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Abstract

In this paper we study an analog of minimal surfaces called Weyl-minimal surfaces in conformal manifolds with a Weyl connection \((M^4, c, D)\). We show that there is an Eells-Salamon type correspondence between nonvertical \(J\)-holomorphic curves in the weightless twistor space and branched Weyl-minimal surfaces. When \((M, c, J)\) is conformally almost-Hermitian, there is a canonical Weyl connection. We show that for the canonical Weyl connection, branched Weyl-minimal surfaces satisfy the adjunction inequality

\[
\chi(T_f \Sigma) + \chi(N_f \Sigma) \leq \pm c_1(f^* T^{(1,0)} M).
\]

The \(\pm J\)-holomorphic curves are automatically Weyl-minimal and satisfy the corresponding equality. These results generalize results in [14], [4] for minimal surfaces in Kähler 4-manifolds which were extended to almost-Kähler manifolds in [2], [13], [9].

1 Introduction

In [4] Eells and Salamon show that when \(M\) is dimension 4, there is a correspondence between nonvertical \(J\)-holomorphic curves in the twistor space and branched minimal surfaces. They use twistor techniques to show that when \(M\) is almost-Kähler the \(\pm J\)-holomorphic curves are minimal. When \(M\) is Kähler they prove the adjuction inequality (1). Concurrently Webster [14] obtained his formulas (2, 3) for a minimal surface in a Kähler 4-manifold. These formulas imply the adjunction inequality. The adjunction inequality was extended to minimal surfaces in almost-Kähler 4-manifolds in [2], [13], [9].

This leads to the following picture for almost-Kähler manifolds. The adjunction inequality holds for minimal surfaces. Every \(\pm J\)-holomorphic curve is minimal, and equality holds in (1) with the corresponding sign.

For an almost-Hermitian manifold, in general, the \(\pm J\)-holomorphic curves are not minimal, and in [2] they remark that the (1) will not hold for minimal surfaces. In this paper we show that the picture for almost-Kähler manifolds can be extended to almost-Hermitian manifolds when considering a conformally invariant condition on surfaces related to the minimal condition. We now briefly describe this condition and list our main theorems.

Let \(M\) be a manifold with conformal metric \(c\) and Weyl connection \(\nabla^D\), and \(i : \Sigma \to M\) an immersed submanifold. The Weyl second fundamental form \(B\) is defined in [12] as follows.
For $g \in c$ there is a one-form $\alpha_g$ such that $\nabla^D g = -2\alpha_g \otimes g$. Let $A_g$ be the usual second fundamental form, then
\[ B = A_g - \left( \alpha_g^* \right)^\perp \otimes g. \]
The submanifold is Weyl-minimal if $\text{tr}_{\gamma} B = 0$.

The Eells-Salamon twistor correspondence can be extended as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $(M^4, c, D)$ be a Weyl manifold. There is a complex structure $J_\pm$ on the weightless twistor spaces $Z_\pm$ which gives a 1-to-1 correspondence between non-vertical $J_\pm$-holomorphic curves in $Z_\pm$ and branched Weyl-minimal immersions $\Sigma^2 \to M$.

If the Weyl derivative is exact, this gives the usual correspondence a preferred metric in $c$. The next results are already known for almost-Kähler manifolds.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $(M^4, c, J)$ be a conformally almost-Hermitian manifold. The almost-complex structure gives rise to a $J_+$-holomorphic section of $Z_+$.

This and the previous theorem imply the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.1.** A $\pm J$-holomorphic curve $f : \Sigma \to M$ is a branched Weyl-minimal immersion.

Finally we prove that Webster’s formulas hold for branched Weyl-minimal immersions.

**Theorem 1.3.** For a Riemann surface $(\Sigma, \eta)$ and a conformally almost-Hermitian manifold $(M^4, c, J)$, if $f : \Sigma \to M$ is a branched Weyl-minimal immersion, with $P$ complex points, and $Q$ anti-complex points then
\begin{align*}
\chi(T_f \Sigma) + \chi(N_f \Sigma) &= -P - Q \quad \text{(2)} \\
\chi_1(f^* T(1,0) M) &= P - Q. \quad \text{(3)}
\end{align*}

The adjunction inequality follows from $P$ and $Q$ being positive.

**Corollary 1.2.** For a Riemann surface $(\Sigma, \eta)$ and a conformally almost-Hermitian manifold $(M^4, c, J)$, if $f : \Sigma \to M$ is a branched Weyl-minimal immersion then
\[ \chi(T_f \Sigma) + \chi(N_f \Sigma) \leq \pm \chi_1(f^* T(1,0) M). \]

The corresponding equality holds for $\pm J$-holomorphic curves.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Weyl Geometry

By definition, the **density bundle** on an $n$-dimensional manifold $M$ is $L := |\Lambda^n TM|^\frac{1}{n}$. The tensor bundles $L^w \otimes TM^j \otimes T^* M^k$ are said to have weight $w + j - k$. A **Weyl derivative** $D$ is a connection on the density bundle. A **conformal metric** $c$ is a metric on the weightless tangent bundle $L^{-1} TM$ satisfying the normalizing condition $|\det c| = 1$. This can also be considered as a metric on $TM$ with values in $L^2$. 

