

REDUCTIVE SUBALGEBRAS OF SEMISIMPLE LIE ALGEBRAS AND POISSON COMMUTATIVITY

DMITRI I. PANYUSHEV AND OKSANA S. YAKIMOVA

ABSTRACT. Let \mathfrak{g} be a semisimple Lie algebra, $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ a reductive subalgebra such that \mathfrak{h}^\perp is a complementary \mathfrak{h} -submodule of \mathfrak{g} . In 1983, Bogoyavlenski claimed that one obtains a Poisson commutative subalgebra of the symmetric algebra $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ by taking the subalgebra \mathcal{Z} generated by the bi-homogeneous components of all $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^\mathfrak{h}$. But this is false, and we present a counterexample. We also provide a criterion for the Poisson commutativity of such subalgebras \mathcal{Z} . As a by-product, we prove that \mathcal{Z} is Poisson commutative if \mathfrak{h} is abelian and describe \mathcal{Z} in the special case when \mathfrak{h} is a Cartan subalgebra. In this case, \mathcal{Z} appears to be polynomial and has the maximal transcendence degree $\mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}) = \frac{1}{2}(\dim \mathfrak{g} + \text{rk } \mathfrak{g})$.

INTRODUCTION

0.1. The ground field \mathbb{k} is algebraically closed and $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) = 0$. For any finite-dimensional Lie algebra \mathfrak{q} , the dual space \mathfrak{q}^* has a Poisson structure. The algebra of polynomial functions on \mathfrak{q}^* , $\mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*]$, is isomorphic to the graded symmetric algebra $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ and the Lie–Poisson bracket $\{ , \}$ is defined on the elements of degree one by $\{\xi, \eta\} = [\xi, \eta]$ for $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{q}$. There is a method for constructing “large” Poisson commutative subalgebras of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ that exploits pairs of *compatible Poisson brackets*, see [4, Sect. 10], [9]. To apply this, one needs a suitable second Poisson bracket beside $\{ , \} = \{ , \}_\mathfrak{q}$. Let us recall some situations, where this “general method” (= method of compatible Poisson brackets) works.

I. The celebrated “argument shift method” goes back to [7] (if \mathfrak{q} is semisimple). It employs an arbitrary $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$ and the Poisson bracket $\{ , \}_\gamma$, where $\{x, y\}_\gamma = \gamma([x, y])$ for $x, y \in \mathfrak{q}$. The brackets $\{ , \}$ and $\{ , \}_\gamma$ are compatible, and the general method produces the *Mishchenko–Fomenko subalgebra* (= *MF-subalgebra*) $(\mathcal{MF})_\gamma \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$. Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^\mathfrak{h}$ be the *Poisson centre* of $(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}), \{ , \})$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^\mathfrak{h} = \{H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}) \mid \{H, x\} = 0 \ \forall x \in \mathfrak{q}\}.$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B63, 14L30, 17B08, 17B20, 22E46.

Key words and phrases. Poisson bracket, coadjoint representation, reductive subalgebra.

The first author is partially supported by R.F.B.R. grant № 20-01-00515. The second author is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) — project number 454900253.

For $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$, let $\partial_\gamma F$ be the directional derivative of F with respect to $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, i.e.,

$$\partial_\gamma F(x) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} F(x + t\gamma) \right|_{t=0}.$$

By the original definition of the \mathcal{MF} -subalgebras [7], $(\mathcal{MF})_\gamma$ is generated by all $\partial_\gamma^k F$ with $k \geq 0$ and $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^\mathfrak{q}$. Since then, the algebras $(\mathcal{MF})_\gamma$ and their quantum counterparts attracted a great deal of attention, see e.g. [3, 8, 15] and references therein. If \mathfrak{q} is reductive and γ is regular in \mathfrak{q}^* , then $(\mathcal{MF})_\gamma$ is a maximal Poisson commutative subalgebra in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ of maximal transcendence degree [12].

II. Let $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{q}_1$ be a \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading, i.e., $[\mathfrak{q}_i, \mathfrak{q}_j] \subset \mathfrak{q}_{i+j \pmod{2}}$. Then \mathfrak{q} admits the Inönü–Wigner contraction to the semi-direct product $\tilde{\mathfrak{q}} = \mathfrak{q}_0 \ltimes \mathfrak{q}_1^{\text{ab}}$, and the second bracket is the Lie–Poisson bracket of $\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}$. (Here \mathfrak{q} and $\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}$ are identified as vector spaces.) The compatibility of $\{ , \}_\mathfrak{q}$ and $\{ , \}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{q}}}$ stems from the presence of \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading, cf. Section 1.1. The sum $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{q}_1$ determines the bi-homogeneous decomposition $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}) = \bigoplus_{i,j \geq 0} \mathcal{S}^i(\mathfrak{q}_0) \otimes \mathcal{S}^j(\mathfrak{q}_1)$. Here the general method yields the Poisson commutative subalgebra generated by the bi-homogeneous components of all $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^\mathfrak{q}$. This case has been studied in [6] and recently in our article [14]. For substantial applications, one has to assume, of course, that \mathfrak{q} is semisimple.

0.2. Soon after [14] has been accepted, we came across an article of Bogoyavlenski [1]. He claims that if \mathfrak{g} is semisimple, $\mathfrak{f} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is reductive and the Killing form of \mathfrak{g} is non-degenerate on \mathfrak{f} , then the direct sum $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$, where $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{f}^\perp$, allows to construct similarly a Poisson commutative subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$. Namely, a special case of [1, Theorem 1] (with $n = k = j = 1$ in the original notation) asserts that the bi-homogeneous components of all $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^\mathfrak{g}$ generate a Poisson commutative subalgebra. However, this is false and we provide a counterexample to that claim. An explanation for that error is that here one can also consider the contraction $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{f} \ltimes \mathfrak{m}^{\text{ab}}$ and the Poisson bracket $\{ , \}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ on the vector space $\mathfrak{g} \simeq \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, but the brackets $\{ , \}_\mathfrak{g}$ and $\{ , \}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}$ are not necessarily compatible. One can also notice that Bogoyavlenski did not properly distinguish a Lie algebra and its dual, and his usage of differentials of elements of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ is sloppy.

