

COMPATIBLE POISSON BRACKETS ASSOCIATED WITH 2-SPLITTINGS AND POISSON COMMUTATIVE SUBALGEBRAS OF $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$

DMITRI I. PANYUSHEV AND OKSANA S. YAKIMOVA

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the symmetric algebra of a reductive Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ equipped with the standard Poisson structure. If $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a Poisson-commutative subalgebra, then $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{C} \leqslant b(\mathfrak{g})$, where $b(\mathfrak{g}) = (\dim \mathfrak{g} + \text{rk } \mathfrak{g})/2$. We present a method for constructing the Poisson-commutative subalgebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r} \rangle}$ of transcendence degree $b(\mathfrak{g})$ via a vector space decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ into a sum of two spherical subalgebras. There are some natural examples, where the algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r} \rangle}$ appears to be polynomial. The most interesting case is related to the pair $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_-)$, where $\mathfrak{b}$ is a Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Here we prove that $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is maximal Poisson-commutative and is complete on every regular coadjoint orbit in $\mathfrak{g}^*$. Other series of examples are related to involutions of $\mathfrak{g}$.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Preliminaries on the coadjoint representation	4
2. Inönü–Wigner contractions and their invariants	6
3. 2-splittings of $\mathfrak{g}$ and Poisson-commutative subalgebras	9
4. The Poisson-commutative subalgebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$	12
5. The maximality of $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$	14
6. The Poisson-commutative subalgebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$	18
7. Poisson-commutative subalgebras related to a 2-splitting of $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$	20
References	22

INTRODUCTION

The ground field $\mathbb{k}$ is algebraically closed and of characteristic 0. A commutative associative $\mathbb{k}$ -algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is a *Poisson algebra* if there is an additional anticommutative bilinear

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B63, 14L30, 17B08, 17B20, 22E46.

Key words and phrases. index of Lie algebra, coadjoint representation, symmetric invariants.

The first author is supported by RFBR grant № 20-01-00515. The second author is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) — project number 330450448.

operation $\{ , \} : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ called a *Poisson bracket* such that

$$\begin{aligned} \{a, bc\} &= \{a, b\}c + b\{a, c\}, & (\text{the Leibniz rule}) \\ \{a, \{b, c\}\} + \{b, \{c, a\}\} + \{c, \{a, b\}\} &= 0 & (\text{the Jacobi identity}) \end{aligned}$$

for all $a, b, c \in \mathcal{A}$. A subalgebra $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{A}$ is *Poisson-commutative* if $\{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}\} = 0$. We also write that $\mathcal{C}$ is a *PC-subalgebra*. The *Poisson centre* of $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{A} = \{z \in \mathcal{A} \mid \{z, a\} = 0 \ \forall a \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Two Poisson brackets on $\mathcal{A}$ are said to be *compatible*, if all their linear combinations are again Poisson brackets. Usually, Poisson algebras occur in nature as algebras of functions on varieties (manifolds), and we only need the case, where such a variety is the dual of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{q}$ and hence $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*] = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ is a polynomial ring in $\dim \mathfrak{q}$ variables.

There is a general method for constructing a “large” Poisson-commutative subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ associated with a pair of compatible brackets, see e.g. [DZ05, Sect. 1]. Let $\{ , \}'$ and $\{ , \}''$ be compatible Poisson brackets on $\mathfrak{q}^*$. This yields a two parameter family of Poisson brackets $a\{ , \}' + b\{ , \}''$, $a, b \in \mathbb{k}$. As we are only interested in the corresponding Poisson centres, it is convenient to organise this, up to scaling, in a 1-parameter family $\{ , \}_t = \{ , \}' + t\{ , \}'', t \in \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{k} \cup \{\infty\}$, where $t = \infty$ corresponds to the bracket $\{ , \}''$. The *index* $\text{ind}\{ , \}$ of a Poisson bracket $\{ , \}$ is defined in Section 1. For almost all $t \in \mathbb{P}$, $\text{ind}\{ , \}_t$ has one and the same (minimal) value. Set $\mathbb{P}_{\text{reg}} = \{t \in \mathbb{P} \mid \text{ind}\{ , \}_t \text{ is minimal}\}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}} = \mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{reg}}$. Let $\mathcal{Z}_t$ denote the Poisson centre of $(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}), \{ , \}_t)$. The crucial fact is that the algebra $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ generated by $\{\mathcal{Z}_t \mid t \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{reg}}\}$ is Poisson-commutative w.r.t. to any bracket in the family. In many cases, this construction provides a PC-subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ of maximal transcendence degree.

A notable realisation of this scheme is the *argument shift method* of [MF78]. It employs the Lie–Poisson bracket on $\mathfrak{q}^*$ and a Poisson bracket $\{ , \}_\gamma$ of degree zero associated with $\gamma \in \mathfrak{q}^*$. Here $\{\xi, \eta\}_\gamma = \gamma([\xi, \eta])$ for $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{q}$. The algebras $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_\gamma$ occurring in this approach are known nowadays as *Mishchenko–Fomenko subalgebras*.

Let G be a connected semisimple Lie group with $\text{Lie}(G) = \mathfrak{g}$. In [PY18], we studied compatible Poisson brackets and PC-subalgebras related to an involution of $\mathfrak{g}$. Our main object now is the 1-parameter family of linear Poisson brackets on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ related to a 2-*splitting* of $\mathfrak{g}$, i.e., a vector space sum $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$, where $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{r}$ are Lie subalgebras. This is also the point of departure for the Adler–Kostant–Symes theorems and subsequent results, see [AMV, Sect. 4.4], [RS94, § 2]. But our further steps are quite different. For $x \in \mathfrak{g}$, let $x_{\mathfrak{r}} \in \mathfrak{r}$ and $x_{\mathfrak{h}} \in \mathfrak{h}$ be the components of x . Here one can contract $\mathfrak{g}$ to either $\mathfrak{h} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}^{\text{ab}}$ or $\mathfrak{r} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}^{\text{ab}}$. Let $\{ , \}_0$ and $\{ , \}_\infty$ be the corresponding Poisson brackets on $\mathfrak{g}^*$. Then

$$\{x, y\}_0 = \begin{cases} [x, y] & \text{if } x, y \in \mathfrak{h}, \\ [x, y]_{\mathfrak{r}} & \text{if } x \in \mathfrak{h}, y \in \mathfrak{r}, \\ 0 & \text{if } x, y \in \mathfrak{r}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \{x, y\}_\infty = \begin{cases} [x, y] & \text{if } x, y \in \mathfrak{r}, \\ [x, y]_{\mathfrak{h}} & \text{if } x \in \mathfrak{h}, y \in \mathfrak{r}, \\ 0 & \text{if } x, y \in \mathfrak{h}. \end{cases}$$

Since $\{ , \} = \{ , \}_0 + \{ , \}_\infty$ is a Poisson bracket, these two brackets are compatible, cf. [PY18, Lemma 1.1]. Consider the 1-parameter family of Poisson brackets

$$\{ , \}_t = \{ , \}_0 + t\{ , \}_\infty,$$

where $t \in \mathbb{P}$. Here $\mathbb{k}^\times \subset \mathbb{P}_{\text{reg}}$. Note that these brackets are different from the bracket

$$(x, y) \mapsto [x_\mathfrak{h}, y_\mathfrak{h}] - [x_\mathfrak{r}, y_\mathfrak{r}]$$

considered in the Adler–Kostant–Symes theory. The algebras $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \mathfrak{h} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}^{\text{ab}}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)} = \mathfrak{r} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}^{\text{ab}}$ are *Inönü–Wigner contractions* of $\mathfrak{g}$, and a lot of information on their symmetric invariants is obtained in [Y14, Y17].

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r} \rangle}$ denote the subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by all centres $\mathcal{Z}_t$ with $t \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{reg}}$. Then $\{\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}\} = 0$ and therefore

$$\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z} \leq \frac{1}{2}(\dim \mathfrak{g} + \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}) = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

This upper bound for $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z}$ is attained if $\text{ind } \{ , \}_0 = \text{ind } \{ , \}_\infty = \text{ind } \{ , \} = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$, i.e., $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_{\text{reg}}$, see Theorem 3.1. A 2-splitting with such property is said to be *non-degenerate*. We show that the 2-splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ is non-degenerate if and only if both subalgebras $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{r}$ are *spherical*, see Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.3 for details. Therefore, we concentrate on 2-splittings involving spherical subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$. This allows us to point out many natural pairs $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r})$ such that $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g})$. Furthermore, in several important cases, $\mathcal{Z}$ is a polynomial algebra.

1) Consider the 2-splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_-$, where $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_-$ are two opposite Borel subalgebras, $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{b}_-$, and $\mathfrak{u}_- = [\mathfrak{b}_-, \mathfrak{b}_-]$. The PC-subalgebra $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ has a nice set of algebraically independent generators. Let $\{H_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}\} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^\mathfrak{g}$ be a set of homogeneous basic invariants and $d_i = \deg H_i$. The splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_-$ leads to a bi-grading in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ and the decomposition $H_i = \sum_{j=0}^{d_i} (H_i)_{(j, d_i-j)}$. Then $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is freely generated by the bi-homogeneous components $(H_i)_{(j, d_i-j)}$ with $1 \leq i \leq \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_j - 1$ and a basis for the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t}$, see Theorem 4.3.

It is easily seen that if $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a PC-subalgebra and $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{C} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g})$, then $\mathcal{C}$ is complete on generic regular G -orbits, cf. Lemma 1.1. Using properties of the principal nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{g} \simeq \mathfrak{g}^*$, we are able to prove that $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is *complete* on **each** regular coadjoint orbit of G (Theorem 4.4) and that it is a *maximal* PC-subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ (Theorem 5.5). One can also consider a more general setting, where $\mathfrak{b}$ is replaced with an arbitrary parabolic $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{b}$, see Remark 4.5.

2) Let σ be an involution of maximal rank of $\mathfrak{g}$, i.e., the (-1) -eigenspace of σ , $\mathfrak{g}_1$, contains a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. If $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is the corresponding fixed-point subalgebra, then there is a Borel $\mathfrak{b}$ such that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0$. This 2-splitting is non-degenerate and we show that $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ is a polynomial algebra, see Theorem 6.1. At least for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_n$, this PC-subalgebra is also

maximal (Example 6.2). It is likely that the maximality takes place for all simple $\mathfrak{g}$.

More generally, a non-degenerate 2-splitting is associated with any involution σ such that $\mathfrak{g}_1 \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}} \neq \emptyset$, see Remark 6.3.

3) Consider a semisimple Lie algebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ and involution τ that permutes the summands. Here $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \cap \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\text{reg}} \neq \emptyset$ and this yields a natural non-degenerate 2-splitting $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} = \Delta_{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \mathfrak{h}$, which represents the famous Manin triple. The corresponding PC-subalgebra $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g})$ appears to be polynomial. This has a well-known counterpart over $\mathbb{R}$ that involves a compact real form $\mathfrak{k}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. Namely, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is considered as a real Lie algebra, then it has the *Iwasawa decomposition* $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ [Lie3, Ch. 5, §4], where $\mathfrak{r} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ is a solvable real Lie algebra. We prove that the $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{r} \rangle}$ is also polynomial, see Section 7.

We refer to [DZ05] for generalities on Poisson varieties, Poisson tensors, symplectic leaves, etc. Our general reference for algebraic groups and Lie algebras is [Lie3].

1. PRELIMINARIES ON THE COADJOINT REPRESENTATION

Let Q be a connected linear algebraic group with $\text{Lie}(Q) = \mathfrak{q}$. Then $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ is the symmetric algebra of $\mathfrak{q}$ over $\mathbb{k}$. It is identified with the graded algebra of polynomial functions on $\mathfrak{q}^*$, and we also write $\mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*]$ for it.

