Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.
VOL. 21 NO. 2 (1998) 249-254

TWO THEOREMS ON (ε)-SASAKIAN MANIFOLDS

XU XUFENG

Department of Mathematics
Xuzhou Normal University
Xuzhou, 221009, P.R. China

and

CHAO XIAOLI

Department of Mathematics
Hangzhou University
Hangzhou, 310028, P.R. China

(Received April 1, 1996 and in revised form July 15, 1996)

ABSTRACT. In this paper, We prove that every (ε)–sasakian manifold is a hypersurface of an indefinite kaehlerian manifold, and give a necessary and sufficient condition for a Riemannian manifold to be an (ε)– sasakian manifold.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES: (ε)–sasakian manifolds; real hypersurface; indefinite kaehlerian manifolds; (ε)–almost contact structure.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let M be a real $(2n+1)$–dimensional differentiable manifold endowed with an almost contact structure (ϕ,ξ,η). This means that ϕ is a tensor field of type (1,1), ξ is a vector field and η is a 1–form on M satisfying:

$$\phi^2 = -I + \eta \otimes \xi; \qquad \eta(\xi) = 1 \tag{1}$$

It follows that

$$\eta \circ \phi = 0; \phi(\xi) = 0; rank\phi = 2n \tag{2}$$

If there exists a semi–Riemannian metric g on M that satisfies (see [1])

$$g(\phi X, \phi Y) = g(X,Y) - \varepsilon\eta(X)\eta(Y) \qquad \forall X,Y \in \Gamma(TM) \tag{3}$$

Where $\varepsilon = \pm 1$,We call (ϕ,ξ,η,g) an (ε)–almost contact metric structure and M an (ε)–almost contact metric manifold.
From (3), we have

$$\eta(X) = \varepsilon g(X,\xi) \qquad \forall X \in \Gamma(TM) \tag{4}$$

$$g(\xi,\xi) = \varepsilon \tag{5}$$

We say that (ϕ,ξ,η,g) is an (ε)–contact metric structure if we have

$$g(X,\phi Y) = d\eta(X,Y) \qquad \forall X,Y \in \Gamma(TM) \tag{6}$$

In this case, M is an (ε)–contact metric manifold. An (ε)–contact metric structure which is normal is called an (ε)–sasakian structure. A manifold endowed with an (ε)–sasakian structure is called an (ε)– sasakian manifold.

In[1], A. Bejancu and K.L. Duggal give a theorem as following:

THEOREM A (see [1] theorem 6)

Let M be an orientable real hypersurface of an indefinite kaehlerian manifold $\overline{M}$, then the following assertions with respect to the (ε)–almost contact metric structure inherited by M are equivalent:

(1) M is an (ε)–sasakian manifold

(2) The (ε)–characteristic vector field ξ satisfies

$$\nabla_X \xi = -\varepsilon \phi X \qquad \forall X \in \Gamma(TM)$$

(3) The shape operator A satisfies

$$AX = -\varepsilon X + (\varepsilon + \eta(A\xi))\eta(X)\xi \qquad \forall X \in \Gamma(TM)$$

This produces a problem whether an (ε)– sasakian manifold must be a real hypersurface of some indefinite kaehlerian manifold. In sec.2, we prove that the answer to this problem is positive. that is

THEOREM 1.1. Every (ε)–sasakian manifold must be a real hypersurface of some indefinite kaehlerian manifold.

In [2], Hatakeyama, Ogewa and Tanno give the condition for a Riemannian manifold to be a K–contact manifold, they prove

THEOREM B (see [2] or [4]) In order that a $(2n+1)$–dimensional Riemannian manifold M is K–contact, it is necessary and sufficient that the following two conditions are satisfied:

(1) M admits a unit killing vector field ξ;

(2) The sectional curvatures for plane sections containing ξ are equal to 1 at every point of M.

In sec.3, we generalize Theorem B by giving the necessary and sufficient condition for a Riemannian manifold to be an (ε)– sasakian manifold, that is

THEOREM 1.2. In order that a $(2n+1)$–dimensional Riemannian manifold M is (ε)–sasakian manifold, it is necessary and sufficient that the following three conditions are satisfied:

(1) M admits a unit killing vector field ξ;

(2) The sectional curvature for plane sections containing ξ are equal to 1 or -1 at every point on M.

