

On Anosovity, divergence and bi-contact surgery

Surena Hozoori

Abstract

We discuss a metric description of the divergence of a (projectively) Anosov flow in dimension 3, in terms of its associated growth rates and give metric and contact geometric characterizations of when a projectively Anosov flow is Anosov. Then, we study the symmetries that the existence of an invariant volume form yields on the geometry of an Anosov flow, from various viewpoints of the theory of contact hyperbolas, Reeb dynamics and Liouville geometry, and give characterizations of when an Anosov flow is volume preserving, in terms of those theories. We finally use our study to show that the bi-contact surgery operations of Salmoiraghi [40, 41] can be applied in an arbitrary small neighborhood of a periodic orbit of any Anosov flow. In particular, we conclude that the Goodman-Fried surgery of Anosov flows can be performed using the bi-contact surgery of [41].

1 Introduction

For almost two decades since the introduction of Anosov flows in the early 1960s [1, 2], the only known examples of Anosov flows on three dimensional closed manifolds were based on either the suspension of Anosov diffeomorphisms of 2-torus, or the geodesic flows on the unit tangent space of hyperbolic surfaces. All such examples are orbit equivalent to an algebraic volume preserving flow, by their natural construction and a lot of interesting properties of Anosov flows were derived assuming the existence of such invariant volume forms. However, the first examples of Anosov flows, which are not orbit equivalent to a volume preserving one, were constructed in 1980 by Franks and Williams [19], using a surgery operation designed for a suspension Anosov flow. Since then, understanding the relation between the existence of an invariant volume form and various aspects of Anosov dynamics has been studied from different viewpoints. In particular, from a topological viewpoint such property is associated with the *transitivity* of an Anosov flow [6] and from a measure theoretic viewpoint, they correspond to ergodic Anosov flows [1, 34]. Moreover, many other dynamical aspects of such flows, including regularity issues, are well-studied in the literature (for instance see [32, 31]).

Our goal in this paper, is to study the relation between the divergence of a flow and Anosovity, in the context of a larger class of dynamics, namely the class of *projectively Anosov flows*, and using the notion of *growth rates of the invariant bundles*. These quantities measure the infinitesimal change of the length of vectors in the stable and unstable directions, and facilitate geometric understanding of Anosov flows. In particular, they play a significant role in the more recent *contact and symplectic geometric theory* of Anosov flows [35, 30, 40]. Therefore, our study gives a new perspective on the class of volume preserving Anosov flows, in terms of those geometries.

It is worth mentioning that although projectively Anosov flows have been previously studied in various contexts, such as foliation theory [17, 7, 36, 15], Riemannian geometry [11, 12, 37, 29], hyperbolic dynamics [27, 4, 38, 39] and Reeb dynamics [28], their primary significance for us is that they serve as bridge between Anosov dynamics and contact and symplectic geometry [35]

(see Section 2.2), eventually yielding a complete characterization of Anosov flows in terms of such geometries [30]. We remark that such flows are also referred to by other names in the literature, including *conformally Anosov flows* or *flows with dominated splitting*.

In this paper, unless stated otherwise, we assume that M is a closed connected oriented three manifold, X is a non-vanishing C^1 vector field and ϕ^t is the flow, generated by X . We also assume the (projectively) Anosov flows to have orientable invariant bundles. This is always achieved, possibly after lifting to a double cover of M . We also call any geometric quantity, which is differentiable in the direction of the flow, *X -differentiable*.

We begin our study with a natural description of the divergence of a projectively Anosov flow in terms of its associated growth rates of the invariant bundles, encapsulated in the following two theorems:

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be the generator of a projectively Anosov flow on M and Ω be some volume form which is X -differentiable. There exists a metric on M , such that $\text{div}_X \Omega = r_s + r_u$, where r_s and r_u are the growth rates of the stable and unstable directions, respectively, measured by such metric.*

Theorem 1.2. *Let X be a projectively Anosov flow with r_s and r_u being its stable and unstable growth rates, measured by some metric. Then,*

- (a) *There exists a volume form Ω on M , which is X -differentiable and $\text{div}_X \Omega = r_s + r_u$.*
- (b) *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a C^1 volume form Ω^ϵ , such that $|\text{div}_X \Omega^\epsilon - (r_s + r_u)| < \epsilon$.*

Although the above description of the divergence is hardly surprising, it accommodates the use of such relation from the viewpoint of differential and contact geometry. One immediate corollary is

Corollary 1.3. *Any projectively Anosov flow preserving some C^0 volume form is Anosov. In particular, any contact projectively Anosov flow (that is when a projectively Anosov flow preserves a transverse contact structure) is Anosov.*

Although the above corollary is well known in the dynamical systems literature (for instance see [3]), it seems that this fact is unexpectedly left obscured in some other areas of research, most importantly when such flows appear in the Riemannian geometry literature. While contributing meaningfully to the related subjects, one can find many interesting results on the Riemannian geometry of contact projectively Anosov flows, ignoring that they are in fact Anosov (for instance, see [11, 12]).

It is well known that many important properties of (projectively) Anosov flows are independent of the norm involved in their definition. On the other hand, there are natural volume forms for such setting, induced from the underlying contact structures of these flows (see section 2.2). It turns out that we can characterize the Anosovity of a projectively Anosov flow, in terms of the divergence of the flow being bounded by these volume forms in an appropriate sense (see Remark 4.1).

Theorem 1.4. *Let X be a projectively Anosov flow. Then, the followings are equivalent:*

- (1) *X is Anosov.*
- (2) *There exists a positive contact form α_+ , such that for some ξ_- , the pair $(\xi_-, \xi_+ := \ker \alpha_+)$ is a supporting bi-contact structure and $-\alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_+ < (\text{div}_X \Omega^{\alpha_+}) \Omega^{\alpha_+} < \alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_+$.*
- (3) *There exists a negative contact form α_- , such that for some ξ_+ , the pair $(\xi_- := \ker \alpha_-, \xi_+)$ is a supporting bi-contact structure and $\alpha_- \wedge d\alpha_- < (\text{div}_X \Omega^{\alpha_-}) \Omega^{\alpha_-} < -\alpha_- \wedge d\alpha_-$.*

Using our description of the divergence of an Anosov flow, we next study the geometric consequences of the existence of an invariant volume form for a smooth Anosov flow, from various

viewpoints. More precisely, Theorem 1.2 shows the symmetry of growth and decay in the unstable and stable directions, respectively, and furthermore, thanks to the differentiability of the stable and unstable foliations in this case [31], such symmetry is well-behaved in the approximation techniques we use, when translating the metric description of Anosov flows to the contact geometric one. We study such symmetry from the view point of *theory of contact hyperbolas*, *Reeb dynamics* and *Liouville geometry*, giving various characterizations of volume preserving Anosov flows.

To begin with, we study volume preserving Anosov flows in terms of the theory of contact hyperbolas, developed by Perrone [37] (see Section 5.1 for definitions) as an analogue of the theory of *contact circles* by Geiges-Gonzalo [23, 22]. Moreover, we will see that these conditions are, in fact, equivalent to a purely Reeb dynamical description of volume preserving Anosov flows.

Theorem 1.5. *Let ϕ^t be a smooth projectively Anosov flow on M . Then, the followings are equivalent:*

- (1) *The flow ϕ^t is a volume preserving Anosov flow.*
- (2) *There exist a supporting bi-contact structure (ξ_-, ξ_+) and contact forms α_- and α_+ for ξ_- and ξ_+ , respectively, such that (α_-, α_+) is a (-1) -Cartan structure.*
- (3) *There exist a supporting bi-contact structure (ξ_-, ξ_+) and Reeb vector fields R_{α_-} and R_{α_+} for ξ_- and ξ_+ , respectively, such that $R_{\alpha_-} \subset \xi_+$ and $R_{\alpha_+} \subset \xi_-$.*

To the best of our knowledge, the only known examples of taut contact hyperbolas, except an explicit example constructed on \mathbb{T}^3 , are achieved using the symmetries of Lie manifolds, giving examples which are compatible with algebraic Anosov flows [37]. However, Theorem 1.5 shows that we can also construct examples of taut contact hyperbolas on hyperbolic manifolds, thanks to the construction of an infinite family of contact Anosov flows on hyperbolic manifolds by Foulon-Hasselblatt [18]. We note that it is not known if any specific manifold can admit infinitely many distinct Anosov flows, while there are at most finitely many contact Anosov flows on any manifold up to orbit equivalence [10]. This gives a partial answer to the classification problem posed in the final remark of [37].

Corollary 1.6. *There exist infinitely many hyperbolic manifolds which admit a (-1) -Cartan structure (and in particular, a taut contact hyperbola).*

Moreover, we study smooth volume preserving Anosov flows from the perspective of Liouville geometry. The construction of exact symplectic 4-manifold for a general Anosov 3-flow is done by the author in [30]. However, we observe that such construction is significantly simplified in the presence of an invariant volume form (the case previously studied by Mitsumatus [35]). In fact, after a canonical reparametrization of a smooth volume preserving Anosov flow, we show that we can improve the relation between such flow and both the underlying Reeb dynamics of Theorem 1.5, as well as the Liouville structure associated with the corresponding exact symplectic 4-manifold. We call such reparametrization *the Liouville reparametrization of a smooth volume preserving Anosov flow* (see Section 5.2 for definitions).

