

RIGIDITY OF INTEGRAL COISOTROPIC SUBMANIFOLDS OF CONTACT MANIFOLDS

ALFONSO GIUSEPPE TORTORELLA

ABSTRACT. Unlike Legendrian submanifolds, the deformation problem of coisotropic submanifolds can be obstructed. Starting from this observation, the special class of *integral coisotropic submanifolds* is singled out as the direct analogue of Legendrian submanifolds for what concerns deformation theory. Indeed, being integral coisotropic is a rigid condition, so that the integral coisotropic deformation problem is unobstructed.

RÉSUMÉ. Contrairement aux sous-variétés Legendriennes, la déformation des sous-variétés coisotropes peut être obstruée. Partant de ce constat, la classe spéciale des *sous-variétés coisotropes intégrales* est désignée comme l'analogue directe des sous-variétés Legendriennes pour ce qui concerne la théorie de la déformation. En fait, être une sous-variété coisotrope intégrale est une condition rigide, de sorte que la déformation de telles sous-variétés ne soit pas obstruée.

1. INTRODUCTION

In symplectic geometry it is well-known that the deformation problem, under Hamiltonian equivalence, of a compact Lagrangian submanifold L is controlled by its de Rham complex, so that it is unobstructed with local moduli space given by $H_{dR}(L)$. Unlike Lagrangian submanifolds the deformation problem of coisotropic submanifolds is much more involved and hard to manage. Indeed in [3] the coisotropic deformation problem is shown to be controlled by an L_∞ -algebra, rather than a dg-space. Moreover the coisotropic deformation problem can be obstructed as explicitly shown in [6]. However, as pointed out in [4], there is the still interesting class of integral coisotropic submanifolds, whose deformation theory resembles that one of Lagrangian submanifolds. The integral coisotropic deformation problem, under Hamiltonian equivalence, is unobstructed, with linear and finite-dimensional local moduli space.

It seems that the contact version of this picture has been only partially unveiled. Our note aims to fill in these gaps.

It is well-known, in contact geometry, that compact Legendrian submanifolds are rigid, so that their deformation problem, under contact equivalence, is unobstructed, with discrete local moduli space. As recently shown in [1], in the contact setting as well, every coisotropic submanifold is equipped with an L_∞ -algebra, rather than an acyclic dg-space, controlling its coisotropic deformation problem. In this note we will construct, in the contact setting, a first example of coisotropic submanifold whose deformation problem is obstructed. Further we will single out, in the contact setting, the special class of integral coisotropic submanifolds which behave like Legendrian submanifolds for what concerns deformation theory. Indeed we prove that compact integral coisotropic submanifolds are rigid, so that their deformation problem, under contact equivalence, is unobstructed, with discrete local moduli space.

2. A LINE BUNDLE APPROACH TO PRE-CONTACT GEOMETRY

Let C be a hyperplane distribution on a manifold M . Fix a line bundle $L \rightarrow M$, and a no-where zero L -valued 1-form $\vartheta: TM \rightarrow L$ such that $\ker \vartheta = C$. Then the curvature form $\omega_\vartheta \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 C^* \otimes L)$ is defined by $\omega_\vartheta(X, Y) = \vartheta([X, Y])$, for all $X, Y \in \Gamma(C)$. The 1-form ϑ , and the corresponding distribution $C = \ker \vartheta$,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53D10 (Primary), 53D35, 53D17.

Key words and phrases. precontact manifolds, Jacobi bundles, Legendrian submanifolds, coisotropic submanifolds, integral coisotropic submanifolds, smooth deformations, moduli of coisotropic submanifolds, contact equivalence.

are said to be *pre-contact* (resp. *contact*) if the vector bundle morphism $\omega_\vartheta^b: C \rightarrow C^* \otimes L$, $X \mapsto \omega_\vartheta(X, -)$, has constant rank (resp. is an isomorphism). A *(pre-)contact manifold* is a manifold M equipped with a *(pre-)contact structure* which is equivalently given by a (pre-)contact distribution C or a (pre-)contact 1-form ϑ on M . Every pre-contact manifold admits a *characteristic foliation* \mathcal{F} : the integral foliation of the (involutive) distribution $\underline{K}_\vartheta := \ker \omega_\vartheta^b$. A *pre-contactomorphism* of a pre-contact manifold (M, C) is a diffeomorphism $\varphi: M \rightarrow M$ preserving C . Hence $\mathfrak{X}_C \subset \mathfrak{X}(M)$, the Lie subalgebra of infinitesimal pre-contactomorphisms, consists of those $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that $[X, \Gamma(C)] \subset \Gamma(C)$.

