

# Liouville–Arnold theorem for contact Hamiltonian systems

Leonardo Colombo<sup>1</sup>, Manuel de León<sup>2,3</sup> Manuel Lainz<sup>2</sup> and Asier López-Gordón<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centro de Automática y Robótica (CSIC-UPM), Carretera de Campo Real, km 0, 200, 28500 Arganda del Rey, Spain.

<sup>2</sup>Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas (CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM), Calle Nicolás Cabrera, 13-15, Campus Cantoblanco, UAM, 28049 Madrid, Spain.

<sup>3</sup>Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales Calle Valverde, 22, 28004, Madrid, Spain.

E-mail: leonardo.colombo@car.upm-csic.es, mdeleon@icmat.es, manuel.lainz@icmat.es, asier.lopez@icmat.es

**Abstract.** Integrability of Hamiltonian systems is often identified with complete integrability, or Liouville integrability, that is, the existence of as many independent integrals of motion in involution as the dimension of the phase space. Under certain regularity conditions, Liouville–Arnold theorem states that the invariant geometric structure associated with Liouville integrability is a fibration by Lagrangian tori, on which motions are linear. In this paper, a Liouville–Arnold theorem for contact Hamiltonian systems is proven. In particular, it is shown that by using a symplectization of a  $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional contact manifold one can define a compact set diffeomorphic to an  $n$ -dimensional torus times the real line and induce action-angle variables which specify the natural canonical coordinates for the partially invariant tori of the system.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Jacobi and contact manifolds</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Jacobi manifolds . . . . .	3
2.2	Contact manifolds . . . . .	4
2.3	Contact Hamiltonian systems . . . . .	6

<b>3</b>	<b>Liouville–Arnold theorem for contact Hamiltonian systems</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Liouville–Arnold theorem for exact symplectic manifolds . . . . .	8
3.2	Symplectization of contact manifolds . . . . .	10
3.3	Proof of the Liouville–Arnold theorem for contact Hamiltonian systems . . .	15

## 1. Introduction

A large class of physical systems can be described through Hamiltonian systems [1]. In such systems, the total energy is described by a Hamiltonian, a smooth scalar function of the system’s generalized coordinates. The dynamics is then completely determined by the partial derivatives of the Hamiltonian with respect to the generalized coordinates. These equations are called Hamilton equations, a system of first-order differential equations. A Hamiltonian system is integrable if there exist explicit solutions to Hamilton’s equations of motion. Liouville–Arnold theorem [2] asserts that under the existence of some functionally independent functions, called first integrals, which are in involution under a Poisson bracket, then the equations of motion of a Hamiltonian system may be integrated by quadratures. That is, Hamilton equations can be solved by a finite number of algebraic operations and the calculation of integrals of known functions. More formally, given a symplectic manifold of dimension  $2n$ , a Hamiltonian system is (Liouville) completely integrable if one can find  $n$  first integrals that pairwise commute and are independent on a dense open subset. In this situation, this open subset admits a Lagrangian foliation and the solutions of the dynamics live in the leaves of the foliation. This notion may be extended, in a natural way, for the more general case when the phase space is a Poisson [15] or Dirac manifold [17], not necessarily symplectic.

In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in the study of contact mechanical systems (see [8] and references therein). Contact geometry has been used in the last years to describe dissipative mechanical systems from a Hamiltonian and Lagrangian point of view, as well as systems in thermodynamics [6], quantum mechanics [7], etc. Nevertheless, there is a lack in the contact geometry literature for complete integrability of contact Hamiltonian systems as in the symplectic, Poisson, or Dirac scenarios.

For contact manifolds a first notion of a completely integrable contact manifold has been given in [11]. In this situation, a contact manifold is said to be integrable if it is a flag of two foliations, Legendrian and co-Legendrian, and a holonomy-invariant transverse measure of the former in the latter, and establishing an equivalence with previously known definitions of contact integrability [4, 5, 13, 14, 16]. Moreover, in [11] the authors show that contact completely integrable systems are solvable in quadratures.

Liouville–Arnold theorem [2, 3, 9] states that the invariant geometric structure associated to Liouville integrability is a fibration by Lagrangian tori, on which motions are linear. The

key to the theorem lies in the action-angle variables, which specify the natural canonical coordinates for the invariant tori of the system. For contact mechanics, however, the Liouville-Arnold theorem does not directly apply, since the contact flow is not Hamiltonian and so the key ideas in the Liouville-Arnold theorem lose their effectiveness. A crucial difference with respect to the standard Hamiltonian case resides in the fact that the Jacobi bracket is not invariant under the flow, and in consequence, no natural analog of the action variables for quasi-periodic flows exists. In this paper a Liouville-Arnold type theorem for contact Hamiltonian systems is provided. In particular, it is shown that by using a symplectization of a  $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional contact manifold it is possible to define a compact set diffeomorphic to an  $n$ -dimensional torus times the real line and induce action-angle variables which specify the natural canonical coordinates for the partially invariant tori of the system.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces Jacobi and contact manifolds in addition to Hamiltonian dynamics on contact manifolds. Section 3.2 deals with the symplectification problem of contact manifolds. Finally, in Section 3 a Liouville-Arnold type theorem for contact Hamiltonian systems is proven and action-angle coordinates are introduced. The classical harmonic oscillator with damping is used as example to illustrate the theoretical results.

## 2. Jacobi and contact manifolds

From now on, all the manifolds and mappings are assumed to be smooth, connected and second-countable. Submersions are assumed to be surjective. Sum over crossed repeated indices is understood. Given a manifold  $M$ , the  $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$ -modules of vector fields and of  $p$ -forms on  $M$  will be denoted by  $\mathfrak{X}(M)$  and by  $\Omega^p(M)$ , respectively. For  $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$  and  $\alpha \in \Omega^p(M)$ , the contraction of  $\alpha$  with  $X$  is denoted by  $\iota_X \alpha$ , and the Lie derivative of  $\alpha$  with respect to  $X$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}_X \alpha$ . Given a set of vector fields  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ , the distribution spanned by them is denoted by  $\langle \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \rangle$ , and analogously for codistributions spanned by one-forms.

### 2.1. Jacobi manifolds

A **Jacobi structure** on a manifold  $M$  is a pair  $(\Lambda, E)$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a bivector field and  $E$  is a vector field on  $M$  such that

$$[\Lambda, E] = 0, \quad [\Lambda, \Lambda] = 2E \wedge \Lambda,$$

where  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  denotes the Schouten–Nijenhuis bracket. A **Jacobi manifold**  $(M, \Lambda, E)$  is a manifold  $M$  with a Jacobi structure  $(\Lambda, E)$ . The bivector  $\Lambda$  induces a  $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$ -module morphism  $\sharp_\Lambda: \Omega^1(M) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$  given by

$$\sharp_\Lambda(\alpha) = \Lambda(\alpha, \cdot).$$

Given a Jacobi structure  $(\Lambda, E)$ , its associated **Jacobi bracket** is the map  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}: \mathcal{C}^\infty(M) \times \mathcal{C}^\infty(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$  given by

$$\{f, g\} = \Lambda(df, dg) + fE(g) - gE(f).$$

This bracket is bilinear and satisfies the Jacobi identity. However, unlike Poisson brackets, in general Jacobi brackets do not satisfy the Leibnitz rule.

