

Any Kähler metric is a Fisher information metric

Emmanuel Gnandi

INSA de Toulouse, Département de Génie Mathématique, 135 Avenue
de Rangueil, Toulouse, 31077, France.

Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): kpanteemmanuel@gmail.com,
gnandi@insa-toulouse.fr;

Abstract

The Fisher information metric or the Fisher-Rao metric corresponds to a natural Riemannian metric defined on a parameterized family of probability density functions. As in the case of Riemannian geometry, we can define a distance in terms of the Fisher information metric, called the Fisher-Rao distance. The Fisher information metric has a wide range of applications in estimation and information theories. Indeed, it provides the most informative Cramer-Rao bound for an unbiased estimator. The Goldberg conjecture is a well-known unsolved problem which states that any compact Einstein almost Kähler manifold is necessarily a Kähler-Einstein. Note that, there is also a known odd-dimensional analog of the Goldberg conjecture in the literature. The main objective of this paper is to establish a new characterization of coKähler manifolds and Kähler manifolds; our characterization is statistical in nature. Finally, we corroborate that every, Kähler and co-Kähler manifolds, can be viewed as being a parametric family of probability density functions, whereas Kähler and coKähler metrics can be regarded as Fisher information metrics. In particular, we prove that, when the Kähler metric is real analytic, it is always locally the Fisher information of an exponential family. We also tackle the link between Kähler potential and Kullback-Leibler divergence.

1 Introduction

In this section, certain relevant notations and useful definitions related to information geometry are recalled. Information geometry is an emerging field which provides a certain correspondence between differential geometry and statistics through the Fisher information matrix (cf. [1], [2], [3], [4]). Several authors have examined the process of

constructing a proper distance between probability distributions referring to its significance in both practical, theoretical statistics, information theory, signal processing, quantitative finance, and machine Learning. To solve this problem, Rao [3] proposed the geodesic distance induced by the Fisher information metric. This geodesic distance is basically known in literature as the Fisher-Rao distance or Rao's distance. Let us consider a statistical model $\mathcal{P}_d(\Xi)$, which is a set of parametric densities defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_d(\Xi) = \{p_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}, \quad (1)$$

where Θ (the parametric space) is an open set of \mathbb{R}^d and Ξ is a sample space, with parameter $\theta = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^d)$. Assuming that p never vanishes, the likelihood function is expressed as follows:

$$l_\theta(x) = \log p_\theta(x).$$

The Fisher matrix tensor is indicated in terms of:

$$g^F(\theta)_{ij} = E_\theta\left(\frac{\partial l_\theta(x)}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial l_\theta(x)}{\partial \theta_j}\right) = -E_\theta\left(\frac{\partial^2 l_\theta(x)}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j}\right) \quad \text{for all } \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j} \in T_\theta \Theta = \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (2)$$

A simple computation reveals that the Fisher-Information matrix can be stated as follows:

$$g^F(\theta)_{ij} = 4 \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \sqrt{p_\theta(x)}}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \sqrt{p_\theta(x)}}{\partial \theta_j} dx \quad (3)$$

The obtained geometry is called the informative geometry of the parametric family $\mathcal{P}_d(\Xi)$. The Fisher information matrix can be regarded as a measure of the amount of information present in the data about a parameter θ . Rao [3] demonstrated that, under elementary regularity hypotheses, $\mathcal{P}_d(\Xi)$ or Θ is a Riemannian manifold with a Riemannian metric, defined by the Fisher-information matrix, called the Fisher-information metric or the Fisher-Rao metric. The Fisher-information metric is invariant under the action of the diffeomorphism group. [Cencov [5],p. 156] proved the uniqueness result for Fisher's information metric on finite sample spaces. Subsequently, in Ay et al. [6], the authors extended Cencov's result to infinite sample spaces. The Fisher information metric is invariant under parametrization on a sample space Ξ and covariant under parametrization on a parametric space Θ , see [7]. The Fisher-Rao distance is inherently designed to be invariant under diffeomorphisms of both the sample space Ξ and the parameter space Θ .

Quantum information geometry has been equally developed, which is a quite natural outcome, mainly as the standard quantum mechanics is a probabilistic-statistical theory. It has been corroborated using the geometrical formulation of quantum mechanics that, the Fisher quantum information metric (SLD metric) on the space of pure quantum states coincides with the Fubini-Study metric of the complex projective space (up to constant)[8]. The above remark indicates a close relationship between Information geometry and Kähler geometry. As far as the current research work is concerned, our central focus is upon the statistical characterization of Kähler and coKähler metrics. This characterization generalizes the well known characterization of Kähler metrics in Hermitian manifolds.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the relevant background in quantum analogue of information geometry. In Section 3, we recall the notion of Hamiltonian structure on odd dimensional manifold and establish the main result of this section:

Theorem 1.1. *An odd dimensional manifold M^{2d+1} admits a Hamiltonian structure, if and only if, its canonical bundle admits a maximal parallel section.*

The proof is based on the symplectization technique and the Gromov h-principle. This theorem reveals that any Hamiltonian structure on an odd-dimension manifold M^{2d+1} arises from SMAT structure on M^{2d+1} . Hamiltonian manifold refers to the odd dimensional analogue of a symplectic manifold. Thus, a link between symplectic geometry and information geometry is established.

Section 4 provides an overview on certain basic concepts of a stable Hamiltonian structure that are highly needed throughout this paper. In this section, our initial target is to prove that on every shs manifold, there are always canonical connections called shs connections. These connections will be useful in the sequel of the paper.

Theorem 1.2. *On every shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$, there are always connections such that:*

$$\nabla E = 0, \nabla \Omega = 0. \quad (4)$$

The proof of this theorem relies on the symplectization technique and we use the symplectic connections on the product $M^{2d+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ to build up the desired connections on the shs manifold. Next, we set forward a description of the set of shs connections in Proposition 4.5 and we confirm that there are shs connections invariant by the Reeb field E in Proposition 4.4. Our second target is to prove that on every shs manifold, both orthogonal distributions ℓ_Ω and ℓ_α are always adapted to SMAT connections in Proposition 4.6. We obtain the local components of the torsion of the dual of an shs connection in local Darboux charts in Proposition 4.7. Our third target lies therefore in proving that there are shs manifolds which do not contain statistical SMAT shs connections. These results are obtained with regard to Proposition 4.9, Proposition 4.10, Proposition 4.11 and Proposition 4.12. In Section 5, our first goal is to introduce a new characterization of a co-Kähler manifold:

Theorem 1.3. *An shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ is a co-Kähler manifold, if and only if, it is a statistical shs manifold.*

According to the above Theorem, we deduce that shs manifolds that contain statistical shs connections are co-Kähler manifolds. In Proposition 5.9 and Corollary 5.10, we examine some statistical properties of shs manifolds, from which we derive a description of the space of statistical shs connections on a statistical shs manifold (co-Kähler manifold). In Section 6, we extend the arguments of Theorem 5.3 to provide a statistical characterization of Kähler manifold. This result is obtained from Proposition 6.7. Statistical characterization of Kähler metrics in terms of parallel transport is displayed in Section 6.3. In Section 6.4, we report a generalization of the theorem of Kobayashi. In Proposition 6.13, we face our statistical characterization of Kähler manifold with the integrability condition of S.Golberg. In Section 6.5, we invest two approaches to prove that any Kähler and co-Kähler metric is a Fisher-Information metric:

Theorem 1.4. *Any Kähler and co-Kähler metric is a Fisher information metric.*

The above result reveals the powerful link between Kähler geometry and Information geometry. In Section 6.6, we explore the nature of Kähler and coKähler manifolds as submanifolds of statistical models. Departing from results drawn in Proposition 6.17, we obtain a lower bound on both geodesic distance of Kähler metrics and the geodesic distance of co-Kähler metrics in Corollary 6.18. In Section 6.7, we address relations between Kähler potential and statistical symplectic connections. We tackle the link between Kähler potential and Kullback-Leibler divergence in Section 6.7.1. Finally in Section 6.7.2, we demonstrate that:

Theorem 1.5. *Any real analytic Kähler metric is locally the Fisher information of an exponential family.*

The above result establishes a strong link between real analytic Kähler manifold and exponential families distributions.

2 Background materials and motivation of the paper

Let \mathcal{H} ($\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\mathcal{H} = d$) be a finite dimensional Hilbert space. Denote by $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{L}_h\mathcal{H}$ the set of linear operators and the set of Hermitian operators of \mathcal{H} , respectively. The family of density operators (quantum states) is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\rho \in \mathcal{L}_h\mathcal{H}, \rho \geq 0, \text{Tr}(\rho) = 1.\}$$

The quantum states \mathcal{M} are partitioned into $\mathcal{M} = \cup_{k=0}^d \mathcal{M}_k$, where $\mathcal{M}_k = \{\rho \in \mathcal{M}, \text{rank}(\rho) = k\}$ is a $(2dk - k^2 - 1)$ -dimensional real manifold. We notably treat \mathcal{M}_d (the space of faithful quantum states) and \mathcal{M}_1 (the space of pure quantum states) in the sequel. We first consider the space of faithful quantum states. Clearly, $\mathcal{M}_d = \{\rho \in \mathcal{M}, \rho > 0\}$ is an open subset of the affine space $\{\rho \in \mathcal{L}_h\mathcal{H}, \text{Tr}(\rho) = 1\}$. From this perspective, we can naturally induce that a flat connection on \mathcal{M}_d , called a mixture connection, is defined by:

$$(\nabla_X^m Y)\rho = X(Y\rho) \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M}_d). \quad (5)$$

It is well known departing from the work of Petz [9] that there exists an infinite number of metrics on \mathcal{M}_d called quantum monotone metric tensors. These metrics were thoroughly classified by Petz [9]. Based on Lesniewski and Ruskai [10], every quantum monotone metric tensor can be obtained by appropriately expanding a quantum relative entropy. Now, selecting a quantum monotone metric g , one can define a dualistic structure (g, ∇^m, ∇^e) on \mathcal{M}_d by:

$$g(\nabla_X^e Y, Z) = X.g(Y, Z) - g(Y, \nabla_X^m Z) \quad \forall X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M}_d). \quad (6)$$

Let us consider the quantum version of the classical Fisher metric, called SLD (Symmetric Logarithmic Derivative) metric, which is defined in [11] as follows:

$$g^{SLD}(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \rho (L_X L_Y + L_Y L_X), \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M}_d).$$

It is not difficult to notice that the dual connection of ∇^m with respect to the SLD metric defined in the above is expressed as:

$$(\nabla_X^e Y)\rho = \frac{1}{2} \{ \rho (X L_Y - \text{Tr} \rho (X L_Y)) + (X L_Y - \text{Tr} \rho (X L_Y)) \rho \}, \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M}_d).$$

The connection ∇^e is called the exponential connection and referring to [12], a direct computation reveals that the torsion of ∇^e is determined by:

$$T^{\nabla^e}(X, Y)\rho = \frac{1}{4} [[L_X, L_Y], \rho].$$

Finally, \mathcal{M}_d is endowed with a dualistic structure $(g^{SLD}, \nabla^m, \nabla^e)$ such that ∇^m is a flat connection and ∇^e is not symmetric but its curvature vanishes. It is significant to note that according to [12], there exists a unique quantum monotone metric g^{BKM} called Bogoliubov-Kubo-Mori metric (BKM metric) such that $(\mathcal{M}_d, g^{BKM}, \nabla^m, \nabla^e)$ is a dually flat manifold. In this particular case, the associated quantum relative entropy corresponds to the von Neumann-Umegaki relative entropy defined by:

$$D(\rho, \sigma) = \text{Tr}[\rho(\log \rho - \log \sigma)] \quad \forall \rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{M}_d.$$

In other words, the KMB Fisher metric is derived from K as follows:

$$g_{ij}^{BKM}(\theta) = \frac{\partial^2 D(\rho_\theta, \rho_{\hat{\theta}})}{\partial \theta^j \partial \hat{\theta}^i} \Big|_{\hat{\theta}=\theta}.$$

Let us consider the space of pure states $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{\rho \in \mathcal{M}, \text{rank}(\rho) = 1\}$. With respect to [8] and [13], it is well known that the space of pure states \mathcal{M}_1 is diffeomorphic with the complex projective space $CP(\mathcal{H})$ and the SLD metric on \mathcal{M}_1 is identical up to a constant factor to the Fubini-Study metric on $CP(\mathcal{H})$:

$$g_{j\bar{k}}^{SLD} = c \frac{(1 + z^l \bar{z}^l) \delta_{jk} - z^k \bar{z}^j}{(1 + z^l \bar{z}^l)^2}, \quad (7)$$

with $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

The above Eq. (7) shows that the Fubini-Study metric can be precisely interpreted as a quantum information metric on pure quantum states. From the above remark, a natural link is established between statistics and Kähler structure of the projective space. The idea that the Kähler structure of projective space may originate from the intrinsic geometry of a statistical manifold is an appealing one. Nevertheless, in the literature, a few links have been established between statistics and Kähler structure, except for the natural connection between the Hessian and Kähler geometries. As reported by Dombrowski and Shima, the tangent bundle over a Hessian manifold admits a Kähler metric induced by the Hessian metric [14], [15]. Departing from the above arguments, it is legitimate to ask this natural question.

Question 1: Is a Kähler metric always a Fisher information metric ? (8)

As the author knows that such a question has not been previously addressed, the main target of this paper resides in answering this question. We are now prepared to introduce one of the central concepts of the paper.

Motivated and inspired by the richness of the construction of dualistical structure in the quantum states, Kurose [16] introduced the notion of statistical manifold admitting torsion (SMAT) as a generalisation of statistical manifold with the basic goal of developing a quantum analogue of information geometry. A *statistical manifold admitting a torsion* (SMAT) is a manifold endowed with a dualistic structure, where one of the dual must be torsion-free but the other is not necessarily (cf. [17, 18], [19], [20]). In [[12], p.19], Amari and Nagaoka asserted "The incorporation of torsion into the framework of information geometry, which would relate it to such fields as quantum mechanics (non commutative probability theory) and systems theory, is an interesting topic for the future." As far as the current research paper is concerned, we tackle the impact of the torsion of dual connections on the symplectic, contact and Kahler geometry.

Definition 2.1. [16] Let M be a manifold, and let (g, ∇, ∇^*) be a dualistic structure on M . The quadruplet (M, g, ∇, ∇^*) is a SMAT if the following equivalent conditions are satisfied:

$$\nabla \text{ is torsion-free,} \quad (9)$$

$$(\nabla_X g)(Y, Z) - (\nabla_Y g)(X, Z) = g(T^{\nabla^*}(X, Y), Z), \quad (10)$$

$$(\nabla_X^* g)(Y, Z) - (\nabla_Y^* g)(X, Z) = -g(T^{\nabla}(X, Y), Z). \quad (11)$$

Throughout this paper, the dual connections (∇, ∇^*) of a SMAT will be called the SMAT connections. If the curvature of one (or equivalently both) of them vanishes, the SMAT (M, g, ∇, ∇^*) will be called partially flat(see [17]). As a statistical structure may be induced by a contrast function (divergence function), a SMAT structure can be equally induced by a pre-contrast function D that is defined in [21]. For a given pre-contrast function D , we can define a dualistic structure (g, ∇, ∇^*) by:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} g_{ij}(\theta) = -\frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta_j^i} \Big|_{\theta=\theta^2=\theta^1}, \\ \Gamma_{kj,i}^*(\theta) = g(\nabla_{\partial_k}^* \partial_j, \partial_i) = -\frac{\partial^2 D}{\partial \theta_k^2 \partial \theta_j^2} \Big|_{\theta=\theta^1=\theta^2}, \\ \Gamma_{ki,j}(\theta) = g(\nabla_{\partial_k} \partial_i, \partial_j) = -\frac{\partial^2 D}{\partial \theta^k \partial \theta^j} \Big|_{\theta=\theta^1=\theta^2}. \end{array} \right.$$

It is easy to infer that the connection ∇^* is symmetric, and the connection ∇ is not necessarily symmetric. Hence, it follows from the definition 2.1 that (g, ∇, ∇^*) is a SMAT structure on M . In [21], Henmi, M., Matsuzoe, H proved that the SMAT arrives in "classical" statistics through an estimating function. In particular, both authors demonstrated that on a parametric statistical model, an estimating function defines a pre-contrast function and obviously a SMAT.

Figure 1 summarises all the different connections used in Information Geometry which will be useful in this paper.




Fig. 1 The connections in information Geometry.

3 Hamiltonian structure and SMAT connections

In this section, we shall clarify that smat structures are found in multiple geometric structures, and a thorough investigation of them yields Kahler geometry results. We shall provide a new characterization of Hamiltonian structure in terms of SMAT connections.

3.1 Parallel section on the canonical bundle of SMAT

Let's select a symmetric connection ∇ on the tangent bundle TM and denote by ${}^*\nabla$ the dual connection of TM^* induced by ∇ . It is defined by:

$$\langle {}^*\nabla_Z\beta, Y \rangle + \beta(\nabla_Z Y) = Z(\beta(Y)) \quad Y, Z \in \Gamma(TM), \beta \in \Gamma(TM^*), \quad (12)$$

where \langle, \rangle denotes the pairing of vectors and covectors. Relying on [22], it is well known that there exists a unique connection on $TM \otimes TM^*$ defined by:

$$\widehat{\nabla}(X \otimes \beta) = \nabla X \otimes \beta + X \otimes \nabla^*(\beta), \quad \forall X \in \Gamma(TM), \beta \in \Gamma(TM^*). \quad (13)$$

Identify $TM \otimes TM^*$ with $\text{End}(TM)$ (the bundle of endomorphism of TM). One can therefore define a connection $\widetilde{\nabla}$ on $\text{End}(TM)$ by:

$$\nabla_X^* \Theta Y = (\widetilde{\nabla}_X \Theta) Y + \Theta \nabla_X Y, \quad \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM) \quad (14)$$

where $\Theta \in \Gamma(\text{End}(TM))$. Now let's opt for some Riemannian metrics g on M and denote the musical isomorphism from TM to TM^* by \flat , which is indicated as follows:

$$\flat : TM \rightarrow TM^* \quad \langle \flat(X), Y \rangle = g(X, Y), \quad X, Y \in \Gamma(TM) \quad (15)$$

We can define a connection on TM by:

$$\nabla^* = b^*(\nabla) = b^{-1} \circ \nabla \circ b.$$

With regard to the above construction, we deduce that (M, g, ∇, ∇^*) is a SMAT.

Definition 3.1. A given section $\Theta \in \Gamma(\text{End}(TM))$ is said to be parallel if $\tilde{\nabla}\Theta = 0$, i.e., if

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X \Theta Y = \Theta \tilde{\nabla}_X Y, \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM). \quad (16)$$

Grounded on Eq. (14), the previous equation is equivalent to:

$$\nabla_X^* \Theta Y = \Theta \nabla_X Y, \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM). \quad (17)$$

Using the difference tensor $U \in TM^* \otimes TM^* \otimes TM$, defined by:

$$U = \nabla^* - \nabla;$$

Eq. (17) is equivalent to either of the two equations:

$$\nabla \Theta = -U(\cdot, \Theta), \quad (18)$$

$$\nabla^* \Theta = \Theta U(\cdot, \cdot). \quad (19)$$

Proposition 3.2. Let's consider a SMAT (M, g, ∇, ∇^*) , and let Θ be a parallel section on $\text{End}(TM)$. The following assertions are therefore equivalent:

1. $\nabla \Theta = 0$,
2. ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of the metric g .

Proof. By a direct computation, we get:

$$(\nabla_Z^* g)(\Theta X, Y) = Z(g(\Theta X, Y)) - g(\nabla_Z^* \Theta X, Y) - g(\Theta X, \nabla_Z^* Y) \quad (20)$$

Now, using the duality condition, we obtain:

$$(\nabla_Z^* g)(\Theta X, Y) = -g(\nabla_Z^* \Theta X - \nabla_Z \Theta X, Y) \quad (21)$$

$$= -g(U(Z, \Theta X), Y) \quad (22)$$

$$= g((\nabla_Z \Theta)X, Y) \quad (23)$$

Hence, by a simple calculation:

$$(-\nabla_Z g)(\Theta X, Y) = (\nabla_Z^* g)(\Theta X, Y) = g((\nabla_Z \Theta)X, Y). \quad (24)$$

The proposition follows from Eq. (24). \square

Let's consider K_M the skew-symmetric endomorphisms of TM . We can naturally endow K_M with the connection ∇ defined in definition 3.1. In this paper, the vector K_M will be called a canonical bundle of M .

Definition 3.3. Consider a $2d+1$ -dimensional manifold M^{2d+1} . A parallel section Θ on the canonical bundle $K_{M^{2d+1}}$ is called maximal if its rank is $2d$.

3.2 SMAT connections and existence of Hamiltonian structure

In this subsection, our central focus is to identify a Hamiltonian structure which is a basic notion in this paper. Subsequently, we prove the main theorem of this section.

Definition 3.4. A Hamiltonian structure on M^{2d+1} is a closed 2-form Ω of maximal rank, *i.e.* such that Ω^d is nowhere-vanishing. We refer to the pair (M^{2d+1}, Ω) as a Hamiltonian manifold.

