

HAANTJES ALGEBRAS OF CLASSICAL INTEGRABLE SYSTEMS

PIERGIULIO TEMPESTA AND GIORGIO TONDO

ABSTRACT. A tensorial approach to the theory of classical Hamiltonian integrable systems is proposed, based on the geometry of Haantjes tensors. We introduce the class of symplectic-Haantjes manifolds (or $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds), as a natural setting where the notion of integrability can be formulated. We prove that the existence of suitable Haantjes algebras of (1,1) tensor fields with vanishing Haantjes torsion is a necessary and sufficient condition for a Hamiltonian system to be integrable in the Liouville-Arnold sense. We also show that new integrable models arise from the Haantjes geometry. Finally, we present an application of our approach to the study of the Post-Winternitz system and of a stationary flow of the KdV hierarchy.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Haantjes algebras of operators	4
2.1. Preliminaries	5
2.2. Haantjes algebras	6
2.3. Haantjes coordinates	7
2.4. Haantjes chains	10
3. The theory of symplectic-Haantjes manifolds	11
3.1. Haantjes algebras and $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds	11
3.2. Darboux–Haantjes coordinates for $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds	15
3.3. Haantjes chains for $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds	17
3.4. Cyclic $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds	18
4. Complete Integrability and Haantjes structures	20
4.1. Haantjes theorem for integrable systems	21
4.2. The analysis of Brouzet	23
5. Integrable models, wave equation and Haantjes geometry	24
6. The inverse problem for systems with two degrees of freedom	25
6.1. A general procedure	25
6.2. On the superintegrable Post-Winternitz system	26
7. The stationary reduction of the seventh-order KdV flow revisited	28
8. Future Perspectives	29
Acknowledgement	30
References	30

1. INTRODUCTION

Integrable systems are ubiquitous in many branches of modern mathematics and theoretical physics. Due to their relevance, in the last decades the search for intrinsic mathematical structures underlying the notion of integrability has been actively pursued. In particular, the investigation of the properties of exact solvability of integrable systems led to the discovery of new important analytic and geometric techniques. It is interesting to observe that finite-dimensional integrable models coming from classical or quantum mechanics share many geometric and algebraic properties with the infinite-dimensional ones described in terms of soliton equations.

The study of the geometry of classical integrable systems has a long history, dating back to the works by Liouville, Jacobi, Stäckel, Eisenhart, Arnold, etc.

In this context, the *bi-Hamiltonian* approach has shown to be crucial for many respects. A bi-Hamiltonian manifold is a differentiable manifold endowed with a pencil of Poisson structures [25]. In particular, the special class of ωN manifolds, introduced in [33, 12], is characterized by a non-degenerate Poisson bivector (whose inverse provides a symplectic structure ω), and a compatible $(1, 1)$ tensor field N , also called recursion or hereditary operator. Such a tensor has a vanishing Nijenhuis torsion as a consequence of the existence of an underlying bi-Hamiltonian structure. The class of ωN manifolds offers a coherent approach to the construction of separation variables; it has been successfully applied, for instance, to the study of Gelfand-Zakharevich systems [16, 22, 12].

The purpose of this paper is to present a new formulation of classical integrability based on Haantjes operators, namely operator fields with vanishing *Haantjes torsion*. The latter concept was introduced in 1955 by Haantjes in [18] as a natural generalization of the Nijenhuis torsion [17]. However, the relevance of the Haantjes differential-geometric work in the realm of integrable systems quite surprisingly has not been recognized for a long time, with the exception of some interesting applications to Hamiltonian systems of hydrodynamic type [13, 6, 14].

The central notion underlying our formulation of integrability is that of *Haantjes algebra*, introduced in [49]. Essentially, a Haantjes algebra is a pair (M, \mathcal{H}) where M is a differentiable manifold and \mathcal{H} is a set of operator fields over M , with vanishing Haantjes torsion, which satisfy suitable compatibility conditions among each others.

The study of these algebras was initiated by us for two reasons. Indeed, they play a crucial role in the theory of diagonalization of operators on differentiable manifolds: Whenever the operators of a Haantjes algebra are semisimple and commute, a set of local coordinates exists where all operators can be diagonalized simultaneously. Moreover, in the non-semisimple case, they acquire simultaneously a block-diagonal form. At the same time, Haantjes algebras naturally generalize several known interesting geometric structures arising in Riemannian geometry [3, 55, 49]. A generalization of both the Haantjes torsion and the Haantjes theorem has been recently proposed in [50].

In this work, we will show the prominent role of Haantjes algebras in the theory of integrable systems. Indeed, we shall define a new family of manifolds, called *symplectic-Haantjes* (or $\omega\mathcal{H}$) manifolds. They are symplectic manifolds endowed with a Haantjes algebra of operators that are compatible with the symplectic structure.

We shall prove that the integrability of a Hamiltonian finite-dimensional system can be characterized in terms of an Abelian algebra of Haantjes operators, whose spectral and geometric properties turn out to be particularly rich. The notion of *Haantjes chain*, defined in this framework, is a natural extension in the context of Haantjes geometry of previous similar notions known in the literature, as that of Lenard-Magri chain [26] and generalized Lenard chain [52, 11, 28], relevant for quasi-bi-Hamiltonian systems and their generalizations.

A comparison between our notion of $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds and the recent definition of “Haantjes manifolds” due to Magri [29, 30, 31, 32] is in order. Our theory mainly differs from the fact that we assume the existence of an algebra of independent Haantjes operators which are supposed to be compatible with the symplectic form ω . Besides, the Haantjes chains in our context are “shorter” than the ones defined in the recent Magri’s theory [30]. This is due to a weaker assumption that allows us to deal with both integrable and separable systems. This fact is an important novelty of the present work.

Our main result concerning integrability is a theorem establishing that *the existence of a $2n$ -dimensional $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold is a necessary and sufficient condition for a non-degenerate Hamiltonian system to be integrable* in the Liouville-Arnold sense. Precisely, we shall prove the existence of n Haantjes operators

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{K}_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\nu_i^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{J})}{\nu_i(\mathbf{J})} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial J_i} \otimes dJ_i + \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} \otimes d\phi_i \right) \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n,$$

where ν_i and $\nu_i^{(\alpha)}$ are the frequencies of the Hamiltonian H and of the $(\alpha) - nth$ linear flow associated with the given system, respectively and (\mathbf{J}, ϕ) are a set of action-angle variables. Formula (1) therefore *intimately relates the Haantjes algebraic-geometric structure of an integrable system with its intrinsic dynamical properties*.

As a by-product of the main theorem, we will be able to define new general classes of integrable models possessing an assigned Haantjes geometry. Quite interestingly, the systems so obtained are related to the wave equation.

An advantage of the present formulation *à la Haantjes* (which also represents the main motivation for our study) is its generality: Haantjes tensors are indeed a larger class of tensors than those of Nijenhuis.

The proposed theory incorporates essentially all the known results on integrability of finite-dimensional systems that have been developed in a bi-Hamiltonian framework up to date, i.e. all the approaches based on Lenard chains and their generalizations (as quasi-bi-Hamiltonian systems [4], etc).

There is a neat relation between the Haantjes geometry developed in the present work and the well known Nijenhuis geometry. In fact, a subfamily of symplectic-Haantjes manifolds is provided by the class of symplectic-Nijenhuis (ωN) manifolds. Precisely, we shall show that given an ωN manifold, under mild assumptions one can construct an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure by taking n independent powers of the recursion operator N . In this case, N will play the role of a generator for the $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure.

However, it is important to notice that there exist $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structures not arising from a subjacent ωN structure. Indeed, whenever the Haantjes algebra \mathcal{H} is non-Abelian, obviously it cannot be cyclically generated by a single Nijenhuis operator.

This is the case, for instance, of the $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold associated with the superintegrable Post-Winternitz system.

Another noteworthy feature of our approach is that a priori the class of Haantjes algebras considered is *not necessarily diagonalizable*. This aspect represents a generalization of the ωN approach, where indeed the operator N is diagonalizable by hypothesis. Nevertheless, our theory keeps the intrinsic simplicity enjoyed by the standard approach to the Lenard-Magri chains for soliton hierarchies.

At the same time, the theory of $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds is motivated by the crucial problem of the construction of coordinate systems allowing the additive separation of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi (HJ) equation (the separation variables). This is one of the most important problems in the theory of classical integrable systems, which historically has motivated a large amount of research work and inspired the formulation of several fundamental geometric developments.

The problem of the construction of separation of variables (SoV) can be recast in our approach and, in many cases, solved explicitly. Our main result in this direction is Theorem 28 ensuring the existence, under mild hypotheses, of a set of distinguished coordinates provided by the Haantjes structure associated with an integrable system, that we shall call the *Darboux-Haantjes coordinates*. They represent separation coordinates for the Hamilton-Jacobi equation associated with the Hamiltonian functions of the given system.

The study of the general problem of separation of variables (including partial separation [47], [10]) in the Haantjes geometry is in progress; the case of multiseparable systems has been addressed in [46].

Finally, we mention that a generalization of $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds that parallels the theory of Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds [21] has been introduced in [56]. The structures arising in this perspective, of Poisson-Haantjes type, will be suitable for studying Gelfand-Zakharevich systems [16].

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we review the main algebraic properties of Nijenhuis and Haantjes tensors, and the notion of Haantjes algebras introduced in [49]. In Section 3, we introduce the main geometric structures needed for the discussion of integrability, i.e. the $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds; also, we clarify their relation with ωN manifolds. In particular, a theorem guaranteeing the existence of the DH coordinates is proved. Besides, the notion of generator of a Haantjes structure is defined. Section 4 contains the theorem that characterizes complete integrability via the Haantjes geometry. In Section 5, new integrable models related to the wave equation are deduced from suitable Haantjes structures.

In Section 6, a procedure for the construction of Haantjes structures for a given integrable system with two degrees of freedom is proposed. Also, the relevant example of the superintegrable Post-Winternitz system, whose separation coordinates are still not known, is worked out. An application of our theory to a stationary reduction of the seventh-order equation of the KdV hierarchy is discussed in Section 7. Some open problems are discussed in the final Section 8.

2. HAANTJES ALGEBRAS OF OPERATORS

Given a dynamical system defined over a finite-dimensional manifold M , a fundamental issue is to find suitable sets of coordinates which allow us to decouple the equations of motion. The natural frames of such coordinates, being obviously integrable, can be characterized in a *tensorial* manner as eigendistributions of a

suitable class of $(1, 1)$ tensor fields, i.e. the ones with a vanishing Nijenhuis or Haantjes tensor. In this section, we review some basic algebraic results concerning the theory of such tensors. For a more complete treatment, see the original papers [18, 41], the related ones [42, 15] and the recent review [20].

2.1. Preliminaries. We shall denote by M a differentiable manifold and by $\mathbf{L} : TM \rightarrow TM$ a $(1, 1)$ smooth tensor field, i.e. a smooth field of linear operators on the tangent space at each point of M . In the following, all tensors will be considered to be smooth.

Definition 1. *The Nijenhuis torsion of \mathbf{L} is the skew-symmetric $(1, 2)$ tensor field defined by*

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}}(X, Y) := \mathbf{L}^2[X, Y] + [\mathbf{L}X, \mathbf{L}Y] - \mathbf{L}([X, \mathbf{L}Y] + [\mathbf{L}X, Y]),$$

where $X, Y \in TM$ and $[\cdot, \cdot]$ denotes the commutator of two vector fields.

In local coordinates $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^n)$, the Nijenhuis torsion can be written in the form

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}})^i_{jk} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{L}_k^i}{\partial x^\alpha} \mathbf{L}_j^\alpha - \frac{\partial \mathbf{L}_j^i}{\partial x^\alpha} \mathbf{L}_k^\alpha + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{L}_j^\alpha}{\partial x^k} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{L}_k^\alpha}{\partial x^j} \right) \mathbf{L}_\alpha^i \right) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left(\mathbf{L}_{[j}^\alpha \partial_{|\alpha|} \mathbf{L}_{k]}^i - \mathbf{L}_\alpha^i \partial_{[j} \mathbf{L}_{k]}^\alpha \right), \end{aligned}$$

for the components of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}}$; among them, $n^2(n-1)/2$ are independent. Here for the sake of brevity we have used the notation $\partial_j := \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$ and the indices between square brackets are to be skew-symmetrized, except those in $|\cdot|$.

