

# The deformations of symplectic structures by moment maps

Tomoya Nakamura <sup>\*</sup>  
email: x-haze@ruri.waseda.jp

March 4, 2024

## Abstract

We study deformations of symplectic structures on a smooth manifold  $M$  via the quasi-Poisson theory. By a fact, we can deform a given symplectic structure  $\omega$  to a new symplectic structure  $\omega_t$  parametrized by some element  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2\mathfrak{g}$ , where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is the Lie algebra of a Lie group  $G$ . Moreover, we can get a lot of concrete examples for the deformations of symplectic structures on the complex projective space and the complex Grassmannian.

## 1 Introduction

In the context of symplectic geometry, deformation-equivalence assumptions and conditions are often appeared, for example, in the statement of Moser's theorem [9] and Donaldson's four-six conjecture [8]. However, it seems that a method of constructing deformation-equivalent symplectic structures specifically is not well known. In this paper, we construct a method of producing new symplectic structures deformation-equivalent to a given symplectic structure. Our approach to deformations of symplectic structures is to use quasi-Poisson theory which was introduced by Alekseev and Kosmann-Schwarzbach [1], and this approach is carried out by using the fact that a moment map for a symplectic-Hamiltonian action  $\sigma$  is also a moment map for a quasi-Poisson action  $\sigma$ . The former moment map satisfies conditions for only one symplectic structure, whereas the latter does conditions for a family of quasi-Poisson structures parametrized by elements in  $\Lambda^2\mathfrak{g}$ . From

---

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Mathematics, Waseda University, 3-4-1, Okubo, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, Japan

here we call these elements *twists*. Regarding the quasi-Poisson structure induced by a symplectic structure as that with twist 0, which is denoted by  $\pi_0$ , we can find different quasi-Poisson structures  $\pi_t$  which induce symplectic structures  $\omega_t$  by the choice of "good" twists  $t$ . The quasi-Poisson structure inducing a symplectic structure must be a nondegenerate Poisson structure. We describe the conditions for the quasi-Poisson structure with a twist  $t$  to be a nondegenerate Poisson structure. Our method of using the family of quasi-Poisson structures is one of interesting geometry frameworks (See [1]).

From here, we explain briefly the difference among moment maps for symplectic- and quasi-Poisson-Hamiltonian actions, and equivariant moment maps for Poisson actions on a smooth manifold (In Poisson geometry, *non*-equivariant moment maps for Poisson action can be defined [4], [5].).

(I) Symplectic-Hamiltonian actions

In symplectic geometry, a moment map  $\mu : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$  for a symplectic action  $\sigma$  of a Lie group  $G$  on a symplectic manifold  $(M, \omega)$  is defined with two conditions: one is for the symplectic structure  $\omega$ ,

$$d\mu^X = \iota_{X_M} \omega \quad (X \in \mathfrak{g}).$$

Here  $\mu^X(p) := \langle \mu(p), X \rangle$  and  $X_M$  is a vector field on  $M$  defined by

$$X_{M,p} := \left. \frac{d}{dt} \sigma_{\exp tX}(p) \right|_{t=0} \quad (1)$$

for  $p$  in  $M$ . The other is the  $G$ -equivariance condition with respect to the action  $\sigma$  on  $M$  and the coadjoint action  $\text{Ad}^*$  on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ ,

$$\mu \circ \sigma_g = \text{Ad}_g^* \circ \mu$$

for all  $g$  in  $G$ . In this paper, we call symplectic actions with moment maps *symplectic-Hamiltonian actions* to distinguish it from other actions with moment maps.

(II) Poisson actions with equivariant moment maps

A Poisson Lie group, which was introduced by Drinfel'd [3], is a Lie group with a Poisson structure  $\pi$  compatible with the group structure. Namely, the structure  $\pi$  satisfies

$$\pi_{gh} = L_{g*} \pi_h + R_{h*} \pi_g \quad (2)$$

for any  $g$  and  $h$  in  $G$ , where  $L_g$  and  $R_h$  are the left and right translations in  $G$  by  $g$  and  $h$ , respectively. Such a structure is called *multiplicative*. Then the simply connected Lie group  $G^*$  called the dual Poisson Lie group is

obtained uniquely from a Poisson Lie group  $(G, \pi)$  and a local action of  $G$  on  $G^*$  is defined naturally. We call a multiplicative Poisson structure  $\pi$  on  $G$  *complete* if the action is global. Then  $(G, \pi)$  is called a *complete Poisson Lie group*. An equivariant moment map  $\mu : M \rightarrow G^*$  for a Poisson action  $\sigma$  of a complete Poisson Lie group  $(G, \pi)$  on a Poisson manifold  $(M, \pi)$  is a generalization of a moment map for a symplectic-Hamiltonian action on a symplectic manifold, which was given by Lu in [4].

### (III) Quasi-Poisson-Hamiltonian actions

Quasi-Poisson theory, which was originated with [1] by Alekseev and Kosmann-Schwarzbach, is a generalization of Poisson theory with Poisson actions. In quasi-Poisson geometry, quasi-triples  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$  and its infinitesimal version, Manin quasi-triples  $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ , play important roles. A quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$  defines a quasi-Poisson Lie group  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$  and we can obtain the notion of a quasi-Poisson action of such a quasi-Poisson Lie group  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$ . A moment map  $\mu$  for the action is a map from  $M$  into  $D/G$  and satisfies a condition not for one quasi-Poisson structure but for a family of quasi-Poisson structures parametrized by elements in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$ . An equivariant moment map for a Poisson action in (II) is an example of a moment map for a quasi-Poisson-Hamiltonian action. In this paper, we use the moment map theory for quasi-Poisson actions to deform symplectic structures on a smooth manifold.

This paper is constructed as follows. It is contents of Section 2 to review the moment map theory for quasi-Poisson actions. In Section 3, we describe a deformation method of symplectic structures on a smooth manifold via the quasi-Poisson theory. This method is the subject in this paper. Theorem 3.1 gives a condition for a twist to deform a symplectic structure to a new one. In addition, Theorem 3.2 gives a sufficient condition for a twist to satisfy the assumption of Theorem 3.1. In Section 4, we introduce concrete examples for deformations of symplectic structures. We give deformations of the Fubini-Study and the Kirillov-Kostant forms on  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  and the complex Grassmannian, respectively.

## 2 Moment maps for quasi-Poisson actions on quasi-Poisson manifolds

In this section, we shall recall the quasi-Poisson theory [1]. We start with the definition of quasi-Poisson Lie groups, which is a generalization of Poisson Lie groups.

**Definition 1.** Let  $G$  be a Lie group with the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then a pair  $(\pi, \varphi)$  is a quasi-Poisson structure on  $G$  if a multiplicative 2-vector field  $\pi$  on  $G$  and an element  $\varphi$  of  $\Lambda^3 \mathfrak{g}$  satisfy

$$\frac{1}{2} [\pi, \pi] = \varphi^R - \varphi^L, \quad (3)$$

$$[\pi, \varphi^L] = [\pi, \varphi^R] = 0, \quad (4)$$

where the bracket  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  is the Schouten bracket on the multi-vector fields on  $G$ , and  $\varphi^L$  and  $\varphi^R$  denote the left and right invariant 2-vector fields on  $G$  with value  $\varphi$  at  $e$  respectively. A triple  $(G, \pi, \varphi)$  is called a quasi-Poisson Lie group.

**Remark 1.** In a quasi-Poisson structure  $(\pi, \varphi)$  on  $G$ , the 2-vector field  $\pi$  is a multiplicative Poisson structure if  $\varphi = 0$ . Namely,  $(G, \pi)$  is a Poisson Lie group.

We use a "quasi-triple" to obtain a quasi-Poisson Lie group. To define a quasi-triple, we describe its infinitesimal version, a Manin quasi-triple.

**Definition 2.** Let  $\mathfrak{d}$  be a  $2n$ -dimensional Lie algebra with an invariant non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form of signature  $(n, n)$ , which is denoted by  $(\cdot | \cdot)$ . Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be an  $n$ -dimensional Lie subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{d}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  be an  $n$ -dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Then a triple  $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$  is a Manin quasi-triple if  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a maximal isotropic subspace with respect to  $(\cdot | \cdot)$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  is an isotropic complement subspace of  $\mathfrak{g}$  in  $\mathfrak{d}$ .