Our main motivation for writing this note was just to clarify and remedy this situation. However, we also discovered some exciting new phenomena. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G)$ be semisimple and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$ as above. Let $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{f})}$ be the subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by the bi-homogeneous components of all $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^\mathfrak{g}$. The results of this note are:

- 1) we provide a criterion for $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{f})}$ to be Poisson commutative;
- 2) using our criterion we prove that $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{sl}_4, \mathfrak{sl}_2)}$ is not Poisson commutative for the standard embedding $\mathfrak{sl}_2 \subset \mathfrak{sl}_4$;
- 3) a corollary of our criterion is that $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{f})}$ is Poisson commutative whenever \mathfrak{f} is abelian (e.g. if \mathfrak{f} is the Lie algebra of a torus in G);

- 4) it is proved that if $\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{t}$ is a Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , then $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})}$ is polynomial, $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g})$, and \mathcal{Z} is complete on every regular G -orbit in \mathfrak{g} .
- 5) We point out an algebraic extension $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \supset \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})}$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is a **maximal** Poisson commutative subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ and is still polynomial.

1. PRELIMINARIES ON THE COADJOINT REPRESENTATION

Let Q be a connected affine algebraic group with $\text{Lie}(Q) = \mathfrak{q}$. The symmetric algebra $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ over \mathbb{k} is identified with the graded algebra of polynomial functions on \mathfrak{q}^* , and we also write $\mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*]$ for it.

Let \mathfrak{q}^ξ denote the stabiliser in \mathfrak{q} of $\xi \in \mathfrak{q}^*$. The *index* of \mathfrak{q} , $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q}$, is the minimal codimension of Q -orbits in \mathfrak{q}^* . Equivalently, $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = \min_{\xi \in \mathfrak{q}^*} \dim \mathfrak{q}^\xi$. By Rosenlicht's theorem [2, I.6], one also has $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = \text{tr.deg } \mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{q}^*)^Q$. The Lie–Poisson bracket for $\mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*]$ is defined on the elements of degree 1 (i.e., on \mathfrak{q}) by $\{x, y\} := [x, y]$. Set further $\hat{\gamma}(x, y) = \gamma([x, y])$ for $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$. For any $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ and $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, we have

$$(1.1) \quad \{F_1, F_2\}(\gamma) = \hat{\gamma}(d_\gamma F_1, d_\gamma F_2)$$

where $d_\gamma F \in \mathfrak{q}$ is the differential of $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ at γ . As Q is connected, we have $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^Q = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^Q = \mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*]^Q$. The set of Q -regular elements of \mathfrak{q}^* is

$$(1.2) \quad \mathfrak{q}_{\text{reg}}^* = \{\eta \in \mathfrak{q}^* \mid \dim \mathfrak{q}^\eta = \text{ind } \mathfrak{q}\}.$$

Set $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{sing}}^* = \mathfrak{q}^* \setminus \mathfrak{q}_{\text{reg}}^*$. We say that \mathfrak{q} has the *codim- n* property if $\text{codim } \mathfrak{q}_{\text{sing}}^* \geq n$. By [5], the semisimple algebras \mathfrak{g} have the *codim-3* property.

Set $\mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{q}) = (\dim \mathfrak{q} + \text{ind } \mathfrak{q})/2$. Since the coadjoint orbits are even-dimensional, this number is an integer. If \mathfrak{q} is reductive, then $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = \text{rk } \mathfrak{q}$ and $\mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{q})$ equals the dimension of a Borel subalgebra. A subalgebra $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ is said to be *Poisson commutative* if $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}\} = 0$. If $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ is Poisson commutative, then $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{A} \leq \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{q})$, see e.g. [15, 0.2].

Definition 1. A Poisson commutative subalgebra $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ is said to be *complete* on a coadjoint orbit $Q\gamma \subset \mathfrak{q}^*$ if $\text{tr.deg } (\mathcal{A}|_{Q\gamma}) = \frac{1}{2} \dim(Q\gamma)$.

The notion of completeness originates from the theory of integrable systems.

For a subalgebra $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ and $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, set $d_\gamma \mathcal{A} = \langle d_\gamma F \mid F \in \mathcal{A} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$.

1.1. Decompositions and compatibility. Let $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus V$ be a vector space decomposition, where \mathfrak{f} is a subalgebra. For any $s \in \mathbb{k}^\times$, define a linear map $\varphi_s : \mathfrak{q} \rightarrow \mathfrak{q}$ by setting $\varphi_s|_{\mathfrak{f}} = \text{id}$, $\varphi_s|_V = s \cdot \text{id}$. Then $\varphi_s \varphi_{s'} = \varphi_{ss'}$ and $\varphi_s^{-1} = \varphi_{s^{-1}}$, i.e., this yields a one-parameter subgroup of $\text{GL}(\mathfrak{q})$. For each s , the formula

$$(1.3) \quad [x, y]_{(s)} = \varphi_s^{-1}([\varphi_s(x), \varphi_s(y)])$$

defines a modified Lie algebra structure on the vector space \mathfrak{q} . All these structures are isomorphic to the initial one. The corresponding Poisson bracket is denoted by $\{ , \}_{(s)}$. We naturally extend φ_s to an automorphism of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$. Then the centre of the Poisson algebra $(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}), \{ , \}_{(s)})$ equals $\varphi_s^{-1}(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}})$. For $x \in \mathfrak{q}$, write $x = x_{\mathfrak{f}} + x_V$ with $x_{\mathfrak{f}} \in \mathfrak{f}$, $x_V \in V$.

If $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus V$ is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading, i.e., $[\mathfrak{f}, V] \subset V$ and $[V, V] \subset \mathfrak{f}$, then $\{ , \}_{(s)} = \{ , \}_{(-s)}$ and $\{ , \}_{(s)} + \{ , \}_{(s')} = 2\{ , \}_{(\tilde{s})}$ with $2\tilde{s}^2 = s^2 + (s')^2$. Therefore the brackets $\{ , \}_{(s)}$ are pairwise compatible and build a two-dimensional pencil.