Definition 2. *The Haantjes tensor associated with \mathbf{L} is the $(1, 2)$ tensor field defined by*

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{L}}(X, Y) := \mathbf{L}^2 \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}}(X, Y) + \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{L}X, \mathbf{L}Y) - \mathbf{L}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}}(X, \mathbf{L}Y) + \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{L}X, Y)).$$

The skew-symmetry of the Nijenhuis torsion implies that the Haantjes tensor is also skew-symmetric. Its explicit intrinsic expression is

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{L}}(X, Y) &= \mathbf{L}^4[X, Y] + [\mathbf{L}^2 X, \mathbf{L}^2 Y] - 2\mathbf{L}^3([X, \mathbf{L}Y] + [\mathbf{L}X, Y]) + \\ &+ \mathbf{L}^2([X, \mathbf{L}^2 Y] + 4[\mathbf{L}X, \mathbf{L}Y] + [\mathbf{L}^2 X, Y]) - 2\mathbf{L}([\mathbf{L}X, \mathbf{L}^2 Y] + [\mathbf{L}^2 X, \mathbf{L}Y]). \end{aligned}$$

Its local expression in recursive form is

$$(6) \quad (\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{L}})^i_{jk} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^n \left(\mathbf{L}_\alpha^i \mathbf{L}_\beta^\alpha (\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}})_{jk}^\beta + (\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}})_{\alpha\beta}^i \mathbf{L}_j^\alpha \mathbf{L}_k^\beta - \mathbf{L}_\alpha^i \left((\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}})_{\beta k}^\alpha \mathbf{L}_j^\beta + (\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{L}})_{j\beta}^\alpha \mathbf{L}_k^\beta \right) \right).$$

More explicitly, we have

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{L}})^i_{jk} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left(-(\mathbf{L}^3)_\alpha^i \partial_{[j} \mathbf{L}_{k]}^\alpha + \sum_{\beta=1}^n \left((\mathbf{L}^2)_\alpha^i (2\mathbf{L}_{[j}^\beta \partial_{|\beta|} \mathbf{L}_{k]}^\alpha - \mathbf{L}_{[j}^\beta \partial_{k]} \mathbf{L}_\beta^\alpha) \right. \right. \\ &\left. \left. + (\mathbf{L}^2)_j^\alpha \mathbf{L}_{[k]}^\beta \partial_\alpha \mathbf{L}_\beta^i - \mathbf{L}_\alpha^i (\mathbf{L}^2)_{[j}^\beta \partial_{|\beta|} \mathbf{L}_{k]}^\alpha - 2 \sum_{\gamma=1}^n \mathbf{L}_\alpha^i \mathbf{L}_{[j}^\beta \mathbf{L}_{k]}^\gamma \partial_\beta \mathbf{L}_\gamma^\alpha \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The following notion is at the heart of the theory we are going to develop.

Definition 3. A Haantjes (Nijenhuis) operator is an operator field whose Haantjes (Nijenhuis) torsion identically vanishes.

Remark 4. Any operator field on a two dimensional manifold is a Haantjes operator. Furthermore, on an n -dimensional manifold, any operator field that admits local charts where it takes a diagonal form is also a Haantjes operator.

2.2. Haantjes algebras. The concept of Haantjes algebra was defined in [49] as an abstract setting for developing the theory of Haantjes operators. Indeed, many important properties of this class of operators can be discussed in a general, basis-independent context, in which the algebraic structure is kept to a minimum. As we shall see, additional structures (as symplectic or Poisson structures) are needed if one wishes to discuss integrable models and the construction of suitable separation variables. For sake of completeness, here a very brief review of the theory of Haantjes algebras is presented.

Definition 5. A Haantjes algebra of rank m is a pair (M, \mathcal{H}) which satisfies the following conditions:

- M is a differentiable manifold of dimension n ;
- \mathcal{H} is a set of Haantjes operators $\mathbf{K} : TM \rightarrow TM$ that generates
 - a free module of rank m over the ring of smooth functions on M

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{H}_{(f\mathbf{K}_1+g\mathbf{K}_2)}(X, Y) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall X, Y \in TM, \quad \forall f, g \in C^\infty(M), \quad \forall \mathbf{K}_1, \mathbf{K}_2 \in \mathcal{H},$$

– a ring w.r.t. the composition operation

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{H}_{(\mathbf{K}_1 \mathbf{K}_2)}(X, Y) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall \mathbf{K}_1, \mathbf{K}_2 \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \forall X, Y \in TM,$$

If

$$(10) \quad \mathbf{K}_1 \mathbf{K}_2 = \mathbf{K}_2 \mathbf{K}_1 \quad \forall \mathbf{K}_1, \mathbf{K}_2 \in \mathcal{H}$$

the algebra \mathcal{H} will be said to be an Abelian Haantjes algebra. Moreover, if the identity operator $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$, then (M, \mathcal{H}) will be said to be a Haantjes algebra with identity.

The assumptions (8), (9) ensure that the set \mathcal{H} is an associative algebra of Haantjes operators; moreover, the Hamilton-Cayley theorem implies that its rank m is not greater than n .

The conditions of Definition 5 might seem difficult to realize. However, a natural class of Haantjes algebras is given, in a local chart $\{U, \mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^n)\}$, by operators of the form

$$(11) \quad \mathbf{K} = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \otimes dx^i,$$

where $l_i(\mathbf{x}) := l_i^i(\mathbf{x})$ are arbitrary smooth functions playing the role of the eigenvalues of \mathbf{K} . The diagonal operators (11) have vanishing Haantjes tensor and satisfy the differential compatibility condition (8), by virtue of Remark 4. Furthermore, they form a commutative ring; thus they also satisfy Eqs. (9).

Definition 6. The algebra generated by operators of the form (11) will be said to be a diagonal Haantjes algebra.

2.2.1. *Cyclic Haantjes algebras.* A particularly relevant class of Abelian Haantjes algebras is given by those generated by a *single* Haantjes operator $\mathbf{L} : TM \mapsto TM$ [49]. One can construct directly a Haantjes algebra \mathcal{L} of rank $m \leq n = \dim(M)$ by choosing as a set of generators the first $(n - 1)$ powers of \mathbf{L} together with $\mathbf{L}^0 := \mathbf{I}$

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L}) := \text{Span}\{\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{L}, \dots, \mathbf{L}^{n-1}, \dots\} = \text{Span}\{\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{L}, \dots, \mathbf{L}^{n-1}\} .$$

The fact that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L})$ is a Haantjes algebra is a consequence of the following result.

Proposition 7. [5]. *Let \mathbf{L} be an operator with vanishing Haantjes tensor on M . Then, for any polynomial $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) = \sum_{j=0}^{(n-1)}$ $a_j(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{L}^j$ with coefficients $a_j \in C^\infty(M)$, the associated Haantjes tensor also vanishes, i.e.*

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{L}}(X, Y) = \mathbf{0} \implies \mathcal{H}_{p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L})}(X, Y) = \mathbf{0} .$$

Proof. See Corollary 3.3, p. 1136 of Ref. [5]. □

According to the previous discussion, one can introduce the notion of cyclic Haantjes algebras.

Definition 8. *Let (M, \mathcal{H}) be an Abelian Haantjes algebra of rank m . An operator \mathbf{L} , with minimal polynomial of degree $h \geq m$, is a generator of \mathcal{H} if*

$$\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L}) .$$

The corresponding algebra will be said to be a cyclic Haantjes algebra.

Let

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{B}_{cyc} = \{\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{L}, \mathbf{L}^2, \dots, \mathbf{L}^{m-1}\}$$

be a cyclic basis of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L})$. A basis \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{H} such that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{cyc}$ will be said to be a cyclic basis of \mathcal{H} .

A generator of \mathcal{H} allows us to represent each Haantjes operator $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ as a polynomial field in \mathbf{L} of degree at most $(h - 1)$, i.e.

$$(14) \quad \mathbf{K} = p_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) = \sum_{i=0}^{h-1} a_i(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{L}^i ,$$

where $a_i(\mathbf{x})$ are smooth functions on M . A natural problem is to establish the conditions ensuring that a given Haantjes algebra is cyclic. This problem has been solved in Proposition 47 of [49], where it was proven that each *semisimple* Abelian algebra (see Definition 9) is cyclic. In the next subsection, we will present an extension of that result.

2.3. Haantjes coordinates. We shall always assume that the eigenvalues of any operator field considered in this article are real functions.

Let us recall the main result of [49] about the existence of Haantjes charts for Haantjes algebras. The set of proper eigenvector fields of a generic operator \mathbf{K} , corresponding to an eigenvalue $l_i(\mathbf{x})$, is given by $\text{Ker}(\mathbf{K} - l_i\mathbf{I})$, whereas the set of its generalized eigenvector fields is $\text{Ker}(\mathbf{K} - l_i\mathbf{I})^{\rho_i}$. We have denoted by ρ_i the Riesz index of l_i (assumed to be independent of \mathbf{x}), that is, the minimum integer such that $\text{Ker}(\mathbf{K} - l_i\mathbf{I})^{\rho_i} = \text{Ker}(\mathbf{K} - l_i\mathbf{I})^{\rho_i+1}$.

Definition 9. *A Haantjes algebra is said to be semisimple if each $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ is semisimple (diagonalizable), that is, if each \mathbf{K} admits a local reference frame formed by proper eigenvector fields of \mathbf{K} .*

If a semisimple Haantjes algebra is Abelian, then there exists a local reference eigenframe in which all $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ take simultaneously a diagonal form. A crucial question is to ascertain whether an *integrable* common eigenframe exists, or equivalently, whether there exists a local coordinate chart where all operators can be simultaneously written in a diagonal form. The answer to this problem is offered by Theorem 11. Preliminarily, we state the following

Definition 10. *Let $\{\mathcal{D}_i, \mathcal{D}_j, \dots, \mathcal{D}_k\}$ be a set of distributions of vector fields. We shall say that these distributions are mutually integrable if*

- i) each of them is integrable;*
- ii) any sum $\mathcal{D}_i + \mathcal{D}_j + \dots + \mathcal{D}_k$ (where all indices i, j, \dots, k are different) is also integrable.*

Theorem 11. [49] *Let (M, \mathcal{H}) be an Abelian Haantjes algebra of rank m and $\{\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_m\}$ a basis of it. Let us consider the spectral decomposition*

$$(15) \quad T_{\mathbf{x}}M = \bigoplus_{a=1}^v \mathcal{V}_a(\mathbf{x})$$

where

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{V}_a(\mathbf{x}) := \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_{i_m}^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) \quad a := (i_1, \dots, i_m)$$

and

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{D}_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{x}) := \text{Ker}(\mathbf{K}_\alpha - l_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{I})^{\rho_{i_\alpha}(\mathbf{x})}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m, \quad i_\alpha = 1, \dots, s_\alpha,$$

where s_α is the number of the distinct eigenvalues of \mathbf{K}_α . The distributions \mathcal{V}_a are mutually integrable; therefore, there exists a set of coordinates (that we shall call Haantjes coordinates) adapted to the decomposition (15), such that all $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ can be simultaneously written in a block-diagonal form. Furthermore, if \mathcal{H} is semisimple, in each set of Haantjes coordinates all $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ can be simultaneously written in a diagonal form.

For the sake of clarity, we also quote Proposition 45 of Ref. [49], which is relevant in the forthcoming discussion.

Proposition 12. *Let \mathbf{L} be a semisimple operator with h pointwise distinct eigenvalues $\{\lambda_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \lambda_h(\mathbf{x})\}$, and \mathbf{K} be another semisimple operator field possessing s pointwise distinct eigenvalues, with $s \leq h$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- \mathbf{K} belongs to the cyclic algebra of rank h generated by \mathbf{L} , i.e.

$$(18) \quad \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L}) ;$$

- there exists a polynomial field $p_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda)$ in λ of degree at most $(h-1)$ such that

$$(19) \quad \mathbf{K} = p_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) ;$$

- each eigendistribution of \mathbf{L} is included in a single eigendistribution of \mathbf{K} :

$$(20) \quad \mathcal{C}_{\lambda_i} := \ker(\mathbf{L} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{l_i} := \ker(\mathbf{K} - l_i \mathbf{I}),$$

where it is understood that the eigenvalues $(l_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, l_h(\mathbf{x}))$ of \mathbf{K} may not be all distinct.

We present now an extension of the result obtained in Proposition 47 of Ref. [49], since it will be relevant in the formulation of the theory of $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds.

Proposition 13. *Every semisimple Abelian Haantjes algebra (M, \mathcal{H}) of rank m is cyclic and admits a family of Haantjes generators; among them, there exists a Nijenhuis operator.*

Moreover, an operator $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ is a generator of \mathcal{H} if and only if it possesses h distinct eigenvalues; precisely, $h = m$ if $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$, or $h = (m + 1)$ otherwise.