Write $\mathfrak{q}^\xi$ for the *stabiliser* in $\mathfrak{q}$ of $\xi \in \mathfrak{q}^*$. The *index* of $\mathfrak{q}$, $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q}$, is the minimal codimension of Q -orbits in $\mathfrak{q}^*$. Equivalently, $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = \min_{\xi \in \mathfrak{q}^*} \dim \mathfrak{q}^\xi$. Let $\mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{q}^*)^Q$ be the field of Q -invariant rational functions and $\mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*]^Q$ the algebra of Q -invariant polynomial functions on $\mathfrak{q}^*$. By the Rosenlicht theorem, one has $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = \text{tr.deg } \mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{q}^*)^Q$. Therefore $\text{tr.deg } \mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*]^Q \leq \text{ind } \mathfrak{q}$. The “magic number” associated with $\mathfrak{q}$ is $\mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{q}) = (\dim \mathfrak{q} + \text{ind } \mathfrak{q})/2$. Since the coadjoint orbits are even-dimensional, the magic number is an integer. If $\mathfrak{q}$ is reductive, then $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = \text{rk } \mathfrak{q}$ and $\mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{q})$ equals the dimension of a Borel subalgebra. The Lie–Poisson bracket on $\mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*]$ is defined on the elements of degree 1 (i.e., on $\mathfrak{q}$) by $\{x, y\} := [x, y]$. The *Poisson centre* of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ is

$$\mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{q}) = \{H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}) \mid \{H, x\} = 0 \ \forall x \in \mathfrak{q}\} = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}.$$

As Q is connected, we have $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}} = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^Q = \mathbb{k}[\mathfrak{q}^*]^Q$. The set of Q -regular elements of $\mathfrak{q}^*$ is

$$(1.1) \quad \mathfrak{q}_{\text{reg}}^* = \{\eta \in \mathfrak{q}^* \mid \dim \mathfrak{q}^\eta = \text{ind } \mathfrak{q}\}.$$

The Q -orbits in $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{reg}}^*$ are also called *regular*. Set $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{sing}}^* = \mathfrak{q}^* \setminus \mathfrak{q}_{\text{reg}}^*$. We say that $\mathfrak{q}$ has the *codim- n* property if $\text{codim } \mathfrak{q}_{\text{sing}}^* \geq n$. By [K63], the semisimple algebras $\mathfrak{g}$ have the *codim-3* property.

Let Ω^i be the $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ -module of differential i -forms on $\mathfrak{q}^*$. Then $\Omega = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n \Omega^i$ is the $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ -algebra of regular differential forms on $\mathfrak{q}^*$. Likewise, $\mathcal{W} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n \mathcal{W}^i$ is the graded skew-symmetric algebra of polyvector fields, which is generated by the $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ -module $\mathcal{W}^1$ of polynomial vector fields on $\mathfrak{q}^*$. Both algebras are free $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ -modules. The *Poisson tensor*

(bivector) $\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})}(\Omega^2, \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}))$ associated with a Poisson bracket $\{ , \}$ on $\mathfrak{q}^*$ is defined by the equality $\pi(df \wedge dg) = \{f, g\}$ for $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$. For any $\xi \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, $\pi(\xi)$ defines a skew-symmetric bilinear form on $T_\xi^*(\mathfrak{q}^*) \simeq \mathfrak{q}$. Formally, if $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$, $v = d_\xi f$, and $u = d_\xi g$, then $\pi(\xi)(v, u) = \pi(df \wedge dg)(\xi) = \{f, g\}(\xi)$. In view of the duality between differential 1-forms and vector fields, we may regard π as an element of $\mathcal{W}^2$. Let $[[,]]: \mathcal{W}^i \times \mathcal{W}^j \rightarrow \mathcal{W}^{i+j-1}$ be the Schouten bracket. The Jacobi identity for π is equivalent to that $[[\pi, \pi]] = 0$, see e.g. [DZ05, Chapter 1.8].

Definition 1. The *index* of a Poisson bracket $\{ , \}$ on $\mathfrak{q}^*$, denoted $\text{ind} \{ , \}$, is the minimal codimension of the symplectic leaves in $\mathfrak{q}^*$.

It is easily seen that if π is the corresponding Poisson tensor, then

$$\text{ind} \{ , \} = \min_{\xi \in \mathfrak{q}^*} \dim \ker \pi(\xi) = n - \max_{\xi \in \mathfrak{q}^*} \text{rk } \pi(\xi).$$

Recall that for a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{q}$ and the dual space $\mathfrak{q}^*$ equipped with the Lie–Poisson bracket $\{ , \}$, the symplectic leaves are the coadjoint Q -orbits. Hence $\text{ind} \{ , \} = \text{ind } \mathfrak{q}$.

1.1. Complete integrability on coadjoint orbits. For $\xi \in \mathfrak{q}^*$, let $Q \cdot \xi$ denote its coadjoint Q -orbit. If $\psi_\xi: T_\xi^* \mathfrak{q}^* \rightarrow T_\xi^*(Q \cdot \xi)$ is the canonical projection, then $\ker \psi_\xi = \mathfrak{q}^\xi$. Let π be the Poisson tensor of the Lie–Poisson bracket on $\mathfrak{q}^*$. Then $\pi(\xi)(x, y) = \xi([x, y])$ for $x, y \in \mathfrak{q}$. The skew-symmetric form $\pi(\xi)$ is non-degenerate on $T_\xi^*(Q \cdot \xi)$. The algebra $\mathbb{k}[Q \cdot \xi]$ carries the Poisson structure, which is inherited from $\mathfrak{q}^*$. We have

$$\{F_1|_{Q \cdot \xi}, F_2|_{Q \cdot \xi}\} = \{F_1, F_2\}|_{Q \cdot \xi}$$

for all $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$. The coadjoint orbit $Q \cdot \xi$ is a smooth symplectic variety.

Definition 2. A set $\mathbf{F} = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\} \subset \mathbb{k}[Q \cdot \xi]$ is said to be a *complete family in involution* if $F_1, \dots, F_m$ are algebraically independent, $\{F_i, F_j\} = 0$ for all i, j , and $m = \frac{1}{2} \dim(Q \cdot \xi)$. In the terminology of [AMV, Def. 4.13], here $(Q \cdot \gamma, \{ , \}, \mathbf{F})$ is a *completely integrable system*.

The interest in integrable systems arose from the theory of differential equations and in particular equations of motions, see e.g. [AMV, Chapter 4]. By now this theory has penetrated nearly all of mathematics and has had a definite impact on such remote fields as combinatorics and number theory. A rich interplay between Lie theory and complete integrability is well-documented, see [RS94, AMV, P90]. Applications of PC-subalgebras of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ are one of the striking examples of this interplay.

Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ be a Poisson-commutative subalgebra. Then the restriction of $\mathcal{A}$ to $Q \cdot \xi$, denoted $\mathcal{A}|_{Q \cdot \xi}$, is Poisson-commutative for every ξ . We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *complete on* $Q \cdot \xi$, if $\mathcal{A}|_{Q \cdot \xi}$ contains a complete family in involution. The condition is equivalent to the equality $\text{tr.deg } (\mathcal{A}|_{Q \cdot \xi}) = \frac{1}{2} \dim(Q \cdot \xi)$.

Lemma 1.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$ is Poisson-commutative, $\xi \in \mathfrak{q}_{\text{reg}}^*$, and $\dim d_\xi \mathcal{A} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{q})$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is complete on $Q \cdot \xi$.*

Proof. Since ξ is regular, we have $\dim \ker \psi_\xi = \text{ind } \mathfrak{q}$. Therefore

$$\dim \psi_\xi(d_\xi \mathcal{A}) \geq \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{q}) - \text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = \frac{1}{2} \dim(Q \cdot \xi)$$

as required. $\square$

2. INÖNÜ–WIGNER CONTRACTIONS AND THEIR INVARIANTS

Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{q}$. Choose a complementary subspace V to $\mathfrak{h}$ in $\mathfrak{q}$, so that $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus V$ is a vector space decomposition. For any $s \in \mathbb{k}^\times$, define the invertible linear map $\varphi_s: \mathfrak{q} \rightarrow \mathfrak{q}$ by setting $\varphi_s|_{\mathfrak{h}} = \text{id}$, $\varphi_s|_V = s \cdot \text{id}$. Then $\varphi_s \varphi_{s'} = \varphi_{ss'}$ and $\varphi_s^{-1} = \varphi_{s^{-1}}$, i.e., this yields a one-parameter subgroup of $\text{GL}(\mathfrak{q})$. The map φ_s defines a new (isomorphic to the initial) Lie algebra structure $[\cdot, \cdot]_{(s)}$ on the same vector space $\mathfrak{q}$ by the formula

$$(2.1) \quad [x, y]_{(s)} = \varphi_s^{-1}([\varphi_s(x), \varphi_s(y)]).$$

The corresponding Poisson bracket is $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{(s)}$. We naturally extend φ_s to an automorphism of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$. Then the centre of the Poisson algebra $(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}), \{\cdot, \cdot\}_s)$ equals $\varphi_s^{-1}(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}})$.

The condition $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}] \subset \mathfrak{h}$ implies that there is a limit of the brackets $[\cdot, \cdot]_{(s)}$ as s tends to zero. The limit bracket is denoted by $[\cdot, \cdot]_{(0)}$ and the corresponding Lie algebra $\mathfrak{q}_{(0)}$ is the semi-direct product $\mathfrak{h} \ltimes V^{\text{ab}}$, where $V^{\text{ab}} \simeq \mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{h}$ as an $\mathfrak{h}$ -module and $[V^{\text{ab}}, V^{\text{ab}}]_{(0)} = 0$. More precisely, if $x = h + v \in \mathfrak{q}_{(0)}$ with $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ and $v \in V$, then

$$[h + v, h' + v']_{(0)} = [h, h'] + [h, v']_V - [h', v]_V,$$

where z_V denotes the V -component of $z \in \mathfrak{q}_{(0)}$. The limit algebra $\mathfrak{q}_{(0)}$ is called an *Inönü–Wigner* (=IW) or *one-parameter contraction* of $\mathfrak{q}$, see [Lie3, Ch. 7, §2.5] or [PY12, Sect. 1]. Below, we will repeatedly use the following

Independence principle. *The IW-contraction $\mathfrak{q}_{(0)}$ does not depend on the initial choice of a complementary subspace V .*

Therefore, when there is no preferred choice of V , we write $\mathfrak{q}_{(0)} = \mathfrak{h} \ltimes (\mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{h})^{\text{ab}}$. By a general property of Lie algebra contractions, we have $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q}_{(0)} \geq \text{ind } \mathfrak{q}$. We need conditions on $\mathfrak{q}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ under which the index of the IW-contraction does not increase. For this reason, we switch below to the case in which $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{g}$ is reductive and hence G is a connected reductive algebraic group.

For any irreducible algebraic G -variety X , there is the notion of the *complexity* of X , denoted $c_G(X)$, see [V86]. Namely, $c_G(X) = \dim X - \max_{x \in X} \dim B \cdot x$, where $B \subset G$ is a Borel subgroup. Then X is said to be *spherical*, if $c_G(X) = 0$, i.e., if B has a dense orbit in X . In particular, for any subgroup $H \subset G$, one can consider the complexity of

the homogeneous space $X = G/H$. Then H (or $\mathfrak{h} = \text{Lie}(H)$) is said to be *spherical* if $c_G(G/H) = 0$.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that G is reductive and the homogeneous space G/H is quasi-affine. Then $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^{\text{ab}}) = \text{ind} \mathfrak{g} + 2c_G(G/H) = \text{rk} \mathfrak{g} + 2c_G(G/H)$. In particular, $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^{\text{ab}}) = \text{ind} \mathfrak{g}$ if and only if $\mathfrak{h}$ is a spherical subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. For the affine homogeneous spaces, a proof is given in [P07, Prop. 9.3]. Here we demonstrate that that proof actually applies in the general quasi-affine setting.

Let $\mathfrak{h}^\perp$ be the annihilator of $\mathfrak{h}$ in the dual space $\mathfrak{g}^*$. It is an H -submodule of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ that is called the *coisotropy representation* of H . Here $\mathfrak{h}^\perp$ and $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h}$ are dual $\mathfrak{h}$ -modules. (If Φ is a G -invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$, then one can identify $\mathfrak{g}^*$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ using Φ , and consider $\mathfrak{h}^\perp$ as a subspace of $\mathfrak{g}$.)

