

The Strong Homotopy Structure of Poisson Reduction

Chiara Esposito*, **Andreas Kraft†**,
Jonas Schnitzer‡

Dipartimento di Matematica
Università degli Studi di Salerno
via Giovanni Paolo II, 123
84084 Fisciano (SA)
Italy

Jonas Schnitzer‡
Department of Mathematics
University of Freiburg
Ernst-Zermelo-Straße, 1
D-79104 Freiburg
Germany

April 2020

Abstract

In this paper we propose a reduction scheme for multivector fields phrased in terms of L_∞ -morphisms. Using well-know geometric properties of the reduced manifolds we perform a Taylor expansion of multivector fields, which allows us to built up a suitable deformation retract of DGLA's. We first obtained an explicit formula for the L_∞ -Projection and -Inclusion of generic DGLA retracts. We then applied this formula to the deformation retract that we constructed in the case of multivector fields on reduced manifolds. This allows us to obtain the desired reduction L_∞ -morphism. Finally, we perform a comparison with other reduction procedures.

*chesposito@unisa.it

†akraft@unisa.it

‡jonas.schnitzer@math.uni-freiburg.de

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	4
3	An Explicit Formula for the L_∞-Projection and -Inclusion	5
4	Reduction of Multivector Fields	8
4.1	Taylor Series Expansion around C	9
4.2	The Cartan Model of Multivector Fields	12
4.3	Formal Equivariant Multivector Fields and Their Reduction	18
4.4	L_∞ -quasi-inverse of ι	19
5	The Reduction L_∞-Morphism and Reduction of Formal Poisson Structures	22
5.1	The Reduction L_∞ -morphism	22
5.2	Reduction of Formal Poisson Structures	23
5.3	Comparison of the Reduction Procedures	24
A	BRST-Like Reduction of Formal Poisson Structures	24
A.1	Homological Perturbation Lemma	25
A.2	Formal Koszul Complex	26
	Bibliography	29

1 Introduction

This paper aims to propose a reduction scheme for multivector fields that is phrased in terms of L_∞ -morphisms and adapted to deformation quantization. Deformation quantization has been introduced in [1] by Bayen, Flato, Fronsdal, Lichnerowicz and Sternheimer and it relies on the idea that the quantization of a Poisson manifold M is described by a formal deformation of the commutative algebra of smooth complex-valued functions $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$, a so-called *star product*. The existence and classification of star products on Poisson manifolds has been provided by Kontsevich's formality theorem [15], whereas the invariant setting of Lie group actions has been treated by Dolgushev, see [9, 10]. In the last years many developments have been done, see e.g. [3, 4, 16]. More explicitly, the formality provides an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism between the differential graded Lie algebra of multivector fields and the multidifferential operators resp. the invariant versions. One open question and our main motivation is to investigate the compatibility of deformation quantization and phase space reduction in the Poisson setting.

In the classical setting one considers here the Marsden-Weinstein reduction [18]. Suppose that a Lie group G acts by Poisson diffeomorphisms on the Poisson manifold M and that it allows an Ad^* -equivariant momentum map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ with $0 \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ as value and regular value, where \mathfrak{g} is the Lie algebra of G . Then $C = J^{-1}(\{0\})$ is a closed embedded submanifold of M and the reduced manifold $M_{\text{red}} = C/G$ is again a Poisson manifold if the action on C is proper and free. Reduction theory is very important and it is still very active field of research. Among the others, we mention the categorical reformulation performed in [7].

In the setting of deformation quantization a quantum reduction scheme has been introduced in [2], see also [14] for a slightly different formulation, which allows the study of the compatibility between the reduction scheme and the properties of the star product, as in [11]. One crucial ingredient are quantum momentum maps (see [26]) and pairs consisting of star products with compatible quantum momentum maps are called *equivariant star products*. For symplectic manifolds these equivariant star products have recently been classified and it has been shown that quantization commutes with reduction, see [22–24]. More precisely, equivariant star products on M are classified by certain elements in the cohomology of the Cartan model for equivariant de Rham cohomology [13] and the characteristic classes of the equivariant star product and the reduced star product are related by pull-backs.

In the more general setting of Poisson manifolds, star products are classified by Maurer-Cartan elements in the DGLA of multivector fields, i.e. by formal Poisson structures. Unfortunately in this case there is no pull-back available and one has to use different techniques. Motivated by the aim of reducing the formality, we want to describe the reductions in terms of L_∞ -morphisms. In particular, in this paper we construct such a reduction for the classical side, i.e. for the *equivariant multivector fields* $T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)$, a certain DGLA whose Maurer-Cartan elements are invariant Poisson structures with equivariant momentum maps. Assuming for simplicity $M = C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, which always holds locally in suitable situations, we can perform a Taylor expansion around C , obtaining a new DGLA $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$. On $C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ we have the canonical momentum map J given by the projection on \mathfrak{g}^* and the canonical linear Poisson structure π_{KKS} induced by the action Lie algebroid. They give a new DGLA structure on $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ with differential $[\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot]$ and we show that this DGLA is quasi-isomorphic to the multivector fields on M_{red} , as desired. One has an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism between these two DGLA's, see Theorem 4.20:

Theorem *There exists an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism $\tilde{T}_{\text{red}}: T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*) \rightarrow T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})$.*

The morphism \tilde{T}_{red} is obtained by inverting a certain inclusion i of DGLA's. In order to give a more explicit formula we look at general deformation retracts: let (A, d_A) and (B, d_B) be two differential graded Lie algebras and assume that we have

$$(A, d_A) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{i} \\ \xrightarrow{p} \end{array} (B, d_B) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{h} \\ \xleftarrow{h} \end{array} \quad (1.1)$$

where i and p are quasi-isomorphisms of cochain complexes with homotopy h , and where $p \circ i = \text{id}_A$ and $h^2 = h \circ i = p \circ h = 0$. Using for a coalgebra morphism $F: S(B[1]) \rightarrow S(A[1])$ the notation

$$L_{\infty, k+1}(F) = Q_{A,2}^1 \circ F_{k+1}^2 - F_k^1 \circ Q_{B, k+1}^k,$$

where $Q_{A, k+1}^k$ and $Q_{B, k+1}^k$ are the extensions of the Lie brackets to the symmetric algebras, and extending h in an appropriate way to H_k on $S^k(B[1])$, we prove in Proposition 3.2 and 3.3:

Proposition *Given a deformation retract as in (1.1).*

- i.) *If i is a DGLA morphism, then $P: S^\bullet(B[1]) \rightarrow S^\bullet(A[1])$ with structure maps $P_1^1 = p$ and $P_{k+1}^1 = L_{\infty, k+1}(P) \circ H_{k+1}$ for $k \geq 1$ yields an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism that is quasi-inverse to i .*
- ii.) *If p is a DGLA morphism, then $I: S^\bullet(A[1]) \rightarrow S^\bullet(B[1])$ with structure maps $I_1^1 = i$ and $I_k^1 = h \circ L_{\infty, k}(I)$ for $k \geq 2$ is an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism that is quasi-inverse to p .*

This allows us to give a more explicit description of \tilde{T}_{red} and its L_∞ -quasi-inverse. Moreover, it allows us to globalize the result, compare Theorem 5.1:

Theorem *There exists a curved L_∞ -morphism*

$$T_{\text{red}}: (T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), 0, 0, [\cdot, \cdot]), \quad (1.2)$$

where the curvature $\lambda = e^i \otimes (e_i)_M$ is given by the fundamental vector fields of the G -action.

We call T_{red} *reduction L_∞ -morphism* and we extend the statements to the setting of formal power series in \hbar . After rescaling the involved curvatures and differentials appropriately, T_{red} gives in particular a way to associate formal Maurer-Cartan elements. In $T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)[[\hbar]]$ resp. $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]]$ with rescaled structures, formal Maurer-Cartan elements can be interpreted as formal Poisson structures π_{\hbar} with formal momentum map $J_{\hbar} = J + \hbar J'$. Thus, we have the following properties:

- The Poisson bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{\hbar}$ induced by π_{\hbar} is G -invariant,
- The fundamental vector fields are given by $\xi_M = \{\cdot, J_{\hbar}(\xi)\}_{\hbar} \in \Gamma^\infty(TM)$, and
- $\{J_{\hbar}(\xi), J_{\hbar}(\eta)\}_{\hbar} = J_{\hbar}([\xi, \eta])$.

Comparing the orders of \hbar directly shows that the lowest order is a well-defined Poisson structure on M and that J is an equivariant momentum map with respect to it, and T_{red} maps such an object to a formal Poisson structure on M_{red} .

Note that there is also another reduction scheme for such formal Poisson structures with formal momentum maps, obtained by adapting the reduction scheme for star products from [2, 14], i.e. using the homological perturbation lemma [6]. Finally, we show in Theorem 5.4:

Theorem *The reduction of formal equivariant Poisson structures with formal momentum maps via the reduction L_∞ -morphism coincides with the reduction of formal Poisson structures via the homological perturbation lemma.*

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we recall the basic notions of (curved) L_∞ -algebras, L_∞ -morphisms and twists. In Section 3 we consider general deformation retracts of DGLA's and prove the explicit formulas for the extensions of the inclusion resp. projection to L_∞ -morphisms needed to describe \tilde{T}_{red} in Section 4. Here we also construct the reduction scheme for the Taylor expansion, both in the classical and the formal setting. Finally, in Section 5 we construct the global reduction L_∞ -morphism and compare the reduction via T_{red} with the classical Marsden-Weinstein reduction and with the reduction of formal Poisson structures via the homological perturbation lemma as explained in Appendix A.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Alejandro Cabrera and Stefan Waldmann for the helpful comments. This work was supported by the National Group for Algebraic and Geometric Structures, and their Applications (GNSAGA – INdAM). The third author is supported by the DFG research training group "gk1821: Cohomological Methods in Geometry"

2 Preliminaries

In this section we recall the notions of (curved) L_∞ -algebras, L_∞ -morphisms and their twists by Maurer–Cartan elements to fix the notation. Proofs and further details can be found in [9, 10, 12].

We denote by V^\bullet a graded vector space over a field \mathbb{K} of characteristic 0 and define the *shifted* vector space $V[k]^\bullet$ by

$$V[k]^\ell = V^{\ell+k}.$$

A degree +1 coderivation Q on the coaugmented counital conilpotent cocommutative coalgebra $S^c(\mathfrak{L})$ cofreely cogenerated by the graded vector space $\mathfrak{L}[1]^\bullet$ over \mathbb{K} is called an *L_∞ -structure* on the graded vector space \mathfrak{L} if $Q^2 = 0$. The (universal) coalgebra $S^c(\mathfrak{L})$ can be realized as the symmetrized deconcatenation coproduct on the space $\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} S^n \mathfrak{L}[1]$ where $S^n \mathfrak{L}[1]$ is the space of coinvariants for the usual (graded) action of S_n (the symmetric group in n letters) on $\otimes^n(\mathfrak{L}[1])$, see e.g. [12]. Any degree +1 coderivation Q on $S^c(\mathfrak{L})$ is uniquely determined by the components

$$Q_n : S^n(\mathfrak{L}[1]) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{L}[2] \quad (2.1)$$

through the formula

$$Q(\gamma_1 \vee \dots \vee \gamma_n) = \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}(k, n-k)} \epsilon(\sigma) Q_k(\gamma_{\sigma(1)} \vee \dots \vee \gamma_{\sigma(k)}) \vee \gamma_{\sigma(k+1)} \vee \dots \vee \gamma_{\sigma(n)}. \quad (2.2)$$

Here $\text{Sh}(k, n-k)$ denotes the set of $(k, n-k)$ shuffles in S_n , $\epsilon(\sigma) = \epsilon(\sigma, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ is a sign given by the rule $\gamma_{\sigma(1)} \vee \dots \vee \gamma_{\sigma(n)} = \epsilon(\sigma) \gamma_1 \vee \dots \vee \gamma_n$ and we use the conventions that $\text{Sh}(n, 0) = \text{Sh}(0, n) = \{\text{id}\}$ and that the empty product equals the unit. Note in particular that we also consider a term Q_0 and thus we are actually considering curved L_∞ -algebras (which will be convenient in the following). Sometimes we also write $Q_k = Q_k^1$ and following [5] we denote by Q_n^i the component of $Q_n^i : S^n L[1] \rightarrow S^i L[2]$ of Q . It is given by

$$Q_n^i(x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n) = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}(n+1-i, i-1)} \epsilon(\sigma) Q_{n+1-i}^1(x_{\sigma(1)} \vee \dots \vee x_{\sigma(n+1-i)}) \vee x_{\sigma(n+2-i)} \vee \dots \vee x_{\sigma(n)}, \quad (2.3)$$

where Q_{n+1-i}^1 are the usual structure maps.

Example 2.1 (Curved Lie algebra) A basic example of an L_∞ -algebra is that of a (curved) Lie algebra $(\mathfrak{L}, R, d, [\cdot, \cdot])$ by setting $Q_0(1) = -R$, $Q_1 = -d$, $Q_2(\gamma \vee \mu) = -(-1)^{|\gamma|}[\gamma, \mu]$ and $Q_i = 0$ for all $i \geq 3$. Note that we denoted the degree in $\mathfrak{L}[1]$ by $|\cdot|$.