(3) $R(X,Y)\xi = 0 \qquad \forall X, Y \perp \xi$

2. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Let M be a $(2n+1)$–dimensional (ε)–sasakian manifold with (ε)–sasakian structure (ϕ, ξ, η, g). Let R be real line with coordinate t and unit tangent vector $\frac{d}{dt}$. Denote $M \times R$ by $\overline{M}$, then vector fields on $\overline{M}$ are given by $\overline{X} = (X, f\frac{d}{dt}), \overline{Y} = (Y, h\frac{d}{dt}), \cdots,$

Where $X, Y \ldots,$ are vector fields tangent to M and $f, h, \ldots,$ are function on M, we define a linear map J on the tangent space of $\overline{M}$ by [5]

$$J\overline{X} = J(X, f\frac{d}{dt}) = (\phi X - f\xi, \eta(X)\frac{d}{dt}) \tag{7}$$

From (1) and (2), we have

$$J^2\overline{X} = J(\phi X - f\xi, \eta(X)\frac{d}{dt}) = (\phi^2 X - \eta(X)\xi, -f\frac{d}{dt}) = -\overline{X}$$

It shows that J is almost complex structure on $\overline{M}$, but M is an (ε)–sasakian manifold, this means $N(J) = 0$, then J is a complex structure on $\overline{M}$, thus $\overline{M}{=}M \times R$ is a complex manifold.

Let $\pi : \overline{M}{=}M \times R \to M$ be the projection map, we introduce a metric G on $\overline{M}$ by

$$G = e^{\varepsilon t}(\pi^* g + \varepsilon dt \otimes dt) \tag{8}$$

As an induced metric of g, we have

$$G((X,0),(Y,0)) = g(X,Y) \qquad\qquad (t = 0) \tag{9}$$

For any vector fields $\overline{X} = (X, f\frac{d}{dt}), \overline{Y} = (Y, h\frac{d}{dt})$on $\overline{M}$, we obtain from (7)(8)

$$G(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = e^{\varepsilon t}(g(X,Y) + \varepsilon f h) \tag{10}$$

$$G(J\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = e^{\varepsilon t}(g(\phi X, Y) - \varepsilon f\eta(Y) + \varepsilon h\eta(X)) \tag{11}$$

$$G(\overline{X}, J\overline{Y}) = e^{\varepsilon t}(g(X, \phi Y) - \varepsilon h\eta(X) + \varepsilon f\eta(Y)) \tag{12}$$

$$\begin{aligned} G(J\overline{X}, J\overline{Y}) &= G((\phi X - f\xi, \eta(X)\frac{d}{dt}), (\phi Y - h\xi, \eta(Y)\frac{d}{dt})) \\ &= e^{\varepsilon t}(g(\phi X, \phi Y) + \varepsilon f h + \varepsilon\eta(X)\eta(Y)) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

From (10)–(13),we see

$$G(\overline{X}, J\overline{Y}) = -G(J\overline{X}, \overline{Y}), \qquad G(J\overline{X}, J\overline{Y}) = G(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$$

Thus G is a Hermitian metric on $\overline{M}$.

Define a 2–fore on $\overline{M}$ by

$$\Phi = e^{\varepsilon t}(\pi^* d\eta + \varepsilon dt \wedge (\pi^*\eta)) \tag{14}$$

using $\pi^* \circ d = d \circ \pi^*$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d\Phi &= \varepsilon e^{\varepsilon t} dt \wedge (\pi^* d\eta + \varepsilon dt \wedge \pi^*\eta)) + \\ &\quad e^{\varepsilon t}[\pi^* d^2\eta + \varepsilon d^2 t \wedge (\pi^*\eta) - \varepsilon dt \wedge \pi^* d\eta] = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

therefore, ϕ is a closed 2–form on $\overline{M}$, by a direct computation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) &= \Phi((X, f\frac{d}{dt}), (Y, h\frac{d}{dt})) \\ &= e^{\varepsilon t}(d\eta(X,Y) + \varepsilon(dt \wedge \pi^*\eta)(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})) \\ &= e^{\varepsilon t}(d\eta(X,Y) + \varepsilon f\eta(Y) - \varepsilon h\eta(X)) \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

From (12) and (16) we see that

$$\Phi(\overline{X},\overline{Y}) = G(\overline{X}, J\overline{Y}) \tag{17}$$

Then from (15) and (17), we know,the Φ defined by (14) is the closed fundamental 2-form, thus the G defined by (8) is an indefinite kaehlerian metric on $\overline{M}^{[3]}$ and hence $\overline{M} = M \times R$ is an indefinite kaehlerian manifold.

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

First of all, we state some results which we shall need later.

LEMMA 3.1. (see [1] p. 548). An (ε)-almost contact metric structure (ϕ, ξ, η, g) is (ε)-sasakian if and only if

$$(\nabla_X \phi)Y = g(X,Y)\xi - \varepsilon\eta(Y)X, \qquad \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM) \tag{18}$$

Where ∇ is the Levi-civita connection with respect to g.

