Geometric methods for the study of symmetries and conservation laws for presymplectic systems

Florian Munteanu

Abstract. In this paper we will focus on finding symmetries and conservation laws by geometric methods of Classical Mechanics. We will extend the study from the classical symplectic case to the presymplectic systems. Important examples will be also presented.

M.S.C. 2010: 70S05, 70S10, 53D05.
Key words: symmetry; conservation law; Noether theorem; dynamical system.

1 Introduction

This paper is devoted to studying symmetries, conservation laws and relationship between this in the geometric framework of Classical Mechanics ([1], [2], [6], [18], [19]). More exactly we extend the study of symmetries and conservation laws from symplectic case to the presymplectic case. We will recall adapted Noether type Theorems for the presymplectic systems with global dynamic and also we will present the constraint algorithm of Gotay-Nester ([10, 11, 12], [16]). All results remains valid for singular Lagrangian and Hamiltonian systems ([4, 5]). We will illustrate the results for some important examples from physics, biology and ecology: the 2-dimensional isotropic harmonic oscillator ([7]), Lotka-Volterra prey-predator ecological system ([17], [23], [24, 25]), Bailey model for the evolution of epidemics ([3], [14], [23]), classical Kermack-McKendrick model of evolution of epidemics ([14], [23]).

There is a very well-known way to obtain conservation laws for a system of differential equations given by a variational principle: the use of the Noether Theorem ([22]) which associates to every symmetry a conservation law and conversely. However, there is a method introduced by G.L. Jones ([13]) and M. Crâşmăreanu ([7]) by which new kinds of conservation laws can be obtained without applying a theorem of Noether type, only using symmetries and pseudosymmetries.

In the second section we recall the basic notions and results for the geometrical study of a dynamical system for the symplectic case and we present the classical Noether Theorem ([22]) and the Theorem of Jones-Crâşmăreanu ([7, 8, 9], [13], [20, 21]).

BSG Proceedings 21. The International Conference "Differential Geometry - Dynamical Systems" DGDS-2013, October 10-13, 2013, Bucharest-Romania, pp. 96-107.

In the third section we present a presymplectic version of the Noether theorem ([16]) and, finally, we extend the results of Jones ([13]) and Crâşmăreanu ([7]) from symplectic systems to presymplectic systems, in order to obtain conservation laws.

In the last section we will present four important examples. For the last three examples, the dynamical systems are included in the presymplectic case because the 2-form ω_L associated to the corresponding Lagrangian is degenerate.

All manifolds are real, paracompact, connected and C^∞. All maps are C^∞. Sum over crossed repeated indices is understood.

2 Symmetries and conservation laws for Hamiltonians systems

If (M, ω) is a symplectic manifold and $H : M \to \mathbf{R}$ is a differentiable function (called *Hamiltonian function*), then the triple (M, ω, H) is said to be a *Hamiltonian system.*

Let us denote by X_H the unique vector field on M which satisfies the equation:

$$i_X\omega = dH \, , \tag{2.1}$$

where i_X denotes the interior product with respect to X.

X_H will be called *the Hamiltonian vector field* associated to the Hamiltonian H.

A function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is called *conservation law* or *constant of motion* for a vector field X on M if f is constant along the every integral curves of X, that is

$$L_X f = 0, \tag{2.2}$$

where $L_X f$ means the Lie derivative of f with respect to X.

The symplectic form ω is an invariant form for X_H (i.e. $L_{X_H}\omega = 0$) and the Hamiltonian H is a conservation law for X_H.

A diffeomorphism $\Phi : M \to M$ is said to be a *symmetry* of $X \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ if $T\Phi(X) = X$, that is Φ maps integral curves of X into integral curves of X.

A dynamical symmetry of X is a vector field Y on M such that $L_X Y = 0$. We have that Y is a dynamical symmetry of X iff its flow consists of symmetries of X.

A Cartan symmetry of the Hamiltonian vector field X_H is a Hamiltonian vector field Y on M associated to some function $G \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $L_Y H = 0$. Obviously, from $i_Y\omega = dG$ one results $L_Y\omega = 0$ and conversely. Moreover, if Y is a Cartan symmetry of X_H then Y is also a dynamical symmetry of X_H.

