

Gauge Symmetries, Contact Reduction, and Singular Field Theories

Callum Bell* and David Sloan†

Department of Physics, Lancaster University, Lancaster UK

The reduction of dynamical systems which are invariant under changes of global scale is well-understood, for classical theories of particles, and fields. The excision of the superfluous degree of freedom describing such a scale leads to a dynamically-equivalent theory, which is frictional in nature. In this article, we extend the formalism to physical models, of both particles and fields, described by singular Lagrangians. Our treatment of classical field theory is based on the manifestly covariant Hamilton De-Donder Weyl formalism, in which the Lagrangian density is introduced as a bundle morphism on the pre-multisymplectic velocity phase space J^1E . The results obtained are subsequently applied to a number of physically-motivated examples, as well as a discussion presented on the implications of our work for classical General Relativity.

I. INTRODUCTION

Singular field theories are, in many cases, amongst the most interesting class of models encountered in the description of natural phenomena [1–3]. Indeed, the most precisely tested mathematical theory to date, the Standard Model of Particle Physics, is a chiral quantum field theory, gauged under local transformations of the group $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ [4–6]. Further, it is postulated that any UV-complete theory of quantum gravity may possess no global symmetries, and that all symmetries must therefore be either spontaneously broken, or gauged [7–9]. It is thus clear that singular theories are of central importance to the advancement of modern theoretical physics.

Any attempt to rigorously develop a quantum theory requires a firm understanding of the classical counterpart upon which it is based. As such, in this article, we shall present a framework in which singular theories that possess scaling symmetries may be reduced to a lower-dimensional, dynamically-equivalent description, that is frictional in nature [10]. For theories of particles, we take, as our starting point, the geometrical constraint algorithm for pre-symplectic systems, developed by Nester *et. al.* in [11–13]. This is presented in section (III A), following a brief review of elementary pre-symplectic geometry in section (II).

Having introduced this preliminary contextual framework, we provide an overview of contact and pre-contact geometry, and how this is used to describe the dynamical evolution of non-conservative systems. Section (VI) is then dedicated to the constraint algorithm for pre-contact Hamiltonian systems, which closely mirrors our presentation of the pre-symplectic constraint procedure.

Following this, we illustrate how the formalism of contact reduction, described in [14] and [15], may be extended to cases in which degeneracies require constraints to be placed upon the dynamical system of interest. We also consider the commutative relationship between excising redundant scaling degrees of freedom, and the restriction of a system's phase space, finding that the order of operations is inconsequential for the final dynamics. Our formalism is then applied to a complete example, in which the symmetry-reduced description is deduced in each of the two possible orders. We have structured things in such a way so as to allow the reader familiar with constrained geometrical mechanics to omit sections (II) - (VI).

A finite-dimensional, manifestly covariant description of classical field theory is best formulated on fibred manifolds, within the context of multisymplectic geometry [16–20]. A constraint algorithm for treating singular field theories has been developed precisely in [21] and [22], and implemented in a number of interesting cases in [23] and [24]. Following a succinct review of multisymplectic geometry, and its implementation in the Lagrangian description of classical field theory, we dedicate section (X) to a discussion of non-conservative

* c.bell8@lancaster.ac.uk

† d.sloan@lancaster.ac.uk

systems; action-dependent field theories are significantly less well-understood than their multisymplectic counterparts [25, 26]; however, due to their capacity for describing dissipative phenomena, such models have recently been the focus of heightened research interest. The study of non-conservative field theories is grounded in a rigorous mathematical framework, known as multicontact geometry [27, 28]; in [29], it was demonstrated that contact reduction may be extended to a field-theoretic context, and that the resulting reduced space is in fact a multicontact manifold. Drawing upon the formalism developed in this work, the latter part of the present article provides a generalisation of these ideas, applicable to singular field theories.

Finally, in a similar spirit to our treatment of the particle case, we conclude with a second complete example, in which we analyse a string-inspired, low-energy effective non-Abelian gauge theory [30, 31]; such a model is of particular interest, as it is found that the redundant degree of freedom coincides precisely with the dilaton field, the excision of which is, a priori, alarming, since it is generally known that the expectation value of this field sets the strength of the string coupling [32, 33].

The ideas developed over the course of the article constitute a foundational framework, within which to analyse singular (field) theories from a systematic perspective; it has recently been shown that the classical Einstein-Hilbert action possesses a redundant scaling degree of freedom, which is made manifest upon decomposing the spacetime metric into the product of a conformal factor and a symmetric rank-two tensor of fixed determinant [34]. Further comments on the application of our work to General Relativity, together with a number of open questions, and lines of future investigation, are presented in section (XIII).

II. GEOMETRICAL PRELIMINARIES

Suppose that Q is an n -dimensional smooth manifold, corresponding to the configuration space of some mechanical system. Local coordinates on Q are taken to be q^i , and we introduce a Lagrangian function $L : TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the tangent bundle [35–37]. Fibre coordinates of TQ are denoted v^i , and we have the bundle projection $\pi : TQ \rightarrow Q$. The tangent bundle is endowed with a number of canonical geometrical features, including the vertical endomorphism $J : T(TQ) \rightarrow T(TQ)$, satisfying $J^2 = 0$, and $\text{rank } J = n$, which constitutes an almost-tangent structure on TQ [38, 39]. Additionally, we have a distinguished Liouville vector field $\Delta \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(TQ)$, defined such that its one-parameter family of transformations generates dilatations of the fibres of TQ . In local bundle coordinates (q^i, v^i) , we have

$$J = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \otimes dq^i \quad \Delta = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \quad (2.1)$$

Given a Lagrangian function L , the canonical structures J and Δ are used to define a (pre-)symplectic Lagrangian system. In particular, the function $E_L := \Delta(L) - L$ corresponds to the scalar energy of the mechanical system described by L , whilst $\theta_L := {}^t J \circ dL$ is used to construct, the Poincaré-Cartan form $\omega_L := -d\theta_L$. Clearly, ω_L is closed; non-degeneracy, on the other hand, is not assured, and throughout subsequent sections, we shall be interested in those systems for which ω_L is degenerate. In such cases, we refer to the triple (TQ, ω_L, E_L) as a pre-symplectic Lagrangian system [40], and from (2.1) it follows that

$$E_L = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i} v^i - L \quad \omega_L = -d \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i} dq^i \right) \quad (2.2)$$

The degeneracy of the 2-form ω_L may be expressed as the requirement that the matrix of second derivatives

$$W_{ij} := \left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v^i \partial v^j} \right)$$

be of non-maximal rank, and thus singular. The equations of motion for a Lagrangian system (TQ, ω_L, E_L) are formulated geometrically via the following vector bundle morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \flat_L : T(TQ) &\longrightarrow T^*(TQ) \\ X &\longmapsto \iota_X \omega_L \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

It should be noted that when ω_L is degenerate, \flat_L is *not* an isomorphism. The dynamics are deduced seeking a vector field $X_L \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(TQ)$, such that

$$\flat_L(X_L) = \iota_{X_L}\omega_L = dE_L \quad (2.4)$$

When (TQ, ω_L, E_L) is a symplectic system, such vector fields are guaranteed to exist, and are unique. In addition, integral curves of X_L project down to curves on the configuration space Q , and these latter curves correspond to physical trajectories of the mechanical system. Such vector fields are interchangeably referred to as *holonomic* or *second-order differential equations* (SODE) [41].

When the system of interest possesses a singular Lagrangian, not only are vector field solutions of (2.4) not guaranteed to exist, but since $\ker \omega_L$ is non-trivial, any solution that is found is no longer unique [40]. In the most favourable of cases, there will exist a submanifold $P_f \hookrightarrow TQ$, upon which (2.4) admits solutions, and this space is deduced through use of a geometrical constraint algorithm [12, 13].

For the purposes of studying the contact reduction of singular systems, we shall work almost exclusively within the Hamiltonian formalism. Our motivation for this is twofold: on the one hand, the Hamiltonian framework provides a well-defined bracket structure, which readily allows us to classify the constraint functions, and deduce the dynamical evolution of any phase space variable. Further, not only does the Lagrangian formalism lack such a bracket, but the geometrical constraint algorithm introduces a myriad of additional complications, which arise owing to a need to impose that, at each step, the vector field solution satisfy the second-order problem. Since the dynamical content of the two formalisms is identical, we shall evade the undesirable features of the Lagrangian description by using it only as a means to obtain the corresponding Hamiltonian function.

For pre-symplectic Lagrangian systems, the Legendre map $FL : TQ \rightarrow T^*Q$ is not a diffeomorphism [42]; in practice, this translates into the more intuitive statement that one cannot ‘invert’ the momenta to solve for the v^i , and write down a Hamiltonian in a straightforward fashion. If we wish to consider symmetry reductions of singular theories, it will be necessary to restrict our attention to those cases in which the Lagrangian is *almost-regular*; such systems are characterised as follows

- ★ $M_0 := FL(TQ)$ is a closed submanifold of T^*Q
- ★ FL is a submersion onto its image
- ★ For every $p \in M_0$, the fibres $FL^{-1}(p)$ are connected submanifolds of TQ

Given an almost-regular Lagrangian system (TQ, ω_L, E_L) , we denote the restriction of the Legendre map to its image via FL_0 ; since this is a submersion, it follows that there exists a *unique* function $H_0 : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $FL_0^*H_0 = E_L$. On the cotangent bundle, there exists a canonical symplectic form ω , expressed in local Darboux coordinates as $\omega = dq^i \wedge dp_i$; if $j_0 : M_0 \hookrightarrow T^*Q$ denotes the inclusion map, then M_0 inherits a pre-symplectic form $\omega_0 := j_0^*\omega$. We shall refer to the triple (M_0, ω_0, H_0) as a pre-symplectic Hamiltonian system, defined on the primary constraint manifold M_0 .

In order to formulate the dynamical problem, the vector bundle morphism $\flat : T(T^*Q) \rightarrow T^*(T^*Q)$ is restricted to M_0 , and the resulting map denoted \flat_0 . We then seek a vector field X_H , such that

$$\flat_0(X_H) = \iota_{X_H}\omega_0 = dH_0 \quad (2.5)$$

As in the Lagrangian case, solutions generally do not exist on the entirety of M_0 , thereby necessitating the implementation of a constraint algorithm, which is described in detail in section (III A). The final constraint manifold M_f is then the maximal subspace of the cotangent bundle upon which the dynamical problem (2.5) possesses well-defined (albeit non-unique) solutions.

III. THE PRE-SYMPLECTIC CONSTRAINT ALGORITHM

Before reviewing how one uses geometrical principles to systematically restrict the phase space of a singular system, we begin by establishing a number of notational conventions used throughout. Firstly, we denote by

$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the natural pairing between a vector space and its dual, writing $\langle dH_0, TM_0 \rangle$ to refer to the contraction of a particular object, such as $dH_0 \in T^*M_0$, with all elements of the space TM_0 .

In general, a (pre-)symplectic form ω on a manifold M allows us to introduce a notion of orthogonality; in particular, for any subspace $N \subset M$, we define the symplectic orthogonal (or symplectic complement) of TN , denoted TN^\perp , as follows

$$TN^\perp := \{X \in TM|_N \mid \omega|_N(X, Y) = 0 \text{ for all } Y \in TN\} \quad (3.1)$$

In addition to the symplectic orthogonal, we also introduce the annihilator of a subspace $S \subset TM$ as

$$S^o := \{\alpha \in T^*M \mid \langle \alpha, v \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } v \in S\} \quad (3.2)$$

The manifold M is said to be reflexive if $(M^*)^* = M$, and topologically closed if $\flat : TM \rightarrow T^*M$ maps closed sets of TM onto closed sets of T^*M [11]; for this class of space, we find that, for a submanifold N of M , the annihilator of the symplectic orthogonal of TN is precisely the image of TN under \flat : that is to say $(TN^\perp)^o = \flat(TN)$.

A. The Hamiltonian Algorithm

When analysing the dynamics of singular systems, we shall use the almost-regular Lagrangian $L : TQ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to obtain the pre-symplectic Hamiltonian system (M_0, ω_0, H_0) , introducing the embedding $j_0 : M_0 \hookrightarrow T^*Q$. It will often be convenient to describe M_0 as the zero-set of a collection of primary constraint functions $\{\phi^a\}$, with $a = 1, \dots, n - k$, in which $n = \dim Q$, and $k = \text{rank } W_{ij}$ [43]. We shall assume throughout that all subspaces generated are regular, closed submanifolds of T^*Q , whose natural injections are embeddings. We therefore begin by seeking a vector field X_H which satisfies

$$\flat_0(X_H) = \iota_{X_H}\omega_0 = dH_0 \quad (3.3)$$

Since ω_0 is pre-symplectic, \flat_0 is not an isomorphism; consequently, an initial prerequisite for our geometrical equation to possess solutions is that, at every point, dH_0 must lie in the range of the map \flat_0 . Given that such a condition is not guaranteed to be satisfied a priori, the first step of the constraint algorithm requires us to restrict M_0 to the following subset

$$M_1 := \{x \in M_0 \mid (dH_0)_x \in \flat_0(T_x M_0)\} \quad (3.4)$$

From the discussion above, under the assumptions of reflexivity and topological closedness, we recall that the image $\flat_0(T_x M_0)$ coincides with the annihilator of $T_x M_0^\perp$; this is particularly noteworthy, as $T_x M_0^\perp$ is precisely $\ker(\omega_0)_x$, which is readily deduced in local coordinates. Thus, from a pragmatic standpoint, it is preferable to characterise M_1 as follows

$$M_1 = \{x \in M_0 \mid \langle (dH_0)_x, \ker(\omega_0)_x \rangle = 0\} \quad (3.5)$$

If $\{X^A\}$ constitutes a basis of $\ker \omega_0$, then M_1 may be described locally as the zero-set of the functions

$$\psi^A := \langle dH_0, X^A \rangle \quad (3.6)$$

We refer to these objects as the secondary constraint functions. In order for any vector field solution X_H , defined over the points of M_1 , to be physically meaningful, it must remain *tangent* to M_1 . If this were not the case, the solution would tend to evolve off the constraint surface, and thus cease to obey the restrictions placed upon the system. Tangency of the solution is not guaranteed, and so must be imposed as an additional constraint, leading us to consider only those points of M_1 at which the solution may be written as $X_H = j_{1*}Z$ for some $Z \in TM_1$; generally, $j_k : M_k \hookrightarrow M_{k-1}$ is used to refer to the inclusion of M_k . The condition $X_H = j_{1*}Z$ is not readily imposed locally, and so we shall use the following alternative criterion to characterise M_2

$$M_2 := \{x \in M_1 \mid \langle (dH_0)_x, T_x M_1^\perp \rangle = 0\} \quad (3.7)$$

That this provides an equivalent definition to that given by imposing $X_H = j_{1*}Z$ follows from a series of simple calculations, outlined in [11]. Vector field solutions on M_2 are now tangent to M_1 , but, in general, not to M_2 , requiring this condition to be imposed as a further restriction. It is then clear from (3.4) and (3.7) how the algorithm must proceed: at the k^{th} step, the submanifold M_k is composed of all points of M_{k-1} at which the solution is tangent to M_{k-1} , but not necessarily to M_k , leading us to restrict M_k to the smaller set M_{k+1} . This condition may be imposed requiring that $X_H = j_{k*}Z$ for some $Z \in TM_k$, or equivalently, by demanding that dH_0 belong to the annihilator $(TM_k^\perp)^o$, so that

$$M_{k+1} = \{x \in M_k \mid \langle (dH_0)_x, T_x M_k^\perp \rangle = 0\} \quad (3.8)$$

The constraint procedure may terminate in one of three ways. Firstly, there may be some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, for which $M_N = \emptyset$; in this case, the equation of motion (3.3) possesses no solution and the system (M_0, ω_0, H_0) does not describe any physical configuration. Alternatively, the algorithm may yield a submanifold M_N , which is non-empty, but of dimension zero; such a space may be identified as a collection of isolated points, which forces the vector field solution to be identically zero. Evidently, neither of these eventualities is particularly interesting from a physical perspective. Consequently, we shall only consider those systems for which there exists some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $M_{N+1} = M_N$, with $\dim M_N \neq 0$. Upon deducing the value of N for which the algorithm terminates, we shall declare $M_f := M_N$ to be the final constraint manifold.

B. Geometry of the Final Constraint Submanifold

The algorithm of the previous section provides a systematic way to restrict the set of points of the cotangent bundle at which the equations of motion of a singular system admit everywhere-tangent solutions. At no point was it necessary to specify the nature of the constraints defining each subspace; once the final submanifold has been found, however, the dynamical evolution of observable quantities is deduced *locally*, which *does* require the distinction between first and second class constraints to be made.

Suppose that the constraint surface M_f is defined as the zero-set of the functions ϕ^α , with $\alpha = 1, \dots, D$. We introduce the matrix J , whose entries are the Poisson brackets of the constraints *i.e.* $J^{\alpha\beta} := \{\phi^\alpha, \phi^\beta\}$. If $\text{rank } J = D - F$, it follows that there exist F C^∞ -linear combinations of the ϕ^α which generate unobservable (gauge) transformations.¹ The goal is then to identify such combinations, corresponding to first class functions, and to modify the original set of constraints, so as to extract a maximal subfamily of second class functions. Note that, since J is calculated from the Poisson bracket, it follows that $\text{rank } \omega_f = D - F$, in which $\omega_f := \iota^* \omega$ is the closed 2-form naturally inherited by M_f , and $\iota := j_f \circ \dots \circ j_0$ defines the embedding of M_f into T^*Q .

In order to extract the first class functions, we introduce a ‘vector’ $v_\alpha = (v_1, \dots, v_D)$, and demand that

$$(v_\alpha J^{\alpha\beta})|_{M_f} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \beta = 1, \dots, D \quad (3.9)$$

It is sufficient to seek these null vectors on the constraint manifold, since a function f is only required to have weakly-vanishing Poisson bracket with the ϕ^α , to be characterised as first class. Having identified all linearly independent combinations satisfying (3.9), indexing the resulting vectors via $v^{(a)}$, the a^{th} first class constraint is simply $\Omega^a := v_\alpha^{(a)} \phi^\alpha$. In order to extract the maximal subfamily of second class constraints, we seek $D - F$ linearly independent vectors $w^{(j)}$, which are *not* in the kernel of J , so that

$$\underbrace{\Omega^a = v_\alpha^{(a)} \phi^\alpha}_{1^{\text{st}} \text{ class}} \quad \underbrace{\chi^j = w_\alpha^{(j)} \phi^\alpha}_{2^{\text{nd}} \text{ class}}$$

The constraint surface M_f may now be characterised as

$$M_f = \{x \in T^*Q \mid \Omega^a(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } a = 1, \dots, F \quad \text{and} \quad \chi^j(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, D - F\} \quad (3.10)$$

¹ Here, and throughout all subsequent analyses, we take the Dirac conjecture - that *all* first class constraints generate gauge transformations - to be true [44–46].