Theorem 1.7. *Let X be a smooth volume preserving Anosov vector field. The Liouville reparametrization X_L of X satisfies the following:*

- (1) *The flow of X_L preserves the transverse plane field $\langle R_{\alpha_-}, R_{\alpha_+} \rangle$, where R_{α_-} and R_{α_+} are the Reeb vector fields of Theorem 1.5;*
- (2) *The pair (M, X_L) can be extended to a smooth Liouville structure $([-1, 1] \times M, Y)$, such that $([-1, 1] \times M, Y)|_{M \times \{0\}} = (M, X_L)$.*

At the end, we discuss the applications of our approach to the surgery theory of Anosov flows. Surgery theory has been a very important part of the geometric theory of Anosov flows from the

early days. Various Dehn-type surgery operations, including Handel-Thurston [26], Goodman-Fried [24, 20] or Foulon-Hasselblatt [18] surgeries, have helped construction of new examples of Anosov flows, answering historically important questions. These include the first examples of Anosov flows on hyperbolic manifolds [24], the construction of infinitely many *contact* Anosov flows on hyperbolic manifolds [18] or the first (non-trivial) classification of Anosov flows on hyperbolic manifolds [43].

Recently, Salmoiraghi [40, 41] has introduced two novel bi-contact geometric surgery operations of (projectively) Anosov flows, which contribute towards the contact geometric theory of Anosov flows (see [35, 30, 14] for instance) and the related surgery theory, reconstructing previously known surgery operations of Foulon-Hasselblatt and Thurston-Handel. These surgeries are applied in the neighborhood of a *Legendrian-transverse knot*, i.e. a knot which is *Legendrian* (tangent) for one of the underlying contact structures in the *supporting bi-contact* and transverse for the other one (see Section 2.2). One of these surgery operations is done by cutting the manifold along an annulus tangent to the flow and the other one on is based on a transverse annulus. However, the relation to Goodman-Fried surgery, which is one of the most significant surgery operations on Anosov flows, and is applied in the neighborhood of a periodic orbit of such flow, relies on one condition. That requires being able to push a periodic orbit to a Legendrian-transverse knot. Salmoiraghi observes that this is possible for the unit tangent space of hyperbolic surfaces [40] and furthermore, shows that if such condition is satisfied, the Goodman-Fried surgery can be reconstructed, using the bi-contact surgery on a transverse annulus (in fact, he generalizes such operation to projectively Anosov flows) [41]. We show that such condition can be satisfied for any C^{1+} Anosov flow, giving an affirmative answer to the question posed in [40]. This takes us one step closer to a contact geometric surgery of Anosov flows, unifying the previously introduced operations.

Theorem 1.8. *Let X be a C^{1+} Anosov flow. Given any periodic orbit γ_0 , there exists a supporting bi-contact structure $(\xi_-, \xi_+ = \ker \alpha_+)$, such that we have $R_{\alpha_+} \subset \xi_-$ in a regular neighborhood of γ_0 . Therefore, there exists an isotopy $\{\gamma_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$, which is supported in an arbitrary small neighborhood of γ_0 , and γ_t is a Legendrian-transverse knot for any $0 < t \leq 1$.*

Corollary 1.9. *The bi-contact surgeries of Salmoiraghi [40, 41] can be applied in an arbitrary small neighborhood of a periodic orbit of any C^{1+} Anosov flow. In particular, the bi-contact surgery of [41] reconstructs the Goodman-Fried surgery.*

In Section 2, we review some basic notions in Anosov dynamics and the growth rates, as well as their connection to contact geometry. In Section 3, we describe the divergence of a (projectively) Anosov flow in terms of its associated growth rates. In Section 4, we discuss some useful interplays between the contact geometry of Anosov flows and various volume forms on our manifold, giving a contact geometric characterization of Anosovity, based on divergence, In Section 5, we study the symmetries that the existence of an invariant volume form implies on the geometry of an Anosov flow, from various viewpoints of the theory of contact hyperbolas, Reeb dynamics and Liouville geometry. Finally, Section 6 is devoted to discussing the applications of our study to bi-contact surgeries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: I want to thank my advisor, John Etnyre, for constant support and encouragement. I am also very grateful to Meysam Nassiri, Federico Salmoiraghi, Domenico Perrone, Thomas Barthelmé, Masayuki Asaoka and Steven Hurder for helpful conversations. The author was partially funded by NSF grant DMS-1906414.

2 Background

In this section, we bring the necessary background for the main results. First, we review some basics about Anosov flows in dimension 3 and their generalization to projectively Anosov flows. Then, we discuss the connection of such flows to contact geometry. This is not, by any means, a thorough treatment and one should consult references like [9] and [21] on these subjects for a more complete perspective.

2.1 (Projectively) Anosov flows and the associated growth rates

Anosov flows in dimension 3 are non-singular flows, whose action on the tangent space of the ambient manifold exhibits exponential growth and decay in two distinct transverse directions. More formally,

Definition 2.1. *Let ϕ^t be the flow, generated by the non-vanishing C^1 vector field X . We call ϕ^t Anosov, if there exists a continuous invariant splitting $TM \simeq E^{ss} \oplus E^{uu} \oplus \langle X \rangle$, such that for some positive contact C and norm $\|\cdot\|$, we have*

$$\|\phi_*^t(u)\| \leq e^{-Ct}\|u\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|\phi_*^t(v)\| \geq e^{Ct}\|v\|,$$

for any $u \in E^{ss}$ and $v \in E^{uu}$.

The classical examples of such flows are the geodesic flows on the unit tangent bundle of hyperbolic surfaces and the suspension of Anosov diffeomorphisms of torus. However, various surgery operations on Anosov flows have yielded many more examples, including infinitely many examples on hyperbolic manifolds. These include surgeries of Thurston-Handel [26], Fried-Goodman [20, 24], Foulon-Hasselblatt [18] and more recently, the *bi-contact geometric* surgeries introduced by Salmoiraghi [40, 41], which manage to reproduce, up to orbit equivalence, the previous operations in many cases.

Remark 2.2. *We remark that the Anosovity of a non-singular flow can be determined by its action on the normal bundle of the direction of the flow. More precisely, a flow ϕ^t , generated by the non-vanishing vector field X , induces a flow on $TM/\langle X \rangle$ via $\pi : TM \rightarrow TM/\langle X \rangle$, usually called the induced Poincaré linear flow. It is a classical result in dynamical systems by Doering [16] that a flow is Anosov, if and only if the induced Poincaré linear flow admits a hyperbolic splitting. That is, there exists a continuous splitting of the normal bundle $TM/\langle X \rangle \simeq E^s \oplus E^u$, which is invariant under the induced Poincaré linear flow and with respect to some norm, the action of such flow on E^u and E^s is exponentially expanding and contracting, respectively.*

One important generalization of Anosov flows, which bridges Anosov dynamics to contact geometry is the following:

Definition 2.3. *Let $\tilde{\phi}^t$ be the Poincaré linear flow as in Remark 2.2. We call ϕ^t projectively Anosov, if there exists a continuous invariant splitting $TM/\langle X \rangle \simeq E^s \oplus E^u$, such that for some positive constant C and norm $\|\cdot\|$, we have*

$$\|\tilde{\phi}_*^t(v)\|/\|\tilde{\phi}_*^t(u)\| \leq e^{Ct}\|v\|/\|u\|,$$

for any $u \in E^s$ and $v \in E^u$. We call E^s and E^u stable and unstable directions, respectively.

In other words, a flow is projectively Anosov, if its induced Poincaré linear flow admits a *dominated splitting*. That is, a continuous and invariant splitting into two line bundles, on which the action of the flow is relatively expanding in one direction with respect to the other. Abusing notation, we also refer to $\pi^{-1}(E^s)$ and $\pi^{-1}(E^u)$, which are C^0 two dimensional sub bundles of TM , by E^s and E^u , and call them *the stable and unstable plane fields*, respectively.

It is known [36] that unlike the Anosov case (as discussed in Remark 2.2), in the case of projectively Anosov flows, the splitting of the normal bundle $TM/\langle X \rangle$ cannot necessarily be lifted to the tangent space TM .

Although it is not a priori obvious if such class is dynamics is strictly larger the class of Anosov flows, we know that projectively Anosov flows are abundant. See [35, 17] for examples on torus bundles, [14] for non-Anosov examples on hyperbolic manifolds and [8] for a more general construction.

In order to build the bridge from the above definitions to the world of differential and contact geometry, it is very useful for us to measure the infinitesimal growth or decay of the length of vectors in the invariant bundles. Note that, after integrating the norm in the above definitions in the direction of the flow, i.e. replacing $\|\cdot\|$ with $\int_0^T \phi^{t*} \|\cdot\| dt$, one can assume that the norm satisfying the (projective) Anosovity condition is *X-differentiable*, i.e. differentiable in the direction of the flow.

