

"Summary" of action-angle (AA) variables [1]

(for 1 D ^{periodic} system) / motion

- AA is a specific canonical transformation (CT) with following features

- (I) New coordinate θ is cyclic [why it's called θ will be clear in (II) below] so that new momentum I is constant along path, i.e.,

$$H(q, p) = H[q(\theta, I), p(\theta, I)] \equiv \tilde{H}(\theta, I) \text{ in general,}$$

but here $\tilde{H}(I \text{ only, no } \theta)$ → transformed Hamiltonian

$$\text{so that } \dot{I} = -\partial \tilde{H}(\theta, I) / \partial \theta \text{ (in general)}$$

$$= -\partial \tilde{H}(I) / \partial \theta = 0 \text{ here}$$

Since along path, $H^{(q,p)}$ or $\tilde{H}(I)$ is also constant (E)

we can write (along path) $I(E)$

$$\text{so, } \dot{\theta} = \partial \tilde{H}(\theta, I) / \partial I \text{ (in general)} = \partial \tilde{H}(I) / \partial I \text{ here}$$

gives $\theta(t) = c(E)t + \text{constant}$, where $c(E) \equiv \frac{1}{\partial I(E) / \partial E}$

i.e., θ is not constant (even if simply linear in time)

- (II) In addition, if we choose

$$I(E) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{\text{cycle}} p(q; E) dq, \text{ where } p(q; E) \text{ is obtained from } H(q, p) = E$$

(see note posted)

we can show that $c(E) (= 1 / [\partial I(E) / \partial E]) = \omega(E) = \frac{2\pi}{T(E)}$,

i.e., angular frequency, so that θ goes thru 2π in time T , thus deserves to be called "angle".

Action variable is a adiabatic invariant

- Suppose one of parameters in Hamiltonian changes with time, but slowly, i.e., $H[q, p, \lambda(t)]$, with $\Delta\lambda$ in time $T \ll \lambda(\text{average})$, i.e., $\dot{\lambda} T / \lambda \equiv \epsilon \ll 1$

[clearly q, p themselves change by $O(1)$ during time T] since H is time-dependent

- We ^{then} expect $\dot{E} \propto \dot{\lambda}$, i.e., E changes at $O(\epsilon)$

- So, ^{we} might guess that a combination of E & λ does not change at $O(\epsilon)$

- Indeed, we can show that action is that combination, i.e., $\dot{I} \propto (\dot{\lambda})^2$ or larger

[^{For this discussion,} $I(E)$ above should ^{perhaps} be written as

$I(E; \lambda)$, where dependence on λ comes

from $H(\underbrace{q, p}_{\text{variables}}; \underbrace{\lambda}_{\text{parameter}}) = E$ with time

In this way, we see that change in I due to above (explicit) dependence on λ (which is varying)

"cancels" that due to E itself changing ^{again} $(\propto \dot{\lambda})$]