Let us consider two L_∞ -algebras (\mathfrak{L}, Q) and $(\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}, \tilde{Q})$. A degree 0 counital coalgebra morphism

$$F: S^c(\mathfrak{L}) \longrightarrow S^c(\tilde{\mathfrak{L}})$$

such that $FQ = \tilde{Q}F$ is said to be an L_∞ -morphism. A coalgebra morphism F from $S^c(\mathfrak{L})$ to $S^c(\tilde{\mathfrak{L}})$ such that $F(1) = 1$ is uniquely determined by its components (also called *Taylor coefficients*)

$$F_n: S^n(\mathfrak{L}[1]) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}[1],$$

where $n \geq 1$. Namely, we set $F(1) = 1$ and use the formula

$$F(\gamma_1 \vee \dots \vee \gamma_n) = \sum_{p \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k_1, \dots, k_p \geq 1 \\ k_1 + \dots + k_p = n}} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}(k_1, \dots, k_p)} \frac{\epsilon(\sigma)}{p!} F_{k_1}(\gamma_{\sigma(1)} \vee \dots \vee \gamma_{\sigma(k_1)}) \vee \dots \vee F_{k_p}(\gamma_{\sigma(n-k_p+1)} \vee \dots \vee \gamma_{\sigma(n)}), \quad (2.4)$$

where $\text{Sh}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$ denotes the set of (k_1, \dots, k_p) -shuffles in S_n (again we set $\text{Sh}(n) = \{\text{id}\}$). We also write $F_k = F_k^1$ and similarly to (2.3) we get coefficients $F_n^j: S^n L[1] \rightarrow S^j L'[1]$ of F by taking the corresponding terms in [8, Equation (2.15)]. Note that F_n^j depends only on $F_k^1 = F_k$ for $k \leq n - j + 1$. Given an L_∞ -morphism F of (non-curved) L_∞ -algebras (\mathfrak{L}, Q) and $(\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}, \tilde{Q})$, we obtain the map of complexes

$$F_1: (\mathfrak{L}, Q_1) \longrightarrow (\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}, \tilde{Q}_1).$$

In this case the L_∞ -morphism F is called an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism if F_1 is a quasi-isomorphism of complexes. Given a dgla $(\mathfrak{L}, d, [\cdot, \cdot])$ and an element $\pi \in \mathfrak{L}[1]^0$ we can obtain a curved Lie algebra by defining a new differential $d + [\pi, \cdot]$ and considering the curvature $R^\pi = d\pi + \frac{1}{2}[\pi, \pi]$. In fact the same procedure can be applied to a curved Lie algebra $(\mathfrak{L}, R, d, [\cdot, \cdot])$ to obtain the twisted curved Lie algebra $(\mathfrak{L}, R^\pi, d + [\pi, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot])$, where

$$R^\pi := R + d\pi + \frac{1}{2}[\pi, \pi].$$

The element π is called a *Maurer–Cartan element* if it satisfies the equation

$$R + d\pi + \frac{1}{2}[\pi, \pi] = 0.$$

Finally, it is important to recall that given a dgla morphism, or more generally an L_∞ -morphism, $F: \mathfrak{L} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}$, one may associate to any Maurer–Cartan element $\pi \in \mathfrak{L}[1]^0$ a Maurer–Cartan element

$$\pi_F := \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n!} F_n(\pi \vee \dots \vee \pi) \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}[1]^0$$

In order to make sense of these infinite sums we consider complete filtered L_∞ -algebras and we demand that Maurer–Cartan elements are in a positive filtration, see [9, 12] for details on such filtrations.

3 An Explicit Formula for the L_∞ -Projection and -Inclusion

From the general theory of L_∞ -algebras one knows that L_∞ -quasi-isomorphisms always admit L_∞ -quasi-inverses. Moreover, it is well-known that given a homotopy retract one can transfer L_∞ -structures. Explicitly, given two cochain complexes (A, d_A) and (B, d_B) with

$$(A, d_A) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{i} \\ \xrightarrow{p} \end{array} (B, d_B) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{h} \\ \xleftarrow{h} \end{array} \quad (3.1)$$

where $h \circ d_B + d_B \circ h = \text{id} - i \circ p$ and where i is a quasi-isomorphism, the homotopy transfer Theorem [17, Section 10.3] states that if there exists an L_∞ -structure on B , then one can transfer it to A in such a way that i extends to an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism.

Let us consider the special case of deformation retracts for DGLA's. More explicitly, let A, B be two DGLA's. A deformation retract of (A, d_A) is given by the diagram

$$(A, d_A) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{i} \\ \xleftarrow{p} \end{array} (B, d_B) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{h} \\ \xleftarrow{h} \end{array} (B, d_B) \quad (3.2)$$

where i and p are quasi-isomorphisms of cochain complexes with homotopy h , i.e. $h d_B + d_B h = \text{id}_B - ip$, as well as

$$p \circ i = \text{id}_A, \quad h^2 = 0, \quad h \circ i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad p \circ h = 0.$$

In addition, we assume that i is a DGLA morphism. As already mentioned, the homotopy transfer theorem and the invertibility of L_∞ -quasi-isomorphisms imply that p extends to an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism denoted by P , see e.g. [17, Prop. 10.3.9]. In the following we give a more explicit description of P . The DGLA structures yield the codifferentials Q_A on $S(A[1])$ and Q_B on $S(B[1])$ and the map h extends to a homotopy $H_n: S^n(B[1]) \rightarrow S^n(B[1])[-1]$ with respect to $Q_{B,n}^n: S^n(B[1]) \rightarrow S^n(B[1])[1]$, see e.g. [17, p. 383] for the construction on the tensor algebra, which adapted to our setting works roughly like: we define the operator

$$K_n: S^n(B[1]) \rightarrow S^n(B[1])$$

by

$$K_n(x_1 \vee \cdots \vee x_n) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{\epsilon(\sigma)}{n-i} ipX_{\sigma(1)} \vee \cdots \vee ipX_{\sigma(i)} \vee X_{\sigma(i+1)} \vee \cdots \vee X_{\sigma(n)}.$$

Note that here we sum over the whole symmetric group and not the shuffles, since in this case the formulas are easier. We extend $-h$ to a coderivation to $S(B[1])$, i.e.

$$\tilde{H}_n(x_1 \vee \cdots \vee x_n) := - \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}(1, n-1)} \epsilon(\sigma) hx_{\sigma(1)} \vee x_{\sigma(2)} \vee \cdots \vee x_{\sigma(n)}$$

and define

$$H_n = K_n \circ \tilde{H}_n = \tilde{H}_n \circ K_n.$$

Since i and p are chain maps, we have

$$K_n \circ Q_{B,n}^n = Q_{B,n}^n \circ K_n,$$

where $Q_{B,n}^n$ is the extension of the differential $Q_{B,1}^1 = -d_B$ to $S^n(B[1])$ as coderivation. Hence we have

$$Q_{B,n}^n H_n + H_n Q_{B,n}^n = (n \cdot \text{id} - ip) \circ K_n,$$

where ip is extended as a coderivation to $S(B[1])$. A combinatorial and not very enlightning computation shows that finally

$$Q_{B,n}^n H_n + H_n Q_{B,n}^n = \text{id} - (ip)^{\vee n}. \quad (3.3)$$

Suppose that we have constructed a morphism of coalgebras P with structure maps $P_k^1: S^k(B[1]) \rightarrow A[1]$ that is an L_∞ -morphism up to order k , i.e.

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^m P_\ell^1 \circ Q_{B,m}^\ell = \sum_{\ell=1}^m Q_{A,\ell}^1 \circ P_m^\ell$$

for all $m \leq k$. Then we have the following statement.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $P: S(B[1]) \rightarrow S(A[1])$ be an L_∞ -morphism up to order $k \geq 1$. Then*

$$L_{\infty, k+1} = \sum_{\ell=2}^{k+1} Q_{A, \ell}^1 \circ P_{k+1}^\ell - \sum_{\ell=1}^k P_\ell^1 \circ Q_{B, k+1}^\ell = Q_{A, 2}^1 \circ P_{k+1}^2 - P_k^1 \circ Q_{B, k+1}^k \quad (3.4)$$

satisfies

$$L_{\infty, k+1} \circ Q_{B, k+1}^{k+1} = -Q_{A, 1}^1 \circ L_{\infty, k+1}. \quad (3.5)$$

PROOF: The statement follows from a straightforward computation. For convenience we omit the index of the differential:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\infty, k+1} Q_{k+1}^{k+1} &= \sum_{\ell=2}^{k+1} Q_\ell^1 (P \circ Q)_{k+1}^\ell - \sum_{\ell=2}^{k+1} \sum_{i=1}^k Q_\ell^1 P_i^\ell Q_{k+1}^i + \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^k P_\ell^1 Q_i^\ell Q_{k+1}^i \\ &= \sum_{\ell=2}^{k+1} Q_\ell^1 (Q \circ P)_{k+1}^\ell - \sum_{\ell=2}^{k+1} \sum_{i=1}^k Q_\ell^1 P_i^\ell Q_{k+1}^i + \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^k Q_\ell^1 P_i^\ell Q_{k+1}^i \\ &= -Q_1^1 (Q \circ P)_{k+1}^1 + Q_1^1 \sum_{i=1}^k P_i^1 Q_{k+1}^i = -Q_1^1 L_{\infty, k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $Q_1^1 Q_1^1 = 0$. \square

This allows us to obtain the L_∞ -quasi-inverse of i , denoted by P , in (3.2) recursively:

Proposition 3.2 *Defining $P_1^1 = p$ and $P_{k+1}^1 = L_{\infty, k+1} \circ H_{k+1}$ for $k \geq 1$ yields an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism $P: S(B[1]) \rightarrow S(A[1])$ that is quasi-inverse to i .*

PROOF: We observe $P_{k+1}^1(ix_1 \vee \cdots \vee ix_{k+1}) = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $x_i \in A$, which directly follows from $h \circ i = 0$ and thus $H_{k+1} \circ i^{\vee(k+1)} = 0$. In addition, one also has for all $k \geq 1$ the identity $L_{\infty, k+1}(ix_1, \dots, ix_{k+1}) = 0$, which follows from the definition of $L_{\infty, k+1}$ and the fact that i is a morphism of DGLAs. We know that P is an L_∞ -morphism up to order one. Suppose that we already know that it is an L_∞ -morphism up to order $k \geq 1$, then this implies

$$\begin{aligned} P_{k+1}^1 \circ Q_{k+1}^{k+1} &= L_{\infty, k+1} \circ H_{k+1} \circ Q_{k+1}^{k+1} \\ &= L_{\infty, k+1} - L_{\infty, k+1} \circ Q_{k+1}^{k+1} \circ H_{k+1} - L_{\infty, k+1} \circ (i \circ p)^{\vee(k+1)} \\ &= L_{\infty, k+1} + Q_1^1 \circ P_{k+1}^1 \end{aligned}$$

by the above lemma, and therefore

$$P_{k+1}^1 \circ Q_{k+1}^{k+1} - Q_1^1 \circ P_{k+1}^1 = L_{\infty, k+1}.$$

Hence P is an L_∞ -morphism up to order $k+1$ and the statement follows inductively. \square

Let us now we assume that $p: B \rightarrow A$ in the deformation retract (3.2) is a DGLA morphism and that i is just a chain map. Then we can analogously give a formula for the extension I of i to an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism.

Proposition 3.3 *The coalgebra map $I: S^\bullet(A[1]) \rightarrow S^\bullet(B[1])$ recursively defined by the maps $I_1^1 = i$ and $I_k^1 = h \circ L_{\infty, k}$ for $k \geq 2$ is an L_∞ -quasi inverse of p . Since $h^2 = 0 = h \circ i$, one even has $I_k^1 = h \circ Q_2^1 \circ I_k^2$.*

PROOF: We proceed by induction: assume that I is an L_∞ -morphism up to order k , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{k+1}^1 Q_{A, k+1}^{k+1} - Q_{B, 1}^1 I_{k+1}^1 &= -Q_{B, 1}^1 \circ h \circ L_{\infty, k+1} + h \circ L_{\infty, k+1} \circ Q_{A, k+1}^{k+1} \\ &= -Q_{B, 1}^1 \circ h \circ L_{\infty, k+1} - h \circ Q_{B, 1}^1 \circ L_{\infty, k+1} \\ &= (\text{id} - i \circ p) L_{\infty, k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

We used that $Q_{B, 1}^1 = -d_B$ and the homotopy equation of h . Moreover, since p is a DGLA morphism and $p \circ h = 0$, we have that $p \circ L_{\infty, k+1} = 0$ for $k \geq 0$. Since I is an L_∞ -morphism up to order one, i.e. a chain map, the claim is proven. \square

4 Reduction of Multivector Fields

In the following, we want to use the above language and considerations to formulate a reduction scheme for multivector fields. We first introduce a new complex which of multivector fields which contains the data of Hamiltonian actions in the case of Lie group actions $\Phi: G \times M \rightarrow M$.

Definition 4.1 (Equivariant Multivectors) *The DGLA of equivariant multivector fields is given by the complex $T_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\bullet}(M)$ defined by*

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}}^k(M) = \bigoplus_{2i+j=k} (S^i \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \Gamma^{\infty}(\Lambda^{j+1} TM))^G = \bigoplus_{2i+j=k} (S^i \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}^j(M))^G,$$

together with the trivial differential and the following Lie bracket

$$[\alpha \otimes X, \beta \otimes Y]_{\mathfrak{g}} = \alpha \vee \beta \otimes [X, Y]$$

for any $\alpha \otimes X, \beta \otimes Y \in T_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\bullet}(M)$.

Here $[\cdot, \cdot]$ refers to the usual Schouten–Nijenhuis bracket on $T_{\text{poly}}(M)$. Notice that invariance with respect to the group action means invariance under the transformations $\text{Ad}_g^* \otimes \Phi_g^*$ for all $g \in G$. We can equivalently interpret this complex in terms of polynomial maps $\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow T_{\text{poly}}^j(M)$ which are equivariant with respect to adjoint and push-forward action. Using this point of view, the bracket can be rewritten as

$$[X, Y]_{\mathfrak{g}}(\xi) = [X(\xi), Y(\xi)]. \quad (4.1)$$

Furthermore, we introduce the canonical linear map

$$\lambda: \mathfrak{g} \ni \xi \mapsto \xi_M \in T_{\text{poly}}^0 M, \quad (4.2)$$

where ξ_M denotes the fundamental vector field corresponding to the action Φ . It is easy to see that λ is central and as a consequence we can turn $T_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\bullet} M$ into a *curved* Lie algebra with curvature λ . Now let (M, π) be a Poisson manifold and denote by $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ the corresponding Poisson bracket. Recall that an (equivariant) momentum map for the action Φ is a map $J: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(M)$ such that

$$\xi_M = \{\cdot, J_{\xi}\} \quad \text{and} \quad J_{[\xi, \eta]} = \{J_{\xi}, J_{\eta}\}. \quad (4.3)$$

An action Φ admitting a momentum map is what we called *Hamiltonian*. In the following we prove a characterization of Hamiltonian actions in terms of equivariant multivectors.

