

METRIC LINES IN THE SPECIAL EUCLIDEAN GROUP ON THE PLANE

YUYANG WANG, SEAN KU, AND ALEJANDRO BRAVO-DODDOLI

ABSTRACT. The Special Euclidean group on the plane $SE(2)$ has the left-invariant sub-Riemannian structure. Every sub-Riemannian manifold possesses a Hamiltonian function governing the sub-Riemannian geodesic flow. Two natural questions are: What are the necessary conditions for periodic sub-Riemannian geodesics? What geodesics are the metric lines in $SE(2)$? We answer both questions, and our method for the second is an alternative proof using the Hamilton-Jacobi theory.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
Organization of the paper	3
Acknowledgements	3
2. The Euclidean group as a sub-Riemannian manifold and the sub-Riemannian geodesic flow	3
2.1. The Euclidean group as a sub-Riemannian manifold	3
2.2. Sub-Riemannian geodesic flow	4
2.3. Proof of Theorem A	9
3. Hamilton-Jacobi Equation and Calibration Functions	9
3.1. Minimizing Method	11
4. Cut times in the Euclidean group	13
4.1. Cut time	13
5. Proof of Theorem B	14
6. Conclusion and Future Work	14
Appendix A. Mañé's critical value	15
References	16

1. INTRODUCTION

The Euclidean special group $SE(2)$ has the structure of a sub-Riemannian Manifold. A sub-Riemannian geodesic flow on the cotangent bundle of $SE(2)$ is a Hamiltonian system with the property that the projection to $SE(2)$ of a solution is a sub-Riemannian geodesic, i.e., locally minimizing horizontal curve. A classic problem in a general Hamiltonian system is the conditions for periodic solutions, and an important question in sub-Riemannian geodesic flow is the characterization of metric lines. The main goal of this paper is to characterize periodic sub-Riemannian geodesics and metric lines.

To endow $SE(2)$ with the structure of a sub-Riemannian manifold, we consider the non-integrable distribution \mathcal{D} framed by the left-invariant vector fields $\{X_\theta, X_u\}$, see equation (3) below, and declare them to be orthonormal. Thus, we obtain a left-invariant sub-Riemannian metric. In general when \mathbb{G} is Lie group with a left-invariant sub-Riemannian

metric, a standard approach to study the sub-Riemannian geodesic flow on is to consider the symplectic reduction by \mathbb{G} . In the particular case of $\text{SE}(2)$, the semidirect group structure of $\text{SE}(2) = \text{SO}(2) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$ plays a primary role, consult [12] for the general theory of symplectic reductions and the theory in the case of semidirect products [11]. However, we will use an alternative method; the group $\text{SE}(2)$ has the structure of a metabelian Carnot group, i.e., the commutator group $[\text{SE}(2), \text{SE}(2)] \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$ is abelian. Thus, we will consider the action of \mathbb{R}^2 and perform the symplectic reduction of the sub-Riemannian geodesic flow by \mathbb{R}^2 , where the reduced space $T^*\text{SE}(2)/\mathbb{R}^2$ is symplectic diffeomorphic to $T^*\text{SO}(2)$; refer to [5] for a detailed discussion of symplectic reductions in the case of metabelian groups.

The first consequence of the symplectic reduction is the primary tool in our work, a bijection between sub-Riemannian geodesics in $\text{SE}(2)$ and a curve α_μ in $T^*\text{SO}(2)$. Let us consider the coordinates (p_θ, θ) in $T^*\text{SO}(2)$, the curve α_μ is defined by the equation

$$(1) \quad \alpha_\mu := \{(p_\theta, \theta) \in T^*\text{SO}(2) : 1 = p_\theta^2 + R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)\},$$

where $\mu = (R, \delta)$ is in $(\mathbb{R}^2)^* \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$.

In sub-sub-Section 2.2.2, we provide a prescription to build a curve in $\text{SE}(2)$ given the curve α_μ ; the **Background Theorem** states that the prescription yields sub-Riemannian geodesic in $\text{SE}(2)$ parameterized by arc-length. Conversely, the prescription can achieve every arc-length parameterized geodesic in $\text{SE}(2)$ by applying it to some curve α_μ .

The first main theorem classifies the periodic geodesics over $\text{SE}(2)$.

Theorem A. *A geodesic is periodic if and only if $R = 0$.*

The proof of Theorem A relies on the period map from Proposition 2.7. Following a simple calculation, we prove that the only periodic geodesics over $\text{SE}(2)$ are those of which $R = 0$.

In [13], I. Moiseev and Y. Sachkov used optimal synthesis to study the cut times of the sub-Riemannian geodesics of the Special Euclidean group $\text{SE}(2)$. One of their main contributions was providing a family of metric lines. In [2], A. Ardentov, G. Bor, E. Le Donne, R. Montgomery, and Y. Sachkov interpreted the sub-Riemannian geodesics as a bicycle path and presented an alternative proof by using an isometry between the geodesic lines and the family of metric lines, see sub-sub-Sections 2.2.4 for the formal definitions geodesic lines. The second goal of this paper is to use the Hamilton-Jacobi theory to provide a complete classification of metric lines on $\text{SE}(2)$, and then give a third proof for I. Moiseev and Y. Sachkov’s result. Let us formalize the definition of a metric line.

Definition 1.1. *Let M be a sub-Riemannian manifold, $\text{dist}_M(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the sub-Riemannian distance on M , and $|\cdot| : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the absolute value. We say that a curve $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ is a metric line if it is a globally minimizing geodesic, i.e.,*

$$|a - b| = \text{dist}_M(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)) \quad \text{for all compact intervals } [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

Alternative terms for “metric lines” are: “globally minimizing geodesics”, “isometric embeddings of the real line”, or “infinite-geodesics.”

In [6, 4], A. Bravo-Doddoli and R. Montgomery used the metabelian structure of the Carnot group $J^k(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ to provide a partial result of the classification of metric lines. We will follow their approach; in sub-Section 2.2.1 we will compute the reduced Hamiltonian H_μ , classify the sub-Riemannian geodesics in $\text{SE}(2)$ according to the reduced dynamics. The classification of the reduced Hamiltonian system is to the classification of the curve α_μ . Summarizing, a sub-Riemannian geodesic is only one of the following types: lines, θ -periodic and heteroclinic geodesics, refer to sub-Section 2.2.1 for formal definitions.

The second main theorem gives a precise classification of metric lines over $SE(2)$.