Lemma 1.1. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus V$, where $\mathfrak{f} \subset \mathfrak{q}$ is a subalgebra and $[\mathfrak{f}, V] \subset V$. For any $x = x_{\mathfrak{f}} + x_V, y = y_{\mathfrak{f}} + y_V \in \mathfrak{q}$, we have*

$$(1.4) \quad [x, y]_{(s)} = [x_{\mathfrak{f}}, x_{\mathfrak{f}}] + [x_{\mathfrak{f}}, y_V] + [x_V, y_{\mathfrak{f}}] + s[x_V, y_V]_V + s^2[x_V, y_V]_{\mathfrak{f}}.$$

Proof. The statement is verified by a straightforward computation. \square

Assume that $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus V$ is an \mathfrak{f} -stable decomposition. One of the crucial properties of $[,]_{(s)}$ is that if $x \in \mathfrak{f}$ and $y \in \mathfrak{q}$, then $[x, y]_{(s)} = [x, y]$ for all $s \in \mathbb{k}$. Then (1.4) shows also that if $[\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{q}] \neq 0$ and $[V, V]$ is not contained in either \mathfrak{f} or V , then the brackets $\{ , \}_{(s)}$ do not build a two-dimensional pencil.

2. A CRITERION FOR COMMUTATIVITY

Let \mathfrak{f} be a subalgebra of \mathfrak{q} . Suppose that there is an \mathfrak{f} -stable decomposition $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$, i.e., $[\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{m}] \subset \mathfrak{m}$. This yields a bi-homogeneous structure for $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$:

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}) = \bigoplus_{i, j \geq 0} \mathcal{S}^i(\mathfrak{f}) \otimes \mathcal{S}^j(\mathfrak{m}).$$

For any $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$, we have $H = \sum_{i, j \geq 0} H_{(i, j)}$, where $H_{(i, j)} \in \mathcal{S}^i(\mathfrak{f}) \otimes \mathcal{S}^j(\mathfrak{m})$. Let $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{f})}$ be the subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ generated by the bi-homogeneous components of all $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}$. Since each bi-homogeneous component of $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}$ is \mathfrak{f} -invariant, we have $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{f})} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{f}}$. It is claimed in [1, Theorem 1] that if \mathfrak{q} is semisimple and \mathfrak{f} is reductive (so that an \mathfrak{f} -stable decomposition of \mathfrak{q} does exist), then $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{f})}$ is Poisson commutative. However, this is **false!** Below, we give a criterion for the Poisson commutativity of $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{f})}$ and provide a counterexample to the assertion of [1]. On the positive side, we deduce from our criterion that $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{f})}$ is Poisson commutative whenever \mathfrak{f} is an abelian subalgebra.

Given $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, we decompose it as $\gamma = \gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} + \gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}$, where $\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}|_{\mathfrak{m}} = 0$ and $\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}|_{\mathfrak{f}} = 0$. Let $\varphi_s : \mathfrak{q} \rightarrow \mathfrak{q}$ be the same as in Section 1.1 with $V = \mathfrak{m}$. Set $\varphi_s(\gamma) = \gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}$. It is well known and easily verified that, for any $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, one has $d_{\xi}H \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{q}^{\xi})$, where $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{q}^{\xi})$ is the centre of \mathfrak{q}^{ξ} . A standard calculation with differentials shows that

$$(2.1) \quad d_{\gamma}(\varphi_s(F)) = \varphi_s(d_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}F)$$

for any $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$.

Theorem 2.1. *The subalgebra $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{f})}$ is Poisson commutative if and only if*

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\mathfrak{f}}((\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}H)_{\mathfrak{f}}, (\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_{s'}(\gamma)}H')_{\mathfrak{f}}) = 0$$

for each $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, all nonzero $s, s' \in \mathbb{k}$, and all $H, H' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the assertion for homogeneous $H, H' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}$. Note that if $H \in \mathcal{S}^d(\mathfrak{q})$ and $H = \sum_{j=0}^d H_{(d-j, j)}$, then $\varphi_s(H) = \sum_j s^j H_{(d-j, j)}$. Therefore, employing the standard argument with the Vandermonde determinant, one shows that

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{Z} = \text{alg}\langle \varphi_s(H) \mid H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}, s \in \mathbb{k}^{\times} \rangle.$$

Hence the algebra \mathcal{Z} is Poisson commutative if and only if for all $H, H' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}$, all nonzero s, s' , and any $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, we have

$$A_{s, s'} = A_{s, s', H, H', \gamma} := \hat{\gamma}(\mathbf{d}_{\gamma}\varphi_s(H), \mathbf{d}_{\gamma}\varphi_{s'}(H')) = 0.$$

Suppose that H, H' and γ are fixed. Then there is no ambiguity in the use of $A_{s, s'}$.

Set $\xi = \mathbf{d}_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}H$ and $\eta = \mathbf{d}_{\varphi_{s'}(\gamma)}H'$. Since $\varphi_s(H)$ belongs to the Poisson centre of $(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}), \{ , \}_{(s^{-1})})$, we derive from (2.1) that

$$\gamma([\mathbf{d}_{\gamma}\varphi_s(H), \mathbf{d}_{\gamma}\varphi_{s'}(H')]_{(s^{-1})}) = \gamma([\varphi_s(\xi), \varphi_{s'}(\eta)]_{(s^{-1})}) = \gamma([\xi_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{f}} + s'\eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{(s^{-1})}) = 0.$$

Similarly, $\varphi_{s'}(H')$ belongs to the Poisson centre of $(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}), \{ , \}_{((s')^{-1})})$ and hence

$$\gamma([\xi_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{f}} + s'\eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{((s')^{-1})}) = 0.$$