Let's associate with the Hamiltonian structure Ω the 1-dimensional foliation $\ell_\Omega \subset TM^{2d+1}$ expressed by:

$$\ell_\Omega = \cup_p \{p, \ker(\Omega_p)\},$$

where $\ker(\Omega_p)$ is the kernel of the linear map $\Omega_p : T_p M^{2d+1} \rightarrow T_p^* M^{2d+1}$ defined by $w \rightarrow \Omega_p(w, \cdot)$. Note that for each $p \in M^{2d+1}$, the 2-form Ω_p is nondegenerate on $T_p M^{2d+1} / \ker(\Omega_p)$. Hence, it is a symplectic form on this vector space and therefore defines an orientation on it. If M^{2d+1} is oriented, there exists a global 1-form α on M^{2d+1} such that $T_p M^{2d+1} / \ker(\Omega_p) = \ker(\alpha_p)$. In this case, the Hamiltonian structure can be defined as an almost cosymplectic structure (almost contact) (Ω, α) such that Ω is closed (cf. [23]). A Hamiltonian manifold is the odd dimensional analogue of a symplectic manifold. To explore this relation, let's consider (M^{2d+2}, Ω) a symplectic manifold and M^{2d+1} a hypersurface on M^{2d+2} . The restriction $\Omega_{M^{2d+1}}$ of Ω is a Hamiltonian structure on M^{2d+1} . If we assume that ℓ_Ω is a regular foliation or in other words if M^{2d+1} / ℓ_Ω is manifold; the manifold M^{2d+1} / ℓ_Ω naturally inherits a symplectic structure. In the literature, Hamiltonian manifolds often bear other names, quasi-contact manifold [24], or 2-calibrated manifold [25]. For further information about Hamiltonian manifolds refer back to [26], [27], [28], [29], [30].

Let us now describe the main results of this section.

Theorem 3.5. *An odd dimensional manifold M^{2d+1} admits a Hamiltonian structure if and only if its canonical bundle admits a maximal parallel section.*

Proof. Let $\pi : W^{2d+2} = M^{2d+1} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M^{2d+1}$ be the canonical projection and denote by $i(x) = (x, 0) : M^{2d+1} \rightarrow W^{2d+2}$ the zero section. Consider a Hamiltonian structure Ω on M^{2d+1} . Now we can construct an almost symplectic form $\tilde{\Omega}$ on W^{2d+2} such that $i^* \tilde{\Omega} = \Omega$. Applying Gromov's h -Principle [31] on the open manifold W^{2d+2} , there exists a family of almost symplectic $\tilde{\omega}_{t \in [0,1]}$ on W^{2d+2} such that $\tilde{\omega}_0 = \tilde{\Omega}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_1 = \omega$ is closed. According to [32, 33], the symplectic manifold (W^{2d+1}, ω) admits infinitely

numerous symplectic connections. A construction is provided in [33] by:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla_X^0 Y + \frac{1}{3}B(X, Y) + \frac{1}{3}B(Y, X) \quad , \quad (25)$$

where ∇^0 is a symmetric connection on W^{2d+2} and $B \in T_1^2(W^{2d+2})$ is defined by:

$$\nabla_X^0 \omega(Y, Z) = \omega(B(X, Y), Z). \quad (26)$$

Consider Darboux charts $(\tilde{U}^i = I \times U^i, x^{\bar{0}}, x^i)$ of (W^{2d+2}, ω) , such that $(U^i, x^i)_{i=0,1,\dots,2d}$ where $x^{\bar{0}}$ is the parameter along \mathbb{R} . With these Darboux charts $(\tilde{U}^i = I \times U^i, x^{\bar{0}}, x^i)$, we have the following equation:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{ijk} = \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^l \omega_{lk} \in S^3 T^* W^{2d+2}, \quad (27)$$

where $\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^l$ are the Christoffel symbols of the symplectic connection $\tilde{\nabla}$. It is well known that the difference $U \in T_1^2(W^{2d+2})$ between two symplectic connections $\tilde{\nabla}, \tilde{\tilde{\nabla}}$ on (W^{2d+2}, ω) satisfies $\omega(U(\cdot, \cdot), \cdot) \in S^3 T^* W^{2d+2}$. Therefore, with Darboux coordinates, we get:

$$\tilde{U}_{ijk} = U_{ij}^l \omega_{lk} \in S^3 T^* W^{2d+2}. \quad (28)$$

In the Darboux charts $(\tilde{U}^i, x^{\bar{0}}, x^i)$, the symplectic connections $\tilde{\nabla}, \tilde{\tilde{\nabla}}$ are provided by:

$$\tilde{\tilde{\Gamma}}_{\bar{0}\bar{0}}^l = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\bar{0}\bar{0}}^l + U_{\bar{0}\bar{0}}^l. \quad (29)$$

Now, referring to Eqs. (27) and (28), we can select \tilde{U} as follows:

$$\tilde{U}_{ijk} = 0, \tilde{U}_{i0j} = 0, \tilde{U}_{00i} = -\tilde{\Gamma}_{00}^l \omega_{li}. \quad (30)$$

Hence, we obtain:

$$\tilde{\tilde{\Gamma}}_{\bar{0}\bar{0}}^l = 0. \quad (31)$$

From the above analysis, we deduce that on the symplectic manifold (W^{2d+2}, ω) , we can find a symplectic connection $\tilde{\tilde{\nabla}}$ satisfying in a local Darboux chart the following condition:

$$\tilde{\tilde{\nabla}}_{\partial_{\bar{0}}} \partial_{\bar{0}} = 0. \quad (32)$$

Now, identify M^{2d+1} with the leaf $x^{\bar{0}} = 0$ of W^{2d+2} . We can define by restriction on this leaf a connection by:

$$\nabla_X Y = \tilde{\tilde{\nabla}}_X Y,$$

for any vectors fields X, Y on M^{2d+1} . The restriction of the symplectic form ω on M^{2d+1} is a Hamiltonian form which satisfies:

$$\nabla \omega = \tilde{\tilde{\nabla}} \omega = 0. \quad (33)$$

Select an almost Hermitian $(\tilde{g}, \tilde{\Theta})$ on (W^{2d+2}, ω) and denote by (g, Θ) the restriction of $(\tilde{g}, \tilde{\Theta})$ on M^{2d+1} . It is straightforward to check that:

$$(\nabla_Z \omega)(X, Y) = g(\nabla_Z^* \Theta X - \Theta \nabla_Z X, Y), \quad (34)$$

for any vector field X, Y, Z on M^{2d+1} . Relying upon Eq. (33), we obtain

$$\nabla_X^* \Theta Y = \Theta \nabla_X Y$$

for any vector field X, Y on M^{2d+1} . Thus, we conclude that the canonical bundle of M^{2d+1} admits a maximal parallel section.

The converse direction is an immediate consequence of construction of parallel section on $K_{M^{2d+1}}$. Let us consider Θ a maximal parallel section on the canonical bundle of M^{2d+1} . We can therefore define a 2-form Ω_Θ by:

$$\Omega_\Theta(X, Y) = g(\Theta X, Y),$$

for all vector fields X, Y on M^{2d+1} . It follows from a direct computation that

$$(\nabla_Z \Omega_\Theta)(X, Y) = g(\nabla_Z^* \Theta X - \Theta \nabla_Z X, Y), \quad (35)$$

for all X, Y, Z on M^{2d+1} . With regard to the above Eq. (35), we obtain:

$$d\Omega_\Theta = 0.$$

Therefore we deduce that $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega_\Theta)$ is a Hamiltonian manifold. \square

Remark 3.6. There exists an alternative technique to prove the necessary parts of the previous theorem in the case where M^{2d+1} is oriented. In that case, the Hamiltonian manifold (M^{2d+1}, Ω) can be viewed as almost cosymplectic $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ such that $d\Omega = 0$ and $\Omega^d \wedge \alpha$ is a volume form on M^{2d+1} . On the co-dimension 1 distribution $\ell_\alpha = \ker(\alpha)$, there always exists a compatible almost complex structure $\Theta : \ell_\alpha \rightarrow \ell_\alpha$. Given an almost complex structure Θ on ℓ_α , we can extend it on TM^{2d+1} by requiring $\Theta|_{\ell_\alpha} = 0$ and $\ell_\alpha = \text{Im}(\Theta) \subset TM^{2d+1}$. Now choose a Riemannian metric g on M^{2d+1} such that $g|_{\ell_\alpha} = \Omega(\cdot, \Theta \cdot)$. Taking into account the above construction of the metric g , it follows that the Hamiltonian 2-form Ω is finally defined by $\Omega = g(\Theta, \cdot)$. Noting that for any point $p \in M^{2d+1}$, there exists neighborhood U^i of p and local Darboux coordinates (z, x^i, y^i) such that $\Omega = dx^1 \wedge dy^1 + \dots + dx^d \wedge dy^d$ (see Libermann and Marle [34], Godbillon [35], Torres [36]). Now, let's define on U^i a connection ∇^i such that $\Gamma_{ij}^l = 0$. Based on this choice, we obviously get :

$$\partial_k \Omega_{ij} = \Omega_{il} \Gamma_{kj}^l + \Omega_{lj} \Gamma_{ki}^l. \quad (36)$$

Hence, ∇^i is a local symplectic connection (ie $\nabla^i \Omega = 0$). Now, using a covering of M^{2d+1} by local Darboux coordinates neighborhoods, moving to a locally finite refinement $(U_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}$ and opting for a partition of unity $(\rho_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}$ subordinate to the open

covering $(U_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}$, we can glue up the local connection symplectic ∇^i on U^i to a global one ∇ by

$$\nabla = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \rho_i \nabla^i. \quad (37)$$

Obviously, $\nabla \Omega = 0$. Now, proceedings with the same computation as in the above theorem, we get:

$$(\nabla_Z \Omega)(X, Y) = g(\nabla_Z^* \Theta X - \Theta \nabla_Z X, Y) \quad \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM^{2d+1}). \quad (38)$$

Thus,

$$\nabla_Y^* \Theta X = \Theta \nabla_Y X, \quad \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM^{2d+1}).$$

To summarise this section, Theorem 3.5 indicates that any Hamiltonian structure on an odd-dimensional always arises from a maximal parallel section of its canonical bundle. Theorem 3.5 manifests a link between the symplectic geometry and quantum information geometry.

4 Stable Hamiltonian structures and SMAT adapted connections

In this section, we review certain basic concepts of a stable Hamiltonian structure needed throughout this paper. A stable Hamiltonian structure (SHS) stands for a generalization of contact, cosymplectic and coKähler structures. It originates from the conjecture of Weinstein [37] which states that a simply connected hypersurface W^{2d+1} of a symplectic manifold (M^{2d+2}, Ω) which carries a contact form α such that $d\alpha = j^* \Omega$ (such submanifolds are called "hypersurface of contact type") admits at least a closed orbit. Here, $j : W^{2d+1} \rightarrow M^{2d+2}$ is the inclusion map. Hofer and Zehnder [38] introduced stable Hamiltonian structures as a hypersurface for which the Weinstein conjecture can be proved. Further interest in stable Hamiltonian structures stems from the extension of the proof of the Weinstein conjecture in dimension three in [39, 40]. Their theorems state that for a closed oriented connected 3-dimensional stable Hamiltonian manifold which is not a \mathbb{T}^2 -bundle over \mathbb{S}^1 , the associated Reeb vector field has a closed orbit. Topological perspectives of stable Hamiltonian manifold were extensively investigated in [41], [42], [43], [28], [44], [45], [46].

Let (M^{2d+1}, Ω) be a Hamiltonian manifold of dimension $2d + 1$. A 1-form α is called a stabilizing 1-form, if it satisfies the following conditions:

$$\alpha \wedge \Omega^d \neq 0, \quad (39)$$

$$\ker(\Omega) \subset \ker(d\alpha). \quad (40)$$

Definition 4.1. A Hamiltonian manifold (M^{2d+1}, Ω) is called stable, if there exists a stabilizing 1-form. The pair (Ω, α) is called a stable Hamiltonian structure.

A stable Hamiltonian structure (Ω, α) induces a canonical Reeb vector field E such that:

$$i_E \Omega = 0, \quad i_E \alpha = 1. \quad (41)$$

The stabilizability condition can be reformulated as:

$$i_E \alpha = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad i_E d\alpha = 0. \quad (42)$$

Based on a straightforward computation, the previous condition implies that:

$$i_E(\alpha \wedge \Omega^d) = \Omega^d \quad \text{and} \quad L_E(\alpha \wedge \Omega^d) = 0 \quad (43)$$

Note that the condition $\alpha \wedge \Omega^d \neq 0$ implies that α is nowhere vanishing. Then, it induces the hyperplane distribution defined by:

$$\ell_\alpha = \ker(\alpha)$$

The stabilization condition implies that the pair (Ω, α) determines a splitting of the tangent bundle of M^{2d+1} as follows:

$$TM^{2d+1} = (\ell_\Omega, E) \oplus (\ell_\alpha, \Omega), \quad (44)$$

where (ℓ_Ω, E) is a line bundle and (ℓ_α, Ω) is a symplectic vector bundle. There exists a natural isomorphism defined by:

$$b_{\Omega, \alpha} : TM^{2d+1} \rightarrow TM^{*2d+1} : X \rightarrow i_X \Omega + \alpha(X)\alpha$$

Therefore, we have:

$$b_{\Omega, \alpha}(E) = \alpha.$$

Note that there is an analogue of Darboux theorem for an shs manifold. The Darboux theorem states that, locally at $p \in M^{2d+1}$, there exist local charts (U^i, x^0, x^i, x^{i+d}) , called Darboux charts such that:

$$E = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0}, \quad \alpha_{U^i} = dx^0 + \sum_i \alpha^i dx^i + \alpha^{i+d} dx^{i+d} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_{U^i} = \sum_i dx^i \wedge dx^{i+d} \quad (45)$$

(see Libermann and Marle [34], Godbillon [35], Torres [36], Siefring [46]). The stabilization condition Eq. (42) translates to:

$$\frac{\partial \alpha^i}{\partial x^0} = \frac{\partial \alpha^{i+d}}{\partial x^0} = 0. \quad (46)$$

Denote $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$. In Darboux charts, $(U^i, (\partial_i)_{i=0}^{i=2d})$, $\partial_0 = E$ and $(\partial_i)_{i=1}^{i=2d}$ is a symplectic basis of ℓ_α adapted to the symplectic form Ω . Note that locally, we have:

$$\ell_\Omega = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0} \right\rangle, \quad \ell_\alpha = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \alpha^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i+d}} - \alpha^{i+d} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0} \right\rangle,$$

(see de León and Izquierdo [47]). According to Libermann [48],[23], an shs structure (Ω, α) on M^{2d+1} , can be viewed as an almsot-cosymplectic structure (Ω, α) satisfying:

$$d\Omega = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_\Omega \subset \ell_{d\alpha}.$$

Hence, in the language of G -structures, an shs structure is a $1 \times Sp(d, \mathbb{R})$ -structure. Now, in the intersection of two Darboux charts, namely (V^j, y^0, y^i, y^{i+d}) and (U^i, x^0, x^j, x^{j+d}) such that $U^i \cap V^j \neq \emptyset$, we have:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y^0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial y^i} = B_j^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} + C_j^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{j+d}}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial y^{i+d}} = -C_j^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} + B_j^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{j+d}}$$

and

$$dy^0 = dx^0, \quad dy^i = B_j^i dx_j - C_j^i dx_{j+d}, \quad dy^{i+d} = C_j^i dx_j + B_j^i dx_{j+d},$$

where $B, C \in GL(d, \mathbb{R})$. Hence, we can cover M^{2d+1} by the atlas $\mathcal{A} = \{U^i, x^i\}_{i \in A}$ such that the shs structure (Ω, α) on each U^i satisfies the condition of Eq. (46).

We note that in the state of art works, stable Hamiltonian manifolds are often referred to as orientable Hamiltonian manifolds such that the foliation ℓ_Ω is geodesible. The stability of the Hamiltonian structure Ω uniquely depends on the geodesibility of the foliation ℓ_Ω (see [49], [40], [50], [51]).

4.1 Basic examples

We will provide and illustrate fundamental examples of stable Hamiltonian structures.

Contact manifolds: $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ such that $\Omega = d\alpha$.

Contact type hypersurfaces: Any hypersurface M^{2d+1} of contact type in a symplectic manifold (W^{2d+2}, Ω) is endowed with a stable Hamiltonian structure with $\Omega = d\alpha$.

Cosymplectic manifolds [23]: $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ such that $d\alpha = 0$. With reference to Li [52], when M^{2d+1} is closed, M^{2d+1} is a symplectic mapping torus *i.e.* $(M^{2d+1} = \frac{Z^{2d} \times [0,1]}{(p,0) \sim (\varphi(p),1)})$, where Z^{2d} is a leaf of the codimension one foliation ℓ_α , and φ is a symplectomorphism of $(Z^{2d}, \tilde{\Omega})$. By the projection $\pi_1 : Z^{2d} \times [0,1] \rightarrow Z^{2d}$, Ω is obtained by glueing up $\tilde{\Omega} = \pi^* \tilde{\Omega}$ by φ and resting on Tischler [53], $\alpha = p^*(d\theta)$, with θ being the angle coordinate on \mathbb{S}^1 and $p : M^{2d+1} = Z_\varphi^{2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$. Note that the leaves of ℓ_α , are all symplectomorphic to each other under the flow of E , and the universal cover $\widetilde{M^{2d+1}}$ of M^{2d+1} is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R} \times \widetilde{Z^{2d}}$, where $\widetilde{Z^{2d}}$ is the universal cover of a leaf of the foliation ℓ_α . For additional details on cosymplectic structure, consult ([54], [55], [56], [57], [48]).

Circle bundles: Let $(B^{2d}, \hat{\Omega})$ be a symplectic manifold satisfying the prequantization condition $(Per(\hat{\Omega}) = c\mathbb{Z}, \text{ with } c \in \mathbb{R})$. Departing from Kostant [58], there exists a corresponding prequantization space, that is a principal \mathbb{S}^1 -bundle $p : M^{2d+1} \rightarrow B^{2d}$, with a principal connection $\alpha \in \Omega^1(M^{2d+1}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfying $\Omega = p^* \hat{\Omega} = d\alpha$. Hence, $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ is a SHS manifold. Note that from Gromov [59], there exists a symplectic immersion j from $(B^{2d}, \hat{\Omega})$ into the Kähler manifold $(\mathbb{C}P^N, \Omega^0)$ for N sufficiently large, such that $\hat{\Omega} = j^* \Omega^0$. The 2-form Ω^0 is the Fubini-Study Kähler form defined by $\Omega^0 = \frac{i}{2\pi} \partial \bar{\partial} \log(1 + |z_i|^2)$.

4.2 Canonical connections on shs manifold

In [60], the authors proved that on contact manifold (M^{2d+1}, α) , there exists a symmetric affine connection such that

$$\nabla E = 0, \nabla d\alpha = 0. \quad (47)$$

A.Lichnerowicz called these connections contact connections. In this section, we introduce a generalisation of the theorem of Lichnerowicz [60]. Our theorem states that every shs manifold admits infinite connections called shs connections, which preserves the shs structure (Ω, α) . The shs connections coincide with the contact connections in the contact manifold case. The idea of the proof relies on symplectization processes.

Theorem 4.2. *On every shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$, there are always connections such that:*

$$\nabla E = 0, \nabla \Omega = 0. \quad (48)$$

Proof. Assume that M^{2d+1} admits an shs structure (Ω, α) . By symplectization, we can always realize M^{2d+1} as hypersurface in the symplectic manifold $(W^{2d+2} = M^{2d+1} \times]-\epsilon, \epsilon[, \tilde{\Omega} = \Omega - d(t\alpha))$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Here, t denotes the coordinate on $] -\epsilon, \epsilon[$. By a direct computation, we get

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega - dt \wedge \alpha - td\alpha.$$

We denote $t = x^{\hat{0}}$. Using Eq. (45), locally in Darboux charts $(\tilde{U}^i = U^i \times I, x^{\hat{0}}, x^i)$ $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2d$, we obtain:

$$\tilde{\Omega} = dx^i \wedge dx^{i+d} - dt \wedge (dx^0 + \alpha^i dx^i + \alpha^{i+d} dx^{i+d}) - td(\alpha^i dx^i + \alpha^{i+d} dx^{i+d}).$$

It follows from the stabilization condition Eq. (46) that

$$\tilde{\Omega} = (1 + t(\frac{\partial \alpha^i}{\partial x^{i+d}} - \frac{\partial \alpha^{i+d}}{\partial x^i})) dx^i \wedge dx^{i+d} - dt \wedge dx^0 - \alpha^i dt \wedge dx^i - \alpha^{i+d} dt \wedge dx^{i+d}. \quad (49)$$

With reference to Eq. (49), the only non-zero components of $\tilde{\Omega}$ are:

$$\tilde{\Omega}_{i, i+d} = 1 + x^{\hat{0}}(\frac{\partial \alpha^i}{\partial x^{i+d}} - \frac{\partial \alpha^{i+d}}{\partial x^i}), \tilde{\Omega}_{\hat{0}, 0} = -1, \tilde{\Omega}_{\hat{0}, i} = -\alpha^i, \tilde{\Omega}_{\hat{0}, i+d} = -\alpha^{i+d}. \quad (50)$$

Now, we shall use the same strategy as in Theorem 1.1 through replacing the closed 2-form ω constructed by the use of Gromov's h -principle with $\tilde{\Omega}$. Let us select a symplectic connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ on $(W^{2d+2}, \tilde{\Omega})$ constructed in theorem 5.3. With Darboux coordinates on $(\tilde{U}^i = U^i \times I, x^{\hat{0}}, x^i)$ $i = 0, \dots, 2d$ of $(W^{2d+2}, \tilde{\Omega})$, we get:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^l \tilde{\Omega}_{lk} = \tilde{\Gamma}_{ik}^l \tilde{\Omega}_{lj}, \text{ for } i, j, k, l = \hat{0}, 0, 1, \dots, 2d.$$

Relying upon Eq. (50), it follows:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{i0}^0 = 0. \quad (51)$$

Now, identify M^{2d+1} with the leaf $t = 0$ of W^{2d+2} . We can define restriction connections ∇ on this leaf by $\Gamma_{ij}^l = \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^l$. Hence, there are connections ∇ on M^{2d+1} satisfying

$$\nabla\Omega = 0. \quad (52)$$

From the above analysis, in Darboux charts $(U^i, x^0, x^1, \dots, x^{2d})$ on $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$, we have:

$$\Gamma_{ij}^l \Omega_{lk} = \Gamma_{ik}^l \Omega_{lj}, \text{ for } i, j, k, l = 0, 1, \dots, 2d.$$

Bear in mind that $i_E \Omega = 0$. Therefore in Darboux charts, we have $\Omega_{l0} = 0$. Consequently, we deduce that

$$\Gamma_{i0}^l \Omega_{lk} = 0.$$

In Darboux charts, we have $\Omega_{i, i+d} = 1$. Then,

$$\Gamma_{i0}^l = 0, \text{ for } l = 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (53)$$

Now, resting on Eq. (51), we get:

$$\Gamma_{i0}^0 = \tilde{\Gamma}_{i0}^0 = 0.$$

Consequently, we have:

$$\Gamma_{i,0}^l = 0, \text{ for } l = 0, 1, \dots, 2d.$$

or equivalently

$$\nabla E = 0. \quad (54)$$

Finally, with respect to Eqs. (52) and (54), we obtain

$$\nabla E = 0, \nabla\Omega = 0.$$

This therefore proves our assertion. \square

Remark 4.3. As presented in section 3, locally we can also define a symmetric connection ∇^i to have zero Christoffel symbols in Darboux charts $(U^i, x^i) \forall i : 0, 1, \dots, 2d$. We hence get

$$\nabla^i E_{U^i} = 0, \quad \nabla^i \Omega_{U^i} = 0$$

Globally, we can glue ∇^i using a partition of unity $(\rho_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}$ subordinate to the open covering $(U_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}$, as $\nabla = \sum_i \rho_i \nabla^i$. We thus deduce that

$$\nabla E = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla\Omega = 0.$$

The desired connections are hence obtained.