Cartan symmetries induce and are induced by conservation laws, and these results are known as the symplectic version of Noether Theorem ([6], [20], [22]):

Theorem 2.1. *If* $Y = X_f$ *is a Cartan symmetry of the Hamiltonian vector field* X_H *(i.e.* $i_{X_f}\omega = df$ *and* $L_{X_f}H = 0$*), then* $f \in C^\infty(M)$ *is a conservation law for* X_H*.*

Conversely, if f *is a conservation law for* X_H*, then the unique vector field* Y *defined by* $i_Y\omega = df$ *is a Cartan symmetry of the Hamiltonian vector field* X_H*.*

If $Z \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is fixed, then $Y \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is called Z*-dynamical pseudosymmetry* for X if there exists $f \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $L_X Y = fZ$. A X-dynamical pseudosymmetry for X is called *dynamical pseudosymmetry* for X.

The notion of dynamical pseudosymmetry is a natural generalization of the notion of dynamical symmetry, but also a weakening of the notion of dynamical symmetry. Dynamical symmetries and pseudosymmetries are just infinitesimal symmetries of the distribution generated by a vector field (O. Krupková, [15]). So, a dynamical pseudosymmetry of X is a vector field for which the generated transformations apply integral manifolds of X into integral manifolds, or equivalently, the generated transformations apply integral mappings of X in integral mappings ([15]). So, the transformations generated by a dynamical pseudosymmetry maps any trajectory of dynamical system associated to X into another trajectory of this (not necessarly integral curves). Given this, we can understand the geometric meaning of these concepts.

Example 2.1. ([8], [9]) The Nahm's system in the theory of static SU(2)-monopoles is presented in [9]:

$$\frac{dx^1}{dt} = x^2x^3,\ \frac{dx^2}{dt} = x^3x^1,\ \frac{dx^3}{dt} = x^1x^2. \tag{2.3}$$

The vector field $X = x^2x^3\frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} + x^3x^1\frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} + x^1x^2\frac{\partial}{\partial x^3}$ is homogeneous of order two, that is $[Y, X] = X$, where $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{3} x^i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$. So, Y is a pseudosymmetry for X.

The next theorem which gives the association between pseudosymmetries and conservation laws is due to M. Crâşmăreanu ([7]) and G.L. Jones ([13]). Next, using this result, we will find new kinds of conservation laws, nonclassical, without the help of Noether's type theorem.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $X \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ be a fixed vector field and $\omega \in A^p(M)$ be a invariant p-form for X. If $Y \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is symmetry for X and $S_1, \ldots, S_{p-1} \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ are $(p-1)$ Y-pseudosymmetry for X then*

$$\Phi = \omega(X, S_1, \ldots, S_{p-1}) \tag{2.4}$$

or, locally,

$$\Phi = S_1^{i_1} \cdots S_{p-1}^{i_{p-1}} Y^{i_p} \omega_{i_1 \ldots i_{p-1} i_p} \tag{2.5}$$

is a conservation laws for (M, X).

Particularly, if Y, $S_1, \ldots, S_{p-1}$ are symmetries for X then Φ given by (2.4) is conservation laws for (M, X).

Now, we can apply this result to the dynamical Hamiltonian systems.

Proposition 2.3. *Let be (M, X_H) a Hamiltonian system on the symplectic manifold (M, ω), with the local coordinates (x^i, p_i). If $Y \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is a symmetry for X_H and $Z \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is a Y-pseudosymmetry for X_H then*

$$\Phi = \omega(Y, Z) \tag{2.6}$$

is a conservation law for the Hamiltonian system (M, X_H).

Particularly, if Y and Z are symmetries for X_H then Φ from (2.6) is a conservation law for (M, X_H).

3 Symmetries and conservation laws for presymplectic systems

In this section section we present a presymplectic version of the Noether theorem ([16]) and we extend the results of Jones ([13]) and Crâşmăreanu ([7]) from symplectic systems to presymplectic systems, in order to obtain new kinds of conservation laws for presymplectic systems, using the theorem 2.2.

Let M be an n-dimensional manifold, ω a closed 2-form with constant rank, and α a closed 1-form. The triple (M, ω, α) is said to be a *presymplectic system* ([16]).

The dynamics is determined by the solutions of the equation

$$i_X \omega = \alpha \, . \tag{3.1}$$

Since ω is not symplectic, (3.1) has no solution, in general, and even if it exists it will not be unique. Let $b : TM \to T^*M$ be the map defined by $b(X) = i_X \omega$. It may happen that b is not surjective. We denote by $ker\omega$ the kernel of b. Exactly, like in the symplectic case, let us remark that ω is an *invariant* 2*-form* for every solution ξ of (3.1), if this solution exists. It is enough to compute $L_\xi \omega = d i_\xi \omega + i_\xi d\omega = 0$.

