

A note on gradient-like vector fields

Kai Cieliebak

Abstract

This note proposes a new notion of a gradient-like vector field and discusses its implications for the theory of Stein and Weinstein structures.

For a smooth function $\phi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on a manifold V , its gradient vector field $\text{grad}_g \phi$ with respect to a Riemannian metric g is defined by $d\phi = g(\text{grad}_g \phi, \cdot)$. For many applications, this notion is too rigid and one wants to allow more general “gradient-like” vector fields X satisfying

$$d\phi(X) > 0 \text{ outside } \text{Zero}(X) = \text{Crit}(\phi), \quad (1)$$

where $\text{Zero}(X)$ denotes the zero set of X and $\text{Crit}(\phi)$ the set of critical points of ϕ . For example, this occurs in Morse theory [6], and in the theory of Weinstein structures where X is additionally required to be Liouville for a symplectic form [2]. The drawback of this notion is that the zeroes of X can be of very different nature from the critical points of ϕ , so one does not expect a good deformation theory for pairs (X, ϕ) satisfying (1). To remedy this, the following more quantitative notion of (1) is used e.g. in [2]:

$$d\phi(X) \geq \delta \cdot (|X|^2 + |d\phi|^2) \text{ for a function } \delta : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \quad (2)$$

However, the deformation theory of such pairs is still not understood. For example, it is unknown whether any pair (X, ϕ) satisfying (2) can be deformed through such pairs to one for which the function is Morse. Because of this, the map from Weinstein to Stein structures in [2] is only defined under the condition that the involved functions are generalized Morse. While this suffices for the discussion of 0- and 1-parametric families of such structures in [2], it has been an obstacle to extending these results to higher dimensional families.

It is the goal of this note to show that these issues get resolved by the following notion. Let us call a vector field X *gradient-like* for ϕ if

$$d\phi = g(X, \cdot) \text{ for some positive smooth } (2, 0) \text{ tensor field } g, \quad (3)$$

where “positive” means $g(v, v) > 0$ for all $v \neq 0$. If g is in addition symmetric this just means $X = \text{grad}_g \phi$, but in general symmetry of g is not required. Denoting \mathfrak{X} the space of vector fields, \mathcal{F} the space of smooth functions $\phi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and \mathcal{G} the space of positive $(2, 0)$ tensor fields, we have the commuting

diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \mathfrak{X} & \xleftarrow{\text{contr}} \{(X, \phi, g) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \mid d\phi = g(X, \cdot)\} \\
& \uparrow & \swarrow \text{contr} \quad \searrow \cong \\
\{(X, \phi) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathcal{F} \mid (3)\} & & \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \\
& \searrow \text{Serre} & \swarrow \text{proj} \\
& \mathcal{F} &
\end{array}$$

Here the middle right arrow is a homeomorphism (because $d\phi = g(X, \cdot)$ uniquely determines X given ϕ, g), the upper and middle arrow have contractible fibres, and the lower right arrow is the canonical projection $(\phi, g) \mapsto \phi$. So we obtain

Lemma 1. *The lower left arrow in the above diagram is a Serre fibration with contractible fibres and a section (just fixing some g), so every family of functions lifts to a family of pairs satisfying (3). In particular, any pair (X, ϕ) satisfying (3) is homotopic through such pairs to one for which the function is Morse, and any 1-parametric family of such pairs is homotopic to one having only birth-death critical points. \square*

Recall that a critical point p of ϕ is called *Morse* if the Hessian of ϕ at p is nondegenerate, and *embryonic* if the Hessian has a 1-dimensional kernel on which the third derivative of ϕ does not vanish. The following lemma shows that at such critical points the notions (2) and (3) are equivalent.