A derivation of a vector bundle $E \rightarrow M$ is an \mathbb{R} -linear map $\square: \Gamma(E) \rightarrow \Gamma(E)$ such that there is a (unique) $\sigma(\square) \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, the *symbol of* \square , satisfying $\square(fe) = f\square e + (\sigma(\square)f)e$, for all $e \in \Gamma(E)$ and $f \in C^\infty(M)$. Equivalently derivations of $E \rightarrow M$ can be seen as infinitesimal vector bundle automorphisms.

Fix a line bundle $L \rightarrow M$. Now derivations of L are just first-order differential operators from $\Gamma(L)$ to $\Gamma(L)$, and can be seen as the sections of the vector bundle $DL := (J^1L)^* \otimes L \rightarrow M$. The latter becomes a Lie algebroid, the *Atiyah algebroid of* L , with Lie bracket given by the commutator, and anchor given by the symbol map $\sigma: DL \rightarrow TM$, $\square \mapsto \sigma(\square)$. Further the *tautological representation* ∇ of the Atiyah algebroid DL in L is defined by $\nabla_\square \lambda = \square \lambda$. These data determine a Cartan calculus on the dg-module $\Omega_L^\bullet := \Gamma(\wedge^\bullet(DL)^* \otimes L)$ with structural operations the de Rham differential d_D , and, for each $\square \in \Gamma(DL)$, the contraction ι_\square and the Lie derivative \mathcal{L}_\square . The elements of Ω_L^\bullet will be called *L-valued Atiyah forms*. Indeed (Ω_L^\bullet, d_D) , the de Rham complex of DL with coefficients in L , also called *der-complex*, is acyclic. In particular $[d_D, \iota_\mathbb{1}] = \text{id}$, where $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the derivation of L given by the identity map, i.e. $\mathbb{1}\lambda = \lambda$.

Remark 2.1. Notice that $\Gamma(L) = \Omega_L^0$, and $\Gamma(J^1L)$ identifies with Ω_L^1 by means of the L -valued duality pairing between J^1L and DL . In view of this, $\Gamma(L) \rightarrow \Gamma(J^1L)$, $\lambda \mapsto j^1\lambda$ coincides with $\Omega_L^0 \rightarrow \Omega_L^1$, $\lambda \mapsto d_D\lambda$.

A line bundle morphism $\varphi: L \rightarrow L'$ is said to be *regular* if it is fiberwise invertible. Each regular line bundle morphism $\varphi: L \rightarrow L'$ determines, in an obvious way, the pull-back of sections $\varphi^*: \Gamma(L') \rightarrow \Gamma(L)$, a Lie algebroid morphism $D\varphi: DL \rightarrow DL'$, and a degree 0 dg-module morphism $\varphi^*: (\Omega_{L'}^\bullet, d_D) \rightarrow (\Omega_L^\bullet, d_D)$.

Remark 2.2. Let $L \rightarrow M$ be a line bundle, and let $S \subset M$ be a submanifold. Consider the restricted line bundle $L_S := L|_S \rightarrow S$, and the regular line bundle morphism $i: L_S \rightarrow L$, covering $\dot{i}: S \rightarrow M$, given by the inclusion. Then $Di: DL_S \rightarrow DL$ is a Lie algebroid monomorphism identifying DL_S with the Lie subalgebroid $\{\square \in (DL)|_S: \sigma(\square) \in TS\}$ of DL .

Lemma 2.3. Let $\varphi: L \rightarrow L'$ be a regular line bundle morphism covering a surjective submersion. An Atiyah form $\eta \in \Omega_L^\bullet$ is basic, i.e. $\eta = \varphi^*(\Omega_{L'}^\bullet)$, if and only if $\iota_\square \eta = \mathcal{L}_\square \eta = 0$ for every $\square \in \Gamma(\ker D\varphi)$.