## 2.2. Contact manifolds

Let  $M$  be an  $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional manifold. A **contact distribution** on  $M$  is a one-codimensional maximally non-integrable distribution  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $M$ . The pair  $(M, \mathcal{H})$  is called a **contact manifold**. A **contact form** on  $M$  is a one-form  $\eta \in \Omega^1(M)$  such that  $\ker \eta$  is a contact distribution on  $M$ . If such one form exists globally,  $(M, \eta)$  is called a **co-oriented contact manifold** [10]. Henceforth, all the contact manifolds considered will be co-oriented. Hence, the following definition will be employed.

**Definition 1.** A **contact manifold** is a pair  $(M, \eta)$ , where  $M$  is an  $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional manifold and  $\eta$  is a 1-form on  $M$  such that  $\eta \wedge (d\eta)^n$  is a volume form, that is,

$$(d\eta)_p \wedge \underbrace{\cdots}_{\text{n-times}} \wedge (d\eta)_p \wedge \eta_p \neq 0, \quad \forall p \in M.$$

The 1-form  $\eta$  is called a **contact form**.

The contact form  $\eta$  on  $M$  defines the vector bundle isomorphism  $\flat: TM \rightarrow T^*M$

$$\flat: v \mapsto \iota_v d\eta + \eta(v)\eta,$$

which induces an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$ -modules  $\flat: \mathfrak{X}(M) \rightarrow \Omega^1(M)$ . There exists a unique vector field  $\mathcal{R}$  on  $(M, \eta)$ , called the **Reeb vector field**, such that  $\flat(\mathcal{R}) = \eta$ , that is,

$$\iota_{\mathcal{R}} d\eta = 0, \quad \iota_{\mathcal{R}} \eta = 1.$$

Given a function  $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$ , its **Hamiltonian vector field**  $X_f$  is given by

$$\flat(X_f) = df - (\mathcal{R}(f) + f)\eta,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\eta(X_f) = -f, \quad \mathcal{L}_{X_f} \eta = -\mathcal{R}(f)\eta.$$

For every  $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional contact manifold  $(M, \eta)$  there exists local coordinates, called **Darboux coordinates**,  $(q^1, \dots, q^n, p_1, \dots, p_n, z)$  such that  $\eta = dz - p_i dq^i$ . In these coordinates, the Reeb vector field is written as  $\mathcal{R} = \partial/\partial z$ .

**Definition 2.** Let  $(M_1, \eta_1)$  and  $(M_2, \eta_2)$  be contact manifolds. A diffeomorphism  $\Phi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  is called a **conformal contactomorphism** if  $\Phi^*\eta_2 = \sigma\eta_1$  for some function  $\sigma$  on  $M_1$  called the **conformal factor**. A **contactomorphism** is a diffeomorphism  $\Phi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  which preserves the contact form  $\eta$ , namely,  $\Phi^*\eta_2 = \eta_1$ .

Let  $(M, \eta)$  be a contact manifold. A vector field  $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$  is called an **infinitesimal conformal contactomorphism** if its flow is a one-parameter group of conformal contactomorphisms. Equivalently,  $\mathcal{L}_X\eta = a\eta$  for some function  $a$  on  $M$  called the **(infinitesimal) conformal factor**. An **infinitesimal contactomorphism** is a vector field  $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$  whose flow is made up of contactomorphisms, that is,  $\mathcal{L}_X\eta = 0$ .

Note that an (infinitesimal) contactomorphism is an (infinitesimal) conformal contactomorphism with (infinitesimal) conformal factor  $(a \equiv 0)$   $\sigma \equiv 1$ .

Let  $(M, \eta)$  be a contact manifold. Then,  $(M, \Lambda, E)$  is a Jacobi manifold, where

$$\Lambda(\alpha, \beta) = -d\eta(\flat^{-1}\alpha, \flat^{-1}\beta), \quad E = -\mathcal{R}.$$

Hence, the associated Jacobi bracket  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$  is given by

$$\{f, g\} = \Lambda(df, dg) + fE(g) - gE(f) = -d\eta(\flat^{-1}df, \flat^{-1}dg) - f\mathcal{R}(g) + g\mathcal{R}(f),$$

for any pair of smooth functions  $f$  and  $g$  on  $M$ .

**Proposition 1.** *On a contact manifold  $(M, \eta)$ , the Jacobi bracket can be expressed in the following ways:*

$$\{f, g\} = X_f(g) + g\mathcal{R}(f) = -X_g(f) - f\mathcal{R}(g) \tag{2}$$

for each pair of functions  $f$  and  $g$  on  $M$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\flat^{-1}(df) = X_f + (\mathcal{R}(f) + f)\mathcal{R},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(df, dg) &= -d\eta(X_f + (\mathcal{R}f + f)\mathcal{R}, X_g + (\mathcal{R}g + g)\mathcal{R}) = -d\eta(X_f, X_g) = -\iota_{X_g}\iota_{X_f}d\eta \\ &= -\iota_{X_g}(\mathcal{L}_{X_f}\eta - d\iota_{X_f}\eta) = -\iota_{X_g}(-\mathcal{R}(f)\eta + df) = -g\mathcal{R}(f) - X_g(f), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\{f, g\} = -g\mathcal{R}(f) - X_g(f) - f\mathcal{R}(g) + g\mathcal{R}(f) = -X_g(f) - f\mathcal{R}(g).$$

The second equality from Eq. (2) follows from the antisymmetry of  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ . □

Given a contact manifold  $(M, \eta)$ , the morphism  $\sharp_\Lambda: \Omega^1(M) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$  defined by its Jacobi structure is given by  $\sharp_\Lambda(\alpha) = \flat^{-1}(\alpha) - \alpha(\mathcal{R})\mathcal{R}$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Given a contact manifold  $(M, \eta)$ , the map  $f \mapsto X_f$  is a Lie algebra anti-isomorphism between the set of smooth functions with the Jacobi bracket and the set of infinitesimal conformal contactomorphisms with the Lie bracket, namely,*

$$\{f, g\} = -\eta([X_f, X_g]),$$

for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$ . Its inverse is given by  $X \mapsto -\eta(X)$ .

Furthermore,  $X_f$  is an infinitesimal contactomorphism if and only if  $\mathcal{R}(f) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_{X_f}\eta = -\mathcal{R}(f)\eta$ ,  $X_f$  is an infinitesimal conformal contactomorphism, and it is an infinitesimal contactomorphism if and only if  $\mathcal{R}(f) = 0$ . Conversely, for any  $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ , the contraction  $\eta(X)$  is a smooth function on  $M$ . This proves that the map  $f \mapsto X_f$  is a bijection.

