arXiv:2001.02623v3 [math.DG] 8 Aug 2023

CANONICAL DOMAINS FOR COADJOINT ORBITS

DAVID MARTÍNEZ TORRES

Abstract. This paper describes two real analytic symplectomorphisms defined on appropriate dense open subsets of any coadjoint orbit of a compact semisimple Lie algebra. The first symplectomorphism sends the open dense subset to a bounded subset of a standard cotangent bundle. The second symplectomorphism has as target a bounded subset of a hyperbolic coadjoint orbit of an associated non-compact semisimple Lie algebra. Therefore, coadjoint orbits of compact Lie algebras are symplectic compactifications of domains of cotangent bundles, and are in symplectic correspondence with hyperbolic orbits of non-compact semisimple Lie algebras.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a compact semisimple Lie algebra. The Killing form intertwines the coadjoint and adjoint representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ and $\mathfrak{g}$, respectively. Therefore, any adjoint orbit is equipped with the Kostant–Kirillov–Souriau symplectic form for which the adjoint action of $\mathfrak{g}$ is Hamiltonian.

Let G be a connected Lie group whose Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g}$. If X is an adjoint orbit, then it can be endowed with a complex structure (a Kähler structure with Kähler form the Kostant-Kirillov-Souriau symplectic form) such that the complexification of G acts on X by holomorphic transformations, and thus so do any of its subgroups. A group involution on G determines one such subgroup upon complexification of its fixed point set. This is a so-called spherical subgroup: Its action on X has a finite number of orbits [27, 20]. In particular, it has a dense open orbit $X^* \subset X$.

Our first result in this paper concerns the existence of canonical coordinates for the restriction of the KKS symplectic form to X^* for appropriate choices of involution.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (X, ω) be an adjoint orbit of the compact semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ endowed with its* KKS *symplectic form. A Lie algebra involution whose opposite involution σ acts on X with non-empty fixed point set determines a real analytic diffeomorphism*

$$\psi : (X^*, \omega, Y, \sigma) \to (D \subset T^*L, d\lambda, E, \iota), \tag{1.1}$$

where

- *Y is a Liouville vector field on X^*;*
- *$L \subset X^*$ is the fixed point set of σ on X (and therefore it is a Lagrangian submanifold);*
- *D is an open bounded star-shaped neighborhood of the zero section of T^*L;*
- *$d\lambda$ is the Liouville symplectic form of T^*L;*
- *E is the Euler vector field of T^*L;*
- *ι is the involution on T^*L which sends a covector to its opposite.*

The real analytic diffeomorphism in (1.1) is K*-equivariant and compatible with the canonical (linear) momentum maps for the* K*-action, where* K *is the connected integration of the fixed point set of the involution.*

Theorem 1.1 describes any symplectic (co)adjoint orbit of a compact Lie algebra as a compactification of a domain in a cotangent bundle with its Liouville symplectic form.

To any Lie algebra involution on $\mathfrak{g}$, there corresponds a non-compact semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$, which is a real form of the complexification of $\mathfrak{g}$. If the opposite involution acts on the adjoint orbit $X \subset \mathfrak{g}$ with non-empty fixed point set, then to X there corresponds an adjoint orbit $X^\vee$ of $\mathfrak{h}$ and a holomorphic adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}$ of the complexified Lie algebra, such that

$$X \subset \mathcal{O} \supset X^\vee.$$

If Ω denotes the holomorphic KKS form on $\mathcal{O}$, then the real KKS symplectic forms on X and $X^\vee$ are $-\Im\Omega$ and $\Re\Omega$, respectively. The real hyperbolic orbit $(X^\vee, \Re\Omega)$ is canonically symplectomorphic to $(T^*L, d\lambda)$ [2, 18, 20]. Therefore, in view of Theorem 1.1, it is natural to ask whether it is possible to produce a transformation of the holomorphic adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}$, which takes $(X^*, -\Im\Omega)$ to a domain of $(X^\vee, \Re\Omega)$.

Our second result describes such a symplectomorphism by means of a Wick rotation-type map:

Theorem 1.2. *Let (X, ω) be an adjoint orbit of the compact semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ endowed with its* KKS *symplectic form. A Lie algebra involution whose opposite involution σ acts on X with non-empty fixed point set determines inclusions of symplectic manifolds*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & (\mathcal{O}, \Omega) & \\ \nearrow & & \nwarrow \\ (X, \omega = -\Im\Omega) & & (X^\vee, \Re\Omega) \end{array}$$

and a real analytic diffeomorphism

$$\Psi : (X^*, \omega, Y, \sigma) \to (D^\vee \subset X^\vee, \Re\Omega, \Re\Lambda, -\theta), \tag{1.2}$$

where

- *$D^\vee$ is an open bounded domain of $X^\vee$,*
- *Λ is the complexification of minus the Liouville vector field Y in Theorem 1.1,*
- *θ is the Cartan involution on the complexification of $\mathfrak{g}$ which fixes $\mathfrak{g}$,*

and Ψ is induced by the flow of Λ for time $i\frac{\pi}{2}$.

The real analytic diffeomorphism in (1.2) is K*-equivariant and compatible with the canonical (linear) momentum maps for the* K*-action, where* K *is the connected integration of the fixed point set of the involution on $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Theorem 1.2 describes a symplectic correspondence of sorts between (co)adjoint orbits of a compact Lie algebra and hyperbolic (co)adjoint orbits of non-compact real forms of the complexification of the compact Lie algebra. Here, the word *correspondence* should be understood as a bijection between orbits of a pair of different subgroups of a complex Lie group, of which there are important examples in the literature with which our construction bears a resemblance; the adjective *symplectic* is added because orbits in correspondence come with a symplectomorphism defined on appropriate domains.

- The first such instance is the Kostant-Sekiguchi correspondence [26, 29], which establishes a bijection between the (finitely many) nilpotent adjoint orbits in the real form $\mathfrak{h}$ with Cartan decomposition $\mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{s}$, and the nilpotent orbits in the complexification of $\mathfrak{s}$ for the action of the complexification of the maximal compact subgroup $\mathrm{K} \subset \mathrm{H}$, where H is the connected

integration of $\mathfrak{h}$. Orbits in correspondence lie in the same adjoint of the complexification of $\mathfrak{g}$ and are K-equivariantly diffeomorphic. In Theorem 1.2, the correspondence is between (some) elliptic orbits and (some) hyperbolic orbits lying in the same orbit of the complexification of $\mathfrak{g}$, and the K-equivariant symplectomorphism is between domains of the corresponding orbits.

- The second example is the Matsuki correspondence [20, 10], which establishes a bijection between the (finitely many) orbits in X of the action of the complexification of K and of H[1]. The correspondence reverts the partial order defined by the inclusion and orbits in correspondence intersect in a unique K-orbit. In Theorem 1.2, the open dense subset X^* is the largest orbit of the complexification of K and $L = X \cap X^\vee$ is the smallest H-orbit, and thus they are in correspondence. We consider the action of H in the larger complex orbit $\mathcal{O}$ — which induces the action of H in X — so that we can realize X^* as a domain of $X^\vee$ in a symplectic and K-equivariant fashion.

The precise meaning of having Ψ in Theorem 1.2 induced by the flow of Λ is the following: We cannot grant that the trajectories starting at all points in X^* exist for time $i\frac{\pi}{2}$. However, they exist for points close enough to L and we are able to prove that the ensuing map has an analytic continuation to the whole X^*.

Theorem 1.1 generalizes, among others, classical results for projective spaces and quadrics. If in $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ we consider the involution that conjugates the coefficients of a matrix, then Theorem 1.1 amounts to the following statement whose origin can be traced back to Archimedes: Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a sphere centered at the origin endowed with the Euclidean area form. If we remove the poles, then we obtain a subset X^* where we can introduce cylindrical coordinates θ, z. In cylindrical coordinates the Euclidean area form is $d\theta \wedge dz$.

To identify the spherical group of which X^* is an open dense orbit, the sphere, or, rather, an adjoint orbit of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, is identified with the complex projective line mapping a matrix to the eigen-line of the the eigen-value of maximal norm. If the equator of the sphere corresponds to symmetric matrices, then north and south poles go to the two points of the quadric $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \{Z_1^2 + Z_2^2 = 0\}$. These are the isotropic lines for the standard complex quadratic form in the complex plane. Its symmetry group $\mathrm{SO}(2,\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ is the spherical subgroup with which we are concerned. It acts on the projective line with three orbits: the two points of the quadric and the open orbit that corresponds to X^*. More generally, for all $n > 2$, the action of $\mathrm{SO}(n,\mathbb{C})$ on $\mathbb{CP}^{n-1}$ has two orbits: the quadric and its complement. Complex conjugation has fixed point set $\mathbb{RP}^{n-1}$. The complement of the quadric endowed with the Fubini–Study symplectic form is known to be symplectomorphic to a disk bundle of $T^*\mathbb{RP}^{n-1}$ with its Liouville symplectic structure [9, 7]. This is yet another instance of Theorem 1.1 applied to $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ and the involution that conjugates the coefficients of a matrix.

Let X be the product of two spheres and let X^* be the complement of the diagonal. Another classical result in symplectic topology says that if X is endowed with a monotone symplectic form, then the anti-diagonal is a Lagrangian 2-sphere and X^* is symplectomorphic to a disk bundle of T^*S^2. The product of two spheres can be identified with the quadric $\mathcal{Q}_2$ in such a way that the diagonal is mapped to $\mathcal{Q}_1$. More generally, if the quadric $\mathcal{Q}_{n-1}$ is endowed with the Fubini–Study form, then the complement of $\mathcal{Q}_{n-2}$ is known to be symplectomorphic to a disk

[1]The correspondence is more general since it applies to any pair of commuting anti-complex involutions in the complexification of $\mathfrak{g}$. We are assuming that one of them is the Cartan involution so we can establish a relation with Theorem 1.2.

bundle of the Lagrangian $n-1$-sphere obtained as the intersection of $\mathcal{Q}_{n-1}$ with $\mathbb{RP}^n$ [7, 4, 24]. This is another instance of Theorem 1.1 applied to $\mathfrak{so}(n,\mathbb{R})$ and the involution whose associated real form is $\mathfrak{so}(n-1,1)$.

For some orbits, Theorem 1.1 can produce more than one canonical domain. A regular adjoint orbit $X \subset \mathfrak{su}(3)$ is identified with the manifold of full flags in $\mathbb{C}^3$. Theorem 1.1 applied to the involution that conjugates the coefficients of a matrix produces a canonical domain symplectomorphic to a subset of the cotangent bundle of the manifold of full real flags (diffeomorphic to the quotient of SU(2) by the quaternions). If the eigen-values of X are of the form $-i\lambda, 0, i\lambda$, then the involution whose associated real form is $\mathfrak{su}(2,1)$ is in the the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, and produces a symplectomorphism known to experts in toric symplectic topology: The Gelfand-Zeitlin map has as its only singular fiber a Lagrangian 3-sphere S^3. There is a symplectomorphism to a star-shaped neighborhood of the zero section of T^*S^3 defined in the complement of the preimage of the two facets of the Gelfand-Zeitlin polytope which do not contain the singular vertex.

The Lagrangians in Theorem 1.1 are well–known to be minimal homogeneous Lagrangians [5] (see also [21]). We are not aware of a previous systematic study of their Weinstein neighborhoods. The techniques and strategy to prove Theorem 1.1 differ much from those used in [7, 4, 24]. First, Lie theoretic methods are used extensively to describe the symplectic geometry of hyperbolic orbits of real and complex semisimple Lie algebras and their relation to Lagrangian fibrations and their affine geometry [18]. Second, geometric counterparts of Kähler potentials are employed [12]; the use of Kähler methods, as opposed to projective ones, is important to have a result that places no integrality requirements on the cohomology class of the coadjoint orbit. Having geometric control on Kähler potentials is fundamental as this translates into geometric control of the associated Liouville vector fields. Third, appropriate Liouville vector fields are the key to apply a classical differential geometric characterization of cotangent bundles with their Liouville symplectic form [22].

We are not aware of previous instances of Theorem 1.2. In regard to the tools in Theorem 1.2, the use of holomorphic vector fields on Kähler manifolds and specifically on complex (co)adjoint orbits is not new. They are employed in [6] to study the space of Kähler structures and the key players there are holomorphic Hamiltonian vector fields rather than Liouville ones as in Theorem 1.2. In regard to the results in Theorem 1.2, a symplectic variation of the Borel embedding realizing the holomorphic duality between non-compact and compact Hermitian symmetric spaces is discussed in [11]. This so-called symplectic duality differs much from Theorem 1.2 both in the methods and in the result, which is an embedding from the non-compact Hermitian symmetric space into its compact dual, which is not a symplectomorphism, but rather relates the KKS symplectic forms by means of a third symplectic form.

