

EINSTEIN EQUATIONS FOR A METRIC COUPLED TO A TRACE-FREE SYMMETRIC TENSOR

DANIEL J. F. FOX

ABSTRACT. There are described equations coupling a completely symmetric conformal Killing or Codazzi tensor to the Einstein equations for a metric, in a manner analogous to that used to obtain the Einstein-Maxwell equations by coupling a two-form to the metric. Examples of solutions are constructed from mean curvature zero immersions, affine spheres, isoparametric polynomials, and regular graphs. There are deduced some constraints on the scalar curvature of the metric occurring in a solution. Along the way, there are reviewed Weitzenböck formulas, vanishing theorems, and related results for conformal Killing and divergence free Codazzi tensors.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
3. Differential operators on trace-free symmetric tensors	6
4. Vanishing theorems for conformal Killing and divergence free Codazzi tensors	10
5. Coupling Einstein equations to symmetric tensors	12
6. Examples of solutions to the coupled equations	15
7. Refined Kato inequalities for trace-free symmetric tensors	21
8. Constraints on solutions	23
References	28

1. INTRODUCTION

The paper considers consistent couplings of the Einstein equations for a pseudo-Riemannian metric with a completely symmetric tensor $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$. The couplings are defined for a class of tensors that includes trace-free Codazzi tensors and conformal Killing tensors. For example, for a trace-free symmetric tensor $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} = \omega_{(i_1 \dots i_k)}$ that is Codazzi, meaning $D_{[i} \omega_{j]p_1 \dots p_{k-1}} = 0$, the resulting equations have the form

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{R}_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{R}_h h_{ij} + \frac{n-2}{2n} \kappa h_{ij} = c \left(\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} |\omega|_h^2 h_{ij} \right),$$

where c is a constant, κ is a function, $\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij} = \omega_i^{p_1 \dots p_{k-1}} \omega_{jp_1 \dots p_{k-1}}$ is the Ricci trace of the Kulkarni-Nomizu product $\omega \otimes \omega$, and \mathcal{R}_{ij} and \mathcal{R}_h are the Ricci and scalar curvature of the Levi-Civita connection D of h_{ij} . What is important about the constant c is its sign, as its modulus can be absorbed into the tensor ω ; see Remark 5.8. It follows from the differential Bianchi identity and the Codazzi condition on $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ that κ must be constant. Note that (1.1) is equivalent to

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{R}_{ij} - c \omega_i^{p_1 \dots p_{k-1}} \omega_{jp_1 \dots p_{k-1}} = \kappa h_{ij}.$$

In the form (1.1), the right-hand side can be viewed as a stress energy tensor and $\frac{n-2}{2n} \kappa$ can be regarded as a cosmological constant.

Equations such as (1.1) can be seen as formal analogues of the Einstein-Maxwell equations, with a completely symmetric tensor coupled to the metric in place of a two-form. The equations (1.1) are a special case of the more general equations (5.21) discussed in detail in Section 5, that allow for coupling also with a trace-free conformal Killing tensor and a relaxation of the Codazzi condition. (For expository simplicity the discussion here in the introduction focuses on (1.1).)

One reason for considering conformal Killing and trace-free Codazzi tensors is that on an oriented Riemann surface these are exactly the real parts of holomorphic vector fields and holomorphic k -differentials [27].

The expression $(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl}$ can be viewed as a curvature term, and Lemma 5.10 shows that a metric h and a tensor ω as in (1.1) such that the modified curvature $\mathcal{R}_{ijkl} - \frac{1}{4}(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl}$ is projectively flat, meaning it solves

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{R}_{ijkl} - c(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl} = -\frac{\kappa}{n(n-1)}(h \oslash h)_{ijkl},$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, yield a solution of (1.1). (Because when $n = 3$ the module of trace-free curvature tensors is empty, in the $n = 3$ case the equations (1.1) and (1.3) are equivalent, meaning that h and ω solve (1.3) for $c \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if they solve (1.1).)

The relation of the equations (1.3) to the equations (1.1) is parallel to the relation, to which it specializes when ω is identically zero, between constant sectional curvature metrics and Einstein metrics.

Section 6 records examples of solutions of the equations (5.21) and (1.3). The equations for a mean curvature zero nondegenerate immersion of a hypersurface in a pseudo-Riemannian space form and the equations for an affine sphere are special cases of the equations (1.3). In these cases the tensor ω is, respectively, the second fundamental form or the cubic form of the immersion. In both these contexts, a solution (h, ω) to the equations (1.1) can be viewed as a more general geometric structure, not necessarily induced via an immersion. These examples show that, at least for $k \leq 3$, solutions to (5.22) abound, although it should be remembered that the basic existence result for affine spheres, due to Cheng and Yau is highly nontrivial. (That the general formalism recovers in the $k = 2$ and $k = 3$ cases these well-known geometric settings serves also as a useful consistency check on the sometimes involved preliminary computations in Sections 3 and 4.)

Lemma 6.8 shows that on any compact simple Lie group solutions to (1.1) can be constructed from invariant polynomials on its Lie algebra. These solutions show that (1.1) admits nontrivial solutions in arbitrarily high dimensions for arbitrarily large k .

If h is Euclidean, so flat, the curvature terms in (1.1) vanish, and there remains a purely algebraic equation for the tensor ω . When $k = 3$, a harmonic cubic polynomial solving the algebraic part of (1.1) can be viewed as the structure tensor of a nonassociative algebra, and from this point of view it can be seen that solutions abound, as the author has shown in [26, section 8] and [28, 29]. Here there are described two constructions of algebraic solutions that work for larger k . First, Theorem 6.12 shows that all isoparametric polynomials yield solutions. Second, Lemma 6.14 shows that such a solution is associated with every k -regular graph.

General existence theorems are not studied here, but Section 8 describes a priori constraints on solutions of the restricted system (1.3) when h is Riemannian. Such results are motivated by and generalize results about immersed submanifolds that go back to Calabi [7], in the context of affine spheres, Simons in the context of minimal immersions in spheres [53], and Cheng-Yau [15, 63] in the context of hypersurfaces of various kinds, as well as many others. The general pattern of such results is as follows. There is a Weitzenböck identity for the Laplacian of the squared-norm of a tensor satisfying some partial differential equation (here ω). Depending on the signs of some curvature terms there are two general classes of results. One uses refined Kato inequalities and sharp algebraic bounds on quadratic terms to obtain a differential inequality that, via a sort of argumentation developed most prominently by Calabi and Cheng-Yau, yields an upper bounds on $|\omega|^2$ that can be interpreted as an upper bound on the scalar curvature of h (working harder along the same lines one could obtain an upper bound on the Ricci curvature of h). The second follows arguments from Simons [53], and integrates the Weitzenböck formula to obtain integral bounds on $|\omega|^2$. In both cases the results along these lines obtained here are reported in Section 8.

Theorem 8.5 shows that if h is a complete Riemannian metric on a manifold of dimension $n > 2$ which with a trace-free Codazzi tensor ω solves (1.3) for $c > 0$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ then

- (1) If $\kappa \geq 0$ then ω is identically zero, and h is a metric of constant sectional curvature.
- (2) If $\kappa < 0$ then the scalar curvature $\mathcal{R}_h = c|\omega|^2 + \kappa$ of h is nonpositive.

In the special case corresponding to the context of the cubic form of a complete hyperbolic affine sphere, Calabi [7] showed the nonpositivity of the Ricci curvature. It seems reasonable to expect that, perhaps with some additional conditions, the nonpositivity of the scalar curvature in Theorem 8.5 can be improved to

nonpositivity of the Ricci curvature. The remaining technical issue is to extend to $k > 3$ certain tensorial identities used in Calabi's argument for $k = 3$.

The proof of Theorem 8.5 requires the Weitzenböck formulas and refined Kato inequalities for trace-free Codazzi tensors and conformal Killing tensors described in sections 3 and 7 and a result of Cheng-Yau on the growth of solutions to a differential inequality of the form $\Delta u \geq Bu^{1+\sigma} - Au$. These results should be understood as generalizations of results for holomorphic tensors on surfaces and as counterparts to classical vanishing theorems for holomorphic symmetric tensors due to Kobayashi [35, 36].

Theorem 8.6 is the integral bound parallel to that of Theorem 8.5 for solutions of (1.3). Its $k = 2$ case recovers an integral estimate of the scalar curvature of a compact mean curvature zero hypersurface in a round sphere due to J. Simons [53], while its $k = 3$ case recovers the analogous integral estimate for the scalar curvature of a compact mean curvature zero Lagrangian submanifold of a constant holomorphic sectional curvature Kähler manifold due to B.-Y. Chen and K. Ogiue [13]. The corresponding result for $k > 3$ obtained here is not sharp, as are the results for $k \leq 3$, because certain inequalities for norms of tensors used in intermediate steps that are sharp for $k \leq 3$ can be improved when $k > 3$. Even when $k \leq 3$, the method of proof, uniform in k and not supposing an immersion in an ambient space, seems a conceptual improvement.

Section 2 describes background material. Section 3 describes Weitzenböck formulas for trace-free Codazzi and conformal Killing tensors. Most of the material recounted in sections 3 and 4 was presented in the author's [26, section 6]. In any case, much of this material has been obtained before or since by others in various forms; see in particular [56], [51], [33] and [31]. It is presented here to make the exposition self-contained, because notations differ substantially between different authors, and because the cases of trace-free Codazzi and conformal Killing tensors can be given a uniform treatment and this seems clarifying.

The Weitzenböck identities are needed here for showing in full generality the equations (5.21) generalizing (1.1) that are considered here are well formulated, and for understanding when their hypotheses are nontrivial. This is described in Section 5. They are needed also to obtain the estimate leading to Theorem 8.5. In the proof of Theorem 8.5 there are needed the refined Kato inequalities for trace-free Codazzi and conformal Killing tensors described in section 7. As is explained there, these can be deduced from general results in [8] and [6] (see also [34]), but considerable work is required to translate general representation theoretic statements into the concrete contexts here, and it is simpler to give the direct proofs recorded here.

The Weitzenböck identities presented here were found by the author in [26], and have been treated independently in [33] (there are notational differences because of different curvature conventions and because here identities are written for symmetric tensors that are assumed trace-free). These Weitzenböck identities serve to deduce for conformal Killing tensors and trace-free Codazzi tensors vanishing theorems that are of independent interest and which are summarized as Corollary 4.5. This objective was incompletely realized in [26], where there was obtained the partial result recalled here as Theorem 4.3. For conformal Killing tensors of rank $k = 2$ this partial result coupled with a theorem of Berger-Ebin [1] is enough to deduce the vanishing theorem under the desired hypotheses of nonnegative or nonpositive sectional curvature, but for $k > 2$ the author then did not see some step necessary to make the argument work and the desired vanishing theorems for trace-free Codazzi and conformal Killing tensors were reported in [27, Corollary 3.1] only for surfaces. For trace-free Codazzi tensors the desired result for all k has recently been proved [51, Corollary 1] along the lines similar to those taken here. For conformal Killing tensors the desired result for all k was obtained in [20] based on a different line of argument. In [33] an elegant proof was given for conformal Killing tensors based on the Weitzenböck formulas, and that proof adapts immediately to give the corresponding (for nonnegative sectional curvature) vanishing theorem for trace-free Codazzi tensors.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper M denotes a connected, smooth manifold of dimension n . The abstract index conventions in the sense of Penrose [46, chapter 2] are used; see also [61]. With these conventions indices are labels indicating tensor type and symmetries and do not refer to any local frame. Let h_{ij} be a pseudo-Riemannian metric with Levi-Civita connection D . Indices are raised and lowered using h_{ij} and the dual symmetric bivector h^{ij} defined by $h^{ip}h_{pj} = \delta_j^i$. The inner product on a tensor module used here is always

that defined by complete contraction with h_{ij} , $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_k} \beta_{i_1 \dots i_k}$, which generally differs from the metric induced by that on TM by a constant factor that depends on the symmetries of the tensors considered. The curvature $\mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^l$ of D is defined by $2D_{[i}D_{j]}\omega_k = -\mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^p \omega_p$ for $\omega_i \in \Gamma(T^*M)$. The curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}_{ijkl} = \mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^p h_{pl} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{MC}(T^*M))$ is defined by lowering the last index. The Ricci and scalar curvatures of h are defined by $\mathcal{R}_{ij} = \rho(\mathcal{R})_{ij} = R_{pij}{}^p$ and $\mathcal{R}_h = h^{ij} \rho(\mathcal{R})_{ij}$. The submodule of $\otimes^4 \mathbb{V}^*$ corresponding to the lexicographic filling of the Young diagram with two rows of two boxes is

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{MC}(\mathbb{V}^*) = \{\mathcal{Y}_{ijkl} \in \otimes^4 \mathbb{V}^* : \mathcal{Y}_{[ij]kl} = \mathcal{Y}_{ijkl} = \mathcal{Y}_{ij[kl]}, \mathcal{Y}_{[ijk]l} = 0\}.$$

that comprises the tensors \mathcal{Y}_{ijkl} having *metric curvature tensor type*. If $\mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^l$ is the curvature tensor of the Levi-Civita connection of a pseudo-Riemannian metric h_{ij} , the tensor $\mathcal{R}_{ijkl} = \mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^p h_{pl}$ takes values in the vector bundle $\mathcal{MC}(T^*M)$.

The space $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{V})$ of polynomials on the vector space \mathbb{V} comprises those functions on \mathbb{V} that are polynomials with respect to any choice of coordinates x^1, \dots, x^n such that dx^1, \dots, dx^n is a parallel frame with respect to the affine structure on \mathbb{V} determined by the lines in \mathbb{V} . The centroaffine structure on \mathbb{V} induces a graded algebra structure, $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{V}) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \text{Pol}^k(\mathbb{V})$, where $\text{Pol}^k(\mathbb{V})$ denotes the subspace of polynomials which are homogeneous of degree k with respect to dilations centered on the origin. The graded symmetric algebra $S(\mathbb{V}^*) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$ of finite linear combinations of completely symmetric covariant tensors on \mathbb{V} is canonically isomorphic to $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{V})$ via the linear map sending $\omega \in S^k(\mathbb{V}^*) \rightarrow P^\omega(x) = \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} x^{i_1} \dots x^{i_k} \in \text{Pol}^k(\mathbb{V})$. Polarization yields the inverse linear map sending $P \in \text{Pol}^k(\mathbb{V}) \rightarrow \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}^P = \frac{1}{k!} D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} P \in S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$. The product $\alpha \odot \beta$ of $\alpha \in S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$ and $\beta \in S^l(\mathbb{V}^*)$ such that $P^\alpha P^\beta = P^{\alpha \odot \beta}$ is given by the symmetrized tensor product $(\alpha \odot \beta)_{i_1 \dots i_{k+l}} = \alpha_{(i_1 \dots i_k} \beta_{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l})}$. For a constant nondegenerate symmetric tensor h_{ij} on \mathbb{V} , or, what is the same, a pseudo-Riemannian metric on \mathbb{V} parallel with respect to the standard flat affine connection D , define

$$(2.2) \quad \text{tr}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_{k-2}} = \omega_{i_1 \dots i_{k-2} p}{}^p, \quad \mathbf{h}(\omega) = h \odot \omega = h_{(i_1 i_2} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_{k+2})},$$

for $\omega \in S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$. By convention, $\text{tr}(\omega) = 0$ when $k = 1$. These operators are adjoints, meaning that $\langle \alpha, \mathbf{h}(\beta) \rangle = \langle \text{tr}(\alpha), \beta \rangle$ for $\alpha \in S^k(\mathbb{V})$ and $\beta \in S^{k-2}(\mathbb{V})$. In particular, the orthogonal complement in $S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$ of the image of $\mathbf{h} : S^{k-2}(\mathbb{V}^*) \rightarrow S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$ is the space $S_0^k(\mathbb{V}^*) = S^k(\mathbb{V}^*) \cap \ker \text{tr}$ of trace-free elements of $S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$.

Define a symmetric bilinear map $\oslash : S^k(\mathbb{V}^*) \times S^k(\mathbb{V}^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{MC}(\mathbb{V}^*)$ by

$$(2.3) \quad (\alpha \oslash \beta)_{ijkl} = \alpha_{k[i} \beta_{j]l p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} - \alpha_{l[i} \beta_{j]k p_1 \dots p_{k-2}}.$$

It is immediate from the definition that $(\alpha \oslash \beta)_{[ijk]l} = 0$, so that $(\alpha \oslash \beta)_{ijkl} \in \mathcal{MC}(\mathbb{V}^*)$. When $k = 2$ the map \oslash is half what is usually called the Kulkarni-Nomizu product. There hold

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(\alpha \oslash \beta)_{ij} &= \alpha_{(i} \beta_{j) p_1 \dots p_{k-1}} - \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{ij} \beta^{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \text{tr}(\beta)_{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} - \frac{1}{2} \beta_{ij} \alpha^{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \text{tr}(\alpha)_{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}}, \\ \mathbf{s}(\alpha \oslash \beta) &= \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle - \langle \text{tr} \alpha, \text{tr} \beta \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For $\alpha \in S^2(\mathbb{V}^*)$ there hold $\rho(\alpha \oslash h)_{ij} = \frac{2-n}{2} (\alpha_{ij} + \frac{1}{n-2} \text{tr}(\alpha) h_{ij})$ and $\mathbf{s}(\alpha \oslash h) = (1-n) \text{tr} \alpha$. Taking $\alpha_{ij} = h_{ij}$, yields that $(h \oslash h)_{ijkl} = 2h_{k[i} h_{j]l}$ satisfies $\rho(h \oslash h)_{ij} = (1-n) h_{ij}$ and $\mathbf{s}(h \oslash h) = -n(n-1)$. It follow that the trace-free part $\text{tf}(\mathcal{Y})_{ijkl}$ of $\mathcal{Y}_{ijkl} \in \mathcal{MC}(\mathbb{V}^*)$ is given by

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{tf}(\mathcal{Y})_{ijkl} &= \mathcal{Y}_{ijkl} + \frac{2}{n-2} (\rho(\mathcal{Y}) \oslash h)_{ijkl} - \frac{1}{(n-2)(n-1)} \mathbf{s}(\mathcal{Y}) (h \oslash h)_{ijkl} \\ &= \mathcal{Y}_{ijkl} + \frac{2}{n-2} (\text{tf}(\rho(\mathcal{Y})) \oslash h)_{ijkl} + \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \mathbf{s}(\mathcal{Y}) (h \oslash h)_{ijkl}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that h is positive definite. An immediate consequence of (2.5) is

$$(2.6) \quad |\mathcal{Y}|_h^2 = |\text{tf} \mathcal{Y}|_h^2 + \frac{4}{n-2} |\text{tf} \rho(\mathcal{Y})|_h^2 + \frac{2}{n(n-1)} (\mathbf{s}(\mathcal{Y}))^2.$$

Any $\mathcal{Y}_{ijkl} \in \mathcal{MC}(\mathbb{V}^*)$ determines a self-adjoint endomorphism of $S^2 \mathbb{V}^*$ defined by $a_{ij} \in S^2 \mathbb{V}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{ipjq} a^{pq} \in S^2 \mathbb{V}^*$. In general this endomorphism does not preserve the subspace $S_0^2 \mathbb{V}^*$. However, the modified endomorphism $a_{ij} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(a)_{ij} = a^{pq} (\mathcal{Y}_{ipjq} + \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{p(i} h_{j)q})$ restricts to a self-adjoint endomorphism of $S_0^2 \mathbb{V}^*$. This is the $k = 2$ special case of the following construction that goes back to A. Lichnerowicz in [39, section 10].

Lemma 2.1. For $\mathcal{Y}_{ijkl} \in \mathcal{MC}(\mathbb{V}^*)$, the linear operator $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}} : S^k(\mathbb{V}^*) \rightarrow S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$ defined by

$$(2.7) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_k} = \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{p(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})}^p + (1-k) \mathcal{Y}_{p(i_1 i_2}{}^q \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k)q}{}^p.$$

has the following properties:

- (1) The operators $\mathbf{h} : S^k(\mathbb{V}^*) \rightarrow S^{k+2}(\mathbb{V}^*)$ and $\mathbf{tr} : S^k(\mathbb{V}^*) \rightarrow S^{k-2}(\mathbb{V}^*)$ defined in (2.2) commute with $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}$ in the sense that there hold

$$(2.8) \quad (k+2)\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{h}(\omega)) = k\mathbf{h}(\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega)), \quad (k-2)\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{tr} \omega) = k \mathbf{tr} \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega),$$

for $\omega \in S^k \mathbb{V}^*$. In particular $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(h^{\odot k}) = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$.

- (2) $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{tf} \omega) = \mathbf{tf} \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$. Hence $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}$ restricts to an endomorphism of $S_0^k \mathbb{V}^*$.

