

Regular contact manifolds: a generalization of the Boothby-Wang theorem

Katarzyna Grabowska*

Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw

Janusz Grabowski†

Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences

Abstract

A *regular contact manifold* is a manifold M equipped with a globally defined contact form η such that the topological space M/\mathcal{R} of orbits (trajectories) of the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} of η carries a smooth manifold structure, so the canonical projection $p : M \rightarrow M/\mathcal{R}$ is a smooth fibration. We show that, under the additional assumption that \mathcal{R} is a complete vector field, this fibration is actually either an S^1 - or an \mathbb{R} -principal bundle. Moreover, there exists a unique symplectic form ω on M/\mathcal{R} such that $p^*(\omega) = d\eta$ which is ρ -integral in the S^1 -bundle case, where ρ is the minimal period of the S^1 -action, so the symplectic manifold $(M/\mathcal{R}, \omega)$ admits a prequantization. We do not assume that M is compact.

Keywords: *contact form; Reeb vector field; smooth fibration; fiber bundle; principal bundle; symplectic form; integrality condition; prequantization.*

MSC 2020: 53D10; 53D35; 37C10; 37C86.

1 Introduction

The main object of our studies in this paper is the structure of regular contact manifolds. More precisely, let η be a contact form on a manifold M , which will be assumed to be connected throughout this paper. We say that the contact manifold (M, η) is *regular* if the foliation $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{R}}$ of M by orbits of the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} of η is simple, i.e., the space $M/\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{R}}$ of orbits has a manifold structure such that the canonical projection $p : M \rightarrow M/\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a smooth fibration. Here, by orbits of \mathcal{R} (which is a nonvanishing vector field on M) we understand the 1-dimensional submanifolds of M , being the images of trajectories of \mathcal{R} . Since any orbit does not depend on the parametrization, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{F}_{f\mathcal{R}}$ for a nonvanishing function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

The structure of compact regular contact manifolds (M, η) has been studied in [3]. Theorem 1 there says that on such a manifold there exists an equivalent contact form η' whose Reeb vector field \mathcal{R}' is periodic, thus inducing a principal action of the group $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ on M . However, the proof in [3] is incomplete in one important respect. It has been already noticed and corrected in [7, 15]. This proof starts with the observation that, as orbits are closed submanifolds in the regular case, for compact M they all are circles, so \mathcal{R} is periodic on each orbit, however, *a priori* with different periods. It has been proved that one can find

*email: konieczn@fuw.edu.pl

†email: jgrab@impan.pl

a nonvanishing smooth function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that all trajectories of $\mathcal{R}' = f\mathcal{R}$ have a common minimal period, so \mathcal{R}' induces a free S^1 -action on M . Further, the authors define this equivalent contact form to be $\eta' = \eta/f$, and claim that \mathcal{R}' is the Reeb vector field of η' , which is clearly false, except when f is a constant.

In this paper we show, in particular, that [3, Theorem 1] is actually true and in a stronger version: the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} itself is automatically the fundamental vector field of a free S^1 -action, so we do not need to seek for a rescaling of \mathcal{R} . What is more, our main result generalizes the Boothby-Wang theorem, as it includes arbitrary (not only compact) regular contact manifolds for which the Reeb vector field is complete (this is automatically satisfied for compact M). It is clear that *a priori* \mathcal{R} may have both, compact orbits as well as non-compact ones. We show, however, that for complete \mathcal{R} we have only two possibilities: either \mathcal{R} has no periodic orbits, or all orbits share the same minimal period.

Theorem 1.1. *If the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} on a regular contact manifold (M, η) is complete, then it induces on M either an \mathbb{R} - or an S^1 -principal action, so $p : M \rightarrow M/\mathcal{R}$ is a principal bundle. Moreover, there exists a symplectic form ω on M/\mathcal{R} such that $p^*(\omega) = d\eta$ and, in the first case, ω is exact, while in the second case the symplectic form ω is ρ -integral, where ρ is the minimal period of the S^1 -action.*

It is easy to see that, in the case of an S^1 -action, (M, η) induces a prequantization of the symplectic manifold $(M/\mathcal{R}, \omega)$. Note also that if \mathcal{R} induces a non-free S^1 -action, then the quotient manifold M/S^1 is generally only an orbifold [14].

2 All equivalent contact forms in one picture

Generally, a *contact structure* on a manifold M of dimension $(2n + 1)$ is a *maximally nonintegrable* distribution $C \subset TM$, being a *field of hyperplanes* on M , i.e., a distribution with rank $2n$. Such a distribution is, at least locally, the kernel of a nonvanishing 1-form η on M , i.e., $C = \ker(\eta)$. Of course, the 1-form η is determined only up to conformal equivalence. Such a (local) 1-form we call a *contact form*. It is characterized by the condition that $\eta \wedge (d\eta)^n$ is nonvanishing, i.e., is a volume form. In this paper we will consider only *trivial (co-oriented)* contact structures, i.e., manifolds equipped with a globally defined contact form. The local picture for contact forms is fully described by the following.

Theorem 2.1 (Contact Darboux Theorem). *Let η be 1-form on a manifold M of dimension $(2n + 1)$. Then η is a contact form if and only if around every point of M there are local coordinates (z, p_i, q^i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$, in which η reads*

$$\eta = dz - p_i dq^i. \quad (1)$$

It is now easy to see that, for any nonvanishing function f on M , a 1-form η is a contact form if and only if $f\eta$ is a contact 1-form. The contact form $f\eta$ we call *equivalent* with η . It defines the same contact distribution $C = \ker(\eta)$.

Any contact form η on M determines uniquely a nonvanishing vector field \mathcal{R} on M , called the *Reeb vector field*, which is characterized by the equations

$$i_{\mathcal{R}}\eta = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad i_{\mathcal{R}}d\eta = 0.$$

The Reeb vector field for the contact form (1) is $\mathcal{R} = \partial_z$.

