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Abstract. We show that locally conformal cosymplectic manifolds may be seen as generalized phase spaces of time-dependent Hamiltonian systems. Thus we extend the results of I. Vaisman for the time-dependent case.

Keywords: cosymplectic manifold, locally conformal cosymplectic manifold, Hamiltonian systems

Classification: 53C15, 58F05, 70H05

1. Introduction.

There is a well known connection between symplectic geometry and mathematical physics, particularly mechanics. A Hamiltonian dynamical system is given by a symplectic manifold (the phase space) and a function on it (the Hamiltonian function). In [7], I. Vaisman shows that locally conformal symplectic manifolds may be seen as generalized phase spaces of Hamiltonian dynamical systems, since the form of the Hamilton equations is preserved by homothetic transformations.

The purpose of this paper is to extend the results of Vaisman to the case of time-dependent Hamiltonian systems. In this case, the phase space is a cosymplectic manifold (the odd dimensional analogue of a symplectic manifold) and the Hamiltonian function a function on it. Then we prove that locally conformal cosymplectic manifolds may be seen as generalized phase spaces of time-dependent Hamiltonian systems.

2. Cosymplectic manifolds and time-dependent Hamiltonian systems.

An almost cosymplectic manifold is a triple \((M, \Omega, \eta)\), where \(M\) is a \((2n + 1)\)-dimensional manifold and \(\Omega\) and \(\eta\) are a 2-form and a 1-form respectively on \(M\) such that \(\eta \wedge \Omega^n \neq 0\). If, in addition, \(\Omega\) and \(\eta\) are closed, i.e., \(d\eta = 0, d\Omega = 0\), then \(M\) is said to be a cosymplectic manifold ([3], [6]).

Let \(C^\infty(M)\) be the ring of differentiable functions on \(M\), and \(\Xi(M), \Lambda^1(M)\) the \(C^\infty(M)\)-modules of differentiable vector fields and 1-forms on \(M\), respectively. If \(M\) is an almost cosymplectic manifold, then there exists an isomorphism of \(C^\infty(M)\)-modules

\[ A : \Xi(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda^1(M) \]
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defined by
\[ A(X) = i_X \Omega + \eta(X) \eta \]
(see [6]). The Reeb vector field \( \xi \) is given by \( \xi = A^{-1}(\eta) \). Thus \( \xi \) is characterized by the identities \( i_\xi \Omega = 0 \), \( \eta(\xi) = 1 \). Now, let \( f : M \to R \) be a differentiable function defined on \( M \). Then there exists a unique vector field \( X_f \) on \( M \) such that \( A(X_f) = df - \xi(f) \eta + \eta \), i.e., \( X_f \) is the vector field characterized by the identities
\[ i_{X_f} \Omega = df - \xi(f) \eta, \quad \eta(X_f) = 1. \]

If \((M, \Omega, \eta)\) is cosymplectic, we call \( X_f \) the Hamiltonian vector field with the energy function \( f \). In fact, this construction generalizes the corresponding one for Hamiltonian vector fields on a symplectic manifold ([1], [4], [5]).

Next, we show that the phase space for a time-dependent Hamiltonian system is a cosymplectic manifold.

Let \((S, \omega)\) be a \(2n\)-dimensional symplectic manifold. Consider the product manifold \( R \times S \) and denote by \( \pi : R \times S \to S \) the canonical projection defined by \( \pi(t, x) = x \), \( t \in R \), \( x \in S \). We set \( \tilde{\omega} = \pi^* \omega \), \( \eta = dt \). Then \((R \times S, \tilde{\omega}, \eta)\) is a cosymplectic manifold. If \( H : R \times S \to R \) is a function, let \( X_H \) be the Hamiltonian vector field for \( H \), i.e., \( X_H \) is the unique vector field on \( R \times S \) characterized by the identities
\[ i_{X_H} \tilde{\omega} = dH - \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} dt, \quad dt(X_H) = 1, \]
since the Reeb vector field is \( \partial/\partial t \).

Consider the canonical coordinates \((q^i, p_i)\) on \( S \) and \((t, q^i, p_i)\) the induced coordinates on \( R \times S \), where \( t \) is the canonical global coordinate on \( R \). Since \( \tilde{\omega} = dq^i \wedge dp_i \), we deduce that
\[ X_H = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}. \]

Hence the integral curves \( \sigma(t) = (t, q^i(t), p_i(t)) \) of \( X_H \) satisfy the Hamilton equations:
\[ \frac{dq^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}, \quad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i}. \]

We remark that the Hamilton equations may be also obtained, if one considers a function \( H : M \to R \) on an arbitrary cosymplectic manifold \((M, \Omega, \eta)\). In fact, there exists a local coordinate system \((t, q^i, p_i)\) on \( M \) such that
\[ \Omega = dq^i \wedge dp_i, \quad \eta = dt. \]

So, the cosymplectic manifolds provide a good geometric framework for time-dependent Hamiltonian systems.
3. Locally conformal cosymplectic manifolds and time-dependent Hamiltonian systems.

An almost cosymplectic manifold \((M, \Omega, \eta)\) is said to be \textbf{locally conformal cosymplectic} (l.c.c.), if there exist an open covering \(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}\), and a system of functions \(\sigma_\alpha : U_\alpha \to \mathbb{R}\) such that

\[
d(e^{2\sigma_\alpha} \Omega) = 0, \quad d(e^{\sigma_\alpha} \eta) = 0.
\]

The local 1-forms \(d\sigma_\alpha\) glue up to a closed 1-form \(\theta\) satisfying

\[
d(\Omega) = -2 \Omega \wedge \theta, \quad d(\eta) = \eta \wedge \theta.
\]

Conversely, if there exists a 1-form satisfying (3), we obtain a family \(\{U_\alpha, \sigma_\alpha\}\) satisfying (2) (see [2]). We call \(\theta\) the \textbf{Lee form}. Clearly, if \((M, \Omega, \eta)\) is cosymplectic, then it is l.c.c. and its Lee form vanishes.