Theorem B. *The metric lines in the $SE(2)$ are precisely the geodesics of the type line and heteroclinic.*

The proof to Theorem B consists of two parts: proving that the geodesics of the type heteroclinic and line are metric lines and showing that the geodesics of the type θ -periodic are not globally minimizing. Our method to prove the first part is to find a calibration function, refer to [3, sub-Chapter 9.47] for the general Hamilton-Jacobi theory, for calibration functions see [8, sub-Chapter 2.8] and to [6] for the theory in the context of the sub-Riemannian geodesics. The second part is a consequence of Proposition 4.2, which states that geodesics of type periodic do not minimize after passing its θ -period.

Organization of the paper. In Section 2, we introduce the group $SE(2)$ as a sub-Riemannian manifold and its metabelian structure. In sub-Section 2.2, we present the Hamiltonian function governing the sub-Riemannian geodesic flow and some properties. We briefly explain the symplectic reduction by the normal subgroup R^2 and write down the reduced Hamiltonian. We state and prove the **Background Theorem**, we show some symmetries of the sub-Riemannian geodesic flow, and classify the sub-Riemannian geodesics. Finally, we prove Theorem A.

In Section 3, we briefly introduce the Hamiltonian-Jacobi equation and its relation to the Eikonal equation. We provide the formal definition of a calibration function and solve the sub-Riemannian Eikonal equation on $SE(2)$. In sub-Section 3.1, we present our method to prove that the type line and heteroclinic geodesics are metric lines.

In Section 4, we present the formal definition of a cut-time and verify that an upper bound for the cut-time for the θ -periodic geodesics is the θ -period. In Section 5, we summarize our results and prove Theorem B. In the Appendix A, we show the relation between the calibration function used to prove Theorem B and the Mañé's critical value.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was conducted as part of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor math REU program during the summer of 2024. We thank Prof. Tasho Kaletha, Annie Winkler, and the faculty at the University of Michigan for organizing this REU. The author S. Ku would like to express gratitude to Prof. Asaf Cohen for providing funding under the National Science Foundation Grant number DMS-2006305.

2. THE EUCLIDEAN GROUP AS A SUB-RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLD AND THE SUB-RIEMANNIAN GEODESIC FLOW

2.1. The Euclidean group as a sub-Riemannian manifold. The special Euclidean group is a 3-dimensional Lie group, if (θ, x, y) in $(0, 2\pi) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ are a local coordinates, then a point g in $SE(2)$ has a matrix representation given by

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta & x \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{se}(2)$ is given by

$$E_\theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E_v = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

then the Lie bracket relation are

$$(2) \quad [E_\theta, E_u] = E_v, \quad [E_\theta, E_v] = -E_u, \quad \text{and} \quad [E_u, E_v] = 0.$$

Let us formalize the definition of metabelian group.

Definition 2.1. *We say a group \mathbb{G} is metabelian if the commutator group $[\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}]$ is abelian.*

In the case of Lie groups, the metabelian definitions is equivalent to $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ being an abelian algebra. Therefore, equation (2) implies that sub-algebra $[\mathfrak{se}(2), \mathfrak{se}(2)]$ is abelian ideal, since it is spanned by the $\{E_u, E_v\}$, then $[\text{SE}(2), \text{SE}(2)]$ is an abelian subgroup making $\text{SE}(2)$ a metabelian Lie group.

For the rest of the paper, we will write the left-invariant vector fields in terms of the operator $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$, rather than use the matrix representation. Thus the left-invariant vector fields are given by

$$(3) \quad X_\theta = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}, \quad X_u = \cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \quad \text{and} \quad X_v = -\sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial y}.$$

The frame $\{X_\theta, X_u\}$ defines a non-integrable distribution \mathcal{D} . To equip \mathcal{D} with a sub-Riemannian inner product we declare the frame to be orthonormal.

2.2. Sub-Riemannian geodesic flow. Let us consider the cotangent bundle $T^* \text{SE}(2)$ with the canonical coordinates $(p, g) = (p_\theta, p_x, p_y, \theta, x, y)$. The left-invariant momentum functions associated to the left-invariant vector fields are given by

$$(4) \quad P_\theta = p_\theta, \quad P_u = p_x \cos \theta + p_y \sin \theta \quad \text{and} \quad P_v = -p_x \sin \theta + p_y \cos \theta.$$

For details about the definition of the momentum functions consult [1, sub-Chpater 3.4] or [14, Definition 1.5.4].

Therefore, the Hamiltonian function governing the sub-Riemannian geodesic flow is

$$(5) \quad H_{sR}(p, g) = \frac{1}{2}(P_\theta^2 + P_u^2) = \frac{1}{2}(p_\theta^2 + (p_x \cos \theta + p_y \sin \theta)^2).$$

For the formal definition of the sub-Riemannian geodesic flow, reefer to [1, sub-sub-Chapter 4.7.2] or [14, 18, sub-Chapter 1.4]. An alternative name for the Hamiltonian function is sub-Riemannian kinetic energy.

We notice that if $(p(t), \gamma(t)) \in T^* \text{SE}(2)$ is a solution to the Hamiltonian system defined by (5), then Hamilton equations $\dot{\theta} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_\theta}$, $\dot{x} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_x}$, and $\dot{y} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_y}$ implies that $\dot{\gamma}(t)$ is tangent to the distribution \mathcal{D} , since momentum functions P_θ and P_u are linear in p_θ, p_x and p_y , so

$$(6) \quad \dot{\gamma}(t) = P_\theta X_\theta(\gamma(t)) + P_u X_u(\gamma(t)).$$

When we choose the energy level $H(p, g) = \frac{1}{2}$, then the corresponding geodesic $\gamma(t)$ is parameterized by arc-length.

The every cotangent bundle T^*M , where M is a smooth manifold, possesses a natural Poisson bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$. A Poisson bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ is a bi-linear operator on the space of smooth functions $C^\infty(M)$, with the property that $(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\})$ is a Lie algebra, and $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ is a derivation, i.e., for all F, G and H in $C^\infty(M)$ the following expression holds

$$\{FG, H\} = F\{G, H\} + G\{F, H\}.$$

An alternative way to write the evolution of a function F through the Hamiltonian of H is given by $\dot{F} = \{F, H\}$.