Definition 2.1. The triple \((M,c,D)\) is called a \textit{Weyl Manifold}.

The bundle \(L\) is trivial, and a nowhere zero section of \(L\), \(\mu\), is called a \textit{length scale}. This defines a metric in the conformal class \(c\) by \(g_\mu = \mu^{-2}c\). The section \(\mu\) gives a trivialization of \(L\) which has a corresponding trivializing connection \(D^\mu\). This defines a one form \(\alpha_\mu = D - D^\mu\), so that
\[
D(h\mu) = (dh + hD)\mu = (dh + h(\alpha_\mu + D^\mu))\mu = (dh + h\alpha_\mu)\mu.
\]
There is a unique symmetric connection \(\nabla^D\) on \(TM\) making \(c\) parallel,
\[
\nabla^D Y = \nabla^g_Y X + \alpha_\mu(X) Y + \alpha_\mu(Y) X - g_\mu(X,Y)\alpha_\mu^5 g_\mu,
\]
where \(\nabla^g\) is the Levi-Civita connection for the metric \(g_\mu\).

\[\text{2.1.1 Weightless Twistor Space}\]

When \(M\) is oriented, \(c\) defines a section \(\nu_c\) of the orientation bundle \(L^n \Lambda^n T^* M\). This can be used to define the conformal Hodge star
\[
\ast : L^n \Lambda^k T^* M \to L^{m+n-2k} \Lambda^{n-k} T^* M,
\]
where for \(\beta, \gamma \in L^k \Lambda^k T^* M\)
\[
\beta \wedge \ast \gamma = c(\beta, \gamma) \nu_c
\]
For \(n = 4\) and \(m = 0\), \(\ast : \Lambda^2 T^* M \to \Lambda^2 T^* M\) is an involution with \(\pm 1\) eigenspaces \(\Lambda^2_{\pm} T^* M\). The weightless twistor spaces \([1]\) can be constructed as the sphere bundles
\[
\mathcal{Z}_\pm = S(L^2 \Lambda^2_{\pm} T^* M).
\]

We now review the construction of an almost-complex structure \(\mathcal{J}_\pm\) on \(\mathcal{Z}_\pm\). This can be seen by working at a point \(q_\pm \in \mathcal{Z}_\pm\) which projects to \(p \in M\). For \(U\) a neighborhood of \(p\), and a local section \(s_\pm : U \to \mathcal{Z}_{\pm|U}\) satisfying \(s_\pm(p) = q_\pm\), there is a weightless Kähler form \(\sigma_\pm\) given by this section and a corresponding almost-complex structure \(\mathcal{J}_\pm\) on \(T_p M\) given by
\[
\sigma_\pm(X, Y) = c(J_\pm X, Y).
\]
As the fiber of \(\mathcal{Z}_\pm\) at \(p\) is a sphere in \(L^2 \Lambda^2_{\pm} T^*_p M\), the vertical tangent space at \(q_\pm\) is the space perpendicular to \(\sigma_\pm\) in \(L^2 \Lambda^2_{\pm} T^*_p M\). This is the space of weightless \(\mathcal{J}_\pm\)-anti-invariant 2-forms \([3]\).

Definition 2.2. The space of weightless \(\mathcal{J}_\pm\)-anti-invariant 2-forms \(L^2 \Lambda^2_{\pm} \mathcal{J}_p T^*_p M\) is the \((-1)\)-eigenspace for the involution \(I_\pm : L^2 \Lambda^2 T^*_p M \to L^2 \Lambda^2 T^*_p M\) given by \((I_\pm \beta)(X, Y) = \beta(J_\pm X, J_\pm Y)\).

There is an induced almost-complex structure acting on \(\beta \in L^2 \Lambda^2_{\pm} \mathcal{J}_p T^*_p M\) by
\[
(J_\pm \beta)(X, Y) = \beta(J_\pm X, Y).
\]
To see that this is an almost-complex structure, first note that \(J_\pm \beta\) is a two form as
\[
\beta(J_\pm X, Y) = -\beta(Y, J_\pm X) = \beta(J_\pm Y, J_\pm X) = -\beta(J_\pm Y, X).
\]
Second, 
\[ I_\pm J_\pm \beta = J_\pm I_\pm \beta = -J_\pm \beta, \]
so \( J_\pm \beta \in L^2 \Lambda^2 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M \). Finally, it is easily seen that \( J_\pm^2 \beta = -\beta \).

Extending \( \beta \) to be complex bilinear gives
\[
\frac{1}{4} \beta(X + iJ_\pm X, Y + iJ_\pm Y) = \frac{1}{2} (\beta + iJ_\pm \beta)(X, Y),
\]
\[
\frac{1}{4} \beta(X - iJ_\pm X, Y + iJ_\pm Y) = 0.
\]
\[
\frac{1}{4} \beta(X - iJ_\pm X, Y - iJ_\pm Y) = \frac{1}{2} (\beta - iJ_\pm \beta)(X, Y).
\]

Therefore \( \beta \in L^2 (\Lambda^2 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M \oplus \Lambda^0 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M) \). This shows that \( L^2 \Lambda^2 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M \perp \sigma_\pm \) as there is an orthogonal splitting
\[
\Lambda^2 T^*_p M \otimes \mathbb{C} = \Lambda^2 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M \oplus \Lambda^0 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M \oplus \mathbb{C} \sigma_\pm.
\]

Furthermore \( \frac{1}{2}(\beta - iJ_\pm \beta) \in L^2 \Lambda^2 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M \) and \( \frac{1}{2}(\beta + iJ_\pm \beta) \in L^2 \Lambda^0 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M \).

