

Deformed Hamiltonian vector fields on Lagrangian fibrations

David S. Tourigny

*Department of Applied Mathematics & Theoretical Physics
University of Cambridge
Wilberforce Road
Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*

Abstract

Networks of planar Hamiltonian systems closely resemble Hamiltonian system in \mathbb{R}^{2n} , but with the canonical equation for one of the variables in each conjugate pair rescaled by a number called the Turing instability parameter. To generalise these dynamical systems to symplectic manifolds in this paper we introduce and study the properties of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields on Lagrangian fibrations. We describe why these objects have some interesting applications to symplectic geometry and discuss how their physical interpretation motivates new problems in Floer theory, mirror symmetry, and the study of \mathbb{D} -Kähler manifolds.

Keywords: Complex networks, Symplectic geometry

1. Introduction

Symplectic geometry arises as the natural generalisation of Hamiltonian mechanics to differentiable manifolds. The phase space of a Hamiltonian system is generalised to a symplectic manifold and phase portraits are interpreted as integral curves of a Hamiltonian vector field. Symplectic geometry therefore has its origins in classical physics, but more recent times have seen string theory play a role in the discovery of Gromov-Witten invariants and the birth of Floer theory. Together with mirror symmetry, these developments are some of the great success stories of symplectic geometry that can be partially attributed to mathematical physics. Very recently, dynamical systems arising in complex network theory were also described from a symplectic viewpoint although not in the setting of differentiable manifolds [1]. The current paper grew out of an attempt to put these dynamical systems into the context of symplectic geometry.

Email address: `dst27@cam.ac.uk` (David S. Tourigny)

Hamiltonian vector fields, which generalise dynamical systems appearing in classical mechanics, play a central role in several different versions of Floer theory for symplectic manifolds and Lagrangian submanifolds. In particular, the original motivation for Floer's work was to find a proof for Arnold's conjecture that the number of periodic solutions of a Hamiltonian system on a symplectic manifold is bounded below by the sum of its Betti numbers. Lagrangian Floer theory extends Hamiltonian Floer theory to pairs of Lagrangian submanifolds where Hamiltonian vector fields are used to ensure transverse intersection. This idea is further generalised by the Fukaya category, which associates to each symplectic manifold an A_∞ -category whose objects are its Lagrangian submanifolds. In this case Hamiltonian vector fields are required to make morphisms and higher compositions of the Fukaya category well-defined. Hamiltonian vector fields also generate a group of exact symplectomorphisms that determine the geometry of a symplectic manifold. From a different viewpoint these mathematical abstractions provide a geometric interpretation for many physical arguments, such as preservation of the phase space distribution function in Liouville's theorem or conservation of energy along the integral curves of a Hamiltonian vector field. In light of this it is quite remarkable that Hamiltonian vector fields have such a clear physical interpretation whilst at the same time motivating (and being used as tools to solve) so many mathematical problems arising in symplectic geometry. Then again, perhaps this is not so surprising given that symplectic geometry was developed to accommodate Hamiltonian systems into a geometric setting. Can the same be achieved for the dynamical systems considered in [1]? This is the question that we attempt to answer here. The main objective is to introduce a new class of objects and problems to the modern-day framework of symplectic geometry.

In \mathbb{R}^{2n} our dynamical systems closely resemble Hamilton's, but with the equation for one of the variables in each conjugate pair of coordinates rescaled by a nonzero factor of $q \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\dot{x}_i = q^{-1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial y_i}, \quad \dot{y}_i = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}. \quad (1)$$

Here $H : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function that might also depend on q . Equations of this form were considered a long time ago in physics and used to model dissipative phenomena [2]. The more recent interpretation of these systems in terms of complex networks is described in section 2 where we also provide some mathematical background required to aid the inexperienced reader of this paper. It is clear that (1) becomes an ordinary Hamiltonian system in the limit $q \rightarrow 1$ and

so to generalise these dynamical systems to symplectic manifolds we introduce the notion of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field in section 3. After proving some basic properties of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields we show how some important problems in complex network theory can be translated into the setting of symplectic geometry.

2. Preliminaries

The purpose of this section is two-fold. Firstly, to provide some motivation for deformed Hamiltonian vector fields. Secondly, to introduce the geometric objects that we will be studying throughout this paper, before fixing notation and conventions for the proceeding sections. The exposition in subsection 2.2 will be at a level suitable for those familiar with basic differential geometry and algebraic topology, and requires no previous exposure to symplectic geometry, mirror symmetry or Floer theory. Unfortunately, there is no way of including a self-contained introduction to these topics in a single paper and so in later sections we will often make the jump to assuming our reader knows a considerable amount of symplectic geometry. The hope is that by including this sort of introductory section, which may at some points seem unnecessary to the experienced reader, those unfamiliar with modern-day concepts may be able to pick up the key ideas and be motivated to learn the relevant material before coming back to the paper at a later date.

2.1. Networks of planar Hamiltonian systems

The primary motivation for deformed Hamiltonian vector fields are complex networks [3] with linear diffusive coupling where the underlying system at each vertex is described by a planar Hamiltonian. More specifically, these are $2n$ -dimensional dynamical systems of the form

$$\dot{x}_i = \frac{\partial h_i(x_i, y_i)}{\partial y_i} + D_x \sum_{j=1}^n W_{ij}(x_j - x_i), \quad \dot{y}_i = -\frac{\partial h_i(x_i, y_i)}{\partial x_i} + D_y \sum_{j=1}^n W_{ij}(y_j - y_i), \quad (2)$$

where the real coefficients $W_{ij} = W_{ji}$ ($i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$) correspond to weights of an undirected, combinatorial graph \mathcal{G} with vertex set V of size n . Positive constants $D_x, D_y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ are called diffusion coefficients since this dynamical system is a discretised reaction-diffusion equation where variables x_i and y_i represent concentrations of a pair of reactants x and y at vertex i of \mathcal{G} , respectively. This procedure of coupling planar systems was introduced by Turing in his

landmark paper on pattern formation [4] and modernised by Nakao & Mikhailov [5]. The n functions $h_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are planar Hamiltonians defining the reaction at each vertex of \mathcal{G}

$$\dot{x} = \frac{\partial h_i(x, y)}{\partial y}, \quad \dot{y} = -\frac{\partial h_i(x, y)}{\partial x}, \quad (3)$$

and in general we call the network *heterogenous*. When restricting to *homogenous* networks we take $h_i(x, y) = h(x, y)$ for all $i \in V$, in which case (2) corresponds to n copies of the same underlying planar system. If $D_x = D_y = 0$ the total system (2) uncouples and is conservative with Hamiltonian

$$H(x_1, y_1, \dots, x_n, y_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(x_i, y_i). \quad (4)$$

It is also integrable by the simple fact that it admits n invariants of motion, $h_i(x_i, y_i)$. However, when $D_x, D_y > 0$ the coupled system (2) is no longer Hamiltonian by construction.

Networks that lead naturally to the definition of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields are those where all planar Hamiltonians take the form $h_i(x, y) = f_i(x) + g_i(y)$. For example, if $h(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}y^2 + P(x)$ for some polynomial P , the level curves of h are rational when $\deg(P) = 1, 2$, elliptic when $\deg(P) = 3, 4$ and hyperelliptic when $\deg(P) \geq 5$. It turns out that when $h_i(x, y) = f_i(x) + g_i(y)$ these dynamical systems can be written in the form (1). To see this, without loss of generality we set $D_x = -q^{-1}$ and $D_y = 1$ so that q can be interpreted as the negative ratio of diffusion coefficients $-D_y/D_x$. Then the network (2) takes the form

$$\dot{x}_i = q^{-1} \frac{\partial H_q}{\partial y_i}, \quad \dot{y}_i = -\frac{\partial H_q}{\partial x_i} \quad (5)$$

with

$$H_q(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n) = \sum_i [f_i(x_i) + qg_i(y_i)] + \sum_{i,j=1}^n W_{ij}(x_i - x_j)(y_i - y_j). \quad (6)$$

The parameter q , called the Turing instability parameter, governs the stability of equilibrium solutions of (2) with critical values sometimes leading to the formation of Turing patterns [4, 5]. In our formulation the Turing instability parameter q also measures the extent to which (5) has been deformed from a Hamiltonian system. There are three important limits to consider. The Hamiltonian limit, $q \rightarrow 1$, is obtained when $D_x = -D_y$. In this limit the two reactants x, y move in opposite directions with the same speed, which is unlikely to be realised in a physical reaction-diffusion system. However, in this limit the whole system becomes Hamiltonian and networks of this form have been studied in some detail [6, 7, 8]. The second limit, $q \rightarrow -1$, is

obtained when $D_x = D_y$. Although once again this limit almost never occurs in practice (unless both reactants happen to have exactly the same diffusive properties) it is a more realistic limit to take if one wants to get some approximate understanding of the dynamics governed by (2). This is complementary to the third limit, $q \rightarrow 0$, which describes the case where the diffusion coefficient D_x becomes very large compared to D_y . In some sense the limits $q \rightarrow 0$ and $q \rightarrow -1$ can be seen as the two natural extremes of the reaction-diffusion system described by (2). We shall see later on that both of these limits also have a very interesting geometric interpretation.