Lemma 2. (a) *If (X, ϕ) satisfies (3), then it also satisfies (2).*
(b) *If (X, ϕ) satisfies (2) and ϕ has only Morse or embryonic critical points, then (X, ϕ) also satisfies (3).*
(c) *If (X, ϕ) satisfies (3) near $\text{Crit}(\phi)$ and (1), then it satisfies (3) everywhere.*

Proof. (a) Given a Riemannian metric with norm $|\cdot|$, define two functions $a, B : V \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by

$$a(p) := \inf_{0 \neq v \in T_p V} \frac{g_p(v, v)}{|v|^2}, \quad B(p) := \sum_{0 \neq v, w \in T_p V} \frac{g_p(v, w)}{|v||w|}.$$

Then $d_p \phi(X) = g_p(X, X) \geq a(p)|X|^2$ and $|d_p \phi(v)| = |g_p(X, v)| \leq B(p)|X||v|$ combine to the following inequalities which imply (2):

$$|d_p \phi|^2 = \sum_{0 \neq v \in T_p V} \frac{|d_p \phi(v)|^2}{|v|^2} \leq B(p)^2 |X|^2 \leq \frac{B(p)^2}{a(p)^2} d_p \phi(X).$$

(b) *Step 1.* Near a Morse singularity, by the Morse lemma we can choose local coordinates $Z \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ in which

$$\phi(Z) = \phi(0) + \frac{1}{2} \langle BZ, Z \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad X(Z) = A(Z)Z$$

for a symmetric invertible matrix B and a smooth map $A : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ with $A(0) = A_0$ invertible. Condition (2) implies that $\langle Bv, A_0v \rangle \geq \beta|v|^2$ for some $\beta > 0$. We are looking for a $(2, 0)$ -tensor field $g_Z(v, w) = \langle G(Z)v, w \rangle$ satisfying

$$\langle G(Z)X(Z), \cdot \rangle = d\phi(Z) = \langle BZ, \cdot \rangle,$$

or equivalently, $G(Z)X(Z) = G(Z)A(Z)Z = BZ$. This is satisfied if we define $G : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ by

$$G(Z)w := BA(Z)^{-1}w.$$

Writing $w = A(Z)v$, for U sufficiently small we then have

$$\langle G(Z)w, w \rangle = \langle Bv, A(Z)v \rangle \geq \frac{\beta}{2}|v|^2 \geq \gamma|w|^2$$

for some $\gamma > 0$, so g is positive.

Step 2. Near an embryonic singularity, by Theorem 9.4 and the proof of Lemma 9.12 in [2] we can choose local coordinates $Z = (w, z) \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ in which

$$\phi(Z) = \phi(0) + \frac{1}{2}\langle Bw, w \rangle + \frac{1}{3}cz^3 \quad \text{and} \quad X(Z) = \left(A(Z)w, a_1(Z)z^2 + a_2(Z)w \right)$$

for a symmetric invertible matrix B , a number $c > 0$, and smooth maps $A : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(m-1) \times (m-1)}$ with $A(0) = A_0$ invertible, $a_1 : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $a_1(0) = 1$, and $a_2 : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ with $a_2(0) = 0$. Condition (2) implies that $\langle Bv, A_0v \rangle \geq \beta|v|^2$ for some $\beta > 0$. We are looking for a $(2, 0)$ -tensor field $g_Z(v, w) = \langle G(Z)v, w \rangle$ satisfying

$$\langle G(Z)X(Z), \cdot \rangle = d\phi(Z) = \langle (Bw, cz^2), \cdot \rangle.$$

We will look for G in the form

$$G(Z) = \begin{pmatrix} g_{11}(Z) & 0 \\ g_{21}(Z) & g_{22}(Z) \end{pmatrix}$$

with respect to the splitting $\mathbb{R}^m = \mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times \mathbb{R}$. Then the preceding equation is equivalent to

$$g_{11}(Z)A(Z)w = Bw \quad \text{and} \quad g_{21}(Z)A(Z)w + g_{22}(Z)\left(a_1(Z)z^2 + a_2(Z)w\right) = cz^2.$$