We shall now show that  $X \mapsto -\iota_X\eta$  is an anti-isomorphism. Since it is a bijection (with inverse  $f \mapsto X_f$ ) it is sufficient to show that it is an antihomomorphism. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} d\eta(X_f, X_g) &= X_f(\eta(X_g)) - X_g(\eta(X_f)) - \iota_{[X_f, X_g]}\eta \\ &= -X_f(g) + X_g(f) - \iota_{[X_f, X_g]}\eta \\ &= -\sharp_\Lambda(df)(g) + f\mathcal{R}(g) + \sharp_\Lambda(dg)(f) - g\mathcal{R}(f) - \iota_{[X_f, X_g]}\eta \\ &= -2\Lambda(df, dg) + f\mathcal{R}(g) - g\mathcal{R}(f) - \iota_{[X_f, X_g]}\eta, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\sharp_\Lambda(df)(g) = -\sharp_\Lambda(dg)(f) = \Lambda(df, dg)$ , but  $\Lambda(df, dg) = -d\eta(X_f, X_g)$ , so

$$\Lambda(df, dg) = f\mathcal{R}(g) - g\mathcal{R}(f) - \iota_{[X_f, X_g]}\eta,$$

and then

$$\{f, g\} = \Lambda(df, dg) - f\mathcal{R}(g) + g\mathcal{R}(f) = -\iota_{[X_f, X_g]}\eta.$$

□

### 2.3. Contact Hamiltonian systems

**Definition 3.** A **contact Hamiltonian system** is a triple  $(M, \eta, H)$ , where  $(M, \eta)$  is a contact manifold and  $H: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a function called the **Hamiltonian function**.

**Definition 4.** Given a contact Hamiltonian system  $(M, \eta, H)$ , an  **$H$ -dissipated quantity** is a function  $f$  on  $M$  such that  $X_H(f) = -\mathcal{R}(H)f$ . A **conserved quantity** is a function  $f$  on  $M$  such that  $X_H(f) = 0$ .

Observe that a function  $f$  on  $M$  is an  $H$ -dissipated quantity if and only if  $\{f, H\} = 0$ . In particular,  $H$  is an  $H$ -dissipated quantity.

**Lemma 3.** *If  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are dissipated quantities and  $f_2 \neq 0$ , then  $f_1/f_2$  is a conserved quantity.*

*Proof:* The result follows from the chain rule. Note that

$$X_H \left( \frac{f_1}{f_2} \right) = \frac{1}{f_2} X_H(f_1) - \frac{f_1}{f_2^2} X_H(f_2) = \frac{1}{f_2} (-\mathcal{R}(H)f_1) - \frac{f_1}{f_2^2} (-\mathcal{R}(H)f_2) = 0,$$

so  $f_1/f_2$  is a conserved quantity.  $\square$

### 3. Liouville–Arnold theorem for contact Hamiltonian systems

**Definition 5.** Let  $(M, \eta)$  be a contact manifold with Jacobi bracket  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ . Two functions  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  on  $M$  are said to be **in involution** if  $\{f_1, f_2\} = 0$ .

Given the functions  $f_\alpha: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\alpha = 0, \dots, n$ , define the function

$$F = (f_0, \dots, f_n): M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

Consider the level sets  $M_\Lambda = F^{-1}(\Lambda)$  and

$$M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+} = \{x \in M \mid \exists r \in (0, \infty): F(x) = r\Lambda\}.$$

**Theorem 4.** [*Liouville–Arnold theorem for contact Hamiltonian systems*] Let  $(M, \eta)$  be a  $(2n+1)$ -dimensional contact manifold. Suppose that  $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n$  are functions in involution such that  $dF$  has rank at least  $n$ . Assume that the Hamiltonian vector fields  $X_{f_\alpha}$  are complete. Given  $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$ , let  $\hat{B} \subseteq S^n$  be an open neighborhood of  $\langle \Lambda \rangle_+$  and let  $\pi: U \rightarrow M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+}$  be a tubular neighborhood of  $M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+}$  such that  $\hat{F}|_U: U \rightarrow \hat{B}$  is a submersion with diffeomorphic fibers. Then

- i) The submanifold  $M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+}$  is coisotropic, invariant by the Hamiltonian flow of  $f_\alpha$ , and diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{T}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1-k}$  for some  $k \leq n$ . In particular, if  $M_\Lambda$  is compact, then  $k = n$ .
- ii) There exists coordinates  $(y^0, \dots, y^n, \tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_n)$  on  $U$  such that the equations of motion are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}^\alpha &= \Omega^\alpha(\tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_n), \\ \dot{\tilde{A}}_i &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

- iii) There exists a conformally equivalent contact form  $\tilde{\eta} = \eta/A_0$  such that  $(y^i, \tilde{A}_i, y^0)$  are Darboux coordinates for  $(M, \tilde{\eta})$ .

The proof of this theorem will consist of the following steps:

- i) Symplectifying the contact manifold  $(M, \eta)$  and the functions  $f_\alpha$ , obtaining a an exact symplectic manifold  $(M^\Sigma, \theta^\Sigma)$  with  $n+1$  functions  $f_\alpha^\Sigma$  in involution with respect to the Poisson bracket.

- ii) Proving a Liouville–Arnold theorem for exact symplectic manifolds.
- iii) Obtaining sufficient conditions on the functions  $f_\alpha$  so that the Liouville–Arnold theorem can be applied to the symplectification.
- iv) Constructing action-angle coordinates on  $M$  from the ones on  $M^\Sigma$ .

### 3.1. Liouville–Arnold theorem for exact symplectic manifolds

An **exact symplectic manifold** is a pair  $(N, \theta)$ , where  $N$  is a manifold and  $\theta$  a one-form on  $N$  such that  $\omega = -d\theta$  is a symplectic form on  $N$ . The **Liouville vector field**  $\Delta$  of  $(N, \theta)$  is given by

$$\iota_\Delta \omega = -\theta.$$

A function  $f: N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called **homogeneous of degree 1** if  $\Delta f = f$ . It is called **homogeneous of degree 0** if  $\Delta f = 0$ .

Given a function  $f$  on  $(N, \theta)$ , its **(symplectic) Hamiltonian vector field**  $X_f$  is given by

$$\iota_{X_f} \omega = df.$$

If  $f$  is homogeneous of degree 1, then

$$\theta(X_f) = f.$$

Hereinafter, it will be assumed that the exact symplectic manifolds have no **singular points**, that is, those in which  $\Delta$  (or, equivalently,  $\theta$ ) vanish. Notice that those points form a closed subset which is contained on a submanifold of dimension at most half of the original manifold. In the case that  $M = T^*Q$  is a cotangent bundle with  $\theta$  the canonical 1-form and  $\Delta$  the canonical Liouville vector field, the zero section would be removed.

Two functions  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  on  $M$  are said to be **in involution** if  $\{f_1, f_2\} = 0$ , where  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$  is the Poisson bracket defined by the symplectic structure  $\omega$ . Given the functions  $f_\alpha: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$ , define the function

$$F = (f_1, \dots, f_n): M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

and the level set  $M_\Lambda = F^{-1}(\Lambda)$ .

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $M$  be an  $n$ -dimensional differentiable manifold and let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$  be linearly independent vector fields. If these vector fields are pairwise commutative, then  $M$  is diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{T}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$  for some  $k \leq n$ , where  $\mathbb{T}^k$  denotes the  $k$ -dimensional torus.*

See [2] for the proof.