There are natural questions to be addressed in relation to Theorem 1.1. For instance, at the level of differential topology, it would be important to understand how the domain D is compactified to produce the coadjoint orbit; it is natural to expect — at least in some cases — that the closure of $D \subset T^*L$ be a closed disk bundle and that there is a Lie group action in the sphere bundle responsible for the identifications. This is the case for projective spaces and quadrics, even accounting for the behavior of the symplectic form (cf. [24]). At the symplectic level, a relevant question is to describe the shape of D with respect to the cotangent lift of the appropriate bi-invariant metric in the Lagrangian. This would be the key to have a unified approach to the computation of a bound from below for the Gromov width of coadjoint orbits [15] as it would reduce the question to estimating embeddings of flat

balls in $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ into D. The relation of Theorem 1.1 with complete integrable systems should also be addressed. For instance, the compatibility with the Gelfand–Zeitlin system should be analyzed in detail (see Example 3.5); to do that, one would not just look at the chain of subalgebras but rather at an appropriate chain of commuting involutions. In the other direction, it would be natural to investigate if some of the known integrable systems on cotangent bundles [21, 9] can be transplanted via Theorem 1.1 to integrable systems on coadjoint orbits. It would also be relevant to compare Theorem 1.1 with the constructions of large toric charts in [1] and in [17].

The relation of Theorem 1.2 with the representation theory of non-compact semisimple Lie algebras should also be addressed.

The organization of this paper is the following. In Section 2, we discuss how the Iwasawa decomposition and anti-complex involutions can be used to describe the geometry of a hyperbolic orbit of a complex semisimple Lie algebra. Section 3 starts describing the interaction between the aforementioned hyperbolic orbits, holomorphic affine Lagrangian fibrations, and geometric counterparts of Kähler potentials for the KKS symplectic structure on an orbit of a compact Lie algebra. Then, it proceeds to the proof of Theorem 1.1 by combining the previous results with a characterization of (star-shaped domains in) cotangent bundles described in [22]. Section 4 analyzes the properties of the complexification of the vector field Y in Theorem 1.1 and proceeds to the proof of Theorem 1.2. The most delicate aspect is to control the domain of definition of the complexified vector field. This is done by means of geometric methods and its proof is deferred to the Appendix.

We would like to thank R. Vianna for discussions on this matter and the anonymous referee for his/her most valuable comments and suggestions.

This work was supported by the FAPERJ grants E-26/202.923/2015, E- 26/010.001249/2016, E-26/202.908/2018 and the CNPQ grant 304049/2018-2.

2. Complexifications, real forms, and the spherical subgroup

We fix once and for all a compact connected semisimple Lie group G whose Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g}$. For convenience we assume G to be simply connected. Let $X \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be an adjoint orbit of G. It will be convenient to regard X as a real form of a holomorphic adjoint orbit of the complexified Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. We denote by θ the Cartan involution on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ whose fixed point set is $\mathfrak{g}$. We also fix σ an anti-complex involution on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ that commutes with θ. For simplicity, we will assume that its fixed point set is a split real form $\mathfrak{h}$, that is, that σ is a Weyl involution. In Section 3.1, we will discuss the case of arbitrary real forms of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. We shall use the same notation for involutions on the Lie algebra and for their integration on the complexification $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$. For instance, the connected integration of $\mathfrak{h}$ will be $\mathrm{H} = (\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}})^{\sigma}$.

The commuting involutions produce a common direct sum decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ into ± 1-eigen-spaces

$$\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g} = i\mathfrak{s} \oplus \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{s} \oplus i\mathfrak{k}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{k}$ is the Lie algebra of the maximal compact subgroup $\mathrm{K} \subset \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{K} = \mathrm{G} \cap \mathrm{H}$.

Multiplication times i identifies $X \subset \mathfrak{g}$ with a G-orbit of $i\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. From now on, we shall work with this G-orbit, which we also denote by $X \subset i\mathfrak{g}$. The reason is that we want to take advantage of the hyperbolic $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$-orbit that contains X, which we shall denote by $\mathcal{O}$.

From the Cartan decomposition $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$ we pass to an Iwasawa decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ by choosing first $\mathfrak{a} \subset i\mathfrak{g}$ a maximal abelian subalgebra. Because $\mathfrak{h}$ is a split real form, we may take $\mathfrak{a} \subset i\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{h}$. The complexification $\mathfrak{a} \oplus i\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{s} \oplus i\mathfrak{s}$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and, therefore, X intersects $\mathfrak{a}$. In other words, the opposite of the restriction of a Weyl involution to $\mathfrak{g}$ acts on every adjoint orbit with non-empty

fixed point set. This means that for any adjoint orbit of $\mathfrak{g}$, a Weyl involution on $\mathfrak{g}$ is in the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1.

Next we fix a root ordering $\Sigma = \Sigma^+ \cup \Sigma^-$ and define $\mathfrak{n} = \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ so that

$$\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$$

is an Iwasawa decomposition of the real semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. We have exactly one point x in the intersection of X with the positive Weyl chamber of $\mathfrak{a}$:

$$X = \mathrm{G}(x) \ \subset \ \mathcal{O} = \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(x).$$

We start by recalling how a structure of complex homogeneous space on X is obtained. Because $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a complex subgroup the adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}$ is a complex manifold. Let $\mathrm{Z} \subset \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ be the centralizer of x and let P be the normalizer of Z. These are complex subgroups. We have a canonical identification $\mathcal{O} \cong \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{Z}$ given by the action of $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ on x, and a submersion

$$\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{Z} \cong \mathcal{O} \to \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{P}. \tag{2.2}$$

The base is canonically diffeomorphic to X as the action of G on $[e]$ provides a section. This section is not holomorphic. Far from it, the anti-holomorphic involution $-\theta$ fixes $\mathfrak{s}$ and therefore fixes the centralizer Z. Thus it descends to an anti-holomorphic involution on G/Z whose fixed point set is the section $\mathrm{G}([e])$.

It is important to regard X not just as a complex homogeneous space, but to remember the whole structure of homogeneous bundle of which X is naturally a section. Furthermore, the Iwasawa decomposition at the group level provides a linearization of this homogeneous bundle (2.2). We state this well-known result as a lemma for further use.

Lemma 2.1. *The group Iwasawa decomposition* $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{GAN}$ *induces a ruling/affine bundle structure on the adjoint orbit* $\mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}/\sim$ *characterized by having the* N*-orbit* $\mathrm{N}(x) = x + \mathfrak{n}(x)$, $\mathfrak{n}(x) = \sum_{\alpha(x)>0} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, *as fiber through* x *and having the action of* $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ *on* $\mathcal{O}$ *preserving the ruling.*

The ruling has the following properties:

(i) The identification $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{Z} \cong \mathcal{O}$ *is a* $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$*-equivariant biholomorphism from the homogeneous to the affine bundle*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{Z} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \Pi \\ \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{P} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}/\sim \end{array} \tag{2.3}$$

(ii) The biholomorphism intertwines the involution on $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{Z}$ *induced by the opposite of* θ *on* $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ *and the restriction to* $\mathcal{O}$ *of the opposite Lie algebra involution* $-\theta$*. Therefore, it identifies the fixed point sets* $\mathrm{G}([e]) \subset \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{Z}$ *and*

$$\mathcal{O}^{-\theta} = \mathcal{O} \cap \mathfrak{s} \oplus i\mathfrak{k} = \mathrm{G}(x) = X \subset \mathcal{O}. \tag{2.4}$$

We now discuss symplectic structures. The orbit $\mathcal{O}$ is endowed with the (holomorphic) KKS symplectic form Ω. We are concerned with two submanifolds of $\mathcal{O}$ whose symplectic geometry can be read using involutions: One is $X \subset \mathcal{O}$. The identification of the adjoint orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$ with the G-orbit $X \subset i\mathfrak{g}$ takes the real KKS symplectic form to $-\Im\Omega$. The other one is the orbit of x by the complex subgroup $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$, which is the fixed point set of the holomorphic involution $\theta\sigma$. Because G is simply connected, the subgroup $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is connected [28, Theorem 8.1]. The group $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a spherical subgroup. It acts on X with a finite number of orbits [27, Corollary 4.3]. The open and dense orbit is the subset $X^* \subset X$ that appears in the statement of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 2.2. *The fixed point sets of the opposite involutions $-\theta$ and $-\theta\sigma$ on $\mathcal{O}$ have the following properties:*

(i) The fixed point set of $-\theta$ — which is the G*-orbit X — is Lagrangian with respect to $\Re\Omega$ and symplectic with respect to $\Im\Omega$.*

(ii) The fixed point set of $-\theta\sigma$ is the $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$*-orbit* $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$*. It is Lagrangian with respect to Ω and it is a section of the Iwasawa projection whose image is the open dense orbit $X^* \subset X$.*

Proof. The opposite involution $-\theta$ on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an anti-conjugate Lie algebra morphism. This means that it acts on the holomorphic Poisson manifold $(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}, \pi_{\mathrm{lin}})$ taking orbits to orbits, but transforming the holomorphic KKS form into its opposite conjugate. Because $-\theta$ restricts to $\mathcal{O}$ to a biholomorphism, it sends Ω to $-\overline{\Omega}$. Thus, its fixed point set — which by (2.4) is X — is Lagrangian with respect to $\Re\Omega$ and symplectic with respect to $\Im\Omega$.

To prove that the fixed point set $\mathcal{O}^{-\theta\sigma} = \mathcal{O} \cap \mathfrak{s} \oplus i\mathfrak{s}$ is a section of the Iwasawa ruling we need to introduce the opposite Iwasawa ruling. Let $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}$ denote the sum of the negative root spaces and let $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x)$ be the sum of those subspaces corresponding to negative roots not vanishing on x. Spreading $x + \overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x)$ via the $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$-action (or just the G-action) produces the opposite Iwasawa ruling of $\mathcal{O}$. Because $\overline{\mathfrak{n}} \cap \mathfrak{n} = \{0\}$, the fibers of both rulings intersect at most in one point. The restriction of $\theta\sigma$ to $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ is minus the identity. Therefore, it exchanges $\mathfrak{n}(x)$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x)$. Hence, the restriction of $-\theta\sigma$ to $\mathcal{O}$ exchanges the Iwasawa and the opposite Iwasawa rulings. The consequence is that the tangent space at a point in $\mathcal{O}^{-\theta\sigma}$ must have trivial intersection with the tangent spaces of the Iwasawa and opposite Iwasawa fibers through the point. Also, if $\mathcal{O}^{-\theta\sigma}$ intersects an Iwasawa fiber in two points, then because $-\theta\sigma$ is a linear transformation the affine line through both points would be contained in $\mathcal{O}^{-\theta\sigma}$, which contradicts the previous statement on the tangent space of the fixed point set. Thus, $\mathcal{O}^{-\theta\sigma}$ is a section of the Iwasawa projection.

Because $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the fixed point set of the involution $\theta\sigma$ on $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$, it follows that $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \subset \mathcal{O}^{-\theta\sigma}$. Let us assume for the moment that $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ projects onto X^*. The opposite involution $-\theta\sigma$ on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an anti-Lie algebra morphism. Because it acts on $\mathcal{O}$ and fixes x, its fixed point set on $\mathcal{O}$ is Lagrangian with respect to Ω. Thus, its dimension equals the dimension of X, and, therefore, $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ must be an open subset of it. By [8, Corollary 5.3] $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ is a closed orbit which implies that it is a connected component of the fixed point set. Assume that there exists another connected component. It is a section of the Iwasawa projection over its image, which must necessarily have the dimension of X. Thus, its intersection with X^* is non-empty, which contradicts that $\mathcal{O}^{-\theta\sigma}$ is a section of the Iwasawa projection.