The space of connections satisfying Eq. (48) will be denoted by $\mathcal{C}M_{(\Omega, \alpha)}^{2d+1}$. These connections will be called **shs-connections**. In what follows, we attempt to prove that there are E -invariant shs connections on an shs manifold.

Proposition 4.4. Let $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ be an shs manifold such that the leaves of ℓ_Ω are closed. The shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ admits E -invariant shs connections.

Proof. First of all, the leaves of the foliation ℓ_Ω are closed. Hence, the space of leaves M^{2d+1}/ℓ_Ω is a smooth manifold. Denote the manifold M^{2d+1}/ℓ_Ω by B^{2d} and the canonical projection by $\pi : X^{2d+1} \rightarrow B^{2d}$. Since $L_E\Omega = 0$, thus there exists on B^{2d} a closed 2-form $\tilde{\Omega}$ such that $\Omega = \pi^*\tilde{\Omega}$. As $\Omega^d = \pi^*\tilde{\Omega}^d$ is non-vanishing, then $(B^{2d}, \tilde{\Omega})$ is a symplectic manifold. The stabilization condition $L_E\alpha = 0$ implies that there is on B^{2d} a 1-form $\tilde{\alpha}$ such that $\alpha = \pi^*\tilde{\alpha}$. Now, consider Darboux charts (\tilde{U}^i, x^i) $i = 1, \dots, 2d$ on the symplectic manifold $(B^{2d}, \tilde{\Omega})$. We can construct a Darboux chart $U^i = \pi^{-1}(\tilde{U}^i)$ with coordinates (x^0, x^i) . On U^i , we have:

$$E = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_0}, \alpha_{U^i} = dx^0 + \sum_i \alpha^i dx^i + \alpha^{i+d} dx^{i+d}, \quad \Omega_{U^i} = \sum_i dx^i \wedge dx^{i+d}, \quad (55)$$

where $\partial_0\alpha^i = \partial_0\alpha^{i+d} = 0$. Let us choose $\tilde{\nabla}$, a symplectic connection on $(B^{2d}, \tilde{\Omega})$. Naturally, on (\tilde{U}^i, x^i) , we have

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{kj}^s \tilde{\Omega}_{is} = \tilde{\Gamma}_{ki}^s \tilde{\Omega}_{js}, \quad (56)$$

where $\tilde{\Gamma}$ denote the Christoffel symbols of $\tilde{\nabla}$. We can define a symmetric connection ∇ on $U^i = \pi^{-1}(\tilde{U}^i)$ by:

$$\Gamma_{ij}^s = \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^s, \Gamma_{j0}^s = 0, \Gamma_{ij}^0 = 0. \quad (57)$$

Departing from Eqs. (56) and (57), it follows that on U^i :

$$\Gamma_{kj}^s \Omega_{is} = \Gamma_{ki}^s \Omega_{js}. \quad (58)$$

Thus, we deduce:

$$(\nabla_{\partial_k}\Omega)(\partial_i, \partial_j) = 0 \quad \forall i, j, k = 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (59)$$

Through a straightforward calculation, we get:

$$(\nabla_{\partial_j}\Omega)(E, \partial_i) = \partial_j.\Omega(E, \partial_i) - \Omega(\nabla_{\partial_j}E, E) - \Omega(E, \nabla_{\partial_j}\partial_i). \quad (60)$$

Since $i_E\Omega = 0$, we obtain:

$$(\nabla_{\partial_j}\Omega)(E, \partial_i) = 0. \quad (61)$$

Using a direct computation, we have:

$$(\nabla_E\Omega)(\partial_i, \partial_j) = \partial_0\Omega(\partial_i, \partial_j) - \Gamma_{0,i}^s \Omega_{sj} - \Gamma_{0,j}^s \Omega_{is}. \quad (62)$$

We obtain from Eq. (57) that:

$$(\nabla_{\partial_0}\Omega)(\partial_i, \partial_j) = 0 \quad \forall i, j = 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (63)$$

Finally, We deduce from the previous identities that:

$$\nabla\Omega = 0. \quad (64)$$

Now, based on Eq. (57), we have $\Gamma_{j0}^s = 0$. Thus,

$$\nabla E = 0. \quad (65)$$

As a matter of fact, connection ∇ is an shs connection. Resting on a direct calculation, we have:

$$(L_E\nabla)(Y, Z) = \nabla_E\nabla_Y Z - \nabla_{\nabla_Y Z} E - \nabla_{[E, Y]} Z - \nabla_Y\nabla_E Z + \nabla_Y\nabla_Z E,$$

for any vector fields Y, Z on M^{2d+1} . With the local basis, we have:

$$(L_E\nabla)(\partial_i, \partial_j) = R^\nabla(E, \partial_i)\partial_j + (\nabla^2 E)(\partial_i, \partial_j), \quad \forall i, j = 0, 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (66)$$

Now, by a direct computation, we get:

$$(L_E\nabla)(\partial_i, \partial_j) = \partial_0(\Gamma_{ij}^s)\partial_s.$$

Using Eq. (57), we obtain:

$$\partial_0\Gamma_{ij}^s = \partial_0\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^s = 0.$$

It follows from the above that:

$$L_E\nabla = 0.$$

The result follows at once. \square

4.2.1 Description of the space of shs connections

A covariant tensor S of rank q is E -transverse, if:

$$i_E S = 0.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{T}_E(M^{2d+1}) = \bigoplus_p \mathcal{T}_E^q(M^{2d+1})$ the tensor algebra of covariant E -transverse tensor on M^{2d+1} . For an shs structure, $(\Omega, \alpha), (\Omega, d\alpha) \in \mathcal{T}_E^2(M^{2d+1}) \times \mathcal{T}_E^2(M^{2d+1})$. Each space $\mathcal{T}_E^q(M^{2d+1})$ contains the subspace $\mathcal{S}_E^q(M^{2d+1})$ of totally symmetric covariant tensor fields of rank q .

Proposition 4.5. The set of shs connections $\mathcal{C}M_{(\Omega, \alpha)}^{2d+1}$ on the shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ is an affine space modelled on the vector space $\mathcal{S}_E^3(M^{2d+1})$.

Proof. Let us consider ∇ a connection satisfying Eq. (48). It is well known that any connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ can be expressed as:

$$\tilde{\nabla} = \nabla + B \text{ where, } B \in T_1^2 M^{2d+1}.$$

It follows from a straightforward computation that $\tilde{\nabla}$ satisfies the condition Eq. (48) if and only if

$$A(X, Y, Z) = \Omega(B(X, Y), Z) \in S^3TM^{2d+1} \quad \text{and} \quad i_E B = 0.$$

Since $i_E \Omega = 0$, then we deduce that $A(X, Y, Z) = \Omega(B(X, Y), Z) \in \mathcal{S}_E^3(M^{2d+1})$. This proves our assertion. \square

Let ∇ be an shs connection and let R^∇ be its curvature tensor. Referring to [61], we can define the analogues of the symplectic curvature for shs connections. The symplectic curvature of an shs connection will be indicated by:

$$S^\nabla(X, Y, Z, W) = \Omega(X, R^\nabla(Z, W)Y),$$

for any vector fields X, Y, Z, W on M^{2d+1} . The components of the curvature on the local Darboux charts are of the form:

$$S_{ijkl}^\nabla = \Omega(\partial_i, R^\nabla(\partial_k, \partial_l)\partial_j) = \Omega_{im}R_{jkl}^m, \quad (67)$$

where $R^\nabla(\partial_j, \partial_k)\partial_i = R_{ijk}^m\partial_m$. From a direct computation, we get:

$$R^\nabla(\partial_i, \partial_j)E = (\nabla^2 E)(\partial_i, \partial_j) - (\nabla^2 E)(\partial_j, \partial_i), \quad i, j = 0, 1, \dots, 2d.$$

Now using Eq. (48), we obtain from a straightforward calculation that

$$(\nabla^2 E)(\partial_i, \partial_j) = \nabla_{\partial_i}(\nabla_{\partial_j} E) - \nabla_{\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j} E = 0, \quad i, j = 0, 1, \dots, 2d.$$

Thus, we get:

$$S_{i0kl}^\nabla = 0, \quad \text{for } i, k, l = 0, 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (68)$$

Resting upon Eq. (48), we have:

$$\partial_k \Omega_{ij} = \Omega_{il} \Gamma_{kj}^l + \Omega_{lj} \Gamma_{ki}^l \quad \text{for } i, j, k = 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (69)$$

Hence, grounded on Lemlein [62], Vaisman [61], the symplectic curvature S^∇ satisfies symmetry properties as:

$$S_{ijkl}^\nabla = S_{jikl}^\nabla, \quad S_{ijkl}^\nabla = -S_{ijkl}^\nabla \quad \text{for } i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (70)$$

Based on Eqs. (68) and (70), the components of the symplectic curvature of an shs connection in the local Darboux charts satisfy the following identities:

$$S_{i0kl}^\nabla = 0, \quad S_{ijkl}^\nabla = S_{jikl}^\nabla, \quad S_{ijkl}^\nabla = -S_{ijkl}^\nabla \quad \text{for } i, j, k, l = 0, 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (71)$$

Resting on [61], we deduce that the Ricci tensor Ric^∇ of an shs connection is symmetric

$$Ric_{ij}^\nabla = Ric_{ji}^\nabla, \quad \text{for } i, j, k, l = 0, 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (72)$$

4.3 Compatible SMAT connections on shs manifolds

The central objective of this subsection is to corroborate that on any shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$, there always are smat connections adapted to the distributions ℓ_Ω and ℓ_α . Remember that a linear connection ∇ on a manifold M is said to be adapted to a distribution H or parallel with respect to ∇ , or ∇ -geodesic if

$$\nabla_Y S \in \Gamma(H), \quad \forall Y \in \Gamma(TM), \forall S \in \Gamma(H),$$

(see [63–65]). With reference to [66], [67], [68], note that for an shs pair (Ω, α) , there exist a tensor field $\Theta \in \Gamma(TM^{2d+1})$ and a compatible Riemannian metric g satisfying:

$$\Theta^2 = -I + \alpha \otimes E \tag{73}$$

$$\Theta E = 0, \quad \alpha \circ \Theta = 0 \tag{74}$$

$$\alpha = g(\cdot, E) \tag{75}$$

$$\Theta^2|_{\ell_\alpha} = -1 \tag{76}$$

$$g = \Omega(\cdot, \Theta) + \alpha \otimes \alpha. \tag{77}$$

Therefore, the Hamiltonian form is indicated by:

$$\Omega = g(\Theta, \cdot)$$

We hence state that (Θ, E, α, g) is the almost contact Riemannian structure associated with the shs structure (Ω, α) . Note that it is, generally, not unique. The triple (Θ, E, α) , is called an almost contact structure on M^{2d+1} . In [69], the triple (Θ, E, α) is also called an almost co-complex structure and the compatible metric g is defined in Eq. (77) as a co-Hermitian metric. Let's denote by $\mathcal{H}(\ell_\alpha)$ the space of Ω -compatible almost complex structure of the symplectic bundle ℓ_α and let's consider a Hermitian metric $g|_{\ell_\alpha} = \Omega(\cdot, \Theta)$ on the symplectic bundle ℓ_α . Extend Θ on TM^{2d+1} as $\Theta|_{\ell_\Omega} = 0$ and $\ell_\alpha = \text{Im}(\Theta) \subset TM^{2d+1}$. According to the decomposition in Eq. (44), any vector fields X, Y in TM^{2d+1} can be stated as follows:

$$X = X_{\ell_\alpha} + (i_X \alpha)E, \quad Y = Y_{\ell_\alpha} + (i_Y \alpha)E, \tag{78}$$

where $X_{\ell_\alpha}, Y_{\ell_\alpha}$ are the ℓ_α -components of the vector fields X and Y . The Hermitian metric $g|_{\ell_\alpha}$ can be extended as follows:

$$g(X, Y) = g|_{\ell_\alpha}(X_{\ell_\alpha}, Y_{\ell_\alpha}) + (i_X \alpha)(i_Y \alpha). \tag{79}$$

We can easily prove that $\Omega = g(\cdot, \Theta)$ and $\alpha = g(\cdot, E)$. We deduce that (Θ, E, α, g) constructed above is the almost contact Riemannian structure associated with the shs structure (Ω, α) . Finally from the above construction, there exists a bijective correspondence between the set of almost contact Riemannian structures associated with the shs structure (Ω, α) and the set of Ω -compatible almost complex structure of the symplectic bundle ℓ_α .

As a matter of fact, the shs structure (Ω, α) can also be written as (Ω, α, g) or (Ω, α, Θ) in the sequel.

Proposition 4.6. On an shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$, there are always SMAT connections suitably adapted to the distributions ℓ_Ω and ℓ_α .

Proof. Select an SHS connection ∇ on $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ and a co-Hermitian metric g on $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$. Using a direct computation, the dual connection ∇^* of ∇ with respect to g satisfies:

$$(\nabla_X^* \alpha)Y = Xg(Y, E) - g(\nabla_X^* Y, E), \quad (80)$$

for any vector field X, Y in M^{2d+1} . According to the duality condition, we obtain

$$(\nabla_X^* \alpha)Y = g(Y, \nabla_X E), \quad (81)$$

for any vector fields X, Y on M^{2d+1} . We infer departing from the condition of Eq. (48) that:

$$\nabla \Omega = 0, \nabla^* \alpha = 0. \quad (82)$$

With reference to Eq. (82), we obtain by a straightforward computation

$$\nabla i_X \Omega = i_{\nabla_X} \Omega, \forall X \in \ell_\Omega, \quad (83)$$

$$\nabla^* i_X \alpha = i_{\nabla^* X} \alpha, \forall X \in \ell_\alpha. \quad (84)$$

Therefore, from Eqs. (83) and (84), we get:

$$\nabla \ell_\Omega \subset \ell_\Omega, \nabla^* \ell_\alpha \subset \ell_\alpha.$$

The desired adapted smat shs connections are therefore obtained. \square




Fig. 2 Smat connections on a shs manifold.

4.4 The torsion of the dual connection of an SHS connection

We may denote the Darboux coordinates by $(x^0, z^i) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}^d$, where $z^i = x_i + ix_{i+d}$ and $\bar{z}^i = x_i - ix_{i+d}$. According to Darboux theorem, it is to be noted that

in a local Darboux charts (U^i, x^0, z^i) , we obtain the following local representation of $E, \Omega, \alpha, \Theta$:

$$E_{U^i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^0}, \Omega_{U^i} = \frac{i}{2} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^i, \alpha_{U^i} = dx^0 + \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{2} + \frac{\alpha_{i+d}}{2i}\right) dz^i + \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{2} - \frac{\alpha_{i+d}}{2i}\right) d\bar{z}^i, \quad (85)$$

$$\Theta_{U^i} = \frac{1}{2} (\Theta_i^j dz^i \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} + \Theta_i^{\bar{j}} dz^i \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^j} + \Theta_i^j d\bar{z}^i \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial z^j} + \Theta_i^{\bar{j}} d\bar{z}^i \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^j}), \quad (86)$$

where $\Theta_i^j, \Theta_i^{\bar{j}}, \Theta_i^{\bar{j}}, \Theta_i^j$ are certain functions on U^i . The co-Hermitian metric g satisfies the following identities:

$$g_{00} = 1, g_{0i} = 0, g_{0\bar{i}} = 0, g_{ij} = g_{\bar{i}\bar{j}} = 0, g_{i\bar{j}} = g_{\bar{j}i}, g_{j\bar{i}} = \bar{g}_{i\bar{j}}, \quad (87)$$

Hence locally, we get

$$g_{U^i} = \alpha_{U^i} \otimes \alpha_{U^i} + 2g_{i\bar{j}} dz^i \otimes d\bar{z}^j, \quad (88)$$

where $g_{i\bar{j}}$ are certain functions on U^i .

Proposition 4.7. The local components of the torsion tensor T^{∇^*} of the dual of an shs connection with respect to Darboux charts are provided by:

1. $T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_0, \partial_0) = 0, T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_0, \partial_j) = g^{\bar{i}p} \partial_0 g_{\bar{i}j} \partial_p, j=1, \dots, 2d,$
2. $T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_i, \partial_k) = \partial_k \Theta_i^p \Theta_p^s \partial_s + \Theta_i^p \Gamma_{kp}^m \Theta_m^l \partial_l - \partial_i \Theta_k^p \Theta_p^r \partial_r - \Theta_k^p \Gamma_{ip}^n \Theta_n^a \partial_a,$
 $i, k=1, \dots, 2d.$

Proof.

$$T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_0, \partial_0) = 0, T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_0, \partial_j) = T_{0j}^{*0} \partial_0 + T_{0j}^{*l} \partial_l, T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_i, \partial_j) = T_{ij}^{*0} \partial_0 + T_{ij}^{*l} \partial_l. \quad (89)$$

Bearing in mind that $\nabla E = 0$ is equivalent to $\nabla^* \alpha = 0$, then for any vector field X, Y , we get

$$0 = (\nabla_X^* \alpha) Y = X. \alpha(Y) - \alpha(\nabla_X^* Y),$$

and

$$0 = (\nabla_Y^* \alpha) X = Y. \alpha(X) - \alpha(\nabla_Y^* X).$$

From the above analysis, we obtain:

$$X. \alpha(Y) - Y. \alpha(X) - \alpha([X, Y]) = \alpha(\nabla_X^* Y) - \alpha(\nabla_Y^* X) - \alpha([X, Y]),$$

that is equivalent to:

$$(d\alpha)(X, Y) = \alpha(T^{\nabla^*}(X, Y)). \quad (90)$$

The stabilization condition yields:

$$\alpha(T^*(E, Y)) = 0. \quad (91)$$

It follows from the above Eqs. (90) and (91) that:

$$T_{0j}^{*0} = 0, T_{ij}^{*0} = 0, \forall i, j. \quad (92)$$

Hence, departing from Eq. (92), we deduce that:

$$T^{\nabla*}(\partial_0, \partial_0) = 0, T^{\nabla*}(\partial_0, \partial_j) = T_{0,j}^{*l} \partial_l, T^{\nabla*}(\partial_i, \partial_j) = T_{ij}^{*l} \partial_l. \quad (93)$$

1. Now from duality condition, we get:

$$\partial_0 g_{ij} = g_{jm} \Gamma_{0i}^m + g_{im} \Gamma_{0j}^{*m} \quad (94)$$

Replacing j by 0 and 0 by j in Eq. (94), we obtain:

$$\partial_j g_{i0} = g_{0m} \Gamma_{ji}^m + g_{im} \Gamma_{j0}^{*m}. \quad (95)$$

Resting upon Eqs. (94) and (95), we get:

$$\partial_0 g_{ij} = g_{im} (\Gamma_{0j}^{*m} - \Gamma_{j0}^{*m}) + g_{jm} \Gamma_{0i}^m. \quad (96)$$

Bearing in mind that $\Gamma_{0i}^m = \Gamma_{i0}^m = 0$, then we have:

$$g_{im} (\Gamma_{0j}^{*m} - \Gamma_{j0}^{*m}) = \partial_0 g_{ij}. \quad (97)$$

With regard to Eq. (97), we get:

$$g_{i\bar{p}} (\Gamma_{0j}^{*\bar{p}} - \Gamma_{j0}^{*\bar{p}}) = \partial_0 g_{ij}. \quad (98)$$

and therefore,

$$T_{0j}^{*\bar{p}} = g^{i\bar{p}} \partial_0 g_{ij}. \quad (99)$$

Accordingly, referring to Eq. (87), we obtain:

$$T_{0j}^{*\bar{p}} = 0. \quad (100)$$

Using again formula Eq. (97) and replacing i by \bar{i} , we get:

$$g_{\bar{i}m} (\Gamma_{0j}^{*m} - \Gamma_{j0}^{*m}) = \partial_0 g_{\bar{i}j}; \quad (101)$$

and hence,

$$T_{0j}^{*p} = g^{\bar{i}p} \partial_0 g_{\bar{i}j}; \quad (102)$$

Consequently, we infer that

$$T^{\nabla*}(\partial_0, \partial_j) = g^{\bar{i}p} \partial_0 g_{\bar{i}j} \partial_p. \quad (103)$$

2. Departing from a straightforward computation, we have

$$\partial_i \cdot \Omega(\partial_j, \Theta \partial_k) = \Omega(\nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_j, \Theta \partial_k) + \Omega(\partial_j, \nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta \partial_k), \quad \forall i, k = 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (104)$$

By a simple observation, we get:

$$\nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta \partial_k = \Theta(\nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_k - \Theta(\nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta) \partial_k), \quad \forall i, k = 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (105)$$

Combining the above equality with Eq. (104), we get:

$$\partial_i \cdot \Omega(\partial_j, \Theta \partial_k) = \Omega(\nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_j, \Theta \partial_k) + \Omega(\partial_j, \Theta(\nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_k - \Theta(\nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta) \partial_k)).$$

Eventually, substituting $\Omega(\partial_j, \Theta \partial_k)$ for $g(\partial_j, \partial_k)$, we get:

$$\partial_i \cdot g(\partial_j, \partial_k) = g(\nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_j, \partial_k) + g(\partial_j, \nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_k - \Theta(\nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta) \partial_k). \quad (106)$$

Thus,

$$\nabla_{\partial_i}^* \partial_k = \nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_k - \Theta(\nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta) \partial_k. \quad (107)$$

It follows from the above that:

$$T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_i, \partial_k) = \Theta((\nabla_{\partial_k} \Theta) \partial_i - (\nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta) \partial_k). \quad (108)$$

Consequently, we obtain:

$$T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_i, \partial_k) = \Theta \nabla_{\partial_k} \Theta \partial_i - \Theta \nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta \partial_k. \quad (109)$$

By a direct computation, we get:

$$T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_i, \partial_k) = \Theta \nabla_{\partial_k} \Theta_i^p \partial_p - \Theta \nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta_k^p \partial_p; \quad (110)$$

$$= \Theta(\partial_k \Theta_i^p \partial_p + \Theta_i^p \nabla_{\partial_k} \partial_p) - \Theta(\partial_i \Theta_k^p \partial_p + \Theta_k^p \nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_p); \quad (111)$$

Finally, we obtain:

$$T^{\nabla^*}(\partial_i, \partial_k) = \partial_k \Theta_i^p \Theta_p^s \partial_s + \Theta_i^p \Gamma_{kp}^m \Theta_m^l \partial_l - \partial_i \Theta_k^p \Theta_p^r \partial_r - \Theta_k^p \Gamma_{ip}^n \Theta_n^a \partial_a. \quad (112)$$

□

4.5 Obstructions to the existence of statistical SMAT shs connections on shs manifolds

We shall now shed light on the work of Lauritzen in the information geometry area.