**Remark 2.** For a given Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{d}$  and a Lie subalgebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  of  $\mathfrak{d}$ , a choice of an isotropic complement subspace  $\mathfrak{h}$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  in  $\mathfrak{d}$  is not unique.

A Manin quasi-triple  $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$  defines the decomposition  $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{h}$ . Then the linear isomorphism

$$j : \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}, \quad (j(\xi)|x) := \langle \xi, x \rangle \quad (\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*, x \in \mathfrak{g}) \quad (5)$$

is determined by the decomposition. We denote the projections from  $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{h}$  to  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  by  $p_{\mathfrak{g}}$  and  $p_{\mathfrak{h}}$  respectively. We introduce an element  $\varphi_{\mathfrak{h}}$  in  $\Lambda^3 \mathfrak{g}$  which is defined by the map from  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}^*$  to  $\mathfrak{g}$ , denoted by the same letter,

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{h}}(\xi, \eta) = p_{\mathfrak{g}}([j(\xi), j(\eta)]), \quad (6)$$

for any  $\xi, \eta$  in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ . We define the linear map  $F_{\mathfrak{h}} : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$  by setting

$$F_{\mathfrak{h}}^*(\xi, \eta) = j^{-1}(p_{\mathfrak{h}}([j(\xi), j(\eta)])) \quad (7)$$

for any  $\xi, \eta$  in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ , where  $F_{\mathfrak{h}}^* : \Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$  is the dual map of  $F_{\mathfrak{h}}$ . These elements will be used later to define a quasi-Poisson structure and a quasi-Poisson action respectively.

Next we define a quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$  and construct a quasi-Poisson structure on  $G$  using  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$ .

**Definition 3.** *Let  $D$  be a connected Lie group with a bi-invariant scalar product with the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{d}$  and  $G$  be a connected closed Lie subgroup of  $D$  with the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be a vector subspace of  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Then a triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$  is a quasi-triple if  $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$  is a Manin quasi-triple.*

A method of constructing a quasi-Poisson structure by a quasi-triple is as follows. Let  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$  be a quasi-triple with a Manin quasi-triple  $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ . Using the inverse  $j^{-1} : \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$  of the linear isomorphism (5), we identify  $\mathfrak{d}$  with  $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^*$ . Consider the map

$$r_{\mathfrak{h}} : \mathfrak{d}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{d}, \quad \xi + X \mapsto \xi,$$

for any  $\xi$  in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  and  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ . This map defines an element  $r_{\mathfrak{h}} \in \mathfrak{d} \otimes \mathfrak{d}$  which we denote by the same letter. We set

$$\pi_D^{\mathfrak{h}} := r_{\mathfrak{h}}^L - r_{\mathfrak{h}}^R,$$

where  $r_{\mathfrak{h}}^L$  and  $r_{\mathfrak{h}}^R$  is denoted as the left and right invariant 2-tensors on  $D$  with value  $r_{\mathfrak{h}}$  at the identity element  $e$  in  $D$  respectively, and we can see that it is a multiplicative 2-vector field on  $D$ . Furthermore, the 2-vector field  $\pi_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$  and the element  $\varphi_{\mathfrak{h}}$  defined by (6) satisfy (3) and (4). We set

$$\pi_{G,g}^{\mathfrak{h}} := \pi_{D,g}^{\mathfrak{h}} \tag{8}$$

for any  $g$  in  $G$ . Then we can see that  $\pi_G^{\mathfrak{h}}$  is well-defined and that  $\pi_G^{\mathfrak{h}}$  is a multiplicative 2-vector field on  $G$ . Moreover,  $\pi_G^{\mathfrak{h}}$  and  $\varphi_{\mathfrak{h}}$  satisfy (3) and (4). Therefore  $(G, \pi_G^{\mathfrak{h}}, \varphi_{\mathfrak{h}})$  is a quasi-Poisson Lie group. We sometimes denote a Lie group with such a structure by  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$ .

From here, we consider only connected quasi-Poisson Lie group  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$  defined as above by a quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$ . For a smooth manifold  $M$  with a 2-vector field  $\pi_M$ , a quasi-Poisson action is defined as follows. It is a generalization of Poisson actions of connected Poisson Lie groups [6].

**Definition 4.** *Let  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$  be a connected quasi-Poisson Lie group acting on a smooth manifold  $M$  with a 2-vector field  $\pi_M$ . The action  $\sigma$  of  $G$  on  $M$  is a*

quasi-Poisson action if for each  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2} [\pi_M, \pi_M] = (\varphi_{\mathfrak{h}})_M, \quad (9)$$

$$\mathfrak{L}_{X_M} \pi_M = F_{\mathfrak{h}}(X)_M, \quad (10)$$

where  $x_M$  is a fundamental multi-vector field for any  $x$  in  $\wedge^* \mathfrak{g}$ . Here  $F_{\mathfrak{h}}$  is the dual of the map (7). Then a 2-vector field  $\pi_M$  is called a quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -structure on  $M$  and  $(M, \pi_M)$  is called a quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -manifold.

**Remark 3.** A quasi-Poisson Lie group  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$  with the natural left action is not a quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -manifold. In fact,  $(\varphi_{\mathfrak{h}})_G = \varphi_{\mathfrak{h}}^R$ .

Finally we define a moment map for a quasi-Poisson action to carry out the deformation of symplectic structures using the moment map theory for quasi-Poisson actions in Section 3. We need some preliminaries to define a moment map. For any quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$ , since  $G$  is a closed subgroup of  $D$ , the quotient space  $D/G$  is a smooth manifold, which is the range of moment maps. The action of  $D$  on itself by left multiplication induces an action of  $D$  on  $D/G$ . We call it  *Dressing action*  of  $D$  on  $D/G$  and denote the corresponding infinitesimal action by  $X \mapsto X_{D/G}$  for  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Let  $p_{D/G} : D \rightarrow D/G$  be the natural projection. Then

$$\pi_{D/G}^{\mathfrak{h}} := p_{D/G*} \pi_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$$

is a 2-vector field on  $D/G$ . We consider the dressing action on  $D/G$  restricted to  $G$ , and can see that  $\pi_{D/G}^{\mathfrak{h}}$  satisfies (9) and (10). Therefore  $(D/G, \pi_{D/G}^{\mathfrak{h}})$  is a quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -manifold. The following definition is one of the important notions to define moment maps.

**Definition 5.** An isotropic complement  $\mathfrak{h}$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  in  $\mathfrak{d}$  is called *admissible at a point  $s$  in  $D/G$*  if the infinitesimal dressing action restricted to  $\mathfrak{h}$  defines an isomorphism from  $\mathfrak{h}$  onto  $T_s(D/G)$ , that is, the map  $\mathfrak{h} \rightarrow T_s(D/G)$ ,  $\xi \mapsto \xi_{D/G, s}$  is an isomorphism. A quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$  is *complete* if  $\mathfrak{h}$  is *admissible everywhere on  $D/G$* .

It is clear that any isotropic complement  $\mathfrak{h}$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is admissible at  $eG$  in  $D/G$ . If the complement  $\mathfrak{h}$  is admissible at a point  $s$  in  $D/G$ , then it is also admissible on some open neighborhood  $U$  of  $s$ . For a quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$ , we assume that  $\mathfrak{h}$  is admissible on an open subset  $U$  of  $D/G$ . Then for any  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ , we define the 1-form  $\hat{X}_{\mathfrak{h}}$  on  $U$  by

$$\langle \hat{X}_{\mathfrak{h}}, \xi_{D/G} \rangle = (X | \xi) \quad (11)$$

for any  $\xi$  in  $\mathfrak{h}$ . If a quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$  is complete, then  $\hat{X}_{\mathfrak{h}}$  is a global 1-form on  $D/G$ . Next we define a twist between isotropic complement subspaces  $\mathfrak{h}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}'$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  in  $\mathfrak{d}$ . Twists also play an important role in the moment map theory for quasi-Poisson actions. Let  $j$  and  $j'$  be the linear isomorphism (5) defined by Manin quasi-triples  $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$  and  $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}')$  respectively. Consider the map

$$t := j' - j : \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{d}.$$

It is easy to show that  $t$  takes values in  $\mathfrak{g}$  and that it is anti-symmetric, so that the map  $t$  defines an element  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$  which we denote by the same letter. The element  $t$  is called the *twist* from  $\mathfrak{h}$  to  $\mathfrak{h}'$ . Fix a quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$ . Let  $\mathfrak{h}_t$  be an isotropic complement of  $\mathfrak{g}$  with a twist  $t$  from  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Then we can represent the elements  $\varphi_{\mathfrak{h}_t}$ ,  $F_{\mathfrak{h}_t}$  and  $\pi_G^{\mathfrak{h}_t}$  defined by a quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h}_t)$  as follows:

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{h}_t} = \varphi_{\mathfrak{h}} + \frac{1}{2}[t, t] + \varphi_t, \quad (12)$$

$$F_{\mathfrak{h}_t} = F_{\mathfrak{h}} + F_t, \quad (13)$$

$$\pi_G^{\mathfrak{h}_t} = \pi_G^{\mathfrak{h}} + t^L - t^R, \quad (14)$$

where  $[t, t] := [t^L, t^L]_e$ ,  $\varphi_t(\xi) := \overline{\text{ad}_{\xi}^* t}$  and  $F_t(X) := \text{ad}_X t$ . Here  $\text{ad}$  denotes the adjoint action of  $\mathfrak{g}$  on  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$  and  $\overline{\text{ad}_{\xi}^* t}$  denotes the projection of  $\text{ad}_{\xi}^* t$  onto  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g} \subset \Lambda^2 \mathfrak{d}$ , where  $\mathfrak{d}^*$  including  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  acts on  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{d}$  by the coadjoint action. Let  $\{e_i\}$  be a basis on  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\{\varepsilon^i\}$  be the basis on  $\mathfrak{h}$  identified with the dual basis of  $\{e_i\}$  on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  by  $j^{-1}$ . Then the basis  $\{\varepsilon_t^i\}$  on  $\mathfrak{h}_t$  identified with the dual basis of  $\{e_i\}$  on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  by  $j'^{-1}$  can be written by

$$\varepsilon_t^i = \varepsilon^i + t^{ij} e_j, \quad (15)$$

where  $t = \frac{1}{2} t^{ij} e_i \wedge e_j$ . Moreover components of  $\varphi_t$  with respect to the basis  $\{\varepsilon^i\}$  are written as

$$\varphi_t^{ijk} = (F_{\mathfrak{h}})_l^{jk} t^{il} - (F_{\mathfrak{h}})_l^{ik} t^{jl}. \quad (16)$$

This indication is useful later. Let  $(M, \pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}})$  be a quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -manifold. We set that  $\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}_t} := \pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}} - t_M$ . Then it follows that  $(M, \pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}_t})$  is a quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}_t}$ -manifold. Now we define moment maps for quasi-Poisson actions.

**Definition 6.** Let  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$  be a connected quasi-Poisson Lie group defined by a quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$  and  $(M, \pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}})$  be a quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -manifold. Then a map  $\mu : M \rightarrow D/G$  which is equivariant with respect to the  $G$ -action on

$M$  and the dressing action on  $D/G$  is a moment map for the quasi-Poisson action of  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$  on  $(M, \pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}})$  if for any open subset  $\Omega \subset M$  and any isotropic complement  $\mathfrak{h}'$  admissible on  $\mu(\Omega)$ ,

$$(\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}'})^{\sharp}(\mu^*(\hat{X}_{\mathfrak{h}'})) = X_M \quad (17)$$

on  $\Omega$  for any  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Here  $\langle (\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}'})^{\sharp}(\alpha), \beta \rangle := \pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}'}(\alpha, \beta)$ . We call a quasi-Poisson action with a moment map a quasi-Poisson-Hamiltonian action.

Actually we need not impose the equation (17) on all admissible complements because we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.1** ([1]). *Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}'$  be two complements admissible at a point  $s$  in  $D/G$ , and  $p$  in  $M$  be such that  $\mu(p) = s$ . Then, at the point  $p$ , conditions (17) for  $\mathfrak{h}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}'$  are equivalent, namely*

$$(\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}})^{\sharp}(\mu^*(\hat{X}_{\mathfrak{h}}))_p = (\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}'})^{\sharp}(\mu^*(\hat{X}_{\mathfrak{h}'}))_p.$$

For a quasi-Poisson manifold with a quasi-Poisson-Hamiltonian action, the following theorem holds.

**Theorem 2.2** ([1]). *Let  $(M, \pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}})$  be a quasi-Poisson manifold on which a quasi-Poisson Lie group  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$  defined by a quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{h})$  acts by a quasi-Poisson-Hamiltonian action  $\sigma$ . For any  $p$  in  $M$ , if both  $\mathfrak{h}'$  and  $\mathfrak{h}''$  are admissible at  $\mu(p)$  in  $D/G$ , then*

$$\text{Im}(\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}'} )_p^{\sharp} = \text{Im}(\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}''} )_p^{\sharp},$$

where  $\mu$  is a moment map for  $\sigma$ .

Now we show important examples for quasi-Poisson-Hamiltonian actions.

**Example 1** (Poisson manifolds [1],[2],[6]). *Let  $(M, \pi)$  be a Poisson manifold on which a connected Poisson Lie group  $(G, \pi_G)$  acts by a Poisson action  $\sigma$ . Then  $(M, \pi)$  is a quasi-Poisson  $(G, \pi_G, 0)$ -manifold and  $\sigma$  is a quasi-Poisson action on  $(M, \pi)$ . In fact, the Manin triple  $(\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^*, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^*)$  corresponding to  $(G, \pi_G)$  is a Manin quasi-triple and the multiplicative 2-vector field  $\pi_G$  on  $G$  coincides with the 2-vector field  $\pi_G^{\mathfrak{g}^*}$  defined by the corresponding quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{g}^*)$ . Since  $[\pi, \pi] = 0$  and the Poisson action  $\sigma$  satisfies*

$$\mathfrak{L}_{X_M} \pi = F_{\mathfrak{g}^*}(X)_M \quad (18)$$

for any  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ , the action  $\sigma$  is a quasi-Poisson action by Definition 4. Here the dual of  $F_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$  coincides with the bracket on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  defined by  $(G, \pi_G)$ .

We assume that  $\pi_G$  is complete and that there exists a  $G$ -equivariant moment map  $\mu : M \rightarrow G^*$  for the Poisson action  $\sigma$ , where  $G^*$  is the dual Poisson Lie group of  $(G, \pi_G)$  and  $G$  acts on  $G^*$  by the dressing action in the sense of Lu and Weinstein [6]. Then  $\sigma$  is a quasi-Poisson-Hamiltonian action. Actually, by the definition, the map  $\mu$  satisfies

$$\pi^\sharp(\mu^*(X^L)) = X_M \quad (19)$$

for any  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ , where  $X^L$  is a left-invariant 1-form on  $G^*$  with value  $X$  at  $e$  in  $G^*$ . The quotient manifold  $D/G$  is diffeomorphic to  $G^*$  as a manifold. The quasi-triple  $(D, G, \mathfrak{g}^*)$  is complete since  $\pi_G$  is complete. Then 1-form  $\hat{X}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$  defined by (11) is global for any  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Furthermore the 1-form  $\hat{X}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$  on  $D/G \cong G^*$  coincides with  $X^L$ . The complement  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  is admissible at any point in  $D/G$ , so that the map  $\mu : M \rightarrow G^* \cong D/G$  is a moment map for the quasi-Poisson action  $\sigma$  because of (19) and Proposition 2.1.

**Example 2** (symplectic manifolds [1],[9]). Let  $(M, \omega)$  be a symplectic manifold on which a connected Lie group  $G$  acts by a symplectic-Hamiltonian action  $\sigma$ . Since the symplectic structure  $\omega$  induces a Poisson structure  $\pi$ , the pair  $(M, \pi)$  is a Poisson manifold. Then the action  $\sigma$  is a Poisson action of a trivial Poisson Lie group  $(G, 0)$  on  $(M, \pi)$ . The trivial Poisson structure 0 on  $G$  is complete and the quasi-triple corresponding to  $(G, 0)$  is  $(T^*G, G, \mathfrak{g}^*)$ , where  $T^*G \cong G \times \mathfrak{g}^*$  is the cotangent bundle of  $G$  equipped with the group structure of a semi-direct product with respect to coadjoint action of  $G$  on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  (See [1]). The dual group  $G^*$  of  $(G, 0)$  is the additive group  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  and the moment map  $\mu$  for symplectic action  $\sigma$  is  $G$ -equivariant with respect to  $\sigma$  on  $M$  and  $\text{Ad}^*$  on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  by the definition. Furthermore the dressing action of  $G$  on  $G^* = \mathfrak{g}^*$  coincides with the coadjoint action  $\text{Ad}^*$ . Thus the map  $\mu : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^* = G^*$  is a moment map for the Poisson action  $\sigma$ . Therefore, by Example 1, the map  $\mu : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^* \cong T^*G/G$  is a moment map for the quasi-Poisson action  $\sigma$  on the quasi-Poisson  $(G, 0, 0)$ -manifold  $(M, \pi)$ .