If P_X and P_Y are the momentum functions associated to the vector fields X and Y , then the relation between the Poisson bracket and vector field bracket is given by

$$\{P_X, P_Y\} = P_{[X, Y]},$$

To compute the differential equations for P_θ , P_u and P_v , we use the above relation to find

$$(7) \quad \dot{P}_\theta = P_u P_v, \quad \dot{P}_u = -P_\theta P_v, \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{P}_v = P_\theta P_u.$$

We notice that the Hamiltonian function $H(p, g)$ does not depend on the variables x and y , then p_x and p_y are constant motions. Equivalently, the Hamiltonian function $H(p, g)$ is invariant under the action of \mathbb{R}^2 by left-multiplication. Therefore, the momentum map associated with the action is given by

$$J(p, g) = (p_x, p_y) = \mu \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where we identify $(\mathbb{R}^2)^*$ with \mathbb{R}^2 itself. For the formal definition of the momentum map, refer to [15] or [3, Appendix 5]. If $(p(t), \gamma(t))$ is a solution of the sub-Riemannian geodesic flow, then we say that a geodesic $\gamma(t)$ has **momentum** μ if $J(p(t), \gamma(t)) = \mu$.

2.2.1. *Reduced dynamics.* Let us consider the level set $\mu = (a, b)$, then the inverse image $J^{-1}(a, b)$ is diffeomorphic to $T^* \text{SO}(2) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mu$. We obtain the reduced Hamiltonian given by

$$(8) \quad H_\mu(p_\theta, \theta) = \frac{1}{2}(p_\theta^2 + R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)),$$

where the bijection between (a, b) and (R, δ) is given by $(R \cos \delta, R \sin \delta) = (a, b)$. The reduced Hamilton equations are

$$(9) \quad \dot{p}_\theta = R^2 \cos(\theta - \delta) \sin(\theta - \delta) \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\theta} = p_\theta.$$

We notice that component θ of the reduced dynamics lays on a closed interval, called the Hill interval. Let us introduce its formal definition.

Definition 2.2. *Let H_μ be a reduced Hamiltonian for the parameter μ . We say that I_μ is a hill interval of H_μ , if I_μ is a closed interval such that $R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta) < 1$ if θ is in the interior of I_μ , and $R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta) = 1$ if θ is in the boundary of I_μ . We say that $\text{Hill}(\mu)$ is the Hill region of H_μ , if $\text{Hill}(\mu)$ is the union of the Hill intervals.*

We think of a point (p_θ, θ) in $T^* \text{SO}(2)$ as a point in the cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times \text{SO}(2) \simeq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbf{S}^1$. The level set $H_\mu^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})$ is the curve α_μ given by the equation (1).

$$(10) \quad \alpha_\mu := \{(p_\theta, \theta) \in \mathbb{R} \times I_\mu \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbf{S}^1 : 1 = p_\theta^2 + R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)\}$$

2.2.2. *Background Theorem.* This sub-Section presents the method to build sub-Riemannian geodesics and prove the **Background Theorem**. Let us provide the prescription: consider the initial value problem given by the Hamilton equations (9) and the initial conditions $\alpha(t_0)$ in α_μ . Having found the solution $(p_\theta(t), \theta(t))$, we define a curve $\gamma(t)$ by the differential equation

$$(11) \quad \dot{\gamma}(t) = \dot{\theta}(t) X_\theta(\gamma(t)) + R \cos(\theta(t) - \delta) X_u(\gamma(t)),$$

where we used the reduced Hamilton system, (9), to identify $\dot{\theta}(t)$ with $p_\theta(t)$.

The **Background Theorem** states that γ is a geodesic with momentum μ .

Background Theorem. *The above prescription yields a sub-Riemannian geodesic in $SE(2)$ with momentum μ parameterized by arc-length. Conversely, every geodesic in $SE(2)$ parameterized by arc-length with momentum μ can be achieved by this prescription applied to the curve α_μ .*

Proof. Let γ be a curve in $SE(2)$ defined by equation (11) for a fixed value of μ . By construction, the curve γ is tangent to the distribution, and by comparing equations (11) with (6), we conclude that it is enough to prove that the restriction of the left-invariant momentum functions $P_\theta(t)$, $P_u(t)$, and $P_v(t)$ restricted to the level set $J^{-1}(\mu)$ are equal to the functions

$$F_\theta(t) = \dot{\theta}(t), \quad F_u(t) = R \cos(\theta(t) - \delta), \quad \text{and} \quad F_v(t) = R \sin(\theta(t) - \delta),$$

respectively. Thus, we must prove that $F_\theta(t)$, $F_u(t)$, and $F_v(t)$ satisfy the equations given by (7). Using the reduced Hamilton equations given by equation (9), we have

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{F}_\theta(t) &= R^2 \cos(\theta(t) - \delta) \sin(\theta - \delta) = F_u(t)F_v(t), \\ \dot{F}_u(t) &= -R \sin(\theta - \delta) \dot{\theta} = -F_\theta(t)F_v(t), \\ \dot{F}_v(t) &= R \cos(\theta - \delta) \dot{\theta} = F_\theta(t)F_u(t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the equations in (12) are identical to those from (7). We conclude that γ is a sub-Riemannian geodesic in $SE(2)$, which, by construction has momentum μ .

Conversely, let γ be an arbitrary geodesic in $SE(2)$ parameterized by arc-length with momentum μ . The restriction of the Hamiltonian H to the level set $J^{-1}(\mu)$ is, by definition, the reduced Hamiltonian H_μ ; the coordinates p_θ and θ satisfy the reduced Hamiltonian equations (9). In addition, the momentum functions $P_\theta(t)$ and $P_u(t)$ restricted to the level set $J^{-1}(\mu)$ have the form $P_\theta(t) = \dot{\theta}$ and $P_u(t) = R \cos(\theta(t) - \delta)$, the equation (6) is identical to (11). Thus, γ is achieved by the prescription applied to the curve α_μ . \square

The projection to \mathbb{R}^2 of the sub-Riemannian geodesics in \mathbb{R}^2 have the following property.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\pi_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ be the projection from $SE(2)$ to \mathbb{R}^2 given by $\pi_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\theta, x, y) = (x, y)$. Let $\gamma(t)$ be a geodesic in $SE(2)$, then the curvature of $\pi_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\gamma(t))$ is given by P_θ .*

Proof. Let $\gamma(t)$ be a sub-Riemannian geodesic in $SE(2)$. The Background Theorem 2.2.2 implies that if $c(t) := \pi_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\gamma(t))$, then $\dot{c}(t) = P_u(\cos(\theta(t)), \sin(\theta(t)))$. So the unitary tangent vector is $(\cos(\theta(t)), \sin(\theta(t)))$, and by differential geometry $\dot{\theta} = P_\theta$ is the curvature of $c(t)$. \square

2.2.3. Symmetries of the reduced Hamiltonian flow. Let us describe the curve α_μ to understand the symmetries of the geodesic flow. The following proposition classifies the level set $H_\mu^{-1} = \alpha_\mu$.