Gotay (1979) and Gotay, Nester (1979) (see [10], [11], [12]) developed a constraint algorithm for presymplectic systems. They consider the points of M where (3.1) has a solution and suppose that this set, denoted by M_2, is a submanifold of M. Nevertheless, these solutions on M_2 may not be tangent to M_2. Then, we have to restrict M_2 to a submanifold where the solutions of (3.1) are tangent to M_2. Proceeding further, we obtain a sequence of submanifolds:

$$\cdots \to M_k \to \cdots \to M_2 \to M_1 = M \, .$$

Alternatively, these constraint submanifolds may be described as follows:

$$M_i = \{x \in M | \alpha(x)(v) = 0, \, \forall v \in T_x M_{i-1}^{\perp}\}$$

where

$$T_x M_{i-1}^{\perp} = \{v \in T_x M | \omega(x)(u, v) = 0, \, \forall u \in T_x M_{i-1}\} \, .$$

We call M_2 *the secondary constraint submanifold*, M_3 *the tertiary constraint submanifold*, and, in general, M_i is *the i-ary constraint submanifold*. If the algorithm stabilizes, that means there exists a positive integer k such that $M_k = M_{k+1}$ and $dim M_k \neq 0$, then we have a *final constraint submanifold* $M_f = M_k$, on which a vector field X exists such that

$$(i_X \omega = \alpha)_{|M_f} \, . \tag{3.2}$$

If ξ is a solution of (3.2), then every arbitrary solution on M_f is of the form $\xi' = \xi + Y$, where $Y \in (ker\omega \cap TM_f)$.

Next, we present the definitions of symmetries and conservation laws for the presymplectic systems which admit a global dynamics ([4], [16]). Also, the adapted Noether Theorem ([16]) is presented. We say that a presymplectic system (M, ω, α) admits a global dynamics if there exists a vector field ξ on M such that ξ satisfies (3.1). This condition is equivalent with the condition: $\alpha(ker\omega)(x) = 0, \; \forall x \in M$.

Definition 3.1. A function $F : M \to \mathbf{R}$ is said to be a *conservation law* (or *constant of the motion*) of ξ if $\xi F = L_\xi F = 0$.

Thus, if γ is an integral curve of ξ, then $F \circ \gamma$ is a constant function.

Definition 3.2. A diffeomorfism $\Phi : M \to M$ is said to be a *symmetry* of ξ if Φ maps integral curves of ξ onto integral curves of ξ, i.e., $T\Phi(\xi) = \xi$.

Definition 3.3. *A dynamical symmetry* of ξ is a vector field X on M such that its flow consists of symmetries of ξ, or, equivalently, $[X, \xi] = L_\xi X = 0$.

We denote by $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$ the set of all solutions of (3.1),

$$\mathcal{X}^\omega(M) = \{X \in \mathcal{X}(M) | i_X \omega = \alpha\}.$$

Definition 3.4. A function $F : M \to \mathbf{R}$ is said to be a *conservation law* (or *constant of the motion*) of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$ if F is constant along all the integral curves of any solution of (3.1).

That is, F satisfies $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)F = 0$ or, equivalently, $(ker\omega)F = 0$.

Definition 3.5. A diffeomorfism $\Phi : M \to M$ is said to be a *symmetry* of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$ if Φ satisfies $T\Phi(\xi) \in \mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$.

Definition 3.6. *A dynamical symmetry* of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$ is a vector field X on M such that $[X, \mathcal{X}^\omega(M)] \subset ker\omega$, i.e. $[X, \xi] = L_\xi X = 0$, for all $\xi \in \mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$.

Let us remark that if F is a constant of motion of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$, then XF is also a constant of motion of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$. Also, if we denote by $D(\mathcal{X}^\omega(M))$ the set of all dynamical symmetries of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$, then for any $X, Y \in D(\mathcal{X}^\omega(M))$ we have $[X, Y] \in D(\mathcal{X}^\omega(M))$, i.e., $D(\mathcal{X}^\omega(M))$ is a Lie subalgebra of the Lie algebra $\mathcal{X}(M)$.