In the presence of second class functions, it is necessary to replace the usual Poisson bracket with the Dirac structure $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_D$ [44, 47]; we introduce the matrix $C^{ij} := \{\chi^i, \chi^j\}$, which, by construction, is of maximal rank $D - F$, and thus non-singular. If C_{ij} are the elements of the inverse C^{-1} , the Dirac bracket of two phase space functions $f, g \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$ is given by

$$\{f, g\}_D := \{f, g\} - \{f, \chi^i\} C_{ij} \{\chi^j, g\} \quad (3.11)$$

The Dirac bracket has a number of noteworthy properties:

- $\{f, gh\}_D = \{f, g\}_D h + g \{f, h\}_D$ for all $f, g, h \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$
- $\{f, \chi^j\}_D = 0$ for any $f \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$
- $\{f, g\}_D \approx \{f, g\}$ for f first class and g arbitrary

We now impose the second class constraints $\chi^j = 0$ as *strong equalities*, which defines a hypersurface

$$M_\chi := \{x \in T^*Q \mid \chi^j(x) = 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, D - F\} \subset T^*Q \quad (3.12)$$

with inclusion $j_\chi : M_\chi \hookrightarrow T^*Q$, which inherits a closed 2-form $\omega_\chi := j_\chi^* \omega$ which is *symplectic*. The Dirac bracket is precisely the algebraic structure required to ‘transfer’ this symplectic structure to functions defined on the whole of T^*Q . In particular, the dynamical evolution of any phase space function $f \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$ may be deduced from $\dot{f} = \{f, H_T\}_D$, in which $H_T := H + \lambda_a \Omega^a$ is the total Hamiltonian; λ^a are arbitrary Lagrange multipliers, and H is any extension of H_0 to the full phase space.

Within M_χ , we consider the first class surface

$$M_\Omega := \{x \in M_\chi \mid \Omega^a(x) = 0 \text{ for } a = 1, \dots, F\} \quad (3.13)$$

M_Ω is an embedded submanifold of M_χ , with inclusion $j_\Omega : M_\Omega \hookrightarrow M_\chi$; the 2-form $\omega_\Omega := j_\Omega^* \omega_\chi$ is maximally degenerate, since M_Ω is first class. It is straightforward to show that the Hamiltonian vector fields X_a corresponding to Ω^a via $\iota_{X_a} \omega_\chi = d\Omega^a$ are tangent to M_Ω , since

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_a} \Omega^b = d\Omega^b[X_a] = \omega_\chi(X_b, X_a) = \{\Omega^b, \Omega^a\} \approx 0$$

Here, the weak equality is taken to signify ‘when restricted to M_Ω .’ In general, a vector field $\xi \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(T^*Q)$ may only be tangent to M_Ω if $\mathcal{L}_\xi \Omega^a \approx 0$ for all Ω^a : that is if $\xi \in \ker \omega_\Omega$; since the first class constraints are assumed to be independent (by which we mean that their differentials are linearly independent) it follows that $\ker \omega_\Omega$ is spanned by the Hamiltonian vector fields X_a .

More formally, at each point $x \in M_\Omega$, the symplectic orthogonal

$$T_x M_\Omega^\perp := \{v \in T_x M_\chi \mid \omega_\chi(v, w) = 0 \text{ for all } w \in T_x M_\Omega\}$$

satisfies $T_x M_\Omega^\perp \subseteq T_x M_\Omega$, and so M_Ω constitutes a coisotropic submanifold of M_χ [48]; for such a class of space, the distribution $x \mapsto T_x M_\Omega^\perp$ is involutive, since, for any two $X, Y \in T_x M_\Omega^\perp$, we take some $Z \in T_x M_\Omega$, and compute

$$d\omega_\chi(X, Y, Z) = X\omega_\chi(Y, Z) - Y\omega_\chi(Z, X) + Z\omega_\chi(X, Y) - \omega_\chi([X, Y], Z) + \omega_\chi([X, Z], Y) - \omega_\chi([Y, Z], X)$$

Since ω_χ is closed, $d\omega_\chi(X, Y, Z) = 0$; moreover, X and Y were taken to be in the symplectic orthogonal $T_x M_\Omega^\perp$, so that the first three terms on the right-hand side vanish. Similar considerations lead us to conclude that

$$d\omega_\chi(X, Y, Z) = -\omega_\chi([X, Y], Z) = 0$$

so that if $X, Y \in T_x M_\Omega^\perp$, then $[X, Y] \in T_x M_\Omega^\perp$. Hence, $x \mapsto T_x M_\Omega^\perp$ is an involutive distribution, which, locally, we may write as the span of the X_a [49]: that is to say

$$T_x M_\Omega^\perp = \text{span}(X_1|_x, \dots, X_F|_x) \subseteq T_x M_\Omega$$

Since the Hamiltonian vector fields of the first class constraints define an involutive distribution, we know, from the Frobenius theorem, that there exists a foliation \mathcal{F} of M_Ω into F -dimensional submanifolds, which, in this context, we refer to as gauge leaves [50, 51]. The gauge orbits correspond to integral curves of the X_a , and they map points of M_Ω into other points, which produce dynamically indistinguishable configurations. Note that these results are valid only on M_Ω : elsewhere, the vector fields X_a do not, in general, close under the Lie bracket.

As a result of the degeneracy of ω_Ω , the constraint surface does not inherit a well-defined bracket structure. It is therefore necessary to construct a reduced space, quotienting out by the gauge orbits; this reduced phase space identifies all points related by gauge transformations, and thus contains only configurations which are physically inequivalent. Upon constructing this space, there arise two distinct possibilities: in the most favourable of cases, the algebra formed by the first class constraints is a genuine Lie algebra; this occurs precisely when the structure functions f_c^{ab} , appearing in $\{\Omega^a, \Omega^b\} = f_c^{ab}\Omega^c$, are constant over the whole of M_Ω . In these conditions, the finite gauge transformations are generated by the elements of the corresponding Lie group G that are path-connected to the identity,² and they give rise to a smooth action of G on M_Ω . It is then possible to perform a reduction procedure, using results similar to those of the Marsden-Weinstein theorem [52, 53], to obtain a phase space M_Ω/G , which is symplectic [54, 55].

In most cases, such conditions will not be realised; it is often found that the Dirac bracket between two first class constraints is strongly equal to some combination of the phase space variables which vanishes on M_Ω . The structure functions are then of the form $f_c^{ab}(q^i, p_i)$, and they define a Lie algebroid on M_Ω [56]. Formally, it is again possible to quotient out by the gauge orbits, obtaining a physical phase space that is symplectic; however it is almost invariably more straightforward to introduce a choice of gauge-fixing. Since we are only concerned with the dynamical evolution of gauge-invariant observable quantities, the precise choice of gauge-fixing is somewhat arbitrary, provided that the gauge is obtainable via a finite number of infinitesimal transformations, and that it fixes all degrees of freedom, leaving no remnant gauge symmetry [57, 58].

Upon carrying out the pre-symplectic reduction process, we obtain a physical state space \mathcal{P} , together with a projection map $\pi : M_\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, sending each point on the constraint surface to its equivalence class under gauge orbits. The reduced phase space \mathcal{P} is symplectic, with associated 2-form $\pi^*\omega_{\mathcal{P}} = j^*\omega$, where $j := j_\chi \circ j_\Omega : M_\Omega \rightarrow T^*Q$ defines the embedding of M_Ω into T^*Q .

IV. CONTACT GEOMETRY

In order to examine the commutative relationship between contact reduction by scaling symmetries, and the restriction of the phase space of mechanical systems described by singular Lagrangians, it will be necessary to understand how the geometric algorithm we have presented for pre-symplectic manifolds is to be adapted to the pre-contact spaces, which naturally arise upon eliminating a scaling degree of freedom [10, 14, 15]. In anticipation of this, we shall briefly introduce the fundamental ideas of contact and pre-contact geometry [59, 60], together with their implementation in the description of Lagrangian and Hamiltonian systems [61–63].

A. Contact Manifolds

A contact structure on a smooth manifold C , of dimension $2n+1$, is a maximally-non-integrable distribution $\xi \subset TC$; locally, this distribution may be described as the kernel of some $\eta \in \Omega^1(U \subset C)$, referred to as a contact form. If the quotient line bundle $TC/\xi \rightarrow C$ is trivial, then ξ is coorientable, and η may be extended to the whole of C [64]. The non-integrability condition of ξ may be expressed as the requirement that

$$\eta \wedge d\eta^n \neq 0 \quad (4.1)$$

² This lifting of the elements of the Lie algebra to the group is, of course, provided by the exponential map.

over the whole of C . The coorientability of ξ implies that C itself is orientable; in this case, $\eta \wedge d\eta^n$ provides a volume form on C , and since, in general, ξ is of rank $2n$, at each point $p \in C$, we have the decomposition

$$T_p C = \ker \eta_p \oplus \ker d\eta_p$$

and $d\eta_p$ defines a skew-symmetric, non-degenerate, bilinear form of maximal rank on the $2n$ -dimensional subspace ξ_p . We henceforth assume that ξ is coorientable, and work with the globally-defined form η ; every contact manifold (C, η) admits a distinguished *Reeb* vector field $\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(C)$, defined via

$$\iota_{\mathcal{R}} d\eta = 0 \quad \quad \iota_{\mathcal{R}} \eta = 1 \quad (4.2)$$

As for symplectic manifolds, around each point $p \in C$, we may always find a local chart of Darboux coordinates $(x^1, \dots, x^n, y_1, \dots, y_n, z)$, in which η takes the form $\eta = dz - y_i dx^i$.

B. Lagrangian Mechanics

Consider the n -dimensional configuration space Q , with local coordinates (q^i) ; the extended tangent bundle $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ is a manifold of dimension $2n + 1$, with induced bundle coordinates (q^i, v^i, z) . The canonical structures of TQ are easily extended to $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ [62], and have local coordinate expression (2.1). A contact Lagrangian is a function $L : TQ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which allows us to define the Cartan forms θ_L and ω_L , together with the energy function E_L . The space $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$ is made into a contact manifold upon introducing the 1-form $\eta_L := dz - \theta_L$, and we refer to the triple $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_L, E_L)$ as a contact Lagrangian system.

C. The Legendre Map

Whilst contact Lagrangian systems are introduced on the space $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$, their Hamiltonian counterparts are studied on the extended cotangent bundle $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$, which admits the following projections

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 : T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow Q \times \mathbb{R} & \pi_1 : T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow T^*Q \\ \rho : T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

The Legendre map $FL : TQ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ acts on the local bundle coordinates (q^i, p_i, z) of $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ according to

$$FL^* q^i = q^i \quad \quad FL^* p_i = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v^i} \quad \quad FL^* z = z \quad (4.4)$$

The extended cotangent bundle inherits a contact structure, defined in terms of the canonical structures of T^*Q ; in particular, if $\vartheta \in \Omega^1(T^*Q)$ and $\Omega = -d\vartheta \in \Omega^2(T^*Q)$ denote the Liouville 1- and 2-forms on the cotangent bundle, then we have

$$\theta = \pi_1^* \vartheta \quad \quad \text{and} \quad \quad \omega = -d\theta = \pi_1^* \Omega \quad (4.5)$$

The Legendre map relates these forms with θ_L and ω_L in the obvious manner

$$FL^* \theta = \theta_L \quad \quad \text{and} \quad \quad FL^* \omega = \omega_L \quad (4.6)$$

The contact 1-form η is then $\eta = dz - \theta$, and the Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} follows from (4.2); in local coordinates, we have

$$\theta = p_i dq^i \quad \quad \omega = dq^i \wedge dp_i \quad \quad \eta = dz - p_i dq^i \quad \quad \mathcal{R} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \quad (4.7)$$

In complete analogy to the symplectic case, the Legendre map provides a set of criteria, according to which we may classify a given contact Lagrangian system; in particular, we shall restrict ourselves to those singular systems which are categorised as ‘almost regular.’

D. Hamiltonian Formalism

If $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_L, E_L)$ is a hyperregular contact Lagrangian system, we introduce the Hamiltonian as the unique function $H : T^*Q \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $FL^*H = E_L$. The triple $(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}, \eta, H)$ is then said to constitute a contact Hamiltonian system, and there exists a bundle morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{b} : T(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}) &\longrightarrow T^*(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}) \\ v &\longmapsto \iota_v d\eta + (\iota_v \eta)\eta \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

The equations of motion are deduced seeking a vector field $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$, which satisfies

$$\bar{b}(X_H) = dH - (\mathcal{R}(H) + H)\eta \quad (4.9)$$

Suppose that we decompose the vector field X_H as

$$X_H = A^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} + B_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} + C \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \quad (4.10)$$

then the coefficient functions A^i , B_i , and C satisfy

$$A^i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} \quad B_i = - \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i} + p_i \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \right) \quad C = p_i \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} - H \quad (4.11)$$

V. PRE-CONTACT SYSTEMS

All results presented thus far are applicable to regular and hyperregular systems; however, the main objective of this work is to present a mathematical framework within which to analyse scaling symmetries in singular theories. Consequently, we shall dedicate the following sections to developing a number of tools required to treat such systems.

A. Jacobi Structures

Both symplectic and contact manifolds belong to a broader class of object known as Jacobi manifolds [65–67]; in general, a Jacobi manifold is a triple (M, Λ, E) , in which $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{X}^2(M)$ is a multivector field of degree two, and $E \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(M)$ is a vector field; together, these objects satisfy [60]

$$[\Lambda, \Lambda] = 2E \wedge \Lambda \quad \mathcal{L}_E \Lambda = [E, \Lambda] = 0 \quad (5.1)$$

in which $[\cdot, \cdot]$ denotes the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket [68–72]. Given a Jacobi manifold (M, Λ, E) , the bivector field Λ allows us to introduce a bundle morphism³

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp_\Lambda : T^*M &\longrightarrow TM \\ \xi &\longmapsto \Lambda(\cdot, \xi) \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

To every function $f \in C^\infty(M)$, there corresponds a Hamiltonian vector field $X_f \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(M)$, given by

$$X_f := \sharp_\Lambda(df) - fE \quad (5.3)$$

Finally, we define the Jacobi bracket between two functions $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \{\cdot, \cdot\}_J : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) &\longrightarrow C^\infty(M) \\ (f, g) &\longmapsto \{f, g\}_J := \Lambda(df, dg) + fE(g) - gE(f) \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

³ It should be noted that our conventions differ to those of [60] and [73]; this is primarily owing to our desire to recover a Poisson bracket that is in-line with conventions used throughout the physics literature.

The pair $(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\}_J)$ then constitutes a Lie algebra, satisfying a weaker form of the Leibnitz rule

$$\{f, gh\}_J = h\{f, g\}_J + g\{f, h\}_J + ghE(f) \quad (5.5)$$

with $f, g, h \in C^\infty(M)$. The evolution of an observable $f \in C^\infty(M)$ along the Hamiltonian flow is given by

$$\dot{f} = X_H(f) = df[X_H] = \{f, H\}_J - fE(H) \quad (5.6)$$

For a contact manifold (M, η) , the vector field E is simply \mathcal{R} , and Λ is given locally by

$$\Lambda = \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} + p_i \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \quad (5.7)$$

We also have $\dot{f} = X_H(f) = \{f, H\}_J - f\mathcal{R}(H)$, with the following expression for the Jacobi bracket

$$\{f, g\}_J = \frac{\partial f}{\partial q^i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial q^i} + \left(p_i \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_i} - g \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} - \left(p_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_i} - f \right) \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \quad (5.8)$$

B. Pre-contact Manifolds

The final piece of mathematical background required to introduce the constraint algorithm is that of pre-contact manifolds [62, 74]; suppose that (M, η) is a $(2n+1)$ -dimensional manifold, equipped with a 1-form η , such that the distribution

$$\mathcal{C} := \ker \eta \cap \ker d\eta \subseteq TM \quad (5.9)$$

is of rank $2n+1-p$; in this case, we refer to \mathcal{C} as the characteristic distribution, and say that η is of class p . In general, if η is of class $2k+1$, then we have

$$\eta \wedge d\eta^k \neq 0 \quad \text{but} \quad \eta \wedge d\eta^{k+1} = 0 \quad (5.10)$$

In addition, around each point $p \in M$, there exist local coordinates $(x_1, \dots, x_k, y^1, \dots, y^k, z, w_1, \dots, w_s)$, with $s = 2(n-k)$, such that η is given by $\eta = dz - y_i dx^i$, and the characteristic distribution is spanned by

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial w_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial w_s} \right\rangle$$

Upon introducing a function $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we refer to the triple (M, η, H) as a pre-contact Hamiltonian system; as in the case of regular contact systems, we introduce the vector bundle morphism $\bar{b} : TM \rightarrow T^*M$, with precisely the same action as in (4.8).

Every pre-contact manifold admits a Reeb vector field \mathcal{R} , defined according to the conditions $\iota_{\mathcal{R}} d\eta = 0$ and $\iota_{\mathcal{R}} \eta = 1$; however, the novelty is that this field is no longer unique. In particular, any $X \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(M)$ is a Reeb vector field if $\bar{b}(X) = \eta$ [60].

Given a distribution $\mathcal{D} \subset TM$, we define the following notion of orthogonality

$$\mathcal{D}^\perp := \{v \in TM \mid \bar{b}(w)(v) = 0 \text{ for all } w \in \mathcal{D}\} \quad (5.11)$$

Note that since $\bar{b}(v)(w)$ is neither symmetric or antisymmetric under the exchange of v and w , the above definition is strictly the *right* complement of \mathcal{D} ; it is of course possible to define the left complement; however, \mathcal{D}^\perp is the space we shall use within the constraint algorithm.

