } f) := df$.

The **evolution vector field** associated with f is the vector field $\mathcal{E}_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ defined by $\mathcal{E}_f := R + X_f$; or, equivalently $b_{(\eta, \omega)}(\mathcal{E}_f) = df - (R(f) - 1)\eta$.

These vector fields can be equivalently characterized as follows:

Proposition 4.6 *The **Hamiltonian vector field** associated with f is determined by the equations:*

$$i(X_f)\eta = 0, \quad i(X_f)\omega = df - R(f)\eta . \quad (4.2)$$

*The **gradient vector field** associated with f is determined by the equations:*

$$i(\text{grad } f)\eta = R(f), \quad i(\text{grad } f)\omega = df - R(f)\eta . \quad (4.3)$$

*The **evolution vector field** associated with f is determined by the equations:*

$$i(\mathcal{E}_f)\eta = 1, \quad i(\mathcal{E}_f)\omega = df - R(f)\eta . \quad (4.4)$$

(Proof) For every $f \in C^\infty(M)$, if X_f is the Hamiltonian vector field associated with f , using the definitions of the isomorphism $\flat_{(\eta,\omega)}$ and of X_f , first we have that,

$$i(X_f)d\eta + (i(X_f)\eta)\eta = \flat_{(\eta,\omega)}(X_f) = df - R(f)\eta , \quad (4.5)$$

and contracting both members with R and using (4.1), we get

$$(i(X_f)\eta) i(R)\eta = i(R)df - R(f) i(R)\eta = R(f) - R(f) = 0 \iff i(X_f)\eta = 0 ,$$

since this holds for every f . Now, going to (4.5), we obtain that

$$i(X_f)d\eta = df - R(f)\eta .$$

Repeating the same procedure for If $\text{grad } f$ is the gradient and the evolution vector fields associated with f , we obtain the corresponding equations for $\text{grad } f$ and \mathcal{E}_f . ■

As in the above chapters, from these results it is immediate to obtain that:

Proposition 4.7 *The equations for the integral curves $c: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ of the Hamiltonian, gradient, and evolution vector fields associated with $f \in C^\infty(M)$ are (respectively):*

$$\begin{aligned} i(\tilde{c})(\eta \circ c) &= 0 \quad , \quad i(\tilde{c})(\omega \circ c) = (df - R(f)\eta) \circ c , \\ i(\tilde{c})(\eta \circ c) &= R(f) \circ c \quad , \quad i(\tilde{c})(\omega \circ c) = (df - R(f)\eta) \circ c , \\ i(\tilde{c})(\eta \circ c) &= 1 \quad , \quad i(\tilde{c})(\omega \circ c) = (df - R(f)\eta) \circ c . \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Local expressions: In Darboux coordinates on M , we have that $R(f) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}$; therefore $df - R(f)\eta = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} dx^i + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} dy_i$, and from (4.2), (4.3), and (4.4), we obtain ¹

$$\begin{aligned} X_f &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}, \\ \text{grad } f &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}, \\ \mathcal{E}_f &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Therefore, if $c(s) = (t(s), x^i(s), y_i(s))$ is an integral curve of some of these vector fields, these expressions imply that $c(s)$ should satisfy the following systems of differential equations,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dt}{ds} &= 0, & \frac{dx^i}{ds} &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i}, & \frac{dy_i}{ds} &= -\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i}, \\ \frac{dt}{ds} &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}, & \frac{dx^i}{ds} &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i}, & \frac{dy_i}{ds} &= -\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i}, \\ \frac{dt}{ds} &= 1, & \frac{dx^i}{ds} &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i}, & \frac{dy_i}{ds} &= -\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

As in symplectic Hamiltonian mechanics, a Poisson bracket can be defined also in the cosymplectic case, using the gradient vector fields. Indeed, it is immediate to prove that:

Proposition 4.8 *Every cosymplectic manifold (M, η, ω) is a Poisson manifold, with the Poisson bracket defined by*

$$\{f, g\} := \omega(\text{grad } f, \text{grad } g) \quad ; \quad f, g \in C^\infty(M).$$

The expression of this Poisson bracket in Darboux coordinates is the usual one:

$$\{f, g\} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial y_i}. \quad (4.9)$$

As a consequence of these definitions and properties, many of the results stated in Section 2.1 about Poisson brackets and canonical transformations for autonomous mechanics can be extended also to the nonautonomous case.

¹Observe that the local expression of the Hamiltonian vector field in the cosymplectic formulation is the same as the Hamiltonian vector field in the symplectic formulation; which justifies the terminology.

4.2. Nonautonomous Hamiltonian dynamical systems

4.2.1. Nonautonomous Hamiltonian systems

Bearing in mind the above considerations and the set of postulates for autonomous dynamical systems, we can state the following postulates for the geometric study of nonautonomous Hamiltonian dynamical systems.

Postulate 4.9 (First Postulate of nonautonomous Hamiltonian mechanics): The phase space of a regular (resp. singular) nonautonomous dynamical system is a differentiable manifold M endowed with a cosymplectic (resp. precosymplectic) structure (η, ω) :

Postulate 4.10 (Second Postulate of nonautonomous Hamiltonian mechanics): The observables or physical magnitudes of a dynamical system are functions of $C^\infty(M)$.

Postulate 4.11 (Third Postulate of nonautonomous Hamiltonian mechanics): The dynamics of a dynamical system is given by a function $h \in C^\infty(M)$ (or, in general, a closed 1-form $\alpha \in Z^1(M)$, such that $\alpha = dh$, locally) which is called the **Hamiltonian function** (or the **Hamiltonian 1-form**) of the system. This function represents the energy of the system.

Postulate 4.12 (Fourth Postulate of nonautonomous Hamiltonian mechanics): The dynamical trajectories of the system are the integral curves of the evolution vector field $\mathcal{E}_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ associated with h ; that is, of the vector field solution to equations (4.4). Thus, they are the solutions to equations (4.6).

Then we define:

Definition 4.13 A *regular nonautonomous or cosymplectic Hamiltonian dynamical system* is a set $(M, \eta, \omega; h)$, where (M, η, ω) is a cosymplectic manifold and $h \in C^\infty(M)$ is the Hamiltonian function of the system. If (M, η, ω) is a precosymplectic manifold, then $(M, \eta, \omega; h)$ is said to be a *singular nonautonomous or precosymplectic Hamiltonian dynamical system*.

Definition 4.14 Given a nonautonomous Hamiltonian dynamical system $(M, \eta, \omega; h)$, the **Hamiltonian problem** posed by the system consists in finding the evolution vector field $\mathcal{E}_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ associated with h (if it exists).

In addition, we have:

Proposition 4.15 *If $(M, \eta, \omega; h)$ is a regular nonautonomous Hamiltonian system, then there exists a unique evolution vector field $\mathcal{E}_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$; that is, a unique vector field which is the solution to equations (4.4).*

(Proof) It is immediate because, if the system is regular, the existence of the isomorphism $\sharp_{(\eta, \omega)}$ is assured. ■

Remark 4.16 *If (M, η, ω, h) is a precosymplectic Hamiltonian system equations (4.4) are not necessarily compatible everywhere on M and a suitable constraint algorithm must be implemented in order to find a final constraint submanifold $P_f \hookrightarrow M$ (if it exists) where there are evolution vector fields $\mathcal{E}_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, tangent to P_f which are solutions to equations (4.4) on P_f . (they are not necessarily unique). Singular nonautonomous systems and the corresponding constraint algorithms are studied in [57, 83, 115–117, 329].*

4.3. Nonautonomous Lagrangian dynamical systems

4.3.1. Geometric elements

In order to develop the cosymplectic Lagrangian formalism, first we have to extend some canonical structures of TQ to $T(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$. Notice that, as $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ is a product manifold, we can write

$$T(\mathbb{R} \times TQ) = T\mathbb{R} \oplus_{\mathbb{R} \times TQ} T(TQ)$$

and this splitting extends in a natural way to vector fields. Thus, any operation on tangent vectors to TQ acts on tangent vectors to $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$. In particular, the canonical endomorphism J of $T(TQ)$ yields a canonical endomorphism $\mathcal{J}: T(\mathbb{R} \times TQ) \rightarrow T(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ and, similarly, the Liouville vector field on TQ yields a Liouville vector field $\Delta \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ which is the Liouville vector field of the vector bundle structure $\pi_{1,0}: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$. In natural coordinates, their local expressions are

$$\mathcal{J} = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \otimes dq^i, \quad \Delta = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}.$$

Definition 4.17 *Let $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$ be a curve. We can write $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2)$, where $c_1: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $c_2: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$. The **lift** of \mathbf{c} to $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ is the curve*

$$\hat{\mathbf{c}} = (c_1, \tilde{c}_2): \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ,$$

where \tilde{c}_2 is the canonical lift of c_2 to TQ . The curve $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ is said to be **holonomic** on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$. A vector field $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ is said to be a **SODE** on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ if its integral curves are holonomic.

As in the autonomous case, the last definition can be equivalently expressed in terms of the canonical structures of $\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}Q$, and so it is immediate to prove that:

Proposition 4.18 *A vector field $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}Q)$ is a SODE if, and only if, $\mathcal{J}(\Gamma) = \Delta$.*

In coordinates, if $\mathbf{c}(t) = (s(t), q^i(t))$, then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{c}}(t) = \left(s(t), q^i(t), \frac{dq^i}{dt}(t) \right) ,$$

and the local expression of a SODE is

$$\Gamma = g \frac{\partial}{\partial s} + v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} ;$$

so, in coordinates a SODE defines the following system of differential equations

$$\frac{ds}{dt} = g(q, \dot{q}, s), \quad \frac{d^2 q^i}{dt^2} = f^i(q, \dot{q}, s) .$$

4.3.2. Lagrangian formalism. Nonautonomous Lagrangian systems

The foundations of the Lagrangian formulation of (first-order) nonautonomous dynamical system are analogous to those given in Section 3.2.1 for autonomous Lagrangian systems; and they can be stated as follows:

Postulate 4.19 (First Postulate of nonautonomous Lagrangian mechanics): The configuration space of a nonautonomous dynamical system with n degrees of freedom is $\mathbb{R} \times Q$, where Q is a n -dimensional differentiable manifold. The phase space is the bundle $\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}Q$.

Postulate 4.20 (Second Postulate of nonautonomous Lagrangian mechanics): The observables or physical magnitudes of a dynamical system are functions of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}Q)$.

Postulate 4.21 (Third Postulate of nonautonomous Lagrangian mechanics): There is a function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}Q)$, called the **Lagrangian function**, which contains the dynamical information of the system.

Let $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}Q)$ be a Lagrangian function. As in the autonomous case, using the canonical structures in $\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}Q$ we can introduce the *Lagrangian forms*

$\theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ})$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ})$ associated with \mathcal{L} , which are defined as follows: $\theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{J}(\text{d}\mathcal{L})$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -\text{d}\theta_{\mathcal{L}}$. They have the local expressions

$$\theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \text{d}q^i, \quad \omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \text{d}q^i \wedge \text{d} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \right).$$

In the same way, we define the *energy Lagrangian function* associated with \mathcal{L} as $E_{\mathcal{L}} := \Delta(\mathcal{L}) - \mathcal{L}$, whose local expression is

$$E_{\mathcal{L}} = v^i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} - \mathcal{L}.$$

Definition 4.22 Given a Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ})$, the **Legendre map** associated with \mathcal{L} is the fiber derivative of \mathcal{L} , considered as a function on the vector bundle $\pi_0: \mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \text{Q}$; that is, the map $\text{FL}: \mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*\text{Q}$ given by

$$\text{FL}(t, q, v_q) = (t, \text{FL}_t(q, v_q)),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_t: \text{TQ} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the restriction of \mathcal{L} to each fiber of the bundle $\pi_1: \mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (that is, the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} with t “frozen”).

In natural coordinates we have

$$t \circ \text{FL} = t, \quad q^i \circ \text{FL} = q^i, \quad p_i \circ \text{FL} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i}.$$

Observe that, considering the canonical cosymplectic manifold $(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*\text{Q}, \eta, \omega)$, where $\omega = -\text{d}\theta$, then the Lagrangian forms can also be defined as

$$\theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \text{FL}^* \theta, \quad \omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \text{FL}^* \omega. \quad (4.10)$$

And, as in the autonomous case, we also have:

Definition 4.23 A Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ})$ is said to be **regular** (resp. **hyperregular**) if the corresponding Legendre map FL is a local (resp. global) diffeomorphism. Elsewhere, \mathcal{L} is called a **singular** Lagrangian.

A singular Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ})$ is called **almost-regular** if $\mathcal{P} := \text{FL}(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ})$ is a closed submanifold of $\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*\text{Q}$ (we will denote the natural embedding by $j_0: \mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*\text{Q}$), FL is a submersion onto its image, and the fibers $\text{FL}^{-1}(\text{FL}(\mathbf{p}))$, for every $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}$, are connected submanifolds of $\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}$.

Once again, as in the autonomous case, it is immediate to prove that \mathcal{L} is regular if, and only if, the matrix $\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j} \right)$ is regular everywhere. Therefore, the following equivalences are also immediate:

Proposition 4.24 *The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *The Lagrangian \mathcal{L} is regular.*
2. *The Legendre map $F\mathcal{L}$ is a local diffeomorphism.*
3. *The pair $(dt, \omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a cosymplectic structure on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$.*

If \mathcal{L} is not regular, then $(dt, \omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a precosymplectic structure on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$. Thus, if \mathcal{L} is a regular (resp. singular) Lagrangian, we have that $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, dt, \omega_{\mathcal{L}}; E_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a cosymplectic (resp. precosymplectic) Hamiltonian system. Then we define:

Definition 4.25 *A **nonautonomous** or pre)cosymplectic Lagrangian dynamical system is a pair $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, \mathcal{L})$, where Q is an n -dimensional manifold, and $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ is the Lagrangian function of the system.*

And now we can state:

Postulate 4.26 (Fourth Postulate of nonautonomous Lagrangian mechanics): The dynamical trajectories of the system are the integral curves of a vector field $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ satisfying the conditions:

1. $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the evolution vector field associated with $E_{\mathcal{L}}$; that is, it is a solution to the equations

$$i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})dt = 1 \quad , \quad i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}} - R_{\mathcal{L}}(E_{\mathcal{L}})dt . \quad (4.11)$$

2. $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE: $\mathcal{J}(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) = \Delta$.

Therefore, these trajectories are the holonomic curves $\mathbf{c}: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ which are the solutions to equations

$$i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(dt \circ \mathbf{c}) = 1 \quad , \quad i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\omega_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \mathbf{c}) = (dE_{\mathcal{L}} - R_{\mathcal{L}}(E_{\mathcal{L}})dt) \circ \mathbf{c} . \quad (4.12)$$

Equations (4.12) are the **nonautonomous Euler–Lagrange equations for curves**. Equations (4.11) are called the **nonautonomous Lagrangian equations for vector fields** and a vector field solution to them (if it exists) is a **nonautonomous Lagrangian dynamical vector field**. If, in addition, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE, then it is called a **nonautonomous Euler–Lagrange vector field** of the system,

In this postulate, $R_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the Reeb vector field of the structure $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, dt, \omega_{\mathcal{L}})$, determined by the corresponding equations to (4.1) which are

$$i(R_{\mathcal{L}})dt = 1, \quad i(R_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0 .$$

Definition 4.27 Given a nonautonomous Lagrangian dynamical system $(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}, \mathcal{L})$, the **Lagrangian problem** posed by the system consists in finding the SODE vector fields $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ})$ solutions to (4.11).

Local expressions: Consider a natural chart $(U; t, q^i, v^i)$ of $\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}$. Bearing in mind the local expressions of the several geometric elements appearing in the nonautonomous dynamical equations, first we obtain that the Reeb vector field is given by

$$R_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + R^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} ,$$

where the functions R^i are obtained from

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial t \partial v^j} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} R^i = 0 ,$$

and then we have that

$$R_{\mathcal{L}}(E_{\mathcal{L}}) = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial t} .$$

Therefore, if $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = f \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + A^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + B^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$, equations (4.11), written in coordinates, lead to $f = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} B^i + \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial q^i} \right) A^i + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial q^j} v^i + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial t} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} , \\ 0 &= \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} (A^i - v^i) . \end{aligned}$$

To demand that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE is locally equivalent to demand that $A^i = v^i$. Furthermore, the integral curves of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ are holonomic; that is, they are of the form $\mathbf{c}(t) = (t, q^i(t), \dot{q}^i(t))$ and

$$A^i = v^i = \frac{dq^i}{dt} , \quad B^i = \frac{d^2 q^i}{dt^2} ,$$

and the combination of these expressions with the above equations leads to the equation of the integral curves of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ which is

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} \circ \mathbf{c} \right) \frac{d^2 q^i}{dt^2} + \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial q^i} \circ \mathbf{c} \right) \frac{dq^i}{dt} + \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial t} \circ \mathbf{c} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} \circ \mathbf{c} = 0 ,$$

or also in an equivalent form as in (3.9), which is the classical coordinate expression of the Euler–Lagrange equations.

Remark 4.28 If the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} is singular (in particular almost-regular), then the existence of solutions to equations (4.11) is not assured except, perhaps, in a submanifold of $\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}$. Furthermore, when these solutions exist, they are not SODE, in general. Thus, in order to recover the Euler–Lagrange equations (4.12) for the integral curves of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$, the condition $\mathcal{J}(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) = \Delta$ must be added to the Lagrangian equations (4.11). Then, as in the autonomous case, in general, a constraint algorithm must be implemented in order to find a submanifold $S \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}$ where the existence of SODE vector fields solutions to the Lagrange equations on S , and tangent to S , are assured. Furthermore, Reeb vector fields $R_{\mathcal{L}}$ are not uniquely defined by equations (4.1) for this case; nevertheless the dynamics and the constraint algorithm are independent of the selected Reeb vector field $R_{\mathcal{L}}$ [83].

4.3.3. Canonical Hamiltonian formalism

As in the autonomous case analyzed in Section 3.3.2, we study the case of hiperregular systems; although all the results hold also for the case of regular systems, changing $\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*Q$ by $\text{FL}(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}) \subset \mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*Q$. First, as FL is a diffeomorphism we have:

Proposition 4.29 *Let $(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}, \mathcal{L})$ be a hiperregular nonautonomous Lagrangian system. Then there exists a unique function $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*Q)$ such that $\text{FL}^*h = E_{\mathcal{L}}$, which is the **Hamiltonian function** associated with the system $(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}, \mathcal{L})$. The triple $(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*Q, dt, \omega, h)$ is the **canonical nonautonomous Hamiltonian system** associated with $(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ}, \mathcal{L})$, where $\omega \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*Q)$ is given in (4.10).*

Therefore, we have the cosymplectic Hamiltonian system $(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*Q, dt, \omega, dh)$, fulfilling the postulates and results established in Section 4.2.1. and hence the Hamiltonian equations for vector fields $\mathcal{E}_h \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*Q)$ and their integral curves $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \text{T}^*Q$ read

$$i(\mathcal{E}_h)dt = 1 \quad , \quad i(\mathcal{E}_h)\omega = dh - R(h)dt \quad , \quad (4.13)$$

$$i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(dt \circ \mathbf{c}) = 1 \quad , \quad i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\omega \circ \mathbf{c}) = (dh - R(h)dt) \circ \mathbf{c} \quad . \quad (4.14)$$

In canonical coordinates, the local expression of the dynamical vector field \mathcal{E}_h solution to equations (4.13) is given by (4.7) and the equations of its integral curves (4.14) are equations (4.8), with $f = h$. Then, since $\frac{dt}{ds} = 1$ implies $t(s) = s + \text{const.}$ (t is an affine transformation of s), we deduce that

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i}, \quad \frac{dy_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i},$$

which are the *cosymplectic Hamilton equations*.

The relation between the Lagrangian and the canonical Hamiltonian formalisms of a (hyper)regular Lagrangian system is stated as in the autonomous case as follows:

Theorem 4.30 (Equivalence Theorem) Let $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, \mathcal{L})$ be a (hyper)regular Lagrangian system.

1. If $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the Lagrangian vector field solution to equations (4.11), then there exists a unique vector field $FL_*\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \equiv \mathcal{E}_h \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ which is the solution to equations (4.13).

Conversely, if \mathcal{E}_h is the evolution vector field solution to equation (4.13), then there exists a unique vector field $FL_*^{-1}\mathcal{E}_h \equiv \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ which is the solution to equations (4.11) and (3.5).

2. Equivalently, if $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$ is a curve and its canonical lift $\hat{\gamma}: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ is a solution to equation (4.12), then $\zeta = FL \circ \hat{\gamma}$ is a curve solution to equation (4.14).

Conversely, if $\zeta: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ is a curve solution to equation (4.14), then $\hat{\gamma} = \widehat{\pi_{(1,0)}} \circ \zeta: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ is a curve solution to equation (4.12).

(Proof) The proof follows the same pattern as in Theorem 3.47. ■

Remark 4.31 If the Lagrangian is almost-regular, then there exists $h_0 \in C^\infty(\mathcal{P})$ such that $FL_0^*h_0 = E_{\mathcal{L}}$, where $FL_0: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is defined by $j_0 \circ FL_0 = FL$. Now, taking $\omega_0 = j_0^*\omega$, the set $(\mathcal{P}, dt, \omega_0, dh_0)$ is a precosymplectic Hamiltonian system which is called the *canonical Hamiltonian system* associated with $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, \mathcal{L})$. In particular, the equations equivalent to (4.13) are

$$i(X_0)dt = 1, \quad i(X_0)(j_0^*\omega_0) = dh_0 - R_0(h_0)dt.$$

where $X_0 \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{P})$. The existence of such a vector field X_0 solution to the above equations is not assured except, perhaps, on a submanifold $\mathcal{P}_f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}$ to which it is tangent. Moreover, the solution is not unique. Furthermore, although Reeb vector fields R are not uniquely defined by equations (4.1) for this case, the dynamics and the constraint algorithm are independent of the selected Reeb vector field R_0 . (Details on the construction of the canonical Hamiltonian formalism for almost-regular nonautonomous Lagrangians and a deeper study on the constraint algorithms and the equivalence between both formalisms can be found, for instance, in [57, 83, 115, 116, 198, 329]).

4.4. Unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism for systems

This section is devoted to explain the extension of the Skinner-Rusk unified formalism, which was presented in Section 3.4, to the case of nonautonomous dynamical systems, using the cosymplectic setting (see [21,47,184] for different but equivalent approaches). This extended formalism is quite similar to the autonomous case.

4.4.1. Extended unified bundle. Unified nonautonomous formalism

Definition 4.32 Let Q be a n -dimensional differentiable manifold. The **extended unified bundle** or **extended Pontryagin bundle** is $\mathcal{M} := \mathbb{R} \times TQ \times_Q T^*Q$, and has natural projections

$$\kappa_1: \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ, \quad \kappa_2: \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q, \quad \kappa_0: \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$$

Its natural coordinates are (t, q^i, v^i, p_i) .

Definition 4.33 A curve $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is **holonomic** on \mathcal{M} if $\kappa_1 \circ \mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ is holonomic.

A vector field $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ is a **holonomic vector field** on \mathcal{M} if its integral curves are holonomic on \mathcal{M} .

The coordinate expressions of holonomic curves and vector fields on \mathcal{M} are the following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}(t) &= \left(s(t), q^i(t), \frac{dq^i}{dt}(t), p_i(t), \right), \\ \Gamma &= g \frac{\partial}{\partial s} + v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + G_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}. \end{aligned}$$

The extended unified bundle \mathcal{M} is endowed with the following canonical structures:

Definition 4.34 1. The **coupling function** on \mathcal{M} is the map $C: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} C : \quad \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R} \times TQ \times_Q T^*Q &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (t, q, v_q, \xi_q) = (t, q^i, v^i, p_i) &\mapsto \langle v_q, \xi_q \rangle = v^i p_i. \end{aligned}$$

2. If $\theta \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ and $\omega \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ are the canonical forms on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$, then the canonical forms on \mathcal{M} are

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{M}} := \kappa_2^* \theta \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{M}), \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{M}} := \kappa_2^* \omega = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{M}} \in \Omega^2(\mathcal{M}),$$

We denote also by dt the pull-back to \mathcal{M} of the canonical 1-form on \mathbb{R} .

Definition 4.35 Given a Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \text{TQ})$, if $\mathfrak{L} = \kappa_1^* \mathcal{L}$, the **Hamiltonian function** is defined as

$$H = C - \mathfrak{L} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) .$$

In coordinates, we have

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{M}} = p_i dq^i, \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{M}} = dq^i \wedge dp_i, \quad H = v^i p_i - \mathfrak{L}(t, q^i, v^i) .$$

The triple $(\mathcal{M}, dt, \Omega_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a precosymplectic manifold, since $\ker \Omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \right\rangle$, where the Reeb vector field can be taken to be $R = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$; and hence $(\mathcal{M}, dt, \Omega_{\mathcal{M}}, H)$ is a precosymplectic Hamiltonian system. The **dynamical problem** for this system consists in finding an evolution vector field $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$, which is a solution to the equations

$$i(X_H)dt = 1, \quad i(X_H)\Omega_{\mathcal{M}} = dH - R(H)dt, \quad (4.15)$$

and then the integral curves $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ of X_H are solutions to the equations

$$i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(dt \circ \mathbf{c}) = 1, \quad i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\Omega_{\mathcal{W}} \circ \mathbf{c}) = (dH - R(H)dt) \circ \mathbf{c}. \quad (4.16)$$

But, as $(\mathcal{M}, \Omega_{\mathcal{M}}, H)$ is a precosymplectic Hamiltonian system, these equations are not compatible on \mathcal{M} . In fact, for an arbitrary vector field in $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$,

$$X_H = g \frac{\partial}{\partial s} + f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + G_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i},$$

equations (4.15) leads to

$$g = 1, \quad f^i = v^i, \quad G_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i}, \quad p_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i}. \quad (4.17)$$

which give different kind of information:

- The first equation fixes the evolution parameter $s = t$.
- The second equations assure that X_H is a holonomic vector field on \mathcal{M} (regardless the regularity of the Lagrangian function).
- The third equations allow us to determine the component functions G_i .
- The fourth equations are compatibility conditions; that is, *compatibility constraints* defining a submanifold $\mathcal{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ where vector fields X_H solution to (4.15) are defined. As in the autonomous case, these constraints give the Legendre map and $\mathcal{M}_0 = \text{graph}(\text{FL})$.

In this way, we have obtained

$$X_H|_{\mathcal{M}_0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i},$$

where the functions F^i are still undetermined. Now, the constraint algorithm continues by demanding the tangency of X_H to the submanifold \mathcal{M}_0 ; that is, we have to impose that $X_H \left(p_i - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{M}_0} = 0$, and then we obtain the equations for the functions F^i :

$$\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v^i \partial v^j} F^j + \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} v^j + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial t \partial v^i} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} = 0 \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{M}_0). \quad (4.18)$$

If \mathcal{L} is a regular Lagrangian, these equations are compatible, and they have a unique vector field X_H which is the solution to (4.15) on \mathcal{M}_0 , and the last system of equations give the dynamical trajectories (i.e., the solutions to equations (4.16) on \mathcal{M}_0). If \mathcal{L} is singular, equations (4.18) can be compatible or not and, eventually, new compatibility constraints can appear, defining a new submanifold $\mathcal{M}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_0$. Then, the constraint algorithm continues by demanding the tangency of solutions to \mathcal{M}_1 , and so on. In the most favorable cases, there is a submanifold $\mathcal{M}_f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_0$ such that there exist holonomic vector fields $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ defined on \mathcal{M}_0 and tangent to \mathcal{M}_f , which are solutions to equations (4.15) at support on \mathcal{M}_f (they are not unique necessarily).

4.4.2. Recovering the nonautonomous Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms

The analysis of the equivalence among the unified, the Lagrangian, and Hamiltonian formalisms is made again for the hyperregular case (the regular case is locally the same. See [21] for details about the singular case).

As in the autonomous case, denoting by $j_0: \mathcal{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ the natural embedding, we have the projections

$$(\kappa_1 \circ j_0): \mathcal{M}_0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ, \quad (\kappa_2 \circ j_0): \mathcal{M}_0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q,$$

where $\kappa_1 \circ j_0$ is a diffeomorphism. The diagram that summarizes the situation is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \mathcal{M} & & \\
 & \swarrow \kappa_1 & \uparrow j_0 & \searrow \kappa_2 & \\
 & & \mathcal{M}_0 = \text{graph}(\text{FL}) & & \\
 & \swarrow \kappa_1 \circ j_0 & & \searrow \kappa_2 \circ j_0 & \\
 \mathbb{R} \times TQ & \xleftarrow{\quad \text{FL} \quad} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q
 \end{array}$$

Hence, functions, differential forms, and vector fields on \mathcal{M} tangent to \mathcal{M}_0 can be restricted to \mathcal{M}_0 , and then they can be translated to the Lagrangian side by using the diffeomorphism $\kappa_1 \circ j_0$, and to the Hamiltonian side using the Legendre map and the projection κ_2 .

Therefore, if $\mathbf{c}(t) = (t, q^i(t), v^i(t), p_i(t))$ is a solution to equation (4.15), and hence it is an integral curve of the vector field X_H solution to equations (4.15), then (4.18) leads to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \circ \mathbf{c} \right) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} \circ \mathbf{c}, \quad (4.19)$$

and from equations (4.17) we obtain

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = v^i, \quad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} \circ \mathbf{c} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i} \circ \mathbf{c}, \quad p_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \circ \mathbf{c}. \quad (4.20)$$

From the first group of these equations, together with (4.19), we recover the Euler–Lagrange equations for the curves $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}(t) = (t, q^i(t), v^i(t))$. In addition, $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i}$, and hence the second group of equations (4.20) is

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i} \circ \mathbf{c}$$

and, using the local expression of H and the first group of equations (4.20), we get

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i} \circ \mathbf{c} = v^i = \frac{dq^i}{dt};$$

but, using the Legendre map (that is, the third group of equations (4.17)) we have that $H = F\mathcal{L}^*h$, and these last equations become the *Hamilton equations* for the curves $\mathbf{c}_h(t) = (t, q^i(t), p_i(t))$.

Every curve $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, taking values on \mathcal{M}_0 can be viewed as $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathbf{c}_h)$, where $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}} = \kappa_1 \circ \mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ and $\mathbf{c}_h = F\mathcal{L} \circ \mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$. Thus, we have proved that:

Theorem 4.36 *If $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, with $\text{Im } \mathbf{c} \subset \mathcal{M}_0$, is a curve fulfilling equations (4.16), then $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the lift to $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ of the projected curve $\mathbf{c}_o = \kappa_0 \circ \mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$ (that is, $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a holonomic curve), and it is a solution to equation (4.12), where $E_{\mathcal{L}} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ is such that $H = \kappa_1^* E_{\mathcal{L}}$. Moreover, the curve $\mathbf{c}_h = \kappa_2 \circ \mathbf{c} = F\mathcal{L} \circ \mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a solution to equation (4.14), where $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ is such that $H = \kappa_1^* h$.*

Conversely, if $\mathbf{c}_o: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ is a curve such that $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_o \equiv \mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a solution to equation (4.12), then the curve $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}, F\mathcal{L} \circ \mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a solution to equation (4.16) and $F\mathcal{L} \circ \mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a solution to equation (4.14).

The curves $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ which are solution to equation (4.16) are the integral curves of the holonomic vector field $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ which is the solution to equations (4.15), the curves $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{L}}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ are the integral curves of the holonomic vector field $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ which is the solution to equations (4.11), and the curves $\mathbf{c}_h: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ are the integral curves of the vector field $\mathcal{E}_h \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ which is the solution to equations (4.13). Therefore:

Theorem 4.37 *Let $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ be the solution to equations (4.15) (on \mathcal{M}_0), which is tangent to \mathcal{M}_0 . Then:*

The vector field $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$, defined by $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \kappa_1 = T\kappa_1 \circ X_H$, is the SODE solution to equations (4.11), where $E_{\mathcal{L}} \in C^\infty(TQ)$ is such that $H = \kappa_1^ E_{\mathcal{L}}$.*

*The vector field $\mathcal{E}_h \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$, defined by $\mathcal{E}_h \circ \kappa_2 = T\kappa_2 \circ X_H$, is the solution to equations (4.13), where $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ is such that $H = \kappa_1^* h$. Furthermore $FL_* \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{E}_h$.*

4.5. Symmetries of regular nonautonomous dynamical systems

We restrict the study of symmetries of regular nonautonomous dynamical system to the case in which the phase space is an almost-canonical cosymplectic manifold; i.e., $\mathbb{R} \times M$, with M a symplectic manifold, and, in particular, to the canonical case $M = T^*Q$. Remember that, in this case, the natural projection $\pi_{\mathbb{R}}: \mathbb{R} \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines a global canonical coordinate t .

This study is inspired in the ideas introduced mainly in [3] and follows the scheme given in Section 2.3. (See also [299] for a very interesting description of symmetries in the Lagrangian formalism).

4.5.1. Symmetries of nonautonomous Hamiltonian systems. Noether Theorem

Let $(\mathbb{R} \times M, \eta, \omega; h)$ be a regular nonautonomous (almost-canonical) Hamiltonian system, and $\mathcal{E}_h \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ its evolution vector field.

Definition 4.38 *A function $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ is a **conserved quantity** or a **constant of motion** if*

$$L(\mathcal{E}_h)f = 0 ;$$

Definition 4.39 *A **dynamical symmetry** of the system $(\mathbb{R} \times M, \eta, \omega; h)$ is a diffeomorphism $\Phi: \mathbb{R} \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times M$ satisfying that*

$$\Phi_* \mathcal{E}_h = \mathcal{E}_h .$$

Definition 4.40 An *infinitesimal dynamical symmetry* of the system $(\mathbb{R} \times M, \eta, \omega; h)$ is a vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that the local diffeomorphisms generated by its flux are dynamical symmetries of the system; that is,

$$L(Y)\mathcal{E}_h = [Y, \mathcal{E}_h] = 0 .$$

It is immediate to check that the results obtained in Section 2.3.2 for the dynamical symmetries of autonomous Hamiltonian systems also hold in this case.

Definition 4.41 A *cosymplectic Noether symmetry* of the system $(\mathbb{R} \times M, \eta, \omega; h)$ is a diffeomorphism $\Phi: \mathbb{R} \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times M$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$(a) \quad \Phi^*\omega = \omega, \quad (b) \quad \Phi^*t = t, \quad (c) \quad \Phi^*h = h.$$

If the cosymplectic structure is exact, and $\omega = -d\theta$, then a cosymplectic Noether symmetry is said to be *exact* if $\Phi^*\theta = \theta$.

Definition 4.42 An *infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetry* of the system $(\mathbb{R} \times M, \eta, \omega; h)$ is a vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ whose local flux are local cosymplectic Noether symmetries; that is, it satisfies that:

$$(a) \quad L(Y)\omega = 0, \quad (b) \quad L(Y)t = i(Y)\eta = 0, \quad (c) \quad L(Y)h = 0.$$

If the cosymplectic structure is exact, an infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetry is said to be *exact* if $L(Y)\theta = 0$.

For the Reeb vector field, we have the following property:

Proposition 4.43 1. If $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ is a cosymplectic Noether symmetry, then $\Phi_*R = R$.

2. If $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ is an infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetry, then $[Y, R] = 0$.

(Proof)

1. As Φ is a cosymplectic Noether symmetry then $\Phi^*\omega = \omega$ and $\Phi^*\eta = \eta$; then, taking into account the conditions (4.1) that characterize the Reeb vector field, we have

$$\begin{aligned} i(\Phi_*R)\eta &= i(R)(\Phi^{-1})^*\eta = i(R)\eta = 1 , \\ i(\Phi_*R)\omega &= i(R)(\Phi^{-1})^*\omega = i(R)\omega = 0 , \end{aligned}$$

and the result is a consequence of the unicity of the Reeb vector field, and so $\Phi_*R = R$.

2. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} i([Y, R])\omega &= L(Y) i(R)\omega - i(R) L(Y)\omega = 0 \iff [Y, R] \in \ker \omega, \\ i([Y, R])\eta &= L(Y) i(R)\eta - i(R) L(Y)\eta = 0 \iff [Y, R] \in \ker \eta, \end{aligned}$$

and then $[Y, R] \in \ker \omega \cap \ker \eta = \{0\}$ (because $\eta \wedge \omega^n$ is a volume form). ■

Remark 4.44 • The condition $\Phi^*t = t$ means that cosymplectic Noether symmetries generate transformations along the fibers of the projection $\pi_{\mathbb{R}}: \mathbb{R} \times M \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$; that is, they leave the fibers of the projection $\pi_{\mathbb{R}}: \mathbb{R} \times M \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ invariant or, what means the same thing, $\pi_{\mathbb{R}} \circ \Phi = \pi_{\mathbb{R}}$.

- In the case of infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetries, the analogous condition is $i(Y)dt = 0$, which means that Y has the local expression $Y = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + g_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}$. This means that Y is tangent to the fibers of the projection $\pi_{\mathbb{R}}$. Thus, these infinitesimal symmetries only generate transformations along these fibers, or, what means the same thing, the local flux of the generators Y leave the fibers of the projection $\pi_{\mathbb{R}}$ invariant. Furthermore, as a consequence of the above proposition, and taking into account that $R = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$, in this local expression for Y the component functions f^i, g_i do not depend on the coordinate t .

Proposition 4.45 1. If $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ is a cosymplectic Noether symmetry, then it is a dynamical symmetry.

2. If $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ is an infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetry, then it is an infinitesimal dynamical symmetry.

(Proof)

1. As Φ is a cosymplectic Noether symmetry, then $\Phi^*\omega = \omega$, $\Phi^*\eta = \eta$, $\Phi^*h = h$, and $\Phi_*R = R$; therefore, from $0 = i(\mathcal{E}_h)\omega - dh + (R(h))\eta$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Phi^*[i(\mathcal{E}_h)\omega - dh + (R(h))\eta] \\ &= i(\Phi_*^{-1}\mathcal{E}_h)(\Phi^*\omega) - \Phi^*dh + ((\Phi_*^{-1}R)(\Phi^*h))(\Phi^*\eta) \\ &= i(\Phi_*^{-1}\mathcal{E}_h)\omega - dh + (R(h))\eta, \end{aligned}$$

and from $0 = i(\mathcal{E}_h)\eta - 1$ we get

$$0 = \Phi^*(i(\mathcal{E}_h)\eta - 1) = i(\Phi_*^{-1}\mathcal{E}_h)(\Phi^*\eta) - 1 = i(\Phi_*^{-1}\mathcal{E}_h)\eta - 1;$$

but as the system is regular, the evolution vector field solution is unique, then $\Phi_*^{-1}\mathcal{E}_h = \mathcal{E}_h$, and hence the result holds.

2. The result for infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetries follows from the above item using the local uniparametric group of diffeomorphisms associated to their fluxes (or also, using the properties (4.1) that characterize the Reeb vector field and reasoning as in the first item).

■

In addition, it is immediate to prove that, if $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times M)$ are infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetries, then so is $[Y_1, Y_2]$.

Consider now the particular case of the canonical model $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$. If $\varphi: Q \rightarrow Q$ is a diffeomorphism, we construct the diffeomorphism $\Phi := (\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}}, T^*\varphi): \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$, where $T^*\varphi: T^*Q \rightarrow T^*Q$ is the canonical lift of φ to T^*Q . Then Φ is said to be the *canonical lift* of φ to $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$. Any transformation Φ of this kind is called a *natural transformation* of $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$.

In the same way, given a vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ we can define its *complete lift* to $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ as the vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ whose local flux is the canonical lift of the local flux of Z to $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$; that is, $Y = Z^*$, where Z^* denotes the complete lift of Z to $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$. Any vector field Y of this kind is called a *natural infinitesimal transformation* of $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$.

Then we define:

Definition 4.46 Let $(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q, \eta, \omega; h)$ be a regular nonautonomous Hamiltonian system.

A symmetry (resp. cosymplectic Noether symmetry) $\Phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ is said to be **natural** if Φ is a natural transformation of $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$.

An infinitesimal symmetry (resp. infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetry) $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ is said to be **natural** if Y is a natural infinitesimal transformation of $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$.

As infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetries are vector fields on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ whose local fluxes are local cosymplectic Noether symmetries, all the results that we state for cosymplectic Noether symmetries also hold for infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetries. Hence, we consider only the infinitesimal case.

Proposition 4.47 Let $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ be an infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetry. Then, for every $p \in \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$, there is an open neighbourhood $U \ni p$, such that:

1. There exist $\mathcal{F} \in C^\infty(U)$, which is unique up to a constant function, such that

$$i(Y)\omega = d\mathcal{F}, \quad (\text{on } U). \quad (4.21)$$

2. There exist $\zeta \in C^\infty(U)$, verifying that $L(Y)\theta = d\zeta$, on U ; and then

$$\mathcal{F} = i(Y)\theta - \zeta, \quad (\text{up to a constant function on } U)$$

Then, for exact infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetries we have that $\mathcal{F} = i(Y)\theta$ (up to a constant function).

(Proof) Recalling the conditions set out in Definition 4.42:

1. It is a consequence of the Poincaré Lemma and the condition

$$0 = L(Y)\omega = i(Y)d\omega + di(Y)\omega = di(Y)\omega.$$

2. We have that

$$dL(Y)\theta = L(Y)d\theta = -L(Y)\omega = 0$$

and hence $L(Y)\theta$ are closed forms. Therefore, by the Poincaré Lemma, there exists $\zeta \in C^\infty(U)$, verifying that $L(Y)\theta = d\zeta$, on U . Furthermore, as (4.21) holds on U , we obtain that

$$d\zeta = L(Y)\theta = di(Y)\theta + i(Y)d\theta = di(Y)\theta - i(Y)\omega = d\{i(Y)\theta - \mathcal{F}\}$$

and the result holds. ■

Finally, the classical Noether's Theorem can be stated for these kinds of symmetries as follows:

Theorem 4.48 (Noether's Theorem): *If $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ is an infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetry then, for every $p \in \mathbb{R} \times M$, there is an open neighbourhood $U \ni p$ such that the function $\mathcal{F} = i(Y)\theta - \zeta$ is a conserved quantity.*

(Proof) From (4.21) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathcal{E}_h)\mathcal{F} &= i(\mathcal{E}_h)d\mathcal{F} = i(\mathcal{E}_h)i(Y)\omega = -i(Y)i(\mathcal{E}_h)\omega \\ &= -i(Y)dh + i(Y)((R(h))\eta) = -L(Y)h + (R(h))i(Y)\eta = 0, \end{aligned}$$

because Y is an infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetry. ■

Remark 4.49 Observe that, using Darboux coordinates on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$, the item 2 of Proposition 4.47 tells us that the conserved quantities associated with infinitesimal cosymplectic Noether symmetries do not depend on the coordinate t (since the generators of these symmetries, the vector fields Y , neither depend on them).

Remark 4.50 The study of symmetries and conserved quantities in the Lagrangian formalism of nonautonomous dynamical systems follows the same patterns as in canonical Hamiltonian formalism, considering the system $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, \eta_{\mathcal{L}}, \omega_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{L}})$ (see also [94, 299]).

4.6. Other geometrical settings for nonautonomous dynamical systems

As we have said in the beginning of this chapter, there are other ways to describe geometrically time-dependent dynamical systems. Next we briefly review two of the best known of them.

4.6.1. Contact formulation

(See [1, 83, 101, 146, 147, 299, 301] for more details).

The manifold where this formalism is developed is the same as in the cosymplectic case; that is $\mathbb{R} \times M$, where (M, Ω) is a symplectic manifold. In particular, it is usual to consider the canonical case, where $M = TQ$ (Lagrangian formalism) or $M = T^*Q$, (Hamiltonian formalism), and $\mathbb{R} \times Q$ is the configuration space of the system.