Definition 3.7. A Cartan symmetry of the presymplectic system (M, ω, α) is a vector field X on M such that $i_X\omega = dG$, for some function $G : M \to \mathbf{R}$, and $i_X\alpha = 0$.

This definition is a natural generalization of the exact Cartan symmetry from the symplectic case. Moreover, $L_X\alpha = di_X\alpha$, that means that in the presymplectic case the 1-form $L_X\alpha$ is always an exact form. If X is a Cartan symmetry of (M, ω, α), then X is a dynamical symmetry of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$. The set $C(\omega, \alpha)$ of all Cartan symetries of (M, ω, α) is a Lie subalgebra of $\mathcal{X}(M)$ and we have $C(\omega, \alpha) \subset D(\mathcal{X}^\omega(M))$.

The presymplectic version of the Noether Theorem is the following ([16]):

Theorem 3.1. *If X is a Cartan symmetry of (M, ω, α), then the function G (as in Definition 3.7) is a conservation law of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$. Conversely, if G is a conservation law of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$, then there exists a vector field X on M such that $i_X\omega = dG$ and X is a Cartan symmetry of (M, ω, α). Moreover, every vector field $X + Z$, with $Z \in ker\omega$ is also a Cartan symmetry of (M, ω, α).*

Next, taking into account that the presymplectic form ω is invariant for every solution ξ of (3.1), we can use the main theorem 2.2 for obtain new kinds of conservation laws (non-Noetherian) for presymplectic systems which admit a global dynamics ([4], [16]). Also, the results remains valid for presymplectic system defined by a singular Lagrangian ([16]).

Definition 3.8. Let (M, ω, α) be a presymplectic system. If we suppose that $\xi \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is a solution of (3.1) and $Y \in \mathcal{X}(M)$, then we say that $Z \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is a Y-dynamical pseudosymmetry of ξ if there exists a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $L_\xi Z = fY$.
A ξ-dynamical pseudosymmetry of ξ is called dynamical pseudosymmetry of ξ.

Obviously, if $Y = 0$, a 0-dynamical pseudosymmetry of ξ is a dynamical symmetry of ξ.

Proposition 3.2. *Let (M, ω, α) be a presymplectic system such that there exists a vector field ξ on M who satisfies (3.1). If $Y \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is a dynamical symmetry of ξ and $Z \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is a Y-dynamical pseudosymmetry of ξ, then $F = \omega(Y, Z)$ is a conservation law for ξ.*
Particularly, if Y and Z are dynamical symmetry of ξ, then $F = \omega(Y, Z)$ is a conservation law for ξ.

Taking into account of the definition of a dynamical symmetry of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$, we can say that, for a fixed $Y \in \mathcal{X}(M)$, the vector field Z on M is a Y-dynamical pseudosymmetry of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$ if for every $\xi \in \mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$, there exists a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $L_\xi Z = fY$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let (M, ω, α) be a presymplectic system such that there exists at least vector field ξ on M who satisfies (3.1). If $Y \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is a dynamical symmetry of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$ and $Z \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is a Y-dynamical pseudosymmetry of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$, then $F = \omega(Y, Z)$ is a conservation law for $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$.*
Particularly, if Y and Z are dynamical symmetry of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$, then $F = \omega(Y, Z)$ is a conservation law of $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M)$.

Example 3.9. ([16]) Let us consider the presymplectic system $(\mathbf{R}^6, \omega, \alpha)$, where

$$\omega = dx^1 \wedge dx^4 - dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \, , \alpha = x^4 dx^4 - x^3 dx^5 - x^5 dx^3,$$

with $(x^1, \ldots, x^6)$ the standard coordinates on $\mathbf{R}^6$.
It is easy to see that $ker\omega$ is generated by $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^5}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^6}$. The only secondary constraint is $\Phi_1 = x^3 = 0$, there are not tertiary constraints and the constraints algorithm ends in M_2, i.e.

$$M_f = M_2 = \left\{(x^1, \ldots, x^6) \in \mathbf{R}^6 | x^3 = 0\right\}$$

The solution of the equation $(i_X\omega = \alpha)_{M_f}$ are

$$\mathcal{X}^\omega(M_f) = x^4 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} + ker\omega \, .$$

If we denote by $i : M_f \to \mathbf{R}^6$ the embedding of M_f in $\mathbf{R}^6$, then $i^*\omega = \omega_{M_f} = dx^1 \wedge dx^4$. So, $ker\omega_{M_f}$ is generated by $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^2}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^5}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^6}$. The solutions of the equation $i_X\omega_{M_f} = i^*\alpha$ are

$$\mathcal{X}^{\omega_{M_f}}(M_f) = x^4 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} + ker\omega_{M_f} \, .$$

Thus, $\mathcal{X}^\omega(M_f)$ is strictly contained in $\mathcal{X}^{\omega_{M_f}}(M_f)$.