Now, for a cooriented contact manifold (M, η) let us consider its symplectization understood as the manifold $\widetilde{M} = M \times \mathbb{R}_+$ equipped with the 1-homogeneous symplectic form

$$\widetilde{\omega}(x, s) = d(s \cdot \eta)(x, s) = ds \wedge \eta(x) + s \cdot d\eta(x).$$

Here, \mathbb{R}_+ is the multiplicative group of positive integers and the homogeneity of degree $a \in \mathbb{R}$ of a differential form β on \widetilde{M} means that

$$h_s^*(\beta) = s^a \cdot \beta, \quad (2)$$

where $h_s(x, s_0) = (x, ss_0)$ is the canonical principal action of \mathbb{R}_+ on \widetilde{M} . In particular, $M = \widetilde{M}/\mathbb{R}_+$, so

$$\tau : \widetilde{M} \ni (x, s) \mapsto x \in M = \widetilde{M}/\mathbb{R}_+$$

is the trivial \mathbb{R}_+ -principal bundle. The generator of the \mathbb{R}_+ -action is the vector field $\nabla = s \partial_s$ which we will call the *Euler vector field*. Note that (2) is equivalent to $\mathcal{L}_\nabla(\beta) = a \cdot \beta$. The 1-form

$$\theta(x, s) = (i_\nabla \widetilde{\omega}) = s \cdot \eta,$$

which is the only 1-homogeneous semibasic potential for $\widetilde{\omega}$, $d\theta = \widetilde{\omega}$, we call the *Liouville form*.

The homogeneity of $\widetilde{\omega}$ implies that the Hamiltonian vector field X_H of any 1-homogeneous Hamiltonian H on \widetilde{M} is \mathbb{R}_+ -invariant, and therefore projects to a vector field X_H^c on M . Since 1-homogeneous Hamiltonians are of the form $H(x, s) = s \cdot G(x)$, we will denote X_{sG}^c simply by X_G . In contact mechanics, X_G is called the *contact Hamiltonian vector field* with the Hamiltonian G . It is easy to show (cf. [8]) that X_G is uniquely determined by the equations

$$i_{X_G} \eta = G, \quad i_{X_G} d\eta = \mathcal{R}(G)\eta - dG,$$

where \mathcal{R} is the Reeb vector field of η . It is indeed a contact vector field, since

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_G} \eta = d(i_{X_G} \eta) + i_{X_G} d\eta = dG + \mathcal{R}(G)\eta - dG = \mathcal{R}(G)\eta.$$

Any function $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defines a section

$$\sigma_F : M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}, \quad \sigma_F(x) = (x, F(x)) \in \widetilde{M},$$

of the principal bundle $\tau : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ whose image is $M_F = \{(x, F(x)) : x \in M\}$. In other words, M_F is defined by the equation $H(x, s) = 1$, where H is the 1-homogeneous Hamiltonian $H(x, s) = s/F(x)$ on \widetilde{M} . It is obvious that σ_F is a diffeomorphism of M onto M_F . The canonical contact form on M_F is the restriction η_F of the Liouville form θ to M_F , and $\sigma_F^*(\eta_F) = F\eta$ is a contact form equivalent to η . Conversely, any 1-form equivalent to η can be obtained in this way for some F . In other words, all contact forms on M which are equivalent to η are in this one-to-one correspondence with sections of the principal bundle $\tau : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$. Since M_F is of codimension 1 in \widetilde{M} , it is a coisotropic submanifold whose characteristic foliation consists of orbits of the Hamiltonian vector field X_H of the 1-homogeneous Hamiltonian $H(x, s) = s/F(x)$. The restriction of the symplectic form $\widetilde{\omega} = d(s\eta)$ to M_F is $d(F\eta)$, so the projection X of X_H to M satisfies $i_X d(F\eta) = 0$. Moreover, because H is 1-homogeneous, we have $\mathcal{L}_\nabla(dH) = dH$, so

$$d(i_{X_H} \theta) = d(i_{X_H} i_\nabla \widetilde{\omega}) = -d(i_\nabla i_{X_H} \widetilde{\omega}) = d(i_\nabla dH) = \mathcal{L}_\nabla(dH) = dH.$$

Since both, $i_{X_H} \theta$ and dH are 1-homogeneous, it follows that $H = i_{X_H} \theta$. Hence, $i_{X_H} \theta = 1$ on M_F , thus $i_X(F\eta) = 1$. Summing up, we get that X is the Reeb vector field of the contact form $F\eta$. Note that the submanifolds M_F of \widetilde{M} are submanifolds of *contact type* in the terminology of Weinstein [21].

Proposition 2.2. *For $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R}_F of the contact form $\eta_F = F\eta$ on M is the Hamiltonian contact vector field associated with the contact Hamiltonian $1/F$. In other words, $\mathcal{R}_F = \tau_*(X_H)$, where X_H is the Hamiltonian vector field on \widetilde{M} associated with the 1-homogeneous Hamiltonian $H(x, s) = s/F(x)$.*

Remark 2.3. The picture presented above is a particular case of a *symplectic \mathbb{R}^\times -principal bundle* in the terminology of [11] (here, $\mathbb{R}^\times = \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ is the multiplicative group of nonzero reals). Such bundles are defined as \mathbb{R}^\times -principal bundles $\tau : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ equipped additionally with a 1-homogeneous symplectic form $\widetilde{\omega}$. The importance of these geometric objects comes from the fact that they canonically induce on M a contact structure, not necessarily cooriented. Cooriented contact structures correspond to trivial \mathbb{R}^\times -principal bundles $\tau : \widetilde{M} = M \times \mathbb{R}^\times \rightarrow M$ which, for connected M , consists of two connected components, and in this case it is enough to consider only the component $M \times \mathbb{R}_+$. If the principal bundle \widetilde{M} is not trivializable, it is connected for connected M . The necessity of using the non-connected group \mathbb{R}^\times instead of just \mathbb{R}_+ comes from the requirement of including non-cooriented contact structures into the picture. Closer studies of such structures, together with the corresponding contact Hamiltonian systems, one can find in a series of papers [5, 8, 9, 11].