From the perspective of complex networks there are several important problems associated with dynamical systems of the form (2). One may be interested in Turing-type pattern formation [4, 5] or, assuming that the underlying planar systems (3) admit periodic orbits, evolution of system toward a synchronous solution [9]. The study of pattern formation and synchronisation for systems (2) was initiated in [1] where networks of planar Hamiltonian systems were found to behave very differently compared with those that admit attractors. Briefly, if solutions of (2) evolve towards a homogenous state, $(x_i, y_i) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ for all $i \in V$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then synchronisation is said to occur. Generally this is only possible for homogenous networks ($h_i = h$ for all $i \in V$), in which case (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) is a periodic orbit of the underlying planar system

$$\dot{x} = \frac{\partial h(x, y)}{\partial y}, \quad \dot{y} = -\frac{\partial h(x, y)}{\partial x}. \quad (7)$$

Since periodic orbits of (7) arise in families it is not at all obvious to which of these the solution (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) corresponds, whereas if the underlying planar system were to admit a limit cycle then clearly (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) must be it. It was proven in [1] that quadratic Hamiltonians $h(x, y) = (y^2 + \omega^2 x^2)/2$ always yield synchronous solutions that can be characterised precisely, but for generic h this characterisation problem remains unsolved. In this paper we shall be concerned with a slightly different problem, which is to see how far one can get by generalising networks (2) to spaces with nontrivial topology in the same way that Hamiltonian systems are generalised by Hamiltonian vector fields. Considering these dynamical systems as deformed Hamiltonian vector fields raises specific questions in symplectic geometry and characterisation of periodic solutions may involve a modified version of Floer theory. In the next subsection we summarise some of the mathematical background that is required for the remainder of this paper.

2.2. Geometric background

By (M, ω) we will denote a differentiable manifold M of dimension $2n$ equipped with a closed and non-degenerate 2-form ω called the symplectic form. Symplectic manifolds always admit an almost complex structure, i.e. an automorphism $J : TM \rightarrow TM$ of the tangent bundle satisfying $J^2 = -id$, and J is said to be *compatible* with ω if $G(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$ is a Riemannian metric on M . We call G the *standard Riemannian metric associated with J* . If the Nijenhuis tensor associated with J vanishes then J is said to be *integrable* and (M, J) *complex*. If J is both integrable and compatible with ω then the triple (M, ω, J) is called *Kähler* and the induced metric G is called a *Kähler metric*. Equivalently, one may instead take as a starting point the pair (M, G) where M is a complex n -fold, defined as having an atlas of charts to the open disk in \mathbb{C}^n , and G the real part of a hermitian form (the complex analogue of a Riemannian metric on M). If the imaginary part of the hermitian form is a symplectic form on M then (M, G) is again said to be Kähler. Both viewpoints are equivalent in the sense that one can think of the triple (ω, J, G) on an equal footing or, as is more common when it comes to mirror symmetry, taking a Kähler metric as the starting point and varying the complex or symplectic structures independently. Hence, there are two natural types of local coordinates on a Kähler manifold: complex (holomorphic), where M is typically considered as a complex n -fold, and symplectic (Darboux) coordinates where M is considered as a real $2n$ -dimensional manifold.

Recall that a submanifold $L \subset M$ of a symplectic manifold (M, ω) is called *Lagrangian* if L is half the dimension of M and ω vanishes when restricted to L . A theorem of Weinstein says that a sufficiently small neighbourhood of a Lagrangian submanifold $L \subset M$ can always be identified with a neighbourhood of the zero section in T^*L by a diffeomorphism that preserves the symplectic form (i.e., a symplectomorphism). By a Lagrangian fibration $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ we mean a smooth fibration $\pi : M \rightarrow B$ over an n -dimensional base manifold B such that at every point $x \in B$ the fibre $F_x = \pi^{-1}(x)$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of the symplectic manifold (M, ω) . The obvious noncompact examples are cotangent bundles $\pi : T^*B \rightarrow B$ where the zero section is canonically identified with B , but it is rare to find particularly exotic examples of compact Lagrangian fibrations without singular fibres. The Arnold-Liouville theorem says that locally a Lagrangian fibration with compact, connected fibre is affinely isomorphic to the product of an affine space with a torus. Indeed, each compact, connected fibre of a smooth Lagrangian fibration must necessarily be a torus and the base must have canonical *integral affine structure*.

This means that B admits an atlas of coordinate charts whose transition functions are elements of the affine group $\mathbb{R}^n \rtimes GL(n, \mathbb{Z})$.

After choosing a compatible almost complex structure J on the total space of a Lagrangian fibration $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ the standard Riemannian metric G induces a decomposition of the tangent bundle TM into vertical and horizontal subspaces

$$TM = T^B M \oplus T^F M . \quad (8)$$

The subspace $T^F M$ is the tangent space to the fibres of $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ and $T^B M$ is its G -orthogonal complement. This in turn corresponds to a decomposition of the metric

$$G = G_B \oplus G_F , \quad (9)$$

where G_B can often be identified with the pull-back under the projection of some Riemannian metric on B (that we also call G_B when it is understood). G_F is the part that annihilates the orthogonal complement of the fibres. As above we prefer to speak of the choice of almost complex structure determining G , but it will sometimes be convenient to view the almost complex structure as being determined by a choice of metric on B . One such example is the analogue of the Sasaki metric G^{Sas} [11] for the cotangent bundle T^*B of a Riemannian manifold (B, G_B) that uniquely determines an almost complex structure $J^{Sas} : G^{Sas}(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, J^{Sas}\cdot)$. Here $\omega = d\theta$ is the canonical symplectic form where θ is the tautological 1-form on the cotangent bundle T^*B . The pair (T^*B, ω) is naturally a symplectic manifold and the fibres of $\pi : (T^*B, \omega) \rightarrow B$ are Lagrangian submanifolds.

Alongside the decomposition of TM induced by the choice of J there is a corresponding decomposition of the cotangent bundle

$$T^*M = (T^B M)^* \oplus (T^F M)^* , \quad (10)$$

where $(T^B M)^*$ is the annihilator of $T^F M$ and $(T^F M)^*$ is that of $T^B M$. This induces a bigrading on differential forms of degree a

$$\Omega^a(M) = \bigoplus_{b+c=a} \Omega^{b,c}(M) , \quad (11)$$

with $\Omega^{b,c}(M)$ denoting the space of sections of $\wedge^b(T^B M)^* \otimes \wedge^c(T^F M)^*$. Whenever there is such a splitting of differential forms the de Rham differential d can be written as a sum of four

components

$$d = d_{1,0} + d_{0,1} + d_{2,-1} + d_{-1,2} , \quad (12)$$

where $d_{c,d} : \Omega^{a,b}(M) \rightarrow \Omega^{a+c,b+d}(M)$. We say that $\alpha \in \Omega^a(M)$ is of type (b,c) if $\alpha \in \Omega^{b,c}(M)$. The Lagrangian condition together with non-degeneracy of the symplectic form implies ω is of type $(1,1)$. Whilst commonplace in Kähler geometry, such decompositions of forms and exterior derivatives rarely have applications outside the world of complex manifolds because *a priori* they depend on the choice of almost complex structure and do not encode the same sort of topological information as the Dolbeault decomposition. However, this decomposition will provide us with an intuitive viewpoint for the construction presented in the following section. For integrability reasons the operator $d_{-1,2}$ vanishes when $\pi : M \rightarrow B$ is a smooth fibration so that after dropping the annoying indices by defining

$$\delta := d_{2,-1} , \quad \partial_+ := d_{1,0} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_- := d_{0,1} \quad (13)$$

the exterior derivative reduces to

$$d = \partial_+ + \partial_- + \delta . \quad (14)$$

Using $d^2 = 0$ one obtains the relations

$$\partial_-^2 = \delta^2 = \partial_+ \partial_- + \partial_- \partial_+ = \partial_+ \delta + \delta \partial_+ = \partial_+^2 + \partial_- \delta + \delta \partial_- = 0 . \quad (15)$$