It remains to show that the image of the orbit $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ by the Iwasawa projection is X^*. For that it is enough to check that the dimension of the tangent space of the $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$-orbit of $x \cong [e]$ in $X \cong \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{P}$ is the dimension of X. The Lie algebra of P is

$$\mathfrak{p} = \overline{\mathfrak{n}}_{(x)} \oplus i\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{n},$$

where $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}_{(x)}$ denotes the sum of root spaces corresponding to negative roots vanishing on x. The kernel of the differential of the Iwasawa projection at x is $\mathfrak{n}$, which is contained in $\mathfrak{p}$. Thus, it suffices to show the equality:

$$[\mathfrak{k} \oplus i\mathfrak{k}, x] \oplus \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

Because σ fixes x both summands are invariant by σ. Therefore, we can equivalently show the equality of real forms

$$[\mathfrak{k}, x] \oplus \overline{\mathfrak{n}}^{\sigma}_{(x)} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^{\sigma} = \mathfrak{h}, \tag{2.5}$$

which follows, for example, from [14, sections 2 and 3]. □

3. LS submanifolds, proper Kähler potentials, and Euler vector fields

The formula for the KKS symplectic form at $x \in \mathcal{O}$ is $\Omega_x([u,x],[v,x]) = \langle x, [u,v]\rangle$, where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the (complex) Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. A similar formula holds at any point in $\mathcal{O}$ due to the invariance of both the bracket and the Killing form by the adjoint action. Therefore, the fibers of the Iwasawa projection are Lagrangian submanifolds of $(\mathcal{O},\Omega)$.

A fibration with Lagrangian fibers has an infinitesimal action of the cotangent bundle of its base on the vertical tangent bundle (see [13] for the smooth case and [18, section 1] for the holomorphic one). In our case, this infinitesimal action integrates into a fiberwise holomorphic group action

$$T^{*1,0}(\mathcal{O}/\sim) \times_{\mathcal{O}/\sim} \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O} \tag{3.1}$$

which turns $\mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}/\sim$ into a holomorphic affine Lagrangian bundle with a Hamiltonian action of $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ [18, Theorem 3.11]. Affine Lagrangian bundles are obtained by gluing together pieces of cotangent bundles with their Liouville symplectic form. In our setting, the spherical subgroup provides one such (large!) piece.

We denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the inverse image of $X^* \subset X \cong \mathcal{O}/\sim$ by the Iwasawa projection. Equivalently, $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{O}$ is the collection of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$-orbits of points in the Iwasawa fiber $x + \mathfrak{n}(x)$.

Proposition 3.1. *There is a canonical extension of the inclusion of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ to an isomorphism of affine Lagrangian bundles*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x), d\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\chi} & (\mathcal{A},\Omega) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \Pi \\ \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) & \xrightarrow{\Pi} & \mathcal{A}/\sim \end{array} \tag{3.2}$$

defined as follows: At a point $y \in \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ the Killing form and the biholomorphism $\Pi : \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \to \mathcal{A}/\sim$ identify a covector at $y \in \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ with a unique vector in the tangent space to the fiber through y, which we add to y.

Proof. According to [18, Theorem 3.11] $\Pi : (\mathcal{O},\Omega) \to \mathcal{O}/\sim$ is an affine Lagrangian bundle. Let us assume that the affine structure on fibers and the action of $T^{*1,0}\mathcal{O}$ on the vertical bundle is the natural one coming from the embedding $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$, by which we mean the following: The affine structure is given by the Iwasawa ruling described in Lemma 2.1. The action of a cotangent vector at a point on $\mathcal{O}/\sim$ is by addition of the vector tangent to its Iwasawa fiber with which it is in duality with respect to the Killing form. This duality at x uses that the complex vector space $\mathfrak{n}(x)$ is isotropic, the identification of the cotangent fiber of $T^{1,0}\mathcal{O}/\sim$ at x with $\{v + \theta v, \mid v \in \mathfrak{n}(x)\}$, and the duality (over the reals) between the latter space and $\mathfrak{n}(x)$ established by the real part of the Killing form — which can be deduced from the non-degeneracy of $\Re\langle\cdot,\theta\cdot\rangle$.

By item (ii) in Proposition 2.2, $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ is a Lagrangian section. Therefore, χ as described in the statement is exactly the action map (3.1) applied to the Lagrangian section $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ of the affine Lagrangian bundle $(\mathcal{O},\Omega)$. Hence, it defines an isomorphism of affine Lagrangian bundles [18, Proposition 1.6].

The affine bundle structure on $\Pi : (\mathcal{O},\Omega) \to \mathcal{O}/\sim$ and action of $T^{*1,0}\mathcal{O}$ is described in [18] as follows. First, one builds an affine Lagrangian bundle (E_x,Ω_x) by symplectic induction [18, Section 2.4]. This means Hamiltonian reduction of $(T^*\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}, d\lambda)$ at x with respect to the action of a standard parabolic subgroup P. The affine Lagrangian bundle structure on $(T^*\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}, d\lambda)$ is the natural one: A covector at a point in $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ acts on the fiber by addition. This affine Lagrangian bundle structure

descends to the quotient (E_x, Ω_x). Second, the momentum map $E_x \to \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}^*}$ restricts to an affine map on fibers and takes the action of $T^{*1,0}\mathcal{O}$ on fibers to addition of covectors [18, section 2.5]. As we transfer the structure from cotangent to tangent bundle, we have to replace addition of a covector on the base by addition of the only vector tangent to the affine fiber furnished by the Killing form. Third, if we choose P to be the parabolic subgroup with Lie algebra $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}_{(x)} \oplus i\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$, then the momentum map is a symplectomorphism $(E_x, \Omega_x) \to (\mathcal{O}, \Omega) \subset \mathfrak{g}$ which takes affine fibers to Iwasawa fibers [18, Theorem 3.11]. Therefore the affine Lagrangian bundle structure on $(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$ is the natural one coming from the embedding in $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. □

In order to ease the notation, from now on we will use the identification of $(\mathcal{A}, \Omega) \to \mathcal{A}/\sim$ with the cotangent bundle of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ without writing χ. Thus, we may now regard X^* as a section of the cotangent bundle that is Lagrangian and symplectic with respect to the real and imaginary parts of the Liouville symplectic form, respectively. This is an LS submanifold in the terminology of [12, Section 2]. Such submanifolds were introduced as geometric counterparts of Kähler potentials.

Proposition 3.2. *The symplectic form $-\Im\Omega$ on X^* has a Kähler potential*

$$-\Im\Omega = i\partial\bar{\partial}h \tag{3.3}$$

normalized by the condition that it vanishes on $x \in X^*$.

Proof. The submanifold $X^* \subset T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ is the graph of a section ς. By item (i) in Proposition 2.2, it is an LS section. It follows from [12, Section 2] that:

- the pullback $\varsigma^*\Im d\lambda$ is a (real) symplectic form on $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$;
- under the identification $T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \cong T^*\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ which takes a complex linear form to its real part, the section ς is a closed 1-form β;
- if β is exact, then any primitive $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x))$ satisfies: $2i\bar{\partial}\partial\eta = \varsigma^*\Im d\lambda$.

In such a situation, pulling back again from $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ to X^* we would conclude that $h = \varsigma^{-1^*}\frac{1}{2}\eta \in C^\infty(X^*)$ is a Kähler potential for $-\Im\Omega$.

Therefore, it remains to discuss the exactness of β. Because $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is invariant under the Cartan involution θ, the Cartan decomposition of $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ induces a Cartan decomposition $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{K}\exp(i\mathfrak{k})$. Thus, if we let K_x denote the isotropy group of the action of K on x, we obtain diffeomorphism $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \cong T^*\mathrm{K}/\mathrm{K}_x$, where the orbit $\mathrm{K}(x)$ goes to the zero section. Hence, the compact K-orbit $\mathrm{K}(x)$ is a deformation retract of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$. The submanifolds X^* and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ intersect precisely in that K-orbit $\mathrm{K}(x)$. Therefore, the closed 1-form $\beta \in \Omega^1(\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x))$ vanishes along $\mathrm{K}(x)$, which implies that it is exact. □

Proposition 3.3. *The Kähler potential h in (3.3) has the following properties:*

(i) It is real analytic.
(ii) It is invariant under the commuting actions of K *and the involution σ.*
(iii) It is Morse–Bott, positive, and vanishes exactly on $\mathrm{K}(x)$.
(iv) It is proper.

Proof. Because X^* is the fixed point set of an anti-holomorphic involution, it is a real analytic submanifold. Therefore, the section $\varsigma \in \Omega^{*1,0}(\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x))$ and its corresponding closed 1-form $\beta \in \Omega^1(\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x))$ are real analytic. Hence so are any of the primitives of β.

The action of σ on $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ defines a semidirect product group $\mathbb{Z}_2 \ltimes \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Because σ fixes the centralizer Z and its normalizer P, the group acts by bundle transformations on $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{Z} \to \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}/\mathrm{P}$. This action is transferred by the biholomorphism (2.3) to an action on $\mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}/\sim$ by affine bundle biholomorphisms. Both $\mathcal{A}$ and the orbit $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ are invariant by the subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2 \ltimes \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$. The cotangent lift of the latter action is identified by χ with the action on $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}/\sim$. The section X^* is invariant

by the subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathrm{K}$. Therefore, the closed 1-form β is $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathrm{K}$-invariant and so any of its primitives are. The involution σ preserves the Iwasawa fibers and, therefore, projecting along fibers identifies $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ and X^* in a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathrm{K}$-equivariant fashion. Thus, the pullback of β to X^* is also a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathrm{K}$-invariant exact 1-form and therefore the Kähler potential h is invariant by the commuting actions of σ and K.

By definition the critical points of h are the intersection of the graph of ς with the zero section: $X^* \cap \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) = \mathrm{K}(x)$. The Morse–Bott condition requires first transversality of the previous intersection. Such intersection is the real form for the involution σ on both $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ and X^* (the latter with respect to the quotient complex structure). Because the Iwasawa projection intertwines both anti-holomorphic involutions, it follows that

$$T_x\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \cap T_xX^* = T_x\mathrm{K}(x).$$

Second, by K-invariance we just need to check the Hessian condition on the normal bundle to $\mathrm{K}(x)$ at x: $T_xX^*/T_x\mathrm{K}$. We shall take as representative of the quotient tangent space

$$\Pi_* T_x \exp(i\mathfrak{k})(x) = \Pi_*[i\mathfrak{k}, x].$$

Let $u \in \mathfrak{k}$ be decomposed as $u = \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} u_\alpha + \theta u_\alpha$, $u_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}^\sigma_\alpha$. We have:

$$[iu, x] = i \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} [u_\alpha + \theta u_\alpha, x] = -i \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} \alpha(x)(u_\alpha - \theta u_\alpha) = - \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} \alpha(x) i(u_\alpha - \theta u_\alpha),$$

and therefore

$$\Pi_*([iu, x]) = i[u, x] + \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} 2i\alpha(x)u_\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} \alpha(x) i(u_\alpha + \theta u_\alpha). \tag{3.4}$$

If we let $u' = -\sum_\alpha i(u_\alpha - \theta u_\alpha) \in \mathfrak{g}$, then we can write

$$[u', x] = \sum_\alpha i\alpha(x)(u_\alpha + \theta u_\alpha) = \Pi_*([iu, x]).$$

Therefore, the intrinsic derivative of ${\varsigma^{-1}}^*\beta$ in the direction of $[u', x]$ reads:

$$\nabla {\varsigma^{-1}}^*\beta([u', x]) = \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} 2i\alpha(x)u_\alpha.$$

To go from the intrinsic derivative of the 1-form to the Hessian of the primitive, we use the linear isomorphism from $\mathfrak{n}^\sigma$ to $T^*_xX^*$ given by twice the real part of the Killing form:

$$\mathrm{Hess}_x([u', x], [u', x]) = 2\Re\langle \nabla {\varsigma^{-1}}^*\beta([u', x]), u'\rangle = 2\Re\langle \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} 2i\alpha(x)u_\alpha, - \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} i(u_\alpha - \theta u_\alpha)\rangle =$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} 4\alpha(x)\Re\langle u_\alpha, -\theta u_\alpha\rangle > 0,$$

where in the last equality, we used that $\mathfrak{n}$ is isotropic for the Killing form and $2\Re\langle\cdot, -\theta\cdot\rangle$ is an inner product on $\mathfrak{h}$ for which root spaces are mutually orthogonal, and in the final inequality, we used that x belongs to the positive Weyl chamber.

From the strict positivity of the Hessian we conclude that $\mathrm{K}(x)$ are minima, and thus h is a positive function.