Thus, in the Lagrangian description of this contact formulation, the dynamics takes place also on the manifold $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$. Then, given an admissible time-dependent Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ (then $\text{rank } \omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 2n$). We define the so-called *Poincaré-Cartan's forms* associated with \mathcal{L} as

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} := \theta_{\mathcal{L}} - E_{\mathcal{L}} dt, \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} := -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \omega_{\mathcal{L}} + dE_{\mathcal{L}} \wedge dt ;$$

The expression in coordinates of $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ is

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} dq^i - \left(v^i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} - \mathcal{L} \right) dt .$$

If \mathcal{L} is a regular Lagrangian, then the pair $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is said to be a *regular time-dependent Lagrangian system*. The dynamical Lagrangian equations for a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$ are

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = 0, \quad i(X_{\mathcal{L}})dt = 1 , \quad (4.22)$$

and the equations for the integral curves $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ of $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ are

$$i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \mathbf{c}) = 0, \quad i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(dt \circ \mathbf{c}) = 1 .$$

These equations are compatible and determinate and, in a local chart of coordinates on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$, its unique solution is

$$X_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} - v^k \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^k \partial v^j} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} .$$

Notice that $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE and hence its integral curves are solutions to the Euler–Lagrange equations. Moreover, we obtain the additional information

$$\frac{dE_{\mathcal{L}}}{dt} \circ \mathbf{c} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial t} \circ \mathbf{c} ,$$

on every integral curve of $X_{\mathcal{L}}$, $\mathbf{c}: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ$. This gives the non-conservation law of the energy. Thus, the Lagrangian contact and cosymplectic formulations are equivalent.

In the Hamiltonian formalism, as in the cosymplectic formulation, the dynamical information is given by the *time-dependent Hamiltonian function* $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$, which may be defined only locally. Then, if $\omega = \pi_2^* \Omega$, where Ω is the canonical 2-form on T^*Q , we define the form (perhaps only locally if h is a locally Hamiltonian function)

$$\Omega_h := \omega + dh \wedge dt \in Z^2(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q) ,$$

which is called the *Hamilton–Cartan 2-form* associated with h . Observe that $\Omega_h = -d\Theta_h$, with $\Theta_h = \theta - h dt$, and $\theta = \pi_2^* \Theta$, where Θ is the Liouville’s 1-form on T^*Q . Obviously $\omega = -d\theta$. Then, the pair $(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q, \Omega_h)$ is said to be a *time-dependent regular (locally) Hamiltonian system*. Its dynamical equations for a vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q)$ are

$$i(X_h)\Omega_h = 0 \quad ; \quad i(X_h)dt = 1 ,$$

and for the integral curves $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ of X_h , the equations are

$$i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\Omega_h \circ \mathbf{c}) = 0, \quad i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(dt \circ \mathbf{c}) = 1 .$$

This system of equations is compatible and determinate. In fact, in a chart of canonical coordinates on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$, the unique solution is the vector field

$$X_h = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial h}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} .$$

and, if $\mathbf{c}(s) = (t(s), q^i(s), p_i(s))$ is an integral curve of X_h , then the second equation implies that $t = s + ctn$. and $c(t)$ is a solution to the Hamilton equations

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_i} \circ \mathbf{c}, \quad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial h}{\partial q^i} \circ \mathbf{c} .$$

Thus the Hamiltonian contact and cosymplectic formulations are also equivalent.

The connection between the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian contact formalisms for nonautonomous systems is performed by the Legendre map $FL: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times$

T^*Q defined in Definition 4.22. Then, as $F\mathcal{L}$ is a (local) diffeomorphism, then all the geometrical objects in $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ are $F\mathcal{L}$ -projectable; in particular we have that

$$F\mathcal{L}^*h = E_{\mathcal{L}} \quad ; \quad F\mathcal{L}^*\Omega_h = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} ,$$

and therefore, for the solutions

$$F\mathcal{L}_*X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_h .$$

Finally, the equivalence between the cosymplectic and the contact (Lagrangian) formulations is stated in the following:

Proposition 4.51 *Let $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, \mathcal{L})$ a time-dependent Lagrangian system. Then equations (4.22) and (4.11) are equivalents.*

(Proof) From (4.22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} = i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + i(X_{\mathcal{L}})dE_{\mathcal{L}}dt - dE_{\mathcal{L}}i(X_{\mathcal{L}})dt \\ &= i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + i(X_{\mathcal{L}})dE_{\mathcal{L}}dt - dE_{\mathcal{L}} . \end{aligned}$$

Now, taking the Reeb vector field $R_{\mathcal{L}}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= i(R_{\mathcal{L}})i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} + i(X_{\mathcal{L}})dE_{\mathcal{L}}i(R_{\mathcal{L}})dt - i(R_{\mathcal{L}})dE_{\mathcal{L}} = i(X_{\mathcal{L}})dE_{\mathcal{L}} - i(R_{\mathcal{L}})dE_{\mathcal{L}} \\ &\iff i(X_{\mathcal{L}})dE_{\mathcal{L}} = i(R_{\mathcal{L}})dE_{\mathcal{L}} , \end{aligned}$$

and coming to the first equation we obtain that

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}} - i(R_{\mathcal{L}})dE_{\mathcal{L}}dt ,$$

which together with $i(X_{\mathcal{L}})dt = 1$ are equations (4.11). ■

The equivalence between the corresponding Hamiltonian equations is proved in the same way.

Remark 4.52 (*Cartan's Theorem*): It can be proved (see [1]) that, if $(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q, \Omega_h)$ is a regular time-dependent Hamiltonian system, then $\Theta_h \wedge \Omega_h^n$ is a volume form on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ if, and only if, the condition $X_h(h) - h \neq 0$ holds everywhere. Then, Θ_h is said to be a *contact form* and the pair $(\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q, \Theta_h)$ is called a *contact manifold*. (See Definition 6.1).

In the same way, if $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a regular time-dependent Lagrangian system, then $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} \wedge \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}^n$ is a volume form on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$ if the condition $X_{\mathcal{L}}(E_{\mathcal{L}}) - E_{\mathcal{L}} \equiv -\mathcal{L} \neq 0$ everywhere. Then $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a contact form, and $(\mathbb{R} \times TQ, \Theta_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a contact manifold.

All this justifies the name of *contact formulation*.

4.6.2. Extended symplectic formulation

(See [9, 146, 219, 286, 287] for details).

In this formulation, the Lagrangian formalism is done starting from the extended configuration space $\mathbb{R} \times Q$ and taking its tangent bundle $T(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \cong T\mathbb{R} \times TQ \cong \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ which is called the *extended velocity phase space* and has the canonical projections

$$\nu: T(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times TQ \quad ; \quad \omega: T(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} .$$

Then, we have the following extensions of the geometrical objects which are defined in $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} &:= \nu^* E_{\mathcal{L}} + \omega \\ \Theta_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} &:= \nu^* \Theta_{\mathcal{L}} + E_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} \wedge dt \\ \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} &:= -d\Theta_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} = \nu^* \Omega_{\mathcal{L}} - dE_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} \wedge dt . \end{aligned}$$

Another way to obtain these geometric elements is constructing the *extended Lagrangian*

$$\mathcal{L}_{ext} := \nu^* \mathcal{L} + \frac{1}{2} \omega^2 \in C^\infty(T(\mathbb{R} \times Q)) \quad (4.23)$$

and using the canonical structures (the vertical endomorphism and the Liouville vector field) of the tangent bundle $T(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$ to construct them. It is obvious that the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} is regular if, and only if, $\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}}$ is a symplectic form and then $(T(\mathbb{R} \times Q), \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}}, E_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}})$ is a regular Hamiltonian system. This means that there exists a unique vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} \in \mathfrak{X}(T(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$ which is the solution to the Lagrangian equation of motion in this formalism, which is

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}}) \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} ,$$

and whose integral curves $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow T(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$ are the solutions to the equation

$$i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\Omega_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} \circ \mathbf{c}) = dE_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} \circ \mathbf{c} .$$

In coordinates, this solution is

$$X_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial E_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}}}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} + v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} - v^k \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^k \partial v^j} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} .$$

Nevertheless, the real manifold of physical states is not $T(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$ but $\mathbb{R} \times TQ$. But as $\ker \rho_* = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \right\rangle$ and $\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega}, X_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} \right] = 0$, this vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}}$ is ρ -projectable and, actually, we have that

$$\rho_* X_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} = X_{\mathcal{L}} ;$$

Note that $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE on $T(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$, although $X_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}}$ is not so on $T(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$, and the integral curves of $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ are solutions to the Euler–Lagrange equations. Thus, the Lagrangian contact (or the cosymplectic) formulation is recovered in this way.

For the Hamiltonian formalism, we take the *extended momentum phase space* $T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \cong T^*\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \cong \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^* \times T^*Q$ (or, more generally, $M \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^*$, where M is any symplectic manifold), and its canonical projections

$$\begin{aligned} pr_1: T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) &\longrightarrow T^*\mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^* & \mu: T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \\ pr_2: T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) &\longrightarrow T^*Q & u: T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \end{aligned}$$

If $\Omega \in \Omega^2(T^*Q)$ and $\Omega_{\mathbb{R}} \in \Omega^2(T^*\mathbb{R})$ are the canonical symplectic forms of T^*Q and $T^*\mathbb{R}$, respectively, then $T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$ can be endowed with the following symplectic structure

$$\Omega_{ext} := pr_2^*\Omega + pr_1^*\Omega_{\mathbb{R}} .$$

The dynamical information is still given by the time-dependent Hamiltonian function $h \in C^\infty(T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$. Then, we can introduce the *extended time-dependent Hamiltonian function*

$$h_{ext} := \mu^*h + u \in C^\infty(T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$$

and it is immediate to prove that

$$\Omega_{ext} = \mu^*\omega - dh_{ext} \wedge dt .$$

Thus we have the symplectic (locally) Hamiltonian system $(T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q), \Omega_{ext}, h_{ext})$. The Hamiltonian dynamical equation for $X_{ext} \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q))$ is

$$i(X_{ext})\Omega_{ext} = dh_{ext} ,$$

and for its integral curves $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$

$$i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\Omega_{ext} \circ \mathbf{c}) = dh_{ext} \circ \mathbf{c} .$$

The unique solution to the above equation, in a chart of natural coordinates (t, u, q^i, p_i) of $T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$, is

$$\begin{aligned} X_{ext} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial h_{ext}}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} + \frac{\partial h_{ext}}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial h_{ext}}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial(\mu^*h)}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} + \frac{\partial(\mu^*h)}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial(\mu^*h)}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} . \end{aligned}$$

Then the integral curves of this vector field are solutions to the Hamilton equations,

$$\frac{dq^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial \mu^*h}{\partial p_i}, \quad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial \mu^*h}{\partial q^i}, \quad \frac{du}{dt} = -\frac{\partial \mu^*h}{\partial t} ,$$

where the last equation shows that the energy is not conserved.

As the physical phase space is $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ and not $T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$, the real dynamical vector field cannot be X_{ext} really, but another one on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q$ which must be related to it. But, as in the Lagrangian formalism, the vector field X_{ext} is μ -projectable and, in fact, we have that

$$\mu_* X_{ext} = X_h .$$

In this way, the equivalence with the Hamiltonian contact (or the cosymplectic) formulation is proved.

In order to establish the equivalence between the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms in this extended symplectic picture, we need a connection between the extended velocity and momentum phase spaces through a suitable “Legendre map”; that is, the fiber derivative of some Lagrangian function on $T(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$. This function cannot be $\rho^* \mathcal{L}$ because its fiber derivative $F(\rho^* \mathcal{L})$ is not a (local) diffeomorphism since $\rho^* \mathcal{L}$ is not a regular Lagrangian on $T(\mathbb{R} \times Q)$. The correct choice consists in taking the extended Lagrangian (4.23) and its fiber derivative

$$F\mathcal{L}_{ext} : T(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \longrightarrow T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) ,$$

which in coordinates is

$$F\mathcal{L}_{ext}^* q^i = q^i, \quad F\mathcal{L}_{ext}^* p_i = \frac{\partial \rho^* \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i}, \quad F\mathcal{L}_{ext}^* t = t, \quad F\mathcal{L}_{ext}^* u = \omega .$$

Observe that $F\mathcal{L}_{ext}$ is just an extension of $F\mathcal{L}$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T(\mathbb{R} \times Q) & \xrightarrow{F\mathcal{L}_{ext}} & T^*(\mathbb{R} \times Q) \\ \nu \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\ \mathbb{R} \times TQ & \xrightarrow{F\mathcal{L}} & \mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \end{array}$$

and $F\mathcal{L}_{ext}$ is a (local) diffeomorphism if, and only if, $F\mathcal{L}$ is so or, what is equivalent, if \mathcal{L} is regular. Therefore

$$F\mathcal{L}_{ext}^* \Omega = \Omega_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}}, \quad F\mathcal{L}_{ext}^* h_{ext} = E_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}}$$

and then

$$F\mathcal{L}_{ext}^* X_{\mathcal{L}_{ext}} = X_{ext} .$$

4.7. Examples

4.7.1. The forced harmonic oscillator with periodic perturbation

We recover the system analyzed in Section 3.7.1, but now the oscillator is also submitted to an external periodic force. In the cosymplectic formalism, the configuration bundle is $\mathbb{R} \times Q = \mathbb{R}^2$, with coordinates (t, q) .

Lagrangian formalism

The cosymplectic Lagrangian formalism takes place on $\mathbb{R} \times TQ \simeq \mathbb{R}^3$, with coordinates (t, q, v) , and the dynamics can be described by the Lagrangian function

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(mv^2 - kq^2) + Aq \cos wt \quad ; \quad k, w \in \mathbb{R}^+ .$$

Now we have

$$E_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{2}(mv^2 + kq^2) - Aq \cos wt, \quad \theta_{\mathcal{L}} = mv \, dq, \quad \omega_{\mathcal{L}} = m \, dq \wedge dv .$$

and \mathcal{L} is a regular Lagrangian. The Reeb vector field for this Lagrangian is just $R_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$. Then, for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = \lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + f \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + g \frac{\partial}{\partial v}$, equations (4.11) give $\lambda = 1$ and

$$i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = m(f \, dv - g \, dq) = mv \, dv + (kq - A \cos wt) \, dq = dE_{\mathcal{L}} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial t} \, dt ,$$

which leads to

$$f = v, \quad mg = -kq + A \cos wt .$$

So the Euler–Lagrange vector field is

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = v \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + \frac{-kq + A \cos wt}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} ,$$

and its integral curves $(q(t), v(t))$ are the solutions to

$$\frac{dq}{dt} = v, \quad m \frac{dv}{dt} = -kq + A \cos wt \quad \implies \quad m \frac{d^2 q}{dt^2} = -kq + A \cos wt ,$$

which is the Euler–Lagrange equation for this time-dependent forced harmonic oscillator.

Hamiltonian formalism

For the Hamiltonian formalism, $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \simeq \mathbb{R}^3$, with coordinates (t, q, p) . First, the Legendre transformation is

$$\mathcal{FL}^*t = t, \quad \mathcal{FL}^*q = q, \quad \mathcal{FL}^*p = mv,$$

which is a diffeomorphism (the Lagrangian is hyperregular). The canonical Hamiltonian function is

$$h = \frac{p^2}{2m} + kq^2 - Aq \cos wt.$$

As $\omega = dq \wedge dp$, the Reeb vector field is $R = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ and, for $\mathcal{E}_h = \Lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + F \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + G \frac{\partial}{\partial p}$, equations (4.13) give $\Lambda = 1$ and

$$i(\mathcal{E}_h)\omega = F dp - G dq = \frac{p}{m} dp + (kq - A \cos wt) dq = dh - R \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} dt,$$

which leads to

$$F = \frac{p}{m}, \quad G = -kq + A \cos wt.$$

So the evolution vector field is

$$\mathcal{E}_h = \frac{p}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial q} - (kq - A \cos wt) \frac{\partial}{\partial p},$$

and its integral curves $(q(t), p(t))$ are the solutions to

$$m \frac{dq}{dt} = p, \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -kq + A \cos wt,$$

which are the Hamilton equations for this time-dependent forced harmonic oscillator.

Using the Legendre map, we check again that the Hamilton and the Euler-Lagrange equations of the system are equivalent. Obviously, we have that $\mathcal{FL}_*\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{E}_h$.

Unified Lagrangian–Hamiltonian formalism

The extended unified bundle is $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R} \times TQ \times_Q T^*Q \simeq \mathbb{R}^4$ with coordinates (t, q, v, p) . The Reeb vector field is $R = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$, the canonical forms are

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{M}} = p dq, \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{M}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{M}} = dq \wedge dp$$

and the Hamiltonian function is

$$H = pv - \frac{1}{2}(mv^2 - kq^2) - Aq \cos wt.$$

For $X_H = g \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + f \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + F \frac{\partial}{\partial v} + G \frac{\partial}{\partial p}$, equations (4.15) give $g = 1$ and

$$i(X_H)\Omega_{\mathcal{W}} = f dp - G dq = (kq - A \cos wt) dq + (p - mv) dv + v dp = dH - R(H)dt ,$$

which leads to

$$f = v, \quad G = -(kq - A \cos wt), \quad p = mv .$$

The last equation is the constraint defining the submanifold $\mathcal{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ and gives the Legendre map. The evolution vector field is

$$X_H|_{\mathcal{M}_0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + v \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + G \frac{\partial}{\partial v} - (kq - A \cos wt) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} ,$$

and the tangency condition leads to

$$X_H(p - mv) = -(kq - A \cos wt) - Gm = 0 \iff G = -\frac{kq - A \cos wt}{m} \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{M}_0) ;$$

therefore

$$X_H|_{\mathcal{M}_0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + v \frac{\partial}{\partial q} - \frac{kq - A \cos wt}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} - (kq - A \cos wt) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} .$$

and its integral curves $(t, q(t), v(t), p(t))$ are the solutions to

$$\frac{dq}{dt} = v, \quad m \frac{dv}{dt} = -(kq - A \cos wt), \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -(kq - A \cos wt) .$$

The first two equations are equivalent to

$$m \frac{d^2 q}{dt^2} = -kq + A \cos wt ,$$

which is the Euler–Lagrange equation of the system. Furthermore, using the constraint $p = mv$ (the Legendre map), the first and third equations are

$$\frac{dq}{dt} = \frac{p}{m}, \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -kq + A \cos wt ;$$

which are the Hamilton equations for the system.

4.7.2. A nonautonomous system with central forces

Consider the *Kepler problem* analyzed in Section 3.7.2 in the case where the mass of the particle subjected to the central field is not constant but a (strictly positive) function of time $m(t)$. As in the standard case, the motion is on a plane; hence the configuration bundle is $\mathbb{R} \times Q = \mathbb{R}^3$ and the coordinates are (t, r, ϕ) , where (r, ϕ) are polar coordinates on the adequate open set $U \subset Q = \mathbb{R}^2$.

Lagrangian formalism

The velocity phase space for the cosymplectic Lagrangian formalism is $\mathbb{R} \times TQ \simeq \mathbb{R}^5$, with local coordinates $(t, r, \phi, v_r, v_\phi)$ and the Lagrangian function is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}m(t)(v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2) - \frac{K}{r}, \quad K \neq 0;$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathcal{L}} &= \frac{1}{2}m(t)(v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2) + \frac{K}{r}, \\ \theta_{\mathcal{L}} &= m(t)(v_r dr + r^2v_\phi d\phi), \\ \omega_{\mathcal{L}} &= m(t)(dr \wedge dv_r + r^2d\phi \wedge dv_\phi - 2rv_\phi dr \wedge d\phi) \\ &\quad - \dot{m}(t)(v_r dt \wedge dr + r^2v_\phi dt \wedge d\phi), \end{aligned}$$

where $\dot{m}(t) = \frac{dm(t)}{dt}$. The Lagrangian is regular and the Reeb vector field for this system is

$$R_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)} \left(v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + v_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} \right).$$

If $X_{\mathcal{L}} = \lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + f_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + f_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + g_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + g_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi}$, equations (4.11) give $\lambda = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} &= \dot{m}(t) [-v_r dr - r^2v_\phi d\phi + (v_r f_r + r^2v_\phi f_\phi) dt] + \\ &\quad m(t) [f_r dv_r + f_\phi r^2 dv_\phi - (g_r - 2rv_\phi f_\phi) dr - (g_\phi r^2 + 2rv_\phi f_r) d\phi] \\ &= \dot{m}(t) (v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2) dt + m(t) v_r dv_r + m(t) r^2v_\phi dv_\phi + \left(m(t) rv_\phi^2 - \frac{K}{r^2} \right) dr \\ &= dE_{\mathcal{L}} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial t} dt, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} f_r &= v_r, \quad f_\phi = v_\phi, \quad v_r f_r + r^2v_\phi f_\phi = v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2, \\ m(t) g_r &= m(t) (2rv_\phi f_\phi - rv_\phi^2) - \dot{m}(t) v_r + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad g_\phi = -\frac{2v_\phi f_r}{r} - \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)} v_\phi, \end{aligned}$$

and then the Euler–Lagrange vector field is

$$X_{\mathcal{L}} = v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + v_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \left(rv_\phi^2 - \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)} v_r + \frac{K}{m(t)r^2} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} - \left(\frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)} v_\phi + \frac{2v_\phi v_r}{r} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi}.$$

Then, its integral curves $(r(t), \phi(t), v_r(t), v_\phi(t))$ are the solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dr}{dt} &= v_r, \quad \frac{d\phi}{dt} = v_\phi, \quad m(t) \frac{dv_r}{dt} = m(t) r v_\phi^2 - \dot{m}(t) v_r + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{dv_\phi}{dt} = \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)} v_\phi - \frac{2}{r} v_\phi v_r \implies \\ \implies m(t) \frac{d^2 r}{dt^2} &= m(t) r \left(\frac{d\phi}{dt} \right)^2 - \dot{m}(t) \frac{dr}{dt} + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{d^2 \phi}{dt^2} = -\frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)} \frac{d\phi}{dt} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{d\phi}{dt} \frac{dr}{dt} \implies \\ \implies \frac{d}{dt} \left(m(t) \frac{dr}{dt} \right) &= m(t) r \left(\frac{d\phi}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{d}{dt} \left(m(t) r^2 \frac{d\phi}{dt} \right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which are the Euler–Lagrange equations for this system.

There is an infinitesimal Lagrangian exact Noether symmetry which is the vector field $Y = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$, because $L(Y)dt = 0$ trivially, and a calculation similar to the one done in the example of Section 3.7.2 leads to $L(Y)\theta_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ and $L(Y)E_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$. Therefore, the associated conserved quantity is

$$f_Y = i \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \right) \theta_{\mathcal{L}} = m(t) r^2 v_\phi ;$$

that is, the angular momentum, as the last Euler–Lagrange equation shows.

Hamiltonian formalism

The cosymplectic Hamiltonian formalism takes place on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*Q \simeq \mathbb{R}^5$, with local coordinates $(t, r, \phi, p_r, p_\phi)$. First, the Legendre transformation is

$$\mathcal{FL}^* t = t, \quad \mathcal{FL}^* r = r, \quad \mathcal{FL}^* \phi = \phi, \quad \mathcal{FL}^* p_r = m(t) v_r, \quad \mathcal{FL}^* p_\phi = m(t) r^2 v_\phi ,$$

which is a diffeomorphism because the Lagrangian is hyperregular. The canonical time-dependent Hamiltonian function is

$$h = \frac{p_r^2}{2m(t)} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2m(t) r^2} + \frac{K}{r} .$$

As $\omega = dr \wedge dp_r + d\phi \wedge dp_\phi$, the Reeb vector field is $R = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$. Then, the Hamiltonian vector field obtained from equations (6.4) is

$$X_h = \frac{p_r}{m(t)} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{p_\phi}{m(t) r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \left(\frac{p_\phi^2}{m(t) r^3} + \frac{K}{r^2} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r} ,$$

and its integral curves $(r(t), \phi(t), p_r(t), p_\phi(t))$ are the solutions to

$$m(t) \frac{dr}{dt} = p_r, \quad m(t) r^2 \frac{d\phi}{dt} = p_\phi, \quad \frac{dp_r}{dt} = \frac{p_\phi^2}{m(t) r^3} + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{dp_\phi}{dt} = 0 ,$$

which are the Hamilton equations for this system.

Although the Hamilton equations have the same aspect as in the autonomous case (see Section 3.7.2), one can observe that, as $m = m(t)$, combining these equations and using the Legendre map, we obtain, in fact, the Euler–Lagrange equations for this nonautonomous system, and $\mathcal{FL}_*X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_h$.

Once again, a Hamiltonian exact Noether symmetry is given by the vector field $Y = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$, since $L(Y)dt = 0$, $L(Y)\theta = 0$, and $L(Y)h = 0$. Then, as the last Hamilton equation shows, the associated conserved quantity is again the angular momentum $f_Y = i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right)\theta = p_\phi$.

Unified Lagrangian–Hamiltonian formalism

The extended unified bundle is $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R} \times TQ \times_Q T^*Q \simeq \mathbb{R}^7$, with natural coordinates $(t, r, \phi, v_r, v_\phi, p_r, p_\phi)$. The Reeb vector field $R = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$, the canonical forms are

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{M}} = p_r dr + p_\phi d\phi, \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{M}} = -d\Theta_{\mathcal{M}} = dr \wedge dp_r + d\phi \wedge dp_\phi,$$

and the Hamiltonian function is

$$H = p_r v_r + p_\phi v_\phi - \frac{1}{2}m(t)(v_r^2 + r^2 v_\phi^2) + \frac{K}{r}.$$

For $X_H = f \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + f_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + f_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + F_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + F_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} + G_r \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r} + G_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi}$, equation (4.15) gives $g = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} i(X_H)\Omega_{\mathcal{M}} &= f_r dp_r + f_\phi dp_\phi - G_r dr - G_\phi d\phi \\ &= -\left(\frac{K}{r^2} + m(t)rv_\phi^2\right)dr + (p_r - m(t)v_r)dv_r \\ &\quad + (p_\phi - m(t)r^2v_\phi)dv_\phi + v_r dp_r + v_\phi dp_\phi \\ &= dH - R(H)dt, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$f_r = v_r, \quad f_\phi = v_\phi, \quad G_r = \frac{K}{r^2} + m(t)rv_\phi^2, \quad G_\phi = 0, \quad p_r = m(t)v_r, \quad p_\phi = m(t)r^2v_\phi.$$

The last two equations are constraints defining the submanifold $\mathcal{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ which give the Legendre map. The evolution vector field is

$$X_H|_{\mathcal{M}_0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + v_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + F_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + F_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} + \left(\frac{K}{r^2} + m(t)rv_\phi^2\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r},$$

and the tangency condition leads to

$$X_H(p_r - m(t)v_r) = \frac{K}{r^2} + m(t)rv_\phi^2 - F_r m(t) - \dot{m}(t)v_r = 0 \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{M}_0)$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow F_r = \frac{K}{m(t)r^2} + rv_\phi^2 - \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)}v_r \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{M}_0),$$

$$X_H(p_\phi - m(t)r^2v_\phi) = -m(t)F_\phi r^2 - m(t)2f_r rv_\phi - \dot{m}(t)r^2v_\phi = 0 \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{M}_0)$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow F_\phi = -\frac{2v_r v_\phi}{r} - \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)}r^2v_\phi \quad (\text{on } \mathcal{M}_0);$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} X_H|_{\mathcal{M}_0} = & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + v_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \left(rv_\phi^2 + \frac{K}{m(t)r^2} - \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)}v_r \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} \\ & - \left(\frac{2v_r v_\phi}{r} + \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)}r^2v_\phi \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} + \left(\frac{K}{r^2} + m(t)rv_\phi^2 \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r}, \end{aligned}$$

and its integral curves $(t, r(t), \phi(t), v_r(t), v_\phi(t), p_r(t), p_\phi(t))$ are the solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dr}{dt} &= v_r, & \frac{d\phi}{dt} &= v_\phi, \\ \frac{dv_r}{dt} &= \frac{K}{m(t)r^2} + rv_\phi^2 - \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)}v_r, & \frac{dv_\phi}{dt} &= -\frac{2v_r v_\phi}{r} - \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)}r^2v_\phi, \\ \frac{dp_r}{dt} &= \frac{K}{r^2} + m(t)rv_\phi^2, & \frac{dp_\phi}{dt} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The first four equations are equivalent to

$$m(t)\frac{d^2r}{dt^2} = m(t)r\left(\frac{d\phi}{dt}\right)^2 + \frac{K}{r^2} - \dot{m}(t)\frac{dr}{dt}, \quad \frac{d^2\phi}{dt^2} = -\frac{2}{r}\frac{d\phi}{dt}\frac{dr}{dt} - \frac{\dot{m}(t)}{m(t)}r^2\frac{d\phi}{dt},$$

which are the Euler–Lagrange equation of the system. Furthermore, using the constraints $p_r = m(t)v_r$ and $p_\phi = m(t)r^2v_\phi$ (that is, the Legendre map), the first, second, fifth, and sixth equations are

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = \frac{p_r}{m(t)}, \quad \frac{d\phi}{dt} = \frac{p_\phi}{m(t)r^2}, \quad \frac{dp_r}{dt} = \frac{p_\phi^2}{m(t)r^3} + \frac{K}{r^2}, \quad \frac{dp_\phi}{dt} = 0;$$

which are the Hamilton equations for the system.

Chapter 5

Riemannian mechanics: Newtonian dynamical systems

In this chapter, we analyze the geometry of Newtonian dynamical systems, which are classical mechanical systems on a (semi)Riemannian manifold: they are also called *purely mechanical systems*. This is the geometrization of the classical *Newtonian Mechanics* or *(semi)Riemannian mechanics*. As we will see, a special type of these systems, the conservative ones, are just a particular kind of the Lagrangian systems studied in the above chapter. Some basic references are [1, 7, 42, 84, 170, 276].

As in the above chapters, we start reviewing the basic notions and properties on connections in manifolds and Riemannian geometry, that are needed for the development of this chapter. Next we introduce the general features about Newtonian dynamical systems and their properties: we state geometrically the classical Newton equations of dynamics, we study conservation laws, and describe some particular types of these kinds of systems. This geometric framework is also used to study the case of systems with holonomic and nonholonomic constraints and their corresponding variational principles. Finally, nonautonomous Newtonian systems are also briefly analyzed.

5.1. Connections in manifolds. Riemannian manifolds

(For a detailed account of these subjects and the proof of the results, see for example [90, 170, 189, 224, 227, 228, 313]).

5.1.1. Connections and covariant derivatives

Definition 5.1 A *connection* on a manifold M is a map

$$\nabla: \mathfrak{X}(M) \times \mathfrak{X}(M) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M), \quad (X, Y) \mapsto \nabla_X Y,$$

satisfying the following properties:

- (i) $\nabla_X Y$ is \mathbb{R} -linear in Y .
- (ii) $\nabla_X Y$ is $C^\infty(M)$ -linear in X .
- (iii) If $f \in C^\infty(M)$, then $\nabla_X(fY) = (L(X)f)Y + f\nabla_X Y$.

Then $\nabla_X Y$ is said to be the **covariant derivative** of Y with respect to X .

Connections and covariant derivatives satisfy the following properties:

- For every $p \in M$, the result of $(\nabla_X Y)(p)$ depends only on the value of X at p and on the value of Y on a neighbourhood of p . Thus, we can calculate $(\nabla_X Y)(p)$ in a local coordinate system around p , and $\nabla_u Y$ is well-defined for $u \in T_p M$.
- (Localization of a connection). If $U \subset M$ is an open set, then there exists a connection ∇^U on U defined as:

$$\nabla_X^U|_U Y|_U := (\nabla_X Y)|_U .$$

- Let (U, x^i) be a local chart; then the vector fields $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ define a basis of $\mathfrak{X}(U)$ and

$$\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} = \Gamma_{ij}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} ,$$

where $\Gamma_{ij}^k \in C^\infty(U)$ are the so-called *Christoffel symbols* of the connection ∇ for the local basis $\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \right\}$ or in the local chart (U, x^i) . Then, if $X = X^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ and $Y = Y^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$,

$$(\nabla_X Y)|_U = (L(X)Y^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} + X^i Y^j \Gamma_{ij}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} .$$

Observe that this expression says that, at $p \in M$, the covariant derivative depends only on the values of Y along a curve $\gamma: (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ such that $\gamma'(0) = X_p$.

This also holds if we have a local basis (X_i) for vector fields on an open set $U \subset M$, not necessarily local coordinate vector fields.

- If M is a parallelizable manifold, and X_1, \dots, X_n is a basis of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$, then any family of differentiable functions $\Gamma_{ij}^k \in C^\infty(M)$ define a connection on M . That is, the Christoffel symbols determine the connection and they allow calculating the covariant derivative in the open set where they are defined.

In particular, if $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, the standard connection is defined taking the Christoffel symbols equal to zero in the natural coordinate system.

- Let (x^1, \dots, x^n) and $(\tilde{x}^1, \dots, \tilde{x}^n)$ be two coordinate systems on the same open set, and Γ_{ij}^k and $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma$ be the corresponding Christoffel symbols, then

$$\Gamma_{ij}^k = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma \frac{\partial \tilde{x}^\alpha}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial \tilde{x}^\beta}{\partial x^j} \frac{\partial x^k}{\partial \tilde{x}^\gamma} + \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{x}^\delta}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} \frac{\partial x^k}{\partial \tilde{x}^\delta},$$

hence they are not the components of any tensor field. Thus, it is a nonsense to say that a connection is null. The Christoffel symbols can vanish in a coordinate system and be different from zero in another one.

- The set of connections on a manifold is not a vector space but an affine space.
- Let ∇^α be a family of connections on M and f_α be a family of differentiable functions such that their supports are a locally finite family of subsets of M . Then $\nabla = f_\alpha \nabla^\alpha$ defined as

$$\nabla_X Y := f_\alpha \nabla_X^\alpha Y$$

is a connection if, and only if, $\sum_\alpha f_\alpha = 1$.

- Using the above item, we can state that any paracompact manifold admits a connection and, conversely, if there exists a connection on M , then M is paracompact. (Remember that to say that M is paracompact is equivalent to say that every open covering has a subordinate partition of unity, or that M is metrizable, or that every connected component has a numerable basis of open sets).

5.1.2. Covariant derivative of tensor fields

Definition 5.2 Let (M, ∇) be a differentiable manifold with a connection, and let $\mathcal{T}(M)$ be the algebra of tensor fields on M . For $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ the **covariant derivative** by X defined by the connection is the unique map $\nabla_X: \mathcal{T}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(M)$ verifying the following properties:

- (i) It is the Lie derivative $L(X)$ on $C^\infty(M)$.
- (ii) It reduces to the well known ∇_X on $\mathfrak{X}(M)$.

(iii) It is \mathbb{R} -linear.

(iv) It respects the type of tensor field; that is, it maps $\mathcal{T}_h^k(M)$ onto $\mathcal{T}_h^k(M)$.

(v) (Leibniz rule): $\nabla_X(S \otimes T) = (\nabla_X S) \otimes T + S \otimes (\nabla_X T)$.

(vi) It commutes with the internal contractions.

That is, ∇_X is a derivation of the \mathbb{R} -algebra $\mathcal{T}(M)$, with zero degree, which commutes with the internal contractions.

Observe that, as a consequence of the definition, we have that, for $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and $S, T \in \mathcal{T}(M)$,

$$\nabla_X(fS \otimes T) = (L(X)f)(S \otimes T) + f(\nabla_X(S \otimes T)) = \nabla_X(S \otimes fT) .$$

The covariant derivative has the following properties:

- For $p \in M$, the value of $(\nabla_X T)(p)$ only depends on $X(p)$ and the value of the tensor field T on an open set containing p . This property has the same consequences as in the case of derivation of vector fields.
- The above properties defining ∇_X allow us to calculate $\nabla_X T$ for any tensor field T providing we know how is the actuation of ∇_X on functions and vector fields. For example, let $X, Y \in \mathcal{T}^1(M)$ and $\alpha \in \Omega^1(M) = \mathcal{T}_1(M)$, then,

$$\langle \nabla_X \alpha, Y \rangle = \nabla_X \langle \alpha, Y \rangle - \langle \alpha, \nabla_X Y \rangle .$$

In particular, we have that $\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}} dx^j = -\Gamma_{ik}^j dx^k$.

- In a local coordinate system (U, x^i) , if

$$X = X^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}, \quad T = T_{j_1, \dots, j_s}^{i_1, \dots, i_r} dx^{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes dx^{j_s} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_r}},$$

then

$$\nabla_X T = S_{j_1, \dots, j_s}^{i_1, \dots, i_r} dx^{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes dx^{j_s} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_r}} ;$$

where

$$S_{j_1, \dots, j_s}^{i_1, \dots, i_r} = X^k \left(\partial_k T_{j_1, \dots, j_s}^{i_1, \dots, i_r} + \sum_{n=1}^r T_{j_1, \dots, j_s}^{i_1, \dots, l, \dots, i_r} \Gamma_{kl}^{i_n} - \sum_{n=1}^s T_{j_1, \dots, l, \dots, j_s}^{i_1, \dots, i_r} \Gamma_{k_n}^l \right) .$$

Definition 5.3 Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_s^r(M)$, $X_i, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, and $\beta^j \in \Omega^1(M)$. The tensor field $\nabla T \in \mathcal{T}_{s+1}^r(M)$ defined by

$$(\nabla T)(X_1, \dots, X_s, Y, \beta^1, \dots, \beta^r) := (\nabla_Y T)(X_1, \dots, X_s, \beta^1, \dots, \beta^r),$$

is called the **covariant differential** of T .

With the same notation for T as in the above item, we have

$$\nabla T = S_{j_1, \dots, j_s; k}^{i_1, \dots, i_r} dx^{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes dx^{j_s} \otimes dx^k \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_r}},$$

where

$$S_{j_1, \dots, j_s; k}^{i_1, \dots, i_r} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} T_{j_1, \dots, j_s}^{i_1, \dots, i_r} + \sum_{n=1}^r T_{j_1, \dots, j_s}^{i_1, \dots, l, \dots, i_r} \Gamma_{kl}^{i_n} - \sum_{n=1}^s T_{j_1, \dots, l, \dots, j_s}^{i_1, \dots, i_r} \Gamma_{k_n}^l.$$

And for functions $f \in C^\infty(M)$, we have $\nabla f = df$.

For a vector field $X = X^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$, we have that

$$\nabla X = \left(\frac{\partial X^i}{\partial x^k} X^i + X^l \Gamma_{kl}^i \right) dx^k \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \in \mathcal{T}_1^1(U).$$

Observe that $(\nabla X)(Y) = \nabla_Y X$.

5.1.3. Covariant derivative along curves

Remember that a *vector field along a map* $F: N \rightarrow M$, is another map $Z: N \rightarrow TM$ such that $Z(q) \in T_{F(q)}M$, for every $q \in N$; that is $\tau_Q \circ Z = F$. The set of vector fields along a map F is a $C^\infty(N)$ -modulus, denoted by $\mathfrak{X}(F)$.

If $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ is a curve, then we have the set $\mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$ as a $C^\infty(I)$ -modulus. One distinguished element of this set is the velocity vector $\gamma' \in \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$. If $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, then $X \circ \gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$; but not every element of $\mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$ is of this kind.

If $Y = Y^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$ is a vector field, then, by the above properties of the covariant derivative, $\nabla_{\gamma'(t)} Y$ is well-defined as

$$\nabla_{\gamma'(t)} Y := (D(Y^j \circ \gamma)(t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} |_{\gamma(t)} + \Gamma_{ij}^k(\gamma(t)) D\gamma^i(t) (Y^j(\gamma(t)) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} |_{\gamma(t)}),$$

where $D = \frac{d}{dt}$ on the functions $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and γ^i are the components of γ . Then:

Definition 5.4 Given a curve $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$, the **covariant derivative** along γ is the unique map $\nabla_t: \mathfrak{X}(\gamma) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$ such that

(i) ∇_t is \mathbb{R} -linear.

(ii) If $f \in C^\infty(I)$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$, then $\nabla_t(f\mathbf{w}) = (Df)\mathbf{w} + f\nabla_t\mathbf{w}$.

(iii) If $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, then $\nabla_t(X \circ \gamma)(t) = \nabla_{\gamma'(t)}X$.

The vector field along γ given by $\nabla_t\mathbf{w}$ is called the **covariant derivative** of \mathbf{w} along γ .

Other notations for $\nabla_t\mathbf{w}$ are $\nabla_t^\gamma\mathbf{w} = \nabla_{\gamma'(t)}\mathbf{w} = \nabla_{\frac{d}{dt}}\mathbf{w}$.

If (U, x^i) is a local chart with $\gamma(I) \subset U$, then a basis for $\mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$ is given by $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \circ \gamma$ and, for $\mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$, then $\mathbf{w} = w^i \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \circ \gamma \right)$, with $w^i \in C^\infty(I)$. Writing $\gamma' = \dot{q}^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \circ \gamma$, we have that

$$\nabla_t\mathbf{w} = \left(\dot{w}^i + (\Gamma_{ij}^k \circ \gamma) \dot{q}^i w^j \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} \circ \gamma.$$

Similarly as above, we can define the concept of tensor field along a map or along a curve, and the covariant derivative of tensor fields along a curve with the same rules as above. If we know the action of ∇_t on functions and vector fields, we can obtain the covariant derivative of any kind of tensor field along the curve γ . In particular, if $\beta \in \Omega^1(\gamma)$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$, then

$$D\langle \beta, \mathbf{w} \rangle = \langle \nabla_t\beta, \mathbf{w} \rangle + \langle \beta, \nabla_t\mathbf{w} \rangle,$$

which, for $\beta = b_j dx^j \circ \gamma$, gives the following expression in a local chart

$$\nabla_t\beta = \left(\dot{b}_j - (\Gamma_{ij}^k \circ \gamma) \dot{q}^i b_k \right) dx^j \circ \gamma.$$

5.1.4. Parallel transport along a curve. Geodesic curves

Definition 5.5 Let (M, ∇) be a manifold with a connection and $\gamma: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow M$ a curve. We say that $\mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$ is **parallel along** γ if $\nabla_t\mathbf{w} = 0$.

The following properties hold:

- (Existence of parallel vector fields). Given (M, ∇) and $\gamma: I \longrightarrow M$, if $t_0 \in I$ and $\mathbf{w}_0 \in T_{\gamma(t_0)}M$, then there exists a unique $\mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$ parallel and such that $\mathbf{w}(t_0) = \mathbf{w}_0$.

This result comes from the linearity of the differential equation defining parallel vector fields along a curve $\gamma: I \longrightarrow M$. We say that \mathbf{w} is the *parallel transport* of \mathbf{w}_0 along γ , with respect to the connection ∇ .

- Observe that the map $T_{\gamma(t_0)}M \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$ given by $\mathbf{w}_0 \mapsto \mathbf{w}$ is linear and bijective.

- If $t \in I$, then the vector $\mathbf{w}(t)$ is called the *parallel transport* of \mathbf{w}_o from $\gamma(t_o)$ to $\gamma(t)$. Thus, for $t_o, t \in I$, we have a *parallel transport operator* along γ , denoted $\tau_{t_o, t}: T_{\gamma(t_o)}M \longrightarrow T_{\gamma(t)}M$, which is a linear isomorphism.
- Let (\mathbf{e}_i) be a basis of $T_{\gamma(t_o)}M$ and \mathbf{w}_i the corresponding parallel transported elements of $\mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$, then:
 1. $(\mathbf{w}_i(t))$ is a basis of $T_{\gamma(t)}M$ for every $t \in I$.
 2. (\mathbf{w}_i) is a basis of $\mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$ as $C^\infty(I)$ -module.
- For $t_o, t \in I$, consider $\tau_{t_o, t}: T_{\gamma(t_o)}M \longrightarrow T_{\gamma(t)}M$ which is the parallel transport operator along γ . Then it is easy to show that,

$$(\nabla_t \mathbf{w})(t_o) = \lim_{t \longrightarrow t_o} \frac{\tau_{t_o, t}^{-1}(\mathbf{w}(t)) - \mathbf{w}(t_o)}{t - t_o};$$

that is, the parallel transport determines the covariant derivative.

