

THE PAINT GROUP TITS SATAKE THEORY OF HYPERBOLIC SYMMETRIC SPACES:

the DISTANCE FUNCTION, PAINT INVARIANTS and DISCRETE SUBGROUPS

UGO BRUZZO,^{a,b,c} PIETRO FRÉ^{d,e,†}, AND MARIO TRIGIANTE^{f,g}

^a SISSA (Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati), Via Bonomea 265, I-34136 Trieste, Italy

^b INFN (Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare), Sezione di Trieste

^c IGAP (Institute for Geometry and Physics), Trieste, Italy

^d Emeritus of Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Torino, Via P. Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy

^e Consultant of Additati&Partners Consulting s.r.l, Via Filippo Pacini 36, I-51100 Pistoia, Italy

^f Dipartimento DISAT, Politecnico di Torino, C.so Duca degli Abruzzi 24, I-10129 Torino, Italy

^g INFN, Sezione di Torino

E-mail: bruzzo@sisssa.it, pietro.fre@unito.it, mario.trigiante@polito.it

Abstract

The present paper, which is partially a review, but also contains several completely new results, aims at presenting, in a unified mathematical framework, a complex and articulated lore regarding non-compact symmetric spaces U/H where U is a simple Lie group, whose Lie algebra \mathbb{U} , is a non-compact real section of a complex simple Lie algebra and $H \subset U$ is the maximal compact Lie subgroup. All such manifolds are *Riemannian normal manifolds*, according to Alekseevsky's definition, in the sense that they are metrically equivalent to a solvable Lie group manifold $\mathcal{S}_{U/H}$. This identification provides a vision in which, on one side one can derive quite explicit and challenging formulae for the unique distance function between points of the manifold, on the other one, one is able to organize the entire set of the available manifolds in universality classes distinguished by their common Tits Satake submanifold and, correspondingly, by their non-compact rank. The members of the class are distinguished by their different Paint Groups, the latter notion having been established by two of the present authors and their collaborators in the years 2007-2009. In relation to the construction of neural networks, these mathematical structures offer unique possibilities of replacing *ad hoc activation functions* with the naturally defined non-linear operations that relate Lie algebras to Lie Groups and viceversa. The Paint Group invariants offer new tokens both to construct algorithms and inspect (hopefully to control) their working. A conspicuous part of the paper is devoted to the study and systematic construction of parabolic/elliptic discrete subgroups of the Lie groups $SO(r, r + q)$, in view of discretization and/or tessellations of the space to which data are to be mapped. Furthermore, it is shown how the ingredients of Special Kähler Geometry and the c-map, well known in the supergravity literature, provide a unified classification scheme of the relevant park of Tits Satake universality classes with non-compact rank $r \leq 4$.

[†] P.G. Fré acknowledges support by the Company *Additati&Partners Consulting s.r.l* during all the time of development of the present research.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Mathematical Theories nursed by Supergravity/Supersymmetry	3
1.2	Application perspectives of a newly reassembled mathematical theory and Data Science	4
1.3	The Supergravity nursed Mathematical Theory exposed in this paper	5
1.4	Historical outline of the already existing ingredients of the PGTS Theory	5
1.4.1	The solvable Lie group representation	5
1.4.2	Special Kähler Geometry	7
1.4.3	The c -map	8
1.4.4	The Tits Satake projection and the Paint Group.	8
1.5	The new ingredients of the PGTS theory introduced in this paper	14
1.5.1	An inspiring chinese box scheme for $r_{(n.c.)} \leq 4$	15
1.5.2	Three viewpoints on the Tits Satake clustering mechanism	15
1.5.3	An innovative group-theoretical scheme of discretization	15
1.5.4	Altogether	15
2	Special Kähler and Special Quaternionic Kähler Geometry	15
2.1	Special Kähler Geometry (of the local type)	16
2.1.1	Hodge–Kähler manifolds	16
2.1.2	Connection on the line bundle	16
2.1.3	Special Kähler Manifolds (of the local type)	17
2.1.4	The symmetric matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ in Special Kähler Geometry	19
2.2	Quaternionic Kähler, versus HyperKähler manifolds	20
2.2.1	The Quaternionic Kähler Geometry in the image of the c -map	23
2.2.2	The HyperKähler two-forms and the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ -connection	24
2.2.3	Homogeneous Symmetric Special Quaternionic Kähler manifolds	25
3	The Solvable Lie Algebra of U/H spaces, the Tits Satake Projection and the Paint Group	28
3.1	The maximally split case	29
3.1.1	Algorithm to find the norm \langle , \rangle_n on the solvable Lie Algebra $Solv_{U/H}$ of a symmetric space	30
3.1.2	The maximally split $SL(N, \mathbb{R})/SO(N)$ symmetric space	31
3.1.3	The solvable coordinates	31
3.2	The triangular embedding of the U/H symmetric spaces associated with other real sections	31
3.3	Tits Satake Projection and the Paint Group	32
3.3.1	The Tits Satake projection: an in depth algebraic glance	33
3.3.2	Tits Satake Universality Classes of Homogeneous Special Geometries	36
3.4	The symmetric spaces $SO(r, r + k)/SO(r) \times SO(r + k)$	37
3.5	The Lie algebras $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + 2s)$ and their solvable Lie subalgebra	40
4	Geodesics on the symmetric spaces U/H	43
4.1	Integrating the geodesic equation	43
4.2	The Geodesic Distance	47
4.2.1	Geodesic distance in view of the Tits Satake projection	49
4.3	A computational strategy	50
4.4	Summary for the distance formula	52
5	Paint Group structure of the square norm and of the distance function	53
5.1	The general distance formula applied to the $r = 1$ case	53
5.1.1	Paint invariant distance formula $r = 1$	54
5.1.2	The squared norm and Paint invariance for $r = 1$	55
5.1.3	The squared norm and subpaint invariance for $r = 1$	55
5.2	The general distance formula applied to the $r = 2$ case	56

5.2.1	The squared norm in the $r = 2$ case	57
6	Systematics of low-rank $\mathcal{M}^{[r,s]}$ manifolds, Clustering and Grassmanian Leaves	58
6.1	The manifolds $\text{SO}(r, r + 2s)/\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r + 2s)$ for small r	61
6.2	Clustering	62
6.2.1	A non-trivial hypothesis	62
6.2.2	Tits Satake grouping	63
6.3	The structure of Tits Satake fibres, from the Euler viewpoint	63
6.3.1	Euler parameterization in the non maximally split cases	64
6.4	The Tits Satake projection revisited in a different perspective	65
6.4.1	A normal subgroup of the full solvable group contains the TS fibres	66
6.4.2	Three complementary viewpoints on the structure of the full manifold U/H in terms of its Tits Satake submanifold	67
7	The two Kählerian building blocks, \mathbb{H}_2 and $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{H}_2$	68
7.1	The Poincaré-Lobachevsky Hyperbolic plane \mathbb{H}_2	68
7.1.1	The various descriptions of the $r = 1$ Tits Satake submanifold	68
7.1.2	Special algebraic features of the $r = 1$ case	69
7.1.3	The Tits Satake projection and the spinor representation	69
7.1.4	Illustration in the simplest case $r = 1, s = 1$	72
7.1.5	Squared norm and Grassmannian leaves	73
7.2	The building block $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{H}_2$	74
7.2.1	The Siegel upper plane and the Tits Satake projection in the $r=2$ case	76
7.2.2	Gamma matrices and the spinor algebra of $\text{SO}(2, 3)$	77
7.2.3	The map from the spinor to the vector representation	78
7.2.4	The pre-image in the symplectic group $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ of the solvable subgroup of $\text{SO}(2, 3)$	79
7.2.5	The Siegel upper plane	81
7.3	c-map construction of the Tits Satake manifold $\text{SO}(3, 4)/\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(4)$	82
8	A grid generating discrete subgroup of $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$	85
8.1	The case $r = 2$ and the discrete group $\Delta_{32,8}$	86
9	A family of subgroups of $\text{SO}(r, r + q, \mathbb{Z})$	92
10	The Laplacian Operator and the Harmonics on U/H	94
10.1	Laplace-Beltrami operators on a symmetric space	95
10.2	Harmonics on coset spaces	97
10.3	Differential operators on H harmonics	98
10.4	The eigenvalues of the Laplacian in general	99
10.5	The spectrum of the Laplacian on the symmetric space $\text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(N)$	100
10.6	The general construction of Harmonics	101
10.7	The irreps contributing to harmonic expansions on $\text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(N)$	102
10.7.1	Examples in the cases $N = 4$	103
10.8	Summarizing	103
11	Conclusions	104
A	Explicit matrix representation for the $J_{ij}^\pm, J_i^I, T_{ij}^\pm, T_i^I$ generators.	106

1 Introduction

The aim of the present paper is to present, in a hopefully self-contained and mathematically well-organized way, an entire compound of mathematical lore that was partially and extensively developed in the context of Supergravity theory and is here enriched with new strategic ingredients in the perspective of applying such structures to an upgrading and improvement of the mathematical framework of Neural Networks, not excluding other possible applications.

The unconventional setup of this article, its content and the motivations for its writing can be understood only if we start from the general considerations exposed in the following subsection.

Indeed the main ambition of, the present paper is that of providing a sound mathematical basis for **A New Paradigm in the construction of Geometric Neural Networks Architectures** that will be developed in a series of subsequent papers partially already *in fieri*. For this new paradigm we have devised the acronym **PGTS Theory** whose rationale will be clear after reading the next subsection.

1.1 Mathematical Theories nursed by Supergravity/Supersymmetry

In the context of the bimillenary fruitful two-way interaction between Mathematics and Physics, the last forty years witnessed a particularly fertile and creative declination of such a general paradigm constituted by the intense and rich cross-fertilization of Supergravity theory with both Algebra and Geometry, within the multifaceted incarnations and aspects of the latter. The inventory of examples is very long but we confine ourselves to a short illustrative list including, in particular, those items that are more relevant to the issues and goals of the present paper:

- 1) The discovery under the name of *Cartan Integrable Systems* [1, 2] of the supersymmetric extension of Sullivan's bosonic *Free Differential Algebras* [3],
- 2) The discovery and formalization of *Special Kähler Geometry* [4–10] in its two versions, *local* and *rigid*.
- 3) The *Solvable Group* representation of *non-compact homogeneous spaces* [11], [12–16].
- 4) The discovery of the *c-map* from *Special Kähler Manifolds* to *Quaternionic Kähler manifolds*, and the discovery of the *c^{*}-map* from *Special Kähler Manifolds* to *Pseudo Quaternionic Kähler manifolds* [17–22].
- 5) The discovery of the concepts of *Paint and subPaint Groups*, the formalization of the *Tits Satake projection* and of its commutativity with the *c-map* [18, 23, 24].
- 6) *Mirror Symmetry* in the Geometry of Calabi-Yau moduli spaces [25–37]
- 7) The discovery of *Englert equation* that generalizes to 7-dimensions the time-honoured *Beltrami equation* operating instead in 3-dimensions [38–40].
- 8) The *T-tensor* and the general *embedding tensor* formulation of gauging of extended supergravities that, once extracted from the supergravity context, is a geometrical theory per se [41], [42], [43], [44] (see [45], [46] for reviews).
- 9) The cross influence on the theory of *restricted holonomy manifolds* as in particular G_2 -manifolds and $Spin(7)$ -manifolds [47, 48].

We might go on, but we stop here, in order to put a question and formulate an answer. Why has this very special relationship between Supersymmetry/Supergravity and Mathematics proven to be much more creative and productive than the general cross-relation between Physics and Mathematics? The answer is very simple: because, to a large extent, here we do not observe a cross-link between Physics and Mathematics rather we enucleate internal cross-links between different chapters of Mathematics and/or different structural grouping of known and/or newly discovered mathematical objects. Supergravity and supersymmetric field theories were originally created as physical theories,

yet their basic principle was a mathematical one, not claimed by experiments, namely the realization of Lagrangian field theories that should incorporate as an infinitesimal invariance (local or global) supersymmetry, *i.e.* a **super Lie algebra**. Such constraint proved to be extremely stringent and at the same time profoundly creative. In the course of its almost fifty year long history, supergravity lagrangian field theory acted as an intermediate step able to connect structures that pertain to pure mathematics, unveiling hidden connections between them, that are also purely mathematical, yet without supersymmetry could not be observed or, to put it better, one was not guided to observe and utilize them as organizing items. We can name this general phenomenon, emerging in all the nine examples mentioned above and also in all the others that we omitted, **the precognition of supersymmetry**.

At the end of the day, we can get rid of the supergravity lagrangians or of the supersymmetric gauge theory lagrangians that were the occasion to discover new mathematical structures or new relations and organization patterns of known mathematical structures and consider the latter for their own sake inside pure mathematics.

Mathematicians are accustomed to the organization of their discipline into a well-established and solid hierarchy that, as any other organization pattern, has its own principles, basic definitions and logical order, also descending from the course of historical development. **The precognition of supersymmetry**, which indirectly stems from a **higher symmetry principle**, provides structural viewpoints that organize objects pertaining to different classical mathematical families into unsuspected and, at first sight bizarre, yet well-defined, chains based on a different logic. The c -map, that is one of our main concerns in the present paper, will be recognized by the reader to be an outstanding example of what we just said.

1.2 Application perspectives of a newly reassembled mathematical theory and Data Science

Summarizing, there is a rich set of mathematical structures connected with supergravity that constitute chapters of pure mathematics, partially preexisting supergravity, partially newly developed in the context of supergravity, which are worth analysing and grouping according to the mathematical logic suggested by *the precognition of supersymmetry*, rather than dismembered according to classical mathematical ordering. The organization of such structures according to the *the precognition of supersymmetry* builds up a systematic theory of its own which happens to be solid, rich, useful and liable to further developments within its own scope. Furthermore, by cutting the historical relation between such theory and its supergravity mother, together with the physics-inspired applications that the latter has suggested, the aforementioned theory *opens up to applications in other scientific fields* besides physics. One application field that will be preeminent in our minds while exposing our scheme and results is located in **Data Science**, with particular reference to the developments put forward by the authors of [49–51], which we might collectively describe as **Hyperbolic Learning**. Yet, although extremely interesting, those developments are not the primary reasons for considering the **supergravity nursed mathematical theory** we are going to expose as relevant to Data Science. The fundamental reason is a deeper one, and makes *Hyperbolic Learning* just a **confirmation** of the need to adopt **a different scheme** in the construction of **Geometric Neural Networks**, rather than a primary motivation. The main reason is the discomfort of any mathematically minded scientist with the use of the so-called **point-wise activation functions** (*sigmoid, arc tangent, Heaveside function, etc.*) on individual components of a pretended vector, which constitutes a *mathematical heresy* and makes the whole architecture of neural networks dependent on the choice of arbitrarily chosen bases, this happening repeatedly in every map from one layer to the next. Such discomfort has emerged also in the community of Data Scientists and the vision of a truly geometrical reformulation of neural networks has been advanced by several authors [52–58]. In particular, according to such visions, a sound *Geometrical Deep Learning* should be based on the **principle of covariance, or equivariance**, with respect to some group of symmetry, of the transformations from one layer to the next, typically thought of as **convolutions**. Consequently, in view of the need for non-linear maps, the layers cannot be thought of as vector spaces; rather, they must be characterized as vector bundles or *"spaces of functions"* on differentiable manifolds \mathcal{M}_n . At the same time the very core of learning algorithms, the **loss-function**, requires the **notion of distance** between the points representing data; this brings us to those differentiable manifolds of negative curvature (Hyperbolic Spaces) that admit uniquely

defined geodesics connecting any two points, providing a notion of distance in terms of length of such geodesic arcs.

The future applications of the theory we are discussing here are therefore to be looked for in all those areas of research of whatever Science where the same geometrical needs as in Data Science are preminent, the distance function being the first on the priority list.

1.3 The Supergravity nursed Mathematical Theory exposed in this paper

The theory we aim to present here in a systematic and logically structured way is tentatively described by this article title. For convenience we might shorten it into the acronym **PGTS Theory**¹ of *Hyperbolic Homogeneous Spaces*. It is that one which emerges from a unified fusion of items 2),3),4),5) of the previous list with the addition of new ingredients introduced in this article. Purified of the original supergravity concepts that favoured the discovery and the framing of its various components, the lore presented here acquires a full mathematical stature of its own. We deem it worth being considered for future developments in a purely mathematical perspective and for the possible establishment of new theorems and proofs. This viewpoint was already assumed by one of the present authors in his book [59], written some years ago, which contains the formulation in the that perspective of several of the ingredients which are here utilized and reframed in a new hopefully tighter and better shaped logical ordering. Indeed the new ingredients that we introduce into the texture provide a new quality and a new overall logical ordering of all the items. We describe such new elements below, after summarizing, within a historical perspective, the older elements of the new reconstruction. It is appropriate to stress that the systematic theory assembled and described in this article is especially liable for perspective applications to Data Science, as we just advocated above, but not only there. Indeed, possibly also in connection with the Data Science applications, yet independently interesting in its own mathematical sake, there is an ensuing **new constructive strategy** for the determination of discrete subgroups of the non-compact isometry groups that include infinite solvable subgroups, substituting abelian lattices of Euclidean or Minkowskian spaces. An example of this mechanism is provided in this paper by the explicit construction of a subgroup of $Sp(4, \mathbb{Z})$, up to our knowledge previously unknown in the mathematical literature, which is of the type described above. In the subsequent section 9, we were able to generalize in a fully systematic form the first example to all the symmetric spaces $SO(p, q)/SO(p) \times SO(q)$. Such constructions might be useful in the discretization of manifolds both for Data Science and for Lattice Quantum Field Theory. Tessellation schemes and Tessellation Coxeter Group constructions can take advantage of the systematic theory here exposed, and similarly, we expect applications in Markov Diffusion Processes both in the continuum and on discretized spaces and graphs.

1.4 Historical outline of the already existing ingredients of the PGTS Theory

In this subsection we preliminarily present in a more or less extended manner, depending on the case, the various concepts and already existing mathematical structures that enter, as a building blocks, the new theoretical setup we plan to advocate in the next subsection of this introduction. All the mathematical ingredients mentioned in the present subsection have been initiated or substantially developed within supergravity theory. In our exposition of the needed conceptual mathematical structures, we briefly sketch their history and the supergravity motivations for their development.

1.4.1 The solvable Lie group representation

The first and most basic ingredient of the whole theory is given by following

Theorem 1.1 *Every non-compact symmetric space U/H where U is a finite-dimensional simple Lie group whose Lie algebra \mathbb{U} is a real section \mathbb{G}_R , different from the unique maximally compact one, of any of the simple complex*

¹Paint Group Tits Satake

Lie algebras $\mathfrak{a}_\ell, \mathfrak{b}_\ell, \mathfrak{c}_\ell, \mathfrak{d}_\ell, \mathfrak{f}_4, \mathfrak{g}_2, \mathfrak{e}_{6,7,8}$ and $H \subset U$ is its maximal compact subgroup (with Lie algebra \mathfrak{H}), is metrically equivalent to a solvable group manifold:

$$\mathcal{S}_{U/H} \sim \exp[\text{Solv}(U/H)] \quad (1.1)$$

whose Lie algebra $\text{Solv}(U/H) \subset \mathbb{U}$ is an appropriate subalgebra of the full isometry algebra \mathbb{U} .

Metrically equivalent means that:

1. As differentiable manifolds the coset manifold U/H and the group manifold $\mathcal{S}_{U/H}$ are diffeomorphic.
2. The U invariant metric g on U/H , which is unique up to an overall constant, coincides with the metric on $\mathcal{S}_{U/H}$ obtained through left transport to any point of $\mathcal{S}_{U/H}$ of a suitable positive definite, symmetric quadratic form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ defined on $\text{Solv}(U/H)$ (which is the tangent space to the Identity $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{S}_{U/H}$)

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g : \text{Solv}(U/H) \otimes \text{Solv}(U/H) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (1.2)$$

satisfying

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_g = \langle Y, X \rangle_g, \quad \langle X, X \rangle_g \geq 0, \quad \langle X, X \rangle_g = 0 \Rightarrow X = 0 \quad \text{for all } X, Y \in \text{Solv}(U/H).$$

The proof of the above theorem is constructive and we shall provide it later, by showing how $\text{Solv}(U/H)$ is explicitly built, starting from the root system of the corresponding complex Lie algebra \mathbb{G} and the Cartan-Weyl basis of generators for the latter.

What is important to note is that one might invert the terms of the argument and consider instead the notion of **normed solvable Lie algebras**

Definition 1.1 A *normed solvable Lie algebra* is a pair $(\text{Solv}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_n)$ where Solv is a finite-dimensional Lie solvable algebra and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_n$ is a positive definite non degenerate quadratic form on it: which is requested to be invariant with respect to the adjoint action of Solv :

$$\forall X, Y, Z \in \text{Solv} \quad : \quad \langle [Z, X], Y \rangle_n + \langle X, [Z, Y] \rangle_n = 0 \quad (1.3)$$

$$\text{Solv} \otimes \text{Solv} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (1.4)$$

satisfying

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_n = \langle Y, X \rangle_n, \quad \langle X, X \rangle_n \geq 0, \quad \langle X, X \rangle_n = 0 \Rightarrow X = 0 \quad \text{for all } X, Y \in \text{Solv}$$

which is requested to be invariant with respect to the adjoint action of Solv :

$$\langle [Z, X], Y \rangle_n + \langle X, [Z, Y] \rangle_n = 0 \quad \text{for all } X, Y, Z \in \text{Solv}.$$

The solvable group manifold $\mathcal{S} = \exp[\text{Solv}]$ inherits from the invariant quadratic form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_n$ defined on its Lie algebra a Riemannian metric (the left transport of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_n$ from the identity to any other point), for which \mathcal{S} is a group of isometries.

In 1975 Alekseevsky considered the problem of constructing all quaternionic Kähler manifolds with a transitive solvable group of isometries [60] and obtained the following result.

Definition 1.2 A Riemannian manifold (M, g) is a **normal Riemannian homogeneous space** if it admits a solvable Lie group \mathcal{S}_M of isometries that acts on M freely and transitively.

Proposition 1.1 [60] There is a one-to-one correspondence between normed solvable Lie algebras (up to isomorphism) and normal Riemannian homogeneous spaces (up to isometry).

Proof. Given a normed solvable Lie algebra $Solv$, the corresponding normal Riemannian homogeneous space is the simply connected, connected Lie group $\exp[Solv]$ equipped with the Riemannian metric given by the left transport of the non-degenerate symmetric form on $Solv$. Vice versa, given a normal Riemannian homogeneous space \mathcal{M} with solvable isometry group $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{M}}$, one establishes a diffeomorphism $f: \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ by choosing a point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and letting $f(g) = gp$. The normed solvable Lie algebra $Solv$ is the Lie algebra of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{M}}$ equipped with the symmetric form given by the pullback Riemannian metric evaluated at the identity. Different choices of p produce isomorphic normed solvable Lie algebras.

Using definition 1.2, theorem 1.1 can be reformulated by saying that all non-compact symmetric spaces U/H are **normal homogeneous spaces**, the converse however is not true. There are examples of normal homogeneous spaces that are not symmetric spaces. In the case of non-compact symmetric spaces U/H , the solvable group $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is defined by the Iwasawa decomposition $U = \mathcal{S}_{U/H} \cdot H$, so that

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{U}{H} \simeq \mathcal{S}_{U/H}. \quad (1.5)$$

Although Theorem 1.1 was more or less present in the mathematical literature in implicit form, its constructive proof which provided a tool of great value for explicit constructions of Supergravity Lagrangians, classification of their gaugings, analysis of cosmic billiards, black hole solutions and scalar potentials came in the years 1997-2004 through the work of supergravity experts in the already quoted papers [13–15].

1.4.2 Special Kähler Geometry

The second fundamental pre-existing ingredient of the *PGTS theory* is **Special Kähler Geometry**. The discovery of this class of complex manifolds and the ample development of their geometry in its two versions, local and rigid, is undebatably due to Supergravity/Supersymmetry authors, much before that either one of the latter attracted the attention of mathematicians. Furthermore neither one of these Kähler geometries might be regarded as a physicists' construction that, at a later stage, was reformulated in mathematical terms by mathematicians. Actually, the precise mathematical formulation and the very mathematical definition of both types of Special Kähler geometry was worked out and published by authors of the Theoretical Physics community, who also established the nomenclature for this chapter of complex differential geometry and the precise relations between the two classes of manifolds, the local and rigid ones. Such relation is a limiting procedure, somewhat reminiscent of group contraction, from the local case to the rigid one. Historically the notion of *local Special Kähler Geometry*, formulated in *special coordinates* was introduced in 1984 by B. de Wit et al. in [61, 62]. More or less at the same time, in 1984, what shortly later became known as *rigid Special Kähler Geometry* was derived from the superspace approach to supersymmetric lagrangian field theories in [63, 64]. The precise mathematical definition of (*local*) *Special Kähler Geometry* was introduced in 1990 in two formulations that were later proved to be equivalent. On one side Strominger in [5], linked (*local*) *Special Kähler Geometry* to the theory of complex structure and Kähler structure deformations of Calabi-Yau threefolds and formulated its definition in terms of a flat symplectic bundle whose sections are related to the periods of the unique $\Omega^{(3,0)}$ -form on the basis of homology 3-cycles. In this way, however, he overlooked the matter of fact that Homogeneous Special Kähler Manifolds (of the local type) do exist which cannot be identified with moduli spaces of any Calabi-Yau threefold. On the other side, in [6] Castellani, D'Auria and Ferrara based the definition of (*local*) *Special Kähler Geometry* on a special identity satisfied by the Riemann tensor of the corresponding Kähler metric which follows from $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry when the complex coordinates of the manifold are identified with the scalar fields of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ vector multiplets coupled to supergravity. The two mathematical definitions, both motivated by the use of such manifolds in the context of supersymmetric field theories, are formulated in a mathematical intrinsic language, and they were almost immediately shown to be equivalent/ Indeed both definitions can be summarized by means of a set of **formal Picard Fuchs equations** disconnected from specific varieties and their deformations (for an early review see the appropriate chapters of [65]). In 1994 the famous paper on the non-perturbative structure of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Supersymmetric Gauge Theories by Seiberg-Witten [66] brought attention to the underlying *Special Kähler*

Geometry of rigid type, that was extensively used by the authors. For the rigid case, there is also a connection with the deformation theory of algebraic variety complex structures and with the corresponding Picard-Fuchs equations. The relevant varieties, in this case, are Riemann surfaces rather than Calabi-Yau threefolds, yet, just as in the local case, the mathematical definition of rigid Special Kähler Geometry is autonomous, precise and fully general. In the 1996 paper [9], which is also rather famous for the number of citations, the mathematical definitions of both *Special Kähler geometries* was clearly spelled out and the contraction procedure, named *rigid limit* from the first to the second was also sketched. The other 1996 paper [67] was devoted to the issue of Picard Fuchs equations of rigid special geometry applied to the case of suitably chosen Riemann surfaces, in particular hyperelliptic. In the later 1998 paper [68] the issue of deriving the rigid limit from the degeneration to Riemann surfaces of a class of Calabi-Yau threefolds that have a fibred-structure was extensively investigated.

In the present context the relevant type of Special Kähler Geometry is the local one² and the formulation of its definition, that we present in section 2.1, was first published in [69] and then included in the already quoted complete exposition of matter-coupled $\mathcal{N} = 2, D = 4$ supergravity theory in [9]. The exposition of section 2.1 closely follows that given in the book [59].

The set of Special Kähler Manifolds (of local type) is vast and it contains manifolds with no continuous isometries, as the already mentioned moduli spaces of *Kähler structure deformations* (i.e. $(1, 1)$ Dolbeault cohomology classes) and of *Complex structure deformations* (i.e. $(2, 1)$ Dolbeault cohomology classes) of *smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds* but also **homogeneous spaces** including **symmetric spaces**. The classification of **homogeneous special geometries** was achieved in [7, 70–73].

1.4.3 The c -map

The third pre-existing ingredient which plays a relevant role in the new and enriched setup presented in this article, just as it already did in the systematics of \mathcal{N} -extended and matter-coupled supergravity models and in their filiations, is the **c -map**. It consists of a quite non-trivial and universal construction that allows to build a quaternionic Kähler manifold \mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} of real dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} = 4n + 4$ starting from any Special Kähler manifold \mathcal{SK}_n of complex dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{SK}_n = n$. The embryo of the c -map construction is due to Cecotti in [17], followed by the seminal paper [74] by Ferrara and Sabharwal. It was utilized and developed to a large extent by de Wit, Van Proeyen, Vanderseypen, Alekseevsky and Cortés in their, in depth, classification study of Homogeneous Special Geometries, already quoted above [7, 70–73]. Further perfected in a more mathematical phrasing in [18] and [75], c -map received its final, general formulation by Fré, Sorin and Trigiante in [76]. In particular in [76] the crucial general expression was derived of the $SU(2)$ -connection of the Quaternionic Kähler Manifolds in terms of generic Special Kähler data. This final general form of the c -map construction was reported in [59] and we present it here in section 2.2.1.

1.4.4 The Tits Satake projection and the Paint Group.

The fourth preexisting ingredient of PGTS Theory, which is inextricably intertwined with the previous three and, once combined with the new elements to be described below, constitutes the very backbone of the whole theory, is the Tits Satake projection with the associated notion of Paint Group, introduced for the first time in [23] and then fully formalized in [18]. Because of the central relevance, in the present context, of this two-component ingredient, we

²In the supergravity literature the current use is that when Special Kähler Geometry is mentioned without further qualifiers one means that of local type. If one wants to refer to rigid Special Kähler Geometry then one adds the qualifier rigid. Such convention we adopt also in this paper. In order to avoid confusions it is useful to stress that in the mathematical literature developed after the two versions of Special Kähler Geometries had been discovered in the supergravity community, the current use is to name Special Kähler Geometry without qualifier the rigid one and to name Projective Kähler Geometry the local one. Irrespectively from the name local versus rigid, that it is reminiscent of the supersymmetry origin of both (local or rigid) and irrespectively of the priority in the discovery of these mathematical structures it remains the intrinsic fact that the rigid case is a limiting case of the local one, where the fundamental flat symplectic bundle providing the definition, degenerates, via an Inonu Wigner contraction of the structural group, in the same way as the Lorentz group contracts to the Galilei group, or the de-Sitter group contracts to the Poincaré one.

anticipate a shortened presentation of its definition and we also briefly summarize the historical developments that led to its conceptualization.

One of the monumental achievements of Élie Cartan was the classification of all Riemannian symmetric spaces which has the classification of real sections of complex simple Lie algebras as prerequisite. Each complex simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} corresponds to a root system $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}$ which is codified and fully determined by a corresponding Dynkin diagram encoding the structure of the Cartan matrix. As it is well known, the root system can be partitioned in two disjoint subsets $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}} = \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^+ \cup \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^-$ of equal cardinality, containing respectively the positive roots and their negatives. This being established, the convenient starting point for all discussions of real sections is provided by the introduction of the Cartan-Weyl basis of generators:

$$T_A = \left\{ \underbrace{H_i}_{\text{Cartan generators}}, \underbrace{E^\alpha}_{\alpha \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^+}, \underbrace{E^{-\beta}}_{\beta \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^+} \right\} ; \quad i = 1, \dots, r \quad (1.6)$$

where r is the rank of \mathfrak{g} and hence the dimension of the chosen Cartan subalgebra $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ (they are all equivalent up to conjugation). Furthermore one can normalize the Cartan generators H_i in such a way that the Killing Cartan metric restricted to \mathcal{H} is

$$\kappa(H_i, H_j) = \delta_{ij} = \text{Kronecker delta} \quad (1.7)$$

Correspondingly the elements of the root system become real valued vectors in \mathbb{R}^r :

$$\alpha(H_i) = \alpha^i \in \mathbb{R} \quad (1.8)$$

In the so defined Cartan-Weyl basis, the commutation relations of the complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} which, as a vector space, is the complex span of T_A :

$$\mathfrak{g} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}(T_A) \quad (1.9)$$

become

$$\begin{aligned} [H_i, H_j] &= 0 , \\ [H_i, E^\alpha] &= \alpha_i E^\alpha , \\ [E^\alpha, E^\beta] &= N(\alpha, \beta) E^{\alpha+\beta} \quad \text{if } (\alpha + \beta) \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}} \quad ; \quad N(\alpha, \beta) = \pm 1 \\ [E^\alpha, E^\beta] &= 0 \quad \text{if } (\alpha + \beta) \notin \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ [E^\alpha, E^{-\alpha}] &= 2\alpha \cdot \mathcal{H} , \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

A basic theorem whose proof is very simple by direct construction (see for instance [77]) is the following

Theorem 1.2 *For all finite dimensional complex simple Lie algebras \mathfrak{g} , the Cartan Weyl generators (1.6) can be realized, in the fundamental defining representation and in all the other linear representations, in such a way that all the T_A are real valued matrices and moreover the Cartan generators H_i are diagonal matrices, the step operators E^α for $\alpha > 0$ are strictly upper triangular matrices and the step operators $E^{-\alpha} = (E^\alpha)^T$ are strictly lower triangular matrices obtained as the transposed of the corresponding matrices E^α .*

Relying on the basis T_A with the properties claimed in theorem 1.2 it is immediate to see that there exists two universal real sections of any complex simple Lie algebra that are the following ones:

a) The maximally split real section $\mathbb{G}_{\max} \subset \mathfrak{g}$. This is defined by assuming that in the linear combinations $c^A T_A$ the allowed coefficients c^A are all real. In any linear representation of \mathbb{G}_{\max} the matrices representing

$$T_A \equiv \{H_i, E^\alpha, E^{-\alpha}\} \quad (1.11)$$

are all *real*. From the representations of \mathbb{G}_{\max} , by taking linear combinations of the generators with complex coefficients one obtains all the linear representations of the complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} .

b) The maximally compact real section \mathbb{G}_{comp} . This real section, whose exponentiation produces a compact Lie group, is obtained by allowing linear combinations with real coefficients of the following set of generators:

$$T_A^c \equiv \{i H_i, i(E^\alpha + E^{-\alpha}), (E^\alpha - E^{-\alpha})\} \quad (1.12)$$

In all linear representations of \mathbb{G}_{comp} the matrices representing the generators T_A^c are *anti-hermitian*.

All other possible real sections of the complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} are obtained by studying the available Cartan involutions of the maximally compact real section \mathbb{G}_{comp} . So consider:

Definition 1.3 *Let:*

$$\theta : \mathbb{G}_{\text{comp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_{\text{comp}} \quad (1.13)$$

be a linear automorphism of the compact Lie algebra \mathbb{G}_{comp} . By definition we have:

$$\forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R} \quad , \quad \forall \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{G}_{\text{comp}} \quad : \quad \begin{cases} \theta(\alpha \mathbf{X} + \beta \mathbf{Y}) = \alpha \theta(\mathbf{X}) + \beta \theta(\mathbf{Y}) \\ \theta([\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}]) = [\theta(\mathbf{X}), \theta(\mathbf{Y})] \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$

If $\theta^2 = \text{Id}$ then θ is named a Cartan involution of the Lie algebra \mathbb{G}_{comp} .

For any Cartan involution θ the possible eigenvalues are ± 1 . This allows us to split the entire Lie algebra \mathbb{G}_{comp} in two subspaces corresponding to the eigenvalues 1 and -1 , respectively:

$$\mathbb{G}_{\text{comp}} = \mathbb{H}_\theta \oplus \mathbb{P}_\theta \quad (1.15)$$

One immediately realizes that:

$$[\mathbb{H}_\theta, \mathbb{H}_\theta] \subset \mathbb{H}_\theta \quad ; \quad [\mathbb{H}_\theta, \mathbb{P}_\theta] \subset \mathbb{P}_\theta \quad ; \quad [\mathbb{P}_\theta, \mathbb{P}_\theta] \subset \mathbb{H}_\theta \quad (1.16)$$

The first of eq.s (1.16) tells us that \mathbb{H}_θ is a subalgebra, the second states that the decomposition (1.15) is reductive, the third shows that it is not only reductive but also symmetric. Hence any Cartan involution singles out a compact coset manifold which is a symmetric Riemannian space.

$$\mathfrak{M}_\theta^c = \frac{\mathbb{G}_c}{\mathbb{H}_\theta} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbb{H}_\theta \equiv \exp[\mathbb{H}_\theta] \quad ; \quad \mathbb{G}_c \equiv \exp[\mathbb{G}_{\text{comp}}] \quad (1.17)$$

The structure 1.16 has also another important consequence. If we define the vector space:

$$\mathbb{G}_\theta = \mathbb{H}_\theta \oplus \mathbb{K}_\theta \quad ; \quad \mathbb{K}_\theta \equiv i\mathbb{P}_\theta \quad (1.18)$$

we see that \mathbb{G}_θ is closed under the Lie bracket and hence it is a Lie algebra. It is some real section of the complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} from which we started and we can consider the new, generally non compact, symmetric space:

$$\mathcal{M}_\theta = \frac{\mathbb{G}_\theta}{\mathbb{H}_\theta} \quad ; \quad \mathbb{H}_\theta \equiv \exp[\mathbb{H}_\theta] \quad ; \quad \mathbb{G}_\theta \equiv \exp[\mathbb{G}_\theta] \quad (1.19)$$

An important theorem for which we refer the reader to classical textbooks [78–80]³ states that, up to isomorphism, all real sections $\mathbb{G}_R \subset \mathfrak{g}$ of a simple complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} are obtained in this way as a \mathbb{G}_θ for a convenient choice of

³The proof is also summarized in appendix B of [81]

the Cartan involution θ . Furthermore as part of the same theorem one has that θ can always be chosen in such a way that it maps the compact Cartan subalgebra into itself:

$$\theta : \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_c \quad (1.20)$$

This short discussion reveals that the classification of real sections of a complex Lie Algebra \mathfrak{g} is in one-to-one correspondence with the classification of symmetric spaces, the complexification of whose Lie algebra of isometries is \mathfrak{g} .

Let us now consider the action of the Cartan involution θ on the Cartan subalgebra:

$$\mathcal{H}_c \equiv \text{span}\{iH_j\} \quad (1.21)$$

of the maximal compact section \mathbb{G}_{comp} . The subspace of \mathcal{H}_c belonging to the eigenspace of θ corresponding to eigenvalue 1 is, according to eq.(1.15), part of the subalgebra $\mathbb{H}_\theta = \mathbb{H}_c$, while the subspace of \mathcal{H}_c belonging to the eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue -1 is, according once again to eq. (1.15), part of the subspace \mathbb{P} . It follows that the Cartan subalgebra of the real section \mathbb{G}_θ can be split in two subalgebras as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{G}_\theta \supset \underbrace{\mathcal{H}_\theta}_{\text{CSA of } \mathbb{G}_\theta} &= \mathcal{H}_\theta^{\text{comp}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_\theta^{\text{n.c.}} \\ \mathcal{H}_\theta^{\text{comp}} &\equiv \mathcal{H}_c \cap \mathbb{H}_\theta \\ \mathcal{H}_\theta^{\text{n.c.}} &= i\mathcal{H}_c \cap \mathbb{P}_\theta \subset \mathbb{K}_\theta \end{aligned} \quad (1.22)$$

Since, as stated by the quoted theorems, any real section \mathbb{G}_R of a complex \mathfrak{g} is isomorphic to \mathbb{G}_θ for a suitable θ , it follows that the splitting of the Cartan subalgebra of any \mathbb{G}_R , into a compact and non-compact subalgebra has an intrinsic meaning. Hence for every real section \mathbb{G}_R we can define the compact and non-compact rank as follows:

$$r_{\text{n.c.}} = \dim \mathcal{H}_\theta^{\text{n.c.}} \leq r \quad ; \quad r_c = \dim \mathcal{H}_\theta^{\text{comp}} = r - r_{\text{n.c.}} \quad (1.23)$$

Having clarified the relation between real sections \mathbb{G}_R of a complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , Cartan involutions θ and non-compact Riemannian symmetric spaces $\frac{\mathbb{G}_\theta}{\mathbb{H}_\theta}$, let us then reconsider a symmetric coset manifold:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}_R} = \frac{\mathbb{G}_R}{\mathbb{H}_c} \quad (1.24)$$

where \mathbb{G}_R is a simple Lie group and $\mathbb{H}_c \subset \mathbb{G}_R$ is its maximal compact subgroup. The Lie algebra \mathbb{H}_c of the denominator \mathbb{H}_c is the maximal compact subalgebra $\mathbb{H}_c \subset \mathbb{G}_R$. Denoting, as usual, by \mathbb{K} the orthogonal complement of \mathbb{H}_c in \mathbb{G}_R :

$$\mathbb{G}_R = \mathbb{H}_c \oplus \mathbb{K} \quad (1.25)$$

we define **rank of the coset** $\mathbb{G}_R/\mathbb{H}_c$ the dimension of the non-compact Cartan subalgebra:

$$\text{rank}(\mathbb{G}_R/\mathbb{H}_c) = r_{\text{nc}} \equiv \dim \mathcal{H}^{\text{n.c.}} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{H}^{\text{n.c.}} \equiv \text{CSA}_{\mathbb{G}_R} \cap \mathbb{K} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{H}^{\text{comp}} \equiv \text{CSA}_{\mathbb{G}_R} \cap \mathbb{H}_c \quad (1.26)$$

Next, choosing a basis of \mathcal{H}_c aligned with the simple roots:

$$\mathcal{H}_c = \text{span}\{iH_{\alpha_i}\} \quad (1.27)$$

we see that by duality of vector spaces the action of the Cartan involution θ is transferred from the Cartan subalgebra to the simple roots α_i and hence to the entire root lattice. As a consequence we can introduce the notion of real and




Figure 1: The Tits-Satake diagram representing the real form $\mathfrak{so}(p, 2\ell - p + 1)$ of the complex $\mathfrak{so}(2\ell + 1)$ Lie algebra

imaginary roots. One argues as follows. Every vector in the dual of the full Cartan subalgebra, in particular every root α , can be decomposed into its parallel and its transverse part to $\mathcal{H}^{n.c.}$:

$$\alpha = \alpha_{\parallel} \oplus \alpha_{\perp} \quad (1.28)$$

A root α is named *imaginary* if $\alpha_{\parallel} = 0$. On the contrary a root α is called real if $\alpha_{\perp} = 0$. Generically a root is complex.

Given the original Dynkin diagram of a complex Lie algebra we can characterize a real section by mentioning which of the simple roots are imaginary. We do this by painting black the imaginary roots. The result is a Tits-Satake diagram like that in fig.1 which corresponds to the real Lie Algebra $\mathfrak{so}(p, 2\ell - p + 1)$ for $p > 2$, $\ell > 2$.

THE ALGEBRAIC TITS SATAKE PROJECTION What we explained above is sufficient to introduce the original notion of the Tits Satake projection which is purely algebro-geometrical at the level of root system. Let us consider a simple real Lie algebra $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$ which is neither maximally split nor maximally compact since its non-compact rank satisfies the condition $0 < r_{n.c.} < r$, having named $r = \text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \text{complexification}(\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}})$. Let us moreover consider the root system $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}$ that, by definition, is a set of Euclidian vectors in $\mathbb{R}^r \sim \mathcal{H}^*$ which is the dual of the full Cartan subalgebra. Next consider the splitting of all the roots $\alpha \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}$ according with eq.(1.28) and define the **algebro-geometric TS projection** as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\text{agTS}} &: \mathbb{R}^r \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_{n.c.}} \\ \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{H}^* &: \pi_{\text{agTS}}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v}_{\parallel} \end{aligned} \quad (1.29)$$

The image through π_{agTS} of the root system $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a new system of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{r_{n.c.}}$.

$$\pi_{\text{agTS}}(\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}) = \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{TS}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{r_{n.c.}} \quad (1.30)$$

A priori there is no reason to expect that $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{TS}}$ should be a root system, yet there is the following:

Theorem 1.3 *If $\mathfrak{g} = \text{complexification}(\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}})$ is any of the simple Lie algebras except \mathfrak{a}_ℓ then $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{TS}}$ is the root system of another simple complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_{TS} of rank $r = r_{n.c.}$. Furthermore \mathfrak{g}_{TS} is the complexification of a **maximally split** simple real Lie algebra \mathbb{G}_{TS} which is a subalgebra of the original not maximally split real Lie algebra $\mathbb{G}_{\text{TS}} \subset \mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$. The Tits Satake subalgebra \mathbb{G}_{TS} is the unique, up to conjugation, maximally split subalgebra of rank equal to the non-compact rank.*

THE PAINT GROUP AND COSMIC BILLIARDS The notion of Paint Group emerged in the context of the application of U/H geometry to cosmological solutions of higher dimensional Supergravity without scalar potential (ungauged supergravity) displaying the very interesting universal mechanism named **cosmic billiard**. Cosmic billiards were proposed in the years 1999-2005 by several authors [82–95] as an elaboration of the much earlier seminal ideas of V.A. Belinsky, I.M. Khalatnikov, E.M. Lifshitz [96–98]. According to such a conception, which is better described as that of *rigid cosmic billiard*, the various dimensions of a higher dimensional gravitational theory are identified with the generators of the Cartan Subalgebra \mathcal{H} of a Supergravity motivated Lie Algebra and cosmic evolution takes place in a Weyl chamber of \mathcal{H} . Considering the Cartan scalar fields as the coordinate of a fictitious ball, during cosmic evolution

such a ball scatters on the walls of the Weyl chambers and this pictorial image of the phenomenon is at the origin of its denomination *cosmic billiard*. The reason why we described the original conception as *rigid billiards* is that the walls of the Weyl chamber were initially looked at as static walls. In the years 2003-2007, two of us (P.F. and M.T.), in collaboration with our students and also with A.S. Sorin, elaborated the conception of *soft cosmic billiard* that relies on the full integrability of geodesic equations for U/H manifolds and on the identification of such geodesic equations with the complete set of field equations of higher dimensional supergravity, while looking at solutions that depend only on one evolutionary parameter, the cosmic time t [99–101]. In the *soft cosmic billiard* picture, the bosonic non-gravitational fields of the supergravity theory (scalars and vector fields) are in one-to-one correspondence with the positive roots of the solvable Lie algebra (see theorem 1.1) and the simple ones with walls of the Weyl Chamber. Since these fields evolve in time as much as the Cartan ones that describe the space-time metric components, the walls causing the scattering of cosmic ball rise and decay, namely they are soft.

