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#### Abstract

After a brief review on the basic notions and the principal results concerning the Jacobi manifolds, the relationship between homogeneous Poisson manifolds and conformal Jacobi manifolds, and also the compatible Jacobi manifolds, we give a generalization of some of these results needed for the contents of this paper. We introduce the notion of Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure and we study the relation between Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifolds and homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds. We present a local classification of homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds and we establish some local models of Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifolds.
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## 1. Introduction

The notion of Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure was introduced in [17] by Marrero et al. and includes, as a particular case, that of weak Poisson-Nijenhuis structure presented in [18]. In this paper we propose a stricter definition of this notion, which generalizes in a natural manner that of Poisson-Nijenhuis structure introduced by Magri and Morosi [6,14], in order to study the completely integrable hamiltonian systems. The aim of this paper is to evidence some aspects of the local geometry of this new structure, hoping that it will play a part as important as Poisson, Jacobi and Poisson-Nijenhuis structures in the study of integrable systems.

The paper is divided into three parts.

[^0]Paragraphs 1-3 of Section 2 (Sections 2.1-2.5) are devoted to the review and some complements of the essential definitions and results on Jacobi manifolds, conformal Jacobi manifolds, homogeneous Poisson manifolds and compatible Jacobi manifolds. In paragraph 4 we introduce the notion of Nijenhuis operator, while in paragraph 5 we define the notions of Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure, conformal Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure and homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure, and we establish a particular relation between Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifolds and homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds. Precisely, we prove that an one-codimensional submanifold of a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold, which is transverse to the homothety vector field, possesses an induced JacobiNijenhuis structure (cf. Proposition 2.12), and that any Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifold can be obtained in this way (cf. Proposition 2.16).

In Section 3 (Sections 3.1-3.4), using the results of $[21,23]$ concerning the local models of Poisson-Nijenhuis structures, we present a local classification of homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds.

Finally, Section 4 (Sections 4.1 and 4.2) describes some local models of Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifolds. On the neighbourhood of a generic point of a differentiable Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifold, we establish the existence of a local coordinates system in which the coefficients of the tensor fields that define the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure are polynomials of degree less or equal to 3 .

Notation: In this paper, we denote by $M$ a $C^{\infty}$-differentiable manifold of finite dimension, $T M$ and $T^{*} M$, respectively, the tangent and cotangent bundle over $M, C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ the space of real $C^{\infty}$-differentiable functions on $M, \Omega^{k}(M), k \in N$, the space of exterior differentiable $k$-forms on $M$, and $\mathcal{V}^{k}(M), k \in N$, the space of skew-symmetric contravariant $k$-tensor fields on $M$.

For the Schouten bracket (cf. $[10,25]$ ) and the interior product of a form with a multivector field, we use the convention of sign indicated by Koszul (cf. $[8,16]$ ).

## 2. Part I

### 2.1. Jacobi manifolds

Let $M$ be a $C^{\infty}$-differentiable manifold of finite dimension. We consider on $M$ a bivector field $\Lambda$ and a vector field $E$ which define on $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ the internal composition law:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\{f, g\}=\Lambda(d f, d g)+\langle f d g-g d f, E\rangle, \quad f, g \in C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is bilinear, skew-symmetric and it verifies, for all $f, g, h \in C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$, the Jacobi identity:

$$
\{f,\{g, h\}\}+\{g,\{h, f\}\}+\{h,\{f, g\}\}=0
$$

if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\Lambda, \Lambda]=-2 E \wedge \Lambda \quad \text { and } \quad[E, \Lambda]=0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where [, ] denotes the Schouten bracket. When conditions (2) are verified, we say that the pair $(\Lambda, E)$ defines a Jacobi structure on $M$ and that $(M, \Lambda, E)$ is a Jacobi manifold.

The bracket (1) is called the Jacobi bracket and the space $\left(C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}),\{\},\right)$ is a local Lie algebra in the sense of Kirillov (cf. [3,5]).

In the particular case where $E$ identically vanishes on $M$, conditions (2) reduce to

$$
[\Lambda, \Lambda]=0
$$

i.e. in this case, $\Lambda$ endows $M$ with a Poisson structure.

We denote by $\Lambda^{\#}: T^{*} M \rightarrow T M$ and $(\Lambda, E)^{\#}: T^{*} M \times \boldsymbol{R} \rightarrow T M \times \boldsymbol{R}$ the vector bundle maps associated, respectively, with $\Lambda$ and ( $\Lambda, E$ ), i.e. for all sections $\alpha, \beta$ of $T^{*} M$ and for all $f \in C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle\beta, \Lambda^{\#}(\alpha)\right\rangle=\Lambda(\alpha, \beta) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\Lambda, E)^{\#}(\alpha, f)=\left(\Lambda^{\#}(\alpha)+f E,-\langle\alpha, E\rangle\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

These maps can be seen, respectively, as homomorphisms of $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$-modules; $\Lambda^{\#}$ : $\Omega^{1}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M)$ and $(\Lambda, E)^{\#}: \Omega^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$.

Finally, with any function $f \in C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$, we associate the vector field

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{f}=\Lambda^{\#}(d f)+f E \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is called the hamiltonian vector field associated with $f$.
The image of $\Lambda^{\#}$ and the vector field $E$ define a completely integrable distribution on $M$, called the characteristic distribution of $(M, \Lambda, E)$, (cf. [1,3,5]). This distribution defines a Stefan foliation of $M$ whose leaves, which are generated by the hamiltonian vector fields (5), are called the characteristic leaves of the Jacobi structure $(\Lambda, E)$ of $M$.

If, at every point of $M$, the dimension of the characteristic leaf of $(\Lambda, E)$ through that point is equal to the dimension of $M$, the Jacobi manifold $(M, \Lambda, E)$ is said to be transitive. According to the parity of the dimension of $M$, there are two kinds of transitive Jacobi manifolds:

1. If $M$ has odd dimension, $(\Lambda, E)$ is defined by a contact one-form (cf. [2,11]).
2. If $M$ has even dimension, $(\Lambda, E)$ is defined by a locally conformal symplectic structure (cf. [2,11]).
The characteristic leaves of $(\Lambda, E)$ are themselves transitive Jacobi manifolds (cf. [2,11]).
Given a Jacobi structure ( $\Lambda, E$ ) on $M$, the space $\Omega^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ is endowed with a Lie algebra structure whose bracket

$$
\begin{equation*}
\{,\}:\left(\Omega^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})\right)^{2} \rightarrow \Omega^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

is defined, for all $(\alpha, f),(\beta, g) \in \Omega^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$, by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\{(\alpha, f),(\beta, g)\}:=(\gamma, h), \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \gamma:=L_{\Lambda^{\#}(\alpha)} \beta-L_{\Lambda^{\#}(\beta)} \alpha-d(\Lambda(\alpha, \beta))+f L_{E} \beta-g L_{E} \alpha-i_{E}(\alpha \wedge \beta)  \tag{8}\\
& h:=-\Lambda(\alpha, \beta)+\Lambda(\alpha, d g)-\Lambda(\beta, d f)+\langle f d g-g d f, E\rangle \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

( $L$ denotes the Lie derivative operator) (cf. [4]). When $E$ identically vanishes on $M$, i.e. $\Lambda$ is a Poisson tensor on $M$, the projection of (6) on $\Omega^{1}(M)$ coincides with the bracket associated with $\Lambda$ that endows this space with a Lie algebra structure (cf. [6,27]).

Let $a \in C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ be a function that never vanishes on $M$, and $\{,\}^{a}: C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \times$ $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \rightarrow C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ a new internal composition law on $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$, bilinear and skew-symmetric, given, for each pair $(f, g) \in C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$, by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\{f, g\}^{a}:=\frac{1}{a}\{a f, a g\} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

This law endows the space $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ with a new Jacobi bracket that defines a new Jacobi structure ( $\Lambda^{a}, E^{a}$ ) on $M$, which is said to be $a$-conformal to the initially given one. The structures $(\Lambda, E)$ and $\left(\Lambda^{a}, E^{a}\right)$ are said to be conformally equivalent. One has

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda^{a}=a \Lambda \quad \text { and } \quad E^{a}=\Lambda^{\#}(d a)+a E \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

The equivalence class of the Jacobi structures on $M$ that are conformally equivalent to a given Jacobi structure is called the conformal Jacobi structure of $M$.

Let $\left(M_{1}, \Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ and $\left(M_{2}, \Lambda_{2}, E_{2}\right)$ be two Jacobi manifolds and $\phi: M_{1} \rightarrow M_{2}$ a differentiable map. If $\Lambda_{1}$ and $E_{1}$ are projectable by $\phi$ on $M_{2}$ and their projections are, respectively, $\Lambda_{2}$ and $E_{2}$, i.e. $\phi_{*} \Lambda_{1}=\Lambda_{2}$ and $\phi_{*} E_{1}=E_{2}$, then $\phi: M_{1} \rightarrow M_{2}$ is said to be a Jacobi morphism or a Jacobi map. When $\phi: M_{1} \rightarrow M_{2}$ is a diffeomorphism, the Jacobi structures $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{2}, E_{2}\right)$ are said to be equivalent.

A map $\phi: M_{1} \rightarrow M_{2}$ is called an a-conformal Jacobi map if there exists $a \in C^{\infty}\left(M_{1}, \boldsymbol{R}\right)$ that never vanishes on $M_{1}$ such that $\phi:\left(M, \Lambda_{1}^{a}, E_{1}^{a}\right) \rightarrow\left(M, \Lambda_{2}, E_{2}\right)$ is a Jacobi map.

For a more detailed exposition of the essential properties of Jacobi manifolds, see [11,15].

### 2.2. Homogeneous Poisson manifolds and conformal Jacobi manifolds

In this paragraph, we present and we complete some results, needed in the sequel, due to Lichnerowicz ([11,12]), and to Dazord et al. ([2]), concerning the homogeneous Poisson manifolds and the conformal Jacobi manifolds.

Definition 2.1. A homogeneous Poisson manifold ( $M, \Lambda, T$ ) is a Poisson manifold $(M, \Lambda)$ with a vector field $T$ on $M$, called the homothety vector field, such that

$$
L_{T} \Lambda=[T, \Lambda]=-\Lambda
$$

Proposition 2.1 ([2]). Let $(M, \Lambda, T)$ be a homogeneous Poisson manifold and $\Sigma$ a submanifold of $M$, of codimension 1 , transverse to the homothety vector field $T$. Then, $\Sigma$ has an induced Jacobi structure $\left(\Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}\right)$ characterized by one of the following properties:

1. For any pair $(f, g)$ of homogeneous functions of degree 1 with respect to $T$, defined on an open subset $\mathcal{O}$ of $M$, the Jacobi bracket of $f$ and $g$, restricted to $\Sigma \cap \mathcal{O}$, is the restriction to $\Sigma \cap \mathcal{O}$ of the Poisson bracket of $f$ and $g$.
2. Let $\pi: U \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the projection on $\Sigma$ of a tubular neighbourhood $U$ of $\Sigma$ in $M$ such that, for any $x \in \Sigma, \pi^{-1}(x)$ is a connected arc of the integral curve of $T$ through $x$.

Let a be a function on $U$, equal to 1 on $\Sigma$ and homogeneous of degree 1 with respect to $T$. Then, the projection $\pi$ is an a-conformal Jacobi map.

Of course, the characteristic leaves of the Jacobi structure $\left(\Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}\right)$ on $\Sigma$ are (at least locally) the projections on $\Sigma$, parallel to the integral curves of $T$, of the symplectic leaves of $(M, \Lambda)$. Since these last ones are all of even dimension, one has:

1. A leaf of ( $\Sigma, \Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}$ ) has even dimension if and only if $T$ is not tangent to the corresponding leaf of $(M, \Lambda)$. Then, the restriction of $\pi: U \rightarrow \Sigma$ to this symplectic leaf of $(M, \Lambda)$ is a local diffeomorphism of this leaf of $(M, \Lambda)$ onto the corresponding leaf of $\left(\Sigma, \Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}\right)$.
2. A leaf of ( $\Sigma, \Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}$ ) has odd dimension if and only if $T$ is tangent to the corresponding leaf of $(M, \Lambda)$. Then, the dimension of this leaf of $\left(\Sigma, \Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}\right)$ is lower one unity than the dimension of the corresponding leaf of $(M, \Lambda)$.

In order to determine, in practice, the pair ( $\Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}$ ) we do as follows: (i) we compute the function $a$, equal to 1 on $\Sigma$ and homogeneous of degree 1 with respect to $T$, i.e. $L_{T} a=a$; (ii) we compute the tensor fields $\Lambda^{a}$ and $E^{a}$ that define, on a tubular neighbourhood $U$ of $\Sigma$ in $M$, the $a$-conformal Jacobi structure to its Poisson structure; (iii) we denote by $\pi: U \rightarrow \Sigma$ the projection of $U$ on $\Sigma$, parallel to the integral curves of $T$, and we project $\Lambda^{a}$ and $E^{a}$ on $\Sigma$ by $\pi$. Since $\pi$ is a Jacobi map of $\left(U, \Lambda^{a}, E^{a}\right)$ onto ( $\Sigma, \Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}$ ), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{\Sigma}=\pi_{*} \Lambda^{a} \quad \text { and } \quad E_{\Sigma}=\pi_{*} E^{a} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that when a Poisson manifold $(M, \Lambda)$ possesses a homothety vector field $T$, i.e. $L_{T} \Lambda=-\Lambda$, this one is not unique. Each vector field of type $T+X$, where $X$ is an infinitesimal Poisson automorphism of $\Lambda$, i.e. $L_{X} \Lambda=0$, is also a homothety vector field of $\Lambda$. Let $\Sigma$ be an one-codimensional submanifold of $M$, transverse to two different homothety vector fields of $\Lambda$. The influence of the choice of a homothety vector field of $(M, \Lambda)$ on the Jacobi structure induced on $\Sigma$ by the homogeneous Poisson structure of $M$ will be studied next.

Lemma 2.1. Let ( $M, \Lambda, T$ ) be a homogeneous Poisson manifold, $\Sigma$ an one-codimensional submanifold of $M$ transverse to the homothety vector field $T$ and $\left(\Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}\right)$ the Jacobi structure on $\Sigma$ induced by the homogeneous Poisson structure ( $\Lambda, T$ ) of $M$. Then, a vector field $T^{\prime}$ on $M$ is a homothety vector field of $\Lambda$ if and only if

$$
T^{\prime}=X+h T
$$

where $X$ is a vector field tangent to $\Sigma$ and $h$ is a differentiable function such that:

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\left[X, \Lambda_{\Sigma}\right]+[X, T] \wedge E_{\Sigma}-h \Lambda_{\Sigma}=-\Lambda_{\Sigma}}  \tag{13}\\
& {\left[X, E_{\Sigma}\right]+\left[h, \Lambda_{\Sigma}\right]-(h+\langle d h, T\rangle) E_{\Sigma}=-E_{\Sigma}} \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. Let $p$ be a point of $\Sigma$ such that $T(p) \neq 0$ and $\Sigma$ is transverse to $T$ at $p$. We may suppose, restricting $\Sigma$ if needed, that there exists an open neighbourhood $U$ of $p$ in $M$
which can be identified with the product $\Sigma \times I$ of the submanifold $\Sigma$ and an open interval $I$ of $\boldsymbol{R}$ containing 0 . Therefore, $\Sigma$ is identified with $\Sigma \times\{0\}$ and $T$, restricted to $U$, with the vector field whose projections on $\Sigma$ and $I$ are, respectively, the zero vector field and the constant vector field equal to 1 , i.e. if $t$ is the canonical coordinate on $I, T=\partial / \partial t$. Then, from Eqs. (11) and (12), it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\Lambda\right|_{U}=\frac{1}{a}\left(\Lambda_{\Sigma}+T \wedge E_{\Sigma}\right) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a$ is the homogeneous function of degree 1 with respect to $T$, defined on $U=\Sigma \times I$, whose restriction to $\Sigma$ is equal to 1, i.e. $a(x, t)=e^{t}$. Also, any vector field $T^{\prime}$ on $U$ can be written as

$$
T^{\prime}=X+h T
$$

where $X$ is a vector field tangent to $\Sigma$ and $h$ is a differentiable function on $U$. It is easy to check that $T^{\prime}$ is a homothety vector field of $\Lambda$ if and only if $X$ and $h$ satisfy Eqs. (13) and (14).

Remark 2.1. Obviously, $T^{\prime}$ is transverse to $\Sigma$ at $p$ if and only if $h(p) \neq 0$. In this case, we may suppose, restricting $U$ if needed, that $h$ never vanishes on $U$.

Lemma 2.2. Under the same hypothesis and notations as above, let $T^{\prime}=X+h T$ be a homothety vector field of $\Lambda$, with $h$ never vanishing on $U$. The homogeneous functions of degree 1 with respect to $T^{\prime}$, defined on $U$ and constant on $\Sigma$, are the functions of type

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x, t)=F(x) \exp \left(\int \frac{d t}{h}\right) \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

satisfying $L_{X} f=0$, where $F$ is an arbitrary differentiable function on $\Sigma$.
Proof. Let $f$ be a differentiable function defined on $U=\Sigma \times I$ having the properties described above. Then, $L_{T^{\prime}} f=f$ and $L_{X} f=0$. We have

$$
\left\langle d f, T^{\prime}\right\rangle=\langle d f, X+h T\rangle=\langle d f, X\rangle+h\langle d f, T\rangle=h \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}=f
$$

Hence,

$$
f(x, t)=\exp \left(\int \frac{\mathrm{d} t}{h}+\varphi(x)\right)
$$

where $\varphi$ is an arbitrary differentiable function independent of $t$. Setting $F(x)=\exp (\varphi(x))$, we get Eq. (16).

Always in the context of the above lemmas, we denote by $\pi: U \rightarrow \Sigma, U=\Sigma \times I$, the first projection, which is the projection of $U$ on $\Sigma$ parallel to the integral curves of $T$. Let $T^{\prime}=X+h T$ be a homothety vector field of $(M, \Lambda)$ different from $T$, transverse to $\Sigma$ at $p$, i.e. $h(p) \neq 0$, and $\pi^{\prime}: U \rightarrow \Sigma$ the projection of $U$ on $\Sigma$ parallel to the integral curves of $T^{\prime}$. After having considered the identification of $U$ with $\Sigma \times I$ and of
$T$ with $\partial / \partial t, \pi^{\prime}$ is the map that takes each point $(x, t)$ of $U=\Sigma \times I$ to the unique point $x^{\prime}$ of $\Sigma$ such that $\left(x^{\prime}, 0\right)$ and $(x, t)$ belong to the same integral curve of $T^{\prime}$. Since $\Sigma$ is an one-codimensional submanifold of $\left(M, \Lambda, T^{\prime}\right)$ transverse to $T^{\prime}$, it possesses a Jacobi structure ( $\Lambda_{\Sigma}^{\prime}, E_{\Sigma}^{\prime}$ ) induced by ( $\Lambda, T^{\prime}$ ), in the sense of Proposition 2.1, such that $\pi^{\prime}$ is an $a^{\prime}$-conformal Jacobi map of $\left(U,\left.\Lambda\right|_{U}\right)$ onto ( $\Sigma, \Lambda_{\Sigma}^{\prime}, E_{\Sigma}^{\prime}$ ), where $a^{\prime}$ is a homogeneous function of degree 1 with respect to $T^{\prime}$, i.e. $L_{T^{\prime}} a^{\prime}=a^{\prime}$, defined on $U$ and equal to 1 on $\Sigma$. Next proposition states a relationship between $\left(\Lambda_{\Sigma}, E_{\Sigma}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{\Sigma}^{\prime}, E_{\Sigma}^{\prime}\right)$.