Definition 5.6 A curve $\gamma: I \longrightarrow M$ is a *geodesic* of the connection ∇ if γ' , as a vector field along γ , is parallel along γ ; that is $\nabla_t \gamma' = 0$.

- If $\gamma = (q^i(t))$ in local coordinates, then the curve γ is a geodesic if, and only if, it satisfies the following second order differential equation

$$\ddot{q}^k + (\Gamma_{ij}^k \circ \gamma) \dot{q}^i \dot{q}^j = 0.$$

As a consequence, given $u_p \in T_p M$ there is a unique geodesic with initial condition u_p .

- *Reparametrization of geodesics:* Let $\gamma: I_1 \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow M$ be a geodesic and let $\varphi: I_2 \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow I_1$ be a diffeomorphism between open intervals on \mathbb{R} . Then the reparametrized curve $\gamma \circ \varphi$ is a geodesic if, and only if, φ is an affine map.
- A vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is said to be *parallel* if it is parallel along any curve on M . This is equivalent to each of the following expressions:
 - i) $\nabla_u X = 0$, for every tangent vector u .
 - ii) $\nabla_Y X = 0$, for every vector field Y .
 - iii) $\nabla X = 0$.
- The above notions can be extended to tensor fields, so defining *tensor fields parallel along a curve* or *parallel tensor fields*.

5.1.5. Torsion and curvature of a connection

Definition 5.7 Let (M, ∇) be a manifold endowed with a connection. The map $T: \mathfrak{X}(M) \times \mathfrak{X}(M) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$ defined by

$$T(X, Y) := \nabla_X Y - \nabla_Y X - [X, Y]$$

is $C^\infty(M)$ -bilinear, and then it defines a tensor field $T \in \mathcal{T}_2^1(M)$ which is called the **torsion tensor** of the connection.

A connection ∇ is said to be **symmetric** if its torsion is zero.

The properties of the torsion tensor are:

- The torsion tensor T is antisymmetric.
- Let (E_i) be a local reference frame of vector fields, (E^i) its dual reference, Γ_{ij}^k the corresponding Christoffel symbols, and $[E_i, E_j] = c_{ij}^k E_k$; then

$$T = T_{ij}^k E^i \otimes E^j \otimes E_k \quad , \quad T_{ij}^k = \Gamma_{ij}^k - \Gamma_{ji}^k - c_{ij}^k .$$

Hence, ∇ is symmetric if, in any system of coordinates, the Christoffel symbols Γ_{ij}^k are symmetric in (i, j) .

- It is easy to show that:
 - Two connections on M are the same if, and only if, they have the same geodesics and the same torsion tensor.
 - Given a connection on M , there exist another, unique, with the same geodesics and null torsion.

Definition 5.8 The map $R: \mathfrak{X}(M) \otimes \mathfrak{X}(M) \otimes \mathfrak{X}(M) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$ defined by

$$R(X, Y)Z := \nabla_X \nabla_Y Z - \nabla_Y \nabla_X Z - \nabla_{[X, Y]} Z$$

is $C^\infty(M)$ -trilinear, then it is a tensor field $R \in \mathcal{T}_3^1(M)$ which is called the **curvature tensor** of the connection ∇ .

A connection is said to be **flat** if its curvature tensor is zero.

The properties of the curvature tensor are:

- The curvature tensor R is antisymmetric in (X, Y) .

- With the same notations as above, in a local reference frame (E_i) we have that

$$R = R_{ijk}^l E^i \otimes E^j \otimes E^k \otimes E_l ,$$

with

$$R_{ijk}^l = \Gamma_{jk,i}^l - \Gamma_{ik,j}^l + \Gamma_{jk}^m \Gamma_{im}^l - \Gamma_{ik}^m \Gamma_{jm}^l - c_{ij}^m \Gamma_{mk}^l .$$

- When the torsion of ∇ is zero, then $R(X, Y)Z + R(Z, X)Y + R(Y, Z)X = 0$. This is called the *Bianchi identity*.
- It can be proved that, for a manifold with a connection, the following conditions are equivalent:
 - (i) The connection is flat.
 - (ii) On a neighbourhood of any point, there exist a local chart with coordinate vector fields which are parallel.
 - (iii) The parallel transport along a curve between two points of the manifold does not depend on the chosen curve.

5.1.6. Riemannian manifolds

Definition 5.9 Let M be a differentiable manifold. A **Riemannian metric** on M is a 2-covariant tensor field $g \in \mathcal{T}_2(M)$ symmetric and positive defined; that is

- (i) The map $g: \mathfrak{X}(M) \times \mathfrak{X}(M) \longrightarrow C^\infty(M)$ is $C^\infty(M)$ -bilinear and symmetric
- (ii) For every $p \in M$, and $u_p \in T_p M$, we have $g(u_p, u_p) \geq 0$, and it is zero if, and only if, $u_p = 0$.

A **Riemannian manifold** (M, g) is a differentiable manifold endowed with a Riemannian metric.

Changing the positive defined condition by nondegeneracy of g , we say that we have a **pseudo Riemannian manifold**. In the case that the signature of a pseudo Riemannian metric g is $(1, m-1)$, or $(m-1, 1)$, we say that (M, g) is a **Lorentzian manifold** and g is a **Lorentz metric**.

In the sequel we will suppose that (M, g) is a Riemannian manifold unless indicated.

We have the following properties:

- We introduce the following notations and terminology:

1. If $u_p, v_p \in T_p M$, then $(u_p | v_p) := g(u_p, v_p)$ is the *scalar product* of u_p and v_p .
2. For $u_p \in T_p M$, the *norm* of u_p is $\| u_p \| := g(u_p, u_p)^{1/2}$.
3. For $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, the scalar product of X and Y is $(X | Y) := g(X, Y) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.
4. For $u_p, v_p \in T_p M$, if $g(u_p, v_p) = 0$ we say that they are *orthogonal*.
5. Two vector fields $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ are orthogonal if $g(X, Y) = 0$.
6. If $u_p, v_p \in T_p M$ and g is Riemannian, then the *angle* θ between u_p and v_p :
 θ is defined by $\cos \theta := \frac{g(u_p, v_p)}{\| u_p \| \| v_p \|}$.

- If (U, x^i) is a local chart, the local expression of g is $g|_U = g_{ij} dx^i \otimes dx^j$, where

$$g_{ij} = g \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \right).$$

The matrix (g_{ij}) is symmetric and positive defined.

- In general, if (E_i) is a basis for vector fields on a manifold, then $g = g_{ij} E^i \otimes E^j$, where $g_{ij} = g(E_i, E_j)$. Remember that (E^j) is the dual basis corresponding to (E_i) .
- *The standard metric on \mathbb{R}^m* : The standard Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^m is given by $g = \delta_{ij} dx^i \otimes dx^j$, in the canonical coordinate system.
- *The Minkowski space*: On the vector space \mathbb{R}^m we introduce the Minkowski metric given by $g = \eta_{ij} dx^i \otimes dx^j$, where the diagonal of (η_{ij}) is $(-1, 1, \dots, 1)$ and all the other elements are zero. This is the so-called *Minkowski metric* and (\mathbb{R}^m, g) is a Lorentzian manifold.
- Let $j: N \hookrightarrow M$ an immersed submanifold of a Riemannian manifold (M, g) . Then (N, j^*g) is a Riemannian manifold. Observe that this can not be true in the pseudo Riemannian case.
- Let (M_1, g_1) and (M_2, g_2) be Riemannian manifolds. An *isometry* between M_1 and M_2 is a diffeomorphism $F: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ such that $F^*g_2 = g_1$. If F is defined only on an open set then it is called a local isometry.
- An *isometry* of (M, g) is a diffeomorphism on M , such that it leaves invariant the metric tensor g .

An *infinitesimal isometry* of (M, g) is a vector field on M such that the diffeomorphisms defined by its flux F^t are isometries of (M, g) . The infinitesimal isometries are called *Killing vector fields*. Clearly, $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is a Killing vector field if, and only if, $L(X)g = 0$.

- In a paracompact differentiable manifold, there exists a Riemannian metric. This is a consequence of the existence of partitions of unity.

For the existence of a Lorentzian metric on a paracompact manifold M , it is necessary that there exists a vector field without critical points. This is true for connected compact manifolds with null Euler–Poincaré characteristic.

5.1.7. Some natural constructions on Riemannian manifolds

Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold.

- For every point $p \in M$, the metric g defines an isomorphism $\hat{g}_p: T_p M \longrightarrow T_p^* M$, such that $\langle \hat{g}_p(u_p), v_p \rangle := g(u_p, v_p)$. This family of isomorphisms collects into a global one $\hat{g}: TM \longrightarrow T^*M$, which is an isomorphism of vector bundles.

This isomorphism can be extended to the corresponding $C^\infty(M)$ -modules of sections; that is, we have the map $g^\flat: \mathfrak{X}(M) \longrightarrow \Omega^1(M)$ defined by $g^\flat(X) = X^\flat := \hat{g} \circ X$, which is an isomorphism with inverse $g^\sharp: \Omega^1(M) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that $\alpha \mapsto \alpha^\sharp = \hat{g}^{-1} \circ \alpha$.

- In a local chart (U, x^i) , the isomorphism \hat{g} and its inverse are given respectively by

$$(x^i, v^i) \mapsto (x^i, v^i g_{ij}(x)), \quad (x^i, \alpha_i) \mapsto (x^i, \alpha_i g^{ij}(x)),$$

where (g^{ij}) is the inverse matrix of (g_{ij}) .

- The above isomorphisms are usually called *musical isomorphisms*, and they are written as v^\flat , for the linear form with coordinates $v_j = v^i g_{ij}$, and α^\sharp , for the tangent vector with coordinates $\alpha^j = \alpha_i g^{ij}$.

Obviously, these isomorphisms can be extended to any kind of tensor fields, and we can lift and low indexes using the metric tensor.

- Let $f \in C^\infty(M)$; the *gradient* of f is the vector field $\text{grad } f := \hat{g}^{-1} \circ df$. Then we have that $(\text{grad } f|X) = \langle df, X \rangle$. In local coordinates, $\text{grad } f = g^{ij} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$.
- In a Riemannian manifold, there exists a canonical measure V_g called *Riemannian volume*. First, in the open set of a local chart (U, x^i) , the integral of a function

$f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\int_U f \, dV_g = \int_{\varphi(U)} \hat{f}(x^1, \dots, x^m) \sqrt{|\det(g_{ij})|} \, dx^1 \dots dx^m,$$

where $\hat{f}(x^1, \dots, x^m)$ is the local expression of f .

- IF M is an oriented manifold, then this measure comes from a canonical volume form Ω_g usually called *canonical Riemannian volume form*. In a local chart, this volume form is given by

$$\Omega_g = \sqrt{|\det(g_{ij})|} \, dx^1 \dots dx^m.$$

5.1.8. The Levi-Civita connection

Definition 5.10 Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. A connection ∇ on M is a **Riemannian connection** if the metric tensor field g is parallel; that is, $\nabla g = 0$.

This is equivalent to say that $\nabla_X g = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$.

Another interesting way to state this property is the following: for every $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$,

$$L_Z(g(X, Y)) = g(\nabla_Z X, Y) + g(X, \nabla_Z Y).$$

Using the idea of covariant derivative along a curve, this condition is equivalent to say that, for every curve $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ and $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\gamma)$, the following equation holds

$$D(X \mid Y) = (\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}(t)} X \mid Y) + (X \mid \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}(t)} Y).$$

Remember that, for a function $f: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $Df = df/dt$.

Observe that, in particular, if X, Y are parallel along γ , then $(X \mid Y)$ is constant, then we get that the parallel transport with a Riemannian connection is an isometry. Furthermore, if γ is a geodesic line, then $(\gamma' \mid \gamma')$ is constant.

Finally, the *Fundamental Theorem of Riemannian geometry* states that, if (M, g) is a Riemannian manifold, there exists one, and only one, connection on M which is Riemannian and symmetric.

Definition 5.11 The above connection, called the **Levi-Civita connection** associated to the metric, is defined by the Koszul formula:

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\nabla_X Y \mid Z) &= L(X)(Y \mid Z) + L(Y)(Z \mid X) - L(Z)(X \mid Y) \\ &\quad + ([X, Y] \mid Z) + ([Z, X] \mid Y) - ([Y, Z] \mid X). \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, unless indicated, when we use a connection ∇ in a Riemannian manifold, we will assume that it is the Levi-Civita connection.

In a local chart (U, x^i) in M , the Christoffel symbols of the Levi-Civita connection in the corresponding local basis for the vector fields are given by:

$$\Gamma_{ij}^k = \frac{1}{2}g^{kl} \left(\frac{\partial g_{jl}}{\partial x^i} + \frac{\partial g_{il}}{\partial x^j} - \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x^l} \right).$$

They are also written as $\Gamma_{ij}^k = g^{kl}[ij, l]$ where $[ij, l]$ are called *Christoffel symbols of the first class*.

5.1.9. Submanifolds of a Riemannian manifold

Let $j: M \hookrightarrow \tilde{M}$ be an embedded submanifold of a Riemannian manifold (\tilde{M}, \tilde{g}) with the Levi-Civita connection $\tilde{\nabla}$. We know that $g = j^*\tilde{g}$ is a Riemannian metric on M . Let ∇ be its Levi-Civita connection.

- For every $p \in M$, the embedding j allows us to identify $T_p M$ as a subspace of $T_{j(p)} \tilde{M}$, hence we have a splitting

$$T_{j(p)} \tilde{M} = T_p M \oplus (T_p M)^\perp.$$

Then every tangent vector $u \in T_{j(p)} \tilde{M}$ can be decomposed as a sum $u = u^\top + u^\perp$, the tangent part to M and the orthogonal one. This splitting can be extended to vector fields on the manifold \tilde{M} .

- Let $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$; on a neighbourhood of every $p \in M$ we can extend the vector fields X, Y to vector fields defined on an open set of \tilde{M} . Hence, we can calculate $(\tilde{\nabla}_X Y)(p) \in T_{j(p)} \tilde{M}$, as this value is independent of the extensions. With this construction, we have a vector field along the embedding j ; that is, $\tilde{\nabla}_X Y: M \rightarrow T\tilde{M}$. This vector field can be split into,

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X Y = (\tilde{\nabla}_X Y)^\top + (\tilde{\nabla}_X Y)^\perp.$$

- It is easy to prove that, for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, the map $(X, Y) \mapsto (\tilde{\nabla}_X Y)^\top$, defines a connection on (M, g) . This connection is precisely the Levi-Civita connection.
- Now we consider the other component of the above splitting: The expression $\Pi(X, Y) = (\tilde{\nabla}_X Y)^\perp$ is $C^\infty(M)$ -bilinear and symmetric in $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. Symmetry holds because $[X, Y] \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, hence $[X, Y]^\perp = 0$.

- The above property of bilinearity implies that the map $\Pi_p: T_p M \times T_p M \longrightarrow (T_p M)^\perp$, for every $p \in M$, is well-defined and gives us a vector valued bilinear symmetric form taking values on $(T_p M)^\perp$. It is called the *second fundamental form* of M .

The decomposition $\tilde{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla_X Y + \Pi(X, Y)$ is called *Gauss formula*.

Furthermore, if $N \in \mathfrak{X}(\tilde{M})$ is orthogonal to M , then we have the so-called *Weingarten equation*: $(\tilde{\nabla}_X N \mid Y) = -(N \mid \Pi(X, Y))$.

- (**Nash Embedding Theorem**): Every Riemannian manifold with a countable basis of open sets is isometric to a submanifold of some \mathbb{R}^n .

It is interesting to analyze the following particular cases of submanifolds of Riemannian manifolds:

Hypersurfaces

Let (\tilde{M}, g) be a Riemannian manifold and $M \subset \tilde{M}$ be a hypersurface of \tilde{M} , and suppose that both manifolds are oriented.

If (X_1, \dots, X_m) is an oriented positive basis of vector fields on M , then, on the points of M , we can take a unique vector field N , unitary and orthogonal to M , such that (X_1, \dots, X_m, N) is an oriented positive basis for \tilde{M} on the points of M . We say that N is the positive-oriented normal vector field to M . In this situation, the second fundamental form can be understood as \mathbb{R} -valued, and we write $h(X, Y) = (\Pi(X, Y) \mid N)$. We have that $\Pi(X, Y) = h(X, Y)N$.

With this construction, we have a 2-covariant tensor field on M . With this quadratic form, using the metric g , at every point $p \in M$, we can define a symmetric endomorphism S on $T_p M$, called the *Weingarten map*, which is defined by

$$(S(X) \mid Y) = h(X, Y) := ((\tilde{\nabla}_X Y)^\perp \mid N) .$$

The eigenvalues of S are called *principal curvatures* and the product of all of them is called the *Gauss curvature*. The eigenvectors are called *principal directions*.

Curves

Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold and $C \subset M$ a connected orientable regular curve; that is, a submanifold of dimension one.

For every $p \in C$ there exists a neighbourhood and a local parametrization of C with a curve $c: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow M$ such that $\|c'(t)\| = 1$, the *arc parameter*, and with the

orientation of C . If $\mathbf{t} = c' \in \mathfrak{X}(C)$ is the tangent vector field, for every $s \in I$, we have that $\mathbf{t}(s)$ is a positive basis of $T_{c(s)}C$.

Suppose that $(\mathbf{t}, \nabla_{\mathbf{t}(s)}\mathbf{t}, \dots, \nabla_{\mathbf{t}(s)}^{m-1}\mathbf{t})$ are linearly independent in some $s_0 \in I$. If we apply the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure, we get an orthonormal basis $(\mathbf{f}_1(s) = \mathbf{t}, \dots, \mathbf{f}_m(s))$ of $T_{c(s)}C$, for s on a neighbourhood of s_0 . This is the so called *Frenet reference*. The covariant derivatives of these vector fields are linear combinations of themselves, and the coefficients are the curvatures of C . This linear combinations are the *Frenet–Serret formulas*.

5.1.10. Curvature and distance on a Riemannian manifold

Definition 5.12 Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold and R be the curvature tensor of the Levi-Civita connection ∇ of (M, g) . The **Riemann curvature tensor** is the tensor field $\text{Rie} \in \mathcal{T}_4(M)$ obtained by lowering the contravariant index of R to the last place:

$$\text{Rie}(X, Y, Z, W) = (R(X, Y)Z \mid W) .$$

The **Ricci curvature tensor** is the tensor field $\text{Ric} \in \mathcal{T}_2(M)$ obtained after the contraction of the first covariant index with the contravariant index of R ; that is $\text{Ric} = c_1^1(R)$.

The **scalar curvature** is the function $S \in C^\infty(M)$ obtained by taking the trace, with respect to g , of the Ricci tensor:

$$S = \text{tr}_g(\text{Ric}) = \text{tr}(\text{Ric}^\sharp) .$$

Remark 5.13 These definitions can change by demanding that the contractions are with other indexes, and then the only difference is a change in the sign.

- A Riemannian manifold is *flat* if it is locally isometric to the Euclidean space. Then, a Riemannian manifold (M, g) is flat if, and only if, its curvature tensor vanishes; that is, its Levi-Civita connection is flat.
- In a local reference for vector fields, we have that

$$\text{Rie} = R_{ijkl} E^i \otimes E^j \otimes E^k \otimes E^l, \text{ where } R_{ijkl} = R_{ijk}^s g_{sl}.$$

$$\text{Ric} = R_{ij} E^i \otimes E^j \text{ with } R_{jk} = R_{ijk}^i.$$

$$S = R_k^k = g^{kj} R_{jk}.$$

Now, let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold.

- *Length of a curve*: Let $\gamma: I \longrightarrow M$ be a C^1 -piecewise curve. The *length* of γ is

$$\ell(\gamma) = \int_I \|\gamma'\| .$$

Observe that this length is invariant by reparametrizations; that is, if $\varphi: J \rightarrow I$ is a diffeomorphism between open real intervals, then $\ell(\gamma \circ \varphi) = \ell(\gamma)$.

- Supposing that the manifold M is connected, any two points can be connected by a piecewise curve. Then, if $p, q \in M$, the *distance* between p and q is defined as:

$$d(p, q) := \inf\{\ell(\gamma) \mid \gamma \text{ is a } \mathcal{C}^1\text{-piecewise curve from } p \text{ to } q\}.$$

The function d is a distance defining the topology of M and is called *Riemannian distance*.

- Let M be a connected differentiable manifold, suppose it is Hausdorff but not necessarily paracompact. Then the following conditions are equivalent:
 1. M admits a Riemannian metric.
 2. M is metrizable as topological space.
 3. The topology of M has a countable basis of open sets.
 4. M is paracompact.
- If (M, g) is a connected Riemannian manifold, we say that it is *geodesically complete* if the domain of definition of all the geodesic curves on M is \mathbb{R} .
- (**Hopf–Rinow Theorem**): Let (M, g) be a connected Riemannian manifold and d its Riemannian distance. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:
 1. For a subset of M , if it is bounded by d and closed, then it is compact.
 2. As a metric space, M is complete.
 3. (M, g) is geodesically complete.

5.2. Newtonian dynamical systems

5.2.1. Newton dynamical equations. Kinetic energy

From a geometric approach, mechanical systems in Newtonian physics have a common background which, as in the above cases, is collected in the following postulates:

Postulate 5.14 (First Postulate of Newtonian mechanics): The **configuration space** Q of the dynamical system with n degrees of freedom is a n -dimensional differentiable manifold which is endowed with a *Riemannian metric* ¹.

¹This formulation can be extended to describe relativistic systems and, in this case, the metric is semi-Riemannian.

The **state space**, or **phase space** of coordinates–velocities, is the tangent bundle TQ or, alternatively, the **phase space** of coordinates–momenta is the cotangent bundle T^*Q of the manifold Q .

Postulate 5.15 (Second Postulate of Newtonian mechanics): The **observables** or physical magnitudes of the dynamical system are functions of $C^\infty(TQ)$ or $C^\infty(T^*Q)$.

The result of the measure of an observable is the value of its representing function at a point of the phase space.

Postulate 5.16 (Third Postulate of Newtonian mechanics): The dynamics of the system is given by a 1-form on Q , the **work form** or **force form**, or equivalently, a vector field on Q , the **force field** or simply the **force**.

With these ideas in mind, we define:

Definition 5.17 A *Newtonian mechanical system* is a triple (Q, g, ω) , where

1. Q is a differentiable manifold ($\dim Q = n$).
2. g is a Riemannian metric on Q . Then (Q, g) is a Riemannian manifold.
3. ω is a differential 1-form on Q , called the **work form**.

As g is a Riemannian metric, the work form $\omega \in \Omega^1(Q)$ is associated to a unique vector field $F \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ such that $i(F)g = \omega$. We call F the **the force field** of the system. In this case, we denote the system as (Q, g, F) .

For a Newtonian system (Q, g, F) , let ∇ be the *Levi-Civita connection* associated to g .

Postulate 5.18 (Fourth Postulate of Newtonian mechanics): The dynamical trajectories of the Newtonian dynamical system (Q, g, F) are the curves $\gamma: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ solution to the equation

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma \quad (5.1)$$

which is called the **Newton equation** of the system.

Remark 5.19 Note that if $F = 0$, then the dynamical trajectories are the geodesic curves of the metric g . This corresponds to the first Newton Law (*Inertia Law*).

If (U, x^i) is a local chart on Q , and $\{\Gamma_{ij}^k\}$ are the corresponding Christoffel symbols of the connection ∇ , then the dynamical equation is locally given by

$$\ddot{\gamma}^k + \Gamma_{ij}^k \dot{\gamma}^i \dot{\gamma}^j = F^k \circ \gamma .$$

Furthermore, if, $\omega = \omega_i dx^i$ and $F = F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$, in this chart, then we have that

$$\omega_i = g_{ij} F^j, \quad F^i = g^{ij} \omega_j ,$$

where g^{ij} are the components of the inverse matrix of g in this local chart (the “inverse metrics”).

This formalism has a dual counterpart as follows:

Definition 5.20 Let (Q, g) be a Riemannian manifold. The musical diffeomorphism associated to the Riemannian metric g , defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta : \quad TQ &\longrightarrow T^*Q \\ (q, v) &\mapsto (q, i(v)g) \end{aligned}$$

gives us the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} TQ & \xrightarrow{\theta} & T^*Q \\ & \searrow \tau_Q & \swarrow \pi_Q \\ & Q & \end{array} .$$

Hence θ can be understood as a differential 1-form on Q along τ_Q (denoted by $\theta \in \Omega^1(Q, \tau_Q)$), called the **linear momentum 1-form** associated with the metric.

Using θ , the Newton equation (5.1) can be equivalently written as:

Proposition 5.21 (Dual form of the dynamical equations): Given a Newtonian dynamical system (Q, g, ω) , a curve $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ is a solution to the dynamical equation if, and only if, it satisfies that

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}) = \omega \circ \gamma \tag{5.2}$$

(Proof) If $\gamma: [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ is a curve on Q , then $\theta \circ \dot{\gamma} \in \Omega^1(Q, \gamma)$, and we have that

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}) = \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(i(\dot{\gamma})g) = i(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}\dot{\gamma})g + i(\dot{\gamma})\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}g = i(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}\dot{\gamma})g = \theta \circ \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}\dot{\gamma}$$

On the other side if γ is a dynamical trajectory, that is $\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}\dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma$, then:

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}) = \theta \circ \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}\dot{\gamma} = \theta \circ F \circ \gamma = i(F)g \circ \gamma = \omega \circ \gamma ;$$

which is the equation (5.2). ■

Note that as $\theta \circ \dot{\gamma} \in \Omega^1(Q, \gamma)$, then, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$, we have

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}((\theta \circ \dot{\gamma})(X)) = (\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}))(X) + (\theta \circ \dot{\gamma})(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}X) .$$

Hence, we obtain the following:

Theorem 5.22 (Linear momentum conservation): If the work form (or in a equivalent way, the force field) of a Newtonian mechanical system (Q, g, ω) is zero, then the linear momentum is invariant, is a constant, along the trajectories of the system. (In a more geometric way, for every trajectory of the system γ , the form $\theta \circ \dot{\gamma} \in \Omega^1(Q, \gamma)$ is parallel along the trajectory γ ²).

(Proof) If $\omega = 0$ or, equivalently, $F = 0$, then the Newton equation is $\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}) = 0$; hence $\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}$ is parallel along the trajectory γ . ■

Finally, with the Riemannian metric, we can associate the following function:

Definition 5.23 Given a Riemannian manifold (Q, g) , the associated **kinetic energy** is the function $K \in C^\infty(TQ)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} K : TQ &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (q, v) &\longmapsto \frac{1}{2}g(v, v) \end{aligned} .$$

Its local expression is

$$K(q^i, v^j) = \frac{1}{2}g_{ij}(q)v^iv^j .$$

5.2.2. Euler–Lagrange equations

Now, we transform the Newton equation into a new form, which is easier to state when we know the elements defining the system. First, we need a technical result:

Lemma 5.24 Let (Q, g) be a Riemannian manifold, $K \in C^\infty(TQ)$ its kinetic energy, ∇ the Levi-Civita connection of g , and $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ a curve. If $(U, \varphi = (q^i))$ is a local chart of Q with $\gamma(t) \in U$, and $(\tau_Q^{-1}(U), q^i, v^i)$ is the natural chart on TQ ; then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = g \left(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma}, \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) .$$

²We maintain the statement as in the classical form in physics: in \mathbb{R}^3 , with a natural Cartesian system of coordinates, we have that $\Gamma_{ij}^k = 0$, for every i, j, k , hence the components of $\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}$ are constants.

(Proof) We compare the local expressions of both sides of the equation. As $K = \frac{1}{2}g_{ij}v^iv^j$, we have that

$$\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} = g_{ij}v^i, \quad \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^j} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial g_{ik}}{\partial q^j} v^i v^k,$$

thus, if $\gamma = (\gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^n)$,

$$\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = (g_{ij} \circ \gamma) \circ \dot{\gamma}^i, \quad \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^j} \dot{\gamma} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial g_{ik}}{\partial q^j} \circ \gamma \right) \dot{\gamma}^i \dot{\gamma}^k.$$

Hence we obtain that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) = \left(\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial q^k} \circ \gamma \right) \dot{\gamma}^k \dot{\gamma}^i + (g_{ij} \circ \gamma) \ddot{\gamma}^i$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = \left(\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial q^k} \circ \gamma \right) \dot{\gamma}^k \dot{\gamma}^i + (g_{ij} \circ \gamma) \ddot{\gamma}^i - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial g_{ik}}{\partial q^j} \circ \gamma \right) \dot{\gamma}^i \dot{\gamma}^k. \quad (5.3)$$

Furthermore,

$$g \left(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma}, \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) = g \left((\ddot{\gamma}^i + \Gamma_{kl}^i \dot{\gamma}^k \dot{\gamma}^l) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) = (g_{ij} \circ \gamma) \ddot{\gamma}^i + (g_{ij} \circ \gamma) \Gamma_{kl}^i \dot{\gamma}^k \dot{\gamma}^l.$$

But we have that

$$[kl, j] = g_{ij} \Gamma_{kl}^i = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial g_{jk}}{\partial q^l} + \frac{\partial g_{jl}}{\partial q^k} - \frac{\partial g_{lk}}{\partial q^j} \right),$$

and by substitution in equation (5.3), we obtain the desired result. ■

Theorem 5.25 (Lagrange): Let (Q, g, ω) a Newtonian mechanical system, and $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ a curve contained in the domain $U \subset Q$ of a chart $(U, \varphi = (q^i))$ of Q . Then, γ is a solution to the dynamical equation (5.1) if, and only if, it satisfies the equations

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = (\omega \circ \gamma) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) = \omega_j \circ \gamma, \quad (5.4)$$

which are called **Euler–Lagrange equations of the second kind** of the system.

(Proof) If γ is a solution to the Newton equation (5.1), then

$$g \left(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma}, \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) = g \left(F \circ \gamma, \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) = (\omega \circ \gamma) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right).$$

Hence, by the previous Lemma, the curve γ satisfies equations (5.4).

Conversely, if γ satisfies (5.4), then,

$$g \left(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma}, \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) = (\omega \circ \gamma) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) = g \left(F \circ \gamma, \frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) ,$$

Therefore $\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma$, hence γ is a solution to the Newton equation. ■

Remark 5.26 • To calculate the Newton equation in a local chart, we need to know the Christoffel symbols of the Levi-Civita connection ∇ associated to g ; but to write the Euler–Lagrange equations we do not need the local expression of the connection. Moreover, observe that the way to get Euler–Lagrange equations does not depend on the local chart we use. We need only to know the local expression of K and ω , and calculate the suitable derivatives.

- Another way to understand Euler–Lagrange equations is as follows: let (U, q^i) be a local chart of Q ; the Newton equations of the system in this chart are written as

$$\ddot{\gamma}^i + \Gamma_{jk}^i \dot{\gamma}^j \dot{\gamma}^k = F^i \circ \gamma ,$$

or, as it is usual,

$$\ddot{q}^i + \Gamma_{jk}^i \dot{q}^j \dot{q}^k = F^i .$$

This is a second order system of differential equations. To transform it into a first order system, we introduce new variables $v^i = \dot{q}^i$, and we obtain the first order system on TQ

$$\dot{q}^i = v^i, \quad \dot{v}^i = F^i - \Gamma_{jk}^i v^j v^k .$$

The associated vector field is given by

$$X = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + (F^i - \Gamma_{jk}^i v^j v^k) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} - \Gamma_{jk}^i v^j v^k \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + F^v ,$$

where F^v is the vertical lift of F from Q to TQ . Observe that we obtain the geodesic vector field plus the vertical lift of the force field.

As $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\tau_Q^{-1}(U))$, for every point $(q, v) \in \tau_Q^{-1}(U)$ there exists a unique solution, with (q_0, v_0) as initial condition. Consider now the functions we need to obtain the Euler–Lagrange equations and calculate the action of X on them. Using the well known properties of Christoffel symbols, we have:

$$X \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^k} \right) = X(g_{lk} v^l) = \frac{\partial g_{lk}}{\partial q^i} v^i v^l + g_{lk} (F^l - \Gamma_{ij}^l v^i v^j) ,$$

hence

$$X \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^k} \right) - \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^k} = \frac{\partial g_{lk}}{\partial q^i} v^i v^l + g_{lk} F^l - g_{lk} \Gamma_{ij}^l v^i v^j - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial q^k} v^i v^j = g_{lk} F^l .$$

So, we have obtained:

Proposition 5.27 *Let (Q, g, ω) be a Newtonian mechanical system, (U, q^i) a local chart on Q and $(\tau_Q^{-1}(U), q^i, v^i)$ the corresponding natural chart on TQ . Then there exists a unique vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\tau_Q^{-1}(U))$ which satisfies,*

1. $L(X)q^k = v^k$.
2. $L(X) \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^k} \right) = \frac{\partial K}{\partial v^k} + g_{ik} F^i$.

Furthermore, its integral curves $\sigma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow TQ$ are canonical lifts of curves $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ to TQ , which are solution to the Newton equations of the system.

(Proof) The existence and unicity of the vector field X are consequences of being $\left(q^k, \frac{\partial K}{\partial v^k} \right)$ a local chart on TQ , because the Riemannian metric g is non-degenerate. The properties of X have been proved in the previous discussion.

Furthermore, the integral curves of X are the lifts to TQ of the solutions to the system of Euler–Lagrange equations, and hence solutions to the Newton equations. ■

Velocity dependent forces

It is usual that the mechanical forces, or the work forms, depend not only on the position coordinates, but also on the velocities. This is the case of dissipative systems or electromagnetic, Lorentz, forces. Geometrically, this means that $\omega \in \Omega^1(Q, \tau_Q)$ and $F \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q)$. In this case the only change we need to do in the above paragraphs are the followings:

1. The Newton equations change to

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \dot{\gamma} ,$$

or in dual form,

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}) = \omega \circ \dot{\gamma} .$$

2. The Euler–Lagrange equations are

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = (g_{ij} F^i) \circ \dot{\gamma} = (\omega_j \circ \dot{\gamma}) .$$

If the force field of the system depends on the velocities, the work form ω cannot be the exterior differential of a function defined on the configuration space Q .

As can be seen, the only changes consist in the substitution of γ by $\dot{\gamma}$, when we compose with ω or with F , to take into account the new domain of definition.

5.2.3. Conservative systems: Mechanical Lagrangians and Euler–Lagrange equations

In particular, we are interested in a special kind of Newtonian systems: those which are of conservative or mechanical Lagrangian type, called *simple mechanical systems*.

Definition 5.28 A Newtonian mechanical system (Q, g, ω) is **conservative** if the work form is exact; that is, there exists $V \in C^\infty(Q)$ such that $\omega = -dV$ ³.

In this case, the function V is called the **potential energy** of the system.

Observe that in this case, the force vector field is $F = -\text{grad } V$.

For these systems, we define:

Definition 5.29 In a conservative Newtonian mechanical system (Q, g, ω) , with $\omega = -dV$, the **total energy** or **mechanical energy** of the system is the function $E \in C^\infty(TQ)$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} E : TQ &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (q, v) &\mapsto K(q, v) + (\tau_Q^* V)(q, v) \end{aligned}$$

(To simplify notation we usually write $E = K + V$).

As a direct consequence of the definition, we have:

Theorem 5.30 (Mechanical energy conservation): Let (Q, g, ω) be a conservative Newtonian mechanical system, then the mechanical energy E is invariant (“constant”) along the trajectories of the system.

(Proof) If $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ is a solution to the Newton equations,

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma, \quad i(F)g = \omega = -dV, \quad (5.5)$$

³The negative sign is a customary tradition in Physics.

then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d(E \circ \dot{\gamma})}{dt} &= \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(E \circ \dot{\gamma}) = \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \left(\frac{1}{2} g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) + V \circ \gamma \right) \\
&= g(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) + \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(V \circ \gamma) = g(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) + dV(\dot{\gamma}) \\
&= g(F, \dot{\gamma}) + dV(\dot{\gamma}) = \omega(\dot{\gamma}) + dV(\dot{\gamma}) = 0 .
\end{aligned}$$

■

Proposition 5.31 *Let (Q, g, ω) be a conservative Newtonian mechanical system with $\omega = -dV$ and let $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ be a curve with image on the domain $U \subset Q$ of a local chart $(U, \varphi = (q^i))$ of Q . Then the Euler–Lagrange equations (5.4) are*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = 0 , \quad (5.6)$$

that is, the Euler–Lagrange equations for the Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} = K - \tau_Q^* V$.

(Proof) In fact we have that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = (-dV \circ \gamma) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^j} \right) = -\frac{\partial(\tau_Q^* V)}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} ,$$

and recalling that $\frac{\partial(\tau_Q^* V)}{\partial v^j} = 0$, we can write

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial(K - \tau_Q^* V)}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial(K - \tau_Q^* V)}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = 0 .$$

■

Definition 5.32 *The function $\mathcal{L} := K - \tau_Q^* V$ is said to be a **Lagrangian function of mechanical type** or a **mechanical Lagrangian function**, and equations (5.6) are the **Euler–Lagrange equations of the first class** of the conservative Newtonian system.*

From now on, we commit an abuse of notation and we write simply $\mathcal{L} = K - V$.

Remark 5.33 • For conservative Newtonian mechanical systems, it is immediate to prove that the vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\tau_Q^{-1}(U))$ of Proposition 5.27 satisfies the condition

$$L(X) \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^k} \right) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^k} ,$$

(instead of the condition 2 in the aforementioned proposition).

- Observe that the Lagrangian functions of *mechanical type*

$$\mathcal{L} = K - V \equiv \frac{1}{2}g_{ij}(q)v^i v^j - V(q)$$

are regular because

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{L}} \equiv g_{ij}(q) dq^i \wedge dv^j .$$

5.2.4. Coupled systems (systems in interaction)

Next we study the case of Newtonian mechanical systems which are made of several dynamical systems in interaction; that is, the so-called *coupled systems*.

Let (Q_1, g_1, ω_1) , (Q_2, g_2, ω_2) be two Newtonian mechanical systems and $F_1 \in \mathfrak{X}(Q_1)$, $F_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(Q_2)$ the corresponding force fields. The dynamical equations for both systems are

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_1}^1 \dot{\gamma}_1 = F_1 \circ \gamma_1 \quad ; \quad \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_2}^2 \dot{\gamma}_2 = F_2 \circ \gamma_2 \quad (5.7)$$

(with $\gamma_1: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q_1$, $\gamma_2: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q_2$). They constitute a non-coupled, separated, set of ordinary differential equations. Together, they are a system of non-coupled ordinary differential equations.

Consider the system (Q, g, ω) , where:

- $Q = Q_1 \times Q_2$; with $\pi_1: Q \rightarrow Q_1$, $\pi_2: Q \rightarrow Q_2$.
- $g = g_1 \oplus g_2$.
- $\omega = \pi_1^* \omega_1 + \pi_2^* \omega_2$.

where we can see that $\nabla = \nabla^1 \oplus \nabla^2$ is the Levi-Civita connection of the Riemannian metric g , defined as follows: if $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ is given by $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, then

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_1}^1 \dot{\gamma}_1 + \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_2}^2 \dot{\gamma}_2 .$$

Moreover, from the expression of ω we obtain that the associated force field $F \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ is

$$F(q) = ((q_1, q_2), F_1(q_1), F_2(q_2)) ,$$

with $q \equiv (q_1, q_2) \in Q$. Then the dynamical equation of the system is

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma ,$$

which is equivalent to the non-coupled system (5.7). From the physical point of view, this situation is a model of two *joint mechanical systems* but *without interaction*. With this in mind we have:

Definition 5.34 We say that N Newtonian systems (Q_μ, g_μ, F_μ) , with $\mu = 1, \dots, N$, are **coupled** (or **in interaction**) if $F_\mu \in \mathfrak{X}(Q_\mu, \pi_\mu)$, that is, we have the following commutative diagram for the force field acting on the system

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & TQ_\mu \\ & \nearrow F_\mu & \downarrow \tau_\mu \\ Q = \prod_{\mu=1}^n Q_\mu & \xrightarrow{\pi_\mu} & Q_\mu \end{array}$$

In this case, if $N = 2$, we have a system of differential equation as in (5.7) but now it is coupled; that is, we have:

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_1}^1 \dot{\gamma}_1 = F_1 \circ \gamma = F_1 \circ (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \quad ; \quad \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_2}^2 \dot{\gamma}_2 = F_2 \circ \gamma = F_2 \circ (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$$

We want to formulate this system as a single Newtonian mechanical system, so we need the following result:

Lemma 5.35 Let M_1, M_2 be manifolds, $M = M_1 \times M_2$ and $\pi_i: M \longrightarrow M_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) the natural projections. Then

1. $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ is canonically isomorphic to $\mathfrak{X}(M_1, \pi_1) \times \mathfrak{X}(M_2, \pi_2)$ (as $C^\infty(M)$ -módules).
2. $\Omega^1(M)$ is canonically isomorphic to $\Omega^1(M_1, \pi_1) \times \Omega^1(M_2, \pi_2)$ (as $C^\infty(M)$ -módules).

(Proof) Recall that if $q \equiv (q_1, q_2) \in M$, we have the isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \alpha_q : & T_q M & \longrightarrow & T_{q_1} M_1 \times T_{q_2} M_2 \\ & v & \mapsto & (T_q \pi_1(v), T_q \pi_2(v)) . \end{array}$$

Hence we obtain the sequence

$$\mathfrak{X}(M) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathfrak{X}(M_1, \pi_1) \times \mathfrak{X}(M_2, \pi_2) \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathfrak{X}(M) ,$$

where the maps are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(X)(q) &:= \alpha_q(X(q)) , \\ \psi(X_1, X_2)(q) &:= \alpha_q^{-1}(X_1(q), X_2(q)) . \end{aligned}$$

If $\rho_i: \mathfrak{X}(M_1, \pi_1) \times \mathfrak{X}(M_2, \pi_2) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M_i, \pi_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are the natural projections, we have that:

1. The map ϕ is well-defined and $\phi(X)$ is differentiable:

It is enough to observe that $\rho_i(\phi(X))$ is differentiable. To obtain this consider $f \in C^\infty(M_i)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} ((\rho_i(\phi(X)))f)(q) &= \rho_i(\alpha_p(X(q)))f \\ &= T_q \pi_i(X(q))f = X(q)(f \circ \pi_i) = (X(f) \circ \pi_i)(q), \end{aligned}$$

which depends differentially on $q \in M$.

2. The map ϕ is injective, because the maps α_q are isomorphisms.
3. The map ϕ is a $C^\infty(M)$ -modules isomorphism as can be seen directly.
4. $\psi \circ \phi = \text{Id}_{\mathfrak{X}(M)}$; in fact, if $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and $p \in M$, we have that

$$((\psi \circ \phi)(X))(q) = \psi(\phi(X))(q) = \alpha_p^{-1}(\phi(X)(q)) = \alpha_q^{-1}(\alpha_p(X(q))) = X(q).$$

The statement (2) is a direct consequence of (1). ■

From this Lemma we obtain:

Theorem 5.36 *Two Newtonian mechanical systems in interaction, (Q_μ, g_μ, F_μ) , $\mu = 1, 2$, are equivalent to a unique Newtonian mechanical system (Q, g, F) , where*

1. $Q = Q_1 \times Q_2$; with $\pi_1: Q \longrightarrow Q_1$, $\pi_2: Q \longrightarrow Q_2$.
2. $g_1 \oplus g_2$.
3. $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $F = (F_1, F_2)$.