Definition 2.4. *Using the above notation and considering $TM/\langle X \rangle \simeq E^s \oplus E^u$, let $\tilde{e}_s \in E^s$ and $\tilde{e}_u \in E^u$ be the unit vectors with respect to some X-differentiable norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $TM/\langle X \rangle$. We call*

$$r_s := \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \ln \|\tilde{\phi}_*^t(\tilde{e}_s)\| \right|_{t=0} \quad \text{and} \quad r_u := \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \ln \|\tilde{\phi}_*^t(\tilde{e}_u)\| \right|_{t=0}$$

the growth rates of the stable and unstable directions, *respectively, with respect to $\|\cdot\|$.*

Remark 2.5. *Note that the norm used in the definition of growth rates is defined on the normal bundle $TM/\langle X \rangle$. However, it is easy to describe these quantities based on the tangent bundle TM . First, given a norm on $TM/\langle X \rangle$, consider some metric on this vector bundle, which induces the norm. Notice that given any transverse C^1 plane field η , there exists a natural isomorphism $\eta \simeq TM/\langle X \rangle$ via the projection $\pi : TM \rightarrow \eta \simeq TM/\langle X \rangle$. Therefore, a Riemannian metric on $TM/\langle X \rangle$ induces a Riemannian metric on η , which can be naturally extended to TM , by letting $\|X\| = 1$ and $X \perp \eta$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the norm on TM , induced from such metric. If $\tilde{e}_s \in E^s \subset TM/\langle X \rangle$ and $\tilde{e}_u \in E^u \subset TM/\langle X \rangle$ are the unit vector fields, their image $e_s \in \pi^{-1}(E^s) \cap \eta$ and $e_u \in \pi^{-1}(E^u) \cap \eta$, under the isomorphism are unit vector fields with respect to the norm induced on TM . It is easy to compute*

$$\mathcal{L}_X e_s = -r_s e_s + q_s X \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_X e_u = -r_u e_u + q_u X,$$

where q_s and q_u are real functions, depending on our choice of η . Naturally, we will have $q_s = q_u = 0$, when η is preserved by X (see Section 3 of [30] for more thorough discussion).

Not surprisingly, the (relative) exponential growth for (projectively) Anosov flows can be easily characterized in terms of such growth rates (see [30] for more details and proofs).

Proposition 2.6. *Let X be a projectively Anosov vector field and r_s and r_u , the growth rates of stable and unstable directions, respectively, with respect to any Riemannian metric, satisfying the metric condition of Definition 2.3, which is X-differentiable, then*

$$r_u - r_s > 0.$$

While Proposition 2.6 expresses the *relative* growth in the unstable direction with respect to the stable direction, the following proposition realizes when we have *absolute* growth and decay in those directions, which by Doering's result [16] yields Anosovity (see Remark 2.2).

Proposition 2.7. *Let X be a projectively Anosov vector field and r_s and r_u . Then X is Anosov, if and only if, with respect to some Riemannian metric, we have*

$$r_u > 0 > r_s.$$

2.2 Relation to (bi-)contact geometry

Recall that a 1-form α is a *contact form* on M , if $\alpha \wedge d\alpha$ is a non-vanishing volume form on M . If $\alpha \wedge d\alpha > 0$ (compared to the orientation on M), we call α a *positive* contact form and otherwise, a *negative* one. We call $\xi := \ker \alpha$ a (positive or negative) *contact structure* on M . Notice that by the Frobenius theorem, contact structures can be thought of as *nowhere integrable* C^1 plane fields, i.e. the extreme opposite of foliations.

For example $\xi_{std} := \ker dz - ydx$ ($\xi_{std} := \ker dz + ydx$) is called the *standard* positive (negative) contact structure on \mathbb{R}^3 , while $\xi_n := \ker \{\cos 2\pi n z dx - \sin 2\pi n dy\}$ on $\mathbb{T}^3 = \mathbb{R}^3/\mathbb{Z}^3$ gives an infinite family of distinct positive (negative) contact structures, when $n \in \mathbb{Z} > 0$ ($n < 0$).

Although we do not go towards the topological aspects of contact structures in this paper, it is worth mentioning that positive (negative) contact structures do not have any local invariant, thanks to the Darboux theorem that states that any two positive (negative) contact structures are locally *contactomorphic* (i.e. locally look like the standard model on \mathbb{R}^3). Furthermore, Gray's theorem shows that any homotopy of a contact structure through contact structures is induced by an isotopy of the ambient manifold.

Associated to any contact structure, there is an important class flows, which we will utilize in this paper. Given any contact form α for a contact structure $\xi := \ker \alpha$, there exists a unique vector field R_α , satisfying

$$d\alpha(R_\alpha, \cdot) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(R_\alpha) = 1.$$

Such vector field is call a *Reeb vector field* and it is easy to check $\mathcal{L}_{R_\alpha} \alpha = 0$. This implies $\mathcal{L}_{R_\alpha} \alpha \wedge d\alpha = 0$. In particular Reeb vector fields are volume preserving. Furthermore, we have $\mathcal{L}_{R_\alpha} \xi = 0$, i.e. Reeb vector fields preserve ξ , and is the transverse contact structures. It is easy to observe that given a contact structure, any transverse vector field preserving the contact structure ξ is a Reeb vector field for an appropriate choice of contact form.

The relation between Anosov dynamics and contact geometry is thanks to the following proposition, first observed by Mitsumatsu [35] and Eliashberg-Thurston [17], which characterizes projectively Anosov flows in terms of contact geometry.

Proposition 2.8. *Let X be a non-vanishing C^1 vector field on M . Then, X generates a projectively Anosov flow, if and only if, there exist positive and negative contact structures, ξ_+ and ξ_- respectively, which are transverse and $X \subset \xi_+ \cap \xi_-$.*

In other words, considering a projectively Anosov flow, the bisectors of E^s and E^u can be seen to be a pair of positive and negative contact structures, possibly after a perturbation to make them C^1 . And conversely, any vector field directing the intersection of such transverse pair is projectively Anosov.

We note the above proposition also shows that the (periodic) orbits of a projectively Anosov flows are *Legendrian* (knots), i.e. tangent, for both of the underlying contact structures.

Using Proposition 2.8, we can easily give examples of non-Anosov projectively Anosov flows. For instance, $(\xi_m := \ker \{dz + \epsilon(\cos 2\pi m z dx - \sin 2\pi m dy)\}, \xi_n := \ker \{dz + \epsilon'(\cos 2\pi n z dx - \sin 2\pi n dy)\})$ is a pair of positive and negative transverse contact structures, whenever $m < 0 < n$ are integers and $\epsilon \neq \epsilon'$. Therefore, any flow, whose generating vector field lies in the intersection $\xi_m \cap \xi_n$, is a projectively Anosov flow on $\mathbb{T}^3 = \mathbb{R}^3/\mathbb{Z}^3$ by Proposition 2.8. Note that there are no Anosov flows on \mathbb{T}^3 .

We call such pair of transverse negative and positive contact structures (ξ_-, ξ_+) a *bi-contact structure, supporting* the underlying projectively Anosov flow. It turns out that by enriching a bi-contact structure with additional contact geometric structures, one can also characterize Anosov flows, purely in terms of contact geometry [30].

3 Divergence and the growth rates

In this section, we show that the divergence of a projectively Anosov flow with respect to the (a priori C^0) volume form, which is induced from any norm satisfying the relevant definition, can be naturally characterized in terms of the growth rates of the stable and unstable directions. We then give approximation results for volume forms with higher regularity.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be the generator of a projectively Anosov flow on M and Ω be some volume form which is X -differentiable. There exists a metric on M , such that $\text{div}_X \Omega = r_s + r_u$, where r_s and r_u are the growth rates of the stable and unstable directions, respectively, measured by the metric.*

Proof. Choose a smooth transverse plane field η and let α_X be a C^1 1-form such that $\alpha_X(\eta) = 0$ and $\alpha_X(X) = 1$. Furthermore, choose the contact form $\tilde{\alpha}_+$, so that $(\xi_-, \xi_+ := \ker \tilde{\alpha}_+)$ is a supporting bi-contact structure for X , for some negative contact structure ξ_- .

We can write $\tilde{\alpha}_+ = \tilde{\alpha}_u - \tilde{\alpha}_s$, where $\tilde{\alpha}_u|_{E^s} = \tilde{\alpha}_s|_{E^u} = 0$. Notice that $\tilde{\alpha}_u$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_s$ are C^0 1-forms, which are X -differentiable, since $\tilde{\alpha}_+$ is C^1 and the projection resulting in such decomposition is X -differentiable.

Since $\tilde{\alpha}_s \wedge \tilde{\alpha}_u \wedge \alpha_X$ is a positive volume form on M , there exists a positive function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, such that $\Omega = \alpha_s \wedge \alpha_u \wedge \alpha_X$, where $\alpha_s = f\tilde{\alpha}_s$ and $\alpha_u = f\tilde{\alpha}_u$.

Finally, we can define the norm $\|\cdot\|$ with $\|X\| = \|e_s\| = \|e_u\| = 1$, where $e_s \in E^s \cap \eta$, $e_u \in E^u \cap \eta$ and $\alpha_s(e_s) = \alpha_u(e_u) = 1$. Notice that by construction $\|\cdot\|$ is X -differentiable.