Proposition 2.2. Under the same assumptions and notations as above, we get

$$
\Lambda_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=\Lambda_{\Sigma}-\frac{1}{h_{0}} X_{0} \wedge E_{\Sigma} \quad \text { and } \quad E_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=\frac{1}{h_{0}} E_{\Sigma}
$$

where $h_{0}$ and $X_{0}$ are, respectively, the restrictions of $h$ and $X$ to $\Sigma \times\{0\}$, identified with $\Sigma$.

Proof. Let $f$ and $g$ be two functions defined on a neighbourhood $U_{\Sigma}$ of $p$ in $\Sigma$. We denote by $F$ and $G$ two functions defined on a neighbourhood of $(p, 0)$ in $\Sigma \times I$, constant on each integral curve of $T^{\prime}$, whose restrictions to $\Sigma \times\{0\}$, identified with $\Sigma$, coincide with $f$ and $g$, respectively. Since $\pi^{\prime}:\left(U,\left.\Lambda\right|_{U}\right) \rightarrow\left(\Sigma, \Lambda_{\Sigma}^{\prime}, E_{\Sigma}^{\prime}\right)$ is an $a^{\prime}$-conformal Jacobi map, we have

$$
\Lambda_{\Sigma}^{\prime}(d f, d g)=a^{\prime} \Lambda(d F, d G) \quad \text { and } \quad E_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=\pi_{*}^{\prime}\left(\Lambda^{\#}\left(d a^{\prime}\right)\right)
$$

with the following convention: if the left member of the first equation is evaluated at $x \in U_{\Sigma}$, then the right member of this equation must be evaluated at a point $(y, t)$ of $\Sigma \times I$ belonging to the integral curve of $T^{\prime}$ through $(x, 0)$. We choose $y=x$ and $t=0$.

We compute $d F$ and $d G$ at $(x, 0)$. We have

$$
d F(x, 0)=D_{x} F(x, 0)+\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(x, 0) d t
$$

where $D_{x} F$ is the partial derivative of $F$ with respect to the variables $x$ on $\Sigma$. Since $F(x, 0)=f(x), D_{x} F(x, 0)=d f(x)$. Moreover, $\left\langle d F(x, 0), T^{\prime}(x, 0)\right\rangle=0$, because $F$ is constant on the integral curves of $T^{\prime}$. Last equality gives

$$
\left\langle\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(x, 0) d t, T(x, 0)\right\rangle=-\frac{1}{h(x, 0)}\langle d f(x), X(x, 0)\rangle .
$$

So,

$$
d F(x, 0)=d f(x)-\frac{1}{h(x, 0)}\langle d f(x), X(x, 0)\rangle d t
$$

and also

$$
d G(x, 0)=d g(x)-\frac{1}{h(x, 0)}\langle d g(x), X(x, 0)\rangle d t
$$

Then, taking into account Eq. (15) and the fact that $\langle d t, T\rangle=1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{\Sigma(x)}^{\prime}(d f(x), d g(x))= & a^{\prime}(x, 0) \Lambda_{(x, 0)}(d F(x, 0), d G(x, 0)) \\
= & \frac{a^{\prime}(x, 0)}{a(x, 0)}\left(\Lambda_{\Sigma}+T \wedge E_{\Sigma}\right)_{(x, 0)}\left(d f(x)-\frac{1}{h(x, 0)}\right. \\
& \left.\times\langle d f(x), X(x, 0)\rangle d t, d g(x)-\frac{1}{h(x, 0)}\langle d g(x), X(x, 0)\rangle d t\right) \\
= & \Lambda_{\Sigma(x)}(d f(x), d g(x))-\frac{1}{h(x, 0)}\langle d f(x), X(x, 0)\rangle \\
& \times\left\langle d g(x), E_{\Sigma}(x)\right\rangle+\frac{1}{h(x, 0)}\langle d g(x), X(x, 0)\rangle\left\langle d f(x), E_{\Sigma}(x)\right\rangle .
\end{aligned}
$$

So, we get

$$
\Lambda_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=\Lambda_{\Sigma}-\frac{1}{h_{0}} X_{0} \wedge E_{\Sigma}
$$

where $h_{0}$ and $X_{0}$ denote, respectively, the restrictions of $h$ and $X$ to $\Sigma \times\{0\}$.
On the other hand,

$$
E_{\Sigma}^{\prime}(x)=T_{(x, 0)} \pi^{\prime}\left(\Lambda_{(x, 0)}^{\#}\left(d a^{\prime}(x, 0)\right)\right)
$$

But, $a^{\prime}$ as a homogeneous function of degree 1 with respect to $T^{\prime}$, equal to 1 on $\Sigma$, is of type (16). Furthermore, $\Lambda_{\Sigma(x)}^{\#}\left(d a^{\prime}(x, 0)\right)=0$ and $\left\langle d a^{\prime}(x, 0), E_{\Sigma}(x)\right\rangle=0$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{(x, 0)}^{\#}\left(d a^{\prime}(x, 0)\right)= & \frac{1}{a(x, 0)}\left(\Lambda_{\Sigma(x)}^{\#}\left(d a^{\prime}(x, 0)\right)+\left\langle d a^{\prime}(x, 0), T\right\rangle E_{\Sigma}\right. \\
& \left.-\left\langle d a^{\prime}(x, 0), E_{\Sigma}\right\rangle T\right)=\frac{\partial a^{\prime}}{\partial t}(x, 0) E_{\Sigma}=\frac{a^{\prime}(x, 0)}{h(x, 0)} E_{\Sigma}
\end{aligned}
$$

and we deduce

$$
E_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=\frac{1}{h_{0}} E_{\Sigma}
$$

Proposition 2.3 ([2]). Let $\left(M_{1}, \Lambda_{1}, T_{1}\right)$ and $\left(M_{2}, \Lambda_{2}, T_{2}\right)$ be two homogeneous Poisson manifolds.

1. The product $M_{1} \times M_{2}$ equipped with the Poisson tensor $\Lambda_{1}+\Lambda_{2}$ and the homothety vector field $T_{1}+T_{2}$ is a homogeneous Poisson manifold.
2. Let $\Sigma_{1}$ be an one-codimensional submanifold of $M_{1}$ transverse to $T_{1}$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma_{1}}, E_{1 \Sigma_{1}}\right)$ the Jacobi structure induced on $\Sigma_{1}$ by the homogeneous Poisson structure $\left(\Lambda_{1}, T_{1}\right)$ of $M_{1}$. Then, $\Sigma_{1} \times M_{2}$ is an one-codimensional submanifold of $M_{1} \times M_{2}$ transverse to $T_{1}+T_{2}$; the bivector field $\Lambda_{\Sigma_{1} \times M_{2}}$ and the vector field $E_{\Sigma_{1} \times M_{2}}$ that define its Jacobi structure induced by the homogeneous Poisson structure $\left(\Lambda_{1}+\Lambda_{2}, T_{1}+T_{2}\right)$ of $M_{1} \times M_{2}$ are given, respectively, by the formulæ

$$
\Lambda_{\Sigma_{1} \times M_{2}}=\Lambda_{1 \Sigma_{1}}+\Lambda_{2}-T_{2} \wedge E_{1 \Sigma_{1}} \quad \text { and } \quad E_{\Sigma_{1} \times M_{2}}=E_{1 \Sigma_{1}}
$$

Proposition 2.4 ([2]). Let ( $M, \Lambda, T$ ) be a homogeneous Poisson manifold, and $\Sigma$ and $\Sigma^{\prime}$ two submanifolds of $M$ of codimension 1 transverse to $T$. We assume that there exists an integral curve of $T$ intersecting $\Sigma$ at a point $p$ and $\Sigma^{\prime}$ at a point $p^{\prime}$. We provide $\Sigma$ and $\Sigma^{\prime}$ with the Jacobi structures induced by the homogeneous Poisson structure of $M$, in the sense of Proposition 2.1. Then, there exists a conformal Jacobi diffeomorphism of a neighbourhood of $p$ in $\Sigma$ onto a neighbourhood of $p^{\prime}$ in $\Sigma^{\prime}$, mapping $p$ to $p^{\prime}$.

Proposition 2.5 ([2]). With any Jacobi manifold $(M, \Lambda, E)$ we may associate a homogeneous Poisson manifold ( $\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{T}$ ) by setting $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$,

$$
\tilde{\Lambda}=e^{-t}\left(\Lambda+\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \wedge E\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \tilde{T}=\frac{\partial}{\partial t}
$$

where $t$ is the canonical coordinate on the factor $\boldsymbol{R}$. Then,

1. the projection $\pi: \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is a $e^{t}$-conformal Jacobi map;
2. the Jacobi structure induced on $M$, considered as an one-codimensional submanifold of $\tilde{M}$ transverse to $\tilde{T}$, by the homogeneous Poisson structure of $\tilde{M}$, in the sense of Proposition 2.1, is the one given initially.
The manifold ( $\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{T})$ is called the Poissonization of the Jacobi manifold $(M, \Lambda, E)$.

### 2.3. Compatible Jacobi structures

Generalizing the notion of compatibility of two Poisson tensors (cf. [13]), we are lead, in a natural way, to the definition of compatibility of two Jacobi structures defined on a differentiable manifold introduced in [19] by one of the authors. In this paragraph, we recall and we complete some results of [19] on compatible pairs of Jacobi structures, useful in the sequel.

Definition 2.2. Two Jacobi structures $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ defined on a differentiable manifold $M$ are said to be compatible if $\left(\Lambda_{0}+\Lambda_{1}, E_{0}+E_{1}\right)$ is also a Jacobi structure on $M$; this fact can be expressed by

$$
\left[\Lambda_{0}, \Lambda_{1}\right]=-E_{0} \wedge \Lambda_{1}-E_{1} \wedge \Lambda_{0} \quad \text { and } \quad\left[E_{0}, \Lambda_{1}\right]+\left[E_{1}, \Lambda_{0}\right]=0
$$

Proposition 2.6 ([19]). Let $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ be two compatible Jacobi structures on a differentiable manifold $M$. Then, for any $a \in C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ that never vanishes on $M$, the Jacobi structures $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{a}, E_{0}^{a}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1}^{a}, E_{1}^{a}\right)$ a-conformal, respectively, to $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ are also compatible on $M$.

Proposition 2.7 ([19]). Two Jacobi structures $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ defined on a differentiable manifold $M$ are compatible if and only if the homogeneous Poisson tensors $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}=e^{-t}\left(\Lambda_{0}+(\partial / \partial t) \wedge E_{0}\right)$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}_{1}=e^{-t}\left(\Lambda_{1}+(\partial / \partial t) \wedge E_{1}\right)$, with respect to $\partial / \partial t$, associated, respectively, with $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$, are compatible on $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$.

Definition 2.3. A homogeneous bihamiltonian manifold ( $M, \Lambda_{0}, \Lambda_{1}, T$ ) is a differentiable manifold $M$ equipped with a pair ( $\Lambda_{0}, \Lambda_{1}$ ) of compatible Poisson tensors in the sense of

Magri, i.e. $\Lambda_{0}+\Lambda_{1}$ is also a Poisson tensor on $M$, and with a vector field $T$ such that

$$
L_{T} \Lambda_{0}=\left[T, \Lambda_{0}\right]=-\Lambda_{0} \quad \text { and } \quad L_{T} \Lambda_{1}=\left[T, \Lambda_{1}\right]=-\Lambda_{1}
$$

Proposition 2.8. Let $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, \Lambda_{1}, T\right)$ be a homogeneous bihamiltonian manifold. We denote by $\Sigma$ and $\Sigma^{\prime}$ two submanifolds of $M$, of codimension 1 , transverse to the homothety vector field $T$. We suppose that there exists an integral curve of $T$ intersecting $\Sigma$ at a point $p$ and $\Sigma^{\prime}$ at a point $p^{\prime}$. We provide $\Sigma$ (respectively $\Sigma^{\prime}$ ) with the pair of compatible Jacobi structures $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right),\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}, E_{1 \Sigma}\right)\right)$ (respectively $\left.\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right),\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)\right)\right)$ induced by the homogeneous bihamiltonian structure of $M$. Then, there exists a conformal Jacobi diffeomorphism of a neighbourhood of $p$ in $\Sigma$ onto a neighbourhood of $p^{\prime}$ in $\Sigma^{\prime}$, with respect both to $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$, and $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}, E_{1 \Sigma}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$, mapping $p$ to $p^{\prime}$.

Proof. First, we remark that the Jacobi structures $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ and ( $\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}, E_{1 \Sigma}$ ) (respectively $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$ ) are compatible; this is a direct result of Propositions 2.1, 2.5 and 2.7.

From Proposition 2.4, there exists a conformal Jacobi diffeomorphism $\phi_{0}$ (respectively $\phi_{1}$ ) of a neighbourhood $U_{0}$ (respectively $U_{1}$ ) of $p$ in $\Sigma$ onto a neighbourhood $U_{0}^{\prime}$ (respectively $U_{1}^{\prime}$ ) of $p^{\prime}$ in $\Sigma^{\prime}$ mapping: (i) $p$ to $p^{\prime}$ and (ii) an $a_{0}$ (respectively $a_{1}$ )-conformal Jacobi structure to $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ (respectively to $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}, E_{1 \Sigma}\right)$ ) to ( $\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}$ ) (respectively to ( $\left.\Lambda_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$ ). From the proof of Proposition 2.4 (cf. [2]), we deduce that the diffeomorphisms $\phi_{0}$ and $\phi_{1}$, and also the functions $a_{0}$ and $a_{1}$, coincide on $U_{0} \cap U_{1}$.

### 2.4. Nijenhuis operator

Let $M$ be a differentiable manifold and $\mathcal{N}: \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ a $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$-linear map given, for all pairs $(X, f) \in \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$, by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}(X, f)=(N X+f Y,\langle\gamma, X\rangle+g f) \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $N$ is a tensor field on $M$ of type (1,1), $Y$ is a vector field on $M, \gamma$ is a differentiable one-form on $M$ and $g$ is a differentiable function on $M . \mathcal{N}:=(N, Y, \gamma, g)$ can be considered as a vector bundle map $\mathcal{N}: T M \times \boldsymbol{R} \rightarrow T M \times \boldsymbol{R}$. Since the space $\mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ endowed with the bracket

$$
[,]:\left(\mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})\right)^{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})
$$

defined, for all $((X, f),(Z, h)) \in\left(\mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})\right)^{2}$, by

$$
[(X, f),(Z, h)]=([X, Z],\langle d h, X\rangle-\langle d f, Z\rangle)
$$

is a real Lie algebra, we can determine, in a natural way, the Nijenhuis torsion $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ of $\mathcal{N}$ as the $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$-bilinear map

$$
\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}):\left(\mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})\right)^{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})
$$

given, for all $((X, f),(Z, h)) \in\left(\mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})\right)^{2}$, by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})((X, f),(Z, h))= & {[\mathcal{N}(X, f), \mathcal{N}(Z, h)]-\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{N}(X, f),(Z, h)] } \\
& -\mathcal{N}[(X, f), \mathcal{N}(Z, h)]+\mathcal{N}^{2}[(X, f),(Z, h)]
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 2.4. A $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$-linear map $\mathcal{N}: \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ is called a Nijenhuis operator on $M$ if its Nijenhuis torsion $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ identically vanishes on $M$.

The notion of Nijenhuis operator introduced above is a generalization of the notion of Nijenhuis tensor. We recall that a Nijenhuis tensor on a differentiable manifold $M$ is a tensor field $N$ on $M$ of type (1,1) whose Nijenhuis torsion

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(N)(X, Z) & =[N X, N Z]-N[N X, Z]-N[X, N Z]+N^{2}[X, Z] \\
& =\left(L_{N X} N-N L_{X} N\right) Z, \quad\left(X, Z \in \mathcal{V}^{1}(M)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

identically vanishes on $M$.
Using $\mathcal{N}:=(N, Y, \gamma, g)$ we can construct on $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$ a tensor field $\tilde{N}$ of type (1,1) by setting

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{N}=N+Y \otimes d t+\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \otimes \gamma+g \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \otimes d t \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $t$ is the canonical coordinate on the factor $\boldsymbol{R}$.
Proposition 2.9 ([20]). The tensor field $\tilde{N}$ on $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$ is a Nijenhuis tensor if and only if

$$
\begin{align*}
& T(N)=Y \otimes d \gamma  \tag{19}\\
& L_{N} \gamma=g d \gamma  \tag{20}\\
& L_{Y} N=-Y \otimes d g  \tag{21}\\
& { }^{\mathrm{t}} N(d g)=L_{Y} \gamma+g d g \tag{22}
\end{align*}
$$

where $T(N)$ is the Nijenhuis torsion of $N, L_{N} \gamma$ is the operator on $M$ given, for all $X, Z \in$ $\mathcal{V}^{1}(M)$, by

$$
L_{N} \gamma(X, Z)=d \gamma(N X, Z)+d \gamma(X, N Z)-d\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N \gamma\right)(X, Z)
$$

and ${ }^{\mathrm{t}} N$ is the transpose of $N$.
It is easy to prove that conditions (19)-(22) assure that $\mathcal{N}:=(N, Y, \gamma, g)$ is a Nijenhuis operator on $M$, and reciprocally. So, we conclude:

Proposition 2.10. Let $\mathcal{N}: \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ be a $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})-$ linear map given by Eq. (17). Then, $\mathcal{N}$ is a Nijenhuis operator on $M$ if and only if its associated tensor field $\tilde{N}$ on $\tilde{M}$, given by Eq. (18), is a Nijenhuis tensor on $\tilde{M}$.

### 2.5. Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifolds

Let $M$ be a differentiable manifold of finite dimension equipped with a Jacobi structure $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ and a $C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$-linear map $\mathcal{N}: \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$, $\mathcal{N}:=(N, Y, \gamma, g)$, given by Eq. (17). Then, we can consider on $M$ the bivector field $\Lambda_{1}$ and the vector field $E_{1}$ characterized by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)^{\#}=\mathcal{N} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#} \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we ask under what conditions does the pair $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ define on $M$ a new Jacobi structure compatible with ( $\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}$ ), in the sense of Definition 2.2, we find (cf. [17]):

1. $\Lambda_{1}$ is skew-symmetric if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}=\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#} \circ{ }^{t} \mathcal{N} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ${ }^{t} \mathcal{N}$ denotes the transpose of $\mathcal{N}$. This condition is equivalent to the following system of conditions:

$$
\begin{align*}
& N E_{0}=\Lambda_{0}^{\#}(\gamma)+g E_{0},  \tag{25}\\
& N \Lambda_{0}^{\#}-Y \otimes E_{0}=\Lambda_{0}^{\# \mathrm{t}} N+E_{0} \otimes Y,  \tag{26}\\
& \left\langle\gamma, E_{0}\right\rangle=0 . \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

Then,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{1}^{\#}=N \Lambda_{0}^{\#}-Y \otimes E_{0}=\Lambda_{0}^{\# \mathrm{t}} N+E_{0} \otimes Y,  \tag{28}\\
& E_{1}=N E_{0}=\Lambda_{0}^{\#}(\gamma)+g E_{0} \tag{29}
\end{align*}
$$

2. When $\Lambda_{1}$ is skew-symmetric, $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ defines a Jacobi structure on $M$ if and only if, for all $(\alpha, f),(\beta, h) \in \Omega^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}(\alpha, f),\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}(\beta, h)\right) \\
& \quad=\mathcal{N} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}\left(\mathcal{C}\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)((\alpha, f),(\beta, h))\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

In the last expression, $\mathcal{C}\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$ is the concomitant of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ and $\mathcal{N}$ defined, for all $(\alpha, f),(\beta, h) \in \Omega^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$, by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{C}\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)((\alpha, f),(\beta, h)) \\
&=\{(\alpha, f),(\beta, h)\}_{1}-\left\{{ }^{\mathrm{t}} \mathcal{N}(\alpha, f),(\beta, h)\right\}_{0} \\
& \quad-\left\{(\alpha, f),{ }^{\mathrm{t}} \mathcal{N}(\beta, h)\right\}_{0}+{ }^{\mathrm{t}} \mathcal{N}\{(\alpha, f),(\beta, h)\}_{0},
\end{aligned}
$$

$\left(\{,\}_{i}\right.$ is the bracket (6) associated with $\left.\left(\Lambda_{i}, E_{i}\right), i=0,1\right)$.
3. When $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ is a Jacobi structure, it is compatible with $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ if and only if, for all $(\alpha, f),(\beta, h) \in \Omega^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$,

$$
\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}\left(\mathcal{C}\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)((\alpha, f),(\beta, h))\right)=0
$$

Hence, we introduce the following definition.