The mistake in [3] was the false claim that, for a nonvanishing function f on M , the vector field $f\mathcal{R}$ is the Reeb vector field for the contact form η/f . Indeed, if $\mathcal{R}' = f\mathcal{R}$ is the Reeb vector field of $\eta' = F\eta$, then necessarily $F = 1/f$. But

$$d\eta' = d(\eta/f) = d\eta/f - (df/f^2) \wedge \eta,$$

and therefore

$$i_{\mathcal{R}'}d\eta' = df/f - (\mathcal{R}(f)/f)\eta.$$

This is constantly 0 if and only if $\mathcal{R}(f)\eta = df$. Hence, for any vector field X taking values in the contact distribution $C = \ker(\eta)$, we get

$$0 = i_X(\mathcal{R}(f)\eta) = X(f).$$

This implies that also $[X, Y](f) = 0$ for all $X, Y \in C = \ker(\eta)$. But C is maximally non-integrable, so such Lie brackets span the whole tangent bundle TM , thus f is a constant. Actually, the phase portraits of the Reeb vector fields of equivalent contact forms can be drastically different.

Example 2.4. The unit sphere $M = S^3$ in \mathbb{R}^4 with coordinates (q^1, p_1, q^2, p_2) carries a canonical contact form η being the restriction of the Liouville 1-form

$$\theta = q^1 dp_1 - p_1 dq^1 + q^2 dp_2 - p_2 dq^2$$

to the sphere. Note that \mathbb{R}^4 is canonically a symplectic manifold with the symplectic form

$$\omega = 2(dq^1 \wedge dp_1 + dq^2 \wedge dp_2).$$

We can also view M as the unit sphere in \mathbb{C}^2 , where we identify $z_k = q^k + ip_k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $(q^k, p_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $k = 1, 2$. The Hamiltonian vector field

$$X_H = (q^1 \partial_{p_1} - p_1 \partial_{q^1}) + (q^2 \partial_{p_2} - p_2 \partial_{q^2})$$

with the Hamiltonian

$$H(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{4}(|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2)$$

is tangent to S^3 and represents there the Reeb vector field of η .

For $a, b \geq 0$ consider a new Hamiltonian

$$H_{a,b}(z_1, z_2) = \frac{a}{4}|z_1|^2 + \frac{b}{4}|z_2|^2.$$

Denote with $F_{a,b}$ the restriction of $H_{a,b}$ to $S^3 : |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 = 1$. Of course, $H_{1,1}$ is our old Hamiltonian H . The projection along the rays of \mathbb{R}^4 onto S^3 maps the Hamiltonian vector field $X_{H_{a,b}}$ onto the Reeb vector field $\mathcal{R}_{a,b}$ of the contact form $\eta/F_{a,b}$ on S^3 . Consequently, trajectories of $X_{H_{a,b}}$ project onto trajectories of $\mathcal{R}_{a,b}$. It is easy to see that

$$X_{H_{a,b}} = a(q^1 \partial_{p_1} - p_1 \partial_{q^1}) + b(q^2 \partial_{p_2} - p_2 \partial_{q^2}),$$

so the trajectories of $X_{H_{a,b}}$ are of the form

$$\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto (e^{ait} z_1, e^{bit} z_2),$$

They project onto the trajectories

$$\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2}} (e^{ait} z_1, e^{bit} z_2)$$

of $\mathcal{R}_{a,b}$. For every $0 < r < 1$, the trajectory starting from a point (z_1, z_2) of the 2-dimensional torus

$$T_r = \{(z_1, z_2) \in S^3 : |z_1|^2 = r\}$$

lays entirely on this torus and is closed if and only if $a/b \in \mathbb{Q}$. Of course, this is the case of the original Reeb vector field $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{1,1}$, but it is clear now that even an arbitrary close to 1 factor $1/F$ in η/F will result in a radical qualitative change of the phase portrait of the corresponding Reeb vector field. We indicated only not closed orbits of $\mathcal{R}_{a,b}$ for $a/b \notin \mathbb{Q}$, but according to the Weinstein Conjecture (which is true for S^3 [13]) there must be a closed orbit of a point of S^3 . Actually, there are two such orbits,

$$\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto (0, e^{bit}) \text{ and } \mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto (e^{2ait}, 0)$$

with the minimal periods $2\pi/b$ and $2\pi/a$, respectively.

3 Contactizations

It is obvious that any co-oriented contact manifold (M, η) of dimension $(2n+1)$ is automatically presymplectic with the exact presymplectic form $d\eta$ of rank $2n$. In this case the involutive distribution $\ker(d\eta)$ is generated by the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} . In the following we will use the terminology of [3].

Definition 3.1. A cooriented contact manifold (M, η) we call *regular* if the foliation $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{R}}$ of M by \mathcal{R} -orbits is simple, i.e., the space $M/\mathcal{R} = M/\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{R}}$ of orbits of \mathcal{R} carries a smooth manifold structure such that the canonical projection $p : M \rightarrow M/\mathcal{R}$ is a surjective submersion. In other words, p is a smooth fibration. We call (M, η) *complete* if the Reeb vector field is complete.