Lemma 2.4. *The level set α_μ consists precisely of the following curves:*

- *If $R > 1$, α_μ consist precisely of two contractible, simple and closed smooth curves. The first curve is given by*

$$\alpha_\mu^1 = \{(p_\theta, \theta) = (\pm \sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)}, \theta) \mid \theta \in I_\mu^1\},$$

here I_μ^1 is the Hill interval $[\theta_{min}^1, \theta_{max}^1]$, where θ_{min}^1 and θ_{max}^1 are given by the solutions to the equation $\theta = \arccos(\frac{1}{R}) + \delta$ using the principal branch of \arccos .

The second curve is given by

$$\alpha_\mu^2 = \{(p_\theta, \theta) = (\pm \sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)}, \theta) \mid \theta \in I_\mu^2\},$$

here I_μ^2 is the Hill interval $[\theta_{min}^2, \theta_{max}^2]$, where θ_{min}^2 and θ_{max}^2 are given by the solution to the equation $\theta = \arccos(\frac{1}{R}) + \delta + \pi$ using the principal branch.

- If $R = 1$, α_μ consists of precisely one non-contractible, non-simple and closed curve.
- If $0 < R < 1$, α_μ consists of precisely two non-contractible, simple, and closed smooth curves given by

$$\alpha_\mu^\pm = \{(p_\theta, \theta) = (\pm\sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)}, \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbf{S}^1\}$$

Proof. By the regular value theorem α_μ is smooth if

$$dH_\mu|_{\alpha_\mu} = (p_\theta, -R^2 \cos(\theta - \delta) \sin(\theta - \delta)) \neq 0.$$

If $p_\theta \neq 0$ then $dH_\mu|_{\alpha_\mu} \neq 0$. Thus, it is enough to focus on the case $p_\theta = 0$. The condition $p_\theta = 0$ implies $R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta) = 1$, thus $dH_\mu|_{\alpha_\mu} = 0$ if and only if $(p_\theta, \theta) = (0, \delta)$ or $(p_\theta, \theta) = (0, \pi + \delta)$. The conditions $\theta = \delta$ or $\theta = \pi + \delta$ imply $R = 1$. Therefore, α_μ is a smooth curve if $R \neq 1$.

If $R > 1$, then the level set α_μ is well defined when $0 \leq 1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)$ and θ has two disjoint intervals where this inequality holds. When we parameterize the curves by θ this inequality yields the Hill intervals I_μ^1 and I_μ^2 . When $p_\theta = 0$, the positive and negative roots coincide, making each curve a simple closed curve.

If $R = 1$, the level set α_μ is well defined for all θ . In addition, we can parameterize the level set by the expression $p_\theta = \pm|\sin(\theta - \delta)|$. When $p_\theta = 0$, the positive and negative root coincide, making the level set a non-simple and closed curve.

If $R > 1$, the level set α_μ is well defined for all θ . In addition, we can parameterize the curves by θ ; the fact that $p_\theta \neq 0$ implies that the positive and negative roots never coincide, making the level set consists of two non-contractible, simple, and closed curves. \square

Remark 2.5. We extend the definition of the curves α_μ^1 and α_μ^2 for the case $R > 1$ to the case $R = 1$ when $I_\mu^1 = [\delta, \pi + \delta]$, and $I_\mu^2 = [\pi + \delta, 2\pi + \delta]$ are the domains of the curves, respectively. Similarly, we extend the definition of the curves α_μ^+ and α_μ^- for the case $0 < R < 1$ to the case $R = 1$.

See Figure 2.1 for a better understanding of Lemma 2.4 and Remark 2.5.

The following lemma describes the symmetries of the reduced Hamiltonian flow, which helps us study the symmetries of the geodesic flow.



Lemma 2.6. *The reduced Hamiltonian has the following symmetries:*

- If $R \geq 1$ and $(p_\theta(t), \theta(t))$ is a solution laying in α_μ^1 , then $(p_\theta(t), \theta(t) + \pi)$ is a solution laying in α_μ^2 .
- If $R \leq 1$ and $(p_\theta(t), \theta(t))$ is a solution laying in α_μ^+ , then $(-p_\theta(-t), \theta(-t))$ is a solution laying in α_μ^- .

Proof. If $R \geq 1$, we notice that if (p_θ, θ) is a point in α_μ^1 , then $(p_\theta, \theta + \pi)$ is a point in α_μ^2 . Moreover, if $(p_\theta(t), \theta(t))$ is a solution, then it is enough to prove that $(\tilde{p}_\theta, \tilde{\theta}) = (p_\theta(t), \theta(t) + \pi)$ is also a solution. Indeed, $(\tilde{p}_\theta, \tilde{\theta})$ satisfies the differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{\theta}} &= \dot{\theta} = p_\theta = \tilde{p}_\theta \quad \text{and} \\ \dot{\tilde{p}}_\theta &= \dot{p}_\theta = R^2 \cos(\theta - \delta) \sin(\theta - \delta) = R^2 \cos(\tilde{\theta} - \delta) \sin(\tilde{\theta} - \delta). \end{aligned}$$

If $R \leq 1$, we notice that if (p_θ, θ) is a point in α_μ^+ , then $(-p_\theta, \theta)$ is a point in α_μ^- . The time reversibility of the reduced Hamiltonian system implies the second part of the

(A) $R > 1$ (B) $R = 1$ (C) $R < 1$ FIGURE 2.1. The panels show the curve α_μ for the three different cases

(A) Heteroclinic

(B) Inflection

(C) Non-Inflection

FIGURE 2.2. The panels show the projection to the plan \mathbb{R}^2 for each type of geodesic

lemma, i.e., if $(p_x(t), \theta(t))$ is a solution to the reduced Hamiltonian system (9), then $(-p_x(-t), \theta(-t))$ lays in α_μ^- . \square

2.2.4. *Classification of sub-Riemannian geodesics.* In this sub-sub-Section, we classify the sub-Riemannian geodesics according to their reduced dynamics. If $\gamma(t)$ is a geodesic parameterized by arc-length in $\text{SE}(2)$, then $\gamma(t)$ is only one of the following three types:

(Line) We say a geodesic γ is of the type line if $\dot{\theta} = 0$. A geodesic is of the type line if and only if its reduced dynamic is trivial, i.e., if $R = 1$ and $\theta = \delta$ or $\theta = \delta + \pi$.