Proof. Let us consider the Haantjes chart

$$(21) \quad \{U, \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{y}^1, \dots, \mathbf{y}^v)\},$$

adapted to the spectral decomposition (15). Then, if $v \geq m$, each operator of the form

$$(22) \quad \mathbf{L} = \sum_{a=1}^v \lambda_a(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{j_a=1}^{r_a} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^{a,j_a}} \otimes dy^{a,j_a},$$

where $r_a = \text{rank } \mathcal{V}_a$ is a generator of \mathcal{H} , provided that its eigenvalue fields $\{\lambda_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \lambda_v(\mathbf{x})\}$ are arbitrary but distinct smooth functions at any point of U . In fact, the eigendistributions of the operator (22) are given by the distributions \mathcal{V}_a defined in Eq. (16); consequently, by construction they satisfy condition (20). Besides, as the eigenvalues of \mathbf{L} are distinct, this operator also satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 12. In particular, if the eigenvalues of \mathbf{L} are chosen to be

$$(23) \quad \lambda_a(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_a(y^{a,1}, \dots, y^{a,r_a}) \quad a = 1, \dots, v,$$

then \mathbf{L} is a Nijenhuis generator, that is, its Nijenhuis torsion identically vanishes. If $v < m$, a generator can still be constructed, because we can further decompose some of the distributions \mathcal{V}_a into a direct sum of mutually integrable sub-distributions. Precisely, we have

$$\mathcal{V}_a = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial y^{a,1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial y^{a,r_a}} \right\rangle = \bigoplus_{i_a=1}^{\bar{r}_{i_a}} \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial y^{a,1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial y^{a,i_a}} \right\rangle = \bigoplus_{i_a=1}^{\bar{r}_{i_a}} \mathcal{C}_{a,i_a},$$

with $\sum \bar{r}_{j_a} = r_a$; the previous decomposition of \mathcal{V}_a can be realized in such a way that the number of addends appearing into the direct sum

$$(24) \quad T_{\mathbf{x}}M = \bigoplus_{a=1, i_a=1}^{v, \bar{r}_{i_a}} \mathcal{C}_{a,i_a}$$

is not less than m .

Let us recall that since \mathcal{H} is a semisimple algebra by assumption, then the degree of the minimal polynomial of any $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ coincides with the number of its distinct eigenvalues.

Assume now that \mathbf{K} belongs to \mathcal{H} and has h distinct eigenvalue fields, with $h = m$ if $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$, or $h = (m + 1)$ otherwise. If $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$, then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{K}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ and having rank m , it coincides with \mathcal{H} . Otherwise, $\mathcal{H} = \text{Span}\{\mathbf{K}, \dots, \mathbf{K}^m\} \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{K})$.

Conversely, assume that a generator \mathbf{L} belongs to \mathcal{H} . Then, by Lemma 37 of [49], we have that $h \leq m$ if $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$, or $h \leq m + 1$ otherwise. Furthermore, we observe that if $\mathbf{I} \notin \mathcal{H}$ and $h = m$, then the cyclic Haantjes algebra $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L})$ would

coincide with \mathcal{H} , which is absurd. Taking into account that $h \geq m$ by Definition 8, the statement is proven. \square

As in the case $v \geq m$ the number v coincides with the number h of the pointwise distinct eigenvalues of \mathbf{L} , we deduce the following

Corollary 14. *Let (M, \mathcal{H}) be a semisimple Abelian Haantjes algebra of rank m . Assume that the number of the addends of the decomposition (15) is $v \geq m$. Then, generators of \mathcal{H} belonging to \mathcal{H} exist if and only if $v = m$, when $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$, or $v = m + 1$, otherwise.*

In Section 3.4, we shall specialize the results of Proposition 13 and Corollary 14 to the case of $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds.

2.4. Haantjes chains. The theory of Lenard–Magri chains is a fundamental piece of the geometric approach to soliton hierarchies. Lenard–Magri chains have been introduced in order to construct integrals of motion in involution for infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems [25, 26] (see also [45], for a brief history about the origin of the name “Lenard chains”). Besides, some non trivial generalizations of Lenard–Magri chains have proved to be useful in the study of separation of variables for finite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems (see [37, 38, 54, 11, 12] and reference therein).

Hereafter, we propose a further generalization of the standard notions of the theory, which has the advantage to be both simple and directly connected to the theory of classical integrable systems.

Definition 15. *Let (M, \mathcal{H}) be a Haantjes algebra of rank m . We shall say that a smooth function H generates a Haantjes chain of closed 1-forms of length m if there exist a distinguished basis $\{\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_m\}$ of \mathcal{H} such that*

$$(25) \quad d(\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_\alpha^T dH) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_\alpha^T : T^*M \rightarrow T^*M$ is the transposed operator of $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_\alpha$. The (locally) exact 1-forms

$$dH_\alpha = \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_\alpha^T dH$$

(which are supposed to be linearly independent), are called the elements of the Haantjes chain of length m generated by H ; the functions H_α are their potential functions.

In order to enquire about the existence of Haantjes chains for an assigned Haantjes algebra, we have to consider the codistribution, of rank $r \leq m$, generated by a given function H through an arbitrary basis $\{\mathbf{K}_1, \mathbf{K}_2, \dots, \mathbf{K}_m\}$ of \mathcal{H} , i.e.

$$(26) \quad \mathcal{D}_H^\circ := \text{Span}\{\mathbf{K}_1^T dH, \mathbf{K}_2^T dH, \dots, \mathbf{K}_m^T dH\},$$

and the distribution \mathcal{D}_H of the vector fields annihilated by them, which has rank $(n - r)$. Note that such distributions do not depend on the particular basis chosen in \mathcal{H} .

The following theorem offers a geometric characterization of the existence of a Haantjes chain generated by a smooth function H in terms of the Frobenius integrability of its associated codistribution.

Theorem 16. *Let (M, \mathcal{H}) be a Haantjes algebra of rank m , and H be a smooth function on M . Let \mathcal{D}_H° be the codistribution (26), assumed to be of rank m (independent on \mathbf{x}), and \mathcal{D}_H be the distribution of the vector fields annihilated by the 1-forms of \mathcal{D}_H° . Then, the function H generates a Haantjes chain (25) if and only if \mathcal{D}_H° (or equivalently \mathcal{D}_H) is Frobenius-integrable.*

Proof. By definition, the Haantjes chain (25) contains m independent exact 1-forms. Therefore, they generate the integrable distribution

$$(27) \quad \mathcal{D}^\circ = \text{Span}\{dH_1 = \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_1^T dH, \dots, dH_m = \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_m^T dH\},$$

which coincides with \mathcal{D}_H° . Vice versa, let \mathcal{D}_H° be integrable and \mathcal{D}_H its foliation. Then, there exist m independent functions (H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m) which are constant on the leaves of \mathcal{D}_H . Their differentials belong to \mathcal{D}_H° , hence they can be written as

$$(28) \quad dH_\alpha = \left(\sum_{\beta=1}^m a_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{K}_\beta^T \right) dH =: \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_\alpha^T dH \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m.$$

□

3. THE THEORY OF SYMPLECTIC-HAANTJES MANIFOLDS

In this section we introduce the new class of symplectic-Haantjes manifolds; we shall call them $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds, by analogy with the well-known ωN manifolds [33, 12]. These new manifolds are essentially Haantjes algebras endowed with a symplectic structure. The main reason to define these manifolds is that, apart from their interesting mathematical properties, they provide a simple but sufficiently general setting in which the theory of Hamiltonian integrable systems can be naturally formulated.

3.1. Haantjes algebras and $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds.

Definition 17. *A symplectic-Haantjes (or $\omega\mathcal{H}$) manifold of class m is a triple (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) which satisfies the following properties:*

- i) (M, ω) is a symplectic manifold of dimension $2n$;
- ii) \mathcal{H} is a Haantjes algebra of rank m ;
- iii) (ω, \mathcal{H}) are algebraically compatible, that is

$$\omega(X, \mathbf{K}Y) = \omega(\mathbf{K}X, Y) \quad \forall \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H},$$

or equivalently

$$(29) \quad \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}^T \mathbf{\Omega}, \quad \forall \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Hereafter $\mathbf{\Omega} := \omega^\flat : TM \rightarrow T^*M$ denotes the fiber bundles isomorphism defined by

$$\omega(X, Y) = \langle \mathbf{\Omega}X, Y \rangle \quad \forall X, Y \in TM,$$

and the map $\mathbf{P} := \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1} : T^*M \rightarrow TM$ is the Poisson bivector induced by the symplectic structure ω .

If the identity operator \mathbf{I} belongs to \mathcal{H} , then we shall say that (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) is a $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold with identity. If \mathcal{H} is an Abelian Haantjes algebra, the resulting $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold will be said to be Abelian.

Remark 18. *The set of conditions of Definition 17 admits a natural, simple realization. Indeed, note that in a coordinate system $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^{2n})$ the operators*

$$(30) \quad \mathbf{K}_\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{2n} \lambda_j^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \otimes dx^j, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m,$$

according to Definition 6, generate a diagonal Haantjes algebra for any smooth function $\lambda_j^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{x})$. Besides, by imposing the algebraic compatibility conditions (29) we get in a Darboux chart the solutions $\{\mathbf{x} = (q^1, \dots, q^n, p_1, \dots, p_n)\}$ given by

$$(31) \quad \mathbf{K}_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{x}) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \otimes dq^i + \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \otimes dp_i \right), \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m.$$

Here $l_i^{(\alpha)} = \lambda_i^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{n+i}^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{x})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

As a consequence of conditions (29), one can immediately deduce the following proposition, which turns out to be crucial for many results of the present theory. For instance, it has important consequences on the spectrum and the eigenvector fields of the Haantjes operators belonging to a $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold.

Proposition 19. *Let (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) be an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold. Then, any composed operator $\mathbf{\Omega} p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{K})$, $\mathbf{P} q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{K}^T)$ (where $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{K})$ and $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{K})$ are polynomial fields in \mathbf{K} and \mathbf{K}^T respectively) is skew-symmetric $\forall \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$. Moreover, if $\omega\mathcal{H}$ is Abelian, then $\mathbf{K}_\alpha^T \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{K}_\beta$, $\mathbf{K}_\alpha \mathbf{P} \mathbf{K}_\beta^T$, are also skew-symmetric $\forall \mathbf{K}_\alpha, \mathbf{K}_\beta \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Corollary 20. *Given a $2n$ -dimensional $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold M , every generalized eigen-distribution $\text{Ker}(\mathbf{K} - l_i \mathbf{I})^{r_i}$, $r_i \in \mathbb{N}$, is of even rank. Therefore, the geometric and algebraic multiplicities of each eigenvalue $l_i(\mathbf{x})$ are even.*

Proof. Given an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold, every generalized eigen-distribution $\text{Ker}(\mathbf{K} - l_i \mathbf{I})^{r_i}$ has the same rank of the kernel of the operator $\mathbf{\Omega}(\mathbf{K} - l_i \mathbf{I})^{r_i}$, which is skew-symmetric by virtue of Proposition 19. Thus, the second statement in the Corollary is a consequence of the fact that the geometric multiplicity of an eigenvalue $l_i(\mathbf{x})$ is equal to the rank of $\text{Ker}(\mathbf{K} - l_i \mathbf{I})$, and its algebraic multiplicity to the rank of $\text{Ker}(\mathbf{K} - l_i \mathbf{I})^{\rho_i}$. \square

Due to the above corollary, and the spectral decomposition of the tangent spaces of M given by

$$(32) \quad T_{\mathbf{x}}M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^s \mathcal{D}_i(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathcal{D}_i(\mathbf{x}) := \text{Ker}(\mathbf{K} - l_i \mathbf{I})^{\rho_i}(\mathbf{x}),$$

as $\text{rank } \mathcal{D}_i \geq 2$, $i = 1, \dots, s$ we conclude that the number of the distinct eigenvalues of any Haantjes operator \mathbf{K} of an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure is not greater than n .

Definition 21. *Given a $2n$ -dimensional $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold, if the number of pointwise distinct eigenvalues of a Haantjes operator $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ is n , we shall say that such operator is maximal.*

Observe that the minimal polynomial of a maximal operator $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ has the form

$$(33) \quad m_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\lambda - l_i(\mathbf{x}) \right)^{\rho_i}.$$

Lemma 22. *A Haantjes operator \mathbf{K} of a $2n$ -dimensional $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold of class m is maximal if and only if its minimal polynomial has degree $m = n$. Therefore, its minimal polynomial is the product of n linear factors; thus, \mathbf{K} is pointwise semisimple.*

Proof. As a consequence of Corollary 20, if \mathbf{K} admits a Jordan chain of length ρ_i associated with a given eigenvalue $l_i(\mathbf{x})$, there must exist, for the same eigenvalue, a “twin” Jordan chain of the same length. Consequently, the number of the Jordan chains of length ρ_i associated to a given eigenvalue is even, and therefore $\rho_i \leq n$.

Observe that \mathbf{K} can be maximal if and only if $\rho_i = 1$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, due to Eq. (33). In fact, in this case every eigendistribution of \mathbf{K} has rank 2 and it is formed by proper eigenvector fields. \square

In the following, we shall present some properties of both algebraic and differential-geometric nature for the Haantjes operators $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$. Denote by

$$(34) \quad \mathcal{E}_i := \bigoplus_{j=1, j \neq i}^s \mathcal{D}_j = \text{Im}(\mathbf{K} - l_i \mathbf{I})^{\rho_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, s,$$

the distribution of rank $(2n - r_i)$ spanned by all of the generalized eigenvectors of a Haantjes operator \mathbf{K} , except those associated with the eigenvalue l_i . Such a distribution will be called a *characteristic distribution* of \mathbf{K} . Let \mathcal{E}_i° denote the module of one-forms that annihilate all vector fields of the distribution \mathcal{E}_i .