Letting r_s and r_u be the growth rates of the stable and unstable directions, respectively, we can compute

$$(\mathcal{L}_X \Omega)(e_s, e_u, X) = -\Omega([X, e_s], e_u, X) - \Omega(e_s, [X, e_u], X) = (r_s + r_u) \Omega(e_s, e_u, X),$$

completing the proof. □

Corollary 3.2. *Any projectively Anosov flow preserving some C^0 volume form is Anosov. In particular, any contact projectively Anosov flow is Anosov.*

Proof. Note that any preserved C^0 volume form is X -differentiable ($\mathcal{L}_X \Omega = 0$). Therefore, Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 2.6 imply $r_s < 0 < r_u$, which guarantees Anosovity. □

Theorem 3.3. *Let X be a projectively Anosov flow with r_s and r_u being its stable and unstable growth rates, measured by some metric. Then,*

- (a) *there exists a volume form Ω on M , which is X -differentiable and $\text{div}_X \Omega = r_s + r_u$,*
- (b) *for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a C^1 volume form Ω^ϵ , such that $|\text{div}_X \Omega^\epsilon - (r_s + r_u)| < \epsilon$.*

Proof. (a) Choose a smooth transverse plane field η . Via η , the norm involved in the definition of the growth rates will induce a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on TM (see Remark 2.5). Define $e_s \in E^s \cap \eta$ and $e_u \in E^u \cap \eta$, so that $\|e_s\| = \|e_u\| = 1$ and (e_s, e_u, X) is an oriented basis for TM . Finally, define the 1-forms α_s, α_u and α_X so that $\alpha_s|_{E^u} = \alpha_u|_{E^s} = \alpha_X|_{\eta} = 0$ and $\alpha_s(e_s) = \alpha_u(e_u) = \alpha_X(X) = 1$.

Letting $\Omega := \alpha_s \wedge \alpha_u \wedge \alpha_X$, it is easy to see $\text{div}_X \Omega = r_s + r_u$, as in Theorem 3.1.

(b) Let Ω be the volume form constructed in part (a) and Ω^∞ be any smooth volume form on M . There exist a X -differentiable function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, such that $\Omega = f\Omega^\infty$. Notice that

$$\mathcal{L}_X \Omega = (X \cdot f)\Omega^\infty + f\mathcal{L}_X \Omega^\infty = (\text{div}_X \Omega)\Omega.$$

By [?], there exists a C^1 function f^ϵ such that $|f^\epsilon - f|$ and $|X \cdot f^\epsilon - X \cdot f|$ are arbitrary small. Therefore, letting $\Omega^\epsilon := f^\epsilon \Omega^\infty$ and computing

$$\mathcal{L}_X \Omega^\epsilon = (X \cdot f^\epsilon)\Omega^\infty + f^\epsilon \mathcal{L}_X \Omega^\infty = (\text{div}_X \Omega^\epsilon)\Omega^\epsilon,$$

we confirm that $\text{div}_X \Omega^\epsilon$ can be taken to be arbitrary close to $\text{div}_X \Omega = r_s + r_u$. \square

4 A contact geometric characterization of Anosovity based on divergence

In this section, we show that we can use the volume forms, naturally coming from the underlying contact structures (see Section 2.2), to give necessary and sufficient conditions for Anosovity of a projectively Anosov flow, which is independent of the metric and utilizes the growth rates. We note that to go from the natural setting of (projectively) Anosov flows, which involves an often C^0 metric, which is solely X -differentiable, to the contact geometric setting, which involves C^1 geometric objects, we need subtle approximation techniques. These techniques were also used by the author in [30].

The following remark shows a given contact form for one of the underlying contact structures of a projectively Anosov flow, induces natural volume forms, as well as a norm, with respect to which we can compute the growth rates.

Remark 4.1. Notice that if $(\xi_- := \ker \alpha_-, \xi_+ := \ker \alpha_+)$ is a supporting bi-contact structure for a projectively Anosov flow, α_+ (α_-) naturally define two volume forms on M . One being the contact volume form, i.e. $\alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_+$ ($\alpha_- \wedge d\alpha_-$). Additionally, we can uniquely write $\alpha_+ = \alpha_u - \alpha_s$ ($\alpha_- = \alpha_u + \alpha_s$), where α_u and α_s are continuous 1-forms, such that $\ker \alpha_u = E^s$, $\ker \alpha_s = E^u$, $\alpha_s(e_s) > 0$ and $\alpha_u(e_u) > 0$. This induces the positive volume form $\Omega^{\alpha_+} := \alpha_s \wedge \alpha_u \wedge \alpha_X$ ($\Omega^{\alpha_-} := \alpha_s \wedge \alpha_u \wedge \alpha_X$), where α_X is any 1-form satisfying $\alpha_X(X) = 1$.

Furthermore, α_+ (α_-) define a norm on $TM/\langle X \rangle$, by letting $\|\tilde{e}\|_s = \|\tilde{e}_u\| = 1$, where $e_s \in E^s$ and $e_u \in E^u$ are vectors in $TM/\langle X \rangle$, satisfying $\pi^* \alpha_s(\tilde{e}_s) = \pi^* \alpha_u(\tilde{e}_u) = 1$. With respect to such norm, we can measure the growth rates of the underlying flow.

Here, we bring two lemmas, which we will simplify the computation in the proof of Theorem 4.4.

Lemma 4.2. Let α_+ and α_- be positive and negative contact forms, such that $(\xi_- := \ker \alpha_-, \xi_+ := \ker \alpha_+)$ is a supporting bi-contact structure for the projectively Anosov flow generated by X . Moreover, let Ω^{α_+} (Ω^{α_-}) be the volume form, and r_u^+ and r_s^+ (r_u^- and r_s^-) be the growth rates, induced by α_+ (α_-) as in Remark 4.1. Then,

$$\alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_+ = (r_u^+ - r_s^+) \Omega^{\alpha_+} \quad \left(\alpha_- \wedge d\alpha_- = -(r_u^- - r_s^-) \Omega^{\alpha_-} \right).$$

Proof. Let $e_s \in E^s$ and $e_u \in E^u$ be the unit vector fields on TM , defined as in Remark 2.5.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_+ &= \left\{ \alpha_+(e_s)d\alpha_+(e_u, X) - \alpha_+(e_u)d\alpha_+(e_s, X) \right\} \Omega^{\alpha_+} \\ &= \left\{ -\alpha_+(e_s)\alpha_+([e_u, X]) + \alpha_+(e_u)\alpha_+([e_s, X]) \right\} \Omega^{\alpha_+} = (r_u^+ - r_s^+)\Omega^{\alpha_+}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar computation for α_- finishes the proof. \square

Note that Theorem 3.1 also yields:

Lemma 4.3. *With the notation of Lemma 4.2,*

$$\mathcal{L}_X \Omega^{\alpha_+} = (r_u^+ + r_s^+)\Omega^{\alpha_+} \left(\mathcal{L}_X \Omega^{\alpha_-} = (r_u^- + r_s^-)\Omega^{\alpha_-} \right).$$

In other words,

$$\operatorname{div}_X \Omega^{\alpha_+} = r_u^+ + r_s^+ \left(\operatorname{div}_X \Omega^{\alpha_-} = r_u^- + r_s^- \right).$$

Theorem 4.4. *Let X be a projectively Anosov flow. Then, the followings are equivalent:*

- (1) X is Anosov.
- (2) There exists a positive contact form α_+ , such that for some ξ_- , the pair $(\xi_-, \xi_+ := \ker \alpha_+)$ is a supporting bi-contact structure and $-\alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_+ < (\operatorname{div}_X \Omega^{\alpha_+})\Omega^{\alpha_+} < \alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_+$.
- (3) There exists a negative contact form α_- , such that for some ξ_+ , the pair $(\xi_- := \ker \alpha_-, \xi_+)$ is a supporting bi-contact structure and $\alpha_- \wedge d\alpha_- < (\operatorname{div}_X \Omega^{\alpha_-})\Omega^{\alpha_-} < -\alpha_- \wedge d\alpha_-$.

Proof. We will show the equivalent of (1) and (2). Showing the equivalence of (1) and (3) is similar.

Assume (2) and let r_u and r_s be the associated growth rates, for some projectively Anosov flow supported by (ξ_-, ξ_+) , induced by α_+ as in Remark 4.1. Using Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3, we can translate the condition on α_+ to

$$r_s - r_u < r_s + r_u < r_u - r_s.$$

This yields $r_s < 0$ and $r_u > 0$, implying the Anosovity of X .

Now, we prove the other implication, utilizing a similar idea as above. However, the main subtlety is to use the X -differentiable norm satisfying the Anosovity condition $r_s < 0 < r_u$, to construct C^1 contact forms α_+ and α_- whose induced norms also satisfy such condition.

Define the 1-forms $\tilde{\alpha}_u$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_s$ by letting $\tilde{\alpha}_u|_{E^s} = \tilde{\alpha}_s|_{E^u} = 0$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_u(e_u) = \tilde{\alpha}_s(e_s) = 1$, where $e_s \in E^s$ and $e_u \in E^u$ are the unit vector fields, induced from the norm. If these 1-forms were C^1 , then $\tilde{\alpha}_u - \tilde{\alpha}_s$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_u + \tilde{\alpha}_s$ would have been the desired positive and negative contact forms. However, $\tilde{\alpha}_u$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_s$ are only C^0 in general and we need to approximate them with C^1 1-forms in a way that their induced growth rates still satisfy the Anosovity condition. This has been done carefully in the proof of the main theorem of [30]. Here, we describe the construction, leaving the details to the reader.

We C^0 -approximate $\tilde{\alpha}_s$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_u$ by C^1 1-forms $\bar{\alpha}_s$ and $\bar{\alpha}_u$, such that $\bar{\alpha}_s(X) = \bar{\alpha}_u(X) = 0$. There exist X -differentiable functions \bar{f}_s and \bar{f}_u , such that $\bar{f}_s \bar{\alpha}_s(e_s) = \bar{f}_u \bar{\alpha}_u(e_u) = 1$. We can approximate \bar{f}_s and \bar{f}_u by C^1 functions f_s and f_u , assuming that $|\bar{f}_s - f_s|$ and $|X \cdot \bar{f}_s - X \cdot f_s|$, as well as $|\bar{f}_u - f_u|$ and $|X \cdot \bar{f}_u - X \cdot f_u|$, are arbitrary small ([30], Lemma 4.2). In particular, since we have $r_s < 0 < r_u$ everywhere, we can assume that

$$X \cdot [f_u \bar{\alpha}_u(e_u)] + (\min_{x \in M} r_u) f_u \bar{\alpha}_u(e_u) \quad \text{and} \quad X \cdot [f_s \bar{\alpha}_s(e_s)] + (\max_{x \in M} r_s) f_s \bar{\alpha}_s(e_s)$$

are everywhere positive and negative, respectively.