We solve the first equation by setting $g_{11}(Z) := BA(Z)^{-1}$. To solve the second equation, we first set $g_{22}(Z) := ca_1(Z)^{-1}$ and then $g_{12}(Z) := -g_{22}(Z)a_2(Z)A(Z)^{-1}$. By the assumptions $a_2(0) = 0$ etc, we can estimate for U sufficiently small:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle G(Z) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{w} \\ \hat{z} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \hat{w} \\ \hat{z} \end{pmatrix} \rangle &= \langle g_{11}(Z)\hat{w}, \hat{w} \rangle + \langle g_{21}(Z)\hat{w}, \hat{z} \rangle + \langle g_{22}(Z)\hat{z}, \hat{z} \rangle \\ &= \langle BA(Z)^{-1}\hat{w}, \hat{w} \rangle - g_{22}(Z)a_2(Z)A(Z)^{-1}\hat{w}\hat{z} + ca_1(Z)^{-1}\hat{z}^2 \\ &\geq \gamma|\hat{w}|^2 - C|Z||\hat{w}||\hat{z}| + \frac{c}{2}\hat{z}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $\gamma, c, C > 0$. This shows that g is positive for U sufficiently small.

Step 3. The preceding two steps provide g in a neighbourhood of the critical points. Away from the critical points the existence of g is obvious, and the constructions on the various regions can be patched together using a partition of unity.

(c) By hypothesis there exist open sets U_0, U_1 with $\text{Crit}(\phi) \subset U_0 \subset \overline{U_0} \subset U_1$ and a positive $(2, 0)$ tensor field g_1 on U_1 such that $d\phi = g_1(X, \cdot)$ on U_1 . Since $d\phi(X) > 0$ on $V \setminus U_0$, there exists a Riemannian metric g_0 on $V \setminus U_0$ such that $d\phi = g_0(X, \cdot)$ on $V \setminus U_0$ (take any g_0 for which X is orthogonal to $\ker d\phi$ and $g_0(X, X) = d\phi(X)$). Now pick a cutoff function $\chi : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which equals 1 on U_0 and 0 on $V \setminus U_1$ and define g by g_1 on U_0 , g_0 on $V \setminus U_1$, and $(1 - \chi)g_0 + \chi g_1$ on $U_1 \setminus U_0$. \square

Remark 3. For a pair (X, ϕ) we have the implications $(4) \implies (3) \implies (2) \implies (1)$ with

$$X = \text{grad}_g \phi \text{ for some Riemannian metric } g, \quad (4)$$

and the converse implications do not hold. For example, on \mathbb{R} the pair $\phi(x) = x^3$ and $X(x) = x^4$ satisfies (1) but not (2), and the pair

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}} & x \neq 0, \\ 0 & x = 0, \end{cases} \quad X(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{x^3} e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}} & x < 0, \\ 0 & x = 0, \\ \frac{1}{x^3} e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}} & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

satisfies (2) but not (3). A pair (X, ϕ) satisfying (3) but not (4) is given in [2, Example 11.18].

Example 4. In dimension 1 for (X, ϕ) real analytic, (2) implies (3). As pointed out by Y. Eliashberg, this is no longer the case in higher dimensions. For example, the pair $\phi(x, y) = \frac{1}{4}(x^4 + y^4)$ and $X(x, y) = (x^3 + x^2y^2)\partial_x + y^3\partial_y$ satisfies (2) but not (3). To see this, note that $X = \nabla\phi + F\partial_x$ with the function $F(x, y) = x^2y^2$. It does not satisfy (3) because F does not lie in the ideal I generated by the partial derivatives $\partial_x\phi = x^3$ and $\partial_y\phi = y^3$ (over the ring of germs of smooth functions), and it satisfies (2) because $F^2 = xy\partial_x\phi\partial_y\phi \in I^2$.