### 3 Main Result

In this section, we carry out deformations of symplectic structures on a smooth manifold. We use the moment map theory for quasi-Poisson actions for it. A moment map for the quasi-Poisson action on a quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -manifold  $(M, \pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}})$  are defined with the conditions for the family of quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}'}$ -structures  $\left\{ \pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}'} \right\}_{\mathfrak{h}'}$  on  $M$ . For each complement  $\mathfrak{h}'$ , there exists

a twist  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\mathfrak{h}' = \mathfrak{h}_t$ , so that the family  $\{\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}'}\}_{\mathfrak{h}'}$  is regarded as the family parametrized by twist,  $\{\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}_t}\}_{t \in \Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}}$ . When the quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}_t}$ -structure with twist  $t = 0$  is induced by a given symplectic structure, we will give the method of finding a quasi-Poisson  $G_D^{\mathfrak{h}_t}$ -structure which induced a symplectic structure in  $\{\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}_t}\}_t$ . That is, we can deform a given symplectic structure to a new one by a twist  $t$ . This deformation can be carried out due to using the family  $\{\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}_t}\}_t$  as moment map conditions for quasi-Poisson actions. In this regard, it is described as follows in [1]: It would be interesting to find a geometric framework for considering the family  $\{\pi_M^{\mathfrak{h}_t}\}_t$ . Our deformation is one of the answers for this proposal.

Let  $(M, \omega)$  be a symplectic manifold on which an  $n$ -dimensional connected Lie group  $G$  acts by symplectic-Hamiltonian action  $\sigma$  with a moment map  $\mu : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ . Let  $\pi$  be the nondegenerate Poisson structure on  $M$  induced by  $\omega$ . Then  $\mu$  is a moment map for the quasi-Poisson-Hamiltonian action  $\sigma$  of  $(G, 0, 0)$  on  $(M, \pi)$  by Example 2 in Section 2.

Let  $(\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^*, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^*)$  be the Manin triple corresponding to the trivial Poisson Lie group  $(G, 0)$ , where  $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^*$  has the Lie bracket

$$[X, Y] = [X, Y]_{\mathfrak{g}}, \quad [X, \xi] = \text{ad}_X^* \xi, \quad [\xi, \eta] = [\xi, \eta]_{\mathfrak{g}^*} = 0 \quad (20)$$

for any  $X, Y$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\xi, \eta$  in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ . Here the bracket  $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathfrak{g}}$  and  $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$  are the brackets on  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  respectively. Then the Manin (quasi-)triple  $(\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^*, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^*)$  defines  $F := F_{\mathfrak{g}^*} = 0$  and  $\varphi := \varphi_{\mathfrak{g}^*} = 0$  (see (6) and (7)). Since the corresponding quasi-triple  $(T^*G, G, \mathfrak{g}^*)$  is complete by Example 1 and 2, an isotropic complement  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  is admissible at any  $\xi$  in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  by Definition 5, and hence it is admissible at any  $\xi$  in  $\mu(M)$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  be an isotropic complement of  $\mathfrak{g}$  in  $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^*$  with a twist  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$  from  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ . When we deform  $\pi$  to  $\pi_M^t := \pi - t_M$  by a twist  $t$ , the quasi-Poisson Lie group  $(G, 0, 0)$  is deformed to  $(G, \pi_G^t, \varphi_{\mathfrak{g}_t^*})$ , where  $\pi_G^t = t^L - t^R$  and  $\varphi_{\mathfrak{g}_t^*} = \frac{1}{2}[t, t] + \varphi_t$  by (12) and (14). Moreover it follows from  $F = 0$  and (16) that  $\varphi_t = 0$ . So  $\varphi_{\mathfrak{g}_t^*} = \frac{1}{2}[t, t]$ .

On the other hand, it follows from Definition 4 that the quasi-Poisson  $(G, \pi_G^t, \varphi_{\mathfrak{g}_t^*})$ -manifold  $(M, \pi_M^t)$  satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} [\pi_M^t, \pi_M^t] = (\varphi_{\mathfrak{g}_t^*})_M, \quad (21)$$

$$\mathfrak{L}_{X_M} \pi_M^t = F_{\mathfrak{g}_t^*}(X)_M. \quad (22)$$

If  $(\varphi_{\mathfrak{g}_t^*})_M = 0$ , i.e.,  $[t, t]_M = 0$ , then the 2-vector field  $\pi_M^t$  is a Poisson structure on  $M$  by (21).

Assume that a twist  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$  is an *r-matrix*, namely that  $[t, t]$  is ad-invariant. Then  $\pi_G^t = t^L - t^R$  is a multiplicative Poisson structure (see [6]). Therefore  $(G, \pi_G^t)$  is a Poisson Lie group. Then it follows that  $F_{\mathfrak{g}_t^*}$  coincides with the dual of the bracket map  $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\pi_G^t} : \mathfrak{g}^* \wedge \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$  on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  defined by the Poisson Lie group  $(G, \pi_G^t)$ . In fact, by the relation (19), we have

$$F_{\mathfrak{g}_t^*}^*(\xi, \eta) = \text{ad}_{t^\sharp(\xi)} \eta - \text{ad}_{t^\sharp(\eta)} \xi, \quad (23)$$

where  $\langle t^\sharp(\xi), \eta \rangle := t(\xi, \eta)$ . And the bracket on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  induced by a multiplicative Poisson structure defined by an r-matrix is represented by the right-hand side of (23) (see [5], Ex.2.19). Therefore, since  $G$  is connected, the condition (22) means that the action  $\sigma$  is a Poisson action of  $(G, \pi_G^t)$  on  $(M, \pi_M^t)$  under the assumption that  $t$  is an r-matrix and that  $[t, t]_M = 0$ .

Let  $\{e_i\}$  be a basis on  $\mathfrak{g}$ , a set  $\{\varepsilon^i\}$  be the dual basis of  $\{e_i\}$  on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ . Then we can write by (15),

$$\mathfrak{g}_t^* = \text{span}\{\varepsilon^i + t^{ij} e_j \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}, \quad (24)$$

where  $t = \frac{1}{2} t^{ij} e_i \wedge e_j$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$ . If  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible at any point in  $\mu(M)$ , then it satisfies  $\text{Im} \pi_p^\sharp = \text{Im}(\pi_M^t)_p^\sharp$  for any  $p$  in  $M$  by Theorem 2.2. The nondegeneracy of  $\pi$  means that  $\text{Im} \pi_p^\sharp = T_p M$  for any  $p$  in  $M$ . Therefore, by the fact that  $\text{Im}(\pi_M^t)_p^\sharp = T_p M$  for any  $p$  in  $M$ , a quasi-Poisson structure  $\pi_M^t$  is also nondegenerate.

Here we shall examine the condition for a isotropic complement to be admissible at a point in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  in more detail. Let  $(\xi_i)$  be the linear coordinates for  $\{\varepsilon^i\}$ . Then it follows that for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\varepsilon^i + t^{ij} e_j)_{\mathfrak{g}^*} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i} + t^{ij} c_{jl}^k \xi_k \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_l} \\ &= -t^{ij} \sum_{l \neq i} c_{lj}^k \xi_k \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_l} - (1 + t^{ij} c_{ij}^k \xi_k) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where  $X \mapsto X_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ , for  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^*$ , is the infinitesimal action of the dressing action on  $\mathfrak{g}^* \cong T^*G/G$ . The quasi-triple  $(T^*G, G, \mathfrak{g}_t^*)$  is complete if and only if the elements (25) form a basis on  $T_\xi(\mathfrak{g}^*) \cong \mathfrak{g}^*$  for any  $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ . Hence this means that the matrix

$$A_t(\xi) := \begin{pmatrix} -1 - t^{1j} c_{1j}^k \xi_k & -t^{1j} c_{2j}^k \xi_k & \cdots & -t^{1j} c_{nj}^k \xi_k \\ -t^{2j} c_{1j}^k \xi_k & -1 - t^{2j} c_{2j}^k \xi_k & \cdots & -t^{2j} c_{nj}^k \xi_k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -t^{nj} c_{1j}^k \xi_k & -t^{nj} c_{2j}^k \xi_k & \cdots & -1 - t^{nj} c_{nj}^k \xi_k \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

is regular for any  $\xi$ . Therefore this is equivalent to  $f_t(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) := \det A_t(\xi) \neq 0$ . Since the constant term of  $f_t$  is  $(-1)^n$  and since coefficients of the rest of the term include  $t^{ij}$ 's, a family of hypersurfaces  $\{f_t = 0\}_{t \in \Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}}$  in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  diverges to infinity as  $t$  approaches the origin 0 in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$ . If  $M$  is compact, then  $\mu(M)$  is bounded. So it follows that an intersection of  $\{f_t = 0\}$  and  $\mu(M)$  is empty for a twist  $t$  close sufficiently to the origin. Therefore since  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible on  $\mu(M)$ , the 2-vector field  $\pi_M^t$  is nondegenerate.