Let \((M, \Omega, \eta)\) be a l.c.c. manifold with Lee form \(\theta\). Then we may define a vector field \(B\) on \(M\) by

\[
A(B) = \theta - \theta(\xi) \eta,
\]

where \(A : \Xi(M) \to \Lambda^1(M)\) is the isomorphism given by (1) and \(\xi\) is the Reeb vector field of \(M\). We call \(B\) the \textbf{canonical vector field}.

Next, let \(f : M \to \mathbb{R}\) be a function on \(M\). Then there exists a unique vector field \(X_f\) on \(M\) defined by

\[
X_f = A^{-1}(df - \xi(f) \eta + \eta) + fB,
\]

i.e., \(X_f\) is characterized by the identities

\[
i_{X_f} \Omega = df - \xi(f) \eta + f(\theta - \theta(\xi) \eta), \quad \eta(X_f) = 1.
\]

We call \(X_f\) \textbf{Hamiltonian vector field} with energy function \(f\). This definition generalizes the corresponding one for cosymplectic manifolds (see Section 2).

Now, consider a time-dependent dynamical system with \(n\) degrees of freedom. Its phase space is a \((2n + 1)\)-dimensional cosymplectic manifold \(M\). We know that the dynamics consists of the orbits of a vector field \(X_H\) (the Hamiltonian vector field for the energy \(H\)) on \(M\) (see Section 2). In fact, we have an open covering of coordinate neighborhoods \(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}\) with local coordinates \((t_\alpha, q^i_\alpha, p^\alpha_i)\), \(1 \leq i \leq n\). The Hamiltonian \(H\) and the cosymplectic structure \((\Omega, \eta)\) restrict to each \(U_\alpha\) given by a local Hamiltonian \(H_\alpha = H_\alpha(t_\alpha, q^i_\alpha, p^\alpha_i)\) and a cosymplectic structure \(\Omega_\alpha = dq^i_\alpha \wedge dp^\alpha_i, \eta_\alpha = dt_\alpha\), respectively. Then \(X_H\) restricted to \(U_\alpha\) is precisely \(X_{H_\alpha}\). Thus, the orbits are given by the Hamilton equations

\[
\frac{dq^i_\alpha}{dt_\alpha} = \frac{\partial H_\alpha}{\partial p^\alpha_i}, \quad \frac{dp^\alpha_i}{dt_\alpha} = -\frac{\partial H_\alpha}{\partial q^i_\alpha}.
\]

(We notice that \(t_\alpha = t\) is a global coordinate.)
Now, let $M$ be an arbitrary $2n + 1$-dimensional manifold endowed with an open covering of coordinate neighborhoods $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ with local coordinates $(t_\alpha, q^i_\alpha, p^i_\alpha)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ and consider the coordinate transformations

$$t_\beta = t_\beta(t_\alpha, q^i_\alpha, p^i_\alpha), \quad q^i_\beta = q^i_\beta(t_\alpha, q^i_\alpha, p^i_\alpha), \quad p^i_\beta = p^i_\beta(t_\alpha, q^i_\alpha, p^i_\alpha).$$

Since the dynamic information is given by a global vector field (the Hamiltonian vector field) we are only interested in the case when (5) preserves the form of the Hamilton equations (4). Clearly, if (5) implies

$$\Omega_\beta = dq^i_\beta \wedge dp^i_\beta = dq^i_\alpha \wedge dp^i_\alpha = \Omega_\alpha, \quad \eta_\beta = dt_\beta = dt_\alpha = \eta_\alpha, \quad H_\beta = H_\alpha,$$

where $H_\alpha : U_\alpha \to R, \alpha \in A$, then (5) preserves (4). But this also happens, if (5) implies

$$\Omega_\beta = \lambda^2_{\beta\alpha} \Omega_\alpha, \quad \eta_\beta = \lambda_{\beta\alpha} \eta_\alpha, \quad H_\beta = \lambda_{\beta\alpha} H_\alpha,$$

where $\lambda_{\beta\alpha} = \text{const.} \neq 0$. In fact, from (6) we obtain

$$X_{H_\alpha} = \lambda_{\beta\alpha} H_{H_\beta},$$

and hence the integral curves of $X_{H_\alpha}$ and $X_{H_\beta}$ are the same. Further (6) implies the cocycle condition

$$\lambda_{\beta\alpha} \lambda_{\alpha\gamma} = \lambda_{\beta\gamma}.$$ 

We know that (7) implies the existence of the local functions $\sigma_\alpha : U_\alpha \to R$ satisfying

$$\lambda_{\beta\alpha} = \frac{e^{\sigma_\beta}}{e^{\sigma_\alpha}}.$$

Thus

$$\Omega = e^{-2\sigma_\alpha} \Omega_\alpha, \quad \eta = e^{-\sigma_\alpha} \eta_\alpha,$$

are globally defined on $M$. Hence $(M, \Omega, \eta)$ is a locally conformal cosymplectic manifold. Moreover, we may define a global function $H : M \to R$ by $H = e^{-\sigma_\alpha} H_\alpha$, and the corresponding Hamiltonian vector field $X_H$ is given by

$$X_H = e^{\sigma_\alpha} X_{H_\alpha}.$$

Therefore, the locally conformal cosymplectic manifolds may be considered as natural phase spaces of time-dependent Hamiltonian dynamical systems.
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