There is an isomorphism, \( \beta \mapsto \beta^v \), from \( L^2 \Lambda^2 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M \) to the vertical tangent space \( V(T_{q_\pm} \mathcal{Z}_\pm) \), so that for \( \beta \in L^2 \Lambda^2 \mathbb{J}_p T^*_p M \) we have \( \beta^v \in V(T_{q_\pm} \mathcal{Z}_\pm) \). This isomorphism and the connection induce an isomorphism, \( X \mapsto X^h \), from \( T_p M \) to the horizontal tangent space \( H(T_{q_\pm} \mathcal{Z}_\pm) \) by
\[
ds_\pm(X) = X^h + (\nabla_X^D \sigma_\pm)^v.
\]
The almost-complex structure on \( \mathcal{Z}_\pm \) is now given by linearly extending
\[
\mathcal{J}_\pm(X^h) := (J_\pm X)^h,
\]
\[
\mathcal{J}_\pm(\beta^v) := (J_\pm \beta)^v.
\]

### 2.1.2 Submanifold Geometry

Let \( (M, c, D) \) be a Weyl manifold, and \( i : \Sigma \to M \) an immersed submanifold. Then \( \Sigma \) inherits a conformal structure \( \tilde{c} \) and Weyl derivative \( \tilde{D} \). One way to see this is to choose a section of \( \alpha \in \Gamma(L) \). Then the metric \( g_\mu \) and the one form \( \alpha_\mu \) can be pulled back to \( \Sigma \) as \( \tilde{g}_\mu = i^* g_\mu \) and \( \tilde{\alpha}_\mu = i^* \alpha_\mu \). Hence \( \tilde{\mu} = |\det \tilde{g}_\mu|^{-1/(2 \dim \Sigma)} \) is a section of the density bundle of \( \Sigma \). The inherited conformal metric is \( \tilde{c} = \tilde{\mu}^2 \tilde{g}_\mu \) and the inherited Weyl derivative is
\[
\tilde{D}(h \tilde{\mu}) = (dh + h \tilde{\alpha}_\mu) \tilde{\mu}.
\]
The connection \( \nabla^D \) on \( \Sigma \) is defined so that \( \tilde{c} \) is parallel,
\[
\nabla^D_X Y = \nabla_X^D Y + \tilde{\alpha}_\mu(X) Y + \tilde{\alpha}_\mu(Y) X - (X, Y)_{g_\mu} \tilde{\alpha}^\mu_{2}\mu.
\]
The Weyl second fundamental form \([12]\) is given by
\[
B^D(X, Y) = \nabla^D_X Y - \nabla^D_Y X.
\]
Equivalently, for \( A_\mu = \nabla^{g_\mu} - \nabla^{g_\mu} \)

\[
B^D(X, Y) = A_{g_\mu}(X, Y) - \langle X, Y \rangle_{g_\mu} \left( \alpha_{\mu}^{g_{g_\mu}} \right)^\perp.
\]

The Weyl mean curvature is

\[
H^D = \frac{1}{\dim\Sigma}\text{tr}_{g_\mu}B^D = H_{g_\mu} - \left( \alpha_{\mu}^{g_{g_\mu}} \right)^\perp,
\]

where \( H_{g_\mu} \) is the usual mean curvature of \( \Sigma \) with respect to the metric \( g_\mu \).

**Definition 2.3.** The immersion \( i: \Sigma \to M \) is Weyl-minimal if \( H^D = 0 \).

The harmonic map equation can also be generalized to this setting. In \([7]\) the second fundamental form of a map \( f: \Sigma \to M \) is defined for manifolds \( \Sigma \) and \( M \) with torsion-free connections \( \nabla^\Sigma \) and \( \nabla^M \). If \( \nabla \) is the induced connection on \( T^*\Sigma \otimes f^*TM \), then the second fundamental form is just \( \nabla df \). If \( \eta \) is a metric on \( \Sigma \) then the tension of the map can be defined as

\[
\tau(\eta, \nabla^\Sigma, \nabla^M) = \text{tr}_\eta \nabla df.
\]

A map is psuedo-harmonic if the tension field is zero. We study the case where the domain \((\Sigma, \eta)\) is a Riemannian manifold with its Levi-Civita connection \( \nabla^\eta \) and the target manifold \((M, c, D)\) is a Weyl manifold. This is opposite of the case studied in \([7]\), where the domain is Weyl and the target is Riemannian.