In this context the distinction between compact and non-compact directions of the Cartan subalgebra appeared essential and this brought the Tits Satake projection into the game. Indeed in 2005, Fré, Gargiulo and Rulik constructed explicit examples of soft cosmic billiards in the case of a *non maximally split symmetric manifold* U/H and analyzed the role of the Tits Satake projection which led to the introduction of the new mathematical concept of *Paint Group* [23]. The tale is simple: considering the algebraic Tits Satake projection shortly described in the previous lines it comes out that from the point of view of the Tits Satake root system Φ_{TS} some of the positive roots have a unique pre-image in the original full algebra root system $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}$, others have a multiplet of pre-images. Since the walls of the relevant Weyl chamber are in correspondence with the Φ_{TS} roots we were obviously interested in the multiplicity of such walls that acquired a color, namely they were **painted**. We observed that the multiplets of preimages of each Tits Satake positive root composed linear representations of a compact subgroup $G_{\text{Paint}} \subset U$ and that such a phenomenon was universal. Different coset manifolds U/H whose Lie algebra \mathfrak{U} projects to the same Tits Satake subalgebra \mathfrak{G}_{TS} are distinguished by a different Paint Group G_{Paint} which is their intrinsic characterization within the universality class labeled by \mathfrak{G}_{TS} .

In 2007, P. Fré, F. Gargiulo, J. Rosseel, K. Rulik, M. Trigiante and A. Van Proeyen [18] axiomatized the Tits Satake projection for all homogeneous special geometries classified, as we said, in [7, 70–73]. The authors of [18] based their formulation of the projection on the intrinsic definition of the *Paint Group* as the group of outer automorphisms of the solvable transitive group of motion of the homogeneous manifold. This is the theory that will be explained in this article and that constitutes an essential part of the PGTS backbone. Up to our knowledge, the very notion of Paint Group as a main component of the Tits Satake projection theory was never developed in the mathematical literature prior to the papers [18, 23].

THE TS PROJECTION IN PGTS THEORY In the PGTS theory resulting from assembling the so far mentioned ingredients, the Tits Satake subalgebra and the Paint Group are going to play an essential role. As we explain in the sequel, the non-compact symmetric spaces $\mathcal{M} = U/H$ have a unique well-defined distance function $d^2(p_1, p_2)$ among any two points $\forall p_{1,2} \in \mathcal{M}$ which is the length of the arc of the unique and always existing geodesic that passes through p_1 and p_2 . That distance function is related with the fundamental harmonic \mathfrak{harm}_0 , corresponding to the eigenfunction of the quadratic *Laplace Beltrami operator* Δ_{LB} corresponding to the lowest eigenvalue λ_0 of its (discrete) spectrum, and it is a function only of the coordinates of the Tits Satake submanifold $\mathcal{M}_{TS} \equiv U_{TS}/H_{TS} \subset \mathcal{M}$ and of a small number $n(r_{n.c.})$, depending on the chosen non-compact rank $r_{n.c.}$, of Paint Group invariants \mathbf{U}_i , ($i = 1, \dots, n(r_{n.c.})$). For instance for $r_{n.c.} \leq 4$, the number $n(r_{n.c.})$ is of the order of unity or few tens, even if the dimension of \mathcal{M} can be of the order of several thousands. Hence the PGTS theory has a built in mechanism of dimensional reduction in the representation of Big Data that are grouped into *similarity classes* corresponding to level set hypersurfaces defined by:

$$\mathcal{M} \supset \Sigma_{\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_{n(r_{n.c.})}} \equiv \{p \in \mathcal{M} \mid \mathbf{U}_i(p) = \lambda_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n(r_{n.c.})\} \quad (1.31)$$

and points of the Tits-Satake (or sub Tits Satake)⁴.

⁴We will be more precise later on with the complementary notions of $G_{\text{subPaint}} \subset G_{\text{Paint}}$ and $G_{\text{subTS}} \subset G_{TS}$ groups.

1.5 The new ingredients of the PGTS theory introduced in this paper

The essential new ingredient introduced in this paper, which is based on previous knowledge, yet, once formulated in an intrinsic way, leads to a new vision and to completely new results, is the distance function expressed by means of a square norm of solvable group elements.

As we said above, the definition 1.2 of *normal homogeneous Riemannian spaces*, due to Alekseevsky, arises from the notion of normed solvable Lie Algebra given in definition 1.1. The norm on the solvable Lie algebra induces a metric on the group manifold $\mathcal{S} = \exp[\text{Solv}]$ and, if \mathcal{S} is metrically equivalent to a symmetric space U/H^5 , which is the case of our interest, the geodesic equations form an integrable system yielding, as stated above, a unique, explicitly calculable, geodesic passing through any two points. This allows us to go one step beyond Alekseevsky's by introducing the more restrictive notion of normed solvable Lie groups:

Definition 1.4 *A normal homogeneous space (\mathcal{M}, g) , metrically equivalent to a solvable group manifold \mathcal{S} is a **normed solvable Lie group** if:*

- a) *the geodesic equations on \mathcal{S} , relative to the metric g , are completely integrable and there is a unique geodesic joining any two group elements $s_{1,2} \in \mathcal{S}$.*
- b) *The distance function between any two solvable group elements $d^2(s_1, s_2)$ depends only on the group element $s_3 \equiv s_1^{-1} \cdot s_2$*

When the above conditions are satisfied we can introduce the square norm function on the solvable Lie group:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N}^2 & : \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \\ \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \mathbb{N}^2(s) & = d^2(s, e) \quad ; \quad e = \text{Identity element of } \mathcal{S} \end{aligned} \quad (1.32)$$

that has the property $\mathbb{N}^2(s) = 0 \Rightarrow s = e$

Conversely we might invert the terms in the definition and state:

Definition 1.5 *A solvable Lie group \mathcal{S} is a **normed solvable Lie group** if it admits a square norm function:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N}^2 & : \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \\ \mathbb{N}^2(s) & = 0 \Rightarrow s = e = \text{Identity element of } \mathcal{S} \end{aligned} \quad (1.33)$$

and there exists a Riemannian metric g on \mathcal{S} such that the geodesic distance relative to g between any two group elements $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ can be written as:

$$d_g^2(s_1, s_2) = \mathbb{N}^2(s_1^{-1} \cdot s_2) \quad (1.34)$$

All non-compact symmetric spaces U/H where the Lie algebra \mathbb{U} of U is a non-compact real section of a complex simple Lie algebra \mathbb{G} are *not only normal homogeneous spaces* but also *normed solvable Lie groups*.

The elaboration of algorithmic procedures for the *explicit calculation* of the norm function in terms of *Paint or subPaint group invariants* is one of the main goals of PGTS in view of applications to Data Science. As we are going to see, the basic calculation expresses the norm function in terms of $\text{arccosh}(\Lambda_i)$ where Λ_i are the $r_{(n.c.)}$ (all non negative) roots of an algebraic equation of order $r_{(n.c.)}$, namely the non-compact rank. Such equation is the secular equation for the eigenvalues of an $r_{(n.c.)} \times r_{(n.c.)}$ matrix $\mathbf{m}(\Upsilon)$ depending on the solvable coordinates that parameterize the solvable group elements. In view of Galois theorem we are guaranteed to have explicit algebraic expressions for the norm function up to $r_{(n.c.)} = 4$. Surprisingly the upper limit $r_{(n.c.)} \leq 4$ is also the limit that is automatically satisfied by all $D = 4$ supergravity relevant U/H manifolds if the number of supersymmetries is $\mathcal{N} = 2$ (see table 5.4 at page 235 of [59]). For $\mathcal{N} = 3, 4, 5, 6$ one goes up to $r_{(n.c.)} = 6$ and for the unique theory $\mathcal{N} = 7, 8$ one has $r_{(n.c.)} = 7$.

⁵The normal Riemannian homogenous spaces that are not symmetric spaces are few families that for the moment we do not consider.

In his original classification of quaternionic Kähler manifolds, also the mathematician Alekseevsky implicitly chose $r_{(n.c.)} = 4$.

These remarks all conspire in suggesting that in a first inspection of applications to Data Science of PGTS theory one had better to consider only the cases $r_{(n.c.)} = 1, 2, 3, 4$, an upper bound on $r_{(n.c.)}$ meeting also the main desire of mapping Big Dimensional Data to spaces of much smaller dimensions (the Tits Satake submanifold) plus a small bunch of subPaint Group invariant qualifiers.

1.5.1 An inspiring chinese box scheme for $r_{(n.c.)} \leq 4$

The very much rewarding result one obtains adopting the aforementioned upper bound on $r_{(n.c.)}$ is that, apart from the easily computable Paint and subPaint invariants, the geometry of the four relevant Tits Satake Manifolds can be completely analyzed, relying on special Kähler geometry and on the c -map, in terms of only two building blocks, namely the Poincaré Lobachevsky hyperbolic plane $\mathbb{H}_2 \equiv \frac{\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(2)}$ and the upper Siegel plane of order 2 $\mathbb{I}\mathbb{S}_2 \equiv \frac{\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SU}(2)}$, as we explain in later sections in all details.

1.5.2 Three viewpoints on the Tits Satake clustering mechanism

Another absolutely new ingredient summarized in section 6.4.2 is provided by the three different and complementary viewpoints on the Tits Satake grouping of points that correspond either to the original formulation in terms of a projection and on the fibres, namely the preimages of each point in the target submanifold, or in the Grassmannian leaves, or still in normal subgroups of the solvable group.

1.5.3 An innovative group-theoretical scheme of discretization

A third new ingredient, illustrated in section 8 is an innovative method of determining discrete subgroups usable for tessellations inspired by the solvable group structure of the manifold. In addition as an example of the method a new, up to our knowledge so far unknown subgroup of $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$ is constructed in section 8. Then in section 9 the example is extended to a fully general and exhaustive construction of parabolic subgroups of all groups $\text{SO}(p, q, \mathbb{Z})$.

1.5.4 Altogether

Altogether, apart from the inclusion of the new above quoted ingredients what is very much new and innovative is the conceptual re-organization of the whole lore about the geometry of non-compact symmetric spaces U/H , which is purified of much of its Supergravity roots and reassembled in the perspective of possible applications to Data Science.

Let us then turn to a thorough presentation of the PGTS theory and of its developments; the latter were not mentioned in the introduction since they will be easier explained after all the building blocks have been laid down.

2 Special Kähler and Special Quaternionic Kähler Geometry

It would be natural from the side of our reader to expect that after the introductory section, the first section providing the exposition of **PGTS theory** should be concerned with the solvable Lie groups $\mathcal{S}_{U/H}$ metrically equivalent to the symmetric spaces U/H , with the Tits Satake projection and with the Paint Group. Yet because of the strong entanglement of the latter notion with **Special Kähler Geometries** and with the **c-map** a logically order exposition requires that we first dwell on a brief exposition of such conceptual structures whose historical birth and development was already illustrated in the introductory section.

2.1 Special Kähler Geometry (of the local type)

In this section we present Special Kähler Geometry in a concise yet full-fledged mathematical form. Let us begin by summarizing some relevant concepts and definitions that are propaedeutical to the main definition.

2.1.1 Hodge–Kähler manifolds

Consider a *line bundle* $\mathcal{L} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{M}$ over a Kähler manifold \mathcal{M} . By definition this is a holomorphic vector bundle of rank $r = 1$. For such bundles the only available Chern class is the first:

$$c_1(\mathcal{L}) = \frac{i}{2} \bar{\partial} (h^{-1} \partial h) = \frac{i}{2} \bar{\partial} \partial \log h \quad (2.1)$$

where the 1-component real function $h(z, \bar{z})$ is some hermitian fibre metric on \mathcal{L} . Let $\xi(z)$ be a holomorphic section of the line bundle \mathcal{L} : noting that under the action of the operator $\bar{\partial} \partial$ the term $\log(\bar{\xi}(\bar{z}) \xi(z))$ yields a vanishing contribution, we conclude that the formula in eq.(2.1) for the first Chern class can be re-expressed as follows:

$$c_1(\mathcal{L}) = \frac{i}{2} \bar{\partial} \partial \log \| \xi(z) \|^2 \quad (2.2)$$

where $\| \xi(z) \|^2 = h(z, \bar{z}) \bar{\xi}(\bar{z}) \xi(z)$ denotes the norm of the holomorphic section $\xi(z)$.

Eq.(2.2) is the starting point for the definition of Hodge–Kähler manifolds. A Kähler manifold \mathcal{M} is a Hodge manifold if and only if there exists a line bundle $\mathcal{L} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{M}$ such that its first Chern class equals the cohomology class of the Kähler two-form K :

$$c_1(\mathcal{L}) = [K] \quad (2.3)$$

In local terms this means that there is a holomorphic section $\xi(z)$ such that we can write

$$K = \frac{i}{2} g_{ij^*} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^{j^*} = \frac{i}{2} \bar{\partial} \partial \log \| \xi(z) \|^2 \quad (2.4)$$

Recalling the local expression of the Kähler metric in terms of the Kähler potential $g_{ij^*} = \partial_i \partial_{j^*} \mathcal{K}(z, \bar{z})$, it follows from eq.(2.4) that, if the manifold \mathcal{M} is a Hodge manifold, then the exponential of the Kähler potential can be interpreted as the metric $h(z, \bar{z}) = \exp(\mathcal{K}(z, \bar{z}))$ on an appropriate line bundle \mathcal{L} .

2.1.2 Connection on the line bundle

On any complex line bundle \mathcal{L} there is a canonical hermitian connection defined by its local connection forms:

$$\theta \equiv h^{-1} \partial h = \frac{1}{h} \partial_i h dz^i \quad ; \quad \bar{\theta} \equiv h^{-1} \bar{\partial} h = \frac{1}{h} \partial_{i^*} h d\bar{z}^{i^*} \quad (2.5)$$

For the line-bundle advocated by the Hodge–Kähler structure we have

$$[\bar{\partial} \theta] = c_1(\mathcal{L}) = [K] \quad (2.6)$$

and since the fibre metric h can be identified with the exponential of the Kähler potential we obtain:

$$\theta = \partial \mathcal{K} = \partial_i \mathcal{K} dz^i \quad ; \quad \bar{\theta} = \bar{\partial} \mathcal{K} = \partial_{i^*} \mathcal{K} d\bar{z}^{i^*} \quad (2.7)$$

To define special Kähler geometry, in addition to the afore-mentioned line-bundle \mathcal{L} we need a flat holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ whose rank must be $2n_V$ ⁶ where $n_V = n+1$ having denoted n the complex dimension of the base manifold \mathcal{M}_n whose coordinates we name z^i . In summary, we need to introduce a rank $2n+2$ bundle $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$, that, as we show later, should be symplectic and flat.

In the sequel we make extensive use of covariant derivatives with respect to the canonical connection of the line-bundle \mathcal{L} . Let us review its normalization. As it is well known there exists a correspondence between line-bundles and U(1)-bundles. If $\exp[f_{\alpha\beta}(z)]$ is the transition function between two local trivializations of the line-bundle $\mathcal{L} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{M}$, the transition function in the corresponding principal U(1)-bundle $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is just $\exp[i\text{Im}f_{\alpha\beta}(z)]$ and the Kähler potentials in two different charts are related by: $\mathcal{K}_\beta = \mathcal{K}_\alpha + f_{\alpha\beta} + \bar{f}_{\alpha\beta}$. At the level of connections this correspondence is formulated by setting: U(1)-connection $\equiv \mathcal{Q} = \text{Im}\theta = -\frac{i}{2}(\theta - \bar{\theta})$. If we apply this formula to the case of the U(1)-bundle $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ associated with the line-bundle \mathcal{L} whose first Chern class equals the Kähler class, we get:

$$\mathcal{Q} = \frac{i}{2} \left(\partial_i \mathcal{K} dz^i - \partial_{i^*} \mathcal{K} d\bar{z}^{i^*} \right) \quad (2.8)$$

Let now $\Phi(z, \bar{z})$ be a section of \mathcal{U}^p . By definition its covariant derivative is $\nabla\Phi = (d - ip\mathcal{Q})\Phi$ or, in components,

$$\nabla_i \Phi = (\partial_i + \frac{1}{2}p\partial_i \mathcal{K})\Phi \quad ; \quad \nabla_{i^*} \Phi = (\partial_{i^*} - \frac{1}{2}p\partial_{i^*} \mathcal{K})\Phi \quad (2.9)$$

A covariantly holomorphic section of \mathcal{U} is defined by the equation: $\nabla_{i^*} \Phi = 0$. We can easily map each section $\Phi(z, \bar{z})$ of \mathcal{U}^p into a section of the line-bundle \mathcal{L} by setting:

$$\tilde{\Phi} = e^{-p\mathcal{K}/2} \Phi. \quad (2.10)$$

With this position we obtain:

$$\nabla_i \tilde{\Phi} = (\partial_i + p\partial_i \mathcal{K})\tilde{\Phi} \quad ; \quad \nabla_{i^*} \tilde{\Phi} = \partial_{i^*} \tilde{\Phi} \quad (2.11)$$

Under the map of eq.(2.10) covariantly holomorphic sections of \mathcal{U} flow into holomorphic sections of \mathcal{L} and viceversa.

2.1.3 Special Kähler Manifolds (of the local type)

We are now ready to give the first of two equivalent definitions of special Kähler manifolds:

Definition 2.1 *A Hodge Kähler manifold is **Special Kähler (of the local type)** if there exists a completely symmetric holomorphic 3-index section W_{ijk} of $(T^*\mathcal{M})^3 \otimes \mathcal{L}^2$ (and its antiholomorphic conjugate $W_{i^*j^*k^*}$) such that the following identity is satisfied by the Riemann tensor of the Levi-Civita connection:*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{m^*} W_{ijk} &= 0 & \partial_m W_{i^*j^*k^*} &= 0 \\ \nabla_{[m} W_{i]jk} &= 0 & \nabla_{[m} W_{i^*]j^*k^*} &= 0 \\ \mathcal{R}_{i^*j\ell^*k} &= g_{\ell^*j} g_{ki^*} + g_{\ell^*k} g_{ji^*} - e^{2\mathcal{K}} W_{i^*\ell^*s^*} W_{tkj} g^{s^*t} \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

In the above equations ∇ denotes the covariant derivative with respect to both the Levi-Civita and the U(1) holomorphic connection of eq.(2.8). In the case of W_{ijk} , the U(1) weight is $p=2$.

Out of the W_{ijk} we can construct covariantly holomorphic sections of weight 2 and -2 by setting:

$$C_{ijk} = W_{ijk} e^{\mathcal{K}} \quad ; \quad C_{i^*j^*k^*} = W_{i^*j^*k^*} e^{\mathcal{K}} \quad (2.13)$$

⁶In Supergravity n_V is the total number of vector fields in the theory, while in the algebraic geometry of Calabi-Yau threefolds it has to do with the number of (2,1) Dolbeault cohomology classes of the threefold, but all this is irrelevant to us in the present context.

The flat bundle mentioned in the previous subsection apparently does not appear in this definition of special geometry. Yet it is there. It is indeed the essential ingredient in the second definition whose equivalence to the first we shall shortly provide.

Let $\mathcal{L} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{M}$ denote the complex line bundle whose first Chern class equals the cohomology class of the Kähler form K of an n -dimensional Hodge–Kähler manifold \mathcal{M} . Let $\mathcal{SV} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ denote a holomorphic flat vector bundle of rank $2n + 2$ with structural group $\mathrm{Sp}(2n + 2, \mathbb{R})$. Consider tensor bundles of the type $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{SV} \otimes \mathcal{L}$. A typical holomorphic section of such a bundle will be denoted by Ω and will have the following structure:

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} X^\Lambda \\ F_\Sigma \end{pmatrix} \quad \Lambda, \Sigma = 0, 1, \dots, n \quad (2.14)$$

By definition the transition functions between two local trivializations $U_i \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $U_j \subset \mathcal{M}$ of the bundle \mathcal{H} have the following form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X^\Lambda \\ F_\Sigma \end{pmatrix}_i = e^{f_{ij}} M_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} X^\Lambda \\ F_\Sigma \end{pmatrix}_j \quad (2.15)$$

where f_{ij} are holomorphic maps $U_i \cap U_j \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ while M_{ij} is a constant $\mathrm{Sp}(2n + 2, \mathbb{R})$ matrix. For a consistent definition of the bundle the transition functions are obviously subject to the cocycle condition on a triple overlap: $e^{f_{ij} + f_{jk} + f_{ki}} = 1$ and $M_{ij} M_{jk} M_{ki} = 1$.

Let $i\langle | \rangle$ be the compatible hermitian metric on \mathcal{H}

$$i\langle \Omega | \bar{\Omega} \rangle \equiv -i\Omega^T \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1} \\ -\mathbf{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \bar{\Omega} \quad (2.16)$$

Definition 2.2 We say that a Hodge–Kähler manifold \mathcal{M} is **special Kähler** if there exists a bundle \mathcal{H} of the type described above such that for some section $\Omega \in \Gamma(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{M})$ the Kähler two form is given by:

$$K = \frac{i}{2} \partial \bar{\partial} \log (i\langle \Omega | \bar{\Omega} \rangle) = \frac{i}{2} g_{i^*j^*} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^{j^*} \quad (2.17)$$

From the point of view of local properties, eq.(2.17) implies that we have an expression for the Kähler potential in terms of the holomorphic section Ω :

$$\mathcal{K} = -\log (i\langle \Omega | \bar{\Omega} \rangle) = -\log [i(\bar{X}^\Lambda F_\Lambda - \bar{F}_\Sigma X^\Sigma)] \quad (2.18)$$

The relation between the two definitions of special manifolds is obtained by introducing a non-holomorphic section of the bundle \mathcal{H} according to:

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} L^\Lambda \\ M_\Sigma \end{pmatrix} \equiv e^{\mathcal{K}/2} \Omega = e^{\mathcal{K}/2} \begin{pmatrix} X^\Lambda \\ F_\Sigma \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.19)$$

so that eq.(2.18) becomes:

$$1 = i\langle V | \bar{V} \rangle = i(\bar{L}^\Lambda M_\Lambda - \bar{M}_\Sigma L^\Sigma) \quad (2.20)$$

Since V is related to a holomorphic section by eq.(2.19) it immediately follows that:

$$\nabla_{i^*} V = \left(\partial_{i^*} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_{i^*} \mathcal{K} \right) V = 0 \quad (2.21)$$

On the other hand, from eq.(2.20), defining:

$$\begin{aligned} U_i &= \nabla_i V = \left(\partial_i + \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \mathcal{K} \right) V \equiv \begin{pmatrix} f_i^\Lambda \\ h_{\Sigma|i} \end{pmatrix} \\ \bar{U}_{i^*} &= \nabla_{i^*} \bar{V} = \left(\partial_{i^*} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{i^*} \mathcal{K} \right) \bar{V} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \bar{f}_{i^*}^\Lambda \\ \bar{h}_{\Sigma|i^*} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

it follows that:

$$\nabla_i U_j = i C_{ijk} g^{k\ell^*} \bar{U}_{\ell^*} \quad (2.23)$$

where ∇_i denotes the covariant derivative containing both the Levi-Civita connection on the bundle \mathcal{TM} and the canonical connection θ on the line bundle \mathcal{L} . In eq.(2.23) the symbol C_{ijk} denotes a covariantly holomorphic ($\nabla_{\ell^*} C_{ijk} = 0$) section of the bundle $\mathcal{TM}^3 \otimes \mathcal{L}^2$ that is totally symmetric in its indices. This tensor can be identified with the tensor of eq.(2.13) appearing in eq.(2.12). Alternatively, the set of differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_i V &= U_i \\ \nabla_i U_j &= i C_{ijk} g^{k\ell^*} \bar{U}_{\ell^*} \\ \nabla_{i^*} U_j &= g_{i^*j} V \\ \nabla_{i^*} V &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

with V satisfying eq.s (2.19, 2.20) give yet another definition of special geometry. In particular it is easy to find eq.(2.12) as integrability conditions of(2.24)⁷.

2.1.4 The symmetric matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ in Special Kähler Geometry

Another essential item intrinsically associated with Special Kähler Geometry is a complex symmetric matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ which in Supergravity has its own motivation for existence, yet from the mathematical viewpoint it is very much significant that the same $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ constitutes an integral part of the Special Geometry set up and might prove of relevance also in Data Science applications. In any case it is an essential ingredient in the c-map construction. We provide its general definition in the following lines. Explicitly $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ which, in relation to its interpretation in the case of Calabi-Yau threefolds, is named the *period matrix*, is defined by means of the following relations:

$$\bar{M}_\Lambda = \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} \bar{L}^\Sigma \quad ; \quad h_{\Sigma|i} = \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} f_i^\Sigma \quad (2.25)$$

which can be solved introducing the two $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ vectors

$$f_I^\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} f_i^\Lambda \\ \bar{L}^\Lambda \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad h_{\Lambda|I} = \begin{pmatrix} h_{\Lambda|i} \\ \bar{M}_\Lambda \end{pmatrix}$$

and setting:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} = h_{\Lambda|I} \circ (f^{-1})^I_\Sigma \quad (2.26)$$

Let us now consider the case where the Special Kähler manifold \mathcal{SK}_n of complex dimension n has some isometry group $U_{\mathcal{SK}}$. Compatibility with the Special Geometry structure requires the existence of a $2n+2$ -dimensional symplectic representation of such a group that we name the **W** representation. In other words, a symplectic embedding

⁷We omit the detailed proof that from eq.s (2.24) one obtains eq.(2.12). The essential link between the two formulations resides in the second of eq.s (2.24) which identifies the tensor C_{ijk} with the expression of the derivative of U_i in terms of the same objects U_k .

of the isometry group \mathcal{SK}_n

$$U_{\mathcal{SK}} \mapsto \text{Sp}(2n+2, \mathbb{R}) \quad (2.27)$$

necessarily exists such that for each element $\xi \in U_{\mathcal{SK}}$ we have its representation by means of a suitable real symplectic matrix:

$$\xi \mapsto \Lambda_\xi \equiv \begin{pmatrix} A_\xi & B_\xi \\ C_\xi & D_\xi \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.28)$$

satisfying the defining relation (in terms of the symplectic antisymmetric metric \mathbb{C}):

$$\Lambda_\xi^T \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \mathbf{1}_{n \times n} \\ -\mathbf{1}_{n \times n} & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{pmatrix}}_{\equiv \mathbb{C}} \Lambda_\xi = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \mathbf{1}_{n \times n} \\ -\mathbf{1}_{n \times n} & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbb{C}} \quad (2.29)$$

which implies the following relations on the $n \times n$ blocks:

$$\begin{aligned} A_\xi^T C_\xi - C_\xi^T A_\xi &= 0 \\ A_\xi^T D_\xi - C_\xi^T B_\xi &= \mathbf{1} \\ B_\xi^T C_\xi - D_\xi^T A_\xi &= -\mathbf{1} \\ B_\xi^T D_\xi - D_\xi^T B_\xi &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

Under an element of the isometry group the symplectic section Ω of Special Geometry transforms as follows:

$$\Omega(\xi \cdot z) = \Lambda_\xi \Omega(z) \quad (2.31)$$

As a consequence of its definition, under the same isometry the matrix \mathcal{N} transforms by means of a generalized linear fractional transformation:

$$\mathcal{N}(\xi \cdot z, \xi \cdot \bar{z}) = (C_\xi + D_\xi \mathcal{N}(z, \bar{z})) (A_\xi + B_\xi \mathcal{N}(z, \bar{z}))^{-1} \quad (2.32)$$

2.2 Quaternionic Kähler, versus HyperKähler manifolds

Next we provide the definition of Quaternionic Kähler manifolds that we compare with that of HyperKähler manifolds.

Both a Quaternionic Kähler or a HyperKähler manifold \mathcal{QM} is a $4m$ -dimensional real manifold endowed with a metric h :

$$ds^2 = h_{uv}(q) dq^u \otimes dq^v \quad ; \quad u, v = 1, \dots, 4m \quad (2.33)$$

and three complex structures

$$(J^x) : T(\mathcal{QM}) \longrightarrow T(\mathcal{QM}) \quad (x = 1, 2, 3) \quad (2.34)$$

that satisfy the quaternionic algebra

$$J^x J^y = -\delta^{xy} \mathbf{1} + \epsilon^{xyz} J^z \quad (2.35)$$

and respect to which the metric is hermitian:

$$\forall \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in T\mathcal{QM} : \quad h(J^x \mathbf{X}, J^x \mathbf{Y}) = h(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \quad (x = 1, 2, 3) \quad (2.36)$$

From eq. (2.36) it follows that one can introduce a triplet of 2-forms

$$K^x = K_{uv}^x dq^u \wedge dq^v \quad ; \quad K_{uv}^x = h_{uv}(J^x)_v^w \quad (2.37)$$

that provide the generalization of the concept of Kähler form occurring in the complex case. The triplet K^x is named the *HyperKähler* form. It is an $SU(2)$ Lie-algebra valued 2-form in the same way as the Kähler form is a $U(1)$ Lie-algebra valued 2-form. In the complex case the definition of Kähler manifold involves the statement that the Kähler 2-form is closed. At the same time in Hodge-Kähler manifolds the Kähler 2-form can be identified with the curvature of a line-bundle which in the case of rigid supersymmetry is flat. Similar steps can be taken also here and lead to two possibilities: either HyperKähler or Quaternionic Kähler manifolds.

Let us introduce a principal $SU(2)$ -bundle \mathcal{SU} as follows:

$$\mathcal{SU} \longrightarrow \mathcal{QM} \quad (2.38)$$

Let ω^x denote a connection on such a bundle. To obtain either a HyperKähler or a Quaternionic Kähler manifold we must impose the condition that the HyperKähler 2-form is covariantly closed with respect to the connection ω^x :

$$\nabla K^x \equiv dK^x + \epsilon^{xyz} \omega^y \wedge K^z = 0 \quad (2.39)$$

The only difference between the two kinds of geometries resides in the structure of the \mathcal{SU} -bundle.

Definition 2.3 *A HyperKähler manifold is a $4m$ -dimensional manifold with the structure described above and such that the \mathcal{SU} -bundle is flat*

Defining the \mathcal{SU} -curvature by:

$$\Omega^x \equiv d\omega^x + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{xyz} \omega^y \wedge \omega^z \quad (2.40)$$

in the HyperKähler case we have:

$$\Omega^x = 0 \quad (2.41)$$

Viceversa

Definition 2.4 *A Quaternionic Kähler manifold is a $4m$ -dimensional manifold with the structure described above and such that the curvature of the \mathcal{SU} -bundle is proportional to the HyperKähler 2-form*

Hence, in the quaternionic case we can write:

$$\Omega^x = \lambda K^x \quad (2.42)$$

where λ is a non vanishing real number.

As a consequence of the above structure the manifold \mathcal{QM} has a holonomy group of the following type:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hol}(\mathcal{QM}) &= SU(2) \otimes \mathbb{H} \quad (\text{Quaternionic Kähler}) \\ \text{Hol}(\mathcal{QM}) &= \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{H} \quad (\text{HyperKähler}) \\ \mathbb{H} &\subset Sp(2m, \mathbb{R}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

In both cases, introducing flat indices $\{A, B, C = 1, 2\} \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma = 1, \dots, 2m\}$ that run, respectively, in the fundamental representation of $SU(2)$ and of $Sp(2m, \mathbb{R})$, we can find a vielbein 1-form

$$\mathcal{U}^{A\alpha} = \mathcal{U}_u^{A\alpha}(q) dq^u \quad (2.44)$$

such that

$$h_{uv} = \mathcal{U}_u^{A\alpha} \mathcal{U}_v^{B\beta} \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{AB} \quad (2.45)$$

where $\mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta} = -\mathbb{C}_{\beta\alpha}$ and $\epsilon_{AB} = -\epsilon_{BA}$ are, respectively, the flat $Sp(2m)$ and $Sp(2) \sim SU(2)$ invariant metrics. The vielbein $\mathcal{U}^{A\alpha}$ is covariantly closed with respect to the $SU(2)$ -connection ω^z and to some $Sp(2m, \mathbb{R})$ -Lie Algebra valued

connection $\Delta^{\alpha\beta} = \Delta^{\beta\alpha}$:

$$\nabla \mathcal{U}^{A\alpha} \equiv d\mathcal{U}^{A\alpha} + \frac{i}{2} \omega^x (\epsilon \sigma_x \epsilon^{-1})^A_B \wedge \mathcal{U}^{B\alpha} + \Delta^{\alpha\beta} \wedge \mathcal{U}^{A\gamma} \mathbb{C}_{\beta\gamma} = 0 \quad (2.46)$$

where $(\sigma^x)_A^B$ are the standard Pauli matrices. Furthermore $\mathcal{U}^{A\alpha}$ satisfies the reality condition:

$$\mathcal{U}_{A\alpha} \equiv (\mathcal{U}^{A\alpha})^* = \epsilon_{AB} \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{U}^{B\beta} \quad (2.47)$$

Eq.(2.47) defines the rule to lower the symplectic indices by means of the flat symplectic metrics ϵ_{AB} and $\mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta}$. More specifically we can write a stronger version of eq. (2.45) [102]:

$$(\mathcal{U}_u^{A\alpha} \mathcal{U}_v^{B\beta} + \mathcal{U}_v^{A\alpha} \mathcal{U}_u^{B\beta}) \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta} = h_{uv} \epsilon^{AB} \quad (2.48)$$

We have also the inverse vielbein $\mathcal{U}_{A\alpha}^u$ defined by the equation

$$\mathcal{U}_{A\alpha}^u \mathcal{U}_v^{A\alpha} = \delta_v^u \quad (2.49)$$

Flattening a pair of indices of the Riemann tensor \mathcal{R}^{uv}_{ts} we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}^{uv}_{ts} \mathcal{U}_u^{\alpha A} \mathcal{U}_v^{\beta B} = -\frac{i}{2} \Omega_{ts}^x \epsilon^{AC} (\sigma_x)_C^B \mathbb{C}^{\alpha\beta} + \mathbb{R}_{ts}^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{AB} \quad (2.50)$$

where $\mathbb{R}_{ts}^{\alpha\beta}$ is the curvature 2-form of the $\text{Sp}(2m)$ connection:

$$d\Delta^{\alpha\beta} + \Delta^{\alpha\gamma} \wedge \Delta^{\delta\beta} \mathbb{C}_{\gamma\delta} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{\alpha\beta} = \mathbb{R}_{ts}^{\alpha\beta} dq^t \wedge dq^s \quad (2.51)$$

eq. (2.50) is the explicit statement that the Levi Civita connection associated with the metric h has a holonomy group contained in $\text{SU}(2) \otimes \text{Sp}(2m)$. Consider now eq.s (2.35), (2.37) and (2.42). We easily deduce the following relation:

$$h^{st} K_{us}^x K_{tw}^y = -\delta^{xy} h_{uw} + \epsilon^{xyz} K_{uw}^z \quad (2.52)$$

that holds true both in the HyperKähler and in the quaternionic case. In the latter case, using eq. (2.42), eq. (2.52) can be rewritten as follows:

$$h^{st} \Omega_{us}^x \Omega_{tw}^y = -\lambda^2 \delta^{xy} h_{uw} + \lambda \epsilon^{xyz} \Omega_{uw}^z \quad (2.53)$$

eq.(2.53) implies that the intrinsic components of the curvature 2-form Ω^x yield a representation of the quaternion algebra. In the HyperKähler case such a representation is provided only by the HyperKähler form. In the quaternionic case we can write:

$$\Omega_{A\alpha, B\beta}^x \equiv \Omega_{uv}^x \mathcal{U}_{A\alpha}^u \mathcal{U}_{B\beta}^v = -i \lambda \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta} (\sigma_x)_A^C \epsilon_{CB} \quad (2.54)$$

Alternatively eq.(2.54) can be rewritten in an intrinsic form as

$$\Omega^x = -i \lambda \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta} (\sigma_x)_A^C \epsilon_{CB} \mathcal{U}^{\alpha A} \wedge \mathcal{U}^{\beta B} \quad (2.55)$$

whence we also get:

$$\frac{i}{2} \Omega^x (\sigma_x)_A^B = \lambda \mathcal{U}_{A\alpha} \wedge \mathcal{U}^{B\alpha} \quad (2.56)$$

2.2.1 The Quaternionic Kähler Geometry in the image of the c -map

Next we consider those Quaternionic Kähler manifolds that are in the image of the c -map.⁸ This latter

$$c\text{-map} : \mathcal{SK}_n \implies \mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} \quad (2.57)$$

is a universal construction that, starting from an arbitrary Special Kähler manifold \mathcal{SK}_n of complex dimension n , irrespectively whether it is homogeneus or not, leads to a unique Quaternionic Kähler manifold \mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} of real dimension $4n + 4$ which contains \mathcal{SK}_n as a submanifold. The precise modern definition of the c -map, originally introduced in [74, 75], is provided below.

Definition 2.5 Let \mathcal{SK}_n be a special Kähler manifold whose complex coordinates we denote by z^i and whose Kähler metric we denote by g_{ij^*} . Let moreover $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}(z, \bar{z})$ be the symmetric period matrix defined by eq.(2.26), introduce the following set of $4n + 4$ coordinates:

$$\{q^u\} \equiv \underbrace{\{U, a\}}_{2 \text{ real}} \cup \underbrace{\{z^i\}}_{\substack{n \text{ complex} \\ 2n \text{ real}}} \cup \underbrace{\mathbf{Z} = \{Z^\Lambda, Z_\Sigma\}}_{(2n+2) \text{ real}} \quad (2.58)$$

Let us further introduce the following $(2n + 2) \times (2n + 2)$ matrix \mathcal{M}_4^{-1} :

$$\mathcal{M}_4^{-1} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \text{Im}\mathcal{N} + \text{Re}\mathcal{N} \text{Im}\mathcal{N}^{-1} \text{Re}\mathcal{N} & -\text{Re}\mathcal{N} \text{Im}\mathcal{N}^{-1} \\ \hline -\text{Im}\mathcal{N}^{-1} \text{Re}\mathcal{N} & \text{Im}\mathcal{N}^{-1} \end{array} \right) \quad (2.59)$$

which depends only on the coordinate of the Special Kähler manifold. The c -map image of \mathcal{SK}_n is the unique Quaternionic Kähler manifold \mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} whose coordinates are the q^u defined in (2.58) and whose metric is given by the following universal formula

$$ds_{\mathcal{QM}}^2 = \frac{1}{4} \left(dU^2 + 4g_{ij^*} dz^j d\bar{z}^{j^*} + e^{-2U} (da + \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{C} d\mathbf{Z})^2 - 2e^{-U} d\mathbf{Z}^T \mathcal{M}_4^{-1} d\mathbf{Z} \right) \quad (2.60)$$

The metric (2.60) has the following positive definite signature

$$\text{sign} [ds_{\mathcal{QM}}^2] = \left(\underbrace{+, \dots, +}_{4+4n} \right) \quad (2.61)$$

since the matrix \mathcal{M}_4^{-1} is negative definite.

In the case the Special Kähler pre-image is a symmetric space $U_{\mathcal{SK}}/H_{\mathcal{SK}}$, the manifold \mathcal{QM} turns out to be a symmetric space, U_Q/H_Q . We come back to the issue of symmetric homogeneous Quaternionic Kähler manifolds in section 2.2.3

⁸Not all non-compact, homogeneous Quaternionic Kähler manifolds that are relevant to supergravity (which are *normal*, i.e. exhibiting a solvable group of isometries having a free and transitive action on it) are in the image of the c -map, the only exception being the quaternionic projective spaces [17, 70]. In the case of Data Science applications, as we discuss in next sections, the Tits Satake projections of low r relevant cases are in the image of the c -map.

2.2.2 The HyperKähler two-forms and the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ -connection

The reason why we state that \mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} is Quaternionic Kähler is that, by utilizing only the identities of Special Kähler Geometry we can construct the three complex structures $J_u^{x|v}$ satisfying the quaternionic algebra (2.35) the corresponding HyperKähler two-forms K^x and the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ connection ω^x with respect to which they are covariantly constant.

The construction is extremely beautiful, it was found in [76] and it is the following one.

Consider the Kähler connection \mathcal{Q} defined by eq. (2.8) and furthermore introduce the following differential form:

$$\Phi = da + \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} \quad (2.62)$$

Next define the two dimensional representation of both the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ connection and of the HyperKähler 2-forms as it follows:

$$\omega = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{x=1}^3 \omega^x \gamma_x \quad (2.63)$$

$$\mathbf{K} = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{x=1}^3 K^x \sigma_x \quad (2.64)$$

where γ_x denotes a basis of 2×2 Euclidian γ -matrices for which we utilize the following basis which is convenient in the explicit calculations⁹:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \\ \gamma_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \gamma_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (2.65)$$

These γ -matrices satisfy the following Clifford algebra:

$$\{\gamma_x, \gamma_y\} = \delta^{xy} \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} \quad (2.66)$$

and $\frac{1}{2} \gamma_x$ provide a basis of generators of the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ algebra.

Having fixed these conventions the expression of the quaternionic $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ -connection in terms of Special Geometry structures is encoded in the following expression for the 2×2 -matrix valued 1-form ω . Explicitly we have:

$$\omega = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{i}{2} \mathcal{Q} - \frac{i}{4} e^{-U} \Phi & e^{-\frac{U}{2}} V^T \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} \\ -e^{-\frac{U}{2}} \bar{V}^T \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} & \frac{i}{2} \mathcal{Q} + \frac{i}{4} e^{-U} \Phi \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.67)$$

where V and \bar{V} denote the covariantly holomorphic sections of Special geometry defined in eq.s (2.19). The curvature

⁹The chosen γ -matrices are a permutation of the standard Pauli matrices divided by $\sqrt{2}$ and multiplied by $\frac{1}{2}$. They can be used as a basis of anti-hermitian generators for the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ algebra in the fundamental defining representation.

of this connection is obtained from a straight-forward calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{K} &\equiv d\omega + \omega \wedge \omega \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} & \mathbf{v} \\ -\bar{\mathbf{v}} & -\mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}\quad (2.68)$$

the independent 2-form matrix elements being given by the following explicit formulae:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{u} &= -i\frac{1}{2}K - \frac{1}{8}dS \wedge d\bar{S} - e^{-U} V^T \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} \wedge \bar{V}^T \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} - \frac{1}{4}e^{-U} d\mathbf{Z}^T \wedge \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} \\ \mathbf{v} &= e^{-\frac{U}{2}} \left(DV^T \wedge \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} - \frac{1}{2}dS \wedge V^T \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} \right) \\ \bar{\mathbf{v}} &= e^{-\frac{U}{2}} \left(D\bar{V}^T \wedge \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} - \frac{1}{2}d\bar{S} \wedge \bar{V}^T \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z} \right)\end{aligned}\quad (2.69)$$

where

$$K = \frac{i}{2} g_{ij^*} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^{j^*} \quad (2.70)$$

is the Kähler 2-form of the Special Kähler submanifold and where we have used the following short hand notations:

$$dS = dU + ie^{-U} (da + \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z}) \quad (2.71)$$

$$d\bar{S} = dU - ie^{-U} (da + \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbb{C} d\mathbf{Z}) \quad (2.72)$$

$$DV = dz^i \nabla_i V \quad (2.73)$$

$$D\bar{V} = d\bar{z}^{i^*} \nabla_{i^*} V \quad (2.74)$$

The three HyperKähler forms K^x are easily extracted from eq.s (2.68-2.69) by collecting the coefficients of the γ -matrix expansion and we need not to write their form which is immediately deduced. The relevant thing is that the components of K^x with an index raised through multiplication with the inverse of the quaternionic metric h^{uv} exactly satisfy the algebra of quaternionic complex structures (2.35). Explicitly we have:

$$\begin{aligned}K^x &= -i4\sqrt{2} \text{Tr} (\gamma^x \mathbf{K}) \equiv K_{uv}^x dq^u \wedge dq^v \\ J_u^{x|s} &= K_{uv}^x h^{vs} \\ J_u^{x|s} J_s^{y|v} &= -\delta^{xy} \delta_u^v + \epsilon^{xyz} J_u^{z|v}\end{aligned}\quad (2.75)$$

The above formulae are not only the general proof that the Riemannian manifold \mathcal{QM} defined by the metric (2.60) is indeed a Quaternionic Kähler manifold, but they also provide an algorithm to write in terms of Special Geometry structures the tri-holomorphic moment map of the principal isometries possessed by \mathcal{QM} ; this property was of high relevance for gauged supergravity models, but it is not yet clear whether it is going to play a role in data science applications.

2.2.3 Homogeneous Symmetric Special Quaternionic Kähler manifolds

When the Special Kähler manifold \mathcal{SK}_n is a symmetric coset space, it turns out that the metric (2.60) is actually the symmetric metric on an enlarged symmetric coset manifold

$$\mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} = \frac{U_Q}{H_Q} \supset \frac{U_{SK}}{H_{SK}} \quad (2.76)$$

Naming $\Lambda[\mathfrak{g}]$ the **W**-representation of any finite element of the $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{SK}}$ group, we have that the matrix $\mathcal{M}_4(z, \bar{z})$ transforms as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_4(\mathfrak{g} \cdot z, \mathfrak{g} \cdot \bar{z}) = \Lambda[\mathfrak{g}] \mathcal{M}_4(z, \bar{z}) \Lambda^T[\mathfrak{g}] \quad (2.77)$$

where $\mathfrak{g} \cdot z$ denotes the non-linear action of $\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{SK}}$ on the scalar fields. Since the space $\frac{\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{SK}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{SK}}}$ is homogeneous, choosing any reference point z_0 all the others can be reached by a suitable group element \mathfrak{g}_z such that $\mathfrak{g}_z \cdot z_0 = z$ and we can write:

$$\mathcal{M}_4^{-1}(z, \bar{z}) = \Lambda^T[\mathfrak{g}_z^{-1}] \mathcal{M}_4^{-1}(z_0, \bar{z}_0) \Lambda[\mathfrak{g}_z^{-1}] \quad (2.78)$$

This allows to introduce a set of $4n + 4$ vielbein defined in the following way:

$$E_{\mathcal{QM}}^I = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ dU, \underbrace{e^i(z)}_{2n}, e^{-U} (da + \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{C} d\mathbf{Z}), \underbrace{e^{-\frac{U}{2}} \Lambda[\mathfrak{g}_z^{-1}] d\mathbf{Z}}_{2n+2} \right\} \quad (2.79)$$

and rewrite the metric (2.60) as it follows:

$$ds_{\mathcal{QM}}^2 = E_{\mathcal{QM}}^I \mathfrak{q}_{IJ} E_{\mathcal{QM}}^J \quad (2.80)$$

where the quadratic symmetric constant tensor \mathfrak{q}_{IJ} has the following form:

$$\mathfrak{q}_{IJ} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \delta_{ij} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & -2\mathcal{M}_4^{-1}(z_0, \bar{z}_0) \end{array} \right) \quad (2.81)$$

The above defined vielbein are endowed with a very special property namely they identically satisfy a set of Maurer Cartan equations:

$$dE_{\mathcal{QM}}^I - \frac{1}{2} f^I{}_{JK} E_{\mathcal{QM}}^J \wedge E_{\mathcal{QM}}^K = 0 \quad (2.82)$$

where $f^I{}_{JK}$ are the structure constants of a solvable Lie algebra \mathfrak{A} which can be identified as follows:

$$\mathfrak{A} = \text{Solv} \left(\frac{\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}} \right) \quad (2.83)$$

In the above equation $\text{Solv} \left(\frac{\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}} \right)$ denotes the Lie algebra of the solvable group manifold metrically equivalent to the non-compact coset manifold $\frac{\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}}$ according to what we explained in section 1.4. In the case $\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{SK}}$ is a *maximally split* real form of a complex Lie algebra, then also $\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is maximally split and we have:

$$\text{Solv} \left(\frac{\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}} \right) = \text{Bor}(\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}}) \quad (2.84)$$

where $\text{Bor}(\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ denotes the *Borel subalgebra* of the semi-simple Lie algebra \mathbb{G} , generated by its Cartan generators and by the step operators associated with all positive roots.