Definition 2.5. A Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure on a differentiable manifold $M$ is defined by a Jacobi structure $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ and a Nijenhuis operator $\mathcal{N}$ that are compatible, i.e. (i) $\mathcal{N} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}=\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#} \circ{ }^{t} \mathcal{N}$ and (ii) $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#} \circ \mathcal{C}\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right):\left(\Omega^{1}(M) \times\right.$ $\left.C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})\right)^{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M) \times C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ identically vanishes on $M$.
$\left(M,\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$ is said to be a Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifold. $\mathcal{N}$ is called the recursion operator of $\left(M,\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$.

Remark 2.2. The notion of Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure presented above is stricter than the one introduced in [17]. In Definition 2.5 we require that the Nijenhuis torsion $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ of $\mathcal{N}$ identically vanishes on $M$, while in [17] it is only required $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ to be null on the image of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}$.

Let $\left(M,\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$ be a Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifold, $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$ the Jacobi structure associated with $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)^{\#}=\mathcal{N} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}$, which is compatible with $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$, and $a \in C^{\infty}(M, \boldsymbol{R})$ a function that never vanishes on $M$. Let us consider the Jacobi structures $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{a}, E_{0}^{a}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1}^{a}, E_{1}^{a}\right) a$-conformal to $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ and ( $\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}$ ), respectively. From Proposition 2.6, ( $\left.\Lambda_{0}^{a}, E_{0}^{a}\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{1}^{a}, E_{1}^{a}\right)$ are compatible. One may ask if there exists a Nijenhuis operator $\mathcal{N}^{a}:=\left(N^{a}, Y^{a}, \gamma^{a}, g^{a}\right)$, compatible with $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{a}, E_{0}^{a}\right)$, such that $\left(\Lambda_{1}^{a}, E_{1}^{a}\right)^{\#}=$ $\mathcal{N}^{a} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}^{a}, E_{0}^{a}\right)^{\#}$.

Proposition 2.11. Under the same assumptions and notations as above, there exists a recursion operator $\mathcal{N}^{a}:=\left(N^{a}, Y^{a}, \gamma^{a}, g^{a}\right)$ of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}^{a}, E_{0}^{a}\right),\left(\Lambda_{1}^{a}, E_{1}^{a}\right)\right)$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N^{a}=N-Y \otimes \frac{d a}{a}, \quad Y^{a}=Y, \\
& \gamma^{a}=\gamma+{ }^{\mathrm{t}} N \frac{d a}{a}-\left(g+\frac{1}{a} L_{Y} a\right) \frac{d a}{a}, \quad g^{a}=g+\frac{1}{a} L_{Y} a .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Taking into account Eqs. (11), (25)-(27), we deduce the expressions written above of $N^{a}, Y^{a}, \gamma^{a}$ and $g^{a}$. It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{N}^{a}:=\left(N^{a}, Y^{a}, \gamma^{a}, g^{a}\right)$ is a Nijenhuis operator. It is compatible with $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{a}, E_{0}^{a}\right)$ because $\left(\Lambda_{1}^{a}, E_{1}^{a}\right)$ is a Jacobi structure compatible with $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{a}, E_{0}^{a}\right)$.

The Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}^{a}, E_{0}^{a}\right), \mathcal{N}^{a}\right)$ is said to be $a$-conformal to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$.
Definition 2.6 ([6,7]). A Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ is a Poisson manifold ( $M, \Lambda_{0}$ ) equipped with a Nijenhuis tensor $N$ compatible with $\Lambda_{0}$, i.e. (i) $N \Lambda_{0}^{\#}=\Lambda_{0}^{\# \mathrm{t}} N$, where ${ }^{\mathrm{t}} N$ is the transpose of $N$, and (ii) $\Lambda_{0}^{\#} \circ C\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right): \Omega^{1}(M) \times \Omega^{1}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(M)$ identically vanishes on $M$. We denote by $C\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ the concomitant of Magri-Morosi of $\Lambda_{0}$ and $N$ given, for all $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Omega^{1}(M) \times \Omega^{1}(M)$, by

$$
C\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)(\alpha, \beta)=\{\alpha, \beta\}_{1}-\left\{{ }^{\mathrm{t}} N \alpha, \beta\right\}_{0}-\left\{\alpha,{ }^{\mathrm{t}} N \beta\right\}_{0}+{ }^{\mathrm{t}} N\{\alpha, \beta\}_{0},
$$

$\left(\{,\}_{i}\right.$ is the bracket associated with $\Lambda_{i}, \Lambda_{i}^{\#}=N^{i} \Lambda_{0}^{\#}, i=0,1$, that endows $\Omega^{1}(M)$ with a Lie algebra structure).
$N$ is called recursion operator of $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N\right)$.

Definition 2.7. A Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ equipped with a vector field $T$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T} \Lambda_{0}=\left[T, \Lambda_{0}\right]=-\Lambda_{0} \quad \text { and } \quad L_{T} N=0 \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

is called a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold.
Remark 2.3. The homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds are a particular class of homogeneous bihamiltonian manifolds (cf. Definition 2.3). From Eq. (30), one has $L_{T} \Lambda_{1}=$ [ $\left.T, \Lambda_{1}\right]=-\Lambda_{1}$, where $\Lambda_{1}$ is the Poisson tensor associated with $\Lambda_{1}^{\#}=N \Lambda_{0}^{\#}$. Moreover, $T$ is a homothety vector field of each member of the hierarchy $\left(\Lambda_{k}, k \in N\right), \Lambda_{k}^{\#}=N^{k} \Lambda_{0}^{\#}$, of pairwise compatible Poisson tensors generated on $M$ by $\Lambda_{0}$ and $N$, i.e. for all $k \in N$, $L_{T} \Lambda_{k}=\left[T, \Lambda_{k}\right]=-\Lambda_{k}$.

Proposition 2.12. Let $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ be a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold and $\Sigma$ an one-codimensional submanifold of $M$ transverse to $T$. Then, $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ induces a Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, on $\Sigma$ characterized by the following properties.

1. $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ is the Jacobi structure induced on $\Sigma$ by the homogeneous Poisson structure $\left(\Lambda_{0}, T\right)$ of $M$, in the sense of Proposition 2.1.
2. $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$ is the Nijenhuis operator induced on $\Sigma$ by the $(N, T)$ structure of $M$, in the sense presented next. Let $\pi: U \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the projection on $\Sigma$ of a tubular neighbourhood $U$ of $\Sigma$ in $M$ such that, for all $x \in \Sigma, \pi^{-1}(x)$ is a connected arc of the integral curve of $T$ through $x$, and let ' $a$ ' be a differentiable function on $U$, that never vanishes, equal to 1 on $\Sigma$ and homogeneous of degree 1 with respect to $T$, as in Proposition 2.1. Then, $N_{\Sigma}$ is the tensor field of type $(1,1)$ on $\Sigma$ induced by $N, Y_{\Sigma}$ is the projection of $\left.(N T)\right|_{\Sigma}$ on $T \Sigma$ by $\pi, \gamma_{\Sigma}$ is the one of $\left.\left({ }^{t} N(d a / a)\right)\right|_{\Sigma}$ on $T^{*} \Sigma$ and $g_{\Sigma}$ is the coefficient of the component of $\left.(N T)\right|_{\Sigma}$ in the direction of $T$.

Proof. Let $a$ be a function on $U$ possessing the above properties. Since $a$ is assumed to be homogeneous of degree 1 with respect to $T$ and never vanishing on $U$, one has $\langle(d a / a), T\rangle=1$ and $L_{T}(d a / a)=0$. Then, at each point $x \in U,(d a / a)(x)$ generates an one-dimensional subspace of $T_{x}^{*} U$ which is the complementary of the annihilator $\langle T(x)\rangle^{\circ}$ of the subspace $\langle T(x)\rangle$ of $T_{x} U$ generated by $T(x)$. Furthermore, $\left.(d a / a)\right|_{\Sigma}=\left.(d a)\right|_{\Sigma}$ is a section of the annihilator of $T \Sigma$.

Let us consider the projection $\pi: U \rightarrow \Sigma$ parallel to the integral curves of $T$. We denote by $T_{\Sigma} \pi: T_{\Sigma} U \rightarrow T \Sigma$ the vector bundle projection of $T_{\Sigma} U$ onto its subbundle $T \Sigma$ and ${ }^{\mathrm{t}} T_{\Sigma} \pi: T^{*} \Sigma \rightarrow T_{\Sigma}^{*} U$ its transpose. So,

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{\Sigma} \pi=I d_{T_{\Sigma} U}-\left.\left(T \otimes \frac{d a}{a}\right)\right|_{\Sigma} \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

and ${ }^{\mathrm{t}} T_{\Sigma \pi}$ is the injection that prolongs every linear form on $\Sigma$ to a linear form on $U$ that vanishes on $\operatorname{ker}\left(T_{\Sigma} \pi\right)=\left\langle\left. T\right|_{\Sigma}\right\rangle$. Then, as we have observed (cf. Section 2.2),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}^{\#}=\left.T_{\Sigma \pi} \circ\left(a \Lambda_{0}^{\#}\right)\right|_{\Sigma} \circ{ }^{t} T_{\Sigma} \pi \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{0 \Sigma}=\left.T_{\Sigma} \pi\left(\left.\Lambda_{0}^{\#}(d a)\right|_{\Sigma}\right) \stackrel{(31)}{=}\left(\Lambda_{0}^{\#}(d a)\right)\right|_{\Sigma} . \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

Of course, the restriction of $\Lambda_{0}$ to $U$ can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{0}=\frac{1}{a}\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}+T \wedge E_{0 \Sigma}\right) . \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, since $L_{T} N=0$, the restriction of $N$ to $U$ may be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
N=N_{\Sigma}+Y_{\Sigma} \otimes \frac{d a}{a}+T \otimes \gamma_{\Sigma}+g_{\Sigma} T \otimes \frac{d a}{a} \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $N_{\Sigma}$ is a tensor field on $\Sigma$ of type (1,1), $Y_{\Sigma}$ is a vector field on $\Sigma, \gamma_{\Sigma}$ is a one-form on $\Sigma$ and $g_{\Sigma}$ is a differentiable function on $\Sigma$. Since the restriction of $T_{\Sigma} \pi: T_{\Sigma} U \rightarrow T \Sigma$ to the horizontal subbundle $T \Sigma$ of $T_{\Sigma} U$, denoted by $\left(T_{\Sigma} \pi\right)_{\mathrm{h}}$, is a bijection, $\left.N\right|_{\Sigma}: T_{\Sigma} U \rightarrow T_{\Sigma} U$ induces on $\Sigma$ a tensor field of type $(1,1)$ defined by $\left.T_{\Sigma \pi} \circ N\right|_{\Sigma} \circ\left(T_{\Sigma} \pi\right)_{\mathrm{h}}^{-1}$. It is not hard to verify that this one is just $N_{\Sigma}$, i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{\Sigma}=\left.T_{\Sigma} \pi \circ N\right|_{\Sigma} \circ\left(T_{\Sigma} \pi\right)_{\mathrm{h}}^{-1} \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, $Y_{\Sigma}$ can be seen as the projection of $\left.(N T)\right|_{\Sigma}$ on $T \Sigma$, i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{\Sigma}=T_{\Sigma} \pi\left(\left.\left.(N T)\right|_{\Sigma} \stackrel{(31)}{=}(N T)\right|_{\Sigma}-\left.\left(\left.i\left(\left.(N T)\right|_{\Sigma}\right)(d a)\right|_{\Sigma}\right) T\right|_{\Sigma}\right. \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\gamma_{\Sigma}$ as the projection of $\left.\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N(d a / a)\right)\right|_{\Sigma}$ on $T^{*} \Sigma$, i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma_{\Sigma}=\left.\left({ }^{{ }^{t}} N \frac{d a}{a}\right)\right|_{\Sigma}-\left.\left\langle\left.\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N \frac{d a}{a}\right)\right|_{\Sigma},\left.T\right|_{\Sigma}\right\rangle d a\right|_{\Sigma} \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $g_{\Sigma}$ as the coefficient of the component of $\left.(N T)\right|_{\Sigma}$ in the direction of $\left.T\right|_{\Sigma}$, i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{\Sigma}=\left\langle\left.\left(\frac{d a}{a}\right)\right|_{\Sigma},\left.(N T)\right|_{\Sigma}\right\rangle \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, from $N=N_{\Sigma}+Y_{\Sigma} \otimes(d a / a)+T \otimes \gamma_{\Sigma}+g_{\Sigma} T \otimes(d a / a)$ we define on $\Sigma$ a $C^{\infty}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{R})$-linear operator $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}: \mathcal{V}^{1}(\Sigma) \times C^{\infty}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^{1}(\Sigma) \times C^{\infty}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{R})$ by setting, for all $(X, f) \in \mathcal{V}^{1}(\Sigma) \times C^{\infty}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{R})$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}(X, f)=\left(N_{\Sigma} X+f Y_{\Sigma},\left\langle\gamma_{\Sigma}, X\right\rangle+g_{\Sigma} f\right) \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clearly, the tensor field $N$ on $U$ can be consider as the tensor field associated with $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=$ ( $N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}$ ), in the sense of Section 2.4. Then, Proposition 2.10 implies that $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}$ is a Nijenhuis operator on $\Sigma$. We are going to verify its compatibility with the Jacobi structure $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ of $\Sigma$. From Definition 2.5, the required conditions are: (i) $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma} \circ$ $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)^{\#}=\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)^{\#} \circ{ }^{t} \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}$ and (ii) the map $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)^{\#} \circ \mathcal{C}\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$ identically vanishes on $\Sigma$. But, after a long computation, we may confirm that the above mentioned conditions hold if and only if the tensor fields $\Lambda_{0}$ and $N$ (cf., respectively, formulæ (34) and (35)) verify

$$
\begin{equation*}
N \Lambda_{0}^{\#}=\Lambda_{0}^{\# t} N \quad \text { and } \quad \Lambda_{0}^{\#} \circ C\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)=0 \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ is a Poisson-Nijenhuis structure on $M$, from Definition 2.6, Eq. (41) holds. Consequently, conditions (i) and (ii) also hold, and ( $\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}$ ) and $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}$ are compatible on $\Sigma$.

Remark 2.4. Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{k}, k \in N\right), T\right), \Lambda_{k}^{\#}=N^{k} \Lambda_{0}^{\#}$, be the hierarchy of pairwise compatible Poisson tensors, homogeneous with respect to $T$, generated on $M$ by $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ (cf. Remark 2.3). Each member ( $\Lambda_{k}, T$ ) of this hierarchy induces on $\Sigma$ a Jacobi structure $\left(\Lambda_{k \Sigma}, E_{k \Sigma}\right)$, in the sense of Proposition 2.1. Hence, we obtain on $\Sigma$ a sequence $\left(\left(\Lambda_{k \Sigma}, E_{k \Sigma}\right), k \in N\right)$ of Jacobi structures. It is easy to verify that they are pairwise compatible and that, for all $k \in N,\left(\Lambda_{k \Sigma}, E_{k \Sigma}\right)$ coincides with the structure defined by

$$
\left(\Lambda_{k \Sigma}, E_{k \Sigma}\right)^{\#}=\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}^{k} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)^{\#}
$$

As in Section 2.2, we remark that when a Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold ( $M, \Lambda_{0}, N$ ) possesses a vector field $T$ verifying Eq. (30), this one is not unique; all the vector fields of type $T+X$, where $X$ is an infinitesimal Poisson automorphism of $\Lambda_{0}$ such that $L_{X} N=0$, also verify Eq. (30). Let $\Sigma$ be an one-codimensional submanifold of $M$ transverse to two different homothety vector fields $T$ and $T^{\prime}$ of $\Lambda_{0}$ such that $L_{T} N=0$ and $L_{T^{\prime}} N=0$. In Section 2.2, we studied the influence of the choice of a such vector field on the Jacobi structure induced on $\Sigma$ by the homogeneous Poisson structure of $M$. Next, we are going to study the influence of this choice on the Nijenhuis operator induced on $\Sigma$ by the Nijenhuis tensor of $M$.

Lemma 2.3. Let $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ be a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold, $\Sigma$ a submanifold of $M$ of codimension 1, transverse to $T$, and $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}\right.$, $\left.\gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma$ by the homogeneous PoissonNijenhuis structure $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ of $M$, in the sense of Proposition 2.12. Then, a vector field $T^{\prime}$ on $M$ verifies Eq. (30) if and only if it is of the type

$$
T^{\prime}=X+h T
$$

where $X$ is a vector field tangent to $\Sigma$ and $h$ is a differentiable function verifying Eqs. (13) and (14) and, also, the following:

$$
\begin{align*}
& L_{X} N_{\Sigma}+Y_{\Sigma} \otimes D h+[X, T] \otimes \gamma_{\Sigma}+\left(\left[X, Y_{\Sigma}\right]\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\langle d h, T\rangle Y_{\Sigma}+g_{\Sigma}[X, T]\right) \otimes \frac{d a}{a}=0,  \tag{42}\\
& -{ }^{\mathrm{t}} N_{\Sigma} D h+i(X) d \gamma_{\Sigma}+D\left(\left\langle\gamma_{\Sigma}, X\right\rangle\right)-\langle d h, T\rangle \gamma_{\Sigma}+g_{\Sigma} D h=0,  \tag{43}\\
& -L_{Y_{\Sigma}} h+L_{X} g_{\Sigma}+\left\langle d\left(\left\langle\gamma_{\Sigma}, X\right\rangle\right), T\right\rangle=0, \tag{44}
\end{align*}
$$

where $D$ denotes the partial derivative with respect to the variables on $\Sigma$.
Proof. We recall the proof of Lemma 2.1 and we require $T^{\prime}=X+h T$ also satisfies $L_{T^{\prime}} N=0$. Taking into account Eq. (35), we verify that $L_{T^{\prime}} N=0$ if and only if $X$ and $h$ fulfill Eqs. (42)-(44).