Remark 3.2. Of course, any regular compact contact manifold is complete. The dynamics of the Reeb vector fields on compact contact manifolds is a subject of intensive studies, partly because its relation to Hamiltonian dynamics on a fixed energy hypersurface. For a very general geometric approach to contact Hamiltonian mechanics as a part of the classical symplectic Hamiltonian mechanics we refer to [8]. A long-standing open problem concerning the Reeb dynamics is the so-called *Weinstein Conjecture*, stating that for contact forms on compact manifolds the corresponding Reeb vector fields carry at least one periodic orbit. Note that in [21] it was supposed additionally that the manifold is simply connected, because the author suspected the existence of a counterexample for a torus. The counterexample appeared to be false and this assumption has been finally dropped. This conjecture has been proved for some particular cases, especially for 3-dimensional manifolds [20]. The origins and the history of the Weinstein Conjecture are nicely described in [19].

The contact manifolds considered by Weinstein were hypersurfaces M in a symplectic manifold (P, Ω) , equipped with a contact form η such that $\Omega|_M = d\eta$, where $\Omega|_M$ is the restriction of Ω to M . Weinstein called them *hypersurfaces of contact type*. Since any hypersurface in a symplectic manifold is automatically coisotropic, the corresponding Reeb vector field on a hypersurface of contact type spans its characteristic distribution. It is proved in [21] that any hypersurface of contact type can be obtained by a *symplectic-to-contact reduction*.

Proposition 3.3 (symplectic-to-contact reduction). *Let (P, Ω) be a symplectic manifold and M be a hypersurface in P . If ∇ is a vector field, defined in a neighbourhood of M , such that ∇ is transversal to M and $\mathcal{L}_\nabla\Omega = \Omega$, then the restriction η to M of the 1-form $\tilde{\eta} = i_\nabla\Omega$ is a contact form on M , and $d\eta = \Omega|_M$.*

Proof. The 2-form $d\eta$ is the restriction to M of

$$d\tilde{\eta} = d i_\nabla\Omega = \mathcal{L}_\nabla\Omega = \Omega.$$

If $X \in (\ker(d\eta) \cap \ker(\eta))$, then $\Omega(\nabla, X) = 0$ and $\Omega(TM, X) = 0$, thus $X = 0$. \square

Here, \mathcal{L} clearly denotes the Lie derivative. There are various generalizations of the above proposition, see for instance [10]. We have also a canonical reduction going in the reverse direction.

Proposition 3.4 (contact-to-symplectic reduction). *Let (M, η) be a regular contact manifold, and let $p : M \rightarrow N = M/\mathcal{R}$ be the corresponding fibration. Then there is a unique symplectic form ω on N such that $p^*(\omega) = d\eta$,*

Proof. The kernel of the closed 2-form $d\eta$ on M is spanned by \mathcal{R} , so one can apply the standard symplectic reduction of presymplectic manifolds. \square

Definition 3.5. The procedure of passing from (M, η) to (N, ω) we call the *contact-to-symplectic reduction*, and the contact manifold (M, η) – a *contactification* of the symplectic manifold (N, ω) .

The following example is well known in the literature (see e.g. [1, Appendix 4]).

Example 3.6. Let (N, ω) be an exact symplectic manifold, $\omega = d\theta$. Then

$$\eta(x, t) = \theta(x) + dt$$

is a contact form on $M = N \times \mathbb{R}$ and (M, η) is a contactification of (N, ω) .

Finding contactifications of compact symplectic manifolds (which are never exact) is generally a more sophisticated task. Note also that contactifications are never unique, since any open submanifold $\mathcal{U} \subset M$ of a contactification (M, η) of (N, ω) which projects onto the whole N is also a contactification of (N, ω) with the contact form $\eta|_{\mathcal{U}}$. Particularly interesting are complete contactifications, e.g. compact contactifications of compact symplectic manifolds which cannot be obtained *via* the above procedure.

4 Regular contact manifolds with compact orbits

Let us consider now a regular contact connected manifold (M, η) , so that $p : M \rightarrow N = M/\mathcal{R}$ is a smooth fibration. The fibers of this fibration consist of orbits of the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} (being closed submanifolds in the regular case) which are diffeomorphic either to circles (compact \mathcal{R} -orbits) or to \mathbb{R} . On every compact orbit \mathcal{O}_x , the flow generated by \mathcal{R} is periodic

with the minimal period $\rho(x)$. Of course, if M is compact, then all orbits, being closed, are circles automatically.

Suppose for a moment that all \mathcal{R} orbits are circles. In this situation, Ehresmann's fibration theorem [6], stating that smooth fibrations $p : M \rightarrow N$ are locally trivial if only p is a proper map (e.g., M is compact), implies that our fibration by compact \mathcal{R} -orbits is actually a locally trivial fibration. Indeed, this follows from the fact that every fiber has a tubular neighbourhood which is relatively compact.

We would like to know whether the flow of \mathcal{R} is periodic as a whole. To get the global periodicity, in [3] the authors proved that the function $\rho(x)$ is smooth, and changed the contact form by multiplying η by $1/\rho$. However, such an approach is a mistake, since the Reeb vector field of $\rho \cdot \eta$ is generally not \mathcal{R}/ρ as they claimed. Actually, the contact form $\rho \cdot \eta$ may even be no longer regular, as shown in Example 2.4. But the situation is in fact much better, and we do not need this passage to an equivalent contact form, as shown in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that, for a connected regular contact manifold (M, η) , the fibration $p : M \rightarrow N = M/\mathcal{R}$ is actually a fiber bundle over N with the typical fiber S^1 . Then the flow generated by \mathcal{R} on M is periodic with the minimal period ρ which is common for all orbits, and defines a principal action of the group S^1 , which turns $p : M \rightarrow N$ into an S^1 -principal bundle with the principal connection η .*

