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ABSTRACT. In this paper, we generalize the Cartan-Ambrose-Hicks
theorem to the case of isometric immersions which contains the
fundamental theorem of submanifolds as a special case.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is clear that isometric mappings between two Riemannian mani-
folds will preserve the curvature tensors of the two Riemannian mani-
folds. It was Cartan [3] first give a converse of this fact in local setting.
This result is nowadays called Cartan’s lemma. In 1956, Ambrose [1]
extended the result to a global setting under the assumptions of simply
connectedness and that curvature tensors are preserved by parallel dis-
placements along broken geodesics. Finally, in 1959, Hicks [4] extend-
ed Ambrose’s result to the case of affine manifolds. Note that Cartan’s
lemma is not a special case of Ambrose’s theorem, because one only
need to check the curvature condition for all geodesics starting from a
given point in Cartan’s lemma while in Ambrose’s theorem, one is re-
quired to check the curvature condition for all broken geodesics starting
from a given point. We would also like to mention that an alternative
proof of Ambrose’s result was given by O’Neil in [6] and in [2], the au-
thors obtained a more general Cartan-Ambrose-Hicks theorem in the
setting of principal fibre bundles.

In [7], we gave an alternative form of the Cartan-Ambrose-Hicks
theorem with an alternative proof by using development of curves. The
result is as follows:

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \((M^n, g)\) and \((\tilde{M}^n, \tilde{g})\) be two Rimannian manifolds
(not necessary complete and may have boundary). Let \(p \in M \setminus \partial M\)
\((\partial M = \emptyset \text{ when } M \text{ is a manifold without boundary}), \tilde{p} \in \tilde{M}\) and \(\varphi :\)
$T_pM \to T_{\tilde{p}}\tilde{M}$ be a linear isometry. Suppose that $M$ is simply connected and for any smooth interior curve $\gamma : [0,1] \to M$ with $\gamma(0) = p$, the development $\bar{\gamma}$ of $\varphi(\gamma)$ exists in $\tilde{M}$. Here

$$v_\gamma(t) = P^0_t(\gamma)(\gamma'(t))$$

for $t \in [0,1]$. Moreover, suppose that $\tau_\gamma^* R_{\tilde{M}} = R_M$ for any smooth interior curve $\gamma : [0,1] \to M$ where

$$\tau_\gamma = P^1_0(\bar{\gamma}) \circ \varphi \circ P^0(\gamma).$$

Here, a curve $\gamma : [0,1] \to M$ is said to be an interior curve if $\gamma(t) \in M \setminus \partial M$ for any $t \in [0,1]$. Then, the map $f(\gamma(1)) = \bar{\gamma}(1)$ from $M$ to $\tilde{M}$ is well defined and $f$ is the local isometry from $M$ to $\tilde{M}$ with $f(p) = \tilde{p}$ and $f_* p = \varphi$.

Recall that the development of a curve $v : [0,T] \to T_pM$ is the curve $\gamma : [0,T] \to M$ such that

$$\gamma(0) = p \text{ and } \gamma'(t) = P^0_t(\gamma)(v(t)) \text{ for any } t \in [0,T],$$

where $P^0_t(\gamma)$ means the parallel displacement from $\gamma(0)$ to $\gamma(t)$ along $\gamma$ (see [5]).

It seems that Theorem 1.1 is more restricted than Ambrose's result because it requires to check the curvature condition for any smooth curves while Ambrose's result only requires to check the curvature condition for broken geodesics. However, because broken geodesics are dense in the space of piece-wise smooth curves, the curvature condition will be true for any smooth curve when it is true for any broken geodesics. So, the complexity to check the curvature condition in Theorem 1.1 and in Ambrose's theorem is the same.

In this paper, motivated by our previous work, we extend the Cartan-Ambrose-Hicks theorem to the case of isometric immersions by generalizing the notion of developments of curves to the positive dimensional case.

Intuitively, for the generalization of developments, we want to recover parallel placements on submanifolds or on the normal vector bundles by just using the second fundamental form. The formal definition is as follows:

**Definition 1.1.** Let $(\tilde{M}^{n+r}, \tilde{g})$ be a Riemannian manifold and $\tilde{p} \in \tilde{M}$. Let $T_{\tilde{p}}\tilde{M} = T^n \oplus N^r$ be an orthogonal decomposition of $T_{\tilde{p}}\tilde{M}$ and $\hat{h}(t) : [0,b] \to \text{Hom}(T \odot T, N)$ and $\hat{v} : [0,b] \to T$ be smooth maps. Let $\hat{e}_1, \hat{e}_2, \cdots, \hat{e}_n$ be an orthonormal basis of $T$ and let $\hat{e}_{n+1}, \cdots, \hat{e}_{n+r}$ be an
folds (not necessary complete and may have boundaries). Let developments. We will then denote the curve \( \tilde{\gamma} : [0, T] \to \tilde{M} \) satisfies the following equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\tilde{E}_i &= \sum_{\alpha=n+1}^{n+r} \left\langle \tilde{h}(t)(\tilde{v}(t), \tilde{e}_i), \tilde{e}_\alpha \right\rangle \tilde{E}_\alpha \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \\
\nabla_{\gamma}(t)A &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\langle \tilde{h}(t)(\tilde{v}(t), \tilde{e}_i), \tilde{e}_\alpha \right\rangle \tilde{E}_i \\
\tilde{\gamma}'(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\langle \tilde{v}(t), \tilde{e}_i \right\rangle \tilde{E}_i \\
\tilde{\gamma}(0) &= \tilde{p} \\
\tilde{E}_A(0) &= \tilde{e}_A
\end{align*}
\]

is called a generalized development of \( \tilde{v} \) and \( \tilde{h} \). Here \( T \circ T \) means the symmetric product of \( T \).