(we have identified $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ with $\mathfrak{X}(M_1, \pi_1) \times \mathfrak{X}(M_2, \pi_2)$, and $\Omega^1(Q)$ with $\Omega^1(Q_1, \pi_1) \times \Omega^1(Q_2, \pi_2)$, in agreement with the above Lemma)⁴.

(Proof) The metric $g = g_1 \oplus g_2$ is Riemannian on Q . Its Levi-Civita connection ∇ is $\nabla_1 \oplus \nabla_2$; then the dynamical equation associated to this Newtonian system can be split into the two components on Q_1 and Q_2 , according to the dynamical equations of the two different systems in interaction Q_1 y Q_2 ; hence we obtain the result.

⁴The meaning of this “equivalence” is the following: if $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q$ is a solution to the dynamical equation of (Q, g, F) , and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, then $\gamma_\mu: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q_\mu$, ($\mu = 1, 2$), is a solution to the coupled dynamical equations of both systems (Q_μ, g_μ, F_μ) ; and conversely.

Observe that

$$i(F)g = i(F_1, F_2)(g_1 \oplus g_2) = i(F_1)g_1 + i(F_2)g_2 = \omega_1 + \omega_2 ,$$

and the dynamical equation $\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma$ splits in two different ones:

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_1}^1 \dot{\gamma}_1 = F_1 \circ \gamma = F_1 \circ (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \quad ; \quad \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_2}^2 \dot{\gamma}_2 = F_2 \circ \gamma = F_2 \circ (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$$

■

Remark 5.37 When studying a physical complex system, it is usual that we first consider the two component systems as independent; that is, without interaction, (Q_1, g_1, F_1) , (Q_2, g_2, F_2) , and in a second approach we introduce the interaction $F^{int} = (F_1^{int}, F_2^{int})$; that is, the force fields depending on the positions of both systems, then we obtain the system $(Q_1 \times Q_2, g_1 \oplus g_2, F_1 + F_1^{int}, F_2 + F_2^{int})$.

Corollary 5.38 A collection of n coupled Newtonian mechanical systems (Q_μ, g_μ, F_μ) , $\mu = 1, \dots, n$, is “equivalent” to a unique Newtonian mechanical system (Q, g, F) , where

1. $Q = Q_1 \times \dots \times Q_N$; with $\pi_\mu: Q \longrightarrow Q_\mu$.
2. $g = g_1 \oplus \dots \oplus g_N$.
3. $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N)$ and $F = (F_1, \dots, F_N)$.

(observe that we have identified $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ with $\prod_{\mu=1}^N \mathfrak{X}(M_\mu, \pi_\mu)$, and $\Omega^1(Q)$ with

$\prod_{\mu=1}^N \Omega^1(M_\mu, \pi_\mu)$ in agreement with the above Lemma).

The system (Q, g, F) is a Newtonian mechanical system composed by different systems with interaction.

Local coordinate expressions: To write the dynamical equation in a local chart, consider the curve $\gamma \equiv (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ (where γ_μ is the component of γ on the manifold Q_μ). The dynamical equation is written as

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}_\mu}^\mu \dot{\gamma}_\mu = F_\mu \circ \gamma .$$

To obtain the local expression of ∇ , let (U_μ, q_μ^i) be local charts on Q_μ . We have that (U, q_μ^i) , with $U = U_1 \times \dots \times U_N$ is a local chart on Q , and if $\{(\Gamma_\mu)^i_{jk}\}$ are the Christoffel symbols of ∇_μ , we have that

$$\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial q_\mu^j}} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_\mu^k} = (\Gamma_\mu)^i_{jk} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_\mu^i}, \quad \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial q_\mu^j}} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_\nu^k} = 0 \quad (\mu \neq \nu) ,$$

because ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection. From these expressions we have that

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = \sum_{\mu=1}^N \left(\dot{\gamma}_{\mu}^j \frac{\partial}{\partial q_{\mu}^j} + (\Gamma_{\mu})_{jk}^i \dot{\gamma}_{\mu}^j \dot{\gamma}_{\mu}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial q_{\mu}^i} \right) = F \circ \gamma ,$$

and, for every $\mu = 1, \dots, N$,

$$\ddot{\gamma}_{\mu}^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q_{\mu}^i} + (\Gamma_{\mu})_{jk}^i \dot{\gamma}_{\mu}^j \dot{\gamma}_{\mu}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial q_{\mu}^i} = F_{\mu}^i \circ \gamma .$$

Hence, if $\dim Q_{\mu} = N_{\mu}$, for every $\mu = 1, \dots, N$ and every $i = 1, \dots, N_{\mu}$, we have

$$\dot{\gamma}_{\mu}^i + (\Gamma_{\mu})_{jk}^i \dot{\gamma}_{\mu}^j \dot{\gamma}_{\mu}^k = F_{\mu}^i \circ \gamma .$$

To write the Euler–Lagrange equations of the system, we need to obtain the associated natural chart $(\tau_{\mu}^{-1}(U), q_{\mu}^j, v_{\mu}^j)$ in TQ and we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v_{\mu}^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K}{\partial q_{\mu}^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = (g_{\mu})_{jk} F_{\mu}^k ,$$

where the kinetic energy function is $K = \sum_{\mu=1}^N K_{\mu}$, because $g = g_1 \oplus \dots \oplus g_N$. Hence, taking into account that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K_{\nu}}{\partial v_{\mu}^j} \right) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial K_{\nu}}{\partial q_{\mu}^j} = 0 \quad ; \quad \text{if } \mu \neq \nu ,$$

we write

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K_{\mu}}{\partial v_{\mu}^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K_{\mu}}{\partial q_{\mu}^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = (g_{\mu})_{jk} F_{\mu}^k .$$

Moreover, if the system is conservative, then $\omega = -dV$ (with $V \in C^{\infty}(Q)$); that is,

$$\omega = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial q_{\mu}^j} dq_{\mu}^j .$$

If we consider the Lagrangian function of the system $\mathcal{L} = K - V$, with local expression

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu=1}^N (g_{\mu})_{jk} v_{\mu}^j v_{\mu}^k - V = \sum_{\mu=1}^N K_{\mu} - V ,$$

we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v_\mu^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q_\mu^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = 0 .$$

Finally, if the force fields depend on the velocities, the expression would be the same writing $F \circ \dot{\gamma}$ instead of $F \circ \gamma$ in every equation. In this case $F_\mu \in \mathfrak{X}(Q_\mu, \pi_\mu \circ \tau_\mu)$, where $\tau_\mu: TQ_\mu \rightarrow Q_\mu$ are the natural projections.

5.3. Systems with holonomic and nonholonomic constraints

Another relevant topic is the study of dynamical systems in classical mechanics with holonomic or nonholonomic constraints. Nonholonomic systems are those subjected to constraints depending on positions and velocities, and they have been thoroughly studied (see, for instance, [7, 30, 92, 119, 123, 151, 157, 234, 258, 267, 328]).

5.3.1. Holonomic constraints. Holonomic d'Alembert Principle

Let (Q, g, ω) be a Newtonian mechanical system and $F \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ its force field. Let S be a submanifold of Q (usually called *submanifold of holonomic constraints*) and $j_S: S \hookrightarrow Q$ the natural embedding. The problem we study consists in describing the dynamics of the system when it is forced to evolve on the submanifold S . To force this behaviour, first it is compulsory to apply a new force field R , called *constraint force*, which obliges the system to remain on S . In general, such force depends, not only on the position, but also on the velocity; then $R \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q)$ and, moreover, it is a new unknown to find.

Then we have a dynamical equation for curves $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S$, which is

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma + R \circ \dot{\gamma} . \quad (5.8)$$

To solve this problem, we introduce the following:

Assumption 5.39 (d'Alembert Principle): The constraint force R is orthogonal to the submanifold S ; that is, for every $q \in S$ and for every $u, v \in T_q S$, we have $g(u, R(q, v)) = 0$.

The question is how to solve the problem and obtain some information about the constraint force. Let $g_S := j_S^* g$. It is obvious that (S, g_S) is a Riemannian manifold. Let ∇^S be the Levi-Civita connection associated to g_S . We have the following natural orthogonal splitting

$$T_q Q = T_q S \oplus (T_q S)^\perp \quad (\forall q \in S \subset Q) ,$$

and the projections

$$\pi_S(q) =: T_q Q \rightarrow T_q S, \quad \pi_S^\perp(q) =: T_q Q \rightarrow (T_q S)^\perp,$$

and, as they are defined at every point, we have

$$\pi_S =: TQ|_S \rightarrow TS, \quad \pi_S^\perp =: TQ|_S \rightarrow TS^\perp.$$

Then d'Alembert's Principle reduces to $\pi_S \circ R = 0$. Hence, we have that:

Proposition 5.40 $\nabla^S = \pi_S \circ \nabla$.

(Proof) It is a direct computation to prove that, on the vector fields tangent to S , the map $\pi_S \circ \nabla$ is a connection on S and it is symmetrical. Furthermore, for every $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$, we have that

$$(\pi_S \circ \nabla_Z)g(X, Y) = g((\pi_S \circ \nabla_Z)X, Y) + g(X, (\pi_S \circ \nabla_Z)Y),$$

and hence $\pi_S \circ \nabla$ is the Levi-Civita connection of g_S . ■

Now, if we take the dynamical equation (5.8) and we split it into the tangent and orthogonal components to S , we obtain

$$\pi_S(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma}) = \pi_S \circ F \circ \gamma + \pi_S \circ R \circ \dot{\gamma} = \pi_S \circ F \circ \gamma, \quad (5.9)$$

$$\pi_S^\perp(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma}) = \pi_S^\perp \circ F \circ \gamma + \pi_S^\perp \circ R \circ \dot{\gamma} = \pi_S^\perp \circ F \circ \gamma + R \circ \dot{\gamma}. \quad (5.10)$$

Denoting $F^S := \pi_S \circ F \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$, the projection of F on S , then equation (5.9) is

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}^S \dot{\gamma} = F^S \circ \gamma; \quad (5.11)$$

and this is the dynamical equation of the Newtonian mechanical system (S, g_S, ω_S) , where $\omega_S = i(F^S)g_S$.

The solutions to equation (5.11) are curves $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S$ such that, if we introduce them into equation (5.10), it allows us to calculate the constraint force R for that trajectory, obtaining

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} - \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}^S \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma - F^S \circ \gamma + R \circ \dot{\gamma}.$$

Then $R \circ \dot{\gamma} \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \dot{\gamma})$. Observe that we can calculate the constraint force only for each trajectory of the system, but not as a vector field depending on the velocities.

We also have:

Proposition 5.41 $\omega_S = j_S^* \omega$.

(Proof) If $q \in S$ and $v \in T_q S$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_S(v) &= (i(F^S)g_S)(v) = g_S(F^S, v) = g(F^S, v) = g(F, v) , \\ (j_S^* \omega)(v) &= (j_S^* i(F)g)(v) = g(F, v) ,\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. ■

We have obtained that the dynamical system describing the motion of the systems (Q, g, ω) constrained to move on the submanifold S , is the Newtonian mechanical system $(S, j_S^* g, j_S^* \omega)$.

D'Alembert's Principle tells us that the constraint force $R \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q)$, the force that obliges the system to move on the submanifold S , is orthogonal to S , but we can set this principle in a dual way:

Proposition 5.42 (Dual d'Alembert Principle): Let $\rho = i(R)g$. Then $j_S^* \rho = 0$.

(Proof) Let $q \in S$ and $u, v \in T_q S$, then $(j_S^* \rho_{(q,v)})(u) = g_S(R(q, v), u) = 0$. ■

Consider now the linear momentum form of the constrained system, $\theta_S: TS \rightarrow T^*S$. The equation of motion using θ_S is,

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}^S(\theta_S \circ \dot{\gamma}) = \omega_S \circ \gamma$$

and as $\omega_S = j_S^* \omega$, we have

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}^S(\theta_S \circ \dot{\gamma}) = j_S^* \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}(\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}) .$$

Next, we discuss some particular cases:

Systems with one constraint

Let $S = \{q \in Q ; \varphi(q) = 0\}$, with $\varphi \in C^\infty(Q)$ and suppose that $d\varphi(q) \neq 0$, for every $q \in S$. This implies that S is a submanifold of Q . Let $X \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ such that $i(X)g = d\varphi$, then X is orthogonal to S . Hence

$$\pi_S^\perp(F) = \frac{g(F, X)}{g(X, X)} X = \frac{d\varphi(F)}{\|d\varphi\|^2} X ,$$

and we have that

$$F^S = \pi_S(F) = F - \frac{d\varphi(F)}{\|d\varphi\|^2} X .$$

As a consequence,

$$\omega_S = \omega - \frac{d\varphi(F)}{\|d\varphi\|^2} d\varphi ,$$

and this allows us to find the trajectories of the system as solutions to the differential equation

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}^S \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma - \frac{d\varphi(F)}{\|d\varphi\|^2} X .$$

We have that the constraint force along the solution γ is given by the equation

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} - \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}^S \dot{\gamma} = \frac{d\varphi(F)}{\|d\varphi\|^2} \circ \gamma - R \circ \dot{\gamma} ,$$

where the only unknown is $R \circ \dot{\gamma}$.

Systems with several constraints

Consider now $S = \{q \in Q ; \varphi_1(q) = 0, \dots, \varphi_h(q) = 0\}$, with $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_h \in C^\infty(Q)$, such that $d\varphi_1(q), \dots, d\varphi_h(q)$ are linearly independent at every point $q \in S$ (we assume that S is not empty). Let $Z_1, \dots, Z_{n-h} \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ such that:

1. $i(Z_i)d\varphi_j = 0$.
2. $g(Z_i, Z_j) = 0; i \neq j$.

To obtain these vector fields Z_i , it is enough to take vector fields $X_1, \dots, X_{n-h} \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ satisfying the first condition (a linear equation) and apply the well known *Gram–Schmidt method*. In this situation, we have

$$\pi_S(F) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{g(F, Z_i)}{g(Z_i, Z_i)} Z_i ;$$

hence, as in the previous case, we obtain the dynamical equation and the expression of the constraint force along every trajectory.

5.3.2. Euler–Lagrange equations

In the above paragraph, we have studied the dynamics of a Newtonian mechanical system (Q, g, ω) constrained to move on the submanifold $j_S: S \hookrightarrow Q$. We have proved that its dynamics is given by the Newtonian mechanical system (S, g_S, ω_S) . To write the corresponding Euler–Lagrange equation of this last system, take a local chart (U, q^i) on S and the corresponding natural lift $(\tau_Q^{-1}(U), q^i, v^i)$ to TS . Then we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K_S}{\partial v^k} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K_S}{\partial q^k} \circ \dot{\gamma} = (g_S)_{ik} (F^S)^i , \quad (5.12)$$

where $K_S \in C^\infty(TS)$ is the *kinetic energy* of the system, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} K_S &: TS \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (q, v) &\mapsto \frac{1}{2}g_S(v, v) . \end{aligned}$$

Then we have that:

Proposition 5.43 $K_S = (Tj_S)^*K$.

(Proof) If $q \in S$ and $v \in T_q S$, then

$$K_S(q, v) = \frac{1}{2}(g_S)_{ik}(q)v^i v^k = \frac{1}{2}g_{ik}(q)v^i v^k$$

and the result follows. ■

Thus, equation (5.12) is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial(Tj_S)^*K}{\partial v^k} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial(Tj_S)^*K}{\partial q^k} \circ \dot{\gamma} = (\omega_S)_k \circ \gamma = (j_S^* \omega)_k \circ \gamma .$$

In the case that the dynamical system is conservative, that is $\omega = -dV$, then

$$\omega_S = j_S^* \omega = -j_S^* dV = -dj_S^* V ,$$

and the above equation takes the expression

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial(Tj_S)^*K}{\partial v_S^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial(Tj_S)^*K}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = -\frac{\partial j_S^* V}{\partial q^k} \circ \gamma ,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_S}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_S}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = 0 ,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_S := (Tj_S)^* \mathcal{L}$. Observe that the constraint force is not in these equations. This was one of the innovations developed by Lagrange.

If (W, x^i) is a local chart on Q , and (U, q^i) is another on S , both adapted to the map $j: W \hookrightarrow U$, then we have the local expression $x^i = f^i(q)$, and hence $\dot{x}^i = \frac{\partial f^i}{\partial q^j} \dot{q}^j$. This shows that it is enough to know the Lagrangian function \mathcal{L} of the unconstrained system, to introduce the expression of x^i, \dot{x}^i using the above local expressions and, by direct derivation, to obtain the Euler–Lagrange equations of the constrained system.

5.3.3. Some examples of Newtonian mechanical systems

In the following examples the question is to identify the elements defining the different systems; that is, the *configuration manifold*, the *Riemannian metric* and the *force field* or the *work form*.

Unconstrained particle in \mathbb{R}^3

Consider a particle with mass m moving on an open set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, and subjected to a force defined by a vector field $F \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$.

The *geometric metric* g is the original metric on \mathbb{R}^3 . Consider, instead, the Riemannian metric given by $\tilde{g} := mg$. Observe that the corresponding Levi-Civita connections ∇ and $\tilde{\nabla}$ for both metrics g y \tilde{g} are the same: it is enough to calculate their Christoffel symbols in any local chart, or recall the calculus of $\nabla_X Y$ for the Levi-Civita connection. Let $\tilde{F} := \frac{F}{m} \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$, and consider the Newtonian mechanical system $(Q, \tilde{g}, \tilde{F})$. The Newton equation is

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = \tilde{F} \circ \gamma = \frac{F}{m} \circ \gamma ,$$

which, as it is usual in mechanics, can be written as

$$m \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma .$$

Observe that the work form is given by

$$\omega = i(\tilde{F})\tilde{g} = i(F)g ,$$

and the linear momentum form is

$$\tilde{\theta} \circ \dot{\gamma} = i(\dot{\gamma})\tilde{g} ,$$

whose local expression is

$$\tilde{\theta} \circ \dot{\gamma} = mg_{ij} \dot{\gamma}^i dq^j \circ \gamma .$$

Particle constrained to a surface of \mathbb{R}^3

Consider now a particle with mass m on an open set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. We have seen above that the Newtonian system describing this situation is given by $(Q, \tilde{g}, \tilde{F})$. If $j_S: S \hookrightarrow Q$ is a regular surface and the particle is constrained to move on it, then the associated Newtonian system is $(S, \tilde{g}_S, \tilde{F}^S)$, where $\tilde{g}_S = j_S^* \tilde{g}$ and $\tilde{F}^S = \pi_S \circ \tilde{F}$. Hence, the dynamical equation is

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}^S \dot{\gamma} = \tilde{F}^S \circ \gamma .$$

If we know one solution γ , then the constraint force along γ is given by the equation

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}\dot{\gamma} - \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}^S\dot{\gamma} = \tilde{F} \circ \gamma - \tilde{F}^S \circ \gamma + \tilde{R} \circ \dot{\gamma} ,$$

from where we can obtain $\tilde{R} \circ \dot{\gamma}$. Recall that $R = m\tilde{R}$.

We can write the dual formulation using the work form

$$\tilde{\omega} = i(F)g = i(\tilde{F})\tilde{g} .$$

with $\tilde{\omega}_S = j_S^*\tilde{\omega}$. Hence, we have that the dynamical equation is

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}}^S(\tilde{\theta}_S \circ \dot{\gamma}) = \tilde{\omega}_S \circ \gamma ,$$

with $\tilde{\theta}_S \circ \dot{\gamma} = i(\dot{\gamma})\tilde{g}_S$, and $\tilde{\theta}_S = (Tj_S)^*\tilde{\theta}$.

Systems of particles in \mathbb{R}^3

Consider now a system made of N particles, denoted P_1, \dots, P_N , with masses m_1, \dots, m_N . We suppose that the particle P_μ moves in Q_μ , open set of \mathbb{R}^3 , equipped with the usual metric g_μ and the associated dynamical metric $\tilde{g}_\mu := m_\mu g_\mu$.

If the force field acting on every particle is $F_\mu \in \mathfrak{X}(Q_\mu)$, that is F_μ depends only on the position of the corresponding particle; then we have N uncoupled mechanical systems, and their dynamical equation can be solved separately.

But, if $\pi_\mu: \prod_{v=1}^N Q_v \longrightarrow Q_\mu$, and the forces on the system are a family of vector fields $F_\mu \in \mathfrak{X}(Q_\mu, \pi_\mu)$; that is, the force F_μ on the particle P_μ depends on the position of the other particles, then the N particles are in interaction and, as we have shown in Section 5.2.4, the N systems $(Q_\mu, \tilde{g}_\mu, \tilde{F}_\mu)$ are equivalent to a unique Newtonian mechanical system $(Q, \tilde{g}, \tilde{F})$ with

1. $Q = \prod_{\mu=1}^N Q_\mu$,
2. $\tilde{g} = \oplus_{\mu=1}^N \tilde{g}_\mu$,
3. $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N)$ and $\tilde{F} = (\tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_N)$,

and the dynamical equation is the corresponding to this last system.

Systems of particles on a submanifold

In this case, we have a system of N particles P_1, \dots, P_N , with masses m_1, \dots, m_N , moving respectively on open sets Q_1, \dots, Q_N in \mathbb{R}^3 . We suppose that every one of

these sets is equipped with the corresponding metric g_μ . If F is the force field acting on the system, then the system is given by $(Q, \tilde{g}, \tilde{F})$, as we have seen in the above paragraph. Observe that it is the same situation if the particles are in interaction or not.

If the dynamics is constrained to a submanifold $j_S: S \hookrightarrow Q$, then there exists a constraint force R , and the dynamical equation is

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = \tilde{F} \circ \gamma + \tilde{R} \circ \dot{\gamma};$$

for curves $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S$, where $\tilde{R} = (\tilde{R}_1, \dots, \tilde{R}_N)$, $R_\mu = m_\mu \tilde{R}_\mu$, $\mu = 1, \dots, N$.

To solve this equation assuming the *d'Alembert Principle*; that is, that \tilde{R} is *orthogonal* to S , we need to decompose the equation projecting onto S and on its orthogonal complement at every point, as we did in the general study, (see Section 5.3). Then we solve the S component and use the orthogonal one to compute the constraint force along every solution.

5.3.4. Nonholonomic constraints. Nonholonomic d'Alembert Principle

Let (Q, g, ω) be a Newtonian mechanical system and $F \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ be the force field. Let C be a submanifold of TQ , such that $\tau_Q(C) = Q$. In this situation C is called the *submanifold of nonholonomic constraints*, and $j_C: C \hookrightarrow TQ$ is the natural embedding. We want to describe the dynamics of the system when it is constrained to evolve on the submanifold C . The system is given by (Q, g, F, C) .

To solve this problem we suppose that there exists a *constraint force* R usually depending on the velocities, that is $R \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q)$, which forces the system to move on C and it is unknown. Then the Newton dynamical equation is given, in this case, for curves $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ such that satisfy:

1. $\dot{\gamma}(t) \in C, t \in I$.
2. $\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma + R \circ \dot{\gamma}$.

Thus, we need to state conditions allowing us to find the trajectories of the system and calculate R ⁵.

Let $(q, v) \in C$. The condition assumed on C , $\tau_Q(C) = Q$, tells us that the dimension of the subspace of $V_{(q,v)}(TQ)$ which is tangent to C , does not depend on the point (q, v) . Let

$$T_{(q,v)}^V C = V_{(q,v)}(TQ) \cap T_{(q,v)} C = \{w \in V_{(q,v)}(TQ) ; w \in T_{(q,v)} C\}$$

⁵Arnold Sommerfeld, in [311], says that this force R is a “geometric force”, versus F which is an “applied force”.

be the vertical subspace tangent to C . This is a vector subbundle of TQ and we can write $T^V C = V(TQ)|_C \cap TC$ as vector bundles on the manifold C . Consider the vertical lift from the point $q \in Q$ to (q, v) given by

$$\lambda_q^{(q,v)} : T_q Q \longrightarrow V_{(q,v)}(TQ),$$

defined as:

$$\lambda_q^{(q,v)}(u_q) : \phi \mapsto \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\phi(q, v + tu) - \phi(q, v)}{t},$$

that is, the directional derivative of ϕ along u_q at the point $(q, v) \in TQ$.

As $\lambda_q^{(q,v)}$ is an isomorphism from $T_q Q$ to $T_{(q,v)}(TQ)$, let $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q$ the inverse image of $T_{(q,v)}^V C \subset T_{(q,v)}(TQ)$ by $\lambda_q^{(q,v)}$. Then $T_q Q = (T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q \oplus (T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q^\perp$, being this an orthogonal decomposition with respect to g .

Then we state:

Assumption 5.44 (Nonholonomic d'Alembert Principle): The constraint force $R \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q)$ satisfies that

$$R(q, v) \in (T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q^\perp,$$

that is, $g(R(q, v), w) = 0$, for every $w \in (T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q$.

In the classical physics literature, the elements in $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q$ are called *virtual velocities*.

Remark 5.45 If there are no constraints, that is $C = TQ$, then for every $(q, v) \in C$ we have that $T_{(q,v)}^V C = V_{(q,v)}(TQ)$, hence $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q = T_q Q$ and $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q^\perp = \{0\}$, that is $R(q, v) = 0$ and there is no constraint force.

This principle allows us to obtain the dynamical equations of the trajectories of the system and the constraint force along every trajectory, as we will see in the sequel.

In order to obtain this, we need to characterize the subspace $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q$ in relation with the constraints, that is the functions vanishing on the submanifold C . First, let $\phi \in C^\infty(TQ)$, and consider the 1-form $d^V \phi \in \Omega^1(Q, \tau_Q)$ defined by

$$(d^V \phi(q, v))(u) = d\phi(\lambda_q^{(q,v)}(u)), \quad (q, v) \in TQ, \quad u \in T_q Q;$$

whose expression in a local natural chart (q^i, v^i) of TQ can be calculated directly applying it to $\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}$ and we obtain $d^V \phi = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial v^i} dq^i$. We have the following result:

Proposition 5.46 *Let $(q, v) \in C$.*

1. *If $w \in T_q Q$, then $w \in (T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q$ if, and only if, $(d^V \phi(q, v))(w) = 0$, for every $\phi \in C^\infty(TQ)$ such that $j_C^* \phi = 0$.*
2. *Let $((T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q)^o = \{\alpha \in T_q^* Q; \alpha(w) = 0, \forall w \in (T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q\} \subset T_q^* Q$ be the annihilator of $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q$, then $((T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q)^o = \{d^V \phi(q, v); \forall \phi \in C^\infty(TQ), j_C^* \phi = 0\}$.*
3. *If $w \in T_q Q$, then $w \in (T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q$ if, and only if, $i(w)g \in ((T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q)^o$.*

(Proof)

1. Let $w \in T_q Q$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} w \in (T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q &\iff \lambda_q^{(q,v)}(w) \in T_{(q,v)}^V C \iff \\ \lambda_q^{(q,v)}(w)(\phi) &= 0, \forall \phi \in C^\infty(TQ), \text{ with } j_C^* \phi = 0 \iff \\ d\phi(\lambda_q^{(q,v)}(w)) &= 0, \forall \phi \in C^\infty(TQ), \text{ with } j_C^* \phi = 0 \iff \\ (d^V \phi(q, v))(w) &= 0, \forall \phi \in C^\infty(TQ), \text{ with } j_C^* \phi = 0. \end{aligned}$$

2. It is a consequence of the previous item.
3. It is a direct consequence of the definitions.

■

Corollary 5.47 *Let $R \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q)$ and $(q, v) \in C$; then $R(q, v) \in (T_{(q,v)}^V C)_p^\perp$ if, and only if, $i(R(q, v))g \in ((T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q)^o$.*

Usually the submanifold C is given by the vanishing of a finite family of constraints, functions defined on TQ . We want to characterize $((T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q)^o$ using these constraints. Then suppose that the submanifold C is defined by the vanishing of r functions $\{\phi^i\}$, with $r < n = \dim Q$, satisfying the condition $\text{rank} \left(\frac{\partial \phi^1, \dots, \phi^r}{\partial v^1, \dots, v^n} \right) = r$. Then $\dim C = 2n - r$. We have:

Proposition 5.48 *Let $(q, v) \in C$, then*

1. $\dim T_{(q,v)}^V C = r$.
2. $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q = \{w \in T_q Q; (d^V \phi^i(q, v))(w) = 0, i = 1, \dots, r\}$.

3. If $\alpha \in T_q^*Q$ satisfies $\alpha|_{(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q} = 0$, then α is a linear combination of the elements $d^V\phi^1(q,v), \dots, d^V\phi^r(q,v)$; that is, the vector space $((T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q)^o$ is generated by $\{d^V\phi^1(q,v), \dots, d^V\phi^r(q,v)\}$.

(Proof) Let (q^i, v^i) a natural coordinate system on TQ .

1. The assumed condition $\text{rank} \left(\frac{\partial \phi^1, \dots, \phi^r}{\partial v^1, \dots, v^n} \right) = r$ implies that, up to a change of order in the coordinates q^1, \dots, q^n , we can suppose that

$$\det \left(\frac{\partial \phi^1, \dots, \phi^r}{\partial v^1, \dots, v^r} \right) \neq 0.$$

Then $(q^1, \dots, q^n, \phi^1, \dots, \phi^r, v^{r+1}, \dots, v^n)$ is a local coordinate system of TQ by the Inverse Function Theorem. The vector space $V_{q,v}(TQ)$ is generated by

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial v^{r+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial v^n} \right\}_{(q,v)},$$

and the subspace $T_{(q,v)}^V C \subset V_{q,v}(TQ)$ is generated by

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^r} \right\}_{(q,v)}.$$

2. The inclusion part is proved in the first item of Proposition 5.46 and the equality follows from a dimensional analysis.
3. The previous items imply that $\{d^V\phi^1(q,v), \dots, d^V\phi^r(q,v)\}$ is a basis of $((T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q)^o$.

■

Then, as a corollary, we obtain:

Proposition 5.49 For every $(q,v) \in C$, the form $\eta \in \Omega^1(Q, \tau_Q)$ satisfies the condition $j_C^* \eta|_{(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q} = 0$ if, and only if, there exist $f_1, \dots, f_r \in C^\infty(TQ)$ such that $\eta = f_i d^V\phi^i$

(Proof) It is a consequence that, for every $(q,v) \in C$, we have that $\eta(q,v) \in ((T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q)^o$.

■

In the case that the constraints define only locally the submanifold C , then the above results are valid only in the corresponding open set.

The last proposition allows us to state the so called Dual d'Alembert nonholonomic Principle which states that “the work form $i(R)g$ corresponding to the constraint force R annihilates the virtual velocities of the system”.

And, as an immediate result, we have:

Corollary 5.50 *If R is the nonholonomic constraint force, then there exist $f^1, \dots, f^r \in C^\infty(TQ)$ such that*

$$i(R)g = f_i d^V \phi^i = f_i \frac{\partial \phi^i}{\partial v^j} dq^j,$$

and, as a consequence,

$$R = f_i \frac{\partial \phi^i}{\partial v^j} g^{jk} \frac{\partial}{\partial q^k}.$$

Definition 5.51 *The functions f^1, \dots, f^r are called **Lagrange multipliers** of the nonholonomic system.*

Particular case: The submanifold $C \subset TQ$ is a linear subbundle of TQ .

1. In this case C is defined by the vanishing of a family of differential forms, that is, we have $\omega^i \in \Omega^1(Q)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, linearly independent at every point of Q , and

$$C = \{(q, v) \in TQ; \omega_q^i(v) = 0, i = 1, \dots, r\}.$$

In local coordinates, if $\omega^i = a_j^i(q) dq^j$, then $\phi^i = a_j^i(q) v^j$, that is the constraints are linear in the velocities, and the expression of the constraint force is

$$R = f_i a_j^i g^{jk} \frac{\partial}{\partial q^k}.$$

2. Alternatively, we can suppose that the subbundle C is given as a regular distribution \mathcal{D} , the distribution annihilated by $\{\omega^i, i = 1, \dots, r\}$. If $(q, v) \in \mathcal{D}$, by linearity, we have that $T_{(q,v)}^V C = \lambda_q^{(q,v)}(\mathcal{D}_q)$, hence $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q = \mathcal{D}_q$ and $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q^\perp = \mathcal{D}_q^\perp$, then the constraint force R is orthogonal to \mathcal{D} .
3. If the distribution \mathcal{D} is integrable and $(q, v) \in \mathcal{D}$ is the initial condition of the dynamical equation for the solution γ , then the image of γ is contained in the integral submanifold of \mathcal{D} passing through the point $q \in Q$, because $\dot{\gamma}(t) \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma(t)}$ for every t . The constraint force R , orthogonal to \mathcal{D} , forces the system to move on the integral submanifolds of the constraint distribution \mathcal{D} .

Remark 5.52 • We can understand the solution as follows: if we have a constraint $\phi : TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there is an associated 1-form, $d^V \phi$, which gives a “constraint force” R^ϕ defined by $i(R^\phi)g = d^V \phi$. If we have r independent constraints $\{\phi^i\}$, we have the corresponding constraint forces, R^{ϕ^i} , and the subbundle generated by them, $\{R^{\phi^i}\}$, and then the resultant constraint force R is on this subbundle.

- For these systems, d’Alembert’s Principle says that, if the system moves “along the vertical fibers” of C , the work realized by the constraint force along the trajectory is null. As we have said, these vertical velocities are called “virtual” because it is not possible to move the system with these velocities on the constraint manifold C .

5.3.5. Dynamical equations

Following the above results, if C is locally defined by the annihilation of r functions $\{\phi^i\}$, and they are independent constraints, then the dynamical equations are

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \gamma + f_j i(d^V \phi^j) g^{-1} \circ \dot{\gamma},$$

or, in dual form,

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} (\theta \circ \dot{\gamma}) = \omega \circ \gamma + f_j d^V \phi^j \circ \dot{\gamma}.$$

These equations together with the constraints defining C , $\phi^1 = 0, \dots, \phi^r = 0$, are a system of $n + r$ equations with $n + r$ unknowns: the components of the trajectory γ and the multipliers f_i . Observe that some of them are differential equations and the remaining ones are the constraint functions.

The corresponding Euler–Lagrange equations are

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = \omega_j \circ \gamma + f_k \frac{\partial \phi^k}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma}, \quad (j = 1, \dots, n),$$

because $\omega = \omega_k dq^k$, with $\omega_k = g_{kj} F^j$.

If the system is conservative, then $\omega = -dV$, where $V \in C^\infty(Q)$ is the potential function. In this case we can introduce the Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} := K - \tau_Q^* V$ and we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = f_k \frac{\partial \phi^k}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma}.$$

In any case, these equations, together with the constraints, defining C , are also a system of $n + r$ equations with $n + r$ unknowns.

If C is a vector subbundle, then $\phi^i = a_j^i(q) v^j$ and the Euler–Lagrange equations are

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial K}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = \omega_j \circ \gamma + f_k a_j^k \circ \dot{\gamma}, \quad (j = 1, \dots, n).$$

Or in the case of conservative systems

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} \circ \dot{\gamma} = f_k a_j^k \circ \dot{\gamma}.$$

Summarizing, the fundamental data in the Lagrangian formulation of the autonomous dynamical systems are the following:

A Newtonian mechanical system (independent of time) is a triple (Q, g, ω) , where (Q, g) is a Riemannian manifold where the motion happens, which is called the *configuration space* of the system, whose points represent the *positions* of the particles of the system, and the form ω or, equivalently, the vector field F , are geometric elements carrying the dynamical information.

The dynamical trajectories, which are the solutions to Newton equations, are curves on TQ which are canonical lifts of curves on Q . The points of the manifold TQ , which are the possible initial conditions for these equations and, hence, they represent the possible *position* and *velocities* of the system) and are the *physical states* of the system, and then TQ is said to be the *state* or *phase space* (of *velocities*) of the system.

In the particular case of conservative systems, the geometric element representing the dynamics is substituted by the (*mechanical*) *Lagrangian function* $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$, and the dynamical equations are the *Euler–Lagrange equations* (of the first kind).

Finally, if the degrees of freedom of the system have some kind of restriction, we have two different situations:

1. If the dynamics takes place on some submanifold $j_S: S \hookrightarrow Q$, the situation is the same, but considering $(S, j_S^*g, j_S^*\omega)$ as a Newtonian system. Observe that, in this case, the configuration space is S and the corresponding phase space (of velocities) is TS .
2. If the configuration space is not restricted but the velocities are, then we have a nonholonomic system, and we need to introduce new unknowns, the Lagrange multipliers, to obtain the corresponding dynamical equations.

5.4. Nonautonomous Newtonian systems

In some interesting cases, the force field acting on a Newtonian system depends not only on the positions and the velocities, but also on time. In the following paragraphs, we will try to extend our geometric formulation to this situation.

5.4.1. Mechanical systems with time-dependent forces

The geometric model appropriate to this case is the following:

Definition 5.53 A *nonautonomous Newtonian mechanical system* is a triple $(\mathbb{R} \times Q, g, F)$, where (Q, g) is a Riemannian manifold and the force field is of the form $F \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \pi_2)$ (with $\pi_2: \mathbb{R} \times Q \rightarrow Q$); that is,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & TQ \\ & \nearrow F & \downarrow \tau_Q \\ \mathbb{R} \times Q & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & Q \end{array} \quad .$$

Moreover, if the force field depends on the velocities, then $F \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q \circ \rho_2)$, with $\rho_2: \mathbb{R} \times TQ \rightarrow TQ$; that is,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & TQ_\mu \\ & & & \nearrow F & \downarrow \tau_Q \\ \mathbb{R} \times Q & \xrightarrow{\rho_2} & TQ & \xrightarrow{\tau_Q} & Q \end{array} \quad .$$

The Newton equations are written in the usual way:

- In the case that the force does not depend on the velocities,

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \bar{\gamma} ,$$

where $\bar{\gamma} = (t, \gamma): I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow I \times Q$. We can also use the dual form by means of the corresponding work form $\omega \in \Omega^1(Q, \pi_2)$.

- If the force field depends on the velocities, then

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \bar{\gamma} ,$$

where $\bar{\gamma} = (t, \dot{\gamma}): I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow I \times TQ$. As above, we can use the corresponding work form $\omega \in \Omega^1(Q, \tau_Q \circ \rho_2)$ and obtain the equations in the dual form.

The Euler–Lagrange equations are the same as usual, but the second term depends on time $t \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, if the work form depends on time, $\omega \in \Omega^1(Q, \pi_2)$, we say that the system is *conservative* if there exists $V: \mathbb{R} \times Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $\omega = -dV_t$, where $V_t: Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $V_t(p) := V(t, p)$, for every $p \in Q$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. In this

situation we can define the Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} := K - V$, depending on time, and the Euler–Lagrange equation are as usual

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \circ \bar{\gamma} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} \circ \bar{\gamma} = 0 .$$

Time dependent Newtonian systems with holonomic and nonholonomic constraints can be studied in the same way, as we see in the next sections.

5.4.2. Time-dependent holonomic and nonholonomic constraints

Definition 5.54 A *nonautonomous holonomic Newtonian mechanical system* is a triple (Q, g, ω) , where (Q, g) is a Riemannian manifold, $\omega \in \Omega^1(Q)$, and we have an embedding $j_S: S \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Q$, where S is a submanifold of $\mathbb{R} \times Q$.

In this situation, we need to suppose that the constraint force depends not only on positions and velocities but on time also; that is $R \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q \circ \rho_2)$. The Newton equation is

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \bar{\gamma} + R \circ \bar{\gamma} ,$$

and d’Alembert’s Principle can be stated as follows:

Assumption 5.55 (Nonautonomous d’Alembert principle): The constraint force $R \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q \circ \rho_2)$ satisfies that, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in S$ and $u, v \in T_p S$,

$$g(R(t, (T_p j_S)(u)), (T_p j_S)(v)) = 0 .$$

As in the autonomous case, this means that $R(t, (T_p j_S)(u)) \in (T_{j_S(p)} S)^\perp$, and the results we obtain are the same as in Section 5.3.

Definition 5.56 A *nonautonomous nonholonomic Newtonian mechanical system* is a triple (Q, g, ω) , where (Q, g) is a Riemannian manifold, $\omega \in \Omega^1(Q)$, and we have an embedding $j_C: C \hookrightarrow TQ$, such that $(\tau_Q \circ j_C)(C) = Q$, where C is a differentiable manifold.

Once again we need to assume that the constraint force also depends on time, that is $R \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q \circ \rho_2)$, and this makes the dynamical trajectories of the system, $\gamma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$, to satisfy $\dot{\gamma}(t) \in TC$, for every $t \in I$. Hence, the Newton equation is

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \dot{\gamma} = F \circ \bar{\gamma} + R \circ \bar{\gamma} .$$

To state the *nonholonomic d’Alembert Principle*, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in C$, we need to define $(T_{j_C(p)} C)_{\tau_Q(p)}$, as in the time independent case (see Section 5.3.4).

With this aim, let $p \in C$ and $j_C(p) = (q, v) \in j_C(C) \subset TQ$, we take $T_{(q,v)}^V C$ as the vertical subbundle tangent to C and in the same way $(T_{(q,v)}^V C)_q$ using the vertical lift $\lambda_q^{(q,v)}$. Then

Assumption 5.57 (Nonautonomous nonholonomic d'Alembert Principle): The constraint force $R \in \mathfrak{X}(Q, \tau_Q \circ \rho_2)$ satisfies that,

$$g(R(t, (q, v)), u) = 0, \quad u \in (T_{(q, v)}^V C)_q$$

for every $p \in C$, $j_C(p) = (q, v) \in j_C(C)$, and every $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

That is, $R(t, j_C(p)) \in (T_{j_C(p)} C)_{(\tau_Q \circ j_C)(p)}^\perp$, for every $p \in C$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

The consequences of this principle on the dynamical equations and the calculus of the constraint force are similar to the autonomous case (see Section 5.3.4), with the only difference that now the Lagrange multipliers f_i are elements of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times TQ)$.

Remark 5.58 Sometimes it is necessary to work with constraints depending on time, called *rheonomic* constraints instead of *scleronomic* constraints or not depending on time (see [303] for details). In this situation we have a submanifold $B \subset \mathbb{R} \times TQ$ such that corresponding manifolds, B_t for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, are diffeomorphic. Then d'Alembert's Principle is stated at every t for the submanifold B_t .

Chapter 6

An introduction to contact mechanics and dissipative dynamical systems

In Chapter 4 we have studied nonautonomous or time-dependent systems; one of the main characteristics of which is that, as discussed there, they are not conservative or dissipative; that is, unlike the conservatives studied in chapter 3 and also in chapter 5, energy is not a conserved quantity. However, in mechanics, there are many other systems that, being autonomous or not autonomous indistinctly, also manifest this characteristic [155, 289]. They are those in which forces of a nonconservative type appear, such as those described in Section 5.2.2.

In recent years, there has been a great interest in geometrically studying these types of systems, by using techniques from *contact geometry* [2, 16, 39, 165]. In fact, the *contact structure* is quite similar to cosymplectic structure and allows us to give a natural Hamiltonian description of mechanical systems with dissipation [34, 36, 37, 63, 179, 181, 221, 237, 338]. Their Lagrangian formalism [86, 109, 160, 181], and their unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism [106] have also been stated in many different situations and application; such as, damped oscillators, motion on viscous fluids, and motion with friction in general. It should be noted, however, that the first Lagrangian formulation for these kinds of systems was first introduced by *G. Herglotz* [200, 202] (see also [166, 226, 237] and [113] for a modern geometric version of this variational approach), who used a generalization of the Hamilton variational principle to obtain the so-called *Herglotz–Euler–Lagrange equations*, which are the same equations that are obtained using contact geometry. In all these descriptions, the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian functions depend also on an additional variable that, as we will see, can be identified with the “action” of the system; and, for this reason, physicists often refer to them as *action-dependent systems*.