Proposition 2.13. Let $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ be a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold, $\Sigma$ an one-codimensional submanifold of $M$ transverse to $T$, and $T^{\prime}=X+h T$ another vector field on $M$ transverse to $\Sigma$ such that $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T^{\prime}\right)$ also defines a homogeneous

Poisson-Nijenhuis structure on M. Let us endow $\Sigma$ with the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structures $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, and $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}^{\prime}, E_{0 \Sigma}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=$ ( $N_{\Sigma}^{\prime}, Y_{\Sigma}^{\prime}, \gamma_{\Sigma}^{\prime}, g_{\Sigma}^{\prime}$ ), induced, respectively, by the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structures $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ and $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T^{\prime}\right)$ of $M$, in the sense of Proposition 2.12. Then,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{0 \Sigma}^{\prime}=\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}-\frac{1}{h_{0}} X_{0} \wedge E_{0 \Sigma} \quad \text { and } \quad E_{0 \Sigma}^{\prime}=\frac{1}{h_{0}} E_{0 \Sigma},  \tag{45}\\
& N_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=N_{\Sigma}-\frac{1}{h_{0}} X_{0} \otimes \gamma_{\Sigma},  \tag{46}\\
& Y_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=N_{\Sigma} X_{0}-\frac{1}{h_{0}}\left\langle\gamma_{\Sigma}, X_{0}\right\rangle X_{0}+h_{0} Y_{\Sigma}-g_{\Sigma} X_{0},  \tag{47}\\
& \gamma_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=\frac{1}{h_{0}} \gamma_{\Sigma},  \tag{48}\\
& g_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=g_{\Sigma}+\frac{1}{h_{0}}\left\langle\gamma_{\Sigma}, X_{0}\right\rangle, \tag{49}
\end{align*}
$$

where $X_{0}$ and $h_{0}$ are, respectively, the restrictions of $X$ and $h$ on $\Sigma$.
Proof. The formulæ (45) are the result of Proposition 2.2. In order to prove Eqs. (46)-(49), we consider the same identifications as in the proofs of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3 and Propositions 2.2 and 2.12. Let $\pi^{\prime}: U \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the projection parallel to the integral curves of $T^{\prime}$ and $a^{\prime}$ a homogeneous function of degree 1 with respect to $T^{\prime}$, defined on $U$, and equal to 1 on $\Sigma$ (cf. Lemma 2.2). We denote by $T_{\Sigma} \pi^{\prime}: T_{\Sigma} U \rightarrow T \Sigma$ the vector bundle projection of $T_{\Sigma} U$ onto its horizontal subbundle $T \Sigma$ associated with $\pi^{\prime}$. We remark that

$$
\left.\frac{d a^{\prime}}{a^{\prime}}\right|_{\Sigma}=\left.\frac{1}{h_{0}} \frac{d a}{a}\right|_{\Sigma}
$$

where $a$ is the homogeneous function of degree 1 with respect to $T$, considered in the above mentioned proofs, and also that

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{\Sigma} \pi^{\prime} & =I d_{T_{\Sigma} U}-\left.\left(T^{\prime} \otimes \frac{d a^{\prime}}{a^{\prime}}\right)\right|_{\Sigma} \\
& =I d_{T_{\Sigma} U}-\left.\left(X_{0}+\left.h_{0} T\right|_{\Sigma}\right) \otimes \frac{1}{h_{0}} \frac{d a}{a}\right|_{\Sigma} \stackrel{(31)}{=} T_{\Sigma} \pi-\left.\frac{1}{h_{0}} X_{0} \otimes \frac{d a}{a}\right|_{\Sigma}
\end{aligned}
$$

From the geometric interpretation of the tensor fields that define on $\Sigma$ the Nijenhuis operator induced by the Nijenhuis tensor of $M$ (cf. Proposition 2.12), and considering also the identifications already made, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=\left.T_{\Sigma} \pi^{\prime} \circ N\right|_{\Sigma} \circ\left(T_{\Sigma} \pi^{\prime}\right)_{\mathrm{h}}^{-1}, \quad Y_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=T_{\Sigma \pi^{\prime}\left(\left.\left(N T^{\prime}\right)\right|_{\Sigma}\right)} \\
& \gamma_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=\left.\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N \frac{d a^{\prime}}{a^{\prime}}\right)\right|_{\Sigma}-\left.\left\langle\left.\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N \frac{d a^{\prime}}{a^{\prime}}\right)\right|_{\Sigma},\left.T\right|_{\Sigma}\right\rangle \frac{d a}{a}\right|_{\Sigma}, \quad g_{\Sigma}^{\prime}=\left\langle\left.\frac{d a^{\prime}}{a^{\prime}}\right|_{\Sigma},\left.\left(N T^{\prime}\right)\right|_{\Sigma}\right\rangle .
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking into account Eq. (35), the computation of the above formulæ yields Eqs. (46)(49).

Proposition 2.14. Let $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ and $\left(M^{\prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N^{\prime}, T^{\prime}\right)$ be two homogeneous Poisson Nijenhuis manifolds.

1. The product $M \times M^{\prime}$ endowed with $\left(\Lambda_{0}+\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N+N^{\prime}, T+T^{\prime}\right)$ is a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold.
2. Let $\Sigma$ be an one-codimensional submanifold of $M$ transverse to $T$ and $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)\right.$, $\left.\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma$ by the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ of $M$, in the sense of Proposition 2.12. Then: (i) $\Sigma \times M^{\prime}$ is an one-codimensional submanifold of $M \times M^{\prime}$ transverse to $T+T^{\prime}$; (ii) if $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma \times M^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}:=\left(N_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}, Y_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}, \gamma_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\right.$, $g_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}$, denotes the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma \times M^{\prime}$ by the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\Lambda_{0}+\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N+N^{\prime}, T+T^{\prime}\right)$ of $M \times M^{\prime}$, its tensor fields are given, respectively, by the formulæ

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{0 \Sigma \times M^{\prime}}=\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}+\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}-T^{\prime} \wedge E_{0 \Sigma} \quad \text { and } \quad E_{0 \Sigma \times M^{\prime}}=E_{0 \Sigma},  \tag{50}\\
& N_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}=N_{\Sigma}+N^{\prime}-T^{\prime} \otimes \gamma_{\Sigma}  \tag{51}\\
& Y_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}=Y_{\Sigma}+\left(N^{\prime}-g_{\Sigma} I d_{T M^{\prime}}\right) T^{\prime}  \tag{52}\\
& \gamma_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}=\gamma_{\Sigma}  \tag{53}\\
& g_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}=g_{\Sigma} . \tag{54}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. We are only going to prove Eqs. (51)-(54); the first part and the fact that $\Sigma \times M^{\prime}$ is an one-codimensional submanifold of $M \times M^{\prime}$ transverse to $T+T^{\prime}$ are obvious; formulæ (50) are the result of Proposition 2.3.

Let $U$ and $a$ be, respectively, the tubular neighbourhood of $\Sigma$ in $M$ and the homogeneous function of degree 1 with respect to $T$ defined on $U$ and equal to 1 on $\Sigma$ that we have considered in order to construct the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$ induced on $\Sigma$ by the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure ( $\Lambda_{0}, N, T$ ) of $M$ (cf. Proposition 2.12). Now, we take the submanifold $\Sigma \times M^{\prime}$ of $M \times M^{\prime}$ and the tubular neighbourhood $U \times M^{\prime}$ of $\Sigma \times M^{\prime}$ in $M \times M^{\prime}$, and we extend the function $a$ (initially defined on $U$ ) on $U \times M^{\prime}$ by imposing $a$ to be constant on each section of type $\{x\} \times M^{\prime}, x \in U$. Of course, the extended function $a$ is equal to 1 on $\Sigma \times M^{\prime}$ and it is homogeneous of degree 1 with respect to $T+T^{\prime}$.

Let $\pi: U \times M^{\prime} \rightarrow \Sigma \times M^{\prime}$ be the projection parallel to the integral curves of $T+T^{\prime}$. We denote by $T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}} \pi: T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\left(U \times M^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow T\left(\Sigma \times M^{\prime}\right)$ the vector bundle projection of $T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\left(U \times M^{\prime}\right)=T_{\Sigma} U \oplus T M^{\prime}$ onto its subbundle $T\left(\Sigma \times M^{\prime}\right)=T \Sigma \oplus T M^{\prime}$. We have

$$
\begin{align*}
T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}} \pi & =I d_{T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\left(U \times M^{\prime}\right)}-\left.\left(\left(T+T^{\prime}\right) \otimes \frac{d a}{a}\right)\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}} \\
& =I d_{T_{\Sigma} U}+I d_{T M^{\prime}}-\left.\left(T \otimes \frac{d a}{a}\right)\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}-\left.\left(T^{\prime} \otimes \frac{d a}{a}\right)\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}, \tag{55}
\end{align*}
$$

and we remark that the restriction of $T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime} \pi} \pi$ to the horizontal subbundle $T\left(\Sigma \times M^{\prime}\right)$ of $T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\left(U \times M^{\prime}\right)$, denoted by $\left(T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}} \pi\right)_{\mathrm{h}}$, is the identity. From Proposition 2.12,

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}= & \left.T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}} \pi \circ\left(N+N^{\prime}\right)\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}} \circ\left(T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime} \pi}\right)_{\mathrm{h}}^{-1}, \\
Y_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}= & T_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime} \pi\left(\left.\left(\left(N+N^{\prime}\right)\left(T+T^{\prime}\right)\right)\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\right),} \\
\gamma_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}= & \left.\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}}\left(N+N^{\prime}\right) \frac{d a}{a}\right)\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}} \\
& -\left.\left\langle\left.\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}}\left(N+N^{\prime}\right) \frac{d a}{a}\right)\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}},\left.\left(T+T^{\prime}\right)\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\right\rangle d a\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}, \\
g_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}= & \left\langle\left.\frac{d a}{a}\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}},\left.\left(\left(N+N^{\prime}\right)\left(T+T^{\prime}\right)\right)\right|_{\Sigma \times M^{\prime}}\right\rangle .
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking into account (55), the computation of the above formulæ yields Eqs. (51)(54).

Proposition 2.15. Let ( $M, \Lambda_{0}, N, T$ ) be a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold and let us consider two one-codimensional submanifolds $\Sigma$ and $\Sigma^{\prime}$ of $M$ transverse to $T$. We suppose that there exists an integral curve of $T$ intersecting $\Sigma$ at a point $p$ and $\Sigma^{\prime}$ at a point $p^{\prime}$. We equip $\Sigma$ (respectively $\left.\Sigma^{\prime}\right)$ with the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$, $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right),\left(\right.$ respectively $\left.\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}:=\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}, g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right)\right)$, induced by the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure ( $\Lambda_{0}, N, T$ ) of $M$, in the sense of Proposition 2.12. Then, there exists a diffeomorphism of a neighbourhood of $p$ in $\Sigma$ onto a neighbourhood of $p^{\prime}$ in $\Sigma^{\prime}$ that maps: (i) a Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure, conformal to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$, to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$ and (ii) $p$ to $p^{\prime}$.

Proof. Let $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}, E_{1 \Sigma}\right)$ (respectively $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$ ) be the Jacobi structure on $\Sigma$ (respectively $\left.\Sigma^{\prime}\right)$ generated by $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$ (respectively $\left.\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right)\right)$. One has that $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}, E_{1 \Sigma}\right)$ (respectively $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$ ) is compatible with ( $\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}$ ) (respectively $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$ ). Taking into account Remark 2.4, ( $\left.\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}, E_{1 \Sigma}\right)$ (respectively ( $\left.\Lambda_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$ ) can be seen as the Jacobi structure induced on $\Sigma$ (respectively $\Sigma^{\prime}$ ) by the homogeneous Poisson structure ( $\left.\Lambda_{1}, T\right), \Lambda_{1}^{\#}=N \Lambda_{0}^{\#}$, of $M$. Then, from Proposition 2.8, there exists $a \in$ $C^{\infty}(\Sigma, \boldsymbol{R})$ that never vanishes on $\Sigma$, and a diffeomorphism $\phi$ of a neighbourhood of $p$ in $\Sigma$ onto a neighbourhood of $p^{\prime}$ in $\Sigma^{\prime}$ mapping : (i) the pair $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}^{a}, E_{0 \Sigma}^{a}\right),\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}^{a}, E_{1 \Sigma}^{a}\right)\right)$ of compatible Jacobi structures, $a$-conformal to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right),\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}, E_{1 \Sigma}\right)\right)$, to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)\right.$, $\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{1 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$ ) and (ii) $p$ to $p^{\prime}$.

As it was shown in Proposition 2.11, $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}^{a}, E_{0 \Sigma}^{a}\right),\left(\Lambda_{1 \Sigma}^{a}, E_{1 \Sigma}^{a}\right)\right)$ possesses a recursion operator $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}^{a}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}^{a}, Y_{\Sigma}^{a}, \gamma_{\Sigma}^{a}, g_{\Sigma}^{a}\right)$. It is not difficult to check that $\phi$ takes $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}^{a}:=$ $\left(N_{\Sigma}^{a}, Y_{\Sigma}^{a}, \gamma_{\Sigma}^{a}, g_{\Sigma}^{a}\right)$ to $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}:=\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}, g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right)$, i.e. at each point $x$ of the considered neighbourhood of $p$ in $\Sigma$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}(\phi(x))=T_{x} \phi \circ N_{\Sigma}^{a}(x) \circ\left(T_{x} \phi\right)^{-1}, \quad Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}(\phi(x))=T_{x} \phi\left(Y_{\Sigma}^{a}(x)\right), \\
& \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}(\phi(x))=\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} T_{x} \phi\right)^{-1}\left(\gamma_{\Sigma}^{a}(x)\right), \quad g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}(\phi(x))=g_{\Sigma}^{a}(x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

So, $\phi$ maps the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}^{a}, E_{0 \Sigma}^{a}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}^{a}\right)$ to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}\right)\right.$, $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}$.

Proposition 2.16. With any Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifold $\left(M,\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right), \underset{\tilde{\sim}}{\mathcal{N}}:=\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{N}}(N, Y$, $\gamma, g)$, we may associate a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda} 0, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T})$ by setting

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}, \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}=e^{-t}\left(\Lambda_{0}+\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \wedge E_{0}\right) \\
& \tilde{N}=N+Y \otimes d t+\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \otimes \gamma+g \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \otimes d t, \quad \tilde{T}=\frac{\partial}{\partial t}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $t$ is the canonical coordinate on the factor $\boldsymbol{R}$.
The Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $M$, considered as an one-codimensional submanifold of $\tilde{M}$ transverse to $\tilde{T}$, by the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure of $\tilde{M}$, in the sense of Proposition 2.12, is the one given initially.

Proof. The facts that ( $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{T}$ ) endows $\tilde{M}$ with a homogeneous Poisson structure and that $\tilde{N}$ is a Nijenhuis tensor on $\tilde{M}$ are well known, respectively, from Propositions 2.5 and 2.10. So, it is enough to check the compatibility of these structures; condition $L_{\tilde{T}} \tilde{N}=0$ obviously holds.

It is easy to prove that

$$
\tilde{N} \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\#}=\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\# t} \tilde{N}
$$

if and only if relations (25)-(27) hold. Hence,

$$
\mathcal{N} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}=\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#} \circ{ }^{\mathrm{t}} \mathcal{N} \Leftrightarrow \tilde{N} \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\#}=\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\# \mathrm{t}} \tilde{N}
$$

On the other hand, when Eqs. (25)-(27) are satisfied, we can prove that

$$
\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#} \circ \mathcal{C}\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)=0 \Leftrightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\#} \circ C\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}\right)=0
$$

Therefore, from the compatibility of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ with $\mathcal{N}$, we deduce the compatibility of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ with $\tilde{N}$.

The proof of the second part of this proposition presents no difficulty.
Remark 2.5. If $\left(M,\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$ is a Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifold in the sense of the definition given in [17], i.e. the torsion $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ of $\mathcal{N}$ only vanishes on the image of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}$, then $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}\right)$ defines a weak Poisson-Nijenhuis structure on $\tilde{M}$ in the sense of [18], i.e. the Nijenhuis torsion $T(\tilde{N})$ of $\tilde{N}$ only vanishes on the image of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\#}$.

From Proposition 2.16 and Remark 2.4 we conclude, as for the Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds, the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1 ([17]). A Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$ on a differentiable manifold $M$ generates a hierarchy $\left(\left(\Lambda_{k}, E_{k}\right), k \in N\right)$ of pairwise compatible Jacobi structures
on M. For all $k \in N,\left(\Lambda_{k}, E_{k}\right)$ is the Jacobi structure associated with the vector bundle $\operatorname{map}\left(\Lambda_{k}, E_{k}\right)^{\#}: T^{*} M \times \boldsymbol{R} \rightarrow T M \times \boldsymbol{R},\left(\Lambda_{k}, E_{k}\right)^{\#}=\mathcal{N}^{k} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}$.

Furthermore, for all $k, l \in N$, the pair $\left(\left(\Lambda_{k}, E_{k}\right), \mathcal{N}^{l}\right)$ defines a Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure on $M$.

## 3. Part II

In this part of our work, we will establish some local models of homogeneous PoissonNijenhuis structures (cf. Definition 2.7). We apply the technic developed in [26] for the local classification of pairs of compatible symplectic forms, and we lean on the results established in [21] and [23], by one of the authors, concerning the construction of canonical forms of Poisson-Nijenhuis structures.

### 3.1. The regular locus of $N$

Let $M$ be a differentiable manifold. We denote by $\boldsymbol{K}_{M}[\lambda]$ the algebra of polynomials of one variable with coefficients in the ring $\mathcal{A}(M, \boldsymbol{K})$ of the $C^{\infty}$-differentiable functions, if $M$ is a real manifold, or of the holomorphic functions on $M$, if $M$ is a complex manifold. A polynomial $P$ of $\boldsymbol{K}_{M}[\lambda]$ is said to be irreducible if it is irreducible at each point of $M$, and two polynomials $P$ and $Q$ of $\boldsymbol{K}_{M}[\lambda]$ are said to be relatively prime if they are relatively prime at each point of $M$.

Let $N$ be a Nijenhuis tensor on $M$. It defines a section of the vector bundle Hom (TM, TM) $\rightarrow M$, where $\operatorname{Hom}(T M, T M)$ denotes the bundle of the endomorphisms of $T M$.

Definition 3.1. We say that the algebraic type of $N: M \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}(T M, T M)$ is constant on an open neighbourhood $U$ of a point $p \in M$, if there exist irreducible polynomials $P_{1}, \ldots, P_{r} \in \boldsymbol{K}_{U}[\lambda]$, relatively prime, and positive integers $n_{i j}, i=1, \ldots, r, j=1, \ldots, s_{i}$, such that, at each $x \in U,\left(P_{i}^{n_{i j}}, i=1, \ldots, r, j=1, \ldots, s_{i}\right)$ is the family of the elementary divisors of $N(x): T_{x} M \rightarrow T_{x} M$.

From a geometrical point of view, the algebraic type of $N: M \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}(T M, T M)$ is constant on $U$ if, at each $x \in U, T_{x} U$ is expressed as a direct sum of $N(x)$-cyclic subspaces isomorphic to the $N(p)$-cyclic subspaces of $T_{p} U$.

Definition 3.2. The map $N: M \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}(T M, T M)$ is said to be 0 -deformable on $U$, if the family ( $P_{i}^{n_{i j}}, i=1, \ldots, r, j=1, \ldots, s_{i}$ ) of its elementary divisors does not depend on the point $x \in U$.

Of course, in the case where $N$ is 0 -deformable on $U$, its algebraic type is constant on $U$.

The set of points in $M$ possessing an open neighbourhood on which the algebraic type of $N$ is constant, is an open dense subset of $M$ (cf. [21]).

Definition 3.3 (Conditions of regularity). A point $p \in M$ is said to be regular with respect to $N$ if it possesses an open neighbourhood $U$ in $M$ such that:

1. the algebraic type of $N$ is constant on $U$;
2. the subspaces

$$
\mathcal{E}_{x}=\bigcap_{i=1}^{s} \operatorname{ker} d f_{i}(x)
$$

of $T_{x} U, x \in U$, where $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{s}$ are the functional coefficients of the irreducible factors of the characteristic polynomial $\mathcal{P}_{N}$ of $N$, define a distribution $\mathcal{E}$ of constant rank on $U$;
3. the algebraic type of the restriction of $N$ to $\mathcal{E}$ is constant on $U$.

Definition 3.4. We call regular locus of $N$, and we denote by $\mathcal{R}_{N}$, the set of the regular points of $M$ with respect to $N$.

The set $\mathcal{R}_{N}$ is an open dense subset of $M$ (cf. [21]).