The identity $\partial_-^2 = 0$ is attributed to the fact we have an involutive distribution on M induced by the vertical directions of the fibration. Obstruction to the identity $\delta = 0$ comes down to the fact that the (G -orthogonal) complementary distribution might not necessarily be integrable. If it were, M would admit a pair of transversal Lagrangian foliations that, although entirely possible, is a rather strict condition to impose. Manifolds with this property have been called *bi-Lagrangian*, *para-Kähler* or \mathbb{D} -*Kähler* in the literature [12, 13, 14, 15]. In this paper however, we shall reserve the phrase *bi-Lagrangian* for integrability of the J -induced complementary distribution of an existing Lagrangian fibration, i.e. (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian if and only if $\delta = 0$.

Given a smooth function $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the Hamiltonian vector field $X_H \in TM$ on (M, ω) is the unique vector field defined by

$$\omega(X_H, \cdot) = -dH . \quad (16)$$

By Liouville's theorem X_H generates an (exact) symplectomorphism of M because its flow preserves the symplectic form

$$L_{X_H}(\omega) = d(\omega(X_H, \cdot)) = -d^2H = 0 , \quad (17)$$

where L_ξ denotes the Lie derivative along the flow of the vector field ξ . X_H uniquely defines a gradient vector field because of the fact that

$$G(JX_H, \cdot) = \omega(X_H, \cdot) = -dH , \quad (18)$$

and so one may identify JX_H with $-\nabla H$, the gradient of $-H$ taken with respect to the standard Riemannian metric associated with J . If $H(t) = H(t+1) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines a 1-periodic family of functions parameterised by $t \in S^1$ then it generates a family of exact symplectomorphisms $\phi_t : M \rightarrow M$ via

$$\frac{d}{dt}\phi_t = X_{H(t)} \circ \phi_t , \quad \phi_0 = id . \quad (19)$$

The *Arnold conjecture* states that for M closed the number of non-degenerate 1-periodic solutions of the associated differential equation

$$\dot{z}(t) = X_{H(t)}(z(t)) , \quad (20)$$

is bounded below by the sum of the Betti numbers of M .

We now briefly outline the basics of Floer theory that lead to a proof of the Arnold conjecture for Hamiltonian flows [16]. For a given symplectic manifold (M, ω) let LM be the space of contractible loops in M and $\{J_t\}$ a 1-periodic family of almost complex structures compatible with ω for each value of $t \in S^1$. Define

$$\mathcal{P}(H) = \{z \in LM \mid (20)\} . \quad (21)$$

The Arnold conjecture says that if the elements of $\mathcal{P}(H)$ are nondegenerate in the sense that

$$\det(1 - d\phi_1(z(0))) \neq 0 , \quad (22)$$

then for M closed one has

$$\#\mathcal{P}(H) \geq \sum_{a=0}^{2n} \dim H_a(M) , \quad (23)$$

where $H_a(M)$ denotes the a th singular homology group of M . To prove (23) Floer considered smooth maps $u : \mathbb{R} \times S^1 \rightarrow M$ that satisfy the partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J_t(u) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - X_{H(t)}(u) \right) = 0 , \quad (24)$$

with boundary conditions $u(s, 0) = u(s, 1)$ and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(s, \cdot) = z^\pm \in \mathcal{P}(H) . \quad (25)$$

In a certain sense this equation can be seen as the negative gradient flow of an action functional of the universal cover of LM and so extending Morse theory to an infinite-dimensional setting Floer constructed an invariant of M (now called Floer homology) involving counts of these solutions. The Floer chain complex, $CF_*(H, J)$, has as its generators the periodic orbits $\mathcal{P}(H)$ and the differential counts *perturbed pseudo-holomorphic curves* (i.e. solutions to the Floer equation) between them. Under suitable conditions the associated Floer homology, $HF_*(H, J)$, is independent of the choices made for H and J . Thus, in the special case where H is chosen to be t -independent the Floer equation reduces to a gradient flow equation on M and therefore $HF_*(H, J)$ agrees with the singular homology $H_*(M)$. Since the number of periodic solutions generating $CF_*(H, J)$ is bounded below by the dimension of $HF_*(H, J)$ this proves the Arnold conjecture for closed manifolds. Floer also introduced a related version of his chain complex that has as its generators the intersection points of two transversely intersecting Lagrangian submanifolds $L_0, L_1 \subset M$ [17]. Introducing an infinite-dimensional analogue of Morse theory along the same lines as Hamiltonian Floer theory led him to consider solutions of the Cauchy-Riemann equation for pseudo-holomorphic curves $u : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ that satisfy boundary conditions $u(s, 0) \in L_0, u(s, 1) \in L_1$. Floer proved that the Lagrangian version of his theory again gives rise to a well-defined chain complex, $CF_*(L_0, L_1)$, provided appropriate conditions are imposed on the Lagrangians and ambient symplectic manifold (e.g. $\pi_2(M, L) = 0$ to avoid contributions from pseudo-holomorphic discs). In particular, he demonstrated that the associated homology, $HF_*(L_0, L_1)$, remains invariant under the action of a Hamiltonian symplectomorphism ϕ_H in the sense that $HF_*(L_0, L_1) \cong HF_*(L_0, \phi_H(L_1))$. He also proved that $HF_*(L, L) \equiv HF_*(L, \phi_H(L)) \cong H_*(L)$ when ϕ_H is chosen to ensure transverse intersection.

3. Deformed Hamiltonian vector fields

We are now in a position to define the objects of primary interest to this paper. As described in subsection 2.1, the initial motivation for introducing deformed Hamiltonian vector fields is to provide a geometric framework for the dynamical systems (5). A particular choice of Hamiltonian means that $q \in \mathbb{R}$ can be interpreted as the Turing instability parameter and in this case systems describe networks of the form (2) [1]. Related systems have also appeared in the physics literature [2] and so deformed Hamiltonian vector fields can be viewed as a generalisation of those ideas as well. After defining deformed Hamiltonian vector fields we will prove several properties that explain how they are related to their ordinary Hamiltonian counterparts. We will also discuss some of the issues surrounding a deformed analogue of Floer theory and why a deformed Arnold conjecture seems far from reach at present.

As before, let $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ be a Lagrangian fibration of a symplectic manifold (M, ω) and pick a smooth function $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Choose an almost complex structure J on M compatible with ω and consider the natural decomposition of the tangent bundle and standard metric

$$T^*M = T^B M \oplus T^F M, \quad G = G_B \oplus G_F. \quad (26)$$

The one-parameter family of metrics $\{G_q\}$ is formed by rescaling the metric in the fibre direction so that for each fixed value of $q \in (0, 1]$ we have a Riemannian metric

$$G_q = G_B \oplus qG_F \quad (27)$$

(we postpone the discussion of what happens for negative q until the next section). Then $\{(M, G_q)\}$ defines a family of Riemannian manifolds with fibres whose volumes are monotonically decreasing as $q \rightarrow 0$. However, as before we prefer to view $\{G_q\}$ as being determined by the almost complex structures $\{J_q\}$ and consider the family $\{(M, \omega, J_q)\}$ defined by requiring that $G_q(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, J_q \cdot)$ for each $q \in (0, 1]$. Using the decomposition of the exterior derivative induced by the Lagrangian fibration we also introduce a family of operators $\{\mathcal{D}_q\}$ to go alongside this family of degenerating symplectic manifolds.