Definition 2.4. An *L-valued pre-symplectic Atiyah form* is a 2-cocycle ϖ of (Ω_L^\bullet, d_D) such that $\iota_\mathbb{1}\varpi$ is nowhere zero, and the vector bundle morphism $\varpi^b: DL \rightarrow (DL)^* \otimes L$, $\square \mapsto \varpi(\square, -)$, has constant rank. Every L -valued pre-symplectic Atiyah form ϖ determines the Lie subalgebroid $K_\varpi := \ker \varpi^b$ of DL . An L -valued pre-symplectic Atiyah form ϖ is said to be *symplectic* if ϖ^b is an isomorphism.

Proposition 2.5. (cf. [5, Propositions 3.3 and 3.6]). For any line bundle $L \rightarrow M$, there is a one-to-one correspondence between L -valued (pre-)contact forms and L -valued (pre-)symplectic Atiyah forms.

Remark 2.6. A Jacobi structure $\{-, -\}$ on a line bundle L , also seen as the section $J \in \Gamma(\wedge^2(J^1L)^* \otimes L)$ such that $J(j^1\lambda, j^1\mu) = \{\lambda, \mu\}$, is called *non-degenerate* if $J^\sharp: J^1L \rightarrow (J^1L)^* \otimes L$, $\alpha \mapsto J(\alpha, -)$, is a vector bundle isomorphism. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between L -valued contact 1-forms ϑ and non-degenerate Jacobi structures $J = \{-, -\}$ on L . Moreover if ϑ and J correspond each other as above, and ϖ is the symplectic Atiyah form corresponding to ϑ , with $C := \ker \vartheta$, then $J^\sharp = (\varpi^b)^{-1}$, and there is a Lie algebra isomorphism $\mathcal{X}: \Gamma(L) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_C$, $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{X}_\lambda := \sigma(J^\sharp(j^1\lambda))$.

For more details on the line bundle approach to pre-contact geometry see [5, Sections 2 and 3].

3. COISOTROPIC SUBMANIFOLDS OF CONTACT MANIFOLDS

Let ϑ be an L -valued contact form on M , with associated contact distribution C , curvature form ω , and corresponding L -valued symplectic Atiyah form ϖ . Fix a submanifold $S \subset M$. Then ϑ and ϖ induce an L_S -valued 1-form $\vartheta_S := \underline{i}^* \vartheta$ and an L_S -valued Atiyah 2-cocycle $\varpi_S := i^* \varpi$. Set $C_S := \ker \vartheta_S = C \cap TS$.

Proposition 3.1. *The following conditions are equivalent*

- (1) ϑ_S is an L_S -valued pre-contact form, with $\underline{K}_{\vartheta_S} = C_S^{\perp \omega}$,
- (2) ϖ_S is a L_S -valued pre-symplectic Atiyah form, with $\underline{K}_{\varpi_S} = (DL_S)^{\perp \varpi}$,
- (3) S is a regular coisotropic submanifold of (M, C) (cf. [1, Definition 5.10]).

If the equivalent conditions (1)–(3) hold, then S is transverse to C , and it inherits the pre-contact structure given by ϑ_S , with pre-contact distribution C_S , and corresponding pre-symplectic Atiyah form ϖ_S .

Remark 3.2. We consider only regular coisotropic submanifolds. In particular, we will not cover Legendrian submanifolds. Without risk of confusion, by coisotropic submanifolds we will always mean regular ones.

Remark 3.3. Not only every coisotropic submanifold of a contact manifold inherits a pre-contact structure, but conversely every pre-contact manifold admits a contact thickening, i.e. an embedding as coisotropic submanifold into a contact manifold, which moreover is unique up to local contactomorphisms. See, e.g. [1, Subsections 5.2 and 5.3] for details about the coisotropic neighborhood Theorem and the contact thickening.

Definition 3.4. Let S be a coisotropic submanifold of a contact manifold (M, C) . A *smooth coisotropic deformation* of S is a smooth 1-parameter family of embeddings $\varphi_t: S \rightarrow M$, with $\varphi_0 = \text{id}_S$, such that $\varphi_t(S)$ is coisotropic in (M, C) . Smooth coisotropic deformations φ_t and φ'_t are identified if $\varphi'_t(S) = \varphi_t(S)$. A smooth coisotropic deformation φ_t is said to be *trivial* if it consists of diffeomorphisms of S .