Since any nondegenerate Poisson structure on  $M$  defines a symplectic structure on  $M$ , the following theorem holds.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(M, \omega)$  be a symplectic manifold on which a connected Lie group  $G$  with the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  acts by a symplectic-Hamiltonian action  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$  be a moment map for  $\sigma$ . Then the following holds:*

1. *If a twist  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$  satisfies that  $[t, t]_M = 0$ , then  $t$  deforms the Poisson structure  $\pi$  induced by  $\omega$  to a Poisson structure  $\pi_M^t := \pi - t_M$ . Moreover, if  $t$  is an  $r$ -matrix, then  $\sigma$  is a Poisson action of  $(G, \pi_G^t)$  on  $(M, \pi_M^t)$ , where  $\pi_G^t = t^L - t^R$ .*
2. *For a twist  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$ , if the isotropic complement  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible on  $\mu(M)$ , then  $t$  deforms the nondegenerate 2-vector field  $\pi$  induced by  $\omega$  to a nondegenerate 2-vector field  $\pi_M^t$ . In particular, if  $M$  is compact, then a 2-vector field  $\pi_M^t$  is nondegenerate for a twist  $t$  close sufficiently to the origin 0 in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$ .*

Therefore, if a twist  $t$  satisfies the assumptions of both 1 and 2, then  $t$  deforms  $\omega$  to a symplectic structure  $\omega^t$  induced by the nondegenerate Poisson structure  $\pi_M^t$ .

The following theorem gives a sufficient condition for a twist to deform a symplectic structure.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $(M, \omega)$  be a symplectic manifold on which an  $n$ -dimensional connected Lie group  $G$  acts by a symplectic-Hamiltonian action  $\sigma$ . Assume that  $X, Y$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$  satisfy  $[X, Y] = 0$ . Then the twist  $t = \frac{1}{2}X \wedge Y$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$  deforms the symplectic structure  $\omega$  to a symplectic structure  $\omega_t$ . For example, a twist  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{h}$ , where  $\mathfrak{h}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , satisfies the assumption of the theorem.*

*Proof.* For  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ , we set

$$X = X^i e_i, \quad Y = Y^j e_j,$$

where  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is a basis on the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then since  $[X, Y] = X^i Y^j c_{ij}^k e_k = 0$ , we obtain the following conditions:

$$X^i Y^j c_{ij}^k = 0 \quad \text{for any } k,$$

where  $c_{ij}^k$  are the structure constants of  $\mathfrak{g}$  with respect to the basis  $\{e_i\}$ . Moreover, since we have

$$[t, t] = \left[ \frac{1}{2} X \wedge Y, \frac{1}{2} X \wedge Y \right] = \frac{1}{2} X \wedge [X, Y] \wedge Y = 0,$$

the twist  $t$  is an r-matrix such that  $[t, t]_M = 0$  obviously. Hence  $\pi_M^t$  is a Poisson structure, and if  $\pi_M^t$  is nondegenerate, then twist  $t$  induces the symplectic structure  $\omega_t$ .

We shall show the nondegeneracy of  $\pi_M^t$ . Let  $\mu$  be the moment map for a given symplectic-Hamiltonian action  $\psi$ . Then the nondegeneracy of  $\pi_M^t$  means that  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible at any point in  $\mu(M)$ . We prove a stronger condition that the quasi-triple  $(T^*G, G, \mathfrak{g}_t^*)$  is complete.

Let  $\{\varepsilon^i\}$  be the dual basis of  $\{e_i\}$  on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  and  $(\xi_i)$  be the linear coordinates for  $\{\varepsilon^i\}$ . Since  $t = \frac{1}{2} X^i Y^j e_i \wedge e_j$ ,

$$\mathfrak{g}_t^* = \text{span}\{\varepsilon^i + X^i Y^j e_j | i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Then it follows that for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$(\varepsilon^i + X^i Y^j e_j)_{\mathfrak{g}^*} = -X^i Y^j \sum_{l \neq i} c_{lj}^k \xi_k \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_l} - (1 + X^i Y^j c_{ij}^k \xi_k) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_i}. \quad (27)$$

The quasi-triple  $(T^*G, G, \mathfrak{g}_t^*)$  is complete if and only if the elements (27) form a basis on  $T_\xi(\mathfrak{g}^*) \cong \mathfrak{g}^*$  for any  $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ . Therefore we shall prove that the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 - X^1 Y^j c_{1j}^k \xi_k & -X^1 Y^j c_{2j}^k \xi_k & \cdots & -X^1 Y^j c_{nj}^k \xi_k \\ -X^2 Y^j c_{1j}^k \xi_k & -1 - X^2 Y^j c_{2j}^k \xi_k & \cdots & -X^2 Y^j c_{nj}^k \xi_k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -X^n Y^j c_{1j}^k \xi_k & -X^n Y^j c_{2j}^k \xi_k & \cdots & -1 - X^n Y^j c_{nj}^k \xi_k \end{pmatrix} \quad (28)$$

is regular. In the case of  $X = 0$ , this matrix is equal to the opposite of the identity matrix, so that it is regular. In the case of  $X \neq 0$ , using  $X^i Y^j c_{ij}^k = 0$ , we can transform the matrix to the opposite of the identity matrix. Thus the matrix (28) is regular. Therefore  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible at any point in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ . That is,  $(T^*G, G, \mathfrak{g}_t^*)$  is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 4.** We try to generalize the assumption of Theorem 3.2 and consider  $X, Y$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$  such that  $[X, Y] = aX + bY$  ( $a, b$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ ), that is, the subspace spanned by  $X, Y$  is also a Lie subalgebra. We set  $t = \frac{1}{2}X \wedge Y$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$ . Since

$$[t, t] = \frac{1}{2}X \wedge [X, Y] \wedge Y = \frac{1}{2}X \wedge (aX + bY) \wedge Y = 0,$$

the twist  $t$  is an  $r$ -matrix such that  $[t, t]_M = 0$ . Therefore the symplectic action  $\psi$  is a Poisson action of  $(G, \pi_G^t)$  on  $(M, \pi_M^t)$ . Then we research whether  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible at all points in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ . Similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.2, a matrix to check the regularity can be deformed to

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 - (aX^k + bY^k)\xi_k & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore this matrix is regular if and only if

$$-1 - (aX^k + bY^k)\xi_k \neq 0.$$

In the case of  $[X, Y] = 0$ , by Theorem 3.2, the space  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible at all points in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ . In the case of  $[X, Y] \neq 0$ , we shall denote by  $\cdot$  the standard inner product on  $\mathfrak{g}^* \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then the above condition means

$$\eta_{[X, Y]} \cdot \xi \neq -1,$$

where  $\eta_X = \sum_k X^k \varepsilon^k$  for  $X = X^k e_k$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $\xi'$  be an element which is not orthogonal to  $\eta_{[X, Y]}$ . By setting

$$\xi := -\frac{\xi'}{\eta_{[X, Y]} \cdot \xi'},$$

we obtain  $\eta_{[X, Y]} \cdot \xi = -1$ , so that  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is not admissible at  $\xi$ . Eventually, to make sure of the admissibility of  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$ , we need check whether such a point  $\xi$  is included in  $\mu(M)$ .