Lemma 4.2 *The curved Maurer–Cartan elements of $T_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\bullet}(M)$ are equivalent to pairs (π, J) , where π is a G -invariant Poisson structure J is a momentum map $J: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow T_{\text{poly}}^{-1}(M)$.*

PROOF: The curved Maurer–Cartan equation reads

$$\lambda + \frac{1}{2}[\Pi, \Pi]_{\mathfrak{g}} = 0$$

for $\Pi \in T_{\mathfrak{g}}^1(M)$. If we decompose $\Pi = \pi - J \in (T_{\text{poly}}^1(M))^G \oplus (\mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}^{-1}(M))^G$, it is easy to see that the curved Maurer–Cartan equation together with the invariance of the elements is equivalent to the conditions (4.3) defining the momentum map. \square

As in the Marsden–Weinstein reduction procedure, we fix a constraint surface $C \subseteq M$, by choosing an equivariant map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ and setting $C = J^{-1}(\{0\})$. Here we always assume that $0 \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ is a regular value of the momentum map, making C a closed embedded submanifold of M . Note that G acts canonically on C , since J is equivariant. From now on we also require the action Φ to be proper around C and free on C .

To implement this choice in our algebraic setting we consider from now on the curved differential graded Lie algebra

$$(T_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\bullet}(M), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]). \quad (4.4)$$

Note that this is in fact a curved Lie algebra since $[J, J] = 0 = [\lambda, \cdot]$. We have to move to the formal setting in order to see why this curved Lie algebra is actually interesting. Therefore, let us consider the curved Lie algebra

$$(T_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\bullet}(M)[[\hbar]], \hbar\lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]).$$

Note that one advantage of the setting of formal power series is that we immediately get a complete filtration by the \hbar -degrees, i.e. by setting

$$\mathcal{F}^k T_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\bullet}(M)[[\hbar]] = \hbar^k T_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\bullet}(M)[[\hbar]].$$

In particular, if we consider formal Maurer-Cartan elements $\hbar(\pi - J') \in \hbar T_{\mathfrak{g}}^1(M)[[\hbar]]$, then the twisting procedures and infinite sums from Section 2 are all well-defined.

Lemma 4.3 *The formal curved Maurer-Cartan elements of $(T_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\bullet}(M)[[\hbar]], \hbar\lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot])$ are equivalent to pairs $\hbar(\pi, J')$, where π is a G -invariant formal Poisson structure with formal moment map $J + \hbar J' : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow T_{\text{poly}}^{-1}(M)[[\hbar]]$.*

PROOF: The proof follows directly by Lemma 4.2 by counting \hbar -degrees. \square

The rest of this paper is devoted to the construction of a curved L_{∞} -morphism

$$T_{\text{red}} : (T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)[[\hbar]], \hbar\lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]], 0, 0, [\cdot, \cdot])$$

with $M_{\text{red}} := C/G$. This morphism is frequently referred to as *reduction morphism*.

4.1 Taylor Series Expansion around C

The main goal of this section is the study of a partial Taylor series expansion of the multivector field on M around C . Let us assume $M = C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$. This is not a strong assumption as we know from [2, Lemma 3] that, if G acts properly on an open neighbourhood of C we can always find an G -invariant open neighbourhood $M_{\text{nice}} \subseteq M$ of C , such that there exists a G -equivariant diffeomorphism $M_{\text{nice}} \cong U_{\text{nice}} \subseteq C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$. Here the Lie group G acts on $C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ as

$$\Phi_g = \Phi_g^C \times \text{Ad}_{g^{-1}}^*,$$

where Φ^C is the induced action on C . Note that in this setting the momentum map on U_{nice} is simply given by the projection to \mathfrak{g}^* . The idea of a Taylor expansion uses the fact that we have the isomorphism

$$T_{\text{poly}}^k(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*) \cong \bigoplus_{i+j=k} \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}^{\infty}(C)} (\Lambda^i \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}^j(C)).$$

First, we define

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*} : \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*) \ni f \longmapsto \sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{I!} e_I \otimes \iota^* \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_I} f \in \prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(C)),$$

where $\alpha_i e^i$ are coordinates on \mathfrak{g}^* and ι^* the restriction to C .

Lemma 4.4 *The map $T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ is equivariant, i.e.*

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*} \circ \Phi_{g,*} = (\text{Ad}_g \otimes \Phi_{g,*}^C) \circ T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}. \quad (4.5)$$

PROOF: We just observe that

$$\Phi_g^* \circ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} = (\text{Ad}_{g^{-1}})_j^i \cdot (\Phi_g^C)^* \circ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_j}$$

for $\text{Ad}_g e_i = (\text{Ad}_g)_i^j e_j$. Hence we have

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}(\Phi_{g,*} f) = \sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{I!} e_I \otimes \iota^* \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_I} \Phi_{g,*} f = (\text{Ad}_g \otimes \Phi_{g,*}^C) \circ T_{\mathfrak{g}^*} f$$

by shifting the components $(\text{Ad}_{g^{-1}})_j^i = (\text{Ad}_g)_i^j$ to the symmetric powers of \mathfrak{g} . \square

Remark 4.5 It is now clear that this map can be restricted to invariant functions in order to obtain invariant elements in $\prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(C))$. Moreover, with a slight adaption of the proof of the Borel-Lemma, see e.g. [20, Theorem 1.3], one can show that the map $T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ is surjective. The more remarkable fact is that the properness of the action ensures that the map

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}: \mathcal{C}^\infty(M \times \mathfrak{g}^*)^G \ni f \mapsto \sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{I!} e_I \otimes \iota^* \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_I} f \in \prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(C))^G$$

is surjective. We omit this proof as we do not use it here and it is just an adaption of the corresponding statement in [19].

We extend this map to $T_{\text{poly}}^\bullet(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ via

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}: T_{\text{poly}}^k(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*) \ni (f \otimes \xi \otimes X) \mapsto \sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{1}{I!} e_I \otimes \xi \otimes \iota^* \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_I} f \cdot X \in \prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes \Lambda \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C))$$

and using Lemma 4.4, we see that also this map can be restricted to invariant multivector fields:

Definition 4.6 (Taylor Expansion around C) *The map*

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}: (S\mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*))^G \longrightarrow T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*) := (S\mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes \Lambda \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)))^G \quad (4.6)$$

is called *Taylor expansion around C* .

Having in mind that the vector space $\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes \Lambda \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C))^G$ is just consisting of Taylor expansions, it is not surprising that it also inherits the structure of a DGLA: for $P, Q \in \prod_i S^i \mathfrak{g}$ and $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, the brackets are given by

$$\begin{aligned} [P, Q] &= 0, & [P \otimes \xi, Q] &= P \vee i_s(\xi)Q, \\ [P \otimes \xi, Q \otimes \eta] &= P \vee i_s(\xi)Q \otimes \eta - Q \vee i_s(\eta)P \otimes \xi, \end{aligned}$$

and they are extended as a Gerstenhaber bracket with respect to the graded commutative product

$$(P \otimes \xi) \cdot (Q \otimes \eta) := P \vee Q \otimes \xi \wedge \eta.$$

We combine it with the usual DGLA structure on $T_{\text{poly}}(C)$ and extend it as in the case of $T_{\mathfrak{g}}^\bullet(M)$ trivially to all of $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$. Summarizing, we have a DGLA structure on the Taylor expansion around C with zero differential.

Lemma 4.7 *The Taylor expansion*

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}: T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M) \longrightarrow T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*) \quad (4.7)$$

is a DGLA morphism.

PROOF: This is an easy verification on generators. □

As a next step we want to include the curvature $\lambda \in T_{\mathfrak{g}}^2(M)$ from Section 4. Recall that

$$\lambda = e^i \otimes (e_i)_M \in T_{\mathfrak{g}}^2(M) = (\mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}^0(M))^G.$$

Using our assumption that $M = C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ and that G acts as the product of the action on C and the coadjoint action, we see that

$$(e_i)_M = (e_i)_C + \alpha_k f_{ji}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_j}, \quad (4.8)$$

where $(e_i)_C$ denotes the fundamental vector field of the action on C and where f_{ji}^k are the structure constants of \mathfrak{g} . This means in particular that

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}(\lambda) = e^i \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes (e_i)_C + f_{ji}^k e^i \otimes e_k \otimes e^j \otimes 1 \in T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*).$$

With a slight abuse of notation we write λ instead of $T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}(\lambda)$. The same argument leads to the observation that

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}(J) = e^i \otimes e_i \otimes 1 \otimes 1,$$

where we also write J instead of $T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}(J)$ in the sequel.

Corollary 4.8 *The map*

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*} : (T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \quad (4.9)$$

is a morphism of curved Lie algebras.

One main advantage of the Taylor expansion $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ consists in the fact that we have a canonical element

$$\pi_{\text{KKS}} := 1 \otimes \left(\frac{1}{2} f_{ij}^k e_k \otimes e^i \wedge e^j \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes e^i \otimes (e_i)_C \right),$$

which is not available in $T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)$. Note that π_{KKS} encodes the action on C and the Lie algebra structure on \mathfrak{g} .

Remark 4.9 (Action Lie algebroid) The bundle $C \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow C$ can be equipped with the structure of a Lie algebroid since \mathfrak{g} acts on C by the fundamental vector fields. The bracket of this *action Lie algebroid* is given by

$$[\xi, \eta]_{C \times \mathfrak{g}}(p) = [\xi(p), \eta(p)] - (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_C} \eta)(p) + (\mathcal{L}_{\eta_C} \xi)(p) \quad (4.10)$$

for $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(C, \mathfrak{g})$. The anchor is given by $\rho(p, \xi) = -\xi_C|_p$. In particular, one can check that π_{KKS} is the negative of the linear Poisson structure on its dual $C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ in the convention of [21].

The canonical π_{KKS} is of big importance since it is part of some kind of normal form for every invariant Poisson structure on $C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ with moment map J . In the Taylor expansion this becomes more clear in the following lemma:

Lemma 4.10 *Let $\pi \in \left(\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes \Lambda \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)) \right)^{\text{G}} \subseteq T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ be a curved Maurer–Cartan element, then*

$$\pi = \pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi_C \quad (4.11)$$

with $\pi_C \in \left(\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}^1(C) \right)^{\text{G}}$.

PROOF: By (4.8) we have for $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$, $c \in C$ and $\alpha = \alpha_i e^i \in \mathfrak{g}^*$

$$\xi_M|_{(c, \alpha)} = -(\text{i}(\text{d}J(\xi))\pi)|_{(c, \alpha)} = \xi_C|_c + \xi_{\mathfrak{g}^*}|_\alpha = \xi_C|_c - f_{jl}^i \text{i}(e_i) \alpha e^j(\xi) \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_l}.$$

This implies directly

$$\pi = \pi_C + (e_i)_C \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_k f_{ij}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_j},$$

where $\pi_C \in \Gamma^\infty(M, \Lambda^2 TC)$ is tangent to C , but can possibly depend on all of $M = C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$. In the Taylor expansion $\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_l}$ corresponds to $\text{i}(e^l)$ and the lemma is shown. \square

Comparing now the terms in $[\pi, \pi] = 0$ with same \mathfrak{g}^* and C degrees gives hints concerning the coefficient function of π_C that can also depend on \mathfrak{g}^* . In particular, the terms in $\Gamma^\infty(\Lambda^3 TC)$ are given by

$$[\pi_C, \pi_C] + 2(e_i)_C \wedge \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i}, \pi_C \right] = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

To conclude this section, we define for later use the operator

$$\partial := \text{id} \otimes \mathfrak{i}_s(e^i) \otimes \text{id} \otimes (e_i)_C \wedge. \quad (4.13)$$

Note that we assume the Koszul sign rule, i.e. applying ∂ to $\xi \otimes P \otimes \alpha \otimes X$ we get a sign $(-1)^{|\alpha|}$. We directly see that $\partial^2 = 0$ and Equation (4.12) can be written as

$$\frac{1}{2}[\pi_C, \pi_C] + (e_i)_C \wedge \mathfrak{i}_s(e^i)\pi_C = \frac{1}{2}[\pi_C, \pi_C] + \partial\pi_C = 0. \quad (4.14)$$

4.2 The Cartan Model of Multivector Fields

In the case of symplectic manifolds, it has been shown in [22] that quantization and reduction commute by exploiting the following diagram

$$((\mathbf{Sg}^* \otimes \Omega(M))^G, d_g) \xrightarrow{\iota^*} ((\mathbf{Sg}^* \otimes \Omega(C))^G, d_g) \xleftarrow{p^*} (\Omega^\bullet(M_{\text{red}}), d)$$

for $M \xleftarrow{\iota} C \xrightarrow{p} M_{\text{red}}$. Here p^* is a quasi-isomorphism and $(\mathbf{Sg}^* \otimes \Omega(C))^G$ is the so-called Cartan model for equivariant de Rham cohomology [13]. We aim to generalize this result to the setting of Poisson manifolds by using the above observation as a guideline. For this reason we introduce our notion for the *Cartan Model of equivariant multivector fields* and compute its relation with $T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})$ and with the Taylor expansion of multivector fields around C from the previous section. We start with the following observation:

Proposition 4.11 *The cohomology of the DGLA $(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot])$ is given by the Lie algebra $((\prod_{i=0}^\infty (\mathbf{S}^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)))^G, [\cdot, \cdot])$. Therefore, the canonical inclusion*

$$\iota: \left(\left(\prod_{i=0}^\infty (\mathbf{S}^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)) \right)^G, 0, [\cdot, \cdot] \right) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [-J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \quad (4.15)$$

becomes a quasi-isomorphism of DGLA's.

PROOF: The map $h = \mathfrak{i}_s(e_l) \otimes \text{id} \otimes e^l \wedge \otimes \text{id}$ satisfies

$$-[J, \cdot] \circ h(\xi \otimes P \otimes \alpha \otimes X) - h \circ [J, \cdot](\xi \otimes P \otimes \alpha \otimes X) = (\deg(\alpha) + \deg(\xi))(\xi \otimes P \otimes \alpha \otimes X)$$

and the statement follows. \square

Note that the cohomology $((\prod_{i=0}^\infty (\mathbf{S}^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)))^G)$ can be equipped with a non-trivial, but canonical differential.