Now, letting $\alpha_u^0 := f_u \bar{\alpha}_u$ and $\alpha_s^0 := f_s \bar{\alpha}_s$, we define

$$\alpha_u^T := I_u^T \phi^{T*} \alpha_u^0 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_s^T := I_s^{-T} \phi^{-T*} \alpha_s^0;$$

where

$$I_u^T := e^{-\int_0^T r_u(t) dt} \quad \text{and} \quad I_s^T := e^{-\int_0^T r_s(t) dt}.$$

It is easy to derive the following properties (See Section 4 of [30] for proofs):

Proposition 4.5. *One can compute*

- (1) $\alpha_u^T(e_u) = \alpha_u^0(e_u) = f_u \bar{\alpha}_u(e_u)$ and $\alpha_s^T(e_s) = \alpha_s^0(e_s) = f_s \bar{\alpha}_s(e_s)$,
- (2) $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha_u^T(e_s) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha_s^T(e_u) = 0$,
- (3) $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} X \cdot \alpha_u^T(e_s) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} X \cdot \alpha_s^T(e_u) = 0$

We define $\alpha_+^T := \alpha_u^T - \alpha_s^T$ and claim that this is the desired negative contact form. Let $e_s^T \in E^s$ and $e_u^T \in E^u$ be the unit vector fields, and r_s^T and r_u^T be the growth rates, with respect to the norm induced from α_+^T . Similar to Lemma 4.2, we can compute (A_s and A_u are positive functions satisfying $e_s^T = A_s e_s$ and $e_u^T = A_u e_u$):

$$\begin{aligned} r_s^T &= \alpha_+^T(e_u^T) d\alpha_+^T(e_s^T, X) = A_u A_s \alpha_+^T(e_u) d\alpha_+^T(e_s, X) = A_u A_s \alpha_+^T(e_u) \{ -X \cdot \alpha_+^T(e_s) - \alpha_+^T([e_s, X]) \} \\ &= A_u A_s \left\{ \alpha_u^T(e_u) - \alpha_s^T(e_u) \right\} \left\{ -X \cdot \alpha_u^T(e_s) + X \cdot \alpha_s^T(e_s) - r_u \alpha_u^T(e_s) + r_s \alpha_s^T(e_s) \right\} \\ &\approx A_u A_s \alpha_u^T(e_u) \{ X \cdot [f_s \bar{\alpha}_s(e_s)] + r_s f_s \bar{\alpha}_s(e_s) \} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the computation above, T is assumed to be sufficiently large (yielding the approximation) and we have used Proposition 4.5.

Similar computation for the unstable growth rate shows that such α_+^T satisfies the conditions of (2), finishing the proof. □

5 Invariant volume forms, (-1) -Cartan structures and Liouville reparametrization

In this section, we study the symmetries that the existence of an invariant volume form implies on the geometry of a smooth volume preserving Anosov flow. This gives us various characterizations of an Anosov flow being volume preserving, in terms of the theory of contact hyperbolas, the Reeb dynamics of the supporting contact structures, and Liouville geometry.

In what follows, by a *volume preserving* Anosov flow, we mean one which preserves a smooth volume form. We note that if the flow is smooth (including in all the results of this section), there is no ambiguity about the regularity of the preserved volume form. That is since, by Corollary 2.1 of [33], when a *smooth* Anosov flow preserves a continuous volume form, such volume form is in fact smooth.

We first note that by [31], E^s and E^u are tangent to C^1 foliations, when X is a smooth Anosov flow, preserving a smooth volume form. This is an important fact in what follows, since it helps us preserve the metric symmetries of a volume preserving Anosov flow, when translating to the framework of contact geometry (which in the general case, requires approximation techniques, as in Theorem 4.4, which do not a priori respect such symmetry).

Let $\tilde{e}_u \in E^u$ be unit vector field with respect to a metric, satisfying the Anosovity condition and let $\tilde{\alpha}_u$ be a 1-form, such that $\tilde{\alpha}_u|_{E^s} = 0$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_u(\tilde{e}_u) = 1$. $\tilde{\alpha}_u$ can be approximated by a C^1 1-form α_u , such that $\alpha_u|_{E^s} = 0$ and for the vector field e_u with $\alpha_u(e_u) = 1$, we have $r_u := \alpha_u([e_u, X]) > 0$. That is, the induced growth rate of the unstable direction is positive.

Let Ω be a smooth volume form which is invariant under the flow, and define $\alpha_s := \Omega(\cdot, e_u, X)$. Note that α_s is a C^1 1-form, whose kernel is E^s . Since $\text{div}_X \Omega = 0$, by Theorem 3.1 we have $r_s := \alpha_s([e_s, X]) = -r_u < 0$.

Now, define $\alpha_+ := \alpha_u - \alpha_s$ and notice that α_+ is a positive contact form, since its induced growth rates satisfy $r_u - r_s = 2r_u = -2r_s > 0$. Similarly, define the negative contact structure $\alpha_- = \alpha_u + \alpha_s$. Therefore, for any smooth volume preserving Anosov flow, we have a supporting bi-contact structure ($\xi_- := \ker \alpha_- = \ker \alpha_u + \alpha_s$, $\xi_+ := \ker \alpha_+ = \ker \alpha_u - \alpha_s$), which captures the symmetry of an invariant volume form.

Furthermore, by solving $d\alpha_+(R_{\alpha_+}, X) = d\alpha_-(R_{\alpha_-}, X) = 0$ and , one can easily show that

$$R_{\alpha_+} \subset \langle e_u - e_s \rangle = \xi_- \quad \text{and} \quad R_{\alpha_-} \subset \langle e_u + e_s \rangle = \xi_-.$$

5.1 Taut contact hyperbolas and a Reeb dynamical characterization

As it can be seen in the discussion above, additional geometric symmetry can be observed in the case of volume preserving Anosov flows. In this section, we describe this extra structure, in terms of the theory of *contact hyperbolas*, developed by Perrone [37], following the similar theory of *contact circles* by Geiges-Gonzalo [23, 22].

A *contact hyperbola* on M is a pair of positive and negative contact forms (α_1, α_2) , such that $\alpha_a := a_1\alpha_1 + a_2\alpha_2$ is also a contact structure, for any $a := (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{H}_r^1$, where $H_r^1 = \{(a_1, a_2) | a_1^2 - a_2^2 = r\}$ for $r \in \{-1, 1\}$. Furthermore, a contact hyperbola is called *taut*, if $\alpha_a \wedge d\alpha_a = r\alpha_1 \wedge d\alpha_1$ (or equivalently, $\alpha_a \wedge d\alpha_a = -r\alpha_2 \wedge d\alpha_2$), for any $a \in \mathbb{H}_r^1$. It is easy to show [37] that (α_1, α_2) is a taut contact hyperbola, if and only if,

$$\alpha_1 \wedge d\alpha_1 = -\alpha_2 \wedge d\alpha_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_1 \wedge d\alpha_2 = -\alpha_2 \wedge d\alpha_1.$$

Notice that if (α_1, α_2) is a taut contact hyperbola, then $\ker \alpha_1$ and $\ker \alpha_2$ form a bi-contact structure if transverse, with any flow directing the intersection of them being projectively Anosov. It is known that the converse is not true, i.e. there are projectively Anosov flows which do not form a contact hyperbola.

As it is seen above, for a smooth volume preserving Anosov flow, the supporting bi-contact structure ($\ker \alpha_- = \ker \{\alpha_u + \alpha_s\}$, $\ker \alpha_+ := \ker \{\alpha_u - \alpha_s\}$) exists, where $\alpha_u|_{E^s} = \alpha_s|_{E^u} = 0$, and the induced volume forms and the growth rates satisfy $\Omega^{\alpha_-} = \Omega^{\alpha_+}$ and $r_s^+ = r_s^- = -r_u^+ = -r_u^-$, respectively. By Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_+ = (r_u^+ - r_s^+) \Omega^{\alpha_+} = (r_u^- - r_s^-) \Omega^{\alpha_-} = -\alpha_- \wedge d\alpha_-.$$

Moreover, Lemma ?? shows that $R_{\alpha_+} \subset \xi_-$ and $R_{\alpha_-} \subset \xi_+$, yielding

$$\alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_- = -\alpha_- \wedge \alpha_+ = 0.$$

Therefore, (α_-, α_+) is a taut contact hyperbola in this case. In fact, it satisfies the stronger condition of $\alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_- = -\alpha_- \wedge \alpha_+ = 0$. A taut contact hyperbola with this property is called a *(-1)-Cartan structure* [37]. It turns out that, not only this can be improved to a geometric characterization of volume preserving flows, it will also give us a characterization, purely in terms of the underlying Reeb flows.