**Theorem 6** (Liouville–Arnold theorem for exact symplectic manifolds). *Let  $(M, \theta)$  be an exact symplectic manifold. Suppose that the functions  $f_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha = 1, \dots, n$ , on  $M$  are functionally independent, in involution and homogeneous of degree 1. Let  $U$  be an open neighborhood of  $M_\Lambda$  such that:*

- i)  $f_\alpha$  have no critical points in  $U$ ,*
- ii) the Hamiltonian vector fields  $X_{f_\alpha}$  are complete,*
- iii) the submersion  $F: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a trivial bundle over a domain  $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ .*

*Then,  $U$  is diffeomorphic to  $W = \mathbb{R}^{n-m} \times \mathbb{T}^m \times V$ , provided with action-angle coordinates  $(y^\alpha, A_\alpha)$  such that*

$$\theta = A_\alpha dy^\alpha.$$

*In these coordinates, the equations of motion are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}^\alpha &= \Omega^\alpha(A_1, \dots, A_n), \\ \dot{A}_\alpha &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Theorem 6.* By Theorem 5,  $M_\Lambda$  is diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^{n-m} \times \mathbb{T}^m$ , which is given by the quotient  $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^m$  of the group  $\mathbb{R}^n$  generated by the Hamiltonian vector fields  $X_{f_\alpha}$ . Thus there are coordinates  $(y^\alpha) = (s^a, \phi^i)$  on  $M_\Lambda$ , where  $X_{f_\alpha}(s^\beta) = \delta_\alpha^\beta$  and  $\phi^i$  are linear functions of  $s^\alpha$ . On the other hand, the values of  $f_\alpha$  define coordinates  $(J_\alpha)$  on  $V$ .

Since  $\pi: U \rightarrow V$  is a trivial bundle, one can choose a trivialization by fixing a global section  $\chi: V \rightarrow U$ . For each  $\Lambda \in V$ , the fiber  $\pi^{-1}(\Lambda) = M_\Lambda$  can be provided with coordinates  $(y^\alpha)$  centered at the point  $\chi(\Lambda)$ . Then,  $(y^\alpha, J_\alpha)$  are bundle coordinates on  $W = \mathbb{R}^{n-m} \times \mathbb{T}^m \times V$ .

Since  $M_\Lambda$  is the level set of  $n$  independent functions in involution, it is a Lagrangian submanifold. Its tangent space is spanned by the vector fields  $\partial/\partial y^\alpha$ . Hence, the symplectic potential in the coordinates  $(y^\alpha, J_\alpha)$  is given by

$$\theta = A_\alpha(J) dy^\alpha + B^\alpha(y, J) dJ_\alpha,$$

where the functions  $A_\alpha$  depend only on the coordinates  $J_\beta$ . By construction, the Hamiltonian vector fields in these coordinates are

$$X_{f_\alpha} = \frac{\partial}{\partial s^\alpha} = M_\alpha^\beta(J) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\beta},$$

so

$$J_\alpha = \theta(X_{f_\alpha}) = M_\alpha^\beta A_\beta.$$

The symplectic form is given by

$$\omega = \left( \frac{\partial A_\alpha}{\partial J_\beta} - \frac{\partial B^\beta}{\partial y^\alpha} \right) dy^\alpha \wedge dJ_\beta + \frac{\partial B^\alpha}{\partial J_\beta} dJ_\alpha \wedge dJ_\beta,$$

so,

$$dJ_\gamma = \iota_{X_{f_\gamma}} \omega = \left( \frac{\partial A_\alpha}{\partial J_\beta} - \frac{\partial B^\beta}{\partial y^\alpha} \right) M_\gamma^\alpha dJ_\beta,$$

thus,

$$\left( \frac{\partial A_\alpha}{\partial J_\beta} - \frac{\partial B^\beta}{\partial y^\alpha} \right) M_\gamma^\alpha = \delta_\gamma^\beta.$$

Since  $y^\alpha$  are linear combinations of flows of  $X_{f_\alpha}$ , they are homogeneous of degree 0, i.e.,  $\Delta(y^\alpha) = 0$ . Then, the Liouville vector field is given by

$$\Delta = C_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial J_\alpha}.$$

Therefore,

$$A_\alpha = \theta \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\alpha} \right) = \omega \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\alpha}, \Delta \right) = \left( \frac{\partial A_\alpha}{\partial J_\beta} - \frac{\partial B^\beta}{\partial y^\alpha} \right) M_\gamma^\alpha C_\beta = C_\gamma,$$

so,

$$J_\gamma = M_\gamma^\alpha A_\alpha = C_\gamma,$$

and, hence,

$$\Delta = J_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial J_\alpha}.$$

Finally,

$$0 = \theta(\Delta) = B^\alpha J_\alpha,$$

so the symplectic potential is

$$\theta = A_\alpha dy^\alpha = M_\alpha^\beta J_\beta dy^\alpha.$$

If  $f_1 \equiv h$  is the Hamiltonian function, its integral curves are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}^\alpha &= M_1^\alpha := \Omega^\alpha, \\ \dot{A}_\alpha &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

### 3.2. Symplectization of contact manifolds

**Definition 6.** Given two exact symplectic manifold  $(M_1, \theta_2)$  and  $(M_2, \theta_2)$ , a **homogeneous symplectomorphism** is a diffeomorphism  $\Phi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  such that  $\Phi^* \theta_2 = \theta_1$ .

Given a symplectic manifold  $(M, \theta)$ , an **infinitesimal homogeneous symplectomorphism** is a vector field  $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$  on whose flow is a one-parameter group of homogenous symplectomorphisms or, equivalently,  $\mathcal{L}_X \theta = 0$ .

Clearly, every (infinitesimal) homogeneous symplectomorphism is an (infinitesimal) symplectomorphism.

**Definition 7.** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a contact distribution on a manifold  $M$ . Consider an exact symplectic manifold  $(M^\Sigma, \theta)$  and a fibre bundle  $\Sigma: (M^\Sigma, \theta) \rightarrow (M, \mathcal{H})$ . This fibre bundle is called a **symplectization** if

$$\Sigma^* \mathfrak{L} = \mathcal{H},$$

outside the singular points, where  $\mathfrak{L} = \ker \theta$  is called the **Liouville distribution**.

**Proposition 7.** *Let  $(M, \eta)$  be a contact manifold. A fibre bundle  $\Sigma: (M^\Sigma, \theta) \rightarrow (M, \eta)$  is a symplectization if, and only if, there exists a function  $\sigma: M^\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$\sigma \Sigma^* \eta = \theta.$$

The  $\sigma$  function is called the **conformal factor** of  $\Sigma$ .

*Proof.* By counting the dimensions of the distributions, it is enough for a symplectization  $\Sigma$  to satisfy  $\Sigma_* \mathfrak{L} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ . By taking duals, this condition is equivalent to

$$\Sigma^*(\mathcal{H}^\circ) \subseteq \mathfrak{L}^\circ,$$

but  $\mathcal{H}^\circ = \langle \eta \rangle$  and  $\mathfrak{L}^\circ = \langle \theta \rangle$ . Thus,

$$\sigma \Sigma^* \eta = \theta,$$

for some function  $\sigma$ . □

**Theorem 8** (Simplectization of conformal contactomorphisms). *A pair of symplectizations  $\Sigma_1: (M_1^\Sigma, \theta_1) \rightarrow (M_1, \mathcal{H}_1)$ ,  $\Sigma_2: (M_2^\Sigma, \theta_2) \rightarrow (M_2, \mathcal{H}_2)$  provides a bijection between conformal contactomorphisms  $F: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  and homogeneous symplectomorphisms  $F^\Sigma: M_1^\Sigma \rightarrow M_2^\Sigma$ . A pair  $(F, F^\Sigma)$  are related by the bijection if and only if the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M_1^\Sigma & \xrightarrow{F^\Sigma} & M_2^\Sigma \\ \downarrow \Sigma_1 & & \downarrow \Sigma_2 \\ M_1 & \xrightarrow{F} & M_2 \end{array} \quad (3)$$

We say that  $F^\Sigma$  is the **symplectization** of  $F$ .