Proposition 4.12 *The differential ∂ defined in (4.13) turns $((\prod_{i=0}^\infty (\mathbf{S}^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)))^G, [\cdot, \cdot])$ into a DGLA.*

PROOF: A straightforward computation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \partial[\xi \otimes X, \eta \otimes Y] &= \mathfrak{i}_s(e^i)(\xi \vee \eta) \otimes (e_i)_C \wedge [X, Y], \\ [\partial(\xi \otimes X), \eta \otimes Y] &= (-1)^k \mathfrak{i}_s(e^i)(\xi) \vee \eta \otimes X \wedge [(e_i)_C, Y] + \mathfrak{i}_s(e^i)(\xi) \vee \eta \otimes (e_i)_C \wedge [X, Y], \\ [\xi \otimes X, \partial(\eta \otimes Y)] &= (-1)^{k-1} \xi \vee \mathfrak{i}_s(e^i)(\eta) \otimes (e_i)_C \wedge [X, Y] - \xi \vee \mathfrak{i}_s(e^i)(\eta) \otimes [(e_i)_C, X] \wedge Y, \end{aligned}$$

where $X \in T_{\text{poly}}^{k-1}(C)$. Using the G -invariance we get

$$\xi \otimes [(e_i)_C, X] = -f_{ij}^k e_k \vee \mathfrak{i}_s(e^j)\xi \otimes X \quad \text{and} \quad \eta \otimes [(e_i)_C, Y] = -f_{ij}^k e_k \vee \mathfrak{i}_s(e^j)\eta \otimes Y.$$

Summarizing, this yields

$$\partial[\xi \otimes X, \eta \otimes Y] = [\partial(\xi \otimes X), \eta \otimes Y] + (-1)^{k-1}[\xi \otimes X, \partial(\eta \otimes Y)]$$

and the proposition is shown. \square

This motivates the following definition.

Definition 4.13 (Cartan model) *Let G be a Lie group action on a manifold C . The DGLA defined by*

$$\left(\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{S}^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)) \right)^G, \partial, [\cdot, \cdot] \quad (4.16)$$

is called Cartan model and is denoted by $T_{\text{Cart}}(C)$.

Seen as a module, $(\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{S}^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)))^G$ is the dual of the Cartan model $(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \Omega(C))^G$ for the equivariant de Rham cohomology [13, 23]. Even the differential ∂ is dual to the insertion $i_{\bullet} = e^i \vee \otimes i_a((e_i)_C)$ that forms together with the de Rham differential the coboundary operator in the usual Cartan model for equivariant cohomology. In the case of forms the equivariant cohomology of the principal fiber bundle C is isomorphic to the de Rham cohomology of the reduced manifold, whereas in our setting we want to show that we get the multivector fields on M_{red} as cohomology. Note that we have a canonical DGLA map

$$p: (T_{\text{Cart}}(C), \partial, [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), 0, [\cdot, \cdot]),$$

which is just given by the projection to the symmetric degree 0 followed by the projection to M_{red} . It is well-defined since invariant multivector fields are projectable.

Proposition 4.14 *The DGLA-map*

$$p: \left(\left(\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{S}^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)) \right)^G, \partial, [\cdot, \cdot] \right) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), 0, [\cdot, \cdot]) \quad (4.17)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism.

PROOF: Consider the principal bundle $\text{pr}: C \rightarrow M_{\text{red}}$ and choose a principal bundle connection $\omega = \omega^i \otimes e_i \in \Omega^1(C) \otimes \mathfrak{g}$, i.e. an equivariant horizontal lift inducing

$$TC = \text{Ver}(C) \oplus \text{Hor}(C) = \ker T \text{pr} \oplus \ker \omega,$$

where $\ker \omega \cong \text{pr}^* TM_{\text{red}}$. Then we can construct a homotopy for ∂ by $h = e_i \vee \otimes i(\omega^i)$. Since $\omega^i((e_j)_M) = \delta_j^i$, it satisfies

$$h \partial + \partial h = (\deg_{\mathfrak{g}} + \deg_{\text{ver}}) \text{id}.$$

With the vertical degree we mean the degree in the splitting $\Lambda^k TC = \bigoplus_{i+j=k} \Lambda^i \text{Ver}(C) \otimes \Lambda^j \text{Hor}(C)$. \square

In other words, the above proposition yields for every principal connection $\omega \in \Omega^1(C) \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ the following deformation retract

$$T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}) \xleftarrow[p]{i} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{S}^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)) \right)^G \xrightarrow{h} \quad (4.18)$$

where i denotes the horizontal lift with respect to the connection ω and the homotopy h is given on all homogeneous elements by

$$h(\xi \otimes X) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\deg(\xi) + \deg_{\text{ver}}(X)} e_i \vee \xi \otimes i(\omega^i) X & \text{if } \deg(\xi) + \deg_{\text{ver}}(X) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, the algebraic relations of a deformation retract between i , p and h are easily seen to be verified. Recall that additionally p is a DGLA morphism, which puts us exactly in the situation of Proposition 3.3. So before we continue to put the Cartan model in the context of reduction, we give an explicit formula for a quasi-inverse of p .

Proposition 4.15 For a fixed principal fiber connection $\omega \in \Omega^1(C) \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ with curvature $\Omega \in \Omega^2(C) \otimes \mathfrak{g}$, one obtains an L_∞ -quasi-inverse of p

$$i_\infty: S(T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[1]) \longrightarrow S\left(\left(\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C))\right)^G [1]\right) \quad (4.19)$$

given by

$$i_\infty = e^\Omega \circ (\cdot)^{\text{hor}}, \quad (4.20)$$

where one extends $(\cdot)^{\text{hor}}$ as a coalgebra morphism and Ω as a coderivation of degree 0. In particular,

$$i_{\infty,1}(X) = X^{\text{hor}} \quad \text{and} \quad i_{\infty,2}(X, Y) = (-1)^{|X|} e_i \otimes \Omega^i(X^{\text{hor}}, Y^{\text{hor}}) \quad (4.21)$$

for a basis $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$ of \mathfrak{g} .

PROOF: Let us fix a principal connection $\omega \in \Omega^1(C) \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ and denote by h the corresponding homotopy and by Ω its curvature. Due to that fact that Equation (4.18) is a deformation retract and p is a DGLA morphism, we are exactly in the situation of Proposition 3.3 and the statement becomes a purely computational issue, so let us start with some book-keeping. Throughout the proof, we will make use of the following equation for $X \in \Gamma^\infty(\Lambda^k TC)$, $Y \in \Gamma^\infty(\Lambda^\ell TC)$ and $\alpha \in \Omega^1(C)$:

$$d\alpha(X, Y) = [i_a(\alpha)X, Y] - (-1)^k [X, i_a(\alpha)Y] - i_a(\alpha)[X, Y] \quad (*)$$

where for the left-hand side, we define

$$d\alpha(X, Y) = (d\alpha)_{ij} i_a(dx^i)X \wedge i_a(dx^j)Y$$

in a coordinate patch. The validity of Equation (*) for one-forms of the type $\alpha = f dg$ follows by the usual Schouten calculus. By \mathbb{R} -linearity of Equation (*), its validity follows for general 1-forms in every coordinate patch and hence also globally. Let us define, using the curvature Ω , the map

$$\Omega: S^2\left(\prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)[1])^G\right) \longrightarrow \left(\prod_i S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)\right)^G [1]$$

defined on homogeneous and factorizing elements $P_j \otimes X_j \in \prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)[1])^G$, $j = 1, 2$ by

$$\Omega(P_1 \otimes X_1 \vee P_2 \otimes X_2) = (-1)^{|X_1|} e_i \vee P_1 \vee P_2 \otimes \Omega^i(X_1, X_2).$$

This map is well defined, i.e. in fact graded symmetric, and of degree 0. With a slight abuse of notation we denote also by

$$\Omega: S^\bullet\left(\prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)[1])^G\right) \longrightarrow S^{\bullet-1}\left(\prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)[1])^G\right)$$

its extension as a coderivation of degree 0, i.e.

$$\Omega(X_1 \vee \dots \vee X_k) = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}(2, k-2)} \epsilon(\sigma) \Omega(X_{\sigma(1)} \vee X_{\sigma(2)}) \vee X_{\sigma(3)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k)}$$

for $X_j \in \prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)[1])^G$. Note that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X_j \in \prod_i (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)[1])^G$, we have that

$$\Omega^k(X_1 \vee \dots \vee X_k) = 0$$

since Ω decreases the symmetric degree by one and hence the expression

$$e^\Omega := \sum_k \frac{1}{k!} \Omega^k$$

is a well defined map. Since Ω is a coderivation of degree 0, it is even a coalgebra morphism. Its components are given by

$$(e^\Omega)_k^\ell = \frac{1}{(k-\ell)!} \Omega^{k-\ell},$$

which can be seen again by counting symmetric degrees. This shows in particular, that $(e^\Omega \circ (\cdot)^{\text{hor}})_1^1 = (\cdot)^{\text{hor}}$. We proceed now inductively, so let us assume that $e^\Omega \circ (\cdot)^{\text{hor}}$ coincides with i_∞ from Proposition 3.3 up to order k . For $X_j \in T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[1]$, $j = 1, \dots, k+1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\infty, k+1}(X_1 \vee \dots \vee X_{k+1}) &= h \circ Q_2^1 \circ i_{\infty, k+1}^2(X_1 \vee \dots \vee X_{k+1}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}(i, k+1-i)} \frac{\epsilon(\sigma)}{2} h \circ Q_2^1 \left(i_{\infty, j}^1(X_{\sigma(1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}) \vee i_{\infty, k-i+1}^1(X_{\sigma(j+1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}(i, k+1-i)} \frac{\epsilon(\sigma)}{2} h \circ Q_2^1 \\ &\quad \left(\frac{\Omega^{j-1}}{(j-1)!} (X_{\sigma(1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}^{\text{hor}}) \vee \frac{\Omega^{k-j}}{(k-j)!} (X_{\sigma(j+1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)}^{\text{hor}}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now take a look at

$$\begin{aligned} &h \circ Q_2^1 \left(\Omega^{j-1} (X_{\sigma(1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}^{\text{hor}}) \vee \Omega^{k-j} (X_{\sigma(j+1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)}^{\text{hor}}) \right) \\ &= (-1)^{1+\sum_{k=1}^j |X_{\sigma(j)}|} h[\Omega^{j-1} (X_{\sigma(1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}^{\text{hor}}), \Omega^{k-j} (X_{\sigma(j+1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)}^{\text{hor}})] \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{1+\sum_{k=1}^j |X_{\sigma(j)}|}}{k} e_i \otimes i_a(\omega^i) [\Omega^{j-1} (X_{\sigma(1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}^{\text{hor}}), \Omega^{k-j} (X_{\sigma(j+1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)}^{\text{hor}})] \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \frac{(-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^j |X_{\sigma(j)}|}}{k} e_i \otimes d\omega^i ((\Omega^{j-1} (X_{\sigma(1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}^{\text{hor}}), \Omega^{k-j} (X_{\sigma(j+1)}^{\text{hor}} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)}^{\text{hor}})). \end{aligned}$$

The factor $\frac{1}{k}$ appears, since Ω^k raises the symmetric degree in \mathfrak{g} by k and hence the commutator has $k-1$ symmetric degrees in \mathfrak{g} degrees and at most one vertical degree, since both of the entries are horizontal multivector fields. Moreover, since $i_a(\omega^i)$ annihilates the terms which do not have a vertical degree, the formula is valid. Note that by definition of the curvature of ω , we have $\Omega = d\omega - \frac{1}{2}[\omega, \omega]$ or for a chosen basis $\Omega^i = d\omega^i - \frac{1}{2}f_{kl}^i \omega^k \wedge \omega^l$. Since ω^i vanishes on horizontal lifts, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &h \circ Q_2^1 \left(\Omega^{j-1} (X_{\sigma(1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}) \vee \Omega^{k-j} (X_{\sigma(j+1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)}) \right) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^j |X_{\sigma(j)}|}}{k} e_i \otimes \Omega^i ((\Omega^{j-1} (X_{\sigma(1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}), \Omega^{k-j} (X_{\sigma(j+1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)})) \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \Omega((\Omega^{j-1} (X_{\sigma(1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}), \Omega^{k-j} (X_{\sigma(j+1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)})) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &i_{\infty, k+1}(X_1 \vee \dots \vee X_{k+1}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}(i, k+1-i)} \frac{\epsilon(\sigma)}{2k} \Omega \left(\frac{\Omega^{j-1}}{(j-1)!} (X_{\sigma(1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}) \vee \frac{\Omega^{k-j}}{(k-j)!} (X_{\sigma(j+1)} \vee \dots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{k!} \Omega^k (X_1 \vee \dots \vee X_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the observation that

$$\Omega^k (X_1 \vee \dots \vee X_{k+1}) = \Omega(\Omega^{k-1} (X_1 \vee \dots \vee X_{k+1}))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \Omega((k-1)!(e^\Omega)_{k+1}^2(X_1 \vee \cdots \vee X_{k+1})) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sh}(i, k+1-1)} \frac{\epsilon(\sigma)}{2} \frac{(k-1)!}{(j-1)!(k-j)!} \\
&\Omega(\Omega^{j-1}(X_{\sigma(1)} \vee \cdots \vee X_{\sigma(j)}) \vee \Omega^{k-j}(X_{\sigma(j+1)} \vee \cdots \vee X_{\sigma(k+1)})),
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed. \square

Corollary 4.16 *The induced map at the level of Maurer-Cartan elements*

$$p: MC(T_{\text{Cart}}(C)) \longrightarrow MC(T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}))$$

is surjective.

PROOF: Let $\pi \in T_{\text{poly}}^1(M_{\text{red}})$ be a Maurer-Cartan element, i.e. a Poisson structure. We define

$$\Pi = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} i_{\infty, k}(\pi^{\vee k}).$$

This series actually well-defined in $T_{\text{Cart}}(C)$, since we have

$$\Pi = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \Omega^{k-1}((\pi^{\text{hor}})^{\vee k})$$

using the explicit form of i_{∞} as in Proposition 4.15. But

$$\Omega^{k-1}((\pi^{\text{hor}})^{\vee k}) \in (\mathbb{S}^{k-1} \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}^1(C))^{\mathbb{G}},$$

whence $\Pi \in MC(T_{\text{Cart}}(C))$ is well-defined. The identity $p(\Pi) = \pi$ is then clear using again the explicit form. \square

Remark 4.17 In particular, the above proposition shows not only that if C admits a flat connection, then i_{∞} has $i_1 = (\cdot)^{\text{hor}}$ as only structure map, but also how to correct the horizontal lift in order to obtain an L_{∞} -quasi-isomorphism.