Example 3.5. In this one and the following examples, we describe the contact analogue of Zambon's example [6]. In doing this, we follow the original approach in the symplectic case.

We consider the contact manifold (M, C_M) , where $M := \mathbb{T}^5 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, and C_M is the kernel of the contact 1-form $\vartheta_M := \sin x_1 dx_2 + \cos x_1 dx_3 + y_4 dx_4 + y_5 dx_5$, with (x_1, \dots, x_5) and (y_4, y_5) denoting the standard coordinates on \mathbb{T}^5 and \mathbb{R}^2 respectively. Note that $S := \mathbb{T}^5 \simeq \mathbb{T}^5 \times \{0\}$ is a coisotropic submanifold, with inherited pre-contact 1-form $\vartheta_S := \sin x_1 dx_2 + \cos x_1 dx_3$. Set $C_S := \ker \vartheta_S$, and denote by \mathcal{F} the characteristic foliation of (S, C_S) . The global frame $\underline{dx}_4 := (dx_4)|_{T\mathcal{F}}$, $\underline{dx}_5 := (dx_5)|_{T\mathcal{F}}$ identifies $T^*\mathcal{F} \rightarrow S$ with the trivial vector bundle $\tau: \mathbb{T}^5 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^5$. Under this identification, (M, C_M) coincides with $(T^*\mathcal{F} \otimes L_S, \ker(\tau^* \vartheta_S + \vartheta_G))$, the contact thickening of S as constructed in [1, Subsection 5.3] for $G = \text{span}\{\partial/\partial x_1, \partial/\partial x_2, \partial/\partial x_3\}$. A straightforward computation shows that $s = f \underline{dx}_4 + g \underline{dx}_5$ is a *coisotropic section* of τ , i.e. its image is a coisotropic submanifold of (M, C_M) , iff $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5)$ satisfy the non-linear first-order pde

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} X(g) - \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} X(f) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_4} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_5} + gY(f) - fY(g), \quad (3.1)$$

where $X := \cos x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} - \sin x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3}$, and $Y := \sin x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} + \cos x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3}$.

Linearizing (3.1), we see that infinitesimal coisotropic deformations of S in (M, C_M) are described exactly by those sections $s = f \underline{dx}_4 + g \underline{dx}_5$ of τ such that

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_4} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_5} = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

The prolongability of an infinitesimal coisotropic deformation $s = f \underline{dx}_4 + g \underline{dx}_5$ to a formal one is subjected to the following necessary condition, obtained integrating (3.1) over $(x_4, x_5) \in \mathbb{T}^2$,

$$0 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} X(g) - \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} X(f) + fY(g) - gY(f) \right] dx_4 dx_5. \quad (3.3)$$

Remark 3.6. Characterization (3.1) of coisotropic sections agrees with the results obtained via the BFV-complex of S in the more general setting of Jacobi manifolds (cf. [2]).

Remark 3.7. Characterization (3.2) of infinitesimal coisotropic deformations amounts to the cocycle condition on $s = f\underline{dx}_4 + g\underline{dx}_5$ in the de Rham complex of the Lie algebroid $T\mathcal{F}$ with coefficients in L_S . Further obstruction (3.3) to the prolongability of s to a formal coisotropic deformation is nothing but the vanishing at $[s]$ of the Kuranishi map $\text{Kur}: H^1(\mathcal{F}; L_S) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{F}; L_S)$. Hence (3.2) and (3.3) recover, in this special case, the results obtained via the L_∞ -algebra of S (cf. [1]).

Example 3.8. Continuing Example 3.5, set $s := \cos x_2 \underline{dx}_4 + \sin x_2 \underline{dx}_5$. Clearly s satisfies (3.2), hence it is an infinitesimal coisotropic deformation of S . However s is formally obstructed because it does not satisfy (3.3). In fact, in this case, the rhs of (3.3) is equal to $(2\pi)^2 \sin x_1 \neq 0$.

The discussion contained in Example 3.8 leads immediately to the following proposition.

