Transformations and Coupling Relations for Affine Connections

James Tao[1] and Jun Zhang[2](✉)

[1] Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
[2] University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 49109, USA
junz@umich.edu

Abstract. The statistical structure on a manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ is predicated upon a special kind of coupling between the Riemannian metric g and a torsion-free affine connection ∇ on the $T\mathfrak{M}$, such that ∇g is totally symmetric, forming, by definition, a "Codazzi pair" $\{\nabla, g\}$. In this paper, we first investigate various transformations of affine connections, including additive translation (by an arbitrary (1,2)-tensor K), multiplicative perturbation (through an arbitrary invertible operator L on $T\mathfrak{M}$), and conjugation (through a non-degenerate two-form h). We then study the Codazzi coupling of ∇ with h and its coupling with L, and the link between these two couplings. We introduce, as special cases of K-translations, various transformations that generalize traditional projective and dual-projective transformations, and study their commutativity with L-perturbation and h-conjugation transformations. Our derivations allow affine connections to carry torsion, and we investigate conditions under which torsions are preserved by the various transformations mentioned above. Our systematic approach establishes a general setting for the study of Information Geometry based on transformations and coupling relations of affine connections – in particular, we provide a generalization of conformal-projective transformation.

1 Introduction

On the tangent bundle $T\mathfrak{M}$ of a differentiable manifold $\mathfrak{M}$, one can introduce two separate structures: affine connection ∇ and Riemannian metric g. The coupling of these two structures has been of great interest to, say, affine geometers and information geometers. When coupled, $\{\nabla, g\}$ is called a Codazzi pair e.g., [14,17], which is an important concept in PDEs and affine hypersurface theory [7,8,10–12,15,16]. Codazzi coupling of a metric and an affine connection is a defining characteristics of "statistical structure" [6] of the manifold of the probability functions [1], where the metric-connection pair arises from a general construction of divergence ("contrast") functions [20,21] or pre-contrast functions [2]. To investigate the robustness of the Codazzi structure, one would perturb the metric and perturb the affine connection, and examine whether, after perturbation, the resulting metric and connection will still maintain Codazzi coupling [13].

F. Nielsen and F. Barbaresco (Eds.): GSI 2015, LNCS 9389, pp. 1–14, 2015.
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-25040-3_36

Codazzi transform is a useful concept in coupling projective transform of a connection and conformal transformation of the Riemannian metric: the pair $\{\nabla, g\}$ is jointly transformed in such a way that Codazzi coupling is preserved, see [17]. This is done through an arbitrary function that transforms both the metric and connection. A natural question to ask is whether there is a more general transformation of the metric and of the connection that preserves the Codazzi coupling, such that Codazzi transform (with the freedom of one function) is a special case. In this paper, we provide a positive answer to this question. The second goal of this paper is to investigate the role of torsion in affine connections and their transformations. Research on this topic is isolated, and the general importance has not been appreciated.

In this paper, we will collect various results on transformations on affine connection and classify them through one of the three classes, L-perturbation, h-conjugation, and the more general K-translation. They correspond to transforming ∇ via a (1,1)-tensor, (0,2)-tensor, or (1,2)-tensor. We will investigate the interactions between these transformations, based on known results but generalizing them to more arbitrary and less restrictive conditions. We will show how a general transformation of a non-degenerate two-form and a certain transformation of the connection are coupled; here transformation of a connection can be through L-perturbation, h-conjugation, and K-translation which specialzes to various projective-like transformations. We will show how they are linked in the case when they are Codazzi coupled to a same connection ∇. The outcome are depicted in commutative diagrams as well as stated as Theorems. Finally, our paper will provide a generalization of the conformal-projective transformation mentioned above, with an additional degree of freedom, and specify the conditions under which such transformation preserves Codazzi pairing of g and ∇. Due to page limit, all proofs are omitted.

2 Transformations of Affine Connections

2.1 Affine Connections

An affine (linear) connection ∇ is an endomorphism of $T\mathfrak{M}$: $\nabla : (X, Y) \in T\mathfrak{M} \times T\mathfrak{M} \mapsto \nabla_X Y \in T\mathfrak{M}$ that is bilinear in the vector fields X, Y and that satisfies the *Leibniz rule*

$$\nabla_X(\phi Y) = X(\phi)Y + \phi \nabla_X Y,$$

for any smooth function ϕ on $\mathfrak{M}$. An affine connection specifies the manner parallel transport of tangent vectors is performed on a manifold. Associated with any affine connection is a system of auto-parallel curves (also called geodesics): the family of auto-parallel curves passing through any point on the manifold is called the *geodesic spray*. The torsion of a connection ∇ is characterized by the (1,2)-tensor *torsion tensor*

$$T^\nabla(X, Y) = \nabla_X Y - \nabla_Y X - [X, Y],$$

which characterizes how tangent spaces twist about a curve when they are parallel transported.