Proof. It is claimed that

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{p(i_1 \mathbf{h}(\omega)_{i_2 \dots i_{k+2}})}^p &= \frac{k}{k+2} h_{(i_1 i_2} \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{i_3 \omega_{i_4 \dots i_{k+2})}^p + \frac{2}{k+2} \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{(i_1 i_2} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_{k+2})}^p, \\ \mathcal{Y}_{(i_1 i_2}{}^q \mathbf{h}(\omega)_{i_3 \dots i_{k+2})pq} &= \frac{k(k-1)}{(k+2)(k+1)} h_{(i_1 i_2} \mathcal{Y}_{i_3 i_4}{}^q \omega_{i_5 \dots i_{k+2})pq} + \frac{2}{(k+2)(k+1)} \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{(i_1 i_2} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_{k+2})}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.9) using (2.7) yields the first identity of (2.8). The validity of (2.9) is shown as follows. Write

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \binom{k+2}{2} \mathbf{h}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}p} &= h_{pi_{k+1}} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k} + k h_{p(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})i_{k+1}} \\ &\quad + k h_{i_{k+1}(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})p} + \binom{k}{2} h_{(i_1 i_2} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k)i_{k+1}p}. \end{aligned}$$

Contracting (2.10) with $\rho(\mathcal{Y})_{i_{k+2}}^p$ yields

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \binom{k+2}{2} \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{i_{k+2}}^p \mathbf{h}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}p} &= \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{i_{k+1}i_{k+2}} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k} + k \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{i_{k+2}(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})i_{k+1}} \\ &\quad + k \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{i_{k+2}}^p h_{i_{k+1}(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})p} + \binom{k}{2} \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{i_{k+2}}^p h_{(i_1 i_2} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k)i_{k+1}p}. \end{aligned}$$

Symmetrizing (2.11) over the uncontracted indices yields the first identity in (2.9). Relabeling i_{k+1} as q in (2.10) and contracting the result with $\mathcal{Y}_{i_{k+1}i_{k+2}}^q$ yields

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \binom{k+2}{2} \mathcal{Y}_{i_{k+1}i_{k+2}}^q \mathbf{h}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_k pq} &= \mathcal{Y}_{i_{k+1}i_{k+2}}^q \left(h_{pq} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k} + k h_{p(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})q} + k h_{q(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})p} + \binom{k}{2} h_{(i_1 i_2} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k)pq} \right) \\ &= \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{i_{k+1}i_{k+2}} \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} - k \mathcal{Y}_{i_{k+2}}^q \mathcal{Y}_{i_{k+1}(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})q} \\ &\quad - k \mathcal{Y}_{i_{k+1}}^q \mathcal{Y}_{i_{k+2}(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})q} + \binom{k}{2} \mathcal{Y}_{i_{k+1}i_{k+2}}^q h_{(i_1 i_2} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k)pq} \end{aligned}$$

Symmetrizing (2.12) over the uncontracted indices yields the second identity in (2.9). Similarly,

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} k(\mathbf{tr} \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega))_{i_1 \dots i_{k-2}} &= k h^{i_{k-1}i_{k-2}} \left(\rho(\mathcal{Y})_{p(i_1 \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k})}^p + (1-k) \mathcal{Y}_{p(i_1 i_2}{}^q \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k)q}{}^p \right) \\ &= (2 \rho(\mathcal{Y})^{pq} \omega_{i_1 \dots i_{k-2}pq} + (k-2) \rho(\mathcal{Y})_{p(i_1} (\mathbf{tr} \omega)_{i_2 \dots i_{k-2})}^p) \\ &\quad - 2 \left(\rho(\mathcal{Y})_p{}^q \omega_{i_1 \dots i_{k-2}q}^p + \binom{k-2}{2} \mathcal{Y}_{p(i_1 i_2}{}^q (\mathbf{tr} \omega)_{i_3 \dots i_{k-2})q}{}^p \right) \\ &= (k-2) \left(\rho(\mathcal{Y})_{p(i_1} (\mathbf{tr} \omega)_{i_2 \dots i_{k-2})}^p + (3-k) \mathcal{Y}_{p(i_1 i_2}{}^q (\mathbf{tr} \omega)_{i_3 \dots i_{k-2})q}{}^p \right) = (k-2) \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{tr} \omega)_{i_1 \dots i_{k-2}}. \end{aligned}$$

That $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(h^{\odot k}) = 0$ follows from $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(h) = 0$ and (2.8) by induction.

By (2.8), $k\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{h}^i(\omega)) = (k-2i)\mathbf{h}^i \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega)$ and $k\mathbf{tr}^i \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega) = (k-2i)\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{tr}^i \omega)$ for all $\omega \in S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$. Consequently, $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{h}^i \mathbf{tr}^i \omega) = \mathbf{h}^i \mathbf{tr}^i \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega)$. Since $\omega - \mathbf{tf} \omega$ is in the image of \mathbf{h} , there results $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathbf{tf} \omega) = \mathbf{tf} \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$. That $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}$ maps trace-free symmetric tensors to trace-free symmetric tensors follows from this observation or from the second identity of (2.8). A more conceptual proof of this claim goes as follows. Define $Y(\omega) = k\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega)$ for $\omega \in S^k(\mathbb{V}^*)$. Then (2.8) means that Y commutes with the $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ triple determined by the operators E , F , and H , so must preserve the decomposition of symmetric tensors into their primitive parts. \square

3. DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS ON TRACE-FREE SYMMETRIC TENSORS

This section studies some operators acting on trace-free symmetric tensors. Let E and F be bundles of tensors on M . A metric h on M determines a pairing $(\alpha, \beta) = \int_M \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle d\text{vol}_h$ of sections $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma(E)$, at least one of which is compactly supported. Write $\|\omega\|^2 = (\omega, \omega)$.

Because the fibers of TM and T^*M carry canonically dual flat centroaffine structures, constructions applicable to dual vector spaces \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{V}^* apply fiberwise to TM and T^*M without change. By definition $S(TM) = \oplus_{k \geq 0} \Gamma(S^k(TM))$ (respectively $S_0(TM) = \oplus_{k \geq 0} \Gamma(S_0^k(TM))$) is the graded vector bundle comprising finite linear combinations of (trace-free) completely symmetric tensors. It becomes a graded algebra when equipped with the fiberwise multiplication \odot . By definition $\text{Pol}(T^*M)$ is the graded subalgebra of $C^\infty(T^*M)$ comprising functions polynomial in the fibers of T^*M and of globally bounded degree. Regarding $\text{Pol}(T^*M)$ as a subspace of $C^\infty(T^*M)$ it acquires from the tautological Poisson structure on T^*M a Poisson structure defined, for $X \in \Gamma(S^k(TM))$ and $Y \in \Gamma(S^l(TM))$ and any torsion-free affine connection ∇ , by

$$(3.1) \quad \{X, Y\}^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l-1}} = kX^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \nabla_p Y^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1})} - lY^{p(i_1 \dots i_{l-1}} \nabla_p X^{i_l \dots i_{k+l-1})}.$$

Given a metric h_{ij} , the connection in (3.1) may be taken to be its Levi-Civita connection D , and $\{h, X\} = 2D^{(i_1} X^{i_2 \dots i_{k+1})}$ for any $X \in \Gamma(S^k(TM))$ (in the bracket $\{h, X\}$ the notation h refers to the dual bivector h^{ij}). Using h , $S(TM)$ and $S(T^*M)$ are identified by index raising and lowering, and for $X \in \Gamma(S^k(TM))$ and $\omega \in \Gamma(S^k(T^*M))$ one defines $X_{i_1 \dots i_k}^\flat = X^{j_1 \dots j_k} h_{i_1 j_1} \dots h_{i_k j_k} \in \Gamma(S^k(T^*M))$ and defines $\omega^\sharp \in \Gamma(S^k(TM))$ dually. Since index raising and lowering induce symmetric algebra isomorphisms, there results on $S(T^*M)$ the Poisson bracket $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ defined by $\{\alpha, \beta\} = \{\alpha^\sharp, \beta^\sharp\}^\flat$.

The divergence operator $\text{div} : \Gamma(T^*M \otimes E) \rightarrow \Gamma(E)$ defined by

$$(3.2) \quad \text{div}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_k} = D^p \omega_{p i_1 \dots i_k}, \quad \omega \in \Gamma(T^*M \otimes E),$$

is the formal adjoint of the negative of the covariant derivative $-D$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let h be a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M . The operator $\mathcal{H} : \Gamma(S^k(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(S^{k+1}(T^*M))$ defined by $\mathcal{H}(\alpha) = \frac{k+1}{2} \{h, \alpha\}$ satisfies $[e^{\text{tr}}, \mathcal{H}] = 2 \text{div } e^{\text{tr}}$.*

Proof. The identity $[e^{\text{tr}}, \mathcal{H}] = 2 \text{div } e^{\text{tr}}$ follows from the validity of

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{k+1}{2} \text{tr}^i \{h, \alpha\} = \frac{k+1-2i}{2} \{h, \text{tr}^i \alpha\} + 2i \text{div}(\text{tr}^{i-1} \alpha),$$

for all $\alpha \in \Gamma(S^k(T^*M))$ and $i \geq 1$, which is proved by induction on i . The case $i = 1$ is a direct computation:

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{k+1}{2} (\text{tr} \{h, \alpha\})_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} &= (k+1) h^{pq} D_{(i_1} \alpha_{i_2 \dots i_{k-1} p q)} \\ &= 2D^p \alpha_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} p} + (k-1) D_{(i_1} (\text{tr } \alpha)_{i_2 \dots i_{k-1})} = 2 \text{div}(\alpha)_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} + \frac{k-1}{2} \{h, \text{tr } \alpha\}_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that tr and div commute. If there holds (3.3), then, using (3.3) and (3.4),

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{k+1}{2} \text{tr}^{i+1} \{h, \alpha\} &= \text{tr} \left(\frac{k+1}{2} \text{tr}^i \{h, \alpha\} \right) = \frac{k+1-2i}{2} \text{tr} \{h, \text{tr}^i \alpha\} + 2i \text{div}(\text{tr}^i \alpha) \\ &= \frac{k-1-2i}{2} \{h, \text{tr}^{i+1} \alpha\} + 2 \text{div}(\text{tr}^i \alpha) + 2i \text{div}(\text{tr}^i \alpha) = \frac{k+1-2(i+1)}{2} \{h, \text{tr}^{i+1} \alpha\} + 2(i+1) \text{div}(\text{tr}^i \alpha), \end{aligned}$$

and this proves (3.3). \square

Let $\text{tf} : \Gamma(S^k(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ be the h -orthogonal projection onto the completely trace-free part and define $\mathcal{L} : \Gamma(S^k(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(S^{k+1}(T^*M))$ by

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{L}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tf} \{h, \omega\},$$

which is the trace-free part of the completely symmetrized covariant derivative of ω . Explicitly, for $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$, $\mathcal{L}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \{h, \omega\} - \frac{k}{n+2(k-1)} h \odot \text{div}(\omega)$, or

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{L}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} = D_{(i_1} \omega_{i_2 \dots i_{k+1})} - \frac{k}{n+2(k-1)} h_{(i_1 i_2} \text{div}(\omega)_{i_3 \dots i_{k+1})}.$$

By definition, \mathcal{L} is the formal adjoint of the composition $-\text{div} \circ \text{tf}$, meaning $(\mathcal{L}(\alpha), \beta) = -(\alpha, \text{div} \text{tf}(\beta))$ for $\alpha \in \Gamma(S^k(T^*M))$ and $\beta \in \Gamma(S^{k+1}(T^*M))$, at least one of which has compact support. If $X \in \Gamma(TM)$, then $\mathcal{L}(X^\flat)$ is the Lie derivative of the conformal structure $[h]$ along X , for

$$(3.8) \quad 2\mathcal{L}(X^\flat)_{ij} = 2\text{tf}(DX^\flat) = 2D_{(i}X_{j)} - \frac{2}{n}D_p X^p h_{ij} = \text{tf}(\mathfrak{L}_X h)_{ij} = (\mathfrak{L}_X[h])_{ij}.$$

The identity (3.8) motivates using the notation, \mathcal{L} , resembling that for the Lie derivative.

Let $\mathcal{C}^{k+1}(\mathbb{V}^*) \subset \otimes^{k+1} \mathbb{V}^*$ be the space of trace-free $(k+1)$ -tensors $\phi_{ij i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}$ having the symmetries determined by the Young projector given by symmetrization over the rows followed by anti-symmetrization over the columns of the Young diagram corresponding to the partition $(n1)$, so satisfying $\phi_{ij i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = \phi_{[ij] i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = \phi_{ij(i_1 \dots i_{k-1})}$ and $\phi_{[ij i_s] i_1 \dots \hat{i}_s \dots i_{k-1}} = 0$ for any $1 \leq s \leq k-1$. Define a differential operator $\mathcal{K} : \Gamma(S^k(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{C}^{k+1}(T^*M))$ to be the trace-free part of $D_{[i\omega_j] i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}$. If $k > 1$ and $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$,

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(\omega)_{ij i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} &= D_{[i\omega_j] i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} - \frac{1}{n+k-3} \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} h_{i_s [i} \text{div}(\omega)_{j] i_1 \dots \hat{i}_s \dots i_{k-1}} \\ &= D_{[i\omega_j] i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} - \frac{k-1}{2(n+k-3)} (h_{i(i_1} \text{div}(\omega)_{i_2 \dots i_{k-1}) j} - h_{j(i_1} \text{div}(\omega)_{i_2 \dots i_{k-1}) i}), \quad \text{if } k > 1, \end{aligned}$$

which is the completely trace-free part of $D_{[i\omega_j] i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}$. For $\gamma \in \Gamma(T^*M) = \Gamma(S_0^1(T^*M))$, $\mathcal{K}(\gamma)_{ij} = D_{[i}\gamma_{j]} = \frac{1}{2}d\gamma_{ij}$. In the $k=1$ case recall that the convention here is $S_0^1(T^*M) = T^*M$. Checking the equality of the two different expressions for the trace part of (3.9) is straightforward. By definition, $\mathcal{K}(\omega)_{ij i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = \mathcal{K}(\omega)_{[ij] i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}$, $\mathcal{K}(\omega)_{ij i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = \mathcal{K}(\omega)_{ij(i_1 \dots i_{k-1})}$, and there vanishes the antisymmetrization of $\mathcal{K}(\omega)_{ij i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}$ over ij and any i_s . From the definition of \mathcal{K} , it follows that its formal adjoint $\mathcal{K}^* : \Gamma(\mathcal{C}^{k+1}(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ satisfies

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{K}^*(\phi)_{i_1 \dots i_k} = -D^p \phi_{p(i_1 \dots i_k)}, \quad \mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_k} = -D^p \mathcal{K}(\omega)_{p(i_1 \dots i_k)},$$

for $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$, and $\phi_{ij i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C}^{k+1}(T^*M))$. If $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ then $D\omega$ has a pure trace part, and parts in the submodules of $\Gamma(S_0^{k+1}(T^*M))$ with symmetries corresponding to the partitions $(n+1)$ and $(n1)$. Lemma 3.2 describes explicitly the decomposition of $D\omega$ into these parts. Some definitions are needed for its statement. The linear map $i_h : \Gamma(S_0^{k-1}(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(T^*M \otimes S_0^k(T^*M))$ defined by

$$(3.11) \quad i_h(\omega)_{ii_1 \dots i_k} = \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} h_{i(i_1} \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k)} + \frac{k(1-k)}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} h_{(i_1 i_2} \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k) i},$$

is characterized by the properties that its image is contained in $\Gamma(T^*M \otimes S_0^k(T^*M))$ and that the nontrivial traces of $i_h(\omega)$ equal ω . In particular, it is injective. For $f \in C^\infty(M) = \Gamma(S_0^0(T^*M))$, $i_h(f)_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} f h_{ij}$ while for $\gamma_i \in \Gamma(T^*M) = \Gamma(S_0^1(T^*M))$, $i_h(\gamma)_{ijk} = \frac{2}{(n-1)(n+2)} (n h_{i(j} \gamma_{k)} - \gamma_i h_{jk})$.

For $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ define $\mathcal{J}(\omega)_{ii_1 \dots i_k} = \frac{2k}{k+1} \mathcal{K}(\omega)_{i(i_1 \dots i_k)}$, which is completely trace-free and satisfies $\mathcal{J}(\omega)_{i(i_1 \dots i_k)} = \mathcal{J}(\omega)_{ii_1 \dots i_k}$ and $\mathcal{J}(\omega)_{(i_1 \dots i_{k+1})} = 0$. Using $\mathcal{K}(\omega)_{[ij i_1] \dots i_{k-1}} = 0$ it can be checked that $\mathcal{J}(\omega)_{[ij] i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = \mathcal{K}(\omega)_{ij i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}$. The identity (3.13) of Lemma 3.2 is a special case of [5, Lemma 2.24].

Lemma 3.2. *For $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ there hold*

$$(3.12) \quad D\omega = \mathcal{L}(\omega) + \mathcal{J}(\omega) + i_h(\text{div}(\omega)),$$

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} |D\omega|^2 &= |\mathcal{L}(\omega)|^2 + |\mathcal{J}(\omega)|^2 + \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} |\text{div}(\omega)|^2 \\ &= |\mathcal{L}(\omega)|^2 + \frac{2k}{k+1} |\mathcal{K}(\omega)|^2 + \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} |\text{div}(\omega)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Substituting the definitions of $\mathcal{L}(\omega)$ and $\mathcal{K}(\omega)$ into

$$(3.14) \quad D_i \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} = D_{(i} \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k)} + \frac{2}{k+1} \sum_{s=1}^k D_{[i} \omega_{i_s] i_1 \dots \hat{i}_s \dots i_k}.$$

and simplifying the trace terms yields (3.12). Alternatively, it is straightforward to check that the right sides of (3.14) and (3.12) are the same modulo pure trace terms. On the other hand from the properties characterizing i_h it follows that the traces of the right sides of (3.14) and (3.12) are the same. This verifies (3.12). Contracting (3.12) with $D^i \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ gives (3.13) \square

It is immediate from (3.13) that $\ker D \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) = \ker \mathcal{L} \cap \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div} \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let (M, h) be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold.*

- (1) *The differential operator $\mathcal{L} : S_0^k(T^*M) \rightarrow S_0^{k+1}(T^*M)$ has injective symbol, so*

$$(3.15) \quad S_0^{k+1}(T^*M) = \mathcal{L}(S_0^k(T^*M)) \oplus (\ker \operatorname{div} \cap S_0^{k+1}(T^*M)),$$

*and $\operatorname{div} \mathcal{L} : S_0^k(T^*M) \rightarrow S_0^k(T^*M)$ is an elliptic operator. If M is compact, then $\operatorname{div} \mathcal{L}$ is nonpositive and $\ker \operatorname{div} \mathcal{L} = \ker \mathcal{L}$.*

- (2) *For any $c \geq \frac{n+2(k-2)}{2(n+k-3)}$, the operator $\diamond_c = (\mathcal{K}, \sqrt{c} \operatorname{div}) : \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{C}^{k+1}(T^*M) \oplus S_0^{k-1}(T^*M))$ has injective symbol, so*

$$(3.16) \quad \diamond_c^* \diamond_c = -\mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K} + c \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}$$

is an elliptic operator. If M is compact, then \diamond_c is nonpositive and $\ker \diamond_c = \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$.

- (3) *For any $c \geq \frac{(k+1)(n+2(k-1))}{2k(n+k-3)}$, the operator $\square_c = (\mathcal{K}, \sqrt{c} \mathcal{L}) : \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{C}^{k+1}(T^*M) \oplus S_0^{k+1}(T^*M))$ has injective symbol, so*

$$(3.17) \quad \square_c^* \square_c = -\mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K} + c \operatorname{div} \mathcal{L}$$

is an elliptic operator. If M is compact, then \square_c is nonpositive and $\ker \square_c = \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \mathcal{L}$.

Proof. Write $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi)$, $\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(Z)(\phi)$, and $\sigma_{\operatorname{div}}(Z)(\phi)$ for the symbols of \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{K} , and div applied to the vector Z^i and $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. Write $(i(Z)\phi)_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = Z^p \phi_{pi_1 \dots i_{k-1}}$. Straightforward computations show

$$(3.18) \quad |\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi)|^2 = \frac{1}{k+1} |Z|^2 |\phi|^2 + \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(k+1)(n+2(k-1))} |i(Z)\phi|^2,$$

$$(3.19) \quad |\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(Z)(\phi)|^2 = \frac{1}{2} (|Z|^2 |\phi|^2 - |i(Z)\phi|^2) - \frac{k-1}{2(n+k-3)} |i(Z)\phi|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(|\phi|^2 - \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n+k-3} |i(Z)\phi|^2 \right).$$

When $k = 1$ and $n = 2$ the coefficient of the pure trace terms in (3.19) should be understood in a limiting sense. By (3.18), if $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi) = 0$ for nonzero Z , then $\phi = 0$, so \mathcal{L} has injective symbol. The remaining claims follow from standard elliptic operator theory as in [1, section 4]. If M is compact, then $(\operatorname{div} \mathcal{L} \omega, \omega) = -\|\mathcal{L}(\omega)\|^2 - c \|\operatorname{div} \omega\|^2 \leq 0$ and $\operatorname{div} \mathcal{L} \omega = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}(\omega) = 0$.