The K-equivariant diffeomorphism $\Pi^{-1} : X^* \to \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ allows us to regard h as a K-invariant function on a complex homogeneous space. This function is strictly plurisubharmonic as it is a Kähler potential. Because h attains a minimum by [3, Theorem 1], it must be proper. □

We define $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^*$ to be one half of the gradient vector field of h. This is the vector field in the statement of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By (3.3) Y is a Liouville vector field. By items (iv) and (iii) in Proposition 3.3, its trajectories for negative time have limit on X^* and its linearization $\nabla Y : TX^*|_{\mathrm{K}(x)} \to TX^*|_{\mathrm{K}(x)}$ has rank half the fiber dimension of the tangent bundle. In particular, the dynamics of Y are normally hyperbolic on X^*, and thus by the unstable manifold theorem trajectories for negative time have a unique limit point in X^* [16]. If Y were complete, then by Nagano's characterization of cotangent bundles [22, Theorem 4.1], the vector field would give rise to a symplectomorphism from X^* to $T^*\mathrm{K}(x)$ taking Y to the Euler vector field. The vector field Y is backwards complete. The construction in [22, Theorem 3] also extends for vector fields that are backwards complete, but the outcome is a symplectomorphism ψ onto a domain $D \subset T^*\mathrm{K}(x)$, which is (fiberwise) star-shaped.

The symplectic form $-\Im\Omega$ and Kähler metric are K-invariant, and, therefore, Y is K-invariant as well. This symmetry extends to $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times$ K-invariance by item (ii) in Proposition 3.3. The cotangent lift of the left action of K on $\mathrm{K}(x)$ is by vector bundle automorphisms. Therefore, the Euler vector field is K-invariant. This symmetry extends as well to $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times$K-invariance, where the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-action comes from the involution ι that sends a covector to its opposite. Because Nagano's symplectomorphism ψ is characterized by taking integral curves of Y to integral curves of the Euler vector field, and because the action of $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathrm{K}$ preserves X^*, the symplectomorphisms must be $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times$K-equivariant. A posteriori, we deduce that the fiber of the unstable normal bundle of Y at a point in X^* is the -1-eigen-space of σ.

Both $(X^*, -\Im\Omega)$ and $(T^*\mathrm{K}(x), d\lambda)$ are K-Hamiltonian spaces. Thus, ψ pulls back any momentum map for the latter space to a momentum map to the former space. The canonical momentum map μ for the cotangent lift of the action sends the zero section to zero. The natural momentum map ν for $(X^*, -\Im\Omega)$ is the restriction of the projection $\mathfrak{p} \oplus i\mathfrak{k} \to \mathfrak{k}$ followed by multiplication times $-i$ and the isomorphism given by twice the real part of the Killing form. Because $\mathrm{K}(x)$ is mapped to zero, ψ must intertwine both momentum maps.

The canonical momentum map $\mu : T^*\mathrm{K}(x) \to \mathfrak{k}^*$ is linear on fibers. Therefore, it relates Euler vector fields. Because $\nu = \mu \circ \psi$ and ψ relates Y to the Euler vector field, then ν also relates Y to the Euler vector field of $\mathfrak{k}^*$.

A subset of $T^*\mathrm{K}(x)$ is bounded if and only if its image by the canonical (proper) momentum map μ is bounded. By the previous paragraph $\mu(D) = \nu(X^*)$. Because $\nu(X^*) \subset \nu(X)$ the former subset is bounded. Hence, $D \subset T^*K$ is a bounded subset. □

Example 3.4. We let $\mathrm{G} = \mathrm{SU}(2)$ and we fix $x \in i\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The holomorphic adjoint orbit in which we are interested is $\mathcal{O} = \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})(x)$. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{n}$ of positive root spaces is the subspace of upper triangular matrices with zeros in the diagonal. The Iwasawa fiber over x described in Lemma 2.1 is

$$\mathrm{N}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \zeta \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot x = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2\zeta \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \mid \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

The complex involution $\theta\sigma$ on $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ takes a matrix to its transpose. Therefore, the spherical group is $\mathrm{SO}(2, \mathbb{C})$. The exponential map is given by

$$z \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \cos(z) & -\sin(z) \\ \sin(z) & \cos(z) \end{pmatrix}, \quad z = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{3.5}$$

The orbit $\mathrm{SO}(2,\mathbb{C})(x)$ is the holomorphic Lagrangian of $(\mathcal{O},\Omega)$ given by

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} z & w \\ w & -z \end{pmatrix} \mid z,w \in \mathbb{C},\ z^2+w^2=1 \right\}.$$

Next we compute the complex 1-form ς on $\mathrm{SO}(2,\mathbb{C})(x)$ defined by the section $X = \mathrm{SU}(2)(x)$ as described in Proposition 3.2. We use that if $h \in \mathrm{SO}(2,\mathbb{C})$ has Iwasawa decomposition $h = gle$ then ς is the dual of $g\cdot x - h\cdot x \in g\cdot\mathfrak{n}$. Therefore, for $c \in \mathfrak{k}$ we have

$$\varsigma_{h\cdot x}(h_* c) = \langle g\cdot x - h\cdot x, h\cdot c\rangle = \langle x - le\cdot x, le\cdot c\rangle = 4\mathrm{tr}(x - l\cdot x)(le\cdot c). \quad (3.6)$$

The Gram–Schmidt algorithm for the standard Hermitian inner product in $\mathbb{C}^2$ returns the Iwasawa factorization:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \cos(z) & -\sin(z) \\ \sin(z) & \cos(z) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\cos(z)}{d} & -\frac{\overline{\sin(z)}}{d} \\ \frac{\sin(z)}{d} & \frac{\overline{\cos(z)}}{d} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cos(z)\overline{\sin(z)} - \sin(z)\overline{\cos(z)} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{d} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $d^2 = \cos(z)\overline{\cos(z)} + \sin(z)\overline{\sin(z)}$. If we pull back ς to $\mathbb{C}$ via the exponential map (3.5) so that $z = a + ib$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$, then (3.6) yields

$$\varsigma_z(c) = -8ic\frac{\sinh(2b)}{\cosh(2b)}.$$

The primitive of

$$\frac{1}{2}\Re\varsigma = 4\frac{\sinh(2b)}{\cosh(2b)}db$$

is the (normalized) Kähler potential

$$h(a,b) = 2\ln\cosh(2b).$$

Therefore, the pullback to $\mathbb{C}$ of the KKS symplectic form is

$$\omega = \frac{1}{2}d\circ J^*\left(\frac{1}{2}\Re\varsigma\right) = \frac{4}{\cosh^2(2b)}da\wedge db.$$

The open dense orbit $X^* \subset \mathrm{SU}(2)(x)$ can be explicitly parameterized by using the the first factor of the Iwasawa decomposition (3.7):

$$\begin{pmatrix} \cos(z) & -\sin(z) \\ \sin(z) & \cos(z) \end{pmatrix}\cdot x = \frac{1}{\cosh(2b)}\left(\cos(2a)\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + \sin(2a)\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) + \frac{\sinh(2b)}{\cosh(2b)}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.8)$$

This implies that the cylindrical coordinates are

$$\theta = 2a, \quad z = \frac{\sinh(2b)}{\cosh(2b)}.$$

Thus the pullback to $\mathbb{C}$ of $d\theta\wedge dz$ is

$$2da\wedge 2\frac{1}{\cosh^2(2b)}db = \frac{4}{\cosh^2(2b)}da\wedge db,$$

which as expected is ω. The Hamiltonian vector field of h is

$$X_h = \sinh(2b)\cosh(2b)\frac{\partial}{\partial a} = \frac{1}{2}\sinh(4b)\frac{\partial}{\partial a},$$

and therefore the gradient vector field is

$$Y = \frac{1}{2}\sinh(2b)\cosh(2b)\frac{\partial}{\partial b}.$$

Its push forward by the coordinate chart is a vector field tangent to the meridian through x. Its height component is:

$$\frac{1}{2}\sinh(2b)\cosh(2b)\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\left(\frac{\sinh(2b)}{\cosh(2b)}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{2}\sinh(2b)\cosh(2b)\left(\frac{2}{\cosh^2(2b)}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial z} = z\frac{\partial}{\partial z}.$$

Hence, in cylindrical coordinates, Y is the Euler vector field of $T^*\mathbb{RP}^1$.

3.1. **Arbitrary involutions.** Let us suppose that σ is an anti-complex Lie algebra involution on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ that commutes with the Cartan involution θ. To place ourselves in the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, we must require that X intersects the fixed point set $\mathfrak{s}$ of the restriction of σ to $i\mathfrak{g}$. We need to make several adjustments in the constructions of the previous sections.

(1) The maximal abelian Lie algebra of $i\mathfrak{g}$ is now chosen to be σ-stable (standard). This means it splits as $\mathfrak{a} \oplus i\mathfrak{t}$, $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{s}$, $i\mathfrak{t} \subset i\mathfrak{k}$. Upon restriction of the roots of $(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{a} \oplus i\mathfrak{t})$ to $\mathfrak{a}$ we get a (reduced) root system for $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{a})$. We first choose an ordering of the reduced root system and then extend it to an ordering of the root system: $\Sigma = \Sigma^+ \cup \Sigma^-$. This means that for a non-imaginary root — a root non-vanishing on $\mathfrak{a}$ — its positivity is determined by the positivity of its restriction to $\mathfrak{a}$.

(2) The intersection of X with $\mathfrak{s}$ is non-empty. Because all maximal abelian subalgebras of $\mathfrak{s}$ are conjugate under the action of K we may assume that $\mathfrak{a}$ intersects X. In that intersection, there is a unique point x lying in the positive Weyl chamber of the ordered reduced root system/ordered root system.

(3) Lemma 2.1 concerns the Cartan involution and thus holds true.

(4) Item (ii) in Proposition 2.2 is about properties of the spherical subgroup $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$, which is the fixed point set of the holomorphic involution $\theta\sigma$. We need further analysis of the affine fibers $x + \mathfrak{n}(x)$ and $x + \overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x)$ to deduce that their intersection and their behavior under the action of $-\theta\sigma$ is the same as the one described when σ is the Weyl involution: First, we recall that every imaginary root vanishes on $\mathfrak{a}$ and therefore its corresponding root space acts trivially on $x \in X \cap \mathfrak{s}$. If we let $\mathfrak{n}_{(\mathfrak{s})}$ and $\mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{s})$ denote the eigen-spaces for the positive imaginary roots and the eigen-space for the positive non-imaginary roots, respectively, we obtain a direct sum decomposition of subalgebras
$$\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{s}) \oplus \mathfrak{n}_{(\mathfrak{s})}.$$
Therefore, we have the corresponding factorization
$$\mathrm{N} = \mathrm{N}(\mathfrak{s})\mathrm{N}_{(\mathfrak{s})}.$$
Because $\mathrm{N}_{(\mathfrak{s})}$ is contained in Z, the centralizer of x, we may assume in the proof of Proposition 2.2 that the fiber $x + \mathfrak{n}(x)$ of the Iwasawa ruling of $\mathcal{O} \to X$ is an affine subspace of $x + \mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{s})$. Likewise, in the opposite Iwasawa decomposition, we may assume that the fiber over x is an affine subspace of $x + \overline{\mathfrak{n}}(\mathfrak{s})$. Because $\mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{s}) \cap \overline{\mathfrak{n}}(\mathfrak{s}) = \{0\}$ and σ fixes the subspaces $\mathfrak{n}(x) \subset \mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{s}), \overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x) \subset \overline{\mathfrak{n}}(\mathfrak{s})$ (for non-imaginary roots their positivity or negativity is dictated by their restriction to $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{s}$) and the direct sum $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}_{(\mathfrak{s})} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_{(\mathfrak{s})}$, Proposition 2.2 remains valid.

(5) Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 in Section 3 remain valid, as they hinge on Proposition 2.2 and general properties of holomorphic cotangent bundles and their sections. The proof of Proposition 3.3 uses two ingredients involving the involution σ: first, that the Iwasawa projection intertwines the involution σ on the total space $\mathcal{O}$ and on the base X. This holds true for arbitrary involutions because as noted we can consider as Iwasawa fiber the σ-invariant subalgebra $\mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{s})$. Second, a decomposition of a vector $u \in \mathfrak{k}$ parameterized by positive roots. For a general involution we should replace the positive roots by the positive non-imaginary roots:
$$u = \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+(\mathfrak{s})} u_\alpha + \theta u_\alpha, \quad u_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}^\sigma_\alpha.$$




FIGURE 1. The image of the Gelfand-Zeitlin map

Note that this is equivalent to using the positive roots of the reduced root system and a basis of the corresponding eigen-spaces (which may have multiplicity greater than one).

With the previous adjustments Theorem 1.1 is valid for arbitrary Lie algebra involutions on $\mathfrak{g}$.

Example 3.5. Any regular orbit of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ is diffeomorphic to the manifold of full flags in $\mathbb{C}^3$. If we apply Theorem 1.1 to any regular orbit and the Weyl involution that conjugates the coefficients of a matrix, then we obtain a symplectomorphism to a domain of the cotangent bundle over the manifold of real full flags — a manifold that is diffeomorphic to the quotient of SU(2) by the quaternions (see e.g. [14, p. 335]).