Contact geometry has also been used to describe different types of physical systems in thermodynamics (for instance, in [34, 35, 306, 326]), quantum mechanics

[86, 201, 211], circuit theory [86, 177], astrophysics [167], theoretical physics [211], control theory [113, 285], etc.; and even to describe other mechanical systems than just dissipative ones [137]. Finally, Herglotz's variational methods and the contact structure itself have been generalized in different ways for the treatment of action-dependent field theories [107, 159, 161, 162, 337] (see also [5, 11, 33, 103, 154, 263, 292, 293, 319] for other contributions and less general approaches).

This whole body of doctrine, generically referred to as *contact mechanics*, is currently a topic of active research, both in its foundation, and in its extensions and applications.

In this chapter, we review the main foundations of contact geometry and its application to describe dissipative autonomous dynamical systems. The extension for the treatment of dissipative nonautonomous dynamical systems (*cocontact formalism*) has been done in [104, 133, 294], as well as to other types of systems and problems, such as higher-order dissipative systems [105], nonholonomic systems [108, 114], or reduction theorems [180, 346].

We start giving the basic concepts and properties of *contact manifolds* and the generic definition of *contact Hamiltonian systems*. Next we develop the Lagrangian, Hamiltonian and unified formalisms for these kinds of systems. We also study symmetries and the fundamental concept of *dissipated quantities* geometrically; defining, in particular, the notion of *contact Noether symmetry* for contact Hamiltonian and Lagrangian systems, and establishing the statements of the so-called “dissipation theorems”. These are analogous to the conservation theorems of conservative systems, and show how to associate dissipated and conserved quantities to these symmetries. Finally, the examples of the damped harmonic oscillator and the Kepler problem with dissipation are analyzed in this context.

6.1. A survey on contact geometry

(See, for instance, [2, 16, 35, 52, 86, 160, 211, 235] for more information).

6.1.1. Contact manifolds

Definition 6.1 A *contact manifold* is a pair (M, η) , where M is a $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional manifold and $\eta \in \Omega^1(M)$ is a differential 1-form such that $\eta \wedge (d\eta)^n$ is a volume form in M . Then, the form η is called a *contact form* (or a *contact structure*),

As a straightforward consequence of this definition, we have that,

Theorem 6.2 Given a contact manifold (M, η) , the condition that $\eta \wedge (d\eta)^n$ is a volume form is equivalent to have the splitting

$$TM = \ker d\eta \oplus \ker \eta \equiv \mathcal{D}^R \oplus \mathcal{D}^C . \quad (6.1)$$

Then, there exists a unique vector field $\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that

$$i(\mathcal{R})d\eta = 0, \quad i(\mathcal{R})\eta = 1 , \quad (6.2)$$

and hence it generates the distribution \mathcal{D}^R .

Conversely, if we have two distributions \mathcal{D}^R and \mathcal{D}^C of ranks 1 and $2n$ respectively, such that (6.1) holds, they define a contact structure on M .

Definition 6.3 The above vector field $\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is called the **Reeb vector field**, and \mathcal{D}^R and \mathcal{D}^C are known as the **Reeb (or horizontal distribution)**, and the **contact (or vertical distribution)** of (M, η) .

Remark 6.4 It is relevant to point out that, although Definition 6.1 is the most assumed, there are other different terminologies in relation to the concept of *contact manifold*. For instance, it can be defined by demanding the existence of two distributions \mathcal{D}^R and \mathcal{D}^C , satisfying the properties stated in Theorem 6.2, instead of using differential forms (see, for instance, [7, 165, 179, 211]), and when these distributions are associated to a fixed form, it is called a **strict contact manifold**. Also, in [1], a more generic definition is given, by demanding the existence of a 2-form of maximal rank in an odd-dimensional manifold, and then calling **exact contact** the case in which this form is exact (which is the case of Definition 6.1).

Given a contact manifold (M, η) , as a consequence of the splitting (6.1), there exists a vector bundle isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \flat_\eta: TM &\longrightarrow T^*M \\ (p, X_p) &\mapsto (p, i(X_p)d\eta_p + [i(X_p)\eta_p]\eta_p) . \end{aligned}$$

and its inverse $\sharp_\eta = \flat_\eta^{-1}: T^*M \longrightarrow TM$. Their natural extensions are the $C^\infty(M)$ -module isomorphisms which are denoted with the same notation,

$$\begin{aligned} \flat_\eta: \mathfrak{X}(M) &\longrightarrow \Omega^1(M) \\ X &\longmapsto i(X)d\eta + (i(X)\eta)\eta \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

and its inverse $\sharp_\eta = \flat_\eta^{-1}: \Omega^1(M) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$. In particular, for the Reeb vector field we have that $\flat_\eta(\mathcal{R}) = \eta$.

Remark 6.5 If in Definition 6.1 the form η is such that $\eta \wedge (d\eta)^n$ is not a volume form, but the rank of the distribution $\ker d\eta \cap \ker \eta$ is constant and $\dim M - \text{rank}(\ker d\eta \cap \ker \eta)$ is odd, then we say that η is a **precontact form** on M and that (M, η) is a **precontact manifold** (moreover, $\dim M$ could be arbitrary). Under these hypotheses, there exist Reeb vector fields defined by (6.2), but they are not uniquely defined, and the map \flat_η is not an isomorphism [104]. (See also [180] for a more general definition of precontact structure, using *contact distributions*).

Proposition 6.6 *On a contact manifold (M, η) , there are charts of coordinates $(U; z^I; s)$, $I = 1, \dots, 2n$, such that*

$$\eta|_U = ds - f_I(z^I) dz^I, \quad \mathcal{R}|_U = \frac{\partial}{\partial s},$$

where f_I are functions depending only on the z^I . (They are called *adapted coordinates of the contact structure*.)

(Proof) On M , we can take local charts of coordinates $(U; z^I, s)$, $I = 1, \dots, 2n$, such that they rectify the vector field \mathcal{R} ; that is, $\mathcal{R} = \frac{\partial}{\partial s}$ on U . Then $\eta|_U = a ds - f_I(z^I, s) dz^I$; but the conditions defining \mathcal{R} imply that $\frac{\partial f_I}{\partial s} = 0$ and $a = 1$, hence the result follows. ■

Furthermore, one can prove the existence of Darboux-type coordinates:

Theorem 6.7 (Darboux theorem for contact manifolds) Let (M, η) be a contact manifold. Then, for every point $p \in M$ there exist a chart of coordinates $(U; x^i, y_i, s)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that

$$\eta|_U = ds - y_i dx^i, \quad \mathcal{R}|_U = \frac{\partial}{\partial s}.$$

These are the **Darboux** or **canonical coordinates** of the contact manifold (M, η) .

(Proof) Taking local charts of adapted coordinates, $(U; z^I, s)$, if we do the quotient U/\mathcal{D}^R , the form $d\eta|_U = df_I(z^I) \wedge dz^I$ projects to the quotient and is a symplectic form on it. Then we can take symplectic Darboux coordinates on the quotient and pull them back to U , thus obtaining contact chart Darboux coordinates $(U; x^i, y_i, s)$ on M . ■

Relevant examples of contact manifolds are:

Canonical model: The canonical model for contact manifolds is the manifold $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$. In fact, if $\Theta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$ is the canonical 1-forms in T^*Q , s is the Cartesian coordinate

of \mathbb{R} , and $\pi_1: T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q$ is the canonical projection, then $\eta = ds - \pi_1^*\Theta = ds - p_i dq^i$ is a contact form in $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$, the Reeb vector field is $\mathcal{R} = \frac{\partial}{\partial s}$, and (s, q^i, p_i) are Darboux coordinates on $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$.

Contactification of a symplectic manifold. If (P, ω) is an exact symplectic manifold such that $\omega = -d\theta \in \Omega^2(P)$, consider the manifold $M = P \times \mathbb{R}$. If s is the Cartesian coordinate of \mathbb{R} , then the 1-form $\eta = ds - \theta \in \Omega^1(M)$ (where we have denoted also by θ the pull-back of θ to M) is a contact form, and (M, η) is a contact manifold which is called the *contactified* of P . Observe that the canonical model, $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$, is the contactified of T^*Q endowed with its canonical symplectic structure.

6.1.2. Hamiltonian, gradient, and evolution vector fields on a contact manifold

As in the case of cosymplectic manifolds, for a contact manifold (M, η) , the existence of the natural $C^\infty(M)$ -modules isomorphism \flat_η , introduced in the above section, allows us to associate some characteristic vector fields to a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$:

Definition 6.8 Let (M, η) be a contact manifold and $f \in C^\infty(M)$.

The **Hamiltonian vector field** associated with f is the vector field $X_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ defined by $\flat_\eta(X_f) := df - (\mathcal{R}(f) + f)\eta$.

The **gradient vector field** associated with f is the vector field $\mathbf{grad} f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ defined by $\flat_\eta(\mathbf{grad} f) := df$.

The **evolution vector field** associated with f is the vector field $\varepsilon_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ defined as $\varepsilon_f := f\mathcal{R} + X_f$ or, equivalently, $\flat_\eta(\varepsilon_f) := df - \mathcal{R}(f)\eta$.

Lemma 6.9 $\mathbf{grad} f = X_f + (\mathcal{R}(f) + f)\mathcal{R}$.

(Proof) Observe that,

$$\flat_\eta(X_f) = df - (\mathcal{R}(f) + f)\eta = \flat_\eta(\mathbf{grad} f) - (\mathcal{R}(f) + f)\eta,$$

then, being \flat_η a diffeomorphism and bearing in mind that $\flat_\eta(\mathcal{R}) = \eta$, the result follows. ■

Taking this into account, these vector fields can be equivalently characterized as follows:

Proposition 6.10 The Hamiltonian vector field associated with f is determined equivalently by the equations:

$$i(X_f)\eta = -f, \quad i(X_f)d\eta = df - \mathcal{R}(f)\eta. \quad (6.4)$$

The gradient vector field associated with f is determined equivalently by the equations:

$$i(\mathbf{grad} f)\eta = \mathcal{R}(f), \quad i(\mathbf{grad} f)d\eta = df - \mathcal{R}(f)\eta. \quad (6.5)$$

The evolution vector field associated with f is determined equivalently by the equations:

$$i(\varepsilon_f)\eta = 0, \quad i(\varepsilon_f)d\eta = df - \mathcal{R}(f)\eta. \quad (6.6)$$

(Proof) For every $f \in C^\infty(M)$, for the Hamiltonian vector field X_f , using the definitions of the isomorphism \flat_η and of X_f , first we have that,

$$i(X_f)d\eta + (i(X_f)\eta)\eta = \flat_\eta(X_f) = df - (\mathcal{R}(f) + f)\eta, \quad (6.7)$$

therefore, contracting both members with the Reeb vector field and using (6.2), we get

$$(i(X_f)\eta) i(\mathcal{R})\eta = i(\mathcal{R})df - (\mathcal{R}(f) + f) i(\mathcal{R})\eta = -f i(\mathcal{R})\eta \iff i(X_f)\eta = -f.$$

Now, going to (6.7), we obtain that

$$i(X_f)d\eta = df - \mathcal{R}(f)\eta.$$

Conversely, using (6.4) in the Definition (6.3) of \flat_η , we get $\flat_\eta(X_f) := df - (\mathcal{R}(f) + f)\eta$.

For the gradient vector field $\mathbf{grad} f$, from the definition of $\mathbf{grad} f$ and the above Lemma 6.9, and using the above results and (6.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} i(\mathbf{grad} f)d\eta &= i(X_f)d\eta + (\mathcal{R}(f) + f) i(\mathcal{R})d\eta = i(X_f)d\eta = df - \mathcal{R}(f)\eta, \\ i(\mathbf{grad} f)\eta &= i(X_f)\eta + (\mathcal{R}(f) + f) i(\mathcal{R})\eta = -f + (\mathcal{R}(f) + f) = \mathcal{R}(f). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, using (6.5) in the Definition (6.3) of \flat_η , we obtain that $\flat_\eta(\mathbf{grad} f) := df$.

Finally, for the evolution vector field ε_f , from the definition of ε_f and using the above results,

$$\begin{aligned} i(\varepsilon_f)d\eta &= i(X_f)d\eta + f i(\mathcal{R})d\eta = i(X_f)d\eta = df - (\mathcal{R}(f))\eta, \\ i(\varepsilon_f)\eta &= i(X_f)\eta + f i(\mathcal{R})\eta = -f + f = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Once again, using (6.6) in the Definition (6.3) of \flat_η , we obtain that $\flat_\eta(\varepsilon_f) := df - \mathcal{R}(f)\eta$. ■

As an immediate consequence of Proposition 6.10 we obtain that:

Proposition 6.11 *The equations for the integral curves $c: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ of the Hamiltonian, the gradient, and the evolution vector fields associated with $f \in C^\infty(M)$ are, respectively,*

$$\begin{aligned} i(\tilde{c})(\eta \circ c) &= -f \circ c \quad , \quad i(\tilde{c})(\omega \circ c) = (df - R(f)\eta) \circ c \quad , \\ i(\tilde{c})(\eta \circ c) &= R(f) \circ c \quad , \quad i(\tilde{c})(\omega \circ c) = (df - R(f)\eta) \circ c \quad , \\ i(\tilde{c})(\eta \circ c) &= 0 \quad , \quad i(\tilde{c})(\omega \circ c) = (df - R(f)\eta) \circ c \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Local expressions: In Darboux coordinates (x^i, y_i, s) on M , we have that $\mathcal{R}(f) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial s}$, then

$$df - \mathcal{R}(f)\eta = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} + y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} \right) dx^i + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} dy_i \quad ,$$

and, from (6.4), (6.5), and (6.6) (or also using (6.4), Lemma 6.9 and the definition of ε_f), we obtain,

$$X_f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} + y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} + \left(y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} - f \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \quad , \quad (6.9)$$

$$\mathbf{grad} f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} + y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} + \left(y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \quad , \quad (6.10)$$

$$\varepsilon_f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} + y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} + y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \quad . \quad (6.11)$$

Therefore, if $c(t) = (x^i(t), y_i(t), s(t))$ is an integral curve of any of these vector fields, this implies that $c(t)$ should satisfy, respectively, the following systems of differential equations:

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \quad , \quad \frac{dy_i}{dt} = - \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} + y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} \right) \quad , \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} - f \quad , \quad (6.12)$$

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \quad , \quad \frac{dy_i}{dt} = - \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} + y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} \right) \quad , \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} \quad ,$$

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \quad , \quad \frac{dy_i}{dt} = - \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} + y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} \right) \quad , \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = y_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i} \quad .$$

6.2. Contact Hamiltonian dynamical systems

(See, for instance, [36, 86, 109, 160, 169, 221] for more details).

6.2.1. Contact Hamiltonian systems

Following the same guidelines as in all previous chapters, the geometric study of dissipative (nonconservative or action-dependent) Hamiltonian dynamical systems in general, is based on the following set of postulates:

Postulate 6.12 (First Postulate of contact Hamiltonian mechanics): The phase space of a regular (resp. singular) dissipative dynamical system is a differentiable manifold M endowed with a contact (resp. precontact) structure $\eta \in \Omega^1(M)$:

Postulate 6.13 (Second Postulate of contact Hamiltonian mechanics): The observables or physical magnitudes of a dissipative dynamical system are functions of $C^\infty(M)$.

Postulate 6.14 (Third Postulate of contact Hamiltonian mechanics): The dynamics of a dissipative dynamical system is given by a function $h \in C^\infty(M)$ (or, in general, a closed 1-form $\alpha \in Z^1(M)$, such that $\alpha = dh$, locally) which is called the **Hamiltonian function** (or the **Hamiltonian 1-form**) of the system. This function represents the energy of the system.

Postulate 6.15 (Fourth Postulate of contact Hamiltonian mechanics): The dynamical trajectories of the dissipative system are the integral curves of the Hamiltonian vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ associated with h ; that is, of the vector field solution to equations (6.4), that are now written as,

$$i(X_h)\eta = -h, \quad i(X_h)d\eta = dh - \mathcal{R}(h)\eta. \quad (6.13)$$

Thus, these trajectories are the solutions to equations (6.12), which read as,

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial y_i}, \quad \frac{dy_i}{dt} = -\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial x^i} + y_i \frac{\partial h}{\partial s}\right), \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = y_i \frac{\partial h}{\partial y_i} - h, \quad (6.14)$$

It is interesting to point out the different roles of the Hamiltonian and the evolution vector fields in cosymplectic and in contact mechanics: in cosymplectic mechanics the dynamic is given by the evolution vector field, but in contact mechanics is given by the Hamiltonian vector field ¹.

¹Although the terminology could be changed to make these aspects coherent, it has not been done because this is the usual nomenclature in the bibliography.

Definition 6.16 A *regular dissipative or contact Hamiltonian dynamical system* is a set (M, η, h) , where (M, η) is a contact manifold and $h \in C^\infty(M)$ is the Hamiltonian function of the system. If (M, η) is a precontact manifold, then (M, η, h) is said to be a *singular dissipative or precontact Hamiltonian dynamical system*².

The equations (6.13) and (6.14) are the (pre)contact Hamiltonian equations for X_h and its integral curves, respectively.

Definition 6.17 Given a dissipative Hamiltonian dynamical system (M, η, h) , the **Hamiltonian problem** posed by the system consists in finding the Hamiltonian vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ associated with h (if it exists).

6.2.2. Properties of contact Hamiltonian systems

Proposition 6.18 If (M, η, h) is a regular dissipative Hamiltonian system, then there exists a unique Hamiltonian vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$; that is, a unique vector field which is the solution to equations (6.13).

(Proof) It is a straightforward consequence of the existence of the isomorphism \sharp_η in the regular case. ■

Remark 6.19 As it happens with singular dynamical systems, if $(M, \eta; h)$ is a precontact Hamiltonian system, equations (6.13) are not necessarily compatible everywhere on M and the corresponding constraint algorithm must be implemented in order to find a *final constraint submanifold* $P_f \hookrightarrow M$ (if it exists) where there are contact Hamiltonian vector fields $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, tangent to P_f , which are solutions (not necessarily unique) to equations (6.13) on P_f .

Proposition 6.20 Let (M, η, h) be a contact Hamiltonian system. Then, the contact Hamiltonian equations (6.13) can be equivalently written as

$$L(X_h)\eta = -\mathcal{R}(h)\eta, \quad i(X_h)\eta = -h. \quad (6.15)$$

and its integral curves $c: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ are solutions to the equations

$$L(\tilde{c})(\eta \circ c) = -((\mathcal{R}(h))\eta) \circ c, \quad i(\tilde{c})(\eta \circ c) = -h \circ c.$$

²We write ‘(pre)contact’ to refer interchangeably to both situations (contact and precontact), and write ‘contact’ or ‘precontact’ to distinguish each of them in particular. In any case, we will refer to this formalism as *contact mechanics*, and we will talk about *contact dynamical systems*, in general.

(Proof) As $i(X_h)\eta = -h$, from equations (6.13) we obtain,

$$L(X_h)\eta = i(X_h)d\eta + d i(X_h)\eta = dh - \mathcal{R}(h)\eta - dh = -\mathcal{R}(h)\eta .$$

Conversely, from (6.15),

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{R}(h)\eta = L(X_h)\eta = i(X_h)d\eta + d i(X_h)\eta = i(X_h)d\eta - dh &\iff \\ i(X_h)d\eta = dh - \mathcal{R}(h)\eta . \end{aligned}$$

From here, the equation for the integral curves is immediate. ■

The first result shows that, unlike in symplectic Hamiltonian systems, the geometric structure of contact Hamiltonian systems is not conserved by the dynamics, and the same happens with the Hamiltonian function. Indeed,

Proposition 6.21 (Dissipation of energy): Let (M, η, h) be a contact Hamiltonian system. If $X_h \in C^\infty(M)$ is solution to the equations (6.13) then,

$$L(X_h)h = -(\mathcal{R}(h))h . \quad (6.16)$$

(Proof) As a consequence of the above proposition, we have,

$$L(X_h)h = -L(X_h)(i(X_h)\eta) = -i(X_h)L(X_h)\eta = i(X_h)((L(\mathcal{R})h)\eta) = -(L(\mathcal{R})h)h .$$
■

As a final result, there is a new way of writing equations (6.13) without using of the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} .

Proposition 6.22 Let (M, η, h) be a contact Hamiltonian system. If $U = \{p \in M; h(p) \neq 0\}$ and $\Omega = -h d\eta + dh \wedge \eta$ on U , equations (6.13) can also be written as

$$i(X_h)\Omega = 0, \quad i(X_h)\eta = -h \quad ; \quad (\text{on } M) , \quad (6.17)$$

and its integral curves $\mathbf{c}: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow M$ are solutions to

$$i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\Omega \circ \mathbf{c}) = 0, \quad i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\eta \circ \mathbf{c}) = -h \circ \mathbf{c} .$$

(Proof) If X_h satisfies equations (6.17), then,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = i(X_h)\Omega &= -h i(X_h)d\eta + (i(X_h)dh)\eta - dh i(X_h)\eta \\ &= -h i(X_h)d\eta + (i(X_h)dh)\eta + h dh \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$h \, i(X_h) d\eta = (i(X_h) dh) \eta + h \, dh . \quad (6.18)$$

Contracting with the Reeb vector field,

$$0 = h \, i(\mathcal{R}) i(X_h) d\eta = (i(X_h) dh) i(\mathcal{R}) \eta + h \, i(\mathcal{R}) dh ,$$

from which $i(X_h) dh = -h \, i(\mathcal{R}) dh$, and using this in (6.18), we get

$$h \, i(X_h) d\eta = h(dh - (i(\mathcal{R}) dh) \eta) = h(dh - (L(\mathcal{R})h) \eta) .$$

and hence $i(X_h) d\eta = dh - (L(\mathcal{R})h) \eta$.

Conversely, if X_h satisfies equations (6.13); then, taking into account (6.16),

$$\begin{aligned} i(X_h) \Omega &= i(X_h) (-h d\eta + dh \wedge \eta) = -h i(X_h) d\eta + (i(X_h) dh) \eta + h dh \\ &= h(L(\mathcal{R})h) \eta + (L(X_h)h) \eta = (h(L(\mathcal{R})h) + (L(X_h)h)) \eta = 0 , \end{aligned}$$

From here, the equation for the integral curves is immediate. ■

This form of the dynamical equations is especially interesting in the case of singular systems because they do not depend on the Reeb vector field and, as we pointed out, in a precontact manifold Reeb vector fields are not uniquely determined.

6.3. Contact Lagrangian dynamical systems

In this section, we review the Lagrangian formulation for contact systems [86, 109, 160].

6.3.1. Contact Lagrangian systems

If Q is a n -dimensional manifold, consider the product manifold $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ equipped with adapted coordinates (q^i, v^i, s) . Now, the canonical projections are denoted

$$s: TQ \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \tau_1: TQ \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ, \quad \tau_0: TQ \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow Q \times \mathbb{R} .$$

As it was discussed in Section 4.3.1, the canonical geometric structures of the tangent bundle TQ , namely the canonical endomorphism and the Liouville vector field, are extended naturally to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$. We use the same notation as in that section to denote them: $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{T}_1^1(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ and $\Delta \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$, respectively; and they have the same coordinate expressions as usual, $\mathcal{J} = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \otimes dq^i$ and $\Delta = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$.

Similarly, the canonical lift of a curve $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q \times \mathbb{R}$ to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$, with $\mathbf{c} = (c^i(t), s(t))$, is defined as in Section 4.3.1, and it is $\widehat{\mathbf{c}}(t) = \left(c^i(t), \frac{dc^i}{dt}(t), s(t) \right)$. Finally,

the definitions of *holonomic curves* and SODE vector fields in $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ are also as in Section 4.3.1.

Then, the foundations of the Lagrangian formalism of the contact formulation for autonomous dissipative systems are established through the reformulation of the generic postulates stated in Section 6.2.1 for contact Hamiltonian systems:

Postulate 6.23 (First Postulate of contact Lagrangian mechanics): The configuration space of a dissipative dynamical system with n degrees of freedom is $Q \times \mathbb{R}$, where Q is a n -dimensional differentiable manifold, and n are the degrees of freedom of the system. The phase space is the bundle $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$.

Postulate 6.24 (Second Postulate of contact Lagrangian mechanics): The observables or physical magnitudes of a dissipative dynamical system are functions of $C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$.

Postulate 6.25 (Third Postulate of contact Lagrangian mechanics): There is a function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$, called the *contact Lagrangian function*, which contains the dynamical information of the system.

Remark 6.26 In many cases, the contact Lagrangian function is of the following type: $\mathcal{L} = L + \phi$, where $L = \tau_1^* L_o$ for a function $L_o \in C^\infty(TQ)$, and $\phi = \tau_0^* \phi_o$, for $\phi_o \in C^\infty(Q \times \mathbb{R})$; that is, in coordinates, $\mathcal{L}(q^i, v^i, s) = L(q^i, v^i) + \phi(q^i, s)$. In particular, the case where $\phi(q^i, s) = \gamma s$, with $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, appears very frequently in physical applications.

Starting from a Lagrangian function the following magnitudes and structures are defined:

Definition 6.27 Let $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ be a Lagrangian function.

The *Lagrangian energy* associated with \mathcal{L} is the function $E_{\mathcal{L}} := \Delta(\mathcal{L}) - \mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$.

The *Cartan Lagrangian forms* associated with \mathcal{L} are defined as

$$\theta_{\mathcal{L}} := \mathcal{J}(\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}) \in \Omega^1(TQ \times \mathbb{R}), \quad \omega_{\mathcal{L}} := -\mathrm{d}\theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^2(TQ \times \mathbb{R}). \quad (6.19)$$

The *(pre)contact Lagrangian form* is

$$\eta_L = \mathrm{d}s - \theta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(TQ \times \mathbb{R}),$$

and it satisfies that $\mathrm{d}\eta_L = \omega_L$.

The pair $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L})$ is a *contact Lagrangian system*.

In natural coordinates (q^i, v^i, s) on $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_L &= ds - \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i} dq^i, \\ d\eta_L &= -\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial s \partial v^i} ds \wedge dq^i - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} dq^j \wedge dq^i - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} dv^j \wedge dq^i.\end{aligned}$$

Definition 6.28 Given a Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$, the **Legendre map** associated with \mathcal{L} is the fiber derivative of \mathcal{L} , considered as a function on the vector bundle $\pi_0: TQ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q \times \mathbb{R}$ that is, the map $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}: TQ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}(q, v_q, s) = (\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}_s(q, v_q), s),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_s: TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the restriction of \mathcal{L} to each fiber of the bundle $TQ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (that is, the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} with s “frozen”).

In natural coordinates, we have:

$$q^i \circ \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L} = q^i, \quad p_i \circ \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i}, \quad s \circ \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L} = s.$$

Observe that, if $\theta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$ is the canonical form and $\omega = -d\theta$,

$$\theta_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^* \theta, \quad \omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^* \omega.$$

Proposition 6.29 For a Lagrangian function, \mathcal{L} the following conditions are equivalent:

1. The Legendre map $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}$ is a local diffeomorphism.
2. The pair $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a contact manifold.
3. The Hessian matrix $W_{ij} \equiv \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j} \right)$ is nondegenerate everywhere.

(Proof) The proof can be done using natural coordinates. ■

Definition 6.30 A Lagrangian function \mathcal{L} is said to be **regular** if the equivalent conditions in the above Proposition 6.29 hold. Otherwise, \mathcal{L} is called a **singular** Lagrangian. In particular, \mathcal{L} is said to be **hyperregular** if $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}$ is a global diffeomorphism.

Remark 6.31 If \mathcal{L} is a regular Lagrangian, then $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a contact Hamiltonian system. When \mathcal{L} is not regular, it can induce a precontact structure, but also a structure which is neither contact nor precontact. For example, the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^n v^i s \text{ in } TQ \times \mathbb{R} \text{ gives a form } \eta_{\mathcal{L}} \in \Omega^1(TQ \times \mathbb{R}) \text{ for which the condition (6.1)}$$

does not hold and that has no Reeb vector fields associated to it (see Remark 6.5).

Definition 6.32 If $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ is a Lagrangian function and $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a contact or a precontact manifold, then the pair $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L})$ is said to be a **(pre)contact Lagrangian dynamical system**.

Given a contact Lagrangian system $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L})$, the Reeb vector field $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ is uniquely determined by the conditions

$$i(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}})d\eta_{\mathcal{L}} = 0, \quad i(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}})\eta_{\mathcal{L}} = 1, \quad (6.20)$$

and its local expression is

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} - W^{ji} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial s \partial v^j} \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}, \quad (6.21)$$

where (W^{ij}) is the inverse of the partial Hessian matrix, namely $W^{ij}W_{jk} = \delta_k^i$. Observe that the Reeb vector field does not appear in the simplest form $\frac{\partial}{\partial s}$, since the natural coordinates in $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ are neither adapted nor Darboux coordinates for $\eta_{\mathcal{L}}$. If $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L})$ is a precontact Lagrangian system then Reeb vector fields are not uniquely defined.

Finally, we state:

Postulate 6.33 (Fourth Postulate of contact Lagrangian mechanics): The dynamical trajectories of the system are the integral curves of a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ satisfying the conditions:

1. $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the Hamiltonian vector field associated with $E_{\mathcal{L}}$; that is, it is a solution to the equations

$$i(X_{\mathcal{L}})\eta_{\mathcal{L}} = -E_{\mathcal{L}} \quad , \quad i(X_{\mathcal{L}})d\eta_{\mathcal{L}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}} - (\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}}(E_{\mathcal{L}}))\eta_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad (6.22)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a Reeb vector field, which is determined by the equations (6.20).

2. $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE: $\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}) = \Delta$.

Therefore, these trajectories are the holonomic curves $\mathbf{c}: I \subset \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ which are the solutions to the equations

$$i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(\eta_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \mathbf{c}) = -E_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \mathbf{c} \quad , \quad i(\tilde{\mathbf{c}})(d\eta_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \mathbf{c}) = (dE_{\mathcal{L}} - (\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}}(E_{\mathcal{L}}))\eta_{\mathcal{L}}) \circ \mathbf{c}. \quad (6.23)$$

Equations (6.23) are called the **(pre)contact Euler–Lagrange equations for curves**. Equations (6.22) are called the **(pre)contact Lagrangian equations for vector fields** and a vector field solution to them (if it exists) is a **(pre)contact Lagrangian dynamical vector field**. If, in addition, $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE, then it is called a **(pre)contact Euler–Lagrange vector field** of the system,

Definition 6.34 Given a (pre)contact Lagrangian dynamical system $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L})$, the **Lagrangian problem** posed by this system consists in finding a SODE vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ solutions to (6.22).

6.3.2. The contact Euler–Lagrange equations

First, using (6.21), a simple computation in coordinates shows that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}}(E_{\mathcal{L}}) = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} . \quad (6.24)$$

Taking this into account, in natural coordinates, for a holonomic curve $\mathbf{c}(t) = (q^i(t), \dot{q}^i(t), s(t))$ on $\mathrm{TQ} \times \mathbb{R}$, equations (6.23) are the *Herglotz–Euler–Lagrange equations*,

$$\frac{ds}{dt} = \mathcal{L} , \quad (6.25)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} = \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} \frac{d^2 q^j}{dt^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} \frac{dq^j}{dt} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial s \partial v^i} \frac{ds}{dt} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} . \quad (6.26)$$

Furthermore, for a vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + g \frac{\partial}{\partial s}$, equations (6.22) lead to

$$\mathcal{L} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} (f^i - v^i) - g = 0 , \quad (6.27)$$

$$(f^j - v^j) \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i \partial v^j} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial s \partial v^i} g - \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} f^j - \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} F^j + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} = 0 , \quad (6.28)$$

$$(f^j - v^j) \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j} = 0 , \quad (6.29)$$

$$(f^j - v^j) \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial s} = 0 , \quad (6.30)$$

and then it is immediate to prove that:

Proposition 6.35 *If \mathcal{L} is a regular Lagrangian, then $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a SODE and the equations (6.27) and (6.28) become*

$$g = \mathcal{L} , \quad (6.31)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j \partial v^i} F^j + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j \partial v^i} v^j + \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial s \partial v^i} \mathcal{L} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} . \quad (6.32)$$

which, for the integral curves of $X_{\mathcal{L}}$, give the equations (6.25) and (6.26).

(Proof) In fact, if \mathcal{L} is a regular Lagrangian, equations (6.29) lead to $v^i = f^i$, which are the SODE condition for the vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}}$. Then, (6.30) holds identically, and (6.27) and (6.28) give the equations (6.31) and (6.32) and then, for the integral curves of X_L , we get equations (6.25) and (6.26). ■

Thus, the local expression of this Euler–Lagrange vector field is

$$X_{\mathcal{L}} = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + W^{ik} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^k} - \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i \partial v^k} v^j - \mathcal{L} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial s \partial v^k} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^k} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + \mathcal{L} \frac{\partial}{\partial s}. \quad (6.33)$$

Remark 6.36 It is important to point out that the expression in coordinates (6.25) of the second Lagrangian equation (6.22) relates the variation of the “dissipation coordinate” s to the Lagrangian function and, from here, we can identify this coordinate with the Lagrangian action, $s = \int \mathcal{L} dt$.

Remark 6.37 If \mathcal{L} is a singular Lagrangian, but $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a precontact manifold, although the Reeb vector fields are not uniquely defined, the Lagrangian equations (6.22) are independent on the Reeb vector field used (see [109]). Alternatively, the Reeb independent equations (6.17) for the precontact Hamiltonian system $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{L}})$ can be used instead. In any case, solutions to the Lagrangian equations are not necessarily SODE and the condition $\mathcal{J}(X_{\mathcal{L}}) = \Delta$ must be added to the Lagrangian equations. Furthermore, these equations are not necessarily compatible everywhere on $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ and a constraint algorithm must be implemented in order to find a final constraint submanifold $S_f \hookrightarrow TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ (if it exists) where there are SODE vector fields $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$, tangent to S_f , which are solutions to the above equations on S_f [109].

6.3.3. Canonical Hamiltonian formalism

Consider a hyperregular Lagrangian system $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L})$ (the regular case is the same, taking $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}(TQ \times \mathbb{R}) \subset T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ instead of $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$, or locally, at least). Then, $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}$ is a diffeomorphism between the contact manifolds $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_{\mathcal{L}})$ and the canonical contact manifold $(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}, \eta)$, with

$$\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^* \eta = \eta_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}_* \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{R}.$$

Furthermore, there exists a function $h \in C^\infty(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$ such that $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^* h = E_{\mathcal{L}}$; so we have the contact Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}, \eta, h)$ and the contact Hamiltonian equations (6.13) (or their equivalent expressions (6.15) or (6.17)), which read as,

$$i(X_h)\eta = -h, \quad i(X_h)d\eta = dh - \mathcal{R}(h)\eta, \quad (6.34)$$

and have a unique solution X_h . The dynamical trajectories are the integral curves of this contact Hamiltonian vector field and, then, they are the solutions to equations (6.14), which read as,

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_i}, \quad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = - \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial x^i} + p_i \frac{\partial h}{\partial s} \right), \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = p_i \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_i} - h, \quad (6.35)$$

Then, if $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$ is the contact Hamiltonian vector field associated with h , we have that $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}_*X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_h$.

For singular Lagrangians, as in the above chapters, we define:

Definition 6.38 A singular Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ is called **almost-regular** if $\mathcal{P} := \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ is a closed submanifold of $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ (the natural embedding is denoted $j_{\mathcal{P}}: \mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$), $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}$ is a submersion onto its image, and the fibers $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^{-1}(FL(p))$, for every $p \in TQ \times \mathbb{R}$, are connected submanifolds of $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$.

In these cases, we have $(\mathcal{P}, \eta_{\mathcal{P}})$, where $\eta_{\mathcal{P}} = j_{\mathcal{P}}^*\eta \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{P})$. Furthermore, the Lagrangian energy function $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ is $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}$ -projectable; i.e., there is a unique $h_{\mathcal{P}} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{P})$ which is $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}$ -related with $E_{\mathcal{L}}$. Then, if $(\mathcal{P}, \eta_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a contact or a precontact manifold, then $(\mathcal{P}, \eta_{\mathcal{P}}, h_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a (pre)contact Hamiltonian system. whose (pre)contact Hamiltonian equations are (6.13) or, alternatively, (6.17), adapted to this situation. As in the Lagrangian formalism, these equations are not necessarily compatible everywhere on \mathcal{P} and a constraint algorithm must be implemented in order to find a final constraint submanifold $P_f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}$ (if it exists) where there are vector fields $X_{h_{\mathcal{P}}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{P})$, tangent to P_f , which are solutions to the precontact Hamiltonian equations on P_f (see [109] for a detailed analysis on all these topics).

6.4. Unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism for contact systems

The Lagrangian-Hamiltonian unified formalism of contact Lagrangian systems has been developed in [106]. Next we present its main features.

6.4.1. Extended precontact unified bundle. Unified formalism

Definition 6.39 Let Q be a n -dimensional differentiable manifold. The **extended precontact unified bundle** (or **extended precontact Pontryagin bundle**) is

$$\mathfrak{M} = TQ \times_Q T^*Q \times \mathbb{R},$$

and it is endowed with the natural projections

$$\rho_1: \mathfrak{M} \longrightarrow TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \quad \rho_2: \mathfrak{M} \longrightarrow T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}, \quad \rho_0: \mathfrak{M} \longrightarrow Q \times \mathbb{R}, \quad s: \mathfrak{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Natural coordinates in \mathfrak{M} are (q^i, v^i, p_i, s) .

Definition 6.40 A curve $\sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ is a **holonomic** in \mathfrak{M} if $\rho_1 \circ \sigma: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ is holonomic curve. A vector field $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathfrak{M})$ satisfies the **second-order condition** in \mathfrak{M} (for short: it is a **SODE** in \mathfrak{M}) if all of its integral curves are holonomic in \mathfrak{M} .

In coordinates, a holonomic curve and a SODE in \mathfrak{M} are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma &= \left(\sigma_1^i(t), \frac{d\sigma_1^i}{dt}(t), \sigma_{2i}(t), \sigma_0(t) \right), \\ \Gamma &= v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + G_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} + f \frac{\partial}{\partial s}.\end{aligned}$$

Definition 6.41 *The bundle \mathfrak{M} is endowed with the following canonical structures:*

1. The **coupling function** in \mathfrak{M} is the map $\mathfrak{C}: \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows: for every $w = (v_q, p_q, s) \in \mathfrak{M}$, where $q \in Q$, $p_q \in T^*Q$, and $v_q \in TQ$, then $\mathfrak{C}(w) := \langle p_q, v_q \rangle$.
2. The **canonical precontact 1-form** on \mathfrak{M} is the ρ_1 -semibasic form

$$\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} := \rho_2^* \eta = ds - \pi_1^* \rho_2^* \pi_1^* \Theta \in \Omega^1(\mathfrak{M}) ;$$

where η is the canonical contact form on $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ (and Θ is the canonical 1-form on T^*Q).

In natural coordinates of \mathfrak{M} we have that $\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} = ds - p_i dq^i$.

Definition 6.42 *Given a Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$, let $\mathfrak{L} = \rho_1^* \mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{M})$. The **Hamiltonian function** is defined as*

$$\mathbf{H} := \mathfrak{C} - \mathfrak{L} = p_i v^i - \mathcal{L}(q^j, v^j, s) \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{M}). \quad (6.36)$$

Remark 6.43 Observe that $(\mathfrak{M}, \eta_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is a precontact manifold. As a consequence, the Reeb vector fields are not uniquely defined and in natural coordinates of \mathfrak{M} the general solution to (6.2) are the vector fields $\mathcal{R} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$ for arbitrary functions F^i . Nevertheless, as we have pointed out, the dynamics obtained from the formalism is independent of the choice of the Reeb vector fields; therefore, as $\mathfrak{M} = TQ \times_Q T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ is a trivial bundle over \mathbb{R} , the canonical vector field $\frac{\partial}{\partial s}$ on \mathbb{R} can be lifted canonically to a vector field in \mathfrak{M} , which can be taken as a representative of the family of these Reeb vector fields.

Thus, we have that $(\mathfrak{M}, \eta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{H})$ is a precontact Hamiltonian system and then, we can pose the dynamic problem for this system which consists of finding a Hamiltonian vector field which is a solution to the precontact Hamiltonian equations

$$i(X_{\mathbf{H}})d\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} = d\mathbf{H} - (\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{H}))\eta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \quad i(X_{\mathbf{H}})\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} = -\mathbf{H}. \quad (6.37)$$

Then, the integral curves $\sigma: I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ of $X_{\mathbf{H}}$, are the solutions to the equations

$$i(\tilde{\sigma})(d\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} \circ \sigma) = (d\mathbf{H} - (\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{H}))\eta_{\mathfrak{M}}) \circ \sigma, \quad i(\tilde{\sigma})(\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} \circ \sigma) = -\mathbf{H} \circ \sigma. \quad (6.38)$$

As we shall see next, these equations are not compatible on \mathfrak{M} , and we have to implement the constraint algorithm in order to find the final constraint submanifold of \mathfrak{M} where there are consistent solutions to the equations. In fact, in natural coordinates of \mathfrak{M} we have that

$$d\mathbf{H} = v^i dp_i + \left(p_i - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \right) dv^i - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} dq^i - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} ds,$$

and, if the local expression of a vector field $X_{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathfrak{M})$ is

$$X_{\mathbf{H}} = f^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + G_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} + f \frac{\partial}{\partial s},$$

we obtain that

$$i(X_{\mathbf{H}})\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} = f - f^i p_i, \quad i(X_{\mathbf{H}})d\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} = f^i dp_i - G_i dq^i, \quad (\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{H}))\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s}(ds - p_i dq^i).$$

Then, equations (6.37) give

$$f = (f^i - v^i) p_i + \mathcal{L}, \quad (6.39)$$

$$f^i = v^i, \quad (6.40)$$

$$p_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i}, \quad (6.41)$$

$$G_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} + p_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s}, \quad (6.42)$$

The equations (6.40) are the holonomy conditions (i.e., $X_{\mathbf{H}}$ must be a sode), which arise straightforwardly from the unified formalism. The algebraic equations (6.41) are compatibility conditions defining the submanifold $\mathfrak{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, where the equations are compatible. This \mathfrak{M}_0 is the *first constraint submanifold* of the Hamiltonian precontact system $(\mathfrak{M}, \eta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{H})$, and is the graph of $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}$; that is,

$$\mathfrak{M}_0 = \{(v_q, \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}(v_q)) \in \mathfrak{M}, \text{ for } v_q \in \text{TQ}\}.$$

In this way, as it is usual, the unified formalism includes the definition of the Legendre map as a consequence of the constraint algorithm.

Thus, vector fields which are solutions to (6.37) are,

$$X_{\mathbf{H}} = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + F^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} + \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} + p_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} + \mathcal{L} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \quad (\text{on } \mathfrak{M}_0).$$

The constraint algorithm continues by demanding that X_H must be tangent to \mathfrak{M}_0 .