Given a pair of contact forms  $\mathcal{H}_1 = \ker(\eta_1)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2 = \ker(\eta_2)$  with conformal factors  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ , the function  $F^\Sigma$  has the expression

$$F^\Sigma = \left( F, \frac{1}{\sigma_1 \Sigma_1^*(f)} \right) \quad (4)$$

on the trivialization induced by the contact forms. Here,  $f$  is the conformal factor of  $F$ .

Moreover, the symplectization is functorial, meaning that if  $F$  and  $G$  are conformal contactomorphism on the appropriate spaces,  $(G \circ F)^\Sigma = G^\Sigma \circ F^\Sigma$ .

*Proof.* Let  $F^\Sigma$  be a homogeneous symplectomorphism. Since  $(F^\Sigma)_* \Delta_1 = \Delta_2$ , and  $\ker(\Sigma_i)_* = \langle \Delta_i \rangle$ ,  $F^\Sigma$  projects onto a function  $F$  such that the diagram (3) commutes. Now, using the commutative diagram, one obtains

$$f_* \mathcal{H}_1 = (\Sigma_2)_* \circ (F^\Sigma)_* \circ ((\Sigma_1)_*)^{-1}(\mathcal{H}_1) = (\Sigma_2)_* \circ (F^\Sigma)_* \mathcal{L}_1 = (\Sigma_2)_* \mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{H}_2.$$

Thus,  $F$  is a conformal contactomorphism.

Now assume that  $F$  is a conformal contactomorphism. Consider the forms  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$ , generating locally both contact distributions. On the trivialization induced by the forms, let  $F^\Sigma = (F, \bar{F})$  be a function that satisfies (3). We shall now show that the unique function of this form that is a homogeneous symplectomorphism is the one in (4). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} (F^\Sigma)^* \theta_2 &= (F^\Sigma)^* (\sigma_2 (\Sigma_2)^* \eta_2) = (F^\Sigma)^* [\sigma_2 (F \circ \Sigma_1 \circ (F^\Sigma)^{-1})^* \eta_2] \\ &= (F^\Sigma)^* (\sigma_2) (\Sigma_1^* F^* \eta_2) = (F^\Sigma)^* (\sigma_2) (\Sigma_1^* (f \eta_1)) \\ &= (F^\Sigma)^* (\sigma_2) \Sigma_1^* (f) \sigma_1 \theta_1, \end{aligned}$$

so  $(F^\Sigma)^* \theta_2 = \theta_1$  if and only if

$$\bar{F} = (F^\Sigma)^* (\sigma_2) = \frac{1}{\Sigma_1^* (f) \sigma_1}.$$

This proves that the correspondence  $F \rightarrow F^\Sigma$  is well-defined and bijective.

In order to show the functorial character of the symplectization, consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \xrightarrow{(G \circ F)^\Sigma} & & \\ M_1^\Sigma & \xrightarrow{F^\Sigma} & M_2^\Sigma & \xrightarrow{G^\Sigma} & M_3^\Sigma \\ \downarrow \Sigma & & \downarrow \Sigma & & \downarrow \Sigma \\ M_1 & \xrightarrow{F} & M_2 & \xrightarrow{G} & M_3 \\ & & \xrightarrow{G \circ F} & & \end{array}$$

Since the symplectization is unique and  $G^\Sigma \circ F^\Sigma$  is a homogeneous symplectomorphism that projects onto  $G \circ F$ , it is its symplectization, i.e.,  $G^\Sigma \circ F^\Sigma = (G \circ F)^\Sigma$ .  $\square$

The fact that the symplectization preserves the composition of morphisms permits to simplectize the vector fields. Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$  be an infinitesimal conformal contactomorphism, and let  $\phi_t$  be its flow. Notice that

$$\phi_{t+r}^\Sigma = (\phi_r \circ \phi_t)^\Sigma = \phi_t^\Sigma \circ \phi_r^\Sigma,$$

so  $\phi_t^\Sigma$  is also a flow. Since it is the symplectization of contactomorphisms, it is a flow of homogeneous symplectomorphisms. Hence, its infinitesimal generator,  $X^\Sigma$  is an infinitesimal homogeneous symplectomorphism.

**Theorem 9** (Symplectization of vector fields). *A symplectization  $\Sigma : (M^\Sigma, \theta) \rightarrow (M, \mathcal{H})$  provides a bijection between infinitesimal conformal contactomorphisms  $X$  on  $M$  and infinitesimal homogeneous symplectomorphisms  $X^\Sigma$  on  $M^\Sigma$  such that  $X$  and  $X^\Sigma$  are related by the bijection if and only if*

$$\Sigma_* X^\Sigma = X.$$

*If the contact distribution is generated by a form  $\eta$ , this vector field can also be characterized as the one that projects onto  $X$  and satisfies*

$$X(\sigma) = -a_X \sigma,$$

where  $a_X$  is the conformal factor of  $X$ . We can also write it as

$$X^\Sigma = X^\sigma - a_X \Delta,$$

where  $X^\sigma$  is the vector field that projects onto  $X$  and satisfies  $X^\sigma(\sigma) = 0$ . In particular, for the Reeb vector field,

$$\mathcal{R}^\Sigma = \mathcal{R}^\sigma.$$

Moreover, for any pair of infinitesimal conformal contactomorphisms  $X, Y$ ,

$$[X, Y]^\Sigma = [X^\Sigma, Y^\Sigma]. \tag{5}$$

In order to proof this Theorem, as well as other subsequent results, the following Lemma is required (see [12, Lemma 6.19.2]).

**Lemma 10.** *Consider the category of all  $n$ -dimensional smooth manifolds with local diffeomorphisms between them. Let  $F$  be a vector bundle functor, that is, a functor which associates a vector bundle  $\pi_M: F(M) \rightarrow M$  to each  $n$ -dimensional manifold  $M$  and a vector bundle homomorphism to each local diffeomorphism  $f: M \rightarrow N$ . Given a vector field  $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$  with flow  $\phi_t$ , there is a vector field  $X^F \in \mathfrak{X}(F(M))$ , given by*

$$X^F = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} F(\phi_t).$$

Then,

$$[X, Y]^F = [X^F, Y^F],$$

for any  $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 9.* By Theorem 8, given the flow  $\phi$  of  $X$  there exist a unique flow  $\phi^\Sigma$  which projects onto  $\phi$ . Hence, there exists a unique infinitesimal homogeneous symplectomorphisms  $X^\Sigma$ , which is the infinitesimal generator of  $\phi^\Sigma$ . Reversing the argument one can see that this correspondence works on the opposite direction.