2.2 Three Kinds of Transformations

The space of affine connections is convex in the following sense: if $\nabla, \widetilde{\nabla}$ are affine connections, then so is $\alpha\nabla + \beta\widetilde{\nabla}$ for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{R}$ so long as $\alpha + \beta = 1$. This normalization condition is needed to ensure that the Leibniz rule holds. For example, $\frac{1}{2}\nabla_X Y + \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y$ is a connection, whereas $\frac{1}{2}\nabla_X Y + \frac{1}{2}\nabla_Y X$ is not; both are bilinear forms of X, Y.

Definition 1. *A* transformation of affine connections *is an arbitrary map from the set $\mathfrak{D}$ of affine connections ∇ of some differentiable manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ to $\mathfrak{D}$ itself.*

In this following, we investigate three kinds of transformations of affine connections:

(i) *translation* by a (1,2)-tensor;
(ii) *perturbation* by an invertible operator or (1,1)-tensor;
(iii) *conjugation* by a non-degenerate two-form or (0,2)-tensor.

Additive Transformation: K-translation

Proposition 1. *Given two affine connections ∇ and $\widetilde{\nabla}$, then their difference $K(X,Y) := \widetilde{\nabla}_X Y - \nabla_X Y$ is a $(1,2)$-tensor. Conversely, any affine connection $\widetilde{\nabla}$ arises this way as an additive transformation by a (1,2)-tensor $K(X,Y)$ from ∇:*

$$\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla_X Y + K(X,Y).$$

It follows that a transformation T of affine connections is equivalent to a choice of $(1,2)$-tensor T_∇ for every affine connection ∇. Stated otherwise, given a connection, any other connection can be obtained in this way, i.e. by adding an appropriate (1,2)-tensor, which may or may not depend on ∇. When the (1,2)-tensor $K(X,Y)$ is independent of ∇, we say that $\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y$ is a K*-translation* of ∇.

Additive transformations obviously commute with each other, since tensor addition is commutative. So additive transformations from a given affine connection form a group.

For any two connections ∇ and $\widetilde{\nabla}$, their difference tensor $K(X,Y)$ decomposes in general as $\frac{1}{2}A(X,Y) + \frac{1}{2}B(X,Y)$ where A is symmetric and B is anti-symmetric. Since the difference between the torsion tensors of $\widetilde{\nabla}$ and ∇ is given by

$$T^{\widetilde{\nabla}}(X,Y) - T^{\nabla}(X,Y) = K(X,Y) - K(Y,X) = B(X,Y),$$

we have the following:

Proposition 2. *K-translaton of an affine connection preserves torsion if and only if K is symmetric: $K(X,Y) = K(Y,X)$.*

The symmetric part, $A(X,Y)$, of the difference tensor $K(X,Y)$ reflects a difference in the geodesic spray associated with each affine connection: $\widetilde{\nabla}$ and ∇ have the same families of geodesic spray if and only if $A(X,Y)=0$.

The following examples are K-translations that will be discussed in great length later on:

(i) $\mathsf{P}^\vee(\tau) : \nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y + \tau(X)Y$, called $\mathsf{P}^\vee$-*transformation*;
(ii) $\mathsf{P}(\tau) : \nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y + \tau(Y)X$, called P-*transformation*;
(iii) $\mathsf{Proj}(\tau) : \nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y + \tau(Y)X + \tau(X)Y$, called *projective transformation*;
(iv) $\mathsf{D}(h,\xi) : \nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y - h(Y,X)\xi$, called D-*transformation*, or dual-projective transformation.

Here, τ is an arbitrary one-form or (0,1)-tensor, h is a non-degenerate two-form or (0,2)-tensor, X, Y, ξ are all vector fields. From Proposition 2, $\mathsf{Proj}(\tau)$ is always torsion-preserving, while $\mathsf{D}(h,\xi)$ is torsion-preserving when h is symmetric.

It is obvious that $\mathsf{Proj}(\tau)$ is the composition of $\mathsf{P}(\tau)$ and $\mathsf{P}^\vee(\tau)$ for any τ. This may be viewed as follows: the P-transformation introduces torsion in one direction, i.e. it adds $B(X,Y) := \tau(Y)X - \tau(X)Y$ to the torsion tensor, but the $\mathsf{P}^\vee$ transformation cancels out this torsion, by adding $-B(X,Y) = \tau(X)Y - \tau(Y)X$, resulting in a torsion-preserving transformation of $\mathsf{Proj}(\tau)$.

Any affine connection ∇ on $T\mathfrak{M}$ induces an action on $T^*\mathfrak{M}$. The action of ∇ on a one-form ω is defined as:

$$(\nabla_X \omega)(Y) = X(\omega(Y)) - \omega(\nabla_X Y).$$

When ∇ undergoes a K-translation, $\nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y + K(X,Y)$ for a (1,2)-tensor K, then

$$(\nabla_X \omega)(Y) \mapsto (\nabla_X \omega)(Y) - \omega(K(X,Y)).$$

In particular, the transformation $\mathsf{P}^\vee(\tau)$ of a connection acting on $T\mathfrak{M}$ induces a change of $\mathsf{P}^\vee(-\tau)$ when the connection acts on $T^*\mathfrak{M}$.