4.5.1 Statistical connections

Amari [1, 70] and [71] introduced a family of α -connections ∇^α , where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is symmetric but non-metric on the statistical model $\mathcal{P}_d(\Xi)$, such that:

$$\nabla^\alpha g^F = \alpha T^{A-C},$$

with T^{A-C} being often called the Amari-Chentsov tensor, in honour of both researchers who have worked intensively on this structure. It is a totally symmetric 3-tensor defined by the following formula:

$$g_{ij}^F = E_{p_\theta}(\partial_i \log p_\theta(x) \partial_j \log p_\theta(x)) \quad \forall i, j = 1, \dots, d, \quad (113)$$

$$T_{ijk}^{A-C} = E_{p_\theta}(\partial_i \log p_\theta(x) \partial_j \log p_\theta(x) \partial_k \log p_\theta(x)) \quad \forall i, j, k = 1, \dots, d. \quad (114)$$

α -connections are defined by:

$$\Gamma_{ij:k}^\alpha(\theta) = E_{p_\theta} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} l_\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} l_\theta \right) + \frac{1-\alpha}{2} E_{p_\theta} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} l_\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} l_\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} l_\theta \right) \quad (115)$$

For $\alpha = 0$, we obtain the Levi-Civita connection of the Fisher metric defined as follows:

$$\Gamma_{ij:k}^{lc}(\theta) = E_{p_\theta} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} l_\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} l_\theta \right) + \frac{1}{2} E_{p_\theta} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} l_\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} l_\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} l_\theta \right). \quad (116)$$

Obviously, in a statistical model $\mathcal{P}_d(\Xi)$, we have the following equation

$$\partial_{\theta_k} \cdot g^F(\partial_{\theta_i}, \partial_{\theta_j}) = g^F(\nabla_{\partial_{\theta_k}}^\alpha \partial_{\theta_i}, \partial_{\theta_j}) + g^F(\partial_{\theta_i}, \nabla_{\partial_{\theta_k}}^{-\alpha} \partial_{\theta_j}), \quad (117)$$

where g^F is the Fisher information matrix defined in Eq. (3). It is to be noted that Steffen L. Lauritzen [4] was motivated by the above construction of ∇^α , as well as the concept of Amari-Chentsov tensor and he came up with the definition of the notion statistical manifold.

Definition 4.8. A statistical manifold refers to a triple (M, g, ∇, ∇^*) satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\forall X, Y, Z \in \Gamma(TM)$,

$$X.g(Y, Z) = g(\nabla_X Y, Z) + g(Y, \nabla_X^* Z). \quad (118)$$

2. Both ∇ and ∇^* are torsion free.

A statistical manifold can equivalently be defined in terms of a Riemannian manifold (M, g) with a 3-symmetric tensor B .

[4] For a statistical manifold (M, g, ∇, ∇^*) , the dual connections (∇, ∇^*) are called statistical connections and the Levi-Civita connection of the metric g is characterized by:

$$2\nabla^{lc} = \nabla + \nabla^*. \quad (119)$$

Alternatively, one may build up statistical connections (∇^D, ∇^{*D}) using smooth functions D (three-times differentiable), which satisfy some conditions (cf. [72], [73], [74]) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ijk}^D(\theta) &= -\partial_{\theta_1 i} \partial_{\theta_1 j} \partial_{\theta_2 k} D(\theta_1, \theta_2) \big|_{\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \theta} \\ \text{and } \Gamma_{ijk}^{*D}(\theta) &= -\partial_{\theta_2 i} \partial_{\theta_2 j} \partial_{\theta_1 k} D(\theta_1, \theta_2) \big|_{\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \theta}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_{ijk}^D(\theta)$, $\Gamma_{ijk}^{*D}(\theta)$ are the symbols of the dual connections ∇^D and ∇^{*D} . In the literature, it is often indicated that the function D is a divergence function (contrast function), or an entropy function.

4.5.2 Statistical connections in an shs manifold

The suitably adapted SMAT connections (∇, ∇^*) to the shs structure (Ω, α) , will be called **the SMAT shs connections** and the set of all SMAT shs connections on $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ is expressed as:

$$\mathcal{E}_{(\Omega, \alpha, g)}(M^{2d+1}) = \left\{ (\nabla, \nabla^*) \left| \begin{array}{c} \nabla E = 0, \nabla \Omega = 0 \\ \text{or} \\ \nabla^* \alpha = 0, \nabla \Omega = 0 \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

We close this section with the investigation of obstructions to the existence of statistical SMAT shs connections. We prove that in some shs manifolds, SMAT shs connections are not statistical connections.

Proposition 4.9. Let $(\Omega = d\alpha, \alpha)$ be a contact manifold. The SMAT shs connections are not statistical connections.

Proof. Assume that (∇, ∇^*) are statistical smat shs connections on the contact manifold. For any X and Y , we have:

$$0 = (\nabla_X^* \alpha)Y = X.\alpha(Y) - \alpha(\nabla_X^* Y),$$

and

$$0 = (\nabla_Y^* \alpha)X = Y.\alpha(X) - \alpha(\nabla_Y^* X).$$

By a simple manipulation, we get:

$$X.\alpha(Y) - Y.\alpha(X) - \alpha([X, Y]) = \alpha(\nabla_X^* Y) - \alpha(\nabla_Y^* X) - \alpha([X, Y]),$$

which is equivalent to:

$$(d\alpha)(X, Y) = \alpha(T^{\nabla^*}(X, Y)). \quad (120)$$

By assumption, ∇^* is a symmetric connection. Accordingly, we have:

$$d\alpha = 0.$$

This is a contradiction and the proof of the proposition is hence complete. \square

Proposition 4.10. Let $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ be a compact shs manifold whose fundamental group is finite. The SMAT shs connections are not statistical connections.

Proof. Consider a statistical shs connection (∇, ∇^*) on M^{2d+1} . It follows from Eq. (120) that α is closed. By assumption, the fundamental group of M^{2d+1} is finite. We deduce that α is exact. From this perspective, it should vanish at some point $p \in M^{2d+1}$, owing to the compactness of M^{2d+1} . However, this is a contradiction because α is nowhere vanishing. This contradiction ends the proof of the proposition. \square

Proposition 4.11. Let $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ be a compact shs manifold with a compatible almost contact metric structure (Θ, E, α, g) such that the Ric^g of g is negative definite. SMAT shs connections are not therefore statistical connections.

Proof. Resting on a direct computation, we have

$$(L_E g)(\partial_i, \partial_{\bar{j}}) = \partial_0 g_{i\bar{j}}. \quad (121)$$

Consider a statistical shs connection (∇, ∇^*) on M^{2d+1} . Based on the proposition 4.7, we get

$$(L_E g)(\partial_i, \partial_{\bar{j}}) = 0. \quad (122)$$

Therefore, the Reeb vector field E is a Killing vector field. By assumption, $Ric^g < 0$. Then according to [75], we deduce that E vanishes identically. This is a contradiction and the result follows at once. \square

Proposition 4.12. Let $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ be an shs manifold with its compatible almost contact metric structure (Θ, E, α, g) . If the Ricci tensor Ric^g of g is positive definite, the SMAT shs connections are not statistical connections.

Proof. Assume that the set of SMAT shs connections contains statistical connections. Departing from Eq. (120), we infer that α is closed. Then, $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha, g)$ is a cosymplectic(almost co-Kähler) manifold. It follows from [76](Theorem 4.2) that

$$Ric^g(E, E) = -\|\nabla^{lc} E\|^2$$

This is a contradiction and the conclusion then follows from it. \square

To sum up, we proved in this section that any shs manifold admits infinite SMAT connections adapted to an shs structure (Ω, α) . We equally noted that for some shs manifolds, there is no statistical shs SMAT connection. The above result indicates that the shs manifolds which contains statistical SMAT shs connections are very special types of manifolds. Hence, a natural question arises

Question 2: Which shs manifold contains a statistical SMAT shs connection ?

For reasons of simplicity, the statistical shs SMAT connections will be called **the statistical shs connections**. In what follows, we attempt to provide an answer to this question. Our answer offers a new approach to the integrability for almost co-Kähler structures on almost contact manifolds.

5 Answer to question 2 and statistical approach to the integrability of almost co-Kähler structure.

Morimoto [77] built up a natural almost complex structure Θ on the product of two almost contact manifolds $(M_j, \Theta_j, E_j, \alpha_j)_{j \in \{1,2\}}$ and revealed that Θ is integral if and only if both of the product factors are normal almost contact manifolds. A direct consequence of this fact lies in that the product of two odd-dimensional spheres $S^{2l+1} \times S^{2k+1}$ is complex. A natural question to ask is to know under what conditions on M_i , the product is a Kähler manifold. It is enticing to speculate that every factor manifold M_i should be Sasakian as a solution. Nevertheless, it is not possible because it would imply that the result of two Sasakian spheres would be a Kähler manifold.

This contradicts the result of Calabi and Eckmann holding that the product of odd dimensional spheres is complex and non Kähler Calabi and Eckmann [78]. The correct geometric structure on factor manifolds M_i should be a co-Kähler structure, as corroborated by Goldberg [79] and later by Capursi [80].

Definition 5.1. A co-Kähler manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ is a cosymplectic manifold admitting a compatible almost contact metric structure (Θ, α, E, g) such that

$$N^\Theta = 0.$$

Recall that N^Θ is defined by

$$N^\Theta = [\Theta, \Theta] - \Theta[\Theta, \cdot] - \Theta[\cdot, \Theta] + \Theta^2[\cdot, \cdot].$$

In the co-Kähler manifold, the compatible (co-Hermitain) metric g will be called a co-Kähler metric in this paper. It is very significant to note that Blair [68] used the term "cosymplectic," whereas Ougie [69], [81] used the term "cocomplex". This first name has been widely adopted in the literature and has been used in numerous papers [82], [83], [76], [84], [85], [86], [87], [88]. However, it may entail confusion because Libermann [23] used the same term to refer to the almost cosymplectic structure (Ω, α) such that Ω and α are closed. We will use the term "co-Kähler" throughout this paper. This name was invested by Bazzoni [89], Janssens, L.Vanhecke [90], etc. This terminology has more recently been adopted in the article of Hongjuin Li [52] who confirmed that any closed co-Kähler manifold is a Kähler mapping torus. According to Li's work, we infer that the co-Kähler manifolds are really odd dimensional analogues of Kähler manifolds. A natural example of co-Kähler manifold is provided by a Kähler manifold product with the circle (or with \mathbb{R}). Some pertinent examples of co-Kähler manifolds are set forward by J. C. Marrero; E. Padrón-Fernández([91]) and Blair[68].

5.1 Statistical characterization of a co-Kähler structure

In 1969, S. I. Goldberg asserted that if the curvature operator of an almost Kähler manifold commutes with the almost complex structure (ie $R^{\nabla^{lc}} \circ \Theta = \Theta \circ R^{\nabla^{lc}}$), then the manifold is a Kähler manifold. He conjectured in [92] that "Every compact Einstein almost Kählerian manifold is a Kähler manifold". Under certain curvature conditions, some progress has been implemented (see [93], [94], [95], [96], [97], [98], [76]). The odd dimensional counterparts of Kählerian manifolds are co-Kähler manifolds. From this perspective, one can ask for a Goldberg-like conjecture for these manifolds. In [83], the author identified a curvature condition for the integrability of the co-symplectic manifolds (almost co-Kähler manifolds). In [99], the author introduced the analogues of the Goldberg conjecture in the case of cosymplectic manifolds (almost co-Kähler manifolds). The author's theorem states that, "Every compact Einstein almost co-Kähler manifold, such that the Reeb vector field is Killing, is a co-Kähler manifold".

Our central objective in this section is to provide a new characterization of co-Kähler manifolds using information geometric ingredients.

Definition 5.2. A **statistical shs manifold** is an shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ such that the set of SMAT shs connections $\mathcal{E}_{(\Omega, \alpha, g)}(M^{2d})$ contains a statistical one.

Theorem 5.3. *An shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ is a co-Kähler manifold, if and only if, it is a statistical shs manifold.*

Proof. Consider an shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ and select a compatible almost co-Kähler structure (Θ, g) defined in Eqs. (73) to (77). Suppose that the set of SMAT shs connections contains a statistical connection (∇, ∇^*) . It follows from Eq. (90), that the stabilization 1-form α is closed. Therefore, the shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ is a co-symplectic manifold (almost co-Kähler manifold). Now, choose a local orthonormal Θ -basis $\{E, X_i, X_{\bar{i}} = \Theta X_i\}$ at each $p \in M^{2d+1}$. The components of the Hamiltonian form Ω in the Θ -basis are provided by:

$$\Omega(E, X_j) = 0 \quad (123)$$

$$\Omega(E, X_{\bar{j}}) = 0 \quad (124)$$

$$\Omega(X_i, X_j) = 0 \quad (125)$$

$$\Omega(X_i, X_{\bar{j}}) = g(X_i, X_j) = \delta_{ij} \quad (126)$$

$$\Omega(X_{\bar{i}}, X_{\bar{j}}) = 0. \quad (127)$$

We shall now prove that $\nabla^* \Omega = 0$. It is sufficient to check the identity in the following three particular cases:

1. By a direct computation, we obtain:

$$(\nabla_E^* \Omega)(X_i, \Theta X_j) = E \cdot \Omega(X_i, \Theta X_j) - \Omega(\nabla_E^* X_i, \Theta X_j) - \Omega(X_i, \nabla_E^* \Theta X_j). \quad (128)$$

As $\nabla \Omega = 0$, we get $\nabla_E^* \Theta X_j = \Theta \nabla_E X_j$. Shs connection ∇ is a symmetric connection. Then,

$$\nabla_E^* \Theta X_j = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, 2d$$

Accordingly, we easily obtain:

$$(\nabla_E^* \Omega)(X_i, \Theta X_j) = -\Omega(\nabla_E^* X_i, \Theta X_j). \quad (129)$$

Now, based on duality condition, we get:

$$E \cdot \Omega(X_i, \Theta X_j) = E \cdot g(X_i, X_j) = g(\nabla_E X_i, X_j) + g(X_i, \nabla_E^* X_j).$$

By a simple computation, we obtain:

$$g(X_i, \nabla_E^* X_j) = 0, \quad \text{for } i, j : 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (130)$$

Departing from Eq. (130), we get:

$$\Omega(\Theta X_i, \nabla_E^* X_j) = 0, \quad \text{for } i, j : 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (131)$$

It follows from Eq. (131) that:

$$(\nabla_E^* \Omega)(X_i, \Theta X_j) = 0 \quad \text{for } i, j : 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (132)$$

2. Using a direct computation, we get:

$$(\nabla_{X_i}^* \Omega)(E, \Theta X_j) = X_i \Omega(E, \Theta X_j) - \Omega(\nabla_{X_i}^* E, \Theta X_j) - \Omega(E, \nabla_{X_i}^* \Theta X_j).$$

Since $i_E \Omega = 0$, we obtain without difficulty that:

$$(\nabla_{X_i}^* \Omega)(E, \Theta X_j) = \Omega(\Theta X_j, \nabla_{X_i}^* E). \quad (133)$$

With respect to Eq. (131) as well as the symmetry of ∇^* , we get

$$\Omega(\Theta X_j, \nabla_{X_i}^* E) = \Omega(\Theta X_j, \nabla_E^* X_i) = 0.$$

We accordingly deduce that:

$$(\nabla_{X_i}^* \Omega)(E, \Theta X_j) = 0, \text{ for } i, j : 1, \dots, 2d.$$

3. Grounded on a direct computation, we have for $i, j, k : 1, \dots, 2d$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Omega)(X_j, \Theta X_k) &= X_i \cdot \Omega(X_j, \Theta X_k) - g(\nabla_{X_i}^* X_j, X_k) \\ &\quad - g(X_j, \nabla_{X_i}^* X_k) - \Omega(X_j, (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Theta) X_k). \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

Using the duality condition and Eq. (107), it follows that:

$$(\nabla_{X_i}^* \Omega)(X_j, \Theta X_k) = -g((\nabla_{X_i} \Theta) X_j, \Theta X_k) - \Omega(X_j, (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Theta) X_k)$$

Again, through a direct computation, we have

$$(\nabla_{X_i}^* \Omega)(X_j, \Theta X_k) = g(\Theta \nabla_{X_i} X_j, \Theta X_k) - g(\nabla_{X_i}(\Theta X_j), \Theta X_k) - \Omega(X_j, (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Theta) X_k)$$

Using the duality once more, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Omega)(X_j, \Theta X_k) &= g(\nabla_{X_i} X_j, X_k) + g(X_j, \nabla_{X_i}^* X_k) - X_i \cdot g(X_j, X_k) \\ &\quad + g(\Theta X_j, (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Theta) X_k) - \Omega(X_j, (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Theta) X_k). \end{aligned} \quad (135)$$

A simple observation yields:

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Omega)(X_j, \Theta X_k) &= g(\nabla_{X_i} X_j, X_k) + g(X_j, \nabla_{X_i}^* X_k) - X_i \cdot g(X_j, X_k) \\ &\quad + \Omega(X_j, (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Theta) X_k) - \Omega(X_j, (\nabla_{X_i}^* \Theta) X_k). \end{aligned} \quad (136)$$

Referring to the duality condition once again, we deduce that:

$$(\nabla_{X_i}^* \Omega)(X_j, \Theta X_k) = 0, \text{ for } i, j, k = 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (137)$$

Finally, resting upon three previous relations, we then have:

$$\nabla^* \Omega = 0. \quad (138)$$

Bearing in mind Eq. (119), we therefore get:

$$\nabla^{lc}\Omega = 0, \quad (139)$$

or equivalently,

$$\nabla^{lc}\Theta = 0. \quad (140)$$

We deduce with reference to [68, 100] that the shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ is a co-Kähler manifold.

Conversely, it is well known departing from [68] that in any co-Kähler manifold, the Levi-Civita connection of the co-Hermitian metric satisfies the following identity:

$$\nabla^{lc}E = 0, \quad \nabla^{lc}\Omega = 0; \quad (141)$$

equivalently,

$$\nabla^{lc}\alpha = 0, \quad \nabla^{lc}\Omega = 0. \quad (142)$$

Remember that the Levi-Civita connection of any metric g is an autodual connection, i.e., $\nabla^{lc} = \nabla^{lc*}$. As a matter of fact, from Eqs. (141) and (142), the Levi-Civita of the co-Kähler metric g is a statistical shs connection (ie, $\nabla^{lc} \in \mathcal{S}_{(\Omega, \alpha, g)}(M^{2d+1})$). This therefore completes the proof. \square

The following corollary is an easy consequence of the above theorem.

Corollary 5.4. A compact shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ is a statistical shs manifold if and only if it is a Kähler mapping torus.

Proof. The previous Theorem 5.3 as well as the Hongjun Li theorem [52] prove our assertion. \square

Remark 5.5. As a consequence of the work of China et al. [85], we deduce that the Betti numbers of a compact statistical shs manifold satisfy the following monotony property:

$$1 \leq b_i(M^{2d+1}) \leq \dots \leq b_d(M^{2d+1}) \quad i \leq d,$$

$$b_{d+1}(M^{2d+1}) \geq \dots \geq b_{2d}(M^{2d+1}) \quad i \geq d + 1,$$

$$b_{d+1}(M^{2d+1}) = b_d(M^{2d+1}).$$

According to Theorem 5.3, we deduce that the only shs manifolds that contain statistical shs connections are co-Kähler manifolds. In other words, a co-Kähler manifold is the only shs manifold which contains a statistical shs connection, which stands for an answer to the question raised in the above section.