Let $\mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{h}^\perp)^H$ denote the subfield of H -invariants in $\mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{h}^\perp)$. The Raïs formula for the index of semi-direct products [R78] asserts that $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^{\text{ab}}) = \text{tr.deg} \mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{h}^\perp)^H + \text{ind} \mathfrak{s}$, where $\mathfrak{s}$ is the $\mathfrak{h}$ -stabiliser of a generic point in $\mathfrak{h}^\perp$. (Here we use the fact that $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{h}^\perp$ are dual H -modules.) Since G/H is quasi-affine, $\mathfrak{s}$ is reductive [P99, Theorem 2.2.6]. Hence $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^{\text{ab}}) = \text{tr.deg} \mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{h}^\perp)^H + \text{rk} \mathfrak{s}$. Moreover, there is a formula for $c_G(G/H)$ in terms of the action $(H : \mathfrak{h}^\perp)$. Namely, $2c_G(G/H) = \text{tr.deg} \mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{h}^\perp)^H - \text{rk} \mathfrak{g} + \text{rk} \mathfrak{s}$ [P99, Cor. 2.2.9]. Whence the conclusion. $\square$

Remark 2.2. If $P \subset G$ is a parabolic subgroup, then G/P is **not** quasi-affine. However, it is proved in [PY13, Theorem 4.1] that $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{p} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p})^{\text{ab}}) = \text{rk} \mathfrak{g}$. For a Borel subgroup B , this appeared already in [PY12, Cor. 3.5]. The reason is that the Raïs formula readily implies that $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{p} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p})^{\text{ab}}) = \text{ind} \mathfrak{g}^e$, where $e \in \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$ is a Richardson element and $\mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$ is the nilradical of $\mathfrak{p}$. The famous *Elashvili conjecture* asserts that $\text{ind} \mathfrak{g}^e = \text{rk} \mathfrak{g}$ for any $e \in \mathfrak{g}$. For the Richardson elements, a conceptual proof of the Elashvili conjecture is given in [CM10].

Remark 2.3. In an earlier version of this article, we conjectured that $\text{ind}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^{\text{ab}}) = \text{ind} \mathfrak{g}$ for *any* spherical subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$. Having heard from us about this problem, D. Timashev informed us that combining some results of Knop [Kn90], the Elashvili conjecture, and the scheme of proof of Theorem 2.1, one can extend Theorem 2.1 to **arbitrary** homogeneous spaces G/H . This general argument is outlined below. We are grateful to Timashev for providing necessary details.

Let $T^*(G/H) = G \times^H \mathfrak{h}^\perp$ be the cotangent bundle of G/H . The generic stabiliser for the H -action on $\mathfrak{h}^\perp$ is isomorphic to a generic stabiliser for the G -action on $T^*(G/H)$. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be such a stabiliser. (If G/H is quasi-affine, then $\mathfrak{s}$ is reductive. But this is not so in general.) A general description of $\mathfrak{s}$, see [Kn90, Sect. 8], can be stated as follows. Fix a maximal torus $T \subset B$ and set $\mathfrak{t} = \text{Lie}(T)$. For a generic B -orbit $\mathcal{O}$ in G/H , consider the parabolic

subgroup $P = \{g \in G \mid g(\mathcal{O}) \subset \mathcal{O}\} \supset B$. Let $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(T)$ be the lattice of weights of all B -semi-invariants in the field $\mathbb{k}(G/H)$ and $\mathfrak{t}_0$ the Lie algebra of $\text{Ker } \Gamma \subset T$. The rank of Γ is called the *rank* of G/H , denoted $r_G(G/H)$. Set $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{t}_0^\perp$, the orthogonal complement w.r.t. $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{t}}$ and consider the Levi subgroup $M = Z_G(\mathfrak{a}) \subset G$. The weights in Γ can be regarded as characters of M and we consider the identity component of their common kernel as a subgroup of M , denoted M_0 . Clearly, M_0 is reductive. Write $\mathfrak{m}_0 \subset \mathfrak{m}$ for their Lie algebras.

Let P_- be the opposite to P parabolic subgroup and $\mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}}$ the nilradical of $\mathfrak{p}_- = \text{Lie}(P_-)$. Then $M_0 \cap P_-$ is a parabolic subgroup of M_0 and Knop's description boils down to the assertion that $\mathfrak{s}$ is the generic stabiliser for the linear action of $M_0 \cap P_-$ on $\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}} = \mathfrak{m}_0 \cap \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}}$. It is noticed by Timashev that $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{m}_0$ is actually the stabiliser in $\mathfrak{m}_0$ of a Richardson element in $\mathfrak{m}_0 \cap \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}} = (\mathfrak{m}_0 \cap \mathfrak{p}_-)^{\text{nil}}$. Hence $\text{ind } \mathfrak{s} = \text{rk } M_0$ by the Elashvili conjecture. By the Raïs formula, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \text{ind}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^{\text{ab}}) = \text{tr.deg } \mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{h}^\perp)^H + \text{ind } \mathfrak{s}.$$

The general theory developed in [Kn90, P90] implies that $\text{tr.deg } \mathbb{k}(\mathfrak{h}^\perp)^H = 2c_G(G/H) + r_G(G/H)$. The last ingredient is that, by the very construction of M_0 , one has $\text{rk } M_0 = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g} - r_G(G/H)$. Gathering the above formulae, we obtain $2c_G(G/H) + \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$ in the right-hand side of (2.2).

Associated with the vector space sum $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus V$, one has the bi-homogeneous decomposition of any homogeneous $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$:

$$H = \sum_{i=0}^d H_{i,d-i},$$

where $d = \deg H$ and $H_{i,d-i} \in \mathcal{S}^i(\mathfrak{h}) \otimes \mathcal{S}^{d-i}(V) \subset \mathcal{S}^d(\mathfrak{g})$. Then $(i, d-i)$ is the *bi-degree* of $H_{i,d-i}$. Let $H^\bullet$ denote the nonzero bi-homogeneous component of H with maximal V -degree. Then $\deg_V H = \deg_V H^\bullet$. Similarly, $H_\bullet$ stands for the nonzero bi-homogeneous component of H with maximal $\mathfrak{h}$ -degree, i.e., minimal V -degree.

It is known that if $H \in \mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{g})$, then $H^\bullet \in \mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes V^{\text{ab}})$ [P07', Prop. 3.1]. However, it is not always the case that $\mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes V^{\text{ab}})$ is generated by the functions of the form $H^\bullet$ with $H \in \mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{g})$. Let $\{H_1, \dots, H_l\}$, $l = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$, be a set of homogeneous algebraically independent generators of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $d_i = \deg H_i$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^l d_i = b(\mathfrak{g})$.

Definition 3. We say that $H_1, \dots, H_l$ is an $\mathfrak{h}$ -good generating system in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ ($= \mathfrak{h}$ -g.g.s. for short) if $H_1^\bullet, \dots, H_l^\bullet$ are algebraically independent.

The importance of g.g.s. is readily seen in the following fundamental results.

Theorem 2.4 ([Y14, Theorem 3.8]). *Let $H_1, \dots, H_l$ be an arbitrary set of homogeneous algebraically independent generators of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus V$. Then*

$$(i) \quad \sum_{j=1}^l \deg_V H_j \geq \dim V;$$

(ii) $H_1, \dots, H_l$ is an $\mathfrak{h}$ -g.g.s. if and only if $\sum_{j=1}^l \deg_V H_j = \dim V$.

Furthermore, if the contraction $\mathfrak{g} \rightsquigarrow \mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \mathfrak{h} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^{\text{ab}}$ has some extra properties, then the existence of an $\mathfrak{h}$ -g.g.s. provides the generators of $\mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{g}_{(0)})$. More precisely, Theorem 3.8(iii) in [Y14] yields the following:

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \mathfrak{h} \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^{\text{ab}}$ has the codim-2 property and $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}$. If there is an $\mathfrak{h}$ -g.g.s. $H_1, \dots, H_l$ in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$, then $H_1^\bullet, \dots, H_l^\bullet$ freely generate $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}_{(0)})^{\mathfrak{g}_{(0)}}$. In particular, $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}_{(0)})^{\mathfrak{g}_{(0)}}$ is a polynomial ring.*

3. 2-SPLITTINGS OF $\mathfrak{g}$ AND POISSON-COMMUTATIVE SUBALGEBRAS

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a semisimple Lie algebra. The sum $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ is called a *2-splitting* of $\mathfrak{g}$, if both summands are Lie subalgebras. Then $\mathfrak{g}^*$ acquires the decomposition $\mathfrak{g}^* = \mathfrak{h}^* \oplus \mathfrak{r}^*$, where $\mathfrak{r}^* = \text{Ann}(\mathfrak{h}) = \mathfrak{h}^\perp$, $\mathfrak{h}^* = \text{Ann}(\mathfrak{r}) = \mathfrak{r}^\perp$. Given a 2-splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$, one can consider two IW-contractions. Here either subalgebra is the preferred complement to the other, so we write $\mathfrak{h} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}^{\text{ab}}$ and $\mathfrak{r} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}^{\text{ab}}$ for these contractions. The important feature of this situation is that the corresponding Poisson-brackets are compatible and their non-trivial linear combinations define Lie algebras isomorphic to $\mathfrak{g}$.

If $x = x_{\mathfrak{h}} + x_{\mathfrak{r}} \in \mathfrak{g}$, then the Lie-Poisson bracket on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is decomposed as follows

$$\{x, y\} = \underbrace{[x_{\mathfrak{h}}, y_{\mathfrak{h}}] + [x_{\mathfrak{h}}, y_{\mathfrak{r}}]_{\mathfrak{r}} + [x_{\mathfrak{r}}, y_{\mathfrak{h}}]_{\mathfrak{r}}}_{\{x, y\}_0} + \underbrace{[x_{\mathfrak{h}}, y_{\mathfrak{r}}]_{\mathfrak{h}} + [x_{\mathfrak{r}}, y_{\mathfrak{h}}]_{\mathfrak{h}} + [x_{\mathfrak{r}}, y_{\mathfrak{r}}]}_{\{x, y\}_\infty}.$$

Here the bracket $\{ , \}_0$ (resp. $\{ , \}_\infty$) corresponds to $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \mathfrak{h} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}^{\text{ab}}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)} = \mathfrak{r} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}^{\text{ab}}$). Using this decomposition, we introduce a 1-parameter family of Poisson brackets on $\mathfrak{g}^*$:

$$\{ , \}_t = \{ , \}_0 + t \{ , \}_\infty,$$

where $t \in \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{K} \cup \{\infty\}$ and we agree that $\{ , \}_\infty$ is the Poisson bracket corresponding to $t = \infty$. It is easily seen that $\{ , \}_t$ with $t \in \mathbb{K}^\times$ is given by the map φ_t , see Eq. (2.1). By [PY18, Lemma 1.2], all these brackets are compatible. Write $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}$ for the Lie algebra corresponding to $\{ , \}_t$. Of course, we merely write $\mathfrak{g}$ in place of $\mathfrak{g}_{(1)}$. All Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}$ have the same underlying vector space $\mathfrak{g}$.

Convention 1. We often identify $\mathfrak{g}$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*$ via the Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}$. We also think of $\mathfrak{g}^*$ as the dual of any algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}$ and usually omit the subscript ‘(t)’ in $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}^*$. However, if $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, then the stabiliser of ξ in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}$ (i.e., with respect to the coadjoint representation of $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}$) is denoted by $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}^\xi$.

Let π_t be the Poisson tensor for $\{ , \}_t$ and $\pi_t(\xi)$ the skew-symmetric bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g} \simeq T_\xi^*(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ corresponding to $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, cf. Section 1. A down-to-earth description is that $\pi_t(\xi)(x_1, x_2) = \{x_1, x_2\}_{(t)}(\xi)$. Set $\text{rk } \pi_t = \max_{\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*} \text{rk } \pi_t(\xi)$.

If $t \neq 0, \infty$, then $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)} \simeq \mathfrak{g}$ and hence $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_{(t)} = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g} = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$.