**Definition 2.4.** A map \( f: \Sigma \to M \) is Weyl-harmonic if \( \tau(\eta, \nabla^\eta, \nabla^D) = 0 \).

From this point we only consider the case where \( \Sigma \) has dimension two. Using local isothermal coordinates on \( \Sigma \) so that \( \eta = e^{2\lambda}(dx^2 + dy^2) \), the tension field is

\[
\tau(\eta, \nabla^\eta, \nabla^D) = e^{-2\lambda}(\nabla^D_{\partial_x}f_x + \nabla^D_{\partial_y}f_y),
\]

where \( f_x = df(\partial_x) \). In terms of the complex coordinate \( z = x + iy \) this is just

\[
\tau(\eta, \nabla^\eta, \nabla^D) = e^{-2\lambda}\nabla^D_{\partial_z}f_x.
\]

This can also be written more explicitly as

\[
\tau(\eta, \nabla^\eta, \nabla^D) = e^{-2\lambda}(\nabla^g_{\partial_x}f_x + \nabla^g_{\partial_y}f_y + 2\alpha_\mu(f_x)f_x + 2\alpha_\mu(f_y)f_y - (|f_x|^2_{g_\mu} + |f_y|^2_{g_\mu})\alpha_{\mu}^{g_{g_\mu}}).
\]

We are also interested in the case where \( f \) is weakly conformal.

**Definition 2.5.** A map \( f: \Sigma \to M \) is weakly conformal if it is conformal whenever \( df \neq 0 \).

If \( z = x + iy \) is a complex coordinate on \( \Sigma \) so that \( \eta = e^{2\lambda}(dx^2 + dy^2) \), then the equations

\[
\eta(\partial_x, \partial_y) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(\partial_x, \partial_x) = \eta(\partial_y, \partial_y)
\]

are conformally invariant. If \( f \) is weakly conformal then this implies that

\[
c(f_x, f_y) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c(f_x, f_x) = c(f_y, f_y).
\]

Extending \( c \) to be complex bilinear, these are equivalent to the equation

\[
c(f_z, f_z) = 0,
\]

where \( f_z = \frac{1}{2}(f_x - if_y) \). Any point where \( df \) is not full rank is called a singular point. A branch point \( p \) is a singular point where in some neighborhood of \( p \), \( f_z = z^kZ \) and \( Z_p \neq 0 \).
Proposition 2.1. If $f : \Sigma \to M$ is weakly conformal, Weyl-harmonic, and non-constant, then $df$ is rank 2 except at an isolated set of branch points.

Proof. Like the harmonic map equation, the Weyl-harmonic map equation can be written as the Laplace equation plus terms quadratic in $df$. Thus the hypotheses of Aronzajn’s unique continuation theorem and the Hartman-Wintner theorem [10] are still satisfied in the Weyl-harmonic case. As $f$ is non-constant, Aronzajn’s theorem implies that $df$ is not zero on an open set. By the Hartman-Wintner Theorem, at every point there is an integer $m \geq 1$ so that in an isothermal coordinate chart,

$$f(x, y) = h(x, y) + o(|(x, y)|^m) \quad \text{and} \quad df(x, y) = dh(x, y) + o(|(x, y)|^{m-1}).$$

for some non-zero homogeneous degree $m$ polynomial $h$. The zeros of $dh$ are isolated, so the zeros of $df$ must be as well. In fact, $h$ must also be weakly conformal and harmonic, thus the only zeros of $dh$ are branch point singularities. Details and further analysis of the structure of these branch points is contained in [11].

Proposition 2.2. If $f : \Sigma \to M$ is weakly conformal and Weyl-harmonic then $f$ is a branched Weyl-minimal immersion.

Proof. In this case,

$$\tau(\eta, \nabla^\eta, \nabla^D) = e^{-2\lambda}(|f_x|^2_{g_\mu} + |f_y|^2_{g_\mu}) \left( H_{g_\mu} - \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial g_\mu} \right)^{-1} \right).$$

Comparing this with equation (7) we see that $\tau(\eta, \nabla^\eta, \nabla^D)$ if and only if $H^D = 0$. □

There is a splitting $TM = T_f \Sigma \oplus N_f \Sigma$, where $T_f \Sigma = df(T\Sigma)$ away from the branch points. At a branch point $p$, $f_z = z^k Z$, $Z_p \neq 0$, and $T_f \Sigma = \text{span}\{\text{Re}(Z_p), \text{Im}(Z_p)\}$. In both cases $N_f \Sigma$ is the orthogonal complement of $T_f \Sigma$.

Definition 2.6. For $M$ oriented, the twistor lifts of $f$, $\tilde{f}_\pm : \Sigma \to Z_\pm$ are determined by two complex structures on $f^*TM$. There are two orthogonal complex structures $J_\pm$ which agree with the complex structure of $\Sigma$ on $T_f \Sigma$. The complex structure $J_+$ preserves the orientation while $J_-$ is orientation reversing. The corresponding weightless Kähler form is then

$$\tilde{f}_\pm = c(J_\pm \cdot, \cdot)$$

The complex structures $J_\pm$ determine a splitting of $f^*TM \otimes \mathbb{C} = f^*T^{(1,0)}_\pm M \oplus f^*T^{(0,1)}_\pm M$.