Comments 5.6. In [30], the author attempted to combine cosymplectic and contact structures. To achieve his goals, he invested the basic cohomology of the foliation ℓ_Ω . The author stated that, if a closed shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ has the dimension of the second basic cohomology group of the ℓ_Ω equal 1, then M^{2d+1} is a co-symplectic manifold or contact manifold. The author's assumption is very strong. In general, the

basic cohomology of a foliation is often infinite dimensional. Now, with our statistical approach, we obtain ℓ_Ω which is a Killing foliation, and therefore a Riemannian foliation. According to the work of [101], we deduce that for a compact statistical shs manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$, the basic cohomology of ℓ_Ω is always finite-dimensional. Furthermore M^{2d+1} is a co-Kähler manifold.

5.2 Statistical properties on a co-Kähler manifold

Lemma 5.7. *Let (∇, ∇^*) be a statistical shs connection on a co-Kähler manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$. The dual connection ∇^* is also an shs connection.*

Proof. Resting on Eq. (119), any statistical shs connection (∇, ∇^*) satisfies the condition:

$$\nabla^* = 2\nabla^{lc} - \nabla. \quad (143)$$

Hence, according to Eqs. (48), (141) and (143), we get:

$$\nabla^* E = 0, \nabla^* \Omega = 0. \quad (144)$$

It follows from Eq. (144), that the dual connection ∇^* is also an shs connection. \square

Corollary 5.8. A statistical shs connection (∇, ∇^*) on a co-Kähler manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$ satisfies the following identities:

$$\nabla \alpha = 0, \nabla^* \alpha = 0. \quad (145)$$

Proof. Let's use the duality condition. We therefore deduce that:

$$(\nabla_X \alpha) Y = g(Y, \nabla_X^* E), \quad (146)$$

for any vector fields X, Y on M^{2d+1} . Now grounded on the above lemma, we deduce that:

$$\nabla \alpha = 0. \quad (147)$$

Remember that the dual connection ∇^* of an shs connection satisfies:

$$\nabla^* \alpha = 0.$$

This proves our assertion. \square

5.2.1 Doubly autoparallel submanifolds on shs manifold

Notably, the concept of doubly autoparallelism is often present but crucial to multiple information geometry applications (see [102], [103], [104]). In what follows, we prove in a statistical shs manifold (∇, ∇^*) that the leaves of both foliations ℓ_Ω and ℓ_α are α -totally geodesic, and therefore α -autoparallel (doubly autoparallel). For a symmetric connection, the autoparallity and totally-geodesibility are equivalent notions (see [105]). Let's introduce a family of α -connections by:

$$\nabla^\alpha = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\nabla^* + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}\nabla, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (148)$$

where ∇, ∇^* are statistical shs connections. Referring to Lemma 5.7 and Eq. (145), one can easily infer that:

$$\nabla^\alpha E = 0, \nabla^\alpha \Omega = 0, \nabla^\alpha \alpha = 0, \text{ for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (149)$$

Hence, $(\nabla^\alpha, \nabla^{-\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}}$ are also statistical shs connections.

By a simple calculation, the readers can prove the following useful statements:

1. $\nabla^{-\alpha}\Theta = \Theta\nabla^\alpha$, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$,
2. $R^{\nabla^\alpha}(\cdot, \cdot)E = 0, R^{\nabla^\alpha}(\cdot, \cdot)\Omega = 0, R^{\nabla^\alpha}(\cdot, \cdot)\alpha = 0$, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$,
3. The Ricci Ric^{∇^α} of the α -connections are symmetric.
4. The manifold $(M^{2d+1}, g, \mu, \nabla^\alpha)$, where $\mu = \alpha \wedge \Omega^d$, is an equi-affine statistical manifold. For general references on equi-affine statistical manifolds, we refer to [106].

Proposition 5.9. Let $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha, g)$ be a co-Kähler manifold. The following statements are satisfied:

1. The leaves of ℓ_Ω are totally geodesic w.r.t. to ∇^α , for all α 's,
2. The leaves of ℓ_α are totally geodesic w.r.t. to ∇^α , for all α 's.

Proof. The verification of both statements is established through

$$\nabla^\alpha i_X \Omega = i_{\nabla^\alpha X} \Omega, \quad \forall X \in \ell_\Omega, \quad (150)$$

$$\nabla^\alpha i_Y \alpha = i_{\nabla^\alpha Y} \alpha, \quad \forall Y \in \ell_\alpha. \quad (151)$$

□

Corollary 5.10. Let $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha, g)$ be a co-Kähler manifold. The leaves of the foliation ℓ_Ω and ℓ_α are statistical submanifolds.

Proof. The claim follows from the above proposition. □




Fig. 3 Statistical leaves on a co-Kähler manifold.

5.3 Description of the set of statistical shs connections on a co-Kähler manifold

Referring to Eq. (149), the set of statistical shs connection on a co-Kähler manifold is expressed as:

$$\mathcal{S}_{(g,\Omega,\alpha)}(M^{2d+1}) = \left\{ (\nabla, \nabla^*) \left| \begin{array}{l} \nabla E = 0, \nabla\Omega = 0, \nabla\alpha = 0, \\ \text{or} \\ \nabla^* E = 0, \nabla^*\Omega = 0, \nabla^*\alpha = 0 \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

We close this section with a description of the set $\mathcal{S}_{(g,\Omega,\alpha)}(M^{2d+1})$.

Proposition 5.11. The space of statistical shs connections $\mathcal{S}_{(g,\Omega,\alpha)}(M^{2d+1})$ is an affine space modelled on the vector space $(S_E^2(M^{2d+1}) \oplus S_E^3(M^{2d+1})) \times (S_E^2(M^{2d+1}) \oplus S_E^3(M^{2d+1}))$.

Proof. Let (∇, ∇^*) be statistical shs connections on $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha)$. As a matter of fact, statistical shs connections (∇, ∇^*) satisfy the following identity:

$$\nabla E = 0, \nabla\Omega = 0, \nabla\alpha = 0;$$

equivalently,

$$\nabla^* E = 0, \nabla^*\Omega = 0, \nabla^*\alpha = 0.$$

The statistical shs connections (∇, ∇^*) satisfy the same conditions. For this reason, it is sufficient to work on one of them. As in Proposition 4.5, any connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ can be indicated in terms of:

$$\tilde{\nabla} = \nabla + A, \quad \text{where } A \in T_1^2 M^{2d+1}.$$

By a direct computation, we obtain the following equation:

$$g(\tilde{\nabla}_X^* Y, Z) = g(\nabla_X^* Y, Z) - g(Y, A(X, Z)). \quad (152)$$

Now, the pair of connections $(\tilde{\nabla}, \tilde{\nabla}^*)$ is a statistical shs connection if and only if the following identities are satisfied:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S(X, Y, Z) = \Omega(A(X, Y), Z) \in \Gamma^\infty(S^3 T M^{2d+1}), \\ Q(X, Y) = \alpha(A(X, Y)) \in \Gamma^\infty(S^2 T M^{2d+1}), \\ A(E., .) = 0. \end{array} \right.$$

From the above, we deduce that the set $\mathcal{S}_{(g,\Omega,\alpha)}(M^{2d+1})$ is an affine space modelled on $(S_E^2(M^{2d+1}) \oplus S_E^3(M^{2d+1})) \times (S_E^2(M^{2d+1}) \oplus S_E^3(M^{2d+1}))$. \square

6 Kähler and co-Kähler metrics are always Fisher information metrics

As [52] Li pointed out, co-Kähler manifolds are analogues of Kähler manifolds. From this perspective, in the literature there are analogous results in both cases. We recall some of these results.

Kähler structure	co-Kähler structure
[94] , [107] Betti numbers $b_{2k} \neq 0$; $b_{2k-1} = 2s$; $b_{i-2}(M^{2d}) \leq b_i(M^{2d})$	[85] $b_i(M^{2d+1}) \neq 0$; $b_1(M^{2d+1}) = 2s + 1$; $b_{i-2} \leq b_i, i \leq d + 1$; $1 \leq b_i(M^{2d+1}) \leq \dots \leq b_d(M^{2d+1})$ $i \leq d$, $b_{d+1}(M^{2d+1}) \geq \dots \geq b_{2d}(M^{2d+1})$ $i \geq d+1$, $b_{d+1}(M^{2d+1}) = b_d(M^{2d+1})$.
[107] The Kähler manifold satisfies the strong Lefschetz property.	[85] The co-Kähler manifold satisfies the strong Lefschetz theorem.
[92] Goldberg integrability condition for almost Kähler manifold	[83] Goldberg integrability condition for almost co-Kähler manifold
[108] Hasegawa theorem on solvmanifold Kähler manifold	[109] Anna Fino and Luigi Vezzoni results on solvmanifold co-Kähler structure.
[110] Formality in sense of Sullivan of Kähler manifold	[85] Formality in sense of Sullivan of co-Kähler manifold.

Table 1 co-Kähler and Kähler correspondance results.

We are now going to reveal that our statistical characterization of co-Kähler manifolds remains true with the Kähler manifold as well.

A symplectic connection [111], [62], [61] on a symplectic manifold (M^{2d}, Ω) is a torsion-free linear connection ∇ on M^{2d} , for which the symplectic 2-form Ω is parallel. Any symplectic manifold admits a symplectic connection (see Bieliavsky et al. [33], Vaisman [61], Lichnerowicz [32]. According to Darboux theorem, on any Darboux charts, one can construct a symplectic connection ∇^i to have zero Christoffel symbols. The desired symplectic connection on (M^{2d}, ω) is now obtained through gluing the local connections ∇^i with the help of the partition of unity. Bieliavsky et al. [33] reported a general construction of a symplectic connection. They proved that the space of symplectic connections on (M^{2d}, ω) is an affine space modeled on the space of symmetric covariant 3-tensor fields on M^{2d} . Vaisman [61]) set forward a curvature classification of symplectic connections.

Let (g, Θ) be an almost Hermitian structure on a symplectic manifold (M^{2d}, ω) . Choose a symplectic connection ∇ . It follows from a straightforward computation that:

$$(\nabla_Z \omega)(X, Y) = g(\nabla_X^* \Theta Z - \Theta \nabla_X Z, Y), \quad (153)$$

where ∇^* is the dual connection of ∇ with respect to the Hermitian metric g . As a direct consequence of Eq. (153), we obtain:

$$\nabla = \Theta^{-1} \nabla^* \Theta. \quad (154)$$

With regard to Eq. (154), Eq. (107) one can easily prove that the following identities hold for any symplectic connection ∇ on (M^{2b}, ω)

$$\nabla_X^* Y = \nabla_X Y - \Theta(\nabla_X \Theta)Y, \quad (155)$$

$$\nabla_X Y = \nabla_X^* Y + \Theta^{-1}(\nabla_X^* \Theta)Y, \quad (156)$$

$$R^\nabla(Y, X)Z = \Theta^{-1}R^{\nabla^*}(X, Y)\Theta Z, \quad (157)$$

$$T^{\nabla^*}(X, Y) = \Theta^{-1}((\nabla_Y^*\Theta)X - (\nabla_X^*\Theta)Y), \quad (158)$$

$$T^{\nabla^*}(X, Y) = \Theta((\nabla_Y\Theta)X - (\nabla_X\Theta)Y), \quad (159)$$

for any vector fields X, Y, Z on M^{2b} .

Hicks [112] introduced the notion of linear perturbations of connection ∇ by:

$$\nabla \rightarrow \nabla^\Theta = \Theta^{-1}\nabla\Theta.$$

Note that the Hicks definition of linear perturbation coincides exactly with the action of the gauge group of the affine space connections. In the literature, the linear perturbation ∇ is also called the Θ -gauge transformation of a connection ∇ (see [113]) or the gauge equation (see [114]). Note that in the case of two isometric metrics, Levi-Civita connections of both metrics are related by a linear perturbation. In 2009, Schwenk-Schellschmidt and Simon [115] extended the works of Hicks in the context of conjugate connections by:

$$\nabla^* = \nabla^\Theta = \Theta^{-1}\nabla\Theta. \quad (160)$$

Eq. (154), brought us to conclude that, any symplectic manifold supports a linear perturbation of Hicks of SMAT connections as follows :

$$\nabla^* = \Theta^{-1}\nabla\Theta \quad \nabla\omega = 0 \quad (161)$$

Fig. 4 Linear perturbation of a symplectic connection by an almost complex structure.

6.1 The dual connection of any symplectic connection is an almost symplectic connection

Definition 6.1. [61],[111] Let (M^{2d}, ω) be an almost symplectic manifold. A linear connection ∇ on M^{2d} is called an almost symplectic connection if:

$$\nabla\omega = 0. \quad (162)$$

Proposition 6.2. The dual connection of any symplectic connection on an almost Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \omega, \Theta, g)$ is an almost-symplectic connection.

Proof. Let us choose a symplectic connection ∇ on $(M^{2d}, \omega, \Theta, g)$. According to Eq. (107), we have:

$$\nabla_X^* Y = \nabla_X Y - \Theta(\nabla_X \Theta)Y, \quad \forall X, Y \quad (163)$$

Now by a direct calculation, we get:

$$\Theta\nabla_X^* Y = \Theta\nabla_X Y + \nabla_X \Theta Y - \Theta\nabla_X Y \quad (164)$$

From the above, we deduce that

$$\nabla_X \Theta Y = \Theta \nabla_X^* Y, \quad \forall X, Y. \quad (165)$$

From a straightforward computation, we get

$$(\nabla_X^* \omega)(Y, Z) = X \cdot \omega(Y, Z) - \omega(\nabla_X^* Y, Z) - \omega(Y, \nabla_X^* Z) \quad (166)$$

Now using the duality condition, we obtain

$$(\nabla_X^* \omega)(Y, Z) = g(\nabla_X \Theta Y - \Theta \nabla_X^* Y, Z) \quad (167)$$

It follows from Eq. (165) that

$$\nabla^* \omega = 0. \quad (168)$$

Then, ∇^* is an almost-symplectic connection. \square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \overset{g}{\curvearrowright} & \\ \nabla^* \omega = 0 & & \nabla \omega = 0 \\ & \underset{g}{\curvearrowleft} & \\ & & T\nabla = 0 \end{array} \quad (169)$$

Fig. 5 Linear perturbation of a symplectic connection is an almost symplectic connection.

6.1.1 Hermitian connections and the dual of a symplectic connection

Two natural connections exist for a given hermitian metric g on M^{2d} . The first is Levi-Civita connection ∇^{lc} of the metric g and the second is the hermitian connection ∇^h , satisfying

$$\nabla^h g = 0, \quad \nabla^h \Theta = 0,$$

and that the $(1, 1)$ -part of the torsion vanishes, i.e.,

$$T^{\nabla^h}(\Theta X, \Theta Y) = T^{\nabla^h}(X, Y), \quad \forall X, Y. \quad (170)$$

There are two well-known Hermitian connections. The Bismut connection (see [116]) and the Chern connection (see [117],[118]).

Proposition 6.3. The dual connection ∇^* of any symplectic connection ∇ on an almost Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \omega, \Theta, g)$ can be expressed as follows:

1. $\nabla^* = \nabla^h + L$, where $\omega(L(X, Y), Z) = \omega(L(X, Z), Y)$, $\forall X, Y, Z$.
2. $\nabla^* = \nabla^{lc} - \frac{1}{3}\Theta(\nabla^{lc}\Theta) - \frac{1}{3}\Theta(\nabla^{lc}\Theta) + K$, where $\omega(K(X, Y), Z) = \omega(K(X, Z), Y)$, $\forall X, Y, Z$.

Proof. 1. The dual connection ∇^* can be stated as:

$$\nabla^* = \nabla + L, \quad \text{where } L \in T_1^2 M^{2d+1}.$$

Departing from proposition 6.2, we deduce that:

$$\nabla^h \omega = 0, \nabla^* \omega = 0. \quad (171)$$

Relying on Eq. (171), we obtain by means of a direct computation that:

$$(\nabla_X^* \omega)(Y, z) = (\nabla_X^h \omega)(Y, z) + \omega(L(X, Y), Z) - \omega(L(X, Z), Y). \quad (172)$$

From the above, the conclusion follows.

2. Resting upon [33], any symmetric connection ∇^0 defines a symplectic connection as follows:

$$\tilde{\nabla} = \nabla^0 + \frac{1}{3}U(X, Y) + \frac{1}{3}U(Y, X),$$

where $\nabla_X^0 \omega(Y, Z) = \omega(U(X, Y), Z)$. Now let's consider $\nabla^{lc} = \nabla^0$. By a straightforward calculation, we obtain:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla_X^{lc} Y - \frac{1}{3}\Theta(\nabla_X^{lc} \Theta)Y - \frac{1}{3}\Theta(\nabla_X^{lc} \Theta)Y, \quad \forall X, Y.$$

As in the first case, we conclude that

$$\nabla_X^* Y = \nabla_X^{lc} Y - \frac{1}{3}\Theta(\nabla_X^{lc} \Theta)Y - \frac{1}{3}\Theta(\nabla_X^{lc} \Theta)Y + K(X, Y),$$

where $\omega(K(X, Y), Z) = \omega(K(X, Z), Y)$. □

6.1.2 α -connections are always almost symplectic connections

Let us consider a pair (∇, ∇^*) of SMAT connections in an almost Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \omega, g, \Theta)$. Exactly as in the case of co-Kähler manifold, we introduce the family α -connections for a pair (∇, ∇^*) as:

$$\nabla^\alpha = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\nabla^* + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}\nabla, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (173)$$

The 1-parameter family $(\nabla^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}}$ connections are distinguished properties of being all almost symplectic connections.

Proposition 6.4. On any almost Kähler manifold, we have:

$$\nabla^\alpha \omega = 0; \quad (174)$$

$$R^{\nabla^\alpha}(\cdot, \cdot)\omega = 0; \quad (175)$$

$$R^{\nabla^\alpha}(\cdot, \cdot) = \Theta^{-1}R^{\nabla^{-\alpha}}(\cdot, \cdot)\Theta; \quad (176)$$

$$U(\Theta, \cdot) = \Theta U(\cdot, \cdot), \text{ where } U = \nabla^* - \nabla. \quad (177)$$

Proof. The result is therefore obtained by a straightforward computation. □

6.2 A new characterisation of Kähler metrics

Let's consider an almost Kähler manifold (M, ω, Θ, g) . The following S. I. Goldberg conjecture [83] is well-known concerning the integrability of the almost complex structure of an almost Kähler manifold.

Goldberg conjecture: "The almost complex structure of a compact Einstein almost Kähler manifold is integrable (and therefore the manifold is Kähler)".

There is some significant progress in certain curvature conditions concerning the Goldberg conjecture. Sekigawa [119] proved the validity of this conjecture for almost Kähler manifolds whose scalar curvature is non negative. A four-dimensional compact almost Kähler manifold which is Einsteinian and $*$ -Einsteinian is a Kähler manifold Sekigawa and Vanhecke [120]. A complete almost Kähler manifold of constant sectional curvature is a flat Kähler manifold (see Sekigawa and Vanhecke [120], Oguro and Sekigawa [121], Olszak [76]). It is still open otherwise.

Before stating the main theorem on this subsection, let us put forward certain pertinent remarks.

Remark 6.5. Consider a Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \omega, \Theta, g)$. On open holomorphic Darboux charts (U^l, z^1, \dots, z^d) centered at some point p , choose the local symplectic connection ∇^l which has zero Christoffel symbols (ie $(\Gamma_{ki}^l)^s = 0$):

$$\nabla_{\partial z_i}^l \partial z_j = 0,$$

$$\nabla_{\partial z_i}^l \partial \bar{z}_j = 0.$$

With respect to the duality condition, one proves that:

$$\partial_k g_{i\bar{j}} = (\Gamma_{ki}^l)^s g_{\bar{j}s} + (\Gamma_{k\bar{j}}^{l*})^s g_{is},$$

$$\partial_{\bar{k}} g_{i\bar{j}} = (\Gamma_{\bar{k}i}^l)^s g_{\bar{j}s} + (\Gamma_{\bar{k}\bar{j}}^{l*})^s g_{is},$$

where $\Gamma_{k\bar{j},i}^{l*}$ are the Christoffel symbols of the dual connection ∇^{l*} of ∇^l . With reference to the definition of ∇^l , we deduce that:

$$g^{i\bar{m}} \partial_k g_{i\bar{j}} = (\Gamma_{k\bar{j}}^{l*})^{\bar{m}},$$

$$g^{i\bar{m}} \partial_{\bar{k}} g_{i\bar{j}} = (\Gamma_{\bar{k}\bar{j}}^{l*})^{\bar{m}}.$$

Finally, we infer that

$$g^{i\bar{m}} (\partial_k g_{\bar{j}i} - \partial_{\bar{j}} g_{ki}) = (\Gamma_{k\bar{j}}^{l*})^{\bar{m}} - (\Gamma_{\bar{j}k}^{l*})^{\bar{m}},$$

$$g^{i\bar{m}} (\partial_{\bar{k}} g_{i\bar{j}} - \partial_{\bar{j}} g_{i\bar{k}}) = (\Gamma_{\bar{k}\bar{j}}^{l*})^{\bar{m}} - (\Gamma_{\bar{j}\bar{k}}^{l*})^{\bar{m}}.$$

Clearly, on the local holomorphic Darboux chart U^l , the connection ∇^{l*} is a symmetric connection.

Proceeding in the same way as the above remark, let's define the space of all SMAT connections (∇, ∇^*) on an almost Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \omega, \Theta, g)$ as:

$$\mathcal{E}_{(g,\omega)}(M^{2d+1}) = \{(\nabla, \nabla^*) | \nabla\omega = 0, T^\nabla = 0\}$$

Definition 6.6. A statistical almost-Kähler $(M^{2d}, \omega, \Theta, g)$ is an almost Kähler manifold such that $\mathcal{S}_{(g,\omega)}(M^{2d})$ contains statistical connections. These connections will be called the statistical symplectic connections.

Proposition 6.7. An almost Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \omega, \Theta, g)$ is a Kähler manifold if and only if it is a statistical almost-Kähler manifold.