We now consider the contact form  $\eta$  with factor  $\sigma$  (i.e.,  $\sigma\Sigma^*\eta = \theta$ ) and let  $X$  be an infinitesimal conformal contactomorphism with conformal factor  $a_X$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}_X\eta = a_X\eta$ ). Then, since  $X^\Sigma$  is a homogeneous symplectomorphism, one has

$$0 = \mathcal{L}_{X^\Sigma}\theta = \mathcal{L}_{X^\Sigma}(\sigma\Sigma^*\eta) = (X^\Sigma(\sigma) + \sigma a_X)\eta,$$

which implies that  $X^\Sigma(\sigma) = -\sigma a_X$ .

Since  $\ker \Sigma = \langle \Delta \rangle$ , the vector field  $X$  is of the form  $X^\sigma + b\Delta$  for some function  $b$ . Thus,

$$-a_X\sigma = X^\Sigma(\sigma) = b\Delta(\sigma) = b\sigma,$$

since  $\sigma$  is homogeneous of degree 1. Hence,  $b = -a_X$ .

Finally, it is clear that the symplectization is a vector bundle functor. Hence, by Lemma 10, Eq. (5) holds.  $\square$

Since the contact Hamiltonian vector fields and the functions on  $(M, \eta)$  on one side, and the homogeneous Hamiltonian vector fields and the homogeneous functions on  $(M^\Sigma, \theta)$  on the other side, are in one-to-one correspondence, there is a bijection between both sets of functions.

**Theorem 11.** *Given a symplectization  $\Sigma: (M^\Sigma, \theta) \rightarrow (M, \eta)$  with conformal factor  $\sigma$ , there is a bijection between functions  $f$  on  $M$  and homogeneous functions of degree 1  $f^\Sigma$  on  $M^\Sigma$  such that*

$$\Sigma_* (X_{f^\Sigma}) = X_f.$$

*This bijection is given by*

$$f^\Sigma = \sigma\Sigma^* f.$$

*Moreover, one has*

$$\{f^\Sigma, g^\Sigma\}_\theta = \{f, g\}_\eta^\Sigma,$$

*where  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\theta$  and  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\eta$  denote the Poisson bracket of  $(M^\Sigma, \theta)$  and the Jacobi bracket of  $(M, \eta)$ , respectively. The vector fields  $X_{f^\Sigma}$  and  $X_f$  are the symplectic Hamiltonian vector field of  $f^\Sigma$  and the contact Hamiltonian vector field of  $f$ , respectively.*

*Proof.* Indeed,

$$f^\Sigma = \theta(X_{f^\Sigma}) = \theta((X_f)^\Sigma) = \sigma\Sigma^*(\eta)((X_f)^\Sigma) = \sigma\Sigma^*(\eta(X_f)) = \sigma\Sigma^* f.$$

The other claims follow from Proposition 2, the equivalent theorem for symplectic geometry (i.e.,  $X_{\{f^\Sigma, g^\Sigma\}_\theta} = -[X_{f^\Sigma}, X_{g^\Sigma}]$ ), and the fact that symplectization preserve the Lie brackets (Eq. (5)).  $\square$

**Corollary 12.** *Given a homogeneous function of degree 0  $g^\Sigma$  on  $M^\Sigma$  one can write  $g^\Sigma = \Sigma^*g$  for some function  $g$  on  $M$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f^\Sigma$  and  $g^\Sigma$  be homogeneous functions of degree 1 and 0, respectively. Then  $f^\Sigma g^\Sigma$  is a homogeneous function of degree 1, so

$$f^\Sigma g^\Sigma = \sigma \Sigma^* h, \quad f^\Sigma = \sigma \Sigma^* f,$$

for some functions  $f$  and  $h$  on  $M$ . Hence, if  $f^\Sigma$  is nonvanishing, one can write

$$g^\Sigma = \frac{\Sigma^* h}{\Sigma^* f} = \Sigma^* \left( \frac{h}{f} \right).$$

□

**Corollary 13.** *The symplectization  $\Sigma$  with conformal factor  $\sigma$  is a conformal Jacobi morphism, namely,*

$$\{\sigma \Sigma^* f, \sigma \Sigma^* g\}_\theta = \sigma \Sigma^* \{f, g\}_\eta.$$

**Corollary 14.** *A function  $f$  on  $M$  is an  $H$ -dissipated quantity if and only if  $f^\Sigma$  is a conserved quantity for  $H^\Sigma$ .*

Given a contact Hamiltonian system  $(M, \eta, H)$ , a **symplectization**  $\Sigma: (M^\Sigma, \theta, H^\Sigma) \rightarrow (M, \eta, H)$  of  $(M, \eta, H)$  with conformal factor  $\sigma$  is a symplectization  $\Sigma: (M^\Sigma, \theta) \rightarrow (M, \eta)$  of  $(M, \eta)$  with conformal factor  $\sigma$  together with a function  $H^\Sigma = \sigma \Sigma^* H$  on  $M^\Sigma$ .

### 3.3. Proof of the Liouville–Arnold theorem for contact Hamiltonian systems

Hereinafter, consider the symplectization  $\Sigma: M \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow M$ . Its conformal factor is  $\sigma = s$ , with  $s$  the global coordinate of  $(0, \infty)$ .

Let  $\tilde{M}_\Lambda = (F^\Sigma)^{-1}(\Lambda)$ . Let  $S: \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow S^n$  denote the projection on the sphere.

**Lemma 15.** *Given  $\langle \Lambda \rangle_+ \in S^n$ , let  $\hat{B} \subseteq S^n$  be an open neighborhood of  $\langle \Lambda \rangle_+$  and let  $\pi: U \rightarrow M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+}$  be a tubular neighborhood of  $M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+}$  such that  $\hat{F}|_U: U \rightarrow \hat{B}$  is a submersion with diffeomorphic fibers. Define  $B = S^{-1}(\hat{B})$  and  $\tilde{U} = \Sigma^{-1}(U)$  and  $\tilde{\pi} = \Sigma_{\tilde{M}_\Lambda}^{-1} \circ \pi \circ \Sigma$ . Then,  $\tilde{\pi}: \tilde{U} \rightarrow \tilde{M}_\Lambda$  is a tubular neighborhood of  $\tilde{M}_\Lambda$  such that  $F|_{\tilde{U}}: \tilde{U} \rightarrow B$  is a submersion with diffeomorphic fibers.*

*This construction is depicted in the following diagram.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \tilde{U} & \xrightarrow{\Sigma} & U \\
 \left( \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \tilde{\pi} \\ \tilde{M}_\Lambda \\ \downarrow \\ B \end{array} \right) & \xrightarrow{\Sigma|_{\tilde{M}_\Lambda}} & \left( \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \pi \\ M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+} \\ \downarrow \\ \hat{B} \end{array} \right) \\
 \left( \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \tilde{M}_\Lambda \\ \downarrow \\ B \end{array} \right) & & \left( \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+} \\ \downarrow \\ \hat{B} \end{array} \right) \\
 & \xrightarrow{S} & 
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\langle \Lambda \rangle_+ \in \hat{B} \subseteq S^n$  and  $U \subseteq \hat{F}^{-1}(\hat{B})$  an open set such that  $\hat{F}|_U$  is a submersion with diffeomorphic fibers. Define  $\tilde{U} = \Sigma^{-1}(U)$  and  $\hat{B} = S^{-1}(B)$ .