If we replace Y by ξ in (18) and from (1) (2) we get

$$\nabla_X \xi = -\varepsilon\phi X \qquad \forall X \in \Gamma(TM) \tag{19}$$

Because

$$\begin{aligned}
(L_\xi g)(X,Y) &= \xi g(X,Y) - g([\xi, X], Y) - g(X, [\xi, Y]) \\
&= \xi g(X,Y) - g(\nabla_\xi X - \nabla_X \xi, Y) - g(X, \nabla_\xi Y - \nabla_Y \xi) \\
&= (\xi g(X,Y) - g(\nabla_\xi X, Y) - g(X, \nabla_\xi Y + g(\nabla_X \xi, Y) + g(X, \nabla_Y \xi) \\
&= (\nabla_\xi g)(X,Y) + g(\nabla_X \xi, Y) + g(X, \nabla_Y \xi) \\
&= g(-\varepsilon\phi X, Y) + g(X, -\varepsilon\phi Y) \\
&= -\varepsilon(g(\phi X, Y) + g(X, \phi Y)) = 0 \qquad \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM)
\end{aligned}$$

Then we get

PROPOSITION 3.1. The characteristic vector field ξ on an (ε)-sasakian manifold is a killing vector field.

LEMMA 3.2.([6] p.265) Let M be a contact metric manifold with contact metric structure (ϕ, ξ, η, g). Then $N^{(3)} \equiv (L_\xi \phi)X$ vanishes if and only if ξ is a killing vector field with respect to g.

PROPOSITION 3.2. Let M be an (ε)-sasakian manifold. then the sectional curvature for plane sections containing ξ are equal to 1 or -1 at every point on M.

PROOF. Let X be an unit vector field on M and $X \perp \xi$, then from (19) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R(\xi, X)\xi &= \nabla_\xi \nabla_X \xi - \nabla_X \nabla_\xi \xi - \nabla_{[\xi,X]}\xi \\
&= -\varepsilon \nabla_\xi (\phi X) + \varepsilon\phi([\xi, X]) \\
&= -\varepsilon(\nabla_\xi(\phi X) - \phi(\nabla_\xi X - \nabla_X \xi)) \\
&= -\varepsilon((\nabla_\xi \phi)X + \phi(\nabla_X \xi))
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.1, we get

$$(\nabla_\xi \phi)X = g(\xi, X)\xi - \varepsilon\eta(X)\xi = 0$$

thus we have

$R(\xi, X)\xi = -\varepsilon\phi(\nabla_X \xi) = \phi^2 X = -X$ then

$$g(R(\xi, X)X, \xi) = -g(R(\xi, X)\xi, X) = \pm 1$$

From (18) and (19), let any $X, Y \in \Gamma(TM)$ and $X, Y \perp \xi$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(X,Y)\xi &= \nabla_X \nabla_Y \xi - \nabla_Y \nabla_X \xi - \nabla_{[X,Y]}\xi \\ &= \nabla_X(-\varepsilon\phi Y) - \nabla_Y(-\varepsilon\phi X) + \varepsilon\phi[X,Y] \\ &= \varepsilon((\nabla_Y\phi)X - (\nabla_X\phi)Y) \\ &= \varepsilon(g(X,Y)\xi - \varepsilon\eta(X)Y - g(X,Y)\xi + \varepsilon\eta(Y)X) \\ &= \eta(Y)X - \eta(X)Y = o \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Proposition 3.1; 3.2, we get the necessary condition of Theorem 2.

Conversely, first, we define a 1-form η and a tensor field of type (1.1) by

$$\eta(X) = g(X, \xi) \qquad \phi X = -\nabla_X \xi$$

We know from [4] (ϕ, ξ, η, g) be an almost contact metric structure, satisfying

$$\phi^2 = -I + \eta \otimes \xi, \qquad g(X, \phi Y) = d\eta(X, Y)$$

$$g(\phi X, \phi Y) = g(X, Y) - \eta(X)\eta(Y)$$

Let $\bar{\xi} = \varepsilon\xi, \bar{\eta} = \varepsilon\eta, \bar{g} = \varepsilon g$, then

$$\bar{\eta}(X) = \varepsilon\bar{g}(X, \bar{\xi}), \qquad \phi X = -\varepsilon \nabla_X \bar{\xi}$$

$$\phi^2 = -I + \bar{\eta} \otimes \bar{\xi}, \qquad \bar{g}(X, \phi Y) = d\bar{\eta}(X, Y)$$

$$\bar{g}(\phi X, \phi Y) = \bar{g}(X, Y) - \varepsilon\bar{\eta}(X)\bar{\eta}(Y)$$

Thus $(\phi, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}, \bar{g})$ be an (ε)–contact metric structure.