For each Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}$, there is the related singular set $\mathfrak{g}_{(t),\text{sing}}^* = \mathfrak{g}^* \setminus \mathfrak{g}_{(t),\text{reg}}^*$, cf. Eq. (1.1). Then, clearly,

$$\mathfrak{g}_{(t),\text{sing}}^* = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^* \mid \text{rk } \pi_t(\xi) < \text{rk } \pi_t\},$$

which is the union of the symplectic $\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}$ -leaves in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ having a non-maximal dimension. For aesthetic reasons, we write $\mathfrak{g}_{\infty,\text{sing}}^*$ instead of $\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty),\text{sing}}^*$.

Let $\mathcal{Z}_t$ denote the centre of the Poisson algebra $(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}), \{ , \}_t)$. Formally, $\mathcal{Z}_t = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}_{(t)})^{\mathfrak{g}_{(t)}}$. Then $\mathcal{Z}_1 = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$. For $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, let $d_\xi F \in \mathfrak{g}$ denote the differential of $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ at ξ . It is a standard fact that, for any $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$, $d_\xi H$ belongs to $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}^\xi)$, where $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}^\xi)$ is the centre of $\mathfrak{g}^\xi$.

Let $\{H_1, \dots, H_l\}$ be a set of homogeneous algebraically independent generators of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$. By the *Kostant regularity criterion* for $\mathfrak{g}$, $d_\xi H_1, \dots, d_\xi H_l$ are linearly independent if and only if $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$, see [K63, Theorem 9]. Therefore

$$(3.1) \quad \langle d_\xi H_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq l \rangle_{\mathbb{K}} = \mathfrak{g}^\xi \text{ if and only if } \xi \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*.$$

(Recall that $\mathfrak{g}^\xi = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}^\xi)$ if and only if $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$ [P03, Theorem 3.3].) For $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, set $d_\xi \mathcal{Z}_t = \langle d_\xi F \mid F \in \mathcal{Z}_t \rangle_{\mathbb{K}}$. Then $d_\xi \mathcal{Z}_t \subset \ker \pi_t(\xi)$ for each t . The regularity criterion obviously holds for any $t \neq 0, \infty$. That is,

$$(3.2) \quad \text{for } t \neq 0, \infty, \text{ one has } \xi \in \mathfrak{g}_{(t),\text{reg}}^* \Leftrightarrow d_\xi \mathcal{Z}_t = \ker \pi_t(\xi) \Leftrightarrow \dim \ker \pi_t(\xi) = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}.$$

Remark. The same property holds for $t = 0$ in some particular cases considered in [Y14, Sections 4 & 5], which also occur below. For instance, if $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r})$ is either $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_-)$, see Section 4, or $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0)$, see Section 6 for details.

3.1. The non-degenerate case. Let us say that a 2-splitting is *non-degenerate*, if $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)} = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$ and thereby $\mathbb{P}_{\text{reg}} = \mathbb{P}$. This is equivalent to that both subalgebras $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{r}$ are spherical, see Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.3.

Clearly, $\{\mathcal{Z}_t, \mathcal{Z}_{t'}\}_t = 0 = \{\mathcal{Z}_t, \mathcal{Z}_{t'}\}_{t'}$ for all $t, t' \in \mathbb{P}$. If $t \neq t'$, then each bracket $\{ , \}_s$ is a linear combination of $\{ , \}_t$ and $\{ , \}_{t'}$. Hence $\{\mathcal{Z}_t, \mathcal{Z}_{t'}\}_s = 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{P}$. By continuity, this ensures that $\ker \pi_{t'}(\xi) = \lim_{t \rightarrow t'} d_\xi \mathcal{Z}_t$ for each $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_{(t'),\text{reg}}^*$, cf. [PY18, Appendix]. Using this one shows that the centres $\mathcal{Z}_t$ ($t \in \mathbb{P}$) generate a PC-subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ with respect to any bracket $\{ , \}_t$, $t \in \mathbb{P}$. Write $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r})} := \text{alg} \langle \mathcal{Z}_t \rangle_{t \in \mathbb{P}}$ for this subalgebra. For each $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, the space $d_\xi \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r})}$ is the linear span of $d_\xi \mathcal{Z}_t$ with $t \in \mathbb{P}$. In [B91], Bolsinov outlined a method for estimating the dimension of such subspaces. A rigorous presentation is contained in Appendices [PY08, PY18], which is going to be used in the following proof.

Theorem 3.1. *Given a non-degenerate 2-splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$,*

- (1) *there is a dense open subset $\Omega \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ such that $\dim \ker \pi_t(\xi) = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$ for all $\xi \in \Omega$ and $t \in \mathbb{P}$;*
- (2) *for all $\xi \in \Omega$, one has $\dim d_\xi \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r})} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ and hence $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r})} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Proof. (1) Suppose that

$$\xi = \xi_{\mathfrak{h}} + \xi_{\mathfrak{r}} \in \mathfrak{h}^* \oplus \mathfrak{r}^* = \mathfrak{g}^*.$$

The presence of the invertible map φ_t implies that $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_{(t),\text{sing}}^*$ if and only if $\xi_{\mathfrak{h}} + t^{-1}\xi_{\mathfrak{r}} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{sing}}^*$. Therefore,

$$(3.3) \quad \bigcup_{t \neq 0, \infty} \mathfrak{g}_{(t),\text{sing}}^* = \{\xi_{\mathfrak{h}} + t\xi_{\mathfrak{r}} \mid \xi_{\mathfrak{h}} + \xi_{\mathfrak{r}} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{sing}}^*, t \neq 0, \infty\}.$$

Since $\text{codim } \mathfrak{g}_{(t),\text{sing}}^* = 3$ for each $t \in \mathbb{K}^\times$, the closure $Y := \overline{\bigcup_{t \neq 0, \infty} \mathfrak{g}_{(t),\text{sing}}^*}$ is of codimension 2 in $\mathfrak{g}^*$. Then we have $\dim \ker \pi_t(\xi) = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{P}$ and all ξ in the dense open subset

$$\Omega = \mathfrak{g}^* \setminus (Y \cup \mathfrak{g}_{(0),\text{sing}}^* \cup \mathfrak{g}_{\infty,\text{sing}}^*).$$

(2) By definition, $d_\xi \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r} \rangle} = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{P}} d_\xi \mathcal{Z} \subset \sum_{t \in \mathbb{P}} \ker \pi_t(\xi)$. Then (3.2) and the hypothesis on ξ imply that $d_\xi \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r} \rangle} \supset \sum_{t \neq 0, \infty} \ker \pi_t(\xi)$. Here we have a 2-dimensional vector space of skew-symmetric bilinear forms $a \cdot \pi_t(\xi)$ on $\mathfrak{g} \simeq T_\xi^* \mathfrak{g}^*$, where $a \in \mathbb{K}$, $t \in \mathbb{P}$. Moreover, $\text{rk } \pi_t(\xi) = \dim \mathfrak{g} - \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$ for each t . By [PY08, Appendix], $\sum_{t \neq 0, \infty} \ker \pi_t(\xi) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{P}} \ker \pi_t(\xi)$ and $\dim \sum_{t \in \mathbb{P}} \ker \pi_t(\xi) = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g} + \frac{1}{2}(\dim \mathfrak{g} - \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}) = b(\mathfrak{g})$. $\square$

Thus, any non-degenerate 2-splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ provides a Poisson-commutative subalgebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r} \rangle} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ of maximal transcendence degree.

Let $\{H_1, \dots, H_l\}$, $l = \text{rk } \mathfrak{g}$, be a set of homogeneous algebraically independent generators of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $d_j = \deg H_j$. Recall that for any H_j , one has the bi-homogeneous decomposition:

$$H_j = \sum_{i=0}^{d_j} (H_j)_{i, d_j-i},$$

and $H_j^\bullet$ is the nonzero bi-homogeneous component of H_j with maximal $\mathfrak{r}$ -degree. Then $\deg_{\mathfrak{r}} H_j = \deg_{\mathfrak{r}} H_j^\bullet$. Similarly, $H_{j,\bullet}$ stands for the nonzero bi-homogeneous component of H_j with maximal $\mathfrak{h}$ -degree, i.e., minimal $\mathfrak{r}$ -degree.

Convention 2. We tacitly assume that the order of summands in the sum $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ is fixed. This means that, for a homogeneous $H \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$, we write $H^\bullet$ (resp. $H_\bullet$) for the bi-homogeneous component of maximal degree w.r.t. the second (resp. first) summand.

It is known that $H_j^\bullet \in \mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}^{\text{ab}})$ and $H_{j,\bullet} \in \mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{r} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}^{\text{ab}})$ [P07', Prop. 3.1].

Theorem 3.2. *The algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r} \rangle}$ is generated by $\mathcal{Z}_0$, $\mathcal{Z}_\infty$, and the set of all bi-homogeneous components of $H_1, \dots, H_l$, i.e.,*

$$(3.4) \quad \{(H_j)_{i, d_j-i} \mid j = 1, \dots, l \text{ \& } i = 0, 1, \dots, d_j\}.$$

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{Z}(\{ , \}_1) = \mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathbb{K}[H_1, \dots, H_l]$. By the definition of $\{ , \}_t$, we have $\mathcal{Z}(\{ , \}_t) = \varphi_t^{-1}(\mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{g}))$ for $t \neq 0, \infty$ and

$$\varphi_t(H_j) = (H_j)_{d_j,0} + t(H_j)_{d_j-1,1} + t^2(H_j)_{d_j-2,2} + \dots$$

Using the Vandermonde determinant, we deduce from this that all $(H_j)_{i,d_j-i}$ belong to $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{v} \rangle}$ and the algebra generated by them contains $\mathcal{Z}_t$ with $t \in \mathbb{k} \setminus \{0\}$. $\square$

The main difficulty in applying this theorem is that one has to know the generators of the centres $\mathcal{Z}_0$ and $\mathcal{Z}_\infty$. The problem is that these centres are not always generated by certain bi-homogeneous components of $H_1, \dots, H_l$. In the subsequent sections, we consider several nice examples of non-degenerate 2-splittings of $\mathfrak{g}$, describe the corresponding Poisson-commutative subalgebras of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ and point out some applications to integrable systems.

4. THE POISSON-COMMUTATIVE SUBALGEBRA $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$

Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_-$ be a fixed triangular decomposition and $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t}$. The corresponding subgroups of G are U, T, U_- , and B . In this section, we take $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{v}) = (\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_-)$. Then $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \mathfrak{b} \ltimes \mathfrak{u}_-^{\text{ab}}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)} = \mathfrak{u}_- \ltimes \mathfrak{b}^{\text{ab}}$. Since G/U_- is quasi-affine, $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)} = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}$, see Theorem 2.1. By a direct computation, one also obtains $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \text{ind } \mathfrak{g}$, cf. Remark 2.2. Hence $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_-$ is a non-degenerate 2-splitting.

In order to get explicit generators of the algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$, we first have to describe the algebras $\mathcal{Z}_0$ and $\mathcal{Z}_\infty$. Recall that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathbb{k}[H_1, \dots, H_l]$ and $H_i^\bullet$ is the bi-homogeneous component of H of highest degree w.r.t. $\mathfrak{u}_-$. The following is Theorem 3.3 in [PY12].

Proposition 4.1. *For $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \mathfrak{b} \ltimes \mathfrak{u}_-^{\text{ab}}$, the Poisson centre $\mathcal{Z}_0 = \mathcal{Z}\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}_{(0)})$ is freely generated by $H_1^\bullet, \dots, H_l^\bullet$. The bi-degree of $H_j^\bullet$ is $(1, d_j - 1)$.*

In our present terminology, one can say that **any** homogeneous generating system $H_1, \dots, H_l \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a $\mathfrak{b}$ -g.g.s.