Proposition 23. *Given an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold, the relations*

$$(35) \quad \Omega(\mathcal{D}_j) = \mathcal{E}_j^\circ \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{D}_j = \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_j^\circ) = \mathcal{E}_j^\perp,$$

$$(36) \quad \Omega(\mathcal{E}_j) = \mathcal{D}_j^\circ \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{E}_j = \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{D}_j^\circ) = \mathcal{D}_j^\perp,$$

hold. Here \mathcal{E}_j^\perp and \mathcal{D}_j^\perp are the symplectic orthogonal distributions of \mathcal{E}_j and \mathcal{D}_j , respectively.

Proof. Property (35) follows from the compatibility condition (29), taking into account that the symplectic operator Ω is invertible. In fact, for each generalized eigenvector field $Y_j \in \mathcal{D}_j$, the one-form ΩY_j is a generalized eigenform of \mathbf{K}^T , as one infers from the relation

$$(\mathbf{K}^T - l_j \mathbf{I})^{\rho_j} \Omega Y_j \stackrel{\text{Prop. 19}}{=} \Omega(\mathbf{K} - l_j \mathbf{I})^{\rho_j} Y_j = \mathbf{0}.$$

Then, since

$$(37) \quad \text{Ker}(\mathbf{K}^T - l_i \mathbf{I})^{\rho_i} = \left(\text{Im}(\mathbf{K} - l_i \mathbf{I})^{\rho_i} \right)^\circ = \mathcal{E}_i^\circ,$$

we deduce that $\Omega Y_j(\mathbf{x})$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}_j^\circ(\mathbf{x})$. Since this subspace has the same dimension of $\mathcal{D}_j(\mathbf{x})$, we obtain Eq. (35). The companion relation (36) follows from Eq. (35) jointly with the observation that, by construction, $\mathcal{E}_j(\mathbf{x})$ is a complementary subspace of $\mathcal{D}_j(\mathbf{x})$ in $T_{\mathbf{x}}M$. \square

Proposition 24. *Given an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold, the distributions \mathcal{D}_j of each $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ are integrable and of even rank. Their integral leaves are symplectic submanifolds of M and are symplectically orthogonal to each other, namely*

$$(38) \quad \omega(\mathcal{D}_j, \mathcal{D}_j) = \text{symplectic}$$

$$(39) \quad \omega(\mathcal{D}_j, \mathcal{D}_k) = \mathbf{0} \quad j \neq k.$$

Proof. The distributions \mathcal{D}_j are integrable due to the Haantjes Theorem [18] and are of even rank by virtue of Corollary 20. Besides, they are symplectic as

$$\mathcal{D}_j \cap (\mathcal{D}_j)^\perp \stackrel{(36)}{=} \mathcal{D}_j \cap \mathcal{E}_j = \{\mathbf{0}\} .$$

Finally, property (39) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{D}_k \subseteq \mathcal{E}_j \stackrel{(36)}{=} D_j^\perp$, if $j \neq k$. \square

Corollary 25. *Given an Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold, each integral leaf D_j of the eigen-distribution \mathcal{D}_j , $j = 1, \dots, s$, is an Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ submanifold.*

Proof. As the Haantjes algebra \mathcal{H} is Abelian by assumption, the submanifold D_j is \mathcal{H} -invariant. Therefore, each operator $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ can be restricted to D_j , giving rise to a Haantjes algebra of rank $\leq m$. Finally, the compatibility condition (29) holds since

$$\mathbf{K}_{|D_j}^T \Omega_{|D_j} = (\mathbf{K}^T \Omega)_{|D_j} = (\Omega \mathbf{K})_{|D_j} = \Omega_{|D_j} \mathbf{K}_{|D_j} \quad \forall \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H} .$$

\square

The $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold associated with the integral leaf D_j will be denoted by $(D_j, \omega_{|D_j}, \mathcal{H}_{|D_j})$.

Below, we shall prove that Proposition (24) and Corollary (25) hold for the intersections of the distributions $\mathcal{D}_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)}$ defined in Eq. (17). Precisely, let us consider the distributions

$$(40) \quad \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)} := \mathcal{W}_{i_1, \dots, i_\alpha} := \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(1)} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)} \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m,$$

which are integrable, being intersections of integrable distributions. Interestingly, the integral leaves of such distributions are themselves $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds.

Proposition 26. *Given an Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold, the distributions $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}$ (40) that have constant rank are integrable and of even rank. Their integral leaves are symplectic submanifolds of M and are symplectically orthogonal to each other, namely*

$$(41) \quad \omega(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}) = \text{symplectic}$$

$$(42) \quad \omega(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\beta)}) = \mathbf{0} \quad \alpha \neq \beta .$$

Moreover, they are $\omega\mathcal{H}$ submanifolds of (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) .

Proof. We prove the result by induction on the number α of the factors in the intersection (40). First, observe that if $\alpha = 1$, properties (41) and (42) are fulfilled according to Proposition 24. Let us suppose that these properties are satisfied by the distributions

$$(43) \quad \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)} = \mathcal{W}_{i_1, \dots, i_{\alpha-1}} = \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(1)} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_{i_{\alpha-1}}^{(\alpha-1)}, \quad \alpha > 1 ;$$

then we will prove that they hold true for the distributions $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)} \cap \mathcal{D}_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)}$. To this aim, we consider the foliation $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}$ and a generic leaf $W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}$ of it. Obviously, the symplectic form ω can be restricted to $W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}$, where it is still non degenerate, by the induction assumption (41). Furthermore, as $W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}$ is invariant for the Haantjes algebra \mathcal{H} , each element of \mathcal{H} can be restricted to $W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}$.

Now, let us denote by $\mathcal{H}|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}}$ the restriction of the Haantjes algebra to $W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}$. Over the leaf $W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}$ the restricted compatibility condition holds true, as $\forall \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$(44) \quad (\mathbf{K}^T)|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}} \Omega|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}} = (\mathbf{K}^T \Omega)|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}} = (\Omega \mathbf{K})|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}} = \Omega|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}} \mathbf{K}|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}}.$$

Therefore, the triple $(W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}, \omega|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}}, \mathcal{H}|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}})$ is a $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold.

Notice that the generalized eigendistribution $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}$ can be characterized at any point by $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{Ker}(\mathbf{K}_\alpha - l_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{I})|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}}^{\rho_i}(\mathbf{x})$. Consequently, the rank of \mathcal{W}_α must be even due to Corollary 20. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}^\perp(\mathbf{x}) &= \left(\text{Ker}(\mathbf{K}_\alpha - l_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{I})|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}}^{\rho_i} \right)^\perp(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \mathbf{P}|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}} \left(\left(\text{Ker}(\mathbf{K}_\alpha - l_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{I})|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}}^{\rho_i} \right)^\circ \right)(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathcal{E}_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)})|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}}(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{P}|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}} = (\Omega|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}})^{-1}$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}^\perp = (\mathcal{D}_{i_m}^{(m)})|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}} \cap (\mathcal{E}_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)})|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha-1)}} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$$

so that $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}$ is a symplectic foliation of M . Observe that condition (44) also holds over any leaf $W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}$. Therefore, we conclude that each integral leaf $W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}$ of the distributions $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}$ is again a $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold; it will be denoted by $(W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}, \omega|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}}, \mathcal{H}|_{W_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)}})$.

To prove relation (42), let us compare $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)} = \mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(1)} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)}$ with $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{J}(\alpha)} = \mathcal{D}_{j_1}^{(1)} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_{j_\alpha}^{(\alpha)}$. We distinguish two possibilities: If, $i_1 \neq j_1, \dots, i_\alpha \neq j_\alpha$, it follows that $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{J}(\alpha)}^\perp$ as $\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(1)} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{j_1}^{(1)} = \mathcal{D}_{j_1}^\perp, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{j_\alpha}^{(\alpha)} = (\mathcal{D}_{j_\alpha}^{(\alpha)})^\perp$. Consequently, Eq. (42) holds true. Instead, if some indices coincide, say $i_1 = j_1, \dots, i_s = j_s$, but $i_{s+1} \neq j_{s+1}, \dots, i_\alpha \neq j_\alpha$, we have:

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}(\alpha)} = (\mathcal{D}_{i_{s+1}}^{(1)} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_{i_\alpha}^{(\alpha)})|_{\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(1)} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_{i_s}^{(s)}}, \quad \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{J}(\alpha)} = (\mathcal{D}_{j_{s+1}}^{(1)} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_{j_\alpha}^{(\alpha)})|_{\mathcal{D}_{i_1}^{(1)} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_{i_s}^{(s)}},$$

therefore we go back to the previous case. \square

3.2. Darboux–Haantjes coordinates for $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds. We wish to show that among the families of Haantjes coordinates defined in Section 2.3, there exist sets of coordinates in which the symplectic form ω takes specifically the *Darboux form*. In order to construct such Darboux-Haantjes coordinates, we first state the following

Lemma 27. *Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold and let*

$$(45) \quad \{U, (x^{1,1}, \dots, x^{1,2\sigma_1}; \dots; x^{a,1}, \dots, x^{a,2\sigma_a}; \dots; x^{v,1}, \dots, x^{v,2\sigma_v})\}$$

be a local chart in M in which ω takes locally the block-form expression

$$(46) \quad \omega = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2\sigma_1} \omega_{ij}^{(1)} dx^{1,i} \wedge dx^{1,j} + \dots + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2\sigma_a} \omega_{ij}^{(a)} dx^{a,i} \wedge dx^{a,j} + \dots + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2\sigma_v} \omega_{ij}^{(v)} dx^{v,i} \wedge dx^{v,j}.$$

Then, its components satisfy the equations

$$(47) \quad \frac{\partial \omega_{ij}^{(a)}}{\partial x^{b,k}} = 0 \quad a \neq b, k = 1, \dots, 2\sigma_b.$$

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of the fact that ω is a closed form. \square

Theorem 28. *Let (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) be an Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold of class m . Among the sets of Haantjes coordinates for \mathcal{H} , there exist local charts in $U \subset M$ with Darboux coordinates*

$$(48) \quad (\mathbf{q}^1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}^v, \mathbf{p}_v) ,$$

where

$$(\mathbf{q}^1, \mathbf{p}_1) = (q^{1,1}, \dots, q^{1,\sigma_1}, p_{1,1}, \dots, p_{1,\sigma_1}); \dots; (\mathbf{q}^v, \mathbf{p}_v) = (q^{v,1}, \dots, q^{v,\sigma_v}, p_{v,1}, \dots, p_{v,\sigma_v}),$$

such that ω takes the Darboux form

$$(49) \quad \omega = \sum_{a=1}^v \sum_{i=1}^{\sigma_a} dp_{a,i} \wedge dq^{a,i} .$$

Here $\sigma_a = 1/2 \text{rank}(\mathcal{V}_a)$, and \mathcal{V}_a ($a = 1, \dots, v$) are the distributions defined in Eq. (16).

Proof. Let us consider a Haantjes chart for \mathcal{H} . It is adapted to the decomposition (15) and has the form (45). In such a chart, each element of the Haantjes algebra takes a block-diagonal form, due to Theorem 11. Besides, the distributions \mathcal{V}_a satisfy the properties stated in Proposition 26 as they correspond to the distributions \mathcal{W}_α when $\alpha = m$. Consequently, in each Haantjes chart, the symplectic form ω takes the block form (46) as

$$\omega \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{a,i}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{b,j}} \right) = 0 \quad a \neq b, \quad i = 1, \dots, 2\sigma_a, \quad j = 1, \dots, 2\sigma_b ,$$

thanks to Eq. (42). Thus, its components satisfy property (47). Then, over the leaves of every distribution \mathcal{V}_a one can find Darboux coordinates for the restriction of the symplectic form, which is still symplectic, due to Eq. (41). Therefore, one can collect such coordinates to obtain a local chart in M like (48), adapted to the decomposition (15). In this chart, the symplectic form ω takes the Darboux form (49) and each Haantjes operator $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ still possesses a block-diagonal form. \square

Definition 29. *Given an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold, the local coordinates where all Haantjes operators take simultaneously a block-diagonal form and, at the same time, the symplectic form takes the Darboux form (49) are called Darboux–Haantjes (DH) coordinates.*

Definition 30. *An $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) will be said to be semisimple if \mathcal{H} is a semisimple Haantjes algebra.*

Corollary 31. *In a semisimple Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) , each $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ takes the diagonal form (31) in every set of Darboux–Haantjes coordinates.*

Proof. Given a semisimple Abelian Haantjes algebra \mathcal{H} , in each set of Haantjes coordinates the operators $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ take a diagonal form. Furthermore, due to Theorem 28, among Haantjes coordinates there exist local charts in which the symplectic form takes the Darboux form (49). In such DH coordinates, every $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ takes the form (31) as a consequence of the compatibility condition (29). \square

3.3. Haantjes chains for $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds. The relevance of Haantjes chains in the theory of $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds is due to the following

Lemma 32. *Let (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) be an Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold. Then the potential functions H_α , whose differentials belong to all Haantjes chains generated by a single function H , are in involution among each others and with H , w.r.t. the Poisson bracket defined by the Poisson operator $\mathbf{P} = \Omega^{-1}$.*

Proof. In fact, we have

(50)

$$\{H_\alpha, H_\beta\} = \langle dH_\alpha, \mathbf{P} dH_\beta \rangle = \langle \mathbf{K}_\alpha^T dH, \mathbf{P} \mathbf{K}_\beta^T dH \rangle = \langle dH, \mathbf{K}_\alpha \mathbf{P} \mathbf{K}_\beta^T dH \rangle \stackrel{\text{Prop. 19}}{=} 0,$$

for $\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, m$. The involution of H_α with H can be proved analogously. \square

An interesting problem is to study both Lagrangian eigendistributions and their associated Lagrangian foliations in an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold. To this aim, let us compare the distribution \mathcal{D}_H , spanned by the vector fields annihilated by the codistribution \mathcal{D}_H° defined by Eq. (26), with the distribution, denoted by \mathcal{D}_H^\perp , of the vector fields symplectically orthogonal to those of \mathcal{D}_H . It is known that $\mathcal{D}_H^\perp = \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{D}_H^\circ)$. Taking into account Eq. (26) and Proposition 19, it turns out that

$$(51) \quad \mathcal{D}_H^\perp = \text{Span}\{\mathbf{K}_1 X_H, \mathbf{K}_2 X_H, \dots, \mathbf{K}_m X_H\},$$

where $X_H = \mathbf{P} dH$ is the Hamiltonian vector field with Hamiltonian function H . Thus, we deduce the following result.

