

On the Kähler-Ricci flows near the Mukai-Umemura 3-fold.

Yuanqi Wang

September 4, 2021

Abstract

In this short note, we show that given a special Kähler-Einstein degeneration with bounded geometry, for any noncentral fiber, there exists a Kähler-Ricci flow which converges to the Kähler-Einstein metric of the central fiber. As an example, Tian's deformations [10] of the Mukai 3-fold admit Kähler-Ricci flows which converge to Donaldson's Kähler-Einstein metric [4] over the Mukai 3-fold.

1 Introduction

This is a following up note of [9]. In 1982, R.Hamilton introduced the Ricci flow in [5]. In the Kähler setting, the Kähler condition is preserved under the flow. H-D. Cao([2]) first studied the Kähler-Ricci flow. Using Yau's estimates for complex Monge-Ampère equations, Cao proved when $C_1(M)$ is negative or zero, the properly normalized Kähler-Ricci flow converges to a Kähler-Einstein metric, thus obtained another proof of the Calabi conjecture originally proved by Yau in [13].

When $C_1(M) > 0$, the situation is more complicated. A result announced by Perelman, and proved by Tian-Zhu in [11] says that if there exists a Kähler-Einstein metric in $C_1(M)$ with respect to the underline complex structure, then the Kähler-Ricci flow

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = -Ric + g \tag{1}$$

initiated from any metric in $C_1(M)$ converges to the Kähler-Einstein metric up to a biholomorphism. However, when there is no Kähler-Einstein metric with respect to the underlying complex structure, it's very interesting to study where does the flow go. It's widely believed that even the limit complex structure (as $t \rightarrow \infty$) could be different from the complex structure of the initial metric of the flow.

In this note, we show that there really exist such kind of examples of flows with jumping complex structures as $t \rightarrow \infty$. These examples live on certain

deformations of the well known Mukai-Umemura 3-fold (see [7], [8]). In the appendix we will say more about these 3-folds for the sake of a self-contained proof, but in this section we abbreviate everything to make it easiest to understand. Denote M_{F_0} as the Mukai-Umemura 3-fold, and M_{F_v} as the deformations (parametrized by tensors v) which are considered by Tian in [10]. The amazing history is that: on one hand, Tian proved that M_{F_v} does not admit any Kähler-Einstein metric; on the other hand, Donaldson proved in [4] that M_{F_0} admits a Kähler-Einstein metric. Moreover, Donaldson also showed there is a 2-parameter family $M_{\alpha,C}$ of deformations (of M_{F_0}) which do admit Kähler-Einstein metrics. Though M_{F_0} is not isolated Kähler-Einstein, the following theorem holds.

Theorem 1.1. *For any v close enough to 0 (as a tensor), there exists a metric ω_v over Tian's deformations M_{F_v} , such that the Kähler-Ricci flow initiated from ω_v converges to Donaldson's Kähler-Einstein metric over the Mukai 3-fold M_{F_0} (up to a biholomorphism). In particular, the limit complex structure (as $t \rightarrow \infty$) is different from the complex structure of the initial metric ω_v .*

Actually it's well known that M_{F_v} is a special example of the following degenerations.

Definition 1.2. We call the triple $(\mathfrak{M}, \varpi, B)$ a special Kähler-Einstein degeneration with bounded geometry if it satisfies the following.

1. $(\mathfrak{M}, \varpi, B)$ is a differentiable family of complex manifolds in the sense of Definition 4.1 in [6] (ϖ is a map of full rank from \mathfrak{M} to B), B is a ball in R^m and is centered at the origin.
2. For any $u \in B$, $\varpi^{-1}(u) \triangleq M_u$ is a Fano Kähler manifold. There exists a smooth tensor $J \in \Gamma(T^*\mathfrak{M} \otimes T\mathfrak{M})$, such that for any point $p \in \mathfrak{M}$, $T_p M_{\varpi(p)}$ is an invariant subspace of J , and J restricts to the complex structure of $M_{\varpi(p)}$. Moreover, there exists a smooth two-form G over \mathfrak{M} such that restricted to each fiber (M_u, TM_u) , $G|_{(M_u, TM_u)} = \omega_u$ is a Kähler metric form in $C_1(M_u, J_u)$.
3. M_0 admits a Kähler-Einstein metric ω_{KE} .
4. There exists a smooth vector field σ over \mathfrak{M} , such that $\varpi_*\sigma = -\sum_i u_i \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i}$. Furthermore, the diffeomorphism σ_a generated by σ is a biholomorphism from M_u to $M_{e^{-a}u}$.