Proof. The proof of the theorem relies on the same strategy adopted with the theorem 5.3. Let us choose (∇, ∇^*) , a statistical symplectic connection. Based on the proposition 6.2, we deduce that:

$$\nabla^*\omega = 0. \quad (178)$$

It follows from Eq. (139) that:

$$\nabla^{lc}\omega = 0. \quad (179)$$

From the above Eq. (179), we conclude that (M^{2d}, ω, g) is a Kähler manifold.

Conversely, it is well known that in any Kähler manifold (M^{2d}, ω, g) , the Levi-Civita connection of the Kähler metric satisfies:

$$\nabla^{lc}\omega = 0. \quad (180)$$

Departing from the above equation, we obtain $\nabla^{lc} \in \mathcal{S}_{(g,\omega)}(M^{2d})$. We conclude that the Kähler manifold (M^{2d}, ω, g) is a statistical almost-Kähler manifold. \square

Corollary 6.8. We obtain the following properties on any Kähler manifold (M^{2d}, ω, g) :

1. $\nabla^a = \nabla^{lc} - \frac{1}{2}a\Theta(\nabla\Theta), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}$.
2. The Ricci curvature Ric^{∇^a} is symmetric.

Proof. The result is therefore obtained by a straightforward computation. \square

Remark 6.9. To sum up, with reference to proposition 6.7, the Kähler metrics on an almost Kähler manifold can be characterized as the Hermitian metrics g such that the dual of a symplectic connection with respect to g is a symmetric connection. In other words, Kähler metrics are Hermitian metrics such that the dual of a symplectic connection is also a symplectic connection.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \nabla^*\omega = 0 & \xleftarrow{g} & \nabla\omega = 0 \\ T\nabla^* = 0 & \xrightarrow{g} & T\nabla = 0 \end{array} \quad (181)$$

Fig. 6 Statistical characterization of Kähler metrics.

From the above remark, we deduce that our statistical approach is a generalization of the well known result in Kähler geometry on the characterization of a Kähler metric, which holds that on an almost Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \omega, g, \Theta)$, Kähler metrics are Hermitian metrics satisfying (see [122]):

$$\nabla^{lc}\omega = 0. \quad (182)$$

6.3 Statistical characterization of Kähler metrics in terms of parallel transport

The Levi-Civita connection corresponds to the only symmetric metric connection that preserves the metric by parallel transport, i.e.

$$g(X_{c(0)}, Y_{c(0)}) = g(\tau_{c(t)}^{\nabla^{lc}} X, \tau_{c(t)}^{\nabla^{lc}} Y), \quad (183)$$

where

$$\nabla_{\dot{c}(t)}^{lc} X = 0 \text{ and } \nabla_{\dot{c}(t)}^{lc} Y = 0. \quad (184)$$

The dual connections refer to another way of preserving the metric (see[1]). Denote by τ^∇ and τ^{∇^*} the parallel transport along curves relative to ∇ and ∇^* , respectively,

$$g(X_{c(0)}, Y_{c(0)}) = g(\tau_{c(t)}^\nabla X, \tau_{c(t)}^{\nabla^*} Y), \quad (185)$$

where

$$\nabla_{\dot{c}(t)} X = 0 \text{ and } \nabla_{\dot{c}(t)}^* Y = 0. \quad (186)$$

The Kähler metrics on a complex manifold (M^{2d}, Θ) can be accounted for in terms of Riemannian metrics satisfying the following equation:

$$\nabla^{lc}\Theta = \Theta\nabla^{lc} \quad (187)$$

In terms of parallel transport, condition Eq. (187) is equivalent to:

$$\tau^{\nabla^{lc}} \Theta X = \Theta \tau^{\nabla^{lc}} X. \quad (188)$$




Fig. 7 Parallel transport and Kähler metrics.

Grounded on proposition 6.4, in any almost Kähler manifold, we get the following identities:

$$\Theta^{-1}\nabla^{-\alpha}\Theta = \nabla^\alpha \Leftrightarrow \nabla^\alpha\omega = 0 \Leftrightarrow \omega(X, Y) = \omega(\tau^{\nabla^\alpha}X, \tau^{\nabla^\alpha}Y); \quad (189)$$

$$\Theta^{-1}\nabla^\alpha\Theta = \nabla^{-\alpha} \Leftrightarrow \nabla^{-\alpha}\omega = 0 \Leftrightarrow \omega(X, Y) = \omega(\tau^{\nabla^{-\alpha}}X, \tau^{\nabla^{-\alpha}}Y). \quad (190)$$

In terms of parallel transport, both of the following diagrams are commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\tau^{\nabla^\alpha}} & \tau^{\nabla^\alpha}X \\ \downarrow \Theta & & \downarrow \Theta \\ \Theta X & \xrightarrow{\tau^{\nabla^{-\alpha}}} & \Theta(\tau^{\nabla^\alpha}X) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\tau^{\nabla^{-\alpha}}} & \tau^{\nabla^{-\alpha}}X \\ \downarrow \Theta & & \downarrow \Theta \\ \Theta X & \xrightarrow{\tau^{\nabla^\alpha}} & \Theta(\tau^{\nabla^{-\alpha}}X) \end{array}$$

Referring to Section 6.3 and Section 6.3, we get:

$$\omega(\tau^{\nabla^{\frac{\nabla^\alpha + \nabla^{-\alpha}}{2}}}X, \tau^{\nabla^{\frac{\nabla^\alpha + \nabla^{-\alpha}}{2}}}Y) = \omega(X, Y), \quad \forall X, Y. \quad (191)$$

According to the duality condition, finally we have:

$$g(\tau^{\nabla^{\frac{\nabla^\alpha + \nabla^{-\alpha}}{2}}}X, \tau^{\nabla^{\frac{\nabla^\alpha + \nabla^{-\alpha}}{2}}}Y) = g(X, Y), \quad \forall X, Y. \quad (192)$$

$$\omega(\tau^{\nabla^{\frac{\nabla^\alpha + \nabla^{-\alpha}}{2}}}X, \tau^{\nabla^{\frac{\nabla^\alpha + \nabla^{-\alpha}}{2}}}Y) = \omega(X, Y), \quad \forall X, Y. \quad (193)$$

From our statistical point of view, Kähler metrics are those Hermitian metrics corroborating that $\nabla^{-\alpha}$ is a symplectic connection. Hence,

$$\tau^{\frac{\nabla^\alpha + \nabla^{-\alpha}}{2}} = \tau^{\nabla^{lc}}. \quad (194)$$

Consequently, with respect to Fig. 7, we have:

$$\omega(X, Y) = \omega(\tau^{\nabla^{lc}}X, \tau^{\nabla^{lc}}Y). \quad (195)$$




Fig. 8 Parallel transport and α -statistical symplectic connections.

6.4 Statistical generalization of S. Kobayashi theorem

Our new approach allows us to provide a generalisation of the S. Kobayashi theorem, which states that:

Theorem 6.10. [123] *A compact Kähler manifold (M^{2d}, Ω, g) with a positive definite Ricci curvature is simply connected. Furthermore, its first Betti number is zero.*

Let's consider a statistical symplectic connection. We obtain the same result as in Kobayashi's theorem when the Ricci of a statistical symplectic connection is positive definite.

Proposition 6.11. Consider the family of α -statistical symplectic connections ∇^α on a compact Kähler manifold (M^{2d}, Ω, g) . Assume that there exists an $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ (but is not necessary $\alpha_0 = 0$) such that $Ric^{\nabla^{\alpha_0}}$ is positive definite. Therefore, its first Betti number is zero.

Proof. With reference to lemma 6.4, it is known that

$$\nabla^{\alpha_0} \Omega^d = 0. \quad (196)$$

Referring to the above formula, we deduce that $(g, \nabla^{\alpha_0}, \Omega^d)$ has an equi-affine statistical structure. By assumption $Ric^{\nabla^{\alpha_0}} > 0$, then, departing from [124][Th 9.6], we conclude that its first Betti number is zero. \square

6.4.1 S.Golberg integrability condition and statistical integrability condition

It is interesting to face our statistical characterization of Kähler metrics with the integrability condition of S.Golberg. Using straightforward calculations, we can prove that

our statistical integrability condition implies the integrability condition of Goldberg [92]. Let us then recall the integrability condition of S. Goldberg.

Theorem 6.12. [125] *Consider an almost Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \Omega, g, \Theta)$. If $R^{\nabla^{lc}} \circ \Theta = \Theta \circ R^{\nabla^{lc}}$, then $(M^{2d}, \omega, \Theta, g)$ is a Kähler manifold.*

Proposition 6.13. Let $(M^{2d}, \omega, \Theta, g)$ be an almost Kähler manifold. The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) M^{2d} is a statistical almost-Kähler manifold,
- (2) $R^{\nabla^{lc}} \circ \Theta = \Theta \circ R^{\nabla^{lc}}$,
- (3) M^{2d} is a Kähler manifold.

Proof. Let's prove that (1) implies (2). Consider an almost Kähler manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, g, \Theta)$. Remember that, from our characterization, a Kähler manifold is the one which contains statistical symplectic connections. Now, let's choose a statistical shs connection (∇, ∇^*) . Using Proposition 6.4, we have:

$$\Theta R^\nabla(Y, X)Z = R^{\nabla^*}(X, Y)\Theta Z \text{ and } R^\nabla(Y, X)\Theta Z = \Theta R^{\nabla^*}(X, Y)Z, \quad \forall X, Y, Z. \quad (197)$$

On the other side, it is known that for a statistical connection (∇, ∇^*) , we have:

$$R^\nabla(X, Y)Z + R^{\nabla^*}(X, Y)Z = 2R^{\nabla^{lc}}(X, Y)Z + 2[U_X, U_Y]Z, \quad (198)$$

where $U = \nabla^* - \nabla = -\Theta(\nabla\Theta)$. Now, using Eq. (198), we obtain:

$$2R^{\nabla^{lc}}(X, Y)\Theta Z = \Theta(R^\nabla(X, Y)Z + R^{\nabla^*}(X, Y)Z) - 2[U_X, U_Y]\Theta Z. \quad (199)$$

Using proposition 6.4 once again, it follows that:

$$[U_X, U_Y]\Theta Z = U_X U_Y \Theta Z - U_Y U_X \Theta Z \quad (200)$$

$$= \Theta[U_X, U_Y]Z, \quad (201)$$

for any vector field X, Y, Z in, M^{2d+1} . Again, it follows from the above calculations that:

$$2R^{\nabla^{lc}}(X, Y)\Theta Z = \Theta(R^\nabla(X, Y)Z + R^{\nabla^*}(X, Y)Z) - 2\Theta[U_X, U_Y]Z. \quad (202)$$

According to Eq. (202), the integrability condition of S.Goldberg and K.Yano is identified as:

$$R^{\nabla^{lc}}(X, Y)\Theta Z = \Theta R^{\nabla^{lc}}(X, Y)Z. \quad (203)$$

From Theorem 6.12, we infer that (2) implies (3). Based on proposition Proposition 6.7, we deduce that (3) implies (2). □

6.5 Positive answer to question 1

6.5.1 The first approach to the resolution of question 1

Before providing an answer to question 1, we need to recall the definition of the isostatistical embedding.

Definition 6.14. A smooth embedding i from a statistical manifold (M, g, T) to a statistical manifold (N, h, K) is isostatistical if it preserves the statistical structure, i.e. $g = i^*h$ and $T = i^*K$.

Theorem 6.15. Any Kähler and co-Kähler metric is a Fisher information metric.

Proof. Consider a Kähler manifold (M^{2d}, Ω_g, g) . Relying on Proposition 6.7, we know that the Kähler metric g always admits statistical connections (∇, ∇^*) verifying

$$\nabla^* \Omega_g = 0, \nabla \Omega_g = 0. \quad (204)$$

Let's define a totally symmetric tensor by:

$$T^{Ka}(X, Y, Z) = g(U(X, Y), Z), \quad (205)$$

where $U = \nabla^* - \nabla$. Resting on Eq. (204) and Eq. (205), we deduce that $(M^{2d}, \Omega_g, g, T^{Ka})$ is a statistical manifold (Amari-Chentsov structure). According to the works of Lê [126], we deduce that the Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \Omega_g, g, T^{Ka})$ can be embedded isostatistically into $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N)$ the set of probability density functions on the sample space Ξ^N , for N sufficiently large, such that the Kähler metric g is induced by the Fisher metric g^F on $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N)$ and T^{Ka} is induced by the Amari-Chentsov tensor T^{A-C} on $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N)$. For the co-Kähler metrics, the proof is based on the same strategy adopted for Kähler metrics. It follows, from Theorem 5.3, that on a co-Kähler manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha, g)$, we have statistical connections (∇, ∇^*) satisfying:

$$\nabla E = 0, \nabla \Omega = 0, \nabla \alpha = 0; \quad (206)$$

$$\nabla^* E = 0, \nabla^* \Omega = 0, \nabla^* \alpha = 0. \quad (207)$$

Let's define a totally symmetric tensor by:

$$T^{CoKa}(X, Y, Z) = g(U(X, Y), Z), \quad (208)$$

where $U = \nabla^* - \nabla$. We deduce from Eqs. (206) to (208) that $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha, g, T^{CoKa})$ is a statistical manifold (Amari-Chentsov structure). Investing once again Lê [126] theorem, the result follows at once. \square

6.5.2 The second approach to the resolution of the question 1

At this stage, we propose another approach based on an explicit construction. Consider a co-Kähler manifold $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha, g)$. Let's build up a family of symmetric connections on $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha, g)$ as follows:

$$\nabla^{\epsilon,a} = \frac{1+a}{2}\nabla^\epsilon + \frac{1-a}{2}\nabla^{-\epsilon}, \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$\nabla^\epsilon = \nabla^{lc} + \epsilon\alpha(\cdot)\alpha(\cdot)E, \quad \forall \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (209)$$

By a direct computation, we get

$$(\nabla^\epsilon)^* = \nabla^{-\epsilon}, \quad (210)$$

Hence,

$$(\nabla^{\epsilon,a})^* = \nabla^{\epsilon,-a}. \quad (211)$$

Consequently, the pair $(\nabla^{\epsilon,a}, \nabla^{\epsilon,-a})$ is a statistical connection.

Now, with a straightforward calculation, one can notice that

$$\nabla^{\epsilon,a}E = a\epsilon\alpha(\cdot)E, \quad \nabla^{\epsilon,a}\Omega = 0, \quad \forall \epsilon \in \mathbb{R} \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (212)$$

Thus, departing from Eq. (212), it follows that the foliation ℓ_Ω is $\nabla^{\epsilon,a}$ -geodesic.

Now, let's use the duality condition determined as follows:

$$X.g(Y, Z) = g(\nabla_X^{\epsilon,a}Y, Z) + g(Y, \nabla_X^{\epsilon,-a}Z) \quad \forall X \in \Gamma(TM^{2d+1}), \quad \forall Y \in \ell_\Omega, \quad \forall Z \in \ell_\alpha. \quad (213)$$

With respect to Eq. (213), we deduce that ℓ_α is $\nabla^{\epsilon,-a}$ -geodesic.




Fig. 9 Canonical statistical connections on a co-Kähler manifold.

Finally, for a co-Kähler manifold (M^{2d+1}, Ω, g) , we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \xleftarrow{g} & \\ \nabla^{\epsilon,-a}\omega = 0 & & \nabla^{\epsilon,a}\omega = 0 \\ \nabla^{\epsilon,-a}E = -a\epsilon\alpha(\cdot)E & & \nabla^{\epsilon,a}E = a\epsilon\alpha(\cdot)E \\ T^{\nabla^{\epsilon,-a}} = 0 & & T^{\nabla^{\epsilon,a}} = 0 \\ & \xrightarrow{g} & \end{array}$$

Fig. 10 Co-Kähler metric and canonical statistical connections.

Hence, $(M^{2d+1}, \Omega, g, \nabla^{\epsilon, a}, \nabla^{\epsilon, -a})$ is a statistical manifold. Now, referring to [126], we deduce that there exists an isostatistical embedding

$$i : (M^{2d+1}, \Omega, \alpha, g, T_{\epsilon, a}^{CoKa}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N), g^F, T^{A-C}), \quad (214)$$

for N sufficiently large, such that

$$g = i^* g^F \text{ and } T_{\epsilon, a}^{CoKa} = i^* T^{A-C};$$

where $T_{\epsilon, a}^{CoKa} = g(\cdot, U_{\epsilon, a})$, and $U_{\epsilon, a} = \nabla^{\epsilon, -a} - \nabla^{\epsilon, a}$. Accordingly, any co-Kähler metric coincides with the Fisher-information metric of $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N)$.

Now consider a Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, \Omega, g, \Theta)$, we can construct a co-Kähler manifold as follows $(W^{2d+2} = M^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}, \Omega, \alpha, \tilde{g}, \tilde{\Theta})$, where $\alpha = dt$, $E = (0, \frac{\partial}{\partial t})$, $\tilde{\Theta}(\cdot, fE) = (\Theta, 0)$, $\tilde{g} = g + \alpha^2$ and $\tilde{\Omega} = \tilde{g}(\tilde{\Theta}, \cdot)$. Now, based on Eq. (214), there exists an isostatistical embedding $i : (W^{2d+2} = M^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}, \tilde{g}, T_{\epsilon, a}^{CoKa}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N), g^F, T^{A-C})$, such that $\tilde{g} = i^* g^F$. Now, identify M^{2d} with the leaf $t = 0$ of W^{2d+2} ; by restriction:

$$g = \tilde{g}|_{M^{2d}} = g^F(\theta)_{ij} = 4 \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \sqrt{p_{\theta}}}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \sqrt{p_{\theta}}}{\partial \theta_j} d\mu. \quad (215)$$

Comments 6.16. *To summarize this subsection, Kähler and co-Kähler manifolds, can be viewed as being a parametric family of probability density functions, whereas Kähler and coKähler metrics can be regarded as Fisher information metrics. We then obtain the answer to question 1.*

6.6 Kähler manifolds and co-Kähler manifolds as submanifold of statistical models

Scrutinizing through literature, there are three main families of statistical models which are identified in terms of:

1. **The family of discrete distribution** The family of discrete distribution(also called the family of categorical distributions in [127]) is a statistical model which has a constant positive curvature. This family belongs to spherical geometry.
2. **The family of location-scale families** belongs to Euclidean geometry(Euclidean manifold)
 - (a) Multivariate normal distributions.(see[128])
 - (b) Logistic Model[129].
 - (c) Weibull Statistical Model.[129]
3. **The family of location families** belongs to Euclidean geometry(Euclidean manifold)

For additional details about the above stated families refer to ([127]).

In information geometry, the study of the nature of submanifolds in a statistical model is of paramount importance (see[12]). From the estimation perspective in information geometry, the existence of efficient estimators depends on the autoparallelity of the corresponding submanifolds in a set of probability distributions(see[12]). In [4], Lauritzen largely focused on categorizing completely α -geodesic submanifolds within specific statistical models (family of normal distribution, family of inverse gaussian family, family of Gamma densities, etc) owing to the significance of these submanifolds in statistical models. In the previous subsection, we demonstrated that Kähler and co-Kähler manifolds are sub-manifolds of statistical models $(\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N), g^F, T^{A-C})$ (or $(\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N), g^F, \nabla^a)$). It is quite natural to understand their nature. We first deal with compact Kähler and co-Kähler manifolds cases, then we handle non-compact cases.

Proposition 6.17. Compact Kähler and co-Kähler manifolds are not ∇^0 -totally geodesic submanifolds of $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N)$.

Proof. First of all, we address compact Kähler manifolds. Consider a compact Kähler manifold (M^{2d}, Ω_g, g) . According to Theorem 6.15, we know that (M^{2d}, Ω_g, g) can be embedded isostatically in $(\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N), g^F, T^{A-C})$, for some finite N . By assumption, M^{2d} is compact. Then, according to Le's[126] work, we deduce that for N sufficiently large (M^{2d}, Ω_g, g) can be embedded isostatically in a probability simplex (Δ^N, g^F, T^{A-C}) on a discrete sample space Ξ with $|\Xi| = N+1$. The probability simplex Δ^N is indicated as follows:

$$\Delta^N = \{p = (p_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}, p_i > 0, \sum_i^{N+1} p_i = 1\} \quad (216)$$

and the Fisher metric on Δ^N is specified in terms of

$$g_p^F(v, w) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{v^i w^j}{p^i} \right) + \frac{v^{N+1} w^{N+1}}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^N p_j}, \forall v, w \in T_p \Delta^N \simeq \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (217)$$

For further details concerning the probability simplex, consult([2],[1]). Departing from [12], [1],[130],[131], a new parameterization is typically used: $q^i = 2\sqrt{p_i}$ $i = 1, \dots, N+1$. With this new parametrization, we can identify Δ^N with the positive portion of sphere of radius 2, denoted $2S_+^N$. Therefore, the Fisher metric g^F is the standard constant positive curvature($c = \frac{1}{4}$) on $2S_+^N$, obtained by the restriction of the ambient Euclidean metric of \mathbb{R}^{N+1} . Now assume that (M^{2d}, Ω_g, g) is ∇^0 -totally geodesic. Hence,

$$R^{\nabla^{lc}}(X, Y, Z) = \frac{1}{4}\{g(Y, Z)X - g(X, Z)Y\}, \forall X, Y, Z \in \Gamma(TM^{2d}). \quad (218)$$

The above Eq. (218) leads to a contradiction with regard to Goldberg's result[125][cor 1.2], which states that Kähler manifolds of non-zero constant curvature do not exist. The result follows at once. For the compact co-Kähler manifolds, the proof relies on exactly the same philosophy as in Kähler manifolds case. We use the same reasoning displayed above and then we conclude using the results obtained by Blair [100], Olszak [76], Olszak [132], Goldberg and Yano [92], which state that co-Kähler manifolds of non-zero constant curvature do not exist in any dimension. \square

Corollary 6.18. For compact Kähler and co-Kähler manifolds, the Hellinger distance is a lower bound on both geodesic distance of Kähler metrics and on the geodesic distance of co-Kähler metrics, for N sufficiently large, i.e:

$$d_{\text{Helliger}}(p, q) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N (\sqrt{p_i} - \sqrt{q_i})^2} \leq d_K(p, q), \quad \forall p, q \in M^{2d} \quad (219)$$

$$d_{\text{Helliger}}(p, q) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N (\sqrt{p_i} - \sqrt{q_i})^2} \leq d_{\text{coK}}(p, q), \quad \forall p, q \in M^{2d+1}, \quad (220)$$

where d_K and d_{coK} corresponds to geodesic distance of the Kähler metric and geodesic distance of the co-Kähler metric, respectively.