It is not hard to see that the definition above is independent of the choices of the orthonormal basis \( \tilde{e}_1, \tilde{e}_2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_{n+r} \). Moreover, it is also not hard to see that the map \( D^0_{\tilde{h}}(\tilde{\gamma}) : T_p\tilde{M} \to T_{\tilde{\gamma}(t)}\tilde{M} \) defined by sending \( \sum_{A=1}^{n+r} c_Ae_A \) to \( \sum_{A=1}^{n+r} c_A\tilde{E}_A(t) \) is also independent of the choices of orthonormal basis. When \( \tilde{h} = 0 \), one can see that the generalized developments of curves are just the same as the classical developments of curves and in this case, \( D^0_{\tilde{h}}(\tilde{\gamma}) = P^0_{\tilde{h}}(\tilde{\gamma}) \). By a similar argument as in [7], one can show the local existence and uniqueness of the generalized developments. We will then denote the curve \( \tilde{\gamma} \) in Definition 1.1 as \( \text{dev}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{h}) \) when it exists.

We are now ready to state the main result of this paper, a Cartan-Ambrose-Hicks theorem for isometric immersions.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \((M^n, g)\) and \((\tilde{M}^{n+r}, \tilde{g})\) be two Riemannian manifolds (not necessary complete and may have boundaries). Let \((V^r, h, D)\) be a Riemannian vector bundle with a compatible connection \( D \) on \( M \), and \( h \in \Gamma(TM \otimes TM, V) \). Let \( p \in M \setminus \partial M, \tilde{p} \in \tilde{M} \), and \( \varphi : T_pM \oplus V_p \to T_{\tilde{p}}\tilde{M} \) be a linear isometry with \( T = \varphi(T_pM) \) and \( N = \varphi(V_p) \). Suppose that \( M \) is simply connected and for any smooth interior curve \( \gamma : [0, 1] \to M \) with \( \gamma(0) = p \), the generalized development \( \tilde{\gamma} \) of \( \tilde{v} \) and \( \tilde{h} \) exists in \( \tilde{M} \). Here

\[
\tilde{v}(t) = \varphi \left( P^0_\gamma(\gamma'(t)) \right)
\]

and

\[
\tilde{h}(t) = (\varphi^{-1})^*P^0_\gamma h
\]

for \( t \in [0, 1] \). Moreover, suppose that
(1) for any $X, Y, Z \in T$ and $\xi \in N$,
\[
\tilde{R}(D^1_0(\tilde{\gamma})(\xi), D^1_0(\tilde{\gamma})X, D^1_0(\tilde{\gamma})(Y), D^1_0(\tilde{\gamma})(Z)) = 0,
\]
where $\tilde{R}$ means the curvature tensor of $\tilde{M}$;

(2) for any $X, Y, Z, W \in T_{\gamma(1)}M$,
\[
R(X, Y, Z, W) = \tau^*_\gamma \tilde{R}(X, Y, Z, W) + \langle h(X, W), h(Y, Z) \rangle - \langle h(X, Z), h(Y, W) \rangle,
\]
where $R$ is the curvature tensor of $M$;

(3) for any $X, Y \in T_{\gamma(1)}M$ and $\xi, \eta \in V_{\gamma(1)}$,
\[
R^V(\xi, \eta, X, Y) = \tau^*_\gamma \tilde{R}(\xi, \eta, X, Y) + \langle A_\xi(Y), A_\eta(X) \rangle - \langle A_\eta(Y), A_\xi(X) \rangle,
\]
where $R^V$ is the curvature tensor of the vector bundle $V$ and $A_\xi(X)$ is defined by
\[
\langle A_\xi(X), Y \rangle = \langle h(X, Y), \xi \rangle
\]
for any tangent vectors $X, Y$ of $M$ and any vector $\xi$ of $V$;

(4) $(D_X h)(Y, Z) = (D_Y h)(X, Z)$ for any tangent vectors $X, Y, Z$ of $M$,

for any smooth interior curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \to M$ where
\[
\tau_\gamma = D^1_0(\tilde{\gamma}) \circ \varphi \circ P^0_1(\gamma) : T_{\gamma(1)}M \oplus V_{\gamma(1)} \to T_{\tilde{\gamma}(1)}\tilde{M}.
\]

Then, the map $f(\gamma(1)) = \tilde{\gamma}(1)$ from $M$ to $\tilde{M}$ and the map $\tilde{f} : V \to T^\perp M$ with $\tilde{f}|_{\gamma(1)} = \tau_\gamma|_{V_{\gamma(1)}}$ are well defined. Moreover $f$ is an isometric immersion from $M$ to $\tilde{M}$ with $f(p) = \tilde{p}$ and $f_* p = \varphi|_{T_pM}$, and $\tilde{f}$ is a linear isometry of Riemannian vector bundles preserving connections such that $\tilde{f}|_{V_p} = \varphi|_{V_p}$ and $\tilde{f}^* h_{\tilde{M}} = h$ where $h_{\tilde{M}}$ is the second fundamental form of the isometric immersion $f : M \to \tilde{M}$.