Theorem 5.1. *Let ϕ^t be a smooth projectively Anosov flow on M . Then, the followings are equivalent:*

(1) *The flow ϕ^t is a volume preserving Anosov flow.*

(2) *There exist a supporting bi-contact structure (ξ_-, ξ_+) and contact forms α_- and α_+ for ξ_- and ξ_+ , respectively, such that (α_-, α_+) is a (-1) -Cartan structure.*

(3) *There exist a supporting bi-contact structure (ξ_-, ξ_+) and Reeb vector fields R_{α_-} and R_{α_+} for ξ_- and ξ_+ , respectively, such that $R_{\alpha_-} \subset \xi_+$ and $R_{\alpha_+} \subset \xi_-$.*

Proof. The above discussion shows that (1) implies (2). We can also conclude (3) from (2), by noticing that $\alpha_- \wedge d\alpha_+ = -\alpha_+ \wedge d\alpha_- = 0$ yields $R_{\alpha_-} \subset \xi_+$ and $R_{\alpha_+} \subset \xi_-$. Therefore, the only remaining part is to show that the flow is volume preserving, with the assumptions of (3).

We first note that any projectively Anosov flow with $R_{\alpha_-} \subset \xi_+$ and $R_{\alpha_+} \subset \xi_-$ is Anosov, thanks to Theorem 6.3 of [30]. Let α_- and α_+ be the contact forms in (3). As in Remark 4.1, we consider the growth rates r_s and r_u , induced from the decomposition $\alpha_+ = \alpha_u - \alpha_s$. Notice that we can write $\alpha_- = f\alpha_u + g\alpha_s$, for positive X -differentiable functions $f, g > 0$. As it was mentioned in Lemma ?? (or is done in Section 6 of [30]), and using the fact that $\alpha_+(R_{\alpha_+}) = 1$, we can write (q_+ being a real function)

$$R_{\alpha_+} = \frac{1}{r_u - r_s}(-r_s e_u - r_u e_s) + q_+ X. \quad (1)$$

and from $\alpha_-(R_{\alpha_+}) = 0$, we get

$$g = -\frac{f r_s}{r_u}. \quad (2)$$

Also, using $\alpha_+(R_{\alpha_-}) = 0$ and $\alpha_-(R_{\alpha_-}) = 1$, we can write (q_- being a real function)

$$R_{\alpha_-} = \frac{1}{f + g}(e_u + e_s) + q_- X. \quad (3)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= d\alpha_-(R_{\alpha_-}, X) = d\alpha_-(e_s + e_u, X) = -X \cdot \alpha_-(e_s, e_u) - \alpha_-([e_s + e_u, X]) \\ &\Rightarrow X \cdot f + X \cdot g + g r_s + f r_u = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Plugging Equation 2 in the above, we get

$$X \cdot f + f r_u - \left(\frac{r_s}{r_u}\right) X \cdot f - f X \cdot \left(\frac{r_s}{r_u}\right) - \frac{f r_s^2}{r_u} = 0.$$

Multiplying both sides by $\frac{r_u}{f(r_u - r_s)}$ and with some manipulation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{X \cdot f}{f} + r_u + r_s + \frac{r_u X \cdot \left(\frac{r_u - r_s}{r_u}\right)}{r_u - r_s} &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow r_u + r_s &= X \cdot \left(\ln \frac{r_u}{f(r_u - r_s)}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Although the solution set for the above differential equation might be hard to understand in general, it turns out that solving Equation 5 over the periodic orbits of our flow suffices for our goal, thanks to the classical *Livšic theory* of dynamical systems.

Let γ be a periodic orbit of X and define a 1-form β_X with $\beta_X(X) = 1$. Integrating both sides of Equation 5 over γ , we get

$$\int_{\gamma} (r_u + r_s)\beta_X = \int_{\gamma} X \cdot \left(\ln \frac{r_u}{f(r_u - r_s)} \right) \beta_X = 0. \quad (6)$$

One can easily show (or see Proposition 3.14 of [30]) that the eigenvalues of the Poincaré return map $T_{\gamma(0)} : TM_{\gamma(0)} \rightarrow TM_{\gamma(0)}$ of γ , corresponding to the unstable and stable directions, are $\lambda_u^\gamma := e^{\int_{\gamma} r_u \beta_X}$ and $\lambda_s^\gamma := e^{\int_{\gamma} r_s \beta_X}$. Therefore, Equation 6 proves that such return map is volume preserving for any periodic orbit of X , since $\det(T_{\gamma(0)}) = \lambda_u^\gamma \lambda_s^\gamma = 1$. Now, Sinai-Livšic [32] shows that this is sufficient for the flow to admit an absolutely continuous volume form and de la Llave-Marco-Moriyón ([33], Corollary 2.1) yields that in fact such volume form is smooth, completing the proof. \square

Theorem 5.1 gives examples of (-1) -Cartan structures and taut contact hyperbolas, whenever we have volume preserving flows, including the case of algebraic Anosov flows and more interestingly, we get examples on hyperbolic manifolds, using the examples of contact Anosov flows on those manifolds [18].

Corollary 5.2. *There exist infinitely many hyperbolic manifolds which admit a (-1) -Cartan structure (and in particular, a taut contact hyperbola).*

5.2 From the viewpoint of Liouville geometry

In [30], we have shown how from an Anosov flow X on a 3-manifold M , we can construct two *Liouville pairs*, (α_-, α_+) and $(-\alpha_-, \alpha_+)$, where $(\xi_- := \ker \alpha_-, \xi_+ := \ker \alpha_+)$ is supporting bi-contact structure for X . That is, $\omega_1 := d\alpha_1$ and $\omega_2 := d\alpha_2$ are exact symplectic structures on $M \times [-1, 1]_t$, where $\alpha_1 := (1-t)\alpha_- + (1+t)\alpha_+$ and $\alpha_2 := (1-t)\alpha_- - (1+t)\alpha_+$.

Recall that $(W, d\alpha)$ is an *exact symplectic 4-manifold*, if W is an oriented 4-manifold (with boundary) and $d\alpha$ is an exact symplectic structure on W , i.e. $d\alpha \wedge d\alpha > 0$. For any exact symplectic manifold $(W, d\alpha)$, there exists a unique vector field Y , such that $\iota_Y d\alpha = \alpha$, or equivalently $\mathcal{L}_Y d\alpha = d\alpha$. Such vector field is call a *Liouville vector field*, if it points in the outward direction on ∂W , and the pair (W, Y) is called a *Liouville structure*. We note that this is the case for an exact symplectic manifold constructed from an Anosov 3-flows above, since it *fills* the contact manifold $(M, \xi_+) \cup (-M, \xi_-)$.

The relation of the associated Liouville vector field and the underlying Anosov vector field is more subtle in the general case. But for smooth volume preserving Anosov flows, such connection becomes very straightforward, thanks to the symmetries implied by the existence of an invariant volume form and the fact that in this case, the stable and unstable foliations are C^1 [31] and as in Theorem 5.1, we do not need approximation techniques (like in Theorem 4.4), which might not respect such symmetry.

In what follows, consider X to be a smooth volume preserving Anosov flow on the 3-manifold M and let $(\alpha_- = \alpha_u + \alpha_s, \alpha_+ = \alpha_u - \alpha_s)$ be the (-1) -Cartan structure of Theorem 5.1. We define the 1-form $\alpha_1 := (1-t)\alpha_- + (1+t)\alpha_+ = 2\alpha_u - 2t\alpha_s$ on $M \times [-1, 1]_t$, and compute

$$\begin{aligned} d\alpha_1 \wedge d\alpha_1 &= \{2d\alpha_u - 2dt \wedge \alpha_s - 2td\alpha_s\} \wedge \{2d\alpha_u - 2dt \wedge \alpha_s - 2td\alpha_s\} \\ &= -4dt \wedge \alpha_s \wedge d\alpha_u = 4r_u dt \wedge \Omega^{\alpha_+}, \end{aligned}$$

implying that $(M \times [-1, 1]_t, d\alpha_1)$ is an exact symplectic manifold. Similarly, we can show $d\alpha_2 \wedge d\alpha_2 = -r_s dt \wedge \Omega^{\alpha_-}$, yielding another exact symplectic structure on $M \times [-1, 1]_t$. Notice that with the above assumptions, we have $r_u = -r_s > 0$ and $\Omega^{\alpha_+} = \Omega^{\alpha_-}$. But the fact that the stable and unstable foliations are C^1 plays a crucial role in preserving the symmetry, when going from a metric description of the underlying Anosov flow to a contact geometric one, and hence, significantly simplifying the construction of the above Liouville pairs, compared to the general case studied in [30]. We also remark that, unless X is an algebraic Anosov flow [25], the (-1) -Cartan structure is a priori only C^1 , and therefore, the 2-forms $d\alpha_1$ and $d\alpha_2$ above are exact symplectic structures, a priori only in the C^0 sense.

Now, if we define the vector field $Y_1 := \frac{1}{r_u}X + 2t\partial_t$, we can compute

$$\iota_{Y_1}d\alpha_1 = \frac{2}{r_u}\iota_X d\alpha_u - 4t\alpha_s - \frac{2t}{r_u}\iota_X d\alpha_s = 2\alpha_u - 4t\alpha_s + 2t\alpha_s = \alpha_1.$$

Therefore, Y_1 is the Liouville vector field for $(M \times [-1, 1]_t, d\alpha_1)$. Notice that a similar computation helps us compute the Liouville vector field of $(M \times [-1, 1]_t, d\alpha_2)$. It is noteworthy and surprising that although the constructed symplectic structures above are a priori only C^0 , their corresponding Liouville vector fields are smooth. Similarly

Now, if we consider the vector field $X_L := \frac{1}{r_u}X$, which is a reparametrization of the original flow, whose associated growth rates are $r'_u = \frac{r_u}{r_u} = 1$ and $r'_s = \frac{r_s}{r_u} = -1$, respectively (see Remark 3.18 of [30]), we have $Y_1|_{M \times \{0\}} = X_L$. We call such X_L the *Liouville reparametrization of a smooth volume preserving Anosov 3-flow*.