According to the theory summarized in section 1.4 above, the very fact that the vielbein (2.79) satisfies the Maurer Cartan equations of the Lie algebra $\text{Solv} \left(\frac{\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}} \right)$ implies that the metric (2.80) is the symmetric metric on the coset manifold $\frac{\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}}$ which therefore admits continuous isometries associated with all the generators of the Lie algebra $\mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. For the reader's convenience the list of Symmetric Special manifolds and of their Quaternionic Kähler counterparts in

\mathcal{SK}_n Special Kähler manifold	\mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} Quaternionic Kähler manifold	$\dim \mathcal{SK}_n =$ n
$\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}$	$\frac{G_{2(2)}}{SU(2) \times SU(2)}$	$n = 1$
$\frac{Sp(6, \mathbb{R})}{SU(3) \times U(1)}$	$\frac{F_{4(4)}}{USp(6) \times SU(2)}$	$n = 6$
$\frac{SU(3,3)}{SU(3) \times SU(3) \times U(1)}$	$\frac{E_{6(2)}}{SU(6) \times SU(2)}$	$n = 9$
$\frac{SO^*(12)}{SU(6) \times U(1)}$	$\frac{E_{7(-5)}}{SO(12) \times SU(2)}$	$n = 15$
$\frac{E_{7(-25)}}{E_{6(-78)} \times U(1)}$	$\frac{E_{8(-24)}}{E_{7(-133)} \times SU(2)}$	$n = 27$
$\frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}{SO(2)} \times \frac{SO(2, 2+p)}{SO(2) \times SO(2+p)}$	$\frac{SO(4, 4+p)}{SO(4) \times SO(4+p)}$	$n = 3 + p$
$\frac{SU(p+1, 1)}{SU(p+1) \times U(1)}$	$\frac{SU(p+2, 2)}{SU(p+2) \times SU(2)}$	$n = p + 1$

Table 1: List of special Kähler symmetric spaces with their Quaternionic Kähler c-map images. The number n denotes the complex dimension of the Special Kähler preimage. On the other hand $4n + 4$ is the real dimension of the Quaternionic Kähler c-map image.

the image of the c-map is recalled in table 1 which reproduces the results of [103], according to which there is a short list of Symmetric Homogeneous Special manifolds comprising five discrete cases and two infinite series.

Inspecting the above results we immediately realize that the Lie Algebra \mathbb{U}_Q contains two universal Heisenberg

subalgebras of dimension $(2n + 3)$, namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}} \supset \text{Heis}_1 &= \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \{ \mathbf{W}^{1\alpha}, \mathbb{Z}_1 \} \quad ; \quad \mathbb{Z}_1 = L_+ \equiv L^1 + L^2 \\ & \quad [\mathbf{W}^{1\alpha}, \mathbf{W}^{1\beta}] = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{C}^{\alpha\beta} \mathbb{Z}_1 \quad ; \quad [\mathbb{Z}_1, \mathbf{W}^{1\beta}] = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.85}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{U}_{\mathcal{Q}} \supset \text{Heis}_2 &= \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \{ \mathbf{W}^{2\alpha}, \mathbb{Z}_2 \} \quad ; \quad \mathbb{Z}_2 = L_- \equiv L^1 - L^2 \\ & \quad [\mathbf{W}^{2\alpha}, \mathbf{W}^{2\beta}] = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{C}^{\alpha\beta} \mathbb{Z}_2 \quad ; \quad [\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbf{W}^{2\beta}] = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.86}$$

The first of these Heisenberg subalgebras of isometries is the universal one that exists for all Quaternionic Kähler manifolds \mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} lying in the image of the c -map, irrespectively whether the pre-image Special Kähler manifold \mathcal{SK}_n is a symmetric space or not. The second Heisenberg algebra exists only in the case when the Quaternionic Kähler manifold \mathcal{QM}_{4n+4} is a symmetric space. As we discuss in sections 8 and 9 the Heisenberg subalgebras can play an important role in the attempts to find discretization schemes via tessellations of the host manifold to which data are mapped, which, as we know, is anyhow a Lie group, namely the solvable group manifold. Hence no discretization scheme can avoid the issue of singling out discrete subgroups of such a group.

From this discussion we also realize that the central charge \mathbb{Z}_1 is just the L_+ generator of a universal $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_E$ Lie algebra that exists only in the symmetric space case and which was named the Ehlers algebra in [59]. When $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_E$ does exist we can introduce the universal compact generator:

$$\mathfrak{G} \equiv L_+ - L_- = 2\lambda^2 \tag{2.87}$$

which rotates the two sets of Heisenberg translations one into the other:

$$[\mathfrak{G}, \mathbf{W}^{i\alpha}] = \epsilon^{ij} \mathbf{W}^{j\alpha} \tag{2.88}$$

3 The Solvable Lie Algebra of U/H spaces, the Tits Satake Projection and the Paint Group

We come next to the core of our exposition and we begin by recalling the list of classical complex Lie algebras. The exceptional Lie algebras also fall in the general scheme of real sections, Tits Satake projection, Solvable Subalgebras and Paint Group characterization, yet they have fixed dimensionality and, while they happened to be very much relevant in Supergravity, they seem to have less chance of application in Data Science, although this is not excluded. For this reason they will be mentioned here only occasionally.

THE CLASSICAL SERIES OF SYMMETRIC NON-COMPACT COSET MANIFOLDS Relying on their complete classification (see [104]), according with standard nomenclature and leaving aside the 5 exceptional algebras that have not a variable dimensionality as required by Data Science, the complex simple Lie algebras are distributed into four infinite families named as follows, where ℓ is the rank, namely the dimensionality of the Cartan subalgebra:

1. \mathfrak{a}_{ℓ} . This is the complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(\ell + 1, \mathbb{C})$.
2. \mathfrak{b}_{ℓ} . This is the complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(2\ell + 1, \mathbb{C})$.
3. \mathfrak{c}_{ℓ} . This is the complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sp}(2\ell, \mathbb{C})$.
4. \mathfrak{d}_{ℓ} . This is the complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(2\ell, \mathbb{C})$.




Figure 2: The Dynkin diagrams of the four infinite families of classical simple algebras

The above classical algebras are determined by the corresponding Dynkin diagrams displayed in fig.2. The unique maximally compact real section of each of these complex Lie algebra is shown below:

1. \mathfrak{a}_ℓ . Maximally compact $\mathfrak{su}(\ell + 1)$.
2. \mathfrak{b}_ℓ . Maximally compact $\mathfrak{so}(2\ell + 1, \mathbb{R})$.
3. \mathfrak{c}_ℓ . Maximally compact $\mathfrak{usp}(2\ell)$.
4. \mathfrak{d}_ℓ . Maximally compact $\mathfrak{so}(2\ell, \mathbb{R})$.

All other real sections \mathbb{U} are non-compact and therefore lead to symmetric spaces \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} .

3.1 The maximally split case

In the case we choose $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{G}_{\max}$ where \mathbb{G}_{\max} is the maximally split real section of any of the simple Lie algebras, according with the definition given in eq.(1.11), the maximally compact subalgebra is just:

$$\mathbb{H} \equiv \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \{E^\alpha - E^{-\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \Phi^+\} \quad (3.1)$$

where Φ^+ denotes the subset of all positive roots of the root system. Furthermore the orthogonal decomposition:

$$\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{H} \oplus \mathbb{K} \quad (3.2)$$

is achieved by setting:

$$\mathbb{K} \equiv \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \{\mathcal{H}_i, E^\alpha + E^{-\alpha} \mid \{\mathcal{H}_i\} = \text{basis of CSA}, \alpha \in \Phi^+\} \quad (3.3)$$

In this case the solvable Lie subalgebra $\text{Sol}_{\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}} \subset \mathbb{U}$ whose corresponding solvable Lie group $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}}$ is metrically equivalent to the symmetric space manifold \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} is just the Borel subalgebra $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{U}) \subset \mathbb{U}$:

$$\text{Sol}_{\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}} = \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{U}) \equiv \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \{\mathcal{H}_i, E^\alpha \mid \{\mathcal{H}_i\} = \text{basis of CSA}, \alpha \in \Phi^+\} \quad (3.4)$$

The equality between the dimensionality of the Borel subalgebra with that of the subspace \mathbb{K} of coset generators and of the symmetric space \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} is evident from eq.s (3.3,3.4).

The Borel subalgebra (3.4) is turned into a **normed solvable Lie algebra** according with definition 1.1 by setting:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{H}_i, \mathcal{H}_j \rangle_n &= 2\delta_{ij}, \\ \langle \mathcal{H}_i, E^\alpha \rangle_n &= 0, \\ \langle E^\alpha, E^\beta \rangle_n &= \delta_{\alpha\beta} \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

This quadratic form is invariant according with eq.(1.3) and its normalization is absolute if the generators of the Weyl-Cartan basis for \mathbb{U} have the standard normalization displayed in eq. (1.10). This norm on the solvable Lie algebra is precisely that induced by the unique (up to an overall scale factor) \mathbb{U} -invariant Riemannian metric on the symmetric space \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} according with definition 1.2 and eq.(??).

In relation to this issue, it is here the appropriate point to mention an algorithmic procedure to find the precise form of the norm \langle, \rangle_n induced on the solvable Lie algebra by the symmetric space canonical metric. Such an algorithm is quite convenient and almost automatic in the dual basis of 1-forms, since it utilizes the standard Mathematica code **Vielbgrav23** [105] for the calculation of the intrinsic components of the curvature 2-form in vielbein Riemannian geometry.

3.1.1 Algorithm to find the norm \langle, \rangle_n on the solvable Lie Algebra $Solv_{\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}}$ of a symmetric space

Let \mathcal{T}_A be any basis of generators of the solvable Lie algebra $Solv_{\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}}$ of any of the hyperbolic symmetric spaces, not necessarily maximally split. Let $\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}}$ a generic element of the solvable group parameterized by any convenient set Υ^I ($I = 1, \dots, \dim(Solv_{\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}})$) of parameters. Let

$$\Theta \equiv \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)^{-1} d[\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)] \quad (3.6)$$

be left-invariant 1-form and

$$\Theta = \sum_{A=1}^{\dim(Solv_{\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}})} \mathbf{e}^A \mathcal{T}_A \quad (3.7)$$

its expansion in the basis of generators \mathcal{T}_A .

The metric on the solvable group manifold can be always written as:

$$ds^2 = \kappa_{AB} \mathbf{e}^A \times \mathbf{e}^B \quad (3.8)$$

where κ_{AB} is a symmetric constant matrix. Use this choice of vielbein to calculate with **Vielbgrav23 code** [105] the curvature 2-form \mathfrak{R}^{AB} , the Riemann tensor Rie^{AB}_{CD} and the Ricci tensor Ric^A_C according to the conventions:

$$\mathfrak{R}^{AB} = \text{Rie}^{AB}_{CD} \mathbf{e}^C \wedge \mathbf{e}^D \quad ; \quad \text{Ric}^A_C = \text{Rie}^{AB}_{CB} \quad (3.9)$$

Since the vielbein \mathbf{e}^A satisfy the Maurer Cartan equations of the solvable group, we are guaranteed that the contorsion has only constant components and so does the spin connection and the Riemann tensor. With an arbitrary choice of the matrix κ_{AB} the Ricci tensor is constant but not proportional to the Kronecker Delta. Imposing that $\text{Ric}^A_C = \lambda \delta^A_C$ yields a number of algebraic equations for κ_{AB} which necessarily has one and only one solution $\kappa_{AB}^{[E]}$ up to an overall constant (depending on λ) since we know a priori that the \mathbb{U} -invariant metric on \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} is an Einstein metric. In this way the precise form of the norm on the solvable Lie algebra induced by the symmetric space can be determined:

$$\langle \mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B \rangle_n = \kappa_{AB}^{[E]} \quad (3.10)$$

3.1.2 The maximally split $SL(N, \mathbb{R})/SO(N)$ symmetric space

The simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{a}_{N-1} , identified by the first line Dynkin diagram in fig.2 (setting $\ell = N - 1$) is the abstract form of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{C})$ of complex traceless matrices in dimension N . The corresponding Borel subalgebra $\mathbb{B}_N^{\mathbb{C}} \equiv \mathbb{B}(\mathfrak{a}_{N-1})$ is simply given by the subset of all upper triangular traceless complex matrices. Hence we define

$$\mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{C}) \supset \mathbb{B}_N^{\mathbb{C}} \ni \mathfrak{b} = \begin{pmatrix} \star & \star & \star & \star & \dots & \star \\ 0 & \star & \star & \star & \dots & \star \\ 0 & 0 & \star & \star & \dots & \star \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \star & \dots & \star \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \star \end{pmatrix}; \quad Tr[\mathfrak{b}] = 0 \quad (3.11)$$

The maximally split real section is obtained by restricting all the traceless $N \times N$ matrices to have purely real entries. This obviously applies also to the upper triangular traceless matrices forming the Borel subalgebra. Hence the real Borellian $\mathbb{B}_N^{\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{R})$ is a solvable subalgebra of $\mathbb{U} = \mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{R})$ having real dimensions:

$$\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{B}_N^{\mathbb{R}} \equiv d_N = \frac{N(N+1)}{2} - 1 \quad (3.12)$$

That above in eq.(3.12) is also, as it should be, the dimension of the coset manifold $SL(N, \mathbb{R})/SO(N)$ which, in this simple case, can also be described as the manifold of all unimodular symmetric matrices \mathcal{M} :

$$SL(N, \mathbb{R})/SO(N) = \{ \mathcal{M} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N) \mid \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^T, \quad \text{Det}[\mathcal{M}] = 1 \} \quad (3.13)$$

The above concise definition of the symmetric space turns out to be very useful while discussing both the spectrum of harmonic functions on U/H and when deriving the integral formulae for the geodesics and, hence, also for the geodesic distance function. Furthermore the concise definition (3.13) applies not only to the maximal split $SL(N, \mathbb{R})/SO(N)$ case, but also to all the other classical U/H . What happens in those cases is that the symmetric unimodular \mathcal{M} is constrained by additional quadratic constraints related with the definition of the relevant Lie group.

3.1.3 The solvable coordinates

In the maximally split case $U/H = SL(N, \mathbb{R})/SO(N)$ we define the mapping from the solvable Lie algebra (in this case the borellian) to the solvable group introducing an ordered graded basis of generators T^A for the Solvable Lie algebra based on the root height. The generators start at grade 0 which corresponds to Cartan generators. Next come the grade 1 generators that are orderly associated with simple roots. Next we have the grade 2 generators associated with the roots of hight 2 and so on up to the unique generators associated with the unique highest root.

In this way we write:

$$\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon) = \prod_{A=1}^n \exp [\Upsilon_A T^A] \quad (3.14)$$

Υ^A are the **solvable coordinates** of the symmetric space.

3.2 The triangular embedding of the U/H symmetric spaces associated with other real sections

In order to construct the solvable Lie Algebra for the other real sections it is very important the following

Statement 3.1 << Let N be the real dimension of the fundamental representation of \mathbb{U} and $\mathbb{H} \subset \mathbb{U}$ its maximal compact subalgebra. Then we always have a suitable symmetric matrix η_t with the appropriate signature for the real sections of \mathfrak{b}_ℓ and \mathfrak{d}_ℓ and a suitable antisymmetric matrix \mathbb{C}_t for the real sections of c_ℓ implying a canonical embedding:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{U} &\hookrightarrow \mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{R}) , \\ \mathbb{U} \supset \mathbb{H} &\hookrightarrow \mathfrak{so}(N) \subset \mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{R}) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Such an embedding is determined, in all cases by the choice of the basis where $\text{Solv}(\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H})$ is made by upper triangular matrices. Furthermore in the same basis, in the case of the \mathfrak{b}_ℓ and \mathfrak{d}_ℓ algebras, all the elements of both \mathbb{K} and \mathbb{H} have to be η_t -antisymmetric matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall K \in \mathbb{K} & : \quad \eta_t K + K^T \eta_t = 0 \\ \forall H \in \mathbb{H} & : \quad \eta_t H + H^T \eta_t = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

while, at the same time they must satisfy the condition:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall K \in \mathbb{K} & : \quad K - K^T = 0 \\ \forall H \in \mathbb{H} & : \quad H + H^T = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

The first condition (3.16) guarantees that the elements of both \mathbb{K} and \mathbb{H} belong to the \mathbb{U} Lie algebra while second condition (3.17) guarantees that \mathbb{H} is mapped to $\mathfrak{so}(N)$ while \mathbb{K} is mapped instead to the orthogonal complement of $\mathfrak{so}(N)$ in $\mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{R})$.

In the case of real sections of the c_ℓ Lie algebras, the conditions to be satisfied by the matrix \mathbb{C}_t and the matrices of \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{K} are identical to those written above (3.16-3.17) with η_t replaced by \mathbb{C}_t . Since the latter is antisymmetric, the condition (3.16) becomes a condition of \mathbb{C}_t symmetry. >>

We show the explicit construction of the η_t matrix in section 3.5 for the case of the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + 2s)$. The choice of such a basis is the strategic instrument to derive the explicit form of all Lie algebra generators and analyse the Tits Satake projection and the Paint group. Let us then turn to the latter, already sketched in the introduction and present it in full fledged form.

3.3 Tits Satake Projection and the Paint Group

In the introductory section we have already anticipated the concept of **algebra-geometric Tits Satake projection**, defined in eq.(1.29) and acting on the root system, according with the decomposition (1.28) induced by the Cartan involution that defines the considered real section \mathbb{U} . We have also presented without proof the theorem 1.3. Indeed as it is the case for almost all the theorems in this chapter of mathematics, the proof is simply by exhaustion, by means of the explicit analysis of each case, being the possible cases in a small finite number.

We consider now the outcome of such a projection in some detail yet first we answer the preliminary question *What is the solvable Lie algebra of the solvable group metrically equivalent to \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} , when the latter is not maximally split?*. The example of the maximally split case clearly suggests what is the required solvable algebra for other real sections. Indeed we have:

$$\text{Solv} \left(\frac{\mathbb{U}}{\mathbb{H}} \right) = \mathcal{H}^{n.c.} \oplus \text{span}(\mathcal{E}^\alpha) \quad ; \quad \forall \alpha \in \Phi_+ / \alpha_{\parallel} \neq 0 \quad (3.18)$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{n.c.}$ is the non-compact part of the Cartan subalgebra and \mathcal{E}^α denotes the combination of step operators pertaining to the positive roots α that appear in the real section $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{G}_R$ and the sum is extended only to those roots that are not purely imaginary. Indeed the step operators pertaining to imaginary roots are included into the maximal compact subalgebra that now is larger than the number of positive roots. The explicit form of the generators associated with the roots can be worked out only through the use of the triangular embedding, yet schematically

eq.(3.18) is sufficient for the general discussion.

3.3.1 The Tits Satake projection: an in depth algebraic glance

In this subsection we elaborate all the needed details explaining how the Tits-Satake projection of a **normed solvable Lie algebra** is actually performed and how it is related to the notions of **Paint Group** G_{paint} and of **subPaint Group** $G_{\text{subpaint}} \subset G_{\text{paint}}$. Such peculiar universal structure of the solvable algebras $\text{Solv}(U/H)$ had not been observed before [23] and it extends beyond symmetric spaces as it was demonstrated in [18]. Indeed the Tits-Satake projection can be defined for general normed solvable Lie algebras. Yet our main interest is in symmetric spaces and the just mentioned notions have been extracted precisely from the case of the Tits-Satake projections of solvable Lie algebras associated with symmetric spaces $\text{Solv}(G/H)$. On these latter we focus.

The Tits-Satake projection consists of two steps. First one sets all $\alpha_{\perp} = 0$, projecting the original root system Φ_U onto a new system of vectors $\bar{\Phi}$ living in a Euclidean space of dimension equal to the non-compact rank r_{nc} . The set $\bar{\Phi}$ is called a restricted root system. It is not an ordinary root system in the sense that roots can occur with multiplicities different from one and $2\alpha_{\parallel}$ can be a root if α_{\parallel} is one. In the second step, one deletes the multiplicities of the restricted roots. Thus we have

$$\pi_{\text{TS}} \quad : \quad \Phi_U \mapsto \Phi_{\text{TS}}; \quad \Phi_U \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\perp}=0} \bar{\Phi} \xrightarrow[\text{multiplicities}]{\text{deleting}} \Phi_{\text{TS}}. \quad (3.19)$$

If $\bar{\Phi}$ contains no restricted root that is the double of another one, then Φ_{TS} is a root system of simple type. We will show later that this root subsystem defines a Lie algebra \mathbb{U}_{TS} , the *Tits-Satake subalgebra* of \mathbb{U} :

$$\Phi_{\text{TS}} = \text{root system of } \mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}, \quad \mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}} \subset \mathbb{U}. \quad (3.20)$$

The Tits-Satake subalgebra \mathbb{U}_{TS} is, as a consequence of its own definition, the maximally non-compact real section of its own complexification. For this reason, considering its maximal compact subalgebra $\mathbb{H}_{\text{TS}} \subset \mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}$ we have a new smaller coset $\mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}/\mathbb{H}_{\text{TS}}$ which is maximally split and whose associated solvable algebra $\text{Solv}(\mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}/\mathbb{H}_{\text{TS}})$ is the Borellian of \mathbb{U}_{TS} .

In the case doubled restricted roots are present in $\bar{\Phi}$, the projection cannot be expressed in terms of a simple Lie algebra, but the concept remains the same. The root system is the so-called bc_r system, with $r = r_{\text{nc}}$ the non-compact rank of the real form \mathbb{U} . It is the root system of a group \mathbb{U}_{TS} , which is now non-semi-simple. The manifold is similarly defined as $\mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}/\mathbb{H}_{\text{TS}}$, where \mathbb{H}_{TS} is the maximal compact subgroup of \mathbb{U}_{TS} . As we already stressed this case happens only in the case of real sections of the \mathfrak{a}_{ℓ} Lie algebras.

The next question is: what is the relation between the two solvable Lie algebras $\text{Solv}(U/H)$ and $\text{Solv}(\mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}/\mathbb{H}_{\text{TS}})$? The answer can be formulated through the following statements A-E.

A] In a projection more than one higher dimensional vector can map to the same lower dimensional one. This means that in general there will be several roots of Φ_U that have the same image in Φ_{TS} . The imaginary roots vanish under this projection, according to the definition of 1.4. Therefore, apart from these imaginary roots, there are two types of roots: those that have a distinct image in the projected root system and those that arrange into multiplets with the same projection. We can split the root spaces in subsets according to whether there is such a degeneracy or not.

Calling $\Phi_{\mathbb{U}}^+$ and Φ_{TS}^+ the sets of positive roots of the two root systems, we have the following scheme:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\mathbb{U}}^+ &= \Phi^\eta \cup \Phi^\delta \cup \Phi_{\text{comp}} \\
\downarrow \pi_{\text{TS}} &\quad \downarrow \pi_{\text{TS}} \quad \downarrow \pi_{\text{TS}} \\
\Phi_{\text{TS}}^+ &= \Phi_{\text{TS}}^\ell \cup \Phi_{\text{TS}}^s \\
\forall \alpha^\ell \in \Phi_{\text{TS}}^\ell &: \dim \pi_{\text{TS}}^{-1}[\alpha^\ell] = 1, \quad \forall \alpha^s \in \Phi_{\text{TS}}^s : \dim \pi_{\text{TS}}^{-1}[\alpha^s] = m[\alpha^s] > 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

The δ part thus contains all the roots that have multiplicities under the Tits-Satake projection while the roots in the η part have no multiplicities. These roots of type η are orthogonal to Φ_{comp} . Indeed, this follows from the fact that for any two root vectors α and β where there is no root of the form $\beta + m\alpha$ with m a non-zero integer, the inner product of β and α vanishes. It also follows from this definition that in maximally split symmetric spaces, in which case $\Phi_{\text{comp}} = \emptyset$, all root vectors are in Φ^η or Φ^ℓ (as the Tits-Satake projection is then trivialized).

These subsets moreover satisfy the following properties under addition of root vectors:

\mathbb{U}	\mathbb{U}_{TS}	(3.22)
$\Phi^\eta + \Phi^\eta \subset \Phi^\eta$	$\Phi_{\text{TS}}^\ell + \Phi_{\text{TS}}^\ell \subset \Phi_{\text{TS}}^\ell$	
$\Phi^\eta + \Phi^\delta \subset \Phi^\delta$	$\Phi_{\text{TS}}^\ell + \Phi_{\text{TS}}^s \subset \Phi_{\text{TS}}^s$	
$\Phi^\delta + \Phi^\delta \subset \Phi^\eta \cup \Phi^\delta$	$\Phi_{\text{TS}}^s + \Phi_{\text{TS}}^s \subset \Phi_{\text{TS}}^\ell \cup \Phi_{\text{TS}}^s$	
$\Phi_{\text{comp}} + \Phi^\eta = \emptyset$		
$\Phi_{\text{comp}} + \Phi^\delta \subset \Phi^\delta$		

Because of this structure we can enumerate the generators of the solvable algebra $\text{Solv}(\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H})$ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Solv}(\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}) &= \{H_i, \Phi_{\alpha^\ell}, \Omega_{\alpha^s|I}\} \\
H_i &\Rightarrow \text{Cartan generators} \\
\Phi_{\alpha^\ell} &\Rightarrow \eta - \text{roots} \\
\Omega_{\alpha^s|I} &\Rightarrow \delta - \text{roots} \quad ; \quad (I = 1, \dots, m[\alpha^s]).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

The index I enumerating the m -roots of $\Phi_{\mathbb{U}}$ that have the same projection in Φ_{TS} is named the *paint index*.

B] There exists a *compact subalgebra* $\mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}} \subset \mathbb{U}$ which acts as an algebra of outer automorphisms (*i.e.* outer derivatives) of the solvable algebra $\text{Solv}_{\mathbb{U}} \equiv \text{Solv}(\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}) \subset \mathbb{U}$, namely:

$$[\mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}}, \text{Solv}_{\mathbb{U}}] \subset \text{Solv}_{\mathbb{U}}. \tag{3.24}$$

C] The Cartan generators H_i and the generators Φ_{α^ℓ} are singlets under the action of $\mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}}$, *i.e.* each of them commutes with the whole of $\mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}}$:

$$[H_i, \mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}}] = [\Phi_{\alpha^\ell}, \mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}}] = 0 \tag{3.25}$$

On the other hand, each of the multiplets of generators $\Omega_{\alpha^s|I}$ constitutes an orbit under the adjoint action of the paint group $\mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}}$, *i.e.* a linear representation $\mathbf{D}[\alpha^s]$ which, for different roots α^s can be different:

$$\forall X \in \mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}} : [X, \Omega_{\alpha^s|I}] = \left(D^{[\alpha^s]}[X] \right)_I^J \Omega_{\alpha^s|J} \tag{3.26}$$

D] The *paint algebra* $\mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}}$ contains a subalgebra

$$\mathbb{G}_{\text{subpaint}}^0 \subset \mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}} \quad (3.27)$$

such that with respect to $\mathbb{G}_{\text{subpaint}}^0$, each $m[\alpha^s]$ -dimensional representation $\mathbf{D}[\alpha^s]$ branches as follows:

$$\mathbf{D}[\alpha^s] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{G}_{\text{subpaint}}^0} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}}_{\text{singlet}} \oplus \underbrace{\mathbf{J}}_{(m[\alpha^s]-1)\text{-dimensional}} \quad (3.28)$$

Accordingly we can split the range of the multiplicity index I as follows:

$$I = \{0, x\}, \quad x = 1, \dots, m[\alpha^s] - 1. \quad (3.29)$$

The index 0 corresponds to the singlet, while x ranges over the representation \mathbf{J} .

E] The tensor product $\mathbf{J} \otimes \mathbf{J}$ contains both the identity representation $\mathbf{1}$ and the representation \mathbf{J} itself. Furthermore, there exists, in the representation $\bigwedge^3 \mathbf{J}$ a $\mathbb{G}_{\text{subpaint}}^0$ -invariant tensor a^{xyz} such that the two solvable Lie algebras $\text{Solv}_{\mathbb{U}}$ and $\text{Solv}_{\mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}}$ can be written as follows

Solv $_{\mathbb{U}}$	Solv $_{\mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}}$
$[H_i, H_j] = 0$ $[H_i, \Phi_{\alpha^\ell}] = \alpha_i^\ell \Phi_{\alpha^\ell}$ $[H_i, \Omega_{\alpha^s I}] = \alpha_i^s \Omega_{\alpha^s I}$ $[\Phi_{\alpha^\ell}, \Phi_{\beta^\ell}] = N_{\alpha^\ell \beta^\ell} \Phi_{\alpha^\ell + \beta^\ell}$ $[\Phi_{\alpha^\ell}, \Omega_{\beta^s I}] = N_{\alpha^\ell \beta^s} \Omega_{\alpha^\ell + \beta^s I}$ If $\alpha^s + \beta^s \in \Phi_{\text{TS}}^\ell$: $[\Omega_{\alpha^s I}, \Omega_{\beta^s J}] = \delta^{IJ} N_{\alpha^s \beta^s} \Phi_{\alpha^s + \beta^s}$ If $\alpha^s + \beta^s \in \Phi_{\text{TS}}^s$: $\begin{cases} [\Omega_{\alpha^s 0}, \Omega_{\beta^s 0}] = N_{\alpha^s \beta^s} \Omega_{\alpha^s + \beta^s 0} \\ [\Omega_{\alpha^s 0}, \Omega_{\beta^s x}] = N_{\alpha^s \beta^s} \Omega_{\alpha^s + \beta^s x} \\ [\Omega_{\alpha^s x}, \Omega_{\beta^s y}] = N_{\alpha^s \beta^s} (\delta^{xy} \Omega_{\alpha^s + \beta^s 0} + a^{xyz} \Omega_{\alpha^s + \beta^s z}) \end{cases}$	$[H_i, H_j] = 0$ $[H_i, E^{\alpha^\ell}] = \alpha_i^\ell$ $[H_i, E^{\alpha^s}] = \alpha_i^s E^{\alpha^s}$ $[E^{\alpha^\ell}, E^{\beta^\ell}] = N_{\alpha^\ell \beta^\ell} E^{\alpha^\ell + \beta^\ell}$ $[E^{\alpha^\ell}, E^{\beta^s}] = N_{\alpha^\ell \beta^s} E^{\alpha^\ell + \beta^s}$ $[E^{\alpha^s}, E^{\beta^s}] = N_{\alpha^s \beta^s} E^{\alpha^s + \beta^s}$ $[E^{\alpha^s}, E^{\beta^s}] = N_{\alpha^s \beta^s} E^{\alpha^s + \beta^s}$

(3.30)

where $N_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ if $\alpha + \beta \notin \Phi_{\text{TS}}$.

SUMMARIZING we can say that for the non-compact, non-maximally split real sections of the simple Lie algebras (with the only exception of the \mathfrak{a}_ℓ series), we have the following four subalgebras:

$$\mathbb{U} \supset \mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}} \supset \mathbb{U}_{\text{subTS}} \quad ; \quad \mathbb{U} \supset \mathbb{G}_{\text{Paint}} \supset \mathbb{G}_{\text{subPaint}} \quad (3.31)$$

where \mathbb{U}_{TS} and $\mathbb{U}_{\text{subTS}}$ are both maximally split of total rank $r_{\text{TS}} = r_{\text{subTS}} = r_{n.c.}(\mathbb{U})$, while $\mathbb{G}_{\text{Paint}}$ and $\mathbb{G}_{\text{subPaint}}$ are maximally compact and have total rank $r_{\text{Paint}} = r_{\text{subPaint}} = r_{\text{comp}}(\mathbb{U})$. Furthermore we have:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbb{G}_{\text{Paint}}, \mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}] &\neq 0 \\ [\mathbb{G}_{\text{subPaint}}, \mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}] &= 0 \\ [\mathbb{G}_{\text{Paint}}, \mathbb{U}_{\text{subTS}}] &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

The Lie subalgebra $\mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}} \subset \mathbb{U}$ has already been described in the previous lines and it is spanned by the non-compact Cartan generators H_i , the step operators Φ_{α^ℓ} associated with the long roots (plus those associated with their negatives) and the step operators $\Omega_{\alpha^s|_0}$ associated with the short roots that are in the singlet representation of the $\mathbb{G}_{\text{subPaint}}$ group (plus those associated with their negatives).

The subalgebra $\mathbb{U}_{\text{subTS}} \subset \mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}$ is obtained by dropping also the generators $\Omega_{\alpha^s|_0}$ namely restricting oneself only to generators that are Paint Group singlets.

As we show in detail in section 3.5 for the series of Lie algebras $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + 2s)$, the above algebraic structure reflects into properties of the symmetric spaces \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} that admit the following series of projections:

$$\frac{\mathbb{U}}{\mathbb{H}} \xrightarrow{\pi_{\text{TS}}} \frac{\mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\text{TS}}} \xrightarrow{\pi_{\text{subTS}}} \frac{\mathbb{U}_{\text{sub}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\text{subTS}}} \tag{3.33}$$

The composition $\pi_{\text{subTS}} \equiv \pi_{\text{sub}} \circ \pi_{\text{TS}}$ allows to write also:

$$\frac{\mathbb{U}}{\mathbb{H}} \xrightarrow{\pi_{\text{subTS}}} \frac{\mathbb{U}_{\text{sub}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\text{subTS}}} \tag{3.34}$$

In the applications to data science it appears of high relevance to investigate the properties of the fibres of these projections, namely:

$$\forall p \in \frac{\mathbb{U}_{\text{TS}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\text{TS}}} : \mathfrak{F}_{\text{TS}}(p) = \pi_{\text{TS}}^{-1}(p) \quad ; \quad \forall p \in \frac{\mathbb{U}_{\text{subTS}}}{\mathbb{H}_{\text{subTS}}} : \mathfrak{F}_{\text{subTS}}(p) = \pi_{\text{subTS}}^{-1}(p) \tag{3.35}$$

that have the structure of vector spaces with a well-defined linear action of either the subPaint or Paint Groups. In other words the manifold \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} acquires the structure of the total space of a vector bundle with base manifold either the TS, or the subTS submanifold and structural group either the subPaint or Paint Group. In particular the norm square function on the \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} symmetric space turns out to depend only on the points of the base manifold and on a limited number of invariants of such a structural group.

3.3.2 Tits Satake Universality Classes of Homogeneous Special Geometries

We analyzed the concepts of Special Kähler manifolds and Quaternionic Kähler manifolds. Furthermore we explained the general construction of the *c-map* that generates an extension of every Special Kähler manifold to a Quaternionic Kähler one. Those Quaternionic Kähler manifolds that are in the image of the *c-map* are named *Special Quaternionic*. Collectively Special Kähler and Special Quaternionic are christened *Special Geometries*. Special Geometries do not have to be homogeneous manifolds under the action of a transitive group of isometries, but some of them are: they are named *Homogeneous Special Geometries*. The homogeneous special geometries discovered in the Supergravity context have been classified, as we already pointed out in the introduction, in [7, 70–73] and fall into a finite set of series, but some of them are infinite and it might seem that one ought to examine an infinite number of cases. This is not so because of the Universality classes created by the Tits Satake Projection.

What is meant by this wording is the following. The Tits Satake projection thoroughly illustrated in the previous subsection has a series of very strong distinctive features:

1. π_{TS} is a projection operator, so that several different manifolds \mathcal{SH}_i ($i = 1, \dots, r$) have the same image $\pi_{\text{TS}}(\mathcal{SH}_i)$.

2. π_{TS} preserves the rank of \mathcal{G}_M namely the dimension of the maximal Abelian semisimple subalgebra (Cartan subalgebra) of \mathcal{G}_M .
3. π_{TS} maps special homogeneous into special homogeneous manifolds: in particular it maps *special Kähler* into *special Kähler* and maps *Quaternionic* into *Quaternionic*
4. π_{TS} commutes with c -map, so that we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Special Kähler} & \xrightarrow{c\text{-map}} & \text{Quaternionic-Kähler} \\
\pi_{\text{TS}} \downarrow & & \pi_{\text{TS}} \downarrow \\
(\text{Special Kähler})_{\text{TS}} & \xrightarrow{c\text{-map}} & (\text{Quaternionic-Kähler})_{\text{TS}}
\end{array} \tag{3.36}$$

The main consequence of the above features is that the whole set of special homogeneous manifolds is distributed into a set of *universality classes* which turns out to be composed of extremely few elements.

If we confine ourselves to homogenous symmetric special geometries then the list of special symmetric manifolds contains only eight items among which two infinite series. They are displayed in the first column of table 2. The c -map produces just as many quaternionic (Kähler) manifolds, that are displayed in the second column of the same table. Upon the Tits-Satake projection, this infinite set of models is organized into just five universality classes that are displayed on the third column of table 2.

The non-compact symmetric spaces to be utilized in Data Science applications are not necessarily special homogeneous spaces, yet in view of the considerations and plans presented in section 1.5,1.5.1 all of the spaces that are there in agenda do appear, at the level of the entire class or of their Tits Satake projection, in table 2. This means that the c -map has a well founded right to be carefully considered and we are going to use it to reduce the menu of building blocks for all cases $r_{n.c.} \leq 4$ made out of only two items.

3.4 The Symmetric Spaces $\text{SO}(r, r+k)/\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+k)$

Having excluded the symmetric spaces associated with the infinite series of \mathfrak{a}_ℓ simple algebra because their Tits Satake projection yields exotic root systems, we remain with the other three series $\mathfrak{b}_\ell, \mathfrak{c}_\ell, \mathfrak{d}_\ell$.

It appears that, in the context of applications to Data Science a relevant class of symmetric spaces is the following one:

$$\mathcal{M}^{[p,q]} = \frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{H}} = \frac{\text{SO}(p,q)}{\text{S}[\text{O}(p) \times \text{O}(q)]}, \quad p < q. \tag{3.37}$$

These manifolds have rank p and describe the hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^{(p,q)}$ defined by the equation:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} (x_i)^2 - \sum_{j=p}^{n-1} (x_j)^2 = 1, \tag{3.38}$$

where $n = p + q$

In order to apply the algebraic machinery described in the previous sections, one has to split the family (3.37) in two subfamilies depending on whether the number $n = p + q$ is even or odd, covering in this way the two classes of real sections respectively associated with the \mathfrak{d}_ℓ and \mathfrak{b}_ℓ series of simple Lie Algebras:

$$\mathcal{M}^{[p,q]} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \nearrow \\ \searrow \end{cases} \begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{d}}^{[r,s]} &= \frac{\text{SO}(r,r+2s)}{\text{S}[\text{O}(r) \times \text{O}(r+2s)]} \\ \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{[r,s]} &= \frac{\text{SO}(r,r+2s+1)}{\text{S}[\text{O}(r) \times \text{O}(r+2s+1)]} \end{aligned} \tag{3.39}$$

Special Kähler \mathcal{SK}_n	Quaternionic \mathcal{QM}_{4n+4}	Tits Satake projection of Quater. \mathcal{QM}_{TS}
$\frac{U(s+1,1)}{U(s+1) \times U(1)}$	$\frac{U(s+2,2)}{U(s+2) \times U(2)}$	$\frac{U(3,2)}{U(3) \times U(2)}$
$\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}$	$\frac{G_{(2,2)}}{SU(2) \times SU(2)}$	$\frac{G_{(2,2)}}{SU(2) \times SU(2)}$
$\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \times \frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}$	$\frac{SO(3,4)}{SO(3) \times SO(4)}$	$\frac{SO(3,4)}{SO(3) \times SO(4)}$
$\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \times \frac{SO(p+2,2)}{SO(p+2) \times SO(2)}$	$\frac{SO(p+4,4)}{SO(p+4) \times SO(4)}$	$\frac{SO(5,4)}{SO(5) \times SO(4)}$
$\frac{Sp(6)}{U(3)}$	$\frac{F_{(4,4)}}{Usp(6) \times SU(2)}$	
$\frac{SU(3,3)}{SU(3) \times SU(3) \times U(1)}$	$\frac{E_{(6,-2)}}{SU(6) \times SU(2)}$	$\frac{F_{(4,4)}}{Usp(6) \times SU(2)}$
$\frac{SO^*(12)}{SU(6) \times U(1)}$	$\frac{E_{(\tau,-5)}}{SO(12) \times SU(2)}$	
$\frac{E_{(\tau,-25)}}{E_{(6,-78)} \times U(1)}$	$\frac{E_{(8,-24)}}{E_{(\tau,-133)} \times SU(2)}$	

Table 2: The eight series of homogenous symmetric special Kähler manifolds (infinite and finite), their quaternionic counterparts and the grouping of the latter into five Tits Satake universality classes.

The Satake diagrams associated with each of the two families are respectively displayed in fig.s 3 and 4 and in their captions all the information regarding the final result of the Tits Satake projection is briefly summarized.

Both series of Lie algebras have the same *Tits Satake subalgebra* that is shown in fig.5 and the same *sub Tits Satake subalgebra* that is shown in fig.6. Hence once the non-compact (or split) rank r is fixed, the two infinite series $\frac{SO(r,r+2s)}{S[O(r) \times O(r+2s)]}$ and $\frac{SO(r,r+2s+1)}{S[O(r) \times O(r+2s+1)]}$ project onto the same maximally split Tits Satake space $\frac{SO(r,r+1)}{SO(r) \times SO(r+1)}$, or onto the same maximally split sub Tits Satake space $\frac{SO(r,r)}{SO(r) \times SO(r+1)}$, constituting a single universality class. What distinguishes the various spaces inside the universality class are **Paint Groups**, either $SO(2s)$ or $SO(2s+1)$. The roots of the restricted system $\bar{\Delta}$ subdivide in the two sets Δ^η and Δ^δ which are respectively singlets and either $2s-$




Figure 3: The Satake diagram of the real section $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$ of the complex Lie Algebra $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{d}_{r+s}$ generating the Lie group $\text{SO}(r, r+2s)$. The total rank of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is $\text{rank} = r + s$, the split rank $\text{rank}_s = r$, the Tits Satake subalgebra is $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}} \supset \mathbb{G}_{\text{TS}} = \mathfrak{b}_r$, the Paint Group is $\text{G}_{\text{Paint}} = \text{SO}(2s)$.




Figure 4: The Tits Satake diagram of the real section $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$ of the complex Lie Algebra $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{b}_{r+s}$ generating the Lie group $\text{SO}(r, r+2s+1)$. The total rank of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is $\text{rank} = r + s$, the split rank $\text{rank}_s = r$, the Tits Satake subalgebra is $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}} \supset \mathbb{G}_{\text{TS}} = \mathfrak{b}_r$, the Paint Group is $\text{G}_{\text{Paint}} = \text{SO}(2s+1)$.

tuplets or $(2s+1)$ -tuplets under the action of the appropriate Paint Group. This means that the solvable coordinates of the coset manifolds subdivide into three classes: the duals of r Cartan generators, the duals of $r(r-1)$ long root generators and the dual of the $r \times (2s)$ or $r \times (2s+1)$ short roots. The plethora of the short root solvable coordinates are actually a small set r of solvable coordinates that carry a second hidden index, the paint index I taking a large number of values.

Because of the above general conclusion, in order to study the full Universality Classes of manifolds (3.37), labeled by the non-compact rank r , it is sufficient to choose one of the two subclasses displayed in eq.(3.39). All the final results for the distance formulae, the Paint and sub-Paint invariants and the geometry in the projected space apply to both cases.

We have chosen throughout this paper to utilize the case $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{[r,s]}$ related with the \mathfrak{d}_{ℓ} series.




Figure 5: The Tits Satake diagram of the Tits Satake subalgebra $\text{SO}(r, r+1)$.




Figure 6: The sub Tits Satake diagram of the subTS subalgebra $\text{SO}(r, r)$.

3.5 The Lie algebras $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + 2s)$ and their solvable Lie subalgebra

For this family of non-compact real sections of the complex $\mathfrak{d}_{\ell=r+s}$ Lie algebras, we refer to the Tits Satake diagram displayed in fig.s 3 and in its caption where all the information regarding the final result of the Tits Satake projection is briefly summarized. Recapitulating what we said in the previous section, the total number of positive roots in the $\Phi_{\mathfrak{d}_{r+s}}$ root system is:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \text{card}[\Phi_{\mathfrak{d}_{r+s}}] &= (r+s)^2 - (r+s) \\ &= \underbrace{r^2 - r}_{\text{long roots}} + \underbrace{2rs}_{\text{short roots}} + \underbrace{s^2 - s}_{\text{roots of } G_{\text{Paint}}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

and the various addends are interpreted as shown above. Indeed we know that the Tits Satake root system Φ_{TS} corresponds to the Dynkin Diagram \mathfrak{b}_r , as displayed in fig.5. This is the root system of the complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(2r + 1)$, whose maximally split real section is $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + 1)$. The number of positive roots in Φ_{TS} therefore is:

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{card}[\Phi_{TS}^{[r,s]}] = r^2 \quad (3.41)$$

As it is evident from the very form of the \mathfrak{b}_r Dynkin diagram, in the corresponding root system $\Phi_{TS}^{[r,s]}$ there are, exactly $r^2 - r$ long roots and r short roots. In the root system $\Phi_{\mathfrak{d}_{r+s}}$ we have one preimage of each of the long roots of $\Phi_{TS}^{[r,s]}$ and $2s$ pre-images of each of the r short-roots. The remaining $s^2 - s$ roots are all imaginary and, in the complete $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + 2s)$ Lie algebra, their associated step operators appear only through their maximally compact combinations $E^\alpha - E^{-\alpha}$ and $i(E^\alpha + E^{-\alpha})$, generating, together with non-compact Cartan generators, the Paint Group $\text{SO}(2s)$. In the $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + 2s)$ Lie algebra, the step operators associated with the $2s$ copies of each short root are linearly transformed one into the other under the adjoint action of the Paint group $\text{SO}(2s)$.