Having seen the importance of the ad-hoc defined differential ∂ on $T_{\text{Cart}}(C)$, we lean now again towards $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ and try to find an extension of the differential $-[J, \cdot]$ in order to make the inclusion $\iota: T_{\text{Cart}}(C) \rightarrow T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ a quasi-isomorphism with respect to ∂ . As a first step we have:

Proposition 4.18 *The map $[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]$ is a well-defined differential on $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ that is explicitly given by*

$$[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \xi \otimes P \otimes \alpha \otimes X] = \xi \otimes \delta_{\text{CE}}(P \otimes \alpha \otimes X) + \partial(\xi \otimes P \otimes \alpha \otimes X). \quad (4.22)$$

Moreover, the canonical inclusion

$$\iota: (T_{\text{Cart}}(C), \partial, [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot])$$

becomes a DGLA morphism.

PROOF: Since the bracket does not depend on the $\mathbb{S}\mathfrak{g}^*$ -part we restrict ourselves to $P \otimes \alpha \otimes X$. Let us compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\frac{1}{2} f_{ij}^k e_k \otimes e^i \wedge e^j, P \otimes \alpha \otimes X \right] &= \frac{1}{2} f_{ij}^k (e_k \otimes [e^i \wedge e^j, P \otimes \alpha] \otimes X + [e_k, P \otimes \alpha] \wedge e^i \wedge e^j \otimes X) \\
&= f_{ij}^k e_k \vee i_s(e^j) P \otimes e^i \wedge \alpha \otimes X - \frac{1}{2} f_{ij}^k P \otimes e^i \wedge e^j \wedge i_a(e_k) \alpha \otimes X
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$[-e^i \wedge (e_i)_C, P \otimes \alpha \otimes X] = -P \otimes e^i \wedge \alpha \otimes \mathcal{L}_{(e_i)_C} X - (-1)^{|\alpha|+|X|} i_s(e^i) P \otimes \alpha \otimes X \wedge (e_i)_C,$$

where $|X|$ denotes the multivector field degree and $|\alpha|$ the form degree. Putting this together we directly get (4.22). Since π_{KKS} is a Poisson structure, we directly see that it squares to zero. Moreover, $[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]$ boils down to ∂ when restricted to elements in the image of the canonical inclusion ι , i.e. in $(1 \otimes \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (\mathbb{S}^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes 1 \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)))^{\mathbb{G}}$. \square

Alternatively, the identity

$$[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, J] = \lambda, \quad (4.23)$$

implies that the canonical π_{KKS} defines a curved Maurer-Cartan element in the curved DGLA $(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot])$. Therefore, twisting by π_{KKS} yields a Lie algebra differential on $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ with curvature zero. The next step is, of course, to check if ι is still a quasi-isomorphism.

Proposition 4.19 *The inclusion*

$$\iota: (T_{\text{Cart}}(C), \partial, [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \quad (4.24)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism of DGLAs.

PROOF: Let us compute the cohomology of $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ by interpreting it as a double complex. The two differentials are $[-J, \cdot]$ and $[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]$ and as bigrading we set

$$C^{p,q} = (S^q \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes (\Lambda \mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C))^{p-q}))^G.$$

One can directly see that the differentials are compatible with the bigrading in the sense that

$$[-J, \cdot]: C^{p,q} \longrightarrow C^{p,q+1}, \quad \text{and} \quad [\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]: C^{p,q} \longrightarrow C^{p+1,q}.$$

By Proposition 4.11 the cohomology of $[-J, \cdot]$ is given by $(\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(C)))^G$, on which the horizontal differential $[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]$ is just ∂ . Thus ι is an isomorphism on the first sheet and thus on the cohomology. \square

The above results show that the Cartan model is an intertwiner of $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ and $T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})$, which can be summarized in the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{c} (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [\pi_{\text{KKS}} - R - J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \\ \uparrow \iota \\ (T_{\text{Cart}}(C), \partial, [\cdot, \cdot]) \\ \begin{array}{c} \nearrow i_{\infty} \\ \searrow p \end{array} \\ (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), [\cdot, \cdot]). \end{array}$$

So far we have shown that both ι and p are DGLA morphisms and also quasi-isomorphisms. For convenience, we included the L_{∞} -quasi-inverse i_{∞} of p . From this diagram and the fact that every L_{∞} -quasi-isomorphism is quasi-invertible, we have the following:

Theorem 4.20 *There exists an L_{∞} -quasi-isomorphism*

$$(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), 0, [-, -]).$$

Note that the KKS Poisson structure is not defined on M , but just in an open neighbourhood of C . Recall that we aim to find a curved L_{∞} -morphism

$$T_{\text{red}}: (T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), 0, 0, [\cdot, \cdot])$$

and its formal correspondence. To achieve this we proceed in the following way: we construct a (non-curved) quasi-inverse of ι in Diagram (4.2) denoted by P and then twist it by $-\pi_{\text{KKS}}$ in order to find a curved morphism

$$P^{-\pi_{\text{KKS}}}: (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), \lambda_{\text{red}}, [\pi_{\text{KKS,red}}, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot])$$

for

$$\lambda_{\text{red}} := \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} P_{1+k}(\lambda \vee \pi_{\text{KKS}}^{\vee k})$$

and

$$\pi_{\text{KKS,red}} := \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} P_k(\pi_{\text{KKS}}^{\vee k}).$$

There are now two issues with this approach:

- Since we did not introduce a complete filtration on the involved DGLAs, we have to check by hand that both of the series actually converge in a suitable sense.
- This is actually not what we want, since our target, i.e. $T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})$, has to have zero curvature and zero differential.

This two problems are solved in Section 4.4, where we construct a quasi inverse of ι such that $\lambda_{\text{red}} = \pi_{\text{KKS,red}} = 0$ and we show that the series are well-defined. But at first we need to extend our considerations to the formal setting, where we have a complete filtration by \hbar .

4.3 Formal Equivariant Multivector Fields and Their Reduction

We want to consider the formal analogue of the equivariant equivariant multivector fields on M from Eq. (4.4). Since we are only interested in formal Maurer-Cartan elements, we have to rescale the curvature by \hbar , i.e. we consider the curved DGLA

$$((\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(M))^G[[\hbar]], \hbar\lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]).$$

A formal curved Maurer-Cartan elements $\hbar(\pi - J') \in \hbar(\mathbf{S}\mathfrak{g}^* \otimes T_{\text{poly}}(M))^G[[\hbar]]$ corresponds to an invariant formal Poisson structure π with formal momentum map $J + \hbar J'$.

The Taylor series expansion discussed in Section 4.1 allows us to interpret the element $\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}}$ as a formal curved Maurer-Cartan element. Thus we can perform the twisting procedure, yielding the following flat DGLA:

$$(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]], [\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]).$$

For a formal Maurer-Cartan element $\hbar(\pi - J')$ one can check that $\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi$ is a G -invariant formal Poisson structure with formal momentum map $J + \hbar J'$ as desired and again $\pi = \pi_C + \mathcal{O}(\hbar)$. Moreover, the Cartan model for the multivector fields reads in the formal setting:

$$(T_{\text{Cart}}(C)[[\hbar]], \hbar\partial, [\cdot, \cdot])$$

and the bracket on $T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]]$ is simply extended \hbar -bilinearly. Summarizing, we have the following claim.

Theorem 4.21 *We have built the following diagram*

$$\begin{array}{c} (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]], [\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \\ \uparrow \iota \\ (T_{\text{Cart}}(C)[[\hbar]], \hbar\partial, [\cdot, \cdot]) \\ \downarrow p \\ (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]], 0, [\cdot, \cdot]), \end{array}$$

where both maps are DGLA morphisms and where ι is still a quasi-isomorphism of DGLAs.

PROOF: The proof essentially follows from the above considerations. More explicitly, the inclusion of the Cartan model into $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]]$ is a quasi-isomorphism of DGLAs since the bracket with $[-J, \cdot]$ is not scaled by \hbar and $[\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]$ is just $\hbar\partial$ in the cohomology of $[-J, \cdot]$. In other words, the argument from Proposition 4.19 applies. \square

Note that here we only use the fact that the L_∞ -quasi-inverse of ι exists. In Section 4.4 we give an explicit formula for this map.

Remark 4.22 (Laurent series) We observe that the map p in the above theorem is *not* a quasi-isomorphism due to the scaling problem by \hbar . Concerning the projection from the Cartan model to M_{red} we still have the map h satisfying $\hbar \partial h + h \hbar \partial = \hbar(\text{deg}_{\mathfrak{g}} + \text{deg}_{\text{ver}}) \text{id}$, as in Proposition 4.14. However, since we are not allowed to divide by \hbar , the projection pr in the formal setting is no longer a quasi-isomorphism. We remark that, if we consider instead Laurent series in \hbar in all the complexes, e.g. $T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[\hbar^{-1}, \hbar]$, then it remains a quasi-isomorphism.

Moreover, we know from [15, Thm. 4.6] that L_{∞} -quasi-isomorphisms induce bijections on the equivalence classes of formal Maurer-Cartan elements. In our setting this yields:

Corollary 4.23 *Every formal Maurer-Cartan element $\hbar(\pi - J')$ in $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]]$ is equivalent to a formal Maurer-Cartan element $\hbar\pi_C \in T_{\text{Cart}}(C)^1[[\hbar]] \subset T_{\text{Tay}}^1(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]]$.*

In other words, the above Corollary states that every formal Poisson structure $\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi$ with formal momentum map $J + \hbar J'$ is equivalent to a formal Poisson structure $\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi_C$ with undeformed momentum map J . Finally, we can construct an explicit equivalence transformation from a generic Maurer-Cartan element $\hbar(\pi - J')$ to one with $J' = 0$. Set $X_{\hbar}^1 = \hbar J'_i e^i$ and $J'_i{}^2 = \exp(X_{\hbar}^1)(J_i) - J_i - \hbar J'_i$. One can recursively define for $k \geq 1$

$$X_{\hbar}^{k+1} = -J'_i{}^{k+1} e^i := -(\exp(X_{\hbar}^k) \cdots \exp(X_{\hbar}^1)(J_i) - J_i - \hbar J'_i) e^i. \quad (4.25)$$

Proposition 4.24 *Let $\hbar(\pi - J')$ be a formal Maurer-Cartan element in $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]]$. Then*

$$X_{\hbar}^{\infty} = \log \left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \exp(X_{\hbar}^k) \cdots \exp(X_{\hbar}^1) \right) \quad (4.26)$$

satisfies $\exp(X_{\hbar}^{\infty})(J_i) = J_i + \hbar J'_i$ and hence $\hbar \exp(-X_{\hbar}^{\infty})(\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi) - \hbar \pi_{\text{KKS}}$ is a formal Maurer-Cartan element in $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^)[[\hbar]]$ equivalent to $\hbar(\pi - J')$.*

PROOF: Note that $X_{\hbar}^1 \in \mathcal{O}(\hbar)$ and inductively one gets

$$\begin{aligned} J_i + \hbar J'_i + J_i{}^{k+1} &= \exp(X_{\hbar}^k) \exp(X_{\hbar}^{k-1}) \cdots \exp(X_{\hbar}^1)(J_i) = \exp(X_{\hbar}^k)(J_i + \hbar J'_i + J_i{}^k) \\ &= J_i + \hbar J'_i + J_i{}^k + X_{\hbar}^k(J_i) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $J_i{}^{k+1} \in \mathcal{O}(\hbar^{k+1})$ as well as $X_{\hbar}^{k+1} \in \mathcal{O}(\hbar^{k+1})$. In particular, X_{\hbar}^{∞} is well-defined and satisfies

$$\exp(X_{\hbar}^{\infty})(J_i) = J_i + \hbar J'_i + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J_i{}^k = J_i + \hbar J'_i$$

in the \hbar -adic topology. The gauge equivalence $\exp(-X_{\hbar}^{\infty})$ therefore maps $\hbar(\pi - J')$ to

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-X_{\hbar}^{\infty}) \triangleright \hbar(\pi - J') &= \exp(-X_{\hbar}^{\infty})(\hbar \pi_{\text{KKS}} - J + \hbar(\pi - J')) - (\hbar \pi_{\text{KKS}} - J) \\ &= \hbar \exp(-X_{\hbar}^{\infty})(\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi) - \hbar \pi_{\text{KKS}}, \end{aligned}$$

compare [25, Prop. 6.2.34] for a formula of the gauge action. \square

4.4 L_{∞} -quasi-inverse of ι

Finally, we want to find an explicit description of the L_{∞} -quasi-inverse of ι , i.e. an L_{∞} -quasi-isomorphism

$$P: (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), 0, [\cdot, \cdot]).$$

One can check that the homotopy h of $[-J, \cdot]$ from Proposition 4.11 does not commute with $[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]$. The idea is to start with $[-J, \cdot]$ as differential on the Taylor decomposition and zero differential on the Cartan model, construct the L_{∞} -quasi-isomorphism P in this case, and then investigate the compatibility with $[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]$.

Let us focus on the following deformation retract of DGLA's

$$(T_{\text{Cart}}(C), 0) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{i} \\ \xrightarrow{p} \end{array} (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [-J, \cdot]) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{h} \\ \xleftarrow{h} \end{array} (4.27)$$

and apply the construction from Section 3. By Proposition 3.2 we have an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism P given by $P_1 = p$ and

$$P_n = P_n^1 = (R_2^1 P_n^2 - P_{n-1}^1 Q_n^{n-1}) \circ H_n, \quad (4.28)$$

where Q and R denote the L_∞ -structure on $S(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[1])$ and on $S(T_{\text{Cart}}(C)[1])$, respectively. Moreover, H_n is the extension of

$$h(\xi \otimes P \otimes \alpha \otimes X) = \begin{cases} \frac{-1}{\deg_{S\mathfrak{g}^*} \xi + \deg_{\Lambda\mathfrak{g}^*} \alpha} \mathfrak{i}_s(e_\ell) \xi \otimes P \otimes e^\ell \wedge \alpha \otimes X & \text{if } \deg_{S\mathfrak{g}^*} \xi + \deg_{\Lambda\mathfrak{g}^*} \alpha \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

since $Q_1^1 = [J, \cdot]$, compare Proposition 4.11.

Lemma 4.25 *For $n = 2$ one has*

$$P_2(X_1 \vee X_2) = -p((-1)^{|X_1|} [hX_1, X_2] - [X_1, hX_2]) \quad (4.29)$$

for all homogeneous $X_1, X_2 \in T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[1]$.