Proposition 4.2. *For $\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)} = \mathfrak{u}_- \ltimes \mathfrak{b}^{\text{ab}}$, one has $\mathcal{Z}_\infty = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{t})$, where $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b}^{\text{ab}} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{b}$ is abelian in $\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}$ and $\mathfrak{b} \simeq \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{u}_-$ as an $\mathfrak{u}_-$ -module, we have $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathcal{Z}_\infty$. Since $\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)} = l = \dim \mathfrak{t}$, this means that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{t}) \subset \mathcal{Z}_\infty$ is an algebraic extension. Because $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{t})$ is algebraically closed in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)})$, we conclude that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{t}) = \mathcal{Z}_\infty$. $\square$

Theorem 4.3. *The algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is polynomial. It is freely generated by the bi-homogeneous components $\{(H_j)_{i,d_j-i} \mid 1 \leq j \leq l, 1 \leq i \leq d_j - 1\}$ and a basis for $\mathfrak{t}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, the generators of $\mathcal{Z}_0$ are certain bi-homogeneous components of $H_1, \dots, H_l$. Therefore, combining Theorem 3.2, Proposition 4.1, and Proposition 4.2, we obtain that $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is generated by the bi-homogeneous components of all H_j 's and $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{t})$.

The bi-homogeneous component $(H_j)_{d_j,0}$ is the restriction of H_j to $(\mathfrak{u}_-)^{\perp} = \mathfrak{b}^* \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$. (Upon the identification of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}^*$, this becomes the restriction to $\mathfrak{b}_- = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_-$.) As H_j is G -invariant, such a restriction depends only on $\mathfrak{t}^* \subset \mathfrak{b}^*$; i.e., it is a W -invariant

element of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{t})$. Since we already have the whole of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{t})$, the functions $\{(H_j)_{d_j,0} \mid 1 \leq j \leq l\}$ are not needed for a minimal generating system. On the other hand, $(H_j)_{0,d_j}$ is the restriction of H_j to $\mathfrak{b}^\perp = \mathfrak{u}_-^* \simeq \mathfrak{u}$. Therefore, $(H_j)_{0,d_j} = 0$ for all j . Thus, $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is generated by the functions pointed out in the statement. The total number of these generators is $l + \sum_{j=1}^l (d_j - 1) = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g})$. Because $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ (Theorem 3.1), all these generators are nonzero and algebraically independent. $\square$

Thus, we have constructed a polynomial Poisson-commutative subalgebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ of maximal transcendence degree.

Theorem 4.4. *The Poisson-commutative algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is complete on every regular coadjoint orbit of G .*

Proof. Given an orbit $G \cdot x \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$, it suffices to find $y \in G \cdot x$ such that $\dim d_y \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g})$. Consider first the regular nilpotent orbit $G \cdot e'$. Let $\{e, h, f\}$ be a principal $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple in $\mathfrak{g}$ such that $e \in \mathfrak{u}$, $h \in \mathfrak{t}$, $f \in \mathfrak{u}_-$. Then $y := e + h - f \in G \cdot e'$. Here $e \in \mathfrak{u}_-^*$ and $(h - f) \in \mathfrak{b}^*$.

We claim that $y \in \mathfrak{g}_{(t), \text{reg}}^*$ for every $t \in \mathbb{P}$. Indeed, if $t \neq 0, \infty$, then $te + (h - f) \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$, cf. (3.3). Further, $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^e = \mathfrak{b}^e = \mathfrak{g}^e$ is commutative and $\dim \mathfrak{g}^e = l$. Therefore also $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^y = \mathfrak{g}^e$ and $y \in \mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{reg}}^*$. Finally, $\text{ad}^*(\mathfrak{u}_-)(h - f) = \text{Ann}(\mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_-)$. Hence $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^y = \dim \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^{h-f} = l$ and $y \in \mathfrak{g}_{\infty, \text{reg}}^*$. The claim is settled.

Now we know that $y \in \Omega$, where Ω is the subset of Theorem 3.1(1). By Theorem 3.1(2), $\dim d_y \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g})$. This means that $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is complete on the regular nilpotent orbit $G \cdot e = G \cdot e'$, see Lemma 1.1.

In general, using the theory of associated cones of Borho and Kraft [BK79], one sees that $G \cdot e \subset \overline{\mathbb{K}^\times \cdot G \cdot x}$ for any $x \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}}^*$. Since the subalgebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is homogeneous, we have

$$\mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}) \geq \max_{x' \in G \cdot x} \dim d_{x'} \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} \geq \max_{e' \in G \cdot e} \dim d_{e'} \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

The result follows in view of Lemma 1.1. $\square$

Remark 4.5. Our $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_-)$ -results can be put in a more general setting in the following way. Let $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{b}$ be a standard parabolic subalgebra with Levi decomposition $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$. This yields the decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}} \oplus \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}}$, where $\mathfrak{p}_- = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}}$ is the opposite parabolic. Consider the 2-splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{p} \oplus \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}}$. Here $\mathfrak{p}$ is a spherical subalgebra, while $\mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}}$ is spherical if and only if $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{b}$. Actually, $c_G(G/P_-^{\text{nil}}) = \dim \mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{l})$, where $\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{l}) = \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{l}$. Then

$$\text{ind } \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)} = \text{ind } (\mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}} \ltimes \mathfrak{p}^{\text{ab}}) = \dim \mathfrak{l},$$

cf. Theorem 2.1. Moreover, one proves here that $\mathcal{Z}_\infty = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{l})$, cf. Proposition 4.2. Therefore, if $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{b}$, then $\mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}} = \{\infty\}$ and the PC-subalgebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}} \rangle}$ is generated by all $\mathcal{Z}_t$ with $t \neq \infty$. In this case, $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}} \rangle} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{l}}$ and one can prove that $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}} \rangle} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}) - \dim \mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{l})$. To describe explicitly $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}} \rangle}$, one has to know the structure and generators of $\mathcal{Z}_0 = \mathcal{Z}\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{p} \ltimes$

$(\mathfrak{p}_-^{\text{nil}})^{\text{ab}}$). However, it is not known whether $\mathcal{Z}_0$ is always polynomial, and generators are only known in some special cases. For instance, this is so if $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal parabolic, i.e., $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{l}] \simeq \mathfrak{sl}_2$ (see [PY13, Section 6]). We hope to consider this case in detail in a forthcoming publication.

5. THE MAXIMALITY OF $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_-)}$

Here we prove that $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_-)}$ is a **maximal** Poisson-commutative subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Let Δ be the set of roots of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$. Then $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$ is the root space for $\mu \in \Delta$. Let Δ^+ be the set of positive roots corresponding to $\mathfrak{u}$. Choose nonzero vectors $e_\mu \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu$ and $f_\mu \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\mu}$ for any $\mu \in \Delta^+$. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l$ be the simple roots and δ the highest root in Δ^+ . Write $\delta = \sum_{i=1}^l a_i \alpha_i$ and set $f_i = f_{\alpha_i}$. Assuming that $\deg H_j \leq \deg H_i$ if $j < i$ for the basic invariants in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$, we have $H_l^* = e_\delta \prod_{i=1}^l f_i^{a_i}$, see [PY12, Lemma 4.1].

Recall that we have two contractions $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)} = \mathfrak{b} \ltimes \mathfrak{u}_-^{\text{ab}}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)} = \mathfrak{u}_- \ltimes \mathfrak{b}^{\text{ab}}$. As the first step towards proving the maximality of $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_-)}$, we study the subsets $\mathfrak{g}_{\infty, \text{sing}}^*$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{sing}}^*$.

Lemma 5.1. (i) $\mathfrak{g}_{\infty, \text{sing}}^* = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} D(\alpha)$, where $D(\alpha) = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^* \mid (\xi, \alpha) = 0\}$ and $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}^* \simeq \mathfrak{g}$.

(ii) For any $\alpha \in \Delta^+$ and a generic $\xi \in D(\alpha)$, we have $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^\xi = l + 2$.

Proof. For $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, let $C = C_\infty(\xi)$ be the matrix of $\pi_\infty(\xi)|_{\mathfrak{u}_- \times \mathfrak{u}_-^{\text{ab}}}$. Since $[\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{b}]_{(\infty)} = 0$, we have $\text{rk } \pi_\infty(\xi) \geq 2 \text{rk } C$. Note that if $[e_\alpha, f_\beta]_{(\infty)} \neq 0$, then either $\alpha = \beta$ or $\alpha - \beta \in \Delta^+$ and therefore $\alpha \succ \beta$ in the usual root order “ $\succ$ ” on Δ^+ . Refining this partial order to a total order on Δ^+ and choosing bases in $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathfrak{u}_-$ accordingly, one can bring C into an upper triangular form with the entries $\xi([f_\alpha, e_\alpha])$ on the diagonal. Now it is clear that $\mathfrak{g}_{\infty, \text{sing}}^* \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} D(\alpha)$.

Let $\xi \in D(\alpha)$ be a generic point. Then $\text{rk } C = \dim \mathfrak{u} - 1$ and there is a nonzero $e \in \mathfrak{u}$ such that $\pi_\infty(\xi)(\mathfrak{u}_-, e) = 0$. Hence $e \in \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^\xi$. Because $\mathfrak{t}$ is the centre of $\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}$, we have $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^\xi$ and $\mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g}) - 1 \geq \text{rk } \pi_\infty(\xi) \geq \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g}) - 2$. Since $\text{rk } \pi_\infty(\xi)$ is an even number, it is equal to $\mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g}) - 2$ and therefore $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^\xi = l + 2$. This settles both claims. $\square$

Lemma 5.2. (i) Set $D_i = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^* \mid \xi(f_i) = 0\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$. Then the union of all divisors in $\mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{sing}}^*$ is equal to $\bigcup_{i: a_i > 1} D_i$.

(ii) For any $D_i \subset \mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{sing}}^*$ and generic $\xi \in D_i$, we have $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\xi = l + 2$.

Proof. (i) By [Y14, Theorem 5.5], a fundamental semi-invariant of $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)}$ is $p = \prod_{i=1}^l f_i^{a_i-1}$. The main property of p is that the union of all divisors in $\mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{sing}}^*$ is $\{\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^* \mid p(\xi) = 0\}$, see [Y14, Def. 5.4]. Hence the assertion.

(ii) Take a generic $\xi \in D_i \subset \mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{sing}}^*$. Then $\xi = y + e$, where $y \in \mathfrak{b}^*$ and $e \in \mathfrak{u}$ is a subregular nilpotent element of $\mathfrak{g}$, cf. [Y14, Sect. 5.2]. According to [Y14, Eq. (5.1)],

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\xi = \dim \mathfrak{b}^e + \text{ind } \mathfrak{b}^e - l.$$

On the one side, $\dim(B \cdot e) \leq \dim \mathfrak{u} - 1$, on the other, $\mathfrak{b}^e \subset \mathfrak{g}^e$ and $\dim \mathfrak{b}^e \leq l + 2$. If $\mathfrak{b}^e = \mathfrak{g}^e$, then $\text{ind } \mathfrak{b}^e = l$ [P03, Cor.3.4], if $\dim \mathfrak{b}^e = l + 1$, then $\text{ind } \mathfrak{b}^e \leq l + 1$. In any case $\dim \mathfrak{b}^e + \text{ind } \mathfrak{b}^e \leq 2l + 2$ and hence $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\xi = l + 2$. $\square$

Remark. Note that all $a_i = 1$ if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A. That is, in that case $\text{codim } \mathfrak{g}_{(0),\text{sing}}^* \geq 2$.

We will need another technical tool, the pencil of skew-symmetric forms on $\mathfrak{g}$ related to the family $\{\pi_t(\xi)\}_{t \in \mathbb{k} \cup \infty}$ for a given $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. To this end, we recall some general theory presented in the Appendix to [PY18].

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a two-dimensional vector space of (possibly degenerate) skew-symmetric bilinear forms on a finite-dimensional vector space $\mathfrak{v}$. Set $m = \max_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \text{rk } A$, and let $\mathcal{P}_{\text{reg}} \subset \mathcal{P}$ be the set of all forms of rank m . Then $\mathcal{P}_{\text{reg}}$ is an open subset of $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sing}} := \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_{\text{reg}}$ is either $\{0\}$ or a finite union of lines. For each $A \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\ker A \subset \mathfrak{v}$ be the kernel of A . Our object of interest is the subspace $L := \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{reg}}} \ker A$.

Proposition 5.3 (cf. [PY18, Theorem A.4]). *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sing}} = \mathbb{k}C$ with $C \neq 0$ and $\text{rk } C = m - 2$. Suppose also that $\text{rk}(A|_{\ker C}) = 2$ for some $A \in \mathcal{P}$. Then (1) $\dim(L \cap \ker C) = \dim \mathfrak{v} - m$, (2) $\dim L = \dim \mathfrak{v} - \frac{m}{2} - 1$, and (3) $A(\ker C, L \cap \ker C) = 0$.*

Proof. The first two assertions are proved in [PY18, Theorem A.4]. We briefly recall the relevant setup.