For all $\tilde{s} \in \mathbb{k}^{\times}$ and $\tilde{H} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}$, we have $\hat{\gamma}(\mathfrak{f}, \mathbf{d}_{\gamma}\varphi_{\tilde{s}}(\tilde{H})) = 0$. Therefore, $\hat{\gamma}(\varphi_s(\xi), \eta_{\mathfrak{f}}) = \hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{f}}, \varphi_{s'}(\eta)) = 0$. Thus,

$$(2.3) \quad C := \hat{\gamma}_{\mathfrak{f}}((\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}H)_{\mathfrak{f}}, (\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_{s'}(\gamma)}H')_{\mathfrak{f}}) = \hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{f}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{f}}) = -s'\hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{f}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}) = -s\hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{f}}).$$

Let us substitute this into the formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma([\varphi_s(\xi), \varphi_{s'}(\eta)]_{(s^{-1})}) &= \\ \hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{f}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{f}}) + s\hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{f}}) + s'\hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{f}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}) + \frac{s'}{s}\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{f}}) + s'\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}}) &= 0, \\ \gamma([\varphi_s(\xi), \varphi_{s'}(\eta)]_{((s')^{-1})}) &= \\ \hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{f}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{f}}) + s\hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{f}}) + s'\hat{\gamma}(\xi_{\mathfrak{f}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}) + \frac{s}{s'}\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{f}}) + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}}) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

obtaining the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} C - C - C + s^{-1}s'\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{f}}) + s'\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}}) &= 0, \\ C - C - C + s(s')^{-1}\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{f}}) + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}}) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore $A_{s, s'} = -C + ss'\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{f}}) + ss'\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}})$.

Suppose that $C = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} s^{-1}\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{f}}) + \gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}}) &= 0, \\ (s')^{-1}\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{f}}) + \gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}}) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thereby $(s^{-1} - (s')^{-1})\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{f}}) = 0$ and $(s - s')\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}}) = 0$. If $s \neq s'$, then necessary $A_{s,s'} = 0$. Since $A_{s,s'}$ is a polynomial in s and s' with constant coefficients, $A_{s,s'} = 0$ for all nonzero s, s' . This settles the 'if' part.

In order to prove the 'only if' implication, suppose that $A_{s,s'} = 0$ for all $s, s' \in \mathbb{k}^{\times}$. Then $x = \gamma_{\mathfrak{f}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{f}})$ and $y = \gamma_{\mathfrak{m}}([\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \eta_{\mathfrak{m}}]_{\mathfrak{m}})$ satisfy $s^{-1}s'x + s'y = s(s')^{-1}x + sy = ss'(x + y) = C$. Assume that $s \neq s'$ and that $s, s' \neq 1$. Then

$$\begin{cases} \frac{s'+s}{ss'} \cdot x + y = 0; \\ \frac{s+1}{s} \cdot x + y = 0, \end{cases}$$

and the only solution of this system is $x = y = 0$. Hence $C = 0$. By the continuity in s and s' , the equality $\hat{\gamma}_{\mathfrak{f}}((d_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}H)_{\mathfrak{f}}, (d_{\varphi_{s'}(\gamma)}H')_{\mathfrak{f}}) = 0$ holds for all $s, s' \in \mathbb{k}^{\times}$. \square

Corollary 2.2. *If \mathfrak{f} is an abelian Lie algebra, then $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{f})}$ is Poisson commutative.*

Proof. Since $[\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{f}] = 0$, we have $[(d_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}H)_{\mathfrak{f}}, (d_{\varphi_{s'}(\gamma)}H')_{\mathfrak{f}}] = 0$ for each $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, all nonzero $s, s' \in \mathbb{k}$, and all $H, H' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}$. Hence $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{f})}$ is Poisson-commutative by Theorem 2.1. \square

Let \mathfrak{g} be a reductive Lie algebra. Then \mathfrak{g} is identified with \mathfrak{g}^* via a G -invariant non-degenerate scalar product (\cdot, \cdot) and $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{q}}$ is a polynomial ring. Let $\{H_1, \dots, H_l\}$ be a set of homogeneous algebraically independent generators of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{q}}$ with $\deg H_j =: d_j$. By the *Kostant regularity criterion* for \mathfrak{g} [5, Theorem 9],

$$(2.4) \quad \langle d_{\xi}H_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq l \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} = \mathfrak{g}^{\xi} \text{ if and only if } \xi \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*.$$

Recall that $\mathfrak{g}^{\xi} = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}^{\xi})$ if and only if $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$ [10, Theorem 3.3].

Example 2.3. If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_n$, then $x^k \in \mathfrak{g}^x$ for any $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. (Here x^k is the usual matrix power.) Moreover, if we identify \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}^* , then $d_x\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{q}} = \langle x^k \mid 0 \leq k < n \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$.

Consider the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{f}) = (\mathfrak{gl}_4, \mathfrak{sl}_2)$ with \mathfrak{sl}_2 embedded in the right lower corner.

$$\text{Take } \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \text{ Then } \gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}} = \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 & 0 & s \\ 0 & 0 & s & 0 \\ s & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & s & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} \neq 0$. For any $k \geq 0$, $(\varphi_s(\gamma))^k = (\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}})^k$ belongs to $d_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{q}}$. Hence

$((\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}})^k)_{\mathfrak{f}} \in (\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}})_{\mathfrak{f}}$. Let us do calculations for $k = 2, 3$:

$$(\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}})^2 = \begin{pmatrix} s^2 & s^2 & 0 & s^2 - s \\ s^2 & 0 & s & 0 \\ s^2 + s & 0 & 1 & s^2 \\ 0 & -s & s^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad (\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}})^3 = \begin{pmatrix} * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & 1 & s^3 \\ * & * & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $e = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $h = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ be the standard basis of \mathfrak{sl}_2 . Then

$$\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} = h, \quad ((\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}})^2)_{\mathfrak{f}} = s^2(e + f), \quad \text{and} \quad ((\gamma_{\mathfrak{f}} + s\gamma_{\mathfrak{m}})^3)_{\mathfrak{f}} = s^3e + h.$$

Therefore, if $s \neq 0$, then $\langle (\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}H)_{\mathfrak{f}} \mid H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} = \mathfrak{f}$. Since $(h, [\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{f}]) \neq 0$, we conclude that

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\mathfrak{f}}((\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_s(\gamma)}H)_{\mathfrak{f}}, (\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_{s'}(\gamma)}H')_{\mathfrak{f}}) \neq 0$$

for all nonzero s, s' . Thus, by Theorem 2.1, $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{f})}$ is not Poisson commutative.