As $\xi_j^1 = p_j - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j} \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{M})$ are the constraints defining \mathfrak{M}_0 , this condition is

$$X_H \left(p_j - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^j} \right) = -\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i \partial v^j} v^i - \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i \partial v^j} F^i - \mathcal{L} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial z \partial v^j} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^j} + p_j \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} = 0 \quad (\text{on } \mathfrak{M}_0), \quad (6.43)$$

and there are two options:

- If \mathcal{L} is a regular Lagrangian, these equations determine all the functions F^i . Then the solution is unique and the algorithm ends.
- If \mathcal{L} is singular, then these equations establish relations among the arbitrary functions F^i ; some of them remain undetermined and the solutions are not unique. Furthermore, new constraints $\xi_\mu^2 \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{M})$ could appear, then defining a new submanifold $\mathfrak{M}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}$. Then, the algorithm continues by demanding the tangency of X_H to \mathfrak{M}_1 , and so on, until we obtain a final constraint submanifold \mathfrak{M}_f (if it exists) where tangent solutions X_H exist.

If $\sigma(t) = (q^i(t), v^i(t), p_i(t), s(t))$ is an integral curve of X_H , we have that $f^i = \frac{dq^i}{dt}$, $F^i = \frac{dv^i}{dt}$, $G_i = \frac{dp_i}{dt}$, $f = \frac{ds}{dt}$, and equations (6.39), (6.40), (6.41), and (6.42) give to the coordinate expression of the equations (6.38); in particular:

- From (6.40), we have that $v^i = \frac{dq^i}{dt}$; that is, the holonomy condition.
- Using (6.40) again, the equation (6.39) gives the equation (6.25) again.
- The equations (6.42) read,

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} + p_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} = - \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i} + p_i \frac{\partial H}{\partial s} \right),$$

which are the second group of Hamilton's equations (6.12). Then, using (6.41), these equations are (on \mathfrak{M}_0),

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \right) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s},$$

which are the Herglotz–Euler–Lagrange equations (6.26). The first group of Hamilton's equations (6.12) arises from the definition of the Hamiltonian function (6.36), using the holonomy condition.

- Using (6.41) and (6.25), the tangency condition (6.43) gives again the Herglotz–Euler–Lagrange equations (6.26). If \mathcal{L} is singular, these equations can be incompatible.

6.4.2. Recovering the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms and equivalence

Now we study the equivalence of the unified formalism with the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms for the hyperregular case (the regular case is the same, at least locally). See [106] more details about the singular case.

First, observe that, in this case, denoting by $j_0: \mathfrak{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ the natural embedding, we have that

$$(\rho_1 \circ j_0)(\mathfrak{M}_0) = TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (\rho_2 \circ j_0)(\mathfrak{M}_0) = T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Furthermore, as \mathfrak{M}_0 is the graph of the Legendre map \mathfrak{FL} , it is diffeomorphic to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$, being the restricted projection $\rho_1 \circ j_0$ this diffeomorphism. So, we have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathfrak{M} & \\ \rho_1 \swarrow & \uparrow j_0 & \searrow \rho_2 \\ & \mathfrak{M}_0 & \\ \swarrow & \searrow & \\ TQ \times \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{FL}} & T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

As in the other unified formalisms, functions, differential forms on \mathfrak{M} , and vector fields on \mathfrak{M} tangent to \mathfrak{M}_0 can be restricted to \mathfrak{M}_0 . Then, they can be translated to the Lagrangian or the Hamiltonian side by using that \mathfrak{M}_0 is diffeomorphic to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$, or projecting to $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$. In particular, a simple calculation in coordinates shows that

$$\rho_1^* E_L = \mathbf{H} = \rho_2^* h,$$

Furthermore, every curve $\sigma: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ which takes values in \mathfrak{M}_0 , can be split as $\sigma = (\sigma_L, \sigma_H)$, where $\sigma_L = \rho_1 \circ \sigma: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma_H = \mathfrak{FL} \circ \sigma_L: I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, taking all of this into account, the results, and the discussion in the above section lead to state:

Theorem 6.44 *Let $\sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, with $\text{Im}(\sigma) \subset \mathfrak{M}_0$, be a curve solution to the equations (6.38) on \mathfrak{M}_0 . Then σ_L is the lift of the projected curve $\mathbf{c} = \rho_0 \circ \sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q \times \mathbb{R}$ to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ (that is, σ_L is a holonomic curve), and it is a solution to the equations (6.23). Moreover, the curve $\sigma_H = \mathfrak{FL} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{c}}$ is a solution to the equations (6.8) on $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$.*

*Conversely, for every curve $\mathbf{c}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$ is a solution to the equations (6.23), we have that the curve $\sigma = (\tilde{\mathbf{c}}, \mathfrak{FL} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{c}})$ is a solution to the equations (6.38) on \mathfrak{M}_0 , and the curve $\mathfrak{FL} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{c}}$ is a solution to the equations (6.8) on $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$.*

The curves $\sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ solution to the equations (6.38) are the integral curves of SODE vector fields $X_{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathfrak{M})$ solution to (6.37) on \mathfrak{M}_0 . The curves $\sigma_L: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow TQ \times \mathbb{R}$

are the integral curves of SODE vector fields $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ solution to (6.23). Finally, the curves $\sigma_h: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ are the integral curves of the contact Hamiltonian vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$ solution to (6.34) on $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$. Then, an immediate corollary of the above theorem is the following:

Theorem 6.45 *Let $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathfrak{M})$ be the contact Hamiltonian vector field solution to the equations (6.37) on \mathfrak{M}_0 , and tangent to \mathfrak{M}_0 .*

Then the vector field $X_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$, defined by $X_{\mathcal{L}} \circ \rho_1 = T\rho_1 \circ X_H$, is a SODE vector field which is a solution to the equations (6.22); that is, the contact Euler-Lagrange vector field, on $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$.

*Furthermore, the vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$, defined by $X_h \circ \rho_2 = T\rho_2 \circ X_H$, is the contact Hamiltonian vector field solution to the equations (6.34) on $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$.*

These results are analogous to those obtained for the unified formalism of dynamical systems.

Remark 6.46 For singular almost-regular Lagrangians, the equivalence between the constraint algorithms in the unified and in the Lagrangian formalism only holds when the second-order condition is imposed, since, unlike in the unified formalism, this condition does not hold in the Lagrangian case (see [266, 307]).

6.5. Symmetries of contact dynamical systems

(See [160] and also [110] for another complementary approach to these topics. See also [163] for a complete classification of symmetries of autonomous and nonautonomous contact systems, and [4] for a reduction scheme).

6.5.1. Symmetries of contact Hamiltonian systems. Dissipated and conserved quantities

Let (M, η, h) be a contact Hamiltonian system with Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} , and let X_h be the contact Hamiltonian vector field for this system; that is, the solution to the Hamilton equations (6.4).

As, for other kinds of dynamical systems, a *dynamical symmetry* of a contact Hamiltonian system is a diffeomorphism $\Phi: M \rightarrow M$ such that $\Phi_* X_h = X_h$. Similarly, an *infinitesimal dynamical symmetry* of a contact Hamiltonian system is a vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ whose local flux is a dynamical symmetry; that is, $L(Y)X_h = [Y, X_h] = 0$. This means that dynamical symmetries map solutions into solutions.

Nevertheless, we are mainly interested in those symmetries that let the geometric structures invariant:

Definition 6.47 A *contact Noether symmetry* of a contact Hamiltonian system (M, η, h) is a diffeomorphism $\Phi: M \rightarrow M$ such that

$$\Phi^* \eta = \eta, \quad \Phi^* h = h .$$

An *infinitesimal contact Noether symmetry* of a contact Hamiltonian system (M, η, h) is a vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ whose local flux is a contact Noether symmetry; that is,

$$L(Y)\eta = 0, \quad L(Y)h = 0 .$$

Proposition 6.48 Every (infinitesimal) contact Noether symmetry preserves the Reeb vector field; that is, $\Phi_* \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}$ (or $[Y, \mathcal{R}] = 0$).

(Proof) We obtain that,

$$\begin{aligned} i(\Phi_*^{-1} \mathcal{R})(\Phi^* d\eta) &= \Phi^*(i(\mathcal{R})d\eta) = 0 , \\ i(\Phi_*^{-1} \mathcal{R})(\Phi^* \eta) &= \Phi^*(i(\mathcal{R})\eta) = 1 , \end{aligned}$$

and, as $\Phi^* \eta = \eta$ and the Reeb vector field is unique, from these equalities we get $\Phi_*^{-1} \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}$ or, equivalently, $\Phi_* \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}$.

For the infinitesimal case, if $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is an infinitesimal Noether symmetry, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} L([Y, \mathcal{R}])\eta &= L(Y)L(\mathcal{R})\eta - L(\mathcal{R})L(Y)\eta = L(Y)i(\mathcal{R})d\eta + d i(\mathcal{R})\eta = 0 \quad (6.44) \\ L([Y, \mathcal{R}])d\eta &= d L([Y, \mathcal{R}])\eta = 0 , \end{aligned}$$

hence $[Y, \mathcal{R}] = L(Y)\mathcal{R} \in \ker \eta \cap \ker d\eta = \{0\}$. ■

As in the dynamical systems studied in the previous chapters, we have:

Proposition 6.49 Every (infinitesimal) contact Noether symmetry is a (infinitesimal) dynamical symmetry.

(Proof) In fact, using that Φ is a contact Noether symmetry and that, by the above proposition, $\Phi_* \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} i(\Phi_*^{-1} X_h)d\eta &= i(\Phi_*^{-1} X_h)(\Phi^* d\eta) = \Phi^*(i(X_h)d\eta) \\ &= \Phi^*(dh - (\mathcal{R}(h))\eta) = dh - (\mathcal{R}(h))\eta , \\ i(\Phi_*^{-1} X_h)\eta &= i(\Phi_*^{-1} X_h)(\Phi^* \eta) = \Phi^*(i(X_h)\eta) = \Phi^*(-h) = -h , \end{aligned}$$

then $\Phi_*^{-1} X_h$ is a solution to the dynamical equation (6.34) and, as the solution is unique, we conclude that $\Phi_* X_h = X_h$, and hence Φ is a symmetry.

For the infinitesimal case we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} i([Y, X_h])\eta &= L(Y) i(X_h)\eta - i(X_h) L(Y)\eta = -L(Y)h = 0, \\ i([Y, X_h])d\eta &= d i([Y, X_h])\eta = 0, \end{aligned}$$

then $[Y, X_h] \in \ker \eta \cap \ker d\eta = \{0\}$ and it is a dynamical symmetry. ■

Now, the result stated in Proposition 6.21, $L(X_h)h = -(\mathcal{R}(h))h$, induces us to define:

Definition 6.50 A *dissipated quantity* of the contact Hamiltonian system (M, η, h) is a function $F \in C^\infty(M)$ satisfying that

$$L(X_h)F = -(\mathcal{R}(h))F. \quad (6.45)$$

A *conserved quantity* of the contact Hamiltonian system (M, η, h) is a function $G \in C^\infty(M)$ satisfying that

$$L(X_h)G = 0.$$

For contact Hamiltonian systems, as we are dealing with dissipative systems, symmetries are associated with dissipated quantities:

Theorem 6.51 (Dissipation theorem). *If $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is an infinitesimal dynamical symmetry, then the function $F = -i(Y)\eta$ is a dissipated quantity.*

(Proof) In fact, Proposition 6.49 says that $[Y, X_h] = 0$; then,

$$\begin{aligned} L(X_h)F &= -L(X_h) i(Y)\eta = -i(Y) L(X_h)\eta - i(L(X_h)Y)\eta = \\ &= (\mathcal{R}(h)) i(Y)\eta + i([Y, X_h])\eta = -(\mathcal{R}(h))F + i([Y, X_h])\eta = -(\mathcal{R}(h))F, \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied that $L(X_h)\eta = -\mathcal{R}(h)\eta$ (by (6.15)). ■

Remark 6.52 In particular, the Hamiltonian vector field X_h is trivially a symmetry, since $[X_h, X_h] = 0$. Then, Proposition (6.16) establishes that its associated dissipated quantity is the energy, $h = -i(X_h)\eta$.

These are “non conservation theorems” which account for the non-conservation of these quantities associated with the symmetries. In particular, every dissipated quantity changes with the same rate, $-\mathcal{R}(h)$, which suggests that the quotient of two dissipated quantities should be a conserved quantity. Indeed:

Proposition 6.53 1. If F_1 and F_2 are dissipated quantities and $F_2 \neq 0$, then $\frac{F_1}{F_2}$ is a conserved quantity.

2. If F is a dissipated quantity and G is a conserved quantity, then FG is a dissipated quantity.

(Proof) In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(X_h) \left(\frac{F_1}{F_2} \right) &= \frac{1}{F_2} L(X_h) F_1 - \frac{F_1}{F_2^2} L(X_h) F_2 = -\frac{1}{F_2} (\mathcal{R}(h)) F_1 + \frac{F_1}{F_2^2} (\mathcal{R}(h)) F_2 = 0 . \\ L(X_h)(FG) &= G L(X_h) F + F L(X_h) G = -(\mathcal{R}(h)) FG. \end{aligned}$$

■

A straightforward consequence of this proposition is that symmetries can also have associated conserved quantities:

Corollary 6.54 For every infinitesimal symmetry $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, if $h \neq 0$, then $-\frac{i(Y)\eta}{h}$ is a conserved quantity.

Contact symmetries also allow us to generate new dissipated quantities from another one.

Proposition 6.55 If $\Phi: M \rightarrow M$ is a contact Noether symmetry and $F \in C^\infty(M)$ is a dissipated quantity, then so is Φ^*F . Similarly, if $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is an infinitesimal contact Noether symmetry, then $L(Y)F$ is a dissipated quantity.

(Proof) In fact, we have

$$L(X_h)(\Phi^*F) = \Phi^* L(\Phi_* X_h) F = \Phi^* L(X_h) F = \Phi^*(-\mathcal{R}(h)) F = -(\mathcal{R}(h))(\Phi^*F) .$$

For the infinitesimal case, taking into account that Y is a contact infinitesimal $L(X_h)F = 0$, that $[Y, X_h] = X_h$ (Proposition 6.49) and that $[Y, \mathcal{R}] = 0$ (Proposition 6.48), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} L(X_h) L(Y) F &= L([X_h, Y]) F - L(Y) L(X_h) F + -L(Y)((\mathcal{R}(h)) F) \\ &= -L(X_h) F - F L(Y)(\mathcal{R}(h)) - (\mathcal{R}(h))(L(Y) F) \\ &= -F L([Y, \mathcal{R}]) h - F L(\mathcal{R}) L(Y) h - (\mathcal{R}(h))(L(Y) F) \\ &= -(\mathcal{R}(h))(L(Y) F) . \end{aligned}$$

■

6.5.2. Symmetries for contact Lagrangian and canonical Hamiltonian systems

Next, we particularize the results on symmetries and dissipated quantities to the case of Lagrangian dissipative systems and their canonical Hamiltonian formalism.

Consider a regular contact Lagrangian system $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L})$, with Reeb vector field $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}}$, and let $X_{\mathcal{L}}$ be the contact Euler–Lagrange vector field for this system; that is, the solution to the Lagrangian equations (6.22).

All the definitions and results about symmetries and dissipated quantities stated in the preceding section hold for the contact system $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{L}})$. In particular, the dissipation theorem states that $-i(Y)\eta_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a dissipated quantity, for every infinitesimal dynamical symmetry $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$, the energy dissipation theorem states that

$$L(X_{\mathcal{L}})E_{\mathcal{L}} = -(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}}(E_{\mathcal{L}})) E_{\mathcal{L}} . \quad (6.46)$$

Furthermore, if $\varphi: Q \rightarrow Q$ is a diffeomorphism, we can construct the *canonical lift* of φ to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ as the diffeomorphism $\Phi := (T\varphi, \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}}): TQ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow TQ \times \mathbb{R}$. These kinds of diffeomorphisms Φ are usually called *natural transformations* on $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, for every vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ we can define its *complete lift* to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ as the vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ whose local flux is the canonical lift of the local flux of Z to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$. The infinitesimal transformation generated by Y are called *infinitesimal natural transformation* on $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$.

Then, taking into account the definitions of the canonical endomorphism \mathcal{J} and the Liouville vector field Δ in $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$, it can be proved that canonical lifts of diffeomorphisms and vector fields from Q to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ preserve these canonical structures. Furthermore, if these lifts leave the Lagrangian function invariant, they also preserve the Reeb vector field $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}}$. Therefore, as an immediate consequence, we obtain the following relation:

Proposition 6.56 *If $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$ (resp. $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ \times \mathbb{R})$) is a canonical lift to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ of a diffeomorphism $\varphi \in \text{Diff}(Q)$ (resp. of a vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$) that leaves the Lagrangian invariant, then it is a (infinitesimal) contact Noether symmetry, i.e.,*

$$\Phi^* \eta_{\mathcal{L}} = \eta_{\mathcal{L}} , \quad \Phi^* E_{\mathcal{L}} = E_{\mathcal{L}} \quad (\text{resp. } L(Y)\eta_{\mathcal{L}} = 0 , \quad L(Y)E_{\mathcal{L}} = 0) .$$

As a further consequence, it is a (infinitesimal) dynamical symmetry.

As a direct consequence, if $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^i} = 0$, then $\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}$ is an infinitesimal contact Noether symmetry, and its associated dissipated quantity is the momentum $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i}$; that is,

$$L(X_{\mathcal{L}}) \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} \right) = -(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{L}}(E_{\mathcal{L}})) \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial s} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial v^i} .$$

(See also [166] for a similar description).

For the canonical Hamiltonian formalism, consider the canonical contact Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}, \eta, h)$. As in the Lagrangian formalism, if $\varphi: Q \rightarrow Q$ is a diffeomorphism, we can construct the *canonical lift* of φ to $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$, which is the diffeomorphism $\Phi := (T^*\varphi, \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}}): T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$. and is called a *natural transformation* on $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$. In the same way, for every vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ we define its *complete lift* to $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ as the vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$ whose local flux is the canonical lift of the local flux of Z to $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$. It is called a *natural infinitesimal transformations* on $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$.

The canonical forms Θ and $\Omega = -d\Theta$ in T^*Q and their extensions to $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ are invariant under the action of canonical lifts of diffeomorphisms and vector fields from Q to T^*Q and $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$. Then, taking into account the definition of the contact form η in $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$, we have:

Proposition 6.57 *If $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$ (resp. $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$) is a canonical lift to $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ of a diffeomorphism $\varphi \in \text{Diff}(Q)$ (resp. of $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$), then*

1. $\Phi^*\eta = \eta$ (resp $L(Y)\eta = 0$).
2. If, in addition, $\Phi^*h = h$ (resp. $L(Y)h = 0$), then it is a (infinitesimal) contact Noether symmetry.

In particular, we have the following:

Theorem 6.58 (Momentum dissipation theorem). If $\frac{\partial h}{\partial q^i} = 0$, then $\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}$ is an infinitesimal contact Noether symmetry, and its associated dissipated quantity is the corresponding momentum p_i ; that is, $L(X_h)p_i = -(\mathcal{R}(h))p_i$.

(Proof) A simple computation in local coordinates shows that $L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}\right)\eta = 0$ and $L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}\right)h = 0$. Therefore, $\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}$ is a contact Noether symmetry and, hence, a dynamical symmetry. The other results are a consequence of the dissipation theorem.

6.6. Examples

6.6.1. The damped harmonic oscillator

Consider a harmonic oscillator in a medium with friction. As in Section 3.7.1, the configuration bundle of the system is $Q = \mathbb{R}$ but, in order to develop the contact formulation, we take the manifold $Q \times \mathbb{R}$. with coordinates (t, q) .

Lagrangian formalism

The Lagrangian description of the one-dimensional damped harmonic oscillator is done in the phase space $\mathrm{TQ} \times \mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$. It is described by the hyperregular contact Lagrangian function,

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s ,$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the dissipation parameter.

We have the contact Lagrangian form,

$$\eta_{\mathcal{L}} = ds - v dq ,$$

and the energy Lagrangian function is

$$E_{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{1}{2}kq^2 + \gamma s .$$

For $X_{\mathcal{L}} = f \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + F \frac{\partial}{\partial v} + g \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathrm{TQ} \times \mathbb{R})$, the contact Lagrangian equations (6.31) and (6.32) are

$$g = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s, \quad f = v, \quad mF = -kq - \gamma mv .$$

whose solution is the SODE vector field,

$$X_{\mathcal{L}} = v \frac{\partial}{\partial q} - \left(\frac{k}{m} q + \gamma v \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v} + \left(\frac{1}{2}mv^2 - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s} .$$

Its integral curves are the solutions to equations (6.25) and (6.26), which for this system give the Herglotz–Euler–Lagrange equations

$$\frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{1}{2}m \left(\frac{dq}{dt} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s, \quad \frac{d^2q}{dt^2} = -\frac{k}{m}q - \gamma \frac{dq}{dt} , \quad (6.47)$$

and the last equation correspond to the well-known dynamical equation of the damped harmonic oscillator.

The dissipation of the energy is given by (6.16), which in the Lagrangian formalism reads

$$L(X_{\mathcal{L}})E_{\mathcal{L}} = -\gamma \left(\frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{1}{2}kq^2 + \gamma s \right) .$$

Hamiltonian formalism

For the canonical Hamiltonian formalism of the system, $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$, and the Legendre map is

$$\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^*q = q, \quad \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^*p = mv, \quad \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^*s = s.$$

The canonical contact form is $\eta = ds - p dq$, and the canonical Hamiltonian function reads

$$h = \frac{p^2}{2m^2} + \frac{1}{2}kq^2 + \gamma s.$$

For $X_h = f \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + F \frac{\partial}{\partial p} + g \frac{\partial}{\partial s}$, the contact Hamiltonian equations (6.34) give

$$f = \frac{p}{m}, \quad F = -kq - \gamma p, \quad g = \frac{p^2}{2m^2} - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s,$$

and its solution is the Hamiltonian vector field,

$$X_h = \frac{p}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial q} - (kq + \gamma p) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} + \left(\frac{p^2}{2m^2} - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s},$$

whose integral curves are the solutions to equations (6.35), which for this system give the Hamilton equations,

$$\frac{dq}{dt} = \frac{p}{m}, \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -kq - \gamma p, \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{p^2}{2m^2} - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s. \quad (6.48)$$

Finally, the dissipation of the energy is given by (6.46),

$$L(X_h)h = -\gamma \left(\frac{p^2}{2m^2} + \frac{1}{2}kq^2 + \gamma s \right).$$

Unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism

The extended unified bundle is $\mathfrak{M} = TQ \times_Q T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^4$ with coordinates (q, v, p, s) . Then we have the precontact Hamiltonian system $(\mathfrak{M}, \eta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \mathbf{H})$, where the canonical contact form is

$$\eta_{\mathfrak{M}} = ds - p dq,$$

the Hamiltonian function is

$$\mathbf{H} = pv - \frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{1}{2}kq^2 + \gamma s.$$

and we can take $\mathcal{R} = \frac{\partial}{\partial s}$ as Reeb vector field. For this system, the compatibility condition for equations (6.37) leads to define the submanifold $\mathfrak{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{M}_0 = \{(q, v, p, s) \in \mathfrak{M} \mid p - mv = 0\} ,$$

and the Hamiltonian vector field solution to (6.37) on \mathfrak{M}_0 is

$$X_{\mathbf{H}}|_{\mathfrak{M}_0} = v \frac{\partial}{\partial q} + F \frac{\partial}{\partial v} - (kq + \gamma p) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} + \left(\frac{p^2}{2m^2} - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s} .$$

The tangency condition for $X_{\mathbf{H}}$ on \mathfrak{M}_0 gives $F = -\frac{k}{m}q - \gamma \frac{p}{m}$, and thus finally,

$$X_{\mathbf{H}}|_{\mathfrak{M}_0} = v \frac{\partial}{\partial q} - \left(\frac{k}{m}q + \gamma \frac{p}{m} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v} - (kq + \gamma p) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} + \left(\frac{p^2}{2m^2} - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s} .$$

Therefore, the integral curves of $X_{\mathbf{H}}$ are the solutions to

$$\frac{dq}{dt} = v, \quad m \frac{dv}{dt} = -mkq - \gamma p, \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -kq - \gamma p, \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{p^2}{2m^2} - \frac{1}{2}kq^2 - \gamma s .$$

The first two equations of this system are equivalent to the second Herglotz–Euler–Lagrange equation (6.47) and, using the constraint $p = mv$ (the Legendre map), the first and third equations are the first pair of the Hamilton equations (6.48).

6.6.2. The Kepler problem with friction

Consider the motion of a massive particle (of mass m) under the action of Newtonian central force in a stellar media with friction. As in the previous cases, the motion is on a plane; hence $Q = \mathbb{R}^2$, and we take (r, ϕ, s) as coordinates in $Q \times \mathbb{R}$, (with the origin of r at the center of the force).

Lagrangian formalism

The Lagrangian formalism takes place in $TQ \times \mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^5$, with local coordinates $(r, \phi, v_r, v_\phi, s)$. The contact Lagrangian function that describes the dynamics is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2) - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s, \quad K \neq 0 ;$$

which is regular as in the above situations. The energy Lagrangian function and the contact Lagrangian form are

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathcal{L}} &= \frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2) + \frac{K}{r} + \gamma s , \\ \eta_{\mathcal{L}} &= ds - m(v_r dr + r^2v_\phi d\phi) , \end{aligned}$$

and the Lagrangian is regular. For $X_{\mathcal{L}} = f_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + f_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + g_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + g_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} + g_s \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$, the contact Lagrangian equations (6.31) and (6.32) give

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2) - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s, \quad f_r = v_r, \quad f_\phi = v_\phi, \\ mg_r &= 2mr v_\phi f_\phi - mrv_\phi^2 + \frac{K}{r^2} - \gamma m v_r, \quad g_\phi = -\frac{2v_\phi f_r}{r} - \gamma r^2 v_\phi, \end{aligned}$$

and the contact Euler–Lagrange vector field is

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\mathcal{L}} &= v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + v_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \left(r v_\phi^2 + \frac{K}{mr^2} - \gamma v_r \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + \left(-\frac{2v_\phi v_r}{r} - \gamma v_\phi \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2) - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, its integral curves are the solutions to equations (6.25) and (6.26) which read as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{ds}{dt} &= \frac{1}{2}m \left(\left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 + r^2 \left(\frac{d\phi}{dt} \right)^2 \right) - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s, \\ m \frac{d^2r}{dt^2} &= mr \left(\frac{d\phi}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{K}{r^2} - m\gamma v_r, \quad \frac{d^2\phi}{dt^2} = -\frac{2}{r} \frac{d\phi}{dt} \frac{dr}{dt} - \gamma \frac{d\phi}{dt}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.49)$$

and are the Herglotz–Euler–Lagrange equations for this system.

Similarly to the above example, the dissipation of the energy reads

$$L(X_{\mathcal{L}})E_{\mathcal{L}} = -\gamma \left(\frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2) + \frac{K}{r} + \gamma s \right).$$

Furthermore, there exists a Lagrangian contact Noether symmetry which is generated by the vector field $Y = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$; in fact, bearing in mind (3.26) and (3.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L(Y)\eta_{\mathcal{L}} &= L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) \left(ds - m(v_r dr + r^2v_\phi d\phi) \right) \\ &= L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) ds - L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) \left(m(v_r dr + r^2v_\phi d\phi) \right) = 0, \\ L(Y)E_{\mathcal{L}} &= L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2v_\phi^2) + \frac{K}{r} + \gamma s \right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding dissipated quantity is the angular momentum map

$$F = -i \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \right) \eta_{\mathcal{L}} = mr^2 v_\phi.$$

Finally, using Corollary 6.54, we obtain that $\frac{F}{E_{\mathcal{L}}}$ is a conserved quantity associated with Y .

Hamiltonian formalism

For the Hamiltonian formalism, $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^5$, with local coordinates $(r, \phi, p_r, p_\phi, s)$. The Legendre transformation is,

$$\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^*r = r, \quad \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^*\phi = \phi, \quad \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^*p_r = mv_r, \quad \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^*p_\phi = mr^2v_\phi, \quad \mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}^*s = s,$$

which is a diffeomorphism, and the Lagrangian is hyperregular. The canonical Hamiltonian function and the canonical contact form are

$$\begin{aligned} h &= \frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} + \frac{K}{r} + \gamma s \\ \eta &= ds - p_r dr - p_\phi d\phi. \end{aligned}$$

For $X_h = F_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + F_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + G_r \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r} + G_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi} + g \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$, the contact Hamiltonian equations (6.34) lead to

$$F_r = \frac{p_r}{m}, \quad F_\phi = \frac{p_\phi}{mr^2}, \quad G_r = \frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2} - \gamma p_r, \quad G_\phi = -\gamma p_\phi, \quad g = \frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s.$$

and then, the contact Hamiltonian vector field is

$$\begin{aligned} X_h = \frac{p_r}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{p_\phi}{mr^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \left(\frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2} - \gamma p_r \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r} - \\ \gamma p_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi} + \left(\frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, its integral curves are the solutions to the equations (6.35) which are

$$\begin{aligned} m \frac{dr}{dt} = p_r, \quad mr^2 \frac{d\phi}{dt} = p_\phi, \quad \frac{dp_r}{dt} = \frac{p_\phi^2}{mr^3} + \frac{K}{r^2} - \gamma p_r, \quad \frac{dp_\phi}{dt} = -\gamma p_\phi, \quad (6.50) \\ \frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s, \end{aligned}$$

and are the Hamiltonian equations for this system.

As it is usual, using the Legendre map one can easily check that $\mathfrak{F}\mathcal{L}_*X_{\mathcal{L}} = X_h$.

Similarly to the above example, the dissipation of the energy reads

$$L(X_h)h = -\gamma \left(\frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} + \frac{K}{r} + \gamma s \right).$$

In addition, we have a Hamiltonian contact Noether symmetry which is again the vector field $Y = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$, since

$$\begin{aligned} L(Y)\eta &= L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) (ds - p_r dr - p_\phi d\phi) = 0, \\ L(Y)h &= L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right) \left(\frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} + \frac{K}{r} + \gamma s\right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The associated dissipated quantity is again the angular momentum,

$$F = -i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\right)\eta = p_\phi.$$

and the corresponding dissipation law is given directly by the last Hamilton equation in (6.50). As above, $\frac{F}{h}$ is a conserved quantity associated with Y .

Unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism

In the precontact extended unified bundle $\mathfrak{M} = TQ \times_Q T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^7$, with coordinates $(r, \phi, v_r, v_\phi, p_r, p_\phi, s)$, the canonical precontact form and the Hamiltonian function are

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\mathfrak{M}} &= ds - p_r dr - p_\phi d\phi, \\ \mathbf{H} &= p_r v_r + p_\phi v_\phi - \frac{1}{2}m(v_r^2 + r^2 v_\phi^2) + \frac{K}{r} + \gamma s, \end{aligned}$$

and we can take $\mathcal{R} = \frac{\partial}{\partial s}$ as Reeb vector field.

For $X_{\mathbf{H}} = f_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + f_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + g_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + g_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} + G_r \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r} + G_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi} + g \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathfrak{M})$, equations (6.37) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} f_r &= v_r, \quad f_\phi = v_\phi, \quad G_r = \frac{K}{r^2} + mrv_\phi^2 - \gamma p_r, \quad G_\phi = -\gamma p_\phi, \\ p_r &= mv_r, \quad p_\phi = mr^2 v_\phi, \quad g = \frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s. \end{aligned} \quad (6.51)$$

The first two equations in (6.51) are constraints defining the submanifold $\mathfrak{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ which give the Legendre map. Thus, the Hamiltonian vector field is

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\mathbf{H}}|_{\mathfrak{M}_0} &= v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + v_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + g_r \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} + g_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} + \left(\frac{K}{r^2} + mrv_\phi^2 - \gamma p_r\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r} - \gamma p_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s}, \end{aligned}$$

and the tangency condition of X_H on \mathfrak{M}_0 leads to obtain that, finally,

$$\begin{aligned} X_H|_{\mathfrak{M}_0} = & v_r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + v_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \left(r v_\phi^2 + \frac{K}{mr^2} - \gamma \frac{p_r}{m} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_r} - \left(\frac{2v_r v_\phi}{r} + \gamma \frac{p_\phi}{m} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_\phi} \\ & + \left(\frac{K}{r^2} + m r v_\phi^2 - \gamma p_r \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_r} - \gamma p_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi} + \left(\frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial s} . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the integral curves of X_H , on \mathfrak{M}_0 , are the solutions to

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = v_r, \quad \frac{d\phi}{dt} = v_\phi, \quad \frac{dv_r}{dt} = \frac{K}{mr^2} + r v_\phi^2 - \gamma \frac{p_r}{m}, \quad \frac{dv_\phi}{dt} = -\frac{2v_r v_\phi}{r} - \gamma \frac{p_\phi}{m} , \quad (6.52)$$

$$\frac{dp_r}{dt} = \frac{K}{r^2} + m r v_\phi^2 - \gamma p_r, \quad \frac{dp_\phi}{dt} = -\gamma p_\phi, \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{p_r^2}{2m} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{2mr^2} - \frac{K}{r} - \gamma s . \quad (6.53)$$

Equations (6.52) are equivalent to the Herglotz–Euler–Lagrange equation (6.49), and using the constraints $p_r = m v_r$ and $p_\phi = m r^2 v_\phi$; that is, the Legendre map, the first and second equations in (6.52) and (6.53) are the Hamiltonian equations (6.50) of the system.

Appendix A

Additional contents

A.1. Tangent and cotangent bundles

(For a detailed account of these subjects and the proof of the results, see for example [90, 215, 227, 280, 315]).

A.1.1. The tangent bundle of a manifold. Canonical lifts

Let Q be a differentiable manifold and $q \in Q$. Every differentiable curve $\gamma: (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ passing through q ; that is, $\gamma(0) = q$, induces a derivation D_γ in $C^\infty(Q)$, in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} D_\gamma: C^\infty(Q) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ f &\longmapsto \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{(f \circ \gamma)(t) - (f \circ \gamma)(0)}{t} \end{aligned} \quad .$$

In the set of such differentiable curves we can define the following equivalence relation

$$\gamma_1 \sim \gamma_2 \iff D_{\gamma_1} = D_{\gamma_2} \, .$$

Then:

Definition A.1 1. A **tangent vector** to Q at q is every equivalence class defined by this relation.

2. The **tangent space** of Q at q , denoted by $T_q Q$, is the vector space of all the tangent vectors to Q at q .

3. The **tangent bundle** of Q is defined as $TQ := \bigcup_{q \in Q} T_q Q$. We denote $\tau_Q: TQ \rightarrow Q$ its natural projection.

Every point $p \in TQ$ is a couple $(q, v) \equiv v_q$, where $q = \tau_Q(p) \in Q$ and $v \in T_q Q$ (it is a tangent vector).

Proposition A.2 *The tangent bundle TQ is a $2n$ -dimensional differentiable manifold whose differentiable structure is inherited from Q . In addition, the natural projection τ_Q is a submersion.*

(Proof) If $\mathcal{A} = \{(U_\alpha; \phi_\alpha)\}$, with $\phi_\alpha \equiv (x^1, \dots, x^n)$, is an atlas of local charts on Q , then the induced atlas on T^*Q is $T\mathcal{A} = \{(\tau_Q^{-1}U_\alpha; \psi_\alpha)\}$, with the coordinate functions ψ_α defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\alpha : \quad \tau_Q^{-1}(U_\alpha) &\longrightarrow \phi_\alpha(U_\alpha) \times \mathbb{R}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n} \\ p = (q, v) &\longmapsto (q^i(p), v^i(p)) \end{aligned} ;$$

where $i = 1, \dots, n$, and:

1. $q^i(p) = (x^i \circ \tau_Q)(p)$ ¹.
2. If $v = \lambda^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \Big|_q$, then $v^i(p) = \lambda^i = v(x^i)$; that is, $v^i(p)$ are the components of the tangent vector $v \in T_q Q$ in the basis $\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \Big|_q \right\}$.

It is obvious that $TQ = \bigcup_{\alpha} \tau_Q^{-1}(U_\alpha)$ and that ψ_α are diffeomorphisms. Then, it is immediate to prove that $T\mathcal{A}$ endows TQ with the structure of a differentiable manifold. If $(U; q^i)$ and $(\bar{U}; \bar{q}^i)$ are two local charts in Q such that $U \cap \bar{U} \neq \emptyset$, and $\bar{q}^j = \varphi^j(q^i)$ in $U \cap \bar{U}$, then for the induced charts $(\tau_Q^{-1}(U); q^i, v^i)$ and $(\tau_Q^{-1}\bar{U}; \bar{q}^i, \bar{v}^i)$ in TQ we have that, on $TU \cap T\bar{U}$, the relation between the coordinates v^i and \bar{v}^i is $\bar{v}^j = \frac{\partial \varphi^j}{\partial q^i} v^i$, since

$$v = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q = v^i \frac{\partial \varphi^j}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{q}^j} \Big|_q = \bar{v}^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{q}^j} \Big|_q ,$$

and hence $\bar{v}^j = \frac{\partial \varphi^j}{\partial q^i} v^i$.

Bearing in mind this local description of the tangent bundle, it is evident that $\dim TQ = 2n$.

Finally, it is immediate to prove that τ_Q is an surjective submersion, since the canonical projection $\tau_Q: TQ \longrightarrow Q$, is a surjective map given, in natural coordinates,

¹It is usual to commit an abuse of notation denoting by q^i both the coordinates in the base manifold Q and in the tangent bundle TQ , and we will do in the sequel.

by $\tau_Q(q^i, v^i) = q^i$, and hence its tangent map $T\tau_Q: TQ \rightarrow TQ$ is defined as follows: if $(q, v) \in TQ$ and $X \in T_{(q,v)}(TQ)$ we have that $X = \lambda^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_{(q,v)} + \mu^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{(q,v)}$, and

$$[T_{(q,v)}\tau_Q](X)(q^j) = X(q^j \circ \tau_Q) = X(q^j) = \lambda^j ,$$

therefore

$$(T\tau_Q)((q, v), X) = (T\tau_Q) \left((q, v), \lambda^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_{(q,v)} + \mu^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \Big|_{(q,v)} \right) = \left(q, \lambda^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q \right) ,$$

with associated matrix is

$$T\tau_Q|_{(q,v)} = (I_{n \times n}, 0_{n \times n}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (\text{A.1})$$

In this way, we conclude that τ_Q is a surjective submersion. ■

Definition A.3 The above charts of the tangent bundle are called **natural charts** and their coordinates **natural coordinates** (q^i are the **base coordinates** and v^i the **fiber coordinates**).

Observe that the coordinate change in TQ , from (q^i, v^i) to (\bar{q}^i, \bar{v}^i) has the Jacobian matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{\partial \varphi^j}{\partial q^i} \right) & 0 \\ \left(\frac{\partial^2 \varphi^j}{\partial q^k \partial q^i} \right) v^i & \left(\frac{\partial \varphi^j}{\partial q^i} \right) \end{pmatrix} ,$$

and, taking into account that its determinant is positive at every point, we conclude that:

Corollary A.4 TQ is an orientable manifold.

The tangent bundle of a manifold is an example of a *vector bundle*. This structure is defined as follows:

Definition A.5 A **vector bundle** is a triple (E, B, π) , where E, B are differentiable manifolds (with $\dim B = m$, $\dim E = m + n$) and $\pi: E \rightarrow B$ is a surjective submersion such that, for every $p \in B$, there exists a local chart (U, ϕ) , $p \in U$, and a diffeomorphism $\psi: \pi^{-1}(U) \rightarrow \phi(U) \times \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying that:

1. If $\pi_1: \phi(U) \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \phi(U)$ is the natural projection, then $\pi_1 \circ \psi = \pi$.

2. $E_p = \pi^{-1}(p)$ is a vector space and, if $\pi_2: \phi(U) \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the natural projection, then the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_p &: E_p \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \\ v &\mapsto (\pi_2 \circ \psi)(p, v) \end{aligned}$$

are vector space morphisms.

E is called the **total manifold** of the vector bundle, B is the **base manifold**, π the **projection of the bundle**, \mathbb{R}^n is the **typical fiber**, n is the **rank of the bundle** and, for every $p \in B$, E_p is the **fiber** over p . The pair (U, ϕ) is said to be a **trivializing open set** and ψ is the associated **coordinate map**.

Observe that the family $(\pi^{-1}(U), \psi)$ is a differentiable atlas of E which is said to be **adapted** to the projection $\pi: E \longrightarrow B$.

There is a natural way to lift diffeomorphisms, curves and vector fields on a manifold to its tangent bundle.

Definition A.6 Let Q be a differentiable manifold and a diffeomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &: Q \longrightarrow Q \\ q &\mapsto \varphi(q) \end{aligned} .$$

The **canonical lift** of φ to TQ is the diffeomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} T\varphi &: TQ \longrightarrow TQ \\ (q, v) &\mapsto (q, T_q\varphi(v)) \end{aligned} .$$

This definition also holds for every map $\varphi: Q \longrightarrow Q$.

The following properties are immediate from the definition:

Proposition A.7 For every $\varphi, \phi \in \text{Diff } Q$,

1. $\varphi^{-1} \circ \tau_Q \circ T\varphi = \tau_Q$.
2. $T(\varphi \circ \phi) = T\varphi \circ T\phi$.

Using the definition of canonical lift of diffeomorphisms, we set:

Definition A.8 Let $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$ be a vector field. The **total, complete** or **canonical lift** of Z to TQ is the vector field $Z^C \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ whose local uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms are the canonical lifts $\{TF_t\}$ of the local uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms $\{F_t\}$ of Z .

As a direct consequence of the definition and of the theorem of existence and unicity of local uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms, we obtain the following result:

Proposition A.9 *Let $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$. Then Z^C is τ_Q -projectable and $\tau_{Q*}Z^C = Z$; that is, $T\tau_Q(Z^C_{(q,v)}) = Z_x$, for every $(q, v) \in TQ$.*

Local expression: In a chart of coordinates $(U; q^i)$ of Q , if

$$Z|_U = f^i(q^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i},$$

then we have that, in the induced chart of natural coordinates $(\tau_Q^{-1}(U); q^i, v^i)$ of TQ ,

$$Z^C|_{\tau_Q^{-1}(U)} = f^i(q^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + v^k \frac{\partial f^i}{\partial q^k}(q^j) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}.$$

In order to prove it, remember that, if $(q, u) \in \tau_Q^{-1}(U)$, then

$$Z^C(q, u) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} TF_t(q, u),$$

where $TF_t(q^i, v^i) = \left(F_t(q^i), \frac{\partial F_t}{\partial q^i} v^i \right)$ and, as a consequence,

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} TF_t(q, u) = \left(\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} F_t(q), \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \left(\frac{\partial F_t}{\partial q^i} v^i \right) (q, u) \right) = \left(f^i(q), v^j \frac{\partial f^i}{\partial q^j}(q^k) \right),$$

and the result follows.

Let $\gamma: (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ be a curve. If $t_0 \in (a, b)$ and $x = \gamma(t_0)$, then $\dot{\gamma}(t_0)$ is the tangent vector to the curve at the point $\gamma(t_0)$; that is, $\dot{\gamma}(t_0) \in T_{\gamma(t_0)}Q$. As $\dot{\gamma}(t)$ is well-defined for every $t \in (a, b)$, we can define:

Definition A.10 *The canonical lift of a curve γ to TQ is the curve*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\gamma}: & (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow TQ \\ & t & \longmapsto (\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \end{array} ,$$

which is defined as

$$(\gamma(t_0), \dot{\gamma}(t_0)) = T_{t_0} \gamma \frac{d}{dt};$$

that is, for every $f: Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then

$$(\gamma(t_0), \dot{\gamma}(t_0))f = (T_{t_0} \gamma \frac{d}{dt})f = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t_0} (f \circ \gamma) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(\gamma(t_0 + h)) - f(\gamma(t_0))}{h}.$$

Observe that $\tau_Q \circ \tilde{\gamma} = \gamma$.