Definition 1. For fixed $q \in (0, 1]$ the deformed exterior derivative \mathcal{D}_q is given by

$$\mathcal{D}_q := \partial_+ + q^{-1}\partial_- + q\delta. \quad (28)$$

The following proposition confirms that for each $q \in (0, 1]$ the operator \mathcal{D}_q is a well-defined differential on $\Omega^*(M)$.

Proposition 1. $\mathcal{D}_q^2 = 0$.

PROOF. We have $\mathcal{D}_q^2 = \partial_+^2 + \partial_- \delta + \delta \partial_- + q(\partial_+ \delta + \delta \partial_+) + q^{-1}(\partial_- \partial_+ + \partial_+ \partial_-) + q^2 \delta^2 + q^{-2} \partial_-^2$ and by (15) every term multiplying a given power of q vanishes. \square

It must be emphasised that the definition of \mathcal{D}_q is only possible because we have a decomposition of the exterior derivative (14) that depends on the Lagrangian fibration *and also the choice of almost complex structure* J . Therefore the two families $\{\mathcal{D}_q\}$ and $\{J_q\}$ are not independent and when we refer to one element, \mathcal{D}_q , say, we will always have a corresponding object, J_q , in the other family. It is important to bear this in mind since this leads to two equivalent definitions of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field.

Definition 2. The deformed Hamiltonian vector field generated by H is the unique vector field $X_H^q \in TM$ that satisfies

$$\omega(X_H^q, \cdot) = -\mathcal{D}_q H . \quad (29)$$

This generalises the usual definition of a Hamiltonian vector field since q serves as a “deformation parameter” for the exterior derivative in the sense that we return to the classical definition in the limit $q \rightarrow 1$. Once more we have actually defined an entire family $\{X_H^q\}$ parameterised by $q \in (0, 1]$ and by writing X_H^q we are referring to the deformed Hamiltonian vector field corresponding to \mathcal{D}_q and J_q . The next proposition provides an equivalent definition for X_H^q in terms of the metric G_q .

Proposition 2. *Given a deformed Hamiltonian vector field X_H^q , the vector field $JX_{H_q}^q$ is the gradient of $-H$ defined using the metric G_q .*

PROOF. We want to show that $G_q(JX_H^q, Y) = -dH(Y)$ for all $Y \in TM$. Using the decomposition of TM we write the vector field $Y \in TM$ as $Y = Y_+ + Y_-$ where $Y_+ \in T^B M$ and $Y_- \in T^F M$. Note $\delta = 0$ when acting on functions so that

$$-\mathcal{D}_q H(Y) = -\partial_+ H(Y_+) - q^{-1} \partial_- H(Y_-) \quad (30)$$

and using ω -compatibility of J we have

$$\omega(X_H^q, Y) = G_B(JX_H^q, Y_+) + G_F(JX_H^q, Y_-) . \quad (31)$$

We define the new vector field Y^q by setting $Y_+^q = Y_+$ and $Y_-^q = q^{-1}Y_-$ and after equating both of the expressions above obtain

$$-dH(Y^q) = G_B(JX_H^q, Y_+^q) + qG_F(JX_H^q, Y_-^q) = G_q(JX_H^q, Y^q) , \quad (32)$$

which proves the proposition. \square

Thus, the vector field JX_H^q on the manifold (M, ω, J) is defined to be the vector field that would be a gradient with respect to the standard Riemannian metric on the manifold (M, ω, J_q) . That is to say, $JX_H^q = -\nabla_q H$ where ∇_q is the gradient associated with G_q . Although somewhat more convoluted, this definition makes explicit the choice of almost complex structure in the construction of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field.

The first definition of a deformed Hamiltonian vector field is more natural from the perspective of understanding the flow of X_H^q and also because geometric properties of the Lagrangian fibration $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ are reflected in the analytic properties of \mathcal{D}_q . It turns out that these properties are tied up with the particular choice of function H used to generate the deformed Hamiltonian vector field. We will now describe what this means.

Definition 3. Functions $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the property $\partial_- \partial_+ H = 0$ are called simple, whilst functions satisfying $\partial_+ H = 0$ are called exceptionally simple.

It is obvious that exceptionally simple implies simple, but the converse is not true. The exceptionally simple condition is intrinsic to the fibration whereas the simple condition depends on the choice of almost complex structure. Sometimes it will prove useful to decompose the function H as $H = H_+ + \hat{H} + H_-$ where $\partial_{\pm} H_{\mp} = 0$. \hat{H} is the part of H that is not necessarily simple nor exceptionally simple, and in particular one has that $\partial_+ \partial_- H = \partial_+ \partial_- \hat{H}$ since $H_+ + H_-$ is simple. Of course this decomposition is not unique, but we assume it is “maximal” in the sense that $\hat{H} = 0$ whenever possible. To get a feel for what the simple condition really means we choose a Darboux coordinate chart $\{x_i, y_j\}$ for $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ as a model for the Lagrangian fibration (M, ω, J) in which $\{x_i\}$ are coordinates on the base \mathbb{R}^n and $\{y_j\}$ are coordinates on the fibres. A generic

Hamiltonian is just an arbitrary function $H(x, y)$ of all the coordinates and one finds that

$$\partial_- \partial_+ H(x, y) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial y_i \partial x_j} dy_i \wedge dx_j , \quad (33)$$

so that H being simple is equivalent to $H(x, y) = H'(x) + H''(y)$. Likewise, H being exceptionally simple is equivalent to setting $H(x, y) = H''(y)$ as a function of the fibre coordinates only. The following proposition describes how the flow of X_H^q depends on the choice of Hamiltonian H by answering the question of when a deformed Hamiltonian field generates a symplectomorphism.

Proposition 3. *For $q \neq 1$ a deformed Hamiltonian vector field X_H^q on (M, ω, J) is symplectic if H is of the form $H = H_+ + H_-$ with $\partial_{\pm} H_{\mp} = 0$. If, in addition, (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian then the flow of X_H^q is symplectic if and only if H is simple.*

PROOF. After a straightforward calculation it becomes clear that in general X_H^q does not generate a symplectomorphism unless $q = 1$ since the 1-form $\mathcal{D}_q H$ is not necessarily closed

$$L_{X_H^q}(\omega) = -d\mathcal{D}_q H = (q^{-1} - 1)(\partial_+^2 + \partial_- \partial_+)H . \quad (34)$$

The 2-forms $\partial_+^2 H$ and $\partial_- \partial_+ H$ are of different type and so we can not have $-\partial_+^2 H = \partial_- \partial_+ H$ unless both are zero, hence proving that H must be simple if $\partial_+^2 = 0$. Using relations (15), if $H = H_+ + H_-$ then $\partial_+^2 H = \partial_+^2 H_+ = -\delta \partial_- H_+ = 0$ and so this condition is sufficient whenever (M, ω, J) is not bi-Lagrangian. \square

We may also ask when a deformed Hamiltonian vector field is *conformally symplectic*, i.e. generates a conformally symplectic diffeomorphism $\phi : M \rightarrow M$ that preserves the symplectic form up to some constant $1 \neq c \in \mathbb{R}$. The conformal symplectomorphisms form a group that, like the group of symplectomorphisms, is one of Cartan's six classes of groups of diffeomorphisms on a manifold M . Conformally symplectic vector fields have previously been used to generalise simple mechanical systems with dissipation [10]. The proposition below answers the question of when a deformed Hamiltonian vector field is conformally symplectic on a bi-Lagrangian manifold.