Proposition 33. *Let (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) be a $2n$ -dimensional Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold, and H be a smooth function on M . The relation*

$$(52) \quad \mathcal{D}_H^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{D}_H$$

holds, namely, \mathcal{D}_H is a coisotropic distribution and \mathcal{D}_H^\perp is an isotropic one. Moreover, if

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{D}_H) = n,$$

they coincide and form a Lagrangian distribution.

Proof. Each vector field belonging to \mathcal{D}_H^\perp is annihilated by any 1-form belonging to \mathcal{D}_H° as

$$\langle \mathbf{K}_\alpha^T dH, \mathbf{K}_\beta X_H \rangle = \langle dH, \mathbf{K}_\alpha \mathbf{K}_\beta \mathbf{P} dH \rangle \stackrel{\text{Prop. 19}}{=} 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{K}_\alpha, \mathbf{K}_\beta \in \mathcal{H}.$$

If $\text{rank}(\mathcal{D}_H) = n$, we also have $\text{rank}(\mathcal{D}_H^\circ) = n = \text{rank}(\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{D}_H^\circ))$. Therefore, $\mathcal{D}_H^\perp = \mathcal{D}_H$. \square

Proposition 34. *Let (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) be a $2n$ -dimensional Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold of class m and H be a smooth function that generates a Haantjes chain of length m . Then, the distribution \mathcal{D}_H (rs. \mathcal{D}_H^\perp) are integrable distributions and have a coisotropic (rs. isotropic) foliation that we denote by \mathcal{D}_H (rs. \mathcal{D}_H^\perp). In particular, if $m = n$, $\mathcal{D}_H = \mathcal{D}_H^\perp$ is a Lagrangian foliation.*

Proof. Let $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m\}$ be the potential functions of the Haantjes chain generated by H . They are in involution, due to Lemma 32; then, they are integral functions of the coisotropic foliation \mathcal{D}_H . Consequently, the isotropic distribution \mathcal{D}_H^\perp is also integrable. In particular, if $m = n$, then $\text{rank}(\mathcal{D}_H) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{D}_H^\perp) = n$. Thus, from Eq. (52) it follows that $\mathcal{D}_H = \mathcal{D}_H^\perp$. \square

The following theorem clarifies the compatibility between a $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold and a set of functions in involution.

Theorem 35. *Let (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) be a $2n$ -dimensional $\omega\mathcal{H}$ Abelian manifold of class m . Let $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m\}$ be a set of independent functions in involution and \mathcal{D}° denote the codistribution spanned by their differentials. The functions $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m\}$ form a Haantjes chain, generated by a smooth function H in involution with them, if and only if H satisfies the condition*

$$(53) \quad \mathcal{D}_H^\circ = \mathcal{D}^\circ .$$

Proof. Condition (53) is equivalent to require that $\mathcal{D}_H^\circ \subseteq \mathcal{D}^\circ$ as they both have, by assumption, the same rank m . Thus, if such an inclusion is satisfied, \mathcal{D}_H is integrable and its foliation is a coisotropic foliation due to Proposition 33. Moreover, by virtue of Theorem 16, it follows that the function H generates the Haantjes chain given by $\{dH_1, dH_2, \dots, dH_m\}$.

Conversely, if $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m\}$ are the potential functions of a Haantjes chain generated by H , as a consequence of Eq. (25) it follows that $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_\alpha^T dH = dH_\alpha \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$, for $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$. Then, condition (53) is satisfied. \square

3.4. Cyclic $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds. A particular, especially relevant family of Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds is represented by the class of symplectic manifolds endowed with a cyclic Haantjes algebra of rank m (see Sec. 2.2.1). This algebra is generated by a single Haantjes operator \mathbf{L} , assumed to satisfy the compatibility condition (29). Taking into account Eq. (14), it is easy to prove that such condition holds true also for each $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L})$. In fact, representing \mathbf{K} as a polynomial field in \mathbf{L} , we have

$$\Omega \mathbf{K} = \Omega p_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) = p_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}^T) \Omega = \mathbf{K}^T \Omega .$$

We shall say that these manifolds are *cyclic $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds*.

For a cyclic $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold one can construct a special class of Haantjes chains. Indeed, in this context, Theorem 16 amounts to say that a function H generates the Haantjes chain

$$(54) \quad dH_\alpha = \mathbf{K}_\alpha^T dH = p_\alpha(\mathbf{L}^T) dH \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m$$

if and only if the codistribution

$$(55) \quad \mathcal{D}_H^\circ = \text{Span}\{dH, \mathbf{L}^T dH, \dots, (\mathbf{L}^T)^{m-1} dH\}$$

is integrable. The chain (54) will be said to be a *cyclic Haantjes chain*.

An important class of cyclic $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds is represented by ωN manifolds [33, 27]. Let (M, ω, \mathbf{N}) be a symplectic-Nijenhuis (or ωN) manifold, that is, a manifold endowed with a symplectic form ω and a Nijenhuis operator \mathbf{N} that satisfy the following compatibility conditions

$$(56) \quad \Omega \mathbf{N} - \mathbf{N}^T \Omega = \mathbf{0} ,$$

$$(57) \quad d(\Omega \mathbf{N}) = \mathbf{0} .$$

Here

$$(58) \quad d\Omega(X, Y) = \mathcal{L}_X(\Omega)Y - \mathcal{L}_Y(\Omega)X + d\langle \Omega X, Y \rangle + \Omega[X, Y] , \quad \forall X, Y \in TM$$

and \mathcal{L}_X denotes the Lie derivative of a tensor field with respect to the vector field X .

Example 36. Let us suppose that the Nijenhuis operator \mathbf{N} has its minimal polynomial of degree m . Then, the $\omega\mathbf{N}$ manifold M has a standard $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure, given by

$$(M, \omega, \mathbf{K}_1 = \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}_2 = \mathbf{N}, \dots, \mathbf{K}_m = \mathbf{N}^{m-1}),$$

with a Haantjes algebra of rank $m \leq \dim(M)$. In fact, each Nijenhuis operator \mathbf{N} is also a Haantjes operator; therefore, it generates the cyclic Haantjes algebra $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{N})$. Besides, the algebraic compatibility condition (56) assures that for all Haantjes operators

$$(59) \quad \mathbf{K} = p_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{N}) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a_i(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{N}^i,$$

condition iii) of Definition 17 is fulfilled.

Furthermore, the differential condition (57) implies that for all \mathbf{K} , the following relation

$$(60) \quad d(\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \mathbf{K})(X, Y) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} da_i \wedge (\boldsymbol{\Omega} \mathbf{N}^i)(X, Y) \quad \forall X, Y \in TM$$

holds.

Note that the cyclic Haantjes chains on $\omega\mathbf{N}$ manifolds coincide with the notion of Nijenhuis chains [11] and of generalized Lenard chains, defined in [48, 53]. In particular, if $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{\alpha} = \mathbf{N}^{\alpha-1}$, the cyclic Haantjes chains coincide with the classical Lenard-Magri chains [27] (see also the analysis of the Benenti systems in terms of Killing-Stäckel in algebras [3]).

We shall now deepen into the relationship between the notion of cyclic Haantjes algebras and the theory of $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds.

Proposition 37. Every semisimple $2n$ -dimensional Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) of class m is a cyclic $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold. Moreover, each generator of \mathcal{H} that belongs to \mathcal{H} must have h distinct eigenvalues, with $h = m$ if $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$, or $h = m + 1$ otherwise. In particular, if \mathcal{H} has rank $m = n$, an operator $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ is a generator of \mathcal{H} if and only if it is maximal. In this case, $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$.

Finally, if a $2n$ -dimensional $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold of class n is non-semisimple, then none of its generators can be maximal.

Proof. The first and the second statement are a direct consequence of Proposition 13. In particular, if $h = n$, the cyclic algebra $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{K})$ generated by a maximal operator $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ has rank n ; therefore, it coincides with \mathcal{H} ; thus, $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$. Conversely, every generator of \mathcal{H} , being semisimple and having its minimum polynomial of degree n (by virtue of the second statement), is maximal.

Finally, we observe that generators of non-semisimple Haantjes algebras cannot be maximal, since maximal operators, due to Lemma 22, are semisimple. \square

The following Proposition, which specializes the results of Proposition 13 and Corollary 14 to the case of a semisimple $2n$ -dimensional Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold of class m , presents an explicit construction of a generator of \mathcal{H} ; in particular, this generator can be chosen to be a Nijenhuis operator.

Proposition 38. Let (M, ω, \mathcal{H}) be an Abelian $2n$ -dimensional semisimple $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold of class m . Let us consider the spectral decomposition (15) and a Darboux-Haantjes chart $\{U, (q^{a,j_a}, p_{a,j_a})\}$, $a = 1, \dots, v$, $j_a = 1, \dots, \sigma_a = \frac{1}{2}\text{rank}(\mathcal{V}_a)$, adapted

to the decomposition (15), namely

$$(61) \quad \mathcal{V}_a = \text{Span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial q^{a,j_a}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{a,j_a}} \right\}.$$

Then, if $m \leq v \leq n$, each operator defined by

$$(62) \quad \mathbf{L} = \sum_{a=1}^v \lambda_a(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) \sum_{j_a=1}^{\sigma_a} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^{a,j_a}} \otimes dq^{a,j_a} + \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{a,j_a}} \otimes dp_{a,j_a} \right)$$

is a generator of \mathcal{H} , provided that $\{\lambda_1(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}), \dots, \lambda_v(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})\}$ are arbitrary, pointwise distinct smooth functions. Therefore, every operator $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{H}$ can be written in the form

$$(63) \quad \mathbf{K} = \sum_{i=1}^m l_i \frac{\prod_{j \neq i} (\mathbf{L} - \lambda_j \mathbf{I})}{\prod_{j \neq i} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)},$$

where $l_i = l_i(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$ are the eigenvalue fields of \mathbf{K} . In particular, if

$$(64) \quad \lambda_a(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) = \lambda_a(q^{a,1}, p_{a,1}, \dots, q^{a,\sigma_a}, p_{a,\sigma_a}) \quad a = 1, \dots, v,$$

the generator \mathbf{L} is a Nijenhuis operator. This operator endows the manifold M with a standard N structure, since it satisfies both conditions (56) and (57), as it can be proved by a direct calculation

If $v < m \leq n$, by means of a further decomposition of \mathcal{V}_a we can re-obtain the case $m \leq v$.

Finally, a generator \mathbf{L} is maximal if and only if $m = v = n$. In this case, $\mathbf{I} \in \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. The inequality $v > n$ cannot hold in an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold of class n because, due to Proposition 26, the rank of each distribution \mathcal{V}_a can not be less than 2. Therefore, we have that $v \leq n$. Let us consider a Darboux-Haantjes chart of the form (61), adapted to the decomposition (15) (whose existence is guaranteed by Theorem 28). In this chart, if $v \geq m$, the generator (22) takes the form (62) and it can be a Nijenhuis operator, providing that its eigenvalues fields are chosen of the form (64).

When $v < m$, a generator can still be constructed since, as in Proposition 13, we can further decompose each distribution \mathcal{V}_a into a direct sum of 2-dimensional sub-distributions

$$\mathcal{V}_a = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\sigma_a} \text{Span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial q^{a,i}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{a,i}} \right\} \quad a = 1, \dots, v.$$

□

4. COMPLETE INTEGRABILITY AND HAANTJES STRUCTURES

The aim of this Section is to prove the main result of this paper, namely the equivalence between the existence of an $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure associated with a Hamiltonian system and its complete integrability in the sense of Liouville and Arnold. In particular, we shall prove formula (1), which relates the Haantjes geometry of a given integrable system with its dynamics. Also, we will show in a specific example how the Haantjes formulation overcomes, for the vector fields under scrutiny, an obstruction to the existence of a classical Lenard chain pointed out by R. Brouzet.

From now on, we will work with the distinguished basis $\{\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_m\}$, and we will drop off the *tilde* over $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_\alpha$ for the sake of simplicity.