Let  $\Lambda' \in B$ . One now has to show that  $\Sigma: (F^\Sigma)^{-1}(\Lambda') \rightarrow \hat{F}^{-1}(\langle \Lambda' \rangle_+)$  is a diffeomorphism. Since  $\Sigma$  is a submersion, it suffices to check that it is a bijection. Let  $y$  be an element of  $\text{xt}U$  such that  $\hat{F}(y) = \langle \Lambda' \rangle_+$ . Since  $\Sigma^{-1}(y) = \{y\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ , there exists a point  $x \in \tilde{U}$  of the form  $(y, \sigma)$ , for  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , such that

$$F^\Sigma(x) = \sigma F(y) = \sigma r \Lambda',$$

for some  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Hence, there is a unique point  $x = (y, 1/r) \in \tilde{U}$  such that  $F^\Sigma(x) = \Lambda'$ .

The next step is to prove that  $\tilde{\pi}: \tilde{U} \rightarrow \tilde{M}_\Lambda$  is a fiber bundle. Since  $\tilde{\pi} = \Sigma_{|\tilde{M}_\Lambda}^{-1} \circ \pi \circ \Sigma$  is a composition of surjective maps, it is surjective. Given a local trivialization  $\Phi: \pi^{-1}(V) \rightarrow V \times \mathcal{F}$  of  $U$  over  $V$ , one has

$$\tilde{\pi}^{-1}(\tilde{V}) = \Sigma^{-1} \circ \pi^{-1} \circ \Sigma_{|\tilde{M}_\Lambda}(\tilde{V}) = \Sigma^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-1}(V \times \mathcal{F}) = \Phi^{-1}(V \times \mathcal{F}) \times \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where  $\tilde{V} = \Sigma_{|\tilde{M}_\Lambda}^{-1}(V)$ , so  $\tilde{\pi}^{-1}(\tilde{V})$  is diffeomorphic to  $\tilde{V} \times \mathcal{F} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . This defines a local trivialization of  $\tilde{U}$  over  $\tilde{V}$ .

The proof is completed by showing that  $F^\Sigma: \tilde{U} \rightarrow B$  is a submersion. From the diagram, one has  $TS \circ TF^\Sigma = TF \circ T\Sigma$ , where  $TS$ ,  $TF$  and  $T\Sigma$  are surjective. Thus,  $TF^\Sigma$  is surjective if and only if  $\ker TS \subseteq \text{Im } TF^\Sigma$ . Clearly,  $\ker TS = \{(x, x) \in T\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\}$ , but  $TF^\Sigma(\Delta) = (F^\Sigma, F^\Sigma)$ . Hence, any  $v \in \ker TS$  can be written as  $v = TF^\Sigma(a\Delta)$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

The main theorem of the paper can finally be proven.

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Let  $F^\Sigma = (f_0^\Sigma, \dots, f_n^\Sigma): M \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , where  $f_\alpha^\Sigma = \sigma \Sigma^* f_\alpha$ . Let  $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$ . Then,

$$(F^\Sigma)^{-1}(\Lambda) = \{(x, s) \in M \times (0, \infty) \mid \sigma F \circ \Sigma(x, s) = \Lambda\} = \left\{ (x, s) \in M \times (0, \infty) \mid F(x) = \frac{\Lambda}{s} \right\},$$

so

$$\Sigma((F^\Sigma)^{-1}(\Lambda)) = \left\{ x \in M \mid \exists s \in (0, \infty): F(x) = \frac{\Lambda}{s} \right\} = M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+}.$$

Since  $X_{f_\alpha^\Sigma}$  are tangent to  $(F^\Sigma)^{-1}(\Lambda)$ , the Hamiltonian vector fields  $X_{f_\alpha} = \Sigma_* X_{f_\alpha^\Sigma}$  are tangent to  $M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+}$ . Since  $df_\alpha^\Sigma = \sigma \Sigma^* df_\alpha + \Sigma^* f_\alpha d\sigma$  and  $\sigma$  is functionally independent of  $\Sigma^* f_\alpha$ , it suffices that  $df_\alpha$  have rank  $n$  for  $df_\alpha^\Sigma$  to have rank  $n+1$ . The fact that  $f_\alpha^\Sigma$  are functionally independent implies that  $X_{f_\alpha^\Sigma}$ , and then  $X_{f_\alpha}$ , are linearly independent. On the other hand, since  $f_\alpha$  are in involution, their Hamiltonian vector fields commute. Hence, by Theorem 5,  $M_{\langle \Lambda \rangle_+}$  is diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{T}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1-k}$  for some  $k \leq n+1$ .



The tangent space  $TM_{\langle\Lambda\rangle_+}$  is spanned by  $X_{f_\alpha}$ . Hence, its annihilator,  $TM_{\langle\Lambda\rangle_+}^\circ$ , is spanned by the one-forms  $\Omega_{\alpha\beta} = f_\alpha df_\beta - f_\beta df_\alpha$ . Thus,  $TM_{\langle\Lambda\rangle_+}^{\perp\Lambda}$  is spanned by the vector fields  $Y_{\alpha\beta} = \sharp_\Lambda(\Omega_{\alpha\beta})$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{\alpha\beta}(Y_{\gamma\delta}) &= f_\alpha f_\gamma \Lambda(df_\beta, df_\delta) - f_\beta f_\gamma \Lambda(df_\alpha, df_\delta) - f_\alpha f_\delta \Lambda(df_\beta, df_\gamma) + f_\beta f_\delta \Lambda(df_\alpha, df_\gamma) \\ &= f_\alpha f_\gamma \{f_\beta, f_\delta\} - f_\beta f_\gamma \{f_\alpha, f_\delta\} - f_\alpha f_\delta \{f_\beta, f_\gamma\} + f_\beta f_\delta \{f_\alpha, f_\gamma\} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

so  $TM_{\langle\Lambda\rangle_+}^{\perp\Lambda} \subseteq TM_{\langle\Lambda\rangle_+}$ , i.e.,  $M_{\langle\Lambda\rangle_+}$  is coisotropic.

Since  $f_\alpha$  are in involution with respect to the Jacobi bracket,  $f_\alpha^\Sigma$  are in involution with respect to the Jacobi bracket. The Hamiltonian vector fields  $X_{f_\alpha^\Sigma}$  are complete since  $X_{f_\alpha}$  are complete. By Lemma 15,  $F_{|\tilde{U}}^\Sigma: \tilde{U} \rightarrow B$  is a submersion with diffeomorphic fibers. Finally, since  $df_\alpha^\Sigma = \sigma\Sigma^*df_\alpha + \Sigma^*f_\alpha d\sigma$  and  $\sigma$  is functionally independent of  $\Sigma^*f_\alpha$ , it suffices that  $df_\alpha$  have rank  $n$  for  $df_\alpha^\Sigma$  to have rank  $n + 1$ .