VI. PRE-CONTACT CONSTRAINT ALGORITHM

We begin by considering a pre-contact Lagrangian system $(TQ \times \mathbb{R}, \eta_L, E_L)$, of class $2k+1$, which occurs precisely when the rank of the Hessian matrix is equal to k over the whole of $TQ \times \mathbb{R}$. The extended cotangent

bundle $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$ has a canonical contact form η , whose construction was given in (4.5); if we introduce the inclusion $\kappa_0 : P_0 := FL(TQ \times \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$, then P_0 inherits the structure of a pre-contact manifold, with corresponding 1-form $\eta_0 = \kappa_0^* \eta = FL_0^* \eta_L$, where FL_0 refers to the restriction of the Legendre map to P_0 . This pre-contact manifold is then made into a Hamiltonian system upon introducing the unique function $H_0 : P_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which satisfies $FL_0^* H_0 = E_L$. In the interest of reducing cumbersome notation in what follows, we introduce

$$\alpha_0 := dH_0 - (\mathcal{R}(H_0) + H_0) \eta_0$$

and write the restriction of the bundle morphism \bar{b} to P_0 as \bar{b}_0 ; thus, the dynamical problem we seek to solve is that of finding a vector field $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(P_0)$, such that

$$\bar{b}_0(X_H) = \alpha_0 \quad (6.1)$$

We first restrict P_0 to the subset of points at which α_0 is in the range of \bar{b}_0 : that is to say

$$P_1 := \{x \in P_0 \mid (\alpha_0)_x \in \bar{b}_0(T_x P_0)\} \quad (6.2)$$

As was the case for the pre-symplectic algorithm, it is convenient to make use of the relationship between the annihilator of the space TP_0^\perp and the image of TP_0 under \bar{b}_0 to write P_1 as

$$P_1 = \{x \in P_0 \mid \langle (\alpha_0)_x, T_x P_0^\perp \rangle = 0\} \quad (6.3)$$

Recall that for the pre-symplectic manifold M_0 , we observed that $TM_0^\perp = \ker \omega_0$, which led to the recharacterisation of M_1 given in (3.5); in the present context, we find that $TP_0^\perp = \mathcal{C}$, which provides the following, more practical condition for deducing P_1

$$P_1 = \{x \in P_0 \mid \langle (\alpha_0)_x, \mathcal{C}_x \rangle = 0\} \quad (6.4)$$

Upon finding a basis for the characteristic distribution, P_1 may be described as the zero-set of a collection of secondary constraint functions. We must now impose that any vector field solution on P_1 be tangent to this space, which generally requires us to restrict to the smaller set

$$P_2 := \{x \in P_1 \mid \langle (\alpha_0)_x, T_x P_1^\perp \rangle = 0\} \quad (6.5)$$

The tangency condition is then imposed recursively, producing a series of embedded submanifolds $\kappa_{i+1} : P_{i+1} \hookrightarrow P_i$, until we reach the final constraint manifold P_f , where further iteration of the algorithm produces no new conditions. In this case, the geometric equation $\bar{b}_0(X_H) = \alpha_0$ has a well-defined, albeit non-unique solution which is everywhere-tangent to P_f . The non-uniqueness follows from the observation that we may add to X_H any element of $\mathcal{C} \cap TP_f$, without altering the physical dynamics or leaving the constraint surface.

In order to deduce local expressions for the dynamical evolution of extended phase space functions, we shall suppose that P_f may be written as the zero-set of the N functions $\{\Phi^\alpha\}$. Introducing the matrix of brackets $K^{\alpha\beta} := \{\Phi^\alpha, \Phi^\beta\}_J$, with $\text{rank } K = N - F$, we extract F first class functions Ω^a , and $N - F$ second class functions χ^j , following precisely the same procedure as in (3.9).

The Jacobi bracket of the second class constraints again forms an invertible matrix $C^{ij} := \{\chi^i, \chi^j\}_J$ of size $(N - F) \times (N - F)$, whose inverse we denote C_{ij} . The extended cotangent bundle admits a second Jacobi structure $(\Lambda_{DJ}, \mathcal{R}_{DJ})$, whose corresponding bracket is the Dirac-Jacobi bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{DJ}$. For two functions $f, g \in C^\infty(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\{f, g\}_{DJ} := \{f, g\}_J - \{f, \chi^i\}_J C_{ij} \{\chi^j, g\}_J \quad (6.6)$$

The Reeb field \mathcal{R}_{DJ} is deduced from the observation that, for any function f , we have $\mathcal{R}_{DJ}(f) = \{1, f\}_{DJ}$; we find that

$$\mathcal{R}_{DJ} := \mathcal{R} + C_{ij} \mathcal{R}(\chi^j) \left[\chi^i \mathcal{R} - \sharp_\Lambda(d\chi^i) \right] \quad (6.7)$$

in which \sharp_Λ is defined in (5.2). In addition to satisfying the weak Leibnitz rule, the Dirac-Jacobi bracket vanishes when one or more of its arguments is second class. With this bracket at our disposal, it is now straightforward to deduce the dynamical evolution of any extended phase space function. The total Hamiltonian is $H_T := H + u_a \Omega^a$, in which H is an arbitrary extension of H_0 to $T^*Q \times \mathbb{R}$, and u_a are undetermined Lagrange multipliers. The time evolution of a function $f \in C^\infty(T^*Q \times \mathbb{R})$ is then given by

$$\dot{f} = X_{H_T}(f) = \{f, H_T\}_{DJ} - f \mathcal{R}_{DJ}(H_T) \quad (6.8)$$

Upon expanding this expression, making use of the weak Leibnitz rule, we find that

$$\dot{f} = (X_H + u_a X_{\Omega^a})(f) + \Omega^a \Lambda_{DJ}(df, du_a) \quad (6.9)$$

When evaluated on the constraint surface P_f , the term proportional to Ω^a vanishes identically, leaving

$$\dot{f} \approx (X_H + u_a X_{\Omega^a})(f) \quad (6.10)$$

VII. CONTACT REDUCTION OF SINGULAR SYSTEMS

Over the course of previous sections, we have constructed a framework in which the dynamics of constrained Hamiltonian systems may be analysed in a geometrical way. With these ideas in-mind, we shall now illustrate how contact reduction by scaling symmetries generalises to singular theories. In order to facilitate our analysis, we begin with an overview of the reduction process for regular systems; a more detailed discussion of these ideas, as well as explicit examples, may be found in [15, 59, 75, 76].

A. Scaling Symmetries of Regular Hamiltonian Systems

Given a symplectic Hamiltonian system, (M, ω, H) , we declare a vector field $D \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(M)$ to constitute a scaling symmetry of degree Λ if the following two conditions hold

$$\mathfrak{L}_D \omega = \omega \quad \mathfrak{L}_D H = \Lambda H \quad (7.1)$$

Here, and throughout what follows, we use the symbol \mathfrak{L} to denote the Lie derivative, reserving the calligraphic \mathcal{L} for the Lagrangian density, encountered in our treatment of multisymplectic field theory.

As a consequence of (7.1), we see that if $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(M)$ is the unique Hamiltonian vector field corresponding to H via the relationship $\iota_{X_H} \omega = dH$, then

$$\iota_{[D, X_H]} \omega = [\mathfrak{L}_D, \iota_{X_H}] \omega = (\Lambda - 1) dH \quad (7.2)$$

Since ω is, by assumption, non-degenerate, it follows that $[D, X_H] = (\Lambda - 1)X_H$, so that the effect of D is to rescale all trajectories by the same non-zero factor, and may thus be considered a generator of changes in global scale. The deduction of physical law is, fundamentally, an empirical process; a measurement of length, for instance, is only meaningful *as compared to* some fiducial length, taken to represent a ‘metre stick’ [77]. Under the effect of a scaling symmetry, not only is the length to be measured scaled, but so too is the instrument used to perform the measurement. Consequently, a dynamical similarity maps between configurations whose constituents are rescaled in such a way so as to produce no observable effect. Such a transformation is the mathematical realisation of Poincaré’s thought experiment, where one imagines waking up to a world in which all distances have suffered a doubling in scale [78]: any attempt to discern the rescaled world from the original configuration will be futile, since observers have access only to *ratios* of dimensionful quantities. We shall develop these ideas somewhat further in section (XII), in the context of low-energy effective gauge theories, examining arguments presented against Poincaré’s stance that a rescaled world would be indistinguishable from our own.

From a minimalistic viewpoint, a mathematical description whose ontology contains redundant degrees of freedom, pertaining to unobservable global scales, is highly undesirable [79, 80]. We argue that, where

possible, any theory of the natural world should be formulated exclusively in terms of empirically accessible quantities, together with those (possibly unobservable) parameters, whose presence contributes to the closure of the algebra of dynamical observables. The identification of a scaling symmetry indicates that our mathematical framework contains just such a redundancy, and the role of ‘contact reduction’ is to make precise the heuristic notion of eliminating this superfluous structure.

If the vector field D is such that its flow acts freely and properly on M , then the quotient space M/\sim formed by identifying points connected by D -orbits has the structure of a smooth manifold of dimension $\dim M - 1$; moreover, the map $\pi : M \rightarrow M/\sim$, sending each point of M to its equivalence class, is a submersion [59, 81, 82]. In addition to being a smooth manifold, the quotient space also inherits a contact structure, defined according to $\xi := \pi_* \ker(\iota_D \omega)$ [14]. We define a scaling function to be any $\rho : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that $\mathfrak{L}_D \rho = \rho$; the existence of a global scaling function allows the contact distribution ξ to be expressed as the kernel of a well-defined 1-form η on M/\sim

$$\pi^* \eta := \frac{\iota_D \omega}{\rho} \quad (7.3)$$

Assuming the existence of a global scaling function, we henceforth adopt the notation (C, η) to refer to the contact manifold M/\sim . Orbits of the symplectic Hamiltonian system project to well-defined curves on C ; more precisely, the Hamiltonian vector field $X_H \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(M)$ generates a line field $\text{span}(X_H)$ on M , which is projected to a line field $\pi_* \text{span}(X_H)$ on C . Additionally, there exists a contact Hamiltonian function $H^c : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which, on the level-set $\pi(H = 0)$, is calculated according to

$$\pi^* H^c := \frac{H}{\rho^\Lambda} \quad (7.4)$$

Elsewhere, *i.e.* on $C \setminus \pi(H = 0)$, the appropriate function is $|H^c|^{1/\Lambda}$ [14]. If X_{H^c} denotes the Hamiltonian vector field of the contact Hamiltonian (7.4), and \mathcal{R} is the Reeb field of η , then the vector field

$$X := X_{H^c} + (\Lambda - 1)H^c \mathcal{R} \quad (7.5)$$

generates $\pi_* \text{span}(X_H)$. In general, a contact vector field is one whose flow preserves the contact distribution; consequently, unless the scaling symmetry of interest is of degree one (which, throughout subsequent discussion, will often be the case) or we restrict ourselves to the zero-set of H^c , the vector field X does not generally preserve $\xi = \ker \eta$. Additionally, it is clear that this construction is dependent upon the relation $\mathfrak{L}_D X_H = (\Lambda - 1)X_H$, which itself derives from the symplectic Hamiltonian equation of motion $\iota_{X_H} \omega = dH$; as a result, scaling symmetries are strictly dynamical in nature: that is to say, the contact-reduced system faithfully reproduces the original symplectic theory *only* when the equations of motion are satisfied.

In general, the presence of the scaling function ρ introduces a reparameterisation of the temporal coordinate on C ; in particular, for a scaling symmetry of degree Λ , trajectories on the symplectic phase space, parameterised by the coordinate t , are projected to curves, governed by changes in τ , with $d\tau = \rho^{\Lambda-1} dt$. Accordingly, if $(q^i(\tau), p_i(\tau), S(\tau))$ describes an integral curve of (7.5), the equations of motion read

$$\frac{dq^i}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial H^c}{\partial p_i} \quad \frac{dp_i}{d\tau} = - \left(\frac{\partial H^c}{\partial q^i} + p_i \frac{\partial H^c}{\partial S} \right) \quad \frac{dS}{d\tau} = p_i \frac{\partial H^c}{\partial p_i} - \Lambda H^c \quad (7.6)$$

This concludes our introductory treatment of contact reduction, and we now apply these ideas to constrained Hamiltonian systems. Before commencing, we remark that there are two conceivable ways of proceeding: on the one hand, given a Hamiltonian H_0 , corresponding to a singular Lagrangian, we may apply the techniques of section (III A), deduce the final constraint manifold, eliminating any gauge degrees of freedom, and then seek a scaling symmetry, to make the contact reduction. Alternatively, we might first identify a scaling degree of freedom within the unconstrained Hamiltonian system, excise this from our ontology, and then use the pre-contact constraint algorithm, to deduce the subset of the reduced space, upon which solutions to the contact equations of motion are well-defined. More succinctly, in what follows, we would like to examine the commutativity of ‘restriction & reduction’ and ‘reduction & restriction.’

B. Reduction & Restriction

Let us suppose that (TQ, η_L, E_L) is an almost-regular Lagrangian system; we begin by deducing the canonical Hamiltonian $H_0 : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined on the primary constraint manifold $j_0 : M_0 \hookrightarrow T^*Q$. This is then extended to a function $H : T^*Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the full phase space, such that $H|_{M_0} = H_0$.⁴ The cotangent bundle T^*Q is a symplectic manifold, whose corresponding 2-form is expressed in local Darboux coordinates as $\omega = dq^i \wedge dp_i$; supposing that M_0 is described as the zero-set of the primary constraint functions ϕ^α , we seek a vector field $D \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(T^*Q)$ which satisfies

$$\mathfrak{L}_D H = \Lambda H \quad \mathfrak{L}_D \omega = \omega \quad \mathfrak{L}_D \phi^\alpha = C_\beta^\alpha \phi^\beta \quad (7.7)$$

for a set of functions $C_\beta^\alpha \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$, with $\det C_\beta^\alpha \neq 0$. The first two conditions simply identify D as a scaling symmetry, while the third ensures that the flow of D maps M_0 onto itself. This is essential, as M_0 describes the maximal subset of points at which solutions to the equations of motion *could* exist (evidently, implementation of the constraint algorithm is likely to restrict M_0 further, but any such restriction will necessarily be a *subset* of M_0); the flow of the scaling field must not, therefore, map points of M_0 , which are (potentially) dynamically admissible, to points of $T^*Q \setminus M_0$, which are not.

In principle, we should now verify that the flow of D does in fact act freely and properly on T^*Q ; supposing that this *is* the case, the space $C := T^*Q/\sim$ is a contact manifold with submersion $\beta : T^*Q \rightarrow C$, and contact distribution $\xi := \beta_* \ker(\iota_D \omega)$. We have a contact form η and Hamiltonian H^c defined precisely as in (7.3) and (7.4) respectively, with the result that (C, η, H^c) constitutes a contact Hamiltonian system.

We highlight that this construction does not directly give rise to a pre-contact manifold; instead, we have symmetry reduced the full phase space, into which the pre-symplectic system is embedded. Had we sought a vector field on M_0 as our scaling symmetry, it is not clear that we should always obtain a well-defined pre-contact form on the quotient space. By working on the full phase space, we have the map $\beta : T^*Q \rightarrow C$, which allows us to construct functions $\gamma^\alpha \in C^\infty(C)$, whose zero-set defines a submanifold $\kappa_0 : C_0 \hookrightarrow C$, which *does* inherit a pre-contact structure; in particular, we have

$$C_0 := \{y \in C \mid \gamma^\alpha(y) = 0\} \quad \text{with} \quad \beta^* \gamma^\alpha := \frac{\phi^\alpha}{\rho^\Lambda} \quad (7.8)$$

The contact Hamiltonian H^c is restricted to a function $H_0^c := H^c|_{C_0}$, and similarly, $\eta_0 := \eta|_{C_0}$ defines a pre-contact form on C_0 , with the result that the triple (C_0, η_0, H_0^c) is a well-defined pre-contact manifold, to which the constraint algorithm of section (VI) may freely be applied. Supposing that the algorithm stabilises on the final constraint surface C_f , we eliminate any gauge degrees of freedom, denoting physical state space $C_\mathcal{P}$, with $\kappa_\mathcal{P} : C_\mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow C_f$. On $C_\mathcal{P}$, we have a well-defined contact form $\eta_\mathcal{P}$, and Hamiltonian $H_\mathcal{P}^c$.

C. Restriction & Reduction

Having shown how we obtain the contact Hamiltonian equations of motion by first contact reducing the pre-symplectic system, and then applying the appropriate constraint algorithm, we shall now consider the reverse process, in which we first carry out the restriction at the symplectic level, before seeking a scaling symmetry with which to contact reduce the constrained theory.

We begin, once again, from the pre-symplectic system (M_0, ω_0, H_0) , and carry out the constraint procedure presented in section (III A), deducing the final submanifold $M_f \hookrightarrow T^*Q$. In order to be able to carry out a contact reduction via scaling symmetry, we must either introduce a particular choice of gauge-fixing, or formally quotient out by the action of the gauge transformations; since we are concerned with the dynamics of observable (*i.e.* gauge-invariant) quantities, this choice is somewhat inconsequential, and we denote the physical phase space \mathcal{P} , with $j_\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow M_f$.

⁴ In practice, H and H_0 have identical coordinate expressions; however, formally, they belong to different spaces.

From above, we know that \mathcal{P} is *symplectic*, with non-degenerate 2-form $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ and Hamiltonian $H_{\mathcal{P}}$. As such, we now seek a vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^{\infty}(\mathcal{P})$, such that

$$\mathfrak{L}_Z \omega_{\mathcal{P}} = \omega_{\mathcal{P}} \quad \mathfrak{L}_Z H_{\mathcal{P}} = \Lambda H_{\mathcal{P}} \quad (7.9)$$

Note that, by construction, the constraint algorithm produces a surface to which all dynamics must remain tangent; thus, we need impose no conditions on the preservation of the constraints. The dynamical evolution of some $f \in C^{\infty}(\mathcal{P})$ is determined via the bracket induced by $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$, that is

$$\dot{f} = \{f, H_{\mathcal{P}}\}_{\mathcal{P}} := \omega_{\mathcal{P}}(X_f, X_{H_{\mathcal{P}}})$$

in which X_f refers to the Hamiltonian vector field associated to f via $\iota_{X_f} \omega_{\mathcal{P}} = df$, and similarly for $X_{H_{\mathcal{P}}}$.

Assuming that the flow of Z acts freely and properly on \mathcal{P} , we have a well-defined quotient space \mathcal{P}/\sim , with submersion $\sigma : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}/\sim$; if $\rho : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a global scaling function on \mathcal{P} , the contact form and Hamiltonian are given by

$$\sigma^* \eta_{\mathcal{P}} = \frac{\iota_Z \omega_{\mathcal{P}}}{\rho} \quad \sigma^* H_{\mathcal{P}}^c = \frac{H_{\mathcal{P}}}{\rho^{\Lambda}} \quad (7.10)$$

Supposing that (q^i, Π_i, S) constitutes a set of local Darboux coordinates on \mathcal{P}/\sim , so that $\eta_{\mathcal{P}} = dS - \Pi_i dq^i$, the symmetry-reduced equations of motion are simply the contact Hamiltonian equations (7.6).