Combining $|\sigma_{\operatorname{div}}(Z)(\phi)|^2 = |\iota(Z)\phi|^2$ with (3.19) yields

$$(3.20) \quad |\sigma_{\diamond_c}(Z)(\phi)|^2 = \frac{1}{2} |Z|^2 |\phi|^2 + \left(c - \frac{1}{2} \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n+k-3} \right) |i(Z)\phi|^2,$$

from which the injectivity of $\sigma_{\diamond_c}(Z)$ is apparent. The ellipticity of \diamond_c follows from standard elliptic operator theory as in [1, section 6]. If M is compact, then $(\diamond_c \omega, \omega) = -\|\mathcal{K}(\omega)\|^2 - c \|\operatorname{div} \omega\|^2 \leq 0$ and $\diamond_c \omega = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{K}(\omega) = 0$ and $\operatorname{div} \omega = 0$.

Combining (3.18) and (3.19) shows

$$(3.21) \quad |\sigma_{\square_c}(Z)(\phi)|^2 = \frac{k+1+2c}{2(k+1)} |Z|^2 |\phi|^2 + \left(\frac{ck(n+2(k-2))}{(k+1)(n+2(k-1))} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n+k-3} \right) |i(Z)\phi|^2,$$

from which the injectivity of $\sigma_{\square_c}(Z)$ is apparent. The ellipticity of \square_c follows from standard elliptic operator theory. If M is compact, then $(\square_c \omega, \omega) = -\|\mathcal{K}(\omega)\|^2 - c \|\mathcal{L} \omega\|^2 \leq 0$ and $\square_c \omega = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{K}(\omega) = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}(\omega) = 0$. \square

Let $\mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^l$ be the curvature tensor of the Levi-Civita connection D of the metric h . For $\omega \in \Gamma(S^k(T^*M))$ there holds $2D_{[i} D_{j]} \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} = -k \mathcal{R}_{ij(i_1}{}^p \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k)p}$. Tracing this in i and i_k yields

$$(3.22) \quad D^p D_j \omega_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} p} - D_j D^p \omega_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} p} = R_j{}^p \omega_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} p} + (1-k) R^p{}_{j(i_1}{}^q \omega_{i_2 \dots i_{k-1}) p q}.$$

Symmetrizing over the free indices yields

$$(3.23) \quad D^p D_{(i_1} \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k)p} - D_{(i_1} D^p \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k)p} = \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_k}.$$

Thus $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega)$ measures the failure of the commutativity of the symmetrized covariant derivative and the divergence operator. For this reason $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega)$ occurs in Weitzenböck type formulas.

Lemma 3.4. *Let (M, h) be a Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ define a formally self-adjoint second order elliptic differential operator $\square_\alpha : \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ by $\square_\alpha \omega = \Delta_h \omega + \alpha \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega)$.*

(1) If $\alpha = -1$, then

$$(3.24) \quad \square_{-1} = \Delta_h \omega - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) = \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n+k-3} \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}(\omega) - 2\mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K}(\omega),$$

is an elliptic operator on $\Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. If M is compact, then \square_{-1} is nonpositive and $\ker \square_{-1} \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) = \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div} \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$.

(2) If $\alpha = \tau(k) = \frac{k}{n+k-2}$, then

$$(3.25) \quad \square_{\tau(k)} \omega = \Delta_h \omega + \frac{k}{n+k-2} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) = \frac{n+2(k-1)}{n+k-2} \operatorname{div} \mathcal{L}(\omega) - \frac{2k(n+k-3)}{(k+1)(n+k-2)} \mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K}(\omega),$$

is an elliptic operator on $\Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. If M is compact, then $\square_{\tau(k)}$ is nonpositive and $\ker \square_{\tau(k)} \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) = \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \mathcal{L} \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$.

(3) If $-1 < \alpha < \tau(k) = \frac{k}{n+k-2}$ then \square_α is an elliptic operator on $\Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. If M is compact, then \square_α is nonpositive and $\ker \square_\alpha \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) = \ker D \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$.

Proof. For $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$, straightforward computations using the Ricci identity and (3.7) show

$$(3.26) \quad \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}(\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_k} = D_{(i_1} D^p \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k)p} + \frac{1-k}{(n+2(k-2))} h_{(i_1 i_2} D^p D^q \omega_{i_3 \dots i_k)pq},$$

$$(3.27) \quad \Delta_h \omega + k \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) = (k+1) \operatorname{div} \mathcal{L}(\omega) - \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{n+2(k-1)} \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}(\omega).$$

Contracting (3.12) with D^i and using (3.26) and (3.10) gives

$$(3.28) \quad \Delta_h \omega = \operatorname{div} \mathcal{L}(\omega) + \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}(\omega) - \frac{2k}{k+1} \mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K}(\omega).$$

Solving (3.27) for $\Delta_h \omega$ and substituting the result into (3.28) yields

$$(3.29) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) = \operatorname{div} \mathcal{L}(\omega) - \frac{(n+k-2)(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}(\omega) + \frac{2}{k+1} \mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K}(\omega).$$

Equation (3.27) and (3.29) are the analogues of the corresponding identities for operators on antisymmetric forms, for example [50, Equations (2.8) and (2.9)]. Rewriting (3.28) in two different ways using (3.27) gives (3.24) and (3.25). The ellipticity of \square_α in these cases, and its nonpositivity when M is compact, follow from Lemma 3.3. Being convex combinations of the elliptic operators \square_{-1} and $\square_{\tau(k)}$, the operators \square_α for $-1 < \alpha < \tau(k)$ are elliptic. If M is compact, the same argument shows that \square_α is nonpositive. By (3.24),

$$(3.30) \quad \square_\alpha \omega = (1+\alpha) \operatorname{div} \mathcal{L}(\omega) + \frac{(n+2(k-2))(k-\alpha(n+k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}(\omega) + \frac{2(\alpha-k)}{k+1} \mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K}(\omega),$$

from which follows $\ker \square_\alpha \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \supset \ker D \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. If M is compact and $\omega \in \ker \square \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$, integrating the right side of (3.30) gives

$$(3.31) \quad 0 = (1+\alpha) \|\mathcal{L}(\omega)\|^2 + \frac{(n+2(k-2))(k-\alpha(n+k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \|\operatorname{div}(\omega)\|^2 + \frac{2(k-\alpha)}{k+1} \|\mathcal{K}(\omega)\|^2,$$

and together with (3.12) this implies $\ker \square_\alpha \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \subset \ker D \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. \square

Remark 3.5. Let M be compact. Define a functional \mathcal{C}_α with arguments a Riemannian metric h_{ij} and a tensor $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ by $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(h, \omega) = -(\omega, \square_\alpha \omega)$. For fixed h the first variation of $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(h, \omega)$ in ω yields the equation $\square_\alpha \omega = 0$. Lemma 3.4 implies that for $-1 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{k}{n+k-2}$ the functional $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(h, \omega)$ is nonnegative.

Remark 3.6. The *Lichnerowicz Laplacian* \diamond_L is the formally self-adjoint operator which acts on an arbitrary rank k covariant tensor $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ by $-\Delta_h \omega + k \widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega)$ (see [39, page 27] for the definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}(\omega)$ for general tensors ω). The linearization of the Ricci curvature of the metric h at the symmetric two-tensor a_{ij} is $\frac{1}{2} \diamond_L a_{ij} + D_{(i} D^p a_{j)p}$. On differential forms the Lichnerowicz Laplacian restricts to the usual Hodge Laplacian. The Lichnerowicz operator restricts to $-\square_{-k}$ on $\Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$.

Remark 3.7. The special case of $\square_{-1} = \Delta_h - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ acting on sections of $S_0^2(T^*M)$ was studied by J. Simons in [53], and this case of Lemma 3.4 is given in [1, section 6.c].

Remark 3.8. As is shown in [1], an infinitesimal deformation of an Einstein metric h on a compact manifold is identified with an $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^2(T^*M)) \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$ solving $\Delta\omega = 2\mathcal{R}(\omega) - \frac{2\mathcal{R}}{n}\omega$. As is summarized in [2, section 12.H] (the notations there are different than those here), using this equation in conjunction with the positivity conditions given by integrating (3.27) and (3.24) gives a proof of the criterion of N. Koiso [37, Theorem 3.3], for the rigidity of an Einstein metric, in particular showing that an Einstein metric of negative sectional curvature is rigid provided $n \geq 3$.

Because the operator $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}$ associated with $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{MC}(\mathbb{V}^*)$ is self-adjoint it determines a quadratic form defined by $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega) = \langle \omega, \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega) \rangle$ for $\omega \in E$ on any $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}$ -invariant subspace $E \subset \otimes^k \mathbb{V}^*$.

Corollary 3.9. *Let (M, h) be a Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. For $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ there hold*

$$(3.32) \quad \frac{1}{2}\Delta_h|\omega|^2 = |D\omega|^2 + (k+1)\langle \omega, \operatorname{div} \mathcal{L}(\omega) \rangle - \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{n+2(k-1)}\langle \omega, \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}(\omega) \rangle - k\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega).$$

$$(3.33) \quad \frac{1}{2}\Delta_h|\omega|^2 = |D\omega|^2 + \frac{n+2(k-1)}{n+k-2}\langle \omega, \operatorname{div} \mathcal{L}(\omega) \rangle - \frac{2k(n+k-3)}{(k+1)(n+k-2)}\langle \omega, \mathcal{K}^*\mathcal{K}(\omega) \rangle - \frac{k}{n+k-2}\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega).$$

$$(3.34) \quad \frac{1}{2}\Delta_h|\omega|^2 = |D\omega|^2 + \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n+k-3}\langle \omega, \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}(\omega) \rangle - 2\langle \omega, \mathcal{K}^*\mathcal{K}(\omega) \rangle + \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega).$$

Proof. Contracting (3.27), (3.25), and (3.24) with ω yields (3.32)-(3.34). (Any two of (3.32)-(3.34) imply the third.) \square

Remark 3.10. If $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \operatorname{div} \cap \ker \mathcal{K}$, (3.34) and

$$(3.35) \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{W}}(\omega) + \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n-2}\langle \rho(\omega \odot \omega), \rho(\mathcal{R}) \rangle + \frac{1-k}{(n-1)(n-2)}\mathcal{R}_h|\omega|_h^2.$$

together yield

$$(3.36) \quad \frac{1}{2}\Delta_h|\omega|^2 = |D\omega|^2 + \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{W}}(\omega) + \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n-2}\langle \rho(\omega \odot \omega), \rho(\mathcal{R}) \rangle + \frac{1-k}{(n-1)(n-2)}\mathcal{R}_h|\omega|_h^2,$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{ijkl} \in \mathcal{MC}(\mathbb{V}^*)$ is the conformal Weyl tensor. This recovers [40, Corollary 4.2].

4. VANISHING THEOREMS FOR CONFORMAL KILLING AND DIVERGENCE FREE CODAZZI TENSORS

This section defines conformal Killing and trace-free Codazzi tensors and proves vanishing theorems for them. The vanishing theorems for conformal Killing tensors and trace and divergence free Codazzi tensors are analogous to the somewhat stronger vanishing theorems for symmetric tensors on Kähler manifolds obtained by S. Kobayashi in [35, 36].

Because \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{K} are constructed by taking trace-free parts they behave well with respect to conformal changes of the metric. The Levi-Civita connections \tilde{D} and D of conformally related pseudo-Riemannian metrics $\tilde{h}_{ij} = fh_{ij}$ are related by $\tilde{D} - D = 2\sigma_{(i}\delta_{j)}^k - h_{ij}h^{kp}\sigma_p$ with $2\sigma_i = d\log f_i$ and $\sigma^i = h^{ip}\sigma_p$. Write $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi)$ for the symbol of \mathcal{L} applied to the vector Z^i and $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$, and similarly for \mathcal{K} and div . For $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$, $0 < f \in C^\infty(M)$, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, there hold

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{h}}(f^\alpha\omega) &= f^\alpha (\mathcal{L}_h(\omega) + 2(\alpha - k)\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\sigma^\sharp)(\omega)), \\ \mathcal{K}_{\tilde{h}}(f^\alpha\omega) &= f^\alpha (\mathcal{K}_h(\omega) + (2\alpha + 1 - k)\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma^\sharp)(\omega)), \\ f \operatorname{div}_{\tilde{h}}(f^\alpha\omega) &= f^\alpha (\operatorname{div}_h(\omega) + (n - 2 + 2\alpha)\iota(\sigma^\sharp)\omega), \end{aligned}$$

so that \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{K} , and div are conformally invariant in the sense that for $0 < f \in C^\infty(M)$ there hold

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{h}}(f^k\omega) = f^k\mathcal{L}_h(\omega), \quad \mathcal{K}_{\tilde{h}}(f^{(k-1)/2}\omega) = f^{(k-1)/2}\mathcal{K}_h(\omega), \quad f \operatorname{div}_{\tilde{h}}(f^{1-n/2}\omega) = f^{1-n/2}\operatorname{div}_h(\omega).$$

Define $\mathcal{L}^\sharp : \Gamma(S_0^k(TM)) \rightarrow \Gamma(S_0^{k+1}(TM))$ by $\mathcal{L}^\sharp(X) = \mathcal{L}(X^\flat)^\sharp$. Then (4.2) implies the invariance $f\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{h}}^\sharp(X) = \mathcal{L}_h^\sharp(X)$, so that while \mathcal{L}^\sharp depends on h , the subspace $\ker \mathcal{L}^\sharp \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(TM))$ does not. A *conformal Killing tensor* of rank k is an element of $\ker \mathcal{L}^\sharp \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(TM))$.

A *conformal Codazzi tensor* is an element of $\ker \mathcal{K} \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. A divergence-free element of $\ker \mathcal{K} \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ is a *trace-free Codazzi tensor*. These have been studied previously in [56, 51].

Remark 4.1. Except in ranks one and two, conformal Killing tensors are not as well studied as their antisymmetric counterparts, the conformal Killing forms, for which [50] is a good reference. Probably their most natural occurrence is as the symbols of symmetries of the Laplacian; see [23, 30, 38, 43, 57]. For further background on Killing and conformal Killing tensors see also [32, 42, 47, 48, 58, 62].

The *Cartan product* $\alpha \odot \beta \in S_0^{k+l}\mathbb{V}^*$ of $\alpha \in S_0^k\mathbb{V}^*$ and $\beta \in S_0^l\mathbb{V}^*$ defined by $\alpha \odot \beta = \text{tf}(\alpha \odot \beta)$ makes $S_0(\mathbb{V}^*) = \oplus_{k \geq 0} S_0^k\mathbb{V}^*$ into a graded associative algebra (see [22, Supplement] or [24] for background). This claim can be justified by showing that the ideal in $(S(\mathbb{V}^*), \odot)$ generated by h equals the kernel $\ker \text{tf}$ of the graded linear map $\text{tf} : S(\mathbb{V}^*) \rightarrow S_0(\mathbb{V}^*)$ sending $\alpha \in S^k(\mathbb{V})$ to its trace-free part. That the symmetrized covariant derivative is a derivation of the graded algebra of symmetric Killing tensors is [57, Lemma 1.3]. Lemma 4.2 is the corresponding statement, that the operator \mathcal{L} acting on conformal Killing tensors is a derivation with respect to the Cartan product.

Lemma 4.2. *On a pseudo-Riemannian manifold (M, h) , the operator \mathcal{L} is a derivation with respect to the Cartan product on $\Gamma(S_0(T^*M))$. Consequently, on a conformal manifold $(M, [h])$, the subspace $\text{CK}(TM, [h]) = \oplus_{k \geq 0} \ker \mathcal{L}^k \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(TM)) \subset \Gamma(S_0(TM))$ comprising finite linear combinations of conformal Killing tensors is a subalgebra with respect to the Cartan product.*

Proof. For $\alpha \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ and $\beta \in \Gamma(S_0^l(T^*M))$, $\alpha \odot \beta = \text{tf}(\alpha \odot \beta) + h \odot \gamma$ for $\gamma \in \Gamma(S^{k+l-2}(T^*M))$, so

$$(4.3) \quad \{h, \text{tf}(\alpha \odot \beta)\} = \{h, \alpha \odot \beta\} + \{h, h \odot \gamma\} = \{h, \alpha \odot \beta\} + h \odot \{h, \gamma\}.$$

Hence, because $\text{tf} : (S(T^*M), \odot) \rightarrow (S_0(T^*M), \odot)$ is a graded linear homomorphism,

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{L}(\alpha \odot \beta) &= \text{tf}\{h, \alpha \odot \beta\} = \text{tf}\{h, \text{tf}(\alpha \odot \beta)\} = \text{tf}\{h, \alpha \odot \beta\} = \text{tf}(\{h, \alpha\} \odot \beta + \alpha \odot \{h, \beta\}) \\ &= \text{tf}(\{h, \alpha\}) \odot \beta + \alpha \odot \text{tf}(\{h, \beta\}) = 2(\mathcal{L}(\alpha) \odot \beta + \alpha \odot \mathcal{L}(\beta)). \end{aligned}$$

The identity (4.4) shows $\text{CK}(T^*M, h) = \oplus_{k \geq 0} \ker \mathcal{L} \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \subset \Gamma(S_0(T^*M))$ is a subalgebra under Cartan product. While $\text{CK}(T^*M, h)$ depends on the choice of $h \in [h]$, it is linearly isomorphic to $\text{CK}(T^*M, e^f h)$ by the graded linear map sending $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ to $f^k \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$, and both are identified with $\text{CK}(TM, [h])$ via index raising, so \mathcal{L}^\sharp is a derivation of $S_0(TM)$ with kernel $\text{CK}(TM, [h])$. \square

It is convenient to say that $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is positive or negative (semi-)definite on $S^k(T^*M)$ or $S_0^k(T^*M)$ if it is positive (semi-)definite or negative (semi-)definite as a quadratic form on $\Gamma(S^k(T^*M))$ or $\Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. Since, by (2.8), $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(h^{\odot k}) = 0$ for any $k \geq 1$, $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is not definite on $\Gamma(S^{2k}(T^*M))$ for any $k \geq 1$.

Theorem 4.3 ([26]). *Let (M, h) be a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n > 2$.*

- (1) *If $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is nonnegative on $S_0^k(T^*M)$ then any $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \text{div}$ is parallel. If moreover $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is at some point of M strictly positive on $S_0^k(T^*M)$ then $\Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \text{div} = \{0\}$.*
- (2) *If $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is nonpositive on $S_0^k(T^*M)$ then any rank k conformal Killing tensor is parallel, and if, moreover, $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is at some point of M strictly negative on $S_0^k(T^*M)$, then any rank k conformal Killing tensor is identically zero.*

Proof. For a compactly supported $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$, integrating any of (3.32)-(3.34) by parts against the Riemannian volume vol_h and simplifying the result using (3.13) yields

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{2}{k+1} \|\mathcal{K}(\omega)\|^2 + \frac{(n+k-2)(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \|\text{div}(\omega)\|^2 - \|\mathcal{L}(\omega)\|^2 = \int_M \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) d\text{vol}_h.$$

The identity (4.5) generalizes the usual integrated Bochner identities for harmonic one-forms and conformal Killing vector fields. If $\omega \in \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \text{div}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}} \geq 0$ then (4.5) shows that $\omega \in \ker \mathcal{L}$ and from (3.13) it follows that $D\omega = 0$. If moreover $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is somewhere positive then (3.34) shows $\omega \equiv 0$. If $\omega \in \ker \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}} \leq 0$ then (4.5) shows that $\omega \in \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \text{div}$ and from (3.13) it follows that $D\omega = 0$. If, moreover, $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is somewhere negative then (3.33) shows $\omega \equiv 0$. \square

Remark 4.4. A result very similar to (1) of Theorem 4.3 was obtained in [56, Theorem 2]. The difference is that the operator $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ and corresponding quadratic form $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ considered in [56] are slightly different (they differ by a term involving the Ricci curvature). The claim here is very slightly more general, but, when the

curvature is assumed to have a definite sign, since this sign is inherited by the Ricci tensor, the ambit of application of the claims is the same.