Multiplicative Transformation: L-pertubation. Complementing the additive transformation, we define a "multiplicative" transformation of affine connections through an invertible operator $L : T\mathfrak{M} \to T\mathfrak{M}$.

Proposition 3. *([13]) Given an affine connection ∇ and an invertible operator L on $T\mathfrak{M}$, then $L^{-1}(\nabla_X(L(Y)))$ is also an affine connection.*

Definition 2. *Given a connection ∇, the L-perturbation of ∇, denoted variously ∇^L, $L(\nabla)$, or $\Gamma_L(\nabla)$, is an endomorphism of $T\mathfrak{M}$ defined as:*

$$\Gamma_L(\nabla) \equiv L(\nabla) \equiv \nabla^L_X Y \equiv L^{-1}(\nabla_X LY).$$

Proposition 4. *([13]) The L-perturbations form a group such that group composition is simply operator concatenation: $\Gamma_K \circ \Gamma_L = \Gamma_{LK}$ for invertible operators K and L.*

Conjugation Transformation by *h*. If h is any non-degenerate $(0,2)$-tensor, it induces isomorphisms $h(X,-)$ and $h(-,X)$ from vector fields X to one-forms. When h is not symmetric, these two isomorphisms are different. Given an affine connection ∇, we can take the covariant derivative of the one-form $h(Y,-)$ with respect to X, and obtain a corresponding one-form ω such that, when fixing Y,

$$\omega_X(Z) = X(h(Y,Z)) - h(Y,\nabla_X Z).$$

Since h is non-degenerate, there exists a U such that $\omega_X = h(U,-)$ as one-forms, so that

$$X(h(Y,Z)) = h(U(X,Y),Z) + h(Y,\nabla_X Z).$$

Defining $D(X,Y) := U(X,Y)$ gives a map from $T\mathfrak{M} \times T\mathfrak{M} \to T\mathfrak{M}$.

Proposition 5. *Taking* $\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y := D(X,Y)$ *gives an affine connection* $\widetilde{\nabla}$ *as induced from* ∇*.*

Definition 3. *This* $\widetilde{\nabla}$ *is called the* left-conjugate *of* ∇ *with respect to* h*. The map taking* ∇ *to* $\widetilde{\nabla}$ *will be denoted* $\mathsf{Left}(h)$*. Similarly, we have a right-conjugate of* ∇ *and an associated map* $\mathsf{Right}(h)$*.*

If $\tilde{h}(X,Y) := h(Y,X)$, then exchanging the first and second arguments of each h in the above derivation shows that $\mathsf{Left}(h) = \mathsf{Right}(\tilde{h})$ and $\mathsf{Right}(h) = \mathsf{Left}(\tilde{h})$. When h is symmetric or anti-symmetric, the left- and right-conjugates are equal; both reduce to the special case of the usual conjugate connection ∇^* with respect to h. In this case, conjugation is involutive: $(\nabla^*)^* = \nabla$.

For a non-degenerate (but not necessarily symmetric or anti-symmetric) h, if there exists a ∇ such that

$$Z(h(X,Y)) = h(\nabla_Z X, Y) + h(X, \nabla_Z Y),$$

then $\nabla = \mathsf{Left}(h)(\nabla) = \mathsf{Right}(h)(\nabla)$; in this case, ∇ is said to be parallel to the two-form h. Because in this case, $\nabla = \mathsf{Left}(\tilde{h})(\nabla) = \mathsf{Right}(\tilde{h})(\nabla)$, ∇ is also parallel to the two-form $\tilde{h}$.

2.3 Codazzi Coupling and Torsion Preservation

Codazzi Coupling of ∇ with Operator L. Let L be an isomorphism of the tangent bundle $T\mathfrak{M}$ of a smooth manifold $\mathfrak{M}$, i.e. L is a smooth section of the bundle $\mathrm{End}(T\mathfrak{M})$ such that it is invertible everywhere, i.e. an invertible $(1,1)$-tensor.