Moreover, there exists a uniquely determined symplectic form ω on N such that $p^(\omega) = d\eta$, so ω represents the curvature of the connection η . The cohomology class of this symplectic form is \mathbb{Z}_ρ -integral, where $\mathbb{Z}_\rho = \rho \cdot \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $[\omega/\rho] \in H^2(N, \mathbb{Z})$.*

Proof. Let us consider a local trivialization $M_U = p^{-1}(U) \simeq U \times S^1$ of the fiber bundle $p : M \rightarrow N$, where U is a connected open subset in N with coordinates $(x^a) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. It will be convenient to consider the standard covering of the circle

$$\mathbb{R} \ni \tau \mapsto [\tau] \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$$

and the corresponding covering

$$\zeta : \tilde{U} = U \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow U \times S^1.$$

It allows us to use coordinates (x^a, τ) on \tilde{U} and to consider functions on $U \times S^1$ as functions on \tilde{U} which are 1-periodic with respect to τ . The pull-back of η to \tilde{U} is a contact form $\eta_{\tilde{U}}$ with the pull-back $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{U}}$ of \mathcal{R} as the Reeb vector field.

Let us write $\eta_{\tilde{U}}$ in coordinates as

$$\eta_{\tilde{U}} = g(x, \tau) d\tau + f_a(x, \tau) dx^a,$$

where $g(x, \tau)$ and $f_a(x, \tau)$ are 1-periodic in τ . Since $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{U}}$ is tangent to the orbits, $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{U}} = \partial_\tau/g$ and

$$\int_0^1 g(x, \tau) d\tau = \rho(x) \tag{3}$$

is the minimal period of \mathcal{R} on \mathcal{O}_x . We also have

$$d\eta_{\tilde{U}} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^a}(x, \tau) dx^a \wedge d\tau + \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \tau}(x, \tau) d\tau \wedge dx^a + \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial x^b}(x, \tau) dx^b \wedge dx^a.$$

Since $i_{\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{U}}} d\eta_{\tilde{U}} = 0$,

$$\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial x^a}(x, \tau) - \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \tau}(x, \tau) \right) dx^a = 0,$$

so

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial x^a}(x, \tau) = \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \tau}(x, \tau)$$

for all a . Consequently (cf. (3)),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x^a}(x) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x^a} \left(\int_0^1 g(x, \tau) d\tau \right) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^a}(x, \tau) d\tau \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \tau}(x, \tau) d\tau = f_a(x, 1) - f_a(x, 0) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

because $f_a(x, \tau)$ are 1-periodic with respect to τ . Hence,

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x^a}(x) = 0$$

for all a , thus $\rho(x)$ is constant on U . But M is connected, so $\rho(x)$ is globally constant, $\rho(x) = \rho$. We have $\text{Exp}(t\mathcal{R}) = \text{id}$ if and only if $t \in \mathbb{Z}_\rho$, where $\mathbb{Z}_\rho = \rho \cdot \mathbb{Z}$. In other words, $p : M \rightarrow N$ is a \mathbb{T}_h -principal bundle in the terminology of [2], where $h = \rho/2\pi$.

Now, we will change the coordinates in \tilde{U} into (x^a, t) , parametrizing fibers of \tilde{U} by trajectories of the lifted Reeb vector field $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{U}} = \partial_\tau/g$,

$$(x, t(x, \tau)) = \left(x, \int_0^\tau g(x, s) ds \right).$$

A direct inspection shows that the diffeomorphism $(x, \tau) \mapsto (x, t(x, \tau))$ maps the vector field $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{U}}$ onto ∂_t . Hence, in the coordinates (x^a, t) our contact form reads

$$\eta_{\tilde{U}} = g(x, \tau) d\tau + f_a(x, \tau) dx^a = dt + h_a(x, t) dx^a \quad (4)$$

for some functions h_a . By a direct check we get that $h_a(x, t) = f_a(x, 0)$, so $h_a(x, t) = h_a(x)$ does not depend on t for all a , and we get

$$d\eta_{\tilde{U}} = \frac{\partial h_a}{\partial x^b}(x) dx^b \wedge dx^a. \quad (5)$$

Finally, since $d\eta$ depends only on coordinates (x^a) , it is the pull-back of a uniquely determined 2-form ω_U on U having in coordinates (x^a) formally the form (5). As $d\eta_{\tilde{U}}$ is of rank $2n$, the form ω_U is symplectic. From the uniqueness of ω_U it follows that there is a globally defined symplectic form ω on N such that $\omega|_U = \omega_U$, and (M, η) is a contactification of ω . Because for $\theta_U = h_a(x) dx^a$ we have $\omega_U = d\theta_U$, each ω_U is exact, but clearly ω need not to be exact globally. Let us study this problem in more detail.

To this end, let us choose a Čech cover $\{U_\alpha\}$ of N (all intersections of the cover members are connected and contractible), so the S^1 -bundles $p : M_\alpha = p^{-1}(U_\alpha) \rightarrow U_\alpha$ are trivial S^1 -principal bundles, and equip \tilde{U}_α with local coordinates (x_α^a, t_α) as above. The contact form η in these coordinates reads (cf. (4))

$$\eta_\alpha = \tilde{\eta}_{U_\alpha} = dt_\alpha + h_a(x) dx_\alpha^a.$$

On the intersection $U_{\alpha\beta} = U_\alpha \cap U_\beta$ consider coordinates (x^a, t_α) and (x^a, t_β) , respectively, where (x^a) are local coordinates on $U_{\alpha\beta}$, the same for U_α and U_β . Since the diffeomorphism $(x^a, t_\alpha) \mapsto (x^a, t_\beta)$ corresponds to an isomorphism of S^1 -principal bundles, we have $t_\beta(x, t_\alpha) = t_\alpha + A_{\beta\alpha}(x)$ for some function $A_{\beta\alpha} : U_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Of course, $A_{\alpha\beta} = -A_{\beta\alpha}$. Since the shift of t_α by

$$T_{\gamma\beta\alpha} = A_{\alpha\gamma} + A_{\gamma\beta} + A_{\beta\alpha}$$

induces the identity on M_α , we have the cocycle condition

$$T_{\gamma\beta\alpha} = A_{\alpha\gamma} + A_{\gamma\beta} + A_{\beta\alpha} \in \mathbb{Z}_\rho = \rho \cdot \mathbb{Z}. \quad (6)$$