Local expression: If (q^i) are local coordinates of Q in a neighbourhood of $\gamma(t_0)$, then $\gamma = (\gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^n)$, with $\gamma^i = q^i \circ \gamma$. If (q^i, v^i) are the natural induced coordinates in TQ , then $\tilde{\gamma}$ is given by $\tilde{\gamma} = (\gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^n, \dot{\gamma}^1, \dots, \dot{\gamma}^n)$, where $\dot{\gamma}^i = \frac{d\gamma^i}{dt}$.

The tangent vector to $\tilde{\gamma}$ at $\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)$ is $T_{t_0}\tilde{\gamma}\frac{d}{dt}$ and, if $f: TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have that

$$\left(T_{t_0}\tilde{\gamma}\frac{d}{dt}\right)f = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t_0} f \circ \tilde{\gamma},$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left(T_{t_0}\tilde{\gamma}\frac{d}{dt}\right)q^i &= \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t_0} q^i \circ \tilde{\gamma} = \dot{\gamma}^i(t_0), \\ \left(T_{t_0}\tilde{\gamma}\frac{d}{dt}\right)v^i &= \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t_0} v^i \circ \tilde{\gamma} = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t_0} \dot{\gamma}^i = \ddot{\gamma}^i(t_0); \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$T_{t_0}\tilde{\gamma}\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) = \dot{\gamma}^i(t_0)\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}\Big|_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)} + \ddot{\gamma}^i(t_0)\frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}\Big|_{\tilde{\gamma}(t_0)}.$$

Remark A.11 Remember that, given a vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$, a curve $\gamma: (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q$ is an *integral curve* of X at $\gamma(t) \in Q$, for $t \in (a, b)$, if

$$X(\gamma(t)) = \dot{\gamma}(t).$$

Taking this into account, if $\beta \in \Omega^k(Q)$, the contraction of β with X , denoted by $i(X)\beta$, allows us to define a new contraction $(i(\tilde{\gamma})(\beta \circ \gamma))$ in a natural way, as follows:

$$i(\tilde{\gamma}(t))(\beta(\gamma(t))) := i(\dot{\gamma}(t))(\beta|_{\gamma(t)}) \quad , \quad \text{for } t \in (a, b). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

A.1.2. The cotangent bundle of a manifold. Canonical lifts

Definition A.12 Let Q be a differentiable manifold. The **cotangent bundle** of Q is the dual bundle T^*Q of the tangent bundle TQ ; that is, $T^*Q := \bigcup_{q \in Q} T_q^*Q$.

We denote $\pi_Q: T^*Q \rightarrow Q$ the natural projection.

Thus, every point $p \in T^*Q$ is a pair $(q, \xi) \equiv \xi_q$, where $q = \pi_Q(p) \in Q$ and $\xi \in T_q^*Q$ (it is a linear form on T_qQ).

Proposition A.13 Let Q be a n -dimensional differentiable manifold. The cotangent bundle T^*Q is a $2n$ -dimensional differentiable manifold, whose differentiable structure is induced by the one of Q in a natural way. Moreover, the natural projection π_Q is a submersion.

(Proof) If $\mathcal{A} = \{(U_\alpha; \phi_\alpha = (x^i))\}$ is an atlas of local charts in Q , then the induced atlas $T^*\mathcal{A} = \{(T^*U_\alpha; \eta_\alpha = (q^i, p_i))\}$ is obtained as follows:

Given one of its elements $(U; x^i)$, we take

1. $T^*U := \pi_Q^{-1}(U)$.
2. For every $p \in T^*Q$, let $q^i(p) := x^i \circ \pi_Q(p)$ ².
3. Let $p \in T^*Q$ with $p = (q, \xi)$. Then $p_i(p) := \left\langle \xi, \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q \right\rangle$; that is, $p_i(p)$ are the components of the linear form ξ in the natural basis $dq^i|_q$ of T_q^*M : $\xi = p_i(p) dq^i|_q$.

If (q^i) and (\bar{q}^i) are two local systems of coordinates in $U \subset Q$, and $\bar{q}^j = \phi^j(q^i)$, then the relation between (p_i) and (\bar{p}_i) is the following,

$$p_i(q, \xi) = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}, \xi \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{\partial \phi^j}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{q}^j}, \xi \right\rangle = \frac{\partial \phi^j}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{q}^j}, \xi \right\rangle = \frac{\partial \phi^j}{\partial q^i} \Big|_q \bar{p}_j(q, \xi) ;$$

that is, $p_i = \frac{\partial \phi^j}{\partial q^i} \bar{p}_j$. Then, the changes of coordinates in T^*Q , from (q^i, p_i) to (\bar{q}^i, \bar{p}_i) , have as Jacobian matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{\partial \phi^j}{\partial q^i} \right) & 0 \\ \left(\frac{\partial^2 \phi^j}{\partial q^k \partial q^i} \right)^{-1} p_i & \left(\frac{\partial \phi^j}{\partial q^i} \right)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} .$$

From this local description of the cotangent bundle it is evident that its dimension is $2n$ as we know previously being the dual bundle of TQ . ■

Definition A.14 The above coordinate charts are called **natural charts** of the cotangent bundle and their elements **natural coordinates** (q^i are the **base coordinates** and p_i the **fiber coordinates**).

Observe that the determinant of the above last matrix is the unity and this is the same for any change of natural coordinates, hence the manifold T^*Q is also an orientable manifold.

In an analogous way as for the tangent bundle, there are natural (canonical) ways to lift diffeomorphisms and vector fields from a differentiable manifold Q to its cotangent bundle T^*Q .

²We commit an abuse of notation, denoting by q^i both the coordinates q^i and x^i .

Definition A.15 Consider a diffeomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &: Q \longrightarrow Q \\ x &\mapsto \varphi(x) \end{aligned} .$$

The *canonical lift* of φ to T^*Q is the diffeomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} T^*\varphi &: T^*Q \longrightarrow T^*Q \\ (\varphi(x), \xi) &\mapsto (x, T^*\varphi(\xi)) \end{aligned}$$

where $T^*\varphi(\xi)$ is defined by duality as follows: if

$$\begin{aligned} T\varphi &: TQ \longrightarrow TQ \\ (q, v) &\mapsto (x, T\varphi(v)) \end{aligned}$$

then, for every $v \in T_qQ$,

$$(T^*\varphi(\xi))(v) := \xi(T\varphi(v)) .$$

The following properties follow straightforwardly from the definition:

Proposition A.16 If $\varphi, \phi: Q \longrightarrow Q$ are diffeomorphisms, then:

1. $\varphi \circ \pi_Q \circ T^*\varphi = \pi_Q$.
2. $T^*(\varphi \circ \phi) = T^*\phi \circ T^*\varphi$,

A relevant property is:

Proposition A.17 If $\varphi: Q \longrightarrow Q$ is a diffeomorphism, then $(T^*\varphi)^*\Theta = \Theta$ and, as a consequence, $(T^*\varphi)^*\Omega = \Omega$ ³.

(Proof) For every $(q, \xi) \in T^*Q$ and $V \in T_{(\varphi(q), \xi)}(T^*Q)$, using the definition of Θ and the first property of the above proposition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} ((T^*\varphi)^*\Theta)_{(\varphi(q), \xi)}(V) &= \Theta_{(q, T^*\varphi(\xi))}(T_{(\varphi(q), \xi)}(T^*\varphi)(V)) \\ &= (\varphi_q^*\xi) \left(T_{(q, T^*\varphi(\xi))} \pi_Q (T_{(\varphi(q), \xi)}(T^*\varphi)(V)) \right) \\ &= (\varphi_q^*\xi) (T_{(\varphi(q), \xi)} (\pi_Q \circ T^*\varphi)(V)) \\ &= \xi \left(T_{\varphi(q)} \varphi (T(\pi_Q \circ T^*\varphi)(V)) \right) \\ &= \xi \left(T_{(\varphi(q), \xi)} (\varphi \circ \pi_Q \circ T^*\varphi)(V) \right) \\ &= \xi (T_{(\varphi(q), \xi)} \pi_Q (V)) \\ &= \Theta_{(\varphi(q), \xi)}(V) . \end{aligned}$$

³With the terminology introduced in Section 2.1.8, we say that $T^*\varphi$ is a *symplectomorphism*

The result for Ω is immediate from here. ■

Definition A.18 Consider a vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$. The **canonical lift** of Z to T^*Q is the vector field $Z^* \in \mathfrak{X}(T^*Q)$ whose local uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms are the canonical lifts T^*F_t of the local uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms F_t of Z .

As a straightforward consequence of the definition and of the theorem of existence and unicity of uniparametric groups of diffeomorphisms, we have that:

Proposition A.19 If $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(Q)$, then Z^* is π_Q -projectable and, for every $p \equiv (q, \xi) \in T^*Q$, we have that $T\pi_Q(Z_p^*) = Z_q$.

The coordinate expression of the canonical lift of a vector field to T^*Q is given in (3.3).

A.2. Lie groups and Lie algebras

(For more information about definitions and properties of Lie groups and Lie algebras, see, for instance, [7, 100, 275, 320, 341]).

Definition A.20 A (finite-dimensional) **Lie group** is a (finite-dimensional) differentiable manifold G such that (i) G is a group and (ii) the following group operations are smooth,

$$\begin{aligned} G \times G &\longrightarrow G, & G &\longrightarrow G \\ (g_1, g_2) &\mapsto g_1 g_2, & g &\mapsto g^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition A.21 Let G be a Lie group. A subset $H \subset G$ is a **Lie subgroup** of G if (i) H is a subgroup of G and (ii) H has a differentiable structure with respect to which it is a submanifold of G and a Lie group.

Given a Lie group G and an element $g \in G$, we can define the diffeomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} L_g: G &\longrightarrow G, & R_g: G &\longrightarrow G \\ g' &\mapsto g g', & g' &\mapsto g' g^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

which are the so-called **left** and **right translations** respectively, and satisfy the following properties:

1. For all $g, g' \in G$; $L_g \circ L_{g'} = L_g L_{g'}$, $R_g \circ R_{g'} = R_g R_{g'}$.
2. For all $g \in G$; $L_g^{-1} = L_{g^{-1}}$, $R_g^{-1} = R_{g^{-1}}$.

3. For all $g, g' \in G$; $L_g \circ R_{g'} = R_{g'} \circ L_g$.

These translations also induce translations on the set of vector fields $\mathfrak{X}(G)$, which are denoted by L_{g*} and R_{g*} , respectively. Then,

Definition A.22 A vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(G)$ is **left** (resp. **right**) **invariant** if, for every $g \in G$,

$$L_{g*}X = X \quad (\text{resp. } R_{g*}X = X) .$$

The sets of these vector fields are denoted $\mathfrak{X}_L(G)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_R(G)$ respectively.

Proposition A.23 The sets $\mathfrak{X}_L(G)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_R(G)$ are Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{X}(G)$.

(Proof) The sum of invariant vector fields is also invariant, and the same thing holds for the Lie bracket, since, for every $g \in G$ and $X_1, X_2 \in \mathfrak{X}_L(G)$ (or $X_1, X_2 \in \mathfrak{X}_R(G)$),

$$L_{g*}[X_1, X_2] = [L_{g*}X_1, L_{g*}X_2] = [X_1, X_2] .$$

■

Definition A.24 The set $\mathfrak{X}_L(G)$ is the **Lie algebra** of G and is denoted by \mathfrak{g} .

Proposition A.25 If $e \in G$ is the neutral element of G , then there is a canonical vector space isomorphism between $\mathfrak{X}_L(G)$ and T_eG .

(Proof) To every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_L(G)$ corresponds a vector of T_eG by means of the isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1: \quad \mathfrak{X}_L(G) &\longrightarrow T_eG \\ X &\longmapsto X(e) := X_e \end{aligned} .$$

Conversely, from every $X_e \in T_eG$, we can obtain a unique vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}_L(G)$ using the map

$$\begin{aligned} X : \quad G &\longrightarrow TG \\ g &\longmapsto (g, TL_g X_e) \end{aligned} .$$

which is a vector field since, for every $f \in C^\infty(G)$, the map $X(f): G \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth and, hence, so is X . Moreover, X is left-invariant, as you can easily see taking into account its construction from X_e . The map giving X from X_e is denoted $\rho_2: T_eG \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}_L(G)$.

■

- Thus, it is usual to identify \mathfrak{g} with $T_e G$, and then the Lie bracket between two vectors of $T_e G$ is defined as

$$[X_e, X'_e] := [\rho_2 X_e, \rho_2 X'_e](e) .$$

Then, if $\{v_i\}$ is a basis of $T_e G$, there exist $c_{ij}^k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$[v_i, v_j] = c_{ij}^k v_k ,$$

which are called **structure constants** of the group G (related to the chosen basis of \mathfrak{g}). It can be proved that $c_{ij}^k = 0$ (for all i, j, k) if, and only if, G is locally isomorphic to \mathbb{R}^n , that is, G is an *Abelian Lie group*.

- As it is obvious, we can take $\mathfrak{X}_R(G)$ instead of $\mathfrak{X}_L(G)$ in order to define \mathfrak{g} . Then, the identification with $T_e G$ would be established in an analogous way, although the Lie algebra structure so obtained in $T_e G$ is the opposite one to the above. Nevertheless, both structures are isomorphic since the map $-\text{Id}_{T_e G}$ exchanges them.

Definition A.26 Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie algebra. Then, we have the following sequence of ideals:

$$\mathfrak{g} \supseteq \mathfrak{g}' \supseteq \mathfrak{g}'' \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathfrak{g}^k \supseteq \dots$$

where

$$\mathfrak{g}' := [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] , \mathfrak{g}'' := [\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}'] , \dots , \mathfrak{g}^k := [\mathfrak{g}^{k-1}, \mathfrak{g}^{k-1}] .$$

Then, \mathfrak{g}^k is called the *kth-derivated algebra* of \mathfrak{g} .

Observe that, if $\mathfrak{g}^k = 0$, then $\mathfrak{g}^{k+1} = 0$. Then we define:

Definition A.27 Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie algebra.

1. \mathfrak{g} is **Abelian** if $\mathfrak{g}' = 0$.
2. \mathfrak{g} is **solvable** if $\mathfrak{g}^k = 0$, for some $k > 0$.
3. Consider now the sequence $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \supseteq \mathfrak{g}_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathfrak{g}_k \supseteq \dots$ where

$$\mathfrak{g}_1 := \mathfrak{g} , \mathfrak{g}_2 := [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}_1] , \dots , \mathfrak{g}_k := [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}_{k-1}]$$

\mathfrak{g} is **nilpotent** if $\mathfrak{g}_k = \{0\}$, for some $k > 0$.

4. \mathfrak{g} is **simple** if it has no ideals other than $\{0\}$ and \mathfrak{g} .

5. \mathfrak{g} is **semisimple** if its largest solvable ideal is $\{0\}$; that is, if $\mathfrak{g}^k = \mathfrak{g}$, for every k .

It is easy to prove that

$$\mathfrak{g} \text{ abelian} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ nilpotent} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ solvable},$$

and that every non-Abelian simple Lie algebra is semisimple.

Definition A.28 Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie algebra. The **center** of \mathfrak{g} is the set

$$\{X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [X, Y] = 0, Y \in \mathfrak{g}\},$$

which is a commutative ideal of \mathfrak{g} .

Definition A.29 A p -form $\beta \in \Omega^p(G)$ is **left** (resp. **right**) **invariant** if, for every $g \in G$,

$$L_g^* \beta = \beta \quad (\text{resp. } R_g^* \beta = \beta).$$

The set of the left-invariant 1-forms is the dual vector space of $\mathfrak{X}_L(G) := \mathfrak{g}$ and is denoted by \mathfrak{g}^* .

Proposition A.30 \mathfrak{g}^* is isomorphic to T_e^*G .

(Proof) It is obvious from the definition. ■

As a consequence, from a covector $\beta_e \in T_e^*G$, we can obtain another one at every point $g \in G$ doing $L_{g^{-1}}^* \beta_e := \beta_g$. Then, the map

$$\begin{aligned} B : G &\longrightarrow T^*G \\ g &\longmapsto (g, \beta_g) \end{aligned}$$

is a left-invariant 1-form. Therefore, it is easy to prove the following properties:

Proposition A.31 1. For every $g \in G$, $\beta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, and $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$, we have that:

- (a) $d\beta$ is left-invariant.
- (b) $\langle X_g, \beta_g \rangle = \langle X_e, \beta_e \rangle$; that is, $\langle X, \beta \rangle = \text{ctn.}$
- (c) $d\beta(X, Y) = -\langle [X, Y], \beta \rangle$.

2. If $\{v_i\}$ is a basis of T_eG and $\{\gamma^i\}$ is the dual basis in T_e^*G , then

$$(a) \quad d\gamma^k(v_i, v_j) = -c_{ij}^l \langle v_l, \gamma^k \rangle = -c_{ij}^k$$

(b) The following equations holds

$$d\gamma^k = -1/2c_{ij}^k \gamma^i \wedge \gamma^j$$

The numbers $c_{ij}^k \in \mathbb{R}$ are called the **Maurer–Cartan structure equations** of the group G (related to the chosen basis of \mathfrak{g}^*).

Definition A.32 The **canonical** or **Maurer–Cartan form** of the Lie group G is the 1-form with values on \mathfrak{g} , $\omega \in \Omega^1(G, \mathfrak{g})$, defined as follows: for every $g \in G$ and $X \in \mathfrak{X}(G)$,

$$\omega_g(X_g) := TL_g^{-1}X_g$$

Obviously, ω is left-invariant.

Observe that, in the definition, $X \in \mathfrak{X}(G)$. In particular, if $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, (that is, X is left-invariant) then we have that $TL_g^{-1}X_g = X_e$. Then an alternative definition of ω is the following:

Definition A.33 The **Maurer–Cartan form** of the Lie group G is the only left-invariant 1-form with values on \mathfrak{g} , $\omega \in \Omega^1(G, \mathfrak{g})$, such that $\omega(X) = X$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$; that is, it gives the identity one on \mathfrak{g} .

Definition A.34 The **uniparametric subgroups** of G are the integral curves passing through e of the left (resp. right) invariant vector fields, that is, the maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \alpha & : & \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow G \\ & & t \longmapsto g_t := \alpha(t) \end{array}$$

such that, if $X \in \mathfrak{X}_L(G)$, then (i) $X_{g_{t_0}} = \frac{d}{dt}\alpha(t)\big|_{t_0}$ and (ii) $X_e = \frac{d}{dt}\alpha(t)\big|_0$.

These uniparametric subgroups are complete and, there exists a bijective correspondence between \mathfrak{g} and the set of uniparametric subgroups of G . The map which implements this correspondence is defined as follows:

Definition A.35 The **exponential map** is defined as,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \exp & : & T_e G \longrightarrow G \\ & & tX_e \longmapsto g_t \end{array}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and such that $\exp(0) = e$; that is, if α is the uniparametric subgroup corresponding to $\rho_2 X_e$, then (i) $\exp(X_e) := \alpha(1)$ and (ii) $\exp(0) := e$.

- Notice that the exponential map maps a point of the line tX_e on T_eG into a point of the integral curve of the vector field ρ_2X_e on G .
- Taking into account that \mathbb{R} is a Lie group with respect to the sum and that $\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow G$ is a Lie group homomorphism, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\exp(t_1X_e)\exp(t_2X_e) &= g_{t_1}g_{t_2} = \alpha(t_1)\alpha(t_2) = \alpha(t_1+t_2) \\ &= g_{(t_1+t_2)} = \exp((t_1+t_2)X_e) .\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \exp(tX_e) \right|_{t_0} = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \alpha(t) \right|_{t_0} = X_{g_{t_0}} ,$$

and, in particular,

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \exp(tX_e) \right|_{t=0} = X_e .$$

All these properties justify the name given to this map ⁴. Observe that the last two equalities are natural from the definition, since $\alpha(t) = \exp(tX_e)$ is the integral curve of X . Hence, the flux of X is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau & : & \mathbb{R} \times G \longrightarrow G \\ & & (t, g) \longmapsto g \exp(tX_e) ; \end{array}$$

that is, $\tau_t(g) = g \exp(tX_e) = R_{\exp(tX_e)}g$.

- The exponential map allows constructing locally the group G from the algebra \mathfrak{g} .

⁴Another justification is that, if V is a vector space, and we consider $G = \text{Aut}(V)$, then $\exp: \text{End}(V) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(V)$ and, for all $a \in \text{End}(V)$, we obtain

$$\exp(a) = e^a := \mathbf{1} + a + a^2/2! + a^3/3! + \dots + a^n/n! + \dots$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the identity and $a^n := a \circ \dots \circ a$ (n times).

Bibliography

- [1] R. Abraham and J.E. Marsden, *Foundations of Mechanics* (2nd ed.), Benjamin–Cummings, New York, 1978. (ISBN-10: 080530102X).
- [2] B. Aebischer, M. Borer, M. Kälin, C. Leuenberger, and H.M. Reimann, *Symplectic Geometry, Progress in Math.* **124**, Birkhäuser Basel, 2012. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-7512-7>).
- [3] C. Albert, “Le théorème de réduction de Marsden–Weinstein en géométrie cosymplectique et de contact”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **6**(4) (1989) 627–649. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0393-0440\(89\)90029-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0393-0440(89)90029-6)).
- [4] A. Anahory, L. Colombo, M. de León, J.C. Marrero, D. Martín de Diego, and E. Padrón, “Reduction by symmetries of contact mechanical systems on Lie groups”, [arxiv.org:2306.07028 \[math-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.07028) (2023).
- [5] V. Apostolov, D. Calderbank, P. Gauduchon, and E. Legendre, “Toric contact geometry in arbitrary codimension”, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* **2020**(8) (2018) 2436–2467. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/imrn/rny021>).
- [6] J.M. Arms, R.H. Cushman, and M.J. Gotay, “A universal reduction procedure for Hamiltonian group actions”, *M.S.R.I. Series* **22**, T. Ratiu ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991, 33–52. (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-9725-0_4).
- [7] V.I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics, Graduate Texts in Math.* **60**. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989. (ISBN-10: 0387968903).
- [8] D. Arovas, *Lecture Notes on Classical Mechanics*, Lecture notes for UCSD PHY 110A/B and PHY 200A, Create Space Indep. Pub. Platform, 2014. (ISBN: 978-1505568714).
- [9] M. Asorey, J.F. Cariñena, and L.A. Ibort, “Generalized canonical transformations for time-dependent systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **24**(12) (1983) 2745. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.525672>).
- [10] P. Balseiro, J.C. Marrero, D. Martín de Diego, and E. Padrón, “A unified framework for mechanics: Hamilton–Jacobi equation and applications”, *Nonlinearity* **23**(8) (2010) 1887–1918. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0951-7715/23/8/006>).

- [11] G. Bande and A. Hadjar, “Contact pairs”, *Tohoku Math. J.* **57**(2) (2005) 247–260. (<https://doi.org/10.2748/tmj/1119888338>).
- [12] A. Banyaga, “On isomorphic classical diffeomorphism groups I”, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **98**(1) (1986) 113–118. (<https://doi.org/10.2307/2045779>).
- [13] A. Banyaga, “On isomorphic classical diffeomorphism groups II”, *J. Diff. Geom.* **28**(1) (1988) 23–35. (<https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1214442158>).
- [14] A. Banyaga, “The structure of classical diffeomorphism groups”, in *Mathematics and its Applications*, **400**, 113–118, Kluwer Acad. Pub. Group, Dordrecht, 1997. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-6800-8>).
- [15] A. Banyaga, *The Geometry surrounding the Arnold-Liouville Theorem*, in *Advances in Geometry. Progress in Mathematics* **172**, J.L. Brylinski, R. Brylinski, V. Nistor, B. Tsygan, and P. Xu (eds); Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 1999. (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1770-1_3).
- [16] A. Banyaga and D.F. Houenou, *A Brief Introduction to Symplectic and Contact Manifolds*, *Nankai Tracts in Math.* **15**, World Scientific, 2016. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/9667>).
- [17] M. Barbero-Liñán, M. de León, and D. Martín de Diego, “Lagrangian submanifolds and Hamilton–Jacobi equation”, *Monatshefte für Mathematik* **171**(3-4) (2013) 269–290. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2012.4.207>).
- [18] M. Barbero-Liñán, M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, J.C. Marrero, and M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, “Kinematic reduction and the Hamilton–Jacobi equation”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **4**(3) (2012) 207–237. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2012.4.207>).
- [19] M. Barbero-Liñán, M. Delgado-Téllez, and D. Martín de Diego, “A geometric framework for discrete Hamilton–Jacobi equation”, *Procs. XX Int. Fall Workshop on Geom. Phys.* (Madrid), *AIP Conference Procs.* **1460** (2012) 164–168. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4733374>).
- [20] M. Barbero-Liñán, A. Echeverría-Enríquez, D. Martín de Diego, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Skinner–Rusk unified formalism for optimal control problems and applications”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40**(40) (2007) 12071–12093. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/40/40/005>).
- [21] M. Barbero-Liñán, A. Echeverría-Enríquez, D. Martín de Diego, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Unified formalism for non-autonomous mechanical systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **49**(6) (2008) 062902. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2929668>).
- [22] L.M. Bates, F. Fassò, and N. Sansonetto, “The Hamilton–Jacobi equation, integrability, and nonholonomic systems”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **6**(4) (2014) 441–449. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2014.6.441>).

- [23] L. Bates and J. Sniatycki, “Nonholonomic reduction”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **32**(1) (1993) 99–115. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4877\(93\)90073-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4877(93)90073-N)).
- [24] C. Batlle, J. Gomis, J.M. Pons, and N. Román-Roy, “Equivalence between the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism for constrained systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **27**(12) (1986) 2953–2962. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.527274>).
- [25] C. Batlle, J. Gomis, J.M. Pons, and N. Román-Roy, “Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints”, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **13**(1) (1987) 17–23. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00570763>).
- [26] S. Benenti and W.M. Tulczyjew, “The geometrical meaning and globalization of the the Hamilton–Jacobi method”, in *Differential Geometric Methods in Mathematical Physics*, 9–21. (Proc. Conf. Aix-en-Provence/Salamanca, 1979), Lect. Notes in Math. **836**, Springer, Berlin, (1980). (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0089724>).
- [27] G. Blankenstein and A.J. Van der Schaft, “Optimal control and implicit Hamiltonian systems”, *Nonlinear Control in the Year 2000*, Eds. A. Isidori, F. Lamnabhi-Lagarigue, W. Respondek. Springer–Verlag, LNCIS 258 (2000) 185–206. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0110216>).
- [28] R.J. Blattner, “Quantization and representation theory”, *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.* **26** (1973) 147–165.
- [29] D. Bleeker, *Gauge Theory and Variational Principles*, Addison-Wesley, Reading (Ma), 1981. (ISBN: 978-0486445465).
- [30] G.A. Bliss, *Lectures on the Calculus of Variations*, Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago (1980). (ISBN: 9781114511354).
- [31] A. Bloch and P. Crouch, “Optimal control, optimization and analytical mechanics”, in *Mathematical Control Theory*, L. Bailieul and J.C. Willems Eds., Springer-Verlag (1999) 265–321. (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1416-8_8).
- [32] A. M. Bloch, P.S. Krishnaprasad, J.E. Marsden, and R. M. Murray, “Nonholonomic mechanical systems with symmetry”, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **136**(1) (1996) 21–99. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02199365>).
- [33] P. Bolle, “Une condition de contact pour les sous-variétés coisotropes d’une variété symplectique”, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Sér. 1* **1** (1996) 83–86.
- [34] A. Bravetti, “Contact Hamiltonian dynamics: The concept and its use”, *Entropy* **19**(10) (2017) 535–546. (<https://doi.org/10.3390/e19100535>).
- [35] A. Bravetti, “Contact geometry and thermodynamics”, *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.* **16**(supp01) (2019) 1940003. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887819400036>).

- [36] A. Bravetti, H. Cruz, and D. Tapias, “Contact Hamiltonian mechanics”. *Ann. Phys.* **376** (2017) 17–39. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2016.11.003>).
- [37] A. Bravetti, M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and E. Padrón, “Invariant measures for contact Hamiltonian systems: symplectic sandwiches with contact bread”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **53**(45) (2020) 455205. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/abbaaa>).
- [38] A.J. Bruce, K. Grabowska, and J. Grabowski, “Higher order mechanics on graded bundles”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **48**(20)(2015) 205203. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/48/20/205203>).
- [39] A.J. Bruce, K. Grabowska, and J. Grabowski, “Remarks on contact and Jacobi geometry”, *Symm. Integ. Geom. Meth. Appl. (SIGMA)*, **13** (2017) 059. (<https://doi.org/10.3842/SIGMA.2017.059>).
- [40] R. Bryant, S. Chern, H. Gardner, P. Griffith, and H. Goldschmidt, *Exterior Differential Systems*, MSRI Book Series **18**, Springer, New York, 1991. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-9714-4>).
- [41] F. Bullo and A.D. Lewis, *Geometric Control of Mechanical Systems*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 2004. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-7276-7>).
- [42] O. Calin and D.H. Chang, *Geometric Mechanics on Riemannian Manifolds*, Birkhäuser, Boston. 2005. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/b138771>).
- [43] C.M. Campos, M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, and M. Vaquero, “Hamilton–Jacobi theory in Cauchy data space”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **76**(3) (2015) 359–387. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877\(15\)30038-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877(15)30038-0)).
- [44] C.M. Campos, M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, and J. Vankerschaver, “Unambiguous formalism for higher order Lagrangian field theories”. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **42**(47) (2009) 475207. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/42/47/475207>).
- [45] A. Cannas da Silva, *Lectures on Symplectic Geometry*, Springer–Verlag, Heildelberg. 2008. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-45330-7>).
- [46] F. Cantrijn, J.F. Cariñena, M. Crampin, and L.A. Ibort, “Reduction of degenerate Lagrangian systems”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **3**(3) (1986) 353–400. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0393-0440\(86\)90014-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0393-0440(86)90014-8)).
- [47] F. Cantrijn, J. Cortés, and S. Martínez, “Skinner–Rusk approach to time-dependent mechanics”, *Phys. Lett. A* **300**(2–3) (2002) 250–258. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601\(02\)00777-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601(02)00777-6)).
- [48] F. Cantrijn, M. Crampin, and W. Sarlet, “Higher-order differential equations and higher-order Lagrangian mechanics”, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* **99**(3) (1986) 565–587. (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305004100064501>).

- [49] F. Cantrijn, M. de León, and E.A. Lacomba, “Gradient vector fields on cosymplectic manifolds”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25**(1) (1992) 175-188. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/25/1/022>).
- [50] F. Cantrijn, M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego, “Reduction of nonholonomic mechanical systems with symmetries”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **42**(1-2) (1998) 25–45. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877\(98\)80003-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877(98)80003-7)).
- [51] F. Cantrijn and J. Vankerschaver, “The Skinner-Rusk approach for vakonomic and nonholonomic field theories”, in *Diff. Geom. Meth. in Mech. and Field Theor.* 1–14, Acad. Press, 2007.
- [52] B. Cappelletti-Montano, A. De Nicola, and I. Yudin, “A survey on cosymplectic geometry”, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **25**(10) (2013) 1343002. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129055X13430022>).
- [53] G. Caratù, G. Marmo, A. Simoni, B. Vitale, and F. Zaccaria, “Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms: An analysis of classical mechanics on tangent and cotangent bundles”, *Nuov Cim B* **31** (1976) 152–172. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02730325>).
- [54] R. Cardona, E. Miranda, D. Peralta-Salas, and F. Presas, “Universality of Euler flows and flexibility of Reeb embeddings”, *Adv. in Math.* **428**(1) (2023) 109142. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2023.109142>)
- [55] J.F. Cariñena, “Theory of singular Lagrangians”, *Fortschr. Phys.* **38**(9) (1990) 641–679. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.2190380902>).
- [56] J.F. Cariñena, J. Clemente-Gallardo, and G. Marmo, “Reduction procedures in classical and quantum mechanics”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **4**(8) (2007) 1363–1403. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887807002594>).
- [57] J.F. Cariñena and J. Fernández-Nuñez, “Geometric theory of time-dependent singular Lagrangians”, *Fortschr. Phys.* **41**(6) (1993) 517-552. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.2190410603>).
- [58] J.F. Cariñena, J. Gomis, L.A. Ibort, and N. Román-Roy, “Canonical transformations theory for presymplectic systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **26**(8) (1985) 1961-1969. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.526864>).
- [59] J.F. Cariñena, J. Gomis, L.A. Ibort, and N. Román-Roy, “Applications of the canonical transformations theory for presymplectic systems”, *Nuovo Cim. B* **98**(2) (1987) 172-196. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02721479>).
- [60] J.F. Cariñena, X. Gràcia, G. Marmo, E. Martínez, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Geometric Hamilton–Jacobi theory”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **3**(7) (2006) 1417–1458. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887806001764>).

- [61] J.F. Cariñena, X. Gràcia, G. Marmo, E. Martínez, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Geometric Hamilton–Jacobi theory for nonholonomic dynamical systems”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **7**(3) (2010) 431–454. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887810004385>).
- [62] J.F. Cariñena, X. Gràcia, G. Marmo, E. Martínez, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Structural aspects of Hamilton–Jacobi theory”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **13**(2) (2016) 1650017. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887816500171>).
- [63] J. Cariñena and P. Guha, “Nonstandard Hamiltonian structures of the Liénard equation and contact geometry”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **16**(supp 01) (2019) 1940001. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887819400012>).
- [64] J.F. Cariñena, L.A. Ibort, G. Marmo, and G. Morandi, *Geometry from dynamics, Classical and Quantum*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2015. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9220-2>).
- [65] J.F. Cariñena and C. López, “The time evolution operator for singular Lagrangians”, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **14**(3) (1987) 203–210. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00416849>).
- [66] J.F. Cariñena and C. López, “The time-evolution operator for higher-order singular Lagrangians”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **7**(11) (1992) 2447–2468. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217751X92001083>).
- [67] J.F. Cariñena, C. López, and N. Román-Roy, “Geometric study of the connection between the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **4**(3) (1987) 315–334. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0393-0440\(87\)90017-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0393-0440(87)90017-9)).
- [68] J.F. Cariñena, C. López, and N. Román-Roy, “Origin of the Lagrangian constraints and their relation with the Hamiltonian formulation”, *J. Math. Phys.* **29**(5) (1988) 1143–1149. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.527955>).
- [69] J.F. Cariñena, J. Nunes da Costa, and P. Santos, “Reduction of Lie algebroid structures”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **2**(5) (2005) 965–991. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887805000909>).
- [70] J.F. Cariñena, J. Nunes da Costa, and P. Santos, “Reduction of Lagrangian mechanics on Lie algebroids”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **57**(3) (2007) 977–990. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2006.08.001>).
- [71] J.F. Cariñena, J. Nunes da Costa, and P. Santos, “Quasi-coordinates from the point of view of Lie algebroid structures”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **40**(33) (2007) 10031. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/40/33/008>).
- [72] E. Cartan, *Leçons sur les Invariants Intégraux*, Hermann. Paris, 1922.

- [73] M. Castrillón-López, P.L. García-Pérez, and T.S. Ratiu, “Euler–Poincaré reduction on principal bundles”, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **58**(2) (2001) 167–180. (<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013303320765>).
- [74] M. Castrillón-López, P.L. García-Pérez, and C. Rodrigo, “Euler–Poincaré reduction in principal fibre bundles and the problem of Lagrange”, *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **25**(6) **25**(6) (2007) 585–593. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.difgeo.2007.06.007>).
- [75] M. Castrillón-López and B. Langerock, “Routh reduction for singular Lagrangians”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **7**(8) (2010) 1451–1489. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887810004907>).
- [76] M. Castrillón-López and J.E. Marsden, “Some remarks on Lagrangian and Poisson reduction for field theories”. *J. Geom. Phys.* **48**(1) (2003) 52–83. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440\(03\)00025-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440(03)00025-1)).
- [77] M. Castrillón-López and T. Ratiu, “Reduction in principal bundles: covariant Lagrange–Poincaré equations”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **236**(2) (2003) 223–250. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-003-0797-5>).
- [78] M. Castrillón-López, T. Ratiu, and S. Shkoller, “Reduction in principal fiber bundles: Covariant Euler–Poincaré equations”, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **128**(7) (2000) 2155–2164. (<https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9939-99-05304-6>).
- [79] H. Cendra, J.E. Marsden, and T.S. Ratiu, *Lagrangian Reduction by Stages*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **152**(722), 2001. (<https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/0722>).
- [80] G. Chavchanidze, “Non-Noether symmetries and their influence on phase space geometry”. *J. Geom. Phys.* **48**(2-3) (2003) 190–202. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440\(03\)00040-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440(03)00040-8)).
- [81] G. Chavchanidze, “Non-Noether symmetries in Hamiltonian dynamical systems”. *Mem. Diff. Eqs. Math. Phys.* **36** (2005) 81–134.
- [82] D. Chinea, M. de León, and J.C. Marrero, “Locally conformal cosymplectic manifolds and time-dependent Hamiltonian systems”, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* **32**(2) (1991) 383–387. (ISSN: 0010-2628).
- [83] D. Chinea, M. de León, and J.C. Marrero, “The constraint algorithm for time-dependent Lagrangians”, *J. Math. Phys.* **35**(7) (1994) 3410–3447. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.530476>).
- [84] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, C. Dewitt-Morette, and M. Dillard-Bleick, *Analysis, Manifolds and Physics* (2nd ed.). North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1982. (ISBN: 0-444-86017-7).

- [85] D. Cline, *Variational Principles in Classical Mechanics* (2nd ed.), Univ. Rochester, Rochester, NY, 2018. (ISBN: 978-0-9988372-7-7).
- [86] F. Ciaglia, H. Cruz, and G. Marmo, “Contact manifolds and dissipation, classical and quantum”. *Ann. Phys.* **398** (2018) 159–179. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2018.09.012>).
- [87] L. Colombo, D. Martín de Diego, and M. Zuccalli, “Optimal control of underactuated mechanical systems: a geometric approach”, *J. Math. Phys.* **51**(8) (2010) 083519. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3456158>).
- [88] L. Colombo, M. de León, P.D. Prieto-Martínez, and N. Román-Roy, “Geometric Hamilton–Jacobi theory for higher-order autonomous systems”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **47**(3) (2014) 235203. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/47/23/235203>).
- [89] L. Colombo, M. de León, P.D. Prieto-Martínez, and N. Román-Roy, “Unified formalism for the generalized k th-order Hamilton–Jacobi problem”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **11**(9) (2014) 1460037. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887814600378>).
- [90] L. Conlon, *Differentiable Manifolds*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2001. (ISBN 978-0-8176-4766-7). (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-4767-4>).
- [91] G.C. Constantelos, “On the Hamilton–Jacobi Theory with derivatives of higher order”, *Nuovo Cim. B* (11) **84**(1) (1984) 91–101. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02721650>).
- [92] J. Cortés, M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, and S. Martínez, “Geometric description of vakonomic and nonholonomic dynamics. Comparison of solutions”. *SIAM J. Control Opt.* **41**(5) (2002) 1389–1412. (<https://doi.org/10.1137/S036301290036817X>).
- [93] J. Cortés, S. Martínez, and F. Cantrijn, “Skinner–Rusk approach to time-dependent mechanics”, *Phys. Lett. A* **300**(2-3) (2002) 250–258. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601\(02\)00777-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601(02)00777-6)).
- [94] M. Crampin, “Constants of the motion in Lagrangian mechanics”, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **16**(10) (1977) 741–754. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01807231>).
- [95] M. Crampin, “On the differential geometry of the Euler–Lagrange equations and the inverse problem of Lagrangian dynamics”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **14**(10) (1981) 2567–2575. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/14/10/012>).
- [96] M. Crampin, “A note on non-Noether constants of motion”, *Phys. Lett. A* **95**(5) (1983) 209–212. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601\(83\)90605-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601(83)90605-9)).
- [97] M. Crampin, “Tangent bundle geometry for Lagrangian dynamics”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **16** (1983) 3755–3772. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/16/16/014>).

- [98] M. Crampin, *Jet Bundle Techniques in Analytical Mechanics*, Quaderni del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Gruppo Nazionale de Fisica Matematica, Florence, **47** 1995.
- [99] M. Crampin and T. Mestdag, “Reduction and reconstruction aspects of second-order dynamical systems with symmetry”, *Acta Appl. Math.* **105** (2009) 241–266. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10440-008-9274-7>).
- [100] M. Crampin and F.A.E. Pirani, *Applicable Differential Geometry*, LMS Lecture Notes Ser. **59**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986. (<https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511623905>).
- [101] M. Crampin, G.E. Prince, and G. Thompson, “A geometrical version of the Helmholtz conditions in time-dependent Lagrangian dynamics”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **17**(7) (1984) 1437–1447. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/17/7/011>).
- [102] G. Darboux, “Sur le problème de Pfaff”, *Bull. Sci. Math. Astr.* (Ser. 2) **6**(1) (1882) 14–36.
- [103] U.N. de Almeida, *Contact Anosov Actions with Smooth Invariant Bundles*, Ph D. thesis, Universidade de São Paulo, 2018. (<https://doi.org/10.11606/T.55.2018.tde-01112018-110622>).
- [104] M. de León, J. Gaset, X. Gràcia, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and X. Rivas, “Time-dependent contact mechanics”, *Monatsh. Math.* **201** (2023) 1149–1183. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00605-022-01767-1>).
- [105] M. de León, J. Gaset, M. Láinz, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Higher-order contact mechanics”. *Ann. Phys.* **425** (2021) 168396. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2021.168396>).
- [106] M. de León, J. Gaset, M. Láinz-Valcázar, X. Rivas, and N. Román-Roy, “Unified Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism for contact systems”, *Fortsch. Phys.* **68**(8) (2020) 2000045. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.202000045>).
- [107] M. de León, J. Gaset, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, X. Rivas, and N. Román-Roy, “Multicontact formulation for non-conservative field theories”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **56**(2) (2023) 025201. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/acb575>).
- [108] M. de León, V.M. Jiménez, and M. Láinz, “Contact Hamiltonian and Lagrangian systems with nonholonomic constraints”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **13**(1) (2021) 25–53. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2021001>).
- [109] M. de León and M. Láinz-Valcázar, “Singular Lagrangians and precontact Hamiltonian systems”. *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **16**(10) (2019) 1950158. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887819501585>).
- [110] M. de León and M. Láinz-Valcázar, “Infinitesimal symmetries in contact Hamiltonian systems”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **153** (2020) 153651. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2020.103651>).