## 4 Deformations of the canonical symplectic form on $\mathbb{CP}^n$ and $\text{Gr}(r; \mathbb{C}^n)$

In this section, we compute specifically which element  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$  defines a different symplectic structure  $\omega_t$  from given one  $\omega$  on a smooth manifold. One

example is the complex projective space  $(\mathbb{CP}^k, \omega_{\text{FS}})$ , where  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  is the Fubini-Study form, with an action of  $\text{SU}(k+1)$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . Another is  $(\mathbb{CP}^n, \omega_{\text{FS}})$  with an action of the torus group  $\mathbb{T}^n$ . The other is the complex Grassmannian  $(\text{Gr}(r; \mathbb{C}^n), \omega_{\text{KK}})$ , where  $\omega_{\text{KK}}$  is the Kirillov-Kostant form, with an action of  $\text{SU}(k+1)$ .

First we review the relation between  $\text{SU}(n+1)$  and  $\mathbb{CP}^n$ . For any  $[z_1 : \cdots : z_{n+1}]$  in  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  and  $g = (a_{ij})$  in  $\text{SU}(n+1)$ , the action is given by

$$g \cdot [z_1 : \cdots : z_{n+1}] := \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} a_{1j} z_j : \cdots : \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} a_{n+1,j} z_j \right].$$

The isotropic subgroup of  $[1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$  is

$$\text{S}(\text{U}(1) \times \text{U}(n)) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta} & O \\ O & B \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SU}(n+1) \middle| \theta \in \mathbb{R}, B \in \text{U}(n) \right\}.$$

Therefore it follows

$$\text{SU}(n+1)/\text{S}(\text{U}(1) \times \text{U}(n)) \cong \mathbb{CP}^n.$$

The complex projective space  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  has the coordinate neighborhood system  $\{(U_i, \varphi_i)\}_i$  consisting of  $n+1$  open sets  $U_i$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} U_i &:= \{[z_1 : \cdots : z_{n+1}] \in \mathbb{CP}^n | z_i \neq 0\}, \\ \varphi_i &: U_i \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n \cong \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \\ [z_1 : \cdots : z_{n+1}] &\mapsto \left( \frac{z_1}{z_i}, \dots, \frac{z_{i-1}}{z_i}, \frac{z_{i+1}}{z_i}, \dots, \frac{z_{n+1}}{z_i} \right) \\ &\mapsto \left( \text{Re} \frac{z_1}{z_i}, \text{Im} \frac{z_1}{z_i}, \dots, \text{Re} \frac{z_{n+1}}{z_i}, \text{Im} \frac{z_{n+1}}{z_i} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n+1$ . By using this coordinate system, the Fubini-Study form  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  on  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  is defined by setting

$$\varphi_i^* \left( \frac{i}{2} \partial \bar{\partial} \log \left( \sum_j |z_j|^2 + 1 \right) \right)$$

on each  $U_i$ .

The action of  $\text{SU}(n+1)$  on  $(\mathbb{CP}^n, \omega_{\text{FS}})$  is a symplectic-Hamiltonian action and its moment map  $\mu$  satisfies

$$\langle \mu([z_1 : \cdots : z_{n+1}]), X \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \text{Im} \frac{\langle {}^t(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}), X {}^t(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) \rangle}{\langle {}^t(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}), {}^t(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) \rangle}$$

for any  $[z_1 : \cdots : z_{n+1}]$  in  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  and  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{su}(n+1)$ .

We use

- $X_{ij}$  : the  $(i, j)$ -element is 1, the  $(j, i)$ -element is  $-1$ , and the rest are 0,
- $Y_{ij}$  : the  $(i, j)$ - and  $(j, i)$ -elements are  $i$ , and the rest are 0,
- $Z_k$  : the  $(k, k)$ -element is  $i$ , and the  $(n+1, n+1)$ -element is  $-i$

for  $1 \leq i < j \leq n+1$  and  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , as a basis of  $\mathfrak{su}(n+1)$  which is defined by a Chevalley basis of the complexified Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{sl}(n+1, \mathbb{C})$  of  $\mathfrak{su}(n+1)$ . The subspace spanned by  $Z_k$ 's is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{su}(n+1)$ .

We consider the case of  $n = 1$ . The complex projective line  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  has the coordinate neighborhood system  $\{(U_1, \varphi_1), (U_2, \varphi_2)\}$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} U_i &:= \{[z_1 : z_2] \in \mathbb{CP}^1 \mid z_i \neq 0\} \quad (i = 1, 2), \\ \varphi_1 &: U_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{R}^2, \quad [z_1 : z_2] \mapsto \frac{z_2}{z_1} \mapsto \left( \operatorname{Re} \frac{z_2}{z_1}, \operatorname{Im} \frac{z_2}{z_1} \right), \\ \varphi_2 &: U_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{R}^2, \quad [z_1 : z_2] \mapsto \frac{z_1}{z_2} \mapsto \left( \operatorname{Re} \frac{z_1}{z_2}, \operatorname{Im} \frac{z_1}{z_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The Fubini-Study form  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  is

$$\omega_{\text{FS}} = \frac{dx_1 \wedge dy_1}{(x_1^2 + y_1^2 + 1)^2}$$

on  $U_1$ , where  $(x_1, y_1) := \left( \operatorname{Re} \frac{z_2}{z_1}, \operatorname{Im} \frac{z_2}{z_1} \right)$ . Then a moment map  $\mu : \mathbb{CP}^1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)^*$  for the natural action of  $\text{SU}(2)$  on  $(\mathbb{CP}^1, \omega_{\text{FS}})$  is defined by

$$\langle \mu([z_1 : z_2]), X \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im} \frac{\langle {}^t(z_1, z_2), X {}^t(z_1, z_2) \rangle}{\langle {}^t(z_1, z_2), {}^t(z_1, z_2) \rangle}$$

for any  $[z_1 : z_2]$  in  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  and  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ . Then  $e_1 := X_{12}$ ,  $e_2 := Y_{12}$  and  $e_3 := Z_1$  form a basis of  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ . Let  $\{\varepsilon^i\}$  be the dual basis of  $\mathfrak{su}(2)^*$ . We obtain

$$\mu(x_1, y_1) = \frac{y_1}{1 + x_1^2 + y_1^2} \varepsilon^1 + \frac{x_1}{1 + x_1^2 + y_1^2} \varepsilon^2 + \frac{1 - x_1^2 - y_1^2}{2(1 + x_1^2 + y_1^2)} \varepsilon^3.$$

Hence  $\mu(\mathbb{CP}^1) \subset \mathfrak{su}(2)^*$  is the 2-sphere with center at the origin and with radius  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Let  $(\xi_i)$  be the linear coordinates for  $\{\varepsilon^i\}$ . We set  $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{su}(2)$ . Any twist  $t$  is an r-matrix on  $\mathfrak{g}$  because  $e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge e_3$  is ad-invariant. Since  $\mathbb{CP}^1$

is 2-dimensional, it follows that  $[t, t]_{\mathbb{CP}^1} = 0$ . Therefore we can deform the Poisson structure  $\pi_{\text{FS}}$  induced by  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  to a Poisson structure  $\pi_{\text{FS}}^t$  on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  by  $t$  and the natural action is a Poisson action of  $(\text{SU}(2), t^L - t^R)$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  be the space twisted  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  by  $t$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}$ . We consider what is the condition for  $t$  under which  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible on  $\mu(\mathbb{CP}^1)$ . For any twist

$$t = \sum_{i < j} \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{ij} e_i \wedge e_j \in \Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g} \quad (\lambda_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}),$$

we obtain

$$\mathfrak{g}_t^* = \text{span}\{\varepsilon^1 + \lambda_{12}e_2 + \lambda_{13}e_3, \varepsilon^2 - \lambda_{12}e_1 + \lambda_{13}e_3, \varepsilon^3 - \lambda_{13}e_1 - \lambda_{23}e_2\}.$$