From the constructions given above, it should be clear that the pre-symplectic and pre-contact constraint algorithms run in parallel. At the i^{th} stage of the pre-symplectic algorithm, the submanifold M_i , with inclusion $j_i : M_i \hookrightarrow M_{i-1}$, may be described as the zero-set of the functions $\phi_{(i)}^{\alpha}$. The projection of these $\phi_{(i)}^{\alpha}$ defines a second set of functions $\gamma_{(i)}^{\alpha}$ according to

$$\beta^* \gamma_{(i)}^{\alpha} := \frac{\phi_{(i)}^{\alpha}}{\rho^{\Lambda}} \quad (7.11)$$

Up to multiplicative factors, these $\gamma_{(i)}^{\alpha}$ coincide with the constraint functions obtained in i^{th} iteration of the pre-contact algorithm. These ideas are summarised in figure 1.

When applying a restriction of the phase space (prior to contact reduction) we arrive at a symplectic manifold \mathcal{P} , which, by construction, contains all points at which the equations of motion admit vector field solutions. We know that the reduced theory faithfully reproduces the original symplectic dynamics only when the equations of motion are satisfied. Since the constraint procedure systematically eliminates all points which are not dynamically-admissible, we expect that the contact-reduced dynamics on $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ coincide with that of the constrained symplectic system at *all* points.

VIII. AN EXAMPLE

We shall now apply the mathematical formalism we have developed throughout to a simple example; for completeness, we obtain the reduced space dynamics via both paths of 1, thereby providing an explicit illustration of the commutativity of the reduction and constraint processes.

A. Restriction & Reduction

For this particular example, we have a configuration manifold $Q = \mathbb{R}_+^4$, with local coordinates (x, y, u, ϕ) , and Lagrangian function

$$L = 2\dot{u}^2 + \frac{1}{2}u^2 \left[\dot{\phi}^2 + (\dot{x} + \dot{y} - \dot{\phi})^2 - (x^2 + y^2 - 2\phi^2) \right] \quad (8.1)$$




FIG. 1. Commutative diagram showing how the two constraint algorithms run in parallel. Starting from the cotangent bundle, with its canonical symplectic form, the right-hand path shows how we may restrict to the primary constraint manifold M_0 , and carry out the pre-symplectic algorithm, to reach the final space \mathcal{P} . This manifold is symplectic, and thus allows a contact reduction to be carried out. Alternatively, the scaling degree of freedom may be excised from the full symplectic phase space, defining the contact manifold C . Upon projecting the primary constraint functions that define M_0 , C is restricted to the *pre-contact* space C_0 , and the left-hand path illustrates the implementation of the pre-contact algorithm. Both paths lead to the same final reduced space $C_{\mathcal{P}}$.

Our motivation for choosing this particular Lagrangian is purely pedagogical; we do not consider this to represent any realistic physical system. Clearly, the Lagrangian is singular, as the Hessian matrix with respect to the velocities $(\dot{x}, \dot{y}, \dot{u}, \dot{\phi})$ is

$$W = u^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 4u^{-2} & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

which is of constant rank 3, provided $u \neq 0$, which we have assumed. This Lagrangian admits a fairly simple scaling symmetry of the form

$$\Sigma = \frac{1}{2} \left(u \frac{\partial}{\partial u} + \dot{u} \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{u}} \right) \quad (8.2)$$

Making the change of variable $u \mapsto e^{\rho/2}$, the scaling symmetry becomes $\Sigma = \partial_{\rho}$, while the Lagrangian adopts the form

$$L = e^{\rho} \left[\frac{1}{2} (\dot{\rho}^2 + \dot{\phi}^2) + \frac{1}{2} (\dot{x} + \dot{y} - \dot{\phi})^2 - \frac{1}{2} (x^2 + y^2) + \phi^2 \right] \quad (8.3)$$

This is the most convenient parameterisation of L , and the one with which we shall henceforth work; the momenta conjugate to $(\dot{x}, \dot{y}, \dot{\rho}, \dot{\phi})$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\rho} &= e^{\rho} \dot{\rho} & p_x &= e^{\rho} (\dot{x} + \dot{y} - \dot{\phi}) \\ p_{\phi} &= e^{\rho} (2\dot{\phi} - (\dot{x} + \dot{y})) & p_y &= e^{\rho} (\dot{x} + \dot{y} - \dot{\phi}) \end{aligned}$$

From this, we see that there is a single primary constraint, defining the submanifold $j_0 : M_0 \hookrightarrow T^*Q$

$$M_0 := \{p \in T^*Q \mid \psi^1(p) := p_x - p_y = 0\} \quad (8.4)$$

The canonical Hamiltonian $H_0 : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is readily calculated to be

$$H_0 = \frac{e^{-\rho}}{2} \left[p_\rho^2 + (p_x + p_\phi)^2 + p_x^2 \right] + e^\rho \left[\frac{1}{2}(x^2 + y^2) - \phi^2 \right] \quad (8.5)$$

Pulling back the canonical symplectic form ω on T^*Q to M_0 , we have $\omega_0 := j^*\omega \in \Omega^2(M_0)$, which, in local coordinates, is given by

$$\omega_0 = d\rho \wedge dp_\rho + d\phi \wedge dp_\phi + (dx + dy) \wedge dp_x \quad (8.6)$$

In accordance with the pre-symplectic constraint algorithm developed in section (III A), we know that the symplectic orthogonal TM_0^\perp coincides precisely with $\ker \omega_0$. In order for the vector field

$$X = A^x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + A^y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + A^\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + A^\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + B^x \frac{\partial}{\partial p_x} + B^\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\rho} + B^\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi}$$

to belong to $\ker \omega_0$, we require $A^x + A^y = 0$ and that the remaining coefficients be zero; consequently, we have

$$\ker \omega_0 = TM_0^\perp = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right\rangle \quad (8.7)$$

The secondary constraint manifold M_1 is composed of those points $p \in M_0$, at which $\langle (dH_0)_p, T_p M_0^\perp \rangle = 0$; from (8.5), we see that this gives rise to a single constraint⁵

$$M_1 = \{p \in M_0 \mid \psi^2(p) := e^\rho (x - y) = 0\} \quad (8.8)$$

Any vector field solution X_H to the geometrical equation $\iota_{X_H} \omega_0 - dH_0 = 0$, restricted to M_1 , must remain tangent to this surface, in order to be considered physically meaningful. As we have seen, this requirement is entirely equivalent to imposing that $\langle (dH_0)_p, T_p M_1^\perp \rangle = 0$ for all points $p \in M_1$. It is straightforward to verify that

$$TM_1^\perp = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right\rangle$$

Consequently, the algorithm stabilises on M_1 , with the two constraints ψ^1 and ψ^2 . In accordance with our general procedure, we introduce the matrix of Poisson brackets $J^{\alpha\beta} := \{\psi^\alpha, \psi^\beta\}$, which is given by

$$J = e^\rho \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -2 \\ 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Clearly, this is invertible, which indicates that ψ^1 and ψ^2 constitute a pair of *second class* constraints; it is therefore unnecessary to eliminate gauge degrees of freedom, and we henceforth refer to M_1 as \mathcal{P} . The inverse J^{-1} is given by

$$J^{-1} = \frac{e^{-\rho}}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and so the Dirac bracket of two functions $f, g \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$ is

$$\{f, g\}_D = \{f, g\} - \frac{e^{-\rho}}{2} \{f, \psi^1\} \{\psi^2, g\} + \frac{e^{-\rho}}{2} \{f, \psi^2\} \{\psi^1, g\} \quad (8.9)$$

⁵ Our inclusion of the exponential factor in ψ^2 may seem somewhat pedantic, since clearly $e^\rho \neq 0$; however, its presence is highly relevant when considering the reduction process.

In order to deduce the dynamical evolution of phase space functions, we should construct the total Hamiltonian; however, having identified ψ^1 and ψ^2 as second class, it follows that the total Hamiltonian coincides with H_0 . It is then straightforward to show that the equations of motion for our phase space variables, which follow from $\dot{f} = \{f, H_0\}_D|_{\mathcal{P}}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \frac{e^{-\rho}}{2} (2p_x + p_\phi) = \dot{y} & \dot{p}_x &= -e^\rho x = \dot{p}_y \\ \dot{\phi} &= e^{-\rho} (p_x + p_\phi) & \dot{p}_\phi &= 2e^\rho \phi \\ \dot{\rho} &= e^{-\rho} p_\rho & \dot{p}_\rho &= \frac{e^{-\rho}}{2} (p_\rho^2 + (p_x + p_\phi)^2 + p_x^2) - e^\rho (x^2 - \phi^2) \end{aligned} \quad (8.10)$$

These dynamical equations must be reproduced by the symmetry-reduced model, else our claim that the excision of a scaling variable is inconsequential for the evolution of observable quantities is unjustified. Turning now to the task of reducing this system, we note that the symplectic form on \mathcal{P} is

$$\omega_{\mathcal{P}} := \omega_0|_{\mathcal{P}} = d\rho \wedge dp_\rho + d\phi \wedge dp_\phi + 2dx \wedge dp_x$$

We also have the following restricted Hamiltonian

$$H_{\mathcal{P}} := H_0|_{\mathcal{P}} = \frac{e^{-\rho}}{2} [p_\rho^2 + (p_x + p_\phi)^2 + p_x^2] + e^\rho [x^2 - \phi^2]$$

In accordance with the results of section (VII C), we now seek a vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(\mathcal{P})$ that satisfies $\mathfrak{L}_Z \omega_{\mathcal{P}} = \omega_{\mathcal{P}}$, and $\mathfrak{L}_Z H_{\mathcal{P}} = \Lambda H_{\mathcal{P}}$; a series of short calculations confirms that

$$Z = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + p_\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\rho} + p_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi} + p_x \frac{\partial}{\partial p_x} \quad (8.11)$$

does indeed satisfy both of these requirements, and is a scaling symmetry of degree one. An obvious choice of scaling function is e^ρ ; thus, we introduce the map $\sigma : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}/\sim$, and construct the 1-form and contact Hamiltonian according to

$$\sigma^* \eta_{\mathcal{P}} = \frac{\iota_Z \omega_{\mathcal{P}}}{e^\rho} \quad \sigma^* H_{\mathcal{P}}^c = \frac{H_{\mathcal{P}}}{e^\rho}$$

We take coordinates on \mathcal{P}/\sim to be $(x, \Pi_x, \phi, \Pi_\phi, S)$, where

$$\sigma^* \Pi_x = \frac{p_x}{e^\rho} \quad \sigma^* \Pi_\phi = \frac{p_\phi}{e^\rho} \quad \sigma^* S = \frac{p_\rho}{e^\rho} \quad (8.12)$$

It then follows that $\eta_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $H_{\mathcal{P}}^c$ have the following local coordinate expressions

$$\eta_{\mathcal{P}} = dS - \Pi_\phi d\phi - 2\Pi_x dx \quad H_{\mathcal{P}}^c = \frac{1}{2} \left[S^2 + (\Pi_x + \Pi_\phi)^2 + \Pi_x^2 \right] + x^2 - \phi^2 \quad (8.13)$$

The contact Hamiltonian equations of motion are then deduced in the standard fashion; however, it should be noted that the multiplicative factor of two in our expression for $\eta_{\mathcal{P}}$ shows that $(x, 2\Pi_x, \phi, \Pi_\phi, S)$ provides the correct set of local Darboux coordinates on \mathcal{P}/\sim . Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \frac{1}{2} (2\Pi_x + \Pi_\phi) & \dot{\Pi}_x &= -(2x + \Pi_x S) \\ \dot{\phi} &= \Pi_x + \Pi_\phi & \dot{\Pi}_\phi &= 2\phi - \Pi_\phi S \\ \dot{S} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[-S^2 + (\Pi_x + \Pi_\phi)^2 \right] - x^2 + \phi^2 \end{aligned} \quad (8.14)$$

It is clear that the equations of motion for the coordinates x and ϕ coincide with those given in (8.10); after some work, it can be shown that the additional action-dependent terms in the momentum equations correctly reproduce the original dynamics.

B. Reduction + Restriction

In order to obtain the contact Hamiltonian equations (8.14) via the alternative method presented in section (VII B), we return to the canonical Hamiltonian H_0 on the primary constraint manifold; in accordance with our general procedure, we extend H_0 to a function H on the full phase space T^*Q

$$H = \frac{e^{-\rho}}{2} \left[p_\rho^2 + (p_x + p_\phi)^2 + p_x^2 \right] + e^\rho \left[\frac{1}{2}(x^2 + y^2) - \phi^2 \right] \quad (8.15)$$

The vector field

$$D = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + p_\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\rho} + p_\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\phi} + p_x \frac{\partial}{\partial p_x} + p_y \frac{\partial}{\partial p_y} \quad (8.16)$$

is a scaling symmetry of degree one, and, crucially, preserves the primary constraint ψ^1 , since $\mathfrak{L}_D \psi^1 = \psi^1$. Thus, we know that the quotient space $C := T^*Q/\sim$ is a contact manifold, and we introduce the surjective map $\beta : T^*Q \rightarrow C$, and take coordinates on C to be $(x, \pi_x, y, \pi_y, \phi, \pi_\phi, S)$, where

$$\beta^* \pi_x = \frac{p_x}{e^\rho} \quad \beta^* \pi_y = \frac{p_y}{e^\rho} \quad \beta^* \pi_\phi = \frac{p_\phi}{e^\rho} \quad \beta^* S = \frac{p_\rho}{e^\rho} \quad (8.17)$$

so that the contact form and Hamiltonian on C become

$$\eta = dS - \pi_x dx - \pi_y dy - \pi_\phi d\phi \quad H^c = \frac{1}{2} \left[S^2 + (\pi_x + \pi_\phi)^2 + \pi_x^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} (x^2 + y^2) - \phi^2$$

We emphasise that (C, η, H^c) is a *contact* Hamiltonian system, and that the symmetry-reduced analogue of the primary constraint manifold M_0 is found by projecting the function ψ^1 , to obtain

$$\beta^* \gamma^1 = \frac{\psi^1}{e^\rho} \implies \gamma^1 = \pi_x + \pi_y$$

Consequently, the primary constraint submanifold C_0 is precisely the zero-set of γ^1 , and the pre-contact system (C_0, η_0, H_0^c) is obtained, restricting η and H^c to this space

$$\eta_0 := \eta|_{C_0} = dS - \pi_x(dx + dy) - \pi_\phi d\phi \quad H_0^c := H^c|_{C_0} = \frac{1}{2} \left[S^2 + (\pi_x + \pi_\phi)^2 + \pi_x^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} (x^2 + y^2) - \phi^2$$

We now apply the pre-contact constraint algorithm developed in section (VI), which begins with the deduction of the characteristic distribution \mathcal{C} . From above, we see that $d\eta_0 = (dx + dy) \wedge d\pi_x + d\phi \wedge d\pi_\phi$, whence it is straightforward to show that

$$\mathcal{C} := \ker \eta_0 \cap \ker d\eta_0 = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right\rangle$$

The first iteration of the constraint algorithm requires us to restrict C_0 to the subset of points at which the covector $\alpha_0 := dH_0^c - (\mathcal{R}(H_0^c) + H_0^c)\eta_0$ is in the annihilator of TC_0^\perp , which, we observed, was equivalent to imposing that $\langle \alpha_0, \mathcal{C} \rangle = 0$. We take, as our Reeb field $\mathcal{R} = \partial/\partial S$, and find that the condition $\langle \alpha_0, \mathcal{C} \rangle = 0$ gives rise to a single secondary constraint

$$C_1 = \{p \in C_0 \mid \gamma^2(p) := x - y = 0\}$$

As expected, comparing this space to M_1 found in (8.8), we see that the constraint γ^2 satisfies

$$\beta^* \gamma^2 = \frac{\psi^2}{e^\rho}$$

Upon calculating TC_1^\perp , we find that imposing $\langle \alpha_0, TC_1^\perp \rangle = 0$ produces no additional constraints, and so the algorithm stabilises on C_1 . Thus, we compute the matrix of Jacobi brackets $K^{\alpha\beta} := \{\gamma^\alpha, \gamma^\beta\}_J$, and referring to (5.8), we find that

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -2 \\ 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \implies K^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The invertibility of this matrix confirms that, as expected, γ^1 and γ^2 are both second class constraints; thus, in order to calculate the equations of motion, we impose such conditions as strong equalities, and introduce the Dirac-Jacobi bracket, which reads

$$\{f, g\}_{DJ} = \{f, g\}_J - \frac{1}{2}\{f, \gamma^1\}_J \{\gamma^2, g\}_J + \frac{1}{2}\{f, \gamma^2\}_J \{\gamma^1, g\}_J \quad (8.18)$$

The evolution of a function f is then computed from $\{f, H_0^c\}_{DJ}|_{c_1}$, and we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \frac{1}{2}(2\pi_x + \pi_\phi) & \dot{\pi}_x &= -(2x + \pi_x S) \\ \dot{\phi} &= \pi_x + \pi_\phi & \dot{\pi}_\phi &= 2\phi - \pi_\phi S \\ \dot{S} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[-S^2 + (\pi_x + \pi_\phi)^2 \right] - x^2 + \phi^2 \end{aligned} \quad (8.19)$$

which coincides precisely with the corresponding set of expressions (8.14), deduced by first restricting the pre-symplectic system, and then making a symmetry reduction. Additionally, since \mathcal{P} was, by construction, the maximal set of points at which the solutions (8.10) are well-defined, we are assured that both (8.14) and (8.19) faithfully reproduce the original dynamics at all points of the reduced space.

In this example, we have provided an explicit illustration of how a constrained Hamiltonian system may be reduced to a simpler, dynamically-equivalent theory, by identifying and excising an unphysical scaling degree of freedom. Whilst relatively simple in nature, the system considered has allowed us to present a fully-worked example of the commutativity of contact reduction and phase space restriction, and thus concludes our treatment of particle dynamics. In the following sections, we introduce the geometrical framework required to describe singular field theories, which will then allow us to provide a field-theoretic discussion, which parallels the ideas presented thus far.

IX. MULTISYMPLECTIC FIELD THEORY

The use of multisymplectic geometry to describe classical field theories is an area of active research interest, as the fibred manifolds it employs provide an arena in which a manifestly covariant formalism may be developed, in a finite-dimensional setting [83–85]. Scaling symmetries of classical field theories have been studied in [34], and a mathematical framework for the contact reduction of multisymplectic theories developed in [29]. The multisymplectic Hamiltonian formalism of singular field theories is still not entirely understood; for example, it is known that there exist certain classes of Lagrangian, for which the construction of the corresponding Hamiltonian is either ambiguous, or simply ill-defined [16]. Additionally, multisymplectic manifolds are not, in general, equipped with a well-defined bracket structure [86], and the local constraint algorithm employs geometrical principles, that render the use of such structures redundant [21, 22]. As a result, in contrast to our study of systems of particles, our analysis of singular field theories will favour the *Lagrangian* formalism, and in what follows, we shall provide a heavily abridged summary of the most pertinent ideas, referring to [29] for more details.