The contact form η_β on $U_{\alpha\beta}$ in coordinates (x^a, t_α) reads

$$\eta_\beta = d(t_\alpha + A_{\beta\alpha}) + \theta_\alpha = \eta_\alpha + dA_{\beta\alpha}(x),$$

where $\theta_\alpha = h_\alpha(x) dx_\alpha^a$. Consequently, on the intersection $U_{\alpha\beta}$ we have $d\theta_\alpha = d\theta_\beta = \omega$ and

$$\theta_\beta - \theta_\alpha = dA_{\beta\alpha}.$$

In view of (6) and the de Rham isomorphism, this means that the cohomology class of the closed 2-form ω/ρ in $H^2(N; \mathbb{R})$ lies, in fact, in the image of $H^2(N; \mathbb{Z})$,

$$[\omega/\rho] \in H^2(N; \mathbb{Z}). \quad (7)$$

Such closed 2-forms ω are called ρ -integral, and it is known that they are characterized by the property $\int_\Sigma \omega \in \mathbb{Z}_\rho$ for each closed 2-dimensional surface Σ in N . □

Note that we did not assume that M is compact, as it is done in [3]. This fact will be crucial for the next steps.

Remark 4.2. In the geometric quantization (see e.g. [2]), for ρ is taken $2\pi\hbar$, where \hbar is the Planck constant, and (7) is the well-known condition for the existence of a prequantum bundle on the symplectic manifold (N, ω) . This is because there is a one-to-one correspondence between S^1 -principal bundles on N and complex Hermitian line bundles $\mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow L \rightarrow N$.

Indeed, the multiplicative group \mathbb{C}^\times of nonzero complex numbers acts canonically on L , and the length $\|z \cdot v\|$ of the vector $z \cdot v \in L$ (with respect to the Hermitian metric) is $|z| \cdot \|v\|$. Identifying S^1 with complex numbers of modulus 1, it is easy to see that the set M of length-1 vectors in L , $M = \{v \in L : \|v\| = 1\}$, being preserved by the S^1 -action, is automatically an S^1 -principal bundle, the S^1 -reduction of L .

Conversely, if $p : M \rightarrow N$ is an S^1 -principal bundle, then the transition functions

$$F_{\alpha\beta} : U_{\alpha\beta} = U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \rightarrow S^1$$

for a Čech cover $\{U_\alpha\}$ of N realizing local trivializations, $p^{-1}(U_\alpha) \simeq U_\alpha \times S^1$, form a Čech cocycle,

$$F_{\alpha\gamma} \cdot F_{\gamma\beta} \cdot F_{\beta\alpha} = 1$$

on $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \cap U_\gamma$. Constructing a complex Hermitian line bundle from the local data $U_\alpha \times \mathbb{C}$ (with the canonical Hermitian structure) and gluing them by

$$G_{\alpha\beta} : U_{\alpha\beta} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow U_{\alpha\beta} \times \mathbb{C}, \quad G_{\alpha\beta}(x, z) = (x, F_{\alpha\beta}(x) \cdot z),$$

we get a complex Hermitian line bundle whose reduction to the S^1 -principal bundle gives back M .

5 The general case

Let us assume again that (M, η) is a regular contact manifold and \mathcal{R} is a complete vector field, thus its flow is global and generates a smooth action $(t, x) \mapsto \text{Exp}(t\mathcal{R})(x)$ on M of the group $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ of additive reals. *A priori*, the dynamics of \mathcal{R} could contain both, compact and non-compact orbits. We will show that this is not possible. Note, however, that without the completeness assumption such examples do exist. For instance, one can take a regular contact compact manifold (like S^3 in Example 2.4) and remove, say, one point from a fiber. Of course, after removing this point the Reeb vector field is no longer complete.

5.1 No compact orbits

Suppose first that all orbits are non-compact. In this case the \mathbb{R} -action induced by \mathcal{R} is free. Moreover, $p : M \rightarrow N = M/\mathcal{R}$ is a fibration with fibers homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} , so automatically a fiber bundle (see e.g. [17, Corollary 31]). It is easy to see that the free \mathbb{R} -action of the flow of \mathcal{R} which respects the fibers of this fiber bundle is automatically proper, so it turns this fiber bundle into an \mathbb{R} -principal bundle. Locally, $p^{-1}(U) = U \times \mathbb{R}$, and using the flow of \mathcal{R} to parametrize the fibers, we get local coordinates (x^a, t) on $U \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathcal{R} = \partial_t$. In other words, the \mathbb{R} -action on $U \times \mathbb{R}$ is $s.(x, t) = (x, t + s)$. This form of \mathcal{R} implies that η can be locally written as

$$\eta = dt + f_a(x, t) dx^a.$$

Hence,

$$d\eta = \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial t}(x, t) dt \wedge dx^a + \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial x^b}(x, t) dx^b \wedge dx^a,$$

and because $i_{\mathcal{R}}d\eta = 0$, we get $\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial t}(x, t) = 0$ for all a . It follows that the functions f_a do not depend on t , $f_a(x, t) = f_a(x)$, so $\eta = dt + \theta_U$, where $\theta_U = f_a(x)dx^a$ is the pull-back of a 1-form on U . Since

$$d\eta = d\theta_U = \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial x^b}(x) dx^b \wedge dx^a \quad (8)$$

is of rank $2n$, it is the pull-back of a uniquely determined symplectic form ω_U on U which in coordinates (x^a) looks exactly like (8). Being uniquely determined by $d\eta$, the symplectic forms ω_U agree on the intersections $U_1 \cap U_2$, so that there is a symplectic form ω on N such that $d\eta = p^*(\omega)$. In other words, (M, η) is a contactification of (N, ω) on which the \mathbb{R} -action generated by the flow of \mathcal{R} defines an \mathbb{R} -principal bundle structure. Moreover, ω represents the curvature of the principal connection η .