We calculate as

$$\begin{aligned} (\varepsilon^1 + \lambda_{12}e_2 + \lambda_{13}e_3)_{\mathfrak{g}^*} &= -(1 + 2\lambda_{12}\xi_3 - 2\lambda_{13}\xi_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_1} - 2\lambda_{13}\xi_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_2} + 2\lambda_{12}\xi_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_3}, \\ (\varepsilon^2 - \lambda_{12}e_1 + \lambda_{13}e_3)_{\mathfrak{g}^*} &= 2\lambda_{23}\xi_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_1} - (1 + 2\lambda_{12}\xi_3 + 2\lambda_{23}\xi_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_2} + 2\lambda_{12}\xi_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_3}, \\ (\varepsilon^3 - \lambda_{13}e_1 - \lambda_{23}e_2)_{\mathfrak{g}^*} &= 2\lambda_{23}\xi_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_1} - 2\lambda_{13}\xi_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_2} - (1 - 2\lambda_{13}\xi_2 + 2\lambda_{23}\xi_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_3}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible at  $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$  in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  if and only if the matrix

$$A_t(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + 2\lambda_{12}\xi_3 - 2\lambda_{13}\xi_2 & 2\lambda_{13}\xi_1 & -2\lambda_{12}\xi_1 \\ -2\lambda_{23}\xi_2 & 1 + 2\lambda_{12}\xi_3 + 2\lambda_{23}\xi_1 & -2\lambda_{12}\xi_2 \\ -2\lambda_{23}\xi_3 & 2\lambda_{13}\xi_3 & 1 - 2\lambda_{13}\xi_2 + 2\lambda_{23}\xi_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is regular. By computing the determinant of the matrix, we have

$$f_t(\xi) = \det A_t(\xi) = (1 + 2\lambda_{23}\xi_1 - 2\lambda_{13}\xi_2 + 2\lambda_{12}\xi_3)^2.$$

So the complement  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible at  $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$  if and only if  $1 + 2\lambda_{23}\xi_1 - 2\lambda_{13}\xi_2 + 2\lambda_{12}\xi_3 \neq 0$ .

Therefore  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  is admissible on  $\mu(\mathbb{CP}^1)$  if and only if the "non-admissible surface"  $\{\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \mathfrak{g}^* \mid 1 + 2\lambda_{23}\xi_1 - 2\lambda_{13}\xi_2 + 2\lambda_{12}\xi_3 \neq 0\}$  for  $\mathfrak{g}_t^*$  and the image  $\mu(\mathbb{CP}^1)$  have no common point. Since  $\mu(\mathbb{CP}^1)$  is the 2-sphere with center at the origin and with radius  $\frac{1}{2}$ , we can see that this condition is equivalent to the condition

$$\lambda_{12}^2 + \lambda_{13}^2 + \lambda_{23}^2 < 1.$$

From the above discussion, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.1.** *If a twist  $t := \sum_{i < j} \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{ij} e_i \wedge e_j$  satisfies  $\lambda_{12}^2 + \lambda_{13}^2 + \lambda_{23}^2 < 1$ , then the Fubini-Study form  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  can be deformed by  $t$  in the sense of Section 3.*

We shall see an example of twists giving symplectomorphisms on  $\mathbb{CP}^1$ .

**Example 3.** *We use a twist  $t = \frac{1}{2} X_{12} \wedge Y_{12}$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{su}(2)$  and a real number  $\lambda$ , where  $-1 < \lambda < 1$ . The symplectic structure  $\omega_{\text{FS}}^{\lambda t}$  deformed  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  by  $\lambda t$  is written by*

$$\omega_{\text{FS}}^{\lambda t} = \left\{ \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \right) (x_1^2 + y_1^2)^2 + 2(x_1^2 + y_1^2) + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda \right) \right\}^{-1} dx_1 \wedge dy_1$$

on  $U_1$ . Then it follows from an elementary calculation that the symplectic volume  $\text{Vol}(\mathbb{CP}^1, \omega_{\text{FS}}^{\lambda t})$  of  $(\mathbb{CP}^1, \omega_{\text{FS}}^{\lambda t})$  is

$$\text{Vol}(\mathbb{CP}^1, \omega_{\text{FS}}^{\lambda t}) = \begin{cases} \pi & (\lambda = 0) \\ \frac{\pi}{\lambda} \log \left| \frac{2+\lambda}{2-\lambda} \right| & (\lambda \neq 0). \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Next, we consider a cohomology class of each  $\omega_{\text{FS}}^{\lambda t}$ . Since  $H_{\text{DR}}^2(\mathbb{CP}^1) = \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a real number  $k_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $[\omega_{\text{FS}}^{\lambda t}] = k_\lambda [\omega_{\text{FS}}]$ . By integrating, we obtain

$$k_\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \left| \frac{2+\lambda}{2-\lambda} \right|,$$

where  $\lambda \neq 0$ . Since the function  $k_\lambda$  of  $\lambda$  is smooth, two symplectic structures  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  and  $k_\lambda \omega_{\text{FS}}^{\lambda t}$  are cohomologous. In particular,  $(\mathbb{CP}^1, \omega_{\text{FS}})$  and  $(\mathbb{CP}^1, k_\lambda \omega_{\text{FS}}^{\lambda t})$  are symplectomorphic by Moser's theorem.

Next we shall see deformations of symplectic structures in the case of  $\mathbb{CP}^n$ .

**Example 4.** *We consider the case of  $n = 2$ . Since  $[Y_{23}, 2Z_1 - Z_2] = 0$  in  $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{su}(3)$ , we use the twist  $t = \frac{1}{2} \lambda Y_{23} \wedge (2Z_1 - Z_2)$  ( $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ) to deform  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$ . Then  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  is deformed to*

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{FS}^t &= \omega_{FS} + \frac{\lambda}{\left\{ \sum_k (x_k^2 + y_k^2) + 1 \right\}^3} \{ (x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1) dx_1 \wedge dy_1 \\ &\quad + (x_1^2 - x_2^2) dx_1 \wedge dx_2 + (x_1 y_1 - x_2 y_2) dx_1 \wedge dy_2 \\ &\quad + (x_1 y_1 - x_2 y_2) dy_1 \wedge dx_2 + (y_1^2 - y_2^2) dy_1 \wedge dy_2 \\ &\quad - (x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1) dx_2 \wedge dy_2 \} \end{aligned}$$

on  $U_1$ , where  $x_i := \text{Re} \frac{z_{i+1}}{z_1}$  and  $y_i := \text{Im} \frac{z_{i+1}}{z_1}$ .

**Example 5.** The next example is a symplectic toric manifold  $\mathbb{CP}^n$  with the torus action:

$$(e^{i\theta_2}, e^{i\theta_3}, \dots, e^{i\theta_{n+1}}) \cdot [z_1 : \dots : z_{n+1}] := [z_1 : e^{i\theta_2} z_2 : \dots : e^{i\theta_{n+1}} z_{n+1}]$$

for any  $\theta_i$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . The moment map  $\mu : \mathbb{CP}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  for this action on  $(\mathbb{CP}^n, \omega_{\text{FS}})$  is

$$\mu([z_1 : \dots : z_{n+1}]) := -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{|z_2|^2}{|z|^2}, \dots, \frac{|z_{n+1}|^2}{|z|^2} \right),$$

where  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . We set  $X_1 := (1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, X_n := (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ . Since  $\mathbb{T}^n$  is commutative, the brackets  $[X_i, X_j]$  vanish for all  $i$  and  $j$ . Hence for any  $\lambda_{12}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , the twist  $t_{12} := \lambda_{12} X_1 \wedge X_2$  deforms  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  to a symplectic structure  $\omega_{\text{FS}}^{t_{12}}$  induced by a Poisson structure  $\pi_{\text{FS}}^{t_{12}} := \pi_{\text{FS}} - (t_{12})_{\mathbb{CP}^n}$  by Theorem 3.2. On the other hand it follows  $\pi_{\mathbb{T}^n}^t = t^L - t^R = 0$  for any twist  $t$  by the commutativity of  $\mathbb{T}^n$ . Therefore, after deformation, the multiplicative Poisson structure 0 on  $\mathbb{T}^n$  is invariant and this action is a symplectic-Hamiltonian action with the same moment map  $\mu$ . Therefore, by Theorem 3.2 again, the twist  $t_{13} := \lambda_{13} X_1 \wedge X_3$  deforms  $\omega_{\text{FS}}^{t_{12}}$  to  $(\omega_{\text{FS}}^{t_{12}})^{t_{13}} = \omega_{\text{FS}}^{t_{12}+t_{13}}$  induced by  $(\pi_{\text{FS}}^{t_{12}})^{t_{13}} = \pi_{\text{FS}}^{t_{12}+t_{13}}$ . Then we see that the trivial Poisson structure on  $\mathbb{T}^n$  is invariant and that the action is a symplectic-Hamiltonian action with  $\mu$ . By repeating this operation, it follows that we can deform  $\omega_{\text{FS}}$  to  $\omega_{\text{FS}}^t$  for any twist  $t = \sum_{i < j} \lambda_{ij} X_i \wedge X_j$  and that the action is a symplectic-Hamiltonian action with  $\mu$ . On  $U_1$ , since we obtain

$$(X_i \wedge X_j)_{\mathbb{CP}^n} = y_i y_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} - y_i x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} - x_i y_j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + x_i x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq n),$$

where  $x_i := \text{Re} \frac{z_{i+1}}{z_1}$  and  $y_i := \text{Im} \frac{z_{i+1}}{z_1}$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\text{FS}}^t &= \omega_{\text{FS}} + \sum_{i < j} \frac{\lambda_{ij}}{\left\{ \sum_k (x_k^2 + y_k^2) + 1 \right\}^3} (x_i x_j dx_i \wedge dx_j \\ &\quad + x_i y_j dx_i \wedge dy_j + y_i x_j dy_i \wedge dx_j + y_i y_j dy_i \wedge dy_j). \end{aligned}$$