A. Lagrangian Field Theory

In general, an m -dimensional manifold \mathcal{M} is said to be multisymplectic if it admits a closed, 1-non-degenerate k -form $\Omega \in \Omega^k(\mathcal{M})$ (with $1 < k \leq m$) [16]; the 1-non-degeneracy condition may be expressed locally as the requirement that for every $p \in \mathcal{M}$ and $X_p \in T_p\mathcal{M}$

$$\iota_{X_p}\Omega_p = 0 \quad \implies \quad X_p = 0$$

If Ω is closed but 1-degenerate, we refer to the pair (\mathcal{M}, Ω) as a pre-multisymplectic manifold; such objects will be of particular relevance in our study of singular theories.

In order to formulate the field equations of a dynamical system in a geometrical fashion, we require a class of objects known as multivector fields. In general, a multivector field of degree r on \mathcal{M} is a section $\mathbf{X} \in \Gamma(\wedge^r T\mathcal{M})$ of the r^{th} exterior power of the tangent bundle. We denote the space of all such multivector fields $\mathfrak{X}^r(\mathcal{M}) := \Gamma(\wedge^r T\mathcal{M})$, and declare some $\mathbf{X} \in \mathfrak{X}^r(\mathcal{M})$ to be *locally decomposable* if, for every point $p \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists an open neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}_p \subset \mathcal{M}$, and vector fields $X_1, \dots, X_r \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(\mathcal{U}_p)$, such that

$$\mathbf{X}|_{\mathcal{U}_p} = X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_r$$

We say that an m -dimensional distribution $\mathcal{D} \subset T\mathcal{M}$ is *locally associated* to a non-zero $\mathbf{X} \in \mathfrak{X}^m(\mathcal{M})$, if there exists some connected open set $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{M}$, such that $\mathbf{X}|_{\mathcal{V}}$ is a section of $\wedge^m \mathcal{D}|_{\mathcal{V}}$; further, \mathbf{X} is said to be *integrable* if its locally associated distribution is integrable.

Consider a fibre bundle $\pi : E \rightarrow M$ over the d -dimensional spacetime manifold M ; we shall suppose that M is orientable, with volume form ω . Local coordinates on M are written as (x^μ) , with $\mu = 0, \dots, d-1$, so that $\omega = dx^0 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{d-1} := d^d x$. The $(n+d)$ -dimensional manifold E is referred to as the covariant configuration space, and the first jet bundle $\kappa : J^1 E \rightarrow E$ of sections of π is the natural space upon which to introduce a Lagrangian density [87, 88]; local coordinates on $J^1 E$, adapted to the bundle structure of E , are given by (x^μ, y^a, y_μ^a) , with $a = 1, \dots, n$. Introducing the bundle projection $\hat{\pi} := \pi \circ \kappa : J^1 E \rightarrow M$, the Lagrangian density \mathcal{L} may be expressed as a $\hat{\pi}$ -semibasic d -form on $J^1 E$

$$\mathcal{L}(x^\mu, y^a, y_\mu^a) = L(x^\mu, y^a, y_\mu^a) \hat{\pi}^* \omega \quad (9.1)$$

in which $L : J^1 E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is referred to as the Lagrangian function, and $\hat{\pi}^* \omega$ is the volume form on M , pulled back to $J^1 E$ [29, 89]. The Lagrangian function is then used to define the Cartan forms $\Theta_L \in \Omega^d(J^1 E)$ and $\Omega_L \in \Omega^{d+1}(J^1 E)$; in local bundle coordinates (x^μ, y^a, y_μ^a) , these are expressed as

$$\Theta_L = \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_\mu^a} dy^a \wedge d^{d-1} x_\mu - \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial y_\mu^a} y_\mu^a - L \right) d^d x \quad \Omega_L := -d\Theta_L \quad (9.2)$$

where $d^{d-1} x_\mu := \iota_{\partial_\mu} d^d x$. The pair $(J^1 E, \Omega_L)$ defines a Lagrangian system, which is said to be *regular* if Ω_L is multisymplectic, and *singular* if it is pre-multisymplectic [22]. The subset of those singular systems which are categorised as *almost-regular* satisfy the same conditions with respect to the Legendre map as those given in section (II) for systems of particles.

Given a regular Lagrangian system $(J^1 E, \Omega_L)$, the dynamical equations are derived from a variational principle [16], which defines critical sections $\phi \in \Gamma(M, E)$; the canonical lifting $j^1 \phi$ of these objects to $J^1 E$ are then integral sections of an equivalence class of locally decomposable, $\hat{\pi}$ -transverse holonomic multivector fields $\{\mathbf{X}_L\}$, each of which satisfies

$$\iota_{\mathbf{X}_L} \Omega_L = 0 \quad (9.3)$$

The most general expression for a locally decomposable field \mathbf{X}_L is

$$\mathbf{X}_L = \bigwedge_{\mu=0}^{d-1} f \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} + F_\mu^a \frac{\partial}{\partial y^a} + G_{\mu\nu}^a \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\nu^a} \right) \quad (9.4)$$

for some non-zero $f \in C^\infty(J^1 E)$. The $\hat{\pi}$ -transversality condition is most readily enforced by setting $\iota_{\mathbf{X}_L} (\hat{\pi}^* \omega) = 1$, which fixes the multiplicative function f to unity. When \mathbf{X}_L is holonomic, it is integrable, and the coefficient functions F_μ^a are simply y_μ^a ; if \mathbf{X}_L has local coordinate expression (9.4), with $F_\mu^a = y_\mu^a$, but is *not* integrable, it is referred to as semi-holonomic.

The critical sections ϕ of the variational problem are such that their canonical lifting $j^1 \phi$ satisfy the *Euler-Lagrange field equations*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial y_\mu^a} \circ j^1 \phi \right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^a} \circ j^1 \phi = 0 \quad (9.5)$$

X. PRE-MULTICONTACT SYSTEMS

In our treatment of scaling symmetries of pre-symplectic systems, we observed that the elimination of a scaling degree of freedom and phase space restriction were commutative processes; indeed, we dedicated significant effort to the construction of the final symmetry-reduced theory via both paths of the commutative diagram 1. When considering field theories, we shall not attempt to retain this same level of generality, and so will restrict our attention to the implementation of a constraint algorithm only *after* the scaling degree of freedom has been eliminated.

The symmetry reduction of multisymplectic field theories has been studied in detail in [29]; there, we presented a brief account of multicontact geometry, as pertained to the reduction of *regular* systems. When the theories of interest are singular, far more care must be taken, for it is not guaranteed that the symmetry-reduced form derived from the pre-multisymplectic Θ_L defines a pre-multicontact structure. Consequently, as an additional step, we must ensure that the reduced theory possesses a well-defined Reeb distribution; such considerations will require the introduction of additional mathematical structures, that were not required in [29]. Our discussion of multicontact geometry shall be limited to those concepts which are fundamental to the construction of classical field theories; more details may be found in [25–27], for example.

A. Multicontact Lagrangian Field Theory

Dissipative (or frictional) field theories are the subject of notably less research interest than their conservative counterparts; this is perhaps due to a tendency to wish to embed any such non-conservative configuration within a larger system, often denominated ‘the environment’. The frictional behaviour of the original system is then palliated by the observation that any apparent losses may simply be attributed to an exchange of energy between the system and environment. The philosophical stance which motivates our study of scaling symmetries is diametrically opposed to the notion of creating larger, redundant mathematical structures, with the sole objective of streamlining practical calculations [77, 80, 90]. We posit that the use of the smallest amount of dynamically-irrelevant structure, even at the expense of superficial mathematical simplicity, should be prioritised, wherever possible [91, 92]. In excising superfluous scaling degrees of freedom, seeking a minimal ontology, we are forced to work with theories which are inherently frictional in nature; consequently, we shall dedicate this section to developing the geometrical tools required to describe such systems.

The fibred manifolds $\pi : E \rightarrow M$, and $\kappa : J^1 E \rightarrow E$ (with $\dim M = d$ and $\dim E = n + d$) of the multisymplectic formalism continue to assume a prominent role in the description of frictional field theories; in particular, the Lagrangian density is now a d -form on the manifold

$$\mathcal{S} := J^1 E \times_M \wedge^{d-1} T^* M \cong J^1 E \times \mathbb{R}^d \quad (10.1)$$

which is a bundle over both E , with projection $\tau : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow E$, and M , with $\beta = \pi \circ \tau : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow M$. Local coordinates on \mathcal{S} are denoted $(x^\mu, y^a, y_\mu^a, s^\mu)$, in which the quantities s^μ correspond to an action density. As in (9.1), we write the Lagrangian density in terms of a local function

$$\mathcal{L}(x^\mu, y^a, y_\mu^a, s^\mu) = L(x^\mu, y^a, y_\mu^a, s^\mu) \beta^* \omega \quad (10.2)$$

In contrast to the multisymplectic case, when the Lagrangian is singular, the d -form Θ_L

$$\Theta_L = \left(ds^\mu - \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_\mu^a} dy^a \right) \wedge d^{d-1} x_\mu + \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial y_\mu^a} y_\mu^a - L \right) d^d x \quad (10.3)$$

does not necessarily define a pre-multicontact structure. It is therefore necessary to introduce a number of additional concepts, which allow us to determine when a given Lagrangian d -form does in fact give rise to such a structure.

We begin by considering a generalisation of the annihilator of a given subspace, that we first encountered in section (II); for the purpose of defining the pre-multicontact structures of this section, in addition to the Lagrangian d -form Θ_L , we also introduce the notation $\Xi := \beta^* \omega \in \Omega^d(\mathcal{S})$; this volume form serves as a

reference object, while Θ_L endows the space \mathcal{S} with the formal geometrical structure of a pre-multicontact manifold. Given a regular distribution $\mathcal{D} \subset T\mathcal{S}$, we introduce the space of r -forms which annihilate all sections of \mathcal{D}

$$\text{Ann}^r(\mathcal{D}) := \{ \xi \in \Omega^r(\mathcal{S}) \mid \iota_X \xi = 0 \text{ for all } X \in \Gamma(\mathcal{D}) \} \quad (10.4)$$

The Reeb distribution associated with $(\mathcal{S}, \Theta_L, \Xi)$ is then defined pointwise as

$$\mathcal{D}_p^R := \{ X \in \ker \Xi_p \mid \iota_X d\Theta_L \in \text{Ann}_p^d(\ker \Xi) \} \quad (10.5)$$

Sections of \mathcal{D}^R are the Reeb vector fields; we denote this space $\mathfrak{R} := \Gamma(\mathcal{D}^R)$. In practice, we shall always work with coordinates on \mathcal{S} adapted to the bundle structure $E \rightarrow M$, and so $\Xi = dx^0 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{d-1}$ is a closed form, from which it follows that $\ker \Xi$ consists of those vector fields whose vertical components $V^\mu \partial_{x^\mu}$ are vanishing. The space $\text{Ann}^d(\ker \Xi)$ then comprises all d -forms $\xi \in \Omega^d(\mathcal{S})$, for which $\iota_X \xi = 0$ for any choice of vector field of the form

$$X = A^a \frac{\partial}{\partial y^a} + B_\mu^a \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\mu^a} + C^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial s^\mu}$$

In addition to the Reeb distribution, we also have the characteristic distribution \mathcal{C} , defined as the intersection $\mathcal{C} := \ker \Xi \cap \ker \Theta_L \cap \ker d\Theta_L$.

With these geometrical constructions in-hand, the conditions under which the triple $(\mathcal{S}, \Theta_L, \Xi)$ constitutes a pre-multicontact manifold are that, for some $0 < k \leq n(1+d)$

- ★ $\text{rank } \ker \Xi = d + n + nd$
- ★ $\text{rank } \mathcal{D}^R = d + k$
- ★ $\text{rank } \mathcal{C} = k$
- ★ $\text{Ann}^{d-1}(\ker \Xi) = \{ \iota_R \Theta_L \mid R \in \mathfrak{R} \}$

Note that we have excluded the possibility that $k = 0$, for this is precisely the condition required for $(\mathcal{S}, \Theta_L, \Xi)$ to be multicontact, and not pre-multicontact. In practice, when working in adapted coordinates, the local Reeb fields are deduced from $\iota_{R_\mu} \Theta_L = d^{d-1} x_\mu$; however, observe that this does not determine the R_μ uniquely, for it is always possible to add to R_μ an element of the characteristic distribution, that is to say $\mathfrak{R} = \text{span}(R_\mu) + \mathcal{C}$.

Given an r -form $\xi \in \Omega^r(\mathcal{S})$, we introduce the following operator

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{d} : \Omega^r(\mathcal{S}) &\longrightarrow \Omega^{r+1}(\mathcal{S}) \\ \xi &\longmapsto \bar{d}\xi := d\xi + \sigma_{\Theta_L} \wedge \xi \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_{\Theta_L} \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{S})$ is known as the *dissipation form*, and is expressed in local coordinates as

$$\sigma_{\Theta_L} = - \frac{\partial L}{\partial s^\mu} dx^\mu \quad (10.6)$$

The $(d+1)$ -form Ω_L is then defined as

$$\Omega_L = \bar{d}\Theta_L = d\Theta_L - \frac{\partial L}{\partial s^\mu} dx^\mu \wedge \Theta_L \quad (10.7)$$

Given a (pre-)multicontact Lagrangian system $(\mathcal{S}, \Theta_L, \Xi)$, the equations of motion for sections $\Psi \in \Gamma(M, \mathcal{S})$ are given by

$$\Psi^* \Theta_L = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi^* \iota_Z \Omega_L = 0 \quad \text{for all } Z \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(\mathcal{S}) \quad (10.8)$$

We also have a similar pair equations for locally decomposable β -transverse multivector fields $\mathbf{X}_L \in \mathfrak{X}^d(\mathcal{S})$, which take the form

$$\iota_{\mathbf{X}_L} \Theta_L = 0 \quad \iota_{\mathbf{X}_L} \Omega_L = 0 \quad (10.9)$$

When $(\mathcal{S}, \Theta_L, \Xi)$ is multicontact, the multivector field solutions are integrable, with holonomic integral sections; in local coordinates, such a section may be expressed as

$$\Psi(x) = \left(x^\mu, y^a(x), \left. \frac{\partial y^a}{\partial x^\mu} \right|_x, s^\mu(x) \right)$$

with which the coordinate-free equations (10.8) become

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial y_\mu^a} \circ \Psi \right) &= \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial y^a} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_\mu^a} \frac{\partial L}{\partial s^\mu} \right) \circ \Psi \\ \frac{\partial s^\mu}{\partial x^\mu} &= L \circ \Psi \end{aligned} \quad (10.10)$$

We refer to these expressions as the *Herglotz-Lagrange field equations* [93]. When $(\mathcal{S}, \Theta_L, \Xi)$ is pre-multicontact, if multivector field solutions of (10.9) do exist, which is not guaranteed, they are generally not integrable. Consequently, the goal of the constraint algorithm, is to deduce the maximal submanifold $\mathcal{S}_f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}$ upon which holonomic multivector field solutions exist, and crucially, are tangent to \mathcal{S}_f .

B. The Pre-multicontact Constraint Algorithm

The geometrical constraint algorithm for singular field theories may be formulated in an intrinsic manner [21]; however, in what follows, we shall provide a somewhat less formal exposition, favouring a local, more practical approach. Recall that the dynamical problem to be solved is the following: given an almost-regular Lagrangian system $(\mathcal{S}, \Theta_L, \Xi)$, we seek the maximal submanifold $\mathcal{S}_f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}$, upon which there exist locally decomposable, β -transverse, holonomic multivector field solutions to (10.9).

We begin by introducing the space of d -multivector fields which are solutions to the equations of motion, but are not necessarily β -transverse or integrable

$$\ker^d(\Theta_L, \Omega_L) := \{ \mathbf{X}_L \in \mathfrak{X}^d(\mathcal{S}) \mid \iota_{\mathbf{X}_L} \Theta_L = 0 \text{ and } \iota_{\mathbf{X}_L} \Omega_L = 0 \}$$

Within this space, we then seek the subset of those multivector fields which are locally decomposable and β -transverse, denoting the resulting subspace $\ker_\beta^d(\Theta_L, \Omega_L) \subset \ker^d(\Theta_L, \Omega_L)$. In practice, as a first step, we shall often simply assume that a solution \mathbf{X}_L has the local coordinate decomposition

$$\mathbf{X}_L = \bigwedge_{\mu=0}^{d-1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} + F_\mu^a \frac{\partial}{\partial y^a} + G_{\mu\nu}^a \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\nu^a} + K_\mu^\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial s^\nu} \right) \quad (10.11)$$

which is clearly an element of $\ker_\beta^d(\Theta_L, \Omega_L)$. Upon substituting this into the dynamical equations $\iota_{\mathbf{X}_L} \Theta_L = 0$ and $\iota_{\mathbf{X}_L} \Omega_L = 0$, we must ensure that the resulting expressions do not contain any inconsistencies. Supposing that we do in fact obtain a compatible set of equations, we now restrict $\ker_\beta^d(\Theta_L, \Omega_L)$ to the subset of semi-holonomic solutions, which amounts to setting $F_\mu^a = y_\mu^a$ in the decomposition (10.11); in general, this step gives rise to further consistency conditions, and possibly to new constraints.

As was the case for the pre-symplectic algorithm, we must, at every stage, ensure that the dynamics of the system remain confined to the constraint submanifold; thus, for each local constraint function Φ , if \mathbf{X}_L is expressed as the product $\mathbf{X}_L = X_0 \wedge \cdots \wedge X_{d-1}$, we must demand that $\mathcal{L}_{X_\mu} \Phi = 0$ for $\mu = 0, \dots, d-1$. If these tangency conditions themselves give rise to additional constraints, such functions must again have vanishing Lie derivative along each of the X_μ .

The final step of the algorithm requires us to examine the integrability of our semi-holonomic solutions. Such an analysis is conducted by considering the constraints which arise as a result of imposing that $[X_\mu, X_\nu] = 0$ for $\mu, \nu = 0, \dots, d-1$. This leads to the final subspace $\ker_H^d(\Theta_L, \Omega_L)$, consisting of locally decomposable, β -transverse, holonomic multivector fields, which, in general, will only exist on the submanifold $\mathcal{S}_f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}$.