The fiber bundle $p : M \rightarrow N$ is clearly trivializable, as the fibers are contractible. Using a global section $\sigma : N \rightarrow M$ to identify N with a submanifold $\sigma(N)$ in M , we can view $M \simeq N \times \mathbb{R}$ as a trivial \mathbb{R} -principal bundle over N . Let η_σ be the contact form η reduced to the horizontal submanifold $\sigma(N)$. By the identification $N \simeq \sigma(N)$ given by the section σ (or the projection p) we can view η_σ as a 1-form on N . Since the pull-back by p of $d\eta_\sigma$ is $d\eta$, we have $d\eta_\sigma = \omega$, so the symplectic form ω is exact. Therefore, it is easy to see that (M, η) is the standard contactification of the symplectic form $\omega = d\eta_\sigma$ described in Example 3.6.

5.2 There exists a compact orbit

For a result being a variant of the celebrated *Reeb local stability theorem* and describing the behavior of smooth fibrations near a compact fiber, we refer to Meigniez [17, Lemma 22]. It simply says that, for a smooth fibration, every compact subset of every fibre has a product neighborhood. In our situation, this immediately implies that, if x is a point in N for which the orbit $\mathcal{O}_x = p^{-1}(x)$ is compact, then there is a (connected) neighbourhood $U \subset N$ of x such that p is a fiber bundle when restricted to $p^{-1}(U)$. In other words, any compact orbit has a neighbourhood $M_U = p^{-1}(U)$ in which p is a trivializable fiber bundle, $M_U \simeq U \times S^1$, with the typical fiber S^1 .

It follows now from Proposition 4.1 that in the open submanifold $M_U \subset M$ the Reeb vector field induces an S^1 -principal action. Let us fix such U and denote the corresponding period ρ . Let

$$M_\rho = \{x \in N : \rho(x) = \rho\}$$

be the set of points of N for which \mathcal{O}_x is a compact orbit with the minimal period ρ . It is clear from what has been said that M_ρ is open. We will show that it is also closed.

Indeed, let $x_0 \in N$ belong to the closure of M_ρ and $y_0 \in \mathcal{O}_{x_0}$. The submersion $p : M \rightarrow N$ is an open map, so in a neighbourhood of y_0 there is a sequence of points (y_n) such that $y_n \rightarrow y_0$ and $p(y_n) = x_n \in M_\rho$. Since \mathcal{R} is complete, its flow φ_t is globally defined for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We have then

$$y_n = \varphi_\rho(y_n) \rightarrow \varphi_\rho(y_0).$$

Hence, $\varphi_\rho(y_0) = y_0$, so \mathcal{O}_{x_0} is also a periodic orbit with period ρ . This is, in fact, the minimal period for \mathcal{O}_{x_0} , since the minimal period (Proposition 4.1) is locally constant on periodic orbits. For connected N all this implies that, if there is one periodic orbit of \mathcal{R} with the minimal period ρ , then all orbits are periodic with the same minimal period ρ .

5.3 The main result

Summing up all our observations in the preceding sections, we can formulate the following general result.

Theorem 5.1. *Let (M, η) be a regular connected and complete contact manifold, and let $p : M \rightarrow N = M/\mathcal{R}$ be the corresponding smooth fibration. Then, either the global flow of the corresponding Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} induces a free S^1 -action with the minimal period ρ that turns p into an S^1 -principal bundle, or it turns p into an \mathbb{R} -principal bundle, which is clearly trivializable, $M \simeq N \times \mathbb{R}$. In both cases the contact form η represents a principal connection of the principal bundle $p : M \rightarrow N$ and (M, η) is a contactification of a uniquely determined symplectic structure ω on N , i.e., $p^*(\omega) = d\eta$.*

Moreover, in the case of the S^1 -principal bundle, the symplectic form ω on N is \mathbb{Z}_ρ -integral, where $\mathbb{Z}_\rho = \rho \cdot \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $[\omega/\rho] \in H^2(N, \mathbb{Z})$. In the case of the \mathbb{R} -principal bundle, in turn, the symplectic form ω is exact, $\omega = d\theta$, for a 1-form θ and $(M \simeq N \times \mathbb{R}, \eta)$ is the standard contactification of an exact symplectic manifold: $\eta(x, t) = \theta(x) + dt$.

The following corollary about contactifications of symplectic manifolds is now obvious.