With respect to Definition (1.2), the following more general theorem is true.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $(\mathfrak{M}, \varpi, B)$ be a special Kähler-Einstein degeneration with bounded geometry. For any fiber M_u , $u \in B$, $u \neq 0$, there exists a metric $\omega_{\phi,u}$, such that the Kähler-Ricci flow initiated from $\omega_{\phi,u}$ converges in*

Cheeger-Gromov sense with polynomial rate to the Kähler-Einstein metric ω_{KE} of M_0 , up to a biholomorphism.

Remark 1.4. Actually Theorem 1.3 implies more than Theorem 1.1 on the behavior of Kähler-Ricci flows near M_{F_0} , starting from the 4th kind of orbits as in page 44 of [4]. Since these are exactly parallel to Theorem 1.1, for the sake of brevity we only consider Tian's deformations. Though holomorphic degenerations are considered most often, Theorem 1.3 holds more generally for smooth degenerations. This is consistent with the real setting of Theorem 1.1 in [9]. The bounded geometry assumption is satisfied in most of the existing examples of degenerations. Similar topic is also discussed in Tian-Zhu's work [12].

Acknowledgements: The author is grateful to Xiuxiong Chen for continuous support and encouragement. The author would like to thank Song Sun for inspiring conversations. The author also would like to thank Xianzhe Dai and Bing Wang for related discussions.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.3.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3 are by simple observations based on the work of Sun and the author [9], Donaldson [4], Tian [10], and Chen-Sun [3]. The point is to construct metrics which satisfy the requirements of Theorem 1.1 in [9]. First we have the following lemma which is well known and essentially due to Kodaira [6].

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose $(\mathfrak{M}, \varpi, B)$ is a special Kähler-Einstein degeneration with bounded geometry. Then for any $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m) \in B$, there is a family of smooth diffeomorphisms ψ_u from M_0 to M_u with the following property. For any $k > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} |\psi_{u,\star}^{-1} \circ J_u \circ \psi_{u,\star} - J_0|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} = 0, \quad (2)$$

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} |\psi_u^\star g_u - g_0|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} = 0. \quad (3)$$

Moreover, there is a smooth family of smooth diffeomorphisms $\psi_{s,u}$ from \mathfrak{M} to itself such that

$$\varpi_\star \left(\frac{d\psi_{s,u}}{ds} \right) = \sum_{\beta=1}^m u_\beta \frac{\partial}{\partial t_\beta}; \quad \psi_{1,u}|_{M_0} = \psi_u.$$

Proof. of Lemma 2.1: We work in the real setting. As the terminology of [6], given any point $p \in \mathfrak{M}$, we can choose local coordinates

$$(x_b, t_\alpha), \quad 1 \leq b \leq 2n, \quad 1 \leq \alpha \leq m.$$

Suppose $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m) \in B$. Then we can lift the vector field

$$\sum_{\beta=1}^m u_\beta \frac{\partial}{\partial t_\beta}$$

up to a vector field V_u over \mathfrak{M} , as in the proof of Theorem 2.4 in [6]. Since $\varpi_\star V_u = \sum_{\beta=1}^m u_\beta \frac{\partial}{\partial t_\beta}$ over B , then V_u generates a smooth family of diffeomorphisms $\psi_{s,u}$ from M_0 to M_{su} . Namely,

$$V_u = \sum_{\beta=1}^m u_\beta \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \rho_k \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_\beta} \right)_k, \quad (4)$$

where ρ_k is the partition of unity subject to an open cover $U_k, 1 \leq k \leq k_0$. Moreover $\psi_u \triangleq \psi_{1,u}$ is a diffeomorphism from M_0 to M_u .

Next we express the complex structure J of \mathfrak{M} in a coordinate neighborhood U as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \sum_{b,c=1}^{2n} J_{bc} dx_b \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_c} + \sum_{b=1}^{2n} \sum_{\beta=1}^m J_{bt_\beta} dx_b \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial t_\beta} \\ &+ \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^m J_{t_\alpha t_\beta} dt_\alpha \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial t_\beta} + \sum_{b=1}^{2n} \sum_{\beta=1}^m J_{t_\beta b} dt_\beta \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_b}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $T_p M_{\varpi(p)}$ is an invariant subspace of J for any p , we have

$$J_{bt_\beta} = 0, \text{ for any } \beta, b.$$

Then restricted over M_0 and TM_0 , using g_0 as our reference metric, we consider

$$D = \psi_{u,\star}^{-1} \circ J_u \circ \psi_{u,\star} - J_0.$$

Let the coordinate representation of D be

$$D = \sum_{b,c=1}^{2n} D_{bc} dx_b \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_c}.$$

Let $w_b = x_b \circ \psi_u$. Then for any $p \in M_0$ and $1 \leq b, c \leq 2n$, we have

$$D_{bc}(p) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{2n} \frac{\partial w_\alpha}{\partial x_b}(p) \frac{\partial x_c}{\partial w_\beta}(\psi_u(p)) J_{\alpha\beta}(\psi_u(p)) - J_{bc}(p). \quad (5)$$