PROOF: One has $P_2^2 \circ H_2 = 0$. Furthermore, for $Q_2^1(X_1, Y_1) = -(-1)^{|X_1|} [X_1, X_2]$ with $|X_1|$ denoting the shifted degree in $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[1]$ we have with the formula for H_2 , see [17, p. 383],

$$\begin{aligned} P_2(X_1 \vee X_2) &= -p \circ Q_2^1 \circ H_2(X_1 \vee X_2) \\ &= -\frac{p}{2} (-(-1)^{|X_1|+1} [hX_1, X_2 + ipX_2] + (-1)^{|X_1|+|X_1|+1} [X_1 + ipX_1, hX_2]) \\ &= -p((-1)^{|X_1|} [hX_1, X_2] - [X_1, hX_2]). \end{aligned}$$

The last step is easily seen for homogeneous elements by counting the \mathfrak{g}^* -degrees. In fact, if $X_2 = ipX_2$, then $hX_2 = 0$ and the statement holds. If $ipX_2 = 0$, then $p([hX_1, X_2]) = 0$ since the bracket contains at least one \mathfrak{g}^* -component that is annihilated by p . The same holds for $1 \leftrightarrow 2$. \square

As a next step we want to obtain an L_∞ -morphism between $(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot])$ and $(T_{\text{Cart}}(C), \partial)$. Let us first observe that P_n contains $n - 1$ brackets and $n - 1$ applications of h , increasing the $\Lambda^\bullet \mathfrak{g}^*$ -degrees. This implies that the P_n are non-zero only if all n arguments have no $\Lambda \mathfrak{g}^*$ -contribution and the sum of the $S \mathfrak{g}^*$ -degrees is $n - 1$. As a consequence, all $n - 1$ brackets consist of pairings between $\Lambda \mathfrak{g}^*$ -components coming from h and the $\prod S \mathfrak{g}^*$ -components, whereas the $T_{\text{poly}}(C)$ -components are just wedged together. Moreover, the first term in (4.28) does not contribute since the bracket R_2^1 is here in C -direction and we have

$$P_n = P_n^1 = -P_{n-1}^1 \circ Q_n^{n-1} \circ H_n. \quad (4.30)$$

Therefore, to prove the compatibility of P with the differentials $[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]$ and ∂ we only have to show

$$-\partial P_n^1 = P_n^1 \circ (Q^\pi)_n^n,$$

where $(Q^\pi)_n^n$ is the extension of $-[\pi_{\text{KKS}}, \cdot]$. By the proof of Proposition 4.18 and the above arguments, the only part with a non-trivial contribution is the extension of $-\partial = -\text{id} \otimes \mathfrak{i}_s(e^i) \otimes \text{id} \otimes (e_i)_C \wedge$.

Proposition 4.26 *The map P from (4.30) is an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism from the Taylor series expansion $(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot])$ to $(T_{\text{Cart}}(C), \partial)$ and an L_∞ -quasi-inverse to the inclusion ι from Proposition 4.19. The same holds in the formal setting with the rescaled differentials $[\hbar \pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot]$ and $\hbar \partial$.*

PROOF: By the above reasoning all brackets consist of pairings in \mathfrak{g}^* -direction and the $T_{\text{poly}}(C)$ -components are just wedged together, so ∂ satisfies a Leibniz rule. Let us show the statement inductively. For $n = 1$ it is obvious. In addition, we know $[h, \partial] = 0$ and thus $H_n(Q^\pi)_n^n = -(Q^\pi)_n^n H_n$. If we prove $(Q^\pi)_n^n Q_{n+1}^n = -Q_{n+1}^n (Q^\pi)_{n+1}^{n+1}$ then (4.30) gives inductively

$$-\partial P_{n+1}^1 = \partial P_n^1 Q_{n+1}^n H_{n+1} = -P_n (Q^\pi)_n^n Q_{n+1}^n H_{n+1} = -P_n Q_{n+1}^n H_{n+1} (Q^\pi)_{n+1}^{n+1}.$$

We only have to show the desired $(Q^\pi)_n^n Q_{n+1}^n = -Q_{n-1}^n (Q^\pi)_n^n$ on the image of H_{n+1} on elements with $\Lambda\mathfrak{g}^*$ -degree zero and with sum of $\text{S}\mathfrak{g}^*$ -degrees n , where $n \geq 1$. In particular, elements in this image have $\Lambda\mathfrak{g}^*$ -degree 1 and $\text{S}\mathfrak{g}^*$ -degree $n - 1$. Consider $X_1 \vee \cdots \vee X_{n+1}$ where w.l.o.g. X_1 has a $\Lambda\mathfrak{g}^*$ -contribution, then the bracket has to be with respect to this vector field, the other terms vanish later under p . Using (2.3) we get as only non-vanishing contribution

$$Q_{n+1}^n(X_1 \cdots X_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=2}^{n+1} (-1)^{|X_i|(|X_2| + \cdots + |X_{i-1}|)} Q_2^1(X_1 \vee X_i) \vee X_2 \vee \cdots \vee^i \cdots \vee X_{n+1},$$

where $|X_i|$ denotes the degree in $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[1]$. A straightforward computation shows again

$$-\partial Q_2^1(X_1 \vee X_i) = Q_2^1(\partial X_1 \vee X_i + (-1)^{|X_1|} X_1 \vee \partial X_i)$$

and combining these two expressions the desired result follows by a comparison of the signs of all terms involving ∂X_j . \square

Remark 4.27 Note that here we can not use the usual twisting procedure since we have no complete filtration compatible to P such that π_{KKS} is of degree one. Of course, this is to be expected since the differential on $T_{\text{Cart}}(C)$ is not an inner one.

We can also show that P is compatible with the curvature, which is easier to show in the formal setting.

Proposition 4.28 *The map P from (4.30) is an L_∞ -morphism between the curved DGLAs $(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]], \hbar\lambda, [-J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot])$ and $(T_{\text{Cart}}(C)[[\hbar]], 0, \hbar\partial, [\cdot, \cdot])$.*

PROOF: We can twist P from Proposition 4.26 with $-\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}}$ as in [12, Lemma 2.7]. Then we obtain an L_∞ -morphism $(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]], \hbar\lambda, [-J, \cdot])$ to $(T_{\text{Cart}}(C), 0, \hbar\partial)$. This is clear since the new codifferential on $\text{S}(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]][1])$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q'_0 &= Q_1(-\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}}) + \frac{1}{2}Q_2(-\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}}, -\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}}) \\ &= [-\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}}] = -\hbar\lambda \\ Q'_1(X) &= Q_1(X) + Q_2(-\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}}, X) = [-\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}} + J + \hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}}, X]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\pi_{\text{KKS}} - R$ contains a $\Lambda\mathfrak{g}^*$ -degree the twisting does not change the L_∞ -structure on the Cartan model and the twisted morphism is just given by P . \square

Note that in this case P is no longer a quasi-isomorphism, and that the result also holds in the classical setting:

Corollary 4.29 *The map P from (4.30) is also an L_∞ -morphism between the curved DGLAs $(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), \lambda, [-J, \cdot])$ and $(T_{\text{Cart}}(C), 0, \partial)$.*

PROOF: Since the morphism P is \hbar -linear we can compute explicitly that the Taylor coefficients of P are compatible with the above curved DGLA structures. By the construction of P we know

$$R_2^1 P_n^2 = P_n^1 Q_n^n + P_{n-1}^1 Q_n^{n-1},$$

where R_2^1 is the bracket on the Cartan model and Q_1^1 is the extension of $[J, \cdot]$. Moreover, we have by Proposition 4.28

$$\hbar R_1^1 P_n^1 + R_2^1 P_n^2 = P_{n+1}^1(\hbar Q_0 \vee \cdot) + P_n^1 Q_n^n + P_{n-1}^1 Q_n^{n-1},$$

where $R_1^1 = -\partial$ and $Q_0 = -\lambda$. This gives

$$\hbar R_1^1 P_n^1 = P_{n+1}^1(\hbar Q_0 \vee \cdot) \implies R_1^1 P_n^1 = P_{n+1}^1(Q_0 \vee \cdot)$$

and the statement is shown. \square

Remark 4.30 This can also be directly shown for the classical setting. Indeed, we do not have the complete filtration, but by the explicit forms of P and π_{KKS} all the appearing series in the twisting procedure are still well-defined.

5 The Reduction L_∞ -Morphism and Reduction of Formal Poisson Structures

Let us now merge together all the results we obtained in the previous sections in order to finalize the construction of the reduction scheme. Given a Lie group action $\Phi: G \times M \rightarrow M$ on a general manifold M and an equivariant map $J: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ with value and regular value 0 interpreted as an element $J \in (\mathfrak{g}^* \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M))^G$. In (4.4) we defined the curved differential graded Lie algebra

$$(T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]),$$

and we want to obtain an L_∞ -morphism to $T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})$ with zero differential in order to reduce in particular formal Poisson structures.

5.1 The Reduction L_∞ -morphism

Under the above assumptions that the action is proper in an open neighbourhood of the constraint surface $C := J^{-1}(\{0\})$, we find an open G -invariant neighbourhood $C \subseteq M_{\text{nice}} \cong U_{\text{nice}} \subseteq C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, such that the momentum map on U_{nice} is just the projection on the second factor and such the group acts as the product of the action on C and the coadjoint action. This yields the curved DGLA morphism

$$\cdot|_{U_{\text{nice}}}: (T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\mathfrak{g}}(U_{\text{nice}}), \lambda|_{U_{\text{nice}}}, -[J|_{U_{\text{nice}}}, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot])$$

which is just the restriction to the invariant open subset M_{nice} concatenated with the extension of the G -equivariant diffeomorphism to U_{nice} . Moreover, we know from [2, Lemma 3] that U_{nice} is an open neighbourhood of $C \times \{0\}$ such that $U_{\text{nice}} \cap (\{p\} \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ is star-shaped around $\{p\} \times \{0\}$ for all $p \in C$, hence we also have the Taylor expansion as in Equation (4.6). It is a morphism of curved DGLA's

$$T_{\mathfrak{g}^*}: (T_{\mathfrak{g}}(U_{\text{nice}}), \lambda|_{U_{\text{nice}}}, -[J|_{U_{\text{nice}}}, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]).$$

With Propostion 4.28 and Corollary 4.29, we obtain furthermore a curved L_∞ -morphism

$$P: (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{Cart}}(C), 0, \partial, [\cdot, \cdot])$$

and finally we have the projection $p: (T_{\text{Cart}}(C), 0, \partial, [\cdot, \cdot]) \rightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), 0, 0, [\cdot, \cdot])$ from Equation (4.18) that is a DGLA morphism and hence also a morphism of (curved) L_∞ -algebras.

Theorem 5.1 *The concatenation of all the above morphism results in a curved L_∞ -morphism*

$$T_{\text{red}}: (T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M), \lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}), 0, 0, [\cdot, \cdot]), \quad (5.1)$$

called reduction L_∞ -morphism. Considering the setting of formal power series in \hbar we can extend T_{red} \hbar -linearly and obtain

$$T_{\text{red}}: (T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)[[\hbar]], \hbar\lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]], 0, 0, [\cdot, \cdot]).$$

5.2 Reduction of Formal Poisson Structures

As mentioned above, a formal curved Maurer-Cartan element $\hbar(\pi - J') \in \hbar T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)[[\hbar]]$ is an invariant formal Poisson structure $\hbar\pi$ with formal moment map $J + \hbar J'$. By T_{red} we obtain therefore a formal Maurer-Cartan element

$$\hbar\pi_{\text{red}} = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} T_{\text{red},k}(\hbar(\pi - J')^{\vee k}) \quad (5.2)$$

in $T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]]$ which corresponds to a formal Poisson structure π_{red} on M_{red} .

In order to show that this morphism gives indeed a non-trivial reduction scheme for formal Poisson structures we show at first that we recover the Marsden-Weinstein reduction. This classical setting is included in our formulation by considering special curved formal Maurer-Cartan elements $\hbar\pi \in \hbar T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)[[\hbar]]$, where in fact $\pi \in T_{\text{poly}}^1(M)$ does not depend on \hbar , i.e. is a classic G -invariant Poisson structure with momentum map π .

Proposition 5.2 *The reduction procedure of Marsden-Weinstein coincides with the one via T_{red} from Theorem 5.1 for Maurer-Cartan elements of the form $\hbar\pi \in \hbar T_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)[[\hbar]]$ with $\pi \in T_{\text{poly}}^1(M)$.*

PROOF: By Lemma 4.10 we know that $\hbar\pi$ takes in the Taylor expansion $\hbar\pi$ the form $\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \hbar\pi_C$, where $\pi_C = \prod_i \pi_C^i$ with $\pi_C^i \in S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}^1(C)$. Then the application of $p \circ P$ yields a Maurer-Cartan element $\hbar\pi_{\text{red}}$ in the reduced DGLA $(T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}}[[\hbar]]), 0, [\cdot, \cdot])$ via

$$\hbar\pi_{\text{red}} = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} p \circ P_k(\hbar(\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi_C), \dots, \hbar(\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi_C)) = p(\hbar\pi_C^0),$$

so this series is indeed well-defined. This Maurer-Cartan element corresponds to a classical Poisson structure π_{red} with

$$p^* \pi_{\text{red}}(d\phi, d\psi) = \pi_C^0(dp^* \phi, dp^* \psi) = \iota^*((\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi_C)(d\text{prol}p^* \phi, d\text{prol}p^* \psi))$$

for $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M_{\text{red}})$, where $\text{prol}: \mathcal{C}^\infty(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty(C) \otimes \prod_i S^i \mathfrak{g}$ is the canonical prolongation. But this is just the usual reduced Poisson structure from Marsden-Weinstein reduction. \square

Now we want to show that our construction is indeed a non-trivial extension of the classical Marsden-Weinstein reduction to the formal setting. For simplicity, let us consider for a moment just a part of T_{red} , namely the map

$$\tilde{T}_{\text{red}} = p \circ P: (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]], \hbar\lambda, -[J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]], 0, 0, [\cdot, \cdot]).$$

Lemma 5.3 *The induced map at the level of Maurer-Cartan elements*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{\text{red}}: MC(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]]) &\longrightarrow MC(T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]]) \\ \hbar(\pi - J') &\longmapsto \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} \tilde{T}_{\text{red},k}((\hbar(\pi - J'))^{\vee k}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

is a surjection.