- [111] M. de León, M. Laínz-Valcázar, A. López-Gordón, and X. Rivas, “Hamilton–Jacobi theory and integrability for autonomous and non-autonomous contact systems”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **187** (2023) 104787. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2023.104787>).
- [112] M. de León, M. Laínz-Valcázar, and A. Muñoz-Brea, “The Hamilton–Jacobi theory for contact Hamiltonian systems”, *Mathematics* **2021** *16*(9) (2021) 1993. (<https://doi.org/10.3390/math9161993>).
- [113] M. de León, M. Laínz-Valcázar, and M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, “Optimal control, contact dynamics and Herglotz variational problem”, *J Nonlinear Sci.* **33** (2023) 9. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00332-022-09861-2>).
- [114] M. de León, M. Laínz-Valcázar, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Constrained Lagrangian dissipative contact dynamics”, *J. Math. Phys.* **62**(12) (2021) 122902. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0071236>).
- [115] M. de León, J. Marín-Solano, and J.C. Marrero, “The constraint algorithm in the jet formalism”, *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **6**(3) (1996) 275-300. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-2245\(96\)82423-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-2245(96)82423-5)).
- [116] M. de León, J. Marín-Solano, J.C. Marrero, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Singular Lagrangian systems on jet bundles”, *Fortsch. Phys.* **50**(2) (2002) 105-169. ([https://doi.org/10.1002/1521-3978\(200203\)50:2<105::AID-PROP105>3.0.CO;2-N](https://doi.org/10.1002/1521-3978(200203)50:2<105::AID-PROP105>3.0.CO;2-N)).
- [117] M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego, “Time-dependent constrained Hamiltonian systems and Dirac brackets”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **29**(21) (1996) 6843-6859. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/29/21/016>).
- [118] M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego, “A new geometrical setting for classical field theories”, *Classical and Quantum Integrability*. Banach Center Pub. **59**, Inst. of Math., Polish Acad. Sci., Warsaw (2003) 189-209. (<https://doi.org/10.4064/bc59-0-10>).
- [119] M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego, “Vakonomic mechanics versus nonholonomic mechanics: a unified geometric approach”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **35**(2-3) (2000) 126–144 ([http://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440\(00\)00004-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440(00)00004-8)).
- [120] M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego, “A geometric Hamilton–Jacobi theory for classical field theories”, *Variations, geometry and physics*, 129–140, Nova Sci. Pub., New York, 2009. (<http://hdl.handle.net/10261/4169>).
- [121] M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego, “Linear almost Poisson structures and Hamilton–Jacobi equation. Applications to nonholonomic mechanics”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **2**(2) (2010) 159–198. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2010.2.159>).

- [122] M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and E. Martínez, “Lagrangian submanifolds and dynamics on Lie algebroids”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38**(24) (2005) R241. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/38/24/R01>).
- [123] M. de León and D. Martín de Diego, “On the geometry of nonholonomic Lagrangian systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **37**(7) (1996) 3389–3414. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.531571>).
- [124] M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, J.C. Marrero, M. Salgado, and S. Vilariño, “Hamilton–Jacobi theory in k -symplectic field theories”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **7**(8) (2010) 1491–1507. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887810004919>).
- [125] M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, and A. Santamaría-Merino, “Symmetries in classical field theories”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **1**(5) (2004) 651–710. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887804000290>).
- [126] M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, and M. Vaquero, “A Hamilton–Jacobi theory for singular Lagrangian systems in the Skinner and Rusk setting”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **9**(8) (2012) 1250074. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887812500740>).
- [127] M. de León, D. Martín de Diego, and M. Vaquero, “A Hamilton–Jacobi theory on Poisson manifolds”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **6**(1) (2014) 121–140. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2014.6.121>).
- [128] M. de León, M.H. Mello, and P.R. Rodrigues, “Reduction of degenerate non-autonomous Lagrangian systems”, *Mathematical Aspects of Classical Field Theory*, *Contemp. Math.* **132**, 275–305, Eds. M.J. Gotay, J.E. Marsden, V. Moncrief, American Math. Society, Seattle, Washington. 1992. (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/conm/132>).
- [129] M. de León, P.D. Prieto-Martínez, N. Román-Roy, and S. Vilariño, “Hamilton–Jacobi theory in multisymplectic classical field theories”, *J. Math. Phys.* **58**(9) (2017) 092901. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5004260>).
- [130] M. de León and P.R. Rodrigues, *Methods of Differential Geometry in Analytical Mechanics*, North-Holland Publishing Co., *North-Holland Math. Studies* **158**, Amsterdam, 1989. (ISBN: 0444558276).
- [131] M. de León and P.R. Rodrigues, *Generalized Classical Mechanics and Field Theory*, *North-Holland Math. Studies* **112**, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1985. (ISBN: 0080872239, 9780080872230).
- [132] M. de León and M. Saralegi, “Cosymplectic reduction for singular momentum maps”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **26**(19) (1993) 1–11. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/26/19/032>).

- [133] M. de León and C. Sardón, “Cosymplectic and contact structures to resolve time-dependent and dissipative Hamiltonian systems”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **50**(25) (2017) 255205. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/aa711d>).
- [134] M. de León and S. Vilariño, “Hamilton–Jacobi theory in k -cosymplectic field theories”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **11**(1) (2014) 1450007. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887814500078>).
- [135] J. de Lucas, X. Gràcia, X. Rivas, and N. Román-Roy, “On Darboux theorems for geometric structures induced by closed forms”, arxiv.org:2306.08556 (2023).
- [136] J. de Lucas, X. Gràcia, X. Rivas, N. Román-Roy, and S. Vilariño, “Reduction and reconstruction of multisymplectic Lie systems”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **55**(29) (2022) 295204. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/ac78ab>).
- [137] J. de Lucas and X. Rivas, “Contact Lie systems: theory and applications”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **56**(33) (2023) 335203. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/ace0e7>).
- [138] J. de Lucas, X. Rivas, S. Vilariño, and B.M. Zawora, “On k -polycosymplectic Marsden–Weinstein reductions”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **191** (2023), 104899. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2023.104899>).
- [139] A. de Nicola and W.M. Tulczyjew, “A variational formulation of analytical mechanics in an affine space”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **58**(3) (2006) 335–350. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877\(07\)00004-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877(07)00004-3)).
- [140] A. Deriglazov, *Classical Mechanics Hamiltonian and Lagrangian Formalism*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2010. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14037-2>).
- [141] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, Belfer Graduate School of Science, New York, Yeshiva University, 1964. (ISBN-10: 0486417131).
- [142] D. Dominici and J. Gomis, “Poincaré–Cartan integral invariant and canonical transformations for singular Lagrangians”, *J. Math. Phys.* **21**(8) (1980) 2124–2130. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.524721>).
- [143] D. Dominici, J. Gomis, G. Longhi, and J.M. Pons, “Hamilton–Jacobi theory for constrained systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **25**(8) (1984) 2439–2460. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.526452>).
- [144] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, A. Ibort, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Invariant forms and automorphisms of locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **4**(4) (2012) 397–419. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2012.4.397>).
- [145] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, C. López, J. Marín-Solano, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Lagrangian-Hamiltonian unified formalism for field theory”, *J. Math. Phys.* **45**(1) (2004) 360–385. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1628384>).

- [146] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Geometrical setting of time-dependent regular systems. Alternative models”, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **3**(3) (1991) 301-330. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129055X91000114>).
- [147] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Non-standard connections in classical mechanics”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **28**(19) (1995) 5553-5567. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/28/19/011>).
- [148] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Reduction of presymplectic manifolds with symmetry”, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **11**(10) (1999) 1209-1248. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129055X99000386>).
- [149] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, N. Román-Roy, and C. Victoria, “Mathematical foundations of geometric quantization”, *Extracta Math.* **13**(2) (1998) 135-238
- [150] A. Echeverría-Enríquez, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, and N. Román-Roy, “Remarks on multisymplectic reduction”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **81**(3) (2018) 415–424. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877\(18\)30057-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877(18)30057-0)).
- [151] L. Elsgolts, *Differential Equations and the Calculus of Variations*, Mir Pubs., Moscow, 1971. (ISBN-10: 0714703710).
- [152] G. Esposito, G. Marmo, and G. Sudarshan, *From Classical to Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004. (<https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511610929>).
- [153] R.P. Feynman, R.B. Leighton, and M. Sands, *Lectures on Physics* Vol. 1, (2nd edition), California Inst. Tech., Basic Books, New York, 2010. (ISBN: 978-0-465-02414-8).
- [154] D. Finamore, “Contact foliations and generalised Weinstein conjectures”, arxiv.org:2202.07622 [math.SG] (2022).
- [155] C.R. Galley, “Classical mechanics of nonconservative systems”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **110**(17) (2013) 174301. (<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.174301>).
- [156] T. Gallissot, “Les formes extérieures en Mécanique”, *Ann. Inst. Fourier Grenoble* **4** (1952) 145-297. (<https://doi.org/10.5802/aif.49>).
- [157] F. Gantmacher, *Lectures in Analytical Mechanics*, Mir, Moscow, 1970. (ISBN-10: 0846405512).
- [158] P.L. García, “Geometric quantization”, *Mem. Real Acad. Cienc. Exact. Fis. Nat.* **11**, Madrid (1979).
- [159] J. Gaset, X. Gràcia, M. Muñoz-Lecanda, X. Rivas, and N. Román-Roy, “A contact geometry framework for field theories with dissipation”, *Ann. Phys.* **414** (2020) 168092. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2020.168092>).

- [160] J. Gaset, X. Gràcia, M. Muñoz-Lecanda, X. Rivas, and N. Román-Roy, “New contributions to the Hamiltonian and Lagrangian contact formalisms for dissipative mechanical systems and their symmetries”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **17**(6) (2020) 2050090. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887820500905>).
- [161] J. Gaset, X. Gràcia, M. Muñoz-Lecanda, X. Rivas, and N. Román-Roy, “A k -contact Lagrangian formulation for nonconservative field theories”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **87**(3) (2021) 347–368. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877\(21\)00041-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877(21)00041-0)).
- [162] J. Gaset, M. Laínz, A. Mas, and X. Rivas, “The Herglotz principle for field theories”, [arxiv.org:2211.17058](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.17058) [math-ph] (2022).
- [163] J. Gaset, A. López-Gordón, A. Mas, and X. Rivas, “Symmetries, conservation and dissipation in time-dependent contact systems”, *Fortschr. Phys.* **71** (2023) 2300048. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.202300048>).
- [164] I.M. Gelfand and S.V. Fomin, *Calculus of Variations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs., N.J., 1963.
- [165] H. Geiges, *An Introduction to Contact Topology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008. (<https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511611438>).
- [166] B. Georgieva and R. Guenther, “First Noether-type theorem for the generalized variational principle of Herglotz”, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* **20**(2) (2002) 261–273. (<https://doi.org/10.12775/TMNA.2002.036>).
- [167] A. Ghosh and C. Bhamidipati, “Contact geometry and thermodynamics of black holes in AdS spacetimes”, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 126020. (<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.100.126020>).
- [168] R. Giachetti, “Hamiltonian systems with symmetry: An introduction”, *Riv. Nuovo Cim.* **4**(12) (1981) 1–63. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02740644>).
- [169] C. Godbillon, *Géométrie Différentielle et Mécanique Analytique*, Hermann, Paris 1969. (ISBN 10: 2705656588).
- [170] L. Godinho and J. Natário, *An Introduction to Riemannian Geometry (With Applications to Mechanics and Relativity)*, Springer, 2014. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08666-8>).
- [171] H. Goldstein, C.P. Poole, and J.L. Safko, *Classical Mechanics* (3rd ed.), Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., 2001. (ISBN 978-0-201-65702-9).
- [172] J. Gomis, J. Llosa, and N. Román-Roy, “Lee Hwa Chung theorem for presymplectic manifolds. Canonical transformations for constrained systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **25**(5) (1984) 1348–1355. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.526303>).

- [173] M. Gotay, J. Isenberg, and J. E. Marsden, “Momentum maps and classical relativistic fields, Part I: Covariant field theory”, arxiv.org: [2004] physics/9801019. “Part II: Canonical analysis of Field Theories”, arxiv.org: [2004] math-ph/0411032.
- [174] M.J. Gotay and J.M. Nester, “Presymplectic Lagrangian systems I: the constraint algorithm and the equivalence problem”, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **30** (1979) 129-142. (https://www.numdam.org/item/AIHPA_1979_30_2_129_0/)
- [175] M.J. Gotay, and J.M. Nester, “Presymplectic Lagrangian systems II: the second order equation problem”, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **32** (1980) 1-13. (https://www.numdam.org/item/AIHPA_1980_32_1_1_0/).
- [176] M.J. Gotay, J.M. Nester, and G. Hinds, “Presymplectic manifolds and the Dirac-Bergmann theory of constraints”, *J. Math. Phys.* **27** (1978) 2388-2399. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.523597>).
- [177] S. Goto, “Contact geometric descriptions of vector fields on dually flat spaces and their applications in electric circuit models and nonequilibrium statistical mechanics”, *J. Math. Phys.* **57**(10) (2016) 102702. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4964751>).
- [178] K. Grabowska and J. Grabowski, “Dirac algebroids in Lagrangian and Hamiltonian mechanics”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **61**(11) (2011) 2233–2253. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2011.06.018>).
- [179] K. Grabowska and J. Grabowski, “A geometric approach to contact Hamiltonians and contact Hamilton–Jacobi theory”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **55**(43) (2022) 435204 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/10.1088/1751-8121/ac9adb>).
- [180] K. Grabowska and J. Grabowski, “Reductions: precontact versus presymplectic”, *Annali di Matematica* (2023). (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-023-01341-y>).
- [181] K. Grabowska and J. Grabowski, “Contact geometric mechanics: the Tulczyjew triples”, arxiv.org:2209.03154 [math.SG] (2022).
- [182] K. Grabowska, J. Grabowski, and P. Urbanski, “Geometrical mechanics on algebroids”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **3**(3) (2006) 559–575. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887806001259>).
- [183] J. Grabowski, G. Landi, G. Marmo, and G. Vilasi, “Generalized reduction procedure: Symplectic and Poisson formalism”, *Fortschr. Phys.* **42**(5) (1994) 393-427. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.2190420502>).
- [184] X. Gràcia and R. Martín, “Geometric aspects of time-dependent singular differential equations”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **2**(4) (2005) 597-618. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887805000697>).

- [185] X. Gràcia and J.M. Pons, “On an evolution operator connecting Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms”, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **17** (1989) 175-180. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00401582>).
- [186] X. Gràcia, and J.M. Pons, “A generalized geometric framework for constrained systems”, *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **2** (1992) 223-247. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-2245\(92\)90012-C](https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-2245(92)90012-C)).
- [187] X. Gràcia, J.M. Pons, and N. Román-Roy, “Higher order Lagrangian systems: geometric structures, dynamics and constraints”, *J. Math. Phys.* **32**(10) (1991) 2744-2763. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.529066>).
- [188] X. Gràcia, J.M. Pons, and N. Román-Roy, “Higher-order conditions for singular Lagrangian systems”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25** (1992) 1981–2004. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/25/7/037>).
- [189] W. Greub, S. Halpering, and S. Vanstone, *Connections, curvature and cohomology*, Acad. Press, New York, 1972. (ISBN: 9780080873602).
- [190] J. Grifone, “Structure presque-tangente et conexions I”, *Ann Inst. Fourier Grenoble* **22**(1) (1972) 287-334. (<https://doi.org/10.5802/aif.407>).
- [191] J. Grifone, “Structure presque-tangente et conexions II”, *Ann Inst. Fourier Grenoble* **22**(3) (1972) 291-338. (<https://doi.org/10.5802/aif.431>).
- [192] S. Grillo, J.C. Marrero, and E. Padrón, “Extended Hamilton–Jacobi theory, symmetries and integrability by quadratures”, *Mathematics* **2021** *9*(12), 1357. (<https://doi.org/10.3390/math9121357>).
- [193] S. Grillo and E. Padrón, “A Hamilton–Jacobi Theory for general dynamical systems and integrability by quadratures in symplectic and Poisson manifolds”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **10**(1) (2016) 101-129. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2016.07.010>).
- [194] S. Grillo and E. Padrón, “Extended Hamilton–Jacobi theory, contact manifolds, and integrability by quadratures”, *J. Math. Phys.* **61**(1) (2020) 012901. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5133153>).
- [195] A. Guerra IV and N. Román-Roy, “More insights into symmetries in multisymplectic field theories”, *Symmetry* **2023**, *15*(2) 390. (<https://doi.org/10.3390/sym15020390>).
- [196] V. Guillemin, V. Ginzburg, and Y. Karshon, *Moment maps, Cobordisms, and Hamiltonian Group Actions*, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs Ser. 98*, American Math. Soc., 2002. (ISBN: 0821805029).
- [197] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg, *Geometric Asymptotics*, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 14*, American Math. Soc., 1977. (ISBN: 978-0-8218-1633-2).

- [198] H. Hamoui and A. Lichnerowicz, “Geometry of the dynamical systems with time-dependent constraints and time-dependent Hamiltonian: an approach towards quantization”, *J. Math. Phys.* **25**(4) (1984) 923–934. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.526247>).
- [199] A.J. Hanson, T. Regge, and C. Teitelboim, *Constrained Hamiltonian systems*, Acad. Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome 1976. (<https://hdl.handle.net/2022/3108>).
- [200] G. Herglotz, “Berührungstransformationen”, Lectures at the University of Gottingen, 1930.
- [201] G. Herczeg and A. Waldron, “Contact geometry and quantum mechanics”, *Phys. Lett. B* **781** 1(2018) 312–315. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2018.04.008>).
- [202] G. Herglotz, *Vorlesungen über die Mechanik der Kontinua*, Teubner-Archiv zur Mathematik **3**, Teubner, Leipzig, 1985.
- [203] R. Hermann, *Differential Geometry and the Calculus of Variations*, *Math. in Sci. and Engineering* **49** Academic Press, New York, 1968. (eBook ISBN: 9780080955575).
- [204] D.D. Holm. *Geometric Mechanics. Part I. Dynamics and Symmetry*. Imperial College Press, London; distributed by World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2008. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/p801>).
- [205] L.A. Ibort, “The geometry of dynamics”, *Extracta Math.* **11**(1) (1996) 80–105.
- [206] L.A. Ibort, M. de León, J.C. Marrero, and D. Martín de Diego, “Dirac brackets in constrained dynamics”, *Fortschr. Phys.* **47** 5 (1999) 459–492. ([https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1521-3978\(199906\)47:5<459::AID-PROP459>3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1521-3978(199906)47:5<459::AID-PROP459>3.0.CO;2-E)).
- [207] L.A. Ibort and J. Marín-Solano, “A geometric classification of Lagrangian functions and the reduction of the evolution space”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25**(11) (1992) 3353–3367. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/25/11/036>).
- [208] D. Iglesias-Ponte, M. de León, and D. Martín de Diego, “Towards a Hamilton–Jacobi theory for nonholonomic mechanical systems”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41**(1) (2008) 015205. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/41/1/015205>).
- [209] J.V. José and E.J. Saletan, *Classical Dynamics. A Contemporary Approach*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998. (ISBN: 0-521-63636-1).
- [210] K. Kamimura, “Singular Lagrangians and constrained Hamiltonian systems, generalized canonical formalism”, *Nuovo Cim. B* **69** (1982) 33–54. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02888859>).
- [211] A. L. Kholodenko, *Applications of Contact Geometry and Topology in Physics*, World Scientific, 2013. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/8514>).

- [212] T. Kibble and F.H. Berkshire, *Classical Mechanics* (5th ed.), World Scientific Pub. Comp., London, 2004. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/p310>).
- [213] A.A. Kirillov, "Geometric quantization", in the *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences* 4: *Dynamical Systems*, Springer, Berlin (1985) 137-172. (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-06793-2_2).
- [214] J. Klein, "Espaces variationelles et mécanique", *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **12** (1962) 1–124. (https://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIF_1962_12_1_0).
- [215] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu, *Foundations of differential geometry* (Vol. 1), Wiley, New York, 1996 (1st ed. 1963). (ISBN: 978-0-471-15733-5).
- [216] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach, *The Noether Theorems. Invariance and Conservation Laws in the Twentieth Century*, Springer, New York, 2011. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-87868-3>).
- [217] O. Krupkova, "Higher-order mechanical systems with constraints", *J. Math. Phys.* **41**(8) (2000) 5304–5324. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.533411>).
- [218] O. Krupková and A. Vondra, "On some integration methods for connections on fibered manifolds", 89–101, in *Differential Geometry and its Applications, Proc. Conf.* (Opava, 1992). Silesian University, Opava, 1993.
- [219] R. Kuwabara, "Time-dependent mechanical symmetries and extended Hamiltonian systems", *Rep. Math. Phys.* **19** (1984) 27-38. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4877\(84\)90023-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4877(84)90023-5)).
- [220] C. Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics* (4th ed.), Dover, New York, 1970. ISBN 0-486-65067-7.
- [221] M. Laínz-Valcázar and M. de León, "Contact Hamiltonian systems", *J. Math. Phys.* **60**(10) (2019) 102902. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5096475>).
- [222] C. Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics* (4th ed.), Dover Pub., NY, 1986. (ISBN: 9780486650678).
- [223] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshits, *Mechanics* (3rd ed.), Elsevier, 1976. (ISBN: 978-0-7506-2896-9).
- [224] S. Lang, *Differential and Riemannian Manifolds*, Springer-Verlag, New York. 1995. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-4182-9>).
- [225] B. Langerock, F. Cantrijn, and J. Vankerschaver, "Routhian reduction for quasi-invariant Lagrangians", *J. Math. Phys.* **51**(2) (2010) 022902, 20 pp. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3277181>).

- [226] M.J. Lazo, J. Paiva, J.T.S. Amaral, and G.S.F. Frederico, “An action principle for action-dependent Lagrangians: Toward an action principle to non-conservative systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **59**(3) (2018) 032902. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5019936>).
- [227] J. M. Lee. *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*, Springer, 2013. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-21752-9>).
- [228] J. M. Lee. *Introduction to Riemannian Manifolds*, Springer, 2018. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91755-9>).
- [229] Lee Hwa Chung, “The universal integral invariants of Hamiltonian systems and applications to the theory of canonical transformations”, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* **LXIIA** (1947), 237–246. (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0080454100006646>).
- [230] M. Leok, T. Ohsawa, and D. Sosa, “Hamilton–Jacobi theory for degenerate Lagrangian systems with holonomic and nonholonomic constraints”, *J. Math. Phys.* **53**(7) (2012) 072905. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4736733>).
- [231] M. Leok and D. Sosa, “Dirac structures and Hamilton–Jacobi theory for Lagrangian mechanics on Lie algebroids”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **4**(4) (2012) 421–442. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2012.4.421>).
- [232] M. Levi, *Classical Mechanics with Calculus of Variations and Optimal Control*, American Math. Soc., 2014. (ISBN 0821891383).
- [233] A.D. Lewis, “The physical foundations of geometric mechanics”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **9**(4) (2017) 487–574. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2017019>).
- [234] A.D. Lewis, “Nonholonomic and constrained variational mechanics”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **12**(2) (2020) 165–308. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2020013>).
- [235] P. Libermann and C.M. Marle, *Symplectic Geometry and Analytical Dynamics*, D. Reidel Pub. Co., Dordrecht, 1987. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-3807-6>).
- [236] A. Lichnerowicz, “Variétés symplectiques et dynamique associée à une sous-variété”, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **280A** (1975) p. 523–527.
- [237] Q. Liu, P.J. Torres, and C. Wang, “Contact Hamiltonian dynamics: variational principles, invariants, completeness and periodic behavior”, *Ann. Phys.* **395** (2018) 26–44. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2018.04.035>).
- [238] J. Llosa and N. Román-Roy, “Invariant forms and Hamiltonian systems: A geometrical setting”, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **27**(12) (1988), 1533–1543. (ISSN 0072-5285). (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00669290>).

- [239] R. Loja-Fernandes , J.P. Ortega, and T.S. Ratiu, “The momentum map in Poisson geometry”, *Am. J. Math.* **131**(5) (2009) 1261–1310 . (<https://doi.org/10.1353/ajm.0.0068>).
- [240] L. Mangiarotti and G. Sardanashvily, *Gauge Mechanics*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1998. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/3905>).
- [241] C.M. Marle, “Poisson manifolds in mechanics”, *Bifurcation theory, mechanics and physics*, 47–76, Math. Appl., Reidel, Dordrecht, 1983. (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-7192-9_3).
- [242] C.M. Marle, “Reduction of constrained mechanical systems and stability of relative equilibria”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **174** (1995) 295–318. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02099604>).
- [243] G. Marmo, G. Mendella, and W.M. Tulczyjew, “Constrained Hamiltonian systems as implicit differential equations”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **30**(1) (1997) 277–293. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/30/1/020>).
- [244] G. Marmo, G. Morandi, and N. Mukunda, “The Hamilton–Jacobi theory and the analogy between classical and quantum mechanics”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **1**(3) (2009) 317–355. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2009.1.317>).
- [245] G. Marmo, E.J. Saletan, A. Simoni, and B. Vitale, *Dynamical Systems, a Differential Geometric Approach to Symmetry and Reduction*. J. Wiley, New York 1985. (<https://doi.org/10.1112/blms/18.5.523>).
- [246] J.C. Marrero, N. Román-Roy, M. Salgado, and S. Vilariño, “On a kind of Noether symmetries and conservation laws in k -cosymplectic field theory”, *J. Math. Phys.* **52**(2) (2011), 022901; (20 pages). (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3545969>).
- [247] J.C. Marrero, N. Román-Roy, M. Salgado, and S. Vilariño, “Reduction of polysymplectic manifolds”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **48**(5) (2015), 055206. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/48/5/055206>).
- [248] J.E. Marsden, G. Misiolek, J.P. Ortega, M. Perlmutter, and T.S. Ratiu, *Hamiltonian Reduction by Stages, Lect. Notes in Math.* **1913**, Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-72470-4>).
- [249] J.E. Marsden and T.S. Ratiu, “Reduction of Poisson manifolds”, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **11** (1986) 161–170. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00398428>).
- [250] J.E. Marsden and T. Ratiu, *Introduction to Mechanics and Symmetry, Texts in Applied Math.* **17**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-21792-5>).

- [251] J.E. Marsden and A. Weinstein, “Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **5**(1) (1974) 121–130. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4877\(74\)90021-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4877(74)90021-4)).
- [252] J.E. Marsden and A. Weinstein, “Some comments on the history, theory, and applications of symplectic reduction”, *Quantization of Singular Symplectic Quotients*. N. Landsman, M. Pflaum, M. Schlichenmanier eds., Birkhauser, Boston (2001) 1–20. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-8364-1>).
- [253] J.E. Marsden, T.S. Ratiu, and A. Weinstein, “Semi-direct products and reduction in Mechanics”, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **281**(1) (1984) 147–177. (<https://doi.org/10.2307/1999527>).
- [254] J.E. Marsden and J. Scheurle, “The reduced Euler–Lagrange equations”, *Fields Inst. Comm.* **1** (1993) 139–164. (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/fic/001>).
- [255] E. Martínez, “Lagrangian mechanics on Lie algebroids”, *Acta App. Math.* **67** (2001) 295–320. (<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011965919259>).
- [256] E. Martínez, “Reduction in optimal control theory”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **53**(1) (2004) 79–90. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877\(04\)90005-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4877(04)90005-5)).
- [257] E. Martínez, T. Mestdag, and W. Sarlet, “Lie algebroid structures and Lagrangian systems on affine bundles”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **44**,(1) (2002) 70–95. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440\(02\)00114-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440(02)00114-6)).
- [258] S. Martínez, J. Cortés, and M. de León, “The geometrical theory of constraints applied to the dynamics of vakonomic mechanical systems: The vakonomic bracket”, *J. Math. Phys.* **41**(4) (2000) 2090–2120. (<http://doi.org/10.1063/1.533229>).
- [259] S. Martínez, J. Cortés and M. de León, “Symmetries in vakonomic dynamics. Applications to optimal control”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **38**(3–4) (2001) 343–365. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440\(00\)00069-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440(00)00069-3)).
- [260] E. Massa and S. Vignolo, “A new geometrical framework for time-dependent Hamiltonian Mechanics”, *Extracta Math.* **18**(1) (2003) 107–118. (ISSN: 0213-8743).
- [261] M.R. Menzio and W.M. Tulczyjew, “Infinitesimal symplectic relations and generalized Hamiltonian dynamics”, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **28**(4) (1978) 349–367. (http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPA1978_28_4_349_0).
- [262] E. Miranda, “Integrable systems and group actions”, *Centr. Eur. J. Math.* **12** (2014) 240–270. (<https://doi.org/10.2478/s11533-013-0333-6>).
- [263] B. Montano, “Integral submanifolds of r -contact manifolds”, *Demonstr. Math.* **41**(1) (2008) 189–202. (<https://doi.org/10.1515/dema-2013-0054>).

- [264] G. Morandi, C. Ferrario, G. Lo Vecchio, G. Marmo, and C. Rubano, "The inverse problem in the calculus of variations and the geometry of the tangent bundle", *Phys. Rep.* **188**(3–4) (1990,) 147–284. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573\(90\)90137-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(90)90137-Q)).
- [265] M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, "Hamiltonian systems with constraints: a geometric approach". *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **28** (11) (1989) 1405–1417. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00671858>).
- [266] M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda and N. Román-Roy, "Lagrangian theory for presymplectic systems", *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **57**(1) (1992) 27–45. (https://www.numdam.org/item/AIHPA_1992_57_1_27_0/).
- [267] J.I. Neĭmark and N.A. Fufaev, *Dynamics of Nonholonomic Systems*, Translated from the 1967 Russian original by J. R. Barbour. Translations of Mathematical Monographs **33**. American Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1972. (<https://doi.org/10.1090/mmono/033>).
- [268] E. Noether, "Invariante Variationsprobleme", *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse* **1918** 235—257. (<http://eudml.org/doc/59024>).
- [269] J. Nunes da Costa and F. Petalidou, "Reduction of Jacobi–Nijenhuis manifolds", *J. Geom. Phys.* **41**(3) (2002) 181–195. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440\(01\)00054-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0393-0440(01)00054-7)).
- [270] J. Nunes da Costa and F. Petalidou, "Reduction of Jacobi–Nijenhuis manifolds via Dirac structures theory", *Diff. Geom. App.* **23**(3) (2005) 282–304. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.difgeo.2005.06.003>).
- [271] J.T. Oden and J.N. Reddy, *Variational Methods in Theoretical Mechanics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1983. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-68811-9>).
- [272] T. Ohsawa, and A.M. Bloch, "Nonholomic Hamilton–Jacobi equation and integrability", *J. Geom. Mech.* **1**(4) (2011) 461–481. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2009.1.461>).
- [273] T. Ohsawa, A.M. Bloch, and M. Leok, "Discrete Hamilton–Jacobi theory", *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **49**(4) (2011) 1829–1856. (<https://doi.org/10.1137/090776822>).
- [274] T. Ohsawa, O.E. Fernández, A.M. Bloch, and MD.V. Zenkov, "Nonholonomic Hamilton–Jacobi theory via Chaplygin Hamiltonization" *J. Geom. Phys.* **61**(8) (2011) 1263–1291. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2011.02.015>).
- [275] T. Okubo, *Differential Geometry, Monographs in Pure and App. Math.* **112**, Marcel Dekker Inc, New York, 1987. (ISBN-10: 082477700X).
- [276] W.M. Oliva, *Geometric Mechanics, Lecture Notes in Math.* **1798**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002. (ISBN: 978-3-540-44242-4).
- [277] J.P. Ortega, "The symplectic reduced spaces of a Poisson action", *Comptes Rendus Math.* **334**(11) (2002) 999–1004. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S1631-073X\(02\)02394-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1631-073X(02)02394-4)).

- [278] J.P. Ortega and T.S. Ratiu, “The Optimal momentum map”, In *Geometry, Mechanics, and Dynamics* 329–362, P. Newton, P. Holmes, and A. Weinstein (eds), Springer, New York, 2002. (https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-21791-6_11).
- [279] J.P. Ortega and T.S. Ratiu, *Momentum maps and Hamiltonian reduction*, *Progress in Math.* **222**, Birkhäuser, New York, 2004. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3811-7>).
- [280] Pham-Mau-Quan, *Introduction à la Géométrie des Variétés Différentiables*, Dunod, Paris, 1969. (ISBN: 2706106549, 9782706106545).
- [281] P.D. Prieto-Martínez and N. Román-Roy, “Lagrangian-Hamiltonian unified formalism for autonomous higher-order dynamical systems”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44**(38) (2011) 385203. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/44/38/385203>).
- [282] P.D. Prieto-Martínez and N. Román-Roy “Unified formalism for higher-order non-autonomous dynamical systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **53**(3) (2012) 032901, 38 pp. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3692326>).
- [283] P.D. Prieto-Martínez and N. Román-Roy “Higher-order mechanics. Variational principles and other topics”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **5**(4) (2015) 493–510. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2013.5.493>).
- [284] P.D. Prieto-Martínez, and N. Román-Roy, “A new multisymplectic unified formalism for second order classical field theories”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **7**(2) (2015) 203–253. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2015.7.203>).
- [285] H. Ramirez, B. Maschke, and D. Sbarbaro, “Partial stabilization of input-output contact systems on a Legendre submanifold”, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* **62**(3) (2017) 1431–1437. (<https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2016.2572403>).
- [286] M.F. Rañada, “Extended Legendre tangent bundle formalism for time-dependent Lagrangian systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **32**(2) (1991) 500–505. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.529442>).
- [287] M.F. Rañada, “Extended Legendre transformation approach to the time-dependent Hamiltonian formalism”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25**(14) (1992) 4025–4035. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/25/14/017>).
- [288] T.S. Ratiu, R. Tudoran, L. Sbano, E. Sousa Dias, and G. Terra, *A Crash Course in Geometric Mechanics, Lecture Note Ser.* **306**, *Geometric Mechanics and Symmetry*, 23–156, London Math. Soc., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2005. (<https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511526367.003>).
- [289] M. Razavy, *Classical and Quantum Dissipative Systems*, Imperial College Press, 2006. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/103911April2017>).

- [290] A.M. Rey, N. Román-Roy, and M. Salgado, “Günther’s formalism in classical field theory: Skinner-Rusk approach and the evolution operator”, *J. Math. Phys.* **46**(5) (2005) 052901. (<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1876872>).
- [291] A.M. Rey, N. Román-Roy, M. Salgado, and S. Vilariño, “k-cosymplectic classical field theories: Tulczyjew and Skinner-Rusk formulations”, *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.* **15** (2011) 1–35. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11040-012-9104-z>).
- [292] X. Rivas, “Nonautonomous k -contact field theories”, *J. Math. Phys.* **64**(3) (2023) 033507. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0131110>).
- [293] X. Rivas, M. Salgado, and S. Souto, “Some contributions to k-contact Lagrangian field equations, symmetries and dissipation laws”, arXiv.org:2304.00833 [math-ph] (2023).
- [294] X. Rivas and D. Torres, “Lagrangian–Hamiltonian formalism for cocontact systems”, *J. Geom. Mech.* **15**(1) (2022) 1–26. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2023001>).
- [295] N. Román-Roy, “A summary on symmetries and conserved quantities of autonomous Hamiltonian systems”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **12**(3) (2020) 541–551. (<https://doi.org/10.3934/jgm.2020009>).
- [296] N. Román-Roy, “An overview of the Hamilton–Jacobi theory: the classical and geometrical approaches and some extensions and applications”, *Mathematics* **2021** 9(1) (2021) 85. (<https://doi.org/10.3390/math9010085>).
- [297] N. Román-Roy, M. Salgado, and S. Vilariño, “Symmetries and conservation laws in the Günther k -symplectic formalism of field theory”, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **19**(10) (2007) 1117–1147. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129055X07003188>).
- [298] E.J. Saletan and A.H. Cromer, *Theoretical Mechanics*, Wiley & Sons, New York, 1971. (ISBN 0471749869, 9780471749868).
- [299] W. Sarlet and F. Cantrijn, “Higher-order Noether symmetries and constants of the motion”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **14**(2) (1981) 479–492. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/14/2/023>).
- [300] W. Sarlet and F. Cantrijn, “Generalizations of Noether’s theorem in classical mechanics”. *SIAM Rev.* **23**(4) (1981) 467–494. (<https://doi.org/10.1137/1023098>).
- [301] W. Sarlet, F. Cantrijn, and M. Crampin, “A new look at second-order equations and Lagrangian mechanics”, *J. Phys. A Math. Gen.* **17**(10) (1984) 1999–2009. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/17/10/012>).
- [302] D.J. Saunders, *The Geometry of Jet Bundles*, *Lect. Notes Ser.* **142**, London Math. Soc., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, New York, 1989. (<https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511526411>).

- [303] F. Scheck, *Mechanics: From Newton Laws to Deterministic Chaos* (4th ed.), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-05370-2>).
- [304] D.J. Simms and N.M.J. Woodhouse, *Lectures on Geometric Quantization, Lecture Notes in Phys.* **53**, Springer, New York, 1976. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-07860-6>).
- [305] R. Sjamaar and E. Lerman, “Stratified symplectic spaces and reduction”, *Ann. Math.* **134**(2) (1991) 375–422. (<https://doi.org/10.2307/2944350>).
- [306] A.A. Simoes, M. de León, M. Láinz-Valcázar, and D. Martín de Diego, “Contact geometry for simple thermodynamical systems with friction”, *Proc. Royal Soc. A: Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **476**(2241) 20200244. (<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2020.0244>).
- [307] R. Skinner and R. Rusk, “Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics I: Formulation on $T^*Q \otimes TQ$ ”, *J. Math. Phys.* **24** (1983) 2589–2594. (<https://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.525654>).
- [308] R. Skinner and R. Rusk, “Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics II: Gauge transformations”, *J. Math. Phys.* **24** (1983) 2595–2601. (<https://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.525655>).
- [309] J. Śniatycki, “Dirac brackets in geometric dynamics”, *Ann. I.H.P. Phys. Théor.* **20**(4) (1974) 365–372. (https://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPA_1974_20_4_365_0).
- [310] J. Śniatycki, *Geometric Quantization and Quantum Mechanics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1980). (<https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-6066-0>).
- [311] A. Sommerfeld, *Mechanics. Lectures on Theoretical Physics I*. Translated from the 4th German ed. by Martin O. Stern. Academic Press, Inc., New York., 1952.
- [312] J.M. Souriau, *Structure of Dynamical Systems: a Symplectic View of Physics*, Springer Science, 2012 (ISBN: 978-1-4612-6692-1).
- [313] M. Spivak, *A Comprehensive Introduction to Differential Geometry*, vol. **II** (1972). (ISBN: 0914098713).
- [314] M. Spivak, *Physics for Mathematicians, Mechanics I*. Publish or Perish, Inc., Houston, Texas, 2010.(ISBN: 978-0-914098-32-4).
- [315] S. Sternberg, *Lectures on Differential Geometry*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964. (ISBN: 978-0821813850).
- [316] J. Struckmeier, “Hamiltonian dynamics on the symplectic extended phase space for autonomous and non-autonomous systems”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38**(6) 1257–1278. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/38/6/006>).
- [317] E.C.G. Sudarshan and N. Mukunda, *Classical Dynamics: A Modern Perspective*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1974. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/9751>).

- [318] H.J. Sussmann, "Symmetries and integrals of motion in optimal control", in *Geometry in Nonlinear Control and Differential Inclusions*, A. Fryszkowski, B. Jakubczyk, W. Respondek, T. Rzezuchowski Eds., Banach Center Pubs. **32**. Math. Inst. Polish Acad. Sci., Warsaw, Poland (1995) 379–393.
- [319] A. Tomassini and L. Vezzoni, "Contact Calabi–Yau manifolds and special Legendrian submanifolds", *Osaka J. Math.* **45**(1) (2008) 127–147.
- [320] P. Tondeur, *Introduction to Lie Groups and Transformation Groups*, *Lect. Notes Math.* **7**, Springer, Berlin, 1965. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0097829>).
- [321] W.M. Tulczyjew, "Hamiltonian systems, Lagrangian systems and the Legendre transformation", *Symp. Math.* **14**(1) (1974) 247–258.
- [322] W.M. Tulczyjew, "Les sous-variétés lagrangiennes et la dynamique hamiltonienne", *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B* **283**(1) (1976), A15–A18.
- [323] W.M. Tulczyjew, "Les sous-variétés lagrangiennes et la dynamique lagrangienne", *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B* **283**(8) (1976), A675–A678.
- [324] G.M. Tuynman, "Geometric quantization", *Proc. Sem. 1983–1985 Mathematical Structures in field theories* **1**, CWI Syllabus, 1985.
- [325] A.J. Van der Schaft, "Symmetries in optimal control", *SIAM J. Control and Optimization* **25**(2) (1987) 245–259. (<https://doi.org/10.1137/0325>).
- [326] A.J. Van der Schaft, "Liouville geometry of classical thermodynamics", *J. Geom. Phys.* **170** (2021) 104365. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2021.104365>).
- [327] J. Vankerschaver, "Euler–Poincaré reduction for discrete field theories", *J. Math. Phys.* **48**(3) (2007) 032902, 17 pp. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2712419>).
- [328] A.M. Vershik, *Classical and Non-classical Dynamics with Constraints*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1108**, 278–301, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0099563>).
- [329] S. Vignolo, "A new presymplectic framework for time-dependent Lagrangian systems: the constraint algorithm and the second-order differential equation problem", *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **33**(28) (2000) 5117–5135. (<https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/33/28/314>).
- [330] A.M. Vinogradov and I. Krasil'shchik, "What is the Hamiltonian formalism?", *Russ. Math. Surveys* **30**(1) (1975) 177–202. (<https://doi.org/10.1070/RM1975V030N01ABEH001403>).
- [331] A.M. Vinogradov and B.A. Kupershrnidt, "The structures of Hamiltonian mechanics", *Russ. Math. Surveys* **32**(4) (1977) 177–243. (<https://doi.org/10.1070/RM1977v032n04ABEH001642>).

- [332] L. Vitagliano, “The Lagrangian-Hamiltonian formalism for higher order field theories”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **60**(6–8) (2010) 857–873. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2010.02.003>).
- [333] L. Vitagliano, “The Hamilton–Jacobi formalism for higher-order field theory”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **07** (2010) 1413–1436. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887810004889>).
- [334] L. Vitagliano, “Hamilton–Jacobi diffieties”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **61**(10) (2011) 1932–1949. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2011.05.003>).
- [335] L. Vitagliano, “Geometric Hamilton–Jacobi field theory”, *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.* **9**(2) (2012) 1260008. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887812600080>).
- [336] L. Vitagliano, “Characteristics, bicharacteristics, and geometric singularities of solutions of PDEs”, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **11**(9) (2014) 1460039. Procs. XXII IFWGP, Évora (Portugal), 2013. (<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887814600391>).
- [337] L. Vitagliano, “ L_∞ -algebras from multicontact geometry”, *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **59** (2015) 147–165. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.difgeo.2015.01.006>).
- [338] M. Visinescu, “Contact Hamiltonian systems and complete integrability”, *AIP Conference Proceedings* **1916**(1) (2017) 020002. (<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5017422>).
- [339] H. Wang, “Symmetric reduction and Hamilton–Jacobi Equation of rigid spacecraft with a rotor”, *J. Geom. Sym. Phys.* **32** (2013) 87–111. (<https://doi.org/10.7546/jgsp-32-2013-87-111>).
- [340] H. Wang, “Hamilton–Jacobi theorems for regular reducible Hamiltonian systems on a cotangent bundle”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **119** (2017) 82–102. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2017.04.011>).
- [341] F.W. Warner, *Foundations on Differentiable Manifolds and Lie Groups*, Scott, Foresman and Co., Glenview, 1971. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-1799-0>).
- [342] A. Weinstein, *Lectures on Symplectic Manifolds*. Reg. Conf. Ser. Math. **29**, American Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1977. (ISBN: 978-0-8218-1679-0).
- [343] A. Weinstein, “On the hypotheses of Rabinowitz’ periodic orbit theorems”, *J. Diff. Eqs.* **33**(3) (1979) 353–358. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396\(79\)90070-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396(79)90070-6)).
- [344] A. Weinstein, “Lagrangian mechanics and groupoids”, *Fields Inst. Comm.* **7** (1996) 207–231.
- [345] E.T. Whittaker, *A Treatise on the Analytical Dynamics of Particles and Rigid Bodies* (4th ed.), Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1937. (ISBN: 978-0521091329).

- [346] C. Willett, "Contact reduction", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **354**(10) (2002) 4245–4260. (<https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-02-03045-3>).
- [347] N.M.J. Woodhouse, *Geometric Quantization* (2nd ed.), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992. (ISBN: 9780198502708).
- [348] N.M.J. Woodhouse, *Introduction to Analytical Dynamics* (2nd ed.), *Springer Undergrad. Math. Ser.*, Springer Science & Business Media, Oxford, 2009. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84882-816-2>).