Using (4), we deduce

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} |V_u|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} = 0.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} |\psi_u - id|_{C^k, \mathfrak{M}} = 0, \text{ id is the identity diffeomorphism from } \mathfrak{M} \text{ to } \mathfrak{M}. \quad (6)$$

(6) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{u \rightarrow 0} |D_{bc}|_{C^k, U} \\
&= \lim_{u \rightarrow 0} |\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta=1}^{2n} \frac{\partial w_\alpha}{\partial x_b}(p) \frac{\partial x_c}{\partial w_\beta}(\psi_u(p)) J_{\alpha\beta}(\psi_u(p)) - J_{bc}(p)|_{C^k, U} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

(7) implies (2). Similarly, (3) is true. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Assumptions and setting as in Lemma 2.1. Let*

$$\tilde{J}_u = \psi_{u, \star}^{-1} \circ J_u \circ \psi_{u, \star}; \quad \tilde{\omega}_u = \psi_u^* \omega_u \in C_1(M_0, J_0).$$

For any δ , there is an ϵ such that if $|u| < \epsilon$, then there exists a 2-form $\omega_{\phi, u} \in C_1(M_0, J_0)$ with the following properties.

- $\omega_{\phi, u}(\cdot, \tilde{J}_u \cdot)$ is a Kähler metric with respect to \tilde{J}_u ;
- $|\omega_{\phi, u} - \omega_{KE}|_{C^{k-1}, M_0, g_0} \leq C\delta$, ω_{KE} is the Kähler-Einstein metric of the central fiber (gauge fixed).

Proof. of Lemma 2.2: Denote $\omega_{KE} \circ \tilde{J}_u$ as the tensor

$$(\omega_{KE} \circ \tilde{J}_u)(X, Y) = \omega_{KE}(X, \tilde{J}_u(Y)).$$

Consider the antisymmetric part of $\omega_{KE} \circ \tilde{J}_u$ as

$$(AS\omega_{KE} \circ \tilde{J}_u)(X, Y) = -\omega_{KE}(X, \tilde{J}_u Y) + \omega_{KE}(Y, \tilde{J}_u X).$$

Since $\omega_{KE} \circ J_0$ is symmetric, we have

$$-\omega_{KE}(X, \tilde{J}_u Y) + \omega_{KE}(Y, \tilde{J}_u X) = -\omega_{KE}[X, (\tilde{J}_u - J_0)Y] + \omega_{KE}(Y, (\tilde{J}_u - J_0)X). \tag{8}$$

Using Lemma 2.1, by letting ϵ to be sufficiently small we obtain

$$|\tilde{J}_u - J_0|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq \delta, \text{ for all } |u| < \epsilon.$$

Hence

$$|AS\omega_{KE} \circ \tilde{J}_u|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta. \tag{9}$$

Then we complexify $\omega_{KE} \circ \tilde{J}_u$ with respect to \tilde{J}_u . Using the fact that $\omega_{KE}^{2,0} \oplus \omega_{KE}^{0,2}$ is precisely the antisymmetric part of $\omega_{KE} \circ \tilde{J}_u$, we get

$$|\omega_{KE}^{2,0}|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} + |\omega_{KE}^{0,2}|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta. \tag{10}$$

Since $\omega_{KE} = \tilde{\omega}_u + d\theta$, we have

$$Re\omega_{KE}^{2,0} = Re(\omega_{KE} - \tilde{\omega}_u)^{2,0} = Re(d\theta)^{2,0}. \tag{11}$$

Then,

$$\omega_{KE}^{0,2} = \bar{\partial}_u \theta^{0,1}, \quad \omega_{KE}^{2,0} = \partial_u \theta^{1,0}. \quad (12)$$

By (10), (11), and (12), we get

$$|\bar{\partial}_u \theta^{0,1}|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} + |\partial_u \theta^{1,0}|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta. \quad (13)$$

We want to find a $(0,1)$ -form ϕ (with respect to \tilde{J}_u) such that

$$|\phi|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\partial}_u \phi = \omega_{KE}^{0,2}. \quad (14)$$

This is straight forward by considering

$$\bar{\partial}_u^* \theta^{0,1} = -\tilde{\omega}_u^{\bar{i}j} \theta_{\bar{i},j}. \quad (15)$$

By solving the Dirichlet problem

$$\Delta_u f = \bar{\partial}_u^* \theta^{0,1}, \quad (16)$$

we get a f such that

$$\bar{\partial}_u^* (\theta^{0,1} - \bar{\partial}_u f) = 0. \quad (17)$$

Let $\phi = \theta^{0,1} - \bar{\partial}_u f$, then

$$\bar{\partial}_u \phi = \bar{\partial}_u \theta^{0,1} = \omega_{KE}^{0,2}, \quad \bar{\partial}_u^* \phi = 0. \quad (18)$$

Claim 2.3. $|\phi|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta$.