PROOF: Let $\hbar\pi_{\text{red}} \in MC(T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]])$, then we know from Corollary 4.16 that

$$\hbar\Pi = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} \iota_{\infty,k}((\hbar\pi_{\text{red}})^{\vee k})$$

is a well-defined Maurer-Cartan element in $T_{\text{Cart}}(C)[[\hbar]]$ with $p(\hbar\Pi) = \hbar\pi$. Using Proposition 4.18 we see that $\hbar(\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \Pi) \in MC(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]])$ and

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} \tilde{T}_{\text{red},k}((\hbar(\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \Pi))^{\vee k}) = p(\hbar\Pi) = \hbar\pi$$

as desired. \square

5.3 Comparison of the Reduction Procedures

We conclude with a comparison of the different reduction procedures. More explicitly, we want to compare the reduction via T_{red} from Theorem 5.1 with the reduction of formal Poisson structures via the homological perturbation lemma, see Appendix A.

In the setting of curved DGLA's or curved L_∞ -algebras it is more tricky to talk about equivalent Maurer-Cartan elements. Thus we switch to the description of our reduction in terms of flat DGLA's as in Theorem 4.21. Here we need π_{KKS} which is not available in the general setting, so from now on we restrict ourselves to the Taylor expansion $(T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*), [\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot])$.

Consider formal Poisson structure $\pi_{\hbar} = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \hbar^r \pi_r \in \Gamma^\infty(\Lambda^2 TM)[[\hbar]]$ with formal equivariant momentum map $J_{\hbar} = J + \hbar J' : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]]$. By Proposition A.3 one gets an induced formal Poisson bracket on $M_{\text{red}} = J^{-1}(\{0\})/G$ via

$$\pi^* \{u, v\}_{\text{red}} = \iota^* \{[\text{prol}\pi^* u], [\text{prol}\pi^* v]\}_{\hbar},$$

where the deformed restriction map is given by

$$\iota^* = \iota^* (\text{id} + \text{i}_a(\hbar J') h_0)^{-1} = \iota^* \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-\text{i}_a(\hbar J') h_0)^k, \quad (5.4)$$

compare Proposition A.3. We directly see that the reduction procedure works analogously for $\pi_{\hbar} \in T_{\text{Tay}}^1(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]]$.

Theorem 5.4 *The reduction of formal equivariant Poisson structures with formal momentum maps via*

$$\tilde{T}_{\text{red}} = p \circ P : (T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]], [\hbar\pi_{\text{KKS}} - J, \cdot], [\cdot, \cdot]) \longrightarrow (T_{\text{poly}}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]], 0, [\cdot, \cdot])$$

coincides with the reduction of formal Poisson structures via the homological perturbation lemma from Proposition A.3.

PROOF: We show at first that the reduction procedures coincide on Maurer-Cartan elements of the form $\hbar\pi_C$, i.e. where the quantum momentum map is just the classical momentum map. Note that by Corollary 4.23 every formal Maurer-Cartan element $\hbar(\pi' - J')$ is equivalent to such a $\hbar\pi_C$. Writing again $\pi_C^i \in (S^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes T_{\text{poly}}^1(C))[[\hbar]]$, the reduced Poisson structure via \tilde{T}_{red} is easy to describe, namely by

$$\hbar\pi_{\text{red}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \tilde{T}_{\text{red},k}^1(\hbar\pi_C \vee \dots \vee \hbar\pi_C) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\hbar^k}{k!} p \circ P_k(\pi_C, \dots, \pi_C) = p(\hbar\pi_C^0).$$

In the reduction via the homological perturbation lemma one has $\iota^* = \iota^*$ and thus the reduced formal Poisson structures coincide by the same reasons as in the classical setting of Proposition 5.2.

The idea is now to use the explicit equivalence from Proposition 4.24. Let $\hbar(\pi - J')$ be a formal Maurer-Cartan element in $T_{\text{Tay}}(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)[[\hbar]]$ and X_{\hbar}^∞ be the equivalence between the formal Maurer-Cartan elements $(\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi, J + \hbar J')$ and $(\pi_{\text{KKS}} + \pi_C, J)$. The reduction via the homological perturbation lemma maps both Poisson structures to the same formal Poisson structure on M_{red} . This follows from Formula (A.13) for the equivalence between the reduced Poisson structures since X_{\hbar}^∞ differentiates only in direction of \mathfrak{g}^* . We only have to show that \tilde{T}_{red} also maps both to the same one. But X_{\hbar}^∞ induces the following equivalence on the level of the reduced manifold

$$p \circ P^1(X_{\hbar}^\infty \vee \exp(\exp(X_{\hbar}^\infty) \triangleright \hbar(\pi - J'))) = 0,$$

see e.g. [5, Prop. 4.9], whence both reduced structures are again equal. This proves the theorem. \square

A BRST-Like Reduction of Formal Poisson Structures

In this section we want to recall a reduction scheme for formal Poisson structures similarly to the reduction of star products in [14] resp. to the BRST reduction as formulated in [2]. We recall at first the homological perturbation lemma adapted to our setting, see [6, Thm. 2.4] and [23, Chapter 2.4].

A.1 Homological Perturbation Lemma

Definition A.1 (Homotopy equivalence data) A homotopy equivalence data (HE data) consists of two chain complexes (C, d_C) and (D, d_D) over a commutative ring R together with two quasi-isomorphisms

$$p: C \longrightarrow D \quad \text{and} \quad i: D \longrightarrow C \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and a chain homotopy

$$h: D \longrightarrow D \quad \text{with} \quad \text{id}_D - pi = d_D h + h d_D \quad (\text{A.2})$$

between pi and id_D .

For a shorter notation we will denote such a HE data by

$$p: (C, d_C) \rightleftarrows (D, d_D): i, h.$$

Moreover, we say that a graded map $B: D_\bullet \longrightarrow D_{\bullet-1}$ with $(d_D + B)^2 = 0$ is a *perturbation* of the HE data. The perturbation is called *small* if $\text{id}_D + Bh$ is invertible, and the homological perturbation lemma states that in this case the perturbed HE data is again a HE data, see [6, Thm. 2.4] for a proof.

Proposition A.2 (Homological perturbation lemma) Let

$$p: (C, d_C) \rightleftarrows (D, d_D): i, h$$

be a HE data and let B be small perturbation of d_D , then the perturbed data

$$P: (C, \widehat{d}_C) \rightleftarrows (D, \widehat{d}_D): I, H \quad (\text{A.3})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (\text{id}_D + Bh)^{-1} B, & \widehat{d}_D &= d_D + B, & \widehat{d}_C &= d_C + iAp, \\ P &= p - hAp, & I &= i - iAh, & H &= h - hAh \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

is again a HE data.

We will even encounter a simpler situation, namely that the complex C is concentrated in degree 0 and $D_n = 0$ for $n < 0$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longleftarrow & D_0 & \xleftarrow[h_0]{d_{D,1}} & D_1 & \xleftarrow[h_1]{d_{D,2}} & \cdots \\ & & \downarrow i & \uparrow p & & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & C_0 & \longleftarrow & 0 & & \end{array} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

In this case, the perturbed HE data corresponding to a small perturbation B according to (A.4) is given by

$$P = p, \quad I = i - i(\text{id}_D + B_1 h_0)^{-1} B_1 h_0, \quad H = h - h(\text{id}_D + Bh)^{-1} Bh$$

and, using the geometric power series, this can be simplified to

$$P = p, \quad I = i(\text{id}_D + B_1 h_0)^{-1}, \quad H = h(\text{id}_D + Bh)^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Here we denote by $B_1: D_1 \longrightarrow D_0$ the degree one component of B , analogously for h .

A.2 Formal Koszul Complex

We start with the classical Koszul complex $\Lambda^\bullet \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$ that can be interpreted as the smooth functions on M with values in the complexified Grassmann algebra of \mathfrak{g} . The Koszul differential ∂ is given by

$$\partial: \Lambda^q \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda^{q-1} \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M), \quad a \mapsto \mathfrak{i}(J_0)a = J_{0,i} \mathfrak{i}(e^i)a, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where \mathfrak{i} denotes the left insertion and $J_0 = J_{0,i} e^i$ the decomposition of J_0 with respect to a basis e^1, \dots, e^n of \mathfrak{g}^* . The corresponding dual basis will be denoted by e_1, \dots, e_n and $\partial^2 = 0$ follows immediately with the commutativity of the pointwise product in $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$. The differential ∂ is also a derivation with respect to associative and super-commutative product on the Koszul complex, consisting of the \wedge -product on $\Lambda^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$ tensored with the pointwise product on the functions. Moreover, it is invariant with respect to the induced \mathfrak{g} -representation

$$\mathfrak{g} \ni \xi \mapsto \rho(\xi) = \text{ad}(\xi) \otimes \text{id} - \text{id} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} \in \text{End}(\Lambda^\bullet \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

as we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \rho(e_a)(x \otimes f) &= f_{a_j}^k e_k \wedge \mathfrak{i}(e^j) \wedge \mathfrak{i}(e^i)x \otimes J_{0,i}f + f_{a_j}^i \mathfrak{i}(e^j)x \otimes J_{0,i}f + \mathfrak{i}(e^i)x \otimes J_{0,i}\{J_{0,a}, f\}_0 \\ &= \rho(e_a) \partial(x \otimes f) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in \Lambda^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$.

One can show that the Koszul complex is acyclic in positive degree with homology $\mathcal{C}^\infty(C)$ in order zero, and that one has a G -equivariant homotopy

$$h_i: \Lambda^i \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda^{i+1} \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

given on $C \subset M_{\text{nice}} \subset C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ by

$$h_k(x)(c, \mu) = e_i \wedge \int_0^1 t^k \frac{\partial x}{\partial \mu_i}(c, t\mu) dt, \quad \text{with} \quad \partial h_0 = \text{id}_0 - \text{prol}^* \quad \text{and} \quad h_0 \circ \text{prol} = 0,$$

where $x \in \Lambda^k \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(C \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ and $(c, \mu) \in C \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, see [2, Lemma 6] and [14] for the notation M_{nice} . In other words, this means that

$$\text{prol}: (\mathcal{C}^\infty(C), 0) \rightleftharpoons (\Lambda^\bullet \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M), \partial): \iota^*, h$$

is a HE data of the special type of (A.5), i.e. we have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{C}^\infty(M) & \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\partial_1} \\ \xrightarrow{h_0} \end{array} & \Lambda^1 \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M) & \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\partial_2} \\ \xrightarrow{h_1} \end{array} & \dots \\ & & \uparrow \text{prol} & & \downarrow \text{prol} & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{C}^\infty(C) & \longleftarrow & 0 & & \end{array}$$

Let now π_{\hbar} be an invariant formal Poisson structure with formal equivariant momentum map J_{\hbar} . In order to take care of the formal momentum map, we extend the Koszul complex \hbar -linearly and gain the HE data

$$\text{prol}: (\mathcal{C}^\infty(C)[[\hbar]], 0) \rightleftharpoons (\Lambda^\bullet \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]], \partial): \iota^*, h.$$

Since the formal momentum map J_{\hbar} is a deformation of J_0 in the sense that the difference $J_{\hbar} - J_0 = J': \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \hbar \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]]$ starts in order one of \hbar , the formal differential $\partial_{\hbar} = \mathfrak{i}(J_{\hbar}) = \partial + B$ with $B = \mathfrak{i}(J')$ on $\Lambda^\bullet \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]]$ is a small perturbation in the sense of the homological perturbation lemma A.2. Indeed, $\partial_{\hbar}^2 = 0$ follows for the same reasons as $\partial^2 = 0$, and $\text{id} + Bh$ is invertible as formal power series since Bh stars in order one of \hbar . Consequently, the corresponding perturbed HE data

$$\mathbf{prol}: (\mathcal{C}^\infty(C)[[\lambda]], 0) \rightleftharpoons (\Lambda^\bullet \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\lambda]], \partial_{\hbar}): \iota^*, \mathbf{h}$$

is given by

$$\mathbf{prol} = \text{prol}, \quad \boldsymbol{\iota}^* = \boldsymbol{\iota}^*(\text{id} + B_1 h_0)^{-1}, \quad \mathbf{h} = h(\text{id} + Bh)^{-1}, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

compare (A.6). In particular, we have $\boldsymbol{\iota}^* \partial_{\hbar} = 0$,

$$\text{id}_{\Lambda^1 \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]]} - \text{prol} \boldsymbol{\iota}^* = \partial_{\hbar} \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{h} \partial_{\hbar} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

as well as $\boldsymbol{\iota}^* \text{prol} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}^\infty(C=[[\hbar]])}$ because of $h_0 \text{prol} = 0$. Moreover, ∂_{\hbar} is still a \mathfrak{g} -equivariant derivation of the algebra structure. Therefore, also $\boldsymbol{\iota}^*$ and \mathbf{h} are \mathfrak{g} -equivariant as all involved maps are.

We denote the image of the deformed Koszul differential by

$$\mathcal{J}_{\hbar} = \text{im } \partial_{\hbar} \Big|_{\Lambda^1 \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]]} = \langle J_i \rangle_i.$$

Since $\text{prol} \boldsymbol{\iota}^*$ is a projection with kernel \mathcal{J}_{\hbar} , compare (A.11), we get with the injectivity of prol

$$\mathcal{J}_{\hbar} = \ker \boldsymbol{\iota}^* \Big|_{\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]]}.$$

As ∂_{\hbar} is $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]]$ -linear, \mathcal{J}_{\hbar} is an ideal in $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]]$ with respect to the pointwise product. Moreover, \mathcal{J}_{\hbar} is a Poisson subalgebra of $(\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]], \{\cdot, \cdot\}_{\hbar})$ because of

$$\boldsymbol{\iota}^* \{f, g\}_{\hbar} = \boldsymbol{\iota}^*(f^i g^j \{J_i, J_j\}_{\hbar} + f^i J_j \{J_i, g^j\}_{\hbar} + J_i g^j \{f^i, J_j\}_{\hbar} + J_i J_j \{f^i, g^j\}_{\hbar}) = 0$$

for $f = f^i J_i, g = g^j J_j \in \mathcal{J}_{\hbar}$. As usual, one can consider the Poisson normalizer

$$\mathcal{B}_{\hbar} = \{f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)[[\hbar]] \mid \{f, \mathcal{J}_{\hbar}\} \subset \mathcal{J}_{\hbar}\},$$

the biggest Poisson subalgebra containing \mathcal{J}_{\hbar} as Poisson ideal. Then we know that the quotient is a Poisson algebra and we even have the following:

Proposition A.3 *There exists a unique formal Poisson structure π_{red} on M_{red} such that*

$$\mathcal{B}_{\hbar}/\mathcal{J}_{\hbar} \ni [f] \longmapsto \boldsymbol{\iota}^* f \in \pi^* \mathcal{C}^\infty(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]]$$

is an isomorphism of Poisson algebras with inverse $\pi^* u \mapsto [\text{prol} \pi^* u]$.