Definition 4. *Let* L *be an operator, and* ∇ *an affine connection. We call* $\{\nabla, L\}$ *a Codazzi pair if* $(\nabla_X L)Y$ *is symmetric in* X *and* Y*. In other words, the following identity holds*

$$(\nabla_X L)Y = (\nabla_Y L)X. \tag{1}$$

Here $(\nabla_X L)Y$ is, by definition,

$$(\nabla_X L)Y = \nabla_X(L(Y)) - L(\nabla_X Y).$$

We have the following characterization of Codazzi relations between an invertible operator and a connection:

Proposition 6. *([13]) Let ∇ and $\widetilde{\nabla}$ be arbitrary affine connections, and L an invertible operator. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *$\{\nabla, L\}$ is a Codazzi pair.*
2. *∇ and $\Gamma_L(\nabla)$ have equal torsions.*
3. *$\{\Gamma_L(\nabla), L^{-1}\}$ is a Codazzi pair.*

Proposition 7. *Let $\{\nabla, L\}$ be a Codazzi pair. Let A be a symmetric (1,2)-tensor, and $\widetilde{\nabla} = \nabla + A$. Then $\{\widetilde{\nabla}, L\}$ forms a Codazzi pair if and only if L is self-adjoint with respect to A:*

$$A(L(X), Y) = A(X, L(Y))$$

for all vector fields X and Y.

In other words, A-translation preserves the Codazzi pair relationship of ∇ with L iff L is a *self-adjoint* operator with respect to A.

Therefore, for a fixed operator L, the Codazzi coupling relation can be interpreted as a quality of *equivalence classes* of connections modulo translations by symmetric (1,2)-tensors A with respect to which L is self-adjoint.

Codazzi Coupling of ∇ with (0,2)-tensor h. Now we investigate Codazzi coupling of ∇ with a non-degenerate (0,2)-tensor h. We introduce the (0,3)-tensor C defined by:

$$C(X, Y, Z) \equiv (\nabla_Z h)(X, Y) = Z(h(X, Y)) - h(\nabla_Z X, Y) - h(X, \nabla_Z Y). \quad (2)$$

The tensor C is called the *cubic form* associated with $\{\nabla, h\}$ pair. When $C = 0$, then we say that h is parallel with respect to ∇.

Recall the definition of left-conjugate $\widetilde{\nabla}$ with respect to a non-degenerate two-form h:

$$Z(h(X, Y)) = h(\widetilde{\nabla}_Z X, Y) + h(X, \nabla_Z Y). \quad (3)$$

Using this relation in (2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} C(X, Y, Z) &\equiv (h(\widetilde{\nabla}_Z X, Y) + h(X, \nabla_Z Y)) - h(\nabla_Z X, Y) - h(X, \nabla_Z Y) \\ &= h((\widetilde{\nabla} - \nabla)_Z X, Y), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$C(X, Y, Z) - C(Z, Y, X) = h(T^{\widetilde{\nabla}}(Z, X) - T^{\nabla}(Z, X), Y),$$

or

$$(\nabla_Z h)(X,Y) - (\nabla_X h)(Z,Y) = h(T^{\widetilde{\nabla}}(Z,X) - T^{\nabla}(Z,X), Y).$$

The non-degeneracy of h implies that $C(X,Y,Z) = C(Z,Y,X)$ if and only if ∇ and $\widetilde{\nabla}$ have equal torsions. This motivates the following definition, in analogy with the previous subsection.

Definition 5. *Let h be a two-form, and ∇ an affine connection. We call $\{\nabla, h\}$ a* Codazzi pair *if $(\nabla_Z h)(X,Y)$ is symmetric in X and Z.*

The cubic form associated with the pair $\{\widetilde{\nabla}, h\}$, denoted as $\widetilde{C}$, is:

$$\widetilde{C}(X,Y,Z) \equiv (\widetilde{\nabla}_Z h)(X,Y) = Z(h(X,Y)) - h(\widetilde{\nabla}_Z X, Y) - h(X, \widetilde{\nabla}_Z Y).$$

We derive, analogously,

$$\widetilde{C}(X,Y,Z) = h(X, (\nabla - \widetilde{\nabla})_Z Y),$$

from which we obtain

$$\widetilde{C}(X,Y,Z) - \widetilde{C}(Z,Y,X) = h(X, T^{\nabla}(Y,Z) - T^{\widetilde{\nabla}}(Y,Z)).$$

Summarizing the above results, we have, in analogy with Proposition 6:

Proposition 8. *Let ∇ be an arbitrary affine connection, h be an arbitrary non-degenerate two-form, and $\widetilde{\nabla}$ denotes the left-conjugate of ∇ with respect to h. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *$\{\nabla, h\}$ is a Codazzi pair.*
2. *∇ and $\widetilde{\nabla}$ have equal torsions.*
3. *$\{\widetilde{\nabla}, h\}$ is a Codazzi pair.*

This proposition says that an arbitrary affine connection ∇ and an arbitrary non-degenerate two-form h form a Codazzi pair precisely when ∇ and its left-conjugate $\widetilde{\nabla}$ with respect to h have equal torsions.

Note that the definition of Codazzi pairing of ∇ with h is with respect to the first slot of h, left-conjugate is a more useful concept. The left- and right-conjugate of a connection ∇ with respect to h can become one and the same, when (i) h is symmetric; or (ii) ∇ is parallel to h: $\nabla h = 0$. These scenarios will be discussed next.