XI. CONTACT REDUCTION OF SINGULAR FIELD THEORIES

We shall now present the field-theoretic construction, which generalises the concepts developed in section (VII); as stated previously, we shall favour the Lagrangian formalism, as opposed to the Hamiltonian framework, as the latter suffers from significantly more pathological features, when considering singular field theories. Our exposition follows closely that of [29], and so we shall focus on features of the reduction process that are unique to singular theories.

Referring to the notation developed throughout section (IX A), we suppose that (J^1E, Ω_L) is a pre-multisymplectic Lagrangian system, with corresponding Lagrangian function $L : J^1E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. From the Cartan d -form Θ_L , we define

$$\theta_L^\mu := -\iota_{\partial_{d-1}} \cdots \iota_{\partial_0} (\Theta_L \wedge dx^\mu) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_\mu^a} dy^a \quad (11.1)$$

The vector field $\Sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(J^1E)$ then constitutes a scaling symmetry of degree Λ if

$$\mathfrak{L}_\Sigma L = \Lambda L \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{L}_\Sigma \theta_L^\mu = \theta_L^\mu \quad \text{for all } \mu = 0, \dots, d-1$$

Consider a Herglotz (*i.e* multicontact) Lagrangian L^H , embedded within a multisymplectic manifold of one dimension higher through the expression

$$L = e^\rho (L^H + \rho_\mu s^\mu) \quad (11.2)$$

We shall suppose that L^H depends upon the scalar fields ϕ^a ($a = 1, \dots, k$), and their first derivatives ϕ_μ^a , together with the action density s^μ . We define a field variable ρ in such a way that

$$\rho_\mu = - \frac{\partial L^H}{\partial s^\mu} \quad (11.3)$$

It is relatively straightforward to show that the equations of motion of L directly imply the Herglotz-Lagrange field equations for L^H , when the former is restricted to the subspace upon which L^H is defined. In light of this, suppose that, having identified a scaling symmetry Σ of our pre-multisymplectic system, we adopt coordinates on J^1E in such a way so as to render this vector field of the form

$$\Sigma = \xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} + \xi_\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_\mu} \quad (11.4)$$

In these coordinates, the Lagrangian function depends upon both ξ and ξ_μ , together with a set of unscaled field variables ψ^a , and their corresponding velocities ψ_μ^a . Finally, we make the redefinition $\xi = e^{\rho/\Lambda}$, so that the scaling symmetry vector field is simply $\Sigma = \Lambda \partial_\rho$, and the Lagrangian takes the form

$$L = e^\rho f(\rho_\mu, \psi^a, \psi_\mu^a) \quad (11.5)$$

The Euler-Lagrange field equation for ρ then implies that the function f may be written as

$$f = \rho_\mu \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho_\mu} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho_\mu}$$

which, when compared to (11.2), and recalling that the Herglotz-Lagrange equations require that $\partial_\mu s^\mu = L^H$, suggests we should identify

$$s^\mu = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho_\mu} \quad L^H = f - \rho_\mu s^\mu \quad (11.6)$$

All steps outlined above are applicable to regular Lagrangian systems; however, the novelty that arises in the singular case, is that the Lagrangian d -form Θ_{L^H} calculated from the symmetry-reduced function L^H is not guaranteed to be pre-multicontact. Consequently, as a crucial additional step, we must compute the characteristic and Reeb distributions, after making the ‘naïve’ contact reduction; if these objects do not

satisfy the conditions given in section (X), the symmetry reduction procedure fails. Of course, we shall only consider those physically interesting cases, in which the reduced space does inherit a pre-multicontact structure; nevertheless, it is a non-trivial condition that must be verified.

Having calculated Θ_{L^H} , and confirmed that $\text{rank } \mathcal{D}^R = d + k$ and $\text{rank } \mathcal{C} = k$, for some $0 < k \leq n(1 + d)$, we have a pre-multicontact manifold $(\mathcal{S}_0, \Theta_{L^H})$, in which \mathcal{S}_0 denotes the reduced space, obtained as a result of excising the scaling variable ρ . Geometrically speaking, if the system of interest is such that we may globally choose a single covariant configuration space variable as a scaling function: that is to say, if the quantity ξ in (11.4) corresponds to a single field variable on E , then, upon writing the Lagrangian in the form (11.5), E separates into two connected pieces E_\pm , where each of E_\pm is the product of a trivial bundle, and a codimension-1 subspace: $E_\pm \cong \tilde{E} \times_M (M \times \mathbb{R}_\pm)$. The two components E_\pm arise as a result of the change of variable $\xi \rightarrow e^{\rho/\Lambda}$, which selects only the positive component of ξ . In order to cover the full range of ξ , we must also consider a change of variables in which $\xi \rightarrow -e^{\rho/\Lambda}$. Within each of E_\pm , it is precisely the trivial bundle $M \times \mathbb{R}_\pm \rightarrow M$ that is eliminated by the contact reduction. Thus, provided we consider both components, so as not to lose any dynamical information, the reduced space is isomorphic to $J^1 \tilde{E} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, in which the codimension-1 subspace \tilde{E} may intuitively be identified with a covariant configuration space comprised of all original field variables, except ρ . The reduced space does *not* simply inherit the structure of the jet bundle $J^1 E$, since the field variable ρ has been excised, but the velocities ρ_μ have not; indeed these d independent parameters span a copy of \mathbb{R}^d , and the Cartan form Θ_{L^H} determines whether this defines a Reeb distribution.

Supposing that $(\mathcal{S}_0, \Theta_{L^H})$ does constitute a pre-multicontact system, with characteristic distribution \mathcal{C} , we calculate the $(d + 1)$ -form $\Omega_{L^H} := d\Theta_{L^H}$, and introduce a multivector field $\mathbf{X}_{L^H} \in \mathfrak{X}^d(\mathcal{S}_0)$, with local decomposition

$$\mathbf{X}_{L^H} = \bigwedge_{\mu=0}^{d-1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} + F_\mu^a \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi^a} + G_{\mu\nu}^a \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_\nu^a} + K_\mu^\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial s^\nu} \right)$$

in which we employ notation consistent with the decomposition (11.5), denoting the unscaled fields ψ^a . Following this, we compute the constraints that arise as a result of setting $\iota_{\mathbf{X}_{L^H}} \Theta_{L^H} = 0$ and $\iota_{\mathbf{X}_{L^H}} \Omega_{L^H} = 0$, following the algorithmic procedure detailed in section (XB). The final constraint submanifold $\mathcal{S}_f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}_0$ is the maximal space upon which holonomic multivector field solutions exist, and further, on this space, the observable dynamics described by these solutions coincides with that which we would have obtained by constraining the original pre-multisymplectic system.

XII. EFFECTIVE NON-ABELIAN GAUGE THEORY

The appearance of scalar fields that directly couple to gauge curvature terms is a phenomenon which arises most notably in string-inspired models [94, 95]. Indeed, the imprint of dilaton fields on low-energy effective actions has speculatively been regarded as a means to offer novel insight into problems such as colour confinement [96, 97]. In this section, we present an example of a non-Abelian gauge theory coupled to a dilaton-like scalar field; our goal is to illustrate how the concepts of previous sections are applied in practice, as well as to discuss the physical interpretation of our results.

A. Geometrical Setting

Let $\pi : P \rightarrow M$ be a principle G -bundle over the d -dimensional spacetime manifold M ; on P , there exists a unique, Lie algebra valued connection 1-form $\omega \in \Omega^1(P, \mathcal{L}(G))$, which descends to a local form $A := s^* \omega \in \Omega^1(U, \mathcal{L}(G))$, in which $s : U \rightarrow P$ is a local trivialising section of P , defined on the open subset $U \subset M$. We shall suppose that the spacetime manifold M is equipped with a Lorentzian metric g of signature $(+, -, -, \dots)$; this metric is considered to be parametric, and non-variational [19], so that, physically, our theory is defined on a curved background, which we may change, but is not coupled to gravity. The appropriate covariant configuration space for this theory is

$$\mathcal{E} = C(P) \times_M (M \times \mathbb{R}) \times_M \text{Sym}_2^{1,d-1}(M) \quad (12.1)$$

where $C(P) \rightarrow M$ is the bundle of connections on P , with $C(P) \cong J^1 P/G$ [98]. The space $\text{Sym}_2^{1,d-1}(M)$ refers to the set of symmetric covariant tensors of rank 2 and Lorentzian signature $(1, d-1)$ on M , and thus parameterises our choice of metric. Local coordinates on E are denoted $(x^\mu, A_\mu^a, \phi; g_{\mu\nu})$, in which the semicolon separates the parametric and variational degrees of freedom, and the index a runs from $a = 1, \dots, \dim \mathcal{L}(G) := n$. The Lagrangian density is a semibasic d -form on the space

$$\mathcal{Q} := J^1(C(P) \times_M (M \times \mathbb{R})) \times_M \text{Sym}_2^{1,d-1}(M) \quad (12.2)$$

upon which we take local coordinates to be $(x^\mu, A_\mu^a, \phi, A_{\mu,\nu}^a, \phi_\mu; g_{\mu\nu})$. The corresponding Lagrangian function $L : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is

$$L = \text{Tr} \left[-\frac{\phi^2}{2g^2} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + 2J_\mu A^\mu \right] + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \phi_\mu \phi_\nu - V(\phi) \quad (12.3)$$

where the trace is taken over the indices of $\mathcal{L}(G)$, and F refers to the Lie algebra valued curvature 2-form $F := dA + \frac{1}{2}[A, A]$.

In what follows, we shall adopt group-theoretic conventions more prevalent in the physics literature, taking the generators T_a of the Lie algebra to be Hermitian, with $[T_a, T_b] = i f_{ab}^c T_c$. Supposing that G is a semi-simple compact Lie group, the Hermiticity of the T_a implies that the Killing form is both non-degenerate, and positive semi-definite; in the fundamental representation, we adopt the following normalisation with respect to the trace

$$\text{Tr}(T_a T_b) = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab} \quad (12.4)$$

and we raise and lower indices with δ^{ab} and δ_{ab} , writing $f_{abc} = \delta_{cd} f_{ab}^d$, for example. Returning to the Lagrangian (12.3), J_μ^a is a Lie algebra valued 1-form that couples to the gauge field, acting as a source term, and $V(\phi)$ is the non-perturbative dilaton potential. For simplicity of exposition, we shall take $V(\phi)$ to be a single mass term $\frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi^2$, and temporarily ignore the source; having carried out the contact reduction, we will briefly comment on the implications of reinstating J_μ^a .

We remark that, with the above conventions, we have implicitly assumed that the dilaton transforms trivially under G ; were ϕ to transform in some non-trivial representation $\rho : G \rightarrow GL(V)$, we would instead have to consider the associated bundle $P \times_\rho V$, with the result that our covariant configuration space \mathcal{E} would instead be

$$\mathcal{E} = C(P) \times_M (P \times_\rho V) \times_M \text{Sym}_2^{1,d-1}(M)$$

where the trivial bundle $M \times \mathbb{R}$ has been replaced with the vector bundle $P \times_\rho V$ associated to P via the representation ρ . In the interest of limiting the number of additional complications, we shall content ourselves with a dilaton that transforms trivially. With these considerations, we rewrite (12.3) as

$$L = -\frac{\phi^2}{4g^2} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_a^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \phi_\mu \phi_\nu - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi^2 \quad (12.5)$$

in which the curvature $F_{\mu\nu}^a$ has the following local coordinate expression

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a = A_{\nu,\mu}^a - A_{\mu,\nu}^a + f_{bc}^a A_\mu^b A_\nu^c$$

The degeneracy of this Lagrangian arises as a result of the gauge symmetry; indeed, the Hessian matrix with respect to $A_{\mu,\nu}^a$ and ϕ_μ has the following entries

$$\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial A_{\nu,\mu}^a \partial A_{\lambda,\kappa}^b} = -\frac{\phi^2}{g^2} \delta_{ab} (g^{\nu\lambda} g^{\mu\kappa} - g^{\nu\kappa} g^{\mu\lambda}) \quad \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \phi_\mu \partial \phi_\nu} = g^{\mu\nu} \quad \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial A_{\nu,\mu}^a \partial \phi_\lambda} = 0$$

which, from the antisymmetric combinations of $g^{\mu\nu}$, is non-invertible. The multisymplectic form Θ_L is of degree d , and from (9.2), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_L = & \left(-\frac{\phi^2}{g^2} F_a^{\mu\nu} dA_\nu^a + g^{\mu\nu} \phi_\nu d\phi \right) \wedge d^{d-1} x_\mu - \left(-\frac{\phi^2}{g^2} F_a^{\mu\nu} A_{\nu,\mu}^a \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\phi^2}{4g^2} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_a^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \phi_\mu \phi_\nu + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi^2 \right) d^d x \end{aligned} \quad (12.6)$$

As described in section (XI), from Θ_L , we extract the following 1-forms

$$\theta_L^\mu := -\iota_{\partial_{d-1}} \cdots \iota_{\partial_0} (\Theta_L \wedge dx^\mu) = -\frac{\phi^2}{g^2} F_a^{\mu\nu} dA_\nu^a + g^{\mu\nu} \phi_\nu d\phi \quad (12.7)$$

From the structure of θ_L^μ , and the Lagrangian (12.5), it is relatively clear that the vector field

$$\Sigma = \frac{1}{2} \left(\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + \phi_\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_\mu} \right)$$

satisfies $\mathfrak{L}_\Sigma \theta_L^\mu = \theta_L^\mu$ and $\mathfrak{L}_\Sigma L = L$, with which we conclude that Σ is a scaling symmetry of degree one.

B. Contact Reduction

Upon making the change of variables $\phi \mapsto e^{\rho/2}$, the scaling symmetry vector field Σ is now simply ∂_ρ , and the Lagrangian, with the curvature term expanded in full, reads

$$L = -\frac{e^\rho}{4g^2} \left[g^{\mu\lambda} g^{\nu\kappa} (A_{\nu,\mu}^a - A_{\mu,\nu}^a + f_{bc}^a A_\mu^b A_\nu^c) (A_{\kappa,\lambda}^a - A_{\lambda,\kappa}^a + f_{de}^a A_\lambda^d A_\kappa^e) \right] + e^\rho \left(\frac{1}{8} g^{\mu\nu} \rho_\mu \rho_\nu - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \right) \quad (12.8)$$

Recall from section (XI) that when the Lagrangian is expressed in the form $L = e^\rho f(\rho_\mu, A_\mu, A_{\mu,\nu})$, the action density is found from $s^\mu = \partial f / \partial \rho_\mu$, whilst the Herglotz Lagrangian takes the form $L^H = f - \rho_\mu s^\mu$; for the former, we find

$$s^\mu := \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho_\mu} = \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\nu} \rho_\nu \quad \implies \quad \rho_\mu = 4g_{\mu\nu} s^\nu \quad (12.9)$$

In anticipation of the elimination of ρ_μ in favour of the action density, we have expressed the former in terms of the latter. The Herglotz Lagrangian for this system is then

$$L^H = -\frac{1}{4g^2} \left[g^{\mu\lambda} g^{\nu\kappa} (A_{\nu,\mu}^a - A_{\mu,\nu}^a + f_{bc}^a A_\mu^b A_\nu^c) (A_{\kappa,\lambda}^a - A_{\lambda,\kappa}^a + f_{de}^a A_\lambda^d A_\kappa^e) \right] - \frac{1}{2} m^2 - 2g_{\mu\nu} s^\mu s^\nu \quad (12.10)$$

Due to the singular nature of the Lagrangian (12.5) from which L^H is constructed, it is not a priori guaranteed that the d -form Θ_{L^H} endows the reduced space with a pre-multicontact structure. Consequently, prior to implementing the constraint algorithm, we must compute the characteristic and Reeb distributions, verifying that they do indeed satisfy the conditions required for Θ_{L^H} to be pre-multicontact.

Geometrically, referring to the decomposition (12.1), we see that the excision of the dilaton corresponds to the removal of the trivial bundle $M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$, defining a reduced covariant configuration space \mathcal{E}_{red} . More formally, since ϕ is a globally-defined scaling function, the symplectification $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{red}}$ is a trivial \mathbb{R}^\times -bundle over M , composed of two connected components $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{red}}^\pm$, which, with the change of variables $\phi \rightarrow e^{\rho/2}$, correspond to symplectification via $\pm e^{\rho/2}$. Consequently, with the understanding that care must be taken to ensure that both components are considered, we may somewhat informally speak of a reduced space \mathcal{E}_{red} that is isomorphic to $C(P) \times_M \text{Sym}_2^{1,d-1}(M)$. The Herglotz Lagrangian is defined on the space

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{red}} = \left(J^1 C(P) \times_M \text{Sym}_2^{1,d-1}(M) \right) \times \mathbb{R}^d \quad (12.11)$$

where the additional factor of \mathbb{R}^d comes from the d velocities ρ_μ , which have assumed the role of the action density s^μ . The task is then to deduce whether the d -form Θ_{L^H} , given by

$$\Theta_{L^H} = \left(ds^\mu + \frac{1}{g^2} F_a^{\mu\nu} dA_\nu^a \right) \wedge d^{d-1} x_\mu + \left(-\frac{1}{g^2} F_a^{\mu\nu} A_{\nu,\mu}^a + \frac{1}{4g^2} F_a^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}^a + \frac{1}{2} m^2 + 2g_{\mu\nu} s^\mu s^\nu \right) d^d x \quad (12.12)$$

endows \mathcal{Q}_{red} with a pre-multicontact structure. In order to calculate Ω_{L^H} , we require the dissipation form σ

$$\sigma = -\frac{\partial L^H}{\partial s^\mu} dx^\mu = 4g_{\mu\nu} s^\nu dx^\mu$$

Thus we find that the $(d+1)$ -form Ω_{L^H} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{L^H} = \frac{1}{g^2} dF_a^{\mu\nu} \wedge dA_{\nu,\mu}^a \wedge d^{d-1}x_\mu + \left(\frac{1}{2g^2} (F_a^{\mu\nu} dF_{\mu\nu}^a - 2F_a^{\mu\nu} dA_{\nu,\mu}^a - 2A_{\nu,\mu}^a dF_a^{\mu\nu}) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{4}{g^2} g_{\mu\lambda} s^\lambda F_a^{\mu\nu} dA_\nu^a \right) \wedge d^d x \end{aligned} \quad (12.13)$$

From the local expression (12.12), we see that $\iota_{\partial_{s^\mu}} \Theta_{L^H} = d^{d-1}x_\mu$, and that the velocity coordinates $A_{\nu,\mu}^a$ only appear in the antisymmetric combinations $A_{\nu,\mu}^a - A_{\mu,\nu}^a$. Additionally, it is straightforward to calculate that $\iota_{\partial_{s^\mu}} d\Theta_{L^H} = 4g_{\mu\nu} s^\nu d^d x$, which is a d -form that is annihilated by any vector field in $\ker \Xi$. From these observations, we deduce that the characteristic and Reeb distributions are given by

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial A_{\nu,\mu}^a} + \frac{\partial}{\partial A_{\mu,\nu}^a} \right\rangle \quad \mathcal{D}^R = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial A_{\nu,\mu}^a} + \frac{\partial}{\partial A_{\mu,\nu}^a}, \frac{\partial}{\partial s^\mu} \right\rangle \quad (12.14)$$

for $\mu, \nu = 0, \dots, d-1$ and $a = 1, \dots, \dim \mathcal{L}(G) = n$. Note that the ranks of these distributions are

$$\text{rank } \mathcal{C} = n \frac{d(d+1)}{2} \quad \text{rank } \mathcal{D}^R = n \frac{d(d+1)}{2} + d$$

which, referring to the discussion of section (X A), are consistent with a pre-multicontact distribution with $k = d$. Consequently, we conclude that Θ_{L^H} does in fact define a pre-multicontact structure on \mathcal{Q}_{red} , and so may proceed with the constraint analysis; for the purpose of discussing the construction of multivector field solutions, we introduce the projection $\beta : \mathcal{Q}_{\text{red}} \rightarrow M$.