Remark 2.4. Example 2.3 also implies that $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{sl}_2)}$ is not Poisson commutative if $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_4$ is replaced with \mathfrak{sl}_4 . For, $\mathfrak{gl}_4 = \mathfrak{z} \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_4$ with $\mathfrak{z} = \mathbb{k}I_4$, hence $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{gl}_4)^{\mathfrak{gl}_4}$ is generated by $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sl}_4)^{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$ and \mathfrak{z} . For any reductive $\mathfrak{f} \subset \mathfrak{sl}_4$, the algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{gl}_4, \mathfrak{f})} = \text{alg}\langle \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{sl}_4, \mathfrak{f})}, \mathfrak{z} \rangle$ is Poisson commutative if and only if $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{sl}_4, \mathfrak{f})}$ is.

Example 2.3 easily generalises to the pairs $(\mathfrak{gl}_n, \mathfrak{gl}_m)$ with $n \geq m + 2$. On the other hand, one can prove that the algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{gl}_3, \mathfrak{sl}_2)}$ or $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{sl}_3, \mathfrak{sl}_2)}$ is still Poisson commutative.

Example 2.5. Let us show that, for a special choice of \mathfrak{f} , the algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{f})}$ is rather close to an \mathcal{MF} -subalgebra.

Let $h \in \mathfrak{g}$ be a semisimple element such that $(h, h) \neq 0$. Set $\mathfrak{f} = \langle h \rangle$. Then $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is the orthogonal complement of h with respect to $(\ , \)$ and the bi-homogeneous decomposition of $H_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is

$$H_j = H_{j,0}h^{d_j} + H_{j,1}h^{d_j-1} + \dots + H_{j,k}h^{d_j-k} + \dots + H_{j,d_j},$$

where $H_{j,k} \in \mathcal{S}^k(\mathfrak{m})$. By definition, $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \langle h \rangle)}$ is generated by $H_{j,k}h^{d_j-k}$ with $1 \leq j \leq l$ and $0 \leq k \leq d_j$. On the one hand, we had $\mathfrak{f} = \langle h \rangle$. On the other hand, let $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ be such that $\gamma(\mathfrak{m}) = 0$ and $\gamma(h) = 1$. Actually, $\gamma = h$ under the identification of \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}^* . Then

$$\partial_{\gamma}^k H_j = \sum_{r=k}^{d_j} r(r-1) \dots (r-k+1) h^{r-k} H_{j,d_j-r}.$$

If $H \in \mathcal{S}^2(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the quadratic form corresponding to $(\ , \)$, then $\partial_{\gamma} H = ch$ for some $c \in \mathbb{k}^{\times}$. Hence $h \in (\mathcal{MF})_{\gamma}$. Arguing by induction on k , we obtain $H_{j,k} \in (\mathcal{MF})_{\gamma}$ for $k \leq d_j$. Thus

$$\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \langle h \rangle)} \subset (\mathcal{MF})_{\gamma} = (\mathcal{MF})_h \subset \text{alg}\langle \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \langle h \rangle)}, h, h^{-1} \rangle.$$

3. PROPERTIES OF THE ALGEBRA $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})}$

Suppose that \mathfrak{g} is semisimple. Let \mathfrak{t} be a Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} and Δ the root system of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$. By Corollary 2.2, the algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})}$ is Poisson commutative, and our goal is to prove that this algebra has a number of remarkable properties. Let \mathfrak{g}_γ be the root space corresponding to $\gamma \in \Delta$ and let $e_\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_\gamma$ be a nonzero vector. Then $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{t}^\perp = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \Delta} \mathfrak{g}_\gamma$.

Recall that $\{H_1, \dots, H_l\}$ is a set of homogeneous algebraically independent generators of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\deg H_j = d_j$. One has $\sum_{j=1}^l d_j = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$. The vector space decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$ provides the bi-homogeneous decomposition of each H_j :

$$H_j = \sum_{i=0}^{d_j} (H_j)_{(i, d_j-i)},$$

where $(H_j)_{(i, d_j-i)} \in \mathcal{S}^i(\mathfrak{t}) \otimes \mathcal{S}^{d_j-i}(\mathfrak{m}) \subset \mathcal{S}^{d_j}(\mathfrak{g})$. Recall that $\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})}$ is the algebra generated by

$$(3.1) \quad \{(H_j)_{(i, d_j-i)} \mid j = 1, \dots, l; i = 0, 1, \dots, d_j\}.$$

Since each H_j is \mathfrak{g} -invariant, all the bi-homogeneous components in (3.1) are \mathfrak{t} -invariant. Hence $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{t}}$. The total number of these functions is $\sum_{j=1}^l (d_j + 1) = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g}) + l$, but some of them are identically equal to zero. Indeed, $(H_j)_{(d_j-1, 1)} \in \mathcal{S}^{d_j-1}(\mathfrak{t}) \otimes \mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathfrak{m}^{\mathfrak{t}} = \{0\}$, hence $(H_j)_{(d_j-1, 1)} \equiv 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, l$. Therefore, the number of nonzero generators of \mathcal{Z} is at most $\mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$.

The bi-homogeneous component $(H_j)_{(d_j, 0)} \in \mathcal{S}^{d_j}(\mathfrak{t})$ is the restriction of H_j to $\mathfrak{t} \simeq \mathfrak{t}^*$. Therefore, by the Chevalley restriction theorem, the polynomials $(H_j)_{(d_j, 0)}$, $j = 1, \dots, l$, are the free generators of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{t})^W$, where W is the Weyl group of \mathfrak{t} . This means that having replaced $(H_1)_{(d_1, 0)}, \dots, (H_l)_{(d_l, 0)}$ with a basis of \mathfrak{t} and keeping intact all other bi-homogeneous components (generators of \mathcal{Z}), we obtain a larger subalgebra $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$, which is an algebraic extension of \mathcal{Z} . Furthermore, since $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{t}}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is still Poisson commutative.