Proposition 3.9. *The coisotropic deformation problem of S (under contact equivalence) is formally obstructed, i.e. there exists an infinitesimal coisotropic deformation of S which cannot be prolonged to a formal coisotropic deformation (even only up to contact equivalence).*

4. INTEGRAL COISOTROPIC SUBMANIFOLDS OF A CONTACT MANIFOLD

Let $L_S \rightarrow S$ be a line bundle, and ϑ_S an L_S -valued pre-contact form, with associated pre-contact distribution C_S , and corresponding pre-symplectic Atiyah form ϖ_S . Lemma 2.3 leads to the following.

Proposition 4.1 (Contact Reduction). *For any surjective submersion $\underline{\pi}: S \rightarrow B$, and any line bundle $L_B \rightarrow B$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *there is a (unique) contact distribution C_B on B , such that $C_S = (T\underline{\pi})^{-1}C_B$, and $(TB)/C_B \simeq L_B$,*
- (2) *there is a regular line bundle morphism $\pi: L_S \rightarrow L_B$, covering $\underline{\pi}$, such that $\ker(D\pi) = K_{\varpi_S}$.*

*If the equivalent conditions (1)–(2) are satisfied then $K_{\vartheta_S} = \ker(T\underline{\pi})$ and $L_S \simeq \underline{\pi}^*L_B$. Moreover, for any π as in (2), there is an L_B -valued contact form ϑ_B , with corresponding symplectic Atiyah form ϖ_B , uniquely determined by $\vartheta_S = \pi^*\vartheta_B$, and $\varpi_S = \pi^*\varpi_B$; additionally $C_B = \ker \vartheta_B$.*

Definition 4.2. If the equivalent conditions (1)–(2) in Proposition 4.1 hold, then (S, C_S) is said to be an *integral pre-contact manifold*, with *reduced contact manifold* (B, C_B) , and *contact reduction* performed via π (or $\underline{\pi}$). A coisotropic submanifold is said to be *integral* if it so wrt its inherited pre-contact structure.

Definition 4.3. Let S be an integral coisotropic submanifold of a contact manifold (M, C_M) . A *smooth integral coisotropic deformation* of S is a smooth coisotropic deformation $\varphi_t: S \rightarrow M$ such that φ_t transforms the characteristic foliation \mathcal{F} of S into the characteristic foliation \mathcal{F}_t of $S_t := \varphi_t(S)$.

Example 4.4. The pre-contact manifold (S, C_S) of Example 3.5 is integral, with reduced contact manifold (B, C_B) , and contact reduction performed by $\underline{\pi}: S \rightarrow B$, where $\underline{\pi}$ is the projection of $S = \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{T}^2$ on $B = \mathbb{T}^3$, and $C_B = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, X\}$ is the kernel of the contact 1-form $\vartheta_B := \sin x_1 dx_2 + \cos x_1 dx_3$. Then \mathcal{F} , the characteristic foliation of (S, C_S) , is the fibration in 2-tori provided by $\underline{\pi}$.

Let $s = f\underline{dx}_4 + g\underline{dx}_5$ be an arbitrary coisotropic section of τ . The inherited pre-contact 1-form $\vartheta_M|_{TS'}$ on $S' := \text{im } s$ identifies with the pre-contact 1-form $s^*\vartheta_M = \cos x_1 dx_2 + \sin x_1 dx_3 + f dx_4 + g dx_5$ on S . The characteristic foliation \mathcal{F}' of $(S, \ker(s^*\vartheta_M))$ is the integral foliation of the distribution given by

$$T\mathcal{F}' = \text{span} \left\{ X(f) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} X + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_4} - fY, X(g) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} X + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_5} - gY \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

As a consequence, each leaf L of \mathcal{F}' is bi-dimensional and transverse to the fibers of the projection $p: \mathbb{T}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$, $(x_1, \dots, x_5) \mapsto (x_4, x_5)$, so that, by a well-known theorem of Ehresmann, $p|_L: L \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$ is a covering map. Hence an arbitrary leaf of \mathcal{F}' can only be diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 , $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^1$ or \mathbb{T}^2 .