The last example is the complex Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}(r; \mathbb{C}^n) := \text{SU}(n)/(\text{S}(\text{U}(r) \times \text{U}(n-r)))$  with the Kirillov-Kostant form  $\omega_{\text{KK}}$ . With respect to  $\omega_{\text{KK}}$ , the natural  $\text{SU}(n)$ -action is symplectic-Hamiltonian ([9]).

Then we consider the following r-matrix of  $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ :

$$t = \frac{1}{4n} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} X_{ij} \wedge Y_{ij},$$

where the r-matrix  $t$  is the canonical one defined on any compact semi-simple Lie algebra over  $\mathbb{R}$  (for example, see [3]). This is an r-matrix such that  $[t, t] \neq 0$ . We show that it satisfies  $[t, t]_M = 0$ , where  $M := \text{Gr}(r; \mathbb{C}^n)$ . Since  $t$  is an r-matrix, the element  $[t, t]$  is ad-invariant by the definition. Therefore  $[t, t]$  is Ad-invariant because  $\text{SU}(n)$  is connected. By the definition of the  $\text{SU}(n)$ -action on  $\text{Gr}(r; \mathbb{C}^n)$ , it follows that

$$[t, t]_M = p_*[t, t]^R,$$

where  $p : \text{SU}(n) \rightarrow \text{Gr}(r; \mathbb{C}^n) = \text{SU}(n)/(\text{S}(\text{U}(r) \times \text{U}(n-r)))$  is the natural projection. Since any point  $m$  in  $\text{Gr}(r; \mathbb{C}^n)$  is represented by  $gH$ , where  $g$  in  $\text{SU}(n)$  and  $H := \text{S}(\text{U}(r) \times \text{U}(n-r))$ , we compute

$$[t, t]_{M,m} = p_*[t, t]_g^R = p_*R_{g*}[t, t].$$

Because of the Ad-invariance of  $[t, t]$ , we obtain

$$p_*R_{g*}[t, t] = p_*L_{g*}L_{g^{-1}*}R_{g*}[t, t] = p_*L_{g*}\text{Ad}_{g^{-1}}[t, t] = p_*L_{g*}[t, t].$$

Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be the Lie algebra of  $H$ . For any  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{h}$  and  $g$  in  $\text{SU}(n)$ , we compute

$$p_*L_{g*}X = p_*L_{g*} \left. \frac{d}{ds} \exp sX \right|_{s=0} = \left. \frac{d}{ds} (g \exp sX) H \right|_{s=0} = \left. \frac{d}{ds} gH \right|_{s=0} = 0,$$

where we have used that  $\exp sX$  is in  $H$  in the third equality. Therefore it holds that  $[t, t]_M = 0$  if each term of  $[t, t]$  includes elements in  $\mathfrak{h}$  as follows. We notice that

$$\mathfrak{h} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{X_{ij}, Y_{ij}, Z_k | 1 \leq i < j \leq r \text{ or } r+1 \leq i < j \leq n, \text{ and } k = 1, \dots, n-1\}.$$

If  $X_{ij}, Y_{ij} \in \mathfrak{h}$ , then

$$[\cdot, X_{ij} \wedge Y_{ij}] = [\cdot, X_{ij}] \wedge Y_{ij} - X_{ij} \wedge [\cdot, Y_{ij}].$$

So these terms include an element in  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Hence we investigate terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} [X_{ij} \wedge Y_{ij}, X_{kl} \wedge Y_{kl}] = & -[X_{ij}, X_{kl}] \wedge Y_{ij} \wedge Y_{kl} - X_{ij} \wedge [Y_{ij}, X_{kl}] \wedge Y_{kl} \\ & -Y_{ij} \wedge [X_{ij}, Y_{kl}] \wedge X_{kl} - X_{ij} \wedge X_{kl} \wedge [Y_{ij}, Y_{kl}], \end{aligned}$$

where  $X_{ij}, Y_{ij}, X_{kl}$  and  $Y_{kl}$  are not in  $\mathfrak{h}$ . In the case of  $i = k$  and  $j = l$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} [X_{ij}, X_{ij}] &= [Y_{ij}, Y_{kl}] = 0, \\ [X_{ij}, Y_{ij}] &= 2(Z_i - Z_j) \in \mathfrak{h}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $Z_n = 0$ . In the case of  $i = k$  and  $j < l$  (resp.  $l < j$ ), since it follows that  $r + 1 \leq j$ ,  $l \leq n$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [X_{ij}, X_{kl}] &= [Y_{ij}, Y_{kl}] = -X_{jl} \text{ (resp. } X_{lj}) \in \mathfrak{h}, \\ [Y_{ij}, X_{kl}] &= [Y_{kl}, X_{ij}] = -Y_{jl} \text{ (resp. } Y_{lj}) \in \mathfrak{h}. \end{aligned}$$

We can also show the case of  $i < k$  (resp.  $k < i$ ) and  $j = l$  in the similar way. Therefore all terms of  $[t, t]$  include elements in  $\mathfrak{h}$ , so that  $[t, t]_M = 0$ . Since  $\text{Gr}(r; \mathbb{C}^n)$  is compact, for sufficiently small  $|\lambda|$ , a 2-vector field  $\pi_{\text{KK}}^{\lambda t}$  is nondegenerate by Theorem 3.1, where  $\pi_{\text{KK}}$  is the Poisson structure induced by  $\omega_{\text{KK}}$ . Example 3 is the special case of this example. From the above discussion, we obtain the following.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $t$  be the above  $r$ -matrix of  $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ . Then there exists sufficiently small number  $\lambda$  such that the Kirillov-Kostant form  $\omega_{\text{KK}}$  on  $\text{Gr}(r; \mathbb{C}^n)$  can be deformed by a twist  $\lambda t$  in the sense of Section 3.*

## acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Yuji Hirota for leading me into the study of quasi-Poisson theory and my supervisor Yasushi Homma for his helpful advice.

## References

- [1] A. Alekseev and Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach. Manin pairs and moment maps. *J. Diff. Geom.* **56** (2000) 133–165.
- [2] H. Bursztyn and M. Crainic. Dirac geometry, quasi-Poisson actions and  $D/G$ -valued moment maps. *J. Diff. Geom.* **82** 3 (2009) 501–566.
- [3] V. G. Drinfel'd. Hamiltonian structures on Lie groups, Lie bialgebras and the geometric meaning of the classical Yang-Baxter equations. *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **27** (1983) 68–71.

- [4] J. -H. Lu. Momentum mappings and reduction of Poisson actions, in Symplectic Geometry, Groupoids and Integrable Systems, P. Dazord and A. Weinstein, eds. *Springer* (1991) 209–226.
- [5] J. -H. Lu. Multiplicative and Affine Poisson structures on Lie groups. Berkeley Thesis (1991).
- [6] J. -H. Lu and A. Weinstein. Poisson-Lie groups, dressing transformations and Bruhat decompositions. *J. Diff. Geom.* **31** (1990) 501–526.
- [7] J. E. Marsden and T. S. Ratiu. *Introduction to Mechanics and Symmetry Second Edition*. (Springer, 2003).
- [8] D. Salamon. Uniqueness of Symplectic Structures. arXiv:1211.2940v5
- [9] A. C. da Silva. *Lectures on Symplectic Geometry*. (Springer-Verlag, 2006).
- [10] I. Vaisman. Lectures on the Geometry of Poisson Manifold. *Birkhaeuser* (1994).