Once again, we use the map φ_s defined in Section 1.1. By (2.4), if $\varphi_s(\gamma) \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$, then $d_{\varphi_s(\gamma)} \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g}^{\varphi_s(\gamma)}$; and by (2.1), we have

$$(3.2) \quad d_\gamma \varphi_s(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}) = \varphi_s(\mathfrak{g}^{\varphi_s(\gamma)}).$$

As before, we identify \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}^* .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $h \in \mathfrak{t}$ and $x \in \mathfrak{m}$ be such that $(h + \mathbb{k}x) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^* \neq \emptyset$. Then $d_{h+x} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathfrak{t} + d_h((\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F})_x)$. Moreover, if $h \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$, then $d_{h+x} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = d_h((\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F})_x) = d_x((\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F})_h)$.*

Proof. The assumption $(h \oplus \mathbb{k}x) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^* \neq \emptyset$ implies that $\Omega := \{s \in \mathbb{k}^\times \mid h + sx \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*\}$ is a nonempty open subset of \mathbb{k}^\times . Since Ω is infinite, we can strengthen (2.2) as

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{Z} = \text{alg}\langle \varphi_s(H) \mid H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}, s \in \Omega \rangle.$$

Combining this with (3.2), we obtain

$$d_{h+x}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathfrak{t} + \sum_{s \in \Omega} d_{h+x}\varphi_s(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}) = \mathfrak{t} + \sum_{s \in \Omega} \varphi_s(\mathfrak{g}^{h+sx}) = \mathfrak{t} + \sum_{s \in \Omega} \mathfrak{g}^{h+sx}.$$

Set $\Omega' = \Omega \sqcup \{0\}$ if $h \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$ and $\Omega' = \Omega$ otherwise. Then the equality $\sum_{s \in \Omega'} \mathfrak{g}^{h+sx} = d_h((\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F})_x)$ follows from [13, Lemma 1.3], see also the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [13, Sect. 2]. If $h \notin \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$, we are done. If $h \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$, then $\mathfrak{g}^h = \mathfrak{t}$ and $\mathfrak{t} + \sum_{s \in \Omega} \mathfrak{g}^{h+sx} = \sum_{s \in \Omega'} \mathfrak{g}^{h+sx}$.

Finally, we recall that $d_h((\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F})_x) = d_x((\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F})_h)$ for any $x, h \in \mathfrak{g}$ by [13, Eq. (2.3)]. \square

Theorem 3.2. For $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ as above, we have

- (i) $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z} = \text{tr.deg } \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ and both algebras \mathcal{Z} and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ are polynomial;
- (ii) both \mathcal{Z} and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ are complete on each regular orbit;
- (iii) $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is a maximal Poisson commutative subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Proof. (i) Since $\mathcal{Z} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is an algebraic extension, the first equality follows. Take a principal \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple $\{e, h, f\} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ such that $h \in \mathfrak{t}$ and $e, f \in \mathfrak{m}$. Note that any nonzero element of $\langle e, h, f \rangle$ is regular in $\mathfrak{g} \simeq \mathfrak{g}^*$. Pick a nonzero $x \in \langle e, f \rangle \subset \mathfrak{m}$ and consider the subspace

$$d_{h+x}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} := \{d_{h+x}F \mid F \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}\} \subset \mathfrak{g}.$$

Because $\varphi_s(h+x) = h+sx \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$ for all s , we have $d_{h+x}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = d_h((\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F})_x)$ by Lemma 3.1.

Using properties of $\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F}$ -subalgebras, see [12], [13, Cor. 1.6 & Lemma 2.1] and the fact that $(\mathbb{k}x \oplus \mathbb{k}h) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\text{sing}} = \{0\}$, we obtain $\dim d_{h+x}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$. It follows that $\text{tr.deg } \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \geq \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$, and since $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{A} \leq \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ for any Poisson commutative subalgebra, we actually get the equality. As both \mathcal{Z} and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ have at most $\mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ generators, they are polynomial. Therefore, \mathcal{Z} is freely generated by

$$\{(H_j)_{(i, d_j - i)} \mid 1 \leq j \leq l; i = 0, 1, \dots, d_j - 2, d_j\},$$

while $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is freely generated by a basis of \mathfrak{t} and the components $(H_j)_{(i, d_j - i)}$, where $1 \leq j \leq l$ and $i = 0, 1, \dots, d_j - 2$.

(ii) In part (i), we proved that $\dim d_{h+x}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$. Then [13, Lemma 1.2] implies that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is complete on the orbit $G(h+x)$. For an appropriate choice of $x \in \langle e, f \rangle$, we obtain a nilpotent element $h+x \in \langle e, h, f \rangle \simeq \mathfrak{sl}_2$. Hence $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is complete on the regular nilpotent orbit. Then a standard deformation argument, see [13, Cor. 2.6], shows that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is complete on every regular orbit. The same line of argument applies to \mathcal{Z} , since $d_{h+x}\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{t})^W = d_h\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{t}$ and $d_{h+x}\mathcal{Z} = d_{h+x}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$.

(iii) The maximality of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ will follow from the fact that $Y = \{\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}^* \mid \dim d_\gamma\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} < \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})\}$ is of codimension ≥ 2 in \mathfrak{g}^* (see below). We identify \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}^* via the Killing form and regard Y as a subvariety of \mathfrak{g} . Write $\gamma = h' + x'$ with $h' \in \mathfrak{t}$, $x' \in \mathfrak{m}$. If $\langle h', x' \rangle \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\text{sing}} = \{0\}$, then $\dim d_h((\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F})_x) = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ [12, Theorem 2.5] and $\dim d_\gamma\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ by Lemma 3.1.