Application to Weinstein structures. Let us now use the new notion of “gradient-like” to define a *Weinstein structure* on V as a triple (ω, X, ϕ) where

- (i) ω is a symplectic form;
- (ii) X is a Liouville vector field for ω , i.e. $L_X\omega = \omega$;
- (iii) $\phi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth exhausting function such that (X, ϕ) satisfies (3).

Here “exhausting” means that ϕ is proper and bounded from below. The form $\lambda = i_X\omega$ satisfies $d\lambda = \omega$ and is called the Liouville form.

Note that there is no condition on the kinds of critical points of ϕ . In contrast, the definition of a “Weinstein structure” in [2] used instead of (iii) the condition

that ϕ has only Morse or embryonic critical points and (X, ϕ) satisfies (2). By Lemma 2, (X, ϕ) then also satisfies (3), so the above definition of a Weinstein structure generalizes the one in [2].

The above definition of a Weinstein structure includes all the natural examples known to me:

Example 5. (a) Recall that a *Stein structure* (J, ϕ) consists of a complex structure J and a smooth exhausting function $\phi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is J -convex, i.e. $-d(d\phi \circ J)(v, Jv) > 0$ for all $v \neq 0$. It gives rise to a natural Weinstein structure $\mathcal{W}(J, \phi) = (\omega_\phi, X_\phi, \phi)$, where $\omega_\phi = -d(d\phi \circ J)$ and X_ϕ is the gradient of ϕ with respect to the Riemannian metric $g_\phi = \omega_\phi(\cdot, J\cdot)$.

(b) The construction in (a) still works if J is just an almost complex structure, the only difference being that g_ϕ need not be symmetric, so the pair (X_ϕ, ϕ) satisfies (3) but not necessarily (4). See [2, Remark 11.17].

(c) The cotangent bundle T^*M of a closed Riemannian manifold M carries the canonical Weinstein structure (ω, X, ϕ) where $\omega = d\lambda$ for the canonical Liouville form $\lambda = p dq$, X is defined by $i_X\omega = \lambda$, and $\phi(q, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2$ for the dual metric. Here X is the gradient of ϕ with respect to the Riemannian metric on T^*M induced by the metric on M and its Levi-Civita connection.

(d) Weinstein manifolds with *arboreal skeleton* also fall into this class, see [1].

On the other hand, the above definition is restrictive enough to allow for a good deformation theory:

Lemma 6. *Let (V, ω, X, ϕ) be a Weinstein manifold with Liouville form λ . Then for each smooth function $\tilde{\phi}$ which is sufficiently close to ϕ in the strong C^2 -topology there exists a Weinstein homotopy from (ω, X, ϕ) to a Weinstein structure $(\tilde{\omega}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{\phi})$. If each connected component of the support S of $\tilde{\phi} - \phi$ is compact, then we can choose the Weinstein homotopy fixed outside S , with fixed $\omega_t = \omega$, and with Liouville forms λ_t such that $\lambda_t - \lambda$ is exact. In particular, (ω, X, ϕ) is Weinstein homotopic with fixed ω to a Weinstein structure $(\omega, \tilde{X}, \tilde{\phi})$ with $\tilde{\phi}$ Morse and $\tilde{\phi} = \phi$ outside a neighbourhood of $\text{Crit}(\phi)$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = i_X\omega$. Define a smooth bundle homomorphism $A : TV \rightarrow TV$ by $\omega(\cdot, A\cdot) = g(\cdot, \cdot)$. Then A is invertible and

$$d\phi = g(X, \cdot) = \omega(X, A\cdot) = \lambda(A\cdot)$$

shows $\lambda = d\phi \circ A^{-1}$.