The solvable Lie algebra $\text{Solv}_{[r,s]}$ associated with this real section, is made by the r non-compact Cartan generators \mathcal{H}_i , the $r^2 - r$ step operators E^{α_i} associated with positive long roots and the $2rs$ step operators associated with pre-images of the short roots $E^{\alpha_i^s}$ ($i, 1, \dots, 2s$). Therefore the total dimension of the solvable Lie algebra is:

$$\dim \text{Solv}_{[r,s]} = r + r^2 - r + 2rs = r(r + 2s) = \dim \frac{\text{SO}(r, r + 2s)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r + 2s)} \quad (3.42)$$

as it should be.

A basis of generators for the $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + 2s)$ Lie Algebra, where the above abstractly described structure is made explicit, is obtained through the construction in dimension $N = 2r + 2s$ of the matrix η_t advocated by the statement

3.1. By definition of the Lie Algebra, the matrix η_t must have signature:

$$\text{sign}_{r,s} = \left\{ \underbrace{+, \dots, +}_{r+2s \text{ times}}, \underbrace{-, \dots, -}_{r \text{ times}} \right\} \quad (3.43)$$

The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(r, r+2s)$ is then made by all $N \times N$ matrices that fulfill the following condition:

$$X \in \mathfrak{so}(r, r+2s) \Leftrightarrow X^T \eta_t + \eta_t X = 0 \quad (3.44)$$

The appropriate choice of η_t is the following one:

$$\eta = \eta_t = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & 1 & \vdots & & & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & & & \\ \hline 0 & \cdots & 0 & \mathbf{1}_{2s \times 2s} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & & & \\ \hline 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & & & \\ \vdots & 1 & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & & \\ 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & & & \end{array} \right) \quad (3.45)$$

The matrix η_t defined above is transformed into the standard one:

$$\eta_b \equiv \text{diag} \left\{ \underbrace{+, \dots, +}_{r+2s \text{ times}}, \underbrace{-, \dots, -}_{r \text{ times}} \right\} \quad (3.46)$$

by the conjugation with a matrix Ω that can be constructed for all pairs $r \geq 1, s \geq 1$ and it has also a general form. Such general form can be easily read off from its expression in the case $r = 3, s = 2$ which we show below:

$$\Omega = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc|c} & r & & 2 & s & & r & & & \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2s \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \\ \hline \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & r \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & \\ \hline \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & r \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & \end{array} \right) \quad (3.47)$$

For all r, s choices:

$$\Omega \eta_t \Omega^T = \eta_b \quad (3.48)$$

Utilizing the basis η_t , the solvable subalgebra is easily identified since, by construction, it is made by all those matrices that satisfy the defining condition 3.44 of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + 2s)$, which in addition are also upper triangular including the diagonal. So doing the procedure to explicitly construct the algebra becomes straight-forward and best suited to computer algorithms. In that construction one automatically derives a set of Cartan-Weyl generators that are well well-adapted to the particularly chosen invariant metric η_t . In this basis the Cartan involution θ defining the orthogonal decomposition (1.18) is simply given by matrix transposition:

$$\forall X \in \mathfrak{so}(r, r + 2s) : \quad \theta(X) = X^T \quad (3.49)$$

Hence, according with the notations introduced in the general analysis of the Tits Satake projection in section 3.3, the generators of the solvable Lie algebras are the following ones:

$$\mathbf{T} = \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} H_i & = \text{Cartan generators} & i = 1, \dots, r \\ \Phi_\alpha^\ell & = \text{Long root generators} & \alpha^\ell = 1, \dots, r^2 - r \\ \Omega_{\alpha^s|I} & = \text{Short root generators} & \alpha^s = 1, \dots, r \quad I = 1, \dots, 2s \\ J_x & = \text{generators of the Paint group} & x = 1, \dots, s(2s - 1) \end{array} \right. \quad (3.50)$$

In the η_t basis the matrices representing H_i are diagonal, those representing Φ_α^ℓ and $\Omega_{\alpha^s|I}$ are upper triangular, while those representing J_x are antisymmetric.

Correspondingly one introduces the set of solvable coordinates for the coset manifold, collectively named Υ , with the following structure:

$$\Upsilon = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \underbrace{\Upsilon_i}_{\text{n.c. Cartan}} \quad | \quad \underbrace{\Upsilon_{r+\alpha^\ell}}_{\text{long roots}} \quad | \quad \underbrace{\Upsilon_{r^2+\alpha^s, I}}_{2s \text{ preimages of each short root } 5} \end{array} \right\} \quad (3.51)$$

and the solvable Lie Algebra element singled out by such coordinates is obtained as:

$$\text{Solv} \ni \mathfrak{s}(\Upsilon) = \Upsilon \cdot \mathbf{T} \quad (3.52)$$

where \mathbf{T} denotes the collection of solvable Lie algebra generators in the above described order.

Once the solvable Lie algebra parameterization is established we need to perform the map of the Lie algebra to the solvable group:

$$\Sigma : \text{Solv} \xrightarrow{\Sigma} \mathcal{S} \equiv \exp[\text{Solv}] \quad (3.53)$$

The precise formulation of the exponential map Σ corresponds to a choice of the solvable coordinates normalization and it is simply a matter of convenience, like the choice of Euler angles in the parameterization of rotation group elements. Our choice which optimizes the metric and the Laplacian to their simplest possible forms is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma[\mathfrak{s}(\Upsilon)] &= \exp[\mathfrak{s}_C(\Upsilon)] \cdot \exp[\mathfrak{s}_{long}(\Upsilon)] \cdot \exp[\mathfrak{s}_{short}(\Upsilon)] \\ \mathfrak{s}_C(\Upsilon) &= \text{projection onto the Cartan subalgebra of Solv} \\ \mathfrak{s}_{long}(\Upsilon) &= \text{projection onto the subspace spanned by the long root generators} \\ \mathfrak{s}_{short}(\Upsilon) &= \text{projection onto the subspace spanned by the short root generators} \\ \mathfrak{s}(\Upsilon) &= \mathfrak{s}_C(\Upsilon) \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{long}(\Upsilon) \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{short}(\Upsilon) \end{aligned} \quad (3.54)$$

The image of the Σ -map will be named $\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)$ and for reader's convenience we display below, choosing the simplest

value $s = 1$ the explicit form of the matrix in the cases $r = 1, 2$. We have

$$\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)^{[1,1]} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\Upsilon_1} & \frac{e^{\Upsilon_1}\Upsilon_{2,1}}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{e^{\Upsilon_1}\Upsilon_{2,2}}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{4}e^{\Upsilon_1}(\Upsilon_{2,1}^2 + \Upsilon_{2,2}^2) \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -\frac{\Upsilon_{2,1}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -\frac{\Upsilon_{2,2}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-\Upsilon_1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.55)$$

for the case $r = 1$, while the case $r = 2$ is shown below

$$\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)^{[2,1]} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\Upsilon_1} & \frac{e^{\Upsilon_1}\Upsilon_3}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2}e^{\Upsilon_1}(\sqrt{2}U_1 + \Upsilon_3V_1) & \frac{1}{2}e^{\Upsilon_1}(\sqrt{2}U_2 + \Upsilon_3V_2) & -\frac{1}{8}e^{\Upsilon_1}(4\mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{V} + \sqrt{2}(\Upsilon_3\mathbf{V}^2 - 4\Upsilon_4)) & -\frac{1}{4}e^{\Upsilon_1}(\mathbf{U}^2 + 2\Upsilon_3\Upsilon_4) \\ 0 & e^{\Upsilon_2} & \frac{e^{\Upsilon_2}V_1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{e^{\Upsilon_2}V_2}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{4}e^{\Upsilon_2}\mathbf{V}^2 & -\frac{e^{\Upsilon_2}\Upsilon_4}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -\frac{V_1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{U_1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -\frac{V_2}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{U_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-\Upsilon_2} & -\frac{e^{-\Upsilon_2}\Upsilon_3}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-\Upsilon_1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.56)$$

In eq.(3.56) we have used the notation $U_i = \Upsilon_{5,i}$ and $V_i = \Upsilon_{6,i}$ which puts into evidence the existence of two Paint vectors \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} in the case $r = 2$ and the Paint Group covariant structure of the solvable group element $\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)^{[2,s]}$. Indeed from eq.(3.56) it is immediate to deduce the general form of the matrix for any value of $2s$.

4 Geodesics on the symmetric spaces U/H

Next, we show that for that for all non-compact symmetric spaces U/H of the type discussed in this paper the geodesic equations can be explicitly integrated; actually there is an explicit and very simple integration formula that yields the unique geodesics passing though any two given points $p_{1,2} \in U/H$.

4.1 Integrating the geodesic equation

To begin with we recall that the Lie algebra \mathbb{U} of U admits a Cartan involution θ , and is split into the eigenspaces \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{K} of θ with eigenvalues $+1$ and -1 , respectively.

$$\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{H} \oplus \mathbb{K} \quad (4.1)$$

where space \mathbb{H} is the Lie algebra of H and \mathbb{K} is its orthogonal complement, namely the space of coset generators. In the real matrix representation of U , in the basis advocated by statement statement 3.1, the involution θ is just matrix transposition as we already recalled in eq.(3.49). In this representation space \mathbb{H} consists of the antisymmetric matrices while \mathbb{K} of symmetric matrices. Using this basis we are relying on the embedding of anyone of the classical non-compact simple groups into $SL(N, \mathbb{R})$ where N is the dimension of the fundamental representation of U . In our basis the elements of the group $\mathcal{O} \in SO(r, r + q)$ and those of the algebra $h \in \mathfrak{so}(r, r + q)$ respectively satisfy:

$$\mathcal{O}^T \eta_t \mathcal{O} = \eta_t \quad ; \quad h^T \eta_t + \eta_t h = 0 \quad (4.2)$$

where the symmetric η_t matrix is that defined in eq.(3.45).

In the η_t basis the elements of the \mathbb{K} subspace are both η_t -antisymmetric and symmetric tout-court, while the elements of the subalgebra \mathbb{H} are both η_t -antisymmetric and antisymmetric tout-court. When dealing with elements of U and of its Lie algebra, we shall always refer to the chosen matrix representation.

The \mathbb{K} vector space is isomorphic to the tangent space to U/H at the origin \mathcal{O} :

$$\mathbb{K} \sim T_{\mathcal{O}}(U/H) . \quad (4.3)$$

According to the Iwasawa decomposition, a generic matrix $\mathfrak{g} \in U$ can always be written as the product of an upper-triangular matrix \mathcal{S} and a compact one $h \in H$: $\mathfrak{g} = \mathcal{S}h$, \mathcal{S} , h being uniquely associated with every \mathfrak{g} . The matrix \mathcal{S} , being upper-triangular, is an element of the solvable subgroup $\exp[Solv_{U/H}] \subset U$. From this property it follows that within each left-coset in U/H we can find a *unique* representative $\mathbb{L} \in \exp[Solv_{U/H}]$ whose parameters Υ_A appearing in the decomposition of a generic element of $Solv_{U/H}$ along a basis of generators T^A , $A = 1, \dots, \dim(U/H)$:

$$\forall \mathfrak{s} \in Solv_{U/H} \quad : \quad \mathfrak{s} = \Upsilon_A T^A \quad (4.4)$$

define the solvable parameterization introduced earlier. The group $\mathcal{S}_{U/H} \equiv \exp[Solv_{U/H}]$ admits a transitive action on U/H as we know from previous sections. While T^A provide a basis of generators of $Solv_{U/H}$, let us denote by K_A a basis of generators for the subspace \mathbb{K} . As explained in the previous sections, we choose the coset representative to be an element $\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)$.

Utilizing a normalization such that $\text{Tr}(K_A K_B) = \delta_{AB}$, and $\text{Tr}(H_A H_B) = \delta_{AB}$, the vielbein of the symmetric space is computed through the left-invariant 1-form of the solvable group as follows:

$$\Theta \equiv \mathbb{L}^{-1} d\mathbb{L} \quad ; \quad \mathbb{V} = V^A K_A \quad ; \quad V^A = \text{Tr}(\Theta \cdot K_A) \quad (4.5)$$

while the \mathbb{H} -connection is provided by:

$$\mathbb{Q} = Q^A H_A \quad ; \quad Q^A = \text{Tr}(\Theta H_A) \quad (4.6)$$

and one can write the projections of $\Theta = \mathbb{Q} + \mathbb{V}$. Besides being both η_t -antisymmetric, the 1-form valued matrices \mathbb{Q} and \mathbb{V} are respectively tout-court antisymmetric and symmetric, respectively.

$$\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{V}^T = \mathbb{V} \quad ; \quad \mathbb{Q}^T = -\mathbb{Q} \quad (4.7)$$

Because of the Maurer Cartan equation $d\Theta + \Theta \wedge \Theta = 0$ satisfied by the left-invariant one-form Θ we have the identities:

$$\mathcal{D}\mathbb{V} \equiv d\mathbb{V} + \mathbb{Q} \wedge \mathbb{V} + \mathbb{V} \wedge \mathbb{Q} = 0 \quad , \quad \mathfrak{R}[\mathbb{Q}] \equiv d\mathbb{Q} + \mathbb{Q} \wedge \mathbb{Q} = -\mathbb{V} \wedge \mathbb{V} \quad (4.8)$$

The U -invariant metric on the symmetric space U/H is the form:

$$ds^2 = \text{Tr}(\mathbb{V}^2) = \sum_{A=1}^{dn} V^A \otimes V^A \quad (4.9)$$

In order to conveniently describe the geodesics on U/H , we introduce the following matrix:

$$\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon) \equiv \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon) \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)^T \quad (4.10)$$

This matrix is a function merely of the point on U/H in that it does not depend on the choice of the coset representative:

$$\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon) h \Rightarrow \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon) h h^T \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)^T = \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon) \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)^T = \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon) \quad (4.11)$$

where we have used the property that, in the chosen real matrix representation, an element $h \in H$ is an orthogonal

matrix. In terms of the matrix $\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon)$ we can define the following \mathbb{U} -valued 1-form:

$$\mathcal{U} \equiv \mathcal{M}^{-1} d\mathcal{M} = 2\mathbb{L}^{-T} \mathbb{V} \mathbb{L}^T, \quad (4.12)$$

The last identity in eq.(4.63) follows from the short calculation recalled below:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} &= \mathbb{L}^{-T} \mathbb{L}^{-1} d\mathbb{L} \mathbb{L}^T + \mathbb{L}^{-T} d\mathbb{L}^T = \mathbb{L}^{-T} \Theta \mathbb{L}^T + \mathbb{L}^{-T} \Theta^T \mathbb{L}^T \\ &= \mathbb{L}^{-T} (\Theta^T + \Theta) \mathbb{L}^T = 2\mathbb{L}^{-T} \mathbb{V} \mathbb{L}^T \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

where we have used the short-hand notation $M^{-T} \equiv (M^{-1})^T$ and the fact that the Vielbein 1-form is the projection of the left-invariant matrix valued one-form Θ onto its symmetric part. Thus we rewrite the metric as follows:

$$ds^2 \propto \text{Tr}(\mathcal{U} \mathcal{U}). \quad (4.14)$$

Consider now a geodesic described by the functions:

$$\Upsilon_A = \Upsilon_A(t; \Upsilon^0). \quad (4.15)$$

where $\Upsilon^0 \equiv (\Upsilon_A^0)$ denotes the initial point on the manifold:

$$\Upsilon_A(t=0; \Upsilon^0) = \Upsilon_A^0. \quad (4.16)$$

The matrix valued vielbein 1-form and \mathbb{H} -connection have the following canonical expansion in coordinate differentials:

$$\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{V}^A(\Upsilon) d\Upsilon_A \quad ; \quad \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}^A(\Upsilon) d\Upsilon_A \quad (4.17)$$

The geodesics is a curve in the manifold, namely a map of the real line into the symmetric space

$$\mu : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \frac{\mathbb{U}}{\mathbb{H}} \quad (4.18)$$

By means of the pull-back we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(\mathbb{V}) &= L(t) dt & ; & \quad \mu^*(\mathbb{Q}) = W(t) dt \\ L(t) &\equiv \dot{\Upsilon}_A \mathbb{V}^A(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon^0)) & ; & \quad W(t) \equiv \dot{\Upsilon}_A \mathbb{Q}^A(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon^0)) \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

where we have denoted

$$\dot{\Upsilon}_A \equiv \frac{d}{dt} \Upsilon_A(t; \Upsilon_0) \quad (4.20)$$

As it was shown in [106] the geodesic equations can be expressed by means of the following:

Statement 4.1 *The matrix valued 1-form \mathcal{U} is constant along geodesics, namely:*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mu^*(\mathcal{U}) = 0 \quad (4.21)$$

which implies:

$$\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon_0))^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon_0)) = Q^T = \text{const} \quad (4.22)$$

The constant matrix $Q \in \mathbb{U}$ encodes the conserved Noether charges of the solution.

Indeed Q is a constant matrix in the tangent space $T_{\Upsilon_0}(\mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H})$ to the Riemannian manifold \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} at the initial point

Υ_0 and defines the *initial velocity* of the geodesic. The *simple transitive action of the solvable group* on the symmetric space U/H implies that \mathbb{K} is isomorphic to the tangent space at the origin $T_{\mathbf{e}}(U/H)$, \mathbf{e} being defined by $\Upsilon^A = 0$ and that we have:

$$Q \in \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon_0) \mathbb{K} \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon_0)^{-1} \sim T_{\Upsilon_0}(U/H) \quad (4.23)$$

Let us show that, from eq. (4.22), a Lax equation follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{dt} \left(\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon_0))^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon_0)) \right) = \mathbb{L}^{-T} (\dot{L} + [L, \Omega^T]) \mathbb{L}^T \\ &\Downarrow \\ 0 &= \dot{L} + [L, \Omega^T] = \dot{L} + [L, W^T] = \dot{L} + [W, L], \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

where we have used $W^T = -W$ and in the above derivation the coset representative \mathbb{L} is evaluated on $\Upsilon^A(t; \Upsilon_0)$. In the latter equation $\dot{L} + [W, L] = 0$, W and L are, respectively, the anti-symmetric and symmetric projections of the same matrix $\hat{\Upsilon}_A \Omega_A(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon_0))$ and thus:

$$W = L_{>} - L_{<} \quad (4.25)$$

Eq. (4.25) provides the precise link between the approach to the integration of geodesic equations originally pursued in [107–109] and based on Kodama integration algorithm [110] and the approach based on Noether charges that directly provides the final integral. Indeed the former approach was based on putting the geodesic equation for the geodesic velocity in the form of a Lax equation. After integration of Lax equation a second integration was necessary, but already reduced to quadratures, in order to obtain the final form of the functions $\Upsilon_A(t)$. Instead in the Noether approach we directly get $\Upsilon_A(t)$ as we show below.

Given the initial data:

$$\Upsilon^0 \equiv (\Upsilon_A^0), \quad Q \in T_{\Upsilon^0}(U/H) \quad (4.26)$$

the solution to (4.22) is given by the functions $\Upsilon_A(t)$ satisfying the following matrix equation:

$$\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon^0)) = \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon^0) \exp [Q^T t] \quad (4.27)$$

We can change the initial point from Υ^0 to $\Upsilon^{0'}$ by acting on \mathcal{M} by means of the unique element $\mathfrak{g} \in \mathcal{S}_{U/H} \subset U$ that maps Υ^0 to $\Upsilon^{0'}$ (simple transitivity) and solving the matrix equation:

$$\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon^{0'})) = \mathfrak{g} \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t; \Upsilon^0)) \mathfrak{g}^T \quad (4.28)$$

The initial velocity Q (Noether charge) transforms consequently:

$$Q \rightarrow Q' = \mathfrak{g} Q \mathfrak{g}^{-1} \in T_{\Upsilon^{0'}}(U/H) \quad (4.29)$$

We can choose $\Upsilon^0 = 0$. In this case we denote by $\Upsilon(t) \equiv v(t; \mathbf{e})$ and equation (4.27) reads:

$$\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t)) = \exp [Q^T t] = \exp [Q t] \quad (4.30)$$

since $Q = Q^T \in \mathbb{K}$ and $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{e}) = \mathbf{1}$. The exponential on the right-hand side is readily computed diagonalizing Q by means of a constant orthogonal matrix \mathcal{O} :

$$Q = \mathcal{O} Q_D \mathcal{O}^T, \quad Q_D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) \quad (4.31)$$

In general, through a transformation $\mathcal{O} \in H$, Q can be always rotated into the Cartan subalgebra of the coset U/H . Thus the number of independent eigenvalues λ of a generic Q equals the rank of the coset. The geodesic matrix

equation then becomes:

$$\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t)) = \mathcal{O} \exp [Q_D t] \mathcal{O}^T = \exp \left[\underbrace{\mathcal{O} \cdot Q_D \cdot \mathcal{O}^T}_{-2 L_0} t \right] \quad (4.32)$$

Indeed what appears embraced in eq.(4.32) is just proportional through a factor -2 to the initial Lax operator L_0 that constitutes the initial condition for the time evolving Lax $L(t)$. Indeed the precise correspondence between the two algorithms is provided by the identification:

$$Q = -2 L_0 \quad (4.33)$$

As one sees, we have a complete integration algorithm for the geodesics provided, from the evolving matrix $\mathcal{M}(t)$, obtained by means of a simple matrix exponential, we are able to extract the upper triangular coset representative $\mathbb{L}(t) = \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon(t))$ such that:

$$\mathcal{M}(t) = \mathbb{L}(t)\mathbb{L}(t)^T \quad (4.34)$$

This goal is achieved through the so-called Cholesky decomposition ¹⁰.

In particular one can apply the Cholesky–Banachiewicz and Cholesky–Crout algorithms. Here are the iterative formulae:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}_{jj} &= \sqrt{\mathcal{M}_{jj} - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \mathbb{L}_{jk}^2} \\ \mathbb{L}_{ij} &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{L}_{jj}} \left(\mathcal{M}_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \mathbb{L}_{ik}\mathbb{L}_{jk} \right), \quad i > j, \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(t)$.

4.2 The Geodesic Distance

As it was many times emphasized above, the main reason while the symmetric spaces under investigation prove relevant for DeepL modeling is that, similarly to flat space, they admit a global and unique definition of a distance, the geodesic one. This is also the prerequisite to study geodesics grids and diffusion equations. In this section we elaborate this aspect in full, relying on the results of section 4.1. It follows that on these negatively curved manifolds, there is just a unique geodesic that joins any two points like it happens in flat space. We begin by recalling eq. (4.27) which implies that given two points of the manifold p_1, p_2 whose solvable coordinates we collectively denote $\Upsilon^{1,2}$ there is a unique geodesic that joins them defined by the following trajectory in the manifold:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t)) &= \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon^1) \exp [Q^T t] \\ Q^T &= \log [\mathcal{M}^{-1}(\Upsilon^1) \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon^2)] \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

In particular, by redefining the *time* variable t , *i.e.* the affine parameter along the geodesic, we can normalize so that:

$$\Upsilon^2 = \Upsilon(1) \quad ; \quad \Upsilon^1 = \Upsilon(0) \quad (4.37)$$

¹⁰See for instance Horn, Roger A.; Johnson, Charles R. (1985). *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-38632-2.

As it was observed in section 4.1 the matrix of the Noether charges Q^T is not symmetric, unless the origin point p_1 of the geodesic going toward p_2 is $p_1 = \mathbf{e}$, namely the **neutral element** of the solvable group:

$$\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{S}_{U/H} \equiv \exp[\mathbb{B}(N, \mathbb{R})] \quad ; \quad \mathbf{e} \equiv \exp[\mathbf{0}] \quad (4.38)$$

In solvable coordinates the **neutral element** is identified by $\Upsilon_A = 0$ ($A = 1, \dots, \dim U/H$). The invariance under the solvable group $\mathcal{S}_{U/H}$ allows however to reduce the calculation of any geodesic to the case where the initial point $p_1 = \mathbf{e}$ is the origin. Having clarified the structure of the solvable group, recalling eq. (4.28) and coming back to eq.(4.36) we define:

$$\mathcal{S}_{U/H} \ni \mathbf{g} = \mathbb{L}^{-1}(\Upsilon^1) \quad ; \quad \mathbb{L}(\tilde{\Upsilon}(t, 0)) = \mathbf{g} \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon(t, \Upsilon^1)) \quad (4.39)$$

so that the trajectory $\tilde{\Upsilon}(t, 0)$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$\tilde{\Upsilon}(0, 0) = 0 = \mathbf{g}(\Upsilon^1) \quad ; \quad \tilde{\Upsilon}(1, 0) = \tilde{\Upsilon}^2 \equiv \mathbf{g}(\Upsilon^2) \quad (4.40)$$

In the above equations (4.39) the coset representative $\mathbb{L}^{-1}(\Upsilon^1)$ is looked at as a realization of the unique solvable group element \mathbf{g} which maps the point p_1 , labeled by coordinates Υ^1 , into the neutral element \mathbf{e} , labeled by coordinates $\Upsilon = 0$. The image through \mathbf{g} of the second point p_2 has, by definition, the new coordinates $\tilde{\Upsilon}^2$. In this way we obtain:

$$\mathcal{M}(\tilde{\Upsilon}(t, 0)) = \exp[t Q_0] = \mathbf{g} \exp[t Q^T] \mathbf{g}^{-1} \Leftrightarrow Q_0 = \mathbf{g} Q^T \mathbf{g}^{-1} \quad (4.41)$$

and the Noether charge Q_0 shifted to the origin is now a symmetric matrix, whatever the points $p_{1,2}$ were, and such is $\mathcal{M}(\tilde{\Upsilon}(t, 0))$.

Let us now come back to equation (4.63) which yields the following compact expression for the line element in the symmetric space:

$$ds^2 = Tr(\mathcal{M}^{-1}(\Upsilon) d\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon) \cdot \mathcal{M}^{-1}(\Upsilon) d\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon)) \quad (4.42)$$

restricting the line element to the geodesic we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2|_{geod.} &= Tr(\mathcal{M}^{-1}(\Upsilon(t)) d\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t)) \cdot \mathcal{M}^{-1}(\Upsilon(t)) d\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon(t))) = Tr(Q^T \cdot Q^T) dt^2 \\ &\downarrow \\ ds &= \sqrt{Tr(Q_0 \cdot Q_0)} dt \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

In the second line of equation (4.43) we have used the properties of the trace to rewrite $Tr(Q^T \cdot Q^T)$ in terms of the symmetric matrix Q_0 . We can do even better and use the **Schur Decomposition** that exists for any non degenerate symmetric matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0 &= -2 \mathcal{O} L_{\text{diag}} \mathcal{O}^T \quad \text{where } \mathcal{O} \in \text{SO}(N) \quad \text{i.e. } \mathcal{O} \cdot \mathcal{O}^T = \mathbf{1} \\ L_{\text{diag}} &= \begin{pmatrix} -\sum_{i=2}^N \mu_i & 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mu_2 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 & \mu_{N-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 & \mu_N \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

having denoted by μ_2, \dots, N the $N - 1$ independent eigenvalues of the traceless initial Lax operator L_0 , where conventionally we set:

$$\mu_1 = - \sum_{i=2}^N \mu_i \quad (4.45)$$

In this way the length of the arc of the unique geodesic joining the point p_1 with the point p_2 is given by:

$$\ell(p_1, p_2) = \ell(\mathbf{e}, \tilde{p}_2) = 4 \sqrt{\text{Tr}(L_{\text{diag}} \cdot L_{\text{diag}})} \int_0^1 dt = 4 \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i^2} \quad (4.46)$$

The final appearance of the geodesic distance is intriguing since it looks like a Euclidean distance. It only looks like that, yet it is very much different, since the μ_i are not the differences of the coordinates of the points p_1, p_2 , rather they are the eigenvalues of the Noether charge matrix Q_0 . The latter is uniquely identified by the choice of the two points p_1, p_2 yet the solvable group is non abelian and the coordinates Υ^1, Υ^2 identify the coordinates of the *difference point* $\tilde{\Upsilon}$ in the complicated non-linear way encoded in the above described procedure.

Furthermore given p_1, p_2 we have the explicit form, not only of the eigenvalues but also of the entire Q_0 -matrix and we can calculate the fully extended geodesics by means of the integration method described in section 4.1 and the Cholevsky-Crout algorithm to obtain the time evolving upper triangular representative $\mathbb{L}(t) = \mathbb{L}(\tilde{\Upsilon}(t, 0))$. This being given we set:

$$\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon(t, \Upsilon^1)) = \mathfrak{g}^{-1} \mathbb{L}(t) \quad (4.47)$$

and using the inverse of the exponential map Σ which is an iterative algorithm we work out the functions:

$$\Upsilon_A(t, \Upsilon^1) \quad ; \quad \Upsilon_A(0, \Upsilon^1) = \Upsilon_A^1, \quad \Upsilon_A(1, \Upsilon^1) = \Upsilon_A^2 \quad (4.48)$$

4.2.1 Geodesic distance in view of the Tits Satake projection

Let us now reconsider the geodesic problem in view of the Tits Satake projection, focusing in particular on the manifolds

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathfrak{g}^{[r,s]} \equiv \frac{\text{SO}(r, r + 2s)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r + 2s)} \quad (4.49)$$

The first step, as we did in eq.(4.10) is to introduce the symmetric matrix:

$$\mathcal{M} \equiv \mathbb{L} \mathbb{L}^T, \quad (4.50)$$

and recall eq.(4.42) which expresses the metric in terms of such an invariant object.

Next we recall eq.(4.36) which expresses the full geodesics in terms of a constant symmetric matrix Q^T , named the matrix of Noether charges, and eq.(4.43) that provides the final answer for the distance in terms of Q^T :

$$d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(Q^T \cdot Q^T)} \quad (4.51)$$

where for the geodesic described by the matrix equation (4.43), that we repeat in the current notations:

$$\mathcal{M}[\Upsilon(\lambda)] = \mathcal{M}[\Upsilon(0)] e^{Q^T t} \quad (4.52)$$

we have named as follows the initial and final points:

$$\Upsilon(t = 0) = \mathbf{v} \quad , \quad \Upsilon(t = 1) = \mathbf{u} \quad (4.53)$$

For consistency if we choose \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} at our will, the corresponding Noether charge matrix is defined by:

$$Q^T[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}] \equiv \log(\mathcal{M}[\mathbf{u}]^{-1} \mathcal{M}[\mathbf{v}]), \quad (4.54)$$

and the distance $d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is calculated by (4.51) upon use of the Noether charge $Q^T = Q^T[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]$.

4.3 A computational strategy

The closed analytic formula for the derivatives of the distance is essential in order to construct analytic loss-functions depending on the weight-parameters. On the other hand the calculation of the logarithm of a large dimensional matrix is a difficult task if it is not numerical. However further elaborations can lead to a simpler and doable task. To this effect let us consider the Cartan orthogonal decomposition in eq. (4.1) of the Lie algebra \mathbb{U} . Instead of the solvable parameterization, one might use the Cartan parameterization in terms of coordinates $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \{\xi^A\}$ such that the coset representative is chosen to be:

$$\mathbb{L}_K[\boldsymbol{\xi}] = e^{K[\boldsymbol{\xi}]}, \quad K[\boldsymbol{\xi}] \equiv \xi^A K_A = K[\boldsymbol{\xi}]^T, \quad (4.55)$$

where $\{K_A\}$ denotes a basis of \mathbb{K} . Projecting the left-invariant 1-form $\Omega \equiv \mathbb{L}^{-1}d\mathbb{L}$ on the generators $\{K_A\}$, that are always appropriately normalized (*i.e.* $Tr(K_A K_B) = \delta_{AB}$), we always obtain an equivalent definition of the vielbein $V^A = Tr(K_A \Omega)$ independently from the specific choice of coset representative \mathbb{L} . Different choices of \mathbb{L} simply amount to different choices of coordinates on the manifold. We consider and compare two choices of coordinates, the solvable ones $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$ and the Cartan ones $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. The relation between the latter and the former can be formally written as follows:

$$\mathbb{L}_K[\boldsymbol{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon})] = \mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}] h[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}], \quad h[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}] \in \mathbb{H} \quad (4.56)$$

where $h[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}]$ is some suitable \mathbb{H}_c compensator. We can avoid the involved calculation of $h[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}]$, considering that eq.(4.56) is equivalent to the following matrix equation:

$$\mathcal{M}_K[\boldsymbol{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon})] \equiv \mathbb{L}_K[\boldsymbol{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon})] \mathbb{L}_K[\boldsymbol{\xi}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon})]^T = \mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}] \mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}]^T = \mathcal{M}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}] \quad (4.57)$$

Indeed the matrix \mathcal{M} is a true function on the symmetric space and it is independent from the coset representative utilized in its definition (4.50)¹¹. Let us then rewrite the geodesic distance in a different way, using the formal relation between the Cartan and the solvable coordinates. To this end we notice that, using for the two points \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} the solvable parameterization in which they are respectively described by the coordinates $\Upsilon_{\mathbf{u}}^A$ and $\Upsilon_{\mathbf{v}}^A$ both $\mathbb{L}[\mathbf{u}]^{-1} = \mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathbf{u}}]^{-1}$ and $\mathbb{L}[\mathbf{v}] = \mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathbf{v}}]$ belong to the same solvable Lie group $\mathcal{S} \equiv e^{\mathcal{S}olv}$. Their product is therefore in the same solvable group:

$$\mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})] \equiv \mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathbf{u}}]^{-1} \mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathbf{v}}] \in \mathcal{S} \quad (4.58)$$

The metric equivalence of the symmetric space \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}_c with the corresponding solvable group \mathcal{S} implies that every manifold point uniquely identifies a corresponding element of the abstract solvable group so that we can write:

$$\mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})] = \mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathbf{w}}] \quad (4.59)$$

where we have named

$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{v} \quad (4.60)$$

the abstract element of the solvable group \mathcal{S} obtained as the product of the inverse of the abstract element \mathbf{u} with the abstract element \mathbf{v} . Clearly, when $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$, the abstract element \mathbf{w} is just the identity and $\mathbb{L}_s[\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathbf{w}}] = \text{Id}$. Therefore the generator of the geodesic connecting the two points, given in eq. (4.54), is expressed solely in terms of the matrix

¹¹Actually the set of matrices \mathcal{M} possessing the following two properties, namely that of being symmetric $\mathcal{M}^T = \mathcal{M}$ and that of being an element of the group $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$, *i.e.* $\mathcal{M}\eta\mathcal{M} = \eta$, can be regarded as the intrinsic global definition of points of the symmetric space, since there is a one-to-one correspondence between points of the manifold \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H}_c and such matrices.

$\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon_{\mathbf{w}})$

$$Q[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}] = \log[\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon_{\mathbf{w}})] \quad ; \quad \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon_{\mathbf{w}}) = \mathbb{L}_s[\Upsilon_{\mathbf{w}}] \cdot \mathbb{L}_s[\Upsilon_{\mathbf{w}}]^T \quad (4.61)$$

This leads to the following expression for the distance function

$$d^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \text{Tr} \left[\log[\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon_{\mathbf{w}})]^2 \right] \quad ; \quad \mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{u}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{v} \quad (4.62)$$

Let us now use eq. (4.57) which states that the matrix $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w})$ depends only on the manifold point (*i.e.* abstract element $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{S}$ of the solvable group) and not on the coordinates utilized to describe it. Hence in formula (4.62) we can replace the solvable parameterization of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w})$ with the Cartan one:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_s(\mathbf{w}) &= \mathcal{M}_K(\mathbf{w}) \\ &= \mathbb{L}_K[\xi_{\mathbf{w}}]^2 = \exp(2K[\xi_{\mathbf{w}}]) \end{aligned} \quad (4.63)$$

The second line in equation (4.63) follows from the fact that the coset generators K_A are symmetric and such is therefore their exponential. Hence the geodesic distance can be written as follows:

$$d^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \text{Tr} [4K[\xi_{\mathbf{w}}]^2] = 2\xi_{\mathbf{w}}^A \xi_{\mathbf{w}}^B \delta_{AB} \quad ; \quad \mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{u}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{v} \quad (4.64)$$

To summarize, the computational steps required by the above procedure are :

- Evaluation of the general relation between the Cartan coordinates ξ and the solvable ones Υ : $\xi^A = \xi^A(\Upsilon)$ from eq. (4.57);
- Evaluation of the product law $\Upsilon(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ from eq. (4.58);
- Evaluation of the geodesic distance from eq. (4.64).

Next in view of eq.(4.64) we need to establish the relation between the Cartan and solvable coordinate.

CARTAN TO SOLVABLE COORDINATES In the fundamental representation of $\text{SO}(r, r+q)$ (where $q = 2s$ or $q = 2s+1$ depending on the \mathfrak{d}_ℓ or \mathfrak{b}_ℓ case), using the η_b -basis, which exists for both algebras, we can write:

$$K_b[\xi] = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{0}_{(r+q) \times (r+q)} & \xi \\ \hline \xi^T & \mathbf{0}_{r \times r} \end{array} \right) \quad (4.65)$$

where now ξ denotes the $r \times (r+q)$ matrix $\xi = (\xi_i^m)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, $m = 1, \dots, r+q$. The version $K_t[\xi]$ of the same matrix (4.65) in the η_t basis can be obtained by means of the inverse similarity transformation with the $\Omega^{-1} = \Omega^T$ matrix.

Equation (4.64) can be written, in terms of the rectangular matrix ξ , as follows:

$$d^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \text{Tr} \left[\xi_{\mathbf{w}}^T \xi_{\mathbf{w}} \right] \quad ; \quad \mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{u}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{v} \quad (4.66)$$

By matrix exponentiation the matrix $\mathcal{M}_K[\xi]$ has the following explicit form:

$$\mathcal{M}_K[\xi] = \exp(2K[\xi]) = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh\left(2(\xi\xi^T)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) & \sinh\left(2(\xi\xi^T)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) (\xi\xi^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi \\ \xi^T \sinh\left(2(\xi\xi^T)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) (\xi\xi^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \cosh\left(2(\xi^T\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.67)$$

The above matrix can be written in the more compact form:

$$\mathcal{M}_K[\boldsymbol{\xi}] = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{X}^T & (\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.68)$$

where the rectangular matrix $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ is related to $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ through the equation:

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{arcsinh} \left[(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}, \quad (4.69)$$

and \mathbf{X} , as a function of the solvable coordinates Υ^A , is read off $\mathcal{M}_K = \mathcal{M}_s$. we can also write:

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}^T \boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{arccosh} \left[(\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]. \quad (4.70)$$

There is no need to find the transformation law $\xi^A = \xi^A(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon})$, which is a laborious and difficult calculation. It suffices to note that the formula for the distance (4.66) can then be rewritten in the following form:

$$d^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\operatorname{arccosh}^2 \left(\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{X}_w^T \mathbf{X}_w \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]; \quad \mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{u}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{v} \quad (4.71)$$

and going one step back to note that the matrix $(\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{X}_w^T \mathbf{X}_w)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, according with eq.(4.63) is determined as identical to the right lower block of the matrix $\mathcal{M}_s(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_w)$ in the η_b basis.

4.4 Summary for the distance formula

Summarizing what we have learned from the above discussion, we can say that, given the two points \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} described in solvable coordinates, the essential calculation is provided by the formula for the **product law**. Once we have $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}]$ we construct the corresponding coset representative $\mathbb{L}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}])$ and the corresponding $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{L}\mathbb{L}^T$ matrix. We transform it to the η_b -basis and we obtain a matrix with the block structure:

$$\mathcal{M}_b^{solv} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} * & * \\ \hline * & \mathbf{m}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_w) \end{array} \right) \quad (4.72)$$

Then the distance between the two points is obtained by setting

$$d^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = N^2(\mathbf{w}) \equiv \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\operatorname{arccosh}^2 \left(\mathbf{m}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_w) \right) \right]; \quad \mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{u}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{v} \quad (4.73)$$

Note that the dimension of the matrix \mathbf{m} is just $r \times r$ which is the non-compact rank, typically a relatively small number, so that the calculation of the *arccosh*, which requires the diagonalization of the matrix can be done using only an $\operatorname{SO}(r)$ transformation and it is typically doable also symbolically without too many efforts.

Furthermore from a conceptual point of view it is important to stress that the distance formula is actually a consequence of two facts:

1. The manifold is a group (solvable in this case) \mathcal{S} so that to any pair of points \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} we can associate a third one $\mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{u}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{v}$
2. On the solvable \mathcal{S} group there exists a map

$$N^2; \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \quad (4.74)$$

which is invariant with respect to the full group of automorphisms of the solvable group, namely the group U of isometries of the manifold U/H_c . The value $N^2(\mathbf{w})$ for any element $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{S}$ of the solvable group can be named its norm: $\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 = N^2(\mathbf{w})$ and the distance of two points \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} is just $\|\mathbf{u}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{v}\|^2$ which formally is the same definition of distance as in flat \mathbb{R}^N where the group is not only solvable but also abelian and for the group product one uses the notation \pm .

All learning algorithms are based on the extremalization of functionals constructed in terms of such invariant functions. If there exist other positive functions on the solvable group that are invariant with respect to the full group U or important subgroups thereof the learning algorithms can be made more articulated.

5 Paint Group structure of the square norm and of the distance function

After the general discussion of the previous section 4.2.1, we illustrate the explicit form of the square norm function on the solvable group $\mathcal{S}_{U/H}$ in two relevant cases $r = 1$ and $r = 2$, emphasizing their Paint Group or subPaint Group covariant structure. The square norm (from which the distance function follows) is the main token in all Deep Learning algorithms and the newly discovered analytic structure of this token in view of the Tits Satake projection and of the Paint and subPaint groups is what opens the most attractive perspectives of applications in the context of Data Science of the PGTS theory of hyperbolic symmetric spaces. Actually the *Poincaré Balls* advocated in [49–51] are just the tip on iceberg whose submersed basis enlarges, increasing the non-compact rank r . Furthermore even in the case of the Poincaré balls the richer structure due to the Tits Satake projection and subPaint spheres was neither noticed nor utilized by the authors of [49–51].

5.1 The general distance formula applied to the $r = 1$ case

In order to calculate the geodesic distance between points of the full manifold $\frac{SO(1,1+2s)}{SO(1+2s)}$ we have to recall eq.(3.55), displaying the $r = 1$ form of the solvable group element, namely the explicit form of the Σ -map, as defined in eq.(3.53-3.54) and calculate its inverse:

$$\Sigma^{-1} : \mathcal{S}_{U/H} \longrightarrow \text{Sol}v_{U/H} \quad (5.1)$$

In this case the inversion is very simple and we have:

$$\Sigma^{-1} : \Upsilon_1 = \log [\mathbb{L}_{1,1}] \quad ; \quad \Upsilon_{2,i} = -\sqrt{2} \mathbb{L}_{1+i,2+2s} \quad i = 1, \dots, 2s \quad (5.2)$$

Furthermore we have also to recall the explicit product law between two elements in the same solvable group. To this effect let us call \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} the solvable coordinates of two points \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} : in the $r = 1$ case they have the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U} &= \{u_1, u_{2,i}\} \\ \mathbf{V} &= \{v_1, v_{2,i}\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

According with eq. (4.58) the next step consists of constructing the product:

$$\mathcal{S}_{[1,s]} \ni \mathbb{L}^{-1}(\mathbf{U}) \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{V}) \equiv \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W}) \quad (5.4)$$

The invertibility of the map Σ described abstractly and in general in eq.s (3.53-3.54) is made explicit for the case $r = 1$ in eq.(5.2): it allows to work out the coordinate vector \mathbf{W} from the coordinate vectors \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= v_1 - u_1 \\ w_{2,i} &= v_{2,i} - \exp[u_1 - v_1] u_{2,i} \quad ; \quad i = 1 \dots, 2s \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

According with eq.(4.68) the next step is that of constructing the fundamental harmonic symmetric matrix:

$$\mathcal{M}_t(\mathbf{W}) \equiv \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W}) \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W})^T \quad (5.6)$$

and transform it to the block diagonal basis utilizing the case $r = 1$ of the matrix Ω defined for all r, s in eq.(3.47):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_b(\mathbf{W}) &= \Omega \mathcal{M}_t(\mathbf{W}) \Omega^T \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W}) \hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W})^T \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W}) \equiv \Omega \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W}) \Omega^T \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

According with eq.(4.72) we can express the distance in terms of the eigenvalues of the 1×1 matrix \mathbf{m} which can be described as:

$$\mathbf{m} = \mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{L} \quad (5.8)$$

where we have named \mathcal{L} the last row of the matrix $\hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W})$:

$$\mathcal{L}_I = \hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W})_{2s+2, I} \quad ; \quad I = 1, \dots, 2 + 2s \quad (5.9)$$

The very much useful point is that the vector \mathcal{L} can be explicitly extracted from the construction of the base-transformed element of the solvable group and written in a Paint Group covariant form for a generic value of the parameter s . Its explicit expression is displayed below and it is manifestly invariant since it depends only from the solvable coordinate w_1 that is a G_{paint} singlet and from invariant/covariant combinations of the G_{paint} -vector $w_{2,i}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}) &= \left\{ \frac{1}{2} e^{w_1} \underbrace{w_{2,i}}_{i=1, \dots, 2s}, -\frac{1}{8} e^{w_1} (\|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 - 4) - \frac{1}{2} e^{-w_1}, \frac{1}{8} e^{w_1} (\|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 + 4) + \frac{1}{2} e^{-w_1} \right\} \\ \|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 &= \sum_i^{2s} w_{2,i} w_{2,i} \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

Finally we can express the distance formula of the two point \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} as:

$$d^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = N^2(\mathbf{w}) = (\text{arccosh}[\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w})])^2 \quad ; \quad \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{v} \quad (5.11)$$

Explicitly we get:

$$N^2(\mathbf{w}) = \left(\text{arccosh} \left[\frac{1}{32} (16e^{-2w_1} + e^{2w_1} + 8\|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 + e^{2w_1} (\|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 + 4)^2) \right] \right)^2 \quad (5.12)$$

5.1.1 Paint invariant distance formula $r = 1$

Referring to eq.s(5.3) we find it convenient to rename:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U} &= \{\lambda, u_i\} \\ \mathbf{V} &= \{\mu, v_i\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

Applying the procedure described in the previous section up to eq.(5.11), we easily arrive at the following result:

$$d^2(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = (\text{arccosh}[\mathfrak{A}_{U,V}])^2 \quad (5.14)$$

where, defining

$$\mathbb{X}_i = e^{\frac{\lambda-\mu}{2}} u_i \quad ; \quad \mathbb{Y}_i = e^{\frac{-\lambda+\mu}{2}} v_i \quad (5.15)$$

we obtain:

$$\mathfrak{A}_{U,V} = \cosh [2(\lambda - \mu)] + \frac{1}{2} \cosh [\lambda - \mu] \|\mathbb{X} - \mathbb{Y}\|^2 + \frac{1}{32} \|\mathbb{X} - \mathbb{Y}\|^4 \quad (5.16)$$

5.1.2 The squared norm and Paint invariance for $r = 1$

As we see the square-norm $N^2(\mathbf{w})$ has a manifest G_{paint} invariant structure since it depends only on the two G_{paint} invariants w_1 and $\|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2$. This is very interesting: it means that if we consider the sublocus $\mathfrak{B}_{\mu,R} \subset \mathcal{M}^{[1,s]}$ of the full manifold characterized as follows:

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\mu,R} = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}^{[1,s]} \mid w_1 = \mu, \|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 = R^2 \right\} \quad (5.17)$$

all points in $\mathfrak{B}_{\mu,R}$ have the same norm and really they constitute something similar to a ball since the condition:

$$\|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 = R^2 \quad (5.18)$$

defines an \mathbb{S}^{2s-1} sphere. Next consider that if we use not only the Paint group rather all the transformations of the maximal compact subgroup H_c we can always rotate any element of the solvable Lie algebra $Solv(U/H)$ into the Cartan subalgebra, which means that we can rotate \mathbf{w} into a $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ such that $\tilde{w}_1 = \lambda \neq \mu$ and $\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 = 0$. Obviously the H_c rotations are a symmetry of the squared norm so that we have

$$N^2(\mathbf{w}) = N^2(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) = (\text{arccosh} [\cosh(2\lambda)])^2 = 4\lambda^2 \quad (5.19)$$

That means that in a shell of fixed squared norm $N^2(\mathbf{w}) = 4\lambda^2$ the group Paint balls $\|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 = R^2$ have a maximum radius that can be calculated from eq. (5.12).