Let us consider the smooth 1-parameter family of coisotropic sections $s_t := t \sin x_1 dx_4$. According to (4.1), the characteristic foliation \mathcal{F}'_t of the pre-contact manifold $(S, \ker(s_t^* \vartheta_M))$ is determined by

$$T\mathcal{F}'_t = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_4} - t \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_5} \right\}. \quad (4.2)$$

Fix arbitrarily $t \in \mathbb{R}$, a leaf L of \mathcal{F}'_t , and a curve $\gamma(u)$ in L , with $\gamma(0) = \bar{x}$. In view of (4.2), there are unique $a, b \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\dot{\gamma}(u) = a(u) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_4} - t \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \right) \Big|_{\gamma(u)} + b(u) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_5} \Big|_{\gamma(u)}$. Consequently, γ is closed iff there is $u_0 > 0$ such that $\int_0^{u_0} a(u) du \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, $t \int_0^{u_0} a(u) du \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, and $\int_0^{u_0} b(u) du \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. Since $p|_L: L \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$ is a covering map, it induces a group monomorphism $(p|_L)_*: \pi_1(L, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{T}^2, p(\bar{x}))$. In view of the latter, if L is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{T}^2 , then there is a closed curve $\gamma(u)$ in L , with $\gamma(0) = \bar{x}$, such that $(2\pi)^{-1} \int_0^{u_0} a(u) du \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, and so t has to be rational. Conversely, if $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, then all the leaves of \mathcal{F}'_t are non-compact, and so the pre-contact manifold $(S, \ker(s_t^* \vartheta_M))$ is not integral.

The above discussion shows that there exist coisotropic submanifolds of (M, C_M) , arbitrarily close to S , which are not integral. This leads to the following proposition.

Proposition 4.5. *Integral coisotropic submanifolds are not stable under small coisotropic deformations.*

4.1. Rigidity of compact integral coisotropic submanifolds. Let $L_M \rightarrow M$ be a line bundle, and ϑ_M an L_M -valued contact form, with $C_M := \ker \vartheta_M$. Denote by ϖ_M the corresponding symplectic Atiyah form, and by J the corresponding Jacobi structure on $L_M \rightarrow M$.

Let S be an integral coisotropic submanifold of (M, C_M) . Fix a smooth integral coisotropic deformation φ_t of S . After setting $S_t := \varphi_t(S)$ and $L_t := L|_{S_t}$, denote by ϖ_t the inherited L_t -valued pre-symplectic Atiyah form, and by K_t the Lie subalgebroid $\ker \varpi_t^b \subset DL$. Moreover fix a regular line bundle morphism $\pi: L_0 \rightarrow L_B$, covering a surjective submersion $\underline{\pi}: S_0 \rightarrow B$, such that $K_0 = \ker(D\pi)$, i.e. the contact reduction of S can be performed via π (cf. Proposition 4.1).

Assume that S is compact. Being interested in small deformations, it is possible to further assume that

- (1) $\tau: M \rightarrow S$ is a tubular neighborhood of S in M , with $L_M = \tau^* L_0$, and φ_t is a section of τ ,
- (2) there is a smooth family of line bundle isomorphisms $\varphi_t: L_0 \rightarrow L_t$, with $\varphi_0 = \text{id}_{L_0}$, covering $\varphi_t: S \rightarrow S_t$, such that $(D\varphi_t)K_0 = K_t$, i.e. the pre-contact structure $\varphi_t^* \varpi_t$ on S is reducible via π .