Let now $\tilde{\phi}$ be close to ϕ in the strong C^2 -topology (see [4]). Then $\tilde{\lambda} := d\tilde{\phi} \circ A^{-1}$ is C^1 -close to λ and $\tilde{\omega} := d\tilde{\lambda}$ is C^0 -close to ω , hence symplectic. The vector field \tilde{X} defined by $i_{\tilde{X}}\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{\lambda}$ is C^0 -close to X and satisfies $L_{\tilde{X}}\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{\omega}$. Now

$$d\tilde{\phi} = \tilde{\lambda}(A\cdot) = \tilde{\omega}(\tilde{X}, A\cdot) = \tilde{g}(\tilde{X}, \cdot)$$

with the $(2,0)$ -tensor field $\tilde{g} := \tilde{\omega}(\cdot, A\cdot)$. Since \tilde{g} is C^0 -close to g , it is also positive (if $g_x(v, v) \geq \delta > 0$ for all v with $|v| = 1$, then $\tilde{g}_x(v, v) \geq \delta/2 > 0$ for all

v with $|v| = 1$). Hence $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{\phi})$ satisfies (3), and therefore $(\tilde{\omega}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{\phi})$ is a Weinstein structure. Applying the same argument to the functions $\phi_t = (1 - t)\phi + t\tilde{\phi}$, $t \in [0, 1]$, we find a Weinstein homotopy (ω_t, X_t, ϕ_t) (in the sense of [2]) from (ω, X, ϕ) to $(\tilde{\omega}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{\phi})$.

Suppose now that each connected component of the support S of $\tilde{\phi} - \phi$ is compact. Then Moser's theorem as stated in [2, Theorem 6.8]) yields a family of diffeomorphisms $h_t : V \rightarrow V$ with $h_0 = \text{Id}$ and $h_t = \text{Id}$ outside S such that $h_t^* \lambda_t - \lambda$ is exact. Thus $(\omega, h_t^* X_t, h_t^* \phi_t)$ is the desired Weinstein homotopy.

Finally, by Sard's theorem there exists a neighbourhood S of $\text{Crit}(\phi)$ with each connected component compact, so the last assertion follows by taking $\tilde{\phi}$ to be Morse with $\tilde{\phi} = \phi$ outside S . \square

This definition of a Weinstein structure provides an appropriate setting for the results in [2]. Fix a compact smooth manifold W with boundary and assume that all considered functions on W have ∂W as their regular maximum level set. Denote by **Stein** and **Weinstein** the spaces of Stein and Weinstein domain structures on W , respectively, and by **Functions** the space of all smooth functions $\phi : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Note that these spaces involve no nondegeneracy assumptions on the underlying functions, whereas in [2] it was assumed that all the underlying functions are generalized Morse. We have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{Stein} & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{W}} & \mathbf{Weinstein} \\
 & \searrow \pi_{\mathfrak{S}} & \swarrow \pi_{\mathfrak{W}} \\
 & \mathbf{Functions} &
 \end{array}$$

where $\mathfrak{W}(J, \phi) = (\omega_\phi, X_\phi, \phi)$ as in Example 5(a) above, $\pi_{\mathfrak{W}}(\omega, X, \phi) := \phi$, and $\pi_{\mathfrak{S}}(J, \phi) := \phi$.

Following [3] let us call a continuous map $p : E \rightarrow B$ between topological spaces a *microfibration* if, given continuous maps $f : D^k \times [0, 1] \rightarrow B$ and $F_0 : D^k \rightarrow E$ with $p \circ F_0 = f|_{D^k \times 0}$, there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and a continuous lift $F : D^k \times [0, \varepsilon] \rightarrow E$ such that $F|_{D^k \times 0} = F_0$ and $p \circ F = f|_{D^k \times [0, \varepsilon]}$. If we can choose $\varepsilon = 1$ it is a *Serre fibration*.