2.2 Conformally Almost-Hermitian Manifolds

A conformally almost-Hermitian manifold $(M^4, J, c)$ is an almost-complex manifold with a conformal structure satisfying

$$c(X, Y) = c(JX, JY).$$

The conformal Kähler form $\omega_c = c(J \cdot, \cdot)$ can be viewed as a 2-form with values in $L^2$. Then there is a unique Weyl derivative satisfying $d^D \omega_c = 0$. Fixing $\mu \in \Gamma(L)$ we can define this Weyl derivative using the Lee form

$$\theta_\mu = J \delta_{g_\mu} \omega_\mu = - (\delta_{g_\mu} \omega_\mu) J,$$
with $\delta_{g_\mu}$ denoting the divergence and $\omega_{g_\mu} = \mu^2 \omega_\mu$. In terms of an orthonormal coframe $\{e^i\}$ of $g_\mu$ satisfying

$$\omega_\mu = e^1 \wedge e^2 + e^3 \wedge e^4,$$

and $a_i = \langle e_i, \delta_{g_\mu} \omega_\mu \rangle_{g_\mu}$ one can check that

$$d\omega_\mu = a_1 e^2 \wedge e^3 \wedge e^4 - a_2 e^1 \wedge e^3 \wedge e^4 + a_3 e^1 \wedge e^2 \wedge e^4 - a_4 e^1 \wedge e^2 \wedge e^3.$$

Then the Lee form is

$$\theta_\mu = -J \ast d\omega_\mu = J(a_1 e^1 + a_2 e^2 + a_3 e^3 + a_4 e^4) = a_1 e^2 - a_2 e^1 + a_3 e^4 - a_4 e^3,$$

furthermore

$$\theta_\mu \wedge \omega_\mu = d\omega_\mu.$$

Then for Weyl derivative $D = d + \alpha_\mu$,

$$d^D \omega = d^D \mu^2 \omega_\mu = 2\mu D(\mu) \omega + \mu^2 d\omega = 2\mu^2 \alpha_\mu \wedge \omega_\mu + \mu^2 \theta_\mu \wedge \omega_\mu.$$ 

The canonical Weyl derivative of $(M, c, J)$ is then determined by setting $\alpha_\mu = -\frac{1}{2} \theta_\mu$. The induced connection on $TM$ is given by

$$\nabla^D_X Y = \nabla^g_X Y - \frac{1}{2} \theta_\mu(X) Y - \frac{1}{2} \theta_\mu(Y) X + \frac{1}{2} \langle X, Y \rangle_{g_\mu} \theta_\mu.$$

The Nijenhuis Tensor of $J$ is given by


This is $J$ antilinear in both slots, that is $N(JX, Y) = -JN(X, Y) = N(X, JY)$. For any vector field, $X$, $\nabla^D_X J$ is also $J$ antilinear.

**Proposition 2.3.** For any almost-Hermitian manifold

$$\langle N(X, Y), JZ \rangle_{g_\mu} = d\omega_\mu(X, Y, Z) - d\omega_\mu(JX, JY, Z) - 2\langle (\nabla^g_X J)X, Y \rangle_{g_\mu}.$$

This is proposition 4.2 in [6] with different conventions. The corresponding formula for conformally almost-Hermitian manifolds with a Weyl derivative is

$$c(N(X, Y), JZ) = d^D \omega_c(X, Y, Z) - d^D \omega_c(JX, JY, Z) - 2c((\nabla^g_X J)X, Y).$$

**Proposition 2.4.** For any conformally almost-Hermitian manifold with canonical Weyl derivative $D$,

$$c(N(X, Y), JZ) = -2c((\nabla^D_X J)X, Y).$$

**Corollary 2.1.** The global section $s : M \to \mathcal{Z}_+$ defined by $\omega_c$ is $J\mathcal{J}_+$-holomorphic.

**Proof.** Letting $X, Y, Z \in TM$, by the proposition,

$$\nabla^D_Z \omega_c)(X, Y) = -\frac{1}{2} c(N(X, Y), JZ),$$

and by the symmetries of the Nijenhuis tensor,

$$\nabla^D_Z \omega_c)(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2} c(N(X, Y), Z) = \frac{1}{2} c(JN(X, Y), JZ) = -\frac{1}{2} c(N(JX, Y), JZ).$$

Therefore $(\nabla^D_Z \omega_c) = \mathcal{J}_+(\nabla^g_Z \omega_c)$, and by equations (4), (5), and (6)

$$ds(JZ) = (JZ)^h + (\nabla^D_{JZ} \omega_c)^v = \mathcal{J}_+ Z^h + \mathcal{J}_+(\nabla^D_Z \omega_c)^v = \mathcal{J}_+ ds(Z).$$

□
3 Main Theorems

3.1 Twistor Correspondence

Following [4] we now show there is a correspondence between weakly conformal Weyl-harmonic maps and non-vertical $J_\pm$-holomorphic maps into the weightless twistor space with Eells-Salamon complex structure on the fibers.

The twistor lifts of a weakly conformal map $f : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ are given by

$$\tilde{f}_\pm = \left( \frac{(1 \pm \ast) f_z \wedge f_{\bar{z}}}{ic(f_z, f_{\bar{z}})} \right)^{b_c},$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$. The natural isomorphism $b_c : L^{-1}TM \rightarrow LT^*M$ preserves weights, but interchanges the holomorphic and anti-holomorphic spaces.

**Theorem 3.1.** A weakly conformal map $f : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ is Weyl-harmonic if and only if the twistor lifts $\tilde{f}_\pm : \Sigma \rightarrow Z_\pm$ are $J_\pm$-holomorphic.