When the target space $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{g})$ in Theorem 1.2 is a space form with sectional curvature $K$, then
\[
\tau_\gamma^* \tilde{R}(X, Y, Z, W) = K \{ \langle X, W \rangle \langle Y, Z \rangle - \langle X, Z \rangle \langle Y, W \rangle \}
\]
because $\tau_\gamma$ is a linear isometry. It is then clear that Theorem 1.2 contains the fundamental theorem for submanifolds as a direct corollary. It seems that this relation of a Cartan-Ambrose-Hicks theorem and the fundamental theorem for submanifolds was not noticed before.

The strategy for the proof of Theorem 1.2 is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [7] using the equation for variation fields of variations for developments of curves. This idea is just the same as the proof of Cartan's lemma using the Jacobi field equation.
Because the assumption of Cartan’s lemma is less restricted than Theorem 1.1 as mentioned before, we would like to mention the corresponding Cartan’s lemma for isometric immersions. Because the proof is similar to and simpler than the proof of Theorem 1.2 we will omit the proof.

**Theorem 1.3** (Cartan’s lemma for isometric immersions). Let \((M^n, g)\) and \((\tilde{M}^{n+r}, \tilde{g})\) be two Riemannian manifolds with \(\tilde{M}\) complete. Let \((V^r, h, D)\) be a Riemannian vector bundle with a compatible connection \(D\) on \(M\), and \(h \in \Gamma(TM \oplus TM, V)\). Let \(p \in M\), \(\tilde{p} \in \tilde{M}\), and \(\varphi : T_p M \oplus V_p \rightarrow T_{\tilde{p}} \tilde{M}\) be a linear isometry with \(T = \varphi(T_p M)\) and \(N = \varphi(V_p)\). Let \(B_p(r)\) be a normal geodesic ball in \(M\). For any geodesic \(\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow B_p(r)\) with \(\gamma(0) = p\), we will denote the generalized development of \(\tilde{v}\) and \(h\) in \(\tilde{M}\) as \(\tilde{\gamma}\) where

\[
\tilde{v}(t) = \varphi(\gamma'(0))
\]

and

\[
\tilde{h}(t) = (\varphi^{-1})^* P^0(\gamma) h
\]

for \(t \in [0, 1]\). Moreover, suppose that

1. for any \(X, Y, Z \in T\) and \(\xi \in N\),

\[
\tilde{R}(D^1_0(\tilde{\gamma})(\xi), D^0_0(\tilde{\gamma})X, D^0_0(\tilde{\gamma})Y, D^0_0(\tilde{\gamma})(Z)) = 0,
\]

where \(\tilde{R}\) means the curvature tensor of \(\tilde{M}\);

2. for any \(X, Y, Z, W \in T_{\gamma(1)}M\),

\[
R(X, Y, Z, W) = \tau^* \tilde{R}(X, Y, Z, W) + \langle h(X, W), h(Y, Z) \rangle - \langle h(X, Z), h(Y, W) \rangle,
\]

where \(R\) is the curvature tensor of \(M\);

3. for any \(X, Y \in T_{\gamma(1)}M\) and \(\xi, \eta \in V_{\gamma(1)}\),

\[
R^V(\xi, \eta, X, Y) = \tau^* \tilde{R}(\xi, \eta, X, Y) + \langle A_\xi(Y), A_\eta(X) \rangle - \langle A_\eta(Y), A_\xi(X) \rangle,
\]

where \(R^V\) is the curvature tensor of the vector bundle \(V\) and \(A_\xi(X)\) is defined by

\[
\langle A_\xi(X), Y \rangle = \langle h(X, Y), \xi \rangle
\]

for any tangent vectors \(X, Y\) of \(M\) and any vector \(\xi\) of \(V\);

4. \((D_X h)(Y, Z) = (D_Y h)(X, Z)\) for any tangent vectors \(X, Y, Z\) of \(M\),

for any geodesic \(\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow B_p(r)\) with \(\gamma(0) = p\) where

\[
\tau_\gamma = D^1_0(\tilde{\gamma}) \circ \varphi \circ P^0(\gamma) : T_{\gamma(1)}M \oplus V_{\gamma(1)} \rightarrow T_{\tilde{\gamma}(1)}\tilde{M}.
\]
Then, the map $f(\gamma(1)) = \tilde{\gamma}(1)$ from $B_p(r)$ to $\tilde{M}$ is an isometric immersion such that $f(p) = \tilde{p}$ and $f_* p = \varphi |_{T_p M}$, and the map $\tilde{f} : V |_{B_p(r)} \to T^\perp M$ with $\tilde{f}|_{\gamma(1)} = \tau_\gamma |_{V_\gamma(1)}$ is a linear isometry of Riemannian vector bundles preserving connections such that $\tilde{f}|_{V_p} = \varphi |_{V_p}$ and $\tilde{f}^* h_{\tilde{M}} = h$ on $B_p(r)$ where $h_{\tilde{M}}$ is the second fundamental form of the isometric immersion $f : B_p(r) \to \tilde{M}$.