Denote by $\dot{\varphi}_t$ and $\dot{\varphi}_t$ the infinitesimal generators of φ_t and φ_t respectively. They are the smooth families $\dot{\varphi}_t \in \Gamma(TM|_{S_t})$ and $\dot{\varphi}_t \in \Gamma((DL_M)|_{S_t})$, with $\sigma(\dot{\varphi}_t) = \dot{\varphi}_t$, defined by $\frac{d}{dt}(\varphi_t^* f) = \varphi_t^*(\dot{\varphi}_t f)$, for all $f \in C^\infty(M)$, and $\frac{d}{dt}(\varphi_t^* \lambda) = \varphi_t^*(\dot{\varphi}_t \lambda)$, for all $\lambda \in \Gamma(L_M)$. Up to quotienting out the trivial integral coisotropic deformations, $\dot{\varphi}_t$ is encoded by the smooth family of L_0 -valued Atiyah 1-forms $\beta_t := \varphi_t^*(\iota(\dot{\varphi}_t)\varpi_M)$. From this definition, it follows immediately that $d_D \beta_t = \frac{d}{dt} \varphi_t^* \varpi_M$. Hence, because of the above condition (2), $\iota(\square)d_D \beta_t = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_\square d_D \beta_t = 0$, for all $\square \in \Gamma(K_0)$. As a consequence, in view of Lemma 2.3 and the acyclicity of the der-complexes, there is a smooth family $\lambda_t \in \Gamma(L_0)$ such that $\beta_t - d_D \lambda_t \in \pi^*(\Omega_{L_B}^1)$, and so, a fortiori, $\beta_t \equiv d_D \lambda_t \pmod{\Gamma((K_0)^0)}$. The above condition (1) guarantees that there is a smooth family $\tilde{\lambda}_t \in \Gamma(L_M)$ such that $\lambda_t = \varphi_t^* \tilde{\lambda}_t$, and so also $\iota(\dot{\varphi}_t)\varpi_M \equiv d_D \tilde{\lambda}_t|_{S_t} \pmod{\Gamma((K_t)^0)}$. Since, $K_t^{\perp \varpi_M} = DL_{S_t}$ (cf. Proposition 3.1), the latter can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\dot{\varphi}_t \equiv (\varpi_M^b)^{-1}(d_D \tilde{\lambda}_t)|_{S_t} \pmod{\Gamma(DL_{S_t})}. \quad (4.3)$$

Let ψ_t be the smooth family of local automorphism of the Jacobi bundle (L_M, J) generated by $J^\#(j^1 \tilde{\lambda}_t) = (\varpi_M^b)^{-1}(d_D \tilde{\lambda}_t)$. Then $\psi_t: L_M \rightarrow L_M$ covers the smooth family $\underline{\psi}_t$ of contactomorphisms of (M, C_M) generated by $\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{\lambda}_t}$. Finally, from (4.3), it follows that $S_t := \varphi_t(S)$ coincides with $\underline{\psi}_t(S)$.

The above discussion shows that every small integral coisotropic deformation of S is induced by a smooth 1-parameter family of contactomorphisms of M . This leads to the following.

Theorem 4.6. *Compact integral coisotropic submanifolds are rigid.*

Corollary 4.7. *The (compact) integral coisotropic deformation problem, under contact equivalence, is unobstructed and its moduli space is discrete.*

Remark 4.8. It is possible to compare Corollary 4.7 with the analogous result in the symplectic case (cf. [4]). On the symplectic side, the local moduli space of a coisotropic submanifold S , with characteristic foliation \mathcal{F} , consists of the elements of $H^1(\mathcal{F})$ that, seen as sections of a vector bundle over S/\mathcal{F} , are flat wrt the Gauss–Manin connection. On the contact side, the local moduli space of S consists of the elements of $H^1(\mathcal{F}; L_S)$ that, seen as sections of a vector bundle over B , are flat wrt a certain connection along DL_B , but now it turns out that there are no non-zero flat sections.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Aïssa Wade for having translated the abstract into French, and to Luca Vitagliano for helpful comments on an earlier version of this note.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. V. Lê, Y.-G. Oh, A. G. Tortorella, and L. Vitagliano. Deformations of coisotropic submanifolds in abstract Jacobi manifolds. *preprint arXiv:1410.8446*, 2014.
- [2] H. V. Lê, A. G. Tortorella, and L. Vitagliano. Jacobi bundles and the BFV-complex. *preprint arXiv:1601.04540*.
- [3] Y.-G. Oh, J.-S. Park. Deformations of coisotropic submanifolds and strong homotopy Lie algebroids. *Invent. Math.*, 161(2):287–360, 2005.
- [4] W.-D. Ruan. Deformation of integral coisotropic submanifolds in symplectic manifolds. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 3(2):161–169, 2005.
- [5] L. Vitagliano. Dirac-Jacobi Bundles. *preprint arXiv:1502.05420*, 2015. accepted for publication on *J. Symplectic Geom.*
- [6] M. Zambon. An example of coisotropic submanifolds C^1 -close to a given coisotropic submanifold. *Differential Geom. Appl.*, 26(6):635–637, 2008.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E INFORMATICA “ULISSE DINI”, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI FIRENZE, VIALE MORGAGNI 67/A, 50134 FIRENZE, ITALY.

E-mail address: alfonso.tortorella@math.unifi.it