5.1.3 The squared norm and subpaint invariance for $r = 1$

Next let us analyse the squared norm formula from the point of view of the G_{subpaint} group. It is easily done by splitting the G_{paint} vector into its first component, which is a *subpaint singlet*, plus the following $2s - 1$ components that form instead a G_{subpaint} multiplet:

$$\begin{aligned} w_{2,1} &= w_2 \\ w_{2,1+\alpha} &= \hat{w}_\alpha \quad ; \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, 2s - 1 \\ \|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{G_{\text{paint}}}^2 &= w_2^2 + \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_2\|_{\text{subpaint}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

Inserting equation (5.20) into eq. (5.12) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} N^2(\mathbf{w}) &= \left(\text{arccosh} [\mathcal{A}_{TS}(\mathbf{w}_{TS}) + \Delta(\mathbf{w}_{TS}, \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}\|^2)] \right)^2 \\ \mathcal{A}_{TS}(\mathbf{w}_{TS}) &= \frac{1}{32} (16e^{-2w_1} + 8w_2^2 + e^{2w_1} (w_2^2 + 4)^2) \\ \Delta(\mathbf{w}_{TS}, \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}\|^2) &= \frac{1}{32} \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}\|^2 (e^{2w_1} (\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}\|^2 + 8) + 2e^{2w_1} w_2^2 + 8) \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_{TS} = \{w_1, w_2, 0, \dots, 0\}$ is the solvable coordinate vector of a point in the Tits Satake submanifold (in this case the upper complex plane or the unit disk, as you prefer), while $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_2\|_{\text{subpaint}}^2 = R^2$ is an S^{2s-2} sphere of points that project onto the same Tits Satake point. Obviously if we fix the norm $N^2(\mathbf{w})$ and we fix a Tits Satake point \mathbf{w}_{TS} ,

whose norm must necessarily be smaller $N^2(\mathbf{w}_{TS}) \leq N^2(\mathbf{w})$, then the radius R of S^{2s-2} sphere is fixed by equation eq. (5.21).

5.2 The general distance formula applied to the $r = 2$ case

In the case $r = 2$ the Paint Group covariant form, utilizes four solvable scalar coordinates $v_{1,2,3,4}$ (the coordinates on the two hyperbolic planes forming the *sub Tits Satake submanifold*) and two solvable vector coordinates $\mathbf{r}_{5,6}$ each of which has $2s$ -components. Indeed according to the general formula (3.51) the generic form of a solvable coordinate vector with $r(r + 2s)$ - components is the following one :

$$\mathbf{r} = \left\{ \underbrace{v_1, v_2}_{\text{n.c. Cartan long roots}}, \underbrace{v_3, v_4}_{2s \text{ preimages of the short root } 5}, \underbrace{\mathbf{r}_5}_{2s \text{ preimages of the short root } 5}, \underbrace{\mathbf{r}_6}_{2s \text{ preimages of the short root } 6} \right\} \quad (5.22)$$

Two points $p_u, p_v \in \mathcal{M}_0^{[2,s]}$ are specified by two solvable coordinate vectors with the structure mentioned in eq.(5.22):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U} &= \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, \mathbf{U}_5, \mathbf{U}_6\} \\ \mathbf{V} &= \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, \mathbf{V}_5, \mathbf{V}_6\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

According with eq. (4.58) the next step consists of constructing the product:

$$\mathcal{S}_{[2,s]} \ni \mathbb{L}^{-1}(\mathbf{U}) \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{V}) \equiv \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W}) \quad (5.24)$$

The invertibility of the map Σ described abstractly and in general in eq.s(3.53-3.54) and made explicit for the case $r = 2$ in table 3 allows to work out the coordinate vector \mathbf{W} from

$$\mathbf{W} = \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbb{L}^{-1}(\mathbf{U}) \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{V})) \quad (5.25)$$

The explicit form in the case $r = 2$ of the coordinate vector \mathbf{W} in terms of the coordinate vectors \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} is displayed below:

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= v_1 - u_1 \\ w_2 &= v_2 - u_2 \\ w_3 &= v_3 - e^{u_1 - u_2 - v_1 + v_2} u_3 \\ w_4 &= v_4 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{u_2 - v_1 - v_2} (e^{u_1} \mathbf{U}_5 \cdot \mathbf{U}_6 - e^{v_1} \mathbf{U}_6 \cdot \mathbf{V}_5) - \frac{1}{4} e^{2(u_2 - v_2)} v_3 |\mathbf{U}_6|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} e^{u_1 + u_2 - v_1 - v_2} (u_3 |\mathbf{U}_6|^2 - 4u_4) \\ \mathbf{W}_5 &= \mathbf{V}_5 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{u_2 - v_2} v_3 \mathbf{U}_6 - \frac{1}{2} e^{u_1 - v_1} (\sqrt{2} u_3 \mathbf{U}_6 + 2 \mathbf{U}_5) \\ \mathbf{W}_6 &= \mathbf{V}_6 - e^{u_2 - v_2} \mathbf{U}_6 \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

According with eq.(4.68) the next step is that of constructing the fundamental harmonic symmetric matrix:

$$\mathcal{M}_t(\mathbf{W}) \equiv \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W}) \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W})^T \quad (5.27)$$

and transform it to the block diagonal basis utilizing the matrix Ω defined for all r, s in eq.(3.47): :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_b(\mathbf{W}) &= \Omega \mathcal{M}_t(\mathbf{W}) \Omega^T \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W}) \hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W})^T \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W}) \equiv \Omega \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W}) \Omega^T \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

According with eq. (4.72) we can express the distance in terms of the eigenvalues of the 2×2 matrix \mathbf{m} which can be described as:

$$\mathbf{m} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathcal{L}^{[1]} \cdot \mathcal{L}^{[1]} & \mathcal{L}^{[1]} \cdot \mathcal{L}^{[2]} \\ \hline \mathcal{L}^{[1]} \cdot \mathcal{L}^{[2]} & \mathcal{L}^{[2]} \cdot \mathcal{L}^{[2]} \end{array} \right) \quad (5.29)$$

where we have named $\mathcal{L}^{[1,2]}$ the last two rows of the matrix $\hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W})$:

$$\mathcal{L}_i^{[1]} = \hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W})_{2s+3,i} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{L}_i^{[2]} = \hat{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{W})_{2s+4,i} \quad (5.30)$$

The very much useful thing is that the vectors $\mathcal{L}^{[1,2]}$ can be explicitly extracted from the construction of the base-transformed element of the solvable group and written in a Paint group covariant form for a generic value of the parameter s . Their explicit form is displayed in table 4. Finally we can express the distance formula of the two point \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} in terms of the eigenvalues of the matrix in eq.(5.29). We have:

$$\Lambda_{\pm} = \mathcal{L}^{[1]} \cdot \mathcal{L}^{[1]} + \mathcal{L}^{[2]} \cdot \mathcal{L}^{[2]} \pm \sqrt{(\mathcal{L}^{[1]} \cdot \mathcal{L}^{[1]} - \mathcal{L}^{[2]} \cdot \mathcal{L}^{[2]})^2 + 4(\mathcal{L}^{[1]} \cdot \mathcal{L}^{[2]})^2} \quad (5.31)$$

and the distance squared is given by:

$$d^2(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = (\text{arccosh}[\Lambda_+])^2 + (\text{arccosh}[\Lambda_-])^2 \quad (5.32)$$

5.2.1 The squared norm in the $r = 2$ case

As it was done for the case $r = 1$ also here the Paint invariant description of the squared distance is also the definition of the squared norm of a solvable group element. Naming:

$$\Upsilon_{\mathbf{w}} = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, \mathbb{U}_i, \mathbb{V}_j\} \quad ; \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 2s \quad (5.33)$$

the solvable coordinate vector that identifies the generic solvable group element via the Σ exponential map, we find that the squared norm of the solvable group element is the following one:

$$\mathbb{N}^2(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{arccosh} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathbf{w}} - \sqrt{\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{w}}} \right) \right] \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{arccosh} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathbf{w}} + \sqrt{\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{w}}} \right) \right] \right)^2 \quad (5.34)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A}_{\mathbf{w}} &= \frac{1}{128} (32\mathbb{V}^2 + 4e^{2w_1} (\mathbb{U}^2 + 2w_3w_4 + 4))^2 + 32 (\mathbb{U}^2 + e^{-2w_2}w_3^2 + e^{2w_2}w_4^2) \\ &+ e^{2w_1} \left(4\mathbb{U} \cdot \mathbb{V} + \sqrt{2} ((\mathbb{V}^2 + 4) w_3 - 4w_4) \right)^2 + 2 (\mathbb{V}^2 e^{w_2} + 8 \sinh(w_2))^2 \\ &+ 2 (\mathbb{V}^2 \sinh(w_2) + (\mathbb{V}^2 + 8) \cosh(w_2))^2 + 64e^{-2w_1} \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{w}} &= \frac{1}{16384} \left(16e^{-4w_2} \left(e^{2(w_1+w_2)} (\mathbb{U}^2 + 2w_3w_4 + 4) \left(4\mathbb{U} \cdot \mathbb{V} + \sqrt{2} ((\mathbb{V}^2 + 4) w_3 - 4w_4) \right) \right) \right. \\ &+ 4 \left(4\mathbb{U} \cdot \mathbb{V} e^{2w_2} + \sqrt{2} (\mathbb{V}^2 + 4) e^{4w_2} w_4 - 4\sqrt{2} w_3 \right)^2 + (32\mathbb{V}^2 - 4e^{2w_1} (\mathbb{U}^2 + 2w_3w_4 + 4))^2 \\ &- 32 (\mathbb{U}^2 + e^{-2w_2}w_3^2 + e^{2w_2}w_4^2) + e^{2w_1} \left(4\mathbb{U} \cdot \mathbb{V} + \sqrt{2} ((\mathbb{V}^2 + 4) w_3 - 4w_4) \right)^2 + 2 (\mathbb{V}^2 e^{w_2} + 8 \sinh(w_2))^2 \\ &\left. + 2 (\mathbb{V}^2 \sinh(w_2) + (\mathbb{V}^2 + 8) \cosh(w_2))^2 - 64e^{-2w_1} \right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

$\mathbb{L}_{1,1}$	=	e^{Υ_1}
$\mathbb{L}_{1,2}$	=	$\frac{e^{\Upsilon_1} \Upsilon_3}{\sqrt{2}}$
$\mathbf{L}_{1,2+i}$	=	$\frac{1}{2} e^{\Upsilon_1} (\sqrt{2} \Upsilon_{5,i} + \Upsilon_3 \Upsilon_{6,i})$
$\mathbb{L}_{1,3+2s}$	=	$e^{\Upsilon_1} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Upsilon_5 \cdot \Upsilon_6 - \frac{\Upsilon_3 \Upsilon_6 ^2}{4\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\Upsilon_4}{\sqrt{2}} \right)$
$\mathbb{L}_{1,4+2s}$	=	$-\frac{1}{2} e^{\Upsilon_1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \Upsilon_5 ^2 + \Upsilon_3 \Upsilon_4 \right)$
$\mathbb{L}_{2,2}$	=	e^{Υ_2}
$\mathbf{L}_{2,2+i}$	=	$\frac{e^{\Upsilon_2}}{\sqrt{2}} \Upsilon_{6,i}$
$\mathbb{L}_{2,3+2s}$	=	$-\frac{1}{4} e^{\Upsilon_2} \Upsilon_6 ^2$
$\mathbb{L}_{2,4+2s}$	=	$-\frac{e^{\Upsilon_2}}{\sqrt{2}} \Upsilon_4$
$\mathbf{L}_{2+i,2+j}$	=	$\delta_{i,j} \quad ; \quad (j \geq i)$
$\mathbb{L}_{3+2s,3+2s}$	=	$e^{-\Upsilon_2}$
$\mathbb{L}_{3+2s,4+2s}$	=	$-\frac{e^{-\Upsilon_2}}{\sqrt{2}} \Upsilon_3$
$\mathbf{L}_{2+i,3+2s}$	=	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Upsilon_{6,i}$
$\mathbf{L}_{2+i,4+2s}$	=	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Upsilon_{5,i}$
$\mathbb{L}_{4+2s,4+2s}$	=	$e^{-\Upsilon_1}$

Table 3: In this table we present the explicit form in the case $r = 2$, $s = \text{generic}$ of the **exponential map** defined in eq.s(3.53-3.54) from the Solvable Lie algebra Solv to the Solvable Group Manifold $\mathcal{S}_{[2,s]}$. This map which is defined in a precise mathematical way and it is explicitly invertible is the substitute of the point-wise activation functions utilized in neural network constructions. The above table is written in a Paint Group covariant way: the boldface symbols are $2s$ -component vector objects that transform in the fundamental defining representation of $\text{SO}(2s)$.

In this way we have shown the explicit expression of the solvable group squared norm in an explicitly Paint Group invariant form. The number of Paint Group invariants from which it depends is 7 rather than 6. Indeed, besides the four singlets w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4 there are also the Paint invariant squared norm $\mathbb{U}^2, \mathbb{V}^2$ and the scalar product \mathbb{UV} . When we are on the Tits Satake submanifold the vectors \mathbb{U} and \mathbb{V} are one dimensional and the invariant \mathbb{UV} is not independent from the first two. In the case of solvable group elements that do not entirely on the Tits Satake submanifold the third invariant is independent since it includes the angle between the two vector and it is significant. The analysis of the squared norm formula with respect to the subpainted group can be done in exactly the same way as in the $r = 1$ case and we do not repeat it here.

6 Systematics of low-rank $\mathcal{M}^{[r,s]}$ manifolds, Clustering and Grassmanian Leaves

In this section we show that the manifolds $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{[r,s]}$ and their Tits Satake projections (see eq.(3.39)), for small values of the non-compact rank $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$, for which Galois theorem guarantees that the distance formula (4.73) can be written explicitly in terms of radicals, fall into an a priori unsuspected systematic scheme.

Indeed, apart from the practical reasons of convenience due to the algebraic solubility in terms of radicals, the limitation to non-compact rank $r_{nc} \leq 4$ has more profound mathematical reasons, rooted in Special Kähler Geometry, special Quaternionic Geometry and the c-map that relates them. One had better not to ignore such structural connections even if one's final aim is the application of the geometrical theory to Data Science. This becomes quite

$\mathcal{L}^{[1]}$	$= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} e^{w_1} (\sqrt{2} \mathbf{W}_5 + w_3 \mathbf{W}_6)$
$\mathcal{L}_{2s+1}^{[1]}$	$= -\frac{1}{2} e^{-w_1} - \frac{1}{8} e^{w_1} (-4 + 2w_3 w_4 + \mathbf{W}_5 ^2)$
$\mathcal{L}_{2s+2}^{[1]}$	$= -\frac{1}{16} e^{w_1} (-4\sqrt{2} w_4 + 4 \mathbf{W}_5 \cdot \mathbf{W}_6 + \sqrt{2} w_3 (-4 + \mathbf{W}_6 ^2))$
$\mathcal{L}_{2s+3}^{[1]}$	$= \frac{1}{8} e^{w_1} (4 + e^{2w_1} (4 + 2w_3 w_4 + \mathbf{W}_5 ^2))$
$\mathcal{L}_{2s+4}^{[1]}$	$= \frac{1}{16} e^{w_1} (-4\sqrt{2} w_4 + 4 \mathbf{W}_5 \cdot \mathbf{W}_6 + \sqrt{2} w_3 (4 + \mathbf{W}_6 ^2))$
$\mathcal{L}^{[2]}$	$= \frac{1}{2} e^{w_2} \mathbf{W}_6$
$\mathcal{L}_{2s+1}^{[2]}$	$= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} e^{-w_2} (w_3 - e^{2w_2} w_4)$
$\mathcal{L}_{2s+2}^{[2]}$	$= -\frac{1}{2} e^{-w_2} - \frac{1}{8} e^{w_2} (-4 + \mathbf{W}_6 ^2)$
$\mathcal{L}_{2s+3}^{[2]}$	$= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} e^{-w_2} (-w_3 + e^{2w_2} w_4)$
$\mathcal{L}_{2s+4}^{[2]}$	$= \frac{1}{2} e^{-w_2} (4 + e^{2w_2} (4 + \mathbf{W}_6 ^2))$

Table 4: In the present table we display the explicit form of the two vectors $\mathcal{L}^{[1,2]}$ necessary for the calculation of the eigenvalues of the matrix \mathfrak{m} which define the final geodesic distance function among any two points in the symmetric manifold $\mathcal{M}_5^{[2,s]}$. The notation that we have adopted here show the complete covariance with respect to the Paint Group. We have used bold faced symbols to denote 2s-vectors like \mathbf{W}_5 and \mathbf{W}_6 whose scalar product is denoted with a dot.

clear if we combine the results displayed in tables 2,1 as we have done in table 5. Inspecting such a table we realize that, at the level of the Tits Satake submanifold, which is what really matters if we rely on **Paint Group** and **sub-Paint Group invariance/covariance**, as indeed we plan to do, and if we utilize both conceptual resources at our disposal, namely the **Tits Satake projection and the c-map**, then there are only three Special Kähler Geometries that codify all possible geometrical questions involved in the mapping of Data to symmetric manifolds of type $\text{SO}(r, r + 2s)/\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r + 2s)$ with $r \leq 4$, namely:

$$\mathcal{SK}_1 \equiv \frac{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(2)}, \quad \mathcal{SK}_2 \equiv \frac{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(2)} \times \frac{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(2)}, \quad \mathcal{SK}_3 \equiv \frac{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(2)} \times \frac{\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})}{\text{U}(2)}, \quad (6.1)$$

From the purely metric point of view the only manifold ingredients are just two, namely the hyperbolic Lobachevsky-Poincaré plane:

$$\mathbb{H}_2 \equiv \frac{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(2)} \quad (6.2)$$

and the Siegel upper half plane of rank (or genus) $g = 2$ (see below):

$$\mathbb{SH}_2 \equiv \frac{\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})}{\text{U}(2)} \quad (6.3)$$

The Special Kähler structure is more than metric, it involves the determination of *the flat symplectic bundle* and of the matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ (see sections 2.1.4), yet for Special Kähler manifolds that are homogeneous symmetric spaces like those in eq. (6.1) this amounts only to the determination of the symplectic \mathbb{W} -representation. Once this well-defined and substantially easy step is completed, all the rest follows automatically via the precise steps of the c-map construction for what attains those manifolds that are in the image of the c-map. In particular from table 5 we see that the Tits Satake submanifolds of the cases $r = 3, 4$ are precisely of that type and that their Special Kähler progenitors are in the list (6.1), hence the previous observation applies. In particular, in view of the relevance of the solvable group manifold metric equivalence, the c-map insight into the algebraic structure of the quaternionic Kähler manifolds and the c-map construction of the vielbein of eq. (2.79) satisfying the Maurer Cartan equations of the full solvable group

r_{nc}	Full Manif. \mathcal{M} $\frac{U}{H_c}$	Type Rie_m, \mathcal{K}_n $\mathcal{SK}_n, \mathcal{QM}_{4m}$	Paint Group G_{Paint}	Tits Satake \mathcal{M}_{TS} $\frac{U_{TS}}{H_{TS}}$	Type Rie_m, \mathcal{K}_n $\mathcal{SK}_n, \mathcal{QM}_{4m}$	c map	
1	$\frac{SO(1,1+2s)}{SO(1+2s)}$	= Rie_{1+2s}	$SO(2s)$	$\frac{SO(1,2)}{SO(2)}$	$\sim \mathcal{SK}_1 \equiv \frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}$	\xrightarrow{c}	$\frac{G_{2(2)}}{\underbrace{SU(2) \times SU(2)}_{\mathcal{QM}_8}}$
2	$\frac{SO(2,2+2s)}{SO(2) \times SO(2+2s)}$ \downarrow $\frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}{SO(2)} \times \frac{SO(2,2+2s)}{SO(2) \times SO(2+2s)}$	= \mathcal{K}_{2+s} \downarrow = \mathcal{SK}_{3+2s}	$SO(2s)$	$\frac{SO(2,3)}{SO(2) \times SO(3)}$ \downarrow $\frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}{SO(2)} \times \frac{SO(2,3)}{SO(2) \times SO(3)}$	= $\mathcal{K}_3 = \frac{Sp(4, \mathbb{R})}{U(2)}$ \downarrow = \mathcal{SK}_3	\xrightarrow{c}	$\frac{SO(4,5)}{\underbrace{SO(4) \times SO(5)}_{\mathcal{QM}_{20}}}$
3	$\frac{SO(3,3+2s)}{SO(3) \times SO(3+2s)}$	= Rie_{9+6s}	$SO(2s)$	$\frac{SO(3,4)}{SO(3) \times SO(4)}$ $\frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}{SO(2)} \times \frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}{SO(2)}$	= \mathcal{Q}_{12} = \mathcal{SK}_2	$\xleftrightarrow{\text{Id}}$ $\xleftarrow{c^{-1}}$	$\frac{SO(3,4)}{\underbrace{SO(3) \times SO(4)}_{\mathcal{QM}_{12}}}$ \leftarrow
4	$\frac{SO(4,4+2s)}{SO(4) \times SO(4+2s)}$	= \mathcal{Q}_{16+8s}	$SO(2s)$	$\frac{SO(4,5)}{SO(4) \times SO(5)}$ $\frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}{SO(2)} \times \frac{Sp(4, \mathbb{R})}{U(2)}$	= \mathcal{Q}_{20} = \mathcal{SK}_3	$\xleftrightarrow{\text{Id}}$ $\xleftarrow{c^{-1}}$	$\frac{SO(4,5)}{\underbrace{SO(4) \times SO(5)}_{\mathcal{QM}_{20}}}$ \leftarrow

Table 5: Table of the non-compact symmetric manifolds of type $SO(r, r+2s)/SO(r) \times SO(r+2s)$ and of their Tits Satake submanifold with emphasis on their relation via c-map.

(see eq.(2.82)) is particularly inspiring. Specifically relevant is the **Golden Split** (see section 1.7 of [59] eq.(1.7.3)) of the quaternionic Lie Algebra of the Quaternionic Kähler manifolds repeated here below:

$$\text{adj}(U_{\mathcal{Q}}) = \text{adj}(SL(2, \mathbb{R})_{\text{E}}) \oplus \text{adj}(U_{\mathcal{SK}}) \oplus \mathfrak{W}_{(2, \mathbf{w})} \quad (6.4)$$

where $SL(2, \mathbb{R})_{\text{E}}$ is the Ehlers group, $U_{\mathcal{SK}}$ is the Special Kähler Geometry Lie Group and \mathbf{W} is the symplectic representation of $U_{\mathcal{SK}}$ required by Special Kähler Geometry. In our case the \mathbf{W} -representation are $(2, 3)$ and $(2, 5)$ for $SO(4, 3)$ and $SO(4, 5)$.

The golden decomposition and its restriction to the solvable subgroup is very precious for the issue of discretizations which, as we already stressed cannot avoid the consideration of discrete subgroups of solvable group and of its discrete automorphism group. Indeed the golden decomposition is a guide for the construction of discrete subgroups of the larger group utilizing, as bricks, already determined discrete subgroups of the building blocks. Such an observation applies to discrete subgroups of all types, both those with elliptic-like rotations and parabolic-like translations or those with elliptic like rotations and Fuchsian-like translation (see the forthcoming paper [111] for the latter case). In the first case (parabolic like translations), besides the $Sp(4, \mathbb{Z})$ example discussed in section 8 we have the general construction, valid for all $SO(r, r+q, \mathbb{Z})$ groups presented in section 9.

Having outlined the perspective let us turn to the details.

6.1 The manifolds $\text{SO}(r, r + 2s)/\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r + 2s)$ for small r

Let us start from the following strategic observation. Referring to eq. (4.72) we note that the time-dependent matrix $\mathcal{M}(t)$ has the following structure:

$$\mathcal{M}(t) = \exp[-2tL] = \exp[-2t\mathcal{O}L_{diag}\mathcal{O}^T] = \mathcal{O} \exp[-2tL_{diag}] \mathcal{O}^T \quad (6.5)$$

where L is the symmetric Lax operator at the origin, whose diagonalized form, obtained by an orthogonal transformation $\mathcal{O} \in \text{SO}(2r + 2s)$ is as follows:

$$\text{diag}(L_{diag}) = \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_r, 0, \dots, 0, -\mu_r, -\mu_{r-1}, \dots, -\mu_1\} \quad (6.6)$$

Any geodesic, that is specified by giving an initial point and an initial Lax operator, namely a generic constant matrix L satisfying the following two conditions:

$$L = L^T \quad ; \quad L\eta_t + \eta_t L = 0 \quad (6.7)$$

can be worked out in an algorithmic way if we are able to solve explicitly the secular equation for the eigenvalues λ_i ($i = 1, \dots, 2r + 2s$) and construct the corresponding ortho-normalized eigenvectors \mathbf{v}_i , which constitute the columns of the orthogonal matrix \mathcal{O} . In view of eq. (6.6) we see that the secular equation of the Lax operator has the following general form:

$$\mathfrak{P}(\lambda) = \lambda^{2s} \prod_{i=1}^r (\lambda^2 - \mu_i^2) \quad (6.8)$$

Hence, in view of Galois theorem, the eigenvalues μ_i admit an explicit expression in terms of radicals of the Lax operator components for all values of the non-compact rank $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$. In other words the geodesic problem is algebraically solvable for all such values of the non-compact rank. For large values of the parameter s difficulties might arise in finding an appropriate basis of orthonormal vectors in the null-eigenspace (the eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda = 0$) but certainly, for $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$, we can work out explicitly, up to the very end, all the geodesics in the corresponding Tits Satake projected manifolds:

$$\mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[r, r+1]} \equiv \frac{\text{SO}(r, r + 1)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r)} \quad (6.9)$$

In previous sections we have already illustrated the structure of the square norm function and of the geodesic construction for the cases $r = 1, 2$, that, as we remarked in the previous introductory section, already provide all the building blocks for all the cases $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$. A further study of such building blocks will follow in section 8. We observe that a similar consideration applies, in view of eq.(4.73) to the determination of the geodesic distance among any two points (both in the full manifold $\mathcal{M}_0^{[r, s]}$ and in its Tits Satake projection $\mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[r, r+1]}$). The argument is very simple: the distance $d^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is given purely in terms of the eigenvalues of the matrix:

$$\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}(\Upsilon[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}]) \quad (6.10)$$

defined in eq.(4.72) since, writing:

$$\mathbf{m} = \mathfrak{D} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \dots & \ddots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & \lambda_{r-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 & \lambda_r \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{D}^T \quad (6.11)$$

where $\lambda_i = \lambda_i[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]$ are the eigenvalues of \mathbf{m} (not to be confused with the eigenvalues μ_i of the Lax operator and $\mathfrak{D} \in \text{SO}(r)$ is the diagonalizing orthogonal matrix (not to be confused with $\mathcal{O} \in \text{SO}(2r + 2s)$), then the distance formula (4.73) becomes:

$$d^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^r \text{arccosh}^2(\lambda_i[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]) \quad (6.12)$$

Once again if $r \leq 4$ the secular polynomial is of maximum degree $r = 4$ and the eigenvalues can be explicitly written in terms of radicals, so that the dependence on the solvable coordinates $\Upsilon_{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\Upsilon_{\mathbf{v}}$ of the two points is explicit and written in terms of algebraic functions and elementary transcendental.

6.2 Clustering

The first main issue in *Data Science Applications of Symmetric Spaces with a non-trivial Tits Satake Projection* is the **grouping of data**. The fact that any data set can be embedded into a manifold $\text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(N)$ has been discussed at length in previous sections. The idea is that whatever sufficiently smooth differentiable manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\text{data}}$ might be the hosting environment for the set of data, certainly that manifold can be embedded into $\text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(N)$:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{data}} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(N) \quad (\text{for } N = \text{convenient}) \quad (6.13)$$

where Φ denotes a suitable set of functions, described by their developments into harmonics, whose vanishing locus is $\mathcal{M}_{\text{data}}$.

Hence the embedding into some $\text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(N)$ cannot be easily determined by **unsupervised neural networks**, since the set of possibilities is too large and actually infinite: the uncertainty on the choice of N , the infinite number of coefficients in each function Φ and the a priori undetermined number of them. Such a task might be the target only of **supervised learning** in presence of suitable training sets.

6.2.1 A non-trivial hypothesis

Assuming that the manifold hosting the data is liable to be embedded into a non-maximally split symmetric space with a non-trivial Tits Satake Projection like $\frac{\text{SO}(r, r+2s)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+2s)}$ is instead a **hypothesis**, actually a **strong one**, which implies a clustering of the data into **Tits Satake fibres**. Conceptually this is so because $\frac{\text{SO}(r, r+2s)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+2s)}$ is naturally embedded into the $\text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(N)$ for $N = 2(r + s)$ by means of the triangular embedding Φ_{triang} advocated in statement 3.1 and explicitly encoded in the construction of the matrix η_t (see eq.s(3.45)):

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{data}} \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\text{unknown}}} \frac{\text{SO}(r, r+2s)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+2s)} \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\text{triang}}} \frac{\text{SL}(2r+2s, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(2r+2s)} \quad (6.14)$$

Looking at the above equation we see that embedding the Data into a specific manifold of type $\frac{\text{SO}(r,r+2s)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+2s)}$ with a specific value of r , in particular $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$ is a hypothesis, since it corresponds to **choosing a priori** a part of the embedding functions. Indeed Φ_{triang} is a completely determined set of harmonic functions assumed to be vanishing. Actually these functions are just matrix elements of the fundamental harmonic \mathcal{M}^{AB} that are set to zero, or related to each other by quadratic equations which amounts to a fully intrinsic and coordinate independent description of the immersion of $\text{SO}(r, r + 2s)/\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r + 2s)$ into $\text{SL}(2r + 2s, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(2r + 2s)$. Indeed the matrix \mathcal{M}^{AB} is required to be an element of the group $\text{SO}(r, r + 2s)$, so it satisfies the equation:

$$\mathcal{M} \eta_t \mathcal{M} = \eta_t \quad ; \quad \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^T \quad (6.15)$$

It follows that assuming the first embedding in eq.(6.14) is a hypothesis and, as such, it might be the target of an **unsupervised neural network learning**. What is the indicator that the hypothesis is viable?

6.2.2 Tits Satake grouping

If the data admit the embedding into $\text{SO}(r, r + 2s)/\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r + 2s)$ it follows that those data that have the same Tits Satake projection will not coincide, yet they must be grouped in some way forming similarity classes. How this grouping is performed is a geometrical issue that can be analyzed in different ways adopting different viewpoints. It is a fundamental question that is left for the future while trying to construct new neural networks based on the mathematical tokens provided by the PGTS theory presented in this paper: we just remind the reader that the constructions of references [49–51], have implicitly but unconsciously assumed the above mentioned hypothesis and this in its more restrictive declination that is the choice $r = 1$. Here we summarize the viewpoint based on the Euler parameterization of the manifold $\mathcal{M}_0^{[r,s]}$ and on Grassmanians.

6.3 The structure of Tits Satake fibres, from the Euler viewpoint

In the general case $\text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(N)$ we have the alternative Euler parameterization of points of the manifold that is provided by the pair $\{\exp[\boldsymbol{\mu}], \mathcal{O}\}$ formed by an element of the maximal torus $\exp[\boldsymbol{\mu}]$, namely the exponential of any element of the Cartan subalgebra, $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{H} \subset \mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{R})$ and any element $\mathcal{O} \in \text{SO}(N)$ of the maximal compact subgroup $\text{H} \subset \text{G}$. Let us briefly outline the logic. A point in the manifold is uniquely determined by a symmetric matrix \mathcal{M}^{AB} with the required properties (just $\det \mathcal{M} = 1$ in the general $\text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})/\text{SO}(N)$ case, condition (6.15) in the $\text{SO}(r, r + 2s)/\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r + 2s)$ case). Such matrix is uniquely determined by its spectrum of eigenvalues μ_i and by the orthogonal matrix \mathcal{O} which diagonalizes it). On the other hand, by means of the Cholevsky Crout algorithm, every symmetric matrix can be written as $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{L} \cdot \mathbb{L}^T$, where \mathbb{L} is a triangular matrix namely an element of the solvable group $\mathcal{S} = \exp[\text{Solv}]$. Furthermore by means of the inverse map Σ^{-1} from \mathbb{L} we retrieve the corresponding element of the Solvable Lie algebra, namely the corresponding solvable coordinates $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$. If we use the simple exponential for Σ we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}^T \mathcal{M} \mathcal{O} &= \exp[\mu_i \mathcal{H}^i] \quad ; \quad \mathcal{H}^i = \text{Cartan generators} \\ &\Downarrow \\ \exp[\mu_i \mathcal{H}^i] &= \mathcal{O}^T \mathbb{L} \mathcal{O} \cdot \mathcal{O}^T \mathbb{L}^T \mathcal{O} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{O}^T \mathbb{L} \mathcal{O} = \exp\left[\frac{1}{2} \mu_i \mathcal{H}^i\right] \\ &\Downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}^T \exp[\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{s}}] \mathcal{O} &= \exp[\mathcal{O}^T \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{s}} \mathcal{O}] = \exp[\mu_i \mathcal{H}^i] \quad ; \quad \text{where } \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{s}} \in \text{Solv} \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

Implicitly the above argument shows that we have a linear action of the orthogonal group on the solvable Lie algebra which rotates a generic element into the Cartan subalgebra. Hence the solvable Lie algebra element $\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{s}}$ that maps to a point in the symmetric manifold can be parameterized by a Cartan subalgebra element $\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \mathcal{H}$ and a finite orthogonal group element \mathcal{O} as we stated; this is the Euler parameterization.

6.3.1 Euler parameterization in the non maximally split cases

In the non maximally split cases the Euler parameterization is more subtle than in the maximally split case, since the element $\mu_{n.c.} \in \mathcal{H}_{n.c.}$ must belong to the non-compact Cartan subalgebra and the element $\mathcal{O} \in \mathbb{H}_c$ in the maximal compact subgroup is defined only up to the stabilizer of $\mu_{n.c.}$ which is the Paint Group $\mathbb{G}_{\text{Paint}}$. In other words the Euler parameterization is given by a pair $\{\exp[\mu_{n.c.}], \mathfrak{p}\}$ where:

$$\mathfrak{p} \in \frac{\mathbb{H}_c}{\mathbb{G}_{\text{Paint}}} \quad (6.17)$$

We can easily check the dimensions. The dimension of the complete manifold is:

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{d}}^{[r,s]} = \dim \frac{\text{SO}(r, r+2s)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+2s)} = r(r+2s) \quad (6.18)$$

while:

$$\dim \frac{\mathbb{H}_c}{\mathbb{G}_{\text{Paint}}} = \dim \frac{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+2s)}{\text{SO}(2s)} = r^2 + r(2s-1) \quad (6.19)$$

so we verify that:

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{d}}^{[r,s]} = \underbrace{\dim \mathcal{H}_{n.c.}}_{=r} + \dim \frac{\mathbb{H}_c}{\mathbb{G}_{\text{Paint}}} \quad (6.20)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{n.c.}$ denotes the non-compact Cartan subalgebra.

Next we want to decompose the manifolds in the considered series with respect to the Tits Satake submanifold:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{d}}^{[r,s]} \xrightarrow{\pi_{TS}} \mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[r,r+1]} \sim \frac{\text{SO}(r, r+1)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+1)} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{d}}^{[r,s]} \quad (6.21)$$

where π_{TS} denotes the Tits Satake projection. We have:

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[r,r+1]} = \dim \frac{\text{SO}(r, r+1)}{\text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+1)} = r^2 + r \quad (6.22)$$

It follows that for each point $p \in \mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[r,r+1]}$ the fiber over it, namely $\pi_{TS}^{-1}(p)$ must have the following dimension:

$$\dim \pi_{TS}^{-1}(p) = r(2s-1) \quad (6.23)$$

How do we interpret this result? Let us discuss it algebraically.

The Lie algebra \mathbb{H}_c of the maximally compact subgroup \mathbb{H}_c admits the following decomposition as a vector space:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_c &= \mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}} \oplus \mathbb{H}_{TS} \oplus \mathbb{F}_{TS} \\ \mathbb{G}_{\text{paint}} &= \mathfrak{so}(2s) \quad \text{Lie algebra of the Paint group} \\ \mathbb{G}_{TS} \supset \mathbb{H}_{TS} &= \mathfrak{so}(r) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(r+1) \quad \text{maximal compact subalgebra of } \mathbb{G}_{TS} = \mathfrak{so}(r, r+1) \\ \mathbb{F}_{TS} &= \text{vector subspace which does not close a Lie algebra} \quad \dim \mathbb{F}_{TS} = r(2s-1) \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

Considering now the vector subspace \mathbb{F}_{TS} , that we denominate the space of **TS fibre generators**, we find:

$$[\mathbb{F}_{TS}, \mathbb{F}_{TS}] \equiv \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{F}} = \mathfrak{so}(r) \oplus \mathbb{G}_{\text{subpaint}} = \mathfrak{so}(r) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2s-1) \quad (6.25)$$

Namely the commutator of \mathbb{F}_{TS} with itself generates a compact Lie algebra $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{F}}$ which is identified in equation (6.25).

This suggests that the direct sum of vector spaces:

$$\mathbb{G}_F \equiv \mathbb{H}_F \oplus \mathbb{F}_{TS} \sim \mathfrak{so}(r + 2s - 1) \quad (6.26)$$

should be a closed subalgebra of the full compact algebra $\mathbb{G}_F \subset \mathbb{H}_c$, namely that we should have:

$$[\mathbb{G}_F, \mathbb{G}_F] \subset \mathbb{G}_F \quad (6.27)$$

which indeed turns out to be true. The explicit structure of the Lie algebra \mathbb{G}_F is easily identified:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{G}_F &= \mathbb{H}_F \oplus \mathbb{F}_{TS} \sim \mathfrak{so}(r + 2s - 1) \subset \mathfrak{so}(r + 2s) \\ [\mathbb{H}_F, \mathbb{F}_{TS}] &= \mathbb{F}_{TS} \\ \mathbb{G}_F &\subset \mathbb{H}_c = \mathfrak{so}(r) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(r + 2s) \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

Uplifting the above results from the Lie algebra to the Lie group level we realize that the **TS fiber generators** span in its origin the tangent space to the following Grassmannian manifold:

$$\mathcal{F}_{TS} = \frac{\mathrm{SO}(r + 2s - 1)}{\mathrm{SO}(r) \times \mathrm{SO}(2s - 1)} \quad (6.29)$$

This analysis suggests a new parameterization of the full manifold that is midway between the solvable parameterization and the Euler parameterization. The rationale is the following. In the Euler parameterization of $\mathcal{M}_5^{[r,s]}$ we can proceed in two steps. First in eq.(6.17) we choose:

$$\mathfrak{p}_{TS} \in \mathbb{H}_{TS} \quad (6.30)$$

The pair $\{\exp[\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n.c.}], \mathfrak{p}_{TS}\}$ singles out a point in the Tits Satake submanifold, and every point $p \in \mathcal{M}_{TS}$ admits such a representation for a suitable $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n.c.}(p)$ and a suitable $\mathfrak{p}_{TS}(p)$. Next we choose a further generic element:

$$\mathfrak{p}_F \in \frac{\mathbb{G}_F}{\mathbb{H}_F} \quad (6.31)$$

and as \mathfrak{p}_F varies in \mathcal{F}_{TS} and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n.c.}(p), \mathfrak{p}_{TS}(p)$ vary for $p \in \mathcal{M}_{TS}$ we obtain all the points of $\mathcal{M}_5^{[r,s]}$. In other words the action of \mathfrak{p}_F on the Tits Satake submanifold generates a homeomorphic copy of the latter in the full manifold. Similarly for each point $p \in \mathcal{M}_{TS}$, considering its orbit under all elements $\mathfrak{p}_F \in \frac{\mathbb{G}_F}{\mathbb{H}_F}$ we obtain a copy of the Grassmannian \mathcal{F}_{TS} that we denominate a **Grassmannian leaf**. Although each leaf is associated with an initial point $p \in \mathcal{M}_{TS}$, the leaf is not the Tits-Satake fiber over the point p , namely it is not the fibre $\pi_{TS}^{-1}(p)$. Indeed the Grassmannian leaf projects in \mathcal{M}_{TS} onto a domain $\mathcal{D}(p) \subset \mathcal{M}_{TS}$ of dimension $\dim[\mathcal{D}(p)] = r$.

Instead a Tits Satake fibre $\pi_{TS}^{-1}(p)$, where π_{TS} is the Tits Satake projection defined in eq.(6.21), is not homeomorphic to a compact space, rather it can be defined in terms of a suitable **normal subgroup of the solvable group** $\mathcal{S}_{[r,s]}$ metrically equivalent to $\mathcal{M}_5^{[r,s]}$ as we show in the next section.

6.4 The Tits Satake projection revisited in a different perspective

We illustrate the idea mentioned in the last lines of the previous section by focusing on an explicit example namely on the case $r = 2$, where for simplicity we also choose $s = 1$. The general form of solvable group element in terms of the solvable coordinates was provided in eq.(3.56). We consider that expression and for our present convenience we rename the coordinates $\Upsilon_i \rightarrow w_i$ and $\Upsilon_{5,6,i} \rightarrow w_{5,6,i}$. The Tits Satake projection corresponds to setting $w_{5,i} = w_{6,i} = 0$ for

($i \geq 2$). This leads to the solvable group element displayed in the following equation:

$$\mathbb{L}_{TS}(\mathbf{w}_{TS}) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{w_1} & \frac{e^{w_1} w_3}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2} e^{w_1} (\sqrt{2} w_5 + w_3 w_6) & 0 & e^{w_1} \left(-\frac{w_3 w_6^2}{4\sqrt{2}} - \frac{w_5 w_6}{2} + \frac{w_4}{\sqrt{2}} \right) & -\frac{1}{2} e^{w_1} \left(\frac{w_5^2}{2} + w_3 w_4 \right) \\ 0 & e^{w_2} & \frac{e^{w_2} w_6}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} e^{w_2} w_6^2 & -\frac{e^{w_2} w_4}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -\frac{w_6}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{w_5}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-w_2} & -\frac{e^{-w_2} w_3}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-w_1} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{w}_{TS} = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5, w_6\} \quad (6.32)$$

As we see the immersion of the TS solvable group in the full manifold solvable group is a 6×6 matrix which has one-column (the third) and one row (the fourth) with all zeros except identity at place (4, 3). In the general case we have $2s - 1$ columns and $(2s - 1)$ rows of that type.

6.4.1 A normal subgroup of the full solvable group contains the TS fibres

At variance with the generation of the Tits Satake fibres by means compact rotations associated with the Grassmanian, as we did in section 6.2.2, we want here to associate them with a suitable normal subgroup $\mathcal{NS}_{fib} \subset \mathcal{S}_{U/H}$ of the full solvable group.

As a candidate we consider the following three parameter ansatz for the generic subgroup element (the parameters ρ, p, q being respectively associated with $w_4, w_{5,2}, w_{6,2}$ and the generalization to higher values of s being also clear and straightforward):

$$\mathfrak{L}(\rho, p, q) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 2p & \rho - 4pq & -2p^2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 2q & -2q^2 & -\rho \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2q & -2p \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.33)$$

The matrices in eq.(6.33) form a group since:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{L}(\rho_1, p_1, q_1) \cdot \mathfrak{L}(\rho_2, p_2, q_2) &= \mathfrak{L}(4p_1 q_2 + \rho_1 + \rho_2, p_1 + p_2, q_1 + q_2) \\ \mathfrak{L}^{-1}(\rho, p, q) &= \mathfrak{L}(4pq - \rho, -p, -q) \end{aligned} \quad (6.34)$$

It is not only a subgroup, actually it is a normal subgroup, as it can be verified by means of the following calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cdot \mathfrak{L}(\rho, p, q) \cdot \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{M}}^{-1} &= \mathfrak{L}(\lambda, h, k) \\ \lambda &= e^{w_1 + w_2} \left(\sqrt{2} p w_{6,2} - \sqrt{2} q w_{5,2} + \sqrt{2} q^2 w_3 + \rho \right), \quad h = \frac{1}{2} e^{w_1} \left(2p + \sqrt{2} q w_3 \right), \quad k = q e^{w_2} \end{aligned} \quad (6.35)$$

It follows that the full solvable group can be written in terms of lateral classes of the normal subgroup as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}_{U/H} \ni \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbb{L}_{TS}(\mathbf{w}_{TS}) \cdot \mathfrak{L}(\rho, p, q) \quad (6.36)$$

There is apparently a double counting since the parameter w_4 is contained both in the Tits Satake group element and

in the normal solvable group element. It is not so because of the following very useful and significant fact. In both cases (the solvable Tits Satake group \mathcal{S}_{TS} and the normal subgroup \mathcal{NS}_{fib}) the family of group elements:

$$\mathfrak{N}(\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\rho \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.37)$$

constitute a normal subgroup since we have:

$$\mathfrak{L}(\rho, p, q) \cdot \mathfrak{N}(\rho) \cdot \mathfrak{L}^{-1}(\rho, p, q) = \mathfrak{N}(\rho) \quad (6.38)$$

$$\mathbb{L}_{TS}(\mathbf{w}_{TS}) \cdot \mathfrak{N}(\rho) \cdot \mathbb{L}_{TS}^{-1}(\mathbf{w}_{TS}) = \mathfrak{N}(\rho e^{w_1+w_2}) \quad (6.39)$$

In other words we have two chains of subgroups and normal subgroups:

$$\mathcal{S}_{U/H} \triangleright \mathcal{NS}_{fib} \triangleright \mathfrak{N} \quad (6.40)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{U/H} \supset \mathcal{S}_{TS} \triangleright \mathfrak{N} \quad (6.41)$$

Correspondingly we can consider the Tits Satake solvable group as **the quotient of full solvable group with respect to the quotient of normal subgroup \mathcal{NS}_{fib} with respect to the group \mathfrak{N}** . In practice this means that we can write the lateral classes in eq.(6.36) as:

$$S_{\mathcal{M}} \ni \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbb{L}_{TS}(\mathbf{w}_{TS})|_{w_4=0} \cdot \mathfrak{N}(\rho) \cdot \mathfrak{L}(0, p, q) \quad (6.42)$$

Indeed since \mathfrak{N} is a normal subgroup both for \mathcal{S}_{TS} and for \mathcal{NS}_{fib} the left and right lateral classes are identical and this allows to put $\mathfrak{N}(\rho)$ in the middle. We stress that this point of view is quite instrumental in the problem of determining discrete parabolic subgroups of the groups $SO(r, r+s, \mathbb{Z})$ that is addressed and solved in section 9.