From the definition of the cubic form (2), it holds that

$$(\nabla_Z \tilde{h})(X,Y) = C(Y,X,Z) = (\nabla_Z h)(Y,X)$$

where $\tilde{h}(X,Y) = h(Y,X)$. So $C(X,Y,Z) = C(Y,X,Z)$ holds for any vector fields X, Y, Z if and only if $h = \tilde{h}$, that is, h is symmetric.

Proposition 9. *For a non-degenerate two-form h, $\nabla h = 0$ if and only if ∇ equals its left (equivalently, right) conjugate with respect to h.*

Note that in this proposition, we do not require h to be symmetric.

The following standard definition is a special case:

Definition 6. *If g is a Riemannian metric, and ∇ an affine connection, the* conjugate connection ∇^* *is the left-conjugate (or equivalently, right-conjugate) of ∇ with respect to g. Denote $\mathsf{C}(g)$ as the involutive map that sends ∇ to ∇^*.*

This leads to the well-known result:

Corollary 7. *$\{\nabla, g\}$ is a Codazzi pair if and only if $\mathsf{C}(g)$ preserves the torsion of ∇.*

2.4 Linking Two Codazzi Couplings

In order to relate these two notions of Codazzi pairs, one involving perturbations via a operator L, and one involving conjugation with respect to a two-form h, we need the following definition:

Definition 8. *The* left L-perturbation *of a $(0,2)$-tensor h is the $(0,2)$-tensor $h_L(X,Y) := h(L(X),Y)$. Similarly, the* right L-perturbation *is given by $h^L(X,Y) := h(X,L(Y))$.*

Proposition 10. *Let h be a non-degenerate $(0,2)$-tensor. If $\widetilde{\nabla}$ is the left-conjugate of ∇ with respect to h, then the left-conjugate of ∇ with respect to h_L is $\Gamma_L(\widetilde{\nabla})$. Analogously, if $\widehat{\nabla}$ is the right-conjugate of ∇ with respect to h, then the right-conjugate of ∇ with respect to h^L is $\Gamma_L(\widehat{\nabla})$.*

Corollary 9. *Let $\widetilde{\nabla}$ be the left-conjugate of ∇ with respect to h. If $\{\nabla, h\}$ and $\{\widetilde{\nabla}, L\}$ are Codazzi pairs, then $\{\nabla, h_L\}$ is a Codazzi pair.*

The following result describes how L-perturbation of a two-form (i.e., a (0,2)-tensor) induces a corresponding "L-perturbation" on the cubic form $C(X,Y,Z)$ as defined in the previous subsubsection.

Proposition 11. *Let $h(X,Y)$ be a non-degenerate two-form and L be an invertible operator. Write $f := h_L$ for notational convenience. Then, for any connection ∇,*

$$C_f(X,Y,Z) = C_h(L(X),Y,Z) + h((\nabla_Z L)X, Y),$$

where C_f and C_h are the cubic tensors of ∇ with respect to f and h.

With the notion of L-perturbation of a two-form, we can now state our main theorem describing the relation between L-perturbation of an affine connection and h-conjugation of that connection.

Theorem 10. *Fix a non-degenerate (0, 2)-tensor h, denote its L-perturbations $h_L(X,Y) = h(L(X),Y)$ and $h^L(X,Y) = h(X,L(Y))$ as before. For an arbitrary connection ∇, denote its left-conjugate (respectively, right-conjugate) of ∇ with respect to h as $\widetilde{\nabla}$ (respectively, $\widehat{\nabla}$). Then:*

(i) $\nabla h_L = 0$ *if and only if* $\Gamma_L(\widetilde{\nabla}) = \nabla$.
(ii) $\nabla h^L = 0$ *if and only if* $\Gamma_L(\widehat{\nabla}) = \nabla$.

This Theorem means that ∇ is parallel to h_L (respectively, h^L) if and only if the left (respectively, right) h-conjugate of the L-perturbation of ∇ is ∇ itself. In this case, L-perturbation of ∇ and h-conjugation of ∇ can be coupled to render the perturbed two-form parallel with respect to ∇. Note that in the above Theorem, there is no torsion-free assumption about ∇, no symmetry assumption about h, and no Codazzi pairing assumption of $\{\nabla, h\}$.

2.5 Commutation Relations Between Transformations

Definition 11. *Given a one-form τ, we define the following transformation of an affine connection ∇:*

(i) $\mathsf{P}^\vee$*-transformation, denoted* $\mathsf{P}^\vee(\tau) : \nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y + \tau(X)Y$*;*
(ii) P*-transformation, denoted* $\mathsf{P}(\tau) : \nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y + \tau(Y)X$*.*
(iii) projective transformation, denoted $\mathsf{Proj}(\tau) : \nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y + \tau(Y)X + \tau(X)Y$*.*

All these are "translations" of an affine connection (see Sect. 2). The first two transformations, (i) and (ii), are "half" of the projective transformation in (iii). While the projective transformation Proj of ∇ preserves its torsion, both $\mathsf{P}^\vee$-transformation and P-transformation introduce torsion (in opposite amounts).