Corollary 5.2. *Let (N, ω) be a compact connected symplectic manifold. Then for any contactification (M, η) of (N, ω) with the complete Reeb vector field, the manifold M is canonically an S^1 -principal bundle (thus compact) such that η is invariant with respect to the S^1 -action.*

6 Conclusions and outlook

Our interests in the subject of this paper came from contact supergeometry [5, 11], contact mechanics [8, 9], and geometry of quantum states [12]. In this paper, for a regular contact manifold (M, η) we have shown that, under the assumption that the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} is complete, the dynamics of \mathcal{R} is very rigid: either each orbit is compact and the flow of \mathcal{R} makes M into an S^1 -principal bundle, or all orbits are non-compact and the flow of \mathcal{R} makes M into an \mathbb{R} -principal bundle. In both cases there is a unique symplectic form ω on the manifold M/\mathcal{R} of \mathcal{R} -orbits such that $p^*(\omega) = d\eta$, where $p : M \rightarrow M/\mathcal{R}$ is the canonical projection, so (M, η) is a contactification of $(M/\mathcal{R}, \omega)$. Moreover, ω satisfies an integrality condition of geometric quantization in the first case, and is an exact symplectic form in the other. Note that the corresponding S^1 -principal bundles over $(M/\mathcal{R}, \omega)$ are in a one-to-one correspondence with complex Hermitian line bundles over M/\mathcal{R} , which makes a connection to geometric quantization and quantum physics. We included also an example showing that even arbitrary small deformations of a contact form within its conformal class can result in a complete qualitative change of the dynamic of the corresponding Reeb vector field.

Our results are more general than the ones announced in [3] (e.g., we do not assume that M is compact) and the way out of the problems concerning the reparametrization of \mathcal{R} is

by showing that we actually do not need any reparametrization, because under completeness assumption all orbits of \mathcal{R} with one periodic orbit are automatically periodic with a common minimal period.

A particularly interesting subject of further studies is explicit constructions of contactifications of coadjoint orbits of compact Lie groups by means of the well-known Marsden-Weinstein-Meyer symplectic reduction [16, 18] or, more precisely, contact reductions in the spirit of [9]. Such contactifications are essentially known from quantum physics in the case of unitary groups. A celebrated example is the unit sphere in a Hilbert space being a contactification of the corresponding space of pure quantum states (complex projective space). This is related to another false statement we found in the literature, this time in paper [4], that the Fubini-Study symplectic forms on complex projective spaces are exact, which is impossible for compact symplectic manifolds.

7 Acknowledgements

The authors thank Alan Weinstein for his clarifications concerning the Weinstein Conjecture.

References

- [1] V. I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics* **60**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.
- [2] S. Bates, A. Weinstein, *Lectures on the geometry of quantization*, *Berkeley Mathematics Lecture Notes* **8**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Berkeley Center for Pure and Applied Mathematics, Berkeley, CA, 1997.
- [3] W. M. Boothby, H. C. Wang, On contact manifolds, *Ann. of Math.* **68** (1958), 721–734.
- [4] H. Cruz-Prado, A. Bravetti, A. Garcia-Chung, From geometry to coherent dissipative dynamics in quantum mechanics, *Quantum Rep.* **3** (2021), 664–683.
- [5] A. J. Bruce, K. Grabowska, J. Grabowski, Remarks on contact and Jacobi geometry, *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* **13** (2017), Paper No. 059, 22 pp.
- [6] C. Ehresmann, Les connexions infinitésimales dans un espace fibré différentiable (French), *Colloque de topologie (espaces fibrés)*, Bruxelles, 1950, pp. 29–55. Georges Thone, Liège; Masson & Cie, Paris, 1951.
- [7] H. Geiges, An introduction to contact topology, *Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math.* **109**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- [8] K. Grabowska, J. Grabowski, A novel approach to contact Hamiltonians and contact Hamilton-Jacobi Theory. *J. Phys. A* **55** (2022), 435204 (34pp).
- [9] K. Grabowska, J. Grabowski, Reductions: precontact versus presymplectic, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* (2023) (online first).
- [10] J. Grabowski, D. Iglesias, J. C. Marrero, E. Padrón, P. Urbański, Poisson-Jacobi reduction of homogeneous tensors, *J. Phys. A* **37** (2004), 5383–5399.
- [11] J. Grabowski, Graded contact manifolds and contact Courant algebroids *J. Geom. Phys.* **68** (2013), 27–58.

- [12] J. Grabowski, M. Kuś, G. Marmo, Geometry of quantum systems: density states and entanglement, *J. Phys. A* **38** (2005), 10217–10244.
- [13] H. Hofer, Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectizations with applications to the Weinstein conjecture in dimension three, *Invent. Math.* **114** (1993), 515–563.
- [14] M. Kegel, Ch. Lange, A Boothby-Wang theorem for Besse contact manifolds, *Arnold Math. J.* **7** (2021), 225–241.
- [15] K. Niederkrüger, Compact Lie group actions on contact manifolds, Inaugural-Dissertation, Universität zu Köln (2005).
- [16] J. E. Marsden, A. Weinstein, T. Ratiu, R. Schmid, R. G. Spencer, Hamiltonian systems with symmetry, coadjoint orbits and plasma physics, Proceedings of the IUTAM-ISIMM symposium on modern developments in analytical mechanics, Vol. I (Torino, 1982), *Atti Accad. Sci. Torino Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur.* **117** (1983), suppl. 1, 289–340.
- [17] G. Meigniez, Submersions, fibrations and bundles, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **354** (2002), 3771–3787.
- [18] K. R. Meyer, Symmetries and integrals in mechanics, *Dynamical systems* (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Bahia, Salvador, 1971), pp. 259–272. Academic Press, New York, 1973.
- [19] F. Pasquotto, A short history of the Weinstein conjecture, *Jahresber. Dtsch. Math.-Ver.* **114** (2012), 119–130.
- [20] C. H. Taubes, The Seiberg-Witten equations and the Weinstein conjecture, *Geom. Topol.* **11** (2007), 2117–2202.
- [21] A. Weinstein, On the hypotheses of Rabinowitz’ periodic orbit theorems, *J. Differential Equations* **33** (1979), 353–358.

Katarzyna Grabowska
Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw,
 ul. Pasteura 5, 02-093 Warszawa, Poland
 konieczn@fuw.edu.pl
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2805-1849>

Janusz Grabowski
Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences
 ul. Śniadeckich 8, 00-656 Warszawa, Poland
 jgrab@impan.pl
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8715-2370>