Proposition 4. *For $q \neq 1$ a deformed Hamiltonian vector field X_H^q on bi-Lagrangian (M, ω, J) is conformally symplectic if and only if $\omega = c' \partial_- \partial_+ H$ for some nonzero constant $c' \in \mathbb{R}$.*

PROOF. When (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian the condition that X_H^q generates a conformal symplectomorphism is that

$$L_{X_H^q}(\omega) = -d\mathcal{D}_q H = (q^{-1} - 1)\partial_- \partial_+ H = c\omega \quad (35)$$

for some nonzero constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly this implies $\omega = c^{-1}(q^{-1} - 1)\partial_- \partial_+ H$. \square

Thus, on a bi-Lagrangian manifold (M, ω, J) a deformed Hamiltonian vector field X_H^q is conformally symplectic whenever $\omega = \partial_- \partial_+ K$ is defined *globally* by the analogue of a Kähler potential $K : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $H = H_+ + K + H_-$ satisfying $\partial_{\pm} H_{\mp} = 0$. This is yet again a very strict condition to impose on a symplectic manifold since, as in the Kähler case, when (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian ω is usually only determined by a potential *locally* [15]. Examples of these manifolds do exist however. Note that because ω is necessarily of type $(1, 1)$ Proposition 4 breaks down when (M, ω, J) is not bi-Lagrangian unless we impose the additional condition that $\partial_+^2 H$ vanishes. We can not ask for H to be exceptionally simple (our definition of a conformally symplectic vector field excludes the symplectic case), so H must be a non-simple Hamiltonian that satisfies $\partial_+^2 H = 0$ with $\omega = c'\partial_- \partial_+ H$. This further restricts the types of functions that may be considered. Different types of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields are defined by allowing the Hamiltonian to also depend on the deformation parameter and weighting various components in a decomposition of H by factors of q . In this case the Hamiltonian associated with \mathcal{D}_q and J_q will be denoted by H_q . For example, given a decomposition $H = H_+ + \hat{H} + H_-$ we may form the new Hamiltonian $H_q = H_+ + \hat{H} + qH_-$ and consider the associated family $\{H_q\}$. There are an infinite number of ways of constructing these families from any one Hamiltonian, and although differences between them appear subtle they play an essential role when taking limits of objects depending on q . However, we will only really be concerned with the family provided in the example above since the motivating dynamical system (2) is described by a Hamiltonian of this form. A detailed analysis of the relationships between deformed Hamiltonian vector fields generated by different H_q would be the subject of another paper since it invariably depends on the particular application to symplectic geometry that one might have in mind. It suffices to say that any algebra generated by these objects would certainly be very different from that of Hamiltonian vector fields since there is no straightforward way of closing a collection of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields under the action of the Lie bracket. Whether or not certain subsets

of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields generate deformed versions of a Lie algebra remains an open question.

As in the Hamiltonian case, a deformed Hamiltonian vector field $X_H^q \in TM$ determines a differential equation

$$\dot{z}(t) = X_H^q(z(t)) , \quad (36)$$

which is the appropriate generalisation of (1). With a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H : S^1 \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ there is an associated two-parameter family of diffeomorphisms $\phi_t^q : M \rightarrow M$ generated via

$$\frac{d}{dt}\phi_t^q = X_{H(t)}^q \circ \phi_t^q , \quad \phi_0^q = id , \quad (37)$$

for each value of $q \in (0, 1]$. These are symplectomorphisms when $H(t) = H_+(t) + H_-(t)$ (or conformal symplectomorphisms when $H(t)$ and (M, ω, J) satisfy the requirements of Proposition 4), but in general they do not preserve ω unless $q = 1$. Since the networks (2) are a particular type of deformed Hamiltonian vector field, characterising periodic solutions to a time-dependent version of (36) is an important question for synchronisation. In light of the previous discussion however, it would not be prudent to formulate a deformed analogue of the Arnold conjecture for solutions to a time-dependent version of (36), even with the assumption that $|1 - q|$ is sufficiently small. The diffeomorphisms generated by deformed Hamiltonian vector fields fail to form a group in the same way that Hamiltonian symplectomorphisms do and it can not be ruled out that nice properties such as the existence of fixed points on closed manifolds are destroyed as soon as q moves infinitesimally away from 1. That being said, we can think of no explicit examples where this turns out to be the case. Moreover, when H is independent of time the Arnold conjecture follows trivially from the fact that the critical points of H are constant solutions of (36) and therefore 1-periodic. Non-degeneracy of the solutions implies H is a Morse function and the result follows from elementary Morse theory and its independence from the choice of metric on M . It therefore seems plausible to see how far one can get following the approach of Floer and studying solutions of the partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J_t(u) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - X_{H(t)}^q(u) \right) = 0 , \quad (38)$$

for smooth maps $u : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ from a Riemann surface Σ with appropriate boundary conditions. Two remarks are in order before outlining the analytic complications that arise when working with this deformed Floer equation.

1) Solutions that do not depend on s satisfy

$$\frac{du}{dt} = X_{H(t)}^q(u) , \quad (39)$$

so are solutions of the time-dependent version of the differential equation (36). Naively one expects solutions of the deformed Floer equation to converge to orbits of $X_{H(t)}^q$ in the limit $|s| \rightarrow \infty$. This would mean that solutions could be interpreted as flow lines connecting these orbits as points in some infinite-dimensional space. The problem is that in order to prove convergence one requires a bound on the energy of a solution. In Floer theory this bound is obtained from a perturbed symplectic action functional, but this does not appear to exist for deformed Hamiltonian vector fields.

2) If H does not depend on time then time-independent solutions to the deformed Floer equation (38) satisfy

$$\frac{du}{ds} + \nabla_q H(u) = 0 . \quad (40)$$

These trajectories are flows of the gradient of $-H$ defined with respect to the deformed metric G_q . In the usual approach to the Arnold conjecture one first proves that Floer homology remains invariant under the choice of a time-independent Hamiltonian and that Floer trajectories are in bijection with gradient flow lines of $-H$. Thus, one proves that Morse and Floer differentials coincide. At first glance it looks as if a similar argument should apply to the deformed Floer equation (38) provided one could prove a homology defined by counts of its solutions remains invariant under a choice of time-independent Hamiltonian.

Besides the fact that there is no analogue of a perturbed symplectic action functional, readers who are familiar with Floer theory at the level of Salamon's lecture notes [18] will realise that proving transversality and compactness (which again relies on existence of an energy bound) for the deformed Floer equation is not straightforward at all. The operator obtained after linearising (38) in a trivialising chart is of the form

$$\mathcal{D}_q = \frac{d}{ds} - A_q(s) , \quad (41)$$

where $A_q(s) : W^{1,p} \rightarrow L^p$ are a family of operators between appropriate Sobolev spaces that are not self-adjoint unless $q = 1$. Hence, the requisite analysis used to prove \mathcal{D}_q is Fredholm

with index expressed in terms of the Conley-Zehnder indices [19, 20] will not go through and one needs to understand the Fredholm property and spectral flow problem from the perspective of hyperbolic operators [21]. We will not elaborate upon this fact except to say that there is an additional complication that in general the spectral flow of $A_q(s)$, and hence the dimension of the corresponding moduli spaces, might also have irregularities at certain values on q . It therefore seems that a Floer-type theory for deformed Hamiltonian vector fields is well beyond the scope of methods available to the field at present. In the next section we hint at a model for deformed Floer theory that is designed to expand upon point 2 above. Namely, we consider a finite-dimensional gradient flow problem on a Lagrangian fibration equipped with the metric G_q .

4. Generalised networks of Hamiltonian systems

In this section we return to the original motivation for introducing deformed Hamiltonian vector fields. The aim is to assign some further geometric meaning to networks of planar Hamiltonian systems (2). In turn, this viewpoint raises several mathematical problems that do not seem to have been considered in symplectic geometry previously. These new ideas include the extension of mirror symmetry to include \mathbb{D} -Kähler manifolds and a “synchronised” version of Floer theory.

4.1. Turing instability

Let $\pi : (M, \omega, J) \rightarrow B$ be a Lagrangian fibration of a symplectic manifold, $W : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ an arbitrary function on M , and $H_{\pm} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a pair of functions satisfying $\partial_{\mp} H_{\pm} = 0$. It quickly becomes apparent that a deformed Hamiltonian vector field $X_{H_q}^q \in TM$ with

$$H_q = H_+ + W + qH_- \tag{42}$$

locally takes the form (2) provided in the symplectic coordinate chart $\{x_i, y_i\}$ the individual functions are given by

$$H_+ = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i), \quad H_- = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(y_i), \quad W = \sum_{i,j=1}^n W_{ij}(x_i - x_j)(y_i - y_j). \tag{43}$$

In this case the Lie derivative of $\omega = \sum_{i=1}^n dx_i \wedge dy_i$ along the direction of the deformed Hamiltonian vector field is given in symplectic coordinates by

$$L_{X_{\gamma, H_q}}(\omega) = (1 - q^{-1}) \sum_{i,j=1}^n \Delta_{ij} dx_i \wedge dy_j, \quad (44)$$

where Δ is the weighted Laplacian matrix of the graph \mathcal{G} . When $1 > q > 0$ the symplectic inner product of two elements in TM expands exponentially under the associated flow, otherwise it contracts for $q > 1$ and $q < 0$. This is equivalent to saying that nonzero diffusion coefficients D_x, D_y of the same sign will give rise to a contraction in symplectic area whereas diffusion coefficients allowed to have opposite signs could generate either contraction or expansion depending on which has the larger amplitude. Below we provide some further geometric interpretations of the Turing instability parameter.