From the above synthesis, it is noteworthy that compact Kähler and co-Kähler manifolds cannot be expected to be ∇^0 totally geodesic submanifolds of $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N)$. We can now ask whether they can at least be ∇^1 -geodesic. The connection $\nabla^1 = \nabla^e$ is called in information geometry, the exponential connection and $\nabla^{-1} = \nabla^m$ is called the mixture connection. Even for e-connections, there are topological obstructions for M^{2d} to be ∇^e -geodesic. To gain a better insight into this notion, consider a compact Kähler manifold (M^{2d}, Ω, g) whose fundamental group is finite. If M^{2d} is ∇^e -geodesic, then M^{2d} would be an exponential model, or more rigorously, the restriction of the family of categorical distributions on the discrete finite sample space Ξ on M^{2d} should be an exponential family. This refers to the fact that ∇^e -totally geodesic submanifolds of the space of all strictly positive probability distributions on a finite sample space are exponential families (see[1],[2]). This is impossible as locally flat compact manifolds have an infinite fundamental group (see[133]). In the case of co-Kähler manifolds, this obstruction doesn't exist, as, according to [52], a compact co-Kähler manifold is a Kähler mapping torus; therefore, M^{2d+1} fibers over a circle \mathbb{S}^1 . Consequently, its fundamental group is infinite.

In the case it would work on Kähler manifolds, according to [1] and [2], there exist local charts (U_j, x^j) on M^{2d} such that $(\Gamma_{ij}^e)^k = 0$. Now, assume that the charts U^j intersect Darboux charts U^i on M^{2d} . Then, on the commune charts (U_{ij}^l, y^l, y^{d+l}) , we get $\Omega_g|_{U_{ij}^l} = \sum dy^l \wedge dy^{d+l}$ and $\nabla_{\partial_{y^j}}^e \partial_{y^j} = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, 2d$. Let $l : U_{ij}^l \rightarrow M^{2d}$ be an inclusion map. The quadruplet $(\Omega_g|_{U_{ij}^l}, l^*g, l^*\nabla^e, l^*\nabla^m)$ is a special Kähler structure and consequently, (∇^e, ∇^m) are statistical symplectic connections on U_{ij}^l . For further details on special Kähler manifold, refer to [134],[135].

Now, let's examine the non-compact manifolds case. Non-compact Kähler and co-Kähler manifolds are neither ∇^0 -totally geodesic in the location-scale families nor in the family of discrete distribution. The proof of this assertion invests exactly the same arguments used for the compact case. The only possibility lies with the family of location families. In this case, according to Wolf [136], Kähler and co-Kähler manifolds are isometric to a flat cylinder over an Euclidean torus.

6.7 Statistical symplectic connections and a Kähler Potential

Proposition 6.19. α -statistical symplectic connections have the following components in local holomorphic coordinates (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) :

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^k = -\alpha\Gamma_{ij}^k + 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^k - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r\delta_{rk} - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^p\Theta_s^p\delta_{pk} \quad (221)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^k = -\alpha\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^k + 2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{lc})^k - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l)\Theta_l^r\delta_{rk} - \alpha\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l\Gamma_{il}^p\Theta_s^p\delta_{pk} \quad (222)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} = -\alpha\Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{k}} + 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^{\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^{\bar{r}}\delta_{\bar{r}k} - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^{\bar{p}}\delta_{\bar{p}k} \quad (223)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} = -\alpha\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}} + 2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{lc})^{\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l)\Theta_l^{\bar{r}}\delta_{\bar{r}k} - \alpha\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^{\bar{p}}\delta_{\bar{p}k} \quad (224)$$

Proof. Grounded on corollary 6.8, we have:

$$\nabla^\alpha = \nabla^{lc} - \frac{1}{2}\alpha\Theta(\nabla\Theta), \forall a \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (225)$$

Let's choose a local coordinate (z_1, \dots, z_d) and hence a local basis $(\partial z_1, \dots, \partial z_d)$ for $T_{\mathbb{C}}M^{2d}$. We define the Christoffel symbols $(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^k$ by

$$\nabla_{\partial z_i}^\alpha \partial z_j = (\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^k \partial z_k + (\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} \partial \bar{z}_k,$$

$$\nabla_{\partial \bar{z}_i}^\alpha \partial \bar{z}_j = (\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^k \partial z_k + (\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} \partial \bar{z}_k,$$

Using a direct computation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2\nabla_{\partial_i}^\alpha \partial_j + \alpha\nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_j &= 2\nabla_{\partial_i}^{lc} \partial_j - \alpha\Theta(\nabla_{\partial_i} \Theta_j^l \partial_l) \\ &= 2\nabla_{\partial_i}^{lc} \partial_j - \alpha\Theta(\partial_i \Theta_j^l \partial_l + \Theta_j^l \nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_l) \\ &= 2\nabla_{\partial_i}^{lc} \partial_j - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r \partial_r - \alpha\Theta_j^l \Theta(\nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_l) \\ &= 2\nabla_{\partial_i}^{lc} \partial_j - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r \partial_r - \alpha\Theta_j^l \Theta(\Gamma_{il}^s \partial_s) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we get

$$2\nabla_{\partial_i}^\alpha \partial_j + \alpha\nabla_{\partial_i} \partial_j = 2\nabla_{\partial_i}^{lc} \partial_j - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r \partial_r - \alpha\Theta_j^l \Gamma_{il}^s \Theta_s^p \partial_p$$

It follows from the above that:

$$(2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^k + \alpha\Gamma_{ij}^k)\partial_k = 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^k \partial_k - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r \partial_r - \alpha\Theta_j^l \Gamma_{il}^s \Theta_s^p \partial_p \quad (226)$$

We deduce that:

$$(2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^k + \alpha\Gamma_{ij}^k)g_{k\bar{l}} = 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^k g_{k\bar{l}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r g_{r\bar{l}} - \alpha\Theta_j^l \Gamma_{il}^p \Theta_s^p g_{p\bar{l}} \quad (227)$$

Thus,

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^k + \alpha\Gamma_{ij}^k = 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^k - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r\delta_{rk} - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^p\Theta_s^p\delta_{pk} \quad (228)$$

Now replacing j by \bar{j} in the above formula, we get

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^k + \alpha\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^k = 2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{lc})^k - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l)\Theta_l^r\delta_{rk} - \alpha\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l\Gamma_{il}^p\Theta_s^p\delta_{pk} \quad (229)$$

Referring to Eq. (226), we obtain

$$(2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} + \alpha\Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{k}})\partial_{\bar{k}} = 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^{\bar{k}}\partial_{\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r\partial_r - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^p\partial_p \quad (230)$$

Hence,

$$(2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} + \alpha\Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{k}})g_{l\bar{k}} = 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^{\bar{k}}g_{l\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^{\bar{r}}g_{\bar{r}l} - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^{\bar{p}}g_{\bar{p}l} \quad (231)$$

we deduce that

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} + \alpha\Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{k}} = 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^{\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^{\bar{r}}\delta_{\bar{r}k} - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^{\bar{p}}\delta_{\bar{p}k} \quad (232)$$

Replacing j by \bar{j} in the above formula, we obtain

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} + \alpha\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}} = 2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{lc})^{\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l)\Theta_l^{\bar{r}}\delta_{\bar{r}k} - \alpha\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^{\bar{p}}\delta_{\bar{p}k} \quad (233)$$

Finally, relying upon Eq. (228), Eq. (229), Eq. (232), Eq. (233) we obtain:

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^k = -\alpha\Gamma_{ij}^k + 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^k - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r\delta_{rk} - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^p\Theta_s^p\delta_{pk} \quad (234)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^k = -\alpha\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^k + 2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{lc})^k - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l)\Theta_l^r\delta_{rk} - \alpha\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l\Gamma_{il}^p\Theta_s^p\delta_{pk} \quad (235)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} = -\alpha\Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{k}} + 2(\Gamma_{ij}^{lc})^{\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^{\bar{r}}\delta_{\bar{r}k} - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^{\bar{p}}\delta_{\bar{p}k} \quad (236)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} = -\alpha\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}} + 2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{lc})^{\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l)\Theta_l^{\bar{r}}\delta_{\bar{r}k} - \alpha\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^{\bar{p}}\delta_{\bar{p}k} \quad (237)$$

□

Corollary 6.20. There exists a real-valued smooth function $\Phi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ known as the Kähler potential such that

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^k = -\alpha\Gamma_{ij}^k + 2g^{k\bar{l}}\partial_i\partial_{\bar{j}}\partial_{\bar{l}}\Phi - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^r\delta_{rk} - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^p\Theta_s^p\delta_{pk} \quad (238)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^k = -\alpha\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^k - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l)\Theta_l^r\delta_{rk} - \alpha\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l\Gamma_{il}^p\Theta_s^p\delta_{pk} \quad (239)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} = -\alpha\Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_j^l)\Theta_l^{\bar{r}}\delta_{\bar{r}k} - \alpha\Theta_j^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^{\bar{p}}\delta_{\bar{p}k} \quad (240)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} = -\alpha\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}} - \alpha\partial_i(\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l)\Theta_l^{\bar{r}}\delta_{\bar{r}k} - \alpha\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l\Gamma_{il}^s\Theta_s^{\bar{p}}\delta_{\bar{p}k} \quad (241)$$

$$\partial_k\partial_{\bar{i}}\partial_j\Phi = \Gamma_{ki,\bar{j}}^a + \Gamma_{k\bar{j},i}^{-a}$$

$$\partial_{\bar{k}}\partial_{\bar{i}}\partial_j\Phi = \Gamma_{\bar{k}i,\bar{j}}^a + \Gamma_{\bar{k}\bar{j},i}^{-a}$$

Proof. It's well known that the Christoffels symbols of the Levi-Civita connection g are identified in a local coordinate (U, z_1, \dots, z_d) by:

$$(\Gamma^{lc})_{ij}^{\bar{k}} = 0, (\Gamma^{lc})_{i\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}} = (\Gamma^{lc})_{i\bar{j}}^k = 0, (\Gamma^{lc})_{ij}^k = g^{k\bar{l}} \frac{\partial g_{i\bar{l}}}{\partial z_j} \quad (242)$$

There exists a real-valued function Φ on a neighbourhood of $p \in M^{2d}$ such that

$$g_{i\bar{k}} = \partial_i \partial_{\bar{k}} \Phi. \quad (243)$$

We accordingly have:

$$(\Gamma^{lc})_{ij}^k = g^{k\bar{l}} \frac{\partial g_{j\bar{l}}}{\partial z_i} = g^{k\bar{l}} \partial_i \partial_j \partial_{\bar{l}} \Phi.$$

With respect to 6.19, we conclude that

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^k = -\alpha \Gamma_{ij}^k + 2g^{k\bar{l}} \partial_i \partial_j \partial_{\bar{l}} \Phi - \alpha \partial_i (\Theta_j^l) \Theta_l^r \delta_{rk} - \alpha \Theta_j^l \Gamma_{il}^p \Theta_s^p \delta_{pk} \quad (244)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^k = -\alpha \Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^k - \alpha \partial_i (\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l) \Theta_l^r \delta_{rk} - \alpha \Theta_{\bar{j}}^l \Gamma_{il}^p \Theta_s^p \delta_{pk} \quad (245)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{ij}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} = -\alpha \Gamma_{ij}^{\bar{k}} - \alpha \partial_i (\Theta_j^l) \Theta_l^{\bar{r}} \delta_{\bar{r}\bar{k}} - \alpha \Theta_j^l \Gamma_{il}^s \Theta_s^{\bar{p}} \delta_{\bar{p}\bar{k}} \quad (246)$$

$$2(\Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^\alpha)^{\bar{k}} = -\alpha \Gamma_{i\bar{j}}^{\bar{k}} - \alpha \partial_i (\Theta_{\bar{j}}^l) \Theta_l^{\bar{r}} \delta_{\bar{r}\bar{k}} - \alpha \Theta_{\bar{j}}^l \Gamma_{il}^s \Theta_s^{\bar{p}} \delta_{\bar{p}\bar{k}} \quad (247)$$

Additionally, departing from Eq. (243) and based on the duality condition, one can get the following expressions:

$$\partial_k \partial_{\bar{i}} \partial_j \Phi = \Gamma_{ki, \bar{j}}^a + \Gamma_{k\bar{j}, i}^{-a};$$

$$\partial_{\bar{k}} \partial_i \partial_j \Phi = \Gamma_{\bar{k}i, \bar{j}}^a + \Gamma_{\bar{k}\bar{j}, i}^{-a},$$

where $\Gamma_{kj, i}^a = g_{il} (\Gamma_{kj}^a)^l$, $\forall i, j, k$. □

6.7.1 Kähler potential and Kullback-Leibler divergence

We start this subsection by recalling an outstanding result known to all specialists. In [72], Matumoto revealed that a divergence exists for any statistical manifold. (M, g, T) . However, it is not unique and there are infinitely many divergences that provide the same geometrical structure. Referring to the work of [72] Matumoto, we deduce with our statistical characterization of Kähler metrics that, for any Kähler metric g , there exists a divergence or contrast function D such that on a neighborhood $\Delta \subset U \times U \simeq U \times \bar{U}$ of the diagonal (\bar{U} denotes the neighborhood defined by conjugated local coordinates), it is expressed by:

$$g_{i, \bar{j}}(p) = -\frac{\partial^2 D(z, \bar{z})}{\partial z^i \partial \bar{z}^j} \Big|_{\Delta} \quad (248)$$

Remember that the Kähler metric can equally be indicated in a local coordinate by the Kähler potential by:

$$g_{i,\bar{j}}(p) = \frac{\partial^2 \Phi(z, \bar{z})}{\partial z^i \partial \bar{z}^j} \quad (249)$$

The affinity between Eq. (248) and Eq. (249) is not accidental. These facts are suggestive that there exists a connection between the Kähler potential and the divergence function. Resting on Eq. (248) and Eq. (249), we obtain on the common holomorphic coordinate, the following formula:

$$\frac{\partial^2 (D(z, \bar{z}) - \Phi(z, \bar{z}))}{\partial z^i \partial \bar{z}^j} = 0. \quad (250)$$

Now, $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -Lemma is estimated in terms of

$$D(z, \bar{z}) = \Phi(z, \bar{z}) + h(z) + \bar{h}(z), \quad (251)$$

where h is an holomorphic function. This yields the relation between the divergence function and the Kähler potential.

We infer from Theorem 6.15 that a Kähler metric is always obtained by pulling back the Fisher metric of some statistical model $(\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N), g^F, T^{A-C})$. Let's consider an isostatistical embedding $i : (M^{2d}, \Omega, g, T^{Ka}) \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N), g^F, T^{A-C})$; for N sufficiently large, where:

$$g = i^* g^F \text{ and } T^{Ka} = i^* T^{A-C}. \quad (252)$$

Consider D_{KL} the Kullback-Leibler divergence on $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N)$, defined as:

$$D_{KL}(p, q) = \mathbb{E}_p(\log(\frac{p}{q})) , p, q \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi^N). \quad (253)$$

It is notably related to the Fisher information metric g^F as follows:

$$g_{ij}^F(\theta_0) = \frac{\partial^2 D_{KL}(p_{\theta_0}, p_{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} \quad (254)$$

With respect to Eq. (254), we obviously locally have

$$D_{KL}(i(z), i(\bar{z})) = D(z, \bar{z}) + r(z) + \bar{r}(z), \quad (255)$$

, where r is some holomorphic function. Now, using Eq. (249), we easily locally obtain

$$D_{KL}(i(z), i(\bar{z})) = \Phi(z, \bar{z}) + f(z) + \bar{f}(z), \quad (256)$$

where f is some holomorphic function.

We conclude this section by investigating the case of real analytic Kähler metrics.

6.7.2 A Real analytic Kähler metric and a Fisher-information metric of exponential family

Let us now consider a real analytic Kähler metric g . Recall that a Kähler metric is a real analytic if in a fixed local coordinate (z_1, \dots, z_d) on a neighbourhood U at any point $z \in M^{2d}$, there exists a real analytical Kähler potential $\Phi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$g_{i\bar{j}} = \frac{\partial^2 \Phi(z, \bar{z})}{\partial z^i \partial \bar{z}^j}. \quad (257)$$

Theorem 6.21. *Any real analytic Kähler metric is locally is the Fisher information of an exponential family.*

Proof. Let's consider a real analytic Kähler metric g on M^{2d} . In the neighbourhood U of each point $z \in M^{2d}$, there exist local holomorphic coordinates (z^1, \dots, z^d) centered at z (unique modulo unitary linear transformations) such that

$$g_{i\bar{j}}(z) = \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial z^i \partial \bar{z}^j}(z) = \delta_{ij} \quad (258)$$

These holomorphic coordinates (z^1, \dots, z^d) are called normal or geodesic coordinates or Bochner's coordinates around the point p (see [137] and [138]). With respect the analyticity of the Kähler metric g , it follows from [138], that the Kähler potential can be analytically extended in a neighbourhood $V \subset U \times U \simeq U \times \bar{U}$ of the diagonal. This extension is denoted by $\Phi(z, \bar{w})$. Now consider the diastasis function $D^g(z, w)$ determined by Calabi [138] as:

$$D^g(z, w) = \Phi(z, \bar{w}) + \Phi(w, \bar{z}) - \Phi(z, \bar{z}) - \Phi(w, \bar{w}), \quad (z, w) \in V. \quad (259)$$

According to [138], the diastasis function satisfies the following properties

$$D(z, z) = 0, \quad (260)$$

$$g_{i\bar{j}}(z) = \frac{\partial^2 D^g(z, w)}{\partial z^i \partial \bar{z}^j} = \frac{\partial^2 \Phi(z, \bar{z})}{\partial z^i \partial \bar{z}^j}, \text{ for } q \text{ fixed}; \quad (261)$$

$$D^g(z, w) = (d_R(z, w))^2 + o(d_R(z, w))^4. \quad (262)$$

where d_R is the geodesic distance with respect to the analytic Kähler metric g between z and w . Referring the above equations 260, 261, 262, we deduce that the diastasis function D^g is a divergence function or a contrast function on U . Now, we can use Eguchi construction [74] in order to define statistical structure as follows:

$$\Gamma_{ij,k}^{D^g}(z) = -\partial_{z^i} \partial_{z^j} \partial_{\bar{z}^k} D^g(z, w) \big|_{z=w}, \quad (263)$$

$$\Gamma_{ij,k}^{*D^g}(z) = -\partial_{z^k} \partial_{\bar{z}^i} \partial_{\bar{z}^j} D^g(z, w) \big|_{z=w}; \quad (264)$$

$$T_{ijk}^{D^g}(z) = \Gamma_{ij,k}^{*D^g}(z) - \Gamma_{ij,k}^{D^g}(z). \quad (265)$$

Obviously, using Eq. (258) on U , we have

$$\Gamma_{ij,k}^{D^g}(z) = \Gamma_{ij,k}^{*D^g}(z) = 0, \text{ and } T_{ijk}^{D^g}(z) = 0. \quad (266)$$

Based on Eq. (266), the diastasic function D^g coincides with Bregman divergence (canonical divergence). For simplicity, we denote $\Phi(z, \bar{z}) = \Phi(z)$. Resting on [139], it's possible to find a measure $\mu(x)$ such that

$$\Phi(z) = \log \int \exp(\langle z, x \rangle) d\mu(x) \quad (267)$$

Therefore, the exponential family is provided by

$$p(x, z) = \exp(\langle z, x \rangle - \Phi(z)). \quad (268)$$

As a matter of fact,

$$g_{i\bar{j}}(z) = g_{i\bar{j}}^F(z) = \frac{\partial^2 (\log \int \exp(\langle z, x \rangle) d\mu(x))}{\partial z^i \partial \bar{z}^j}.$$

The result follows at once. \square

The following corollary is an easy consequence of the above theorem.

Corollary 6.22. Any real analytic Kähler manifold (M, g) is locally an exponential family.

Proof. The claim follows from the above theorem. \square




Fig. 11 An real analytic Kähler manifold is locally an exponential family.

7 Examples

1. Statistical almost Kahler manifolds (Kähler manifolds)

- (a) Special Kähler manifolds,
- (b) Holomorphic statistical manifolds,
- (c) Conic Kähler manifolds,
- (d) Projective special Kähler manifolds.

2. Statistical shs manifolds (co-Kähler manifolds)

Consider a statistical almost Kähler manifold $(M^{2d}, g, \Omega, \Theta, \nabla, \nabla^*)$. We can construct a statistical shs manifold as follows:

$$(W^{2d+1} = M^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}, \tilde{g}, \tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\nabla}, \tilde{\nabla}^*),$$

where $\tilde{\alpha} = dt$, $E = (0, \frac{\partial}{\partial t})$, $\tilde{\Theta}(\cdot, fE) = (\Theta, 0)$, $\tilde{g} = g + dt^2$ and $\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{g}(\tilde{\Theta}, \cdot)$ and the shs statistical connections are indicated by:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla_X Y, \tilde{\nabla}_E X = \tilde{\nabla}_X E = 0, \tilde{\nabla}_E E = 0, \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM^{2d}),$$

$$\tilde{\nabla}^*_X Y = \nabla^*_X Y, \tilde{\nabla}^*_E X = \tilde{\nabla}^*_X E = 0, \tilde{\nabla}^*_E E = 0, \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM^{2d}).$$

Summary and Perspectives

Information geometry grants the opportunity to handle other connections (statistical connections) which generalise Levi-Civita connection. Therefore, multiple theorems of Riemannian geometry can be generalized with statistical connections. In the current research paper, we have proved a strong link between Information geometry and Kähler geometry. Through we did not solve Goldberg's conjecture, we provided given new characterisations of Kähler metrics and co-Kähler metrics with statistical ingredients. In particular, we corroborate that any Kähler manifold is a family of probability distributions and any Kähler metrics is a Fisher information metric. We also confirmed that a real analytic Kähler metric is always locally the Fisher information metric of some exponential family. As a final note, we would assert that this work can be taken further and built upon. In future research, we intend to solve Golberg's conjecture using a statistical approach.