2. GENERALIZED DEVELOPMENTS OF CURVES AND PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we will show the local existence and uniqueness of the generalized developments of curves, derive the equation for the variation field of a variation of generalized developments of curves, and finally give the proof of Theorem 1.2. For the purpose of simplicity, we will adopt the Einstein summation convention and the following notations:

1. capital letters such as $A, B, C$ etc. denote indices in $\{1, 2, \cdots, n+r\}$;
2. lower-case letters such as $i, j, k, l$ etc. denote indices in $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$;
3. Greek letters such as $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ etc. denote indices in $\{n+1, n+2, \cdots, n+r\}$,
4. the symbol $'$ means taking derivative with respect to $t$.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let the notations be the same as in Definition 1.1 and $\tilde{p}$ is an interior point of $\tilde{M}$. Then, the generalized development is unique and exists for a short time. Moreover, if the Riemannian manifold $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{g})$ is complete without boundary, then $\tilde{\gamma}$ will exist all over $[0, b]$.

**Proof.** Let $(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_{n+r})$ be a local coordinate at $\tilde{p}$ with $x_A(\tilde{p}) = 0$ for $A = 1, 2, \cdots, n+r$, and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_A}(p) = \tilde{e}_A.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

Suppose that $\tilde{\gamma}(t) = (x_1(t), x_2(t), \cdots, x_{n+r}(t))$, then

$$\tilde{E}_A = x_{AB} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_B}$$

and

$$\tilde{v} = v_i \tilde{e}_i.$$  

Moreover, suppose that

$$h^\alpha_{ij}(t) = \left\langle \tilde{h}(t)(\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{e}_j), \tilde{e}_\alpha \right\rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)
Substituting all the above into (1.1), we have

\[
\begin{cases}
  x_i'^\alpha + x_i^j x^j_i \tilde{\Gamma}^A_{BC} - h_a^{ij} v_j x^a_A = 0 \\
x^\alpha A + x_a^A x^j_i \tilde{\Gamma}^A_{BC} + h_a^{ij} v_j x_i A = 0 \\
x_i' - v_i x_i A = 0 \\
x_A(0) = 0 \\
x_{AB}(0) = \delta_{AB}.
\end{cases}
\]

(2.3)

Here $\tilde{\Gamma}^C_{AB}$’s are the Christofel symbols for $\tilde{M}$. By standard theory for ODEs, we get the local existence and uniqueness for the solution of the equation. Moreover, when $\tilde{M}$ is complete without boundary, by standard extension argument, we get the global existence of $\tilde{\gamma}$. □

Next, we want to show that $D^t_0(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a linear isometry.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let the notations be the same as in Definition 1.1. Then,

\[
\langle \tilde{E}_A, \tilde{E}_B \rangle = \delta_{AB}
\]

(2.4)

for any $A, B = 1, 2, \cdots, n + r$.

**Proof.** Let $X_{AB} = \langle \tilde{E}_A, \tilde{E}_B \rangle - \delta_{AB}$. Then, $X_{AB}(0) = 0$ for any $A, B = 1, 2, \cdots, n + r$. Moreover, by (1.1),

\[
X_{\alpha i}' = \frac{d}{dt} \langle \tilde{E}_i, \tilde{E}_\alpha \rangle
\]

(2.5)

\[
= \langle \tilde{h}(t)(\tilde{v}(t), \tilde{e}_i), \tilde{e}_\beta \rangle \langle \tilde{E}_\beta, \tilde{E}_\alpha \rangle - \langle \tilde{h}(t)(\tilde{v}(t), \tilde{e}_j), \tilde{e}_\alpha \rangle \langle \tilde{E}_j, \tilde{E}_\alpha \rangle
\]

and similarly,

\[
X_{ij}' = \langle \tilde{h}(t)(\tilde{v}(t), \tilde{e}_i), \tilde{e}_\alpha \rangle X_{\alpha j} + \langle \tilde{h}(t)(\tilde{v}(t), \tilde{e}_j), \tilde{e}_\alpha \rangle X_{\alpha i}
\]

(2.6)

and

\[
X_{\alpha \beta}' = - \langle \tilde{h}(t)(\tilde{v}(t), \tilde{e}_i), \tilde{e}_\alpha \rangle X_{i\beta} - \langle \tilde{h}(t)(\tilde{v}(t), \tilde{e}_i), \tilde{e}_\beta \rangle X_{i\alpha}.
\]

(2.7)

So, $X_{AB}$’s satisfy a first order homogeneous linear system of ODEs with initial data $X_{AB}(0) = 0$. This implies that $X_{AB}(t) = 0$ for any $t$ and completes the proof of the proposition. □