In this example, we shall apply Theorem 1.1 to the involution

$$\tau : \mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C}) \to \mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C}), \quad z \mapsto -I_{2,1} z^* I_{2,1}, \quad I_{2,1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and to the (regular) orbit of

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The involution τ fixes x and the spherical subgroup $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ associated to τ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} z & w & 0 \\ \mu & \nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon \end{pmatrix}, \quad z, w, \mu, \nu, \epsilon \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (z\nu - w\mu)\epsilon = 1. \tag{3.9}$$

Our main objective is to describe the relation between the orbits of the action of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ in $X = \mathrm{SU}(3)(x)$ and the Gelfand–Zeitlin map

$$\lambda : X \to \mathbb{R}^3, \quad y \mapsto (\lambda^{(1)}(y), \lambda_1^{(2)}(y), \lambda_2^{(2)}(y)),$$

where $\lambda_j^{(i)}$ is the jth eigen-value (in decreasing order) of the ith principal minor.

The image of the Gelfand–Zeitlin map is the polytope showed in Figure 3.5 (see [23, section 2.3] for a detailed account of the Gelfand-Zeitlin system). By definition x is mapped to the origin. The remaining six vertices are the image of the diagonal

matrices in X. For example, the one mapped to $(1,1,0)$ is

$$y = s \cdot x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & i \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.10}$$

There are six $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$-orbits which are the preimages of the three vertical edges — the closed orbits – the preimages of the interior of the two faces that do not contain the origin, and the preimage of the complement of the two faces — the dense open orbit X^*. For instance, $w \in X$ belongs to the preimage of the segment joining the vertices $(1,1,-1)$ and $(-1,1,1)$ if and only if the eigen-lines of the eigen-values ± 1 are contained in the plane $\mathbb{C}^2 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ spanned by the first two vectors of the canonical basis. To describe $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(w)$ we write $w = g \cdot y$, $g \in \mathrm{SU}(3)$, and we let the $\mathrm{SU}(3)$-factor in the Iwasawa/Gram-Schmidt factorization of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}g$ act on w. Because matrices in $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ preserve $\mathbb{C}^2$, matrices in $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}g$ take the plane spanned by the first and third vectors of the canonical basis to the plane $\mathbb{C}^2$ and their second and third columns are orthogonal. This implies that the $\mathrm{SU}(3)$-factor coming from the Gram-Schmidt factorization of matrices in $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}g$ also takes the plane spanned by the first and third vectors of the canonical basis to the plane $\mathbb{C}^2$. Therefore, the orbit $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(w)$ is contained in the preimage of the segment. The previous argument also shows that the preimage of the segment is the K-orbit of any of its points. Hence it is also the orbit of the complexified spherical subgroup $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$. The description of the two open orbits of complex dimension 2 and of the open dense orbit is analogous.

The second objective is a partial description of the Kähler potential on $X^* = \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ produced by Theorem 1.1.

The isotropy subgroup at x for the action of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the one-dimensional torus

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{-2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*.$$

The subgroup $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ obtained by setting $\epsilon = 1$ in (3.9) is a full slice to the right action of the above one-dimensional torus on $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and intersects each orbit in one point. Therefore, the orbit of x by $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ (both in $X = \mathrm{SU}(3)(x)$ and in $\mathcal{O} = \mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{C})(x)$) is the same as the free orbit by $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$. In particular we see that the Lagrangian $X^\tau = \mathrm{K}(x)$ is diffeomorphic to the free orbit of the maximal compact subgroup $\mathrm{SU}(2) \subset \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$, that is, it is a (well-known) Lagrangian 3-sphere.

To construct the complex 1-form ς on $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ as in (3.6) it is necessary to obtain the Iwasawa decomposition for $h \in \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$. The maximal torus invariant by τ where x lies is not inside the diagonal matrices. Hence, we need to conjugate it to a diagonal torus, apply the Gram-Schmidt algorithm, and then conjugate back the factorization (cf. [25]). More precisely, if for any $h \in \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ we write $hs^* = gle$, where s is defined in (3.10), then the expression for ς in (3.6) becomes

$$\zeta_{h\cdot x}(h_* c) = \langle x - s^* les \cdot x, s^* les \cdot c \rangle = 6\mathrm{tr}(x - s^* les \cdot x)(s^* les \cdot c), \quad c \in \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C}). \tag{3.11}$$

The explicit formula for ς is rather involved due to lack of compatibility of matrices in $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})s^*$ with the Gram–Schmidt algorithm. It becomes tractable if we confine ourselves to the curve

$$\mathbb{R} \subset \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{\exp} \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}), \quad b \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\exp} \begin{pmatrix} e^b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-b} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Right multiplication by s^* of an element in the curve has the following factorization:

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e^b & 0 & -ie^b \\ 0 & e^{-b} & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{e^b}{\sqrt{e^{2b}+1}} & 0 & \frac{-i}{\sqrt{e^{2b}+1}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{-i}{\sqrt{e^{2b}+1}} & 0 & \frac{e^b}{\sqrt{e^{2b}+1}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \frac{i(1-e^{2b})}{2e^b} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{e^{2b}+1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-b} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{2e^b}{\sqrt{e^{2b}+1}} \end{pmatrix}$$

The action of an element of the curve h on x is obtained by letting the special unitary factor above act on sx:

$$\frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} \frac{e^{2b}-1}{e^{2b}+1} & 0 & \frac{2ie^b}{e^{2b}+1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{-2ie^b}{e^{2b}+1} & 0 & \frac{1-e^{2b}}{e^{2b}+1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Its image by the Gelfand–Zeitlin map is the segment from the origin to $(1,0,0)$ (open in that edge). The restriction of ς in (3.11) to points $b \in \mathbb{R} \subset \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ yields:

$$\varsigma_b(c) = 3c_1 e^{3b}\frac{e^{2b}-1}{e^{2b}+1}, \quad c = \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & c_2 & 0 \\ c_3 & -c_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Therefore, the pullback of the normalized Kähler potential is

$$h(b) = e^{3b} - \frac{2}{3}e^b + \frac{2}{3}\arctan e^b - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{\pi}{6}.$$


4. The flow for imaginary time

The commuting involutions θ and σ produce a common direct sum decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ in ± 1-eigen-spaces

$$\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g} = i\mathfrak{s} \oplus \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{s} \oplus i\mathfrak{k}.$$

The product of the trivial vector field on $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and minus the holomorphic Euler vector field on $\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a vector field on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ whose flow for time $i\frac{\pi}{2}$ intertwines $-\theta$ and σ. This flow is only compatible with the complex linear structure on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$, and not with the Lie brackets (cf. Remark 4.6).

The orbit $X = \mathrm{G}(x)$ sits inside $\mathfrak{s} \oplus i\mathfrak{k}$. The adjoint orbit $X^\vee$ in the statement of Theorem 1.2 is $\mathrm{H}(x) \subset \mathfrak{s} \oplus \mathfrak{k}$, $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{s}$. The involution σ fixes x and $X^\vee$ is the corresponding real form of $\mathcal{O} = \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$: $\mathrm{H}(x) = \mathcal{O}^\sigma$. The involutions $-\theta$ and σ act on $X^\vee$ and X, respectively, with common fixed point set $\mathrm{K}(x)$. As for symplectic structures, the KKS symplectic forms on the real adjoint orbits correspond to $-\Im\Omega$ and $\Re\Omega$, respectively, and $\mathrm{K}(x)$ sits in both orbits as a Lagrangian submanifold:



If the flow for time $i\frac{\pi}{2}$ of a holomorphic vector field Λ on (a subset of) $\mathcal{O}$ is to intertwine (subsets of) (X, σ) and $(X^\vee, -\theta)$, it is natural that the linear projection $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ relates Λ to (plus or minus) the Euler vector field. Furthermore, if the flow is to take $-\Im\Omega$ to $\Re\Omega$, then it is natural that Λ be an anti-Liouville vector

field for Ω: $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda \Omega = -\Omega$. The pullback form under the flow for time[2] $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is $e^{-z}\Omega$, and, therefore, for time $i\frac{\pi}{2}$ we obtain:

$$e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}}\Omega = -i\Omega.$$

Because X is a real form of $\mathcal{O}$ and $-Y$ is a real analytic vector field on it, it has a complexification Λ. In general, not much can be said about the domain of definition of a complexified object. However, the following result — whose proof is deferred to the Appendix — shows that the domain of definition of Λ is rather large:

Proposition 4.1. *The vector field Λ is defined in*

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A} \cap -\theta(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{O}.$$

This is an open connected subset which is invariant under $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$, and the restriction of Λ to this subset is $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$-invariant.

Next, we address the relation of Λ with the symplectic form Ω:

Lemma 4.2. *The vector field Λ on $\mathcal{B}$ is an anti-Liouville vector field for Ω:*

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda \Omega = -\Omega. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Because (4.1) is an equality of holomorphic 2-forms and X^* is a real form of the connected $(\mathcal{B}, -\theta)$, by analytic continuation the equality holds if and only if

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda \Omega|_{X^*} = -\Omega|_{X^*}.$$

At a given point $y \in X^*$ we need to check an equality of complex linear 2-forms. Upon identifying $T^{1,0}_y\mathcal{O}$ with $T_y\mathcal{O}$, we are led to prove an equality of complex–valued J-complex 2-forms. The equality follows if it holds for vectors on T_yX^* because this is a real form of $(T_y\mathcal{O}, J)$. Thus, it is enough to verify that the pullback of (4.1) to X^* holds. The pullback of the right–hand side is the purely imaginary 2-form $i\Im\Omega$; this also implies that Ω equals the complexification of $-i\Im\Omega$. Therefore, the left hand side of (4.1) is the complexification of $\mathcal{L}_{-Y} - i\Im\Omega$. Hence, the pullback of (4.1) to X^* is

$$\mathcal{L}_Y i\Im\Omega = i\Im\Omega,$$

which holds by (3.3). □

We find it difficult to describe the properties of the flow of Ω on the whole $\mathcal{B}$. However, we have a precise picture near the compact subset $\mathrm{K}(x)$ of its zero set:

Lemma 4.3. *There exists $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{B}$ a connected K-invariant open neighborhood of $\mathrm{K}(x)$ where the (holomorphic) flow of $-\Lambda$ defines an action of the semigroup $\mathbb{D}^* \subset \mathbb{C}^*$ of complex numbers of norm smaller that one.*

Proof. The complexification of the K-equivariant real analytic diffeomorphism (1.1) takes $-\Lambda$ to the holomorphic Euler vector field of the complexification of the cotangent bundle $T^*\mathrm{K}(x)$ (a holomorphic vector bundle). Therefore, on a connected neighborhood $\mathcal{B}'$ of $\mathrm{K}(x)$ the vector field Λ will share the following qualitative properties of the Euler vector field of a holomorphic vector bundle:

(i) It vanishes along $\mathrm{K}(x)$ and at any point there its intrinsic linearization is a (complex) projection.
(ii) Its flow at any point is defined in a neighborhood of the half plane $\{\Re z \leq 0\}$. The restriction of the flow to $\{\Re z \leq 0\}$ integrates into an action of the semigroup $\mathbb{D}^* \subset \mathbb{C}^*$.

[2]A maximal integral curve of a holomorphic vector field has as domain a Riemann surface, which maps to $\mathbb{C}$. For our integrated equations to make sense, we assume that we work with integral curves with (maybe small) domains inside $\mathbb{C}$.

Finally, because K is compact and the diffeomorphism (1.1) is K-equivariant, the connected neighborhood $\mathcal{B}'$ can be assumed to be K-invariant. □

Remark 4.4. A (large) model for the complexification of $T^*\mathrm{K}(x)$ is given by $T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \overset{\chi}{\cong} \mathcal{A}$ with involution the cotangent lift of $-\theta$. It turns out that this cotangent lift is $-\theta$ itself acting on $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, we get an abstract identification of $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{O}$ with a subset of $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{O}$. This identification is not given by the inclusion because $-\Lambda$ does not equal the Euler vector field of $\mathcal{A}$. (Lemma 5.1).

We now look at how the action of the semigroup $\mathbb{D}^*$ described in Lemma 4.3 relates to the real forms X and $X^\vee$ and to the involutions.

Proposition 4.5. *The action of* $\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{i\pi}{2}} \in \mathbb{D}^*$ *on* $\mathcal{B}'$ *in Lemma 4.3 interchanges the anti-holomorphic involutions* $-\theta$ *and* σ *and therefore it interchanges their fixed point set* $\mathcal{B}' \cap X$ *and* $\mathcal{B}' \cap X^\vee$.