(Heteroclinic) We say a geodesic γ is of the type heteroclinic if its reduced dynamics is heteroclinic. The reduced dynamic is heteroclinic if and only if $R = 1$ and $\dot{\theta} \neq 0$.

(θ -periodic) We say a geodesic γ is of the type θ -periodic if its reduced dynamics is periodic. The reduced dynamic is periodic if and only if $R \neq 1$.

Lemma 2.3 states that a geodesic projected to the plane \mathbb{R}^2 has curvature $P_\theta = p_\theta$, then following the terminology from [13], we also distinguish whether the projection of the geodesics have inflection points.

(Inflection) We say a geodesic $\gamma(t)$ is of the type inflection if the projection $\pi_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\gamma(t))$ has inflection points. $\gamma(t)$ has inflection points if and only if $R > 1$.

(Non-Inflection) We say a geodesic γ is Non-Inflection if the projection $\pi_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\gamma(t))$ does not have inflection points. $\gamma(t)$ is non-inflection if and only if $R \leq 1$.

The following proposition gives explicit formulas for the θ -period, as well as the change performed by the x and y coordinates during the period.

Proposition 2.7. *Let γ be a sub-Riemannian geodesic of the type θ -periodic with momentum μ and Hill interval I_μ . Then, the θ -period is given by*

$$L(\mu) := \int_{I_\mu} \frac{d\theta}{\sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)}}$$

The changes $\Delta x(\mu)$ and $\Delta y(\mu)$ perform by the coordinates x and y after the geodesic travels a period $L(\mu)$ are given by

$$\Delta x(\mu) := \int_{I_\mu} \frac{R \cos(\theta - \delta) \cos(\theta) d\theta}{\sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta y(\mu) := \int_{I_\mu} \frac{R \cos(\theta - \delta) \sin(\theta) d\theta}{\sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)}}.$$

In addition, the changes $\Delta x(\mu)$ and $\Delta y(\mu)$ are independent of the initial point.

Proof. Being the reduced system H_μ one degree of freedom system, we reduced to quadrature the dynamic in the following way: Using the energy level $H_\mu = \frac{1}{2}$ and the second reduced Hamilton equation from (9), we have

$$(13) \quad \dot{\theta} = \pm \sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)}.$$

We solve the differential equation using the separation of variable method. To compute $\Delta x(\mu)$ and $\Delta y(\mu)$, we integrate the coordinates x and y in the same way using equation (11).

We remark that there is no ambiguity regarding the sign of $\dot{\theta}$. If $\dot{\theta}$ is positive in the interval $(t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, then the interval of integration $[t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon]$ is positively oriented. Conversely, if $\dot{\theta}$ is negative in the interval $(t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, then the interval of integration $[t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon]$ is negatively oriented. Therefore, if $\dot{\theta}$ is negative, we utilize the positive root and integrate on the positively oriented interval $[\theta(t + \epsilon), \theta(t - \epsilon)]$. We make the convention to choose the positive root and integrate using positively oriented intervals. For more details about this integration, refer [10, Section 11] for a general mechanical system. \square

2.3. Proof of Theorem A.

Proof. When $R = 0$, x and y are constant and θ is periodic, so the geodesic is periodic.

Let assume that $\gamma(t)$ is a periodic sub-Riemannian geodesic, then Proposition 2.7 implies that a geodesic γ of the type θ -periodic is periodic if and only if $\Delta x(\mu) = 0$, and $\Delta y(\mu) = 0$. Therefore, Proposition 2.7 and the cosine addition formula implies

$$0 = a\Delta x(\mu) + b\Delta y(\mu) = R^2 \int_{\beta_\mu} \frac{\cos^2(\theta - \delta) d\theta}{\sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)}}.$$

Where we used the relation $(a, b) = R(\cos(\delta), \sin(\delta))$ again. Since the integral from the above equation is positive, we conclude $R = 0$. \square

3. HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATION AND CALIBRATION FUNCTIONS

We will utilize Hamilton-Jacobi theory to build a calibration function. For more details on the Hamilton-Jacobi theory refer to [3, Section 47] or [10, Section 47]. For the general theory of calibration functions consult [8], [14, sub-sub-Chapter 1.9.2], or [6, Section 5] in the context of sub-Riemannian geometry.

Let us first introduce the proper definitions: Given a Riemannian manifold M and a Hamiltonian function $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the time-independent Hamilton Jacobi equation is a partial differential equation in $S : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$(14) \quad H(dS, q) = \text{const},$$

where dS is the differential of S .

When the Hamiltonian H is purely kinetic (see [3, Chapter 2]), the Hamilton-Jacobi equation is also known as the **Eikonal equation** and we can rewrite (14) as $\|\nabla S\| = 1$. A solution S to the Eikonal equation has the property that it measure the oriented distance from the point q to a given sub-manifold, consult [16] for more details about this property in the Riemannian case.

When we consider a sub-Riemannian manifold with a sub-Riemannian kinetic energy, the corresponding operator is the horizontal gradient, denoted by $\nabla_{hor}S$, then the sub-Riemannian Eikonal equation is given by $\|\nabla_{hor}S\| = 1$. Let us introduce horizontal gradient definition.

Definition 3.1. *Let M be a sub-Riemannian manifold with distribution \mathcal{D} . For a function $S : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the horizontal gradient of S , denoted as $\nabla_{hor}S$, is the unique horizontal vector field satisfying, for every $q \in M$.*

$$\langle \nabla_{hor}S, v \rangle_q = dS_q(v),$$

for all $v \in \mathcal{D}_q$.