4.1. Haantjes theorem for integrable systems. We propose a characterization of the notion of integrability in the sense of Liouville–Arnold in terms of $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifolds.

Theorem 39 (Liouville-Haantjes). *Let M be a $2n$ -dimensional Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold of class n and $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n\}$ be smooth potential functions of a Haantjes chain generated by a function H . Then, the foliation generated by these functions is Lagrangian. Consequently, each Hamiltonian system, with Hamiltonian functions H and H_α , $1 \leq \alpha \leq n$, is integrable by quadratures.*

Conversely, let us consider a completely integrable system with n degrees of freedom, defined by a Hamiltonian H and a set of n integrals of motion $\{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$, in involution and independent among each other. Let $\{(J_k, \phi_k)\}$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, denote a set of action-angle variables, with associated frequencies $\nu_k(\mathbf{J}) := \frac{\partial H}{\partial J_k}$. If H is non degenerate, that is

$$(65) \quad \det \left(\frac{\partial \nu_k}{\partial J_i} \right) = \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial J_i \partial J_k} \right) \neq 0 ,$$

then M admits, in any tubular neighbourhood of an Arnold torus, a semisimple $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure whose Haantjes algebra is generated by the operators

$$(66) \quad \mathbf{K}_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\nu_i^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{J})}{\nu_i(\mathbf{J})} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial J_i} \otimes dJ_i + \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} \otimes d\phi_i \right) \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n ,$$

where $\nu_i^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{J})$ are the frequencies of the $(\alpha) - n$ th linear flow.

Proof. To prove the first statement, by virtue of the classical Liouville–Arnold theorem, it is sufficient to note that the functions H_α belonging to a Haantjes chain are in involution w.r.t. the Poisson bracket defined by the symplectic form ω , thanks to Lemma 32.

Let us prove the converse statement. The integrals of motion $\{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ are all assumed to be independent smooth functions on an open dense subset of the phase space, in involution among each others and with H . Due to the celebrated Arnold theorem [2], the $2n$ -dimensional phase space is foliated by leaves whose compact connected components are invariant tori. Also, at least in any tubular neighbourhood of each torus, there exists a set of action-angle (AA) variables $\{(J_i, \phi_i)\}$, such that the symplectic 2-form reads

$$(67) \quad \omega = \sum_{i=1}^n dJ_i \wedge d\phi_i .$$

Owing to condition (65), the set $\{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ depends on the action variables only [2]. Then, the functions H_α take the generic form

$$(68) \quad H_\alpha = H_\alpha(\mathbf{J}), \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n.$$

With these data, we shall construct a semisimple and Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure associated with the given integrable system.

As a basis of the Haantjes algebra we wish to construct, we can take the following *diagonal* operators in the action-angle coordinates

$$(69) \quad \mathbf{K}_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{J}) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial J_i} \otimes dJ_i + \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} \otimes d\phi_i \right) \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n ,$$

where $l_i^{(\alpha)}$ are arbitrary smooth functions. They comply with Definition 5 and fulfil the compatibility condition (29).

Moreover, we impose that the integrals of motion $\{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n\}$ form a Haantjes chain generated by H , i.e.

$$(70) \quad \mathbf{K}_\alpha^T dH = dH_\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n.$$

Being \mathbf{K}_α diagonal in the AA variables, such conditions are equivalent to the following system of $2n$ algebraic equations in the n indeterminate functions: $l_i^{(\alpha)}$

$$(71) \quad l_i^{(\alpha)} \frac{\partial H}{\partial J_i} = \frac{\partial H_\alpha}{\partial J_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

$$(72) \quad l_i^{(\alpha)} \frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi_i} = \frac{\partial H_\alpha}{\partial \phi_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Obviously, Eqs. (72) are trivially satisfied, so that only Eqs. (71) have to be taken into account. Without loss of generality, we assume that ν_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, are non-vanishing functions. Then, equations (71) imply that the eigenvalues of the α -th operator must be the ratio between the frequencies associated to the α -th integral of motion and to the Hamiltonian, respectively. It is easy to prove that the Haantjes operators so obtained are linearly independent, due to the independence of the integrals of motion. Consequently, the Haantjes algebra involved in the Haantjes chain (70) is generated by the distinguished basis of operators (66). \square

There is a natural relation between AA variables and DH coordinates in the Haantjes geometry, as clarified by

Proposition 40. *Any set of AA variables for a completely integrable system is a set of DH coordinates for the $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold given by the symplectic form ω and the Haantjes diagonal algebra generated by the operators (66).*

Remark 41. *The Haantjes operators (66) exist without any restriction on the form of the Hamiltonian function H , except for the non-degeneracy condition (65). However, if one wishes to construct a Nijenhuis recursion operator \mathbf{N} for H , i.e. a Nijenhuis operator that, at the same time, provides a classical Lenard chain*

$$(73) \quad dH_\alpha = (\mathbf{N}^T)^\alpha dH \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n,$$

and has the natural vector fields $\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial J_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i}\right)$ as eigenvectors, then the Hamiltonian function must take necessarily the separated form

$$(74) \quad H(\mathbf{J}) = \sum_{k=1}^n H_k(J_k),$$

where $H_k(J_k)$ is a smooth function of the single action variable J_i (see [33], [35]).

Remark 42. *The non constant eigenvalues $l_i^{(\alpha)}(\mathbf{x})$ of the Haantjes operators (66) \mathbf{K}_α , $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, n$, depending only on action variables, are integrals of motion for the Hamiltonian vector field X_H , i.e. their Lie derivatives along the flow of X_H vanishes:*

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_H} l_i^{(\alpha)} = 0.$$

However, this property does not imply that the Haantjes operators are invariant along the flow of X_H , as

$$(75) \quad \mathcal{L}_{X_H} \mathbf{K}_\alpha = \sum_{i,k=1}^n (l_i^{(\alpha)} - l_k^{(\alpha)}) \frac{\partial \nu_i}{\partial J_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} \otimes dJ_k .$$

4.2. The analysis of Brouzet. In [7], R. Brouzet studied the existence of a Nijenhuis *recursion* operator for a completely integrable system, that is a Nijenhuis operator *compatible* with ω and fulfilling the requirement

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_H}(\mathbf{N}) = 0 .$$

Notice that this requirement is not satisfied by the Haantjes operators (66), according to Eq. (75). Brouzet proved that the existence of a Nijenhuis recursion operator for X_H in a tubular neighbourhood of a Liouville torus implies very strong restrictions on the form of its Hamiltonian function. Accordingly, he presented an example of an integrable system with two degrees of freedom that *does not admit* a recursion operator compatible with the original symplectic structure. Here we show that such example does admit a simple formulation in the context of the $\omega\mathcal{H}$ geometry.

In his analysis, Brouzet considered the symplectic manifold $M = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2$, with the action variables $(J_1, J_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the angles (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) on the bi-dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^2 , and the Hamiltonian function

$$(76) \quad H = J_1(1 + J_2^2) ,$$

which is not of the form (74) and is non degenerate in the dense open submanifold $M' := \{m \in M : J_2 \neq 0\}$. The corresponding Hamiltonian vector field

$$(77) \quad X_H = (1 + J_2^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_1} + 2J_1 J_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_2}$$

is completely integrable, since any smooth function depending only on the action variables is an integral of motion for it. For instance, let us take

$$(78) \quad H_1 = J_1 , \quad H_2 = J_2 ,$$

which on M' are functionally independent among each others. One can easily verify that the two Hamiltonian functions in involution $\{H_1, H_2\}$ are the potential functions of a Haantjes chain w.r.t. the $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure given by the standard symplectic form

$$(79) \quad \omega = dJ_1 \wedge d\phi_1 + dJ_2 \wedge d\phi_2$$

and by the Haantjes operators

$$(80) \quad \mathbf{K}_1 = \frac{1}{(1 + J_2^2)} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial J_1} \otimes dJ_1 + \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_1} \otimes d\phi_1 \right) , \quad \mathbf{K}_2 = \frac{1}{2J_1 J_2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial J_2} \otimes dJ_2 + \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_2} \otimes d\phi_2 \right) ,$$

which are constructed in the open submanifold of M' where $J_1 \neq 0$ according to the formulae (66).

It is interesting to observe that the authors of [24] have by-passed the Brouzet obstruction to the existence of a Nijenhuis recursion operator for the Hamiltonian (76) (and for other examples presented in [8]) by using a different strategy. Their approach consists in looking for a Nijenhuis recursion operator compatible with a

symplectic structure *alternative* to the original one. Instead, in our theory, the Haantjes operators are compatible with the original symplectic structure.

5. INTEGRABLE MODELS, WAVE EQUATION AND HAANTJES GEOMETRY

Given the equivalence between complete integrability of a Hamiltonian system and the existence of an associated $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure, we can use this equivalence in two ways: to construct integrable models from a given Haantjes geometry (the *direct problem*) or, conversely, to determine the Haantjes geometry of a given integrable system (the *inverse problem*). In this section, we will adopt the first point of view, in order to show the flexibility of the Haantjes approach in applicative contexts. We consider the simplest case of a manifold M of dimension 4 and of a Haantjes algebra of class 2, whose basis is $\{\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}\}$ for a suitable \mathbf{K} . Indeed, by searching for Haantjes chains w.r.t. such a distinguished basis, we are able to define families of associated integrable models.

Precisely, we will show that by means of the Haantjes geometry, solutions of the two-dimensional wave equation can be used to define new integrable systems.

Theorem 43. *Let $\xi = \frac{x+y}{\sqrt{2}}$, $\eta = \frac{x-y}{\sqrt{2}}$, $p_\xi = \frac{p_x+p_y}{\sqrt{2}}$, $p_\eta = \frac{p_x-p_y}{\sqrt{2}}$ be characteristic coordinates and momenta in an open set of M . The Hamiltonian*

$$(81) \quad H = H_1(\xi, \eta, p_\xi, p_\eta) = f(\eta) + g(\xi) + F(p_\eta) + G(p_\xi)$$

where f, g, F, G are arbitrary functions of their arguments, is integrable and admits the first integral of motion

$$(82) \quad H_2(\xi, \eta, p_\xi, p_\eta) = -f(\eta) + g(\xi) - F(p_\eta) + G(p_\xi).$$

Proof. Consider the uniform Haantjes operator in Cartesian coordinates and momenta

$$(83) \quad \mathbf{K} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \otimes dy + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \otimes dx + \frac{\partial}{\partial p_x} \otimes dp_y + \frac{\partial}{\partial p_y} \otimes dp_x.$$

We construct the Haantjes chain

$$(84) \quad \mathbf{K}^T dH = dH_2.$$

This chain is defined by the differential relations

$$(85) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial p_y} = \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial p_x}, \\ \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial p_x} = \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial p_y}, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial x}, \\ \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial y}. \end{cases}$$

These equations can be combined to define the wave equations

$$(86) \quad H_{i,p_x p_x} - H_{i,p_y p_y} = 0, \quad H_{i,xx} - H_{i,yy} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Therefore the Hamiltonian functions

$$(87) \quad H_1(x, y, p_x, p_y) = F(p_x - p_y) + G(p_x + p_y) + f(x - y) + g(x + y)$$

and

$$(88) \quad H_2(x, y, p_x, p_y) = -F(p_x - p_y) + G(p_x + p_y) - f(x - y) + g(x + y),$$

where F, G, f, g are arbitrary smooth functions of their arguments, define a completely integrable system, separable in the coordinates $(\xi, \eta, p_\xi, p_\eta)$. \square

Example 44. *Choosing the functions F, G, f, g as a power of their arguments, we get the interesting family of models*

$$(89) \quad H_1 = (p_x - p_y)^n + (p_x + p_y)^n + (x - y)^m + (x + y)^m, \quad n, m \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$(90) \quad H_2 = -(p_x - p_y)^n + (p_x + p_y)^n - (x - y)^m + (x + y)^m.$$

For $n = 2$, the Hamiltonian function H_1 is quadratic in the momenta and corresponds to a class of separable systems that have been discussed in [43] (page 81). In particular, for $n = 2, m = 3$ one obtains the Sawada-Kotera system [1]. For $n > 2$ we have, to the best of our knowledge, a new family of integrable systems.

The direct method outlined in this section can be widely adopted to generate new models from known Haantjes operators. However, an exhaustive analysis of this approach is out of the scopes of the present work.

6. THE INVERSE PROBLEM FOR SYSTEMS WITH TWO DEGREES OF FREEDOM

In this Section, we deal with the inverse problem. More precisely, given a set of independent functions in involution, we will construct by means of them a Haantjes algebra compatible with the symplectic form. In other words, we shall determine a Haantjes algebra for an assigned integrable system, represented in physical variables.

6.1. A general procedure. Let us consider the simplest case of Hamiltonian systems with two degrees of freedom. We propose a general procedure allowing us to determine a Haantjes algebra with identity and of class 2, associated to the Haantjes chain formed by the differentials of the two given integrals of motion. We search for a generator of such Haantjes algebra, that is to say a Haantjes operator \mathbf{L} whose minimal polynomial is of degree two (namely, the maximum degree allowed by our assumptions):

$$(91) \quad m_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda) := \lambda^2 - c_1(\mathbf{x})\lambda - c_2(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $c_1(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\text{Trace}(\mathbf{L})$, $c_2(\mathbf{x}) = -\sqrt{\det(\mathbf{L})}$. Let us note that such a requirement does not imply the semisimplicity of \mathbf{L} (unless the existence of two real, distinct roots of $m_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda)$ is also assumed).