Proof. Let $y \in \mathcal{B}' \cap X^*$ and let $z = \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{i\pi}{2}} \cdot y$. We can describe z in a different manner: The point y determines a backward trajectory of the real vector field $-\Re\Lambda = Y$ with limit point in $\mathrm{K}(x)$. By K-invariance of Λ, we may assume this point to be x. The tangent space to the unstable manifold of Y at x is $\Pi_*[i\mathfrak{k}, x]$ — the orthogonal complement of $T_x\mathrm{K}(x)$. By [22, Theorem 3], the point y determines a unique vector $v \in \Pi_*[i\mathfrak{k}, x]$ such that the real analytic curve $y(t)$, $t \in [0,1]$, characterized by

$$ty'(t) = -\Re\Lambda(y(t)), \quad y'(0) = v,$$

satisfies $y(1) = y$. By items (i) and (ii) in the proof of Lemma 4.3 z equals $z(1)$ for the real analytic curve $z(t)$, $t \in [0,1]$, characterized by:

$$tz'(t) = -\Re\Lambda(z(t)), \quad z'(0) = -Jv.$$

If we write $v = \Pi_*([iu, x])$, $u = \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+(\mathfrak{s})} u_\alpha + \theta u_\alpha$, $u_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}^\sigma_\alpha$, then by (3.4)

$$-Jv = -iv = -i\sum_\alpha \alpha(x) i(u_\alpha + \theta u_\alpha) = -\sum_\alpha \alpha(x)(u_\alpha + \theta u_\alpha) \in \mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{h}.$$

We want to show that $z(t)$ is contained in the real form $X^\vee = \mathrm{H}(x)$. Because Y is σ-invariant and $\mathcal{B}$ is connected by analytic continuation $-\Re\Lambda$ is also σ-invariant. Because $\mathrm{H}(x)$ is the fixed point set of σ, the vector field $-\Re\Lambda$ at points of the real form $\mathrm{H}(x)$ must be tangent to it. Therefore, its backward trajectories determine a submanifold of stable manifold at x whose tangent space at x is a subspace $W \subset T_x\mathrm{H}(x) \subset T_x\mathcal{A}$. By a dimension count on $\mathrm{H}(x)$ it follows that W must have half of the dimension of the tangent space of the stable manifold, which is a complex vector space. Because both Jv and $W \subset T_x\mathrm{H}(x)$ are contained in the real form $\mathfrak{h}$, the subspace spanned by them is totally real. Therefore, Jv must be in W. Hence the trajectory $z(t)$ is in $X^\vee$ and so is its endpoint $z = \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{i\pi}{2}} \cdot y$.

The action of $\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{i\pi}{2}}$ on $\mathcal{B}' \cap X^\vee$ is the action of $\mathrm{e}^{-i\pi} = -1$ on $\mathcal{B}' \cap X$. By appealing again to [22, Theorem 3] or to Theorem 1.1, the latter action is exactly that of the involution σ on $\mathcal{B}' \cap X$.

By the previous results, the conjugation of $-\theta$ and σ by the action of $\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{i\pi}{2}}$ are anti-holomorphic involutions whose fixed point set is $\mathcal{B}' \cap X^\vee$ and $\mathcal{B}' \cap X$, respectively (and they are defined on a connected neighborhood of their fixed point set). But two anti-holomorphic involutions with equal fixed point set must be equal, as their composition is a holomorphic automorphism which is the identity on a real form. Therefore, $-\theta$ and σ are exchanged upon conjugation by the action of $\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{i\pi}{2}}$. □

Remark 4.6. For any point $z \in \mathcal{B}'$, the linear projection $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ identifies the compactification of the orbit $\mathbb{D}^* \cdot z$ with a holomorphic disk (perhaps of small radius). Under this identification, $-\theta$ and σ become the reflections on the real and imaginary axis, respectively. These holomorphic disks are the appropriate non-linear lifts of the holomorphic disks associated to the Euler vector field of $\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$.

We have all the ingredients to prove the symplectic correspondence between compact orbits and hyperbolic orbits:

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The real part of Λ is tangent to both X^* and $X^\vee$. On X^* it coincides with $-Y$, which is complete for positive time. We shall argue that $\Re\Lambda$ is everywhere defined on $X^\vee$, and that it is complete there.

The vector field Λ is defined on $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A} \cap -\theta(\mathcal{A})$. Let $z \in X^\vee = \mathcal{O}^\sigma$. If $z \notin \mathcal{B}$, then it belongs to an opposite Iwasawa fiber over a point in $X \backslash X^*$. Because the involution σ preserves the Iwasawa and opposite Iwasawa fibrations and acts freely on $X \backslash X^*$, $\sigma(z) = z$ implies that z would belong to two different fibers of the opposite Iwasawa fibration, which is not possible.

By Theorem 1.1 and analytic continuation the complex linear projection $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ relates Λ to minus the holomorphic Euler vector field. The orbit $X^\vee$ is contained in the preimage of $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Therefore, the restriction of the linear projection $X^\vee \subset \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{s} \to \mathfrak{k}$ relates $\Re\Lambda$ to minus the Euler vector field. Because the latter map is proper (it is the momentum map for the action of K) and the Euler vector field is complete, we conclude that $\Re\Lambda|_{X^\vee}$ is complete.

We now proceed to define the map Ψ in (1.2). Given $y \in X^*$ because $-Y$ is complete for positive time, there exists $t_y \geq 0$ such that the flow of $\Re\Lambda$ for any time greater than t_y takes y into $\mathcal{B}' \cap X^*$. We choose any $t > t_y$ and apply the flow map of $\Re\Lambda$. Next, since we are in $\mathcal{B}'$, we can let $-i\frac{\pi}{2}$ act on this point as defined in Lemma 4.3; this action is the flow map of $\Im\Lambda$ for time $i\frac{\pi}{2}$. Finally, because by Proposition 4.5 the resulting point is in $X^\vee$, by the previous paragraph we can apply to it the flow map of $\Re\Lambda$ for time $-t$.

The point $\Psi(y)$ does not depend on the choice of $t > t_y$. By Lemma 4.3 at points in $\mathcal{B}'$, the flow of Λ is defined in the positive half plane (and thus the flows of $\Re\Lambda$ and $\Im\Lambda$ for the corresponding times commute). In particular, at $y \in \mathcal{B}'$ the definition of Ψ is the Wick rotation given by the flow of Λ for time $i\frac{\pi}{2}$. By elementary ordinary differential equations (ODEs) theory in a neighborhood of a fixed $y \in X^*$, we can take a common time $t > 0$. This implies that Ψ is a real analytic local diffeomorphism. If $y, y' \in X^*$ are different points, then we can always find a common flow time $t > 0$. Then, Ψ for both points becomes the composition of the same three injective maps, and thus the images differ. If we denote by $D^\vee \subset X^\vee$ the image of Ψ, we conclude that $\Psi : X^* \to D^\vee$ is a real analytic diffeomorphism.

By Proposition 4.5 the flow of Λ for time $i\frac{\pi}{2}$ on $\mathcal{B}'$ takes σ to $-\theta$. Because Ψ, σ, and $-\theta$ are real analytic, by analytic continuation $\Psi : X^* \to D^\vee$ must intertwine the involutions everywhere.

By Lemma 4.2 Λ is anti-Liouville for Ω. Therefore, on $\mathcal{B}'$ its flow for time $i\frac{\pi}{2}$ pulls backs Ω to $-i\Omega$, and thus $\Re\Omega$ to $-\Im\Omega$. Because Ψ is a real analytic map and Ω is a holomorphic 2-form, once more by analytic continuation, $\Psi : X^* \to D^\vee$ must pull back $\Re\Omega$ to $-\Im\Omega$ everywhere. □

Example 4.7. We let $x \in X \subset \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ as in Example 3.4. The points in $X \backslash X^*$ are

$$\pm \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \pm i \\ \pm i & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot x.$$

Hence, the vector part of the positive and negative Iwasawa fibers over them are:

$$\zeta\left(\begin{pmatrix}0&1\\1&0\end{pmatrix}\mp\begin{pmatrix}1&0\\0&-1\end{pmatrix}\right),\ \zeta\in\mathbb{C},\quad \zeta\left(\begin{pmatrix}0&1\\1&0\end{pmatrix}\pm\begin{pmatrix}1&0\\0&-1\end{pmatrix}\right)\ \zeta\in\mathbb{C}. \tag{4.2}$$

Let e,f,z be coordinates on $i\mathfrak{su}(2)=\mathfrak{p}\oplus i\mathfrak{k}$ in the basis of (cyclically) permuted Pauli matrices and let E,F,Z be the complexified coordinates on $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. By (4.2), the vector part of the positive and negative Iwasawa fibers over $X\backslash X^*$ are the two lines of the quadric $\{E^2+F^2=0\}\subset\mathfrak{p}\oplus i\mathfrak{p}$.

The parameterization (3.8) sends $\frac{1}{2}\sinh(2b)\cosh(2b)\frac{\partial}{\partial b}$ to

$$Y=-\frac{ez^2}{e^2+f^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial e}-\frac{fz^2}{e^2+f^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial f}+z\frac{\partial}{\partial z}.$$

The formula above is valid for every SU(2)-orbit in $i\mathfrak{su}(2)$. The complexification of Y is the vector field

$$-\Lambda=-\frac{EZ^2}{E^2+F^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial E}-\frac{FZ^2}{E^2+F^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial F}+Z\frac{\partial}{\partial Z}. \tag{4.3}$$

It is defined away from the locus $\{E^2+F^2=0\}\subset\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. The points of $X\backslash X^*$ correspond to $Z=\pm1$. Therefore, on $\mathcal{O}=\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})(x)$ the vector field $-\Lambda$ is defined exactly in the complement of the Iwasawa and opposite Iwasawa fibers over $X\backslash X^*$. This is the subset $\mathcal{B}\subset\mathcal{O}$, so the result is consistent with Proposition 4.1.

Equation (4.3) yields elementary O.D.E.'s for the third component of the flow and for the sum of the squares of the first and second components of the flow. Thus, the flow of $-\Lambda$ for time $w\in\mathbb{C}$ is given by

$$\Phi_w=\left(\left(1+\frac{Z^2}{E^2+F^2}(1-\mathrm{e}^{2w})\right)^{1/2}E,\left(1+\frac{Z^2}{E^2+F^2}(1-\mathrm{e}^{2w})\right)^{1/2}F,\mathrm{e}^wZ\right),$$

where the branches of the square root in the first and second components are the standard ones. The flow preserves the Killing form of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. Thus, it evolves along adjoint orbits. The trajectories starting at $X^*\subset\mathcal{B}$ correspond to real values (e,f,z). Because the equation

$$1+\frac{z^2}{e^2+f^2}(1-\mathrm{e}^{2w})=0$$

has no solutions for $\Re w\leq 0$, we conclude that the flow Φ at points in X^* is defined in the negative half plane $\{\Re w\leq 0\}$. This is consistent with Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 4.5. In fact in this case Φ is the Wick-type rotation, as Lemma 4.3 is valid in the whole open sense subset $\mathcal{B}\subset\mathcal{O}$. The diffeomorphism

$$\Psi(e,f,z)=\Phi_{-i\frac{\pi}{2}}(e,f,z)=\left(\left(1+\frac{2z^2}{e^2+f^2}\right)^{1/2}e,\left(1+\frac{2z^2}{e^2+f^2}\right)^{1/2}f,-iz\right)$$

takes $i\mathfrak{su}(2)=\mathfrak{p}\oplus i\mathfrak{k}$ to $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})=\mathfrak{p}\oplus\mathfrak{k}$ therefore sending $X^*\subset\{e^2+f^2+z^2=1\}$ into the hyperboloid $\{e^2+f^2+(iz^2)=1\}=\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})(x)\subset\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$. One may rewrite

$$\Psi(e,0,z)=(\cosh(\ln(z)+\sqrt{z^2+1}),0,z). \tag{4.4}$$

Remark 4.8. The real hyperbolic orbit $X^\vee$ of the non-compact semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ is canonically symplectomorphic to the cotangent bundle over the Lagrangian L, which is its submanifold of real flags (the intersection with the -1-eigen-space in the Cartan decomposition) [19]:

$$\Xi:(X^\vee,\Re\Omega)\to(T^*L,d\lambda).$$

The Iwasawa ruling together with twice the Killing form identify the orbit with the cotangent bundle of the submanifold of real flags. With this identification, the

symplectomorphism Ξ is the identity. The reason is that the Euler vector field is a (complete) Liouville vector field for the KKS symplectic form.