Important examples of Lagrangian fibrations are Lagrangian torus fibrations, and for the key ideas behind the classification of these the reader is referred to [22, 23]. From the Arnold-Liouville theorem a smooth Lagrangian fibration $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$ with connected, compact fibres is necessarily a torus fibration over an integral affine manifold B with transition functions in the subgroup $\mathbb{R}^n \rtimes GL(n, \mathbb{Z}) \subset \text{Aff}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The integral affine structure determines a subbundle $\Lambda^* \subset T^*B$ of integral 1-forms and the holonomy of Λ^* is called the affine monodromy of the Lagrangian torus fibration. The fibration $\pi : M \rightarrow B$ is a principal torus bundle if and only if the affine monodromy is trivial and globally there exists an isomorphism $M \cong T^*B/\Lambda^*$ if and only if $\pi : M \rightarrow B$ admits a global section. In symplectic coordinates on a Lagrangian torus fibration the metric G_q is therefore

$$G_q = (G_B)_{ij} dx_i \otimes dx_j + q(G_B^{-1})_{ij} dy_i \otimes dy_j \quad (45)$$

and we find that the diameter of M stays bounded whilst the volume of the fibres shrink to zero as $q \rightarrow 0$. Translating this to the family of almost complex structures $\{J_q\}$ we recognise the limit $q \rightarrow 0$ as the large complex structure limit of mirror symmetry (see [24, 25, 26] and references therein). Thus, as suggested in subsection 2.1, one may assign a geometric interpretation to the limit of the Turing instability parameter where one diffusion coefficient becomes very large compared to the other.

For the definition of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields it seemed more natural to assume that $q > 0$, but from positivity of diffusion coefficients in (2) one expects to have $q < 0$. In

this case the metric G_q is no longer Riemannian but instead a psuedo-Riemannian metric with neutral signature. In fact when $q = -1$ the metric

$$G_{-1} = G_B \oplus -G_F \tag{46}$$

is precisely the standard metric induced by a choice of *almost \mathbb{D} -complex structure* T on M (here we use the terminology of Harvey and Lawson [14] whilst others call T an *almost bi-Lagrangian*, an *almost para-complex*, or an *almost product structure*). In analogy with the complex case an almost \mathbb{D} -complex structure T is an automorphism $T : TM \rightarrow TM$ satisfying $T^2 = id$ with $G_{-1}(\cdot, \cdot) = \omega(\cdot, T\cdot)$ the *standard psuedo-Riemannian metric associated with T* . Any Lagrangian fibration should in principle admit an almost \mathbb{D} -complex structure, but here the specific choice of T is determined by the choice of J . In particular, the decomposition (8) of TM induced by J coincides with the eigenspace decomposition of TM induced by T . Like J , T has an associated Nijenhuis tensor and its vanishing is equivalent to the almost \mathbb{D} -complex structure being integrable and (M, T) being *\mathbb{D} -complex*. Integrability of T corresponds to (M, ω, J) being bi-Lagrangian by our terminology or (M, ω, T) being *\mathbb{D} -Kähler* by that of Harvey and Lawson. Many of the standard constructions from Kähler geometry carry over to the \mathbb{D} -Kähler case and, just as one describes Kähler manifolds using complex coordinates, it is common to discuss these spaces in terms of \mathbb{D} -complex numbers (the two-dimensional algebra \mathbb{D} generated by 1 and τ satisfying $\tau^2 = -1$). Notions of \mathbb{D} -complex conjugates, \mathbb{D} -holomorphic functions, and decompositions of forms and the exterior derivative are defined similarly (see [14] for details). For now we continue in the spirit of the previous subsection and assume that both J and T are integrable. This means that (M, ω, J) is Kähler and (M, ω, T) is \mathbb{D} -Kähler (equivalently (M, ω, J) is bi-Lagrangian). By allowing negative values of q the family $\{J_q\}$ extended to the interval $q \in [-1, 1]$ traces out a path in the combined space of all ω -compatible (\mathbb{D} -)complex structures, the \mathbb{D} -complex structures compatible in the sense that $\omega(\cdot, T\cdot)$ is a metric of neutral signature on M . This path starts at the \mathbb{D} -complex structure T with $q = -1$ and ends at the complex structure J with $q = 1$. However, it must also pass through the singular point at $q = 0$ where the metric G_q degenerates on the fibres of $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$. As described previously, this point represents a boundary or cusp in the space of compatible complex structures and the limit $q \rightarrow 0^+$ is precisely the large complex structure limit of mirror symmetry in which the SYZ conjecture is expected to hold [26].

The endpoints and singularity of the path $\{J_q\}$ therefore correspond geometrically to the three limits of the Turing instability parameter described in subsection 2.1. Allowing q to vary across the interval $[-1, 1]$ automatically extends semi-flat mirror symmetry to include a duality with \mathbb{D} -Kähler geometry and it turns out that analogues of special Lagrangian submanifolds (the basis of the SYZ conjecture) have already been studied there [14]. In particular, it is the Ricci-flat, affine \mathbb{D} -Kähler manifolds that provide the natural duals of Calabi-Yau manifolds and because of their bi-Lagrangian structure these are also Lagrangian torus fibrations over an affine base equipped with Koszul metric. If suitably defined, the parametrisation $\{J_q\}$ should provide a way to move between Kähler and \mathbb{D} -Kähler Lagrangian fibrations, perhaps as submanifolds in a higher-dimensional ambient space. Mirror symmetry could then be used to set up a quadrality involving mirror pairs of both types of geometry. To the best of our knowledge nothing along these lines has appeared in the literature so far.

4.2. Synchronisation

Two-dimensional bi-Lagrangian manifolds are necessarily Lorentz surfaces and therefore non-compact if not the torus. Simple higher-dimensional examples can be obtained by taking n -fold products of these [12] and Lagrangian fibrations of this type form a good starting point for discussing synchronisation in terms of deformed Hamiltonian vector fields. In complex network theory [3, 9] the subspace $S = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n) : x_i = x_j, y_i = y_j \forall i, j \in V\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is usually called the *synchronisation manifold* of the network (2), but of course this is only globally well-defined as a submanifold using the existence of global coordinates on \mathbb{R}^{2n} . Generally S is not well-defined for an arbitrary Lagrangian fibration. However, it is well-defined as the diagonal $S = \{(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{L}^n : z_i = z_j \forall i, j \in V\}$ in an n -fold product of a Lorentz surface \mathcal{L} , where the product structure reflects the fact that we are considering a homogenous network (recall this means $h_i = h$ for all $i \in V$). From the previous subsection it follows that a distinguishing feature the Hamiltonian (42) in the deformed Hamiltonian vector field generalising (2) is that W must vanish on S . Although it is unlikely that an arbitrary deformed Hamiltonian vector field will admit periodic orbits due to the dissipative nature of its flow, the restriction of $X_{H_q}^q$ to S is Hamiltonian by the simple fact that $W|_S = 0$ and H_q encodes n copies of the same two-dimensional Hamiltonian system (7) on \mathcal{L} . Intuition therefore suggests that $X_{H_q}^q$ admits at least as many periodic orbits as a generic Hamiltonian vector field on \mathcal{L} , and that these enumerate

synchronised states for (2).