PROOF: We have for $u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]], j = j^k J_k \in \mathcal{J}_{\hbar}$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\hbar}$

$$\boldsymbol{\iota}^* \{\text{prol} \pi^* u, j\}_{\hbar} = \boldsymbol{\iota}^*(j^k \{\text{prol} \pi^* u, J_k\}_{\hbar} + J_k \{\text{prol} \pi^* u, j^k\}_{\hbar}) = \boldsymbol{\iota}^*(j^k \mathcal{L}_{(e_k)_M} \text{prol} \pi^* u) = 0$$

as well as

$$\mathcal{L}_{(e_i)_C} \boldsymbol{\iota}^* f = \boldsymbol{\iota}^* \mathcal{L}_{(e_i)_M} f = \boldsymbol{\iota}^* \{f, J_i\}_{\hbar} = 0,$$

thus the maps are both well-defined. The fact that the maps are mutually inverse is clear since

$$\boldsymbol{\iota}^* \text{prol} = \text{id} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{id} - \text{prol} \boldsymbol{\iota}^* = \partial_{\hbar} \mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{J}_{\hbar}.$$

The compatibility with the pointwise product follows from the explicit form $\boldsymbol{\iota}^* = \boldsymbol{\iota}^* \circ \sum_k (-B_1 h_0)^k$ and the fact that

$$h_0(f \text{prol} \phi) = \text{prol} \phi \cdot h_0 f,$$

which directly yields

$$\boldsymbol{\iota}^*([fg]) = \boldsymbol{\iota}^*([f \text{prol} \boldsymbol{\iota}^* g]) = \boldsymbol{\iota}^* f \cdot \boldsymbol{\iota}^* g.$$

The compatibility of prol in the setting $M = M_{\text{nice}}$ in the notation of [14] is clear since it is just a pull-back. In addition, we get a unique induced formal Poisson structure on M_{red} via

$$\pi^* \{u, v\}_{\text{red}} = \boldsymbol{\iota}^* \{[\text{prol} \pi^* u], [\text{prol} \pi^* v]\}_{\hbar}.$$

Antisymmetry is clear and also the Jacobi identity follows directly, where we omit the sign for the equivalence classes:

$$\pi^* \{u, \{v, w\}_{\text{red}}\}_{\text{red}} = \boldsymbol{\iota}^* \{\text{prol} \pi^* u, \text{prol} \boldsymbol{\iota}^* \{\text{prol} \pi^* v, \text{prol} \pi^* w\}_{\hbar}\}_{\hbar}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \iota^* (\{ \{ \text{prol}\pi^*u, \text{prol}\pi^*v \}_{\hbar}, \text{prol}\pi^*w \}_{\hbar} + \{ \text{prol}\pi^*v, \{ \text{prol}\pi^*u, \text{prol}\pi^*w \}_{\hbar} \}_{\hbar}) \\
&= \pi^* (\{ \{ u, v \}_{\text{red}}, w \}_{\text{red}} + \{ v, \{ u, w \}_{\text{red}} \}_{\text{red}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Concerning the Leibniz identity we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi^* \{ u, vw \}_{\text{red}} &= \iota^* \{ \text{prol}\pi^*u, \text{prol}(\pi^*v)\text{prol}(\pi^*w) \}_{\hbar} \\
&= \iota^* (\{ \text{prol}\pi^*u, \text{prol}(\pi^*v) \}_{\hbar} \text{prol}(\pi^*w) + \text{prol}(\pi^*v) \{ \text{prol}\pi^*u, \text{prol}(\pi^*w) \}_{\hbar}) \\
&= \pi^* (v \{ u, w \}_{\text{red}} + \{ u, v \}_{\text{red}} w)
\end{aligned}$$

since $\iota^*(f\text{prol}\phi) = \iota^*(f)\phi$. □

Now we want to show that the reduction procedure is compatible with equivalences, i.e. that equivalent formal Poisson structures with formal momentum maps are reduced to equivalent reduced Poisson structures.

Proposition A.4 *Let $T = \exp(X_{\hbar}): (\pi_{\hbar}, J_{\hbar}) \rightarrow (\pi'_{\hbar}, J'_{\hbar})$ be an equivalence of formal invariant Poisson structures with momentum maps, i.e. $X_{\hbar} \in \hbar\Gamma^{\infty}(TM)[[\hbar]]$ such that*

$$T\pi_{\hbar} = \pi'_{\hbar} \quad \text{and} \quad T \circ J_{\hbar} = J'_{\hbar}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Then one has even $X_{\hbar} \in \hbar\Gamma^{\infty}(TM)^G[[\hbar]]$ and

$$T_{\text{red}} = (\pi^*)^{-1} \circ \iota'^* \circ T \circ \text{prol} \circ \pi^* \quad (\text{A.13})$$

is an equivalence between the reduced formal Poisson structures π_{red} and π'_{red} .

PROOF: The proof is analogue to the case of star products in [23, Lemma 4.3.1]. At first, as in [25, Prop. 6.2.20] one can show that $T\pi_{\hbar} = \pi'_{\hbar}$ is equivalent to

$$T\{f, g\}_{\hbar} = \{Tf, Tg\}'_{\hbar}.$$

But then (A.12) implies

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} Tf = \{Tf, J'_{\hbar}(\xi)\}'_{\hbar} = T\{f, J_{\hbar}(\xi)\}_{\hbar} = T\mathcal{L}_{\xi_M} f.$$

In particular, this yields $[\xi_M, X_{\hbar}] = 0$ and thus the invariance of X_{\hbar} . In addition, recall from Proposition A.3 that we have an isomorphism of Poisson algebras

$$(\mathcal{C}^{\infty}(M_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]], \pi_{\text{red}}) \cong \frac{\mathcal{B}_{\hbar}}{\mathcal{J}_{\hbar}}.$$

By [25, Prop. 6.2.7] we know that T is an automorphism with respect to the pointwise product, thus we see directly from the definition of the deformed Koszul differential that

$$T \circ \partial_{\hbar} = \partial'_{\hbar} \circ T \quad \implies \quad T: \mathcal{J}_{\hbar} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{J}'_{\hbar}.$$

Analogously, we have for $j' \in \mathcal{J}'_{\hbar}$ with $j = T^{-1}j' \in \mathcal{J}_{\hbar}$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\hbar}$

$$\{Tf, j'\}'_{\hbar} = T\{f, j\}_{\hbar} \in T\mathcal{J}_{\hbar} = \mathcal{J}'_{\hbar} \quad \implies \quad T: \mathcal{B}_{\hbar} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{B}'_{\hbar}.$$

Thus T_{red} establishes an isomorphism of the spaces $\mathcal{B}_{\hbar}/\mathcal{J}_{\hbar}$ and $\mathcal{B}'_{\hbar}/\mathcal{J}'_{\hbar}$. It remains to check the compatibility with the Poisson bracket:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi^* T_{\text{red}} \{ u, v \}_{\text{red}} &= \iota'^* T \text{prol}^* \{ \text{prol}\pi^*u, \text{prol}\pi^*v \}_{\hbar} \\
&= \iota'^* T \{ \text{prol}\pi^*u, \text{prol}\pi^*v \}_{\hbar}
\end{aligned}$$

since T maps the kernel of ι^* into the kernel of ι'^* . On the other hand, we get

$$\pi^* \{ T_{\text{red}}u, T_{\text{red}}v \}'_{\text{red}} = \iota'^* \{ \text{prol}\iota'^* T \text{prol}\pi^*u, \text{prol}\iota'^* T \text{prol}\pi^*v \}'_{\hbar}$$

$$= \iota^{*'}\{T\text{prol}\pi^*u, T\text{prol}\pi^*v\}'_{\hbar}$$

since we take on the right hand side the bracket in $\mathcal{B}'_{\hbar}/\mathcal{J}'_{\hbar}$ where $[\text{prol}\iota^{*'}f] = [f]$. Thus the compatibility with the brackets is shown. It remains to show that T_{red} is of the form $T_{\text{red}} = \exp(X_{\text{red},\hbar})$ for some vector field $X_{\text{red},\hbar} \in \hbar\Gamma^{\infty}(TM_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]]$. Since $T = \exp(X_{\hbar})$ we know that T_{red} is a formal power series of $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ -linear operators starting with $\text{id} + \hbar(\dots)$. We can write $T_{\text{red}} = \exp(\hbar D)$ via

$$\hbar D = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{s+1}}{s} (T - \text{id})^s.$$

Again by [25, Prop. 6.2.7] it suffices to show $T_{\text{red}}(uv) = T_{\text{red}}(u)T_{\text{red}}(v)$, which directly implies $T_{\text{red}} = \exp(X_{\text{red}})$ for some vector field $X_{\text{red}} \in \hbar\Gamma^{\infty}(TM_{\text{red}})[[\hbar]]$. But this is clear since each of the involved maps in the definition of T_{red} is compatible with the pointwise product: The maps prol, π^* and $(\pi^*)^{-1}$ since they resp. their inverses are pull-backs, the map T since $T = \exp(X_{\hbar})$ and ι^{*} by Proposition A.3. \square

Bibliography

- [1] BAYEN, F., FLATO, M., FRØNSDAL, C., LICHNEROWICZ, A., STERNHEIMER, D.: *Deformation Theory and Quantization*. Ann. Phys. **111** (1978), 61–151. 2
- [2] BORDEMANN, M., HERBIG, H.-C., WALDMANN, S.: *BRST Cohomology and Phase Space Reduction in Deformation Quantization*. Commun. Math. Phys. **210** (2000), 107–144. 2, 4, 9, 22, 24, 26
- [3] CALAQUE, D.: *Formality for Lie algebroids*. Comm. Math. Phys. **257** (2005). 2
- [4] CALAQUE, D., DOLGUSHEV, V. A. V HALBOUT, G.: *Formality theorems for Hochschild cochains in the Lie algebroid setting*. Crelle's J. reine angew. Math. **612** (2007). 2
- [5] CANONACO, A.: *L_{∞} -algebras and quasi-isomorphisms*. In: *Seminari di Geometria Algebrica 1998-1999*, 67–86. Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 1999. 4, 24
- [6] CRAINIC, M.: *On the perturbation lemma, and deformations*. Preprint **arXiv:math/0403266** (2004). 4, 24, 25
- [7] DIPPELL, M., ESPOSITO, C., WALDMANN, S.: *Coisotropic Triples, Reduction and Classical Limit*. Documenta Math. **24** (2019), 1811–1853. 2
- [8] DOLGUSHEV, V.: *A formality theorem for Hochschild chains*. Adv. Math. **200** (2006), 51–101. 5
- [9] DOLGUSHEV, V. A.: *Covariant and equivariant formality theorems*. Adv. Math. **191** (2005), 147–177. 2, 4, 5
- [10] DOLGUSHEV, V. A.: *A Proof of Tsygan's Formality Conjecture for an Arbitrary Smooth Manifold*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, 2005. math.QA/0504420. 2, 4
- [11] ESPOSITO, C., KRAFT, A., WALDMANN, S.: *BRST Reduction of Quantum Algebras with *-Involutions*. Comm. Math. Phys. (to appear). 2
- [12] ESPOSITO, C., DE KLEIJN, N.: *L_{∞} -resolutions and twisting in the curved context*. Preprint **arXiv:1801.08472** (2018), 16 pages. 4, 5, 21
- [13] GUILLEMIN, V. W., STERNBERG, S.: *Supersymmetry and Equivariant de Rham Theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1999. 2, 12, 13
- [14] GUTT, S., WALDMANN, S.: *Involutions and Representations for Reduced Quantum Algebras*. Adv. Math. **224** (2010), 2583–2644. 2, 4, 24, 26, 27
- [15] KONTSEVICH, M.: *Deformation Quantization of Poisson manifolds*. Lett. Math. Phys. **66** (2003), 157–216. 2, 19
- [16] LIAO, H.-Y., STIÉNON, M., XU, P.: *Formality and Kontsevich–Duflo type theorems for Lie pairs*. Adv. Math. **352** (2019), 406–482. 2

- [17] LODAY, J.-L., VALLETTE, B.: *Algebraic Operads*, vol. 346 in *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2012. 6, 20
- [18] MARSDEN, J., WEINSTEIN, A.: *Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry*. Reports on Math. Phys. **5** (1974), 121–130. 2
- [19] MIASKIWSKYI, L.: *Invariant Hochschild cohomology of smooth functions*. Preprint **arXiv:1808.08096** (2018), 16 pages. 10
- [20] MOERDIJK, I., REYES, G.E.: *Models for Smooth Infinitesimal Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York, 1991. 10
- [21] NEUMAIER, N., WALDMANN, S.: *Deformation Quantization of Poisson Structures Associated to Lie Algebroids*. SIGMA **5** (2009), 074. 11
- [22] REICHERT, T.: *Characteristic classes of star products on Marsden-Weinstein reduced symplectic manifolds*. Lett. Math. Phys. **107** (2017), 643–658. 2, 12
- [23] REICHERT, T.: *Classification and Reduction of Equivariant Star Products on Symplectic Manifolds*. PhD thesis, Institute of Mathematics, University of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany, 2017. 2, 13, 24, 28
- [24] REICHERT, T., WALDMANN, S.: *Classification of Equivariant Star Products on Symplectic Manifolds*. Lett. Math. Phys. **106** (2016), 675–692. 2
- [25] WALDMANN, S.: *Poisson-Geometrie und Deformationsquantisierung. Eine Einführung*. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Berlin, New York, 2007. 19, 28, 29
- [26] XU, P.: *Fedosov *-Products and Quantum Momentum Maps*. Commun. Math. Phys. **197** (1998), 167–197. 2