A function $F : M_f \to \mathbf{R}$ is a conservation law of $\mathcal{X}^{\omega}(M_f)$ if

$$x^4 \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^1} = 0,\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^5} = 0,\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^6} = 0.$$

In particular, each function F which depends only on x^2 and x^4 is a conservation law of $\mathcal{X}^{\omega}(M_f)$. For example, $F_1(x^1,\dots,x^6) = x^2$ and $F_2(x^1,\dots,x^6) = x^4$ are constants of the motion of $\mathcal{X}^{\omega}(M_f)$. A function $F : M_f \to \mathbf{R}$ is a conservation law of $\mathcal{X}^{\omega_{M_f}}(M_f)$ if

$$x^4 \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^1} = 0,\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^2} = 0,\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^5} = 0,\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^6} = 0.$$

Therefore, the functions F which are constants of motion of $\mathcal{X}^{\omega_{M_f}}(M_f)$ are the ones which depend only of x^4, for instance $F_2(x^1,\dots,x^6) = x^4$.

Obviously, all the constants of motion of $\mathcal{X}^{\omega_{M_f}}(M_f)$ are also constants of motion of $\mathcal{X}^{\omega}(M_f)$.

The vector field $X = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}$ on $\mathbf{R}^6$ satisfies the conditions from the definition of Cartan symmetry, with $G(x^1,\dots,x^6) = x^4$, and we can deduce that X is a Cartan symmetry of $\left(M_f, \omega_{M_f}, \alpha_{M_f}\right)$ and G_{M_f} is a conservation law of $\mathcal{X}^{\omega_{M_f}}(M_f)$.

If we consider the dynamical symmetries of $\xi \in \mathcal{X}^{\omega_{M_f}}(M_f)$, $Y = x^1\frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} + x^4\frac{\partial}{\partial x^4}$, $Z = x^1\frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} - x^4\frac{\partial}{\partial x^4}$, then we will obtain $F = \omega_{M_f}(Y,Z) = -x^1x^4$ a conservation laws for ξ, by using the proposition 3.2.

4 Examples

In this section we will present four very important examples of variational dynamical systems, that is the dynamics is described by a system of ordinary differential equations (SODE) which can be written as the Euler-Lagrange equations associated to a Lagrangian L,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial y^i}\right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial x^i} = 0\,. \tag{4.1}$$

First example is the well-known 2-dimensional isotropic harmonic oscillator ([7]) for which the Lagrangian L is regular. This example represent a very good model for understanding the symplectic case. Finally, we present three examples from biology and ecology: prey-predator ecological system ([17], [23], [24], [25]), Bailey model for the evolution of epidemics ([3], [14], [23]), classical Kermack-McKendrick model of evolution of epidemics ([14], [23]). This dynamical systems are included in the presymplectic case because the 2-form ω_L associated to the corresponding Lagrangian is degenerate.

Let L be a Lagrangian on the tangent bundle TM and $\theta_L = \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^i}x^i$, $\omega_L = d\theta_L$ the the Poincaré-Cartan forms associated to L, where (x^i, y^i) are the local coordinates on TM. If the Lagrangian L is regular, then the 2-form ω_L is symplectic and we can consider the Hamiltonian system (TM, ω_L, E_L), where $E_L = \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^i}y^i - L$ is the energy of L. The Hamiltonian vector field associated to $H = E_L$ is S_L the canonical semispray of L.

Locally, $S_L = y^i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - G^i\frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}$, where $G^i = g^{ij}\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y^j x^k}y^k - \frac{\partial L}{\partial x^j}\right)$ and g^{ij} is the inverse of the fundamental metric of L, $g_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y^i y^j}$ ([18, 19]).

The Euler-Lagrange equations associated to L are equivalently with the system of ODEs,

$$\frac{dy^i}{dt} = -G^i \, , \ \frac{dx^i}{dt} = y^i \, ,$$

which give the flow of vector field S_L on TM. The integral curves of S_L is exactly the solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations (4.1) associated to L ([18, 19]).