Corollary 4.5. *Let h be a Riemannian metric on a compact manifold M of dimension $n > 2$.*

- (1) *(Stepanov, [56, Theorem 2]; see also [51, Corollary 1]) If h has nonnegative sectional curvature, then $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$ is parallel. If, moreover, the sectional curvature is strictly positive at some point of M then $\Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div} = \{0\}$.*
- (2) *(Dairbekov-Sharafutdinov, [20, Theorem 1.6]; see also [33, Proposition 6.6]) If h has nonpositive sectional curvature, then a rank k conformal Killing tensor is parallel, and if, moreover, the sectional curvature is strictly negative at some point of M , then a rank k conformal Killing tensor is identically zero.*

Proof. Both claims follow from Theorem 4.3 once it is known that a sign condition on the sectional curvature of h implies the same sign condition for $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ on $\Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. When $k = 2$ this follows from the proof of [1, Proposition 6.1], but that argument (which is direct) does not extend straightforwardly to the case $k > 2$. For conformal Killing tensors, claim (2) is [20, Theorem 1.6]. A proof of the result of Dairbekov-Sharafutdinov for all k based on Weitzenböck formulas as in Theorem 4.3 was given as [33, Proposition 6.6]; they show via an elegant integration in the fibers argument that the condition (2) of Theorem 4.3 follows from the nonpositivity of the sectional curvature. Their argument works equally well assuming nonnegativity of the sectional curvature, and combined with Theorem 4.3, this yields corollary 4.5. Alternatively, in the case of trace-free Codazzi tensors, the proof of [51, Corollary 1] shows how to deduce the required nonnegativity for $k > 2$ from the Berger-Ebin argument. \square

Remark 4.6. The $n = 2$ case of Corollary 4.5 was proved in [27, section 3]. The $k = 2$ case of (1) of Corollary 4.5 is stated as [40, Theorem 5.1], where this statement is generalized to higher rank traceless Codazzi tensors supposing the background metric is conformally flat.

5. COUPLING EINSTEIN EQUATIONS TO SYMMETRIC TENSORS

This section describes Einstein-like equations coupling a metric to a trace-free symmetric k -tensor.

Given $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ define one-forms by

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_h(\omega)_i &= \omega^{p_1 \dots p_k} \mathcal{K}_h(\omega)_{ip_1 \dots p_k}, & \mathcal{B}_h(\omega)_i &= \omega^{p_1 \dots p_k} \mathcal{L}_h(\omega)_{ip_1 \dots p_k}, \\ \mathcal{D}_h(\omega)_i &= \omega_i^{p_1 \dots p_{k-1}} \operatorname{div}_h(\omega)_{p_1 \dots p_{k-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.2), with $\sigma_i = \frac{1}{2} d \log f_i$,

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f \mathcal{A}_{fh}(f^\alpha \omega) &= f^{2\alpha+1-k} \left(\mathcal{A}_h(\omega) + \frac{2\alpha+1-k}{2} \left(|\omega|_h^2 \sigma_i - \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n+k-3} \iota(\sigma^\sharp) \rho(\omega \otimes \omega) \right) \right), \\ f \mathcal{B}_{fh}(f^\alpha \omega) &= f^{2\alpha+1-k} \left(\mathcal{B}_h(\omega) + \frac{2(\alpha-k)k}{k+1} \left(|\omega|_h^2 \sigma_i + \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n+2(k-1)} \iota(\sigma^\sharp) \rho(\omega \otimes \omega) \right) \right), \\ f \mathcal{D}_{fh}(f^\alpha \omega) &= f^{2\alpha+1-k} \left(\mathcal{D}_h(\omega) + (n-2+2\alpha) \iota(\sigma^\sharp) \rho(\omega \otimes \omega) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let M be a manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$ and let h be a pseudo-Riemannian metric. For $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ there hold*

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\rho(\omega \otimes \omega))_i &= -\frac{2}{k+1} \mathcal{A}(\omega)_i + \mathcal{B}(\omega)_i + \left(1 + \frac{n-2}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \right) \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i \\ &= -\frac{2}{k+1} \mathcal{A}(\omega)_i + \mathcal{B}(\omega)_i + \frac{(n+k-2)(n+2(k-2))+2(n-2)}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i, \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}(|\omega|^2 h) = \frac{1}{2} D_i |\omega|^2 = \frac{2k}{k+1} \mathcal{A}(\omega)_i + \mathcal{B}(\omega)_i + \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i,$$

$$(5.5) \quad \frac{1}{2} D_i |\omega|^2 - \operatorname{div}(\rho(\omega \otimes \omega))_i = 2\mathcal{A}(\omega)_i - \frac{n-2}{n+k-3} \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i,$$

$$(5.6) \quad \frac{1}{2k} D_i |\omega|^2 + \operatorname{div}(\rho(\omega \otimes \omega))_i = \frac{k+1}{k} \mathcal{B}(\omega)_i + \frac{n+2k}{n+2(k-1)} \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i,$$

where when $k = 1$ (5.3)-(5.6) have sense as written if $\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij}$ is interpreted as $\omega_i \omega_j$.

Proof. Suppose $k \geq 2$ and let $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. Contracting $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ with $D_i \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ and using (3.12) yields

$$(5.7) \quad \frac{1}{2} D_i |\omega|^2 = \omega^{i_1 \dots i_k} D_i \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} = \frac{2k}{k+1} \mathcal{A}(\omega)_i + \mathcal{B}(\omega)_i + \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i,$$

which is (5.3). Contracting $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ with $D_{i_1} \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k i}$ and using (3.12) yields

$$(5.8) \quad \omega^{i_1 \dots i_k} D_{i_1} \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k i} = -\frac{2}{k+1} \mathcal{A}(\omega)_i + \mathcal{B}(\omega)_i + \frac{2(1-k)}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i.$$

Differentiating $\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij} = \omega_{ia_1 \dots a_{k-1}} \omega_j^{a_1 \dots a_{k-1}}$ yields

$$(5.9) \quad \omega^{i_1 \dots i_k} D_{i_1} \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k i} = \operatorname{div}(\rho(\omega \otimes \omega))_i - \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i.$$

Substituting (5.9) in (5.8) yields (5.4). Taking linear combinations of (5.3) and (5.4) in different ways yields (5.5) and (5.6). The $k = 1$ cases of (5.5) and (5.6) follow from

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(\gamma \otimes \gamma - \frac{1}{2} |\gamma|_h^2 h)_i &= \operatorname{div}(\gamma) \gamma_i - 2\gamma^p D_{[i} \gamma_{p]} = \operatorname{div}(\gamma) \gamma_i - 2\gamma^p \mathcal{K}(\gamma)_{ip}, \\ \operatorname{div}(\gamma \otimes \gamma + \frac{1}{2} |\gamma|_h^2 h)_i &= \operatorname{div}(\gamma) \gamma_i + 2\gamma^p D_{(i} \gamma_{p)} = \frac{n+2}{2} \operatorname{div}(\gamma) \gamma_i + 2\gamma^p \mathcal{L}(\gamma)_{ip}, \end{aligned}$$

valid for any $\gamma \in \Gamma(T^*M)$. \square

Remark 5.2. Among the possible linear combinations of (5.3) and (5.4), the combinations (5.6) and (5.5) are distinguished by the absence of $\mathcal{A}(\omega)$ or $\mathcal{B}(\omega)$. This is relevant because the conformal scaling of $\mathcal{A}(\omega)$, $\mathcal{B}(\omega)$, and $\mathcal{D}(\omega)$ is different. The first two rescale in a way that depends on k , while the last rescales in a way that depends only on dimension. This means that given a conformal structure $[h]$ it makes sense to impose that either $\mathcal{A}(\omega)$ or $\mathcal{B}(\omega)$ vanish, but does not make sense to require that both vanish. The vanishing of $\mathcal{D}(\omega)$ can then be treated as condition selecting within the conformal class.

Recall the convention $S_0^1 \mathbb{V}^* = \mathbb{V}^*$. Define linear operators $\mathcal{T}^\pm : \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(S^2 T^*M)$ by

$$(5.11) \quad \mathcal{T}^+(\omega)_{ij} = \begin{cases} (\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} |\omega|_h^2 h_{ij} & k = 1, \\ \rho(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} |\omega|_h^2 h_{ij} & k \geq 2, \end{cases} \quad \mathcal{T}^-(\omega)_{ij} = \begin{cases} (\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} |\omega|_h^2 h_{ij} & k = 1, \\ \rho(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij} + \frac{1}{2k} |\omega|_h^2 h_{ij} & k \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Note the asymmetry in the definitions; there is a k in the definition of \mathcal{T}^- that is not present in the definition of \mathcal{T}^+ . The \pm in the notation is motivated by thinking of sections of $S_0^k T^*M$ as sections of $S_0^{-k} T^*M$ (although this has no sense), so corresponding to negative integers. By definition,

$$(5.12) \quad \operatorname{tr} \mathcal{T}^+(\omega) = \frac{2-n}{2} |\omega|_h^2, \quad \operatorname{tr} \mathcal{T}^-(\omega) = \frac{n+2k}{2k} |\omega|_h^2.$$

The operators \mathcal{T}^\pm depend on h . When it is necessary to indicate this dependence there is written \mathcal{T}_h^\pm . From the identities, for $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$,

$$(5.13) \quad \omega \otimes_{fh} \omega = f^{2-k} \omega \otimes \omega, \quad \rho_{fh}(\omega \otimes_{fh} \omega) = f^{1-k} \rho_h(\omega \otimes \omega), \quad |\omega|_{fh}^2 = f^{-k} |\omega|_h^2,$$

for $0 < f \in C^\infty(M)$, it follows that the operators \mathcal{T}^\pm are conformally invariant in the sense that

$$(5.14) \quad \mathcal{T}_{fh}^\pm(f^\alpha \omega)_{ij} = f^{2\alpha+1-k} \mathcal{T}_h^\pm(\omega)_{ij}, \quad \omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)).$$

Corollary 5.3. *Let (M, h) be a pseudo-Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. For $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$,*

$$(5.15) \quad \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{T}^+(\omega))_i = -2\mathcal{A}(\omega)_i + \frac{n-2}{n+k-3} \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i, \quad \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{T}^-(\omega))_i = \frac{k+1}{k} \mathcal{B}(\omega)_i + \frac{n+2k}{n+2(k-1)} \mathcal{D}(\omega)_i.$$

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 5.1 and (5.11). \square

Lemma 5.4. *Let (M, h) be a pseudo-Riemannian manifold M of dimension $n \geq 3$. Consider sequences of tensors $\{\omega(k) \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) : k \geq 1\}$ and $\{\gamma(k) \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) : k \geq 1\}$ such that*

- $\omega^{(k)} \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{D} \cap \ker \mathcal{A}$,
- $\gamma^{(k)} \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{D} \cap \ker \mathcal{B}$, and
- the tensors $\mathcal{T}_{ij}^{cod} = \sum_{k \geq 1} a_k \mathcal{T}^+(\omega^{(k)})_{ij}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{ij}^{kill} = \sum_{k \geq 1} b_k \mathcal{T}^-(\omega^{(k)})_{ij}$ converge pointwise to smooth sections of $S^2(T^*M)$ for some sequences $\{a_k \in \mathbb{R} : k \geq 1\}$ and $\{b_k \in \mathbb{R} : k \geq 1\}$.

Then the equations

$$(5.16) \quad \mathcal{R}_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_h h_{ij} + \frac{n-2}{2n}\kappa h_{ij} = \mathcal{T}_{ij}^{cod} + \mathcal{T}_{ij}^{kill}$$

are consistent and

$$(5.17) \quad \kappa = \mathcal{R}_h - \sum_{k \geq 1} a_k |\omega^{(k)}|_h^2 + \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{n+2}{k(n-2)} b_k |\gamma^{(k)}|_h^2$$

is a constant. If $n > 2$ the equations (5.16) hold for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if

$$(5.18) \quad \mathcal{R}_{ij} - a_1 \omega_i^{(1)} \omega_j^{(1)} - \sum_{k \geq 2} a_k \rho(\omega^{(k)} \otimes \omega^{(k)})_{ij} - b_1 \gamma_i^{(1)} \gamma_j^{(1)} - \sum_{k \geq 2} b_k \rho(\gamma^{(k)} \otimes \gamma^{(k)})_{ij} = \frac{\kappa}{n} h_{ij},$$

in which case κ has the form (5.17).

Remark 5.5. Note that the equations (5.16) make sense for h of any signature, although for indefinite signature h the expressions $|\omega^{(k)}|_h^2$ need not be positive.

Proof of Lemma 5.4. By Corollary 5.3, \mathcal{T}_{ij}^{cod} and \mathcal{T}_{ij}^{kill} are divergence free. Taking the divergence of both sides of (5.16) shows that κ must be constant if (5.16) is to admit solutions. The form (5.17) for κ follows by tracing both sides of (5.16). Evidently (5.16) implies (5.18). If there holds (5.18), taking the divergence of (5.18) and using the traced differential Bianchi identity $2D^p \mathcal{R}_{ip} = D_i \mathcal{R}_h$ and Corollary 5.3, shows

$$(5.19) \quad 0 = \frac{n-2}{n} \left(\mathcal{R}_h - \sum_{k \geq 1} a_k |\omega^{(k)}|_h^2 + \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{n+2}{k(n-2)} b_k |\gamma^{(k)}|_h^2 \right),$$

so that, since $n > 2$, κ as in (5.17) is constant. With (5.18) this implies (5.16). \square

Corollary 5.6. If h is a Riemannian metric on a compact manifold M of dimension $n \geq 2$, and $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker(\Delta_h - \widehat{\mathcal{R}})$, then ω satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 5.4.

Proof. Since M is compact, and $\Delta_h - \widehat{\mathcal{R}} = \square_{-1}$, Lemma 3.4 shows that $\ker(\Delta_h - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}) \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) = \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div} \cap \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. \square

Let $\mathcal{T}_{ij} \in \Gamma(S^2 T^*M)$. A pseudo-Riemannian metric g_{ij} solves the *Einstein equations with energy momentum tensor \mathcal{T}_{ij} and cosmological constant Λ* if

$$(5.20) \quad \mathcal{R}_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_g g_{ij} = 8\pi \mathcal{T}_{ij} - \Lambda g_{ij}.$$

In this case, it follows from the traced differential Bianchi identity that \mathcal{T}_{ij} is divergence free.

Corollary 5.7. On an n -dimensional manifold M a pair (h, ω) comprising a pseudo-Riemannian metric h_{ij} and a tensor $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ solves the system

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= -2(n+k-3)\mathcal{A}(\omega) + (n-2)\mathcal{D}(\omega), \\ \mathcal{R}_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_h h_{ij} + \frac{n-2}{2n}\kappa h_{ij} &= c(\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}|\omega|_h^2 h_{ij}) = c\mathcal{T}^+(\omega)_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

for some real constants κ and c if and only if h solves the *Einstein equations with energy momentum tensor $\frac{c}{8\pi}\mathcal{T}^+(\omega)_{ij}$ and cosmological constant $\Lambda = \frac{n-2}{2n}\kappa = \frac{n-2}{2n}(\mathcal{R}_h - c|\omega|_h^2)$.*

The system (5.21) has been written so as to make readily apparent its formal resemblance to the Einstein-Maxwell system for a metric and a two-form.

Remark 5.8. In (5.21), the absolute value of c can always be absorbed into ω , but its sign cannot, and the qualitative properties of the solutions of the resulting equations depend on this sign. If c has the wrong sign, the solutions of (5.21) may not admit any possible physical interpretation. Physical considerations focus attention on solutions of the Einstein equations for which the energy momentum tensor satisfies some energy condition, such as the *weak energy condition* that $x^i x^j \mathcal{T}_{ij} \geq 0$ for all timelike vector fields x^i , where x^i is *timelike* if $|x|_h^2 < 0$. (Such a condition is vacuous if h_{ij} is Riemannian.) Changing the sign of c destroys such a condition. However, as examples coming from the study of submanifolds show, the equations (5.21) have mathematical interest even without such an energy condition (see Example 6.1).

Example 5.9. In the case $k = 1$, for a solution (h, ω) of (5.21), the one-form ω is h -harmonic. If, moreover, $\omega = d\phi$ for some $\phi \in C^\infty(M)$, then ϕ solves the wave equation $\Delta_h \phi = 0$, and in Lorentzian signature can be interpreted as a massless scalar field, so the pair $(h, d\phi)$ satisfies the Einstein scalar field equations. In the Riemannian case, were M compact, then ϕ would be harmonic, so constant, and ω would vanish identically, but if ω is not required to be exact, there can still be interesting solutions in Riemannian signature.

Thinking of $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ as a $S_0^{k-1}(T^*M)$ -valued one-form, $(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl}$ can be viewed as a curvature term. Lemma 5.10 shows that a metric and $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \operatorname{div} \cap \ker \mathcal{K}$ such that the modified curvature $\mathcal{R}_{ijkl} - \frac{1}{4}(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl}$ is projectively flat, meaning it is a multiple of $(h \oslash h)_{ijkl}$, yield a solution of (5.21).

Lemma 5.10. *Let h_{ij} be a pseudo-Riemannian metric on a manifold M of dimension $n \geq 3$. Suppose $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$ satisfies $\omega^{a_1 \dots a_k} \mathcal{K}(\omega)_{ia_1 \dots a_k} = 0$ and that there is $\kappa \in C^\infty(M)$ such that the curvature \mathcal{R}_{ijkl} of h_{ij} satisfies*

$$(5.22) \quad \mathcal{R}_{ijkl} - c(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl} = -\frac{\kappa}{n(n-1)}(h \oslash h)_{ijkl},$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then h and ω solve the equations (5.21). In particular, κ is a constant.

If $n = 3$, then h and ω solve (5.22) for $c \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if they solve (5.21).

Proof. By (2.4), tracing (5.22) yields $\mathcal{R}_{ij} = \frac{\kappa}{n}h_{ij} + c\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ij}$. Tracing this yields $\mathcal{R}_h = \kappa + c|\omega|_h^2$, and calculating the trace-free part of \mathcal{R}_{ij} yields the last equation of (5.21). From Lemma 5.4 it follows that κ is a constant. If (h, ω) solves (5.21), then, by (2.5) and (5.21),

$$(5.23) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}_{ijkl} - c(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl} \\ &= \mathcal{W}_{ijkl} - c \operatorname{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl} - \frac{2}{n-2} \operatorname{tf}(\rho(\mathcal{R}) - c\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)) \oslash h - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} (\mathcal{R}_h - c|\omega|_h^2) h \oslash h \\ &= \mathcal{W}_{ijkl} - c \operatorname{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl} - \frac{\kappa}{n(n-1)} h \oslash h, \end{aligned}$$

where the conformal Weyl tensor \mathcal{W}_{ijkl} of h is the trace-free part of \mathcal{R}_{ijkl} . If $n = 3$, then there vanish \mathcal{W}_{ijkl} and $\operatorname{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl}$, and (5.23) shows that h and ω solve (5.22). \square

The qualitative properties of solutions of (5.22) depend strongly on the signs of the parameters c and κ .

6. EXAMPLES OF SOLUTIONS TO THE COUPLED EQUATIONS

This section records examples of solutions of the equations (5.21).

Example 6.1. Lemma 6.2 yields solutions of (5.21) with c having either sign.

Lemma 6.2. *Let (N, g) be an $(n+1)$ -dimensional pseudo-Riemannian space form with scalar curvature \mathcal{R}_g and let $i : M \rightarrow N$ be an immersion of an n -dimensional hypersurface M such that $h_{ij} = i^*(g)_{ij}$ is nondegenerate. Let Π_{ij} be the second fundamental form of the immersion i defined with respect to a unimodular transverse vector field Z^I orthogonal to $i(M)$ and satisfying $\epsilon = |Z|_g^2 \in \{\pm 1\}$. If g has constant curvature $\hat{R}_{IJK}{}^L = -\frac{2\mathcal{R}_g}{n(n+1)}g_{K[I}\delta_{J]}{}^L$, and $i(M)$ has mean curvature zero, then (h, Π) solves (5.22) with $c = -\epsilon$ and $\kappa = \frac{n-1}{n+1}\mathcal{R}_g$.*

Proof. Let Π_{ij} and $S_i{}^j$ be the second fundamental form and shape operator with respect to the normal field Z^I . Then $\Pi_{ij} = \epsilon S_i{}^p h_{pj}$. Let D be the Levi-Civita connection of h_{ij} . The Gauss-Codazzi equations imply that $D_{[i}\Pi_{j]k} = 0$ and $\mathcal{R}_{ijkl} = \mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^p h_{pl} = -\epsilon(\Pi \oslash \Pi)_{ijkl} - \frac{\mathcal{R}_g}{n(n+1)}(h \oslash h)_{ijkl}$. If the immersion has mean curvature zero, then $\Pi_p{}^p = 0$, so $D^p \Pi_{ip} = D_i \Pi_p{}^p = 0$ and $\Pi_{ij} \in \Gamma(S_0^2(T^*M)) \cap \ker \operatorname{div} \cap \ker \mathcal{K}$. \square

Example 6.3. The notions described next are special cases of more general ones introduced in [26]. Let h_{ij} be a pseudo-Riemannian metric and let ∇ be a torsion-free affine connection satisfying $\nabla_{[i}h_{j]k} = 0$ and $\nabla_i \det h = 0$. The torsion-free *conjugate* connection $\bar{\nabla}$ defined by $\bar{\nabla} = \nabla + h^{kp} \nabla_i h_{jp}$ satisfies $\bar{\nabla}_i h_{jk} = -\nabla_i h_{jk}$, so also $\bar{\nabla}_{[i}h_{j]k} = 0$ and $\bar{\nabla}_i \det h = 0$ too. The conjugate connection of $\bar{\nabla}$ is ∇ , so conjugacy is an involution on the space of torsion-free affine connections satisfying $\nabla_{[i}h_{j]k} = 0$ and $\nabla_i \det h = 0$. Such a

connection has *self-conjugate* curvature if its curvature tensor equals the curvature tensor of its conjugate connection.