Consider the map $\psi : \mathfrak{g}_{\text{sing}} \times \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ defined by $\psi(\xi, s) = \xi_{\mathfrak{t}} + s\xi_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and let \tilde{Y} be the closure of $\text{Im}(\psi)$. Set $\mathfrak{t}_{\text{sing}} := \mathfrak{t} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\text{sing}}$ and $\mathfrak{m}_{\text{sing}} := \mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\text{sing}}$. Then

$$Y \subset \tilde{Y} \cup (\mathfrak{t}_{\text{sing}} \times \mathfrak{m}) \cup (\mathfrak{t} \times \mathfrak{m}_{\text{sing}}).$$

- Since $\text{codim } \mathfrak{g}_{\text{sing}} = 3$, we have $\dim \tilde{Y} \leq \dim \mathfrak{g} - 2$.
- As $\mathfrak{m}_{\text{sing}}$ is conical and $\langle e, f \rangle \cap \mathfrak{m}_{\text{sing}} = \{0\}$, we have $\dim \mathfrak{m}_{\text{sing}} \leq \dim \mathfrak{m} - 2$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{t} \times \mathfrak{m}_{\text{sing}} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ does not contain divisors.
- We prove below that $\dim(Y \cap (\mathfrak{t}_{\text{sing}} \times \mathfrak{m})) \leq \dim \mathfrak{g} - 2$, which yields the required estimate of $\text{codim } Y$.

The subset $\mathfrak{t}_{\text{sing}} \subset \mathfrak{t}$ is the union of all reflection hyperplanes in \mathfrak{t} . That is, if

$$\mathcal{H}_{\gamma} = \{x \in \mathfrak{t} \mid (\gamma, x) = 0\},$$

then $\mathfrak{t}_{\text{sing}} = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Delta} \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}$. (Of course, $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma} = \mathcal{H}_{-\gamma}$.) Suppose that $h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\nu}$ is generic, i.e., $h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \setminus \bigcup_{\gamma \neq \pm\nu} \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}$. Then $h' \in \mathfrak{g}$ is subregular and

$$\mathfrak{g}^{h'} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{\nu} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\nu} = \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \oplus \langle e_{\nu}, h_{\nu}, e_{-\nu} \rangle \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2,$$

where $h_{\nu} = [e_{\nu}, e_{-\nu}]$. Note also that $\mathcal{H}_{\nu} = d_{h'}\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} \subset \mathfrak{t}$, cf. [14, Lemma 4.9]. Without loss of generality, we may assume that ν is a **simple** root with respect to some choice of $\Delta^+ \subset \Delta$. Let $\Pi \subset \Delta^+$ be the corresponding set of simple roots and $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{u}^+ \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-$. We may also assume that $e = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} c_{\alpha} e_{\alpha} \in \mathfrak{u}$ with $c_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{k}^{\times}$ and $f = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} e_{-\alpha} \in \mathfrak{u}^-$ for a principal \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple $\{e, h, f\}$ with $h \in \mathfrak{t}$, cf. [5, Theorem 4]. Then $f + \mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}$ by [5, Lemma 10]. In particular, $h' + sf \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}$ for any $s \in \mathbb{k}^{\times}$.

Lemma 3.3. *If $h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\nu}$ is generic, then $\mathfrak{g}^{h'+sf} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-$ for any $s \neq 0$.*

Proof. As is well known, $(\mathfrak{g}^{h'+sf})^{\perp} = [\mathfrak{g}, h' + sf]$. Hence it suffices to prove that $[\mathfrak{g}, h' + sf] \supset (\mathcal{H}_{\nu} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-)^{\perp} = \langle h_{\nu} \rangle \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-$.

Since $h' + sf \in \mathfrak{b}^-$ is regular in \mathfrak{g} , we have $\mathfrak{g}^{h'+sf} \subset \mathfrak{b}^-$. Hence $[\mathfrak{g}, h' + sf] \supset (\mathfrak{b}^-)^{\perp} = \mathfrak{u}^-$. Next, $[e_{\nu}, h' + sf] = [e_{\nu}, sf] = s[e_{\nu}, e_{-\nu}] = s \cdot h_{\nu} \in [\mathfrak{g}, h' + sf]$. \square

Now, set

$$\mathbb{V} := d_{h'}((\mathcal{MF})_f) = \sum_{s \neq 0} \mathfrak{g}^{h'+sf},$$

where the last equality stems from [13, Lemma 1.3]. On the one hand, $\mathbb{V} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-$ by the above lemma. On the other hand, $\dim \mathbb{V} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g}) - 1$ in view of [13, proof of Theorem 2.4]. Hence $\mathbb{V} = \mathcal{H}_{\nu} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-$.

The differentials $d_{h'+f}((H_j)_{(d_j, 0)}) = d_{h'}((H_j)_{(d_j, 0)}) = d_{h'}H_j$ with $1 \leq j \leq l$ are linearly dependent, hence $\dim d_{h'+f}\mathbb{Z} \leq \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g}) - 1$. Recall that $h' + sf \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}$ for any $s \in \mathbb{k}^{\times}$.

Combining (3.3) with (3.2), we obtain

$$\mathbb{V}_Z := d_{h'+f}\tilde{Z} \supset \sum_{s \neq 0} \varphi_s(\mathfrak{g}^{h'+sf}) = \varphi_s(\mathbb{V}) = \mathcal{H}_\nu \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-.$$

Thus $\mathbb{V}_Z = \mathcal{H}_\nu + \mathfrak{u}^-$. Next $d_{h'+f}\tilde{Z} \neq d_{h'+f}Z$, since $\mathfrak{t} \not\subset \mathbb{V}_Z$. We obtain $\dim d_{h'+f}\tilde{Z} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$, which means that $\dim d_\gamma\tilde{Z} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ on a dense open subset of $\mathcal{H}_\nu \times \mathfrak{m}$. Since $\nu \in \Delta$ is arbitrary, this implies that $\dim(Y \cap (\mathfrak{t}_{\text{sing}} \times \mathfrak{m})) \leq \dim \mathfrak{g} - 2$.