From our Hamiltonian function in equation (5), we see that the Hamilton Jacobi equation is the following partial differential equation;

$$(15) \quad 1 = \left(\frac{\partial S_\mu}{\partial \theta}\right)^2 + \left(\cos \theta \frac{\partial S_\mu}{\partial x} + \sin \theta \frac{\partial S_\mu}{\partial y}\right)^2.$$

Let us solve the sub-Riemannian Eikonal equation by reducing it to an ordinary differential equation. Consider the ansatz

$$(16) \quad S_\mu(\theta, x, y) = f(\theta) + R \cos(\delta)x + R \sin(\delta)y.$$

Substituting into equation (15) we find that

$$1 = (f'(\theta))^2 + R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta).$$

Therefore $f(\theta)$ is a solution to the differential equation

$$f'(\theta) = \pm \sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)},$$

and the solution S_μ is given by

$$(17) \quad S_\mu^\pm(\theta, x, y) = \pm \int \sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)} d\theta + R \cos(\delta)x + R \sin(\delta)y.$$

Proposition 3.2. *Let S_μ^\pm be a solution to the Eikonal equation given by equation (17), and γ be a geodesic with momentum μ , then $\nabla_{hor}S_\mu^\pm = \dot{\gamma}$ whenever $\dot{\theta}$ has the same sign that the root of (17).*

Before we make the proof to Proposition 3.2, let us introduce the co-frame of left-invariant one-forms:

$$\Theta_\theta = d\theta, \quad \Theta_u = \cos \theta dx + \sin \theta dy, \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_v = -\sin \theta dx + \cos \theta dy.$$

Remark 3.3. An alternative way to define the non-integrable distribution \mathcal{D} over $\text{SE}(2)$ is as the kernel of Θ_v , since $\Theta_v(X_\theta) = \Theta_v(X_u) = 0$. This tell us that $\text{SE}(2)$ has the structure of a contact manifold. It is well known that a contact sub-Riemannian structure do not have abnormal geodesics, consult [1, Proposition 4.38] or [14, sub-Chapter 5.2] for more details.

Proof. Let γ be a geodesic of momentum μ , without loss of generality let us consider the positive root from equation (17) and assume that $\dot{\theta}$ is positive; then we can write the differential of S_μ in terms of the co-frame

$$\begin{aligned} dS_\mu^+ &= \sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)} d\theta + R \cos(\delta) dx + R \sin(\delta) dy \\ &= \sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)} d\theta + R \cos(\theta - \delta) d\Theta_u + R \sin(\theta - \delta) d\Theta_v. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.1 gives us the horizontal gradient

$$\nabla_{hor} S_\mu^+ = \sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)} X_\theta + R \cos(\theta - \delta) X_u.$$

By equation (11), we conclude that $\nabla_{hor} S_\mu = \dot{\gamma}(t)$. □

Let us now introduce the definition of calibration functions.

Definition 3.4. Let M be a sub-Riemannian manifold with distribution \mathcal{D} , we say that a function $S : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a calibration function for the geodesic γ if the following conditions hold:

- $dS(\gamma'(t)) = 1$ for all t .
- $|dS(v)| \leq \|v\|$ for all vectors v in \mathcal{D} , where $\|\cdot\|$ is the sub-Riemannian norm given by $\|v\| := \sqrt{\langle v, v \rangle}$ for all vectors v in \mathcal{D} .

Lemma 3.5. If γ is a sub-Riemannian geodesic with momentum μ , then the function S_μ^\pm given by (17) is a calibration function for γ , whenever $\dot{\theta}$ has the same sign that the root of (17).

Proposition 3.2 implies Lemma 3.5.

Proof. With lost of generality let us consider the positive root from (17). The condition $\dot{\gamma}(t) = \nabla_{hor} S_\mu^+$ and the definition 3.1 imply the first condition from Definition 3.4, since

$$dS_\mu^+(\dot{\gamma}(t)) = \langle \dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t) \rangle = 1.$$

To prove the second condition; let v be an arbitrary vector in \mathcal{D} , then the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality implies that

$$|dS_\mu^+(v)| = |\langle \nabla_{hor} S_\mu^+, v \rangle| \leq \|\nabla_{hor} S_\mu^+\| \|v\| = \|v\|$$

Therefore, such S_μ^\pm is a calibration function for γ , whenever $\dot{\theta}$ has the same sign that the root of (17). □

3.1. Minimizing Method. We will utilize the calibration function constructed in Lemma 3.5 to study the metric lines on $\text{SE}(2)$. The following proposition exemplifies this.

Proposition 3.6. Let M be a sub-Riemannian Manifold and $S : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^2 global solution of the Eikonal equation, then the integral curves of its horizontal gradient flow given by $\dot{\gamma}(t) = \nabla_{hor} S(\gamma(t))$ are metric lines.

Proof. As S is a C^2 global solution on M , dS is an exact 1-form. By Stoke's theorem, for two arbitrary curves γ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ sharing the same end points A and B in M , we have that

$$\int_{\gamma} dS = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} dS = S(A) - S(B)$$

Furthermore, for any smooth curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ in M , we have

$$\int_{\tilde{\gamma}} dS = \int \langle \nabla S, \dot{\tilde{\gamma}} \rangle dt \leq \int \|\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\| \|\nabla_{hor} S(\tilde{\gamma}(t))\| dt = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \|\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}\| dt = \ell(\tilde{\gamma})$$

where ℓ is the sub-Riemannian length. The equality holds if and only if $\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t) = f \nabla_{hor} S(\tilde{\gamma}(t))$ for some scalar function f . That is, $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a reparameterization of an integral curve of $\nabla_{hor} S$.

Since any γ satisfying $\dot{\gamma}(t) = \nabla_{hor} S(\gamma(t))$ is an integral curve, therefore

$$dS(\dot{\gamma}) = \langle \nabla_{hor} S, \dot{\gamma} \rangle = \langle \nabla_{hor} S, \nabla_{hor} S \rangle = 1.$$

For any other curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ in M , we have

$$dS(\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}) = \langle \nabla_{hor} S, \dot{\tilde{\gamma}} \rangle < \|\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}\|$$

The inequality above is strict since $\tilde{\gamma}$ is different from γ on at least an open set, because the two curves are smooth. Therefore, the inequality becomes

$$\ell(\gamma) = S(A) - S(B) = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} dS < \ell(\tilde{\gamma}).$$

This completes the proof. \square

In view of Proposition 3.6, in order to classify the metric lines on $SE(2)$ we need to study when the calibration function defined in equation (17) is globally defined and C^2 .

Proposition 3.7. *The calibration function given by equation (17) is not globally defined for every value of R . However, the calibration function given by*

$$(18) \quad S_{\delta}^{\pm}(\theta, x, y) = \mp \cos(\theta - \delta) + x \cos(\delta) + y \sin(\delta)$$

is a globally defined and smooth calibration function for geodesics of the heteroclinic and line type corresponding to α_{μ} , where $R = 1$.