Take non-proportional $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{reg}}$. By [T91, Theorem 1(d)], there is the *Jordan–Kronecker canonical form* for A and B . This means that there is a decomposition $\mathfrak{v} = \mathfrak{v}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{v}_d$ such that $A(\mathfrak{v}_i, \mathfrak{v}_j) = 0 = B(\mathfrak{v}_i, \mathfrak{v}_j)$ for $i \neq j$, and the pairs $A_i = A|_{\mathfrak{v}_i}, B_i = B|_{\mathfrak{v}_i}$ have a rather special form. Namely, each pair (A_i, B_i) forms either a *Kronecker* or a *Jordan block* (see [PY18, Appendix] for more details). Assume that $\dim \mathfrak{v}_i > 0$ for each i .

- For a Kronecker block, $\dim \mathfrak{v}_i = 2k_i + 1$, $\text{rk } A_i = 2k_i = \text{rk } B_i$ and the same holds for every nonzero linear combination of A_i and B_i .
- For a Jordan block, $\dim \mathfrak{v}_i$ is even and both A_i and B_i are non-degenerate on $\mathfrak{v}_i$. Moreover, there is a unique $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{k}$ such that $\det(A_i + \lambda_i B_i) = 0$ and hence $\text{rk}(A_i + \lambda_i B_i) \leq \dim \mathfrak{v}_i - 2$. In particular, any Jordan block gives rise to a line $\mathbb{k}(A + \lambda_i B) \subset \mathcal{P}_{\text{sing}}$.

Since $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sing}}$ is a sole line, the critical values λ_i for all Jordan blocks must be equal. Furthermore, since $\text{rk } C = m - 2$, there must be only one Jordan block, and we may safely assume that this block corresponds to $\mathfrak{v}_d$.

Now, we are ready to prove assertion (3). It is clear that $L \subset \bigoplus_{i < d} \mathfrak{v}_i$ and

$$(L \cap \ker C) \subset \bigoplus_{i < d} \ker C_i,$$

where $\dim \ker C_i = 1$ for each $i < d$. Since $A(\mathfrak{v}_i, \mathfrak{v}_j) = 0$ for $i \neq j$, we obtain $A(\ker C, L \cap \ker C) = 0$. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the subalgebra generated by $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$, e_δ , and f_i with $1 \leq i \leq l$. Recall that $H_l^\bullet \in \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ and that $H_l^\bullet = e_\delta \prod_{i=1}^l f_i^{a_i}$ by [PY12, Lemma 4.1]. In view of this and Theorem 4.3, $\mathcal{C}$ has a set $\{F_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g}) + l\}$ of homogeneous generators such that $\{F_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq l\}$ is a basis of $\mathfrak{t}$, F_k is of the form $(H_j)_{i, d_j - i}$ if $l < k < \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$, and the last $l + 1$ elements F_k are root vectors.

By the very construction, we have

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{t}}.$$

Proposition 5.4. *The subalgebra $\mathcal{C}$ is algebraically closed in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Proof. For $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, we set $L(\gamma) = \sum_{t \neq 0, \infty} \ker \pi_t(\gamma)$ and $V(\gamma) = d_\gamma \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$. If $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_{(t), \text{reg}}^*$ for all $t \neq 0, \infty$, then $L(\gamma) \subset V(\gamma)$ in view of (3.2). It follows from (5.1) that $\gamma([V(\gamma), \mathfrak{t}]) = 0$. Consider the following condition on γ :

$$(\diamond) \quad \gamma \text{ is nonzero on at least } l \text{ elements among } e_\delta, f_1, \dots, f_l.$$

Note that condition $(\diamond)$ holds on a big open subset and that the $\mathfrak{t}$ -weights of the l elements involved, say $x_1, \dots, x_l$, are linearly independent. The linear independence of the selected l -tuple of $\mathfrak{t}$ -weights implies that if γ satisfies $(\diamond)$, $\gamma([\mathfrak{t}, x]) = 0$, and $x \in \langle x_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq l \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$, then $x = 0$. Hence here $\dim d_\gamma \mathcal{C} \geq \dim V(\gamma) + l$. In the proof, we compute $\dim d_\gamma \mathcal{C}$ only at points γ satisfying $(\diamond)$.

We readily obtain that $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{C} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g}) + l$ and hence the homogeneous generators F_k with $1 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g}) + l$ are algebraically independent. The goal is to show that the differentials of the polynomials F_k are linearly independent on a **big** open subset. Note that the assertion is obvious for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2$, because here $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$ be the dense open subset defined in Theorem 3.1. Then $\dim V(\gamma) = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ for any $\gamma \in \Omega$. However, the complement of Ω may contain divisors; i.e., the divisors lying in $\mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{sing}}^*$ or in $\mathfrak{g}_{\infty, \text{sing}}^*$, see (3.3).

- Concentrate first on the irreducible divisors in $\mathfrak{g}_{\infty, \text{sing}}^*$. Such a divisor $D(\alpha)$ is the hyperplane defined by $\alpha \in \Delta^+$, see Lemma 5.1(i). There is a non-empty open subset $\mathcal{U} \subset D(\alpha)$ such that any $\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{U}$ is regular for all $t \neq \infty$ and satisfies $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^{\tilde{\gamma}} = l + 2$, see (3.3) and Lemmas 5.2, 5.1. We have $\mathfrak{t} \subsetneq \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$. Recall from the proof of Lemma 5.1 that there is a nonzero $e \in \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$. Let μ be a maximal element in the subset $\{\beta \in \Delta^+ \mid (e, f_\beta) \neq 0\}$. Then $([u_-, e], f_\mu) = 0$. Hence $e \in \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^{\gamma}$ for any $\gamma = \tilde{\gamma} + c f_\mu$, where $c \in \mathbb{k}$ and f_μ is regarded as a linear function on $\mathfrak{g}$. For $h \in \mathfrak{t}$ such that $[h, e_\mu] = e_\mu$, we have $\gamma([h, e]) = \tilde{\gamma}([h, e]) + c(f_\mu, e)$ and here $(f_\mu, e) \neq 0$. For a generic $c \in \mathbb{k}$, one obtains $\gamma([\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^{\gamma}]) \neq 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{U}$. On the one hand, $\text{rk } \pi(\gamma)|_{\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^{\gamma}} \geq 2$, on the other hand, $\text{rk } \pi(\gamma)|_{\mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^{\gamma}} \leq 2$ by [PY18, Lemma A.3]. According to [PY08, Lemma A.1], $L(\gamma) = \sum_{t \neq \infty} \ker \pi_t(\gamma)$. Now Proposition 5.3 implies

that $\dim L(\gamma) = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}) - 1$ and

$$\pi(\gamma)(L(\gamma) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^\gamma, \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^\gamma) = 0.$$

By the construction $\pi(\gamma)(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{g}_{(\infty)}^\gamma) \neq 0$. Hence $\mathfrak{t} \not\subset L(\gamma)$ and $\dim(L(\gamma) + \mathfrak{t}) > \dim L(\gamma)$. For a generic $\gamma \in D(\alpha)$, we have then $\dim V(\gamma) = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\dim d_\gamma \mathcal{C} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}) + l$.

- Consider a divisor $D_i \subset \mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{sing}}^*$ that is defined by f_i with $a_i > 1$, see Lemma 5.2. We can safely assume here that $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type A. Otherwise $\mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{sing}}^*$ has no divisors, cf. [PY12, Prop. 4.3]. Because $[\mathfrak{b}, f_i]_{(0)} \subset \mathbb{k}f_i$, we have $f_i \in \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ for any $\tilde{\gamma} \in D_i$. Let $\gamma \in D_i$ be generic. Lemma 5.2 shows that $\text{rk } \pi_0(\gamma) = \dim \mathfrak{g} - l - 2$ and that $\text{rk } \pi_\infty(\gamma) = l$. By [PY08, Lemma A.1], $L(\gamma) = \sum_{t \neq 0} \ker \pi_t(\gamma)$. The next task is to show that γ is nonzero on $[f_i, \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\gamma]$. In order to do this, we employ considerations from [Y14, Sect. 5.2].

Set $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_i = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathbb{k}f_i$. Then $\overline{(D_i \cap \mathfrak{u})} = \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$ is the nilpotent radical of $\mathfrak{p}$. Write $\gamma = y + e$, where $y \in \mathfrak{b}^* \simeq \mathfrak{b}_-$ and $e \in \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$ is a subregular element of $\mathfrak{g}$, cf. the proof of Lemma 5.2(ii). We may safely assume that e is a Richardson element, i.e., $Pe \subset \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$ is the dense orbit of the parabolic subgroup $P \subset G$ with $\text{Lie}(P) = \mathfrak{p}$. There are two possibilities, either $[\mathfrak{p}, e] = \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$ is equal to $[\mathfrak{b}, e]$ or not.

Suppose that $\dim[\mathfrak{b}, e] < \dim \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$, then there is a nonzero $f \in \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$ such that $(f, [\mathfrak{b}, e]) = 0$. At the same time, $(f, [\mathfrak{p}, e]) \neq 0$. Therefore $(f, [f_i, e]) = ([f, f_i], e) \neq 0$. Note that $\gamma([f, \mathfrak{g}]_{(0)}) = (e, [f, \mathfrak{b}]) = 0$, i.e., $f \in \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\gamma$. We have also $\gamma([f, f_i]) = (e, [f, f_i]) \neq 0$. Thus γ is nonzero on $[f_i, \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\gamma]$.

Suppose now that $[\mathfrak{b}, e] = \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$. In this case, $\dim \mathfrak{b}^e = l + 1$ and Be is dense and open in $\mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$. By [Y14, Lemma 5.10], $\mathfrak{b}^e$ is abelian. Set $\mathcal{U}_0 = \{\gamma \in D_i \mid \dim \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\gamma = l + 2\}$. Then $\gamma = e + y \in \mathcal{U}_0$ for any $y \in \mathfrak{b}_-$ in view of a direct calculation from [Y14, Lemma 4.8]. Furthermore, $\gamma([f_i, \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\gamma]) = 0$ if and only if $(f_i, [e + y, \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\gamma]) = 0$. As a point of an appropriate Grassmannian, the subspace $\mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\gamma$ depends on $\gamma \in \mathcal{U}_0$ continuously. Therefore it suffices to find just one point $\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{U}_0$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}([f_i, \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^{\tilde{\gamma}}]) \neq 0$.

Consider first the case, where $[f_i, e_\delta] \neq 0$. Set $\tilde{\gamma} = e + f_{\delta - \alpha_i}$. Then $e_\delta \in \mathfrak{g}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$. Here $[f_i, e_\delta]$ is a nonzero scalar multiple of $e_{\delta - \alpha_i}$, hence $\tilde{\gamma}([f_i, e_\delta]) = (f_{\delta - \alpha_i}, [f_i, e_\delta]) \neq 0$.

In the remaining cases, $(\delta, \alpha_i) = 0$, $\mathfrak{b}^e$ is abelian, and still $a_i > 1$. This is possible if and only if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type B_l with $l \geq 3$ and $i \geq 3$, see [GHR] and [Y14, Prop. 5.13]. As a Richardson element in $\mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}}$, we take $e = e_{\alpha_{i-1} + \alpha_i} + \sum_{j \neq i} e_j$; next $\beta = \delta - (\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \dots + \alpha_i)$ and $y = f_\beta$. There is a standard choice of root vectors related to elementary skew-symmetric matrices. It leads, for example, to $e_{\alpha_{i-1} + \alpha_i} = [e_{i-1}, e_i]$. After such a normalisation, $\xi := e_{\beta + \alpha_i} - e_\beta \in \mathfrak{b}^e$. Furthermore, $\text{ad}_{(0)}^*(\xi)f_\beta = -[e_\beta, f_\beta]$ and there is

$$\eta \in \langle f_j, [f_{i-1}, f_i] \mid j \neq i - 1, i \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$$

such that $\xi + \eta \in \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ for $\tilde{\gamma} = e + y$. Finally $(e + y, [f_i, \xi + \eta]) = (e, [f_i, \eta]) + (f_\beta, [f_i, e_{\beta + \alpha_i}])$ is nonzero, because $(e, [f_i, \eta]) = 0$ and $([f_\beta, f_i], e_{\beta + \alpha_i}) \neq 0$.