The following theorem proves that the Liouville reparametrization of a smooth volume preserving Anosov flow has even a closer relation to the underlying Reeb dynamics of Theorem 5.1

Theorem 5.3. *Let X be a smooth volume preserving Anosov vector field. The Liouville reparametrization X_L of X satisfies the following:*

(1) *The flow of X_L preserves the transverse plane field $\langle R_{\alpha_-}, R_{\alpha_+} \rangle$, where R_{α_-} and R_{α_+} are the Reeb vector fields of Theorem 5.1;*

(2) *The pair (M, X_L) can be extended to a smooth Liouville structure $([-1, 1] \times M, Y)$, such that $([-1, 1] \times M, Y)|_{M \times \{0\}} = (M, X_L)$.*

Proof. The above argument yields (2). In order to prove (1), let $(\alpha_- = \alpha_u + \alpha_s, \alpha_+ = \alpha_u - \alpha_s)$ be the (-1) -Cartan structure of Theorem 5.1. We have

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_L}\alpha_+ = \mathcal{L}_{X_L}(\alpha_u - \alpha_s) = \alpha_u + \alpha_s = \alpha_-.$$

Similarly, one can show $\mathcal{L}_{X_L}\alpha_- = \alpha_+$. Define the 1-form α_{X_L} by letting $\alpha_{X_L}(X_L) = 1$ and $\alpha_{X_L}(\langle R_{\alpha_-}, R_{\alpha_+} \rangle) = 0$. The goal is prove $\mathcal{L}_{X_L}\alpha_{X_L} = 0$. Note that by construction, α_{X_L} is differentiable along the flow and $(\mathcal{L}_{X_L}\alpha_{X_L}) \wedge \alpha_{X_L} = 0$.

Also, by plugging the basis $(R_{\alpha_-}, R_{\alpha_+}, X_L)$, we can observe

$$d\alpha_+ = \alpha_{X_L} \wedge \alpha_- \quad \text{and} \quad d\alpha_- = \alpha_{X_L} \wedge \alpha_+,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_{X_L}\alpha_{X_L}) \wedge \alpha_- &= \mathcal{L}_{X_L}(\alpha_{X_L} \wedge \alpha_-) - \alpha_{X_L} \wedge \mathcal{L}_{X_L}\alpha_- \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{X_L}d\alpha_+ - \alpha_{X_L} \wedge \alpha_+ = d(\mathcal{L}_{X_L}\alpha_+) - \alpha_{X_L} \wedge \alpha_+ = d\alpha_- - d\alpha_- = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $(\mathcal{L}_{X_L}\alpha_{X_L}) \wedge \alpha_+ = 0$. This yields $\mathcal{L}_{X_L}\alpha_{X_L} = 0$, completing the proof. \square

6 Applications to bi-contact surgeries

In this section, we discuss the implications of our work in the surgery theory of Anosov flows. Theorem 5.1 shows that for volume preserving Anosov flows, the Reeb vector fields associated with the supporting bi-contact structure ($\xi_- = \ker \alpha_-$, $\xi_+ = \ker \alpha_+$) can be contained in one another. In this case, if we flow a periodic orbit of the flow γ_0 , which is a Legendrian knot for both ξ_- and ξ_+ , along one of these Reeb vector fields, say R_{α_+} , it stays Legendrian for ξ_+ (since R_{α_+} preserves ξ_+) and it immediately becomes transverse to ξ_- (since R_{α_+} is a Legendrian vector field for ξ_-). We call such a knot a *Legendrian-transverse* knot.

In [40, 41], Salmoiraghi develops two flavors of *bi-contact surgery* operations in a neighborhood of a Legendrian-transverse knot. One of these operations is applied by cutting the manifold on an annulus, which is tangent to the flow and contains the Legendrian-transverse knot, and then glueing back using a Dehn twist [40]. The other operation is applied to a transverse annulus containing such knot [41]. Moreover, he shows that using the coordinates coming from the above argument on the Reeb vector field, one can reconstruct the classical *Goodman-Fried surgery* in the neighborhood of a periodic orbit of an Anosov flow, using the bi-contact surgery of [41]. However, notice that in the above argument, it suffices for the Reeb vector field of just one of the contact structures to be contained in the other contact structure, only in a small neighborhood of the periodic orbit one wants to apply the Goodman-Fried surgery on. In the following, we show that this is possible for *any* (possibly non volume preserving) C^{1+} Anosov flow, where by a C^{1+} flow, we mean a C^1 flow with Hölder continuous derivatives (that includes any C^2 flow).

Theorem 6.1. *Let X be a C^{1+} Anosov flow. Given any periodic orbit γ_0 , there exists a supporting bi-contact structure ($\xi_-, \xi_+ = \ker \alpha_+$), such that we have $R_{\alpha_+} \subset \xi_-$ in a regular neighborhood of γ_0 . Therefore, there exists an isotopy $\{\gamma_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$, which is supported in an arbitrary small neighborhood of γ_0 , and γ_t is a Legendrian-transverse knot for any $0 < t \leq 1$.*

Proof. As discussed above, it is enough to show that there exists a tubular neighborhood $N(\gamma_0)$ and a pair of contact forms α_+ and α_- , such that $(\ker \alpha_-, \ker \alpha_+)$ is a supporting bi-contact structure for X and $\alpha_-(R_{\alpha_+}) = 0$. It is easy to show that this would have been possible, if the associated growth rates were constant. The idea of the proof is to find an appropriate norm, which satisfies this condition on γ_0 and use the openness of the contact condition. To do so, we need an approximation technique similar to Theorem 4.4. The only caveat is that we need our approximation not to affect the preassigned norm on γ_0 .

Let T be the period of γ_0 and $\lambda_u^{\gamma_0}$ and $\lambda_s^{\gamma_0}$ be the eigenvalues of the return map along γ_0 , corresponding to the unstable and stable directions, respectively. We can choose an X -differentiable norm on $TM/\langle X \rangle|_{\gamma_0}$, such that the induced growth rates $r_u|_{\gamma_0}$ and $r_s|_{\gamma_0}$ are constants satisfying $e^{r_u T} = \lambda_u^{\gamma_0}$ and $e^{r_s T} = \lambda_s^{\gamma_0}$. We can then extend such norm to a C^1 norm on $TM/\langle X \rangle \simeq E^s \oplus E^u$ in a neighborhood of γ_0 . Let $N(\gamma_0)$ be a possibly smaller neighborhood, on which $r_s < 0 < r_u$.

We define the C^0 1-forms $\tilde{\alpha}_u$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_s$, by letting $\tilde{\alpha}_u(E^s) = \tilde{\alpha}_s(E^u) = 0$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_u(e_u) = \tilde{\alpha}_s(e_s) = 1$, where $e_s \in E^s$ and $e_u \in E^u$ are the unit vectors with respect to our norm. We can C^0 -approximate $\tilde{\alpha}_u$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_s$ by smooth 1-forms $\bar{\alpha}_u$ and $\bar{\alpha}_s$ and find X -differentiable functions f_u and f_s such that $f_u \bar{\alpha}_u(e_u) = f_s \bar{\alpha}_s(e_s) = 1$. Using the following lemma, we can approximate these functions with appropriate C^1 functions to serve our goal.

Lemma 6.2. *If f is X -differentiable and η -Hölder continuous and γ is a periodic orbit of X (a C^1 flow on n -dimensional closed manifold M). Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a C^1 function \bar{f} , such that $f = \bar{f}|_{\gamma}$ and we have $|f - \bar{f}| < \epsilon$ and $|X \cdot f - X \cdot \bar{f}| < \epsilon$.*

Proof. We can write $f(x) = f^\gamma(x) + d^{\frac{\eta}{2}}(x)g(x)$, where $f^\gamma(x)$ is any C^1 extension of $f|_\gamma$, $d(x)$ is the distance of any point of M from γ (which is a C^1 function) and $g(x)$ is well-defined, continuous and X -differentiable on $M \setminus \gamma$. We extend g to M by letting $g(\gamma) = 0$.

Claim 6.3. *The function g is continuous and X -differentiable on M .*

Proof.

$$\lim_{d(x) \rightarrow 0} g(x) = \lim_{d(x) \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x) - f^\gamma(x)}{d^{\frac{\eta}{2}}(x)} = \lim_{d(x) \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x) - f^\gamma(x)}{d^\eta(x)} d^{\frac{\eta}{2}}(x) = 0.$$

The last equality follows from f being η -Hölder continuous. Therefore, g is a continuous function on M (in fact it is $\frac{\eta}{2}$ -Hölder continuous). Moreover, g is X -differentiable everywhere, since we have $X \cdot g|_\gamma = 0$. \square

Now, we use Lemma 4.2 of [30] to find a C^1 function \bar{g} , where $|g - \bar{g}|$ and $|X \cdot g - X \cdot \bar{g}|$ arbitrary small. In fact, if we define $\bar{f} := f^\gamma + d^{\frac{\eta}{2}}\bar{g}$, we can find an approximation of g , such that \bar{f} is the desired C^1 function. This completes the proof of Lemma 6.2. \square

Let \bar{f}_s and \bar{f}_u be the approximations of f_s and f_u as in Lemma 6.2. Define the C^1 contact forms α_+^T and α_-^T as in Theorem 4.4 (for sufficiently large T) and let $e'_s \in E^s$, $e'_u \in E^u$, r'_u and r'_s be induced as before. We can observe that by construction, we have $e_s = e'_s$, $e_u = e'_u$, $r_s = r'_s$ and $r_u = r'_u$, when restricted to γ_0 . As in Equation 1, we have $R_{\alpha_+^T} = \frac{1}{r'_u - r'_s} \{-r'_u e'_s - r'_s e'_u\} + q_+ X$, for some real function q_+ . Let $\xi'_- := \langle R_{\alpha_+}, X \rangle$.