A cooriented n -dimensional hypersurface M in $(n + 1)$ -dimensional flat affine space equipped with the standard parallel volume form is *nondegenerate* if its second fundamental form is everywhere nondegenerate. This condition does not depend on the choice of a vector field transverse to the hypersurface. With the given coorientation, the second fundamental form determines on M a conformal structure $[h]$. A choice of transverse vector field determines an induced torsion-free affine connection, ∇ , and a pseudo-Riemannian metric, h , representing $[h]$ (the second fundamental form with respect to the given transversal). The equiaffine normal is the transverse vector field determined by the requirements that it be consistent with the given coorientation and satisfy $\nabla_{[i}h_{j]k} = 0$ and $\nabla_i \det h = 0$. The last condition is equivalent to the requirement that the volume density determined by h equals that determined by interior multiplying the transversal in the ambient volume form. The connection, ∇ , and metric, h , associated with the equiaffine normal are called the *equiaffine connection* and *equiaffine (or Blaschke) metric*.

The conormal map associating with $p \in M$ the annihilator of the tangent space $T_p M$ takes values in the projectivization of the vector space \mathbb{V} dual to the ambient affine space. Because M is nondegenerate this conormal map is an immersion and the connection $\bar{\nabla}$ conjugate to ∇ represents the flat projective structure on the hypersurface obtained by pulling back that on the projectivization $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{V})$. In particular $\bar{\nabla}$ is projectively flat (one says that ∇ is conjugate projectively flat).

Let $\frac{1}{2}L_{ij}{}^k$ be the difference tensor of the Levi-Civita connection, D , of the equiaffine metric and the equiaffine connection, ∇ , so that $D = \nabla + \frac{1}{2}L_{ij}{}^k$, and write $L_{ijk} = L_{ij}{}^p h_{pk}$. Then $\nabla_i h_{jk} = L_{i(jk)}$, and from $\nabla_{[i}h_{j]k} = 0$ it follows that $L_{ijk} = L_{(ijk)}$, while from $\nabla_i \det h = 0$ it follows that $L_{ip}{}^p = 0$, so that $L_{ijk} \in \Gamma(S_0^3(T^*M))$. The tensor L_{ijk} is known as the *Fubini-Pick form*; the constant factor $1/2$ is conventional.

The *equiaffine mean curvature*, \mathcal{H} , of M is the average of the eigenvalues of the shape operator associated with the equiaffine normal. The hypersurface M is an *affine sphere* if the lines spanned by its equiaffine normals are all parallel or all meet in a point (called the *center* of the affine sphere). Equivalently, the equiaffine shape operator is a multiple of the identity endomorphism (in this case the multiple equals the equiaffine mean curvature and is constant). The curvature of the equiaffine metric h of an affine sphere satisfies $\mathcal{R}_{ijkl} - \frac{1}{4}(L \oslash L)_{ijkl} = -2\mathcal{H}(h \oslash h)_{ijkl}$, so (h, L) is a pair satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 5.10. For background on affine spheres see [7, 41] (these treat only the case of convex affine spheres, but the local computations are the same in any signature).

A convex affine sphere M cooriented to the concave side and having equiaffine mean curvature $\mathcal{H} < 0$ is said to be *hyperbolic*. By a theorem due to S. Y. Cheng and S.-T. Yau [16, 17, 41], the interior of a pointed proper open convex cone is foliated by hyperbolic affine spheres having center at its vertex, asymptotic to the cone, and for which the equiaffine metric is complete. The Cheng-Yau theorem on the existence of hyperbolic affine spheres thus guarantees many solutions to (5.16) when $k = 3$, moreover for which h is a complete Riemannian metric.

Theorem 6.4 shows that on a compact manifold a solution of a particular case of (5.21) is equivalent to the existence of a torsion-free affine connection that is Einstein-like in the sense that its Ricci curvature is a constant multiple of the metric. Example 6.3 shows that these conditions are satisfied by the equiaffine metric and affine connection induced on a convex nondegenerate hypersurface in flat affine space (in this case the Codazzi tensor is twice the usual cubic form). Since in this case the affine connection has projectively flat conjugate and there hold the stronger equations (5.22), this shows that (5.21) is a strict relaxation of (5.22) in the sense that a solution of (5.21) need not come from a solution of (5.22).

Theorem 6.4. *Let M be a manifold of dimension $n > 2$, and let h be a Riemannian metric on M having Levi-Civita connection D and curvature $\mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^l$.*

- (1) *Suppose $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^3(T^*M))$ is Codazzi, meaning $D_{[i}\omega_{j]kl} = 0$, and (h, ω) is a solution of (5.21) for $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c = 1$. The torsion-free affine connection $\nabla^\pm = D \pm \omega_{ij}{}^k$ has the following properties:*
 - (a) $\nabla_{[i}^\pm h_{j]k} = 0$ and $\nabla_i \det h = 0$.

- (b) The curvature $R_{ijk}^{\pm l}$ satisfies $R_{ijkl}^+ = R_{ijk}^+ h_{pl} = \mathcal{R}_{ijkl} + 2\omega_{pl[i}\omega_{j]k}{}^p = R_{ijk}^- h_{pl} = R_{ijkl}^-$. In particular, $R_{ijkl}^+ = R_{ijkl}^-$ has the symmetries of a metric curvature tensor.
- (c) $R_{ij}^{\pm} = R_{pij}^{\pm p} = \mathcal{R}_{ij} - \omega_{ip}{}^q \omega_{jq}{}^p = \frac{\kappa}{n} h_{ij}$ and $R^{\pm} = h^{ij} R_{ij}^{\pm} = \mathcal{R}_h - |\omega|^2 = \kappa$ is constant.
- (2) Suppose ∇ is a torsion-free affine connection satisfying $\nabla_{[i} h_{j]k} = 0$ and $\nabla_i \det h = 0$ having self-conjugate curvature R_{ijk}^l satisfying $R_{ij} = R_{pij}{}^p = \frac{\kappa}{n} h_{ij}$ for some constant κ . Then the difference tensor $\omega_{ij}{}^k = \nabla - D$ satisfies $\omega_{ijk} = \omega_{ij}{}^p h_{pk} \in \Gamma(S_0^3(T^*M))$, $D_{[i}\omega_{j]kl} = 0$, and $\kappa = \mathcal{R}_h - |\omega|^2$ is constant, and the pair (h, ω) solves (5.21) with constants κ and $c = 1$.

Proof. First suppose the conditions of (1). Claims (1a)-(1c) follow from straightforward computations as follows. By the definition of ∇^{\pm} and the symmetry of ω_{ijk} , $\nabla^{\pm} h_{ij} = \mp 2\omega_{ij}{}^k$. Antisymmetrizing yields $\nabla_{[i}^{\pm} h_{j]k} = 0$. Because ω_{ijk} is trace-free, $\nabla_i^{\pm} \det h = h^{pq} \nabla_i^{pm} h_{pq} = \mp 2\omega_{ip}{}^p = 0$. This proves (1a). The curvature of ∇^{\pm} satisfies

$$(6.1) \quad R_{ijk}^{\pm l} = \mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^l \pm 2D_{[i}\omega_{j]k}{}^l + 2\omega_{p[i}{}^l \omega_{j]k}{}^p = \mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^l + 2\omega_{p[i}{}^l \omega_{j]k}{}^p,$$

the last equality because $D_{[i}\omega_{j]kl} = 0$. This shows (1b) and (1c) follows by taking traces. The constancy of κ was assumed, and is equivalent to the constancy of R^{\pm} , for, Now suppose ∇ is as in (2). Define $\omega_{ijk} = \omega_{ij}{}^p h_{pk}$ by $\nabla - D = \omega_{ij}{}^k$. Because ∇ and D are torsion-free, $\omega_{[ij]k} = 0$. Then $\nabla_i h_{jk} = -2\omega_{i(jk)}$, so $0 = \nabla_{[i} h_{j]k} = -\omega_{[ij]k} - \omega_{k[ij]} = -\omega_{k[ij]}$, showing that $\omega_{ijk} = \omega_{(ijk)}$ and $\nabla_i h_{jk} = -2\omega_{ijk}$. Similarly, $0 = \nabla_i \det h = h^{pq} \nabla_i h_{pq} = -\omega_{ip}{}^p$, so $\omega_{ijk} \in \Gamma(S_0^3(T^*M))$. The connection $\bar{\nabla}$ conjugate to ∇ is defined by $\bar{\nabla} = \nabla + h^{kp} \nabla_i h_{jp} = D + \omega_{ij}{}^k - 2\omega_{ij}{}^k = D - \omega_{ij}{}^k$, so ∇ and $\bar{\nabla}$ have the forms $\nabla^{\pm} = D \pm \omega_{ij}{}^k$. The curvature $R_{ijk}^{\pm l}$ of ∇^{\pm} satisfies

$$(6.2) \quad R_{ijkl}^{\pm} = R_{ijk}^{\pm p} h_{pl} = \mathcal{R}_{ijkl} \pm 2D_{[i}\omega_{j]kl} + 2\omega_{pl[i}\omega_{j]k}{}^p,$$

so that $\nabla = \nabla^+$ has self-conjugate curvature if and only if $D_{[i}\omega_{j]kl} = 0$. In this case $\kappa h_{ij} = R_{ij} = R_{pij}{}^p = \mathcal{R}_{ij} - \omega_{ip}{}^q \omega_{jq}{}^p$ and $n\kappa = h^{ij} R_{ij} = \mathcal{R}_h - |\omega|^2$. Using the differential Bianchi identity, $D_{[i}\omega_{j]kl} = 0$, and $\omega_{ip}{}^p = 0$ there results

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} nD_i \kappa &= D_i(\mathcal{R} - |\omega|^2) = 2D^p \mathcal{R}_{ip} - 2\omega^{abc} D_i \omega_{abc} = 2D^p \mathcal{R}_{ip} - 2\omega^{abc} D_a \omega_{bci} \\ &= 2D^p \mathcal{R}_{ip} - 2D^a (\omega^{abc} \omega_{bci}) + 2\omega_{bci} D^a \omega_a{}^{bc} = 2D^p (\mathcal{R}_{ip} - \omega_{ia}{}^b \omega_{pb}{}^a) = 2D^p R_{ip}^{\pm} = 2D_i \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Since $n > 2$ this implies $\kappa = \mathcal{R}_h - |\omega|^2$ is constant. \square

Example 6.5. Let (N, Ω) be a $2n$ -dimensional symplectic manifold and let $i : M \rightarrow N$ be a Lagrangian immersion. Tensors on M are labeled with lowercase Latin indices and tensors on N are labeled with uppercase Latin indices. A (para/pseudo)-Kähler structure is a triple (G, A, Ω) comprising a (pseudo-)Riemannian metric G_{IJ} , an integrable (para)complex structure, and a symplectic form Ω_{IJ} , which are *compatible* in the sense that

$$(6.4) \quad A_I{}^P A_P{}^J = \epsilon \delta_I{}^J, \quad \Omega_{IJ} = A_I{}^P G_{PJ}, \quad A_I{}^P \Omega_{PJ} = \epsilon G_{IJ}, \quad \Omega_{IP} G^{JP} = A_I{}^J,$$

where, when $\epsilon = 1$ the qualifier *para* applies, and when $\epsilon = -1$ the qualifier *pseudo* is used if G_{IJ} is not Riemannian signature.

A (para/pseudo)-Kähler manifold (N, G, A) has *constant (para)-holomorphic sectional curvature* $4c$ if its Levi-Civita connection $\widehat{\nabla}$ has curvature $\widehat{R}_{IJK}{}^L$ of the form

$$(6.5) \quad \widehat{R}_{IJK}{}^L = 2c (\delta_{[I}{}^L G_{J]K} - \epsilon A_{[I}{}^L \Omega_{J]K} + \epsilon \Omega_{IJ} A_K{}^L).$$

If $\dim N = 2n$, then the Ricci and scalar curvatures are $\widehat{R}_{IJ} = 2c(n+1)G_{IJ}$ and $\widehat{R} = 4cn(n+1)$.

An immersion $i : M \rightarrow N$ into a (para/pseudo)-Kähler manifold (N, Ω, A, G) is *nondegenerate* if the induced tensor $h = i^*(G)$ is nondegenerate. Let (N, G, A, Ω) be a $2n$ -dimensional (para/pseudo)-Kähler manifold with canonical (Levi-Civita) connection $\widehat{\nabla}$ and let $i : M \rightarrow N$ be a nondegenerate Lagrangian immersion with second fundamental form $\Pi(X, Y)$ equal to the projection of $\widehat{\nabla}_X T i(Y)$ onto the normal bundle of M . Define $\Pi_{ijk} = \Pi_{(ijk)} = \Pi_{ij}{}^q \Omega_{qk}$ on M , so $\Pi(X, Y, Z) = \Omega(\widehat{\nabla}_X T i(Y), T i(Z))$. The tensor Π is symmetric because $\widehat{\nabla}$ is torsion-free and the immersion is Lagrangian. Let D be the Levi-Civita connection

of the metric $h_{ij} = i^*(G)_{ij}$ on M . Tensors defined on M are raised and lowered using h_{ij} and h^{ij} . Let $\hat{R}_{IJK}{}^L$ be the curvature of $\widehat{\nabla}$ and let $\mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^l$ be the curvature of D . Define $\Pi_{ij}{}^k = h^{kp}\Pi_{ijp} = \Pi_{ij}{}^k$. Note that $\Pi_{ij}{}^k$ is not the second fundamental form as such, as its upper index is twisted by the (para)-complex structure. Let $P \in \Gamma(\text{End}(i^*(TN)))$ be projection onto $Ti(TM)$ along $ATi(TM)$. It is claimed that, for $X, Y \in \Gamma(TM)$ there hold

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} Ti(D_X Y) &= P\widehat{\nabla}_X Ti(Y), \\ \widehat{\nabla}_X Ti(Y) &= Ti(D_X Y) + \epsilon ATi(\Pi^\sharp(X, Y)), \quad \widehat{\nabla}_X ATi(Y) = ATi(D_X Y) + Ti(\Pi^\sharp(X, Y)). \end{aligned}$$

Because i is nondegenerate $Ti(TM)$ and $ATi(TM)$ are transverse, so P is well-defined. By definition of the second fundamental form there is induced on M a torsion-free connection D such that $\widehat{\nabla}_X Ti(Y) = Ti(D_X Y) + \Pi(X, Y)$ where $\Pi(X, Y)$ is the projection of $\widehat{\nabla}_X Ti(Y)$ onto $ATi(TM)$ along $Ti(TM)$. In particular, $Ti(D_X Y) = P\widehat{\nabla}_X Ti(Y)$ by definition of D . Then

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} (D_X h)(Y, X) &= XG(Ti(Y), Ti(Z)) - G(Ti(D_X Y), Ti(Z)) - G(Ti(Y), Ti(D_X Z)) \\ &= (\widehat{\nabla}_X G)(Ti(Y), Ti(Z)) + G(\pi(X, Y), Ti(Z)) + G(Ti(Y), \pi(X, Z)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

shows that D is the Levi-Civita connection of h . By the definition of Π^\sharp there holds

$$(6.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega(\pi(X, Y), Ti(Z)) &= \Omega(\widehat{\nabla}_X Ti(Y), Ti(Z)) = \Pi(X, Y, Z) = h(\Pi^\sharp(X, Y), Z) \\ &= G(Ti(\Pi^\sharp(X, Y)), Ti(Z)) = \epsilon \Omega(ATi(\Pi^\sharp(X, Y)), Ti(Z)), \end{aligned}$$

for all $X, Y, Z \in \Gamma(TM)$, and by the nondegeneracy of Ω this shows $\pi(X, Y) = \epsilon ATi(\Pi^\sharp(X, Y))$, so that $\widehat{\nabla}_X Ti(Y) = Ti(D_X Y) + \epsilon ATi(\Pi^\sharp(X, Y))$. The identity $\widehat{\nabla}_X ATi(Y) = ATi(D_X Y) + Ti(\Pi^\sharp(X, Y))$ follows because A is $\widehat{\nabla}$ -parallel.

The Lagrangian immersion has *mean curvature zero* if $\Pi_{ip}{}^p = 0$.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $i : M \rightarrow N$ be a nondegenerate mean curvature zero Lagrangian immersion of the n -dimensional manifold M in the $2n$ -dimensional (para/pseudo-)Kähler manifold (N, G, Ω, A) with constant (para)-holomorphic curvature $4\hat{c}$. Let $h_{ij} = i^*(G)_{ij}$ be the induced metric. Then (h, Π) solves (5.22) with $c = \epsilon$ and $\kappa = \hat{c}n(n-1)$.*

Proof. From (6.6) it follows that there are tensors $\mathcal{T}_{ijk}{}^l$ and $\mathcal{N}_{ijk}{}^l$ on M having the algebraic symmetries of a curvature tensor of metric type and such that

$$(6.9) \quad \hat{R}(X, Y)Ti(Z) = Ti(\mathcal{T}(X, Y)Z) + \epsilon ATi(\mathcal{N}(X, Y)Z)$$

for all $X, Y, Z \in \Gamma(TM)$. Straightforward computations using (6.6) show that

$$(6.10) \quad \mathcal{T}_{ijk}{}^l = \mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^l - 2\epsilon(\Pi \otimes \Pi)_{ijk}{}^l, \quad \mathcal{N}_{ijk}{}^l = 2D_{[i}\Pi_{j]k}{}^l = 2\mathcal{K}(\Pi).$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_{ij} = \mathcal{T}_{pij}{}^p$, $\mathcal{N}_{ij} = \mathcal{N}_{pij}{}^p$, $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_p{}^p$, and $\mathcal{N}_p{}^p = 0$. Tracing (6.10) yields

$$(6.11) \quad \mathcal{T}_{ij} = \mathcal{R}_{ij} - \epsilon \rho(L \otimes L)_{ij}, \quad \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{R} - \epsilon |L|_h^2, \quad \mathcal{N}_{ij} = \text{div}(\Pi)_{ij}.$$

Let $\hat{R}_{IJKL} = \hat{R}_{IJK}{}^P G_{PL}$. Suppressing notation indicating the differential of i , it follows from (6.9) that $\mathcal{T}_{ijkl} = \hat{R}_{ijkl}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{ijkl} = A_i{}^P \hat{R}_{Pjkl}$. If G has constant (para)-holomorphic sectional curvature, it follows from (6.5) that $\hat{R}_{IJKL} = 2\hat{c}(G_{L[I}G_{J]K} + \epsilon \Omega_{L[I}\Omega_{J]K} + \epsilon \Omega_{IJ}\Omega_{KL})$ and $A_I{}^P \hat{R}_{PJKL} = 2\hat{c}(\Omega_{L[I}G_{J]K} + G_{K[I}\Omega_{J]L} + 2G_{IJ}\Omega_{KL})$. Pulling these back to M via i yields $\mathcal{T}_{ijkl} = \hat{R}_{ijkl} = 2ch_{[i}h_{j]k}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{ijkl} = A_i{}^P \hat{R}_{Pjkl} = 0$. The remaining identities in

$$(6.12) \quad \mathcal{N}_{ijk}{}^l = 0, \quad \mathcal{T}_{ijk}{}^l = 2\hat{c}\delta_{[i}{}^l h_{j]k}, \quad \mathcal{T}_{ij} = \hat{c}(n-1)h_{ij}, \quad \mathcal{T} = cn(n-1).$$

are obtained by taking traces. Substituting (6.12) in (6.10), and (6.11) shows that $\Pi_{ijk} \in \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \text{div}$ and with the curvature $\mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^l$ of the Levi-Civita connection D of h_{ij} satisfies

$$(6.13) \quad \mathcal{R}_{ijkl} = -\hat{c}(h \otimes h)_{ijkl} + \epsilon(\Pi \otimes \Pi)_{ijkl},$$

and so also $\mathcal{R}_{ij} = \hat{c}(n-1)h_{ij} + \epsilon \rho(\Pi \otimes \Pi)_{ij}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \hat{c}n(n-1) + \epsilon |\Pi|_h^2$. \square

There seems to be no general existence result already known for the case $k > 3$.