4.1 The 2-dimensional isotropic harmonic oscillator

The next system of ordinary differential equations (SODE)

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} \ddot{q}^1 + \omega^2 q^1 & = & 0 \\ \ddot{q}^2 + \omega^2 q^2 & = & 0 \end{array} \right. \tag{4.2}$$

can be written as the Euler-Lagrange equations (4.1) with the Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\dot{q}^1\right)^2 + \left(\dot{q}^2\right)^2\right] - \frac{\omega^2}{2}\left[\left(q^1\right)^2 + \left(q^2\right)^2\right] .$$

Applying the conservation of energy we have two conservation laws $\Phi_1 = \left(\dot{q}^1\right)^2 + \omega^2\left(q^1\right)^2$, $\Phi_2 = \left(\dot{q}^2\right)^2 + \omega^2\left(q^2\right)^2$.

The complet lift of $X = q^2\frac{\partial}{\partial q^1} - q^1\frac{\partial}{\partial q^2}$ is an exact Cartan symmetry with $f = 0$ and then the associated classical Noetherian conservation law is $\Phi_3 = P_X = J(X)L = X^i\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} = q^2\dot{q}^1 - q^1\dot{q}^2$.

But we can obtain a nonclassical conservation law with symmetries taking into account that the canonical spray of L is $S = \dot{q}^1\frac{\partial}{\partial q^1} + \dot{q}^2\frac{\partial}{\partial q^2} - \omega^2 q^1\frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{q}^1} - \omega^2 q^2\frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{q}^2}$ and another computation gives that $Y = \dot{q}^2\frac{\partial}{\partial q^1} + \dot{q}^1\frac{\partial}{\partial q^2} - \omega^2 q^2\frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{q}^1} - \omega^2 q^1\frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{q}^2}$ is a symmetry for S. Also, because S is total 1-homogeneous, that means that S is 1-homogeneous with respect to all variables $(q, \dot{q})$, it result that $Z = q^1\frac{\partial}{\partial q^1} + q^2\frac{\partial}{\partial q^2} + \dot{q}^1\frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{q}^1} + \dot{q}^2\frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{q}^2}$ is a symmetry for S. Next, we have $L_Y H = 0$, $L_Z H = 2H$ and then $\Phi = \omega_L(S, Y) = 0$, $\Phi = \omega_L(S, Z) = 2H$, that means that we not have new conservation law applying theorem 2.2. But $\Phi_4 = \omega_L(Y, Z) = \dot{q}^1\dot{q}^2 + \omega^2 q^1 q^2$ is a new conservation law given by theorem 2.2 or by their corollaries.

We remark that Φ_4 is a nonclassical conservation law, obtained by symmetries, and Φ_4 represent the energy of a new Lagrangian of (4.2), $\tilde{L} = \dot{q}^1\dot{q}^2 - \omega^2 q^1 q^2$.

4.2 The prey-predator ecological system

Let us consider the system of ordinary differential equations ([23]):

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} \dot{x} & = & ax - bxy \\ \dot{y} & = & -cy + dxy \end{array} \right. , \ a, b, c, d > 0. \tag{4.3}$$

This system is a complex biological system model, in which two species x and y live in a limited area, so that individuals of the species y (predator) feed only individuals of species x (prey) and they feed only resources of the area in which they live. Proportionality factors a and c are respectively increasing and decreasing prey and predator populations. If we assume that the two populations come into interaction, then the factor b is decreasing prey population x caused by this predator population y and the factor d is population growth due to this population x.

The prey-predator system (4.3) is called *Lotka–Volterra equations* and, also known as *the predator-prey equations.* This system is a pair of first order, nonlinear, differential equations frequently used to describe the dynamics of biological systems in which two species interact, one a predator and one its prey. x is the number of prey (for example, *rabbits*), y is the number of some predator (for example, *foxes*), $\dot{x} = \frac{dx}{dt}$, $\dot{y} = \frac{dy}{dt}$ represent the growth rates of the two populations over time, t represents time.