Definition 12. *Given a vector field ξ and a non-degenerate 2-form h, we define the* D*-transformation of an affine connection ∇ as*

$$\mathsf{D}(h, \xi) : \nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y - h(Y, X)\xi.$$

Furthermore, the transformation $\tilde{\mathsf{D}}(h, \xi)$ *is defined to be* $\mathsf{D}(\tilde{h}, \xi)$*.*

These transformations behave very nicely with respect to left and right h-conjugation, as well as L-perturbation. More precisely, we make the following definition:

Definition 13. *We call left (respectively right) h-*image *of a transformation of a connection the induced transformation on the left (respectively right) h-conjugate of that connection. Similarly, we call L-*image *of a transformation of a connection the induced transformation on the L-perturbation of that connection.*

Proposition 12. *The left and right h-images of* $\mathsf{P}^\vee(\tau)$ *are both* $\mathsf{P}^\vee(-\tau)$*.*

Proposition 13. *The L-image of* $\mathsf{P}^\vee(\tau)$ *is* $\mathsf{P}^\vee(\tau)$ *itself.*

Proposition 14. *If V is a vector field, so that $h(V, -)$ is a one-form, then the left h-image of* $\mathsf{P}(h(V, -))$ *is* $\mathsf{D}(h, V)$*, while the right h-image of* $\mathsf{P}(h(-, V))$ *is* $\tilde{\mathsf{D}}(h, V)$*.*

Proposition 15. *The L-image of* $\mathsf{D}(h, V)$ *is* $\mathsf{D}(h_L, L^{-1}(V))$, *whereas the L-image of* $\tilde{\mathsf{D}}(h, V)$ *is* $\tilde{\mathsf{D}}(h^L, L^{-1}(V))$.

We summarize the above results in the following commutative prisms.

Theorem 14. *Let h be a non-degenerate two-form, L be an invertible operator, Z be a vector field, and τ be a one-form. Then we have four commutative prisms:*



Corollary 15. *With respect to a Riemannian metric g, an invertible operator L, and an arbitrary one-form τ, we have the following commutative prisms:*



Each • represents the space of affine connections of some differentiable manifold $\mathfrak{M}$.

These commutative prisms are extremely useful in characterizing transformations that preserve Codazzi coupling. Indeed, Propositions 6 and 8 say that it is enough to characterize the torsion introduced by the various translations in Definitions 11 and 12. We have the following:

Proposition 16. *With respect to the transformation of connections: $\nabla_X Y \mapsto \widetilde{\nabla}_X Y$, let $I(X,Y)$ denote the induced change in torsion, i.e. $B(X,Y) := T^{\widetilde{\nabla}}(X,Y) - T^{\nabla}(X,Y)$. Then*

(i) For $\mathsf{P}^{\vee}(\tau)$: $B(X,Y) = \tau(X)Y - \tau(Y)X$.
(ii) For $\mathsf{P}(\tau)$: $B(X,Y) = \tau(Y)X - \tau(X)Y$.
(iii) For $\mathsf{Proj}(\tau)$: $B(X,Y) = 0$. Projective transformations are torsion-preserving.
(iv) For $\mathsf{D}(h,\xi)$: $B(X,Y) = \Big(h(X,Y) - h(Y,X)\Big)\xi$.
(v) For $\tilde{\mathsf{D}}(h,\xi)$: $B(X,Y) = \Big(h(Y,X) - h(X,Y)\Big)\xi$.

Note that the torsion change $B(X,Y)$ is same in amount but opposite in sign for cases (i) and (ii), and for cases (iv) and (v). $B(X,Y)$ is always zero for case (iii), and becomes zero for cases (iv) and (v) when h is symmetric.

Corollary 16. $\mathsf{P}^{\vee}$*-transformations* $\mathsf{P}^{\vee}(\tau)$ *preserve Codazzi pairing of ∇ with L: For arbitrary one-form τ, if $\{\nabla, L\}$ is a Codazzi pair, then $\{\mathsf{P}^{\vee}(\tau)\nabla, L\}$ is a Codazzi pair.*

Corollary 17. D*-transformations* $\mathsf{D}(g,\xi)$ *preserve Codazzi pairing of ∇ with L: For any symmetric two-form g, vector field ξ, and operator L that is self-adjoint with respect to g, if $\{\nabla, L\}$ is a Codazzi pair, then $\{\mathsf{D}(g,\xi)\nabla, L\}$ is a Codazzi pair.*

2.6 The Conformal-Projective Transformation

The Codazzi transformation for a metric g and affine connection ∇ has been defined as

$$g(X,Y) \mapsto e^{\phi} g(X,Y)$$
$$\nabla_X Y \mapsto \nabla_X Y + X(\phi)Y + Y(\phi)X$$

for any smooth function ϕ. It is a known result that this preserves Codazzi pairs $\{\nabla, g\}$. In our language, this transformation can be described as follows: it is a (torsion-preserving) projective transformation $\mathsf{P}(d\phi)\mathsf{P}^{\vee}(d\phi)$ applied to ∇, and an L-perturbation $g \mapsto g_{e^{\phi}}$ applied to the metric, where e^{ϕ} is viewed as an invertible operator.