The composition of the symplectomorphism ψ^{-1} and Ψ in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 with Ξ is a K-equivariant symplectomorphism

$$\Upsilon : (D \subset T^*L, d\lambda) \to (\Psi(D^\vee) \subset T^*L, d\lambda)$$

which is the identity on the zero section. In the case of $X \subset i\mathfrak{su}(2)$ discussed in Examples 3.4 and 4.7 we have $\Upsilon(D) = D$. However, the corresponding automorphism Υ is not the identity. Equation (4.4) shows that a trajectory of the vector field Y is not sent to a trajectory of the Euler vector field (the image of the trajectory is not in a Iwasawa fiber of the hyperboloid).

5. Appendix: The domain of the complexified Liouville vector field

For a given symplectic form, the set of Liouville vector fields is an affine space whose vector space are symplectic vector fields. If we denote by Ξ the Euler vector field of $\mathcal{A}$ (rather, the image of the Euler vector field by χ), then the difference $\Xi - \Lambda$ must be a symplectic vector field. The diffeomorphism given by the Iwasawa projection identifies the closed 1-form $\beta \in \Omega^1(\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x))$ with a real analytic 1-form on X^*, which we still denote by β. Because the latter is an open subset of a real form for $(\mathcal{O}, -\theta)$, it admits a complexification $\beta^{\mathbb{C}}$, which determines a symplectic vector field $X_{\beta^{\mathbb{C}}}$:

$$\iota_{X_{\beta^{\mathbb{C}}}}\Omega = \beta^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

Lemma 5.1. *The difference of the Euler vector field and Λ is the symplectic vector field determined by $\beta^{\mathbb{C}}$:*

$$\Xi - \Lambda = X_{\beta^{\mathbb{C}}}. \tag{5.1}$$

The equality is valid on any connected open neighborhood of X^* in $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof. Because $X^* \subset X$ is an open subset of a real form of $\mathcal{O}$, it suffices to prove (5.1) the equality in points of X^*:

$$(\Xi - \Lambda)|_{X^*} = X_{\beta^{\mathbb{C}}}|_{X^*}.$$

This equality is equivalent to the one obtained by taking contraction with Ω,

$$\iota_{\Xi-\Lambda}\Omega|_{X^*} = \iota_{X_{\beta^{\mathbb{C}}}}\Omega|_{X^*},$$

which leads us to proving the equality of holomorphic 1-forms:

$$\lambda|_{X^*} - \iota_\Lambda\Omega|_{X^*} = \beta^{\mathbb{C}}|_{X^*},$$

where λ is the tautological 1-form of the cotangent bundle. It is enough to test the 1-forms on vectors tangent to X^*. At a point $y \in X^*$, the right–hand side returns β_y. The expression of the tautological 1-form at $y \in X^*$ is obtained by regarding the point as a complex 1-form via the identification of $\mathcal{A}$ with $T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$:

$$\lambda_y = \beta_y - i\beta_y \circ J.$$

Because the tautological 1-form vanishes along fibers of the cotangent bundle, we have:

$$\lambda|_{T_yX^*} = \beta_y - i\beta_y \circ \Pi_* \circ J.$$

Because $\iota_\Lambda\Omega$ is the complexification of $\iota_Y - i\Im\Omega$:

$$\iota_\Lambda\Omega|_{T_yX^*} = -\iota_Y i\Im\Omega|_{T_yX^*} = i\iota_Y - \Im\Omega = -i\beta_y \circ \Pi_* \circ J.$$

Hence, the left–hand side gives:

$$\lambda|_{T_yX^*} - \iota_\Lambda\Omega|_{T_yX^*} = \beta_y - i\beta_y \circ \Pi_* \circ J + i\beta_y \circ \Pi_* \circ J = \beta_y,$$

which proves the equality. □

By (5.1) the (connected) domain of definition of Λ and $\beta^{\mathbb{C}}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is the same. The 1-form $\beta \in \Omega^1(\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x))$ is constructed geometrically as the section of $\Pi : T^*\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \to \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ determined by X^*. Our purpose is to complexify the previous geometric construction.

Let $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{H}} = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \oplus j\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ be the complexification of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and let $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{H}}$ denote its simply connected integration. There is an isomorphism of complex Lie algebras:

$$f_1 : \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{H}} \to \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}, \quad u + jv \mapsto (u + iv, \theta(u - iv)). \tag{5.2}$$

More precisely: $u_{\mathfrak{g}} + u_{i\mathfrak{g}} + jv_{\mathfrak{g}} + jv_{i\mathfrak{g}} \mapsto (u_{\mathfrak{g}} + iv_{i\mathfrak{g}} + iv_{\mathfrak{g}} + u_{i\mathfrak{g}}, u_{\mathfrak{g}} - iv_{i\mathfrak{g}} - u_{i\mathfrak{g}} + iv_{\mathfrak{g}})$. On $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{H}}$ the complexifications $\theta^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\sigma^{\mathbb{C}}$ are commuting holomorphic involutions. Let $\tilde{x} = -jix \in j\mathfrak{g}$. Because it is fixed by $\theta^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $-\sigma^{\mathbb{C}}$ the involutions act on the orbit $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$, which we denote by $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$. Their respective fixed point sets are better understood by looking at their images by f_1 in the product Lie algebra. To do this analysis, we need to introduce subalgebras, subgroups, and orbits on both sides of (5.2). As for the left–hand side, we denote by $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$, $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$, and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}$ the complex subgroups of $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{H}}$ that integrate the subalgebras

$$\mathfrak{k} \oplus j\mathfrak{k}, \quad \mathfrak{g} \oplus j\mathfrak{g}, \quad \mathfrak{k} \oplus i\mathfrak{k} \oplus j\mathfrak{k} \oplus ji\mathfrak{k}. \tag{5.3}$$

In the product Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and in its product integration, we use the subindex Δ to refer to diagonal subalgebras and subgroups; the subindex Δ^θ describes the image of diagonal subalgebras and subgroups by the involution that is the identity on the first factor and θ on the second factor. We use the same notation for the Lie algebra isomorphism f_1 and for its integration.

The following lemma contains straightforward computations:

Lemma 5.2. *The isomorphism f_1 in (5.2) has the following properties:*

(i) It identifies the subgroups $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$, $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}$ with $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta}$, $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta}$, and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$.
(ii) It takes $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ to the $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$-orbit of (x, x).
(iii) It intertwines $\theta^{\mathbb{C}}$ and the transposition of factors.

On the semisimple product Lie algebra and Lie group, we fix the 'anti-diagonal' Iwasawa decomposition:

$$\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{GAN} \times \mathrm{GA}\overline{\mathrm{N}}.$$

Via the isomorphism f_1 in (5.2), we induce an Iwasawa decomposition for $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{H}}$ whose nilpotent Lie algebra we denote by $\mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}}$. By item (ii) in Lemma 5.2 $\tilde{x}$ corresponds to a hyperbolic element. Thus, $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ supports the corresponding Iwasawa ruling (and its opposite one).

Lemma 5.3. *The fixed point set of $-\theta^{\mathbb{C}}\sigma^{\mathbb{C}}$ on $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ is the orbit $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$ and it is a Lagrangian section of the Iwasawa rulings.*

Proof. The fixed point set of $\theta^{\mathbb{C}}\sigma^{\mathbb{C}}$ on $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{H}}$ is a spherical subgroup and $\tilde{x}$ is a hyperbolic element fixed by $-\theta^{\mathbb{C}}\sigma^{\mathbb{C}}$. Therefore, the result is proved exactly as item (ii) in Proposition 2.2 complemented by item (4) in Section 3.1. □

The isomorphism of complex Lie algebras

$$f_2 : \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathfrak{g} \oplus j\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{H}}, \quad u + iv \mapsto u + jv, \tag{5.4}$$

maps x to $\tilde{x}$ and restricts to an equivariant biholomorphism from $\mathcal{O}$ to $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x}) \subset \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$.

Lemma 5.4. *The fixed point set of $\theta^{\mathbb{C}}$ on $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ is the orbit $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$ and it is a section of the Iwasawa ruling. The subset of points of $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$ that the Iwasawa map relates to points in the Lagrangian $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$ equals $f_2(\mathcal{B})$.*

Proof. The involution $\theta^{\mathbb{C}}$ fixes $\tilde{x}$ so it acts on $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$. We use the linear isomorphism f_1 to take the problem of describing its fixed point set to the product Lie algebra. By items (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 5.2 the fixed point set in $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the intersection of the orbit $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(x,x)$ with the diagonal. This is exactly the orbit by the diagonal subgroup $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta}$. Therefore, by item (i) in Lemma 5.2

$$\left(\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}\right)^{\theta^{\mathbb{C}}} = \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x}).$$

At (x,x) the tangent space of the orbit $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta}(x,x)$ and of the Iwasawa fiber are the diagonal subalgebra of the sum of the tangent spaces to the two Iwasawa fibers through x and the product of both tangent spaces, respectively:

$$(\sum_{\alpha(x)>0} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha})_{\Delta}, \quad \sum_{\alpha(x)>0} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \times \sum_{\alpha(x)>0} \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}.$$

They are complementary subspaces. Because all of the structure is invariant by the action of $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{H}}$, transversality holds at every point of $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta}(x,x)$. Because $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$ is the intersection of $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ with a vector subspace if two points of the same Iwasawa fiber intersected $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$, then the line joining both points should also be in $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$. This would contradict the transversality of the intersection. Therefore, $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$ is a section of the Iwasawa ruling.

Let $z \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ be a point in the image by $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}$ of the Iwasawa fiber over $-jix$. Its image $f_1(z)$ can be written as:

$$(h \cdot (x+u), h' \cdot (x+u')), \quad h, h' \in \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}},\, u \in \sum_{\alpha(x)>0} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha},\, u' \in \sum_{\alpha(x)>0} \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}.$$

The point $f_1(z)$ belongs to $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta}(x,x)$ if and only if for some $g \in \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$, we have

$$(h \cdot (x+u), h' \cdot (x+u')) = (g \cdot x, g \cdot x).$$

If we write $x + u = l \cdot u$, $l \in \mathrm{N}$, $x + u' = l' \cdot x$, $l' \in \overline{\mathrm{N}}$, then this is equivalent to

$$hl \cdot x = g \cdot x, \quad hl' \cdot x = g \cdot x,$$

which can be rewritten as $g \cdot x \in \mathcal{A} \cap -\theta(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{B}$.

Because the composition $f_1 \circ f_2$ is the diagonal embedding, we conclude that the Iwasawa map on $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ relates $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$ with $f_2(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$. □

To discuss why the orbits we constructed are complexifications of the orbits that are involved in the definition of β, we introduce t the anti-holomorphic involution on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{H}}$ given by conjugation with respect to j. The point $\tilde{x}$ belongs to the fixed point set of $-t$.

Lemma 5.5. *The anti-holomorphic involution $-t$ acts on $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ in an anti-complex affine fashion and it preserves the open subset $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x} + \mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}})$. The isomorphism of Lie algebras f_1 (5.2) takes the real forms with respect to $-t$ of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$, $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$, and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x} + \mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}})$ to $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x)$, $\mathrm{G}_{\Delta}(x,x)$, and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}\mathrm{N}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x)$, respectively.*

Proof. The linear isomorphism f_1 takes t to the transposition of factors followed by θ on both factors. Therefore, t on the product Lie algebra sends the Iwasawa fiber $\mathfrak{n}(x) \times \overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x)$ to itself in an anti-complex fashion. It also sends the maximal compact subgroup $\mathrm{G} \times \mathrm{G}$ and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ to themselves. Hence, $-t$ acts by anti-complex affine transformations on $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ preserving $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x} + \mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}})$.