Remark 45. *In the case $n = 2$, any non-isotropic (that is $\mathbf{L}_1 \neq l(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{I}$) Haantjes operator, compatible with the symplectic form, is a generator of the cyclic Haantjes algebra $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L}_1) = \text{Span}\{\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{L}_1\}$. Besides, any other generator of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L}_1)$ has the form*

$$(92) \quad \mathbf{L}_2 = f\mathbf{I} + g\mathbf{L}_1,$$

where f and g are arbitrary smooth functions, with g nowhere vanishing. In fact,

$$(93) \quad \det(\mathbf{L}_2 - \lambda\mathbf{I}) = \det(f\mathbf{I} + g\mathbf{L}_1 - \lambda\mathbf{I}) = g^n \det\left(\mathbf{L}_1 - \frac{\lambda - f}{g}\mathbf{I}\right).$$

Therefore, the eigenvalues $\lambda_i^{(1)}$ of \mathbf{L}_1 and $\lambda_i^{(2)}$ of \mathbf{L}_2 are related by the affine equations

$$(94) \quad \lambda_i^{(2)} = f + g\lambda_i^{(1)} \quad i = 1, 2;$$

consequently, $\lambda_1^{(1)} = \lambda_2^{(1)} \Leftrightarrow \lambda_1^{(2)} = \lambda_2^{(2)}$. Then, we can conclude that the Haantjes algebra (even if non-semisimple) contains a maximal generator if and only if all of its generators are maximal.

The procedure can be sketched as follows. Given two independent integrals of motion in involution $\{H_1 = H, H_2\}$, we look for an operator \mathbf{L} with the following properties:

i) it is compatible with the symplectic form

$$(95) \quad \mathbf{L}^T \boldsymbol{\Omega} = \boldsymbol{\Omega} \mathbf{L} ;$$

ii) it provides us with a Haantjes chain for the integrals

$$(96) \quad \mathbf{L}^T dH = dH_2 ;$$

iii) it is a Haantjes operator

$$(97) \quad \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{L}}(X, Y) = \mathbf{0} \quad \forall X, Y \in TM .$$

The algebraic compatibility condition (95) is very strong: chosen a set of Darboux coordinates, it allows us to reduce the number of unknown components of the operator \mathbf{L} from 16 to 6. We obtain that it must have the form

$$(98) \quad \mathbf{L} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} l_1^1 & l_2^1 & 0 & l_4^1 \\ l_1^2 & l_2^2 & -l_4^1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & l_2^3 & l_1^1 & l_1^2 \\ -l_2^3 & 0 & l_2^1 & l_2^2 \end{array} \right] ,$$

where l_j^i are unknown arbitrary functions on M . Note that the form (98) for \mathbf{L} guarantees that condition (91) is satisfied. The relations (96), still algebraic, provide us with a system of 4 algebraic equations in the 6 unknown functions; it turns out that only 3 equations are independent; thus we are left with 3 unknown functions. The vanishing of the Haantjes torsion (97) of \mathbf{L} provides us with an over-determined system of 24 PDEs of first order, which can be managed with some suitable ansätze. For instance, some homogeneity properties for the components of \mathbf{L} can be assumed.

6.2. On the superintegrable Post-Winternitz system. By means of the procedure described above, we can discuss now the inverse problem for a system which recently has attracted much attention: the Post-Winternitz (PW) system [44]. Indeed, it is a maximally *superintegrable* system [36] with integrals of motion cubic and quartic in the momenta. As a consequence of maximal superintegrability, its bounded orbits are closed and periodic. Thus, as any superintegrable system, it does not fulfil the non degeneracy condition (65), so that Theorem 39 cannot be applied. Despite its regularity properties, separation variables for the PW system are not known. Since it does not belong to the classical Stäckel family of Hamiltonian functions quadratic in the momenta, the PW system is certainly not separable by an extended point transformation.

Let us consider a set of canonical coordinates (x, y, p_x, p_y) ; the Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonian function

$$(99) \quad H = H_1 = \frac{1}{2}(p_x^2 + p_y^2) + a \frac{x}{y^{\frac{2}{3}}} \quad a \in \mathbb{R}, \quad y \neq 0 ,$$

admits the two independent integrals of motion

$$(100) \quad H_2 = 2p_x^3 + 3p_y^2 p_x + a \left(9y^{\frac{1}{3}} p_y + 6 \frac{x}{y^{\frac{2}{3}}} p_x \right)$$

and

$$(101) \quad H_3 = p_y^4 - 12ay^{\frac{1}{3}}p_xp_y + 4a\frac{x}{y^{\frac{2}{3}}}p_y^2 - 2a^2 \left(9y^{2/3} - \frac{2x^2}{y^{\frac{4}{3}}} \right).$$

We shall prove that these integrals form the two different Haantjes chains $\{dH_1, dH_2\}$ and $\{dH_1, dH_3\}$; each of them is sufficient to guarantee the complete integrability of the PW system.

By performing the extended-point canonical transformation

$$(102) \quad q_1 = y^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad q_2 = \frac{x}{y^{\frac{2}{3}}}, \quad p_1 = 2\frac{x}{y^{\frac{1}{3}}}p_x + 3y^{\frac{2}{3}}p_y, \quad p_2 = y^{\frac{2}{3}}p_x,$$

we reduce the Hamiltonian functions to a rational form; from it we infer the weights of the three components of (98) (still unknown after having imposed the conditions (96)). As a result of the previous approach, we get the $\omega\mathcal{H}$ manifold $(\omega, \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}_2^{(PW)})$ associated with the Haantjes chain $\{dH, dH_2\}$, where

$$(103) \quad \mathbf{K}_2^{(PW)} = 3 \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} 2p_x & p_y & 0 & 3y \\ 0 & 2p_x & -3y & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 2p_x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & p_y & 2p_x \end{array} \right],$$

once written in the original coordinates (x, y, p_x, p_y) . Similarly, we obtain a second $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure $(\omega, \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}_3^{(PW)})$ associated with the Haantjes chain $\{dH, dH_3\}$, where

$$(104) \quad \mathbf{K}_3^{(PW)} = 4 \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} p_y^2 + 2a\frac{x}{y^{2/3}} & -(p_xp_y + 3ay^{1/3}) & 0 & -3yp_x \\ 0 & p_y^2 + 2a\frac{x}{y^{2/3}} & 3yp_x & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & p_y^2 + 2a\frac{x}{y^{2/3}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -(p_xp_y + 3ay^{1/3}) & p_y^2 + 2a\frac{x}{y^{2/3}} \end{array} \right].$$

Although both $\mathbf{K}_2^{(PW)}$ and $\mathbf{K}_3^{(PW)}$ have a minimal polynomial of degree 2, they are not semisimple, since each of them possesses a single eigenvalue of algebraic multiplicity equal to 4, with two proper eigenvectors and two generalized eigenvectors.

Moreover, neither of the two non-semisimple Haantjes algebras generated by $\{\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}_2^{(PW)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}_3^{(PW)}\}$ admits a maximal generator, by Remark 45. However, their two Haantjes chains assure the superintegrability of the PW model. Thus, the existence of $\mathbf{K}_2^{(PW)}$ and $\mathbf{K}_3^{(PW)}$ shows that the Haantjes theory can be naturally applied to non-Stäckel systems which do not possess any evident separability structure, even when they do not satisfy the non-degeneracy condition (65). Furthermore, one can verify that the set $\{\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}_2^{(PW)}, \mathbf{K}_3^{(PW)}\}$ is still a basis of a Haantjes algebra. However, this algebra is non-Abelian, therefore it does not admit a generator. Thus, the PW system is a remarkable example of a superintegrable system admitting a non Abelian $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structure of rank 3.

Remark 46. *Once the algebra \mathcal{H} associated with an integrable system is determined, assuming that it is Abelian a theorem proved in [49] guarantees that there exists a local chart where all Haantjes operators can be put in diagonal form (if \mathcal{H} is semisimple) or in a block-diagonal form (if it is not). This fact is crucial in order to find separation variables [46], whenever they exist, or, more generally, to study partial separability [47], [9].*

Remark 47. *The procedure described above can also be applied to the case when an Hamiltonian function is given, but no integrals of motion are known. In this situation, Eq. (96) for the Haantjes chain can be used to construct, in principle, both the integrals of motion (if they exist) and the corresponding Haantjes operators.*

7. THE STATIONARY REDUCTION OF THE SEVENTH-ORDER KdV FLOW REVISITED

In this section, in order to show the large range of applicability of the theory previously developed, we shall discuss an important example of Hamiltonian integrable system, defined on a six-dimensional symplectic manifold, which is obtained as a stationary reduction of the seventh-order equation of the Korteweg de Vries (KdV) hierarchy.

In [52], a method to obtain the Poisson pencil $P_1 - \lambda P_0$ of the stationary flows of the KdV hierarchy was presented. In [37], this method was applied to construct the stationary reduction of the seventh-order equation of the hierarchy. The restricted Poisson pencil turns out to be a degenerate pencil of co-rank one in a seven dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}^{(7)}$, being therefore a Gelfand-Zakarevich system [16]. It possesses a polynomial Casimir function of length four, starting with a Casimir of P_0 and ending with a Casimir of P_1 . Then, a Marsden-Ratiu reduction procedure [34], similar to the one used in other cases [52, 39, 40], was performed to each six-dimensional symplectic leaf S_0 of the Poisson tensor P_0 , in order to get rid of the Casimir of P_0 .

Furthermore, by restricting the polynomial Casimir function to S_0 , one of the present authors was able to obtain in [37] three Hamiltonian functions in involution which in the Darboux chart $(q_1, q_2, q_3, p_1, p_2, p_3)$ read

(105)

$$\begin{aligned} H = H_1 &= p_1 p_2 + \frac{1}{2} p_3^2 - \frac{5}{8} q_1^4 + \frac{5}{2} q_1^2 q_2 + \frac{1}{2} q_1 q_3^2 - \frac{1}{2} q_2^2, \\ H_2 &= \frac{1}{2} p_1^2 + p_1 p_2 q_1 + p_3^2 q_1 - p_2^2 q_2 - p_2 p_3 q_3 - \frac{1}{2} q_1^5 - \frac{1}{4} q_1^2 q_3^2 + \frac{1}{2} q_2 q_3^2 + 2 q_1 q_2^2, \\ H_3 &= \frac{1}{2} p_3^2 q_1^2 + p_3^2 q_2 - p_1 p_3 q_3 - p_2 p_3 q_1 q_3 + \frac{1}{2} p_2^2 q_3^2 + \frac{1}{2} q_1^3 q_3^2 - q_1 q_2 q_3^2 - \frac{1}{8} q_3^4. \end{aligned}$$

However, as typically happens in the case of Gelfand-Zakarevich systems, the reduced integrable Hamiltonian systems on S_0 do not possess a bi-Hamiltonian description but a ωN one [12]. Nevertheless, they can also be described in the context of our new theory. In fact, we search for a generator \mathbf{L} of a cyclic Haantjes algebra \mathcal{H} of rank 3, therefore with the minimal polynomial of degree 3:

$$(106) \quad m_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda) := \lambda^3 - c_1(\mathbf{x})\lambda^2 - c_2(\mathbf{x})\lambda - c_3(\mathbf{x}) .$$

To this aim, we follow a procedure whose first step is analogous to the one performed in two degrees of freedom. We look for an operator \mathbf{K}_2 that satisfies

$$(107) \quad \mathbf{K}_2^T \Omega = \Omega \mathbf{K}_2 ,$$

$$(108) \quad \mathbf{K}_2^T dH = dH_2 ,$$

$$(109) \quad \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{K}_2}(X, Y) = \mathbf{0} \quad \forall X, Y \in TM .$$

Condition (107) allows us to reduce the unknown components of the operator \mathbf{K}_2 from 36 to 15. Under the simplest ansatz that the remaining elements of \mathbf{K}_2 are *linear* in the Darboux coordinates $(q_1, q_2, q_3, p_1, p_2, p_3)$, we find the following, unique solution of Eqs. (107), (108) and (109):

$$(110) \quad \mathbf{K}_2 = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} q_1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -2q_2 & q_1 & -q_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -q_3 & 0 & 2q_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -p_2 & -p_3 & q_1 & -2q_2 & -q_3 \\ p_2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & q_1 & 0 \\ p_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -q_3 & 2q_1 \end{array} \right].$$

Since \mathbf{K}_2 is a maximal semisimple Haantjes operator in the points where the discriminant Δ of its minimal polynomial

$$(111) \quad \Delta = -(8q_1^4q_2 + 4q_1^3q_3^2 + 32q_1^2q_2^2 + 72q_1q_2q_3^2 + 27q_3^4 + 32q_3^3)$$

is positive, then, by virtue of Proposition 37, it generates a cyclic Haantjes algebra \mathcal{H} . Thus, we search for another Haantjes operator \mathbf{K}_3 such that

$$(112) \quad \mathbf{K}_3 = f\mathbf{I} + g\mathbf{L} + h\mathbf{L}^2, \quad \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{K}_2,$$

$$(113) \quad \mathbf{K}_3^T dH = dH_3,$$

where f, g, h are suitable smooth functions on M to be determined. The unique solution is $\mathbf{K}_3 = (q_1^2 + 2q_2)\mathbf{I} - 2q_1\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{L}^2$, therefore

$$(114) \quad \mathbf{K}_3 = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 0 & 0 & -q_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ q_3^2 & 0 & -q_1q_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -q_1q_3 & -q_3 & q_1^2 + 2q_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & p_2q_3 - p_3q_1 & 0 & q_3^2 & -q_1q_3 \\ 0 & 0 & -p_3 & 0 & 0 & -q_3 \\ -(p_2q_3 - p_3q_1) & p_3 & 0 & -q_3 & -q_1q_3 & q_1^2 + 2q_2 \end{array} \right].$$

Thus, $\{\mathbf{K}_1 = \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}_2, \mathbf{K}_3\}$ is a distinguished basis of the cyclic Abelian Haantjes algebra of rank 3 generated by $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{K}_2$, which provides us with the Haantjes chain $\{dH_1, dH_2, dH_3\}$.

8. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

The extension of the present theory to the case of quantum integrable systems is a nontrivial task. This research line would pave the way to an algebraic interpretation of the notion of Haantjes integrability developed here, in terms of infinite-dimensional commuting operators on a Hilbert separable space of quantum states.

Also, it would be interesting to compare the geometric structures underlying the vision offered here with the intrinsic, purely algebraic structures developed in [23], in the context of *nilpotent integrability*.

We mention that new $\omega\mathcal{H}$ structures have been recently found in Ref. [19], which is based on an earlier version of this article.

An in-depth analysis of the case of *superintegrable systems* [51], especially maximally superintegrable ones, has been performed [46]. Along these lines, we also wish to construct a generalization of our approach to the study of the geometry of certain classical systems, as the abovementioned Post-Winternitz model of Section

6.2, that do not possess any known system of separation coordinates. We believe that our theory can offer a proper language in which the study of separability can be formulated and carried out.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research of P. T. has been supported by the research project PGC2018-094898-B-I00, Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades and Agencia Estatal de Investigación, Spain, and by the Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres of Excellence in R&D (CEX2019-000904-S), Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades y Agencia Estatal de Investigación, Spain.

P. T. is a member of Gruppo Nazionale di Fisica Matematica (GNFM) of INDAM.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Aizawa, N. Saito, *On the stability of isolating integrals, I. Effect of the perturbation in the potential function*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn, **32**, 1636-1640 (1972).
- [2] V. I. Arnold, V. V. Kozlov, A. I. Neishtadt, *Mathematical Aspects of Classical and Celestial Mechanics*, Springer, Berlin (1997).
- [3] S. Benenti, *Special symmetric two-tensors, equivalent dynamical systems, cofactor and bi-cofactor systems*, Acta Appl. Math. **87**, 33-91 (2005).
- [4] M. Błaszak, *Multi-Hamiltonian Theory of Dynamical Systems*, Texts and Monographs in Physics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1998).
- [5] O. I. Bogoyavlenskij, *General algebraic identities for the Nijenhuis and Haantjes tensors*, Izv. Math. **68**, 1129-1141 (2004).
- [6] O. I. Bogoyavlenskij, *Schouten tensor and bi-Hamiltonian systems of hydrodynamic type*, J. Math. Phys. **47**, paper n. 023504, 14 pages (2006).
- [7] R. Brouzet, *Systemes bihamiltoniens et complete integrabilite en dimension 4*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris **311**, 895-898 (1990).
- [8] R. Brouzet, *About the existence of recursion operators for completely integrable Hamiltonian systems near a Liouville torus*, J. Math. Phys. **34**, 1309-1313 (1993).
- [9] C. M. Chanu and G. Rastelli, *Block-separation of variables: a form of partial separation for natural Hamiltonians*, SIGMA **15**, 013 (2019).
- [10] T. Daudé, N. Kamran and F. Nicoleau, *Separability and symmetry operators for Painlevé metrics and their conformal deformation*, SIGMA **15**, paper n. 069 (2019).
- [11] G. Falqui, F. Magri and G. Tondo, *Bi-Hamiltonian systems and separation of variables: an example from the Boussinesq hierarchy*, Theor. Math. Phys. **122**, 176-192 (2000).
- [12] G. Falqui and M. Pedroni, *Separation of variables for bi-Hamiltonian systems*, Math. Phys., Anal. and Geom. **6**, 139-179 (2003).
- [13] E. V. Ferapontov, *On the matrix Hopf equation and integrable hamiltonian system of hydrodynamic type, which do not possess Riemann invariants*, Phys. Lett. A **179**, 391-397 (1993).
- [14] E. V. Ferapontov and D. G. Marshall, *Differential-geometric approach to the integrability of hydrodynamics chains: the Haantjes tensor*, Mat. Ann. **339**, 61-99 (2007).
- [15] A. Frolicher and A. Nijenhuis, *Theory of Vector-Valued Differential Forms. Part I*, Indag. Mathematicae **18**, 338-359 (1956).
- [16] I. M. Gelfand, I. Zakharevich, *Webs, Lenard schemes, and the local geometry of biHamiltonian Toda and Lax structures*, Selecta Math. **6**, 131-183 (2000).
- [17] V. S. Gerdjikov, G. Vilasi and A. B. Yanovski, *Integrable Hamiltonian Hierarchies*. Lect. Not. Phys., Vol. **748** Berlin Heidelberg: Springer, 2008
- [18] J. Haantjes, *On X_{n-1} -forming sets of eigenvectors*, Indag. Mathematicae **17**, 158-162 (1955).
- [19] K. Kikuchi, T. Takeuchi, *Examples of 4-dimensional symplectic-Haantjes manifolds*, SUT J. Math. **56**, 93-108 (2020).
- [20] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach, *Beyond recursion operators*, in Trends in Mathematics, Geometric Methods in Physics XXXVI, Workshop and Summer School, Białowieża, Poland, July 2017, Eds. P. Kielonowski, A. Odziejewicz, E. Previato, Birkhauser, Basel (2019).

- [21] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach, F. Magri, *Poisson-Nijenhuis structures*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Theor. **53**, 3581 (1990).
- [22] A. Ibort, F. Magri and G. Marmo, *Bi-Hamiltonian structures and Stäckel separability*, J. Geom. Phys., **33**, 210-228 (2000).
- [23] A. Ibort, G. Marmo, M. A. Rodríguez and P. Tempesta, *Nilpotent integrability, reduction of dynamical systems and a third-order Calogero-Moser system*, Ann. Mat. Pura e Applicata, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-019-00828-x> (2019).
- [24] G. Landi, G. Marmo and G. Vilasi, *Recursion operators: Meaning and existence for completely integrable systems*, J. Math. Phys., **35**, 800-815 (1994).
- [25] F. Magri, *A simple model of the integrable Hamiltonian equation*, J. Math. Phys. **19**, no. 5, 1156-1162 (1978).
- [26] F. Magri, *A Geometrical approach to nonlinear solvable equations*, in Lecture Notes in Physics **120**, (M. Boiti, F. Pempinelli, G. Soliani eds.), Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1980), pp. 233-263.
- [27] F. Magri, *Geometry and soliton equations*. In: Atti Accad. Sci. Torino Suppl. physics **124**, (1990), pp. 181-209.
- [28] F. Magri, *Lenard chains for classical integrable systems*, Theor. Math. Phys. **137**, 1716-1722 (2003).
- [29] F. Magri, *Recursion operators and Frobenius manifolds*, SIGMA **8**, paper 076, 7 pages (2012).
- [30] F. Magri, *Haantjes manifolds*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **482**, paper 012028, 10 pages (2014).
- [31] F. Magri, *WDVV Equations*, Theor. Math. Phys. **189**, 1486-1499 (2016), arXiv:1510.07950 (2015).
- [32] F. Magri, *Haantjes manifolds and Veselov Systems*, Theor. Math. Phys. **189**, 1486-1499 (2016).
- [33] F. Magri, C. Morosi, *Characterization of Integrable Systems through the Theory of Poisson-Nijenhuis Manifolds*, Quaderno S **19**, Università di Milano (1984).
- [34] J. E. Marsden, T. Ratiu, *Reduction of Poisson Manifolds*, Lett. Math. Phys. **11**, 161-169 (1986).
- [35] H. P. McKean, *Compatible Brackets in Hamiltonian Mechanics*. In: Fokas, T., Zakharov, V.E. (eds.) Important Development in Soliton Theory, 344-354, Springer Ser. Nonlinear Dynamics, Springer, Berlin, (1993).
- [36] W. Miller Jr., S. Post and P. Winternitz, *Classical and Quantum Superintegrability with Applications*, J. Phys. A, **46**, 423001 (2013).
- [37] C. Morosi, G. Tondo, *Quasi-bi-Hamiltonian systems and separability*, J. Phys. A **30**, 2799-2806 (1997).
- [38] C. Morosi, G. Tondo, *On a class of dynamical systems both quasi-bi-Hamiltonian and bi-Hamiltonian*, Phys. Lett. A **247**, 59-64 (1998).
- [39] C. Morosi, G. Tondo, *The quasi-bi-Hamiltonian formulation of the Lagrange top*, J. Phys. A **35**, 1741-1750 (2002).
- [40] C. Morosi, G. Tondo, *Separation of Variables in multi-Hamiltonian systems: an application to the Lagrange top*, Theor. Math. Phys. **137**, 1550-1560, (2003).
- [41] A. Nijenhuis, *X_{n-1} -forming sets of eigenvectors*, Indag. Mathematicae **54**, 200-212 (1951).
- [42] A. Nijenhuis, *Jacobi-type identities for bilinear differential concomitants of certain tensor fields I,II*, Indag. Math **17**, 390-397, 398-403 (1955).
- [43] A.M. Perelomov, *Integrable Systems of Classical Mechanics and Lie Algebras*, Birkhäuser, Basel (1990).
- [44] S. Post, P. Winternitz, *A non separable quantum superintegrable system in 2D real Euclidean space*, J. Phys. A **44**, 162001, 8 pages (2011).
- [45] J. Praught, R. G. Smirnov, *Andrew Lenard: a mystery unraveled*, SIGMA **1**, 005 (2005).
- [46] D. Reyes, P. Tempesta and G. Tondo, *Classical Multiseparable Hamiltonian Systems, Superintegrability and Haantjes Geometry*, preprint arXiv:2012.09819 (2020).
- [47] P. Stäckel, *Ueber quadratische Integrale der Differentialgleichungen der Dynamik*, Ann. Math. Pura e Applicata **25**, 55-60 (1897).
- [48] P. Tempesta, G. Tondo, *Generalized Lenard chains, separation and Superintegrability*, Phys. Rev. E **85**, paper n. 046602, 11 pages (2012).
- [49] P. Tempesta, G. Tondo, *Haantjes Algebras and Diagonalization*, arXiv 1710:04522, J. Geom. Phys. **160**, paper n. 103968, 21 pages (2021).
- [50] P. Tempesta, G. Tondo, *A New family of higher-order Haantjes Tensors and a Generalized Haantjes Integrability Theorem*, arxiv: 1809.05908v3 (2021)

- [51] P. Tempesta, P. Winternitz, J. Harnad, W. Miller, Jr, G. Pogosyan, M. A. Rodríguez (eds), *Superintegrability in Classical and Quantum Systems*, Montréal, CRM proceedings and Lecture Notes, AMS, vol. **37** (2004).
- [52] G. Tondo, *On the integrability of stationary and restricted flows of the KdV hierarchy*, J. Phys. A **28**, 5097-5115, (1995).
- [53] G. Tondo, *Generalized Lenard chains and multi-separability of the Smorodinsky-Winternitz system*, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **482**, paper n. 012042, 10 pages (2014).
- [54] G. Tondo, C. Morosi, *Bi-Hamiltonian manifolds, quasi-bi-Hamiltonian systems and Separation of Variables*, Rep. Math. Phys. **44**, 255-266 (1999).
- [55] G. Tondo, P. Tempesta, *Haantjes structures for the Jacobi-Calogero model and the Benenti Systems*, SIGMA **12**, paper n. 023, 18 pages (2016).
- [56] G. Tondo, *Haantjes Algebras of the Lagrange top*, Theor. Math. Phys. **196**, 1366-1379 (2018).

DEPARTAMENTO DE FÍSICA TEÓRICA II, FACULTAD DE FÍSICAS, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE, 28040 – MADRID, SPAIN AND INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS, C/ NICOLÁS CABRERA, NO 13–15, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN.

Email address: p.tempesta@fis.ucm.es, piergiulio.tempesta@icmat.es

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E GEOSCIENZE, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TRIESTE, PIAZZA EUROPA 1, I-34127 TRIESTE, ITALY.

Email address: tondo@units.it