**Proof.** The twistor lifts $\tilde{f}_\pm$ are $J_\pm$-holomorphic provided $d\tilde{f}_\pm(\partial_z) \in T^{(1,0)}Z_\pm$. We have

$$d\tilde{f}_\pm(\partial_z) = (f_z)^h + \left( \nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} \tilde{f}_\pm \right)^v,$$

and since $f_z \in T^{(1,0)}M$, we have $(f_z)^h \in H(T^{(1,0)}Z_\pm)$. Thus all that is required is $\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} \tilde{f}_\pm \in T^{(0,2)}M$. We find that

$$(\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} \tilde{f}_\pm)_{\pm}^{(0,2)} = \left( \frac{\sqrt{2} f_z \wedge (\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} f_{\bar{z}})_{\pm}^{(1,0)}}{ic(f_z, f_{\bar{z}})} \right)^{b_c},$$

$$(\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} \tilde{f}_\pm)_{\pm}^{(1,1)} = 0,$$

$$(\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} \tilde{f}_\pm)_{\pm}^{(2,0)} = \left( \frac{\sqrt{2}(\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} f_{\bar{z}})_{\pm}^{(0,1)} \wedge f_z}{ic(f_z, f_{\bar{z}})} \right)^{b_c}.$$ 

It follows that $\tilde{f}_\pm$ is pseudo-holomorphic map if and only if $(\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} f_{\bar{z}})_{\pm}^{(1,0)} = kf_z$, for some function $k$. Taking the conformal inner-product with $f_{\bar{z}}$ gives

$$c((\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} f_{\bar{z}})_{\pm}^{(1,0)}, f_{\bar{z}}) = kc(f_z, f_{\bar{z}}).$$

Since $f_{\bar{z}} \in T^{(0,1)}M$ this is just

$$c(\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} f_{\bar{z}}, f_{\bar{z}}) = kc(f_z, f_{\bar{z}}),$$

and since $c$ is $\nabla^D$ parallel we have

$$\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} c(f_z, f_{\bar{z}}) = 2kc(f_z, f_{\bar{z}}).$$

For $f$ weakly conformal, this shows that $k = 0$. Therefore $\tilde{f}_\pm$ is $J$-holomorphic if and only if $(\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} f_{\bar{z}})_{\pm}^{(1,0)} = 0$, but since $\nabla^{D}_{\partial_z} f_{\bar{z}}$ is real, this can only be true when it is zero. $\square$
Corollary 3.1. There is a one-to-one correspondence between weakly conformal Weyl-harmonic maps to $M$ and non-vertical $J$-holomorphic maps to the twistor space.

Proof. It only remains to show that for a non-vertical $J$-holomorphic curve, $\phi: \Sigma \to Z_\pm$ the projection $\bar{\phi}: \Sigma \to M$ is weakly conformal and Weyl-harmonic. It is clearly weakly conformal as $\bar{\phi}$ is holomorphic with respect to the complex structure defined by $\phi$, which implies $c(\bar{\phi}_z, \bar{\phi}_z) = 0$. It is Weyl-harmonic as $\phi$ is its twistor lift and is $J$-holomorphic.

Corollary 3.2. The $J$-holomorphic curves $f: \Sigma \to M$ are weakly conformal and Weyl-harmonic.

Proof. The composition with the section $s: M \to Z_+$ determined by $J$ is a $J_+$-holomorphic curve of $Z_+$.

3.2 Adjunction Inequality

In this section we fix a metric $g$ in the conformal class. For a holomorphic normal coordinate $z$ on $\Sigma$, split $f_z$ into its holomorphic and antiholomorphic parts

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(f_z - iJf_z) \quad \bar{\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(f_z + iJf_z),$$

we have

$$\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle = 0 = \langle \beta, \beta \rangle.$$

When $f$ is weakly conformal, this implies that

$$\langle \alpha, \bar{\beta} \rangle = 0.$$

Thus $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are Hermitian orthogonal and away from their zeros span the holomorphic tangent bundle $f^*T^{(1,0)}M$. The Weyl-harmonic map equation in coordinates is

$$\nabla_{\partial_z}^D f_z = 0.$$

Since $\nabla^D$ does not preserve the almost-complex structure, we write the equation using the connection $\nabla^{D,J}$, given by

$$\nabla^{D,J}_X Y = \nabla^{D}_X Y - \frac{1}{2}J(\nabla^{D}_X J)Y.$$

This connection preserves the complex structure, and thus preserves the holomorphic and anti-holomorphic tangent spaces. In terms of this connection the Weyl-harmonic map equation is

$$\nabla^{D,J}_{\partial_z} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{2}J(\nabla^{D,J}_{\partial_z} J) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z}.$$