Corollary 7. *The map $\pi_{\mathfrak{W}} : \mathbf{Weinstein} \rightarrow \mathbf{Functions}$ is a microfibration.*

Proof. Let continuous families of Weinstein structures (ω_p, X_p, ϕ_p) and functions $\phi_{p,t}$, $(p, t) \in D^k \times [0, 1]$, with $\phi_{p,0} = \phi_0$ be given. Since W is compact, there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ such that for each $(p, t) \in D^k \times [0, \varepsilon]$ the function $\phi_{p,t}$ is sufficiently C^2 -close to ϕ_p so that Lemma 6 applies. Since the construction in its proof is completely canonical, it provides the desired continuous lift $(\omega_{p,t}, X_{p,t}, \phi_{p,t})$ for $(p, t) \in D^k \times [0, \varepsilon]$. \square

Remark 8. (a) The map $\pi_{\mathfrak{W}} : \mathbf{Weinstein} \rightarrow \mathbf{Functions}$ is *not* a Serre fibration. For example, for ϕ in the image of $\pi_{\mathfrak{W}}$ the unstable manifold at each critical

point must have at least dimension $\dim W/2$ (see [2, Proposition 11.9]). It would be interesting to know whether, for a function with isolated critical points, this is the only condition for being in the image of $\pi_{\mathfrak{W}}$.

(b) Lemma 6 also yields an analogue of Corollary 7 for Weinstein manifolds instead of Weinstein domains, which is however more complicated to state.

In view of Corollary 7, Theorem 1.1 in [2] becomes

Theorem 9 ([2]). *The map $\mathfrak{W} : \mathfrak{Stein} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Weinstein}$ induces an isomorphism on π_0 and a surjection on π_1 .*

Conjecture 1.4 in [2] now takes the form

Conjecture 10 ([2]). *The map $\mathfrak{W} : \mathfrak{Stein} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Weinstein}$ is a weak homotopy equivalence.*

Hypersurfaces in contact manifolds. For background on the following discussion see [5]. Consider a compact cooriented codimension 1 hypersurface Σ in a cooriented contact manifold $(M, \xi = \ker \alpha)$. It carries a 1-dimensional characteristic foliation with singularities at points p where $\xi_p = T_p \Sigma$, where p is called positive if the coorientations of ξ_p and $T_p \Sigma$ agree and negative otherwise. The restriction $\beta = \alpha|_{\Sigma}$ is a Liouville form near the singular points, and we can choose a vector field X generating the characteristic foliation which agrees with \pm the Liouville field near \pm singular points. Let us call Σ *gradient-like* if X is gradient-like for some function $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the sense of (3). If ϕ has only Morse resp. Morse and birth-death critical points this agrees with the notion of a Morse resp. 1-Morse hypersurface in [5]. Since every exact deformation of β near its singular locus can be realized by a deformation of Σ in (M, α) , Lemma 6 yields

Corollary 11. *The map $(\Sigma, X, \phi) \mapsto \phi$ that associates to each gradient-like hypersurface its function is a microfibration. In particular, each gradient-like hypersurface can be C^2 -perturbed to one with only Morse singularities. \square*

Acknowledgement. The idea of this note arose during preparation for a “Mathematical Conversation” at the Institute for Advanced Study on January 26, 2022. I thank its organisers and participants for making this happen despite freezing temperatures, and Y. Eliashberg for inspiring conversations afterwards.

References

- [1] D. Álvarez-Gavela, Y. Eliashberg and D. Nadler, *Weinstein manifolds as cotangent buildings*, in preparation.
- [2] K. Cieliebak and Y. Eliashberg, *From Stein to Weinstein and Back. Symplectic Geometry of Affine Complex Manifolds*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications 59 (2012).

- [3] M. Gromov, *Partial Differential Relations*, Springer (1986).
- [4] M. Hirsch, *Differential Topology*, Springer (1976).
- [5] K. Honda and Y. Huang, *Convex hypersurface theory in contact topology*, arXiv:1907.06025.
- [6] J. Milnor, *Lectures On The H-Cobordism Theorem*, Notes by L. Siebenmann and J. Sondow, Princeton University Press (1965).