Next, we come to derive the equation for the variation field of a variation of generalized developments.
**Theorem 2.2.** Let \((\tilde{M}^{n+r}, \tilde{g})\) be a Riemannian manifold and \(\tilde{p} \in \tilde{M}\). Let \(T_p\tilde{M} = T^n \oplus N^r\) be an orthogonal decomposition of \(T_p\tilde{M}\) and \(\tilde{v}(u, t) : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \to T\) and \(\tilde{h}(u, t) : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \to \text{Hom}(T \otimes T, N)\) be smooth maps. Let

\[
(2.8) \quad \tilde{\Phi}(u, t) = \tilde{\gamma}_u(t) = \text{dev}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{v}(u, \cdot), \tilde{h}(u, \cdot))(t),
\]

\(\tilde{e}_1, \cdots, \tilde{e}_n\) be an orthonormal frame for \(T\), and \(\tilde{e}_{n+1}, \cdots, \tilde{e}_{n+r}\) be an orthonormal frame for \(N\). Moreover, let \(\tilde{E}_A(u, t) = D^t_0(\tilde{\gamma}_u)(\tilde{e}_A)\) for \(A = 1, 2, \cdots, n + r\). Suppose that

\[
(2.9) \quad \tilde{v}(u, t) = v_i(u, t)\tilde{e}_i
\]

and

\[
(2.10) \quad \tilde{h}(u, t)(\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{e}_j) = h^{\alpha}_{ij}(u, t)\tilde{e}_\alpha,
\]

\[
(2.11) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial u} := \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial u} = \tilde{U}_A \tilde{E}_A
\]

and

\[
(2.12) \quad \nabla_{\tilde{\alpha}} \tilde{E}_A = \tilde{X}_{AB} \tilde{E}_B.
\]

Then, \(\tilde{X}_{AB} = -\tilde{X}_{BA}\) for \(A, B = 1, 2, \cdots, n + r\), and

\[
(2.13) \quad \begin{cases}
\tilde{U}_i' = 2\tilde{U}_i' h^\alpha_{ij} v_j + \tilde{U}_i' \partial_t (h^\alpha_{ij} v_j) + \tilde{U}_k h^\alpha_{kl} h^\alpha_{ij} v_j v_j + \tilde{R}_{ijkA} \tilde{U}_A v_j v_k + \\
+ \partial_u \partial_t v_i + (\partial_v v_j) X_{ji} - v_j v_k h^\alpha_{jk} \tilde{X}_\alpha + \\
\tilde{U}_\alpha'' = -2\tilde{U}_\alpha'' h^\alpha_{ij} v_j - \tilde{U}_k \partial_t (h^\alpha_{ij} v_j) + \tilde{U}_\beta h^\beta_{jk} h^\alpha_{ij} v_j v_k + \tilde{R}_{j\alpha iA} \tilde{U}_A v_j v_j + \\
+ (\partial_v v_i) X_{ij} + \partial_u (v_i v_j) h^\alpha_{ij} + v_i v_j h^\alpha_{ij} \tilde{X}_{\alpha i} + \\
\tilde{X}_{ij}' = \tilde{X}_{ij}' h^\alpha_{jk} v_k - h^\alpha_{ik} v_k X_{ij} + \tilde{R}_{i j k A} \tilde{U}_A v_k + \\
\tilde{X}_{\alpha i}' = -\tilde{X}_{ij}' h^\alpha_{jk} v_k + \partial_u (h^\alpha_{ij} v_j) + h^\beta_{ij} v_j \tilde{X}_{\alpha i} + \tilde{R}_{i\alpha j A} \tilde{U}_A v_j + \\
\tilde{U}_A (u, 0) = \tilde{X}_{AB} (u, 0) = \tilde{U}_\alpha'' (u, 0) = 0, \\
\tilde{U}_i' (u, 0) = \partial_u v_i (u, 0).
\end{cases}
\]

Here

\[
(2.14) \quad \tilde{R}_{ABCD} = \tilde{R} (\tilde{E}_A, \tilde{E}_B, \tilde{E}_C, \tilde{E}_D).
\]

**Proof.** By Proposition 2.1

\[
(2.15) \quad \tilde{X}_{AB} = \left\langle \nabla_{\tilde{\alpha}} \tilde{E}_A, \tilde{E}_B \right\rangle = - \left\langle \tilde{E}_A, \nabla_{\tilde{\alpha}} \tilde{E}_B \right\rangle = - \tilde{X}_{BA}.
\]

Moreover, by (1.1), we have

\[
(2.16) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial t} = \tilde{\gamma}'_u = v_i(u, t) \tilde{E}_i(u, t).
\]
Moreover, and

\[ \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} = \partial_t v_i (u, t) \tilde{E}_i (u, t) + v_i (u, t) \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \tilde{E}_i (u, t) = \partial_t \tilde{v}_i \tilde{E}_i + v_i v_j h^\alpha_{ij} \tilde{E}_\alpha, \]

(2.17)