Given this observation we can rationalise a generalisation of synchronised periodic orbits for deformed Hamiltonian vector fields on any Lagrangian fibration $\pi : (M, \omega, J) \rightarrow B$. Provided W vanishes on a symplectic submanifold $(S, \omega|_S) \subset (M, \omega)$, a deformed Hamiltonian vector field $X_{H_q}^q$ with Hamiltonian (42) becomes an ordinary Hamiltonian vector field when restricted to S . This suggests that $X_{H_q}^q$ admits at least as many periodic orbits as a generic Hamiltonian vector field on S . It may serve as an approach to Floer theory with deformed Hamiltonian vector fields provided one is careful to make the right choices of Hamiltonians and symplectic submanifolds of (M, ω) . Here we sketch out a model for the Floer theory by showing how it could work for critical points. The approach is purely conjectural since we do not have at our disposal the analytic tools required for a complete study. We consider a Morse-type model for Floer theory with deformed Hamiltonian vector fields and try to obtain a topological estimate for the number of equilibrium solutions, which becomes possible in the limit $q \rightarrow 0$. In particular, we restrict to cotangent bundles T^*B where we conjecture that this number is bounded below by the Betti numbers of S .

The starting point for obtaining information about S given data on T^*B is an extension of the Lagrange multiplier Morse theory developed in [28, 29]. Frauenfelder (and Schecter-Xu for the rank one case) considered Morse theory on the trivial vector bundle $B \times \mathcal{V}^* \rightarrow B$ using a smooth function $F : B \times \mathcal{V}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$F(x, v^*) = f(x) + v^*(w(x)) , \quad (47)$$

where $v^* \in \mathcal{V}^*$, $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $w : B \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$. Here \mathcal{V}^* is the dual of a finite dimensional vector space \mathcal{V} . If 0 is a regular value of w , then it is a well-known fact that there exists a bijective correspondence $\lambda : \text{Crit}(F) \rightarrow \text{Crit}(f|_{w^{-1}(0)})$ between critical points of F and critical points of $f|_{w^{-1}(0)}$. Using several different approaches, both [28] and [29] prove the existence of a homotopy between the moduli spaces of gradient flow lines of F on $B \times \mathcal{V}^*$ and those of $f|_{w^{-1}(0)}$ on $w^{-1}(0)$. Most relevant to us is the adiabatic limit method used in [29] to show that gradient flow lines of F converge to those of $f|_{w^{-1}(0)}$ as the volume of the fibre is taken to zero. There are two issues that arise when generalising this result to general Lagrangian fibrations $\pi : (M, \omega) \rightarrow B$.

1) It is natural to take the generalisation of w to be a section of the dual fibration whose

zero locus, $w^{-1}(0)$, defines the submanifold of interest. The problem is that the concept of a dual fibration and zero locus (in the sense required for the Lagrange multiplier construction) becomes ambiguous in cases where the fibres need not be vector spaces. In particular, for most compact fibres there is no notion of a uniquely distinguished point at 0.

2) In general, $B \times \mathcal{V}^*$ is of rank $k < n$ so that $w^{-1}(0) \subset B$ is a submanifold of dimension $n - k > 0$. For a Lagrangian fibration the fibres are always of dimension n however, which means that w must degenerate on certain fibre directions if we are to ensure $n - k$ is nonzero. Even if f is Morse this necessarily implies F can only ever be Morse-Bott so that something must be done to account for the “left over” directions of the fibration.

The second point is most easily addressed by perturbing F using a family of Morse functions having compact support on the degenerate directions associated with critical submanifolds. Although F is Morse-Bott its perturbation becomes Morse [30]. It is precisely this approach that means we can realise H_q in (42) as a perturbed Morse-Bott function with q interpreted as the small parameter of the perturbation, H_- the perturbing Morse function, and W and H_+ can be identified with the appropriate generalisations of $v^*(w(x))$ and $f(x)$, respectively. To address the first point we shall content ourselves with considering cotangent bundles $M = T^*B$ where B is a closed, oriented manifold that is not necessarily affine. The choice of almost complex structure is again determined by the Sasaki metric G after a choice of metric G_B on B .

Our assumption on the function W used to construct the Hamiltonian (42) is that $W = \theta(\hat{w})$ for some $\hat{w} \in TT^*B$ whose horizontal projection is a vector field $w : B \rightarrow TB$ that has zero set $w^{-1}(0) \subset B$ with codimension k as a closed, oriented submanifold of B . We use w_i to denote the n functions $w_i : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by w in an appropriate trivialisation and impose that the vertical projection of dh has rank k . The Hamiltonian H_q is then constructed using a Morse function $H_+ = f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ together with a function $H_- = g$ whose domain will include the critical submanifolds of $H_0 \equiv H_{q=0}$. We assume further that the restriction $f|_{w^{-1}(0)}$ is a Morse function on $w^{-1}(0)$ and extending g to the whole of T^*B using cut-off functions we obtain the Hamiltonian

$$H_q(z) = f(\pi(z)) + \langle z, w(\pi(z)) \rangle + qg(z) , \quad q \in (0, 1] , \quad (48)$$

where $z \in T^*B$. To illustrate how H_q can be viewed as a perturbed Morse-Bott function and

define g properly we shall first consider the critical point set of

$$H_0(z) = f(\pi(z)) + \langle z, w(\pi(z)) \rangle , \quad (49)$$

which is the analogue of F in [28, 29]. The critical point set of H_0 consists of pairs (x, y) satisfying (in local coordinates)

$$w_i(x) = 0 , \quad df(x) + y_i dw_i(x) = 0 , \quad (50)$$

which by the assumptions on w is just the condition that $x \in w^{-1}(0)$ is a critical point of $f|_{w^{-1}(0)}$. The combination of the y_i spanning the vertical kernel of dw define a $(n - k)$ -dimensional fibre Z_x over x that we assume can be extended to a proper fibre bundle $Z \rightarrow w^{-1}(0)$. Because $f|_{w^{-1}(0)}$ is a Morse function with isolated critical points the critical point set of H_0 is a disjoint union of isolated critical submanifolds $\mathcal{V}_x \cong Z_x$ that are identified with the fibres of Z over each critical point $x \in \text{Crit}(f|_{w^{-1}(0)})$,

$$\text{Crit}(H_0) = \coprod_{x \in \text{Crit}(f|_{w^{-1}(0)})} \mathcal{V}_x . \quad (51)$$

This shows that critical submanifolds of H_0 are in one-to-one correspondence with critical points of $f|_{w^{-1}(0)}$. Using an argument similar to Frauenfelder [28] we find that H_0 is Morse-Bott and for indices the following relation holds

$$\text{index}_{H_0}(\mathcal{V}_x) = \text{index}_{f|_{w^{-1}(0)}}(x) + k . \quad (52)$$

Returning to the case $q \neq 0$ it is now straightforward to see that choosing g to define a family of Morse functions $g_x : Z_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ parameterised by $x \in w^{-1}(0)$ means that H_q is a Morse function on T^*B . Critical points p of H_q can be identified with pairs (x, y) where $x \in w^{-1}(0)$ is a critical point of $f|_{w^{-1}(0)}$ and y is a critical point of g_x on the fibre Z_x . The index of a critical point $p = (x, y) \in \text{Crit}(H_q)$ is

$$\text{index}_{H_q}(p) = \text{index}_{f|_{w^{-1}(0)}}(x) + \text{index}_{g_x}(y) + k , \quad (53)$$

and these are equilibrium solutions of the deformed Hamiltonian vector field $X_{H_q}^q$. We would like to obtain a lower bound on the number of these solutions and for that reason shall introduce a Morse-type complex generated by critical points of $X_{H_q}^q$. By Proposition 2, for fixed q we have

that $JX_{H_q}^q$ is the negative gradient of H_q defined with respect to the metric G_q . Denote by $\phi_t^q : T^*B \rightarrow T^*B$ the flow of

$$\frac{du}{dt} = JX_{H_q}^q(u) , \quad (54)$$

and for each $p \in \text{Crit}(H_q)$ define the stable and unstable manifolds by

$$W_q^s(p) = \{z \in T^*B \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_t^q(z) = p\} , \quad W_q^u(p) = \{z \in T^*B \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \phi_t^q(z) = p\} , \quad (55)$$

respectively. For $q \in (0, 1]$ we assume the pair (H_q, G_q) satisfy the Morse-Smale condition so that for all $p^\pm \in \text{Crit}(H_q)$ the family of moduli spaces

$$\mathcal{M}_q(p^-, p^+) = W_q^u(p^-) \cap W_q^s(p^+) / \mathbb{R} , \quad (56)$$

is a family of smooth manifolds all of dimension

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}_q(p^-, p^+)) = \text{index}_{H_q}(p^-) - \text{index}_{H_q}(p^+) - 1 . \quad (57)$$