Proof. We notice that by construction, the differential of the calibration function dS_{μ}^{\pm} , given by (17), for a parameter μ is only defined in the closed region $\Omega_{\mu} := Hill(\mu) \times \mathbb{R}^2$, where $Hill(\mu)$ is the Hill region from Definition 2.2. Thus, Lemma 2.4 says that when $R > 1$, Ω_{μ} is a proper sub-set of $SE(2)$ and S_{μ}^{\pm} is not globally defined.

When $R \leq 1$, the differential of the calibration function dS_{μ} is globally defined. However, the differential is not exact since the integral over a non-contractible loop is not zero. Indeed, if γ is a non-contractible loop in $SE(2)$, then

$$\int_{\gamma} dS_{\mu}^{\pm} = \pm \int_0^{2\pi} \sqrt{1 - R^2 \cos^2(\theta - \delta)} d\theta \neq 0.$$

The function S_{δ}^{\pm} , given by (18), is a globally defined and smooth by construction. Let us verify that S_{δ}^{\pm} is a calibration function:

If $\gamma(t)$ is a geodesic of the type line, then $\theta(t) = \delta$ for all time and the Background Theorem implies

$$\dot{\gamma}(t) = \cos(\delta) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \sin(\delta) \frac{\partial}{\partial y}.$$




FIGURE 4.1. The panels show the cut points for each case

Therefore $dS_\delta^\pm(\dot{\gamma}) = 1$.

Let us assume that $\gamma(t)$ is a geodesic of the type heteroclinic, without lose of generality let consider an initial condition on α_μ^1 , given by remark 2.5, and $\dot{\theta}$ positive, then the Background Theorem implies

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\gamma}(t) &= \sqrt{1 - \cos^2(\theta(t) - \delta)}X_\theta + \cos(\theta(t) - \delta)X_u \\ &= \sin(\theta(t) - \delta)X_\theta + \cos(\theta(t) - \delta)X_u.\end{aligned}$$

We notice that $0 \leq \sin(\theta(t) - \delta)$, since $\theta(t)$ lays in the interval $[\delta, \delta + \pi]$. Therefore $dS_\delta^+(\dot{\gamma}) = 1$ and S_δ^+ satisfies the first condition from Definition 3.4 for geodesic of type heteroclinic and line, and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies the second condition. \square

We are ready to prove that geodesics of the type heteroclinic and line are metric lines.

Proposition 3.8. *Geodesics of the type line and heteroclinic metric lines.*

Proof. Propositions 3.6 and 3.7 imply the desired result. \square

4. CUT TIMES IN THE EUCLIDEAN GROUP

Having completed Proposition 3.8, we have proved the first part of Theorem B. To complete the proof, it remains to show that geodesics of the type θ -periodic fail to qualify as metric lines. To do so, we will prove that such geodesics fails to minimize past its θ -period.

4.1. Cut time. Let us formalize the definition of the cut time.

Definition 4.1. *Let γ be a sub-Riemannian geodesic parameterized by arc-length, we define the cut time of γ as*

$$t_{cut}(\gamma) = \sup\{t > 0 \mid \gamma|_{[0,t]} \text{ is length minimizing}\}.$$

If two geodesics with the same initial point touch after a positive time, then the geodesics fail to minimize after this time, refer to [7, Lemma 5.2] for the \mathbb{R} case. The following proposition demonstrates that this is the case for geodesics of the type θ -periodic.

Proposition 4.2. *If a geodesic is of the type θ -periodic with period L , then L is an upper-bound for the cut time.*

Proof. Let $\gamma(t)$ be an L periodic sub-Riemannian geodesic with momentum μ and initial condition $\gamma(0) = (\theta_0, x_0, y_0)$, we will consider two cases when $\dot{\theta}_0 \neq 0$ and $\dot{\theta}_0 = 0$. We remark that the second case only corresponds to geodesics of the type inflection ($R > 1$).

Case $\dot{\theta}_0 \neq 0$: there are exactly two geodesics with initial condition $\gamma(0)$ and momentum μ , namely $\gamma(t)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}(t)$, the latter of which is defined as the one whose reduced dynamics are solution to the Hamiltonian H_μ and have the initial condition $(\tilde{p}_\theta(0), \tilde{\theta}(0)) = (-\dot{\theta}_0, \theta_0)$. The time reversibility (see Lemma 2.6) implies $\theta(t) = \tilde{\theta}(-t)$ for all t , and the periodicity gives $\theta(L) = \tilde{\theta}(L)$.

Moreover, we claim that $\gamma(L) = \tilde{\gamma}(L)$. This follows by Proposition 2.7, which states the difference in \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} over the period L is the same as the difference for \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} . That is to say

$$\gamma(L) = \gamma(0) + (0, \Delta x(\mu), \Delta y(\mu)) = \tilde{\gamma}(L)$$

Therefore, we have constructed two distinct geodesics meeting at time L , implying that any geodesics of the type θ -periodic fails to minimize past its period L .

Let μ be such that $R > 1$, and let us consider an initial condition $\dot{\theta}(0) = 0$. We will show that $\gamma(L)$ is conjugate to $\gamma(0)$ along γ , thus γ is not minimizing past $\gamma(L)$. To do so, we will construct a killing vector field, which by general theory is a Jacobi field when restricted to a geodesic. By [6, Section 3], a vector field K is a killing vector field if and only if its momentum function P_K commutes with the Hamiltonian with respect to the Poisson bracket, i.e. $\{H, P_K\} = 0$. It follows that $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ are killing vector fields, since

$$\dot{P}_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x}} = \{H, P_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}\} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{P}_{\frac{\partial}{\partial y}} = \{H, P_{\frac{\partial}{\partial y}}\} = 0,$$

Consider the two Jacobi fields on γ :

$$W_1(t) = \cos(\theta_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \sin(\theta_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \quad \text{restricted to } \gamma, \quad \text{and}$$

$$W_2(t) = \dot{\gamma}(t).$$

We see that at $t = kL$, we have $W_2(kL) = X_u(\gamma(kL)) = \cos(\theta_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \sin(\theta_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$. Therefore, $W_1(0) = W_1(L) = W_2(0) = W_2(L)$. Thus the Jacobi Field $J = W_1 - W_2$ vanishes at $t = 0$ and $t = L$. Moreover, J is not trivial since $\dot{\theta}(t) \neq 0$ along $0 < t < L/2$ and $L/2 < 0 < L$. At the time $t = L/2$, we have that

$$W_2(L/2) = \cos(\theta(L/2)) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \sin(\theta(L/2)) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \neq W_1(L/2).$$

Showing that $\gamma(L)$ is a conjugate point and fails to minimize beyond $t = L$. □

5. PROOF OF THEOREM B

Proof. Proposition 3.8 shows that the geodesics of the type line and heteroclinic are metric lines. Proposition 4.2 implies that geodesics of type θ -periodic do not qualify as metric lines, since the period L is an upper-bound for its cut time.