Example 6.7. Let G be a connected compact simple Lie group of dimension greater than 3 with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , let $h_{ij} = -B_{ij}$ be the bi-invariant metric determined by the negative of the Killing form of \mathfrak{g} , and note that h_{ij} is Einstein with Ricci curvature $\mathcal{R}_{ij} = \frac{1}{4}h_{ij}$.

Let $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} \in S^k(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ be the complete polarization of a homogeneous degree k polynomial P invariant under the adjoint action of G on \mathfrak{g} . More precisely, suppose that P is one of a set of homogeneous generators of the ring of invariant polynomials on \mathfrak{g} and that $k \geq 3$. If \mathfrak{g} has rank l then the ring of invariant polynomials on \mathfrak{g} is generated by l algebraically independent homogeneous elements (see e.g. [3, section VIII.8]). The degrees $2 = u_1 < \dots < u_l$ of the homogeneous generators are given in terms of the exponents $m_1 < \dots < m_l$ of the Weyl group W of \mathfrak{g} by $u_i = m_i + 1$, and satisfy $u_1 \dots u_l = |W|$ and $2(u_1 + \dots + u_l) = \dim \mathfrak{g} + l$. Since G acts on \mathfrak{g} orthogonally, the h -Laplacian is invariant under the G -action, so $\Delta_h P$ is again an invariant polynomial. Let E be the invariant polynomial corresponding to h . The harmonic part Q of P is obtained by subtracting from P a linear combination of terms of the form $E^s \Delta_h^s P$ ($s > 0$). Since each of these terms is G -invariant, so is Q . Since the homogeneous generators of the ring of invariant polynomials are algebraically independent, it cannot be that P is a linear combination of powers of E , so Q is not null. It follows that it may be supposed from the beginning that P is Δ_h -harmonic, or, equivalently, that $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ is trace-free. In particular, this shows that on \mathfrak{g} there exists a Δ_h -harmonic homogeneous G -invariant polynomial of degree at least 3.

Lemma 6.8. *Let G be a connected compact simple Lie group of dimension greater than 3 with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , let $h_{ij} = -B_{ij}$ be the bi-invariant metric on G determined by the negative of the Killing form B_{ij} of \mathfrak{g} , and let D be its Levi-Civita connection. Suppose $k \geq 3$ and let $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} \in S^k(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ be the complete polarization of a Δ_h -harmonic homogeneous G -invariant polynomial P of degree k . The pair (h, ω) solves the equations (5.16) on G .*

Proof. The invariance of P means that $0 = k c_{i(i_1}{}^p \omega_{i_2 \dots i_k)p} = -2D_i \omega_{i_1 \dots i_k}$, so that ω is parallel, and so in the kernel of \square_{-1} by (3.29). Let $\sigma_{ij} = \omega_{ii_1 \dots i_{k-1} j}{}^{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}$. Then

$$(6.14) \quad \begin{aligned} c_{ij}{}^p \sigma_{pk} &= -c_{ji}{}^p \omega_{pi_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \omega_k{}^{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = (k-1) c_{j(i_1}{}^p \omega_{i_2 \dots i_{k-1})pi} \omega_k{}^{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \\ &= (k-1) c_{j(p}{}^{i_1} \omega_{i_2 \dots i_{k-1})ki_1} \omega_i{}^{pi_2 \dots i_{k-1}} = -c_{jk}{}^{i_1} \omega_{i_1 pi_2 \dots i_{k-1}} \omega_i{}^{pi_2 \dots i_{k-1}} = -c_{jk}{}^p \sigma_{ip}, \end{aligned}$$

showing that σ_{ij} is an invariant bilinear form. By the simplicity of \mathfrak{g} there is a constant c such that $\sigma_{ij} = c h_{ij}$, and tracing this equality shows that $c = |\omega|_h^2 / \dim \mathfrak{g}$. It follows that (h, ω) solves the equations (5.16). \square

Example 6.9. When the metric h_{ij} is flat, the equations (5.16) admit purely algebraic solutions. In this example h_{ij} is a flat Riemannian metric on an n -dimensional vector space \mathbb{V} , although many of the claims make sense in other signatures. Let x^i denote the radial Euler vector field. Let $E(x) = |x|_h^2$. Let $\Delta = \Delta_h$. If $F(x)$ is a function on \mathbb{V} , let $F_{i_1 \dots i_k} = D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} F$. Sometimes it is convenient to write $D^{(k)} F$ for the k -fold covariant derivative of F (for example $D^{(2)} F$ is the Hessian of F). If F is a polynomial homogeneous of degree g then $x^{i_1} \dots x^{i_j} F_{i_1 \dots i_j} = g(g-1) \dots (g-j+1)F$. In this case $F_{i_1 \dots i_g}$ is a constant tensor, so parallel.

Lemma 6.10. *Let F be an h -harmonic polynomial homogeneous of degree $g \geq 2$ on the n -dimensional Euclidean vector space (\mathbb{V}, h) . Let $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_g} = F_{i_1 \dots i_g}$. The pair (h, ω) solves the equations (5.16) (with $\gamma = 0$) if and only if there is $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that P solves any one of the following equivalent equations:*

$$(6.15) \quad 0 = F_{ip_1 \dots p_{g-1}} F_j{}^{p_1 \dots p_{g-1}} - c h_{ij},$$

$$(6.16) \quad 0 = D_i D_j \left(|D^{(g-1)} F|^2 - c E \right),$$

$$(6.17) \quad 0 = |D^{(g-1)} F|^2 - c E.$$

In this case $c = |D^{(g)} F|^2$.

Proof. The equivalence of (6.15) and (6.16) follows from the vanishing of $F_{i_1 \dots i_{g+1}}$. Because $|D^{(g-1)} F|^2 - c E$ is a homogeneous quadratic polynomial, its Hessian vanishes if and only if it vanishes identically, so the equations (6.15) and (6.16) are equivalent to (6.17). \square

Example 6.11. A hypersurface in a Riemannian space form is *isoparametric* if its principal curvatures are constant. The question of classifying isoparametric hypersurfaces was posed and partially solved by E. Cartan in [11, 12, 10]. See [19], [52], and [59] and for background. In [45, 44] it is shown that for an isoparametric hypersurface in a constant curvature $(n-1)$ -dimensional sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{V} : E(x) = 1\}$:

- the number g of distinct principal curvatures satisfies $g \in \{1, 2, 3, 6\}$;
- if the distinct principal curvatures are ordered $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots > \lambda_g$, the multiplicities, m_i , of the λ_i satisfy $m_i = m_{i+2}$ (indices modulo 6), so that there are at most two distinct multiplicities m_1 and m_2 (moreover, if $g < 4$ then $m_1 = m_2$ always); and
- every such hypersurface arises as a level set of the restriction to the sphere of a polynomial $P : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ homogeneous of degree g and satisfying the equations

$$(6.18) \quad |dP|^2 = g^2 E^{g-1}, \quad \Delta P = \frac{m_2 - m_1}{2} g^2 E^{\frac{g}{2} - 1}.$$

A polynomial P solving (6.18) is called a *Cartan-Münzner polynomial*. Examples of solutions for which the resulting hypersurfaces are not extrinsically homogeneous are known when $g = 4$; see for example [25].

Theorem 6.12. *Let P be a Cartan-Münzner polynomial homogeneous of degree $g \geq 2$ and having multiplicities m_1 and m_2 on the n -dimensional Euclidean vector space (\mathbb{V}, h) . Then the trace-free part $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_g}$ of $P_{i_1 \dots i_g}$ solves (6.15), so the pair (h, ω) solves the equations (5.16) (with $\gamma = 0$).*

Proof. It suffices to show that P solves an equation of the form (6.17). The following identity is needed. For any polynomial F homogeneous of degree g there holds

$$(6.19) \quad \Delta(E^i F) = 2i(n + 2(g + i - 1))E^{i-1}F + E^i \Delta F.$$

In particular, the special case $f = 1$ yields $\Delta E^i = 2i(n + 2(i - 1))E^{i-1}$.

In the case $m_1 = m_2$, the polynomial P is harmonic and so $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_g} = P_{i_1 \dots i_g}$. In this case applying Δ^{g-2} to the first equation of (6.18) and simplifying the result using (6.19) yields

$$(6.20) \quad 2^{g-2} g(g!) (n + 2(g - 2)) \dots (n + 2) E = \Delta^{g-2} (g^2 E^{g-1}) = \Delta^{g-2} |dP|^2 = 2^{g-2} |D^{(g-1)} P|^2.$$

Differentiating this yields

$$(6.21) \quad D_i D_j |D^{(g-1)} P|^2 = 2g(g!) (n + 2(g - 2)) \dots (n + 2) h_{ij},$$

which suffices to show that P solves (6.17). The argument in the general case is similar, but more involved. Since $m_1 = m_2$, if $g < 4$, it can be supposed that $g \in \{4, 6\}$. In particular, g is even. Let $P = \sum_{i=0}^{g/2} E^i Q^{(g-2i)}$ be the Lefschetz decomposition of P into its harmonic components. Here $Q^{(g-2i)}$ is a harmonic polynomial homogeneous of degree $g - 2i$, and the decomposition is uniquely determined. Applying Δ to both sides and using (6.19) yields

$$(6.22) \quad \frac{m_2 - m_1}{2} g^2 E^{\frac{g}{2} - 1} = \Delta P = \sum_{i=1}^{g/2} 2i(n + 2(g - i - 1)) E^{i-1} Q^{(g-2i)}.$$

By the uniqueness of the Lefschetz decomposition, this implies $Q^{(g-2i)} = 0$ if $0 < i < g/2$. Hence

$$(6.23) \quad P = Q + \frac{(m_2 - m_1)g}{2(n + g - 2)} E^{g/2}$$

where Q is a harmonic polynomial homogeneous of degree g . Note that the desired tensor $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_g}$ equals $Q_{i_1 \dots i_g}$. Calculating the differential of (6.23) using the homogeneity of Q yields

$$(6.24) \quad g^2 E^{g-1} = |dP|^2 = |dQ|^2 + \frac{(m_2 - m_1)g^3}{(n + g - 2)} E^{g/2-1} Q + \frac{(m_2 - m_1)^2 g^2}{(n + g - 2)^2} E^{g-1},$$

so that

$$(6.25) \quad 0 = |dQ|^2 + g^3 \frac{(m_2 - m_1)}{(n + g - 2)} E^{g/2-1} Q + g^2 \left(\frac{(m_2 - m_1)^2}{(n + g - 2)^2} - 1 \right) E^{g-1}.$$

Applying Δ^{g-2} to both sides of (6.25) and simplifying using (6.19) yields

$$(6.26) \quad 0 = 2^{g-2} \left(|D^{(g-1)} Q|^2 + \left(\frac{(m_2 - m_1)^2}{(n + g - 2)^2} - 1 \right) g(g!) (n + 2(g - 2)) (n + 2(g - 3)) \dots (n + 2) E \right).$$

Hence

$$(6.27) \quad Q_{ip_1 \dots p_{g-1}} Q_j^{p_1 \dots p_{g-1}} = \left(1 - \frac{(m_2 - m_1)^2}{(n+g-2)^2}\right) g(g!)(n+2(g-2))(n+2(g-3)) \dots (n+2) h_{ij}.$$

Because $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_g}$ is parallel, this suffices to prove the claim. \square

Example 6.13. Let $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be an enumeration of the edge set of a finite k -regular graph with vertex set V . The partial Steiner system \mathcal{B} determined by the incidence of edges in the given graph is the collection of k -element subsets (blocks) of $\bar{n} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in \mathcal{B}$ if and only if the edges e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k} are incident at some vertex in V . Let \mathbb{V} be the n -dimensional real vector space generated by E and equip \mathbb{V} with the flat Riemannian metric h with respect to which E is an ordered orthonormal basis. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be the coordinates of $x \in \mathbb{V}$ with respect to the ordered basis E . The quadratic form $Q(x)$ determined by h is $Q(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2$. Associate with $I \in \mathcal{B}$ the monomial $x_I = x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_k}$. Let $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^{\mathcal{B}}$, so that $\epsilon_I \in \{\pm 1\}$ for each $I \in \mathcal{B}$.

Lemma 6.14. *Let \mathcal{B} be the partial Steiner system determined by the incidence of edges in a finite k -regular graph. For the homogeneity k polynomial $P(x) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{B}} \epsilon_I x_I$ associated with a k -regular graph and a choice of signs $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^{\mathcal{B}}$, the pair $(h, D^{(k)}P)$ solves (5.16).*

Proof. The component $\frac{\partial^{k-1} P}{\partial x_{i_1} \dots \partial x_{i_{k-1}}}$ is nonzero if and only if $\{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}\}$ is contained in some block $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ in \mathcal{B} (because any $k-1$ edges meet at most one vertex there is at most one such block). In this case $\frac{\partial^{k-1} P}{\partial x_{i_1} \dots \partial x_{i_{k-1}}} = \epsilon_I x_{i_k}$. Since there are $(k-1)!$ orderings of the distinct indices i_1, \dots, i_{k-1} and since the index of a given edge appears in exactly two blocks there results $|D^{(k-1)}P|_h^2 = 2(k-1)!Q$. Because no variable x_i appears in any monomial of P with a power higher than one, P is h -harmonic. By Lemma 6.10 this shows that the pair $(h, D^{(k)}P)$ solves (5.16). \square

7. REFINED KATO INEQUALITIES FOR TRACE-FREE SYMMETRIC TENSORS

The inequality (7.1) of Lemma 7.1 generalizes the estimate for the second fundamental form of a minimal hypersurface proved in [49]. With a 1 in place of $\frac{n+k-2}{n+2(k-1)}$, it follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and is known as a *Kato inequality*. The estimates (7.1)-(7.3) are *refined Kato inequalities* in the sense of [8] and [6], and can be deduced from the results in either of those papers. In particular the results of [8, Section 6] include Lemma 7.1, and the discussion at the very end of [8, Section 6] gives the explicit constants of (7.1)-(7.3) for the cases $k = 1, 2$. (The $k = 2$ case of (7.1) had earlier been stated in [4, section 4].) To keep the exposition self-contained, here there is given a direct proof of (7.1)-(7.3) following the general procedure described in the introduction of [6], and not utilizing general representation theoretic machinery.

Lemma 7.1. *Let M be an n -dimensional manifold with a Riemannian metric h having Levi-Civita connection D , and let $\phi_{i_1 \dots i_k} \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$, where $k \geq 1$. If $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \text{div}$ (that is $D_{[i} \phi_{j]i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = 0$) then where $|\phi|^2 \neq 0$ there holds*

$$(7.1) \quad |d|\phi||^2 \leq \frac{n+k-2}{n+2(k-1)} |D\phi|^2.$$

*If $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{L} \cap \ker \text{div}$ (that is $D_{(i_1} \phi_{i_2 \dots i_{k+1})} = 0$) then where $|\phi|^2 \neq 0$ there holds*

$$(7.2) \quad |d|\phi||^2 \leq \frac{k}{k+1} |D\phi|^2.$$

*If $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{L} \cap \ker \mathcal{K}$ (that is $D\phi$ is pure trace) then where $|\phi|^2 \neq 0$ there holds*

$$(7.3) \quad |d|\phi||^2 \leq \frac{k}{n+2(k-1)} |D\phi|^2.$$

Proof. Write $\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi)$ for the symbol of \mathcal{L} applied to the vector Z^i and $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$, and similarly for \mathcal{K} and div . Write $(i(Z)\phi)_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = Z^p \phi_{pi_1 \dots i_{k-1}}$ and suppose Z^i has unit norm. When $k = 1$ and $n = 2$ the coefficient of the pure trace terms in (3.19) should be understood in a limiting sense. The nonnegativity of $|\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(Z)(\phi)|^2$ in (3.19) yields

$$(7.4) \quad \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n+k-3} |i(Z)\phi|^2 \leq |\phi|^2.$$

Together (3.18) and (7.4) give

$$(7.5) \quad |\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{k+1}|\phi|^2 + \frac{k(n+k-3)}{(k+1)(n+2(k-1))}|\phi|^2 = \frac{n+k-2}{n+2(k-1)}|\phi|^2.$$

Contracting (3.12) with $\sigma_D(Z)(\omega)$ and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality shows

$$(7.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}Z^i d_i |\phi|^2 &= Z^i \phi^{i_1 \dots i_k} D_i \phi_{i_1 \dots i_k} = \langle \sigma_D(Z)(\phi), D\phi \rangle \\ &= \langle \sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi), \mathcal{L}(\phi) \rangle + \frac{2k}{k+1} \langle \sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(Z)(\phi), \mathcal{K}(\phi) \rangle + \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} \langle i(Z)\phi, \operatorname{div}(\phi) \rangle, \\ &\leq |\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi)| |\mathcal{L}(\phi)| + \frac{2k}{k+1} |\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(Z)(\phi)| |\mathcal{K}(\phi)| + \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} |i(Z)\phi| |\operatorname{div}(\phi)|. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$. By (3.13), $|D\phi|^2 = |\mathcal{L}(\phi)|^2$. Substituting this and (7.5) into (7.6) gives

$$(7.7) \quad |\phi|^2 |Z^i d_i |\phi||^2 = \frac{1}{4} |Z^i d_i |\phi|^2|^2 \leq |\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi)|^2 |\mathcal{L}(\phi)|^2 = |\sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(Z)(\phi)|^2 |D\phi|^2 \leq \frac{n+k-2}{n+2(k-1)} |\phi|^2 |D\phi|^2.$$

This holds for all unit norm Z^i , so shows (7.1).

Suppose $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{L} \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$. By (3.13), $|D\phi|^2 = \frac{2k}{k+1} |\mathcal{K}(\phi)|^2$, and, by (3.19), $2|\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(Z)(\phi)|^2 \leq |\phi|^2$. In (7.6) these give

$$(7.8) \quad \begin{aligned} |\phi|^2 |Z^i d_i |\phi||^2 &= \frac{1}{4} |Z^i d_i |\phi|^2|^2 \leq \left(\frac{2k}{k+1}\right)^2 |\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(Z)(\phi)|^2 |\mathcal{K}(\phi)|^2 \\ &= \frac{2k}{k+1} |\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(Z)(\phi)|^2 |D\phi|^2 \leq \frac{k}{n+1} |\phi|^2 |D\phi|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This holds for all unit norm Z^i , so shows (7.2).

Suppose $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{L} \cap \ker \mathcal{K}$. By (3.13), $|D\phi|^2 = \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} |\operatorname{div}(\phi)|^2$. With (7.4) in (7.6) this gives

$$(7.9) \quad \begin{aligned} |\phi|^2 |Z^i d_i |\phi||^2 &= \frac{1}{4} |Z^i d_i |\phi|^2|^2 \leq \left(\frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))}\right)^2 |i(Z)\phi|^2 |\operatorname{div}(\phi)|^2 \\ &= \frac{k(n+2(k-2))}{(n+k-3)(n+2(k-1))} |i(Z)\phi|^2 |D\phi|^2 \leq \frac{k}{n+2(k-1)} |\phi|^2 |D\phi|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This holds for all unit norm Z^i , so shows (7.3). \square

Remark 7.2. When $n = 2$ the inequalities (7.1), (7.2), and (7.3) are in fact equalities; see section 3 of [27]. Since here attention is focused on the case $n > 2$, further discussion is omitted.

Remark 7.3. The proof of Lemma 7.1 shows that if $\phi \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$ then the largest eigenvalue μ of the symmetric two-tensor $\rho(\phi \otimes \phi)_{ij}$ satisfies $\mu \leq \frac{n+k-3}{n+2(k-2)} |\phi|^2$. By (7.4) for any vector field X^i there holds $X^i X^j \rho(\phi \otimes \phi)_{ij} = |i(X)\rho(\phi)|^2 \leq \frac{n+k-3}{n+2(k-2)} |\phi|^2 |X|^2$, which suffices to show the claim. This means $\rho(\phi \otimes \phi)_{ij} \leq \frac{n+k-3}{n+2(k-2)} |\phi|^2 h_{ij}$.