Because the involutions $t, \theta^{\mathbb{C}}$, and $\sigma^{\mathbb{C}}$ commute, $-t$ acts on $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$ and $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$. By (i) in Lemma 5.2 the image by f_1 of these orbits are the orbits $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta}(x,x)$ and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x,x)$. Therefore, the images by f_1 of their real forms with respect to $-t$ equal the orbits $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x)$ and $\mathrm{G}_{\Delta}(x,x)$, respectively. Likewise, the image by f_1 of the real form of $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ must contain the orbit $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x)$. Its open subset $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}\mathrm{N}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x)$ is contained in $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x} + \mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}})$ and thus on its real form. Because $-t$ acts by bundle

isomorphism preserving the section $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$, the real form must be a subbundle over its fixed point set. Hence, the image by f_1 of the real form of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x}+\mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}})$ must be

$$\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}\mathrm{N}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x) = \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}(x+m, x-\theta m), \quad m \in \mathfrak{n}(x). \tag{5.5}$$

□

By Lemma 5.3 $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of the orbit $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{H}}$ which is a section of the Iwasawa ruling. Therefore, by Proposition 3.1, the open subset $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x}+\mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}})$ is canonically identified with the holomorphic cotangent bundle of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$; in fact the statement about the symplectic form is not needed here and all is needed is the use of the Killing form. By item (i) in Lemma 5.2 the linear isomorphism f_1 takes the vector bundle $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x}+\mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}})$ to the product vector bundle $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)(x+\mathfrak{n}(x)) \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x+\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x))$. It also takes the Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{H}}$ to the product Killing form. Hence, f_1 takes the cotangent bundle structure of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x}+\mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}})$ to the product cotangent bundle structure on $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)(x+\mathfrak{n}(x)) \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x+\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x))$. We shall modify the latter identification by composing with bundle automorphisms of each factor. Specifically, we will fix the identification

$$T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \times T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \overset{\chi_1}{\cong} \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)(x+\mathfrak{n}(x)) \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x+\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x)), \tag{5.6}$$

which sends a vector in the fibers to a covector by means of one half of the Killing form in the first factor and minus one half of the Killing form in the second factor. Via f_1 this is transferred to another identification

$$T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x}) \overset{\chi^{\mathbb{H}}}{\cong} \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x}). \tag{5.7}$$

We define the real analytic diffeomorphism

$$f_3 : \mathcal{A} \to \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}\mathrm{N}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x), \quad hl\cdot x \mapsto (hl\cdot x, \theta(hl)\cdot x). \tag{5.8}$$

Lemma 5.6. *The identification χ_1 in (5.6) has the following properties:*

(i) It takes the real form $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}\mathrm{N}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x)$ to the cotangent bundle of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x)$, which is the real form of the zero section. Therefore, the holomorphic cotangent bundle on the right–hand side of (5.6) is the complexification of the cotangent bundle of the real form $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x) \subset \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x,x)$.

(ii) Its composition on the right with $T^*\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \times T^*\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \equiv T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \times T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)$ and on the left with f_3^{-1} is the identification

$$T^*\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \equiv T^{*1,0}\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x) \overset{\chi}{\cong} \mathcal{A}.$$

Proof. By (5.5), a point z in the real form of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x)(x+\mathfrak{n}(x)) \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x+\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(x))$ can be written:

$$z = (hl\cdot x, \theta(hl)\cdot x) = (h\cdot(x+m), \theta(h)\cdot(x-\theta m)), \quad h \in \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}},\ l \in \mathrm{N},\ m \in \mathfrak{n}(x) \in \overline{\mathrm{N}}.$$

The identification χ_1 takes z to a complex covector. We shall take its real part to work in the ordinary cotangent bundle. The action on the tangent vector $(h\cdot[u,x], \theta(h)\cdot[v,x])$, $u, v \in \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$, is given by

$$\frac{1}{2}\Re\langle m, u\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle \theta(h)\cdot\theta m, \theta(h)\cdot v\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle m, u\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\Re\langle \theta m, v\rangle, \tag{5.9}$$

where we used that θ is an automorphism of the real part of the Killing form. By Lemma 5.5, the real form of the zero section is $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}(x,x) \subset \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x,x)$. Therefore, vectors in the ± 1-eigen-bundles are, respectively, of the form

$$(h.[u,x], \theta(h)\cdot[\theta(u),x]), \quad (h\cdot[u,x], \theta(h)\cdot[-\theta(u),x]).$$

Equation (5.9) implies that z annihilates the -1-eigen-space, which proves item (i). A posteriori we deduce that the involution on the right–hand side of (5.6) is the

cotangent lift of the involution on the zero section (the cotangent lift is naturally defined in the real cotangent bundle).

A point $hl \cdot x = h \cdot (x = m) \in \mathcal{A}$ corresponds by χ in (3.2) to a real covector whose action on the vector $h_*[u, x]$ is $\Re\langle m, u\rangle$. Because f_3 sends the point and vector to

$$(hl \cdot x, \theta(hl) \cdot x) = (h \cdot (x + m), \theta(h) \cdot (x - \theta m)), \quad (h.[u, x], \theta(h) \cdot [\theta(u), x]),$$

Equation (5.9) shows that f_3 is compatible with the cotangent bundle identifications χ and χ_1. □

Proof of Proposition 4.1. The equality (5.1) implies that discussing domains of definition of Λ inside of $\mathcal{A}$ is the same as discussing domains of definition of the complexification of $\beta \in \Omega^1(X^*)$.

By Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, the affine bundle $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$ has sections $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})$ and $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$. The former section is used as zero section of a vector bundle structure and the latter is seen as a section of this bundle. By Lemma 5.4 only the open subset $f_2(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$ defines a section. Because $\chi^{\mathbb{H}}$ in (5.7) is an identification of vector bundles, the section $f_2(\mathcal{B})$ is identified with a 1-form $\Sigma' \in \Omega^{1,0}(\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x}))$. The Iwasawa projection identifies it with a 1-form $\Sigma \in \Omega^{1,0}(f_2(\mathcal{B}))$.

By Lemma 5.5, the linear isomorphism f_1 takes the real form with respect to $-t$ of the affine bundle and both sections to $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}(x, x)$, $\mathrm{G}_\Delta(x, x)$ and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\Delta^\theta}\mathrm{N}_{\Delta^\theta}(x, x)$, respectively. Strictly speaking, the lemma discusses the real form for the whole section $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x})$. Because $f_2(\mathcal{B}) = \mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{x}) \cap \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x} + \mathfrak{n}^{\mathbb{H}})$ and the involution preserves the affine fibers, the real form of $f_2(\mathcal{B})$ is sent to

$$\mathrm{G}_\Delta(x, x) \cap \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x + \mathfrak{n}) \times \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x + \overline{\mathfrak{n}}) = X^*_\Delta.$$

Item (i) in Lemma 5.6 implies that Σ' is the complexification of

$$\Re\Sigma'|_{\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})^{-t}} \in \Omega^1(\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{H}}(\tilde{x})^{-t}),$$

and the same holds for Σ. By item (ii) in 5.6

$$(f_1^{-1} \circ f_3)^* \Re\Sigma = \beta \in \Omega^1(X^*).$$

Because the composition $f_1 \circ f_2$ is the diagonal embedding

$$f_1 \circ f_2|_{X^*} = f_3.$$

The conclusion is that

$$f_2^* \Sigma \in \Omega^{1,0}(\mathcal{B}), \quad f_2^* \Re\Sigma|_{X^*} = \beta \in \Omega^1(X^*),$$

and therefore the complexification of β is defined in $\mathcal{B}$.

To discuss topological properties of $\mathcal{B}$ we use the viewpoint of complex homogeneous spaces on (2.2). We may take $\mathrm{G}^{\mathbb{C}}$ to be a linear algebraic group. Then the Iwasawa map is a morphism from an algebraic to a projective variety. Because $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an algebraic group X^* is a Zariski open subset, and so is its inverse image $\mathcal{A}$. The reasoning for $-\theta(\mathcal{A})$ is the same once we replace the parabolic subgroup P by its opposite $\theta(\mathrm{P})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{B}$ is a Zariski open subset and in particular it is connected.

By construction $\mathcal{A}$ is saturated by $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$-orbits. The same applies to $-\theta(\mathcal{A}) = \mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}(x + \overline{\mathfrak{n}})$. Hence $\mathcal{B}$ is saturated by orbits of $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Because Y is K-invariant and $\mathcal{B}$ is connected and $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$-invariant, by analytic continuation, Λ is also $\mathrm{K}^{\mathbb{C}}$-invariant. □

References

[1] Alekseev, A; Berenstein, A; Hoffman, B; Lane, J; Li, Y. Action-angle coordinates on coadjoint orbits and multiplicity free spaces from partial tropicalization. Adv. Math. 414 (2023), Paper No. 108856, 84 p. Preprint arXiv:2003.13621.

[2] Azad, H.; van den Ban, E.; Biswas, I. Symplectic geometry of semisimple orbits. Indag. Math. (N.S.) 19 (2008), no. 4, 507–533.

[3] Azad, H.; Loeb, J.-J. Plurisubharmonic functions and the Kempf-Ness theorem. Bull. London Math. Soc. 25 (1993), no. 2, 162–168.

[4] Audin, M. On the topology of Lagrangian submanifolds. Examples and counter-examples. Port. Math. (N.S.) 62 (2005), no. 4, 375–419.

[5] Bedulli, L.; Gori, A. Homogeneous Lagrangian submanifolds. Comm. Anal. Geom. 16 (2008), no. 3, 591–615.

[6] Bhattacharyya, R.; Burns, D.; Lupercio, E.; Uribe, A. The exponential map of the complexification of the group of analytic Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms. Pure Appl. Math. Q. 18 (2022), no. 1, 33–70.

[7] Biran, P. Lagrangian barriers and symplectic embeddings. Geom. Funct. Anal. 11 (2001), no. 3, 407–464.

[8] Birkes, D. Orbits of linear algebraic groups. Ann. of Math. (2) 93 (1971), 459–475.

[9] Bolsinov, A.; Jovanovic, B. Complete involutive algebras of functions on cotangent bundles of homogeneous spaces. Math. Z. 246 (2004), no. 1-2, 213–236.

[10] Bremigan, R.; Lorch, J. Orbit duality for flag manifolds. Manuscripta Math. 109 (2002), no. 2, 233–261.

[11] Di Scala, A.; Loi, A. Symplectic duality of symmetric spaces. Adv. Math. 217 (2008), no. 5, 2336–2352.

[12] Donaldson, S. K. Holomorphic discs and the complex Monge-Ampère equation. J. Symplectic Geom. 1 (2002), no. 2, 171–196.

[13] Duistermaat, J. J. On global action-angle coordinates. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 33 (1980), no. 6, 687–706.

[14] Duistermaat, J. J.; Kolk, J. A. C.; Varadarajan, V. S. Functions, flows and oscillatory integrals on flag manifolds and conjugacy classes in real semisimple Lie groups. Compositio Math. 49 (1983), no. 3, 309–398.

[15] Fang, X.; Littelmann, P.; Pabiniak, M. Simplices in Newton-Okounkov bodies and the Gromov width of coadjoint orbits. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 50 (2018), no. 2, 202–218.

[16] Hirsch, M. W.; Pugh, C. C.; Shub, M. Invariant manifolds. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 583. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1977.

[17] Hoffman, B.; Lane, J. Stratified Gradient Hamiltonian Vector Fields and Collective Integrable Systems. Preprint:arXiv:200813656.

[18] Lisiecki, W. Holomorphic Lagrangian bundles over flag manifolds. J. Reine Angew. Math. 363 (1985), 174–190.

[19] Martínez Torres, D. Semisimple coadjoint orbits and cotangent bundles. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 48 (2016), no. 6, 977–984.

[20] Matsuki, T. The orbits of affine symmetric spaces under the action of minimal parabolic subgroups. J. Math. Soc. Japan 31 (1979), no. 2, 331–357.

[21] Mykytyuk, I. Integrability of geodesic flows for metrics on suborbits of the adjoint orbits of compact groups. Transform. Groups 21 (2016), no. 2, 531–553.

[22] Nagano, T. 1-forms with the exterior derivative of maximal rank. J. Differential Geom. 2 (1968), 253–264.

[23] Nohara, Y.; Ueda, K. Floer cohomologies of non-torus fibers of the Gelfand-Cetlin system. J. Symplectic Geom. 14 (2016), no. 4, 1251–1293.

[24] Oakley, J.; Usher, M. On certain Lagrangian submanifolds of $S^2 \times S^2$ and $\mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^n$. Algebr. Geom. Topol. 16 (2016), no. 1, 149–209.

[25] Sawyer, P. Computing the Iwasawa decomposition of the classical Lie groups of noncompact type using the QR decomposition. Linear Algebra Appl. 493 (2016), 573–579.

[26] Sekiguchi, J. Remarks on real nilpotent orbits of a symmetric pair. J. Math. Soc. Japan 39 (1987), no. 1, 127–138.

[27] Springer, T. Some results on algebraic groups with involutions. Algebraic groups and related topics (Kyoto/Nagoya, 1983), 525–543, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 6, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985.

[28] Steinberg, R. Endomorphisms of linear algebraic groups. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 80 American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI 1968 108 p.

[29] Vergne, M. Instantons et correspondance de Kostant-Sekiguchi. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 320 (1995), no. 8, 901–906.

Applied Mathematics Department, ETSAM Section, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Avda. Juan de Herrera, 4, 28040, Madrid, Spain
Email address: df.mtorres@upm.es