Therefore, we conclude that the metric lines in SE(2) are precisely the geodesics of the type line and heteroclinic. □

6. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

Future work:

- (1) Extend our characterizations of the metric lines and periodic geodesics to $SE(3)$, or more generally to $SE(n)$.
- (2) Study the eigenvalue problems and fundamental solutions of the sub-Riemannian Laplace, Heat, and Schrödinger operators on $SE(2)$.

APPENDIX A. MAÑE'S CRITICAL VALUE

In this section, we will show the calibration function defined in Proposition 3.7 correspond to the Mañe's critical value. The Mañe's critical value is a fundamental concept from KAM theory. We will follow the approach from [9] by A. Figalli and L Rifford, for a more extensive explanation refer to [8].

Let M be a smooth connected compact Riemannian manifold without boundary, $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Hamiltonian function and $\|\cdot\|_x^*$ be the norm on T_x^*M . We say that H is a Tomelli Hamiltonian if

- Superlinear growth: For every $K \geq 0$ there exist a constant $C^*(K)$ such that

$$H(x, p) \geq K\|p\|_x^* - C^*(K) \quad \text{for all } (p, x) \in T^*M.$$

- Uniform convexity: For every (p, x) in T^*M , the second derivative along the fiber $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2}$ is positive definite.

Notice that reduced Hamiltonian H_μ , given by (8), is a Tonelli Hamiltonian for all value μ in \mathbb{R}^2 . The Mañe's critical value can be defined as follows

Definition A.1. *We call Mañe's critical value of a Hamiltonian function H , and we denote it by $c[H]$, the infimum of the values c in \mathbb{R} for which there exist a function $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of a class C^1 satisfying*

$$(19) \quad H(du, x) \leq c \quad \text{for all } x \in M.$$

If the Tonelli Hamiltonian corresponds to a mechanical system, i.e., H has the form

$$H(p, x) = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|_x^2 + V(x) \quad \text{for all } (p, x) \in T^*M,$$

where $V : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a potential function of class C^k , $k \geq 2$. Then it is easy to check that

$$c[H] = \max_{x \in M} V(x).$$

In the case reduced Hamiltonian H_μ , we have $\frac{R^2}{2} = c[H_\mu]$. The following proposition make the link between the Mañe's critical value and a calibration function for a curve over an infinite interval.

Proposition A.2. *Suppose $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies inequality from equation (19). If u is a calibration function for a curve $\gamma(t)$ over an infinite interval, then c is equal to Mañe's critical value $c[H]$.*

The proof of A.2 is in [8, Proposition 4.3.6]. We conclude that reduced Hamiltonian function H_μ has a globally minimizing solution of action if $H(p(t), \theta(t)) = \frac{R^2}{2}$. It is easy to show that sub-Riemannian geodesic whose reduce dynamics has energy $H(p(t), \theta(t)) = \frac{R^2}{2}$ are reparametrization of geodesic of the type heteroclinic and line.

REFERENCES

- [1] Andrei Agrachev, Davide Barilari, and Ugo Boscain. *A Comprehensive Introduction to Sub-Riemannian Geometry*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [2] Andrei Ardentov, Gil Bor, Enrico Le Donne, Richard Montgomery, and Yuri Sachkov. Bicycle paths, elasticae and sub-riemannian geometry. *Nonlinearity*, 34, 2021.
- [3] Vladimir Igorevich Arnold. *Mathematical methods of classical mechanics*. Springer Science.
- [4] Alejandro Bravo-Doddoli. Metric lines in jet space, 2023.
- [5] Alejandro Bravo-Doddoli, Enrico Le Donne, and Nicola Paddeu. Symplectic reduction of the sub-riemannian geodesic flow for metabelian nilpotent groups, 2023.
- [6] Alejandro Bravo-Doddoli and Richard Montgomery. Geodesics in Jet Space. *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics*, 2021.
- [7] Jeff Cheeger and David G. Ebin. *Comparison theorems in Riemannian geometry*. North-Holland, 1975.
- [8] Albert Fathi. *The Weak KAM Theorem in Lagrangian Dynamics*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [9] Alessio Figalli and Ludovic Rifford. Aubry sets, hamilton-jacobi equations, and the mañé conjecture. *Geometric Analysis, Mathematical Relativity, and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, pages 83–104, 2013.
- [10] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz. *Mechanics third edition: Volume 1 of course of theoretical physics*. 1976.
- [11] Jerrold Marsden, Tudor Ratiu, and Alan Weinstein. Semidirect product and reduction in mechanics. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 2007.
- [12] Jerrold Marsden and Alan Weinstein. Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry. *Reports on mathematical physics*, 5(1):121–130, 1974.
- [13] Igor Moiseev and Yuri L. Sachkov. Maxwell strata in sub-riemannian problem on the group of motions of a plane. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 2010.
- [14] Richard Montgomery. *A tour of subriemannian geometries, their geodesics and applications*. Number 91. American Mathematical Soc., 2002.
- [15] Juan-Pablo Ortega and Tudor S Ratiu. *Momentum maps and Hamiltonian reduction*, volume 222. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [16] Takashi Sakai. On riemannian manifolds admitting a function whose gradient is of constant norm. *Kodai Mathematical Journal*, 19:39–51, 1996.

Y. WANG; UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, 530 CHURCH ST, ANN ARBOR, MI 48109, UNITED STATES, WANGYY@UMICH.EDU

S. KU; NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, COURANT INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, 251 MERCER ST, NEW YORK, NY 10012, UNITED STATES, SK8980@NYU.EDU

ALEJANDRO BRAVO-DODDOLI; UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, 530 CHURCH ST, ANN ARBOR, MI 48109, UNITED STATES, ABRAVODO@UMICH.EDU