C. The Constraint Algorithm

As described in section (X B), the objective of the constraint procedure is to deduce the maximal submanifold $\mathcal{Q}_f \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{\text{red}}$ upon which there exist multivector field solutions \mathbf{X} of the equations $\iota_{\mathbf{X}} \Theta_{L^H} = 0$ and $\iota_{\mathbf{X}} \Omega_{L^H} = 0$, that are locally decomposable, β -transverse, and holonomic. We begin by supposing that a locally decomposable, β -transverse solution $\mathbf{X} \in \ker_\beta^d(\Theta_{L^H}, \Omega_{L^H})$ exists, with

$$\mathbf{X} = \bigwedge_{\mu=0}^{d-1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} + C_{\mu\nu}^a \frac{\partial}{\partial A_\nu^a} + G_{\mu\nu\kappa}^a \frac{\partial}{\partial A_{\kappa,\nu}^a} + K_\mu^\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial s^\nu} \right) := \bigwedge_{\mu=0}^{d-1} V_\mu \quad (12.15)$$

The contraction of \mathbf{X} with the pre-multicontact form Θ_{L^H} provides a single equation, as the degree of the multivector field coincides with that of the differential form. Imposing that $\iota_{\mathbf{X}} \Theta_{L^H} = 0$, we find that

$$K_\mu^\mu = \frac{1}{g^2} (A_{\nu,\mu}^a - C_{\mu\nu}^a) F_a^{\mu\nu} + \left(-\frac{1}{4g^2} F_a^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}^a - \frac{1}{2} m^2 - 2g_{\mu\nu} s^\mu s^\nu \right) \quad (12.16)$$

Note that the final quantity on the right-hand side is precisely L^H , and the bracket $(A_{\nu,\mu}^a - C_{\mu\nu}^a)$ vanishes upon imposing semi-holonomy.

The contraction $\iota_{\mathbf{X}} \Omega_{L^H}$ is somewhat involved, and the lengthy algebraic manipulations required are not particularly illuminating; for completeness, we provide the details in appendix A. Performing the contraction $\iota_{\mathbf{X}} \Omega_{L^H}$, and setting the result to zero, we obtain the following pair of expressions

$$0 = (A_{\nu,\mu}^a - A_{\mu,\nu}^a) - (C_{\mu\nu}^a - C_{\nu\mu}^a) \quad (12.17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} (G_{\mu\rho\sigma}^a - G_{\sigma\rho\mu}^a) + f_{bc}^a g^{\nu\rho} A^{b\mu} (C_{\mu\rho}^c - C_{\rho\mu}^c) + f_{bc}^a (g^{\nu\rho} A^{b\mu} - g^{\mu\rho} A^{b\nu}) C_{\mu\rho}^c \\ + f_{bc}^e f_{de}^a A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} A_\mu^d + 4g_{\mu\lambda} s^\lambda F^{a\mu\nu} \end{aligned} \quad (12.18)$$

Having computed $\iota_{\mathbf{X}}\Theta_{L^H}$ and $\iota_{\mathbf{X}}\Omega_{L^H}$ in local coordinates, the next stage of the algorithm requires that we examine the effects of imposing semi-holonomy;⁶ for the multivector field (12.15), this implies we should set $C_{\mu\nu}^a = A_{\nu,\mu}^a$. With this, (12.17) is rendered trivial, and (12.16) reduces to $K_\mu^\mu = L^H$, as expected. Following the procedure detailed in appendix A, combining the $G_{\mu\rho\sigma}^a$ terms with $f_{bc}^a (g^{\nu\rho} A^{b\mu} - g^{\mu\rho} A^{b\nu}) C_{\mu\rho}^c$, and denoting the result $g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} F_{\rho\sigma,\mu}^a$, we find that (12.18) becomes

$$0 = g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} F_{\rho\sigma,\mu}^a + f_{bc}^a g^{\nu\rho} A^{b\mu} F_{\mu\rho}^c + 4g_{\mu\lambda} s^\lambda F^{a\mu\nu} \quad (12.19)$$

It should be noted that, in the above, care has been taken to ensure that our notation for the velocity coordinates of the gauge field is merely reminiscent of a partial derivative with respect to the spacetime coordinates. In particular, until we have examined the integrability of our system, $A_{\nu,\mu}^a \neq \partial_\mu A_\nu^a$ and $G_{\mu\nu\sigma}^a \neq \partial_\mu \partial_\nu A_\sigma^a$. However, upon imposing the necessary conditions for $\text{span}(V_\mu)$ to define an involutive distribution, we may affirm that the multivector field \mathbf{X} possesses holonomic integral sections $\psi : M \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{\text{red}}$, whose local coordinate expression is

$$\psi(x) = \left(x^\mu, A_\mu^a(x), \frac{\partial A_\mu^a}{\partial x^\nu}(x), s^\mu(x) \right) \quad (12.20)$$

Only after introducing these integral sections may we identify $A_{\nu,\mu}^a$ with the familiar $\partial_\mu A_\nu^a$. In light of this, we now turn to an analysis of the integrability of \mathbf{X} ; the distribution formed by the V_μ will be involutive if, and only if it is closed under the Lie bracket; however, since partial derivatives with respect to the spacetime coordinates commute, involutivity is only guaranteed if $[V_\mu, V_\nu] = 0$ for all $\mu, \nu = 0, \dots, d-1$. Thus, computing the Lie bracket, and demanding that the result be zero, we find that

$$G_{\nu\mu\sigma}^a - G_{\mu\nu\sigma}^a = A_{\sigma,\mu\nu}^a - A_{\sigma,\nu\mu}^a \quad (12.21)$$

This condition produces no inconsistencies for the coefficients of the multivector field, and so (12.16) and (12.19) may be reexpressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu s^\mu &= L^H \\ \partial_\mu F^{a\mu\nu} + f_{bc}^a A_\mu^b F^{c\mu\nu} + 4g_{\mu\lambda} s^\lambda F^{a\mu\nu} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (12.22)$$

The first two terms of the second expression form the familiar covariant derivative $(\mathcal{D}_\mu F^{\mu\nu})^a$, whilst the final term is a common feature of contact-reduced theories, that arises as a result of eliminating a scaling degree of freedom from our ontology. More concretely, in the original Lagrangian (12.3), there was a coupling between the scalar field ϕ and the gauge-kinetic term $\text{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu})$; the removal of the dilaton, in favour of a minimal ontology, comes at the cost of introducing a dissipative characteristic into the theory, which is made manifest through the coupling of the gauge field strength to the action density.

Before concluding, there remains an important matter to be discussed, concerning the physical interpretation of the excision of the scalar field ϕ . In particular, one may be inclined to object that, for theories in which parameter values are determined by expectation values of scalar fields, it is not possible to claim that such fields are ‘redundant’. However, this is not the case; consider, for instance, an experiment in which one attempts to deduce the expectation value $\langle\phi\rangle$, which, for the current discussion, we shall suppose to fix some coupling parameter g_s . The value of g_s is not something directly accessible to an observer, but rather is deduced via comparison to a reference object; this is entirely analogous to how an object of length 1 m is only known to be such because its size is in a 1:1 ratio with that of a previously-standardised instrument. Consequently, under changes generated by ϕ , the measuring apparatus is subjected to precisely the same rescaling as g_s , with the result that the overall scaling is empirically inaccessible. Thus, we *are* justified in asserting that this degree of freedom is redundant, from the perspective of the algebra of dynamical observables.

In fact, we make a somewhat bolder claim: if one is able to construct a theory whose empirically-accessible degrees of freedom are invariant under a particular transformation, we assert that it is a *necessary* condition,

⁶ Recall that it is semi-holonomy that we must impose first, since we have not yet considered the integrability of \mathbf{X} .

for any relational description, that the mathematical artifice generating such transformations be excisable.

To appreciate why this must be so, consider an arbitrary system \mathcal{S} , together with an intrinsic observer, who wishes to construct a relational description of \mathcal{S} . The observer has at their disposal only those quantities whose values are ascertainable through physical measurement. For instance, all lengths are deduced with respect to a standard metre stick, and similarly, all times are measured as multiples of the standardised ‘tick’ of a clock.

Suppose that we ourselves are *extrinsic* (i.e external) observers to \mathcal{S} , and we note that, under a certain transformation \mathcal{T} , the set of variables we use to describe \mathcal{S} suffer a rescaling. However, this rescaling is such that the dynamical equations we deduce remain invariant. As a trivial example, we consider a pair of variables (x, t) , with $\mathcal{T} : (x, t) \mapsto (\lambda x, \lambda t)$; the velocity \dot{x} remains invariant, even though the variables used to deduce \dot{x} do not. The generator of the transformation \mathcal{T} must be a redundant component of our description; if it were redundant, but non-excisable, then it would necessarily appear in the ontology of the observer, else the intrinsic and extrinsic theories would not describe the same system. This contradicts our assumption that the observer’s description is relational. Similarly, if the generator of \mathcal{T} were non-excisable because its presence was required to deduce dynamical evolution, it would be false to claim that the relational description is invariant under \mathcal{T} . Consequently, in order for it to be simultaneously true that the observer’s description is wholly relational *and* that there exists a transformation which leaves the dynamical observables invariant, it must be the case that the generator of this transformation is a feature of our mathematical description that can be removed.

Finally, before concluding, we briefly comment that, had we retained the source term J_μ^a in our Lagrangian, after introducing the change of variables $\phi \rightarrow e^{\rho/2}$, (12.8) would instead read

$$L = e^\rho \left(-\frac{1}{4g^2} F_{\mu\nu}^a F_a^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{8} g^{\mu\nu} \rho_\mu \rho_\nu - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \right) + J_\mu^a A_\mu^a \quad (12.23)$$

Clearly the presence of this additional term destroys the scaling symmetry, and we are no longer able to make a contact reduction. For theories of particles (described within the Hamiltonian formalism), an expedient trick for treating such systems is to make the coupling dynamical, by enlarging the phase space, appending a copy of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ to the cotangent bundle. With this, the coupling is promoted to a momentum variable, such that the Hamiltonian is independent of the corresponding conjugate position. In this way, Hamilton’s equations reveal that the new momentum is constant in time, which is precisely the desired outcome [14]. At present, more work is required to find a field-theoretic analogue - if such an extension exists - which allows coupling parameters to acquire their own dynamics, rendering Lagrangians of the type (12.23) reducible.

XIII. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

Many of the most mathematically-rich models in contemporary theoretical physics possess, as a central component, gauge symmetries; such theories are described by singular Lagrangians, and over the course of this article, we have provided a basic introduction to gauge theories, from the perspective of geometric mechanics. For systems of particles, the appropriate formalism was that of pre-symplectic geometry, while a field-theoretic discussion required the introduction of the fibred manifolds of pre-multisymplectic geometry. We have demonstrated that singular theories which exhibit invariance under global scaling transformations may be subjected to a reduction process similar to that which has been studied for regular systems, provided that degeneracies are controlled, through use of a suitable constraint algorithm. We observed that this constraint procedure could be implemented pre- or post-reduction; from a physical perspective, this is to be expected: if the processes of contact reduction and phase space restriction were non-commutative, this would imply that the constraint functions had, in some sense, information about the global scaling variable. Had the reduction of a constrained system led to a theory distinct from that obtained via the constraint of a reduced theory, then any system described by a degenerate Lagrangian would offer a means to detect changes in global scale, which is a highly unphysical outcome.

Having described the reduction of singular field theories, we then provided an example of an effective non-Abelian gauge theory coupled to a dilaton-like field; it was observed that this real scalar field was in fact

redundant, and could therefore be excised. The elimination of this degree of freedom was, at first sight, relatively alarming, particularly because the coupling parameters of a theory are often fixed by the expectation value of such scalar fields. However, we argued that the strength of an interaction is something that must necessarily be deduced via empirical methods; as such, any hypothetical experiment, conducted with the aim of measuring such parameters will be insensitive to a rescaling of their values, since the apparatus itself will suffer an identical change in scale.

The results presented throughout constitute a framework within which to analyse singular theories; it is known that, upon making a conformal decomposition of the spacetime metric, the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian possesses a scaling symmetry, corresponding precisely to the conformal factor [34]. To our knowledge, this scaling symmetry has not been studied within the first-order Palatini formalism, for which the multisymplectic Lagrangian description has been developed in [99] and [100]. From the results of the present work, we know that it is possible to implement the geometrical constraint algorithm *after* having eliminated the scaling degree of freedom. As such, it will be of great interest to examine any simplifications that arise, as a result of working with a reduced ontology, in which we retain only those degrees of freedom required to close the algebra of dynamical observables.

In general, we distinguish between two principal approaches to the treatment of classical field theory. On the one hand, as is customary when attempting to construct a quantum analogue of the theory, one may consider the temporal evolution of the initial data, defined on a particular choice of Cauchy slice [101]. This ‘canonical’ formulation studies spatially-dependent fields, defined at fixed instants of time, and has the notably inconvenient features of possessing an infinite-dimensional phase space, and sacrificing manifest Lorentz covariance [102]. The ADM formalism of General Relativity is a constrained Hamiltonian theory that adopts just such an approach, considering the (globally-hyperbolic) spacetime manifold to be foliated by spacelike hypersurfaces [103, 104].

The Hamilton De-Donder Weyl formalism we have employed throughout makes no distinction between the spacetime coordinates, which immediately guarantees the Lorentz covariance that was absent in the canonical formulation. Having established a framework within which to treat constrained theories, it will be highly illustrative to contrast the constraint of a contact-reduced action for General Relativity with the more familiar canonical approach.

Appendix A: Multivector Field Manipulations for Non-Abelian Gauge Theory

Here, we provide details of the algebraic manipulations required to compute $\iota_{\mathbf{X}}\Omega_{L^H}$, that were omitted from the main text. For convenience, we reproduce the local form of Ω_{L^H} given in (12.13)

$$\Omega_{L^H} = \frac{1}{g^2} dF_a^{\mu\nu} \wedge dA_\nu^a \wedge d^{d-1}x_\mu + \left(\frac{1}{2g^2} (F_a^{\mu\nu} dF_{\mu\nu}^a - 2F_a^{\mu\nu} dA_{\nu,\mu}^a - 2A_{\nu,\mu}^a dF_a^{\mu\nu}) - \frac{4}{g^2} g_{\mu\lambda} s^\lambda F_a^{\mu\nu} dA_\nu^a \right) \wedge d^d x \quad (\text{A1})$$

We begin by simplifying this expression, noting that the term $(F_{\mu\nu}^a - 2A_{\nu,\mu}^a) dF_a^{\mu\nu}$ may be expanded as

$$\Omega_{L^H} \supset (F_{\mu\nu}^a - 2A_{\nu,\mu}^a) dF_a^{\mu\nu} = - (A_{\nu,\mu}^a + A_{\mu,\nu}^a - f_{bc}^a A_\mu^b A_\nu^c) dF_a^{\mu\nu} = f_{bc}^a A_\mu^b A_\nu^c dF_a^{\mu\nu}$$

where, in the final equality, we have used the fact that $(A_{\nu,\mu}^a + A_{\mu,\nu}^a)$ is symmetric under the exchange of μ and ν , whereas $F_a^{\mu\nu}$ is antisymmetric. The differential $dF_a^{\mu\nu}$ may itself be expanded, allowing the second

bracket of (A1) to be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2g^2} (f_{bc}{}^a A_\mu^b A_\nu^c dF_a^{\mu\nu} - 2 F_a^{\mu\nu} dA_{\nu,\mu}^a) &= \frac{1}{2g^2} (f_{abc} A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} dF_{\mu\nu}^a - 2 F_a^{\mu\nu} dA_{\nu,\mu}^a) \\
&= \frac{1}{2g^2} ((f_{abc} A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} - F_a^{\mu\nu}) dA_{\nu,\mu}^a - (f_{abc} A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} - F_a^{\mu\nu}) dA_{\mu,\nu}^a \\
&\quad + f_{abc} f_{de}{}^a A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} (A_\mu^d dA_\nu^e + A_\nu^e dA_\mu^d)) \\
&= \frac{1}{g^2} ((A_a^{\mu,\nu} - A_a^{\nu,\mu}) dA_{\nu,\mu}^a + f_{abc} f_{de}{}^a A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} A_\mu^d dA_\nu^e)
\end{aligned}$$

In passing from the second to the third line, we have expanded each of the curvature terms, so that

$$f_{abc} A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} - F_a^{\mu\nu} = A_a^{\mu,\nu} - A_a^{\nu,\mu}$$

We have then relabeled dummy indices, and used the antisymmetry of $F_a^{\mu\nu}$. With this, the final form of Ω_{L^H} we use to deduce the geometrical field equations is

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_{L^H} &= \frac{1}{g^2} dF_a^{\mu\nu} \wedge dA_\nu^a \wedge d^{d-1}x_\mu \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{g^2} \left[(A_a^{\mu,\nu} - A_a^{\nu,\mu}) dA_{\nu,\mu}^a + (f_{abc} f_{de}{}^a A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} A_\mu^d - 4g_{\mu\lambda} s^\lambda F_e^{\mu\nu}) dA_\nu^e \right] \wedge d^d x
\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

The multivector field \mathbf{X} is of degree d , while Ω_{L^H} is a $(d+1)$ -form; as such, the contraction $\iota_{\mathbf{X}} \Omega_{L^H}$ yields a 1-form. The pair of expressions (12.17) and (12.18) arise as a result of contracting the d fields V_μ with Ω_{L^H} in such a way so as to leave a form proportional to $dA_{\nu,\mu}^a$ and dA_ν^a respectively. In the latter case, particular care must be taken, for $dF_a^{\mu\nu}$ contains dA_ν^a terms, which require us to swap the order of the triple wedge product, relabel dummy indices, and use the antisymmetry of f_{abc} to obtain the result. The equations of motion, reproduced here for convenience, read

$$0 = (A_{\nu,\mu}^a - A_{\mu,\nu}^a) - (C_{\mu\nu}^a - C_{\nu\mu}^a) \tag{A3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} (G_{\mu\rho\sigma}^a - G_{\sigma\rho\mu}^a) + f_{bc}{}^a g^{\nu\rho} A^{b\mu} (C_{\mu\rho}^c - C_{\rho\mu}^c) + f_{bc}{}^a (g^{\nu\rho} A^{b\mu} - g^{\mu\rho} A^{b\nu}) C_{\mu\rho}^c \\
&\quad + f_{bc}{}^e f_{de}{}^a A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} A_\mu^d + 4g_{\mu\lambda} s^\lambda F^{a\mu\nu}
\end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

When semi-holonomy is imposed, the first term of (12.18) may be combined with $f_{bc}{}^a (g^{\nu\rho} A^{b\mu} - g^{\mu\rho} A^{b\nu}) C_{\mu\rho}^c$ to produce an object we shall denote $g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} F_{\rho\sigma,\mu}^a$; this is achieved by relabeling both spacetime and Lie algebra indices, and using the antisymmetric properties of $f_{bc}{}^a$. Finally, we write $(C_{\mu\rho}^c - C_{\rho\mu}^c)$ as $F_{\mu\rho}^c - f_{de}{}^c A_\mu^d A_\rho^e$, and combine terms, using the Jacobi identity, as follows

$$f_{bc}{}^e f_{de}{}^a A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} A_\mu^d - f_{bc}{}^a f_{de}{}^c A^{e\nu} A_\mu^d A^{b\mu} = (f_{de}{}^a f_{bc}{}^e + f_{be}{}^a f_{cd}{}^e) A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} A_\mu^d = -f_{ce}{}^a f_{db}{}^e A^{b\mu} A^{c\nu} A_\mu^d$$

It is then clear that this term vanishes as a result of the antisymmetry of $f_{db}{}^e$ in d and b . Combining these observations, the equation of motion

$$0 = g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} F_{\rho\sigma,\mu}^a + f_{bc}{}^a g^{\nu\rho} A^{b\mu} F_{\mu\rho}^c + 4g_{\mu\lambda} s^\lambda F^{a\mu\nu} \tag{A5}$$

follows immediately.