6.4.2 Three complementary viewpoints on the structure of the full manifold U/H in terms of its Tits Satake submanifold

Summarizing, in the present section we have illustrated how the full manifold can be viewed in three different complementary ways in relation to its Tits-Satake submanifold:

$$\frac{U_{TS}}{H_{TS}} \subset \frac{U}{H} \quad (6.43)$$

Given the Tits-Satake projection:

$$\pi_{TS} = \frac{U}{H} \longrightarrow \frac{U_{TS}}{H_{TS}} \quad (6.44)$$

1) In the first picture we view $\frac{U}{H}$ as the total space of a **vector bundle** over the base manifold $\mathcal{M}_{base} = \frac{U_{TS}}{H_{TS}}$ with structural group $G_{struc} = SO(r) \times G_{subPaint}$. Indeed given a point $p \in \frac{U_{TS}}{H_{TS}}$ we have:

$$\pi_{TS}(p) \sim \mathbb{V}_1 \oplus \mathbb{V}_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{V}_r \quad (6.45)$$

where \mathbb{V}_i are r copies of a $(2s-1)$ -dimensional vector space supporting the fundamental representation of the

subPaint group $G_{\text{subPaint}} = \text{SO}(2s - 1)$. The group $\text{SO}(r)$ included in the isotropy group of the base manifold acts on the r vector spaces \mathbb{V}_i rotating one into the other as a whole. The first picture is entirely located in the solvable parameterization of the full manifold $\frac{U}{H}$

- 2) The second picture, as we have explained above, relies on a hybrid parameterization of U/H , partially solvable, partially Euler. Given any point $p \in \frac{U_{\text{TS}}}{H_{\text{TS}}}$ we consider its orbit with respect to all elements $\mathfrak{p}_F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{TS}} \equiv \frac{G_F}{H_F}$ that are compact rotations. The orbit $\mathcal{F}_{\text{TS}}(p) \subset \frac{U}{H}$ is a submanifold of the full symmetric space, diffeomorphic to the Grassmanian $\frac{G_F}{H_F}$. The full manifold is:

$$\frac{U}{H} = \bigcup_{p \in \frac{U_{\text{TS}}}{H_{\text{TS}}}} \mathcal{F}_{\text{TS}}(p) \quad (6.46)$$

- 3) Since both the full manifold $\frac{U}{H}$ and the Tits Satake submanifold $\frac{U_{\text{TS}}}{H_{\text{TS}}}$ are diffeomorphic, as differentiable manifolds, to their respective solvable groups $\mathcal{S}_{U/H}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\frac{U_{\text{TS}}}{H_{\text{TS}}}}$, we can inquire what is the relation between the former and the latter solvable groups. We find that the latter is the quotient of the former with respect to a normal subgroup $\mathcal{NS}_{\text{fib}}$ as we have explained in eq. (6.42)

The way of looking at the Tits Satake fibres as elements of a normal subgroup (picture 3) is not contradictory with, rather it is complementary to the other representation of the same in G_{subpaint} language (picture 1). The latter viewpoint is more handy in constructing functionals to be extremized, in order to map data points to the manifold. Conversely the view point in terms of normal solvable subgroups is appropriate while discussing discretization of the space. Since the space is a group (the solvable group \mathcal{S}) the only meaningful way to perform a discretization is by means of discrete subgroups of the solvable group (see section 9).

Furthermore let us add that while the present article was prepared for publication, research on the application of the PGTS theory to the formulation of the new paradigm in the construction of neural networks advanced and the second view point (picture 2) happened to be very much handy as one of the basic ingredients of the new paradigm. For this we refer the reader to the forthcoming paper [112].

7 The two Kählerian building blocks, \mathbb{H}_2 and $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{H}_2$

In this section we study in detail the two Kählerian building blocks of the various constructions outlined in section 6.

7.1 The Poincaré-Lobachevsky Hyperbolic plane \mathbb{H}_2

In this subsection we collect all the relevant items and necessary formulae relative to the Tits Satake submanifold of the $r = 1$ series of symmetric spaces $\mathcal{M}_3^{[r,s]}$, namely:

$$\mathbb{H}_2 \equiv \mathcal{M}_{\text{TS}}^{[1,s]} = \frac{\text{SO}(1,2)}{\text{SO}(2)} \quad (7.1)$$

7.1.1 The various descriptions of the $r = 1$ Tits Satake submanifold

The main special feature of the $r = 1$ case is related to the local isomorphism of the Tits Satake group that can be alternatively viewed as:

$$U_{\text{TS}} = \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \sim \text{Sp}(2, \mathbb{R}) \sim \text{SO}(1, 2) \sim \text{SU}(1, 1) \quad (7.2)$$

The presentation in terms of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ versus that in terms of $\text{SO}(1, 2)$ corresponds to the use of the 2-dimensional spinor representation versus the 3-dimensional vector representation¹². Finally the first and the last presentation of the Tits Satake group are related by a Cayley transformation and the Tits Satake submanifold can be alternatively viewed in either one of the two standard geometric models:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{H}_2 &= \frac{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(2)} \Leftrightarrow \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Im}z > 0\} \\ \mathbb{H}_2 &= \frac{\text{SU}(1, 1)}{\text{U}(1)} \Leftrightarrow \{\omega \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\omega|^2 < 1\}\end{aligned}\tag{7.3}$$

In order to emphasize the general features of the Tits Satake projection we rather start from the $\text{SO}(1, 2)$ description of the Tits-Satake subgroup G_{TS} .

7.1.2 Special algebraic features of the $r = 1$ case

Algebraically the $r = 1$ case has the following distinctive simplifying features:

A) The maximal compact subgroup H_c is simple rather than semisimple:

$$\text{H}_c = \text{SO}(2 + 2s) \quad ; \quad \text{The factor } \text{SO}(r) \text{ is missing for } r = 1\tag{7.4}$$

B) In the construction of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(1, 1 + 2s)$ the long roots are absent and we have only one Paint Group $2s$ -multiplet of short roots.

C) In virtue of the above feature the solvable group $\mathcal{S} = e^{\text{Solv}}$, metrically equivalent to the non-compact symmetric manifold $\mathcal{M}_\mathfrak{g}^{[1, s]}$ has a very simple structure: its Lie algebra Solv contains an abelian ideal of dimension $2s$ and one Cartan generator. Namely the generators are:

$$\text{T} = \{C, S_i\} \quad ; \quad [C, S_i] = S_i \quad ; \quad [S_i, S_j] = 0\tag{7.5}$$

Correspondingly the solvable group element parameterizing the symmetric space is the one given in eq.(3.55):

D) The Grassmanian leaf of eq.(6.29) reduces to a familiar $2s - 1$ dimensional sphere:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{TS}} = \frac{\text{SO}(2s)}{\text{SO}(2s - 1)} \sim \mathbb{S}^{2s-1}\tag{7.6}$$

This geometric characterization of the Grassmanian leaves is what justifies the denomination of Poincaré Balls.

7.1.3 The Tits Satake projection and the spinor representation

The spinor representation of the full group $\text{SO}(1, 1 + 2s)$ certainly exists for any value of s , its dimension being much larger than that of the $(2 + 2s)$ -dimensional defining vector representation. The Tits Satake subgroup $\text{U}_{\text{TS}} = \text{SO}(1, 2)$ benefits instead from the exceptional low-rank Lie Algebra automorphisms and its spinor representation has dimension 2. Indeed, as already recalled the spinor group which provides a double covering of $\text{SO}(1, 2)$ is the maximally split simple group $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$. It is very simple and quite important to recall the precise form of this double covering map.

¹²As it will be thoroughly discussed in the forthcoming paper [111] the use of the spinor versus the vector representation of the manifold has relevant consequences at the level of the harmonic expansion of functions on the manifold (see section 10) and hence of neural networks algorithms utilized to describe for instance pictures or other types of data mapped to hypersurfaces inside the hyperbolic symmetric space.

As usual we start from the construction of the $SO(1,2)$ gamma-matrices in a base adapted to the chosen basis of the mother group $SO(1,1+2s)$ where the solvable subgroup elements are upper triangular as displayed in eq.(3.55). The solvable coordinate vector is very simple in the $r = 1$ case and the Tits Satake projection is equally simple:

$$\pi_{TS}(\Upsilon) = \{\Upsilon_1, \Upsilon_{2,1}, 0, \dots, 0\} \quad (7.7)$$

Correspondingly, starting from equation (3.55), we have:

$$\forall \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon) \in e^{Solv_{so(1,1+2s)}} \quad : \quad \pi_{TS}(\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} e^{\Upsilon_1} & e^{\Upsilon_1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Upsilon_{2,1} & -e^{\Upsilon_1} \frac{1}{4} \Upsilon_{2,1}^2 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} \Upsilon_{2,1} \\ \hline 0 & 0 & e^{-\Upsilon_1} \end{array} \right) \equiv \mathbb{L}(\hat{\Upsilon}) \in e^{Solv_{so(1,2)}} \quad (7.8)$$

where we have denoted by $Solv_{so(1,1+2s)}$ the solvable Lie algebra associated with the non-maximally split full manifold and $Solv_{so(1,2)}$ the solvable Lie algebra associated with the Tits Satake maximally split submanifold (7.1). Furthermore we have denoted:

$$\hat{\Upsilon} = \{\Upsilon_1, \Upsilon_{2,1}\} \quad (7.9)$$

In the upper triangular basis inherited from the mother group $SO(1,1+2s)$, the invariant metric of the Tits Satake subgroup $SO(1,2)$ is the following one:

$$\eta_t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.10)$$

Hence a triplet of well-adapted gamma matrices should satisfy the following Clifford algebra:

$$\{\gamma_i, \gamma_j\} = \eta_{t|ij} \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} \quad ; \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3 \quad (7.11)$$

An explicit representation is the following one:

$$\gamma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \gamma_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \gamma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.12)$$

Then the map from the group $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, whose elements are 2×2 real valued matrices of determinant one:

$$SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \ni \mathbf{m} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \alpha\delta - \gamma\beta = 1 \quad (7.13)$$

to elements of the group $SO(1,2)$, namely to 3×3 real valued matrices \mathcal{O} satisfying the constraint $\mathcal{O}^T \eta_t \mathcal{O} = \eta_t$ is provided by the following quadratic relation:

$$\mathcal{O}_i^j[\mathbf{m}] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{m}^{-1} \gamma_i \mathbf{m} \gamma_k) \eta^{kj} \quad (7.14)$$

Inside the group $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ we have a 2-dimensional solvable subgroup $\mathfrak{T} \subset SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ formed by the upper triangular matrices whose image in $SO(1,2)$ is also upper triangular as a 3×3 matrix

$$\mathfrak{T} \ni \mathbf{t} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ 0 & \alpha^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{O}_i^j[\mathbf{t}] = \text{upper triangular} \quad (7.15)$$

Actually we find that:

$$\mathbb{L}(\widehat{\Upsilon}) = \mathcal{O}[t] \quad \text{iff} \quad \alpha = \pm e^{\frac{\Upsilon_1}{2}}, \beta = \pm \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{\Upsilon_1}{2}} \Upsilon_{2,1} \quad (7.16)$$

Recalling that the upper complex plane (the first choice in eq.(7.3)) is invariant under the action of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ we see that the solvable subgroup \mathfrak{T} has a simple transitive action on it. Indeed under the fractional linear transformation:

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{C}, \forall \mathbf{g} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \quad : \quad \mathbf{g}(z) = \frac{\alpha z + \beta}{\gamma z + \delta} \quad (7.17)$$

the upper complex plane is just the orbit under the solvable subgroup $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ of the special point i . Hence we can set:

$$z = i\alpha^2 + \alpha\beta = \frac{1}{2}e^{\Upsilon_1} \Upsilon_{2,1} + ie^{\Upsilon_1} \in \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Im}z > 0\} \quad (7.18)$$

The representation of the Tits Satake submanifold as the interior of the unit circle is obtained by means of the standard Cayley transformation:

$$\omega = \frac{z - i}{z + i} = \frac{e^{2\Upsilon_1} (\Upsilon_{2,1}^2 + 4) - 4}{e^{2\Upsilon_1} (\Upsilon_{2,1}^2 + 4) + 8e^{\Upsilon_1} + 4} - i \frac{4e^{\Upsilon_1} \Upsilon_{2,1}}{e^{2\Upsilon_1} (\Upsilon_{2,1}^2 + 4) + 8e^{\Upsilon_1} + 4} \quad (7.19)$$

Eq.(7.19) is the explicit final form of the Tits Satake projection that maps any point $p \in \mathcal{M}_\mathfrak{g}^{[1,s]}$ to a point of the Tits Satake submanifold $\mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[1,2]}$ represented as the interior of the unit-circle in the complex plane ω . The point of the full manifold is identified by the vector of solvable coordinates:

$$\Upsilon = \{\Upsilon_1, \Upsilon_{2,i}\} \quad ; \quad i = 1, \dots, 2s \quad (7.20)$$

One disregards all the coordinates $\Upsilon_{2,i>1}$ and out of Υ_1 and Υ_2 constructs the complex number ω . This can be done for a discrete number of points p or for entire submanifolds or lines. In particular the Tits Satake projection can be done for a geodesic. Suppose that $\Upsilon_{geo}(t)$ represents a geodesic of the full manifold; by means of the Tits Satake projection we can see the image of the ambient space geodesic inside the unit-circle:

$$\omega_g(t) = \pi_{TS}(\Upsilon_{geo}(t)) \quad (7.21)$$

The question arises whether the image of a geodesic of the full space inside the Tits Satake submanifold is a geodesic of the latter. The answer is no! What is true is rather the following:

- A)** Any geodesic of the Tits Satake submanifold $\mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[1,2]}$ **is also a geodesic** with respect to the metric of the full manifold $\mathcal{M}_\mathfrak{g}^{[1,1+2s]}$.
- B)** Generically the Tits Satake projection of a geodesic of the full manifold $\mathcal{M}_\mathfrak{g}^{[1,1+2s]}$ **is not a geodesic** with respect to the metric of $\mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[1,2]}$, unless it is fully contained in $\mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[1,2]}$.

In the next subsection we illustrate the above notions by means of the simplest example $r = 1$ and $s = 1$.

7.1.4 Illustration in the simplest case $r = 1, s = 1$

We begin by considering the explicit form of the solvable group element providing the solvable coset representative of the manifold $\frac{\text{SO}(1,1+2)}{\text{SO}(3)}$:

$$\mathbb{L}_{\mathfrak{d}|1,s}(\Upsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\Upsilon_1} & \frac{e^{\Upsilon_1}\Upsilon_{2,1}}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{e^{\Upsilon_1}\Upsilon_{2,2}}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{4}e^{\Upsilon(1)}(\Upsilon_{2,1}^2 + \Upsilon_{2,2}^2) \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -\frac{\Upsilon_{2,1}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -\frac{\Upsilon_{2,2}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-\Upsilon_1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.22)$$

which corresponds to the generic solvable coordinate vector:

$$\Upsilon = \{\Upsilon_1, \Upsilon_{2,1}, \Upsilon_{2,2}\} \quad (7.23)$$

The Tits Satake projection on the Tits Satake submanifold defined is effected by setting $\Upsilon_{2,2} = 0$. For convenience we can label a point in $\mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[1,2]}$ by $\Upsilon_1 = w_1, \Upsilon_{2,1} = w_2$ yielding the point (7.18) in the upper complex plane. In the intrinsic parameterization of the full manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{d}}^{[1,1]}$ by means of the symmetric matrix $\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon) \equiv \mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)\mathbb{L}^T(\Upsilon)$, the points of the Tits Satake submanifold are in one-to-one correspondence with the matrices:

$$\mathcal{M}_{TS}(w_1, w_2) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{16}e^{2w_1}(w_2^2 + 4)^2 & \frac{e^{w_1}w_2(w_2^2 + 4)}{4\sqrt{2}} & 0 & -\frac{w_2^2}{4} \\ \frac{e^{w_1}w_2(w_2^2 + 4)}{4\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2}(w_2^2 + 2) & 0 & -\frac{e^{-w_1}w_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{w_2^2}{4} & -\frac{e^{-w_1}w_2}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & e^{-2w_1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.24)$$

The geometry of the Tits Satake projection and the foliation of the full manifold into Grassmanian leaves can now be understood by recalling the basic principle of the Euler parameterization. The entire space can be organized into the union of the Grassmanian leaves associated with the points of the Tits Satake submanifold namely the Hyperbolic plane. Each Grassmanian leaf is the orbit of a point $p \in \mathcal{M}_{TS}$ with respect to the action of $\exp[\mathbb{F}_{TS}]$ (see eq.s(6.26-6.28)). In the $r = 1, s = 1$ case the subspace \mathbb{F}_{TS} is one-dimensional and it is spanned by the compact generator:

$$J_F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.25)$$

Hence we have:

$$\mathcal{O}_F(\phi) = \exp[\phi J_F] = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2\left[\frac{\phi}{2}\right] & 0 & \frac{\sin[\phi]}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2}[\cos[\phi] - 1] \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{\sin[\phi]}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & \cos[\phi] & -\frac{\sin[\phi]}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{2}[\cos[\phi] - 1] & 0 & \frac{\sin[\phi]}{\sqrt{2}} & \cos^2\left[\frac{\phi}{2}\right] \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.26)$$

and the points of the full manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{d}}^{[1,1]}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the symmetric matrices:

$$\mathcal{M}[w_1, w_2, \phi] = \mathcal{O}_F(\phi)\mathcal{M}_{TS}(w_1, w_2)\mathcal{O}_F^T(\phi) \quad (7.27)$$

In this way one explicitly realizes the foliation structure of the full manifold. To each point $p \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{TS}}^{[1,2]}$ of the Tits Satake submanifold (singled out by the coordinates of a point in the upper complex plane or in the unit circle, eventually $w_{1,2}$), one associates an entire sphere \mathbb{S}^{2s-1} , in the case $s = 1$ a circle \mathbb{S}^1 . Explicitly utilizing the Cholevsky Crout algorithm in order to express the symmetric matrix $\mathcal{M}[w_1, w_2, \phi]$ in terms of an upper triangular matrix $\mathbb{L}(\Upsilon)$ and then the inverse of the Σ -map to work out Υ one finds:

$$\Upsilon(w_1, w_2, \phi) = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1}{(e^{2w_1} (w_2^2 + 4) (\cos(\phi) - 1) - 4(\cos(\phi) + 1))^2} \right) + w_1 + \log(8), w_2, \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{4} (e^{w_1} w_2^2 + 8 \sinh(w_1)) \sin(\phi) \right\} \quad (7.28)$$

Naming x, y the real and imaginary parts of the upper complex plane z -point in the map (7.18) we finally get the following parameterization of the points of the full-manifold:

$$(x, y, w_{2,2}) = \left\{ \frac{2\sigma}{-(\rho^2 + \sigma^2 - 1) \cos(\phi) + \rho^2 + \sigma^2 + 1}, \frac{2\rho}{-(\rho^2 + \sigma^2 - 1) \cos(\phi) + \rho^2 + \sigma^2 + 1}, -\frac{(\rho^2 + \sigma^2 - 1) \sin(\phi)}{\rho} \right\} \quad (7.29)$$

where we have redefined:

$$w_1 = \log[\rho] \quad ; \quad w_2 = 2 \frac{\sigma}{\rho} \quad (7.30)$$

In fig.7 we illustrate the foliation of the considered manifold in two ways: with three examples of topological circles associated with three different points of the upper complex plane model of the hyperbolic space and with the surface generated by taking the circles associated with each of the points in a line (actually a geodesic) of the same upper complex plane.

Next let us consider fig.8: it displays the geodesics that joins two points belonging to the same leaf, namely the one singled out by the parameters $w_1 = 2, w_2 = 3/2$. The important point to be stressed is that the geodesic joining two points of the same leaf does not lie on the leaf (see the caption of fig.8 for more details). The same phenomenon is emphasized even more strongly in fig.9. Furthermore the example in the quoted figure emphasizes another fundamental aspect. As it is visually clear from the picture, the projection of a geodesic of the ambient space onto the Tits Satake submanifold, namely the interior of the unit disk, is not a geodesic of the TS manifold (*i.e* an arc of a circle with center on the boundary of the unit disk). Indeed the projected geodesic can be a much more complicated curve even turning back, as it happens in the present example.

In fig.10 we display instead the case of a geodesic joining two points on two different leaves.

7.1.5 Squared norm and Grassmannian leaves

Last but not least we reconsider, in view of the Grassmann leaf picture, the squared norm on the solvable group. To this effect we focus on the *Grassmannian leaf* associated with a point of the Tits Satake submanifold. Utilizing the $s = 1$ case in order to obtain simple results that we later generalize by Paint Invariance we consider the orbit under the $U(1)$ group generated by the unique fibre generator that was already calculated and presented in eq.(7.28). We calculate the norm square $N^2(\Upsilon[w_1, w_2, \phi])$ and we find

$$N^2(\Upsilon[w_1, w_2, \phi]) = \left(\operatorname{arccosh} \left[\frac{1}{32} (16e^{-2w_1} + 8w_2^2 + e^{2w_1} (w_2^2 + 4)^2) \right] \right)^2 \quad (7.31)$$




Figure 7: In the present figure we illustrate the foliation structure encoded in eq.(7.29). In the image on the left we display three circles respectively associated with three different points of the upper complex plain, namely $z = -\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{3}{2}$, $z = \frac{2}{3} + i\frac{1}{2}$ and $z = 2 + i\frac{3}{2}$. In the image on the right we display the surface generated by taking all the circles associated with each of the points along a line in the upper complex plane that is the bluish horizontal plane cutting the surface. The chosen line is just a geodesic of the Tits Satake submanifold, namely a circle with center on the real line. Such geodesics is the thick blue line described by the formula $z[\psi] = -\frac{1}{3} + \frac{3}{2} e^{i\psi}$.

which is independent from the angle ϕ . Namely all points in the Grassmann leaf have the same norm as their unique representative point lying on the Tits Satake submanifold.

That above is a completely general result that holds true for $r = 1$ and all values of s , but it is also true for higher values of the non-compact rank r and for all corresponding various of s .

Thus it emerges the true meaning of the description of the full manifold as provided by eq.(6.46). Each point $p \in \frac{U_{TS}}{H_{TS}}$ of the Tits Satake submanifold has a well-defined and finite squared norm $N^2(p) = R^2$. There is however in the full manifold $\frac{U}{H}$ and entire compact submanifold, diffeomorphic to the Grassmannian (6.29), whose points have the same squared norm.

The use of this property in devising optimized procedures of mapping data to hyperbolic manifolds is one of the several open perspectives for applications of the PGTS theory to Data Science.

7.2 The building block \mathbb{SH}_2

In this section we focus on the case $r = 2$ of the series of symmetric manifolds $\frac{SO(r,r+2s)}{SO(r) \times SO(r+2s)}$ in a completely synoptic setup with respect to our previous treatment of the case $r = 1$. The motivation for this synopsis is twofold:

1. On one hand we want to stress that the $r = 1$ case is completely aligned with all the subsequent $r > 1$ ones and that the Tits Satake projection, which went unnoticed and unexploited by the authors in [49–51], is actually the conceptual backbone for all the members of the considered series of manifolds.
2. On the other hand we want to emphasize that the $r = 2$ and $r = 1$ cases are twins inside the entire series since




Figure 8: In this figure we display the circular leaf associated with the point $w_1 = 2, w_2 = 3/2$ of the Tits Satake submanifold. The leaf is shown in the three dimensional space $\{x, y, z = w_{2,2}\}$ where x, y are the real and imaginary part of the point $\zeta(w_1, w_2)$ in the upper complex plane. It corresponds to the close curve, marked dashed in red color in the third picture on the right. Two points on the leaf, respectively corresponding to $\phi = \pi/10$ and $\phi = \pi/5$, are joined by a geodesic, marked solid brown, that, as one sees, does not lie on the leaf. The Tits Satake projection of such geodesic is displayed in the first picture, while its entire three dimensional shape is shown in the second picture.

their respective Tits Satake submanifolds are just the first and the second instance of a *Siegel upper complex plane*, which is the appropriate generalization of the Lobachevsky-Poincaré hyperbolic plane. Instead, for values $r > 2$, the Tits Satake submanifold, that, by definition, is always a maximally split symmetric space, is not a further instance of a Siegel upper complex plane. Indeed the appearance of the first two Siegel planes is strictly linked with the low-rank sporadic isomorphisms of simple Lie algebras.

3. Notwithstanding its exceptionality, the Siegel plane twin relation between the $r = 2$ and $r = 1$ case has relevant consequences for the generalization to the higher non-compact rank $r = 3, 4$ via the c -map relations that we have emphasized in section 6. In particular, as we have put into evidence there, the standard hyperbolic plane and the Siegel upper plane of order 2 are the Kähler building blocks for all cases $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$. This is particularly relevant at the level of the search for discrete subgroups. The discrete subgroups of the two quaternionic cases 3 and 4 will be constructed starting from tensor products of the discrete subgroups of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $Sp(4, \mathbb{R})$ like in a Chinese box game.

In view of what we said above, we propose to name the $r = 2$ case **Siegel lumps** opposed to the **Poincaré balls** of the case $r = 1$. The word *lump* opposed to *ball* recalls the fact that, in the $r = 2$ case, Tits Satake fibres are not related to spherical leaves rather with leaves that have the shape of a more general Grassmanian.

In subsection 7.2.1 we discuss in depth the structure of the Tits Satake submanifold

$$\mathbb{S}\mathbb{H}_2 \equiv \frac{SO(2, 3)}{SO(2) \times SO(3)} \simeq \frac{Sp(4, \mathbb{R})}{U(1) \times SU(2)} \quad (7.32)$$

which is indeed the natural generalization of the $r = 1$ Tits Satake manifold, *i.e.* of the hyperbolic plane, being the next instance of a Siegel upper plane of which the hyperbolic plane is the first instance.




Figure 9: In this figure we display the circular leaf associated with the point $w_1 = 2, w_2 = 3/2$ of the Tits Satake submanifold. The leaf is shown in the three dimensional space $\{x, y, z = w_{2,2}\}$ where x, y are the real and imaginary part of the point $\zeta(w_1, w_2)$ in the upper complex plane. It corresponds to the close curve, marked dashed in red color in the third picture on the right. Two points on the leaf, respectively corresponding to $\phi = -\pi/4$ and $\phi = \pi/3$, are joined by a geodesic, marked solid blue, that, as one sees, does not lie on the leaf. The Tits Satake projection (in its unit disk model) of such geodesic is displayed in the first picture, while its entire three dimensional shape is shown in the second picture.

7.2.1 The Siegel upper plane and the Tits Satake projection in the $r=2$ case

According with the statement made at the end of section 7.2, we come now to the complete study of the Tits Satake manifold (7.32). The equivalence shown in eq.(7.32) is due to the equivalence of the complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{b}_2 with the complex Lie algebra \mathfrak{c}_2 which is one of the few low-rank sporadic isomorphisms:

$$\mathfrak{so}(5, \mathbb{C}) \simeq \mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{C}) \quad (7.33)$$

At the level of maximal compact real section eq.(7.33) implies:

$$\mathfrak{so}(5) \simeq \mathfrak{usp}(4) \quad (7.34)$$

while at the level of maximally split real section it yields:

$$\mathfrak{so}(2, 3) \simeq \mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R}) \quad (7.35)$$

Eq.(7.35) is the one relevant for our purposes. The isomorphism is explicitly realized by means of the spinor representation of the group $SO(2, 3)$ so that the first step in its construction goes through the set up of a convenient set of




Figure 10: In this figure we show a geodesics that joins two points located on different leaves. The first circular leaf is associated with the point $w_1 = 6/5$, $w_2 = 7/3$ of the Tits Satake submanifold, while the second leaf is associated with the point $w_1 = 3/4$, $w_2 = -10/3$ of the same manifold. The two leaves are shown in the three dimensional space $\{x, y, z = w_{2,2}\}$, where x, y are the real and imaginary part of the point $\zeta(w_1, w_2)$ in the upper complex plane, in the third picture and they correspond to the close curves, marked dashed respectively in red and blue color. The point on the first leaf, corresponding to $\phi = \pi/4$ is joined to the point corresponding to $\phi = 2\pi/3$, on the second leaf by a geodesic, marked solid brown. The projection of such a geodesics in the Tits Satake submanifold is displayed in the first picture, while the second picture displays its development in the full three dimensional space.

4×4 gamma matrices well adapted to the chosen η_t :

$$\eta_t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.36)$$

7.2.2 Gamma matrices and the spinor algebra of $SO(2, 3)$

We have determined a set of five 4×4 matrices Γ_i that possess the following properties:

1. They satisfy the required Clifford algebra

$$[\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j] = 2\eta_{t|ij} \mathbf{1}_{4 \times 4} \quad (7.37)$$

2. All their matrix entries are real and they are all traceless

$$\text{Tr} \Gamma_i = 0 \quad i = 1 \dots, 5 \quad (7.38)$$

3. They admit the following antisymmetric charge conjugation matrix

$$C_s = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \quad (7.39)$$

such that:

$$C_s \Gamma_i = - (C_s \Gamma_i)^T \quad (7.40)$$

namely $C_s \Gamma_i$ are all antisymmetric.

4. The spinor generators of $SO(2, 3)$:

$$J_{ij} \equiv \frac{1}{4} [\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j] \quad (7.41)$$

multiplied by the charge conjugation matrix are instead symmetric, namely satisfy the condition:

$$C_s J_{ij} + J_{ij}^T C_s = \mathbf{0}_{4 \times 4} \quad (7.42)$$

Eq.(7.42) is the key item of the isomorphism. Indeed it states that the 10 generators of $SO(2, 3)$ are 10 linearly independent matrices satisfying the condition to be elements of the $\mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ Lie algebra with symplectic invariant matrix C_s as given in equation (7.39). On the other hand the two conditions (7.38,7.40) tell us that the vector representation is obtained from the symplectic traceless antisymmetric bispinor representation. As we show below this is the key ingredient to realize the explicit map from 5×5 group elements of $SO(2, 3)$ and 4×4 group elements of $Sp(4, \mathbb{R})$.

Having clarified the required properties and their group-theoretical interpretation we mention the explicit gamma matrix basis we have found:

$\Gamma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2} \\ 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\Gamma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	(7.43)
$\Gamma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\Gamma_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	
$\Gamma_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$		

7.2.3 The map from the spinor to the vector representation

Having firmly established the relation between the $\mathfrak{so}(2, 3)$ and the $\mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ Lie algebras we can construct the explicit map between spinor symplectic group elements and pseudo-orthogonal ones.

Let $\mathcal{S} \in \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ be a symplectic group element, namely a 4×4 real matrix such that the following condition holds true:

$$\mathcal{S}^T C_s \mathcal{S} = C_s \quad (7.44)$$

The corresponding group element $\mathcal{O}[\mathcal{S}] \in \text{SO}(2, 3)$ is determined by the relation:

$$\mathcal{S}^{-1} \Gamma_j \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{O}^i_j[\mathcal{S}] \Gamma_i \quad (7.45)$$

which implies

$$\mathcal{O}^i_j[\mathcal{S}] = \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} (\Gamma_i^T \mathcal{S}^{-1} \Gamma_j \mathcal{S}) \quad (7.46)$$

since the gamma-matrices are normalized in such a way that:

$$\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} (\Gamma_i^T \Gamma_p) = \delta_p^i \quad (7.47)$$

Note that eq.(7.46) is the perfect $r = 2$ counterpart of eq.(7.14) that applies to the Tits Satake group of the $r = 1$ case.

7.2.4 The pre-image in the symplectic group $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ of the solvable subgroup of $\text{SO}(2, 3)$

A question that naturally arises at this point is that of identifying the pre-image in the spinor symplectic group of the solvable group which is metrically equivalent to the Tits-Satake symmetric space $\text{SO}(2, 3)/\text{SO}(2) \times \text{SO}(3)$. At the level of Lie algebra we find that the 6-dimensional solvable Lie algebra of the Tits-Satake submanifold admits, in the symplectic 4-dimensional representation, the following generators, where we do not care about the precise correspondence with the generators in the vector 5-dimensional representation:

$T_1^{[Sp]} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$	$T_2^{[Sp]} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$	(7.48)
$T_3^{[Sp]} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$T_4^{[Sp]} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	
$T_5^{[Sp]} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$T_6^{[Sp]} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	

As one sees, considering the block structure of the symplectic group elements:

$$\mathcal{S} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array} \right) \quad (7.49)$$

where A, B, C, D are 2×2 matrices we find that the elements of the solvable subgroup are characterized by the vanishing of the C -block, both at the level of Lie Algebra and of the full group. The additional constraints streaming from the request that the group element should be in the exponential map of the Lie algebra generated by the 6

generators in eq.(7.48) leads, after suitable redefinitions, to the following general form of the 4×4 matrix depending on 6-parameters $\mathbf{a} = a_i$:

$$\mathcal{S}_s[\mathbf{a}] = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_1}\sqrt{a_2}} & \frac{a_6}{\sqrt{a_1}\sqrt{a_2}} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}a_4}{\sqrt{a_1}\sqrt{a_2}} - \frac{a_5 a_6}{\sqrt{a_1}\sqrt{a_2}} & \frac{a_5}{\sqrt{a_1}\sqrt{a_2}} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{a_2}}{\sqrt{a_1}} & \frac{\sqrt{a_2}a_5}{\sqrt{a_1}} - \frac{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{a_2}a_3a_6}{\sqrt{a_1}} & \frac{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{a_2}a_3}{\sqrt{a_1}} \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{a_1}\sqrt{a_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{a_1}a_6}{\sqrt{a_2}} & \frac{\sqrt{a_1}}{\sqrt{a_2}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.50)$$

As one sees the block $C = 0$ while $D = (A^{-1})^T$. The fact that the matrices of type (7.50) constitute a subgroup can be explicitly verified since we have:

$$\mathcal{S}_s[\mathbf{a}] \cdot \mathcal{S}_s[\mathbf{b}] = \mathcal{S}_s[\mathbf{c}] \quad (7.51)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= a_1 b_1 \\ c_2 &= a_2 b_2 \\ c_3 &= \frac{a_3 b_1}{b_2} + b_3 \\ c_4 &= -a_6^2 b_3 b_2^2 + a_4 b_1 b_2 - \sqrt{2} a_6 b_5 b_2 + b_4 \\ c_5 &= a_5 b_1 + \sqrt{2} a_6 b_2 b_3 + b_5 \\ c_6 &= a_6 b_2 + b_6 \end{aligned} \quad (7.52)$$

Utilizing the spinor map of eq.(7.46) we obtain:

$$\mathcal{O}[\mathcal{S}_s[\mathbf{a}]] = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & \sqrt{2}a_2a_3 & \sqrt{2}a_5 & \frac{\sqrt{2}a_4}{a_2} & \frac{-a_5^2 + 2a_3a_4}{a_1} \\ 0 & a_2 & \sqrt{2}a_6 & -\frac{a_6^2}{a_2} & \frac{a_6(\sqrt{2}a_3a_6 - 2a_5) - \sqrt{2}a_4}{a_1} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -\frac{\sqrt{2}a_6}{a_2} & \frac{2a_3a_6 - \sqrt{2}a_5}{a_1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{a_2} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}a_3}{a_1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{a_1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.53)$$

The corresponding solvable group element constructed with the Σ -exponential map in terms of the solvable coordinates:

$$\mathbf{W} = \left\{ w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(2s-1)}, w_6, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(2s-1)} \right\} \quad (7.54)$$

the zeros corresponding to the Tits-Satake projection, have the following explicit form:

$$\mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W}) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{w_1} & \frac{e^{w_1}w_3}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2}e^{w_1}(w_3w_6 + \sqrt{2}w_5) & \frac{1}{8}e^{w_1}(-\sqrt{2}w_3w_6^2 + 4\sqrt{2}w_4 - 4w_5w_6) & -\frac{1}{4}e^{w_1}(2w_3w_4 + w_5^2) \\ 0 & e^{w_2} & \frac{e^{w_2}w_6}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{4}e^{w_2}w_6^2 & -\frac{e^{w_2}w_4}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -\frac{w_6}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{w_5}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-w_2} & -\frac{e^{-w_2}w_3}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-w_1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.55)$$

Imposing the identification:

$$\mathcal{O}[\mathcal{S}_s[\mathbf{a}]] = \mathbb{L}(\mathbf{W}) \quad (7.56)$$

one finds a unique solution for the a_i parameters in terms of the w_i parameters. Replacing such solution into eq.(7.53) one obtains the spinor image of the Tits Satake projected solvable group element:

$$\mathcal{S}_s[\mathbf{W}] = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\frac{1}{2}(-w_1-w_2)} & \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}(w_2-w_1)}w_6 & \frac{1}{4}e^{\frac{1}{2}(w_1+w_2)}(w_5w_6 - 2\sqrt{2}w_4) & \frac{1}{4}e^{\frac{1}{2}(w_1-w_2)}(2w_5 + \sqrt{2}w_3w_6) \\ 0 & e^{\frac{1}{2}(w_2-w_1)} & \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}(w_1+w_2)}w_5 & \frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}(w_1-w_2)}w_3}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & e^{\frac{1}{2}(w_1+w_2)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}(w_1+w_2)}w_6 & e^{\frac{1}{2}(w_1-w_2)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.57)$$

Note that eq.(7.57) is the precise counterpart of eq.s (7.15,7.16) that appear in the discussion of the $r = 1$ case.

7.2.5 The Siegel upper plane

The *Siegel upper complex plane* of degree (or genus) g is the generalization to higher dimensions of the Lobachevsky-Poincaré hyperbolic plane.

Just as the standard hyperbolic plane with Poincaré metric is a complex analytic realization of a maximally split symmetric space, namely $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SO}(2)$, in the same way, the upper Siegel plane of degree g is the complex analytic realization of the symmetric space:

$$\mathcal{M}_{Siegel} = \frac{\mathrm{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{R})}{\mathrm{S}[\mathrm{U}(1) \times \mathrm{U}(g)]} \quad (7.58)$$

The key observation is the following. Just in the same way as the *fractional linear transformation*:

$$z \rightarrow \tilde{z} \equiv \frac{az + b}{cz + d} \quad ; \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \quad (7.59)$$

maps complex numbers z with strictly positive imaginary part into complex numbers \tilde{z} with the same property, **the fractional linear matrix transformation**:

$$Z_{g \times g} \rightarrow \tilde{Z}_{g \times g} \equiv (A_{g \times g} Z_{g \times g} + B_{g \times g}) \cdot (C_{g \times g} Z_{g \times g} + D_{g \times g})^{-1} \quad ; \quad \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A_{g \times g} & B_{g \times g} \\ \hline C_{g \times g} & D_{g \times g} \end{array} \right) \in \mathrm{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{R}) \quad (7.60)$$

maps **complex symmetric matrices**:

$$Z_{g \times g} = X_{g \times g} + iY_{g \times g} \quad ; \quad Z_{g \times g}^T = Z_{g \times g} \quad (7.61)$$

whose imaginary part $Y_{g \times g}$ is positive definite (namely has strictly positive eigenvalues) into **complex symmetric matrices** $\tilde{Z}_{g \times g}$ with the same property. The relations among the $g \times g$ blocks:

$$A^T C = C^T A \quad ; \quad B^T D = D^T B \quad ; \quad A^T D - C^T B = \mathbf{1} \quad (7.62)$$

following from the very definition of the $\mathrm{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{R})$ group, are instrumental in the lengthy yet straightforward proof of what was stated above.

The number of real components of $Z_{g \times g}$ exactly matches the dimension of the *maximally split symmetric space* defined in eq.(7.58) so that the upper Siegel plane constitutes its holomorphic realization. Furthermore the choice of the Borel solvable subgroup inside $\mathrm{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{R})$ provides a convenient parameterization of the matrix $Z_{g \times g}$. Indeed this latter is the orbit under the fractional linear action of the Borel subgroup of the special matrix $Z_0 = i \mathbf{1}_{g \times g}$.

Applying this idea to the case $g = r = 2$ which is ours and utilizing the parameterization of the Borel solvable subgroup provided in eq.(7.57), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z &= X + iY \\
X &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8}(w_6(4w_5 + \sqrt{2}w_3w_6) - 4\sqrt{2}w_4) & \frac{1}{4}(2w_5 + \sqrt{2}w_3w_6) \\ \frac{1}{4}(2w_5 + \sqrt{2}w_3w_6) & \frac{w_3}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \\
Y &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{4}e^{-w_1-w_2}(e^{2w_2}w_6^2 + 4) & \frac{1}{2}e^{w_2-w_1}w_6 \\ \frac{1}{2}e^{w_2-w_1}w_6 & e^{w_2-w_1} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{7.63}$$

Eq.(7.63) are the precise counterpart in the $r = 2$ case of eq.s(7.29-7.30). It is also appropriate to stress once again what was already recalled above, namely that in the series of non-maximally split manifolds (3.39) the appearance of the Siegel upper plane as realization of the Tits Satake sub-manifold $\mathcal{M}_{TS} \subset \mathcal{M}^{[r,r+q]}$ where $q = 2s$, or $q = 2s + 1$ is limited to $r = 1, 2$ and it is strictly due to sporadic low-rank Lie Algebra isomorphisms. The Tits Satake submanifold exists in all cases but it is not equivalent to a Siegel symmetric space as defined in eq.(7.58). For instance in the case $r = 3$, the Tits Satake submanifold is:

$$\mathcal{M}_{TS}^{[3,4]} = \frac{\mathrm{SO}(3,4)}{\mathrm{SO}(3) \times \mathrm{SO}(4)} \tag{7.64}$$

where the numerator group $\mathrm{SO}(3,4)$ corresponds to the maximally split real section $\mathfrak{so}(3,4)$ of the complex $\mathfrak{so}(7, \mathbb{C})$ Lie algebra. The spinor representation of $\mathrm{SO}(3,4)$ is therefore an appropriate $\mathrm{Spin}(3,4)$ subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}(4,4)$ which is made of pseudo-orthogonal rather than symplectic matrices. The upper Siegel plane with $g > 2$ can instead appear as Tits Satake submanifold in the Tits Satake projection of other non maximally split manifolds originating from real sections of the $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{C})$ Lie Algebra, which we do not study in the present article. Yet in view of the analysis presented in the introductory section 6 the upper Siegel plane of degree 2 appears as building block also in the c-map construction of cases 3, 4.

As we stressed several times, in applications to Data Science a crucial issue is that of *discretization schemes* of the symmetric spaces U/H to which we map the data. In view of the fundamental theorem 1.1 such *discretization schemes* necessarily involve the consideration of discrete subgroups of the full isometry group that should intersect the solvable group by means of suitable infinite order normal subgroups. Such observation provides a precious key in the search for discrete subgroups suitable for discretization schemes. In section 8 we illustrate such an issue with the determination of a discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$ of the requested type, which up to our knowledge was so far unknown.