Claim 6.4. *There exists a regular neighborhood $N(\gamma_0)$, on which ξ'_- is a negative contact structure.*

Proof. Choose a 1-form α_- such that $\xi'_- := \ker \alpha_-$ and $\alpha_-(e'_s + e'_u) > 0$. Compute

$$\begin{aligned} d\alpha_-(R_{\alpha_+}, X) &= \frac{1}{r'_u - r'_s} \alpha_-([X, -r'_u e'_s - r'_s e'_u]) \\ \Rightarrow d\alpha_-(R_{\alpha_+}, X)|_{\gamma_0} &= \frac{r'_s r'_u}{r'_u - r'_s} \alpha_-(e'_s + e'_u) < 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality, we have used the fact that by construction, we have $X \cdot r'_s = X \cdot r_s = X \cdot r'_u = X \cdot r_u = 0$ on γ_0 . Thanks to the openness of the contact condition, ξ'_- is a negative contact structure in some small regular neighborhood $N(\gamma_0)$. \square

We can extend $\xi'|_{N(\gamma_0)}$ to some negative contact structure ξ_- on M , such that the supporting bi-contact structure $(\xi_-, \xi_+ = \ker \alpha_+)$ has the desired properties. \square

Corollary 6.5. *The bi-contact surgeries of Salmoiraghi [40, 41] can be applied in an arbitrary small neighborhood of a periodic orbit of any C^{1+} Anosov flow. In particular, the bi-contact surgery of [41] reconstructs the Goodman-Fried surgery.*

References

- [1] Anosov, Dmitry Victorovich. *Ergodic properties of geodesic flows on closed Riemannian manifolds of negative curvature*. Hamiltonian Dynamical Systems. CRC Press, 2020. 486-489.
- [2] Anosov, Dmitry Victorovich. *Geodesic flows on closed Riemannian manifolds of negative curvature*. Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov 90.5 (1967).
- [3] Araújo, Vítor, and Maria José Pacifico. *Three-dimensional flows*. Vol. 53. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [4] Arroyo, Aubin, and Federico Rodriguez Hertz. *Homoclinic bifurcations and uniform hyperbolicity for three-dimensional flows*. Annales de l'IHP Analyse non linéaire. Vol. 20. No. 5. 2003.
- [5] Asaoka, Masayuki. *Goodman-Fried surgery, Birkhoff section, and R-covered Anosov flows*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.08215 (2021).
- [6] Asaoka, Masayuki. *On invariant volumes of codimension-one Anosov flows and the Verjovsky conjecture*. Inventiones mathematicae 174.2 (2008): 435.
- [7] Asaoka, Masayuki. *Regular projectively Anosov flows on three-dimensional manifolds*. Annales de l'Institut Fourier. Vol. 60. No. 5. 2010.
- [8] Asaoka, Masayuki, Emmanuel Dufraine, and Takeo Noda. *Homotopy classes of total foliations*. Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici 87.2 (2012): 271-302.
- [9] Barthelmé, Thomas. *Anosov flows in dimension 3 preliminary version*. Preprint (2017).
- [10] Barthelmé, Thomas, and Kathryn Mann. *Orbit equivalences of \mathbb{R} -covered Anosov flows and applications*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.11811 (2020).
- [11] Blair, David E. *Riemannian geometry of contact and symplectic manifolds*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [12] Blair, David E., and D. Perrone. *Conformally Anosov flows in contact metric geometry*. Balkan Journal of Geometry and Its Applications 3.2 (1998): 33-46.
- [13] Bonatti, Christian, Lorenzo J. Díaz, and Marcelo Viana. *Dynamics beyond uniform hyperbolicity: A global geometric and probabilistic perspective*. Vol. 102. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [14] Bowden, Jonathan, Christian Bonatti, and Rafael Potrie. *Some remarks on projective Anosov flows in hyperbolic 3-manifolds*. 2018 MATRIX Annals. Springer, Cham, 2020. 359-369.
- [15] Colin, Vincent, and Sebastiao Firmo. *Paires de structures de contact sur les variétés de dimension trois*. Algebraic & Geometric Topology 11.5 (2011): 2627-2653.
- [16] Doering, Clauss. *persistently transitive vector fields on three-dimensional manifolds*, *Dynamical Systems and Bifurcation Theory*. Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser. 160 (1987): 59-89.
- [17] Eliashberg, Yakov, and William P. Thurston. *Confoliations*. Vol. 13. American Mathematical Soc., 1998.

- [18] Foulon, Patrick, and Boris Hasselblatt. *Contact Anosov flows on hyperbolic 3-manifolds*. *Geometry & Topology* 17.2 (2013): 1225-1252.
- [19] Franks, John, and Bob Williams. *Anomalous Anosov flows*. *Global theory of dynamical systems*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1980. 158-174.
- [20] Fried, David. Transitive Anosov flows and pseudo-Anosov maps. *Topology* 22.3 (1983): 299-303.
- [21] Geiges, Hansjörg. *An introduction to contact topology*. Vol. 109. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [22] Geiges, Hansjörg, and Jesús Gonzalo. *Contact circles on 3-manifolds*. *Journal of Differential Geometry* 46.2 (1997): 236-286.
- [23] Geiges, Hansjörg, and Jesús Gonzalo. *Contact geometry and complex surfaces*. *Inventiones mathematicae* 121.1 (1995): 147-209.
- [24] Goodman, Sue. *Dehn surgery on Anosov flows*. *Geometric dynamics*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1983. 300-307.
- [25] Ghys, Étienne. *Rigidité différentiable des groupes fuchsien*s. "Publications Mathématiques de l'Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques 78.1 (1993): 163-185.
- [26] Handel, Michael, and William P. Thurston. Anosov flows on new three manifolds. *Inventiones mathematicae* 59.2 (1980): 95-103.
- [27] Hirsch, Morris W., Charles C. Pugh, and Michael Shub. *Invariant manifolds*. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 76.5 (1970): 1015-1019.
- [28] Hozoori, Surena. *Dynamics and topology of conformally Anosov contact 3-manifolds*. *Differential Geometry and its Applications* 73 (2020): 101679.
- [29] Hozoori, Surena. *Ricci curvature, Reeb flows and contact 3-manifolds*. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis* (2021): 1-26.
- [30] Hozoori, Surena. *Symplectic Geometry of Anosov Flows in Dimension 3 and Bi-Contact Topology*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.02768 (2020).
- [31] Hurder, Steve, and Anatole Katok. *Differentiability, rigidity and Godbillon-Vey classes for Anosov flows*. *Publications Mathématiques de l'Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques* 72.1 (1990): 5-61.
- [32] Livšic, A. N., Sinai, Ja. G. *Invariant measures that are compatible with smoothness for transitive C-systems*. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 207 (1972), 1039–1041.
- [33] de la Llave, Rafael, Jose Manuel Marco, and Roberto Moriyón. *Canonical perturbation theory of Anosov systems and regularity results for the Livsic cohomology equation*. *Annals of Mathematics* 123.3 (1986): 537-611.
- [34] Margulis, Gregori Aleksandrovitsch. *On some aspects of the theory of Anosov systems*. *On Some Aspects of the Theory of Anosov Systems*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004. 1-71.

- [35] Mitsumatsu, Yoshihiko. *Anosov flows and non-Stein symplectic manifolds*. Annales de l'institut Fourier. Vol. 45. No. 5. 1995.
- [36] Noda, Takeo. *Projectively Anosov flows with differentiable (un) stable foliations*. Annales de l'institut Fourier. Vol. 50. No. 5. 2000.
- [37] Perrone, Domenico. *Taut contact hyperbolas on three-manifolds*. Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry (2021): 1-31.
- [38] Pujals, Enrique. *From hyperbolicity to dominated splitting*. Inst. de Matemática Pura e Aplicada, 2006.
- [39] Pujals, Enrique R., and Martín Sambarino. *On the dynamics of dominated splitting*. Annals of mathematics (2009): 675-739.
- [40] Salmoiraghi, Federico. *Surgery on Anosov flows using bi-contact geometry*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07109 (2021).
- [41] Salmoiraghi, Federico. *Goodman surgery and projectively Anosov flows*. In Preparation.
- [42] Shannon, Mario. *Dehn surgeries and smooth structures on 3-dimensional transitive Anosov flows*. General Topology [math.GN]. Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté, 2020. English. fNNT : 2020UBFCK035ff. fftel-02951219f.
- [43] Yu, Bin. *Anosov flows on Dehn surgeries on the figure-eight knot*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.16348 (2021).

Surena Hozoori, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ATLANTA, GA 30332
E-mail address: shozoori3@gatech.edu