The evolution system (4.3) can be written in the form of Euler-Lagrange equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{lcl} \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}}\right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial x} & = & 0 \\ \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{y}}\right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial y} & = & 0 \end{array} \right. \tag{4.4}$$

where the Lagrangian L is

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\ln y}{x}\dot{x} - \frac{\ln x}{y}\dot{y}\right) + c\ln x - a\ln y - dx + by \tag{4.5}$$

and the corresponding Hamiltonian H is

$$H = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}}\dot{x} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{y}}\dot{y} - L = -c\ln x + a\ln y + dx - by \tag{4.6}$$

Let us remark that the total energy $E_L = H$ is *a conservation law* for prey-predator system (4.3).

If we consider the Poincaré-Cartan forms associated to L, $\theta_L = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}}dx + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{y}}dy$ and $\omega_L = -d\theta_L$, then ω_L has a constant rank, equal with 2, and so, we will obtain a presymplectic system $(T\mathbf{R}^2, \omega_L, dE_L)$.

4.3 The Bailey model for the evolution of epidemics

In Bailey model for the evolution of epidemics are considered two classes of hosts: individuals suspected of being infected, whose number is denoted by x and individuals infected carriers, whose number we denote by y.

Assume that the latency and average removal rate is zero and then remain carriers infected individuals during the entire epidemic, with no death, healing and immunity. It is proposed that, in unit time, increasing the number of individuals suspected of being infected to be proportional to the product of the number of those infected them. These considerations lead us to the evolutionary dynamical system given by the system of ordinary differential equations ([23]):

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{lcl} \dot{x} & = & -kxy \\ \dot{y} & = & kxy \end{array} \right., \ k > 0. \tag{4.7}$$

The model is suitable for diseases known animal and plant populations and also corresponds quite well the characteristics of small populations spread runny noses, dark, people such as students of a class team.

First of all, let us remark that we have *a conservation law*, $x + y = n$. That means that n, the total number of individuals of a population, does not change during the evolution of this epidemic.

The equations (4.7) can be write as Euler-Lagrange equations, where the Lagrangian L is

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\ln y}{x}\dot{x} - \frac{\ln x}{y}\dot{y}\right) + k(x+y) \tag{4.8}$$

and the corresponding Hamiltonian H is

$$H = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}}\dot{x} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{y}}\dot{y} - L = -k(x+y)\,. \tag{4.9}$$

4.4 The classical Kermack-McKendrick model of evolution of epidemics

The classical model of evolution of epidemics was formulated by Kermack (1927) and McKendrick (1932) as follows. Let us denote the numerical size of the population with n and let us divide it into three classes: the number of individuals suspected of x, the number of individuals infected carriers y, and the number of isolate infected individuals z.

For simplicity, we take zero latency period, that all individuals are simultaneously infected carriers that infect those suspected of being infected. Considering the previous example we note the rate constant k_1 of disease transmission. Changing the size of infected carriers depends on the rate k_1 and also depend on k_2, the rate that carriers are isolated. In this way, we have the system ([23]):

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} &= -k_1 xy \\ \dot{y} &= k_1 xy - k_2 y \\ \dot{z} &= k_2 y \end{cases}, \quad k_1, k_2 > 0. \tag{4.10}$$

Let us note that $x + y + z = n$, i.e. the number of individuals of the population does not change. This *conservation law* tells us not cause deaths epidemic.

The evolution of a dynamic epidemic begins with a large population which is composed of a majority of individuals suspected of being infected and in a small number of infected individuals. Initial number of isolated infected people is considered to be zero. So, we can consider the subsystem ([23]):

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} &= -k_1 xy \\ \dot{y} &= k_1 xy - k_2 y \end{cases}, \quad k_1, k_2 > 0. \tag{4.11}$$

The Lagrange and Hamilton functions of the system (4.11) are

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\tfrac{\ln y}{x}\dot{x} - \tfrac{\ln x}{y}\dot{y}\right) + k_1(x+y) - k_2 \ln x\,, \\ H &= -k_1(x+y) + k_2 \ln x\,, \end{aligned}$$

and so, we have a new *conservation law* of (4.11),
$H = E_L = -k_1(x+y) + k_2 \ln x$.

If we get back to the Kermack-McKendrick model (4.10), then we have that the Lagrangian whose Euler-Lagrange equations are really (4.10) is

$$\overline{L} = L + \frac{1}{2}(\dot{z} - k_1 y)^2\,, \tag{4.12}$$

where L is the Lagrangian of the subsystem (4.11).
The corresponding Hamiltonian is given by

$$\overline{H} = \dot{x}\frac{\partial \overline{L}}{\partial \dot{x}} + \dot{y}\frac{\partial \overline{L}}{\partial \dot{y}} + \dot{z}\frac{\partial \overline{L}}{\partial \dot{z}} - \overline{L}\,. \tag{4.13}$$

Acknowledgements. This research was partially supported by Grant FP7-PEOPLE-2012-IRSES-316338.