### 3.2. Decomposition of homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds

Let $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ be a homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold, i.e. $\Lambda_{0}$ is nondegenerate, fact that imposes $M$ to have even dimension, $L_{T} \Lambda_{0}=-\Lambda_{0}$ and $L_{T} N=0$, and let $p$ be a point of $M$ having an open neighbourhood $U$ in $M$ on which the algebraic type of $N$ is constant. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_{N}$ the characteristic polynomial of $N$ and we assume that it is written on $U$ as a product $\mathcal{P}_{N}=\mathcal{P}_{1} \cdot \mathcal{P}_{2}$ of two polynomials $\mathcal{P}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{2}$, relatively prime, with leading coefficient 1 . Let us set $N_{1}=\mathcal{P}_{1}(N)$ and $N_{2}=\mathcal{P}_{2}(N)$. Then, $T U=$ $\operatorname{ker} N_{1} \oplus \operatorname{ker} N_{2}$ and also $T U=\operatorname{Im} N_{2} \oplus \operatorname{Im} N_{1}$, because ker $N_{1}=\operatorname{Im} N_{2}$ and ker $N_{2}=$ $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$. The vector bundle maps $N_{i}: \operatorname{Im} N_{i} \rightarrow \operatorname{Im} N_{i}, i=1,2$, are isomorphisms. Also, $T^{*} U=\operatorname{Im}^{\mathrm{t}} N_{2} \oplus \operatorname{Im}^{\mathrm{t}} N_{1}$, where ${ }^{\mathrm{t}} N_{i}=\mathcal{P}_{i}\left({ }^{t} N\right)$ is the transpose of $N_{i}, i=1,2$.

Lemma 3.1. The vector subbundles $\operatorname{Im} N_{i}, i=1,2$, are involutive.
Proof. Let $X$ and $Y$ be two sections of $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$. Since $N_{1}: \operatorname{Im} N_{1} \rightarrow \operatorname{Im} N_{1}$ is an isomorphism, $X=N_{1} V$ and $Y=N_{1} W$, where $V$ and $W$ are also two sections of $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$. Then, $[X, Y]=\left[N_{1} V, N_{1} W\right]=T\left(N_{1}\right)(V, W)+N_{1}\left[N_{1} V, W\right]+N_{1}\left[V, N_{1} W\right]-N_{1}^{2}[V, W]$. But, $T\left(N_{1}\right)(V, W)=\sum_{r=0}^{m}\left(\alpha_{r}(V) N^{r} W-\alpha_{r}(W) N^{r} V\right)$, where $\alpha_{r}, r=1, \ldots, m$, are one-forms, and so $T\left(N_{1}\right)(V, W)$ is a section of $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$, because $V$ and $W$ are sections of $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$. Consequently, $[X, Y]$ is a section of $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$, and the involutivity of $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$ is proved.

Analogously, one proves the involutivity of $\operatorname{Im} N_{2}$.
Then, $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$ and $\operatorname{Im} N_{2}$ define two complementary foliations of $U$. Consequently, on a convenient neighbourhood of $p, M$ is identified with a product $M^{\prime} \times M^{\prime \prime}$ of two manifolds; $M^{\prime}$ (respectively $M^{\prime \prime}$ ) is represented by the set of the leaves of the foliation defined by $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$ (respectively $\operatorname{Im} N_{2}$ ). Hence, $T M^{\prime}=\operatorname{Im} N_{2}=\operatorname{ker} N_{1}$ and $T M^{\prime \prime}=\operatorname{Im} N_{1}=\operatorname{ker} N_{2}$.

Lemma 3.2. For all $k \in N, \Lambda_{k}\left(\operatorname{Im}^{t} N_{2}, \operatorname{Im}^{t} N_{1}\right)=0$, where $\Lambda_{k}$ is the Poisson tensor associated with the vector bundle map $\Lambda_{k}^{\#}: T^{*} M \rightarrow T M, \Lambda_{k}^{\#}=N^{k} \Lambda_{0}^{\#}$.

Proof. For all $\alpha, \beta$ one-forms on $U$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{k}\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N_{2} \alpha,{ }^{\mathrm{t}} N_{1} \beta\right) & =\Lambda_{k}\left(\mathcal{P}_{2}\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N\right) \alpha, \mathcal{P}_{1}\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N\right) \beta\right)=\Lambda_{k}\left(\mathcal{P}_{1}\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N\right) \mathcal{P}_{2}\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N\right) \alpha, \beta\right) \\
& =\Lambda_{k}\left(\mathcal{P}_{N}\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} N\right) \alpha, \beta\right)=0,
\end{aligned}
$$

because $\mathcal{P}_{N}$ is an annihilator polynomial of ${ }^{\mathrm{t}} N$.
Proposition 3.1. Keeping the same assumptions and notations as above, the homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ is identified, on a neighbourhood of $p$, with the product $\left(M^{\prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N^{\prime}, T^{\prime}\right) \times\left(M^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}, N^{\prime \prime}, T^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds.

Proof. From Lemma 3.2, the tensor fields $\Lambda_{k}, k \in N$, are locally expressed as

$$
\Lambda_{k}=\sum_{1 \leq i<j \leq n_{1}} f_{k i j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}}+\sum_{1 \leq l<m \leq n_{2}} g_{k l m} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{l}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{m}}
$$

where $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n_{1}}\right), n_{1}=\operatorname{dim} M^{\prime}$, (respectively $\left.\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n_{2}}\right), n_{2}=\operatorname{dim} M^{\prime \prime}\right)$, is a local coordinate system of $M^{\prime}$ (respectively $M^{\prime \prime}$ ). Since $\Lambda_{k}, k \in N$, are pairwise compatible Poisson tensors, their associated Poisson brackets $\{,\}_{k}, k \in N$, verify the Jacobi identity and the generalized Jacobi identity. Applying these identities to the coordinate functions, we prove that, for all $k \in N, f_{k i j}, 1 \leq i<j \leq n_{1}$, only depend on $x$-coordinates and $g_{k l m}$, $1 \leq l<m \leq n_{2}$, only depend on $y$-coordinates (cf. [21]).

Let us set, for all $k \in N$,

$$
\Lambda_{k}^{\prime}=\sum_{1 \leq i<j \leq n_{1}} f_{k i j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}} \quad \text { and } \quad \Lambda_{k}^{\prime \prime}=\sum_{1 \leq l<m \leq n_{2}} g_{k l m} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{l}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{m}}
$$

$\Lambda_{k}^{\prime}\left(\right.$ respectively $\left.\Lambda_{k}^{\prime \prime}\right), k \in N$, define on $M^{\prime}$ (respectively $M^{\prime \prime}$ ) a hierarchy of pairwise compatible Poisson tensors, with $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}$ (respectively $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ ) nondegenerate on $M^{\prime}$ (respectively $M^{\prime \prime}$ ), whose recursion operator $N^{\prime}$ (respectively $N^{\prime \prime}$ ) is the projection of $\left.N\right|_{\operatorname{Im} N_{2}}$ (respectively $\left.N\right|_{\operatorname{Im} N_{1}}$ ) on $\operatorname{Im} N_{2}\left(\right.$ respectively $\operatorname{Im} N_{1}$ ). The characteristic polynomial of $N^{\prime}$ (respectively $N^{\prime \prime}$ ) is $\mathcal{P}_{1}$ (respectively $\mathcal{P}_{2}$ ).

From this decomposition, the homothety vector field $T$ is written as

$$
T=T^{\prime}+T^{\prime \prime}
$$

where $T^{\prime}$ (respectively $T^{\prime \prime}$ ) is a vector field tangent to $M^{\prime}$ (respectively $M^{\prime \prime}$ ), i.e. in the ( $x, y$ ) product coordinates of $M=M^{\prime} \times M^{\prime \prime}$,

$$
T^{\prime}=\sum_{i=1}^{n_{1}} a_{i}(x, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \quad \text { and } \quad T^{\prime}=\sum_{l=1}^{n_{2}} b_{l}(x, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{l}}
$$

So, $L_{T} \Lambda_{0}=-\Lambda_{0}$ if and only if

$$
\begin{align*}
& L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=\left[T^{\prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}\right]=-\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}  \tag{56}\\
& L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}=\left[T^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right]=-\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}  \tag{57}\\
& L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=\left[T^{\prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right]+\left[T^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}\right]=0 \tag{58}
\end{align*}
$$

and $L_{T} \Lambda_{1}=-\Lambda_{1}$ (cf. Remark 2.3) if and only if

$$
\begin{align*}
& L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime}=\left[T^{\prime}, \Lambda_{1}^{\prime}\right]=-\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}  \tag{59}\\
& L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}=\left[T^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right]=-\Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}  \tag{60}\\
& L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime}=\left[T^{\prime}, \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right]+\left[T^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{1}^{\prime}\right]=0 . \tag{61}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}$ and $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ are nondegenerate, respectively, on $M^{\prime}$ and $M^{\prime \prime}$, taking into account Eqs. (56), (57), (59) and (60), and the fact that $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}=N^{\prime} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}$ and $\Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}=N^{\prime \prime} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}$, we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime}=0 \quad \text { and } \quad L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime \prime}=0 \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

So, $L_{T} N=0$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime}=0 \tag{63}
\end{equation*}
$$

But, the local expressions of $L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime}$ and $L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime}$ only have, respectively, terms of type $\partial / \partial x \otimes d y$ and $\partial / \partial y \otimes d x$. Then, Eq. (63) holds if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime}=0 \quad \text { and } \quad L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime}=0 \tag{64}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently, conditions (58), (61) and (64) give

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime} & =L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime} \cdot \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+N^{\prime \prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime} \cdot \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}+N^{\prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime} \\
& =N^{\prime \prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+N^{\prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=N^{\prime \prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}-N^{\prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime} \\
& =\left(N^{\prime \prime}-N^{\prime}\right) \cdot L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, we obtain that, out of the singular locus of $N^{\prime}$ and $N^{\prime \prime}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}=0 \tag{65}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, on account of Eq. (58),

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=0 \tag{66}
\end{equation*}
$$

After a straightforward computation, we find that, in ( $x, y$ )-coordinates, Eqs. (65) and (66) have, respectively, the matricial expressions

$$
\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime} \cdot\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{\partial a_{1}}{\partial y_{1}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial a_{n_{1}}}{\partial y_{1}} \\
\vdots & & \vdots \\
\frac{\partial a_{1}}{\partial y_{n_{2}}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial a_{n_{1}}}{\partial y_{n_{2}}}
\end{array}\right)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \Lambda_{0}^{\prime} \cdot\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{\partial b_{1}}{\partial x_{1}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial b_{n_{2}}}{\partial x_{1}} \\
\vdots & & \vdots \\
\frac{\partial b_{1}}{\partial x_{n_{1}}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial b_{n_{2}}}{\partial x_{n_{1}}}
\end{array}\right)=0
$$

Since $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ and $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}$ are nondegenerate, respectively, on $M^{\prime \prime}$ and $M^{\prime}$, the above equations imply that, out of the singular locus of $N^{\prime}$ and $N^{\prime \prime}$, the functional coefficients $a_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n_{1}$, of $T^{\prime}$ only depend on the $x$-coordinates and the functional coefficients $b_{l}, l=1, \ldots, n_{2}$, of $T^{\prime \prime}$ only depend on the $y$-coordinates. From the continuity of $a_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n_{1}$, and $b_{l}$, $l=1, \ldots, n_{2}$, on $M$, the above result holds on any neighbourhood of $p$ in $M$.

From Eq. (56) (respectively Eq. (57)) and Eq. (62), we deduce that $T^{\prime}$ (respectively $T^{\prime \prime}$ ) is a homothety vector field of $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N^{\prime}\right)$ (respectively $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}, N^{\prime \prime}\right)$ ).

### 3.3. Local models of homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds

Let $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ be a homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure defined on a differentiable manifold $M$ of dimension $2 n$. From the results of the previous paragraph, the problem of constructing a local model of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ reduces to the search of the normal form of these tensor fields in the particular case where $\mathcal{P}_{N}$ is a power of an irreducible polynomial. The possible case are:

1. $\mathcal{P}_{N}(\lambda)=(\lambda+f)^{2 n}$;
2. $\mathcal{P}_{N}(\lambda)=\left(\lambda^{2}+g \lambda+h\right)^{n}$, (this case arises if $M$ is a real manifold).

Studying the two cases separately, we establish in [21] the following theorems.
Theorem 3.1. Let $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ be a symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure defined on a differentiable manifold $M$ (real or complex) of dimension $2 n$, and $p$ a regular point of $M$ with respect to $N$. If the characteristic polynomial of $N$ is of type $\mathcal{P}_{N}(\lambda)=(\lambda+f)^{2 n}$ and $d f(p) \neq 0$, then there exists an open neighbourhood $U$ of $p$ in $M$ with local coordinates $\left(\left(x_{j}^{i}\right), y_{1}, y_{2}\right), i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, where $y_{2}=f-a, a=f(p)$, centered at $p$, in which $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ has the following expression:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{0}=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{i}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k}^{i}}\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{1}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{2}},  \tag{67}\\
& N=-\left(y_{2}+a\right) I d+H+\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{1}} \otimes \alpha-Z \otimes d y_{2}, \tag{68}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& H=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{i}} \otimes d x_{2 k+1}^{i}+\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k+2}^{i}} \otimes d x_{2 k}^{i}\right)\right],  \tag{69}\\
& \alpha=d x_{2}^{1}+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}}\left[\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) x_{2 k}^{i} d x_{2 k-1}^{i}+\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) x_{2 k-1}^{i} d x_{2 k}^{i}\right]\right),  \tag{70}\\
& Z=\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{1}^{1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}}\left[\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) x_{2 k-1}^{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{i}}-\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) x_{2 k}^{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k}^{i}}\right]\right) . \tag{71}
\end{align*}
$$

If $d f(p)=0$, the above expressions do not include the $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ coordinates.

Idea of proof. After the determination in [21] of the canonical form of a nondegenerate bivector defined on a $2 n$-dimensional vector space $V$ and of an endomorphism of $V$, and also of a symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure depending on a parameter whose recursion operator is nilpotent and 0 -deformable, with respect to the parameter too, we construct the model of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ as follows.

If $d f(p)=0$, since $p \in \mathcal{R}_{N}, f$ is constant on $U$ and $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N+f I d\right)$ defines on $U$ a symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure whose recursion operator is 0 -deformable and nilpotent. Then, its model is well known from the precedents and from it we easily deduce the normal form of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$.

If $d f(p) \neq 0$, we consider the pair $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N+f I d\right)$ of tensor fields that induces on the integral manifolds of the quotient bundle ker $d f / X_{f}$, where $X_{f}=\Lambda_{0}^{\#}(d f)$, a symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure depending parametrically on $f$ whose recursion operator is nilpotent and 0 -deformable, with respect to the parameter too. For all values of the parameter $f$, the model of the induced structure is well known from the previous study. From this model, we establish the normal form of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$, presented by Theorem 3.1. In the local expressions ((67)-(71)) of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right), m$ denotes the number of the $(N+f I d)(x)$-invariant subspaces in which the quotient space $\operatorname{ker} d f(x) / X_{f}(x), x \in U$, is decomposed; the $i$ th-subspace, $i=1, \ldots, m$, is decomposed into two $(N+f I d)(x)$-cyclic subspaces, both of dimension $r_{i} ; y_{2}=f-a, a=f(p)$, and $y_{1}$ is chosen in such a way that $\partial / \partial y_{1}=X_{f}$.

The models are completely determined by the algebraic type of $N$.
When $\mathcal{P}_{N}(\lambda)=(\lambda+f)^{2 n}$ and $d f(p) \neq 0$, we find that, in the coordinates of Theorem 3.1,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{1}=-\left(y_{2}+a\right) \Lambda_{0}+\Pi+Z \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{1}} \tag{72}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{i}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k+2}^{i}}\right) \tag{73}
\end{equation*}
$$

and that a representative of the homothety vector field $T$ of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ is the vector field

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{T}=\frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{1}^{1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} x_{2 k-1}^{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{i}}\right)+y_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{1}} \tag{74}
\end{equation*}
$$

it is a model of $T$, modulo the addition of an infinitesimal Poisson automorphism $X$ of $\Lambda_{0}$ such that $L_{X} N=0$. We remark that, if $d f(p)=0$, Eqs. (72) and (74) do not include coordinates $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$.

In the case where $\mathcal{P}_{N}(\lambda)=\left(\lambda^{2}+g \lambda+h\right)^{n}$, with $g^{2}-4 h$ strictly negative on a neighbourhood $U$ of $p$ in $M$, the construction of the models is based on: (i) The existence on $U$ of a complex structure $J$, i.e. $J^{2}=-I d$ and its Nijenhuis torsion identically vanishes. $J$ is the semi-simple part of the operator $N_{0}=2\left(4 h-g^{2}\right)^{-1 / 2} N+g\left(4 h-g^{2}\right)^{-1 / 2} I d$, so there exists a polynomial $Q \in \boldsymbol{K}_{U}[\lambda]$ with constant coefficients, because $N_{0}$ is 0 -deformable,
such that $J=Q\left(N_{0}\right)$, i.e. $J$ is a polynomial operator of $N$ whose coefficients are functions depending on $g$ and $h$ (cf. [24]); (ii) The following lemma.

Lemma 3.3 ([21]). Under the same assumptions and notations as above, let $\bar{\Lambda}_{0}$ (respectively $\left.\bar{\Lambda}_{1}\right)$ be the tensor field associated with the vector bundle map $\bar{\Lambda}_{0}^{\#}=J \Lambda_{0}^{\#}($ respectively $\left.\bar{\Lambda}_{1}^{\#}=J \Lambda_{1}^{\#}\right)$. Then, $\bar{\Lambda}_{0}\left(\right.$ respectively $\left.\bar{\Lambda}_{1}\right)$ is a Poisson tensor compatible with $\Lambda_{0}$ (respectively $\Lambda_{1}$ ), and $\hat{\Lambda}_{0}=\Lambda_{0}-i \bar{\Lambda}_{0}$ (respectively $\hat{\Lambda}_{1}=\Lambda_{1}-i \bar{\Lambda}_{1}$ ) is a holomorphic complex Poisson tensor.

Furthermore, $\left(\hat{\Lambda}_{0}, \hat{\Lambda}_{1}\right)$ is a pair of compatible holomorphic complex Poisson tensors.
We remark that the recursion operator of $\left(\hat{\Lambda}_{0}, \hat{\Lambda}_{1}\right)$ is also $N$ that is holomorphic. Moreover, the regular locus of $N$, seen as a holomorphic tensor field, coincide with the one of $N$, seen as a real tensor field, and its characteristic polynomial is $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{N}(\lambda)=(\lambda+f)^{n}$, where $f=(1 / 2)\left[g-\mathrm{i}\left(4 h-g^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right]$ is a holomorphic function. So, there exists a neighbourhood $U$ of $p$ in $M$ with local complex coordinates $\left(\left(z_{l}^{j}\right), w_{1}, w_{2}\right), j=1, \ldots, m, l=1, \ldots, 2 r_{j}$, $r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, centered at $p$, in which $\hat{\Lambda}_{0}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_{1}$ are given, respectively, by (67) and (72). If $\left(\left(x_{l}^{j}\right), u_{1}, u_{2} ;\left(y_{l}^{j}\right), v_{1}, v_{2}\right), j=1, \ldots, m, l=1, \ldots, 2 r_{j}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, is the system of real coordinates on $U$ associated with the complex one, after making the convenient replacements in the obtained expressions of $\hat{\Lambda}_{0}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_{1}$, we take their real parts. Hence, we obtain a normal form of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, \Lambda_{1}\right)$ and, consequently, of $N$. They are presented in next theorem.