Now we show that $N^{(1)} = 0$, from condition (3) of Theorem 2, we obtain

$(\nabla_X\phi)Y = (\nabla_Y\phi)X, \qquad \forall X, Y \perp \bar{\xi},$ thus

$$\begin{aligned} N_\phi(X,Y) &= [\phi,\phi](X,Y) \\ &= (\nabla_{\phi X}\phi)Y - (\nabla_{\phi Y}\phi)X + \phi[(\nabla_Y\phi)X - (\nabla_X\phi)Y] \\ &= (\nabla_{\phi X}\phi)Y - (\nabla_{\phi Y}\phi)X \qquad \forall X, Y \perp \bar{\xi} \end{aligned}$$

By using Lemma 3.1, we get

$$N_\phi(X, Y) = -2\bar{g}(X, \phi Y)\bar{\xi}$$

then

$$N^{(1)}(X, Y) = N_\phi(X, Y) + 2\bar{g}(X, \phi Y)\bar{\xi} = 0$$

If $X \perp \bar{\xi}$, we have by Lemma 3.2

$$N^{(1)}(X,\bar{\xi}) = N_{\phi}(X,\bar{\xi}) = \varepsilon\phi(L_{\bar{\xi}}\phi)X = 0$$

Thus, for any vector field X, Y on M $N^{(1)}(X,Y) = 0$

Hence, the (ε)–contact metric structure $(\phi, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}, \bar{g})$ is normal, that is, M is an (ε)– sasakian manifold with an (ε)–sasakian structure $(\phi, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}, \bar{g})$.

Theorem 2 can be improved.

THEOREM 2′. In order that a $(2n+1)$–dimensional Riemannian manifold M is (ε)–sasakian manifold, it is necessary and sufficient that the following two conditions are satisfied

(1) M admits a unit killing vector field ξ

(2) $R(X,Y)\xi = \eta(Y)X - \eta(X)Y \qquad \forall X, Y \in \Gamma(TM)$

References

[1] BEJANCU, A. and DUGGAL, K.L., Real hypersurface of indefinite kaehlerian manifolds, *Internat. J. Math.& Math. Sci.* 16(1993), 545–556.

[2] HATAKEYAMA, Y., OGEWA, Y. and TANNO, S., Some properties of manifolds with certain metric structure, *Tohoku Math. J.* 15(1963), 42–48.

[3] KOBAYASHI, S. and NOMIZU, K., Foundations of differential geometry, vol.II (1969).

[4] BLAIR, D.E., Contact manifolds in Riemannian geometry, *Springer*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* vol.II 509(1976).

[5] SASAKI, S. and HATAKEYAMA, Y., On differentiable manifolds with certain structure which are closely related to almost structure, ,*ibid* 13(1961), 281–294.′

[6] YANO, K. and KON, M., Structure on manifolds, *world scientific,Singapore*, 1984.

Journal of Applied Mathematics and Decision Sciences

Special Issue on
Decision Support for Intermodal Transport

Call for Papers

Intermodal transport refers to the movement of goods in a single loading unit which uses successive various modes of transport (road, rail, water) without handling the goods during mode transfers. Intermodal transport has become an important policy issue, mainly because it is considered to be one of the means to lower the congestion caused by single-mode road transport and to be more environmentally friendly than the single-mode road transport. Both considerations have been followed by an increase in attention toward intermodal freight transportation research.

Various intermodal freight transport decision problems are in demand of mathematical models of supporting them. As the intermodal transport system is more complex than a single-mode system, this fact offers interesting and challenging opportunities to modelers in applied mathematics. This special issue aims to fill in some gaps in the research agenda of decision-making in intermodal transport.

The mathematical models may be of the optimization type or of the evaluation type to gain an insight in intermodal operations. The mathematical models aim to support decisions on the strategic, tactical, and operational levels. The decision-makers belong to the various players in the intermodal transport world, namely, drayage operators, terminal operators, network operators, or intermodal operators.

Topics of relevance to this type of decision-making both in time horizon as in terms of operators are:

- Intermodal terminal design
- Infrastructure network configuration
- Location of terminals
- Cooperation between drayage companies
- Allocation of shippers/receivers to a terminal
- Pricing strategies
- Capacity levels of equipment and labour
- Operational routines and lay-out structure
- Redistribution of load units, railcars, barges, and so forth
- Scheduling of trips or jobs
- Allocation of capacity to jobs
- Loading orders
- Selection of routing and service

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jamds/guidelines.html. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/, according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	June 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	September 1, 2009
Publication Date	December 1, 2009

Lead Guest Editor

Gerrit K. Janssens, Transportation Research Institute (IMOB), Hasselt University, Agoralaan, Building D, 3590 Diepenbeek (Hasselt), Belgium; Gerrit.Janssens@uhasselt.be

Guest Editor

Cathy Macharis, Department of Mathematics, Operational Research, Statistics and Information for Systems (MOSI), Transport and Logistics Research Group, Management School, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussel, Belgium; Cathy.Macharis@vub.ac.be