References

[1] R. A. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, *Foundations of Mechanics (Second Edition)*, Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Company, New York, 1978.

[2] V. I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 60, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1978

[3] N. T. J. Bailey, *The Mathematical Theory of Infectious Diseases*, Hafner Press, New York, 1975.

[4] J. F. Cariñena, M. F. Rañada, *Noether's Theorem for Singular Lagrangians*, Lett. Math. Phys., 15 (1988), 305-311.

[5] J. F. Cariñena and C. Lopez, *Origin of the Lagrangian constraints and their relation with the Hamiltonian formulation*, J. Math. Phys. 29 (1988), 1143.

[6] M. Crampin, F. A. E. Pirani, *Applicable Differential Geometry*, London Math. Society, Lectures Notes Series 59, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

[7] M. Crâşmăreanu, *Conservation laws generated by pseudosymmetries with applications to Hamiltonian systems*, Ital. J. Pure Appl. Math. 8 (2000), 91-98.

[8] M. Crâşmăreanu, *First integrals generated by pseudosymmetries in Nambu-Poisson mechanics*, J. of Non. Math. Phys. 7, 2 (2000), 126-135.

[9] R. Ibanez, M. de León, J. C. Marrero, M. de Diego, *Nambu-Poisson Dynamics*, Arch. Mech. 50, 3 (1998), 405-413.

[10] M. J. Gotay, *Presymplectic Manifolds, Geometric Constraint Theory and the Dirac-Bergmann Theory of Constraints*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Center of Theor. Phys., University of Maryland, USA, 1979.

[11] M. J. Gotay, J. M. Nester, *Presymplectic Lagrangian systems. I: the constraint algorithm and the equivalence theorem*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, A, 30 (1979), 129-142.

[12] M. J. Gotay, J. M. Nester, *Presymplectic Lagrangian systems. II: the second-order equation problem*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, A, 32 (1980), 1-13.

[13] G. L. Jones, *Symmetry and conservation laws of differential equations*, Il Nuovo Cimento, 112, 7, (1997), 1053-1059.

[14] W. D. Kermack, A. G. McKendrick, *A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics*, J. Royal Stat. Soc., A 115 (1927), 700-721; A 138 (1932), 55-83.

[15] O. Krupková, *The Geometry of Ordinary Variational Equations*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1997.

[16] M. de León, D. M. de Diego, *Symmetries and constants of motion for singular Lagrangian systems*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 35, 5 (1996), 975-1011.

[17] A. J. Lotka, *Elements of Physical Biology*, Williams-Wilkins, Baltimore, 1925.

[18] R. Miron, M. Anastasiei, *The Geometry of Lagrange Spaces: Theory and Applications*, Fundamental Theories of Physics 59, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994.

[19] R. Miron, D. Hrimiuc, H. Shimada, V. S. Sabău, *The Geometry of Lagrange and Hamilton Spaces*, Fundamental Theories of Physics, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.

[20] F. Munteanu, *A study on the dynamical systems in the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism*, Proc. S.S.M.R. Conf., Brasov (2001), 169-178.

[21] F. Munteanu, *On the semispray of nonlinear connections in rheonomic Lagrange geometry*, Proc. Conf. Finsler-Lagrange Geometry, Iasi, ed. M. Anastasiei, Kluwer Academic Publishers 2003, 129-137.

[22] E. Noether, *Invariante Variationsprobleme*, Gött. Nachr. (1918), 235-257.

[23] V. Obădeanu, *Differential Dynamical Systems. The Dynamics of Biological and Economical Processes*, Ed. West University of Timisoara, 2006.

[24] V. Volterra, *Leçon sur la Theorie Mathématique de la lutte pour la vie*, Gauthier-Villars, 1931.

[25] V. Volterra, *Principles de biologie mathématique*, Acta Biother. 3 (1937), 1-36.

Author's address:

Florian Munteanu
Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Craiova,
Al.I. Cuza 13, Craiova 200585, Dolj, Romania.
E-mail: munteanufm@gmail.com , munteanufm@central.ucv.ro