Theorem 3.2. Let $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ be a symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure defined on a real differentiable manifold $M$ of dimension $2 n$, and $p$ a regular point of $M$ with respect to $N$. If the characteristic polynomial of $N$ is of type $\mathcal{P}_{N}(\lambda)=\left(\lambda^{2}+g \lambda+h\right)^{n}$, with $g^{2}-4 h$ locally strictly negative, then there exists an open neighbourhood $U$ of $p$ in $M$ with local coordinates $\left(\left(x_{l}^{j}\right), u_{1}, u_{2} ;\left(y_{l}^{j}\right), v_{1}, v_{2}\right), j=1, \ldots, m, l=1, \ldots, 2 r_{j}$, $r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, centered at $p$, in which the tensors fields $\Lambda_{0}$ and $N$ are expressed as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
\Lambda_{0}= & \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}} \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{j}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k}^{j}}-\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{2 k-1}^{j}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{2 k}^{j}}\right)\right] \\
& +\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u_{1}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{2}}-\frac{\partial}{\partial v_{1}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial v_{2}}\right)  \tag{75}\\
N= & -\left(u_{2}+a\right) I d-\left(v_{2}+b\right) J+H_{x}+H_{y}+\frac{\partial}{\partial u_{1}} \otimes\left(\alpha_{x}-\alpha_{y}\right) \\
& +\frac{\partial}{\partial v_{1}} \otimes\left(\alpha_{x}+\alpha_{y}\right)-Z_{x} \otimes\left(d u_{2}+d v_{2}\right)-Z_{y} \otimes\left(d u_{2}-d v_{2}\right), \tag{76}
\end{align*}
$$

where $a=\operatorname{Re} \hat{a}, b=\operatorname{Im} \hat{a},(\hat{a}=f(p))$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
J= & \sum_{j, l}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{l}^{j}} \otimes d x_{l}^{j}-\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{l}^{j}} \otimes d y_{l}^{j}\right)-\frac{\partial}{\partial u_{1}} \otimes d v_{1}-\frac{\partial}{\partial u_{2}} \otimes d v_{2} \\
& +\frac{\partial}{\partial v_{1}} \otimes d u_{1}+\frac{\partial}{\partial v_{2}} \otimes d u_{2}, \\
H_{x}= & \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{j}} \otimes d x_{2 k+1}^{j}+\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k+2}^{j}} \otimes d x_{2 k}^{j}\right)\right], \\
H_{y}= & \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{2 k-1}^{j}} \otimes d y_{2 k+1}^{j}+\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{2 k+2}^{j}} \otimes d y_{2 k}^{j}\right)\right], \\
\alpha_{x}= & d x_{2}^{1}+\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}}\left[\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) x_{2 k}^{j} d x_{2 k-1}^{j}+\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) x_{2 k-1}^{j} d x_{2 k}^{j}\right]\right), \\
\alpha_{y}= & \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}}\left[\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) y_{2 k}^{j} d y_{2 k-1}^{j}+\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) y_{2 k-1}^{j} d y_{2 k}^{j}\right]\right), \\
Z_{x}= & \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{1}^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}}\left[\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) x_{2 k-1}^{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{j}}-\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) x_{2 k}^{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k}^{j}}\right]\right), \\
Z_{y}= & \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}}\left[\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) y_{2 k-1}^{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{2 k-1}^{j}}-\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) y_{2 k}^{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{2 k}^{j}}\right]\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

After a long computation, we show that, in the coordinates of Theorem 3.2,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{T}=\frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{1}^{1}}+\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}}\left(x_{2 k-1}^{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{j}}+y_{2 k-1}^{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{2 k-1}^{j}}\right)+u_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{1}}+v_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_{1}} \tag{77}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a representative of the homothety vector field $T$ of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$, modulo the addition of an infinitesimal Poisson automorphism $X$ of $\Lambda_{0}$ such that $L_{X} N=0$.

From this study, we conclude the following theorem.
Theorem 3.3. Let $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ be a homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure defined on a differentiable manifold $M$ of dimension $2 n$. Then, on a neighbourhood of each regular point $p$ of $M$ with respect to $N$, the model of $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ is a finite product of homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds whose recursion operator has as characteristic polynomial a power of an irreducible polynomial.

If $M$ is a complex manifold, the Poisson-Nijenhuis structure's model of each factor of this product is given by Theorem 3.1 and the model of the corresponding homothety vector field is given by Eq. (74), modulo the addition of an infinitesimal Poisson biautomorphism of the factor's Poisson-Nijenhuis structure.

If $M$ is a real manifold, the Poisson-Nijenhuis structure's model of each factor of this product is given by Theorem 3.1 or Theorem 3.2, according to the type of the characteristic polynomial of the factor's recursion operator, and the model of the corresponding homothety vector field is given, respectively, by Eq. (74) or (77), modulo the addition of an infinitesimal Poisson biautomorphism of the factor's Poisson-Nijenhuis structure.

The models are completely determined by the family of the elementary divisors of $N$. (We notice that each elementary divisor appears an even number of times in this family.)

### 3.4. Local models of homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds of odd dimension

Let $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N, T\right)$ be a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure defined on a $(2 n+1)$ dimensional differentiable manifold $M$, with $\Lambda_{0}$ of maximum rank on an open dense subset of $M$. Using the results on: (i) the local models of symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structures (see Section 3.3 and [21]); (ii) the symplectization of a Poisson-Nijenhuis structure (see [22]) and (iii) the reduction of a Poisson-Nijenhuis structure (see [28,18]), we establish in [23] the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4. Under the same assumptions and notations as above, on a neighbourhood of each point $p \in \mathcal{R}_{N}$ such that corank $\Lambda_{0}(p)=1$, the model of $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ is a product of a Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold ( $M^{\prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N^{\prime}$ ) of odd dimension $2 l-1, l \leq n+1$, whose Nijenhuis tensor $N^{\prime}$ has a characteristic polynomial of type $\mathcal{P}_{N^{\prime}}(\lambda)=(\lambda+f)^{2 l-1}$, and of a symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold ( $M^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}, N^{\prime \prime}$ ).

If $p^{\prime}$ is the projection of $p$ on $M^{\prime}$ and $d f\left(p^{\prime}\right) \neq 0$, then there exists an open neighbourhood $U^{\prime}$ of $p^{\prime}$ in $M^{\prime}$ with local coordinates $\left(\left(x_{j}^{\prime i}\right), y^{\prime}\right), i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq$ $r_{m}, y^{\prime}=f-a^{\prime}, a^{\prime}=f\left(p^{\prime}\right)$, centered at $p^{\prime}$, such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k}^{\prime i}}\right)  \tag{78}\\
& N^{\prime}=-\left(y^{\prime}+a^{\prime}\right) I d+H^{\prime}-Z^{\prime} \otimes d y^{\prime} \tag{79}
\end{align*}
$$

where $H^{\prime}$ and $Z^{\prime}$ are given, in these coordinates, respectively, by Eqs. (69) and (71). If $d f\left(p^{\prime}\right)=0$, expressions (78) and (79) and also those of $H^{\prime}$ and $Z^{\prime}$ do not include coordinates $x_{2 r_{m}}^{\prime m}$ and $y^{\prime}$.

If $p^{\prime \prime}$ is the projection of $p$ on $M^{\prime \prime}$, the normal form of the tensor fields $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ and $N^{\prime \prime}$, on an open neighbourhood of $p^{\prime \prime}$ in $M^{\prime \prime}$, is presented by Theorem 3.3.

The model of $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ is completely determined by the family of the elementary divisors of $N$.
(In formulæ (78) and (79), $m$ and $r_{i}, i=1, \ldots, m$, have the same meaning as in Theorem 3.1.)

Let $\left(x_{k}^{\prime \prime}\right), k=1, \ldots, \operatorname{dim} M^{\prime \prime}$, be a system of local coordinates of $M^{\prime \prime}$, centered at $p^{\prime \prime}$, in which $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}, N^{\prime \prime}\right)$ has the model's expression (cf. Theorem 3.3). Because of the identification $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N\right)=\left(M^{\prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N^{\prime}\right) \times\left(M^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}, N^{\prime \prime}\right)$ on an open neighbourhood $U$ of $p$ in $M$, the
homothety vector field $T$ is written, in the local coordinate product system $\left(\left(x_{j}^{\prime i}\right), y^{\prime} ; x_{k}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, $i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}, k=1, \ldots, \operatorname{dim} M^{\prime \prime}$, of $M=M^{\prime} \times M^{\prime \prime}$, as

$$
T=T^{\prime}+T^{\prime \prime}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& T^{\prime}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{2 r_{i}} a_{j}^{i}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime} ; x^{\prime \prime}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}^{\prime i}}+b\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime} ; x^{\prime \prime}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^{\prime}} \quad \text { and } \\
& T^{\prime \prime}=\sum_{k=1}^{\operatorname{dim} M^{\prime \prime}} c_{k}\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime} ; x^{\prime \prime}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k}^{\prime \prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

are, respectively, vector fields tangent to $M^{\prime}$ and $M^{\prime \prime}$. Since ( $\Lambda_{0}, N, T$ ) is a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure, $L_{T} \Lambda_{0}=-\Lambda_{0}, L_{T} N=0$ and $L_{T} \Lambda_{1}=-\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{1}^{\#}=N \Lambda_{0}^{\#}$. But, $\Lambda_{i}=\Lambda_{i}^{\prime}+\Lambda_{i}^{\prime \prime}, i=0$, 1 . Hence, $L_{T} \Lambda_{0}=-\Lambda_{0}$ if and only if

$$
\begin{align*}
& L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=\left[T^{\prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}\right]=-\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}  \tag{80}\\
& L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}=\left[T^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right]=-\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}  \tag{81}\\
& L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=\left[T^{\prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right]+\left[T^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}\right]=0 \tag{82}
\end{align*}
$$

and $L_{T} \Lambda_{1}=-\Lambda_{1}$ if and only if

$$
\begin{align*}
& L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime}=\left[T^{\prime}, \Lambda_{1}^{\prime}\right]=-\Lambda_{1}^{\prime}  \tag{83}\\
& L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}=\left[T^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right]=-\Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}  \tag{84}\\
& L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime}=\left[T^{\prime}, \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right]+\left[T^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{1}^{\prime}\right]=0 . \tag{85}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ is nondegenerate on $M^{\prime \prime}$, Eqs. (81) and (84) yield

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime \prime}=0 \tag{86}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, $L_{T} N=0$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime}+L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime}=0 \tag{87}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, in the coordinate product system considered above, the matricial expressions of $L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime}, L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime}$ and $L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime}$ are, respectively, of type:

$$
L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
A & B \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & \Gamma \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & 0 \\
\Delta & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

So, Eq. (87) holds if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime}+L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime}=0 \quad \text { and } \quad L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime}=0 \tag{88}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking into account the second condition of Eq. (88), Eq. (85) implies

$$
\begin{align*}
L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{1}^{\prime} & =L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime} \cdot \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+N^{\prime \prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+L_{T^{\prime \prime}} N^{\prime} \cdot \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}+N^{\prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime} \\
& =L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime} \cdot \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+N^{\prime \prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+N^{\prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=0 \tag{89}
\end{align*}
$$

Considering the local expressions of the terms of left member of Eq. (89), we conclude that this equality holds if and only if

$$
L_{T^{\prime}} N^{\prime \prime} \cdot \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}+N^{\prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=0 \quad \text { and } \quad N^{\prime \prime} \cdot L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}=0
$$

So, out of the singular locus of $N^{\prime \prime}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}=0 \tag{90}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, because of Eq. (82),

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{T^{\prime \prime}} \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}=0 \tag{91}
\end{equation*}
$$

After a direct computation, we find that, in the considered local coordinate product system, Eqs. (90) and (91) are expressed, in terms of matrices, respectively, as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime} \cdot\left(\frac{\partial\left(a_{j}^{i}, b\right)}{\partial x^{\prime \prime}}\right)=0 \tag{92}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{0}^{\prime} \cdot\left(\frac{\partial c_{k}}{\partial\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)}\right)=0 \tag{93}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ is nondegenerate on $M^{\prime \prime}$, Eq. (92) means that, out of the singular locus of $N^{\prime \prime}$, the functional coefficients of $T^{\prime}, a_{j}^{i}, i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, and $b$, only depend on the $x^{\prime}$ and $y^{\prime}$ coordinates. Because of the continuity of these functions on $M$, the above result hold on any neighbourhood of $p$ in $M$. On the other hand, since the restriction of $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}$ to its symplectic leaves, defined by the equation $y^{\prime}=$ constant, is inversible on these leaves, Eq. (93) implies that, out of the singular locus of $N^{\prime \prime}$, the functional coefficients of $T^{\prime \prime}, c_{k}, k=1, \ldots, \operatorname{dim} M^{\prime \prime}$, only depend on the $y^{\prime}$ and $x^{\prime \prime}$ coordinates. Because these functions are continuous on $M$, the above conclusion holds on any neighbourhood of $p$ in $M$

Of course, $T^{\prime}$ and $T^{\prime \prime}$ are, respectively, homothety vector fields of ( $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N^{\prime}$ ) and ( $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}, N^{\prime \prime}$ ).
Let $S_{0}$ be the symplectic leaf of $\Lambda_{0}$ through $p$. Since $\left(M, \Lambda_{0}, N\right)=\left(M^{\prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N^{\prime}\right) \times$ $\left(M^{\prime \prime}, \Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}, N^{\prime \prime}\right)$, on a neighbourhood of $p$, and $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ is symplectic on $M^{\prime \prime}, S_{0}=S_{0}^{\prime} \times M^{\prime \prime}$, where $S_{0}^{\prime}$ is the symplectic leaf of $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}$ through $p^{\prime}$. In the product coordinates $\left(\left(x_{j}^{\prime i}\right), y^{\prime} ; x_{k}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, $i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}, k=1, \ldots, \operatorname{dim} M^{\prime \prime}$, of $M=M^{\prime} \times M^{\prime \prime}$, $S_{0}$ and $S_{0}^{\prime}$ are determined by the same equation $y^{\prime}=0$. The functions $\left(\left(x_{j}^{\prime i}\right) ; x_{k}^{\prime \prime}\right), i=$ $1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}, k=1, \ldots, \operatorname{dim} M^{\prime \prime}$, define on $S_{0}=S_{0}^{\prime} \times M^{\prime \prime}$ a coordinate product system. If $T=T^{\prime}+T^{\prime \prime}$ is tangent to $S_{0}$, i.e. $b\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime} ; x^{\prime \prime}\right)=0$, then $T^{\prime}$ is tangent to $S_{0}^{\prime}$, and reciprocally. In this case, $T$ is a homothety vector field of
the symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure induced on $S_{0}$ by $\left(\Lambda_{0}, N\right)$ and so is $T^{\prime}$ for the symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure induced on $S_{0}^{\prime}$ by ( $\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, N^{\prime}$ ). The recursion operator of the latter structure is 0 -deformable and its characteristic polynomial is $(\lambda+f)^{2 l-2}$. Consequently, in the considered case, the local expression of $T^{\prime}$, in coordinates $\left(x_{j}^{\prime i}\right), i=$ $1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, of $S_{0}^{\prime}$, is

$$
\begin{equation*}
T^{\prime}=\frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{1}^{\prime 1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} x_{2 k-1}^{\prime i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}}\right) \tag{94}
\end{equation*}
$$

modulo the addition of an infinitesimal Poisson biautomorphism of $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{\prime}, \Lambda_{1}^{\prime}\right), \Lambda_{1}^{\# \#}=N^{\prime} \Lambda_{0}^{\# \#}$, tangent to $S_{0}^{\prime}$ (cf. Eq. (74) and the remark that follows). The local expression of $T^{\prime \prime}$, in coordinates $\left(x_{k}^{\prime \prime}\right), k=1, \ldots, \operatorname{dim} M^{\prime \prime}$, of $M^{\prime \prime}$, is well determined by Theorem 3.3.

## 4. Part III

In the third and last part of this work, we are going to study the problem of constructing a normal form of the tensor fields of a Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right), \mathcal{N}:=$ ( $N, Y, \gamma, g$ ), defined on a finite dimensional differentiable manifold $M$. In order to establish these forms, we consider the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ defined on $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$ from $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$ (cf. Proposition 2.16). In the case where $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ is of maximum rank on $\tilde{M}$ (or on an open dense subset of $\tilde{M}$ ) and $\tilde{T}$ is tangent to the symplectic leaves of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ (of course, this always happen when $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ is symplectic), the local model of ( $\left.\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$, on an open neighbourhood of a regular point $\tilde{p}$ of $\tilde{M}$ with respect to $\tilde{N}$, is well determined, according to the parity of the dimension of $\tilde{M}$, by Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 and by formula (94). Then, taking: (i) an one-codimensional submanifold $\Sigma$ of $\tilde{M}$ transverse to the homothety vector field $\tilde{T}$; (ii) a function $a$ defined on a tubular neighbourhood $\tilde{U}$ of $\Sigma$ in $\tilde{M}$, equal to 1 on $\Sigma$ and homogeneous of degree 1 with respect to $\tilde{T}$, and (iii) the pair $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{a}, \tilde{E}_{0}^{a}\right)$ that defines on $\tilde{U}$ the Jacobi structure which is $a$-conformal to the Poisson structure's model, and computing: (i) the projection of ( $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{a}, \tilde{E}_{0}^{a}$ ) on $\Sigma$ parallel to the integral curves of the model of $\tilde{T}$, and (ii) from the model of $\tilde{N}$, the Nijenhuis operator induced on $\Sigma$, we obtain on $\Sigma$ a Jacobi-Nijenhuis model structure (cf. Proposition 2.12), that, from Proposition 2.15, is equivalent to a Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure on $M$, conformal to the one given initially. In this way, we end up establishing, on a neighbourhood of a point $p$ of $M$, which is the projection on $M$ of a regular point $\tilde{p}$ of $\tilde{M}$ with respect to $\tilde{N}$, a model of a structure that is conformal to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$, in the cases where:

1. $M$ has odd dimension and $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ is transitive on $M$;
2. $M$ has even dimension, say $2 n$, and the characteristic leaf $C_{0}$ of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ through $p$ has odd dimension, equal to $2 n-1$, fact that imposes $\tilde{T}=\partial / \partial t$ to be tangent to the corresponding symplectic leaf of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ (cf. Section 2.2).
(We remark that the set of points in $M$ that can be seen as projections of regular points of $\tilde{M}$ with respect to $\tilde{N}$, is an open dense subset of $M$, because $\mathcal{R}_{\tilde{N}}$ is an open dense subset of $\tilde{M}$.)

The case where $M$ has even dimension and ( $\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}$ ) is transitive on $M$ is going to be treated separately in Sections 4.2.

### 4.1. Local models of odd-dimensional Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifolds

Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right), \mathcal{N}:=(N, Y, \gamma, g)$, be a transitive Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure defined on a $(2 n+1)$-dimensional differentiable manifold $M$ and $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ its associated homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure on $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$ (cf. Proposition 2.16). Since $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}=e^{-t}\left(\Lambda_{0}+(\partial / \partial t) \wedge E_{0}\right),(t$ is the canonical coordinate on the factor $\boldsymbol{R})$, is nondegenerate on $\tilde{M}$, on a neighbourhood of each regular point $\tilde{p} \in \tilde{M}$ with respect to $\tilde{N}=$ $N+Y \otimes d t+(\partial / \partial t) \otimes \gamma+g \partial / \partial t \otimes d t$, the model of $\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ is a finite product of homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds whose recursion operator has as characteristic polynomial a power of an irreducible polynomial (cf. Theorem 3.3). In what follows, this decomposition of $\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ is going to be referred as the "model decomposition" of ( $\left.\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$. Let $p$ be the projection of $\tilde{p}$ on $M$. Because $\tilde{T}=(\partial / \partial t)$ is transverse to $M$ at $p$, at least one of the components of the decomposition of $\tilde{T}$ is transverse to $M$ at $p$. Therefore, in order to construct a local model of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$, we distinguish and we study separately the following cases:

1. The recursion operator of the homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure of the factor of the "model decomposition" of ( $\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}$ ) corresponding to the considered component of $\tilde{T}$, i.e. the component that is transverse to $M$ at $p$, has a characteristic polynomial of type $(\lambda+f)^{2 q}, q \leq n+1$.
2. The recursion operator of the homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure of the factor of the "model decomposition" of ( $\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}$ ) corresponding to the considered component of $\tilde{T}$, i.e. the component that is transverse to $M$ at $p$, has a characteristic polynomial of type $\left(\lambda^{2}+f \lambda+h\right)^{q}, q \leq n+1$, with $f^{2}-4 h$ locally strictly negative. (In order to avoid any confusion, in this paragraph, we will not use $g$ as a coefficient of the characteristic polynomial of the recursion operator because it appears as a coefficient of $\tilde{N}$.)