Since $\nabla^{D,J}_{\partial_z} J$ is $J$ anti-linear, it maps from $T^{(1,0)}M$ to $T^{(0,1)}M$ and from $T^{(0,1)}M$ to $T^{(1,0)}M$. The Weyl-harmonic map equation can then be written in terms of $\alpha$ and $\bar{\beta}$ as

$$\nabla^{D,J}_{\partial_z} \alpha = -\frac{i}{2}(\nabla^{D,J}_{\partial_z} J)\bar{\beta},$$

$$\nabla^{D,J}_{\partial_z} \bar{\beta} = \frac{i}{2}(\nabla^{D,J}_{\partial_z} J)\alpha.$$
Using proposition 2.4, a weakly conformal Weyl-harmonic map must satisfy
\[
\langle \nabla_{\partial_z}^D \alpha, \bar{\alpha} \rangle = -\frac{i}{2} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z}^D J) \bar{\beta}, \bar{\alpha} \rangle, \quad \langle \nabla_{\partial_z}^D \alpha, \bar{\beta} \rangle = -\frac{i}{2} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z}^D J) \bar{\beta}, \bar{\beta} \rangle, \\
= \frac{i}{4} \langle N (\bar{\beta}, \bar{\alpha}) , J f_z \rangle, \quad \langle \nabla_{\partial_z}^D \alpha, \bar{\beta} \rangle = \frac{i}{4} \langle N (\bar{\beta}, \bar{\beta}) , J f_z \rangle, \\
= \frac{1}{4} \langle N (\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) , \bar{\alpha} \rangle, \quad \langle \nabla_{\partial_z}^D \alpha, \bar{\beta} \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \langle N (\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) , \bar{\beta} \rangle = 0,
\]
where the last line follows from \( \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta} \in f^*T^{(0,1)}M \), which implies \( N (\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) \in f^*T^{(1,0)}M \). This implies that away from the zeros of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \),
\[
\nabla_{\partial_z}^D \bar{\alpha} = \frac{\langle N (\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}), \bar{\alpha} \rangle}{4 \| \alpha \|^2} \alpha.
\]
Similarly
\[
\langle \nabla_{\partial_z}^D \bar{\beta}, \beta \rangle = \frac{i}{2} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z}^D J) \alpha, \beta \rangle, \quad \langle \nabla_{\partial_z}^D \beta, \alpha \rangle = \frac{i}{2} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_z}^D J) \alpha, \alpha \rangle, \\
= -\frac{i}{4} \langle N (\alpha, \beta) , J f_z \rangle, \quad \langle \nabla_{\partial_z}^D \beta, \alpha \rangle = -\frac{i}{4} \langle N (\alpha, \alpha) , J f_z \rangle, \\
= \frac{1}{4} \langle N (\alpha, \beta) , \beta \rangle, \quad \langle \nabla_{\partial_z}^D \beta, \beta \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \langle N (\alpha, \beta) , \beta \rangle = 0.
\]
This gives
\[
\nabla_{\partial_z}^D \bar{\beta} = \frac{\langle N (\alpha, \beta), \beta \rangle}{4 \| \beta \|^2} \beta.
\]
By the Koszul-Malgrange theorem \[8\], there are holomorphic structures on \( f^*T^{(1,0)}M \) and \( f^*T^{(0,1)}M \) so that
\[
\bar{\partial} X = \nabla_{\partial_z}^D J X \otimes d\bar{z}.
\]
Then for a Weyl-harmonic map
\[
\bar{\partial} \alpha = \frac{\langle N (\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}), \bar{\alpha} \rangle}{4 \| \alpha \|^2} \alpha \otimes d\bar{z}, \quad \bar{\partial} \bar{\beta} = \frac{\langle N (\alpha, \beta), \bar{\beta} \rangle}{4 \| \beta \|^2} \bar{\beta} \otimes d\bar{z}.
\]
The Bers-Vekua similarity principle (see \[5\]) implies that near any point \( p \in \Sigma \) we have
\[
\alpha = \gamma_p e^{\sigma_p}, \quad \bar{\beta} = \delta_p e^{\tau_p},
\]
for some local holomorphic sections \( \gamma_p \) of \( f^*T^{(1,0)}M \), \( \delta_p \) of \( f^*T^{(0,1)}M \), and some bounded functions \( \sigma_p, \tau_p \). This can be used to define the indices
\[
R = \sum_{f_z (p) = 0} \text{ord}_p (f_z) \geq 0, \tag{18}
Q = \sum_{\alpha (p) = 0} \text{ord}_p (\gamma_p) - R \geq 0, \tag{19}
P = \sum_{\beta (p) = 0} \text{ord}_p (\delta_p) - R \geq 0. \tag{20}
\]
These are the total ramification index $R$, the number of anti-complex points $Q$, and the number of complex points $P$. Following [4], these determine the degrees of the line bundles spanned by the vector valued one forms $f_zdz$, $\alpha dz$ and $\beta dz$ respectively. If $[f_z]$, $[\alpha]$, and $[\beta]$ are line bundles generated by the locally defined sections then we have

$$R = -\chi(\Sigma) + c_1([f_z]),$$
$$Q + R = -\chi(\Sigma) + c_1([\alpha]),$$
$$P + R = -\chi(\Sigma) - c_1([\beta]).$$

We also have $f^*T^{(1,0)}M = [\alpha] \oplus [\beta]$, and since $\alpha$ and $\beta$ span a negatively oriented, maximal isotropic subspace of $f^*TM \otimes \mathbb{C}$ which contains $f_z$, it must be that $f^*T^{-1,0}_M = [\alpha] \oplus [\beta]$. Therefore we have

$$c_1(f^*T^{(1,0)}M) = Q - P,$$
$$c_1(f^*T^{-1,0}_M) = Q + P + 2R + 2\chi(\Sigma),$$
$$= Q + P + 2c_1([f_z]),$$
$$= Q + P + 2\chi(T_\Sigma).$$