Lemma 7.4. Let h be a Riemannian metric on a manifold M of dimension $n > 2$ and let $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. Wherever $\omega \neq 0$ there hold

$$(7.10) \quad |\omega|^{(n+2(k-1))/(n+k-2)} \Delta_h |\omega|^{(n-2)/(n+k-2)} \geq \frac{n-2}{n+k-2} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega), \quad \text{if } \omega \in \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div},$$

$$(7.11) \quad |\omega|^{(k+1)/k} \Delta_h |\omega|^{(k-1)/k} \geq -\frac{2(k-1)}{k+1} \langle \omega, \mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K}(\omega) \rangle, \quad \text{if } \omega \in \ker \mathcal{L} \cap \ker \operatorname{div},$$

$$(7.12) \quad |\omega|^{(n+2(k-1))/k} \Delta_h |\omega|^{(2-n)/k} \leq \frac{n-2}{n+k-2} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega), \quad \text{if } \omega \in \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \mathcal{L}.$$

Proof. Let $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M))$. Wherever $|\omega| > 0$ there holds

$$(7.13) \quad \frac{1}{2\lambda} |\omega|^{2(1-\lambda)} \Delta_h |\omega|^{2\lambda} = \frac{1}{2} \Delta_h |\omega|^2 + 2(\lambda - 1) |d|\omega||^2.$$

Combining (7.13) with (7.1), (3.28), (3.33), (3.34), and Lemma 7.1 yields (7.10)-(7.12). \square

Remark 7.5. If h is flat and $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is harmonic, then $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} = D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} f \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$. By Lemma 7.4 the function $|\omega|^p$ is subharmonic for all $p \geq (n-2)/(n+k-2)$. For the flat Euclidean connection on \mathbb{R}^n and $k = 1$ this is [54, Theorem A], and for $k > 1$ it is [9, Theorem 1]. In the opposite direction, [55, Theorem 2(b)] shows that on flat Euclidean space the best p for which $|\omega|^p$ is subharmonic

is $(n-2)/(n+k-2)$, and [55, Theorem 2(a)] shows that on flat Euclidean space, given any section ω of $S_0^k(T^*M)$ there is around every point a neighborhood U and a harmonic function $f \in C^\infty(U)$ such that on U there holds $\omega_{i_1 \dots i_k} = D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} f$.

If $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is harmonic then $df \in \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$, and Lemma 7.4 shows that

$$(7.14) \quad (n-1)|df|^{n/(n-1)} \Delta_h |df|^{(n-2)/(n-1)} \geq (n-2) \rho(\mathcal{R})(df, df).$$

If h has nonnegative Ricci curvature it follows that $|df|^p$ is subharmonic for any $p \geq (n-2)/(n-1)$.

Remark 7.6. Suppose $\omega_{ij} \in \Gamma(S_0^2(T^*M)) \cap \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \operatorname{div}$. If the sectional curvature is nonnegative then $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is nonnegative on $S_0^2(T^*M)$ so $|\omega|^{(n-2)/n}$ is subharmonic by (7.10); if M is compact this means $|\omega|$ is constant, and by (3.34) this implies ω is parallel. Moreover, if the sectional curvature is positive at some point, then $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is positive on $S_0^2(T^*M)$ at that point and ω must be identically zero. This recovers Theorem 7.7.

Theorem 7.7 (M. Berger - D. Ebin, [1]). *On a compact Riemannian manifold with nonnegative sectional curvature, a $b_{ij} \in \Gamma(S^2(T^*M))$ such that $D_{[i} b_{j]k} = 0$ and $D_i b_p{}^p = 0$ is parallel; if the sectional curvature is somewhere positive, then b_{ij} is a constant multiple of the metric.*

Corollary 7.8. *The following are equivalent for a Riemannian manifold (M, h) of dimension $n \geq 3$.*

- (1) *The curvature \mathcal{R}_{ijkl} of h is harmonic, meaning $D_p \mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^p = 0$.*
- (2) *The trace-free part $\operatorname{tf}(\mathcal{R})_{ij}$ of its Ricci tensor is in $\ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$, so is a Codazzi tensor.*
- (3) *Its Ricci tensor is a Codazzi tensor and its scalar curvature is constant.*

If $n \geq 4$, then these conditions are equivalent to

- (4) *The Weyl curvature \mathcal{W}_{ijkl} of h is harmonic, meaning $D_p \mathcal{W}_{ijk}{}^p = 0$.*

If h satisfies any of these equivalent conditions and M is compact, then that h have nonnegative sectional curvature which is somewhere positive implies h is Einstein.

Proof. For any Riemannian metric, $\operatorname{div}(\operatorname{tf}(\mathcal{R}))_i = \frac{n-2}{2n} D_i \mathcal{R}$ and

$$(7.15) \quad 2\mathcal{K}(\operatorname{tf}(\mathcal{R}))_{ijk} = D_p \mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^p + \frac{2}{n(n-1)} h_{k[i} D_{j]} \mathcal{R} = 2D_i \mathcal{R}_{j]k} + \frac{2}{n(n-1)} h_{k[i} D_{j]} \mathcal{R}.$$

It follows that, if $n > 2$, then $\operatorname{tf}(\mathcal{R})_{ij} \in \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$ if and only if $D_p \mathcal{R}_{ijk}{}^p = 0$. In this case $D_i \mathcal{R} = 0$, so $\mathcal{R} \in \ker \mathcal{K} \cap \ker \operatorname{div}$ and \mathcal{R} is constant. That (3) implies (2) is immediate. When $n > 3$, the identity

$$(7.16) \quad D_p \mathcal{W}_{ijk}{}^p = \frac{2(n-3)}{n-2} (\mathcal{K}(\operatorname{tf}(\mathcal{R}))_{ijk} + \frac{n-2}{2n(n-1)} h_{k[i} D_{j]} \mathcal{R}),$$

implies the equivalence of (3) and (4). Applying Theorem 7.7 to $\operatorname{tf}(\mathcal{R})_{ij}$ yields the final claim. \square

The equivalencies of Corollary 7.8 are essentially [21, Lemma 1]. The final claim (4) might be new.

8. CONSTRAINTS ON SOLUTIONS

This section obtains a priori constraints on the growth of solutions of (5.22). This requires bounds on complicated tensorial equations. The bounds presented are sharp for $k \leq 3$ but could be improved for $k > 3$. It would also be interesting to extend, even partially, such constraints to solutions of (5.21).

Lemma 8.1. *Let (\mathbb{V}, h) be a Euclidean vector space of dimension $n \geq 2$. For $k \geq 2$ and $\omega \in S_0^k \mathbb{V}^*$ there hold*

$$(8.1) \quad \frac{n+k-3}{n+2(k-2)} |\omega|_h^4 \geq |\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2 \geq \frac{1}{n} |\omega|_h^4,$$

$$(8.2) \quad \frac{(n-2)(n+k-2)}{n(n+2(k-2))} |\omega|_h^4 \geq |\operatorname{tf} \rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2,$$

$$(8.3) \quad 4|\omega|_h^4 \geq |\omega \oslash \omega|_h^2 \geq \frac{2}{n(n-1)} |\omega|_h^4,$$

$$(8.4) \quad \left(4 - \frac{2}{n(n-1)}\right) |\omega|_h^4 \geq |\operatorname{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{4}{n-2} |\operatorname{tf}(\rho(\omega \oslash \omega))|_h^2 \geq |\operatorname{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2.$$

Proof. For $x_i \in \mathbb{V}^*$, the nonnegativity of the squared norm of

$$(8.5) \quad x_{[i} \omega_{j]} i_1 \dots i_{k-1} - \frac{1}{n+k-3} \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} h_{i_s} [i \omega_{j]} i_1 \dots \hat{i}_s \dots i_{k-1} x^p,$$

(where \hat{i}_s denotes the omission of the index i_s) yields

$$(8.6) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq 2x^i \omega^{j i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \left(x[i\omega_j]_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} - \frac{1}{n+k-3} \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} h_{i_s} [i\omega_j]_{i_1 \dots \hat{i}_s \dots i_{k-1}} x^p \right) \\ &= |x|_h^2 |\omega|_h^2 - |\iota(x)\omega|_h^2 - \frac{k-1}{n+k-3} |\iota(x)\omega|_h^2 = |x|_h^2 |\omega|_h^2 - \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n+k-3} |\iota(x)\omega|_h^2, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(8.7) \quad \rho(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ij} x^i x^j = |\iota(x)\omega|_h^2 \leq \frac{n+k-3}{n+2(k-2)} |x|_h^2 |\omega|_h^2.$$

This shows $\frac{n+k-3}{n+2(k-2)} |x|_h^2 |\omega|_h^2 h_{ij} - \rho(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ij}$ is positive semidefinite. Because $\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ij}$ is also positive semidefinite and the endomorphisms $\frac{n+k-3}{n+2(k-2)} |\omega|_h^2 \delta_i^j - \rho(\omega \oslash \omega)_i^j$ and $\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)_i^j$ commute, contracting with $\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)^{ij}$ yields

$$(8.8) \quad \frac{n+k-3}{n+2(k-2)} |\omega|_h^4 \geq |\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2 = |\text{tf}(\rho(\omega \oslash \omega))|_h^2 + \frac{1}{n} |\omega|_h^4,$$

from which the inequalities (8.1) and (8.2) follow.

From (2.6) there follows

$$(8.9) \quad |\omega \oslash \omega|_h^2 = |\text{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{4}{n-2} |\text{tf}(\rho(\omega \oslash \omega))|_h^2 + \frac{2}{n(n-1)} |\omega|_h^4.$$

Using the nonnegativity of $|\text{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2$ and $|\text{tf}(\rho(\omega \oslash \omega))|_h^2$ yields the second inequality in (8.3). There remains to show the leftmost inequality of (8.3). For $\tau_{ij} \in S_0^2 \mathbb{V}^*$,

$$(8.10) \quad 0 \leq (\tau_{ij} \omega_{kl q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} - \tau_{kl} \omega_{ij q_1 \dots q_{k-2}}) (\tau^{ij} \omega^{kl q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} - \tau^{kl} \omega^{ij q_1 \dots q_{k-2}}) = |\tau|_h^2 |\omega|_h^2 - |\iota(\tau)\omega|_h^2,$$

where $(\iota(\tau)\omega)_{i_1 \dots i_{k-2}} = \tau^{pq} \omega_{pq i_1 \dots i_{k-2}}$. This means that the symmetric quadratic form defined on $S_0^2 \mathbb{V}^*$ by contracting $\tau^{ij} \tau^{kl}$ with the tensor $|\omega|_h^2 h_{k(i} h_{j)l} - \omega_{ij q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega_{kl}^{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}}$ is positive semidefinite. Since the quadratic form defined on $S_0^2 \mathbb{V}^*$ by contracting $\tau^{ij} \tau^{kl}$ with $\omega_{ij q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega_{kl}^{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}}$ is also positive semidefinite and the corresponding endomorphisms commute it follows that

$$(8.11) \quad 0 \leq (|\omega|_h^2 h_{k(i} h_{j)l} - \omega_{ij q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega_{kl}^{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}}) \omega^{ij}{}_{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega^{kl}{}_{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}}$$

so that

$$(8.12) \quad \omega_{ij q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega_{kl}^{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega^{ij}{}_{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega^{kl}{}_{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \leq |\omega|_h^4.$$

Define

$$(8.13) \quad \mathcal{M} = \omega_j{}^{k q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega_k{}^{i p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega_i{}^l{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega_l{}^j{}_{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}}.$$

From

$$(8.14) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq 2\omega_{k(i}{}^{p_1 \dots p_{k-1}} \omega_{j)l}{}_{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega^{k(i}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega^{j)l}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \\ &= \omega_{k i p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega_{j l}{}^{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega^{k i}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega^{j l}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} + \mathcal{M} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(8.15) \quad |\omega \oslash \omega|_h^2 = 2\omega_{k i p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega_{j l}{}^{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega^{k i}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega^{j l}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} - 2\mathcal{M}$$

it follows that

$$(8.16) \quad \begin{aligned} |\omega \oslash \omega|_h^2 &= 2\omega_{k i p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega_{j l}{}^{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega^{k i}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega^{j l}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} - 2\mathcal{M} \\ &\leq 4\omega_{k i p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega_{j l}{}^{p_1 \dots p_{k-2}} \omega^{k i}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \omega^{j l}{}_{q_1 \dots q_{k-2}} \leq 4|\omega|_h^4, \end{aligned}$$

the last equality by (8.12). This shows (8.3). Combining the leftmost inequality of (8.3) with (8.9) yields

$$(8.17) \quad \left(4 - \frac{2}{n(n-1)}\right) |\omega|_h^4 \geq |\text{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{4}{n-2} |\text{tf}(\rho(\omega \oslash \omega))|_h^2 \geq |\text{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2.$$

This shows (8.4). □

By (2.6), for $\omega \in S_0^k \mathbb{V}^*$ there holds

$$(8.18) \quad |\omega \oslash \omega|_h^2 = |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{4}{n-2} |\mathbf{tf} \rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{2}{n(n-1)} |\omega|_h^4.$$

From (8.18) there follows

$$(8.19) \quad \frac{k-1}{2} |\omega \oslash \omega|^2 + |\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 = \frac{k-1}{2} |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n-2} |\mathbf{tf} \rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{n+k-2}{n(n-1)} |\omega|_h^4,$$

for $\omega \in S_0^k \mathbb{V}^*$.

The proofs of theorems 8.5 and 8.6 depend on estimating (8.19) from above and below.

The estimates (8.3) and (8.4) can be improved when $k \leq 3$.

Lemma 8.2. *Let (\mathbb{V}, h) be a Euclidean vector space of dimension $n \geq 2$. For $\omega \in S_0^2 \mathbb{V}^*$,*

$$(8.20) \quad 2 \frac{n-2}{n-1} |\omega|^4 = |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 + \frac{2n}{n-2} |\mathbf{tf} \rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 \geq |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|_h^2,$$

$$(8.21) \quad 2|\omega|^4 = |\omega \oslash \omega|^2 + 2|\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2.$$

Proof. By (2.5),

$$(8.22) \quad \mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)_{ijkl} = 2\omega_{k[i}\omega_{j]l} + \frac{2}{n-2}(\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)_{k[i}h_{j]l} - \rho(\omega \oslash \omega)_{l[i}h_{j]k}) - \frac{2}{(n-1)(n-2)}|\omega|^2 h_{k[i}h_{j]l}.$$

Hence

$$(8.23) \quad \begin{aligned} |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 &= \langle \mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega), \omega \oslash \omega \rangle \\ &= 4\omega^{ki}\omega^{jl}\omega_{k[i}\omega_{j]l} + \frac{8}{n-2}\omega^{ki}\omega^{jl}\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)_{k[i}h_{j]l} - \frac{4}{(n-1)(n-2)}|\omega|^2\omega^{ki}\omega^{jl}h_{k[i}h_{j]l} \\ &= 2|\omega|^4 - 2|\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 - \frac{4}{n-2}|\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 + \frac{2}{(n-1)(n-2)}|\omega|^4 \\ &= 2(1 + \frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)})|\omega|^4 - \frac{2n}{n-2}|\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(8.24) \quad \begin{aligned} |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 + \frac{2n}{n-2}|\mathbf{tf} \rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 + \frac{2}{n-1}|\omega|^4 \\ = |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 + \frac{2n}{n-2}|\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 - \frac{2}{(n-1)(n-2)}|\omega|^4 = 2|\omega|^4, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (8.20) after rearranging terms. Combining (8.19) with (8.20) yields (8.21). \square

The key step in the proof of Lemma 8.3 comes from the proof of Theorem 4.2 in [13].

Lemma 8.3. *Let (\mathbb{V}, h) be a Euclidean vector space of dimension $n \geq 2$. For $\omega \in S_0^3 \mathbb{V}^*$,*

$$(8.25) \quad \frac{2n-1}{n} |\omega|^4 \geq |\omega \oslash \omega|^2 + |\rho(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 \geq |\omega \oslash \omega|^2 \geq \frac{2}{n(n-1)} |\omega|^4,$$

$$(8.26) \quad 2 \frac{n-2}{n-1} |\omega|^4 \geq |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2 + \frac{n+2}{n-2} |\mathbf{tf}(\rho(\omega \oslash \omega))|^2 \geq |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \oslash \omega)|^2.$$

Proof. Let $\{e(1)^i, \dots, e(n)^i\}$ be an h -orthonormal basis of \mathbb{V} . In terms of the endomorphisms $\omega(i)_j^k = e(i)^p \omega_{pj}^k \in \text{End}(\mathbb{V})$, $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$(8.27) \quad [\omega(i), \omega(j)]_{kl} = -2e(i)^a e(j)^b \omega_{k[a} \omega_{b]l} = -e(i)^a e(j)^b (\omega \oslash \omega)_{abkl}.$$

By [18, Lemma 1], for symmetric endomorphisms A_i^j and B_i^j of \mathbb{V} there holds $|[A, B]|_h^2 \leq 2|A|_h^2 |B|_h^2$, and applied with (8.27) this yields

$$(8.28) \quad |\omega \oslash \omega|_h^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n |[\omega(i), \omega(j)]|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n |[\omega(i), \omega(j)]|^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n |\omega(i)|^2 |\omega(j)|^2.$$

There hold

$$(8.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n |\omega(i)|^4 &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\omega(i)|^2 \right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n |\omega(i)|^2 |\omega(j)|^2 = |\omega|^4 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n |\omega(i)|^2 |\omega(j)|^2, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n |\omega(i)|^4 &= \frac{1}{2(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n (|\omega(i)|^2 - |\omega(j)|^2)^2 + \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n |\omega(i)|^2 |\omega(j)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The observations (8.29), which are key to the proof, appear in the proof of Theorem 4.2 in [13]. Summing $\frac{2n-1}{n}$ times the first equation of (8.29) with $\frac{1-n}{n}$ times the second equation of (8.29) yields

$$(8.30) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n |\omega(i)|^4 = \frac{2n-1}{n} |\omega|^4 - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n (|\omega(i)|^2 - |\omega(j)|^2)^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n |\omega(i)|^2 |\omega(j)|^2.$$

There holds $\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ab} e(i)^a e(j)^b = \langle \omega(i), \omega(j) \rangle$. Because $\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)$ is symmetric, the h -orthonormal basis $\{e(1)^i, \dots, e(n)^i\}$ can be chosen to be also orthogonal with respect to $\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)$ so that $\langle \omega(i), \omega(j) \rangle = 0$ if $i \neq j$. In this case,

$$(8.31) \quad |\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \omega(i), \omega(j) \rangle^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n |\omega(i)|^4.$$

Combining (8.28), (8.29), and (8.31) yields

$$(8.32) \quad \begin{aligned} |\omega \otimes \omega|_h^2 + |\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)|^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n |\omega(i)|^2 |\omega(j)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n |\omega(i)|^4 \\ &= \frac{2n-1}{n} |\omega|^4 - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n (|\omega(i)|^2 - |\omega(j)|^2)^2 \leq \frac{2n-1}{n} |\omega|^4, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the leftmost inequality of (8.25). Combining this with (8.18) yields (8.26). \square

It follows from (2.4) and (2.7) that for $\alpha, \beta \in S^k \mathbb{V}^*$ and $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{MC}(\mathbb{V}^*)$,

$$(8.33) \quad \langle \alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\beta) \rangle = \langle \rho(\alpha \otimes \beta), \rho(\mathcal{Y}) \rangle + \frac{(k-1)}{2} \langle \alpha \otimes \beta, \mathcal{Y} \rangle.$$

When $n > 2$ and $\alpha, \beta \in S_0^k \mathbb{V}^*$, substituting (2.5) into (8.33) yields

$$(8.34) \quad \langle \alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{Y}}(\beta) \rangle = \frac{(k-1)}{2} \langle \alpha \otimes \beta, \mathbf{tf} \mathcal{Y} \rangle + \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n-2} \langle \rho(\alpha \otimes \beta), \mathbf{tf}(\rho(\mathcal{Y})) \rangle + \frac{n+k-2}{n(n-1)} s(\mathcal{Y}) \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle.$$

Taking $\beta = \alpha \in S^k \mathbb{V}^*$ in (8.33) yields

$$(8.35) \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\alpha) = \langle \rho(\alpha \otimes \alpha), \rho(\mathcal{Y}) \rangle + \frac{(k-1)}{2} \langle \alpha \otimes \alpha, \mathcal{Y} \rangle.$$

Theorem 8.4 is needed in the proof of Theorem 8.5. The statement of Theorem 8.4 can be found in the form given here, in the context of Hermitian manifolds, as [60, Theorem 4.1].