(2.18)

and

\[ \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \left( \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \tilde{E}_i = \tilde{U}_A^t \tilde{E}_A + \tilde{U}_i \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \tilde{E}_i + \tilde{U}_i \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \tilde{E}_\alpha = \tilde{U}_A^t \tilde{E}_A + \tilde{U}_i h^\alpha_{ij} v_j \tilde{E}_\alpha - \tilde{U}_i h^\alpha_{ij} v_j \tilde{E}_i, \]

(2.19)

On the other hand, by (2.17) and Proposition 2.1

\[ \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \left( \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) = \tilde{U}_A^t \tilde{E}_A + 2 \tilde{U}_i h^\alpha_{ij} v_j \tilde{E}_\alpha - 2 \tilde{U}_i h^\alpha_{ij} v_j \tilde{E}_i + \tilde{U}_k \partial_t (h^\alpha_{jk} v_j) - \tilde{U}_k h^\beta_{jk} h^\alpha_{ij} v_i v_k \tilde{E}_\alpha - [\tilde{U}_i \partial_t (h^\alpha_{ij} v_j) + \tilde{U}_k h^\alpha_{kl} h^\alpha_{ij} v_i v_k] \tilde{E}_i. \]

Comparing (2.19) and (2.20), and by that \( \tilde{X}_{ai} = - \tilde{X}_{ia} \), we have

\[ \tilde{U}_i'' = 2 \tilde{U}_i' h^\alpha_{ij} v_j + \tilde{U}_a \partial_t (h^\alpha_{ij} v_j) + \tilde{U}_k h^\alpha_{kl} h^\alpha_{ij} v_i v_k + \tilde{R}_{ijkl} \tilde{U}_A v_j v_k + \tilde{R}_{i} (\partial_t v_i) \tilde{X}_{ji} - v_j v_k h^\alpha_{kl} \tilde{X}_{ia} \]

(2.21)

and

\[ \tilde{U}_a'' = - 2 \tilde{U}_a' h^\alpha_{ij} v_j - \tilde{U}_k \partial_t (h^\alpha_{ij} v_j) + \tilde{U}_k h^\beta_{jk} h^\alpha_{ij} v_i v_k + \tilde{R}_{ja} (\partial_t v_i) \tilde{X}_{ia} + \tilde{R}_{i} (\partial_t v_i) \tilde{X}_{ia} + \tilde{R}_{i} (\partial_\alpha v_i) \tilde{X}_{ia} + \tilde{R}_{i} (\partial_\alpha v_i) \tilde{X}_{ia} + \tilde{R}_{i} (\partial_\alpha v_i) \tilde{X}_{ia} + \tilde{R}_{i} (\partial_\alpha v_i) \tilde{X}_{ia}. \]

(2.22)

Moreover,

\[ \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial a} \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial a} \tilde{E}_i = \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial a} (\tilde{X}_{ia} \tilde{E}_a) + \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial a} (\tilde{X}_{ij} \tilde{E}_j) = (\tilde{X}_{ia}' + \tilde{X}_{ij} h^\alpha_{jk} v_k) \tilde{E}_a + (\tilde{X}_{ij}' - \tilde{X}_{ia} h^\alpha_{jk} v_k) \tilde{E}_j \]

(2.23)
and on the other hand,

\begin{equation}
\frac{\nabla}{\nabla} \cdot \frac{\nabla}{\nabla} E_i = \nabla \cdot \nabla \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \right) E_i + \tilde{R}\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \right) E_i
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
=\left( h_{ik}^\alpha v_k X_{\alpha j} + \tilde{R}_{ijkA} \tilde{U}_A v_k \right) E_j + \left[ \partial_u (h_{ij}^\alpha v_j) + h_{ij}^\beta v_j \tilde{X}_{\beta \alpha} + \tilde{R}_{\alpha jA} \tilde{U}_A v_j \right] E_\alpha
\end{equation}

Hence, by comparing (2.23) and (2.24), and by that \( \tilde{X}_{\alpha j} = -\tilde{X}_{j \alpha} \),

\begin{equation}
\tilde{X}_{ij} = \tilde{X}_{i\alpha} h_{jk}^\alpha v_k - h_{ik}^\alpha v_k \tilde{X}_{\alpha j} + \tilde{R}_{ijkA} \tilde{U}_A v_k
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
\tilde{X}_{i\alpha} = -\tilde{X}_{ij} h_{jk}^\alpha v_k + \partial_u (h_{ij}^\alpha v_j) + h_{ij}^\beta v_j \tilde{X}_{\beta \alpha} + \tilde{R}_{\alpha jA} \tilde{U}_A v_j
\end{equation}

Similarly,

\begin{equation}
\tilde{X}_{i\alpha} = \tilde{X}_{i\alpha} h_{ij}^\beta v_j - \tilde{X}_{ij} h_{ij}^\alpha v_j + \tilde{R}_{\alpha jA} \tilde{U}_A v_j
\end{equation}

Finally, \( \tilde{U}_A(u, 0) = 0 \) because \( \Phi(u, 0) = \tilde{p} \) and \( X_{AB}(u, 0) = 0 \) because \( \tilde{E}_A(u, 0) = \tilde{e}_A \). Moreover, by

\begin{equation}
\tilde{U}_A'(u, 0) \tilde{e}_A = \nabla \cdot \nabla \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \right) E_i
\end{equation}

we know that \( \tilde{U}_A'(u, 0) = \partial_u v_i(u, 0) \) and \( \tilde{U}_A'(u, 0) = 0 \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) and \( \alpha = n + 1, n + 2, \ldots, n + r \).