As generalizations to Codazzi transformation, researchers have introduced, progressively, the notions of 1-conformal transformation and α-conformal transformation in general [4], dual-projective transformation which is essentially (-1)-conformal transformation [3], and conformal-projective transformation [5], which encompass all previous cases.

Two statistical manifolds $(\mathfrak{M}, \nabla, g)$ and $(\mathfrak{M}, \nabla', g')$ are said to be *conformally-projectively equivalent* [5] if there exist two functions ϕ and ψ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{g}(u,v) &= e^{\phi+\psi} g(u,v), \\ \nabla'_u v &= \nabla_u v - g(u,v)\text{grad}_g \psi + \{d\phi(u)v + d\phi(v)u\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note: $\phi = \psi$ yields conformal equivalency; $\phi = const$ yields 1-conformal (i.e., dual projective) equivalency; $\psi = const$ yields (-1)-conformal (i.e., projective) equivalency. It is shown [9] that when two statistical manifolds $(\mathfrak{M}, \nabla, g)$ and $(\mathfrak{M}, \nabla', g')$ are conformally-projectively equivalent, then $(\mathfrak{M}, \nabla^{(\alpha)}, g)$ and $(\mathfrak{M}, \nabla'^{(\alpha)}, g')$ are also conformally-projectively equivalent, with inducing functions $\phi^{(\alpha)} = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\phi + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}\psi, \psi^{(\alpha)} = \frac{1-\alpha}{2}\psi + \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\phi$.

In our framework, we see that this transformation can be expressed as follows: it is an $e^{\psi+\phi}$-perturbation of the metric g, along with the affine connection transformation

$$\mathsf{D}(g, \text{grad}_g\, \psi)\mathsf{Proj}(d\phi) = \mathsf{D}(g, \text{grad}_g\, \psi)\mathsf{P}(d\phi)\mathsf{P}^\vee(d\phi).$$

The induced transformation on the conjugate connection will be

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{e^{\psi+\phi}}\mathsf{P}(d\psi)\mathsf{D}(g, \text{grad}_g\, \phi)\mathsf{P}^\vee(-d\phi) &= P^\vee(d\phi + d\psi)\mathsf{P}(d\psi)\mathsf{D}(g, \text{grad}_g\, \phi)\mathsf{P}^\vee(-d\phi) \\ &= \mathsf{P}^\vee(d\psi)\mathsf{P}(d\psi)\mathsf{D}(g, \text{grad}_g\, \phi) \\ &= \mathsf{D}(g, \text{grad}_g\, \phi)\mathsf{Proj}(d\psi), \end{aligned}$$

which is a translation of the same form as before, but with ψ and ϕ exchanged. (The additional $\Gamma_{e^{\psi+\phi}}$ in front is induced by the $e^{\psi+\phi}$-perturbation of the metric.) In particular, this is a torsion-preserving transformation, because D and Proj are, which shows that conformal-projective transformations preserve Codazzi pairs $\{\nabla, g\}$. We can generalize the notion of conformal-projective transformation in the following way:

Definition 18. *Let V and W be vector fields, and L an invertible operator. A* generalized conformal-projective transformation $\mathsf{CP}(V, W, L)$ *consists of an L-perturbation of the metric g along with a torsion-preserving transformation $\mathsf{D}(g, W)\mathsf{Proj}(\tilde{V})$ of the connection, where $\tilde{V}$ is the one-form given by $\tilde{V}(X) := g(V, X)$ for any vector field X.*

Proposition 17. *A generalized conformal-projective transformation $\mathsf{CP}(V, W, L)$ induces the transformation $\Gamma_L\mathsf{P}(\tilde{W})\mathsf{D}(g, V)\mathsf{P}^\vee(-\tilde{V})$ on the conjugate connection.*

Proposition 18. *A generalized conformal-projective transformation $\mathsf{CP}(V, W, L)$ preserves Codazzi pairs $\{\nabla, g\}$ precisely when the torsion introduced by Γ_L cancels with that introduced by $\mathsf{P}(\tilde{W})\mathsf{P}^\vee(-\tilde{V})$, i.e.*

$$L^{-1}(\nabla_X(L(Y))) - L^{-1}(\nabla_Y(L(X))) - \nabla_X Y + \nabla_Y X = (\tilde{W} + \tilde{V})(X)Y + (\tilde{W} + \tilde{V})(Y)X.$$

Theorem 19. *A generalized conformal-projective transformation* $\mathsf{CP}(V, W, L)$ *preserves Codazzi pairs* $\{\nabla, g\}$ *if and only if* $L = e^f$ *for some smooth function* f*, and* $\tilde{V} + \tilde{W} = df$*. (The "only if" direction requires* $\dim \mathfrak{M} \geq 4$*.)*