-
- [1] Lochlainn O’Raifeartaigh. *The dawning of gauge theory*. Princeton University Press, 2020.
 - [2] Mark Srednicki. *Quantum field theory*. Cambridge university press, 2007.
 - [3] Giovanni Jona-Lasinio. Relativistic field theories with symmetry-breaking solutions. *Nuovo Cimento*, 34(CERN-TH-450):1790–1795, 1964.
 - [4] Michael E Peskin. *An Introduction to quantum field theory*. CRC press, 2018.
 - [5] Mary K Gaillard, Paul D Grannis, and Frank J Sciulli. The standard model of particle physics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 71(2):S96, 1999.

- [6] David Griffiths. *Introduction to elementary particles*. John Wiley & Sons, 2020.
- [7] Eran Palti. The swampland: introduction and review. *Fortschritte der Physik*, 67(6):1900037, 2019.
- [8] Marco Raveri, Wayne Hu, and Savdeep Sethi. Swampland conjectures and late-time cosmology. *Physical Review D*, 99(8):083518, 2019.
- [9] Daniel Harlow and Hiroshi Ooguri. Symmetries in quantum field theory and quantum gravity, 2019.
- [10] David Sloan. Scale symmetry and friction. *Symmetry*, 13(9):1639, 2021.
- [11] Mark J. Gotay, James M. Nester, and George Hinds. Presymplectic manifolds and the dirac-bergmann theory of constraints. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 19(11):2388–2399, 11 1978.
- [12] Mark J. Gotay and James M. Nester. Presymplectic lagrangian systems. I : the constraint algorithm and the equivalence theorem. *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré. Section A, Physique Théorique*, 30(2):129–142, 1979.
- [13] Mark J. Gotay and James M. Nester. Presymplectic lagrangian systems. II : the second-order equation problem. *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré. Section A, Physique Théorique*, 32(1):1–13, 1980.
- [14] Alessandro Bravetti, Connor Jackman, and David Sloan. Scaling symmetries, contact reduction and poincaré’s dream. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 56(43):435203, 2023.
- [15] David Sloan. Dynamical similarity. *Physical Review D*, 97(12):123541, 2018.
- [16] Narciso Román-Roy et al. Multisymplectic lagrangian and hamiltonian formalisms of classical field theories. *SIGMA. Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications*, 5:100, 2009.
- [17] Mark J Gotay. A multisymplectic framework for classical field theory and the calculus of variations: I. covariant hamiltonian formalism. In *Mechanics, analysis and geometry: 200 years after Lagrange*, pages 203–235. Elsevier, 1991.
- [18] Mark J Gotay. A multisymplectic framework for classical field theory and the calculus of variations ii: Space + time decomposition. *Differential Geometry and its Applications*, 1(4):375–390, 1991.
- [19] Mark J. Gotay, James Isenberg, Jerrold E. Marsden, and Richard Montgomery. Momentum maps and classical relativistic fields. part i: Covariant field theory, 2004.
- [20] Mark J. Gotay, James Isenberg, and Jerrold E. Marsden. Momentum maps and classical relativistic fields. part ii: Canonical analysis of field theories, 2004.
- [21] Manuel de León, Jesús Marín-Solano, and Juan C Marrero. A geometrical approach to classical field theories: a constraint algorithm for singular theories. In *New Developments in Differential Geometry: Proceedings of the Colloquium on Differential Geometry, Debrecen, Hungary, July 26–30, 1994*, pages 291–312. Springer, 1996.
- [22] Manuel De León, Jesús Marín-Solano, Juan Carlos Marrero, Miguel C Muñoz-Lecanda, and Narciso Román-Roy. Pre-multisymplectic constraint algorithm for field theories. *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics*, 2(05):839–871, 2005.
- [23] Joaquim Gomis, Arnaldo Guerra Iv, and Narciso Román-Roy. Multisymplectic constraint analysis of scalar field theories, chern-simons gravity, and bosonic string theory. *Nuclear Physics B*, 987:116069, 2023.
- [24] Jordi Gaset and Narciso Román-Roy. New multisymplectic approach to the metric-affine (einstein-palatini) action for gravity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.06181*, 2018.
- [25] Manuel de León, Jordi Gaset, Miguel C Muñoz-Lecanda, Xavier Rivas, and Narciso Román-Roy. Multi-contact formulation for non-conservative field theories. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 56(2):025201, 2023.
- [26] Manuel De León, Jordi Gaset Rifà, Miguel C Muñoz-Lecanda, Xavier Rivas, and Narciso Román-Roy. Practical introduction to action-dependent field theories. *Fortschritte der Physik*, 73(5):e70000, 2025.
- [27] Manuel de León, Rubén Izquierdo-López, and Xavier Rivas. Brackets in multicontact geometry and multisymplectization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13224*, 2025.
- [28] Xavier Rivas, Narciso Román-Roy, and Bartosz M Zawora. Symmetries and noether’s theorem for multicontact field theories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.03463*, 2025.
- [29] Callum Bell and David Sloan. Dynamical similarity in multisymplectic field theory, 2025.
- [30] Rainer Dick. Implications of a dilaton in gauge theory and cosmology. *Fortschritte der Physik/Progress of Physics*, 45(7):537–587, 1997.
- [31] Joseph Polchinski and Matthew J Strassler. The string dual of a confining four-dimensional gauge theory. *arXiv preprint hep-th/0003136*, 2000.
- [32] Moira Chas and Dennis Sullivan. String topology. *arXiv preprint math/9911159*, 1999.
- [33] Luis E Ibanez and Angel M Uranga. *String theory and particle physics: An introduction to string phenomenology*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [34] David Sloan. Dynamical similarity in field theories. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 42(4):045001, 2025.
- [35] José Rachid Mohalle. *Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Mechanics: A Modern Approach with Core Principles and Underlying Topics*. Springer Nature, 2024.
- [36] Jean Louis Koszul and Yi Ming Zou. *Introduction to symplectic geometry*. Springer, 2019.
- [37] Pedro D Prieto-Martínez. Geometrical structures of higher-order dynamical systems and field theories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.7825*, 2014.
- [38] Frederick Brickell and RS Clark. Integrable almost tangent structures. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 9(4):557–563, 1974.

- [39] Manuel De León, Isabel Méndez, and Modesto Salgado. p-almost tangent structures. *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo*, 37(2):282–294, 1988.
- [40] Muñoz Lecanda and N Roman Roy. Lagrangian theory for presymplectic systems. In *Annales de l’IHP Physique théorique*, volume 57, pages 27–45, 1992.
- [41] Manuel De León, Modesto Salgado-seco, and Silvia Vilarino-fernandez. *Methods of differential geometry in classical field theories: k-symplectic and k-cosymplectic approaches*. World Scientific, 2015.
- [42] C Batlle, J Gomis, JM Pons, and N Roman-Roy. On the legendre transformation for singular lagrangians and related topics. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 20(15):5113, 1987.
- [43] Yaser Tavakoli. Lecture i: Constrained hamiltonian systems. *Courses in canonical gravity given at The Federal University of Espirito Santo*, 2014.
- [44] Paul AM Dirac. *Lectures on quantum mechanics*. Courier Corporation, 2013.
- [45] Yong-Long Wang, Zi-Ping Li, and Ke Wang. Gauge symmetries and Dirac conjecture. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, 48:1894–1904, 2009.
- [46] X Gràcia and J.M Pons. Gauge generators, dirac’s conjecture, and degrees of freedom for constrained systems. *Annals of Physics*, 187(2):355–368, 1988.
- [47] Alberto Ibort, Manuel de Leon, Juan C Marrero, and David Martin de Diego. Dirac brackets in constrained dynamics. *Fortschritte der Physik: Progress of Physics*, 47(5):459–492, 1999.
- [48] Manuel de León and Rubén Izquierdo-López. A review on coisotropic reduction in symplectic, cosymplectic, contact and co-contact hamiltonian systems. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 57(16):163001, 2024.
- [49] John M Lee. Smooth manifolds. In *Introduction to smooth manifolds*, pages 1–29. Springer, 2003.
- [50] Serge Lang. *Differential manifolds*, volume 212. Springer, 1972.
- [51] Mark JD Hamilton. *Mathematical gauge theory*. Springer, 2017.
- [52] Jerrold Marsden and Alan Weinstein. Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry. *Reports on mathematical physics*, 5(1):121–130, 1974.
- [53] Jeremy Butterfield. On symplectic reduction in classical mechanics. *The Handbook of Philosophy of Physics, North Holland*, 2006:1–131, 2006.
- [54] A Echeverría-Enríquez, Miguel C Muñoz-Lecanda, and N Román-Roy. Reduction of presymplectic manifolds with symmetry. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, 11(10):1209–1247, 1999.
- [55] Mark J Gotay and James M Nester. Presymplectic hamilton and lagrange systems, gauge transformations and the dirac theory of constraints. In *Group Theoretical Methods in Physics: Seventh International Colloquium and Integrative Conference on Group Theory and Mathematical Physics, Held in Austin, Texas, September 11–16, 1978*, pages 272–279. Springer, 2005.
- [56] Eckhard Meinrenken. Lie algebroids, 2024.
- [57] Marc Henneaux and Claudio Teitelboim. *Quantization of gauge systems*. Princeton university press, 1992.
- [58] Reiji Sugano, Yusho Kagraoka, and Toshiei Kimura. Gauge transformations and gauge-fixing conditions in constraint systems. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 7(01):61–89, 1992.
- [59] Alessandro Bravetti. Contact geometry and thermodynamics. *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics*, 16(supp01):1940003, 2019.
- [60] Manuel de León and Manuel Lainz Valcázar. Singular lagrangians and precontact hamiltonian systems. *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics*, 16(10):1950158, October 2019.
- [61] Manuel de León and Manuel Lainz. A review on contact hamiltonian and lagrangian systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.05579*, 2020.
- [62] Manuel de León, Jordi Gaset, Manuel Lainz, Xavier Rivas, and Narciso Román-Roy. Unified lagrangian-hamiltonian formalism for contact systems. *Fortschritte der Physik*, 68(8), June 2020.
- [63] Manuel de León and Manuel Lainz Valcázar. Contact hamiltonian systems. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 60(10), 2019.
- [64] Hansjörg Geiges. Contact geometry, 2004.
- [65] André Lichnerowicz. Les variétés de jacobi et leurs algebres de lie associées. *J. Math. pures et appl.*, 57:453–488, 1978.
- [66] Katarzyna Grabowska, Janusz Grabowski, and Paweł Urbański. Av-differential geometry: Poisson and jacobi structures. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 52(4):398–446, 2004.
- [67] Janusz Grabowski and Giuseppe Marmo. Jacobi structures revisited. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 34(49):10975, 2001.
- [68] Jan Arnoldus Schouten. On the differential operators of first order in tensor calculus. *Convegno Internazionale di Geometria Differenziale, Italia, 1953, Edizioni Cremonese, Roma*, pages 1–7, 1954.
- [69] Albert Nijenhuis. Jacobi-type identities for bilinear differential concomitants of certain tensor fields. ii. In *Indagationes Mathematicae (Proceedings)*, volume 58, pages 398–403. Elsevier BV, 1955.
- [70] Charles-Michel Marle. The schouten-nijenhuis bracket and interior products. *Journal of geometry and Physics*, 23(3-4):350–359, 1997.

- [71] Yvette Kosmann-Schwarzbach. From poisson algebras to gerstenhaber algebras. In *Annales de l'institut Fourier*, volume 46, pages 1243–1274, 1996.
- [72] Ping Xu. Gerstenhaber algebras and bv-algebras in poisson geometry. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 200(3):545–560, 1999.
- [73] Manuel de León and Manuel Lainz Valcázar. Infinitesimal symmetries in contact hamiltonian systems. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 153:103651, July 2020.
- [74] Xavier Rivas Guijarro. Geometrical aspects of contact mechanical systems and field theories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.11537*, 2022.
- [75] David Sloan. New action for cosmology. *Physical Review D*, 103(4):043524, 2021.
- [76] David Sloan. Herglotz action for homogeneous cosmologies. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 40(11):115008, 2023.
- [77] Sean Gryb and David Sloan. When scale is surplus. *Synthese*, 199(5):14769–14820, 2021.
- [78] Henri Poincaré and Francis Maitland. *Science and method*. Courier Corporation, 2003.
- [79] Chris Smeenk. Philosophy of cosmology. 2013.
- [80] Jenann Ismael. Symmetry and superfluous structure: Lessons from history and tempered enthusiasm. In *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Physics*, pages 563–577. Routledge, 2021.
- [81] John L Kelley. *General topology*. Courier Dover Publications, 2017.
- [82] Boris Rosenfeld and Bill Wiebe. *Geometry of Lie groups*, volume 393. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [83] F Cantrijn, A Ibort, and M De Leon. Hamiltonian structures on multisymplectic manifolds. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino*, 54(3):225–236, 1996.
- [84] Frans Cantrijn, Alberto Ibort, and Manuel De León. On the geometry of multisymplectic manifolds. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 66(3):303–330, 1999.
- [85] Michael Forger and Leandro G Gomes. Multisymplectic and polysymplectic structures on fiber bundles. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, 25(09):1350018, 2013.
- [86] Igor V Kanatchikov. On field theoretic generalizations of a poisson algebra. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 40(2):225–234, 1997.
- [87] David J Saunders. *The geometry of jet bundles*, volume 142. Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- [88] Boris A Kupershmidt. Geometry of jet bundles and the structure of lagrangian and hamiltonian formalisms. In *Geometric Methods in Mathematical Physics: Proceedings of an NSF-CBMS Conference Held at the University of Lowell, Massachusetts, March 19–23, 1979*, pages 162–218. Springer, 2006.
- [89] Ioan Bucataru and Matias F Dahl. Semi-basic 1-forms and helmholtz conditions for the inverse problem of the calculus of variations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0903.1169*, 2009.
- [90] Bas C. van Fraassen. Modeling and measurement: The criterion of empirical grounding. *Philosophy of Science*, 79(5):773–784, 2012.
- [91] Michael Esfeld and Dirk-André Deckert. *A minimalist ontology of the natural world*. Routledge, 2017.
- [92] Michael Esfeld. A proposal for a minimalist ontology. *Synthese*, 197(5):1889–1905, 2020.
- [93] Jordi Gaset, Manuel Lainz, Arnau Mas, and Xavier Rivas. The herglotz variational principle for dissipative field theories. *Geometric Mechanics*, 01(02):153–178, June 2024.
- [94] Michael B Green, John H Schwarz, and Edward Witten. *Superstring theory: volume 2, loop amplitudes, anomalies and phenomenology*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [95] Joseph Polchinski. Renormalization and effective lagrangians. *Nuclear Physics B*, 231(2):269–295, 1984.
- [96] Mohamed Chabab. Confinement driven by scalar field in 4d non abelian gauge theories. In *AIP Conference Proceedings*, volume 881, pages 238–245. American Institute of Physics, 2007.
- [97] T Barakat and M Chabab. Heavy meson masses via dick interquark potential. *arXiv preprint hep-ph/0101056*, 2001.
- [98] MC Lopez and JM Masque. The geometry of the bundle of connections. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 236(4):797–811, 2001.
- [99] D Vey. Multisymplectic formulation of vielbein gravity i. *De Donder-Weyl formulation, Hamiltonian*, (1), 2014.
- [100] Stefano Vignolo, Roberto Cianci, and Danilo Bruno. *A first-order purely frame-formulation of general relativity*. Dipartimento di Matematica, 2005.
- [101] Arthur E Fischer and Jerrold E Marsden. The initial value problem and the dynamical formulation of general relativity. *General relativity: an Einstein centenary survey*, 138, 1979.
- [102] Igor V Kanatchikov. Basic structures of the covariant canonical formalism for fields based on the de donder-weyl theory. *arXiv preprint hep-th/9410238*, 1994.
- [103] Richard Arnowitt, Stanley Deser, and Charles W Misner. The dynamics of general relativity, gravitation: An introduction to current research. *Chap*, 7:227–265, 1962.
- [104] Ericourgoulhon. *3+ 1 formalism in general relativity: bases of numerical relativity*, volume 846. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.