By the preceding paragraph, all the hypotheses of Theorem 6 hold for the functions  $f_\alpha^\Sigma$  on the exact symplectic manifold  $(M^\Sigma, \theta^\Sigma)$ . Hence, there are coordinates  $(y_\Sigma^\alpha, A_\Sigma^\alpha)$  such that

$$\theta^\Sigma = A_\Sigma^\alpha dy_\Sigma^\alpha, \quad X_{f_\alpha^\Sigma} = M_\alpha^\beta \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\Sigma^\beta}.$$

By construction,  $A_\Sigma^\alpha$  are homogeneous functions of degree 1, so there exists functions  $A_\alpha$  on  $M$  such that  $A_\Sigma^\alpha = \sigma\Sigma^*A_\alpha$ . Similarly, since  $y_\Sigma^\alpha$  are homogeneous of degree 0, there exists functions  $y^\alpha$  on  $M$  such that  $y_\Sigma^\alpha = \Sigma^*y^\alpha$ . As a matter of fact,  $y^\alpha = M_\beta^\alpha s^\beta$ , where  $X_{f_\alpha}(s^\beta) = \delta_\alpha^\beta$ . Since  $\sigma\Sigma^*\eta = \theta^\Sigma$ , the contact form is given by

$$\eta = A_\alpha dy^\alpha,$$

where  $y_\Sigma^\alpha = \Sigma^*y^\alpha$  and

$$f_\alpha = M_\alpha^\beta A_\beta.$$

The functions  $A_\alpha$  are dissipated quantities since they are linear combinations of dissipated quantities.

If  $\Lambda \neq 0$ , there is at least one nonvanishing  $f_\alpha$ . Hence, there is at least one nonvanishing  $A_\alpha$ . By relabeling the  $A_\alpha$  if necessary, without loss of generality one can assume that  $A_0 \neq 0$ . Defining  $\tilde{A}_i = -A_i/A_0$  and

$$\tilde{\eta} = \frac{1}{A_0}\eta = dy^0 - \tilde{A}_i dy^i,$$

it is clear that  $(y^i, \tilde{A}_i, y^0)$  are Darboux coordinates for the contact manifold  $(M, \tilde{\eta})$ .

Since  $\tilde{A}_i$  are conserved quantities and  $y^\alpha$  are linear combinations of flows of Hamiltonian vector fields, the equations of motion are

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{y}^\alpha &= \Omega^\alpha, \\ \dot{\tilde{A}}_i &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\Omega^\alpha = M_\beta^\alpha$  if  $f_\beta \equiv h$  is the Hamiltonian function.

□

### Acknowledgements

We are thankful to Robert Cardona and Guillermo Gallego for some fruitful discussions along the writing process of the paper. The authors acknowledge financial support from Grant PID2019-106715GB-C21 funded by MCIN/AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033. Manuel de León, Manuel Lainz and Asier López-Gordón also received support from the Grant CEX2019-000904-S funded by MCIN/AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033. Asier López-Gordón would also like to thank MCIN for the predoctoral contract PRE2020-093814

### References

- [1] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, and T. Ratiu. *Manifolds, Tensor Analysis, and Applications*. Red. by J. E. Marsden, L. Sirovich, and F. John. Vol. 75. Applied Mathematical Sciences. New York, NY: Springer New York, 1988. ISBN: 978-1-4612-6990-8 978-1-4612-1029-0. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4612-1029-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1029-0).
- [2] V. I. Arnold. *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1978. ISBN: 978-1-4757-1693-1. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4757-1693-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-1693-1).
- [3] M. Audin. *Torus Actions on Symplectic Manifolds*. Basel: Birkhäuser Basel, 2004. ISBN: 978-3-0348-9637-5 978-3-0348-7960-6. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-0348-7960-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-7960-6).
- [4] A. Banyaga and P. Molino. “Géométrie Des Formes de Contact Complètement Intégrables de Type Toriques”. In: *Séminaire Gaston Darboux de Géométrie et Topologie Différentielle, 1991–1992 (Montpellier)*. Univ. Montpellier II, Montpellier, 1993, pp. 1–25.
- [5] A. Banyaga. “The Geometry Surrounding the Arnold-Liouville Theorem”. In: *Advances in Geometry*. Vol. 172. Progr. Math. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1999, pp. 53–69.
- [6] A. Bravetti. “Contact Geometry and Thermodynamics”. In: *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.* 16 (supp01 Feb. 2019), p. 1940003. ISSN: 0219-8878, 1793-6977. DOI: [10.1142/S0219887819400036](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219887819400036).
- [7] F. M. Ciaglia, H. Cruz, and G. Marmo. “Contact Manifolds and Dissipation, Classical and Quantum”. In: *Annals of Physics* 398 (Nov. 1, 2018), pp. 159–179. ISSN: 0003-4916. DOI: [10.1016/j.aop.2018.09.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2018.09.012).

- [8] M. de León and M. Lainz. “A Review on Contact Hamiltonian and Lagrangian Systems”. In: *Revista de la Real Academia de Ciencias Canaria XXXI* (2019), pp. 1–46. arXiv: [2011.05579](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.05579).
- [9] E. Fiorani, G. Giachetta, and G. Sardanashvily. “The Liouville–Arnold–Nekhoroshev Theorem for Non-Compact Invariant Manifolds”. In: *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 36.7 (Feb. 2003), p. L101. ISSN: 0305-4470. DOI: [10.1088/0305-4470/36/7/102](https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/36/7/102).
- [10] H. Geiges. *An Introduction to Contact Topology*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-521-86585-2. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511611438](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511611438).
- [11] B. Khesin and S. Tabachnikov. “Contact Complete Integrability”. In: *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.* 15.4-5 (Oct. 2010), pp. 504–520. ISSN: 1560-3547, 1468-4845. DOI: [10.1134/S1560354710040076](https://doi.org/10.1134/S1560354710040076).
- [12] I. Kolář, J. Slovák, and P. W. Michor. *Natural Operations in Differential Geometry*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 1993. ISBN: 978-3-642-08149-1 978-3-662-02950-3. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-662-02950-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-02950-3).
- [13] E. Lerman. “Contact Toric Manifolds”. In: *J. Symplectic Geom.* 1.4 (2003), pp. 785–828. ISSN: 1527-5256.
- [14] P. Libermann. “Legendre Foliations on Contact Manifolds”. In: *Differential Geom. Appl.* 1.1 (1991), pp. 57–76. ISSN: 0926-2245. DOI: [10.1016/0926-2245\(91\)90022-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-2245(91)90022-2).
- [15] E. Miranda and A. Planas. *Action-Angle Coordinates and KAM Theory for Singular Symplectic Manifolds*. Dec. 31, 2022. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2301.00266](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.00266). arXiv: [2301.00266](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.00266) [math].
- [16] M.-Y. Pang. “The Structure of Legendre Foliations”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 320.2 (1990), pp. 417–455. ISSN: 0002-9947, 1088-6850. DOI: [10.1090/S0002-9947-1990-1016808-6](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-1990-1016808-6).
- [17] N. T. Zung. *Action-Angle Variables on Dirac Manifolds*. Apr. 17, 2012. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1204.3865](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1204.3865). arXiv: [1204.3865](https://arxiv.org/abs/1204.3865) [math-ph].