### 4.1.1. Study of Case 1

We denote by ( $\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}$ ) the factor of the "model decomposition" of ( $\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}$ ) whose homothety vector field $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ is transverse to $M$ at $p$, and we suppose that its recursion operator $\tilde{N}^{\prime}$ has a characteristic polynomial of type $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{N}^{\prime}}(\lambda)=(\lambda+f)^{2 q}, q \leq n+1$. Then, on a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}$ in $\tilde{M},\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)=\left(\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right) \times\left(\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, where ( $\left.\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is the product of the other factors of the "model decomposition" of ( $\left.\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$. If $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$ are, respectively, the projections of $\tilde{p}$ on $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, the normal form of $\left(\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)$, on a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$ in $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, is given by Theorem 3.1 and Eq. (74), and the one of ( $\left.\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, on a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$ in $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, by Theorem 3.3.

Now, we suppose that $d f\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}\right) \neq 0$, and we consider a local coordinate system $\left(\left(\tilde{x}_{j}^{\prime i}\right), \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime}\right)$, $i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, where $\tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime}=f-\tilde{a}^{\prime}, \tilde{a}^{\prime}=f\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}\right)$, centered at $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$, in which the tensor fields $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ are written as their models (67), (68)
and (74). An one-codimensional submanifold of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, transverse to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ and passing by $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$, is the hypersurface $\Sigma^{\prime}$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ defined by the equation $\tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}=0$, (it can also be seen as the hypersurface of level $2 / 3$ of the functional coefficient $\tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}+2 / 3$ of $\partial / \partial \tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}$ in the considered model expression of $\left.\tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)$. Moreover, a function $a$ defined on a well chosen tubular neighbourhood $\tilde{U}^{\prime}$ of $\Sigma^{\prime}$ in $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, which vanishes nowhere on $\tilde{U}^{\prime}$, equal to 1 on $\Sigma^{\prime}$ and homogeneous of degree 1 with respect to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$, is the function

$$
a\left(\left(\tilde{x}_{j}^{\prime i}\right), \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}+1
$$

We denote by $\pi^{\prime}: \tilde{U}^{\prime} \rightarrow \Sigma^{\prime}$ the projection parallel to the integral curves of $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$, by $T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}$ : $T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \tilde{U}^{\prime} \rightarrow T \Sigma^{\prime}$ the associated vector bundle projection of $T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \tilde{U}^{\prime}$ onto its subbundle $T \Sigma^{\prime}$, by ${ }^{\mathrm{t}} T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}: T^{*} \Sigma^{\prime} \rightarrow T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{*} \tilde{U}^{\prime}$ the transpose of $T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}$, and by $\left(T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}\right)_{\mathrm{h}}$ the restriction of $T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \pi^{\prime}$ to the horizontal subbundle $T \Sigma^{\prime}$ of $T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \tilde{U}^{\prime}$, which is a bijection.

Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}:=\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$, be the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma^{\prime}$ by the homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure ( $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}$ ) of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ (cf. Proposition 2.12). One has

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime \#}=\left.T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \pi^{\prime} \circ\left(a \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\not \#}\right)\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime} \circ}{ }^{\mathrm{t}} T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}  \tag{95}\\
& E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}\left(\left.\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\not \#}(d a)\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right)  \tag{96}\\
& N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\left.T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \circ} \circ \tilde{N}^{\prime}\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \circ\left(T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}\right)_{\mathrm{h}}^{-1}  \tag{97}\\
& Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}\left(\left.\left(\tilde{N}^{\prime} \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right)  \tag{98}\\
& \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\left.\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} \tilde{N}^{\prime} d a\right)\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}}-\left\langle{ }^{\left.\left.\left({ }^{\mathrm{t}} \tilde{N}^{\prime} d a\right)\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}},\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}}\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right\rangle d \tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1} \mid \Sigma^{\prime}}\right.  \tag{99}\\
& g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\left\langle\left. d a\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}},\left.\left(\tilde{N}^{\prime} \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right\rangle \tag{100}
\end{align*}
$$

Their computation yields:

$$
\begin{align*}
\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & -\frac{3}{2}\left[\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}}+\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}}\right)+\tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}}\right] \\
& \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}}+\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime}}+\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime i}}\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime}}  \tag{101}\\
E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & \frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}},  \tag{102}\\
N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & -\left(\tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{a}^{\prime}\right) I d_{\Sigma^{\prime}}-\frac{3}{2} T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} \otimes d \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+H_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}+\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}} \otimes \alpha_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} \\
& +\left(\frac{3}{2} T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}-Z_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \otimes d \tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime} \tag{103}
\end{align*}
$$

where $-(3 / 2) T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ is the projection of $\left.\left(\partial / \partial \tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right)\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}}$ on $T \Sigma^{\prime}$ parallel to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime \prime}}+\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime \prime}}\right)+\tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}},  \tag{104}\\
& H_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}} \otimes d \tilde{x}_{2 k+1}^{\prime 1}\right)+\sum_{k=1}^{r_{1}-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k+2}^{\prime \prime}} \otimes d \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime 1}\right) \\
& +\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}-1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}} \otimes d \tilde{x}_{2 k+1}^{\prime i}+\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k+2}^{\prime i}} \otimes d \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime i}\right)\right],  \tag{105}\\
& \alpha_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=d \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}+\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}}\left[\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime 1} d \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}+\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} d \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime 1}\right] \\
& +\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}}\left[\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime i} d \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}+\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i} d \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime i}\right]\right) \text {, }  \tag{106}\\
& Z_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}}\left[\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime \prime}}\right]-\sum_{k=1}^{r_{1}}\left[\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime \prime}}\right] \\
& +\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}}\left[\left(k+\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime \prime}}-\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime \prime}}\right]\right) \text {, }  \tag{107}\\
& Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}-1}\left(\tilde{x}_{2 k+1}^{\prime}-\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime \prime}}-\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime \prime} \tilde{x}_{2 r_{1}-1}^{\prime 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 r_{1}-1}^{\prime 1}} \\
& +\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}-1}\left(\tilde{x}_{2 k+1}^{\prime i}-\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime \prime} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}}\right]-\sum_{i=2}^{m} \frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime \prime} \tilde{x}_{2 r_{i}-1}^{\prime i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 r_{i}-1}^{\prime \prime}} \\
& +\left(\frac{1}{3} \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}+\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime 1}\right. \\
& \left.+\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i} \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime i}\right]-\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime} \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}},  \tag{108}\\
& \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\frac{3}{2}\left(d \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}-d \tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime}\right) \text {, }  \tag{109}\\
& g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=-\left(\tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{a}^{\prime}\right)+\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime} . \tag{110}
\end{align*}
$$

(Taking into account the remark of Theorem 3.1, if $d f\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}\right)=0$, the obtained local expressions of the tensor fields of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$ do not include the $\tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime}$ coordinates.)

Now, we consider a local coordinate system $\tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, centered at $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$, in which ( $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}$, $\left.\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ has the expression of its model (see Theorem 3.3), and the product system $\left(\left(\tilde{x}_{j}^{\prime i}\right), \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}\right.$, $\left.\tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime} ; \tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}\right), i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, where $\tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime}=$ $f-\tilde{a}^{\prime}, \tilde{a}^{\prime}=f\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}\right)$, centered at $\tilde{p}=\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}, \tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Furthermore, we take the submanifold $\Sigma=$ $\Sigma^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ of codimension 1, transverse to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}+\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$, defined, of course, by $\tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}=0$.

Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, be the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma=\Sigma^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ by the homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis product structure $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)=\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)+\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ (cf. Propositions 2.12 and 2.14). From Proposition 2.14, one has

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{0 \Sigma}=\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}+\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}-\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime} \wedge E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} \text { and } E_{0 \Sigma}=E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}  \tag{111}\\
& N_{\Sigma}=N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}+\tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}-\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime} \otimes \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}  \tag{112}\\
& Y_{\Sigma}=Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}+\left(\tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}-g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} I d_{T \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}}\right) \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}  \tag{113}\\
& \gamma_{\Sigma}=\gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}  \tag{114}\\
& g_{\Sigma}=g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} \tag{115}
\end{align*}
$$

The local expressions of the tensor fields $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}:=\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right.$, $g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}$, in the coordinates of $\Sigma^{\prime}$, are given by Eqs. (101)-(110), and those of ( $\left.\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, in the considered coordinate system $\tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, are known by Theorem 3.3. Hence, formulæ (111)-(115) give us the local expression of the tensor fields of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=$ $\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, in the coordinate product system $\left(\tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_{2 r_{m}}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{y}_{2}^{\prime} ; \tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of $\Sigma=$ $\Sigma^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$.

### 4.1.2. Study of Case 2

We work as in Case 1 . We denote by ( $\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}$ ) the factor of the "model decomposition" of ( $\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}$ ) whose homothety vector field $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ is transverse to $M$ at $p$, and we assume that its recursion operator $\tilde{N}^{\prime}$ has a characteristic polynomial of type $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{N}^{\prime}}(\lambda)=$ $\left(\lambda^{2}+f \lambda+h\right)^{q}, q \leq n+1$, with $f^{2}-4 h$ locally strictly negative. Then, on a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}$ in $\tilde{M},\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)=\left(\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right) \times\left(\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, where $\left(\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right.$, $\left.\tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is the product of the other factors of the "model decomposition" of ( $\left.\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$. If $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$ are, respectively, the projections of $\tilde{p}$ on $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, the normal form of $\left(\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)$, on a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$ in $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, is given by Theorem 3.2 and Eq. (77), and the one of ( $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$ ), on a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$ in $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, by Theorem 3.3.

Let $\left(\left(\tilde{x}_{l}^{\prime j}\right), \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime},\left(\tilde{y}_{l}^{\prime j}\right), \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}\right), j=1, \ldots, m, l=1, \ldots, 2 r_{j}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, be a local coordinate system of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, centered at $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$, in which the tensor fields $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ are expressed as their models (Eq. (75)-(77)). To the role of an one-codimensional submanifold of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ transverse to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$, we take the hypersurface $\Sigma^{\prime}$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ through $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$ that is defined by the equation $\tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}=0$. A function $a$ defined on a well chosen tubular neighbourhood $\tilde{U}^{\prime}$ of $\Sigma^{\prime}$ in $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, which never vanishes on $\tilde{U}^{\prime}$, equal to 1 on $\Sigma^{\prime}$ and homogeneous of degree 1 with
respect to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$, is the function

$$
a\left(\left(\tilde{x}_{l}^{\prime j}\right), \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime},\left(\tilde{y}_{l}^{\prime j}\right), \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}+1
$$

We denote by $\pi^{\prime}: \tilde{U}^{\prime} \rightarrow \Sigma^{\prime}$ the projection parallel to the integral curves of $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$, by $T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}$ : $T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \tilde{U}^{\prime} \rightarrow T \Sigma^{\prime}$ the associated vector bundle projection of $T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \tilde{U}^{\prime}$ onto its subbundle $T \Sigma^{\prime}$, by ${ }^{\mathrm{t}} T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \pi^{\prime}: T^{*} \Sigma^{\prime} \rightarrow T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{*} \tilde{U}^{\prime}$ the transpose of $T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}$, and by $\left(T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \pi^{\prime}\right)_{\mathrm{h}}$ the restriction of $T_{\Sigma^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}}$ to the horizontal subbundle $T \Sigma^{\prime}$ of $T_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \tilde{U}^{\prime}$, which is a bijection.

Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}:=\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$, be the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma^{\prime}$ by the homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ (cf. Proposition 2.12). The tensor fields defining this structure are given, respectively, by the formulæ (95)-(100). In this case, their computation yields

$$
\begin{align*}
\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & -\frac{3}{8}\left[\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime}}+\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}} \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}}\right)+\tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}}+\tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}}\right] \\
\wedge & \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime \prime}}+\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}} \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime \prime}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime \prime}}+\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}} \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime j}}\right) \\
- & \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}} \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{2 k}^{\prime j}}\right)+\frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime}}-\frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}},  \tag{116}\\
E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & \frac{3}{8} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime \prime}},  \tag{117}\\
N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & -\left(\tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{a}^{\prime}\right) I d_{\Sigma^{\prime}}-\frac{3}{2} T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} \otimes d \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+H_{\tilde{x}^{\prime} \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}-\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) J_{\Sigma^{\prime}} \\
& -\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \frac{3}{2} T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} \otimes d \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}+\left(\frac{3}{2} T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}-Z_{\tilde{x}^{\prime} \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \otimes\left(d \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime}+d \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}\right)+H_{\tilde{y}^{\prime}}^{\prime} \\
& -Z_{\tilde{y}^{\prime}}^{\prime} \otimes\left(d \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime}-d \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}} \otimes\left(\alpha_{\tilde{x}^{\prime} \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}-\alpha_{\tilde{y}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}} \otimes\left(\alpha_{\tilde{x}^{\prime} \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}+\alpha_{\tilde{y}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \tag{118}
\end{align*}
$$

where $-(3 / 2) T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ is the projection of $\left.\left(\partial / \partial \tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right)\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}}$ on $T \Sigma^{\prime}$ in the direction of $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & \sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime \prime}}+\sum_{j=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}} \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}}\right) \\
& +\tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}}+\tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_{\Sigma^{\prime}}= & \sum_{l=2}^{2 r_{1}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{l}^{\prime}} \otimes d \tilde{x}_{l}^{\prime 1}-\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{l}^{\prime 1}} \otimes d \tilde{y}_{l}^{\prime 1}\right)+\sum_{j=2}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{2 r_{j}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{l}^{\prime j}} \otimes d \tilde{x}_{l}^{\prime j}-\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{l}^{\prime j}} \otimes d \tilde{y}_{l}^{\prime j}\right) \\
& -\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}} \otimes d \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}-\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime}} \otimes d \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}} \otimes d \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}+\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}} \otimes d \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

the tensor fields $H_{\tilde{x}^{\prime} \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \alpha_{\tilde{x}^{\prime} \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, Z_{\tilde{x}^{\prime} \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ have, respectively, the expressions (105)-(107), and $H_{\tilde{y}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \alpha_{\tilde{y}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, Z_{\tilde{y}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ those that appear in Theorem 3.2,

$$
\begin{align*}
& Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}-1}\left[\tilde{x}_{2 k+1}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}-\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}} \\
& +\sum_{j=2}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}-1}\left[\tilde{x}_{2 k+1}^{\prime j}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}-\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}} \\
& +\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left[\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{2 r_{j}-1}^{\prime j}-\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 r_{j}-1}^{\prime j}\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 r_{j}-1}^{\prime j}} \\
& +\left[-\frac{2}{3}\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right)+\tilde{y}_{3}^{\prime 1}-\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}} \\
& +\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}-1}\left[-\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}+\tilde{y}_{2 k+1}^{\prime}-\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right) \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime \prime}} \\
& +\sum_{j=2}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}-1}\left[-\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}+\tilde{y}_{2 k+1}^{\prime j}-\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right) \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j}} \\
& +\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left[-\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 r_{j}-1}^{\prime j}-\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right) \tilde{y}_{2 r_{j}-1}^{\prime j}\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{y}_{2 r_{j}-1}^{\prime j}} \\
& +\left[\frac{1}{3} \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}+\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{1}+\sum_{j=2}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j} \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime j}\right. \\
& \left.-\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j} \tilde{y}_{2 k}^{\prime j}+\tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right)-\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right) \tilde{u}^{\prime}{ }_{1}\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}} \\
& +\left[\frac{1}{3} \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}+\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime 1}+\sum_{j=2}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j} \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime j}\right. \\
& \left.+\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{r_{j}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{y}_{2 k-1}^{\prime j} \tilde{y}_{2 k}^{\prime j}-\tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right)-\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right) \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}}, \tag{119}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\frac{3}{2}\left(d \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) d \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}-d \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime}-d \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}\right),  \tag{120}\\
& g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=-\left(\tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{a}^{\prime}\right)+\frac{3}{2}\left(\tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+\left(\tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime}+\tilde{b}^{\prime}\right) \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right) . \tag{121}
\end{align*}
$$

Afterwards, we consider a local coordinate system $\tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, centered at $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$, in which ( $\left.\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ has the expression of its model (see Theorem 3.3), and also the product system $\left(\left(\tilde{x}_{l}^{\prime j}\right), \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime},\left(\tilde{y}_{l}^{\prime j}\right), \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime} ; \tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}\right), j=1, \ldots, m, l=1, \ldots, 2 r_{j}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, centered at $\tilde{p}=\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}, \tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Moreover, we take the submanifold $\Sigma=$ $\Sigma^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ of codimension 1, transverse to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}+\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$, defined, of course, by $\tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}=0$.

Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, be the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma=\Sigma^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ by the homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis product structure $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)=\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)+\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, (cf. Propositions 2.12 and 2.14). From Proposition 2.14 we deduce the expressions of the tensor fields of $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ and of $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$ that are represented, respectively, by formulæ (111) and (112)-(115). Then, taking into account the already established local expressions of ( $\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ ) and of $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}:=\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$ in the coordinates of $\Sigma^{\prime}$ (see relations (116)-(121)), and also the local expressions of $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ in the considered coordinate system $\tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ (cf. Theorem 3.3), from Eqs. (111)-(115) we may deduce the local expressions of $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ and of $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$ in the coordinate product system $\left(\tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_{2 r_{m}}^{\prime m}, \tilde{u}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{u}_{2}^{\prime}, \tilde{y}_{1}^{\prime 1}, \ldots, \tilde{y}_{2 r_{m}}^{\prime m}, \tilde{v}_{1}^{\prime}, \tilde{v}_{2}^{\prime} ; \tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of $\Sigma=\Sigma^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$.

In conclusion, we present the following theorem.
Theorem 4.1. Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right), \mathcal{N}:=(N, Y, \gamma, g)$, be a transitive Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure defined on a $(2 n+1)$-dimensional differentiable manifold $M,\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ the associated homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure on $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$, and p a generic point of $M$, viewed as the projection on $M$ of a regular point $\tilde{p}$ of $\tilde{M}$ with respect to $\tilde{N}$. Also, let ( $\left.\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)$ be a factor of the "model decomposition" of $\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ whose homothety vector field $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ is supposed to be transverse to $M$ at $p, \Sigma$ a submanifold of $\tilde{M}$ through $\tilde{p}$ of codimension 1 and transverse to $\tilde{T}$, and $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$, $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma$ by $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$. If the characteristic polynomial of $\tilde{N}^{\prime}$ is of the type $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{N}^{\prime}}(\lambda)=(\lambda+f)^{2 q}$ (respectively $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{N}^{\prime}}(\lambda)=\left(\lambda^{2}+f \lambda+h\right)^{q}$, with $f^{2}-4 h$ locally strictly negative $), q \leq n+1$, then, there exists a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}$ in $\Sigma$ with a coordinates system, centered at $p$, in which the tensor fields of $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ and of $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$ are written, respectively, as Eqs. (111) and (112)-(115), taking into account formulæ (101)-(110) (respectively (116)-(121)). The structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$ is locally equivalent to a conformal structure to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$.

