

Nambu-Poisson manifolds and associated n -ary Lie algebroids

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2001 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 34 9753

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/34/45/501>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.66.16.101

The article was downloaded on 02/06/2010 at 09:37

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

Corrigendum

Nambu–Poisson manifolds and associated n -ary Lie algebroids

J A Vallejo 2001 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34** 2867–2881

There is an incorrect result in this paper, labelled theorem 9. In the proof it is stated that, by the Leibniz property, it is necessary to check only that

$$[\mathcal{L}_P, [[\dots [[\mathcal{L}_P, a_1], a_2], \dots], a_{n-1}]] \in \mathcal{D}_{n-1}$$

when the a_i 's are of the form $f \in C^\infty(M)$, $df \in \Omega^1(M)$. But this is incorrect. If we take, say, $a_1 = f_1 dg_1$, then other terms with a different structure appear, which cannot be cancelled by the reasoning given in the paper. In fact, one might wonder if a different proof can be provided, such as $[\mathcal{L}_P, [[\dots [[\mathcal{L}_P, a_1], a_2], \dots], a_{n-1}]] \in \mathcal{D}_{n-1}$ when the a_i 's are arbitrary 1-forms, but this is not possible. From the definition of the bracket $[[\dots, \dots]]_{\mathcal{L}_P}$, particularized to the $n = 3$ case for convenience, it is possible to obtain the relation

$$[[\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3]]_{\mathcal{L}_P} = dP(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) + i(q(\alpha_2 \wedge \alpha_3))d\alpha_1 - i(q(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_3))d\alpha_2 + i(q(\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2))d\alpha_3$$

and this is the bracket considered by Vaisman [1] and by Grabowski and Marmo [2], which is known to work only with exact 1-forms. This relation holds for any n , so the bracket proposed by the author cannot induce any n -ary Lie algebroid using the operator \mathcal{L}_P .

However, the author believes that the previous results leading to the incorrect theorem 9 are still correct. In particular, they leave open the question of whether there is an operator D , different from \mathcal{L}_P , which can verify the conditions appearing in theorem 6, namely

$$[D, [[\dots [[D, a_1], a_2], \dots], a_{n-1}]] \in \mathcal{D}_{n-1}$$

although, at the time of writing this note, the author has not been able to find a suitable one.

On the other hand, the results contained in section 6, are still valid, as they use the bracket $[[\dots, \dots]]_{\mathcal{L}_P}$ only on exact 1-forms.

The coincidence of the bracket $[[\dots, \dots]]_{\mathcal{L}_P}$ with that proposed by Vaisman was very kindly communicated to the author by M E Padrón and J C Marrero.

References

- [1] Vaisman I 1998 Nambu–Lie groups *Preprint* arXiv math.DG/9812064
- [2] Grabowski J and Marmo G 2000 On Filippov algebroids and multiplicative Nambu–Poisson structures *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **12** 35–50