Thus, we can define a family of Morse-Smale-Witten complexes, $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J_q)$, by counting flow lines of (54) that join critical points of H_q . The notation $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J_q)$ indicates the choice of Hamiltonian and almost complex structure. One might hope that, since the generators are identical, it might be possible to relate the differentials of $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J_q)$ with a Morse complex on the total space of $Z \rightarrow w^{-1}(0)$. The problem is that flow lines of $JX_{H_q}^q$ may be very different to the gradient flow lines of $-(f|_{w^{-1}(0)} + g)$ that are required to construct such a Morse complex. In particular, it is certainly not true that flow lines of $JX_{H_q}^q$ must be constrained to the submanifold $Z \subset T^*B$. However, as q goes to zero the only flow lines of $JX_{H_q}^q$ that contribute to the differential are those that converge to gradient flow lines on Z (to prove this rigorously following [29] we would need to appeal to a recent theorem by Eldering [31] on persistence of noncompact normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds). This implies that in the adiabatic limit elements of $W_q^u(p^-) \cap W_q^s(p^+)$ are in bijection with maps $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Z$ satisfying

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -\nabla(f|_{w^{-1}(0)} + g)(u) , \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(t) = p^\pm , \quad (58)$$

where p^\pm are the critical points corresponding bijectively to (x^\pm, y^\pm) . Thus, for q sufficiently small, we obtain an isomorphism of moduli spaces that means we can identify $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J_q)$ with a Morse complex on Z .

By standard arguments for Morse theory on vector bundles over closed, oriented manifolds the homology of the chain complex obtained from $\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J_q)$ in this way is isomorphic to the singular homology of $w^{-1}(0)$ with grading shifted down by k . In turn we may identify the singular homology of $w^{-1}(0)$ with that of the generalised synchronised state S , which is itself a vector bundle over $w^{-1}(0)$. Thus, for q sufficiently small, we obtain an isomorphism

$$H_*(\mathcal{C}_*(H_q, J_q)) \cong H_{*-k}(S) , \quad (59)$$

which describes how topological information about a submanifold $S \subset T^*B$ is encoded by a deformed Hamiltonian vector field. In particular, we obtain a lower bound on the number of equilibrium solutions

$$\dot{z}(t) = X_{H_q}^q(z(t)) , \quad H_q = H_+ + \theta(\hat{w}) + qH_- . \quad (60)$$

Conjecture 1. *For sufficiently small q the number of critical points of the deformed Hamiltonian vector field (60) is bounded below by*

$$\sum_{a=0}^{n-k} \dim H_a(S) , \quad (61)$$

where S is synchronisation manifold defined by $\theta(\hat{w}) = 0$.

We tentatively suggest that an analogous statement extends to periodic orbits of time-dependent deformed Hamiltonian vector fields and therefore a “synchronised” version of the Arnold conjecture.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to S. Mescher, I. Smith and J. Smith for their useful comments and insightful suggestions. This work also benefitted from conversations with A. Abbondandolo, M. Abouzaid, M. Gross, W.J. Merry and F. Schmäscke. I am supported by a Research Fellowship from Peterhouse, Cambridge.

References

- [1] D. S. Tourigny, *Networks of planar Hamiltonian systems*, (2017) arxiv submit/1775085.
- [2] R. J. Duffin, *Pseudo-Hamiltonian mechanics*, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **9** (1962) 309.
- [3] S. Boccaletti, V. Latorab, Y. Morenod, M. Chavezf & D.U. Hwanga, *Complex networks: Structure and dynamics*, *Phys. Rep.* **424** (2006) 175.
- [4] A.M. Turing, *The Chemical Basis of Morphogenesis*, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **237** (1952) 37.
- [5] H. Nakao and A.S. Mikhailov, *Turing patterns in network-organized activator-inhibitor systems*, *Nat. Phys.* **6** (2010) 544.
- [6] P. Smereka, *Synchronization and relaxation for a class of globally coupled Hamiltonian systems*, *Physica D* **124** (1998) 104.
- [7] D.H. Zanette, and A.S. Mikhailov, *Complex behaviour of globally coupled Hamiltonian elements*, *Phys. Lett. A* **235** (1997) 135.
- [8] A. Hampton and D.H. Zanette, *Measure synchronization in coupled Hamiltonian systems*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 2179.
- [9] A. Arenas, A. Díaz-Guilera, J. Kurths, Y. Moreno & C. Zhoug, *Synchronisation on complex networks*, *Phys. Rep.* **469** (2008) 93.
- [10] R. McLachlan and M. Perlmutter, *Conformal Hamiltonian systems*, *J. Geom. Phys.* **39** (2001) 276.
- [11] S. Sasaki, *On the differential geometry of tangent bundles of Riemannian manifolds*, *Tohoku Math. J.* **10** (1958) 338.
- [12] F. Etayo, R. Santamaria and U. R. Trías, *The geometry of a bi-Lagrangian manifold*, *Diff. Geom. Applic.* **24** (2006) 33.
- [13] V. Cruceanu, P. Fortuny and P.M. Gadea, *A survey on Paracomplex Geometry*, *Rocky Mount. J. Math.* **26** (1996) 83.

- [14] R. Harvey and H.B. Lawson, *Split special Lagrangian geometry*, in *Metric and differential geometry*, Progr. in Math., vol 297, Birkhäuser (2012).
- [15] V. Cortés, C. Mayer, T. Mohaupt and F. Saueressig, *Special geometry of euclidean supersymmetry, I. Vector multiplets*, *JHEP* **3** (2004) 28.
- [16] A. Floer, *Symplectic fixed points and holomorphic spheres*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **120** (1989) 575.
- [17] A. Floer, *Morse theory for Lagrangian intersections*, *J. Differential Geom.* **28** (1988) 513.
- [18] D. Salamon, *Lectures on Floer homology. Symplectic geometry and topology* (Park City, UT, 1997), 143-229. IAS/Park City Mathematical Series, 7. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1999.
- [19] A. Floer, H. Hofer and D. Salamon, *Transversality in elliptic Morse theory for the symplectic action*, *Duke Math. J.* **80** (1995) 251.
- [20] J. Robbin and D. Salamon, *The spectral flow and the Maslov index*, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **27** (1995) 1.
- [21] A. Abbondandolo and P. Majer, *Ordinary differential operators in Hilbert spaces and Fredholm pairs*, *Math. Z.* **243** (2003) 525.
- [22] J. J. Duistermaat, *On global action-angle coordinates*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **33** (1980) 687.
- [23] N. T. Zung, *Symplectic topology of integrable Hamiltonian systems. II. Topological classification*, *Compos. Math.* **138** (2003) 125.
- [24] A. Strominger, S. T. Yau and E. Zaslow, *Mirror symmetry is T-duality*, *Nuclear Phys. B* **479** (1996) 243.
- [25] N.C. Leung, *Mirror symmetry without corrections*, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **13** (2005) 287.
- [26] M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman, *Homological mirror symmetry and torus fibrations*, in *Symplectic geometry and mirror symmetry*, 203-263, World Sci. Publishing (2001).

- [27] K. Fukaya and Y. G. Oh, *Zero-loop open strings in the cotangent bundle and Morse homotopy*, *Asian J. of Math.* **1** (1998) 96.
- [28] U. Frauenfelder, *Vortices on the cylinder*, *Int. Math. Res. Notices* **42** (2006) 2179.
- [29] S. Schecter and G. Xu, *Morse theory for Lagrange multipliers and adiabatic limits*, *J. Diff. Eqns.* **257** (2014) 4277.
- [30] A. Banyaga and D. Hurtubise, *Cascades and perturbed Morse-Bott functions*, *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* **13** (2013) 237.
- [31] J. Eldering, *Normally Hyperbolic Invariant Manifolds –The noncompact Case*, Atlantis Series in Dynamical Systems, vol. 2, Atlantis Press, Paris (2013).