### 4.2. Local models of even-dimensional Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifolds

Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right), \mathcal{N}:=(N, Y, \gamma, g)$, be a Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure defined on a $2 n$-dimensional differentiable manifold $M$ and ( $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}$ ) the associated homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure defined on $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$ (cf. Proposition 2.16). We assume
that the Poissonization $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}=e^{-t}\left(\Lambda_{0}+(\partial / \partial t) \wedge E_{0}\right)(t$ is the canonical coordinate on the factor $\boldsymbol{R})$ of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ is of maximum rank on an open dense subset of $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$. Let $p$ be a generic point of $M$, i.e. $p$ can be viewed as the projection on $M$ of a regular point $\tilde{p}$ of $\tilde{M}$, with respect to $\tilde{N}=N+Y \otimes d t+(\partial / \partial t) \otimes \gamma+g(\partial / \partial t) \otimes d t$, such that corank $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}(\tilde{p})=1$. Our aim is to construct a model of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$ on a neighbourhood of $p$. We remark that the characteristic leaf $C_{0}$ of $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ through $p$ is the projection on $M$, parallel to the integral curves of $\tilde{T}=(\partial / \partial t)$, of the symplectic leaf $\tilde{S}_{0}$ of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ through $\tilde{p}$ (see Section 2.2); of course, $\operatorname{dim} \tilde{S}_{0}=2 n$. Then,

- if $\tilde{T}=(\partial / \partial t)$ is tangent to $\tilde{S}_{0}, C_{0}$ has dimension $2 n-1$, and we have that rank $\Lambda_{0}(p)=$ $2 n-2$ and $E_{0}(p) \notin \Im \Lambda_{0}^{\#}(p)$;
- if $\tilde{T}=(\partial / \partial t)$ is not tangent to $\tilde{S}_{0}, C_{0}$ has dimension $2 n$, i.e. $\operatorname{dim} C_{0}=\operatorname{dim} M$, consequently rank $\Lambda_{0}(p)=2 n$ and $E_{0}(p) \in \Im \Lambda_{0}^{\#}(p)$, and the restriction to $\tilde{S}_{0}$ of the projection of $\tilde{M}$ on $M$ parallel to the integral curves of $\tilde{T}=(\partial / \partial t)$ is a local diffeomorphism of $\tilde{S}_{0}$ onto $C_{0}$. Then, in this case, $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ is transitive on a neighbourhood of $p$ in $M$.

Hence, in order to establish a model of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$ on a neighbourhood of $p$, we will study separately the above mentioned cases.

### 4.2.1. Study of the case where $\partial / \partial t$ is tangent to $\tilde{S}_{0}$

In this case, for the construction of a normal form of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$ on a neighbourhood of $p$, we apply the technique developed in the previous paragraph. From Theorem 3.4 and the study that follows, on a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}$ in $\tilde{M}$, the model of $\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ is a product of a homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold ( $\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}$ ) of odd dimension $2 l-1$, $l \leq n+1$, whose recursion operator $\tilde{N}^{\prime}$ has a characteristic polynomial of type $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{N}^{\prime}}(\lambda)=$ $(\lambda+f)^{2 l-1}$ and whose homothety vector field $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ is tangent to the symplectic leaf $\tilde{S}_{0}^{\prime}$ of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}$ passing by the projection $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$ of $\tilde{p}$ on $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, and a homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold ( $\left.\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$. The normal form of ( $\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}$ ) is well described by Theorem 3.4 and Eq. (94) and the one of ( $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$ ) by Theorem 3.3. In what follows, this decomposition of $\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ will be referred as the "model decomposition" of $\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$. Since $\tilde{T}=\partial / \partial t$ is supposed to be transverse to $M$ at $p$, we have that at least one of its components is transverse to $M$ at $p$. We distinguish and we treat separately the following cases:

1. The component of $\tilde{T}$ that is transverse to $M$ at $p$ is $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$.
2. The component of $\tilde{T}$ that is transverse to $M$ at $p$ is $\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$.

Case 1. We take the factor ( $\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}$ ) of the "model decomposition" of ( $\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}$ ) that possesses the properties stated above and whose homothety vector field $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ is supposed to be transverse to $M$ at $p$. We assume that $d f\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}\right) \neq 0$, and we consider a local coordinate $\operatorname{system}\left(\left(\tilde{x}_{j}^{\prime i}\right), \tilde{y}^{\prime}\right), i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}, r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, where $\tilde{y}^{\prime}=f-\tilde{a}^{\prime}$, $\tilde{a}^{\prime}=f\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}\right)$, centered at $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$, in which the tensor fields $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ are written, respectively, as their models (78), (79) and (94). For the role of an one-codimensional submanifold of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ transverse to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$, we take the hypersurface $\Sigma^{\prime}$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ defined by the equation $\tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}=0$; of course $\tilde{p}^{\prime} \in \Sigma^{\prime}$. A function $a$ defined on a well chosen tubular neighbourhood $\tilde{U}^{\prime}$ of $\Sigma^{\prime}$
in $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, which never vanishes on $\tilde{U}^{\prime}$, equal to 1 on $\Sigma^{\prime}$ and homogeneous of degree 1 with respect to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$, is the function

$$
a\left(\left(\tilde{x}_{j}^{\prime i}\right), \tilde{y}^{\prime}\right)=\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}+1
$$

Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}:=\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$, be the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma^{\prime}$ by the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure ( $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}$ ) of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$ (cf. Proposition 2.12). Developing the same reasoning as in Section 4.1, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} & =-\frac{3}{2}\left[\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}}+\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}}\right)\right] \\
& \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}}+\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime 1}}+\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k}^{\prime i}}\right),  \tag{122}\\
E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} & =\frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime \prime}},  \tag{123}\\
N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} & =-\left(\tilde{y}^{\prime}+\tilde{a}^{\prime}\right) I d_{\Sigma^{\prime}}-\frac{3}{2} T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime} \otimes d \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}+H_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}+\left(\frac{3}{2} T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}-Z_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \otimes d \tilde{y}^{\prime} \tag{124}
\end{align*}
$$

where $-(3 / 2) T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ is the projection of $\partial /\left.\partial \tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}\right|_{\Sigma^{\prime}}$ on $T \Sigma^{\prime}$ parallel to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$,

$$
T_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime \prime}}+\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}}\right)
$$

and $H_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, Z_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ are given, respectively, by Eqs. (105) and (107),

$$
\begin{align*}
Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & \sum_{k=2}^{r_{1}-1}\left(\tilde{x}_{2 k+1}^{\prime}-\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime 1}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime}}-\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1} \tilde{x}_{2 r_{1}-1}^{\prime 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 r_{1}-1}^{\prime}} \\
& +\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{r_{i}-1}\left(\tilde{x}_{2 k+1}^{\prime i}-\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1} \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 k-1}^{\prime i}}\right]-\sum_{i=2}^{m} \frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime} \tilde{x}_{2 r_{i}-1}^{\prime i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_{2 r_{i}-1}^{\prime i}}  \tag{125}\\
\gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & \frac{3}{2}\left(d \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1}-d \tilde{y}^{\prime}\right)  \tag{126}\\
g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}= & -\left(\tilde{y}^{\prime}+\tilde{a}^{\prime}\right)+\frac{3}{2} \tilde{x}_{3}^{\prime 1} \tag{127}
\end{align*}
$$

(If $d f\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}\right)=0$, the obtained local expressions of the tensor fields of the structure ( $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right.$, $\left.E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}$ ) do not include the $\tilde{x}_{2 r_{m}}^{\prime m}$ and $\tilde{y}^{\prime}$ coordinates.)

Now, we consider a local coordinate system $\tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, centered at $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$ (we denote by $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$ the projection of $\tilde{p}$ on $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ ), in which ( $\left.\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ has the expression of its model presented by Theorem 3.3, and also the product system $\left(\left(\tilde{x}_{j}^{\prime i}\right), \tilde{y}^{\prime} ; \tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}\right), i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, 2 r_{i}$, $r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{m}$, of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, where $\tilde{y}^{\prime}=f-\tilde{a}^{\prime}, \tilde{a}^{\prime}=f\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}\right)$, centered at $\tilde{p}=\left(\tilde{p}^{\prime}, \tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}\right)$.

Moreover, we consider the hypersurface $\Sigma=\Sigma^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ defined by the equation $\tilde{x}_{1}^{\prime 1}=0$. Of course, it is an one-codimensional submanifold of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime}$, passing by $\tilde{p}$, transverse to the homothety vector field $\tilde{T}^{\prime}+\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$.

Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, be the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma=\Sigma^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ by the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis product structure $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)=\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)+\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, (cf. Propositions 2.12 and 2.14). From Proposition 2.14, we deduce the expressions (111)-(115) of the tensor fields of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$. Since we know the local models of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime}}:=$ $\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}, g_{\Sigma^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$, in the coordinates ( $\left.\tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_{2 r_{m}}^{\prime m}, \tilde{y}^{\prime}\right)$ of $\Sigma^{\prime}$ (cf. relations (122)-(127)), and of ( $\left.\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ in the considered coordinate system $\tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ (cf. Theorem 3.3), (111)-(115) give us the local writing of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, in the local coordinate product system $\left(\tilde{x}_{2}^{\prime 1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_{2 r_{m}}^{\prime m}, \tilde{y}^{\prime} ; \tilde{x}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of $\Sigma=\Sigma^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$.

Then, we are lead to the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right), \mathcal{N}:=(N, Y, \gamma, g)$, be a Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure defined on a $2 n$-dimensional differentiable manifold $M$ and $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ the associated homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure on $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$. Suppose that $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ is such that its Poissonization $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ is of maximum rank on an open dense subset of $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$. Let $p$ be a generic point of $M$, viewed as the projection on $M$ of a regular point $\tilde{p} \in$ $\tilde{M}$, with respect to $\tilde{N}$, such that corank $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}(\tilde{p})=1$, and let $\tilde{S}_{0}$ be the symplectic leaf of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ through $\tilde{p}$. Also let $\left(\tilde{M}^{\prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)$ be the odd-dimensional factor of the "model decomposition" of $\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ whose homothety vector field $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ is assumed to be transverse to $M$ at $p, \Sigma$ an one-codimensional submanifold of $\tilde{M}$, passing by $\tilde{p}$, transverse to $\tilde{T}$, and $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma$ by $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$. If $\tilde{T}$ is tangent to $\tilde{S}_{0}$, then, there exists a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}$ in $\Sigma$ with a system of coordinates, centered at $\tilde{p}$, in which the tensor fields of $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ and of $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$ are written, respectively, as Eqs. (111) and (112)-(115) (taking into account (122)-(127)). The structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$ is locally equivalent to a conformal structure to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$.

Case 2. Take the factor ( $\left.\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of the "model decomposition" of ( $\left.\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ which is a homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold whose homothety vector field $\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$ is supposed to be transverse to $M$ at $p$. Let $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$ be the projection of $\tilde{p}$ on $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$. From Theorem 3.3, on a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$ in $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime},\left(\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is identified with a finite product of homogenous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds whose recursion operator has a characteristic polynomial that is a power of an irreducible polynomial. Since $\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$ is transverse to $M$ at $p$, at least one of its components, in the considered decomposition, is transverse to $M$ at $p$.

Let $\Sigma^{\prime \prime}$ be a submanifold of $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ of codimension 1, passing by $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$ and transverse to $\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$, and $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}:=\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, g_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma^{\prime \prime}$ by the homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure ( $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$ ) of $\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ (cf. Proposition 2.12). The local model of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is well known from Theorem 4.1.

Now, we consider the submanifold $\Sigma=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \Sigma^{\prime \prime}$ of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$, which is, of course, one-codimensional and transverse to $\tilde{T}^{\prime}+\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$. Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=$ ( $N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}$ ), be the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \Sigma^{\prime \prime}$ by the homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis product structure $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)=\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime}\right)+\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of $\tilde{M}=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}$ (cf. Propositions 2.12 and 2.14). From Proposition 2.14,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Lambda_{0 \Sigma}=\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}+\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}-\tilde{T}^{\prime} \wedge E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime} \quad \text { and } \quad E_{0 \Sigma}=E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}  \tag{128}\\
& N_{\Sigma}=\tilde{N}^{\prime}+N_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}-\tilde{T}^{\prime} \otimes \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime},  \tag{129}\\
& Y_{\Sigma}=\left(\tilde{N}^{\prime}-g_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime} I d_{T \tilde{M}^{\prime}}\right) \tilde{T}^{\prime}+Y_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime},  \tag{130}\\
& \gamma_{\Sigma}=\gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}  \tag{131}\\
& g_{\Sigma}=g_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime} \tag{132}
\end{align*}
$$

Then, if $\tilde{x}^{\prime}$ is a local coordinate system of $\tilde{M}^{\prime}$, centered at $\tilde{p}^{\prime}$, in which the tensor fields $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{T}^{\prime}$ are written, respectively, as Eqs. (78), (79) and (94), and if $\tilde{x}_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}$ is a local coordinate system of $\Sigma^{\prime \prime}$, centered at $\tilde{p}^{\prime \prime}$, in which the tensor fields of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}:=$ $\left(N_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, Y_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, \gamma_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, g_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, have the expressions of their models (cf. Theorem 4.1), formulæ (128)-(132) give us the local expression of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, in the local coordinate product system $\left(\tilde{x}^{\prime} ; \tilde{x}_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of $\Sigma=\tilde{M}^{\prime} \times \Sigma^{\prime \prime}$.

So, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right), \mathcal{N}:=(N, Y, \gamma, g)$, be a Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure defined on a $2 n$-dimensional differentiable manifold $M$ and $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ the associated homogeneous Poisson-Nijenhuis structure on $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$. Suppose that $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ is such that its Poissonization $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ is of maximum rank on an open dense subset of $\tilde{M}=M \times \boldsymbol{R}$. Let $p$ be a generic point of $M$, viewed as the projection on $M$ of a regular point $\tilde{p} \in \tilde{M}$, with respect to $\tilde{N}$, such that corank $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}(\tilde{p})=1$, and let $\tilde{S}_{0}$ be the symplectic leaf of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ through $\tilde{p}$. Also, let ( $\left.\tilde{M}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{N}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ be the homogeneous symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold of the "model decomposition" of $\left(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$ whose homothety vector field $\tilde{T}^{\prime \prime}$ is supposed to be transverse to $M$ at $p, \Sigma$ an one-codimensional submanifold of $\tilde{M}$, passing by $\tilde{p}$, transverse to $\tilde{T}$, and $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$, the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure induced on $\Sigma$ by $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}, \tilde{T}\right)$. If $\tilde{T}$ is tangent to $\tilde{S}_{0}$, then, there exists a neighbourhood of $\tilde{p}$ in $\Sigma$ with a system of coordinates, centered at $\tilde{p}$, in which the tensor fields of $\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right)$ and of $\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}:=\left(N_{\Sigma}, Y_{\Sigma}, \gamma_{\Sigma}, g_{\Sigma}\right)$ are written, respectively, as Eq. (128) and (129)-(132) ) taking into account the model expression of $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}, E_{0 \Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ presented by Theorem 4.1). The structure $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0 \Sigma}, E_{0 \Sigma}\right), \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma}\right)$ is locally equivalent to a conformal structure to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$.

### 4.2.2. Study of the case where $\partial / \partial t$ is not tangent to $\tilde{S}_{0}$

Consider the same context as in the beginning of Section 4.2 and assume that the homothety vector field $\tilde{T}=\partial / \partial t$ of $\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}, \tilde{N}\right)$ is not tangent to the symplectic leaf $\tilde{S}_{0}$ of $\tilde{\Lambda}_{0}$ through $\tilde{p}$. As we have remarked, in this case $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$ is transitive on a neighbourhood
$U$ of $p$ in $M$. Then, there exists a differentiable function $f \in C^{\infty}(U, \boldsymbol{R})$ that vanishes nowhere on $U$ such that the Jacobi structure $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{f}, E_{0}^{f}\right), f$-conformal to $\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)$, is a symplectic Poisson structure on $U$, i.e. $\Lambda_{0}^{f}=f \Lambda_{0}$ is a nondegenerate Poisson tensor on $U$ and $E_{0}^{f}=\Lambda_{0}^{\#}(d f)+f E_{0}=0(\mathrm{cf} .[11,2,9])$.

Let $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}^{f}, E_{0}^{f}\right), \mathcal{N}^{f}\right), \mathcal{N}^{f}:=\left(N^{f}, Y^{f}, \gamma^{f}, g^{f}\right)$, be the Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure, $f$ conformal to $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right), \mathcal{N}\right)$, and ( $\left.\Lambda_{1}^{f}, E_{1}^{f}\right)$ the Jacobi structure, $f$-conformal to $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)$, $\left(\Lambda_{1}, E_{1}\right)^{\#}=\mathcal{N} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}, E_{0}\right)^{\#}$. From Proposition 2.11,

$$
\left(\Lambda_{1}^{f}, E_{1}^{f}\right)^{\#}=\mathcal{N}^{f} \circ\left(\Lambda_{0}^{f}, E_{0}^{f}\right)^{\#}
$$

Then,

$$
E_{1}^{f}=N^{f} E_{0}^{f}=0
$$

(cf. Eq. (29)), which means that $\Lambda_{1}^{f}=f \Lambda_{1}$ endows $U$ with a Poisson structure. Of course, $\Lambda_{1}^{f}$ is compatible with $\Lambda_{0}^{f}$. Since $\Lambda_{0}^{f}$ is nondegenerate on $U$, the pair ( $\Lambda_{0}^{f}, \Lambda_{1}^{f}$ ) possesses a recursion operator on $U$ that is no other than the tensor field of type $(1,1)$

$$
N^{f}=N-Y \otimes \frac{d f}{f}
$$

of $\mathcal{N}^{f}:=\left(N^{f}, Y^{f}, \gamma^{f}, g^{f}\right)$. Then, $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{f}, N^{f}\right)$ defines on $U$ a symplectic Poisson-Nijenhuis structure.
Of course, the local model of $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{f}, N^{f}\right)$ is known by Theorem 3.3. On the other hand, since $\left(\left(\Lambda_{0}^{f}, E_{0}^{f}\right), \mathcal{N}^{f}\right), \mathcal{N}^{f}:=\left(N^{f}, Y^{f}, \gamma^{f}, g^{f}\right)$, is a Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure (see Proposition 2.11), its tensor fields verify Eqs. (19)-(22) and (25)-(27). Because $E_{0}^{f}=0$ and $\Lambda_{0}^{f}$ is nondegerate on $U$, from

$$
N^{f} E_{0}^{f}=\Lambda_{0}^{f \#}\left(\gamma^{f}\right)+g^{f} E_{0}^{f}
$$

we get that $\gamma^{f}=0$ on $U$. Then (cf. Proposition 2.11),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma=-{ }^{\mathrm{t}} N \frac{d f}{f}+g^{f} \frac{d f}{f} \tag{133}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking into account this result, from

$$
{ }^{\mathrm{t}} N^{f}\left(d g^{f}\right)=L_{Y f} \gamma^{f}+g^{f} d g^{f},
$$

we deduce that $g^{f}$ is a functional proper value of $N^{f}$ or that $g^{f}$ is constant on $U$. So, if $s$ is a local coordinate system of $M$, centered at $p$, in which $\left(\Lambda_{0}^{f}, N^{f}\right)$ has the expression of its model (cf. Theorem 3.3), then, we can easily deduce from this the local writings of $\Lambda_{0}$, $E_{0}=-\Lambda_{0}^{\#}(d f / f), N, Y$ and $g$ in this system and, from Eq. (133), the one of $\gamma$.
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