Theorem 8.4 (S. Y. Cheng and S. T. Yau, [17, Corollary 1 on p. 857], [14, Corollary to Theorem 8 on p. 353]). *Let (M, g) be a complete n -dimensional Riemannian manifold with Ricci curvature bounded from below by $-\kappa(n-1)g_{ij}$ for a real constant $\kappa \geq 0$. Suppose $u \in C^2(M)$ is nonnegative and not identically 0 and satisfies $\Delta u \geq Bu^{1+\sigma} - Au$ for constants $B > 0$, $\sigma > 0$, and $A \in \mathbb{R}$. If $A \leq 0$, then u is identically zero, while, if $A > 0$, there holds $\sup_M u \leq |A/B|^{1/\sigma}$.*

Theorem 8.5. *Let M be a manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$. Suppose h is a complete Riemannian metric which with $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \operatorname{div} \cap \ker \mathcal{K}$ solves (5.22) for $c > 0$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$.*

- (1) *If $\kappa \geq 0$ then ω is identically zero, and h is a metric of constant sectional curvature.*
- (2) *If $\kappa < 0$ then the scalar curvature $\mathcal{R}_h = c|\omega|^2 + \kappa$ of h is nonpositive.*

Proof. By (5.22), $\rho(\mathcal{R})_{ij} = c\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ij} + \frac{\kappa}{n}h_{ij}$, $\mathcal{W}_{ijkl} = c\mathbf{tf}(\omega \otimes \omega)_{ijkl}$, $\mathbf{tf} \rho(\mathcal{R})_{ij} = c\mathbf{tf} \rho(\omega \otimes \omega)$, and $s(\mathcal{R}) = c|\omega|_h^2 + \kappa$. Together with (8.33), (8.34), and (8.19) these observations yield

$$(8.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) &= \frac{k-1}{2} \langle \mathcal{R}, \omega \otimes \omega \rangle + \langle \rho(\mathcal{R}), \rho(\omega \otimes \omega) \rangle \\ &= c \left(\frac{k-1}{2} |\omega \otimes \omega|_h^2 + |\rho(\omega \otimes \omega)|_h^2 \right) + \frac{\kappa(n+k-2)}{n(n-1)} |\omega|_h^2 \\ &= c \left(\frac{k-1}{2} |\mathbf{tf}(\omega \otimes \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n-2} |\mathbf{tf} \rho(\omega \otimes \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{n+k-2}{n(n-1)} |\omega|^4 \right) + \frac{\kappa(n+k-2)}{n(n-1)} |\omega|_h^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c > 0$, it follows from (8.36), (8.1), and (8.2) that

$$(8.37) \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) \geq \frac{\kappa(n+k-2)}{n(n-1)} (c|\omega|_h^2 + \kappa) |\omega|_h^2.$$

Substituting (8.37) into (7.10) of Lemma 7.4 yields

$$(8.38) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_h |\omega|^{\frac{n-2}{n+k-2}} &\geq \frac{n-2}{n+k-2} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) |\omega|_h^{-\frac{n+2(k-1)}{n+k-2}} \geq \frac{n-2}{n(n-1)} (c|\omega|_h^2 + \kappa) |\omega|_h^{\frac{n-2}{n+k-2}} \\ &= \frac{n-2}{n(n-1)} \left(c \left(|\omega|_h^{\frac{n-2}{n+k-2}} \right)^{1+\frac{2(n+k-2)}{n-2}} + \kappa |\omega|_h^{\frac{n-2}{n+k-2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Because h is complete, Theorem 8.4 applies. If $\kappa \geq 0$, it implies ω vanishes. In this case h is a metric of constant sectional curvature. If $\kappa < 0$, Theorem 8.4 yields $\sup_M |\omega|_h^2 \leq -\kappa/c$. This implies $\sup_M \mathcal{R}_h \leq 0$. \square

Theorem 8.6. *Let M be a compact oriented manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$. Suppose the Riemannian metric h and $\omega \in \Gamma(S_0^k(T^*M)) \cap \ker \operatorname{div} \cap \ker \mathcal{K}$ solve (5.22) for $c < 0$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$(8.39) \quad 0 \geq \int_M |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{n+k-2}{n(n-1)} \kappa + c \left(1 + \frac{(2n+1)(k-1)}{n} \right) |\omega|^2 \right) d \operatorname{vol}_h, \quad \text{if } k > 3.$$

$$(8.40) \quad 0 \geq \int_M |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{n+1}{n(n-1)} \kappa + \frac{2n-1}{n} c |\omega|^2 \right) d \operatorname{vol}_h. \quad \text{if } k = 3.$$

$$(8.41) \quad 0 \geq \int_M |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \kappa + c |\omega|^2 \right) d \operatorname{vol}_h, \quad \text{if } k = 2.$$

Proof. The equation (8.36) remains valid and yields

$$(8.42) \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) = c \left(\frac{k-1}{2} |\operatorname{tf}(\omega \otimes \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{n+2(k-2)}{n-2} |\operatorname{tf} \rho(\omega \otimes \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{n+k-2}{n(n-1)} |\omega|^4 \right) + \frac{\kappa(n+k-2)}{n(n-1)} |\omega|^2.$$

When $k = 2$, combining (8.42) with (8.20) yields

$$(8.43) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) &= \frac{c}{2} \left(|\operatorname{tf}(\omega \otimes \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{2n}{n-2} |\operatorname{tf} \rho(\omega \otimes \omega)|_h^2 + \frac{2}{n-1} |\omega|^4 \right) + \frac{\kappa}{n-1} |\omega|^2 \\ &= c |\omega|^4 + \frac{\kappa}{n-1} |\omega|^2 = |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{\kappa}{n-1} + c |\omega|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.34) and (8.43) yields

$$(8.44) \quad 0 = \frac{1}{2} \int_M \Delta_h |\omega|^2 d \operatorname{vol}_h = \int_M (|D\omega|^2 + \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega)) d \operatorname{vol}_h = \int_M \left(|D\omega|^2 + |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{\kappa}{n-1} + c |\omega|^2 \right) \right) d \operatorname{vol}_h,$$

which shows (8.41). When $k = 3$, combining (8.42) with (8.25) yields

$$(8.45) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) &= c \left(|\operatorname{tf}(\omega \otimes \omega)|^2 + \frac{n+2}{n-2} |\operatorname{tf} \rho(\omega \otimes \omega)|^2 + \frac{n+1}{n(n-1)} |\omega|^4 \right) + \frac{\kappa(n+1)}{n(n-1)} |\omega|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{c(2n-1)}{n} |\omega|^4 + \frac{\kappa(n+1)}{n(n-1)} |\omega|^2 = |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{n+1}{n(n-1)} \kappa + \frac{2n-1}{n} c |\omega|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.34) and (8.45) yields

$$(8.46) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_M \Delta_h |\omega|^2 d \operatorname{vol}_h = \int_M (|D\omega|^2 + \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega)) d \operatorname{vol}_h \\ &= \int_M \left(|D\omega|^2 + |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{n+1}{n(n-1)} \kappa + \frac{2n-1}{n} c |\omega|^2 \right) \right) d \operatorname{vol}_h, \end{aligned}$$

which shows (8.40). When $k > 3$, combining (8.42) with (8.2) and (8.4) yields

$$(8.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega) &\geq c \left(\frac{k-1}{2} \left(4 - \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \right) + \frac{n+k-2}{n} + \frac{n+k-2}{n(n-1)} \right) |\omega|^4 + \frac{\kappa(n+k-2)}{n(n-1)} |\omega|^2 \\ &= |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{n+k-2}{n(n-1)} \kappa + c \left((k-1) \left(2 - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \right) + \frac{n+k-2}{n-1} \right) |\omega|^2 \right) \\ &= |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{n+k-2}{n(n-1)} \kappa + c \left(1 + \frac{(2n+1)(k-1)}{n} \right) |\omega|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.34) and (8.42) yields

$$(8.48) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_M \Delta_h |\omega|^2 d \operatorname{vol}_h = \int_M (|D\omega|^2 + \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}(\omega)) d \operatorname{vol}_h \\ &\geq \int_M |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{n+k-2}{n(n-1)} \kappa + c \left(1 + \frac{(2n+1)(k-1)}{n} \right) |\omega|^2 \right) d \operatorname{vol}_h, \end{aligned}$$

which shows (8.39). \square

Remark 8.7. Applied with h_{ij} the induced metric and ω_{ij} the second fundamental form of a mean curvature zero compact immersed hypersurface in the $(n+1)$ -dimensional round sphere of scalar curvature $n(n+1)$ as in Example 6.1, Theorem 8.6 recovers the specialization to such hypersurfaces of [53, Theorem 5.3.2] (which applies to compact submanifolds of arbitrary codimension). Concretely, in this case, $c = -1$ and $\mathcal{R}_h - |\omega|^2 = \kappa = n(n-1)$, so (8.41) becomes

$$(8.49) \quad 0 \geq \int_M |\omega|^2 (n - |\omega|^2) d \operatorname{vol}_h = -n^2(n-1)^2 \int_M \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{R}_h}{n(n-1)} \right) \left(\frac{n-2}{n-1} - \frac{\mathcal{R}_h}{n(n-1)} \right) d \operatorname{vol}_h.$$

which recovers [53, Theorems 5.3.2 and 5.3.3]. From (8.49) it follows that either $\mathcal{R}_h = 1$ and ω is identically zero, so that the hypersurface is a totally geodesic hypersphere; $\mathcal{R}_h = 2n(n-1)$ and $|\omega|^2 = 2n$, in which case ω is parallel; or $\inf_M \mathcal{R}_h < 2n(n-1)$, which is [53, Corollary 5.3.3].

Remark 8.8. Applied with h_{ij} the induced metric and ω_{ijk} the twisted second fundamental form of a mean curvature zero compact immersed Lagrangian submanifold in a $2n$ -dimensional Kähler manifold of constant holomorphic section curvature \hat{c} as in Lemma 6.6 of Example 6.5, Theorem 8.6 recovers the specialization to such hypersurfaces of [13, Theorem 4.1]. Concretely, in this case, $c = -1$, $\kappa = \hat{c}n(n-1)$, and $|\omega|^2 = \hat{c}n(n-1) - \mathcal{R}_h$, so (8.40) becomes

$$(8.50) \quad 0 \geq \int_M |\omega|^2 \left(\frac{n(n+1)}{2n-1} \hat{c} - |\omega|^2 \right) d \operatorname{vol}_h = n^2(n-1)^2 \int_M \left(\hat{c} - \frac{\mathcal{R}_h}{n(n-1)} \right) \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_h}{n(n-1)} - \frac{2n(n-2)}{(2n-1)(n-1)} \hat{c} \right) d \operatorname{vol}_h,$$

which recovers [13, Theorem 4.1]. From (8.50) it follows that, if $\hat{c} > 0$, then either $\mathcal{R}_h = n(n-1)\hat{c}$ and ω is identically zero, so that the hypersurface is a totally geodesic hypersphere; $\mathcal{R}_h = \frac{2n^2(n-2)}{2n-1}\hat{c}$ and $|\omega|^2 = \frac{n(n+1)}{2n-1}\hat{c}$, in which case ω is parallel; or $\inf_M \mathcal{R}_h < \frac{2n^2(n-2)}{2n-1}\hat{c}$.

REFERENCES

1. M. Berger and D. Ebin, *Some decompositions of the space of symmetric tensors on a Riemannian manifold*, J. Differential Geometry **3** (1969), 379–392.
2. A. L. Besse, *Einstein manifolds*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3), vol. 10, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
3. N. Bourbaki, *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 7–9*, Elements of Mathematics (Berlin), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005, Translated from the 1975 and 1982 French originals by Andrew Pressley.
4. J.-P. Bourguignon, *The “magic” of Weitzenböck formulas*, Variational methods (Paris, 1988), Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., vol. 4, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990, pp. 251–271.
5. J.-P. Bourguignon, O. Hijazi, J.-L. Milhorat, A. Moroianu, and S. Moroianu, *A spinorial approach to Riemannian and conformal geometry*, EMS Monographs in Mathematics, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2015.
6. T. Branson, *Kato constants in Riemannian geometry*, Math. Res. Lett. **7** (2000), no. 2-3, 245–261.
7. E. Calabi, *Complete affine hyperspheres. I*, Symposia Mathematica, Vol. X (Convegno di Geometria Differenziale, INDAM, Rome, 1971), Academic Press, London, 1972, pp. 19–38.
8. D. M. J. Calderbank, P. Gauduchon, and M. Herzlich, *Refined Kato inequalities and conformal weights in Riemannian geometry*, J. Funct. Anal. **173** (2000), no. 1, 214–255.
9. A. P. Calderón and A. Zygmund, *On higher gradients of harmonic functions*, Studia Math. **24** (1964), 211–226.
10. E. Cartan, *Familles de surfaces isoparamétriques dans les espaces à courbure constante*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **17** (1938), no. 1, 177–191.
11. ———, *Sur des familles remarquables d’hypersurfaces isoparamétriques dans les espaces sphériques*, Math. Z. **45** (1939), 335–367.
12. ———, *Sur des familles d’hypersurfaces isoparamétriques des espaces sphériques à 5 et à 9 dimensions*, Univ. Nac. Tucumán. Revista A. **1** (1940), 5–22.
13. B.-y. Chen and K. Ogiue, *On totally real submanifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **193** (1974), 257–266.

14. S. Y. Cheng and S. T. Yau, *Differential equations on Riemannian manifolds and their geometric applications*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **28** (1975), no. 3, 333–354.
15. ———, *Maximal space-like hypersurfaces in the Lorentz-Minkowski spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **104** (1976), no. 3, 407–419.
16. ———, *On the regularity of the Monge-Ampère equation $\det(\partial^2 u / \partial x_i \partial x_j) = F(x, u)$* , Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **30** (1977), no. 1, 41–68.
17. ———, *Complete affine hypersurfaces. I. The completeness of affine metrics*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **39** (1986), no. 6, 839–866.
18. S. S. Chern, M. do Carmo, and S. Kobayashi, *Minimal submanifolds of a sphere with second fundamental form of constant length*, Functional Analysis and Related Fields (F. E. Browder, ed.), Springer, New York, 1970, pp. 59–75.
19. Q.-S. Chi, *Classification of isoparametric hypersurfaces*, Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians. Vol. I, Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM), vol. 36, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2017, pp. 437–451.
20. N. S. Dairbekov and V. A. Sharafutdinov, *Conformal Killing symmetric tensor fields on Riemannian manifolds*, Mat. Tr. **13** (2010), no. 1, 85–145.
21. A. Derdziński, *Riemannian metrics with harmonic curvature on 2-sphere bundles over compact surfaces*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **116** (1988), no. 2, 133–156.
22. E. B. Dynkin, *Maximal subgroups of the classical groups*, Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč. **1** (1952), 39–166.
23. M. Eastwood, *Higher symmetries of the Laplacian*, Ann. of Math. (2) **161** (2005), no. 3, 1645–1665.
24. M. G. Eastwood, *The Cartan product*, Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin **11** (2004), no. 5, 641–651.
25. D. Ferus, H. Karcher, and H. F. Münzner, *Cliffordalgebren und neue isoparametrische Hyperflächen*, Math. Z. **177** (1981), no. 4, 479–502.
26. D. J. F. Fox, *Geometric structures modeled on affine hypersurfaces and generalizations of the Einstein Weyl and affine hypersphere equations*, arXiv:0909.1897.
27. ———, *Einstein-like geometric structures on surfaces*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **XII** (2013), no. 5, 499–585.
28. ———, *Geometric structures modeled on affine hypersurfaces and generalizations of the Einstein-Weyl and affine sphere equations*, Extended abstracts Fall 2013—geometrical analysis, type theory, homotopy theory and univalent foundations, Trends Math. Res. Perspect. CRM Barc., vol. 3, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015, pp. 15–19.
29. ———, *Harmonic cubic homogeneous polynomials such that the norm-squared of the Hessian is a multiple of the Euclidean quadratic form*, Anal. Math. Phys. **11** (2021), no. 1, 43.
30. A. R. Gover and J. Šilhan, *Higher symmetries of the conformal powers of the Laplacian on conformally flat manifolds*, J. Math. Phys. **53** (2012), no. 3, 032301, 26.
31. C. Hadfield, *Resonances for symmetric tensors on asymptotically hyperbolic spaces*, Anal. PDE **10** (2017), no. 8, 1877–1922.
32. K. Heil and T. Jentsch, *A special class of symmetric Killing 2-tensors*, J. Geom. Phys. **138** (2019), 103–123.
33. K. Heil, A. Moroianu, and U. Semmelmann, *Killing and conformal Killing tensors*, J. Geom. Phys. **106** (2016), 383–400.
34. N. Hitchin, *A note on vanishing theorems*, Geometry and analysis on manifolds, Progr. Math., vol. 308, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015, pp. 373–382.
35. S. Kobayashi, *The first Chern class and holomorphic symmetric tensor fields*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **32** (1980), no. 2, 325–329.
36. ———, *First Chern class and holomorphic tensor fields*, Nagoya Math. J. **77** (1980), 5–11.
37. N. Koiso, *Nondeformability of Einstein metrics*, Osaka J. Math. **15** (1978), no. 2, 419–433.
38. T. Levasseur and J. T. Stafford, *Higher symmetries of powers of the Laplacian and rings of differential operators*, Compos. Math. **153** (2017), no. 4, 678–716.
39. A. Lichnerowicz, *Propagateurs et commutateurs en relativité générale*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1961), no. 10, 56.
40. H. L. Liu, U. Simon, and C. P. Wang, *Higher order Codazzi tensors on conformally flat spaces*, Beiträge Algebra Geom. **39** (1998), no. 2, 329–348.
41. J. C. Loftin, *Survey on affine spheres*, Handbook of geometric analysis. Vol. II, Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM), vol. 13, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2010, pp. 161–192.
42. R. G. McLenaghan, R. Milson, and R. G. Smirnov, *Killing tensors as irreducible representations of the general linear group*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **339** (2004), no. 9, 621–624.
43. J.-P. Michel, P. Somberg, and J. Šilhan, *Prolongation of symmetric Killing tensors and commuting symmetries of the Laplace operator*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **47** (2017), no. 2, 587–619.
44. H. F. Münzner, *Isoparametrische Hyperflächen in Sphären*, Math. Ann. **251** (1980), no. 1, 57–71.
45. ———, *Isoparametrische Hyperflächen in Sphären. II. über die Zerlegung der Sphäre in Ballbündel*, Math. Ann. **256** (1981), no. 2, 215–232.
46. R. Penrose and W. Rindler, *Spinors and space-time: Vol. 1, Two-spinor calculus and relativistic fields*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984.
47. R. Rani, S. B. Edgar, and A. Barnes, *Killing tensors and conformal Killing tensors from conformal Killing vectors*, Classical Quantum Gravity **20** (2003), no. 11, 1929–1942.
48. K. Schöbel, *The variety of integrable Killing tensors on the 3-sphere*, SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl. **10** (2014), Paper 080, 48.
49. R. Schoen, L. Simon, and S. T. Yau, *Curvature estimates for minimal hypersurfaces*, Acta Math. **134** (1975), no. 3–4, 275–288.

50. U. Semmelmann, *Conformal Killing forms on Riemannian manifolds*, Math. Z. **245** (2003), no. 3, 503–527.
51. I. G. Shandra, S. E. Stepanov, and J. Mikeš, *On higher-order Codazzi tensors on complete Riemannian manifolds*, Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry **56** (2019), no. 3, 429–442.
52. A. Siffert, *A new structural approach to isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **52** (2017), no. 4, 425–456.
53. J. Simons, *Minimal varieties in riemannian manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **88** (1968), 62–105.
54. E. M. Stein and G. Weiss, *On the theory of harmonic functions of several variables. I. The theory of H^p -spaces*, Acta Math. **103** (1960), 25–62.
55. ———, *Generalization of the Cauchy-Riemann equations and representations of the rotation group*, Amer. J. Math. **90** (1968), 163–196.
56. S. E. Stepanov, *Fields of symmetric tensors on a compact Riemannian manifold*, Mat. Zametki **52** (1992), no. 4, 85–88.
57. T. Sumitomo and K. Tandai, *Killing tensor fields on the standard sphere and spectra of $SO(n+1)/(SO(n-1) \times SO(2))$ and $O(n+1)/(O(n-1) \times O(2))$* , Osaka J. Math. **20** (1983), no. 1, 51–78.
58. M. Takeuchi, *Killing tensor fields on spaces of constant curvature*, Tsukuba J. Math. **7** (1983), no. 2, 233–255.
59. G. Thorbergsson, *A survey on isoparametric hypersurfaces and their generalizations*, Handbook of differential geometry, Vol. I, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2000, pp. 963–995.
60. V. Tosatti, *A general Schwarz lemma for almost-Hermitian manifolds*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **15** (2007), no. 5, 1063–1086.
61. R. M. Wald, *General relativity*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1984.
62. N. M. J. Woodhouse, *Killing tensors and the separation of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. **44** (1975), no. 1, 9–38.
63. S. T. Yau, *Submanifolds with constant mean curvature. II*, Amer. J. Math. **97** (1975), 76–100. MR 0370443

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA A LA INGENIERÍA INDUSTRIAL, ESCUELA TÉCNICA SUPERIOR DE INGENIERÍA Y DISEÑO INDUSTRIAL, UNIVERSIDAD POLITÉCNICA DE MADRID, RONDA DE VALENCIA 3, 28012 MADRID ESPAÑA
 Email address: daniel.fox@upm.es