Since $c_1(f^*T^{-1,0}_M) = \chi(T_\Sigma) - \chi(N_\Sigma)$ we now have the Webster’s formulas

$$c_1(f^*T^{(1,0)}M) = Q - P;$$
$$\chi(T_\Sigma) + \chi(N_\Sigma) = -P - Q. \quad (21)$$

Since $P$ and $Q$ are both non-negative, this gives the adjunction inequalities.

$$\chi(T_\Sigma) + \chi(N_\Sigma) + c_1(f^*T^{(1,0)}M) = -2P \leq 0; \quad (23)$$
$$\chi(T_\Sigma) + \chi(N_\Sigma) - c_1(f^*T^{(1,0)}M) = -2Q \leq 0. \quad (24)$$

4 Examples

4.1 Exact and Closed Weyl Derivatives

If $(M, c, D)$ is a Weyl manifold and there is a length scale $\mu$ so that $\alpha_\mu$ is exact, then $D$ is called exact. If $\alpha_\mu = du$, then $D = D e^{-\mu} \mu$ and the Weyl-minimal surfaces are just the minimal surfaces for the metric $g e^{-\mu} = e^{2u}g^\mu$. Similarly, if $\alpha_\mu$ is closed then $D$ is called closed. In this case, if $f : \Sigma \to M$ is a Weyl-minimal branched immersion then there is a lift to the universal cover $\tilde{f} : \tilde{\Sigma} \to \tilde{M}$. The conformal metric and Weyl Derivative can be lifted to $\tilde{M}$ and the closed Weyl derivative becomes exact. Thus $\tilde{f}$ is a minimal surface for a metric in the lifted conformal class.
4.2 Hopf Surfaces

The primary Hopf surface $M = S^1 \times S^3$ is fibered over $S^2$ with fiber $T^2$. The bundle projection is just the projection to the $S^3$ component followed by the Hopf map. There is a Hermitian structure on $M$ induced by the standard Hermitian structures on the base and fiber. The Lee form is just $d\phi$, where $\phi$ is the angle along $S^1$. Every fiber is $J$-holomorphic and is therefore Weyl-minimal. It is also minimal as $\theta^2$ is tangent to the fiber.

In addition, there is a Lagrangian Weyl-minimal surface for every great circle $\gamma$ in the base $S^2$. To see this consider the Clifford torus in $S^3$ which maps to $\gamma$ under the Hopf map. This torus contains two great circles on $S^3$, one tangent to the fiber and one perpendicular to the fiber. The great circle perpendicular to the fiber times the product $S^1$ gives a Lagrangian totally geodesic $T^2$ to which $\theta^2$ is tangent, and is therefore Weyl-minimal.

Since $\theta = d\phi$ is closed we can look at the universal cover $\tilde{M} = \mathbb{R} \times S^3$. Using $\phi$ as the coordinate on $\mathbb{R}$ the metric is just
\[
g_{\tilde{M}} = d\phi^2 + g_{S^3}.
\]
Therefore the Weyl-minimal surfaces will lift to minimal surfaces of the conformal metric
\[
e^{2\phi}g_{\tilde{M}} = e^{2\phi}d\phi^2 + e^{2\phi}g_{S^3} = (de^\phi)^2 + e^{2\phi}g_{S^3}.
\]
Using the new coordinate $r = e^\phi$ this is just the (incomplete) flat metric on $\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus 0 \cong \tilde{M}$.
\[

\]

Any surface lifted from $M$ will be invariant under deck transformation $\phi \mapsto \phi + 2\pi$ or $r \mapsto e^{2\pi}r$. The Weyl-minimal surfaces described above correspond to the planes through the origin in $\mathbb{R}^4$.

4.3 $U(1) \times U(1)$ Principal Bundles over a Riemann Surface

Let $p : M \to \Sigma$ be a $U(1) \times U(1)$ principal bundle over a Riemann surface $\Sigma$ with volume form $\omega_\Sigma$. If $i\beta$ is a connection form then $\beta$ is an $\mathbb{R}^2$-valued form with components $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$. If $\bar{\omega}_\Sigma = p^*\omega_\Sigma$ then $d\beta = F\bar{\omega}_\Sigma$ where $F = (F_1, F_2) : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^2$. The Kähler form $\omega = \beta_1 \wedge \beta_2 + \bar{\omega}_\Sigma$ has exterior derivative
\[
d\omega = (F_1\beta_2 - F_2\beta_1) \wedge \bar{\omega}_\Sigma = (F_1\beta_2 - F_2\beta_1) \wedge \omega.
\]
Therefore the Lee form is $\theta = F_1\beta_2 - F_2\beta_1$. For a constant curvature connection, this will be closed. The Hopf surface is a special case for this example where $\Sigma = S^2$ with the round metric, and $M$ has associated bundle $M \times \mathbb{C}^2 / U(1) \times U(1) = \mathbb{C} \oplus K$. As in that case, the fiber is always a $J$-holomorphic curve and therefore Weyl-minimal. If a closed geodesic on $\gamma : S^1 \to \Sigma$ has a closed horizontal lift $\tilde{\gamma}$ and the connection has constant curvature then $\tilde{\gamma}(s) \cdot (e^{-iF_2t}, e^{iF_1t})$ parametrizes a Lagrangian minimal torus on $M$ to which $\theta^2$ is tangent, and thus Weyl-minimal.
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