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Let \( e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n \) and \( e_{n+1}, e_{n+2}, \ldots, e_{n+r} \) be orthonormal basis of \( T_pM \) and \( V_p \) respectively, and let \( \tilde{e}_A = \varphi(e_A) \) for \( A = 1, 2, \ldots, n + r \). For \( x \in M \), let \( \gamma_0, \gamma_1 : [0, 1] \to M \) be two smooth interior curves joining \( p \) to \( x \). Since \( M \) is simply connected, there is a smooth map \( \Phi : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \to M \) such that

\begin{equation}
\begin{cases}
\Phi(0, t) = \gamma_0(t) & \text{for } t \in [0, 1] \\
\Phi(1, t) = \gamma_1(t) & \text{for } t \in [0, 1] \\
\Phi(u, 0) = p & \text{for } u \in [0, 1] \\
\Phi(u, 1) = x & \text{for } u \in [0, 1],
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

and \( \gamma_u(t) = \Phi(u, t) \) is an interior curve for any \( u \in [0, 1] \). Let

\begin{equation}
v(u, t) = P^0_t(\gamma_u)(\gamma_u'(t)).
\end{equation}
Then $\gamma_u$ is the development of $v(u, \cdot)$. Let $\tilde{v} = \varphi(v)$, and let $h(u, t) = P^\varphi_t(\gamma_u)h$ and $\tilde{h}(u, t) = (\varphi^{-1})^* h(u, t)$. Moreover, let

$$\bar{\Phi}(u, \cdot) = \tilde{\gamma}_u = \text{dev}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{v}(u, \cdot), \tilde{h}(u, \cdot)),$$

$$\bar{E}_A(u, t) = D^\varphi_0(\gamma_u)(\tilde{e}_A)$$

and

$$E_A(u, t) = P^\varphi_0(\gamma_u)(e_A)$$

for $A = 1, 2, \ldots, n + r$. Suppose that

(2.31) $v = v_i e_i$

and

(2.32) $h(u, t)(e_i, e_j) = h^\alpha_\beta(u, t)e_\alpha$.

Then, it is clear that

(2.33) $\tilde{v} = v_i \tilde{e}_i$

and

(2.34) $\tilde{h}(\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{e}_j) = h^\alpha_\beta \tilde{e}_\alpha$.

Suppose that

(2.35) $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial u} = U_i E_i$,

(2.36) $\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial u}} E_i = X_{ij} E_j$

and

(2.37) $D_{\frac{\partial}{\partial u}} E_\alpha = X_{\alpha\beta} E_\beta$.

By Lemma 2.2 in [7], one has

$$\begin{cases}
U''_i = R_{kiij} v_k v_l U_j + \partial_u \partial_v v_i + \partial_v v_j X_{ji} \\
X'_{ij} = R_{ijlk} v_l U_k \\
X'_{\alpha\beta} = R^\alpha_{\alpha\beta ij} v_i U_j \\
X_{ij}(u, 0) = 0 \\
X_{\alpha\beta}(u, 0) = 0 \\
U_i(u, 0) = 0 \\
U'_i(u, 0) = \partial_u v_i(u, 0),
\end{cases}$$

where $R_{ijkl} = R(E_i, E_j, E_k, E_l)$ and $R^\alpha_{\alpha\beta ij} = R^\alpha(E_\alpha, E_\beta, E_i, E_j)$.

Furthermore, suppose that

(2.39) $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial u} = \tilde{U}_A E_A$. 
and

\[(2.40) \quad \tilde{\nabla}_{\alpha} \tilde{E}_A = \tilde{X}_{AB} \tilde{E}_B.\]

We claim that \(\tilde{U}_i = U_i, \tilde{U}_\alpha = 0, \tilde{X}_{ij} = X_{ij}, \tilde{X}_{\alpha\beta} = X_{\alpha\beta}\) and \(\tilde{X}_{i\alpha} = h_{ij}^\alpha U_j\). By Theorem 2.2, we only need to verify that the \(\tilde{U}_A\)'s and \(\tilde{X}_{AB}\)'s defined above satisfy the Cauchy problem (2.13).

The initial data in (2.13) are clearly satisfied. Moreover, by (2.38) and assumption (2),

\[(2.41) \quad \tilde{U}_i''' = U_i'' + \partial_u (v_i h_{ij})\]

\[= R_{kij} v_k v_i U_j + \partial_u \partial_t v_i + \partial_t v_j X_{ji}\]