Now we know that $\pi(\gamma)(f_i, \mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\gamma) \neq 0$. By [PY18, Lemma A.3], $\text{rk}(\pi(\gamma)|_{\mathfrak{g}_{(0)}^\gamma}) \leq 2$, hence the rank in question is equal to 2. According to Proposition 5.3, $\dim L(\gamma) = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}) - 1$ and $f_i \notin L(\gamma)$.

Note that $\pi(\gamma)(f_i, \mathfrak{t}) = 0$. Furthermore, if $x \in \langle e_\delta, f_j \mid j \neq i \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$ and $\pi(\gamma)(\mathfrak{t}, x) = 0$, then $x = 0$. Therefore $\dim d_\gamma \mathcal{C} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}) + l$. Since $d_\gamma \mathcal{C} = \langle d_\gamma F_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}) + l \rangle_{\mathbb{k}}$, the goal is achieved, the differentials dF_k are linearly independent on a big open subset. According to [P²Y07, Theorem 1.1], the subalgebra $\mathcal{C}$ is algebraically closed in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$. $\square$

Theorem 5.5. *The algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ is a maximal Poisson-commutative subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ be a Poisson-commutative subalgebra and $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} \subset \mathcal{A}$. Since $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} = \mathbf{b}(\mathfrak{g}) = \text{tr.deg } \mathcal{A}$, each element $x \in \mathcal{A}$ is algebraic over $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$. Hence it is also algebraic over $\mathcal{C}$ and by Proposition 5.4, we have $x \in \mathcal{C}$. Since $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$, we have $\{\mathfrak{t}, x\} = 0$. The algebra of $\mathfrak{t}$ -invariants in $\mathcal{C}$ is generated by $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ and the monomials $e_\delta^c f_1^{c_1} \dots f_l^{c_l}$ such that $c_i = ca_i$. Each such monomial is a power of $H_l^\bullet$. Therefore $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{u}_- \rangle} = \mathcal{A}$. $\square$

6. THE POISSON-COMMUTATIVE SUBALGEBRA $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$

If σ is an involution of $\mathfrak{g}$, then $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$, where $\mathfrak{g}_i = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \sigma(x) = (-1)^i x\}$. As is well-known, $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is a spherical subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Therefore, there is a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ such that $\mathfrak{g}_0 + \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{g}$.

An involution σ is said to be of *maximal rank*, if $\mathfrak{g}_1$ contains a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\dim \mathfrak{g}_1 = \dim \mathfrak{b}$, $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = \dim \mathfrak{u}$, and such σ is unique up to G -conjugation. Therefore, in the maximal rank case, there is a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ such that

$$(6.1) \quad \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}.$$

Recall that (for $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}$) there is a bijection between the (conjugacy classes of complex) involutions of $\mathfrak{g}$ and the real forms of $\mathfrak{g}$, see e.g. [Lie3, Ch. 4, 1.3]. Under this bijection the involution of maximal rank corresponds to the split real form of $\mathfrak{g}$. This bijection also allows us to associate the Satake diagram [Lie3, Ch. 4, 4.3] to any involution. In this section, we assume that σ is of maximal rank and take $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{r}) = (\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0)$ such that Eq. (6.1) holds. As in Section 4, to describe the generators of $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$, we need a set of generators for the Poisson centres $\mathcal{Z}_0 = \mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{b} \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_0^{\text{ab}})$ and $\mathcal{Z}_\infty = \mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{g}_0 \ltimes \mathfrak{b}^{\text{ab}})$. By the Independence Principle of Section 2, we have

$$\mathfrak{b} \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_0^{\text{ab}} \simeq \mathfrak{b} \ltimes \mathfrak{u}_-^{\text{ab}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{g}_0 \ltimes \mathfrak{b}^{\text{ab}} \simeq \mathfrak{g}_0 \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_1^{\text{ab}}.$$

Hence the structure of $\mathcal{Z}_0$ is already described in Prop. 4.1, whereas the Poisson centre of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}_0 \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_1^{\text{ab}})$ is described in [P07']. Namely, $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}_0 \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_1^{\text{ab}})$ is freely generated by the bi-homogeneous components of $\{H_i\}$ of minimal degree w.r.t. $\mathfrak{g}_0$, i.e., of maximal degree w.r.t. $\mathfrak{g}_1$ (or $\mathfrak{b}$). In particular, any generating system $H_1, \dots, H_l \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -g.g.s.

Theorem 6.1. *The algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ is polynomial. It is freely generated by the bi-homogeneous components $\{(H_j)_{i, d_j-i} \mid 1 \leq j \leq l, 1 \leq i \leq d_j\}$.*

Proof. It follows from the above discussion and Theorem 3.2 that $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ is generated by the bi-homogeneous components of all $\{H_i\}$. The total number of all bi-homogeneous components equals $\sum_{j=1}^l (d_j + 1) = b(\mathfrak{g}) + l$. As in the proof of Theorem 4.3, the component $(H_j)_{0, d_j}$ is the restriction of H_j to $\mathfrak{b}^\perp$. Under the identification of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}^*$, we have $\mathfrak{b}^\perp = \mathfrak{u}$. Therefore $(H_j)_{0, d_j} \equiv 0$ for all j . Thus, there remain at most $b(\mathfrak{g})$ nonzero bi-homogeneous components and, in view of Theorem 3.1, these components must be nonzero and algebraically independent. $\square$

Thus, we have obtained a polynomial Poisson-commutative subalgebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ of maximal transcendence degree.

Example 6.2. (1) If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_n$ and σ is of maximal rank, then $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{so}_n$. Here $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{(0), \text{sing}}^* \leq \dim \mathfrak{g} - 2$ by [P07', Theorem 3.3] and $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\infty, \text{sing}}^* \leq \dim \mathfrak{g} - 2$ by [PY12, Section 4]. In view of (3.3), this implies that the open subset Ω of Theorem 3.1 is big. Thus, the differentials of the free generators of $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ are linearly independent on the big open subset Ω . By [P²Y07, Theorem 1.1], this means that $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ is an algebraically closed subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$. Since $\text{tr.deg } \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ is maximal possible among all PC-subalgebras, $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ is a **maximal** PC-subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sl}_n)$.

(2) By [PY12, Theorem 4.4], if $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple, but $\mathfrak{g} \neq \mathfrak{sl}_n$, then $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\infty, \text{sing}}^* = \dim \mathfrak{g} - 1$. Therefore, the above argument does not generalise. Still, this does not prevent $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ from being a maximal PC-subalgebra. Actually, we do not know yet whether $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \rangle}$ is maximal for the other simple $\mathfrak{g}$.

Remark 6.3. If σ is not of maximal rank, then $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 > \dim \mathfrak{u}$ and the sum $\mathfrak{g}_0 + \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{g}$ **cannot** be direct. Given $\mathfrak{g}_0$, one can choose a generic “opposite” Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ such that $\dim(\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{g}_0)$ is minimal possible and $\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{g}_0$ is closely related to a Borel subalgebra of a certain Levi subalgebra. Namely, there is a parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{b}$, with the standard Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l} \subset \mathfrak{p}$, such that $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{l}] \subset \mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{g}_0 \subset \mathfrak{l}$ and $\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{g}_0$ is a Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{s} := \mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{g}_0$ [P99, Chapters 1, 2]. (The semisimple algebra $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{l}]$ corresponds to the subset of black nodes of the Satake diagram of σ .) Therefore, there is always a *solvable* subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ normalised by $\mathfrak{t}$ such that $\mathfrak{h} \oplus (\mathfrak{g}_0 \cap \mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{b}$ and hence $\mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}$. Here $\mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}} \subset \mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{p}^{\text{nil}} \oplus \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$, where $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ is the centre of $\mathfrak{l}$. Hence **any** involution σ gives rise to a natural 2-splitting of $\mathfrak{g}$. But this $\mathfrak{h}$ not necessarily spherical. A sufficient condition for sphericity is that the Satake

diagram of σ has no black nodes. (This is equivalent to that $\mathfrak{g}_1 \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}} \neq \emptyset$.) Then $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{g}_0 \subset \mathfrak{t}$. Hence $\mathfrak{h} \supset \mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{b}^{\text{nil}}$ and thereby $\mathfrak{h}$ is spherical. Thus any involution of $\mathfrak{g}$ having the property that $\mathfrak{g}_1 \cap \mathfrak{g}_{\text{reg}} \neq \emptyset$ gives rise to a *non-degenerate* 2-splitting.

- If $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple, then such involutions that are not of maximal rank exist only for $\mathbf{A}_n$, $\mathbf{D}_{2n+1}$, and $\mathbf{E}_6$. However, it is not yet clear how to describe explicitly the Poisson centre $\mathcal{ZS}(\mathfrak{h} \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_0^{\text{ab}})$ if $\mathfrak{h} \neq \mathfrak{b}$.

- Yet another similar possibility is the semisimple algebra $\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g} \simeq \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple and σ is the permutation of summands. Here everything can be accomplished explicitly, see the following section.

7. POISSON-COMMUTATIVE SUBALGEBRAS RELATED TO A 2-SPLITTING OF $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$

In this section, we consider in detail the good case mentioned at the end of Remark 6.3 and its application to Lie algebras over $\mathbb{R}$.

Let τ be the involution of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} := \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g} \simeq \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ such that $\tau(x_1, x_2) = (x_2, x_1)$. Then $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0 = \Delta_{\mathfrak{g}} \simeq \mathfrak{g}$ is the usual diagonal in $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_1$ is the antidiagonal $\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}}^{(-)} = \{(x, -x) \mid x \in \mathfrak{g}\}$. Here a generic opposite Borel subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ for $\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{b}_-$ and $\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}} \cap (\mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{b}_-) = \Delta_{\mathfrak{t}}$. It follows that a complementary solvable subalgebra for $\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is

$$\mathfrak{h} = \Delta_{\mathfrak{t}}^{(-)} \oplus (\mathfrak{u} \times \mathfrak{u}_-),$$

where $\Delta_{\mathfrak{t}}^{(-)} = \{(x, -x) \mid x \in \mathfrak{t}\}$. This yields the 2-splitting

$$(7.1) \quad \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \Delta_{\mathfrak{g}},$$

associated with τ in the sense of Remark 6.3. Next step is to prove that this 2-splitting is non-degenerate and both related IW-contractions of $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ have a polynomial ring of symmetric invariants.

By the Independence Principle, the IW-contraction $(\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g})_{(\infty)} = \Delta_{\mathfrak{g}} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}^{\text{ab}}$ is isomorphic to the *Takiff Lie algebra* $\mathfrak{g} \ltimes \mathfrak{g}^{\text{ab}}$. A description of the symmetric invariants of $\mathfrak{g} \ltimes \mathfrak{g}^{\text{ab}}$ is due to Takiff [Ta71], cf. also [P07]. This implies that there is a good generating system here. More explicitly, let $\{H_{j,I}, H_{j,II} \mid 1 \leq j \leq l\}$ be the obvious set of basic symmetric invariants of $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$. Then $\{H_{j,I} \pm H_{j,II} \mid 1 \leq j \leq l\}$ is a $(\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}})$ -g.g.s.

Set $\mathbb{V} = \Delta_{\mathfrak{t}} \oplus (\mathfrak{u}_- \times \mathfrak{u}) \subset \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$. As $\mathbb{V}$ is a complementary space to $\mathfrak{h}$ in $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$, it follows from the independence principle that

$$\mathfrak{q} := \mathfrak{h} \ltimes \mathbb{V}^{\text{ab}} \simeq \mathfrak{h} \ltimes \Delta_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{ab}} = (\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g})_{(0)},$$

i.e., $\mathfrak{q}$ is the IW-contraction of $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ associated with $\mathfrak{h}$. Recall that $d_j = \deg H_j$.