This class of transformations is *strictly larger* than the class of conformal-projective transformations, since we may take $\tilde{V}$ to be an arbitrary one-form, not necessarily closed, and $\tilde{W} := df - \tilde{V}$ for some fixed smooth function f. The conformal-projective transformations result when f is itself the sum of two functions ϕ and ψ, in which case $df = d\phi + d\psi$ is a natural decomposition. Theorem 19 shows that the conformal-projective transformation admits interesting generalizations that preserve Codazzi pairs, by virtue of having an additional degree of freedom. This generalization demonstrates the utility of our "building block" transformations P, $\mathsf{P}^\vee$, D, and Γ_L in investigating Codazzi pairing relationships under general transformations of affine connections. Furthermore, this analysis shows that even torsion-free transformations may be effectively studied by decomposing them into elementary transformations that induce nontrivial torsions.

Acknowledgment. This work was completed while the second author (J.Z.) was on sabbatical visit at the Center for Mathematical Sciences and Applications at Harvard University under the auspices and support of Prof. S.T. Yau.

References

1. Amari, S., Nagaoka, H.: Method of Information Geometry. Oxford University Press, AMS Monograph, Providence, RI (2000) AQ1
2. Masayuki, H., Matsuzoe, H.: Geometry of precontrast functions and nonconservative estimating functions. In: International Workshop on Complex Structures, Integrability and Vector Fields, vol. 1340(1), AIP Publishing (2011)
3. Ivanov, S.: On dual-projectively flat affine connections. J. Geom. **53**(1–2), 89–99 (1995)
4. Kurose, T.: On the divergences of 1-conformally flat statistical manifolds. Tohoku Math. J. Second Ser. **46**(3), 427–433 (1994)
5. Kurose, T.: Conformal-projective geometry of statistical manifolds. Interdisc. Inf. Sci. **8**(1), 89–100 (2002)
6. Lauritzen, S.: Statistical manifolds. In: Amari, S., Barndorff-Nielsen, O., Kass, R., Lauritzen, S., Rao, C.R. (eds.) Differential Geometry in Statistical Inference, vol. 10, pp. 163–216. IMS Lecture Notes, Hayward, CA (1987)
7. Liu, H.L., Simon, U., Wang, C.P.: Codazzi tensors and the topology of surfaces. Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom. **16**(2), 189–202 (1998)
8. Liu, H.L., Simon, U., Wang, C.P.: Higher order Codazzi tensors on conformally flat spaces. Contrib. Algebra Geom. **39**(2), 329–348 (1998)
9. Matsuzoe, H.: On realization of conformally-projectively flat statistical manifolds and the divergences. Hokkaido Math. J. **27**, 409–421 (1998)
10. Nomizu, K., Sasaki, T.: Affine Differential Geometry - Geometry of Affine Immersions. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1994)
11. Pinkall, U., Schwenk-Schellschmidt, A., Simon, U.: Geometric methods for solving Codazzi and Monge-Ampere equations. Math. Ann. **298**(1), 89–100 (1994)

12. Schwenk-Schellschmidt, Angela, Udo Simon, and Martin Wiehe.: Generating higher order Codazzi tensors by functions. TU, Fachbereich Mathematik (3), 1998
13. Schwenk-Schellschmidt, A., Simon, U.: Codazzi-equivalent affine connections. RM **56**(1–4), 211–229 (2009)
14. Simon, U.: Codazzi tensors. In: Ferus, D., Ktihnel, W., Simon, U., Wegner, B.: Global Differential Geometry and Global Analysis, vol. 838, pp. 289–296. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg (1981)
15. Simon, U., Schwenk-Schellschmidt, A., Viesel, H.: Introduction to the Affine Differential Geometry of Hypersurfaces. Lecture Notes Science University of Tokyo, Tokyo (1991)
16. Simon, U.: Transformation techniques for partial differential equations on projectively flat manifolds. RM **27**(1–2), 160–187 (1995)
17. Simon, U.: Affine differential geometry. In: Dillen, F., Verstraelen, L. (eds.) Handbook of Differential Geometry, vol. 1, pp. 905–961. Elsevier Science (2000)
18. Simon, U.: Affine hypersurface theory revisited: gauge invariant structures. Russian Mathematics c/c of Izvstiia-Vysshie Uchebnye Zavedeniia Matematika **48**(11), 48 (2004)
19. Uohashi, K.: On α-conformal equivalence of statistical manifolds. J. Geom. **75**, 179–184 (2002)
20. Zhang, J.: Divergence function, duality, and convex analysis. Neural Comput. **16**, 159–195 (2004)
21. Zhang, J.: Nonparametric information geometry: from divergence function to referential-representational biduality on statistical manifolds. Entropy **15**, 5384–5418 (2013)