7.3 c-map construction of the Tits Satake manifold $\mathrm{SO}(3,4)/\mathrm{SO}(3) \times \mathrm{SO}(4)$

Following the last comments reported in the above subsection, we conclude with the explicit demonstration of the c-map construction of the Tits Satake manifold for the $r = 3$ universality class starting from the special Kähler manifold:

$$\mathcal{SK}_2 \equiv \frac{\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}{\mathrm{SO}(2)} \times \frac{\mathrm{SO}(1,2)}{\mathrm{SO}(2)} \tag{7.65}$$

The holomorphic symplectic section of eq.(2.14) is in the case of the special Kähler manifold (7.65) given by the following expression

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_h &= \{X^\Lambda, F_\Sigma\} \\
&= \left\{ \frac{z^2}{2\sqrt{2}}, \frac{z}{2}, -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}, -\frac{S}{2\sqrt{2}}, \frac{Sz}{2}, \frac{Sz^2}{2\sqrt{2}} \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{7.66}$$

where S is the complex coordinate spanning the first hyperbolic plane $\frac{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(2)}$, while z is the complex coordinate spanning the second hyperbolic plane $\frac{\text{SO}(1, 2)}{\text{SO}(2)}$ that in the special structure have distinct and not interchangeable roles. Let us also name:

$$x = \text{Re}z \quad ; y = \text{Im}z \quad ; \quad P = \text{Re}S \quad ; Q = \text{Im}S \quad (7.67)$$

From its definition given in eq.s(2.25-2.26) we can calculate the 3×3 complex period matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ which has the following form:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{iQ(x^2+y^2)^2}{y^2} & \frac{i\sqrt{2}Qx(x^2+y^2)}{y^2} & P - \frac{iQx^2}{y^2} \\ \frac{i\sqrt{2}Qx(x^2+y^2)}{y^2} & P + iQ\left(\frac{2x^2}{y^2} + 1\right) & -\frac{i\sqrt{2}Qx}{y^2} \\ P - \frac{iQx^2}{y^2} & -\frac{i\sqrt{2}Qx}{y^2} & \frac{iQ}{y^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.68)$$

From eq.(7.68) we easily extract the real and imaginary parts of $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ and we can calculate the 6×6 matrix \mathcal{M}_4^{-1} defined in eq.(2.59). It has the following explicit expression.

$$\mathcal{M}_4^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{Qy^2} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}x}{Qy^2} & -\frac{x^2}{Qy^2} & -\frac{Px^2}{Qy^2} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}Px}{Qy^2} & \frac{P}{Qy^2} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{2}x}{Qy^2} & \frac{2x^2+1}{y^2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}x(x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}Px(x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & \frac{P(2x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}Px}{Qy^2} \\ -\frac{x^2}{Qy^2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}x(x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & \frac{(x^2+y^2)^2}{Qy^2} & \frac{P(x^2+y^2)^2}{Qy^2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}Px(x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & -\frac{Px^2}{Qy^2} \\ -\frac{Px^2}{Qy^2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}Px(x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & \frac{P(x^2+y^2)^2}{Qy^2} & \frac{(P^2+Q^2)(x^2+y^2)^2}{Qy^2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}x(P^2+Q^2)(x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & -\frac{x^2(P^2+Q^2)}{Qy^2} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{2}Px}{Qy^2} & \frac{P(2x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}Px(x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}x(P^2+Q^2)(x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & \frac{(P^2+Q^2)(2x^2+y^2)}{Qy^2} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}x(P^2+Q^2)}{Qy^2} \\ \frac{P}{Qy^2} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}Px}{Qy^2} & -\frac{Px^2}{Qy^2} & -\frac{x^2(P^2+Q^2)}{Qy^2} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}x(P^2+Q^2)}{Qy^2} & \frac{P^2+Q^2}{Qy^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.69)$$

At this point we have, ready in explicit form, all the items necessary to write the Quaternionic Kähler metric in the image of the c-map as given in eq.(2.60). However it is better to pause and recall that the considered Special Kähler model is a homogeneous symmetric space so that also its quaternionic Kähler image has to be a symmetric space, according to what is explained in section 2.2.3. Furthermore according with eq.s (2.76-2.78) the symplectic image $\Lambda[\mathfrak{g}^{-1} \in \text{Sp}(6, \mathbb{R})$ of the $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \text{SO}(1, 2)$ group element which brings z, S to their respective origins $z_0 = i$ and $S_0 = i$ should bring the matrix \mathcal{M}_4^{-1} to a constant simple form. In our notation the mentioned symplectic group element is

$$\Lambda(\mathfrak{g}^{-1}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Q}y} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}x}{\sqrt{Q}y} & -\frac{x^2}{\sqrt{Q}y} & -\frac{Px^2}{\sqrt{Q}y} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}Px}{\sqrt{Q}y} & \frac{P}{\sqrt{Q}y} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{Q}} & \frac{\sqrt{2}x}{\sqrt{Q}} & \frac{\sqrt{2}Px}{\sqrt{Q}} & \frac{P}{\sqrt{Q}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{y}{\sqrt{Q}} & \frac{Py}{\sqrt{Q}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{Q}y & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2}\sqrt{Q}x & \sqrt{Q} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{Q}x^2}{y} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{Q}x}{y} & \frac{\sqrt{Q}}{y} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.70)$$

and indeed we have:

$$\mathcal{M}_4^{-1} = \Lambda(\mathfrak{g}^{-1})^T \cdot \Lambda(\mathfrak{g}^{-1}) \quad (7.71)$$

This enables us to right directly the 12 vielbein 1-forms of the symmetric space (7.64) according with eq.(2.79)

$$\begin{aligned} E^1 &= dU, \quad E^2 = \frac{dP}{2Q}, \quad E^3 = \frac{dQ}{2Q}, \quad E^4 = \frac{dx}{2y}, \quad E^5 = \frac{dy}{2y} \\ E^6 &= \exp[-U] \left(da + \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbf{Z}^T \cdot \mathbf{C}d\mathbf{Z} \right), \quad E^{6+i} = \exp\left[\frac{U}{2}\right] (\Lambda(\mathfrak{g}^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{Z})^i \quad i = 1, \dots, 6 \end{aligned} \quad (7.72)$$

where $\mathbf{Z} = \{Z^1, Z^2, Z^3, Z^4, Z^5, Z^6\}$, α is some constant to be determined and

$$\mathbb{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 3} & \mathbf{1}_{3 \times 3} \\ -\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 3} & \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 3} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.73)$$

The 1-forms E^I satisfy the following Maurer Cartan equations by construction:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= dE^1 \\ 0 &= dE^2 - 2E^2 \wedge E^3 \\ 0 &= dE^3 \\ 0 &= dE^4 - 2E^4 \wedge E^5 \\ 0 &= dE^5 \\ 0 &= dE^6 - \alpha E^7 \wedge E^{10} - \alpha E^8 \wedge E^{11} - \alpha E^9 \wedge E^{12} + E^1 \wedge E^6 \\ 0 &= dE^7 + \frac{1}{2}E^1 \wedge E^7 - 2E^2 \wedge E^{12} + E^3 \wedge E^7 + 2\sqrt{2}E^4 \wedge E^8 + 2E^5 \wedge E^7 \\ 0 &= dE^8 + \frac{1}{2}E^1 \wedge E^8 - 2E^2 \wedge E^{11} + E^3 \wedge E^8 - 2\sqrt{2}E^4 \wedge E^9 \\ 0 &= dE^9 + \frac{1}{2}E^1 \wedge E^9 - 2E^2 \wedge E^{10} + E^3 \wedge E^9 - 2E^5 \wedge E^9 \\ 0 &= dE^{10} + \frac{1}{2}E^1 \wedge E^{10} - E^3 \wedge E^{10} - 2E^5 \wedge E^{10} \\ 0 &= dE^{11} + \frac{1}{2}E^1 \wedge E^{11} - E^3 \wedge E^{11} - 2\sqrt{2}E^4 \wedge E^{10} \\ 0 &= dE^{12} + \frac{1}{2}E^1 \wedge E^{12} - E^3 \wedge E^{12} + 2\sqrt{2}E^4 \wedge E^{11} + 2E^5 \wedge E^{12} \end{aligned} \quad (7.74)$$

On the other hand if we consider the standard parameterization of the solvable group $S_{U/H}$ for the maximally split U/H manifold of eq.(7.64) according with eq.s(3.50-3.51), we construct the left-invariant one-form Θ defined in eq.(4.6) and we project it onto the generators of the solvable group T_A rather than onto the generators K_A of the coset manifold:

$$\Theta = \sum_{A=1}^{12} \mathbf{e}^A T_A \quad (7.75)$$

we obtain another set of 1-form \mathbf{e}^A satisfying the following Maurer Cartan equations:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^1 \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^2 \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^3 \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^4 + \mathbf{e}^1 \wedge \mathbf{e}^4 - \mathbf{e}^2 \wedge \mathbf{e}^4 \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^5 + \mathbf{e}^1 \wedge \mathbf{e}^5 - \mathbf{e}^3 \wedge \mathbf{e}^5 + \frac{\mathbf{e}^4 \wedge \mathbf{e}^6}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^6 + \mathbf{e}^2 \wedge \mathbf{e}^6 - \mathbf{e}^3 \wedge \mathbf{e}^6 \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^7 + \mathbf{e}^1 \wedge \mathbf{e}^7 + \mathbf{e}^2 \wedge \mathbf{e}^7 - \frac{\mathbf{e}^5 \wedge \mathbf{e}^9}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\mathbf{e}^6 \wedge \mathbf{e}^8}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{\mathbf{e}^{10} \wedge \mathbf{e}^{11}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^8 + \mathbf{e}^1 \wedge \mathbf{e}^8 + \mathbf{e}^3 \wedge \mathbf{e}^8 + \frac{\mathbf{e}^4 \wedge \mathbf{e}^9}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{\mathbf{e}^{10} \wedge \mathbf{e}^{12}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^9 + \mathbf{e}^2 \wedge \mathbf{e}^9 + \mathbf{e}^3 \wedge \mathbf{e}^9 - \frac{\mathbf{e}^{11} \wedge \mathbf{e}^{12}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^{10} + \mathbf{e}^1 \wedge \mathbf{e}^{10} + \frac{\mathbf{e}^4 \wedge \mathbf{e}^{11}}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\mathbf{e}^5 \wedge \mathbf{e}^{12}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^{11} + \mathbf{e}^2 \wedge \mathbf{e}^{11} + \frac{\mathbf{e}^6 \wedge \mathbf{e}^{12}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 &= d\mathbf{e}^{12} + \mathbf{e}^3 \wedge \mathbf{e}^{12} \end{aligned} \quad (7.76)$$

The two sets of Maurer Cartan equations coincide if we set $\alpha = -\frac{1}{64}$ and if we make the following identification:

$$\begin{aligned}
E^1 &= \mathbf{e}^1 + \mathbf{e}^2 \\
E^2 &= \mathbf{e}^4 \\
E^3 &= \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{e}^1 - \mathbf{e}^2) \\
E^4 &= \mathbf{e}^{12} \\
E^5 &= \frac{\mathbf{e}^3}{2} \\
E^6 &= \mathbf{e}^7 \\
E^7 &= -32\sqrt{2}\mathbf{e}^8 \\
E^8 &= -8\sqrt{2}\mathbf{e}^{10} \\
E^9 &= -2\sqrt{2}\mathbf{e}^5 \\
E^{10} &= \mathbf{e}^6 \\
E^{11} &= 4\mathbf{e}^{11} \\
E^{12} &= 16\mathbf{e}^9
\end{aligned} \tag{7.77}$$

We do not show the explicit form of the 1-form \mathbf{e}^i because it is too big. What we have shown proves that the c -map construction provides a much simpler form of the metric. The invariant Einstein metric can be obtained from the 1 forms E^i with a few simple relative rescalings that we also omit for brevity.

8 A grid generating discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$

The perspective applications of PGTS theory to Data Science will always meet the problem of discretization, in one way or another, since Data, even if very big, are anyhow discrete sets: hence their mapping to symmetric spaces U/H necessarily introduces a finite set of points or of finite subsets into the latter. The ways to look at such discrete set of manifold points are various, yet at the end of the day they always result into some kind of tessellation of the hosting manifold that can be more or less regular, depending on the case. Indeed distributing points into a manifold creates a subdivision of the latter into cells, marked by the presence or the absence of a host. Hence tessellation schemes and their associated graphs and groups are an unavoidable chapter of the tale. In a forthcoming paper [111] we plan to discuss the general setup of tessellations of the Hyperbolic Plane \mathbb{H}_2 within the framework of Coxeter groups, introducing also some new or less studied one. In that context we will address the distinction between polygonal and apeirogon tessellations (an apeirogon is a polygon with an infinite number of edges) debating the relative merit of both in the context of Data mapping. Obviously tessellations of the Siegel halfspace $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{H}_2$ have also to be constructed and this requires the study and classification of discrete subgroups of $\mathrm{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ which is a much wider and more complex task. In line with the main conceptual stream of the present paper we want to show that the representation of the entire symmetric space as the group-manifold of a solvable Lie group provides new insights and suggestions for the construction of infinite discrete subgroups of $\mathrm{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ certainly related with tessellation schemes of $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{H}_2$. In particular in the present section we show an example of a discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$ which appears to be a generalization for $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{H}_2$ of what the full modular group $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is for the Hyperbolic Plane \mathbb{H}_2 , namely the generator of an apeirogon tessellation. The main point of interest in the construction we are going to present in this section is the very construction algorithm. It is based on a discretization of the solvable subgroup of $\mathrm{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$.

In line with what we stated above we concentrated on the following idea. The imaginable discretization of the full space requires a process in two steps:

1. In a first step one establishes a discrete subgroup $\Delta \subset \mathrm{SO}(r, r+1)$ of the Tits Satake isometry group with an ensuing tessellation of the Tits Satake submanifold $\mathcal{M}_{TS} = \frac{\mathrm{SO}(r, r+1)}{\mathrm{SO}(r) \times \mathrm{SO}(r+1)}$.

2. In a second stage one might try to extend the group $\Delta \subset \text{SO}(r, r+1)$ with new fibre generators that necessarily belong to the normal subgroup discussed in previous section 6.4. Actually in section 9 we show how we can directly determine the parabolic subgroups of all $\text{SO}(r, r+p, \mathbb{Z})$ for all $r, p \in \mathbb{N}$.

The requirements for step number one are rather clear and the result has been inspiring in order to find the general solutions discussed in sect. 9. For *apeirogon-like tessellation* the group should be of the type $\Delta_{\infty,3,2}$ which, in the $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ case is just the modular group $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$. In mathematical terms that means that the group Δ should contain several generators T_i ($i = 1, \dots, p$) of order infinity typically obtained as finite parabolic elements of the solvable group or of its subgroups. It is however necessary that such generators close a group, which, in particular means that the inverse of each of them must be a word composed with the generators as letters. These infinite dimensional subgroup is the analogous of what in crystallography is the *lattice*. In addition to the lattice, we need the analogue of the *Point Group* which should map the lattice into itself. If we name \mathcal{I} the infinite group generated by the T_i , the point group \mathfrak{P} is the external automorphism group of \mathcal{I} and it must be a finite subgroup of the compact isotropy group of the manifold, namely we must have $\mathfrak{P} \subset \text{SO}(r) \times \text{SO}(r+1)$.

8.1 The case $r = 2$ and the discrete group $\Delta_{32,8}$

In the case $r = 2$ the Tits Satake isometry group $\text{SO}(2, 3)$ is locally isomorphic to $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$, whose fundamental defining representation is the spinor representation of $\text{SO}(2, 3)$. Hence what we are looking for is a discrete subgroup $\Delta_{2m,n} \subset \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ which will be the double covering of a subgroup $\hat{\Delta}_{m,n} \subset \text{SO}(2, 3)$. The notation that we utilize is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} 2m &= |\mathfrak{P}_{2m}| \quad \text{where } \mathfrak{P}_{2m} \subset \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1) = \text{Point Group} \\ n &= \# \text{ of generators } T_i \end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

Utilizing the guiding lines outlined above and requesting that the discrete subgroup $\Delta_{2m,n}$ should contain two copies of the modular group $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ we have been able to determine a group

$$\Delta_{32,8} \subset \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z}) \tag{8.2}$$

which is actually a subgroup of the integer-valued symplectic group. We presently describe it.

Prior to that let us explain the reason behind the request of the two copies of $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ which proved to be rather decisive. The reason is that, according with equation 7.60 the action of any element $g \in \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ on the coset manifold is the fractional linear transformation of the symmetric complex matrix:

$$Z = \begin{pmatrix} z & \omega \\ \omega & \zeta \end{pmatrix} ; \quad z, \omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \tag{8.3}$$

which represents the entire manifold. When Z is diagonal, namely when $\omega = 0$ the two remaining complex entries z, ζ represent the coordinates of two hyperbolic upper planes. The subgroup $\Gamma \subset \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ which respects diagonality, namely the condition $\omega = 0$ is $\Gamma = \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$. Hence it is reasonable to ask that the intersection $\Delta \cap \Gamma$ of the searched for discrete group with the stability subgroup Γ of the submanifold $\omega = 0$ should be:

$$\Delta \cap \Gamma = \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})_1 \times \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})_2 \tag{8.4}$$

In this way the two disconnected hyperbolic planes z and ζ might be covered with apeirogon tiles. Subsequently, introducing additional generators of the group Δ we generate a tiling also of the third plane that interacts with the first two creating new faces, edges and vertices.

In the above outlined perspective it is convenient to recall eq.(7.63) which provides the parameterization of the

of the complex matrix (8.3) in terms of the solvable coordinates $w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5, w_6$ which can be summarized by stating:

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \frac{1}{8} \left(-4\sqrt{2}w_4 + w_6 \left(4w_5 + \sqrt{2}w_3w_6 \right) + 2ie^{-w_1-w_2} (e^{2w_2}w_6^2 + 4) \right) \\ \zeta &= \frac{w_3}{\sqrt{2}} + ie^{w_2-w_1} \\ \omega &= \frac{1}{4} \left(2w_5 + 2ie^{w_2-w_1}w_6 + \sqrt{2}w_3w_6 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8.5)$$

As one sees from eq.(8.5) the diagonalization condition of the matrix Z corresponds to setting $w_5 = w_6 = 0$ which implies that the other two solvable coordinates w_3, w_4 obtain the interpretation of real parts of the complex coordinates ζ and z , respectively. This is a formidably helpful information. The parabolic generators of the searched for discrete group Δ have to be found as finite elements of the solvable group associated respectively to w_3, w_4 and w_5, w_6 . There is a conceptual distinction between the two pairs. In the solvable group which is metrically equivalent to the Siegel half-plane w_3, w_4 correspond to the exponentials of the long root generators that are Paint Group singlets, while w_5, w_6 correspond to exponentials of the short generators that form Paint group multiplets. This observation might be very much relevant while addressing the issue of extending the tessellation group from the Tits Satake submanifold to the entire manifold.

Inspired by our previous analysis of the normal subgroup of the solvable group associated with the Tits Satake fibres and relying on Paint group invariance that states that it is irrelevant, in the Tits Satake projection, which of the $2s$ copies of the coordinates $w_{5,i}, w_{6,i}$ we keep, setting to zero all the other copies, we consider the 4×4 image $\mathcal{S}_s[\mathbf{W}]$ of the solvable Tits Satake group inside $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ which was presented in eq.(7.57). In that matrix we make the substitution:

$$w_{1,2,3} \rightarrow 0 \quad ; \quad w_4 \rightarrow \sqrt{2}\rho \quad ; \quad w_5 \rightarrow 2\sqrt{2}p \quad ; \quad w_6 \rightarrow 2\sqrt{2}q \quad (8.6)$$

and we obtain the symplectic image of the normal subgroup associated with the short roots $w_{5,6}$ and the highest long root w_4

$$\mathfrak{L}(\rho, p, q) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{2}q & \frac{1}{4}(8pq - 4\rho) & \sqrt{2}p \\ 0 & 1 & \sqrt{2}p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{2}q & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.7)$$

It is from the normal subgroup $\mathfrak{L}(\rho, p, q)$ that we selected the integer-valued generators able to translate the solvable coordinates w_5, w_6 and hence generate translations of the complex number ω appearing in the parameterization of the Siegel upper plane.

On the other hand we consider the subgroup obtained by setting in $\mathcal{S}_s[\mathbf{W}]$ the values:

$$w_{1,2} \rightarrow 0 \quad ; \quad w_3 \rightarrow \sqrt{2}h \quad ; \quad w_4 \rightarrow \sqrt{2}k \quad ; \quad w_{5,6} \rightarrow 0 \quad (8.8)$$

and we obtain the 2-parameter subgroup of the following matrices.

$$\mathfrak{T}(h, k) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -k & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & h \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.9)$$

It is from the above subgroup that we have taken the integer-valued generators able to translate the solvable coordinates

w_3, w_4 . Our starting point has been the following

CHOICE OF 4 INFINITE ORDER TRANSLATION GENERATORS We have selected:

$$T_1 = \mathfrak{T}(0, -1) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.10)$$

$$T_2 = \mathfrak{T}(1, 0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.11)$$

$$T_3 = \mathfrak{L}\left(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.12)$$

$$T_4 = \mathfrak{L}\left(0, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.13)$$

Defining a symbol:

$$\mathbf{FL}[\mathfrak{g}, Z] \equiv (A_{\mathfrak{g}}Z + B_{\mathfrak{g}}) \cdot (C_{\mathfrak{g}}Z + D_{\mathfrak{g}})^{-1} \quad ; \quad \mathfrak{g} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A_{\mathfrak{g}} & B_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ \hline C_{\mathfrak{g}} & D_{\mathfrak{g}} \end{array} \right) \quad (8.14)$$

which denotes the fractional linear action of an $\mathrm{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ matrix on a complex symmetric matrix Z we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{FL}[T_1, Z] &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} z+1 & \omega \\ \hline \omega & \zeta \end{array} \right) \quad ; \quad \mathbf{FL}[T_2, Z] = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} z & \omega \\ \hline \omega & \zeta+1 \end{array} \right) \\ \mathbf{FL}[T_3, Z] &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} z & \omega+1 \\ \hline \omega+1 & \zeta \end{array} \right) \quad ; \quad \mathbf{FL}[T_4, Z] = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \zeta+2\omega+z & \zeta+\omega \\ \hline \zeta+\omega & \zeta \end{array} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8.15)$$

The above defined generators are all of order infinity and create a regular grid of points in the three complex planes. Since we are interested in creating two copies of the modular group, one acting on the plane z , the other acting on the plane ζ and since the modular group is completely generated by a generator T of infinite order and by another S of order 2 such that $(ST)^3 = \mathrm{Id}$ we had to find two extra generators S_1, S_2 of our discrete group, to be extracted from the compact subgroup $\mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{U}(1) \subset \mathrm{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$, such that

$$[S_1, S_2] = 0 \quad S_1^2 = S_2^2 = \mathrm{Id} \quad ; \quad (S_1 \cdot T_1)^2 = (S_2 \cdot T_2)^2 = \mathrm{Id} \quad (8.16)$$

In the above equation one should be careful that the relation $\dots = \mathrm{Id}$ must be understood in the projective sense and not necessarily matrix wise. In other words what matters is that the matrix product should act as the identity in the

fractional linear transformation. With some ingenuity we found:

$$S_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad S_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.17)$$

In this way we obtained the goal of introducing two copies of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ in our candidate group, yet if we wanted to include also the generators T_3, T_4 we had to find additional elliptic generators, namely included in $SU(2) \times U(1)$ able to create the inverse of T_3, T_4 .

After some attempts and restricting our attention to integer-valued matrices we found the following two generators:

$$Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad Q_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.18)$$

that, in proper matrix sense, satisfy the following relations:

$$Q_1^4 = Q_2^4 = Q_1 T_3 Q_1^3 = Q_2 T_4 Q_2^3 = \mathbf{1}_{4 \times 4} \quad (8.19)$$

Eq.(8.19) demonstrates that by themselves $\{Q_1, Q_2, T_3, T_4\}$ generate a group because the inverse of any word can be found among the words.

The transformations associated with the four so far introduced elliptic generators are the following ones:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{FL}[S_1, Z] &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -\frac{1}{z} & -\frac{\omega}{z} \\ -\frac{\omega}{z} & \zeta - \frac{\omega^2}{z} \end{array} \right) && \text{order of the transformation} = 4 \\ \mathbf{FL}[S_2, Z] &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} z - \frac{\omega^2}{\zeta} & -\frac{\omega}{\zeta} \\ -\frac{\omega}{\zeta} & -\frac{1}{\zeta} \end{array} \right) && \text{order of the transformation} = 4 \\ \mathbf{FL}[Q_1, Z] &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \zeta & -\omega \\ -\omega & z \end{array} \right) && \text{order of the transformation} = 2 \\ \mathbf{FL}[Q_2, Z] &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \frac{\omega z}{\omega^2 - \zeta z} & \frac{\omega}{\zeta z - \omega^2} \\ \frac{\omega}{\zeta z - \omega^2} & \frac{\zeta}{\omega^2 - \zeta z} \end{array} \right) && \text{order of the transformation} = 2 \end{aligned} \quad (8.20)$$

THE FINITE ELLIPTIC SUBGROUP Having gone so far, the next interesting question is what is the finite group generated by the four introduced elliptic generators. The answer was obtained utilizing the appropriate routines included in the background MATHEMATICA NoteBook **NonComSymSpacNeuNet.nb** devoted to the generation of a finite group from a set of elements and to the subsequent structural analysis of the same by its reorganization into conjugation classes.

The result is a finite subgroup $\mathfrak{P}_{32} \subset Sp(4, \mathbb{Z})$ containing 32 elements as the given name indicates. The order of the generators is, depending on the conjugacy class¹³, one of the numbers 2, 4, 8. With some effort we were able to

¹³There are 14 conjugacy classes

identify two generators respectively named \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} that are the following ones:

$$\mathcal{A} = Q_1 S_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.21)$$

$$\mathcal{B} = Q_2^2 Q_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.22)$$

and satisfy the following relations as $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$ matrices:

$$\mathcal{A}^8 = \mathcal{B}^4 = (\mathcal{B}\mathcal{A})^4 = \mathbf{1}_{4 \times 4} \quad (8.23)$$

The explicit action of the elliptic subgroup generators on the Siegel plane is instead the following one:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{FL}[\mathcal{A}, Z] &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \zeta - \frac{\omega^2}{z} & \frac{\omega}{z} \\ \frac{\omega}{z} & -\frac{1}{z} \end{array} \right) & \text{order of the transformation} = 4 \\ \mathbf{FL}[\mathcal{B}, Z] &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \frac{z}{\omega^2 - \zeta z} & \frac{\omega}{\zeta z - \omega^2} \\ \frac{\omega}{\zeta z - \omega^2} & \frac{\zeta}{\omega^2 - \zeta z} \end{array} \right) & \text{order of the transformation} = 2 \\ \mathbf{FL}[\mathcal{B}\mathcal{A}, Z] &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} z - \frac{\omega^2}{\zeta} & -\frac{\omega}{\zeta} \\ -\frac{\omega}{\zeta} & -\frac{1}{\zeta} \end{array} \right) & \text{order of the transformation} = 2 \end{aligned} \quad (8.24)$$

$$(8.25)$$

A complete list of the 32 group elements of \mathfrak{P}_{32} is provided in table 6.

THE NORMAL PARABOLIC SUBGROUP Having constructed the elliptic point group \mathfrak{P}_{32} we turn our attention to the parabolic translation generators that we already had introduced in such a way that special elements of the point group can construct their inverse. We take the set \mathfrak{S} of 8 elements composed by $T_{1,2,3,4}$ plus their inverses $T_{1,2,3,4}^{-1}$ and we create the orbit of that set with respect to the conjugation with respect to all elements of \mathfrak{P}_{32} . We discover that such orbit is a set \mathfrak{U} containing 16 elements and that the inverse of each of the elements in \mathfrak{U} is contained in \mathfrak{U} as well. Hence we conclude that we can single out a subset of $\mathfrak{S} \subset \mathfrak{U}$ containing 8 elements and no inverse of any of them. Clearly the complement of \mathfrak{S} in \mathfrak{U} contains the 8 inverses.

In table 7 the list of the 8 parabolic generators of order ∞ forming the set \mathfrak{S} is presented in explicit matrix form as elements of $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$.

Next it is very important to emphasize another series of relations satisfied by the generators T_i not involving the elliptic generators of the finite subgroup \mathfrak{P}_{32} .

Such relations are the following ones:

$$(T_1 T_6)^6 = (T_2 T_8)^6 = (T_3 T_7)^6 = (T_4 T_5)^6 = \mathbf{1}_{4 \times 4} \quad (8.26)$$

and they are extremely important. They suffice to show that the inverse of each of the 8 generators can be written as a word in the same letters and from that it follows also that any word in T_i has an inverse that can be expressed as a

1	$A = Q_1 \cdot S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	17	$A.B.B.B = Q_1 \cdot Q_1 \cdot S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$
2	$B = Q_1 \cdot Q_1 \cdot Q_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	18	$B.A.B.A = S_2 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$
3	$A.A = Q_1 \cdot Q_2 \cdot S_2 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	19	$B.A.B.B = Q_1 \cdot Q_1 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
4	$A.B = S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	20	$B.B.B.B = Q_1 \cdot Q_2 \cdot Q_2 \cdot Q_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
5	$B.A = S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	21	$A.A.A.B.A = Q_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
6	$B.B = Q_2 \cdot Q_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$	22	$A.A.A.B.B = Q_1 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
7	$A.A.A = Q_1 \cdot S_2 \cdot S_2 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	23	$A.A.B.A.B = Q_1 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
8	$A.A.B = Q_1 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	24	$A.A.B.B.B = Q_1 \cdot S_2 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
9	$A.B.A = Q_1 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	25	$A.B.A.B.A = Q_1 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_2 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
10	$A.B.B = Q_1 \cdot Q_2 \cdot Q_2 \cdot S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	26	$A.B.A.B.B = Q_2 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
11	$B.A.B = Q_1 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	27	$B.A.B.B.B = Q_2 \cdot S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
12	$B.B.B = Q_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	28	$A.A.A.B.A.B = Q_2 \cdot Q_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
13	$A.A.A.B = S_2 \cdot S_2 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	29	$A.A.A.B.B.B = S_1 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
14	$A.A.B.A = S_1 \cdot S_1 \cdot S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	30	$A.A.B.A.B.A = Q_1 \cdot Q_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
15	$A.A.B.B = S_1 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	31	$A.A.B.A.B.B = S_1 \cdot S_2 \cdot S_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$
16	$A.B.A.B = S_1 \cdot S_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	32	$A.A.A.B.A.B.B = Q_1 \cdot Q_2 \cdot Q_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

Table 6: In this table we display the complete list of the 32 elements of the elliptic subgroup \mathfrak{P}_{32} of the discrete subgroup $\Delta_{[32,8]} \subset \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$. In the column after the progressive number one finds the identification of the group element as a word in terms of the generators A, B , while in the next column there is the identification of the same element as a word in the generators $S_{1,2}, Q_{1,2}$. The last column provides the explicit expression of the element as an integer-valued 4×4 symplectic matrix, namely as an element of $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$

$T_1 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$T_2 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$T_3 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$T_4 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$T_5 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$T_6 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$T_7 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$T_8 =$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

Table 7: In this table we display the complete list of the 8 generators of the normal subgroup \mathfrak{T}_8 of the discrete subgroup $\Delta_{[32,8]} \subset \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$.

word in the same symbols. The infinite set of words written in terms of the eight symbols T_i forms a group \mathfrak{T} . The finite group \mathfrak{P}_{32} is by construction an automorphism group of \mathfrak{T} , the action of \mathfrak{P}_{32} on \mathfrak{T} being by conjugation:

$$\forall \gamma \in \mathfrak{P}_{32} \quad : \quad C_\gamma : \mathfrak{T} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{T} \quad ; \quad \forall t \in \mathfrak{T} : C_\gamma(t) = \gamma \cdot t \cdot \gamma^{-1} \in \mathfrak{T} \quad (8.27)$$

Because of the above property the set of all elements of $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$ of the form $\gamma \cdot t$ where $\gamma \in \mathfrak{P}_{32}$ and $t \in \mathfrak{T}$ is a group since also their product and their inverse can be written in the same way. We name such a group $\Delta_{32,8}$.

The group \mathfrak{T} is a normal subgroup in $\Delta_{32,8}$.

9 A family of subgroups of $\text{SO}(r, r + q, \mathbb{Z})$

We wish to generalize the construction, discussed in the previous section, of the subgroup $\Delta_{32,8}$ of $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$, to a discrete subgroup $\hat{\Delta}^{[r,q]}$ of $\text{SO}(r, r + q)$. Let us introduce the following notation for the generators of *Solv* in $\mathfrak{so}(r, r + q)$:

$$H_i = H_{\epsilon_i}, E_{\epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j}, E_{\epsilon_i^I} ; \quad i = 1, \dots, r, \quad I = 1, \dots, q. \quad (9.1)$$

where ϵ_i is an orthonormal basis and $\epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j$ are the long positive roots α , while ϵ_i^I are the restricted short positive roots σ^I , the index I , spanning the fundamental representation of the point group $\text{SO}(q)$, labels their multiplicity.

These generators are normalized to satisfy the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
[H_i, E_\alpha] &= \alpha_i E_\alpha, \quad [H_i, E_{\sigma^I}] = \sigma_i^I E_{\sigma^I}, \\
[E_\alpha, E_{-\alpha}] &= 4\alpha_i H_i, \quad [E_{\sigma^I}, E_{-\sigma^I}] = 2\sigma_i^I H_i, \\
[E_{\epsilon_i^I}, E_{\epsilon_j^J}] &= -\delta_{IJ} E_{\epsilon_i + \epsilon_j}, \quad [E_{\epsilon_i^I}, E_{-\epsilon_j^J}] = -\delta_{IJ} E_{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j},
\end{aligned} \tag{9.2}$$

where we take $E_{-\alpha} = E_\alpha^T$ and $E_{-\sigma^I} = E_{\sigma^I}^T$. Next, we consider, in the fundamental representation of $\text{SO}(r, r+q)$ the following integer generators:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{ij}^\pm &\equiv \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{4}(E_{\epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j} - E_{\epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j}^T)\right), \\
J_i^I &= \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(E_{\epsilon_i^I} - E_{\epsilon_i^I}^T)\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{9.3}$$

These matrices are all elliptic and generate the group $\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[r,q]}$ which we shall name *generalized Weyl group* [113]. They satisfy the conditions:

$$(J_i^I)^2 = (J_{ij}^\pm)^4 = \mathbf{1}.$$

We also define the following integer parabolic generators:

$$T_{ij}^\pm \equiv \exp(2E_{\epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j}) ; \quad T_i^I \equiv \exp(2E_{\epsilon_i^I}). \tag{9.4}$$

One can verify that the following relations hold:

$$(J_{ij}^\pm)^{-1} \cdot T_{ij}^\pm \cdot J_{ij}^\pm = (T_{ij}^\pm)^{-T}, \quad (J_i^I)^{-1} \cdot T_i^I \cdot J_i^I = (T_i^I)^{-T}. \tag{9.5}$$

In general, one can verify that:

$$(T_i^I)^{-1}, (T_i^I)^T, (T_i^I)^{-T} \in \hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[r,q]-1} \cdot T_i^I \cdot \hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[r,q]}. \tag{9.6}$$

In order to generate the inverses of the T_{ij}^\pm we can use the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
(T_i^I \cdot T_j^I \cdot (T_i^I)^{-1} \cdot (T_j^I)^{-1}) \cdot T_{ij}^+ &= (T_{ij}^+)^{-1}, \\
(T_i^I \cdot (T_j^I)^T \cdot (T_i^I)^{-1} \cdot (T_j^I)^{-T}) \cdot T_{ij}^- &= (T_{ij}^-)^{-1},
\end{aligned} \tag{9.7}$$

The group $\hat{\Delta}^{[r,q]}$ is generated by $J_{ij}^\pm, J_i^I, T_{ij}^\pm, T_i^I$. In Appendix A we give the explicit matrix form of the generators for the cases $r=2, q=1$ and $r=3, q=1$. Here we wish to show how the generators of $\Delta_{32,8}$, discussed in the previous section, fit the present section's general construction. One can verify that:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 &= \exp(E_{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2}^{[\text{Sp}]}) , \quad T_2 = \exp(E_{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2}^{[\text{Sp}]}) , \quad T_3 = \exp(E_{\epsilon_1}^{[\text{Sp}]}) , \quad T_4 = \exp(E_{\epsilon_2}^{[\text{Sp}]}) , \\
T_5 &= T_4^{-T} , \quad T_6 = T_1^{-T} , \quad T_7 = T_3^{-T} , \quad T_8 = T_2^{-T}
\end{aligned} \tag{9.8}$$

where $E_{\alpha}^{[\text{Sp}]}$ denotes the generator E_{α} in the fundamental 4-dimensional representation of $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{Z})$. The Cartan generators in the same representation read:

$$H_1^{[\text{Sp}]} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad H_2^{[\text{Sp}]} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

As for the elliptic generators of \mathfrak{P}_{32} we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &= \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(E_{\epsilon_2}^{[\text{Sp}]} - E_{-\epsilon_2}^{[\text{Sp}]})\right), \quad Q_2 = \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(E_{\epsilon_1}^{[\text{Sp}]} - E_{-\epsilon_1}^{[\text{Sp}]})\right), \\ S_1 &= \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(E_{\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2}^{[\text{Sp}]} - E_{-\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}^{[\text{Sp}]})\right), \quad S_2 = \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(E_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}^{[\text{Sp}]} - E_{-\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2}^{[\text{Sp}]})\right) \end{aligned} \quad (9.9)$$

Note the different powers in the definition of the generators in terms of exponentials. This is related to $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ being the double cover of $\text{SO}(2, 3)$. Aside from this, T_1 corresponds to T_{12}^+ , T_2 to T_{12}^- , T_3 to $T_1^{I=1}$ and T_4 to $T_2^{I=1}$, Q_1 to $J_2^{I=1}$, Q_2 to $J_1^{I=1}$, S_1 to J_{12}^+ , S_2 to J_{12}^- . Note that for the parabolic generators of $\Delta_{32,8}$, we find relations which are analogous to (9.7):

$$T_3 \cdot T_4 \cdot T_3^{-1} \cdot T_4^{-1} = T_1^{-2}, \quad T_3 \cdot T_4^T \cdot T_3^{-1} \cdot T_4^{-T} = T_2^{-2}. \quad (9.10)$$

We observe that the order of $\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[2,1]} \subset \text{SO}(2, 3)$ is 16, half the order of \mathfrak{P}_{32} .

In general, we find:

$$|\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[1,1]}| = 2, \quad |\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[2,1]}| = 16, \quad |\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[3,1]}| = 192, \quad |\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[4,1]}| = 3072. \quad (9.11)$$

These numbers for $|\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[r,1]}|$ are reproduced by the expression $2^{2r-1} r!$. As for certain non-Tits-Satake manifolds, we also find:

$$|\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[2,2]}| = 32, \quad |\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[2,3]}| = 64, \quad |\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[2,4]}| = 128, \quad |\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[3,2]}| = 384, \quad |\hat{\mathfrak{P}}^{[3,3]}| = 768. \quad (9.12)$$

10 The Laplacian Operator and the Harmonics on U/H

One of the main targets for the use of the PGTS theory of non-compact symmetric spaces in Data Science problems is related to the following fact. Once data have been mapped to the chosen U/H in a prescribed optimal way, any functional relation among the data is encoded in functions Φ defined over the hosting manifold U/H. All functions on a symmetric space (compact or non-compact) admit a canonical representation as a series development:

$$\Phi(\Upsilon) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\hat{\lambda}_{2n} \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}_{2n}} C_{\hat{\lambda}_{2n}}^{\ell} \mathbf{harm}_{\hat{\lambda}_{2n}}^{\hat{\lambda}_{2n}}(\Upsilon) \quad (10.1)$$

in harmonics $\mathbf{harm}_{\hat{\lambda}_{2n}}^{\hat{\lambda}_{2n}}(\Upsilon)$, that are eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator and admit a unique algebraic group-theoretical construction. Furthermore, the spectrum of the Laplacian is also determined a priori in terms of group-theory. This means that any kind of learning algorithm should focus only on the determination of the series coefficients $C_{\hat{\lambda}_{2n}}^{\ell}$ obtaining in this way an intrinsic, coordinate independent representation of the functional relations satisfied by the data.

For all the non-compact symmetric spaces considered in the PGTS theory, the general construction of harmonic analysis on U/H specializes in such a way that all the harmonics $\mathbf{harm}_{\hat{\lambda}_{2n}}^{\hat{\lambda}_{2n}}(\Upsilon)$ are actually constructed as suitable

tensor products of the symmetric matrix $\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon)$ introduced in eq.(4.10).

In the present section we just provide a concise summary of the harmonic analysis set up in the case of the maximally split symmetric manifold $\frac{\text{SL}(\text{N}, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(\text{N})}$, illustrating the eigenvalue and the eigenfunction spectrum. Due to the always-existing triangular embedding (see statement 3.1):

$$\frac{\text{U}}{\text{H}} \xrightarrow{\text{Triang}} \frac{\text{SL}(\text{N}, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(\text{N})} \quad (10.2)$$

the harmonics of the various U/H can be obtained from those of the mother manifold $\frac{\text{SL}(\text{N}, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(\text{N})}$ through the implementation of the additional algebraic constraints satisfied by the matrix \mathcal{M} when it is restricted to the subgroup $\text{U} \subset \text{SL}(\text{N}, \mathbb{R})$.

The present section is somewhat sketchy and, as we already said, it is limited to the maximal case $\text{SL}(\text{N}, \mathbb{R})$ yet it is an essential conceptual thread in the texture of the PGTS theory in view of Data Science applications.

10.1 Laplace-Beltrami operators on a symmetric space

A fundamental concept relative to a symmetric space $\mathcal{M} = \text{U}/\text{H}$ is that of rank (not to be confused with the non-compact rank $r_{n.c.}$ discussed above). The coset-rank can be defined in equivalent ways that are rooted either in the algebraic structure of the isometry group U and of its subgroup H or on the spectrum of invariant differential operators.

Quoting from [114] we recall that on a coset manifold $\mathcal{M} = \text{U}/\text{H}$, if we name T_A a set of generators of the \mathbb{U} Lie algebra, $\mathbf{k}_A(\Upsilon) = k_A^\mu(\Upsilon) \partial_\mu$ the corresponding Killing vector fields generating the isometries of the U-invariant metric a differential operator Δ of the second order or higher is named an *invariant operator*, if and only if

$$[\Delta, \mathcal{L}_A] = 0 \quad ; \quad \forall \mathcal{L}_A \in \mathfrak{i}^*(\mathbb{U}) \quad (10.3)$$

where:

$$\mathcal{L}_A \equiv \mathbf{i}_{\mathbf{k}_A} \circ \text{d} + \text{d} \circ \mathbf{i}_{\mathbf{k}_A} \quad (10.4)$$

is the Lie derivative along the Killing vector \mathbf{k}_A which realizes a map from the abstract Lie Algebra \mathbb{U} to its image inside the infinite dimensional Lie algebra of vector fields, *i.e.* into the space of sections of the tangent bundle to \mathcal{M} :

$$\mathfrak{i}^* \quad : \quad \mathbb{U} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{i}^*(\mathbb{U}) \subset \Gamma \left[\mathcal{T} \left(\frac{\text{U}}{\text{H}} \right) \right] \quad (10.5)$$

Indeed the Lie derivatives satisfy the commutation relations of the \mathbb{U} Lie algebra with the same structure constants:

$$[\mathcal{L}_A, \mathcal{L}_B] = f_{AB}^C \mathcal{L}_C \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad [T_A, T_B] = f_{AB}^C T_C \quad (10.6)$$

1. The invariant operators are diagonal on **harmonics** that can be indeed defined as their eigenfunctions. The **Laplace Beltrami operators** are a complete set of invariant operators and every Δ satisfying eq. (10.3) is a function of them.
2. There are $\mathfrak{r} = \text{coset rank}$ independent Laplace-Beltrami operators on each coset manifold U/H. The coset rank of U/H is defined as the number of irreducible representations of the subalgebra \mathbb{H} in which its orthogonal complement \mathbb{K} splits in the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{U} &= \mathbb{H} \oplus \mathbb{K} \quad ; \quad \mathbb{K} \bigoplus_{\alpha=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathbb{K}_\alpha \\ [\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{K}_\alpha] &\subset \mathbb{K}_\alpha \quad \text{no invariant subspace in each } \mathbb{K}_\alpha \end{aligned} \quad (10.7)$$

3. In a coset manifold of coset rank τ the first lower degree τ Laplace-Beltrami operators can be chosen as a complete basis of invariant operators. The remaining higher order L.B. operators are functionally dependent on the first τ operators.

It should be stressed that what we said above applies to the invariant differential operators Δ_s working on the space of functions in each open chart of $\mathcal{U} \subset U/H$:

$$\Delta_s : \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{U}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{U}) \quad (10.8)$$

Given the coset rank there are just τ independent Laplace-Beltrami operators Δ_s . If we consider the space of sections of each associated bundle to the principle bundle:

$$U \xrightarrow{\pi} U/H \quad : \quad \forall p \in U/H \quad \pi^{-1}(p) \simeq H \quad (10.9)$$

then for each of such bundles:

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha \xrightarrow{\pi_\alpha} \frac{U}{H} \quad : \quad \forall p \in \frac{U}{H} \quad \pi^{-1}(p) \simeq \mathbb{V}_\alpha \quad (10.10)$$

where \mathbb{V}_α is the carrier vector space of a linear representation D_α of the structural group H , there are, typically τ Laplace Beltrami operators Δ_α that act on sections of the bundle:

$$\Delta_\alpha : \Gamma\left(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, \frac{U}{H}\right) \longrightarrow \Gamma\left(\mathcal{E}_\alpha, \frac{U}{H}\right) \quad (10.11)$$

In the case of interest to us the coset rank of the coset $\frac{SL(N, \mathbb{R})}{SO(N)}$ is always $\tau = 1$ since the \mathbb{K} subspace is uniformly in the irreducible representation:

$$D_{2\text{sym}}(SO(N)) = \mathbf{fund} \underset{\text{symm}}{\otimes} \mathbf{fund} - \text{Trace} \quad (10.12)$$

where **fund** denotes the N -dimensional defining representation of $SO(N)$ and the dimension of the representation in eq.(10.12) is

$$\dim_{\mathbb{R}} D_{2\text{sym}}(SO(N)) = \frac{N(N+1)}{2} - 1 \quad (10.13)$$

In the case of the symmetric spaces $\mathcal{M}_0^{[r,s]} = SO(r, r+2s)/SO(r) \times SO(r+2s)$ the coset rank is also $\tau = 1$ since the \mathbb{K} -space is uniformly in the bifundamental irreducible representation of $SO(r) \times SO(r+2s)$.

We note just in passing that the flat Euclidian space used in most neural network algorithms and deep learning constructions is also a coset manifold of rank $r = 1$, precisely given by:

$$\text{Flat Space} = \frac{ISO(N)}{SO(N)} \quad (10.14)$$

with the difference that $U = ISO(N)$ is not a semi-simple Lie Algebra and the representation to which \mathbb{K} is assigned is the fundamental N -dimensional one rather than the traceless symmetric of rank 2. The translation group is Abelian and coincides with the manifold itself. The spectrum of the Laplace-Beltrami operator is continuous rather than discrete, as it is the case with the symmetric manifolds here under consideration, as we are going to illustrate in the sequel. In other words all the structures that introduce a sequence of parameters suitable to be *target of learning* are lost.