By assumption (4),

\[(2.42) \quad \partial_u (v_i h_{ij}^\alpha)\]

\[= \partial_u \left( h \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right), E_\alpha \right)\]

\[= \left< D_{\alpha_u} \left( h \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right), E_\alpha \right) \right> + \left< h \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right), D_{\alpha_u} E_\alpha \right>\]

\[= \left< \left( D_{\alpha_u} h \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right), E_\alpha \right> + \left< \left( \nabla_{\alpha_u} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right), E_\alpha \right> + \left< \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right), D_{\alpha_u} E_\alpha \right>\]

\[= \left< \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial u} h \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial u}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right), E_\alpha \right> + \left< \left( \nabla_{\alpha_u} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \right), E_\alpha \right> + \left< \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right), D_{\alpha_u} E_\alpha \right>\]

\[= (\partial_t h_{ij}^\alpha) U_i v_j + 2U_i h_{ij}^\alpha v_j + h_{ij}^\alpha v_i v_j X_{\alpha\beta},\]

So, by assumption (1) and the last equation,

\[(2.43) \quad -2U_i h_{ij}^\alpha v_j - U_k \partial_t (h_{jk}^\beta v_j) + U_k h_{jk}^\alpha h_{ij}^\alpha v_k + R_{j\alpha\beta} U_{i\alpha} v_i v_j\]

\[+ (\partial_t v_i) \tilde{X}_{i\alpha} + \partial_u (v_i h_{ij}^\alpha v_j) + v_i v_j h_{ij}^\alpha \tilde{X}_{\beta\alpha}\]

\[= -2U_i h_{ij}^\alpha v_j - U_k \partial_t (h_{jk}^\beta v_j) + R_{j\alpha\beta} U_{k\alpha} v_i v_j\]

\[+ (\partial_t v_i) h_{ij}^\alpha U_j + [(\partial_t h_{ij}^\alpha) U_i v_j + 2U_i h_{ij}^\alpha v_j + h_{ij}^\beta v_i v_j X_{\alpha\beta}] + v_i v_j h_{ij}^\beta X_{\beta\alpha}\]

\[= 0\]

\[= \tilde{U}_i'''.\]
By (2.38) and assumption (2),
\[ \tilde{X}'_{ij} = \tilde{X}_{ij} \]
\[ = R_{ijkl} v_k U_l \]
\[ = (\tilde{R}_{ijkl} + h^\alpha_{ik} h^\alpha_{jk} - h^\alpha_{ik} h^\alpha_{jl}) v_k U_l \]
\[ = \tilde{X}_{i\alpha} h^\alpha_{jk} v_k - h^\alpha_{ik} v_k \tilde{X}_{j\alpha} + \tilde{R}_{ij\alpha} U_A v_k. \]

By assumption (1) and (4),
\[ \tilde{X}'_{i\alpha} = \partial_t (h^\alpha_{ij} U_j) \]
\[ = \partial_t \left\langle h \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial u}, E_i \right), E_{\alpha} \right\rangle \]
\[ = \left\langle (D_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} h) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial u}, E_i \right), E_{\alpha} \right\rangle + \left\langle h \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial u}, E_i \right), E_{\alpha} \right\rangle \]
\[ = \left\langle (D_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} h) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial u}, E_i \right), E_{\alpha} \right\rangle \]
\[ = \partial_u \left\langle h \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, E_i \right), E_{\alpha} \right\rangle - \left\langle h \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, E_i \right), \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial u}} E_{\alpha} \right\rangle - \left\langle h \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, E_i \right), \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial u}} E_{\alpha} \right\rangle \]
\[ = - \tilde{X}_{ij} h^\alpha_{jk} v_k + \partial_u (h^\alpha_{ij} v_j) + h^\beta_{ij} v_j X_{\beta\alpha} \]
\[ = - \tilde{X}_{ij} h^\alpha_{jk} v_k + \partial_u (h^\alpha_{ij} v_j) + h^\beta_{ij} v_j \tilde{X}_{\beta\alpha} + \tilde{R}_{ij\alpha} U_A v_j. \]

Finally, by assumption (3) and (2.38),
\[ \tilde{X}'_{i\beta} = \tilde{X}'_{i\beta} \]
\[ = R_{i\alpha\beta} v_j U_j \]
\[ = (\tilde{R}_{i\alpha\beta} + h^\alpha_{ik} h^\beta_{jk} - h^\alpha_{ik} h^\beta_{jk}) v_i U_j \]
\[ = \tilde{X}_{i\alpha} h^\beta_{jk} v_j - \tilde{X}_{i\beta} h^\alpha_{jk} v_j + \tilde{R}_{i\alpha\beta} U_A v_i. \]

These complete the proof the claim.

By the claim, we know that $\tilde{U}_A(u, 1) = 0$ for any $u$ and $A = 1, 2, \cdots, n + r$. This implies that $\tilde{\gamma}_0(1) = \tilde{\gamma}_1(1)$. So, $f$ is well defined. Moreover, note that $f_u (\partial \Phi / \partial u) \tilde{\Phi}$ and
\[ (2.47) \quad \left\| \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial u} \right\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{A} U_A^2} = \left\| \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial u} \right\|. \]
so $f$ is a local isometry. By that $\tilde{X}_{\alpha\beta} = X_{\alpha\beta}$, we know that $\tilde{f}$ is well-defined. The other properties of $f$ and $\tilde{f}$ are not hard to verify by noting that $f_*E_i = \tilde{E}_i$ and $\tilde{f}E_\alpha = \tilde{E}_\alpha$. This completes the proof of the theorem. □
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