Proposition 7.1. *We have $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = 2l$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^{\mathfrak{q}}$ is freely generated by the polynomials*

$$\mathbf{F}_j = (H_{j,I} - H_{j,II})^{\bullet} \text{ with } 1 \leq j \leq l$$

and a basis of Δ_t .

Proof. Let $\gamma = (\xi, \xi) \in \mathfrak{q}^*$ be a linear form such that $\xi \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ and $\dim \mathfrak{g}^\xi = l$. Then $\dim \mathfrak{q}^\gamma = 2l$ and thereby $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} \leq 2l$. Note also that Δ_t belong to the centre of $\mathfrak{q}$, i.e., $[\Delta_t, \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}]_{(\infty)} = 0$.

Let $F_j = F_{j,I}$ be the highest $\mathfrak{u}_-$ -component of $H_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^\mathfrak{g}$ w.r.t. the splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_-$. By [Y14, Lemma 5.7], we have $F_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_-)$. Recall that by [PY12] the elements $\{F_j\}$ are algebraically independent and $\deg_{\mathfrak{u}_-} F_j = d_j - 1$. Similarly, let $F_{j,II}$ be the highest $\mathfrak{u}$ -component of $H_{j,II}$ w.r.t. the splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{b}_- \oplus \mathfrak{u}$.

For each $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ and $s \in \{I, II\}$, we have $H_{j,s}^\bullet \in \mathcal{S}(\Delta_t)$. In view of this and the above paragraph,

$$F_j = F_{j,I} - F_{j,II} + \tilde{F}_j, \text{ where } \tilde{F}_j \in \Delta_t \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q}).$$

We see that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})^\mathfrak{q}$ contains $2l$ algebraically independent elements and hence $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} \geq 2l$. Thereby $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = 2l$.

Assume that $\dim(\langle d_\gamma F_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq l \rangle_{\mathbb{k}} + \Delta_t) < 2l$ for all points γ of a divisor $D \subset \mathfrak{q}^*$. Then D is defined by a homogeneous polynomial and $\dim(D \cap \text{Ann}(\Delta_t)) \geq \dim \mathfrak{q} - l - 1$. If we write $\gamma = \gamma_I + \gamma_{II}$ for $\gamma \in (D \cap \text{Ann}(\Delta_t))$, then the differentials $\{d_{\gamma_s} F_{j,s}\}$ are linearly dependent at γ_s and thus

$$\gamma_I \in (\mathfrak{b} \ltimes \mathfrak{u}_-^{\text{ab}})^*_{\text{sing}}, \quad \gamma_{II} \in (\mathfrak{b}_- \ltimes \mathfrak{u}^{\text{ab}})^*_{\text{sing}}$$

by [Y14]. The intersection $(\mathfrak{b} \ltimes \mathfrak{u}_-^{\text{ab}})^*_{\text{sing}} \cap \text{Ann}(\mathfrak{t})$ is a proper closed subset of $\text{Ann}(\mathfrak{t})$, cf. Lemma 5.2(i). Thereby $\dim(D \cap \text{Ann}(\Delta_t)) \leq \dim \mathfrak{q} - l - 2$, a contradiction.

By [P²Y07, Theorem 1.1], the polynomials $\{F_j\}$, together with a basis of Δ_t , generate an algebraically closed subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{q})$. Since $\text{ind } \mathfrak{q} = 2l$, we are done. $\square$

Thus, the above results show that 2-splitting (7.1) is non-degenerate, and we can consider the corresponding Poisson-commutative subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g})$.

Theorem 7.2. *The algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \Delta_{\mathfrak{g}} \rangle} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g})$ is polynomial. It is freely generated by the bi-homogeneous components*

$$\{(H_{j,I} + H_{j,II})_{s,d_j-s}, (H_{j,I} - (-1)^{d_j} H_{j,II})_{s',d_j-s'} \mid 1 \leq j \leq l, 1 \leq s \leq d_j, 1 \leq s' \leq d_j - 1\}$$

together with a basis for Δ_t .

Proof. It follows from the description of $\mathcal{Z}_\infty$ and Theorem 3.2 that $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \mathfrak{b}, \Delta_{\mathfrak{g}} \rangle}$ is generated by all the bi-homogeneous components of $\{H_{j,I} \pm H_{j,II}\}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_0$. By Proposition 7.1, $\mathcal{Z}_0$ is generated by the bi-homogeneous components of the form $\{(H_{j,I} - H_{j,II})^\bullet\}$ with $j = 1, \dots, l$ and a basis for Δ_t . Thus, the total number of generators is at most $2b(\mathfrak{g}) + 3l$.

Since the components of the form $(H_{j,I} \pm H_{j,II})_{0,d_j}$ are either zero or belong to $\mathcal{S}(\Delta_t)$, they are redundant. Notice also that $(H_{j,I} - (-1)^{d_j} H_{j,II})_{d_j,0} = 0$ for all j . Therefore, there

are at most $2b(\mathfrak{g}) = b(\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g})$ nonzero generators and, in view of Theorem 3.1, they must be algebraically independent. $\square$

7.1. The real picture. Assume now that $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathfrak{k}$ be a compact real form of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{k} = i\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$, where $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a maximal torus in a split real form $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathfrak{g}$. Set $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$. It is an $\mathbb{R}$ -subalgebra of $\mathfrak{b}$ and we have the real 2-splitting $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{r} \oplus \mathfrak{k}$, which is the Iwasawa decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$ as a real Lie algebra. The complexification of this decomposition is conjugate to the 2-splitting of $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ defined by Eq. (7.1). Here $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{r})$ is a Manin triple over $\mathbb{R}$, see [DZ05, Sect. 5.3].

We choose the basic symmetric invariants of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that each H_j takes only real values on $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Over $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is generated by $\operatorname{Re} H_j$ and $\operatorname{Im} H_j$ with $1 \leq j \leq l$.

Translating Theorem 7.2 to the real setting, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 7.3. *Let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the symmetric algebra over $\mathbb{R}$ of the real Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Then the $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra $\mathcal{Z}_{(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{k})} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g})$ is polynomial. It is freely generated by the bi-homogeneous components*

$$\{(\operatorname{Re} H_j)_{s, d_j - s}, (\operatorname{Im} H_j)_{s', d_j - s'} \mid 1 \leq j \leq l, 1 \leq s \leq d_j, 1 \leq s' \leq d_j - 1\}$$

together with a basis of $i\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Remark 7.4. We associated a 2-splitting of $\mathfrak{g}$ to any (complex) involution σ , see Remark 6.3. If $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}, \sigma}$ is the real form of $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to σ , then the Iwasawa decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}, \sigma}$ is just the real form of that 2-splitting. We hope to elaborate on this relationship and related PC-subalgebras in the future.

REFERENCES

- [AMV] M. ADLER, P. VAN MOERBEKE, and P. VANHAECKE. “Algebraic Integrability, Painlevé Geometry, and Lie algebras”, *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Bd. 47*, Springer 2004.
- [B91] A. BOLSINOV. Commutative families of functions related to consistent Poisson brackets, *Acta Appl. Math.*, **24**, no. 3 (1991), 253–274.
- [BK79] W. BORHO and H. KRAFT. Über Bahnen und deren Deformationen bei linearen Aktionen reduktiver Gruppen, *Comment. Math. Helv.* **54** (1979), no. 1, 61–104.
- [CM10] J.-Y. CHARBONNEL and A. MOREAU. The index of centralizers of elements of reductive Lie algebras, *Doc. Math.*, **15** (2010), 387–421.
- [DZ05] J.-P. DUFOUR and N.T. ZUNG. “Poisson structures and their normal forms”. *Progress in Mathematics*, **242**. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005.
- [GHR] S.M. GOODWIN, L. HILLE, and G. RÖHRLE. The orbit structure of Dynkin curves, *Math. Z.*, **257** (2007), no. 2, 439–451.
- [Lie3] V.V. GORBATSEVICH, A.L. ONISHCHIK and E.B. VINBERG. *Lie Groups and Lie Algebras III* (Encyclopaedia of Math. Sciences, vol. 41) Berlin: Springer 1994.
- [K63] B. KOSTANT. Lie group representations on polynomial rings, *Amer. J. Math.*, **85** (1963), 327–404.
- [Kn90] F. KNOP. Weylgruppe und Momentabbildung, *Invent. Math.*, **99** (1990), 1–23.

- [MF78] A.S. MISHCHENKO and A.T. FOMENKO. Euler equation on finite-dimensional Lie groups, *Math. USSR-Izv.* **12** (1978), 371–389.
- [P90] D. PANYUSHEV. Complexity and rank of homogeneous spaces, *Geom. Dedicata* **34** (1990), 249–269.
- [P99] D. PANYUSHEV. Complexity and rank of actions in invariant theory, *J. Math. Sci. (New York)*, **95** (1999), 1925–1985.
- [P03] D. PANYUSHEV. The index of a Lie algebra, the centraliser of a nilpotent element, and the normaliser of the centraliser, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, **134**, Part 1 (2003), 41–59.
- [P07] D. PANYUSHEV. Semi-direct products of Lie algebras and their invariants, *Publ. RIMS*, **43**, no. 4 (2007), 1199–1257.
- [P07'] D. PANYUSHEV. On the coadjoint representation of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -contractions of reductive Lie algebras, *Adv. Math.*, **213** (2007), 380–404.
- [P²Y07] D. PANYUSHEV, A. PREMÉT and O. YAKIMOVA. On symmetric invariants of centralisers in reductive Lie algebras, *J. Algebra*, **313** (2007), 343–391.
- [PY08] D. PANYUSHEV and O. YAKIMOVA. The argument shift method and maximal commutative subalgebras of Poisson algebras, *Math. Res. Letters*, **15**, no. 2 (2008), 239–249.
- [PY12] D. PANYUSHEV and O. YAKIMOVA. A remarkable contraction of semisimple Lie algebras, *Annales Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, **62**, no. 6 (2012), 2053–2068.
- [PY13] D. PANYUSHEV and O. YAKIMOVA. Parabolic contractions of semisimple Lie algebras and their invariants, *Selecta Math. (New Series)*, **19** (2013), 699–717.
- [PY18] D. PANYUSHEV and O. YAKIMOVA. Poisson-commutative subalgebras of $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ associated with involutions, *Intern. Math. Res. Notices*, to appear ([DOI](#)), [arxiv1809.00350v1](#) [[math.RT](#)], 34 pp.
- [P90] A.M. PERELOMOV. *Integrable systems of classical mechanics and Lie algebras*, x+307 pp. Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 1990.
- [R78] M. RAÏS. L'indice des produits semi-directs $E \times_{\rho} \mathfrak{g}$, *C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris, Ser. A t.* **287** (1978), 195–197.
- [RS94] A.G. REYMAN and M.A. SEMENOV-TIAN-SHANSKY. Group-theoretical methods in the theory of finite-dimensional integrable systems, In: *Integrable Systems II. "Dynamical Systems VII"*, Encyclopaedia of Math. Sciences, Berlin: Springer, vol. **16** (1994), 116–220.
- [Ta71] S.J. TAKIFF. Rings of invariant polynomials for a class of Lie algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **160** (1971), 249–262.
- [T91] R.C. THOMPSON. Pencils of complex and real symmetric and skew matrices, *Linear Algebra and its Appl.*, **147** (1991), 323–371.
- [V86] E.B. VINBERG. Complexity of actions of reductive groups, *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **20** (1986), 1–11.
- [Y14] O. YAKIMOVA. One-parameter contractions of Lie–Poisson brackets, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, **16** (2014), 387–407.
- [Y17] O. YAKIMOVA. Symmetric invariants of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -contractions and other semi-direct products, *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, (2017) 2017 (6): 1674–1716.

(D.Panyushev) INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS OF THE R.A.S, BOLSHOI KARETNYI PER. 19, MOSCOW 127051, RUSSIA

E-mail address: panyushev@iitp.ru

(O.Yakimova) UNIVERSITÄT ZU KÖLN, MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, WEYERTAL 86-90, 50931 KÖLN, DEUTSCHLAND

E-mail address: oksana.yakimova@uni-jena.de