Acknowledgement

I am thankful to Michel Nguiffo-Boyom and Stephane Puechmorel for their introduction to the field of information geometry. I am sincerely grateful to Frédéric Barbaresco and all members of the working group "Nord-Bassin parisien" for stimulating conversations and clarifications on information geometry concepts. Thanks to Charles-Michel Marle for constructive discussions and insightful suggestions on cosymplectic structures which played an intrinsic role in this article. I would like to thank Andreas Guitart and Samir Marouani for their valuable help in presenting this article.

References

- [1] Amari, S.-i.: Differential geometrical theory of statistics. *Differential geometry in statistical inference* (10), 19–94 (1987)
- [2] Amari, S.-i., Nagaoka, H.: *Methods of Information Geometry* vol. 191. American Mathematical Soc., ??? (2007)
- [3] Rao, C.R.: Information and the accuracy attainable in the estimation of statistical parameters. In: *Breakthroughs in Statistics: Foundations and Basic Theory*, pp. 235–247. Springer, ??? (1992)
- [4] Lauritzen, S.L.: Statistical manifolds. *Differential geometry in statistical inference* **10**, 163–216 (1987)
- [5] Cencov, N.N.: *Statistical Decision Rules and Optimal Inference* vol. 53. American Mathematical Soc., ??? (2000)
- [6] Ay, N., Jost, J., Lê, H.V., Schwachhöfer, L.: Information geometry and sufficient statistics. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **162**, 327–364 (2015)
- [7] Calin, O., Udrişte, C.: *Geometric Modeling in Probability and Statistics* vol. 121. Springer, ??? (2014)
- [8] Facchi, P., Kulkarni, R., Man’Ko, V., Marmo, G., Sudarshan, E., Ventriglia, F.: Classical and quantum fisher information in the geometrical formulation of quantum mechanics. *Physics Letters A* **374**(48), 4801–4803 (2010)
- [9] Petz, D.: Monotone metrics on matrix spaces. *Linear algebra and its applications* **244**, 81–96 (1996)
- [10] Lesniewski, A., Ruskai, M.B.: Monotone riemannian metrics and relative entropy on noncommutative probability spaces. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **40**(11), 5702–5724 (1999)
- [11] Petz, D.: *Quantum Information Theory and Quantum Statistics*. Springer, ??? (2007)
- [12] Amari, S.-i., Nagaoka, H.: *Methods of Information Geometry* vol. 191. American Mathematical Soc., ??? (2000)
- [13] Cirelli, R., Lanzavecchia, P., et al.: Hamiltonian vector fields in quantum mechanics. *Nuovo Cimento B;(Italy)* **79**(2) (1984)
- [14] Dombrowski, P.: *On the geometry of the tangent bundle*. (1962)
- [15] Shima, H.: *The Geometry of Hessian Structures*. World Scientific, ??? (2007)

- [16] Kurose, T.: Statistical manifolds admitting torsion. Geometry and Something, Fukuoka University (2007)
- [17] Henmi, M., Matsuzoe, H.: Statistical manifolds admitting torsion and partially flat spaces. Geometric Structures of Information, 37–50 (2019)
- [18] Matsuzoe, H., Kurose, T.: Quasi-statistical manifolds and geometry of affine distributions. Pure and Applied Differential Geometry; Van der Veken, J., Van de Woestyne, I., Verstraelen, L., Vrancken, L., Eds, 208–214 (2012)
- [19] Zhang, J., Khan, G.: From hessian to weitzenböck: Manifolds with torsion-carrying connections. Information Geometry **2**, 77–98 (2019)
- [20] Zhang, J., Khan, G.: New geometry of parametric statistical models. In: International Conference on Geometric Science of Information, pp. 288–296 (2019). Springer
- [21] Henmi, M., Matsuzoe, H.: Geometry of pre-contrast functions and non-conservative estimating functions. In: AIP Conference Proceedings, vol. 1340, pp. 32–41 (2011). American Institute of Physics
- [22] Abe, N.: General connections on vector bundles. Kodai Mathematical Journal **8**(3), 322–329 (1985)
- [23] LIBERMANN, M.P.: Sur les automorphismes infinitesimaux des structures symplectiques et des structures de contact. Coll. Géom. Diff. Globale, 37–58 (1959)
- [24] Casals, R., Pancholi, D.M., Presas, F.: Almost contact 5-manifolds are contact. Annals of Mathematics, 429–490 (2015)
- [25] Ibort, A., Marti, D., *et al.*: Lefschetz pencil structures for 2-calibrated manifolds. Comptes rendus. Mathématique **339**(3), 215–218 (2004)
- [26] McDuff, D., Salamon, D.: Introduction to Symplectic Topology vol. 27. Oxford University Press, ??? (2017)
- [27] Cieliebak, K., Volkov, E.: Stable hamiltonian structures in dimension three are supported by open books. arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.3854 (2010)
- [28] Eliashberg, Y., Kim, S.S., Polterovich, L.: Geometry of contact transformations and domains: orderability versus squeezing. Geometry & Topology **10**(3), 1635–1747 (2006)
- [29] Wendl, C.: Open book decompositions and stable hamiltonian structures. Expositiones Mathematicae **28**(2), 187–199 (2010)
- [30] Acakpo, B.: Stable hamiltonian structure and basic cohomology. Annali di

- [31] Gromov, M.L.: Stable mappings of foliations into manifolds. *Mathematics of the USSR-Izvestiya* **3**(4), 671 (1969)
- [32] Lichnerowicz, A.: Déformations d’algèbres associées à une variété symplectique (les $*_{\nu}$ -produits). In: *Annales de L’institut Fourier*, vol. 32, pp. 157–209 (1982)
- [33] Bieliavsky, P., Cahen, M., Gutt, S., Rawnsley, J., Schwachhöfer, L.: Symplectic connections. *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* **3**(03), 375–420 (2006)
- [34] Libermann, P., Marle, C.-M.: *Symplectic Geometry and Analytical Mechanics* vol. 35. Springer, ??? (2012)
- [35] Godbillon, C.: *Géométrie Différentielle et Mécanique analytique*. FeniXX, ??? (1969)
- [36] Torres, D.M.: The geometry of 2-calibrated manifolds. *Portugaliae Mathematica* **66**(4), 427–512 (2009)
- [37] Weinstein, A.: On the hypotheses of rabinowitz’ periodic orbit theorems. *Journal of Differential Equations* **33**(3), 353–358 (1979) [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396\(79\)90070-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396(79)90070-6)
- [38] Hofer, H., Zehnder, E.: Symplectic capacities. In: *Symplectic Invariants and Hamiltonian Dynamics*, pp. 51–67. Springer, ??? (1994)
- [39] Hutchings, M., Taubes, C.H.: The weinstein conjecture for stable hamiltonian structures. *Geometry & Topology* **13**(2), 901–941 (2009)
- [40] Rechtman, A.: Existence of periodic orbits for geodesible vector fields on closed 3-manifolds. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **30**(6), 1817–1841 (2010)
- [41] Cieliebak, K., Volkov, E.: First steps in stable hamiltonian topology. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* **17**(2), 321–404 (2015)
- [42] Eliashberg, Y., Givental, A., Hofer, H.: Introduction to symplectic field theory. *Visions in Mathematics: GAFA 2000 Special Volume, Part II*, 560–673 (2010)
- [43] Bourgeois, F., Eliashberg, Y., Hofer, H., Wysocki, K., Zehnder, E.: Compactness results in symplectic field theory. *Geometry & Topology* **7**(2), 799–888 (2003)
- [44] Latschev, J., Wendl, C., Hutchings, M.: Algebraic torsion in contact manifolds. *Geometric and Functional Analysis* **21**(5), 1144–1195 (2011)
- [45] Niederkrüger, K., Wendl, C.: Weak symplectic fillings and holomorphic curves. In: *Annales Scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure*, vol. 44, pp. 801–853

(2011)

- [46] Siefring, R.: Intersection theory of punctured pseudoholomorphic curves. *Geometry & Topology* **15**(4), 2351–2457 (2011)
- [47] León, M., Izquierdo, R.: A review on coisotropic reduction in symplectic, cosymplectic, contact and co-contact hamiltonian systems. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* (2023)
- [48] Libermann, P.: Sur quelques exemples de structures pfaffiennes et presque cosymplectiques. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata* **60**(1), 153–172 (1962)
- [49] Gluck, H.: Dynamical behavior of geodesic fields. In: *Global Theory of Dynamical Systems: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, June 18–22, 1979*, pp. 190–215 (2006). Springer
- [50] Wad: Geodesic foliations by circles. *Journal of Differential Geometry* **10**(4), 541–549 (1975)
- [51] Sullivan, D.: A foliation of geodesics is characterized by having no “tangent homologies”. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **13**(1), 101–104 (1978)
- [52] Li, H.: Topology of co-symplectic/co-kähler manifolds. *Asian Journal of Mathematics* **12**(4), 527–544 (2008)
- [53] Tischler, D.: On fibering certain foliated manifolds overs1. *Topology* **9**(2), 153–154 (1970)
- [54] Reeb, G.: Sur les solutions périodiques de certains systèmes différentiels perturbés. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **3**, 339–362 (1951)
- [55] Takizawa, S.: On contact structures of real and complex manifolds. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series* **15**(3), 227–252 (1963)
- [56] León, M., Tuynman, G.M.: A universal model for cosymplectic manifolds. *Journal of Geometry and Physics* **20**(1), 77–86 (1996)
- [57] Albert, C.: Le théoreme de réduction de marsden-weinstein en géométrie cosymplectique et de contact. *Journal of Geometry and Physics* **6**(4), 627–649 (1989)
- [58] Kostant, B.: Quantization and unitary representations. *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk* **28**(1), 163–225 (1973)
- [59] Gromov, M.: A topological technique for the construction of solutions of differential equations and inequalities. *Intern. Congr. Math.(Nice 1970)* **2**, 221–225 (1971)

- [60] Lichnerowicz, A.: Géométrie et cohomologies associées a une variété de contact
- [61] Vaisman, I.: Symplectic curvature tensors. Monatshefte für Mathematik **100**(4), 299–327 (1985)
- [62] Lemlein, V.: Spaces of symmetric almost symplectic connectivity. In: Doklady Akademii Nauk, vol. 115, pp. 655–658 (1957). Russian Academy of Sciences
- [63] Bejancu, A., Farran, H.R.: Foliations and Geometric Structures vol. 580. Springer, ??? (2006)
- [64] Bejancu, A.: Geometry of CR-submanifolds vol. 23. Springer, ??? (2012)
- [65] Walker, A.G.: Connexions for parallel distributions in the large (ii). The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics **9**(1), 221–231 (1958)
- [66] De León, M., Rodrigues, P.R.: Methods of Differential Geometry in Analytical Mechanics. Elsevier, ??? (2011)
- [67] Sasaki, S.: Shigeo Sasaki: Selected Papers. Kinokuniya, ??? (1985)
- [68] Blair, D.E.: Riemannian Geometry of Contact and Symplectic Manifolds. Springer, ??? (2010)
- [69] Ogiue, K., Okumura, M.: On cocomplex structures. In: Kodai Mathematical Seminar Reports, vol. 19, pp. 507–512 (1967). Department of Mathematics, Tokyo Institute of Technology
- [70] Amari, S.-i.: Differential-geometrical Methods in Statistics vol. 28. Springer, ??? (2012)
- [71] Chentsov, N.: Statistical decision rules and optimal inference nauka moscow. English translation (1982)
- [72] Matumoto, T., *et al.*: Any statistical manifold has a contrast function—on the c_3 -functions taking the minimum at the diagonal of the product manifold. Hiroshima Math. J **23**(2), 327–332 (1993)
- [73] Eguchi, S.: Second order efficiency of minimum contrast estimators in a curved exponential family. The Annals of Statistics, 793–803 (1983)
- [74] Eguchi, S.: Geometry of minimum contrast. Hiroshima Mathematical Journal **22**(3), 631–647 (1992)
- [75] Bochner, S.: Vector fields and ricci curvature (1946)
- [76] Olszak, Z.: On almost cosymplectic manifolds. Kodai Mathematical Journal **4**(2), 239–250 (1981)

- [77] Morimoto, A.: On normal almost contact structures. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan* **15**(4), 420–436 (1963)
- [78] Calabi, E., Eckmann, B.: A class of compact, complex manifolds which are not algebraic. *Annals of Mathematics*, 494–500 (1953)
- [79] Goldberg, S.: Totally geodesic hypersurfaces of kaehler manifolds. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **27**(2), 275–281 (1968)
- [80] Capursi, M.: Some remarks on the product of two almost contact manifolds. *An. Stiint. Univ. Al. I. Cuza Iasi Sect. I a Mat* **30**(1), 75–79 (1984)
- [81] Ogiue, K.: G-structures defined by tensor fields. In: *Kodai Mathematical Seminar Reports*, vol. 20, pp. 54–75 (1968). Department of Mathematics, Tokyo Institute of Technology
- [82] Watson, B.: New examples of strictly almost kähler manifolds. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **88**(3), 541–544 (1983)
- [83] Goldberg, S., Yano, K.: Integrability of almost cosymplectic structures. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **31**(2), 373–382 (1969)
- [84] León, M., González, J.C.M.: Compact cosymplectic manifolds of positive constant f^* -sectional curvature. *Extracta mathematicae* **9**(1), 28–31 (1994)
- [85] Chinea, D., León, M., Marrero, J.C.: Topology of cosymplectic manifolds. *Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées* **72**(6), 567–591 (1993)
- [86] Chinea, D., León, M.d., Marrero, J.C.: Spectral sequences on sasakian and cosymplectic manifolds (1997)
- [87] Fujimoto, A., Muto, H.: On cosymplectic manifolds. *Tensor NS* **28**, 43–52 (1974)
- [88] MARRERO, M.D.L.-J.C.: Compact cosymplectic manifolds with transversally positive definite ricci tensor
- [89] Bazzoni, G., Oprea, J.: On the structure of co-kähler manifolds. *Geometriae Dedicata* **170**(1), 71–85 (2014)
- [90] Janssens, D., Vanhecke, L.: Almost contact structures and curvature tensors. *Kodai Mathematical Journal* **4**(1), 1–27 (1981)
- [91] Marrero, J., Padron, E.: New examples of compact cosymplectic solvmanifolds. *Archivum Mathematicum* **34**(3), 337–345 (1998)
- [92] Goldberg, S., Yano, K.: Integrability of almost cosymplectic structures. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **31**(2), 373–382 (1969)

- [93] Sekigawa, K.: On some 4-dimensional compact einstein almost kähler manifolds. *Mathematische Annalen* **271**, 333–337 (1985)
- [94] Goldberg, S.I.: *Curvature and Homology*. Courier Corporation, ??? (1998)
- [95] Sawaki, S.: On almost-hermitian manifolds satisfying a certain condition on the almost-complex structure tensor. *Differential Geometry (in Honor of Kentaro Yano)*, Kinokuniya, Tokyo, 443–450 (1972)
- [96] Sawaki, S.: Sufficient conditions for an almost-hermitian manifold to be kählerian. *Hokkaido Mathematical Journal* **1**(1), 21–29 (1972)
- [97] Sawaki, S., Kotô, S.: Almost complex metric spaces. *Sūgaku* **16**, 9–18 (1964)
- [98] Gray, A.: Curvature identities for hermitian and almost hermitian manifolds. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series* **28**(4), 601–612 (1976)
- [99] Montano, B.C., Pastore, A.M.: Einstein-like conditions and cosymplectic geometry. *Journal of Advanced Mathematical Studies* **3**(2), 27–41 (2010)
- [100] Blair, D.E.: *THE THEORY OF QUASI-SASAKIAN STRUCTURES*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, ??? (1966)
- [101] Kacimi-Alaoui, A.E., Sergiescu, V., Hector, G.: La cohomologie basique d’un feuilletage riemannien est de dimension finie. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **188**, 593–599 (1985)
- [102] Ohara, A.: Information geometric analysis of an interior point method for semidefinite programming. *Geometry in Present Day Science* **1**, 49–74 (1999)
- [103] Ohara, A., Wada, T.: Information geometry of q-gaussian densities and behaviors of solutions to related diffusion equations. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **43**(3), 035002 (2009)
- [104] Nagaoka, H.: Information-geometrical characterization of statistical models which are statistically equivalent to probability simplexes. In: *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1346–1350 (2017). IEEE
- [105] Kobayashi, S., Nomizu, K.: *Foundations of differential geometry ii*, interscience publ. New York London Sydney (1969)
- [106] Nomizu, K., Sasaki, T.: *Affine Differential Geometry: Geometry of Affine Immersions*. Cambridge university press, ??? (1994)
- [107] Deligne, P., Griffiths, P., Morgan, J., Sullivan, D.: Real homotopy theory of kähler manifolds. *Inventiones mathematicae* **29**, 245–274 (1975)

- [108] Hasegawa, K.: A note on compact solvmanifolds with kähler structures (2006)
- [109] Fino, A., Vezzoni, L.: Some results on cosymplectic manifolds. *Geometriae Dedicata* **151**, 41–58 (2011)
- [110] Sullivan, D.: Differential forms and the topology of manifolds. *Manifolds Tokyo*, 37–49 (1973)
- [111] Tondeur, P.: Affine zusammenhänge auf mannigfaltigkeiten mit fast-symplektischer struktur. *Commentarii mathematici Helvetici* **36**(1), 234–244 (1962)
- [112] Hicks, N.: Linear perturbations of connexions. *Michigan Mathematical Journal* **12**(4), 389–397 (1965)
- [113] Fei, T., Zhang, J.: Interaction of codazzi couplings with (para-) kähler geometry. *Results in Mathematics* **72**(4), 2037–2056 (2017)
- [114] Nguiffo Boyom, M.: Foliations-webs-hessian geometry-information geometry-entropy and cohomology. *Entropy* **18**(12), 433 (2016)
- [115] Schwenk-Schellschmidt, A., Simon, U.: Codazzi-equivalent affine connections. *Results in Mathematics* **56**, 211–229 (2009)
- [116] Bismut, J.-M.: A local index theorem for non kähler manifolds. *Mathematische Annalen* **284**(4), 681–699 (1989)
- [117] Chern, S.-s.: Characteristic classes of hermitian manifolds. *Annals of Mathematics*, 85–121 (1946)
- [118] Vanhecke, L., Gray, A., Barros, M., Naveira, A.: The chern numbers of holomorphic vector bundles and formally holomorphic connections of complex vector bundles over almost complex manifolds. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik* **314**, 84–98 (1980)
- [119] Sekigawa, K.: On some compact einstein almost kähler manifolds. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan* **39**(4), 677–684 (1987)
- [120] Sekigawa, K., Vanhecke, L.: Four-dimensional almost kähler einstein manifolds. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata* **157**, 149–160 (1990)
- [121] Oguro, T., Sekigawa, K.: Non-existence of almost kähler structure on hyperbolic spaces of dimension $2n(\geq 4)$. *Mathematische Annalen* **300**, 317–329 (1994)
- [122] Tian, G.: *Canonical Metrics in Kähler Geometry*. Birkhäuser, ??? (2012)
- [123] Kobayashi, S.: On compact kahler manifolds with positive definite ricci tensor. *Annals of Mathematics*, 570–574 (1961)

- [124] Opozda, B.: Bochner’s technique for statistical structures. *Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry* **48**(4), 357–395 (2015)
- [125] Goldberg, S.I.: Integrability of almost kähler manifolds. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **21**(1), 96–100 (1969)
- [126] Lê, H.V.: Statistical manifolds are statistical models. *Journal of Geometry* **84**, 83–93 (2006)
- [127] Nielsen, F.: An elementary introduction to information geometry. *Entropy* **22**(10), 1100 (2020)
- [128] Costa, S.I., Santos, S.A., Strapasson, J.E.: Fisher information distance: A geometrical reading. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **197**, 59–69 (2015)
- [129] Rylov, A.: Constant curvature connections on statistical models. In: *Information Geometry and Its Applications IV*, pp. 349–361. Springer, ??? (2016)
- [130] Kass, R.E., Vos, P.W.: *Geometrical Foundations of Asymptotic Inference*. John Wiley & Sons, ??? (2011)
- [131] Burbea, J.: *Informative Geometry of Probability Spaces*. Center for Multivariate Analysis, University of Pittsburgh, ??? (1984)
- [132] Olszak, Z.: Almost cosymplectic manifolds with kahlerian leaves. *Tensor, NS* **46**, 117–124 (1987)
- [133] Ay, N., Tuschmann, W.: Dually flat manifolds and global information geometry. *Open Systems & Information Dynamics* **9**(2), 195–200 (2002)
- [134] Freed, D.S.: Special kaehler manifolds. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **203**, 31–52 (1999)
- [135] Hitchin, N.J.: The moduli space of complex lagrangian submanifolds. arXiv preprint math/9901069 (1999)
- [136] Wolf, J.A.: *Spaces of Constant Curvature* vol. 372. American Mathematical Soc., ??? (1972)
- [137] Bochner, S.: *Curvature in hermitian metric* (1947)
- [138] Calabi, E.: Isometric imbedding of complex manifolds. *Annals of Mathematics*, 1–23 (1953)
- [139] Banerjee, A., Merugu, S., Dhillon, I.S., Ghosh, J., Lafferty, J.: Clustering with bregman divergences. *Journal of machine learning research* **6**(10) (2005)