10.2 Harmonics on coset spaces

Let us consider as a first step the group manifold of the Lie group U . A complete functional basis on U is given by the matrix elements of the U Irreducible Representations. Indeed any function

$$\Phi(g) \quad g \in U \quad (10.15)$$

can be expanded as

$$\Phi(g) = \sum_{(\mu)} \sum_{m,n=1}^{\dim(\mu)} c_{mn}^{(\mu)} D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(g) \quad (10.16)$$

where (μ) are the UIRs of U , m, n run in these representations, and D are the elements of these representations. In fact, the $D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(g)$ satisfy orthogonality and completeness relations that for continuous groups are the obvious generalization of the same orthogonality relations that hold true for finite groups.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U dg D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(g) D_{sr}^{(\nu)}(g^{-1}) &= \frac{\text{vol}(U)}{\text{vol}(\mu)} \delta_{mr} \delta_{ns} \delta^{(\mu)(\nu)} \\ \sum_{(\mu)} D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(g) D_{nm}^{(\mu)}(g^{-1}) \dim(\mu) &= \delta(g - g') \text{vol}(U). \end{aligned} \quad (10.17)$$

If $\Phi(g)$ transforms in an irreducible representation (μ) of U , for example under left multiplication, namely

$$\Phi_m^{(\mu)}(g'g) = D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(g') \Phi_n^{(\mu)}(g), \quad (10.18)$$

then only a subset of the complete functional basis is present, the D 's that transform in the same way, that is,

$$D_{mn}^{(\mu)} \quad \mu, m \text{ fixed} \quad (10.19)$$

So in this case the expansion is shorter:

$$\Phi_m^{(\mu)}(g) = \sum_n c_n^{(\mu)} D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(g). \quad (10.20)$$

Let us now consider the functions $\Phi(y)$ on a coset manifold U/H . The matrix elements

$$D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(\mathbb{L}(y)),$$

where $\mathbb{L}(y)$ is a coset representative of the coset space and y are the coset manifold coordinates, constitute a complete functional basis on U/H :

$$\Phi(y) = \sum_{(\mu)} \sum_{m,n=1}^{\dim(\mu)} c_{mn}^{(\mu)} D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(\mathbb{L}(y)) \quad (10.21)$$

satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{U/H} dm(y) D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(\mathbb{L}(y)) D_{sr}^{(\nu)}(\mathbb{L}(y)^{-1}) &= \frac{\text{vol}(U/H)}{\text{vol}(\mu)} \delta_{mr} \delta_{ns} \delta^{(\mu)(\nu)} \\ \sum_{(\mu)} D_{mn}^{(\mu)}(\mathbb{L}(y)) D_{nm}^{(\mu)}(\mathbb{L}(y')^{-1}) \dim(\mu) &= \delta(y - y') \text{vol}(U/H) \end{aligned} \quad (10.22)$$

where $dm(y)$ is the invariant measure on U/H .

We are interested in functions $\Phi(\mathbb{L}(y))$ on which a linear action of the subgroup $H \subset U$ is well-defined, namely

that transform within an irreducible linear representation (ρ) of H

$$\forall h \in H \quad : \quad h \cdot \Phi_i^{(\rho)}(\mathbb{L}(y)) \equiv D_{ij}(h)^{(\rho)} \Phi_j^{(\rho)}(\mathbb{L}(y)) \quad (10.23)$$

the index i running in (ρ) .

Recalling, as it was done in eq.(10.9), that a coset manifold U/H can be interpreted as the base manifold of a principal fiber bundle having the subgroup H as structural group, the functions $\Phi_i^{(\rho)}(\mathbb{L}(y))$ advocated in eq.(10.23) are actually sections of an associated vector bundle in the representation (ρ) of the principal bundle (10.9). Such objects that are relevant both in classical and quantum field theories and in particular in Kaluza Klein compactifications of higher dimensional theories are also considered the main ingredients of recent *Geometrical Deep Learning constructions*, as we already remarked.

Hence how do we determine such vector bundle sections constructed in terms of representation matrix elements

$$D_{mn}^{(\mu)} \quad m, n \text{ running in } (\mu) \text{ of } U \quad ? \quad (10.24)$$

The answer is simple. We have to choose matrix elements of the following type

$$D_{in}^{(\mu)} \quad i \text{ running in } (\rho) \text{ of } H, n \text{ running in } (\mu) \text{ of } U \quad (10.25)$$

hence we have to choose only those irreps (μ) that satisfy the following condition: the decomposition of (μ) with respect to $H \subset U$ must contain the H irreducible representation (ρ) :

$$(\mu) \xrightarrow{H} \dots \oplus (\rho) \oplus \dots \quad (10.26)$$

Only in this case $D_{mn}^{(\mu)}$ decomposes in $(\dots, D_{in}^{(\mu)}, D_{i'n}^{(\mu)}, \dots)$ and the $D_{in}^{(\mu)}$ actually exists. The functions constructed with matrix elements of the representations satisfying (10.26) are named H -**harmonics** on U/H , and constitute a complete basis for the sections of ρ -vector bundle on U/H : $\Phi_i^{(\rho)}(\mathbb{L}(y))$. Its generic expansion is the following one:

$$\Phi_i^{(\rho)}(y) = \sum'_{(\mu)} \sum_n c_n^{(\mu)} D_{in}^{(\mu)}(\mathbb{L}(y)) \quad (10.27)$$

where \sum' means a sum only on the representations (μ) satisfying the property (10.26). Notice that the H -harmonics have both an index running in an irreducible representation of U (on the right) and an index running in an irreducible representation of H (on the left). The coefficients of the expansion $c_n^{(\mu)}$ have an index of a representation of U present in the expansion \sum' .

Notice that when we deal with functions on the manifold rather than with sections of vector bundles the relevant representation ρ of H is simply the singlet representation, so that the sum \sum' is extended only to those representations of U that when decomposed with respect to H they contain the singlet.

10.3 Differential operators on H harmonics

H -harmonics have a very powerful property: the action on them of differential operators can be expressed in a completely algebraic way. The H -covariant external differential:

$$\mathcal{D}^H \mathbb{L}^{-1}(y) \equiv (d + \omega^i T_i) \mathbb{L}^{-1}(y) \quad (10.28)$$

becomes

$$\mathcal{D}^H \mathbb{L}^{-1}(y) = -V^a T_a \mathbb{L}^{-1}(y), \quad (10.29)$$

or, expanding on the vielbein $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{H}} = E^a \mathcal{D}_a^{\mathbb{H}}$,

$$\mathcal{D}_a^{\mathbb{H}} \mathbb{L}^{-1}(y) = -T_a \mathbb{L}^{-1}(y) \quad (10.30)$$

with T_a generator of the subspace \mathbb{K} defined by the orthogonal decomposition $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{K} \oplus \mathbb{H}$, in the representation in which the inverse coset representative is expressed.

Since the harmonics *are* the inverse coset representatives in the representation (μ) :

$$D^{(\mu)}(\mathbb{L}^{-1}(y))_n^i = \mathbb{L}^{-1}(y)_n^i \quad (10.31)$$

More precisely, the harmonic in the (ρ, μ) , representations $D^{(\mu)}_n^i$, is obtained doing the decomposition (10.26) of the first index of $D^{(\mu)}_n^m = \mathbb{L}^{-1}_n^m$ and taking the (ρ) term. We consider the *inverse* coset representative because for simplicity of notation, we want \mathbb{H} to act on their left, while it acts on the right of coset representatives.

Hence the action of \mathbb{H} -covariant derivative on the harmonic $D_n^i(y) \equiv D_n^i(\mathbb{L}(y))$ is

$$\mathcal{D}_a^{\mathbb{H}} D_n^i(y) = -(T_a D(y))_n^i = -(T_a)_m^i D_n^m \quad (10.32)$$

where $(T_a)_m^i$ is defined as the (ρ) term in the decomposition (10.26) of the index n in $(T_a)_m^n$, namely,

$$(T_a)_m^n = \left\{ \dots, (T_a)_m^i, \dots \right\} \quad (10.33)$$

Utilizing

$$\omega^{ab} \eta_{bc} \equiv \omega^a_c = \frac{1}{2} C^a_{cd} V^d + C^a_{ci} \omega^i \quad (10.34)$$

which expresses the spin $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ -connection ω^a_b of the n -dimensional coset manifold \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} in terms of the \mathbb{U} -group structure constants and of the \mathbb{H} -connection ω^i , it is evident that once the \mathbb{H} -covariant differential is reduced to an algebraic action on the harmonics the same will be true of the standard $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ -covariant differential:

$$\mathcal{D} \equiv \mathcal{D}^{\mathfrak{so}(n)} = d + \omega^{ab} J_{ab} \quad (10.35)$$

where J_{ab} are the $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ generators.

It follows that the Laplace-Beltrami invariant operators of differential geometry that are all $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ invariant operators quadratic in the $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ derivatives will have on harmonics an algebraic action and will take on them a numerical eigenvalue that can be calculated a priori in terms of the generators of the \mathbb{U} Lie algebra and depend only on the \mathbb{U} irreducible representation (μ) . In conclusion when we consider sections of the various associated vector bundles to the principal bundle (10.9), the harmonics constitute a complete basis for the functional space over \mathbb{U}/\mathbb{H} and all differential operations in this functional space are reduced to algebraic ones.

Thanks to group theory, analysis is reduced to algebra.

10.4 The eigenvalues of the Laplacian in general

Further elaborating the above basic facts in eq.s (V.3.28) and (V.3.29) of the second volume of [114] it was proved that the scalar Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_s acting on the scalar harmonic in the irreducible representation (μ) :

$$\mathfrak{Harm}_\ell^{(\mu)} \equiv D_{0,\ell}^{(\mu)}(\mathbb{L}^{-1}(y)) \quad ; \quad \ell \text{ runs in } (\mu) \text{ and } 0 \text{ means singlet} \quad (10.36)$$

can be represented as follows:

$$\Delta_s \mathfrak{Harm}_\ell^{(\mu)} = (g^{AB} \mathcal{L}_A \mathcal{L}_B) \mathfrak{Harm}_\ell^{(\mu)} = \underbrace{(g^{AB} T_A T_B)_{\ell j}^{(\mu)}}_{\text{Casimir operator}} \mathfrak{Harm}_j^{(\mu)} \quad (10.37)$$

where g^{AB} is the Killing metric on the U Lie algebra, $\mathcal{L}_{A,B}$ denote, as above, the covariant Lie derivatives along the Killing vectors and $(g^{AB} T_A T_B)$ is the unique quadratic Casimir operator on the same Lie algebra. Since in each irreducible representation the Casimir is proportional to the identity matrix with an overall constant factor $\mathcal{C}^{(\mu)}$, we have that the harmonics $\mathfrak{Harm}_\ell^{(\mu)}$ are eigenfunctions of the Laplace operator the value of the Casimir as eigenvalue:

$$\Delta_s \mathfrak{Harm}_\ell^{(\mu)} = \mathcal{C}^{(\mu)} \mathfrak{Harm}_\ell^{(\mu)} \quad (10.38)$$

Finally due to Weyl and Freudenthal we have a beautiful and concise formula which expresses the value of the Casimir in any irreducible representation of the simple Lie Algebra. Let $\Lambda^{(\mu)}$ be the highest weight vector of the irreducible representation (μ) . It has the form:

$$\Lambda^{(\mu)} = \sum_{i=1}^r n_i^{(\mu)} \mathbf{w}^i \quad ; \quad n_i^{(\mu)} \in \mathbb{N} \quad (10.39)$$

where \mathbf{w}^i are the simple weights of the Lie algebra and the positive integers $n_i^{(\mu)}$ are the so-named **Dynkin labels** of the irrep (μ) . Then the value of the quadratic Casimir in the (μ) irrep is given by:

$$\mathcal{C}^{(\mu)} = \langle \Lambda^{(\mu)} + 2\rho, \Lambda^{(\mu)} \rangle \quad ; \quad \rho \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha > 0} \alpha \quad (10.40)$$

According to our notations ρ is the half sum of all the positive roots of the Lie algebra.

10.5 The spectrum of the Laplacian on the symmetric space $SL(N, \mathbb{R})/SO(N)$

In the case of the symmetric space of interest to us, the fundamental defining N -dimensional representation of the group $U = SL(N, \mathbb{R})$ is irreducible with respect to the subgroup $H = SO(N)$ so that it cannot contribute to scalar harmonics. Indeed the lowest representation that contains a singlet when reduced to the H -subgroup is the 2-symmetric one with unit determinant obtained as it follows

$$\boxed{A|B} \equiv \mathbb{L}_i^A \mathbb{L}_j^B \delta^{ij} = (\mathbb{L} \mathbb{L}^T)^{AB} \equiv \mathcal{M}^{AB} \quad (10.41)$$

In eq.(10.41) the matrix $\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon)$ is the same as that previously introduced in eq.(4.10) whose independent components are exactly as many as the dimension of the coset manifold namely $\frac{1}{2}N(N+1) - 1$. For this reason the matrix $\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon)$ can be regarded as a coordinate for points in the manifold and the metric in terms of $\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon)$ was written in eq.(4.63,4.14). When the matrix is parameterized in terms of the solvable coordinate or of any other set of independent coordinates it automatically satisfies the constraint $\text{Det}\mathcal{M} = 1$. In order to use \mathcal{M} as a coordinate such a highly non-linear constraint has to be imposed by hand.

What is very important is that now we see that the matrix $\mathcal{M}(\Upsilon)$ is also the fundamental building block of harmonics, in terms of which all the other higher harmonics are constructed. For this reason, we have utilized the Young Tableau notation which is very handy and economical. We can write:

$$\Delta_s \boxed{A|B} = \mathcal{C}^2(N) \boxed{A|B} \quad (10.42)$$

As one can visually see from the ListPlot displayed in figure 11, the growth of the eigenvalue of the quadratic Casimir Operator on the fundamental harmonic is approximately linear in N , with a slope that starting from $20/9 \simeq 2.2222$




Figure 11: This figure visualizes the approximately linear behavior of the quadratic Casimir on the fundamental harmonic in dependence of the number N

at $N = 3$ gradually approaches 2 as $N \rightarrow \infty$

10.6 The general construction of Harmonics

Now the general form of harmonics can be easily constructed taking into account that for the group $SL(N, \mathbb{R})$ the irreducible linear representations are in one-to-one correspondence with the Young Tableaux, namely with the partition of an integer number $1 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$ *i.e.* with the r -tuples λ of integer numbers (with $r \leq n$) such that :

$$\lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_r\} \quad ; \quad \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{r-1} \geq \lambda_r \quad ; \quad \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i = n \quad (10.43)$$

As it is well known, to each partition λ one associates a corresponding tableau which is the disposition of n boxes in r -lines, each line not longer than the one above, which is not only a mnemonic representation of the partition but also a graphical representation of an operator acting on the indices A_1, \dots, A_n of a tensor:

$$\lambda \Rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline A_1 & A_2 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & A_{\lambda_1} \\ \hline A_{\lambda_1+1} & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & A_{\lambda_2} & & \\ \hline \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & & & \\ \hline \bullet & \bullet & A_n & & & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad (10.44)$$

Indeed the Young operator acting on the set of n indices associated with the Young tableau is classically defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Y}_\lambda &= Q \circ P \\
P &= \sum_p p = \text{symmetrizer of each line, summing on all permutations of } \lambda_i \text{ objects} \\
Q &= \sum_q q (-1)^{\delta_p} = \text{antisymmetrizer of each column, summing on all permutations on columns} \quad (10.45)
\end{aligned}$$

In this way, one constructs an irreducible representation of the symmetric group S_n , yet for a general theorem the irreducible representations of the group $SL(N, \mathbb{R})$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the irreducible n -index tensors, namely those whose indices have been symmetrized/antisymmetrized with one of the available Young tableaux that are as many as the partitions of n into integers. Obviously the irreps of $SL(N, \mathbb{R})$ are infinitely many because the number n of indices of the tensor is unbounded.

The great advantage of working with the group $SL(N, \mathbb{R})$, which, for suitable N , contains, as a subgroup, any other of the U groups under consideration, is that the relation between the description of the irreducible representations in terms of Young Tableaux and in terms of maximal weights (*i.e.*) of *Dynkin labels*, is immediate. The Dynkin labels defined in eq.(10.39) are immediately related to the Young labels λ by means of the following rule:

$$\begin{aligned}
n_1 &= \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \\
n_2 &= \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 \\
&\dots = \dots \\
n_r &= \lambda_{r-1} - \lambda_r \quad (10.46)
\end{aligned}$$

10.7 The irreps contributing to harmonic expansions on $SL(N, \mathbb{R})/SO(N)$

In view of what we discussed before the rule to select the irreps that contribute to the harmonic expansion of a generic function on the manifold is very simple. The only available Young tableaux are those where the number of boxes on each line is even since the tensor must be constructed from the tensor product of an integer number of fundamental harmonics \overline{AB} . For instance, if we consider the harmonics that can be obtained from the square of two fundamental harmonics we have:

$$\overline{AB} \otimes \overline{CD} = \overline{ABCD} \oplus \overline{\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A & B \\ \hline C & D \\ \hline \end{array}} \quad (10.47)$$

A priori we have:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \oplus \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \oplus \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad (10.48)$$

yet applying the Young operator corresponding to the last tableau on the r.h.s. of equation (10.48) to the product of the two symmetric matrices we obtain identically zero just because of their symmetry:

$$\mathbb{Y}_{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array}} [\mathcal{M}(A, B) \mathcal{M}(C, D)] = 0 \quad (10.49)$$

Similarly it happens for all higher tensor products of the matrix \mathcal{M} , or equivalently of its inverse:

$$\mathcal{N} \equiv \mathcal{M}^{-1} \quad (10.50)$$

10.7.1 Examples in the cases $N = 4$

N=4 CASE Utilizing the explicit differential form of the Laplacian operator in the U/H invariant metric written in terms of solvable coordinates we obtain:

$$\Delta_s \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon) = 9 \mathcal{M}(\Upsilon) \quad (10.51)$$

in agreement with the corresponding Casimir value calculated with Weyl–Freudenthal formula. Next let us consider the level two harmonics, namely those obtained from the product of two fundamental ones as in eq.(10.48). For instance we can consider the following object:

$$\boxed{1} \boxed{2} \boxed{3} \boxed{4} = \mathcal{M}^{12} \mathcal{M}^{34} + \mathcal{M}^{13} \mathcal{M}^{24} + \mathcal{M}^{23} \mathcal{M}^{14} \quad (10.52)$$

and applying the Laplace-Beltrami operator we find:

$$\Delta_s \boxed{1} \boxed{2} \boxed{3} \boxed{4} = 24 \boxed{1} \boxed{2} \boxed{3} \boxed{4} \quad (10.53)$$

The eigenvalue 24 is precisely that expected from the calculation of the Casimir for the representation $\boxed{\square} \boxed{\square} \boxed{\square} \boxed{\square}$, in the case $N = 4$. Indeed it corresponds to the highest weight vector:

$$\Lambda^{\boxed{\square} \boxed{\square} \boxed{\square} \boxed{\square}} = 4 \mathbf{w}_1 \stackrel{\text{for } N=4}{=} \left\{ \frac{10}{3}, -\frac{2}{3}, -\frac{2}{3} \right\} \quad (10.54)$$

which inserted in the Weyl-Freudenthal formula (10.40) together with

$$\rho \stackrel{\text{for } N=4}{=} \{2, 1, 0\} \quad (10.55)$$

yields precisely:

$$\mathcal{C}^{\boxed{\square} \boxed{\square} \boxed{\square} \boxed{\square}}(4) = 24 \quad (10.56)$$

Consider next the other irreducible representation in the same $n = 4$ level of the case $N = 4$. We have for instance:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array} = 2\mathcal{M}^{12} \mathcal{M}^{34} - \mathcal{M}^{32} \mathcal{M}^{14} - \mathcal{M}^{13} \mathcal{M}^{24} \quad (10.57)$$

and by explicit evaluation, we find:

$$\Delta_s \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array} = 12 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad (10.58)$$

which is perfectly consistent with the calculation of the Casimir eigenvalue, by means of formula (10.40). Indeed we have

$$\Lambda^{\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array}} = 2 \mathbf{w}_2 \stackrel{\text{for } N=4}{=} \left\{ \frac{4}{3}, \frac{4}{3}, -\frac{2}{3} \right\} \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array}}(4) = 12 \quad (10.59)$$

10.8 Summarizing

Relying on these illustrations we conclude by saying that any function on the symmetric space can be developed into harmonics that are in one-to-one correspondence with the irreducible representations of the isometry group pertaining to the special set clarified above, for which the parameters λ_i are all even.

To this effect, we are now introducing a more compact notation. First of all, we introduce the set of all contributing irreps that we name $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$. The irreps in $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ can be alternatively singled out by the Dynkin labels or by the integer partitions

λ . They have a degree which is just the sum of the even λ s, Hence we can write

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{2n} \quad (10.60)$$

By definition $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{2n}$ is the set of all partitions of the even number $2n$ into even integers. We name the elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{2n}$ as $\widehat{\lambda}_{2n}$. The set of $2n$ indices arranged with the appropriate symmetry provided by the corresponding Young Tableau can be regarded as a unique index ℓ which takes as many values as there are independent ways of filling the Young Tableau boxes. The number of the latter is the dimension of the irreducible representation. Hence we introduce the symbol:

$$\mathfrak{harm}_{\ell}^{\widehat{\lambda}_{2n}}(\Upsilon) = \text{harmonic of degree } 2n \text{ in } \widehat{\lambda}_{2n} \text{ irrep} \quad (10.61)$$

and for any function $\Phi(\Upsilon)$ we can write the harmonic expansion (10.1).

The coefficients $C_{\widehat{\lambda}_{2n}}^{\ell}$ are constant numbers and constitute the *generalized Fourier components* of the chosen function in the harmonic expansion. As we already stated at the beginning of the present section, **generalized Fourier components** are the **target of supervised learning** in Data Science applications once the Data have been mapped to the U/H symmetric space in an optimal way as the result of some appropriate **unsupervised optimization algorithm**. Obviously when $U \subset \text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})$ is a proper subgroup, which is our general case of manifolds with non-trivial Tits Satake submanifold, one has to decompose the irreducible representations of the bigger group $\text{SL}(N, \mathbb{R})$ with respect to smaller one U . Typically this can be done in an automatic and algebraic way by diagonalizing the Casimir operator:

$$\mathbf{QC} = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \mathcal{H}_i \cdot \mathcal{H}_i + \sum_{\alpha > 0} (\mathcal{E}^{\alpha} \cdot \mathcal{E}^{-\alpha} + \mathcal{E}^{-\alpha} \cdot \mathcal{E}^{\alpha}) \quad (10.62)$$

on the symmetric matrix \mathcal{M} and on its tensor products.

11 Conclusions

We do not spend too many words for the conclusions, since all the main conceptual issues have been repeatedly emphasized both in the introduction and throughout all the expository sections. We just reiterate what we said at the beginning: the PGTS theory of non-compact symmetric spaces is a self-contained and rich theoretical scheme that provides its perspective utilizer in Data Science with an ample spectrum of tokens to be used in constructing learning algorithms more structured than the usual ones merely based on the distance function. It is now challenging to probe their effectiveness in designing new architectures for neural networks. On the other hand from a purely mathematical viewpoint, the reassembling of non-compact symmetric space geometrical lore in the here proposed setup with the inclusion of several new items and results opens new visions and research directions the most fertile and attractive being the one associated with the determination of discrete groups of the tessellation type.

As we already mentioned here and there throughout the body of the present foundational paper aiming at establishing a new PGTS theoretical paradigm for neural network architectures, while we were finalizing its text for publication, the research in our group continued and we already found some instances of application of the paradigm that are the topics of two forthcoming papers [111, 112]. More generally we better determined the directions in which the applications either are or have to be developed. A very sketchy summary of the next coming research lines might be described as follows:

- A) Use of the generalized and progressive Tits Satake projection as a mathematical framework for the interpretation and construction of multi-layer neural networks, the various layers belonging to the same Tits Satake Universality class [112]. In this setup a basic ingredient is the geometrical interpretation of the separator hypersurfaces in the organization of data by classes. The already obtained results for $r = 1$ have to be generalized to $r = 2$ and

larger.

- B)** The use of harmonic expansion on U/H in the construction of neural networks where the data can be regarded as a sequence of points in section of a vector bundle such that U/H is the total bundle space, the base manifold is the Tits Satake submanifold \mathcal{M}_{TS} and the vector fibres are $\pi_{TS}^{-1}(p)$, $\forall p \in \mathcal{M}_{TS}$. Such an issue is addressed in a preliminary analysis in the forthcoming [111].
- C)** Within the scope of the framework to be presented in [112] we plan to study and devise inspection and control additions to the neural network architecture that allow to study the evolution of Paint Group invariants through epochs.
- D)** Study of the Heat Kernel on the various Tits Satake universality classes in view of establishing diffusion processes both in the continuous and in the discrete case.
- E)** Embedding of tree graph structures in non-compact hyperbolic manifolds of various non-compact rank utilizing

Acknowledgements

The present paper is the first result of an intense research activity pursued since late 2023 spring by the three of us, with the inspiring and precious contributions of our friends and colleagues Michele Caselle and Guido Sanguinetti but also of the junior members of our collaboration team, namely the Ph.D. students Federico Milanesio and Matteo Santoro. The research project of which the present paper constitutes the first step forward has the ambitious aim of providing an innovative mathematical framework for geometrical neural networks and has been launched because of the vision and generosity of our dear friend Sauro Additati who incited us to accept the challenge, generously supporting the Ph.D. fellowships of the younger members and the full-dedication to this cause of the elder and retired member (P.F.).

A Explicit matrix representation for the $J_{ij}^\pm, J_i^I, T_{ij}^\pm, T_i^I$ generators.

In this appendix, we give the explicit matrix representation of the generators $J_{ij}^\pm, J_i^I, T_{ij}^\pm, T_i^I$ for the discrete subgroups $\hat{\Delta}^{[r,q]}$ of $\text{SO}(r, r+q)$ discussed in Section 9. We work in the basis in which the invariant matrix is:

$$\text{diag}(\overbrace{+, \dots, +}^r, \overbrace{-, \dots, -}^{r+q}). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Case $r = 2, q = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} J_{12}^+ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & J_{12}^- &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ J_1^{I=1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & J_2^{I=1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ T_{12}^- &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & -2 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & T_{12}^+ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & -2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ T_1^{I=1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & T_2^{I=1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 & -1 & -2 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{12}^- &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_{12}^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\
T_{13}^- &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_{13}^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
T_{23}^- &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_{23}^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -2 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
T_1^{I=1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_2^{I=1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
T_3^{I=1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

References

- [1] R. D’Auria and P. Fre, “Cartan integrable systems, that is Differential Free Algebras, in Supergravity,” in *September School on Supergravity and Supersymmetry*, 9 1982.
- [2] R. D’Auria and P. Fre, “Geometric Supergravity in $d = 11$ and Its Hidden Supergroup,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 201, pp. 101–140, 1982. [Erratum: *Nucl.Phys.B* 206, 496 (1982)].
- [3] D. Sullivan, “Infinitesimal computations in topology,” *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, vol. 47, 1977.
- [4] L. Castellani, R. D’Auria, and S. Ferrara, “Special Kahler Geometry: An Intrinsic Formulation From $N = 2$ Space-time Supersymmetry,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. B241, pp. 57–62, 1990.
- [5] A. Strominger, “Special Geometry,” *Comm. Math. Phys.*, vol. 133, p. 163, (1990).
- [6] L. Castellani, R. D’Auria, and S. Ferrara, “Special geometry without special coordinates,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 7, pp. 1767–1790, 1990.
- [7] B. de Wit and A. Van Proeyen, “Special geometry, cubic polynomials and homogeneous quaternionic spaces,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 149, pp. 307–334, 1992.
- [8] R. D’Auria, S. Ferrara, and P. Fré, “Special and quaternionic isometries: General couplings in $n=2$ supergravity and the scalar potential,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B 359, p. 705, 1991.
- [9] L. Andrianopoli, M. Bertolini, A. Ceresole, R. D’Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fre, and T. Magri, “ $N=2$ supergravity and $N=2$ superYang-Mills theory on general scalar manifolds: Symplectic covariance, gaugings and the momentum map,” *J. Geom. Phys.*, vol. 23, pp. 111–189, 1997.
- [10] J. De Jaegher, B. de Wit, B. Kleijn, and S. Vandoren, “Special geometry in hypermultiplets,” *Nuclear Physics B*, vol. 514, pp. 553 – 582, Mar. 1998.
- [11] E. Cremmer and B. Julia, “The $SO(8)$ Supergravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 159, pp. 141–212, 1979.
- [12] P. Fre, L. Girardello, I. Pesando, and M. Trigiante, “Spontaneous $N=2 \rightarrow N=1$ local supersymmetry breaking with surviving compact gauge group,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 493, pp. 231–248, 1997.
- [13] L. Andrianopoli, R. D’Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fre, and M. Trigiante, “RR scalars, U duality and solvable Lie algebras,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 496, pp. 617–629, 1997.
- [14] L. Andrianopoli, R. D’Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fre, and M. Trigiante, “ $E(7)(7)$ duality, BPS black hole evolution and fixed scalars,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 509, pp. 463–518, 1998.
- [15] M. Trigiante, *Duality in Supergravity and Solvable Lie Algebras*. PhD thesis, SISSA, Trieste, 1997.
- [16] L. Andrianopoli, R. D’Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fré, R. Minasian, and M. Trigiante, “Solvable Lie algebras in type IIA, type IIB and M-theories,” *Nuclear physics B*, vol. 493, no. 1-2, pp. 249–277, 1997. [hep-th/9612202].
- [17] S. Cecotti, “Homogeneous Kähler manifolds and t algebras in $n = 2$ supergravity and superstrings,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 124, pp. 23–55, 1989.
- [18] P. Fre, F. Gargiulo, J. Rosseel, K. Rulik, M. Trigiante, and A. Van Proeyen, “Tits-Satake projections of homogeneous special geometries,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 24, pp. 27–78, 2007.
- [19] E. Bergshoeff, W. Chemissany, A. Ploegh, M. Trigiante, and T. Van Riet, “Generating Geodesic Flows and Supergravity Solutions,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 812, p. 343, 2009. <https://arxiv.org/abs/0806.2310v5>.

- [20] P. Frè, A. Sorin, and M. Trigiante, “Integrability of supergravity black holes and new tensor classifiers of regular and nilpotent orbits,” *JHEP*, vol. 1204, p. 015, 2012.
- [21] P. Frè, A. Sorin, and M. Trigiante, “Black Hole Nilpotent Orbits and Tits Satake Universality Classes,” *arXiv/hep-th*, 2011. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.5986>.
- [22] P. Fré and A. S. Sorin, “Extremal multicenter black holes: nilpotent orbits and Tits Satake universality classes,” *Journal of High Energy Physics*, vol. 2013, Jan. 2013.
- [23] P. Fré, F. Gargiulo, and K. Rulik, “Cosmic billiards with painted walls in non-maximal supergravities: a worked out example,” *Nuclear Physics B*, vol. 737, no. 1, pp. 1–48, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2005.10.023 [hep-th/0507256].
- [24] M. Rocek, C. Vafa, and S. Vandoren, “Quaternion-kähler spaces, hyperkähler cones, and the c-map,” *arXiv/math.DG*, 2006. <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0603048>.
- [25] P. Candelas, X. C. de la Ossa, P. S. Green, and L. Parkes, “An exactly soluble superconformal theory from a mirror pair of Calabi–Yau manifolds,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. 258B, p. 118, (1991).
- [26] E. Witten, “Mirror symmetry and topological field theory,” in *Essays on mirror manifolds* (S. Y. I. Press, ed.), 1992.
- [27] B. Greene and M. Plesser, “Duality in Calabi–Yau moduli space,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B338, p. 15, (1990).
- [28] P. Candelas, M. Lynker, and R. Schimmrigk, “Calabi–Yau manifolds in weighted P_4 ,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B341, p. 383, (1990).
- [29] P. Berglund and T. Hübsch, “A generalized construction of mirror manifolds,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B393, p. 377, (1993).
- [30] P. Berglund and S. Katz, “Mirror symmetry for hypersurfaces in weighted projective space and topological couplings,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B420, p. 289, (1994).
- [31] P. Berglund, E. Derrick, T. Hübsch, and D. Jancic, “On periods for string compactifications,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B420, p. 268, (1994).
- [32] P. Aspinwall and D. Morrison, “Topological field theories and rational curves,” *Comm. Math. Physics*, vol. 151, p. 245, (1993).
- [33] P. Aspinwall, C. A. Lutken, and G. Ross, “Construction and couplings of mirror manifolds,” vol. 241B, p. 373, (1990).
- [34] P. Aspinwall and C. A. Lutken, “Quantum algebraic geometry of superstring compactifications,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B355, p. 482, (1991).
- [35] S. Hosono, A. Klemm, and S. Theisen, “Lectures on mirror symmetry,” in *Third Baltic Student Seminar*, (1993).
- [36] P. Candelas, X. C. de la Ossa, A. Font, S. Katz, and D. Morrison, “Mirror symmetry for two parameters models,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B416, p. 481, (1994).
- [37] S. Hosono, A. Klemm, S. Theisen, and S. T. Yau, “Mirror symmetry, mirror map and applications to Calabi–Yau hypersurfaces,” *Preprint*, vol. HUTMP-93, p. 0801, (1993).
- [38] F. Englert, “Spontaneous Compactification of Eleven-Dimensional Supergravity,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. 119B, p. 339, 1982.

- [39] P. Fre, “Supersymmetric M2-branes with Englert fluxes, and the simple group $\mathrm{PSL}(2, 7)$,” *Fortsch. Phys.*, vol. 64, no. 6-7, pp. 425–462, 2016.
- [40] B. L. Cerchiai, P. Fré, and M. Trigiante, “The Role of $\mathrm{PSL}(2, 7)$ in M-theory: M2-Branes, Englert Equation and the Septuples,” *Fortsch. Phys.*, vol. 67, no. 5, p. 1900020, 2019.
- [41] B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, “N=8 Supergravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 208, p. 323, 1982.
- [42] F. Cordaro, P. Fre, L. Gualtieri, P. Termonia, and M. Trigiante, “N=8 gaugings revisited: An Exhaustive classification,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 532, pp. 245–279, 1998.
- [43] H. Nicolai and H. Samtleben, “Maximal gauged supergravity in three-dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 86, pp. 1686–1689, 2001.
- [44] B. de Wit, H. Samtleben, and M. Trigiante, “On Lagrangians and gaugings of maximal supergravities,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 655, pp. 93–126, 2003.
- [45] H. Samtleben, “Lectures on Gauged Supergravity and Flux Compactifications,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 25, p. 214002, 2008.
- [46] M. Trigiante, “Gauged Supergravities,” *Phys. Rept.*, vol. 680, pp. 1–175, 2017.
- [47] Becker, K. and Becker, M., “Manifolds with G_2 and $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ holonomy,” in *String Theory and M-Theory : A Modern Introduction*, pp. 433–455, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [48] P. Fre’ and M. Trigiante, “Twisted tori and fluxes: A No go theorem for Lie groups of weak $G(2)$ holonomy,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 751, pp. 343–375, 2006.
- [49] Maximilian Nickel and Douwe Kiela, “Poincaré Embeddings for Learning Hierarchical Representations,” *arXiv*, 2017. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.08039>.
- [50] Maximilian Nickel and Douwe Kiela, “Learning Continuous Hierarchies in the Lorentz Model of Hyperbolic Geometry,” *arXiv*, 2018. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.03417>.
- [51] L.-P. D. B. L. Klimovskaia, A. et al., “Poincaré maps for analyzing complex hierarchies in single-cell data,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 11, no. 2966, 2020. <https://rdcu.be/dR3qZ>.
- [52] J. Aronsson, “Homogeneous vector bundles and G-equivariant convolutional neural networks,” *Sampling Theory, Signal Processing, and Data Analysis*, vol. 20, jul 2022. available on ArXiv at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.05400>.
- [53] T. Cohen, M. Geiger, and M. Weiler, “A General Theory of Equivariant CNNs on Homogeneous Spaces,” *arXiv*, 2018. available on ArXiv at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.02017>.
- [54] T. S. Cohen and M. Welling, “Group equivariant convolutional networks,” *arXiv*, 2016. available on ArXiv at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.07576>.
- [55] M. M. Bronstein, J. Bruna, Y. LeCun, A. Szlam, and P. Vandergheynst, “Geometric deep learning: Going beyond euclidean data,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 34, pp. 18–42, jul 2017. available on ArXiv at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.08097>.
- [56] F. Monti, D. Boscaini, J. Masci, E. Rodolà, J. Svoboda, and M. M. Bronstein, “Geometric deep learning on graphs and manifolds using mixture model cnns,” *arXiv*, 2016. available on ArXiv at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.08402>.

- [57] S. Sommer and A. Bronstein, “Horizontal flows and manifold stochastics in geometric deep learning,” *arXiv*, 2021. available on ArXiv at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.06397>.
- [58] M. M. Bronstein, J. Bruna, T. Cohen, and P. Velichkovich, “Geometric Deep Learning: Grids, Groups, Graphs, Geodesics, and Gauges,” *arXiv*, 2021. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.13478>.
- [59] P. G. Fré, *Advances in Geometry and Lie Algebras from Supergravity*. Theoretical and Mathematical Physics book series, Springer, 2018.
- [60] D. Alekseevsky, “Classification of quaternionic spaces with a transitive solvable group of motions,” *Math. USSR Izvestija*, vol. 9, pp. 297–339, 1975.
- [61] B. de Wit, P. G. Lauwers, R. Philippe, S. Q. Su, and A. Van Proeyen, “Gauge and Matter Fields Coupled to N=2 Supergravity,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. 134B, pp. 37–43, 1984.
- [62] B. de Wit and A. Van Proeyen, “Potentials and Symmetries of General Gauged N=2 Supergravity: Yang-Mills Models,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B245, pp. 89–117, 1984.
- [63] G. Sierra and P. Townsend, “An introduction to N=2 rigid supersymmetry,” *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, pp. 349–430, 1983. Editor B. Milewski, Proceedings published by World Scientific, Singapore.
- [64] S. J. Gates, Jr., “Superspace Formulation of New Nonlinear Sigma Models,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 238, pp. 349–366, 1984.
- [65] P. Fre and P. Soriani, *The N=2 wonderland: From Calabi-Yau manifolds to topological field theories*. Singapore, World Scientific (1995) 468 p, 1995.
- [66] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, “Electric - magnetic duality, monopole condensation, and confinement in N=2 supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 426, pp. 19–52, 1994. [Erratum: Nucl.Phys.B 430, 485–486 (1994)].
- [67] Billó, M and Ceresole, A and D’Auria, R and Ferrara, S and Fré, P and Regge, T and Soriani, P and Proeyen, A Van, “A search for non-perturbative dualities of local N = 2 Yang - Mills theories from Calabi - Yau 3-folds,” *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, vol. 13, pp. 831 – 864, May 1996.
- [68] M. Billó, F. Denef, P. Fré, I. Pesando, W. Troost, A. V. Proeyen, and D. Zanon, “The rigid limit in special Kähler geometry - from - fibrations to special Riemann surfaces: a detailed case study,” *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, vol. 15, pp. 2083 – 2152, Aug. 1998.
- [69] P. Fre, “Lectures on special Kahler geometry and electric - magnetic duality rotations,” *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.*, vol. 45BC, pp. 59–114, 1996.
- [70] B. de Wit, F. Vanderseyen, and A. Van Proeyen, “Symmetry structure of special geometries,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B400, pp. 463–524, 1993.
- [71] B. de Wit and A. Van Proeyen, “Broken sigma model isometries in very special geometry,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. B293, pp. 94–99, 1992.
- [72] B. de Wit and A. Van Proeyen, “Isometries of special manifolds.” 1995.
- [73] V. Cortés, “Alekseevskian spaces,” *Diff. Geom. Appl.*, vol. 6, pp. 129–168, 1996.
- [74] S. Ferrara and S. Sabharwal, “Quaternionic Manifolds for Type II Superstring Vacua of Calabi-Yau Spaces,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B332, pp. 317–332, 1990.

- [75] R. D’Auria, S. Ferrara, and M. Trigiante, “C - map, very special quaternionic geometry and dual Kahler spaces,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. B587, pp. 138–142, 2004.
- [76] P. Fré, A. S. Sorin, and M. Trigiante, “The c -map, Tits Satake subalgebras and the search for $\mathcal{N} = 2$ inflaton potentials,” *Fortsch. Phys.*, vol. 63, pp. 198–258, 2015.
- [77] P. G. Fré, *Discrete, Finite and Lie Groups*. De Gruyter, 2023.
- [78] R. Gilmore, *Lie groups, Lie algebras, and some of their applications*. Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [79] S. Helgason, *Differential geometry and symmetric spaces*. Academic press, 1962.
- [80] A. W. Knap, *Lie groups beyond an introduction*, vol. 140 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [81] M. Henneaux, D. Persson, and P. Spindel, “Spacelike singularities and hidden symmetries of gravity,” *Living Reviews in Relativity*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2008. doi:10.12942/lrr-2008-1 (arXiv:0710.1818 [hep-th]).
- [82] J. Demaret, M. Henneaux, and P. Spindel, “Nonoscillatory behavior in vacuum Kaluza-Klein cosmologies,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. 164B, pp. 27–30, 1985.
- [83] J. Demaret, J. L. Hanquin, M. Henneaux, P. Spindel, and A. Taormina, “The Fate of the Mixmaster Behavior in Vacuum Inhomogeneous Kaluza-Klein Cosmological Models,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. B175, pp. 129–132, 1986.
- [84] J. Demaret, Y. De Rop, and M. Henneaux, “Chaos in Nondiagonal Spatially Homogeneous Cosmological Models in Space-time Dimensions ≤ 10 ,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. B211, pp. 37–41, 1988.
- [85] T. Damour, M. Henneaux, B. Julia, and H. Nicolai, “Hyperbolic Kac-Moody algebras and chaos in Kaluza-Klein models,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. B509, pp. 323–330, 2001.
- [86] T. Damour, S. de Buyl, M. Henneaux, and C. Schomblond, “Einstein billiards and overextensions of finite dimensional simple Lie algebras,” *JHEP*, vol. 08, p. 030, 2002.
- [87] T. Damour, M. Henneaux, and H. Nicolai, “Cosmological billiards,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 20, pp. R145–R200, 2003.
- [88] S. de Buyl, M. Henneaux, B. Julia, and L. Paulot, “Cosmological billiards and oxidation,” *Fortsch. Phys.*, vol. 52, pp. 548–554, 2004. [PoSjhw2003,015(2003)].
- [89] J. Brown, O. J. Ganor, and C. Helfgott, “M theory and E(10): Billiards, branes, and imaginary roots,” *JHEP*, vol. 08, p. 063, 2004.
- [90] F. Englert, M. Henneaux, and L. Houart, “From very-extended to overextended gravity and M-theories,” *JHEP*, vol. 02, p. 070, 2005.
- [91] T. Damour, “Cosmological singularities, Einstein billiards and Lorentzian Kac-Moody algebras,” in *Miami Waves 2004: Conference on Geometric Analysis, Nonlinear Wave Equations and General Relativity Coral Gables, Florida, January 4-10, 2004*, 2005. [J. Hyperbol. Diff. Equat.(2005)].
- [92] T. Damour, “Poincare, relativity, billiards and symmetry,” in *Proceedings, Symposium Henri Poincare, Brussels, Belgium, 8-9 Oct 2004*, p. 149, 2005.
- [93] M. Henneaux and B. Julia, “Hyperbolic billiards of pure $D = 4$ supergravities,” *JHEP*, vol. 05, p. 047, 2003.
- [94] A. Keurentjes, “The Group theory of oxidation,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B658, pp. 303–347, 2003.

- [95] A. Keurentjes, “The Group theory of oxidation 2: Cosets of nonsplit groups,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B658, pp. 348–372, 2003.
- [96] V. Belinsky, I. Khalatnikov, and E. Lifshitz, “Oscillatory approach to a singular point in the relativistic cosmology,” *Adv.Phys.*, vol. 19, pp. 525–573, 1970.
- [97] V. Belinsky, I. Khalatnikov, and E. Lifshitz, “A general solution of the Einstein equations with a time singularity,” *Adv.Phys.*, vol. 31, pp. 639–667, 1982.
- [98] J. K. Erickson, D. H. Wesley, P. J. Steinhardt, and N. Turok, “Kasner and mixmaster behavior in universes with equation of state $w \geq 1$,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D69, 2004.
- [99] P. F. V. Gili, F. Gargiulo, A. Sorin, K. Rulik, and M. Trigiante, “Cosmological backgrounds of superstring theory and Solvable Algebras: Oxidation and Branes,” *Nucl.Phys.*, vol. B685, pp. 3–64, 2004. <https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0309237v2>.
- [100] P. Fré and A. S. Sorin, “Integrability of supergravity billiards and the generalized Toda lattice equation,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B733, pp. 334–355, 2006.
- [101] P. Fré and A. S. Sorin, “The Weyl group and asymptotics: All supergravity billiards have a closed form general integral,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B815, pp. 430–494, 2009.
- [102] J. Bagger and E. Witten, “The Gauge Invariant Supersymmetric Nonlinear Sigma Model,” *Phys. Lett.*, vol. 118B, pp. 103–106, 1982.
- [103] E. Cremmer and A. Van Proeyen, “Classification of Kahler Manifolds in $N = 2$ Vector Multiplet Supergravity Couplings,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 2, p. 445, 1985.
- [104] Pietro Giuseppe Fré, *Discrete, Finite and Lie Groups*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2023.
- [105] Pietro Giuseppe Fré, “Mathematica Codes for Discrete, Finite and Lie Groups,” Download the codes from the site: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111201535>.
- [106] W. Chemissany, J. Rosseel, M. Trigiante, and T. Van Riet, “The Full integration of black hole solutions to symmetric supergravity theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 830, pp. 391–413, 2010.
- [107] P. Fré and A. Sorin, “Integrability of supergravity billiards and the generalized toda lattice equations,” *Nuclear Physics B*. <https://doi.org/10.1016>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0510156>.
- [108] P. Fré and A. S. Sorin, “The Weyl group and asymptotics: All supergravity billiards have a closed form general integral,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B815, pp. 430–494, 2009.
- [109] P. Fré and A. S. Sorin, “Supergravity black holes and billiards and the Liouville integrable structure associated with Borel algebras,” *Journal of High Energy Physics*, vol. 2010, no. 3. <https://arxiv.org/abs/0903.2559v3>.
- [110] Y. Kodama and J. Ye, “Toda hierarchy with indefinite metric,” *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, vol. 91, no. 4, pp. 321–339, 1995. <https://arxiv.org/abs/solv-int/9505004>.
- [111] P. Fré, F. Milanesio, G. Sanguinetti, M. Santoro, and M. Trigiante, “From the $\Delta_{8,3,2}^+$ and other tilings of Poincaré Plane to Harmonic analysis on U/H manifolds for PGTS Neural Networks,” *ArXiv to appear*, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/xxxx.yyyyyy>.
- [112] P. Fré, F. Milanesio, M. Santoro, and G. Sanguinetti, “Geometrically consistent Hyperbolic Deep Learning,” *ArXiv to appear*, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/xxxx.yyyyyy>.

- [113] P. Fré, A. S. Sorin, and M. Trigiante, “Black hole nilpotent orbits and Tits Satake universality classes,” 2011.
- [114] L. Castellani, R. D’Auria, and P. Fré, *Supergravity and superstrings: A Geometric perspective. Vol. 1,2,3. pages 2162*. Singapore: World Scientific, 1991.