Thus, we have proved that $\dim Y \leq \dim \mathfrak{g} - 2$.

Since \tilde{Z} is generated by algebraically independent homogeneous polynomials and $\text{codim } Y \geq 2$, it follows from [11, Theorem 1.1] that \tilde{Z} is an algebraically closed subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ (i.e., if $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ is algebraic over the quotient field of \tilde{Z} , then $F \in \tilde{Z}$). An inclusion $\tilde{Z} \subset \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$, where $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}\} = 0$, is only possible if \mathcal{A} is an algebraic extension of \tilde{Z} , because $\text{tr.deg } \tilde{Z} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{A} \leq \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$. Therefore we must have $\tilde{Z} = \mathcal{A}$. \square

Remark 3.4. We know that $\tilde{Z} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{t}}$ and $\text{tr.deg } \tilde{Z} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$. If $h \in \mathfrak{t}_{\text{reg}}^*$, then these two properties are also satisfied for $(\mathcal{MF})_h$ [12]. One may say that \tilde{Z} resembles all such \mathcal{MF} -subalgebras. However, there is no choice of $h \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ involved in the construction of \tilde{Z} and $Z \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{N_G(\mathfrak{t})}$ unlike any of $(\mathcal{MF})_h$ with $h \in \mathfrak{t}_{\text{reg}}^*$.

Furthermore, by Lemma 3.1, we have $d_{h+x}\tilde{Z} = d_h((\mathcal{MF})_x) = d_x((\mathcal{MF})_h)$ for any $x \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $h \in \mathfrak{t}_{\text{reg}}^*$. It is tempting to further investigate this relationship.

Another intriguing task is to produce a quantisation of \tilde{Z} , i.e., a commutative subalgebra of the enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ such that its associated graded algebra is \tilde{Z} .

REFERENCES

- [1] O.I. BOGOYAVLENSKI. Integrable Euler equations associated with filtrations of Lie algebras, *Matem. Sbornik*, **121**, no. 2 (1983), 233–242 (Russian). English transl.: *Math. USSR-Sb.*, **49**:1 (1984), 229–238.
- [2] M. BRION. Invariants et covariants des groupes algébriques réductifs, Dans: “*Théorie des invariants et géométrie des variétés quotients*” (Travaux en cours, t. **61**), 83–168, Paris: Hermann, 2000.
- [3] B. FEIGIN, E. FRENKEL, and L. RYBNIKOV. Opers with irregular singularity and spectra of the shift of argument subalgebra, *Duke Math. J.*, **155** (2010), no. 2, 337–363.
- [4] I.M. GELFAND and I.S. ZAKHAREVICH. Webs, Lenard schemes, and the local geometry of bi-Hamiltonian Toda and Lax structures, *Selecta Math., New Ser.*, **6** (2000), 131–183.
- [5] B. KOSTANT. Lie group representations on polynomial rings, *Amer. J. Math.*, **85** (1963), 327–404.
- [6] I.V. MIKITYUK. Integrability of Euler equations connected with filtrations of semisimple Lie algebras, *Matem. Sb.*, **125**, no. 4 (1984), 539–546 (Russian). English transl.: *Math. USSR-Sb.*, **53**:2 (1986), 541–549.
- [7] A.S. MISHCHENKO and A.T. FOMENKO. Euler equation on finite-dimensional Lie groups, *Izv. AN SSSR. Ser. Matem.* **42**, no. 2 (1978), 396–415 (Russian). English transl.: *Math. USSR-Izv.* **12** (1978), 371–389.
- [8] A. MOLEV and O. YAKIMOVA. Quantisation and nilpotent limits of Mishchenko–Fomenko subalgebras, *Represent. Theory*, **23** (2019), 350–378.

- [9] A. PANASYUK. Veronese webs for bi-Hamiltonian structures of higher corank. *Poisson geometry* (Warszawa, 1998), 251–261, Banach Center Publ., **51**, Polish Acad. Sci. Inst. Math., Warszawa, 2000.
- [10] D. PANYUSHEV. The index of a Lie algebra, the centraliser of a nilpotent element, and the normaliser of the centraliser, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, **134**, Part 1 (2003), 41–59.
- [11] D. PANYUSHEV, A. PREMÉT and O. YAKIMOVA. On symmetric invariants of centralisers in reductive Lie algebras, *J. Algebra*, **313** (2007), 343–391.
- [12] D. PANYUSHEV and O. YAKIMOVA. The argument shift method and maximal commutative subalgebras of Poisson algebras, *Math. Res. Letters*, **15**, no. 2 (2008), 239–249.
- [13] D. PANYUSHEV and O. YAKIMOVA. Poisson commutative subalgebras and complete integrability on non-regular coadjoint orbits and flag varieties, *Math. Zeitschrift*, **295** (2020), 101–127.
- [14] D. PANYUSHEV and O. YAKIMOVA. Poisson commutative subalgebras of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ associated with involutions, *Intern. Math. Res. Notices*, to appear (doi), (arxiv:1809.00350).
- [15] Э.Б. ВИНБЕРГ. О некоторых коммутативных подалгебрах универсальной обертывающей алгебры, *Изв. АН СССР. Сер. Матем.* **54**, № 1 (1990), 3–25 (Russian). English translation: E.B. VINBERG. On certain commutative subalgebras of a universal enveloping algebra, *Math. USSR-Izv.* **36** (1991), 1–22.
- [16] O. YAKIMOVA. Symmetric invariants of \mathbb{Z}_2 -contractions and other semi-direct products, *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, (2017) 2017 (6): 1674–1716.

(D. Panyushev) INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS OF THE R.A.S., BOLSHOI KARETNYI PER. 19, MOSCOW 127051, RUSSIA

Email address: panyushev@iitp.ru

(O. Yakimova) INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, FRIEDRICH-SCHILLER-UNIVERSITÄT JENA, JENA, 07737, DEUTSCHLAND

Email address: oksana.yakimova@uni-jena.de