The claim easily follows from the existence of G , which is actually a smooth family of metrics. For the sake of a self-contained note, we include the detail here. We first show $|\phi|_0 \leq C\delta$. Were this not true, there exists a sequence (ϕ_i, u_i) such that

$$u_i \rightarrow u_\infty, \quad \bar{\partial}_{u_i} \phi_i \rightarrow 0 \text{ in the sense of } (C^k, g_0), \quad \bar{\partial}_{u_i}^* \phi_i = 0, \quad \text{but } |\phi_i|_{C^0} = 1. \quad (19)$$

Hence

$$\Delta_{H, u_i} \phi_i \rightarrow 0 \text{ in the sense of } (C^{k-1}, g_0). \quad (20)$$

The Bochner formula for any metric and 1-form η reads as :

$$\Delta_g \eta = \Delta_{H, g} \eta - Ric_g \odot \eta, \quad \odot \text{ is some algebraic tensor product.} \quad (21)$$

By standard Schauder estimates (with respect to g_0), and the fact that $|Ric_{u_i}|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta$ (from item 2 in Definition 1.2), we deduce from (19), (20), and (21) that

$$|\phi_i|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C. \quad (22)$$

Then $\phi_i \rightarrow \phi_\infty$ in C^{k-1} -topology such that

$$|\phi_\infty|_0 = 1, \quad |\phi|_{C^{k-1}, g_0, M_0} \leq C, \quad \Delta_{H, \omega_{u_\infty}} \phi_\infty = 0. \quad (23)$$

This contradicts the simply connectness of Fano-manifolds (there should be no nontrivial harmonic form). Therefore

$$|\phi|_0 \leq C\delta. \quad (24)$$

By the Schauder-estimate of g_0 again and the fact $|Ric_u|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta$, we get the following estimate with a C independent of u .

$$|\phi|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta. \quad (25)$$

Then ϕ satisfies (14). Moreover, we have $\partial\bar{\phi} = \omega_{KE}^{2,0}$ and $|\bar{\phi}|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta$.

Define $\omega_{\phi, u} \triangleq \omega_{KE} - d(\phi + \bar{\phi})$. Then $\omega_{\phi, u}$ is Kähler with respect to \tilde{J}_u . Furthermore, (18) and (25) imply

$$|\omega_{\phi, u} - \omega_{KE}|_{C^{k-1}, g_0, M_0} \leq C\delta.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof. of Theorem 1.3: Without loss of generality we assume B is the unit ball. Fix a finite cover $(\mathfrak{U}_j, 1 \leq j \leq C)$ of M_0 in \mathfrak{M} with nontrivial intersection with M_0 . It suffices to show there exists a $\omega_{\phi, u}$ as in Theorem 1.3 for any $u \in B_r$, where r is sufficient small such that $B(r)$ is contained in the B -slice for all \mathfrak{U}_j , and every $u \in B(r)$ satisfies

$$|\psi_{u, \star}^{-1} \circ J_u \circ \psi_{u, \star} - J_0|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} + |\psi_u^* g_u - g_0|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \leq \delta, \quad (26)$$

guaranteed by Lemma 2.1. Then $\tilde{J}_u (= \psi_{u, \star}^{-1} \circ J_u \circ \psi_{u, \star})$ and $\tilde{g}_u (= \psi_u^* g_u)$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 2.2. Notice that since $C_1(M_0, \tilde{J}_u)$ is an integer cohomology class, \tilde{J}_u converges to J_0 , and \tilde{g}_u converges to $g_0 \in C_1(M_0, J_0)$, we have

$$C_1(M_0, \tilde{J}_u) = C_1(M_0, J_0).$$

Hence, Lemma 2.2 produces a metric $\omega_{\phi, u}$ which satisfies the assumptions in Theorem 1.1 of [9].

Step 1. We briefly show the Kähler-Ricci flow produces a degeneration of \tilde{J}_u to a Kähler-Einstein complex structure. Actually, Theorem 1.1 of [9] says the Kähler-Ricci flow initiated from $\omega_{\phi, u}$ converges to a Kähler-Einstein metric $(\tilde{\omega}_{KE}, \tilde{J}_{KE})$. In particular, there exists a smooth time-dependent family of smooth diffeomorphisms ψ_t such that $\psi_t^* \tilde{J}_u$ converges to \tilde{J}_{KE} . Thus \tilde{J}_u degenerates to \tilde{J}_{KE} , in the sense of the setting of Theorem 1.5 in [3].

Step 2. In this step we point out that \tilde{J}_u degenerates to J_0 , which is also Kähler-Einstein. To be precise, suppose $\sigma_a M_u = M_{u(a)}$, then $(M_{u(a)}, J_{u(a)})$ is biholomorphic to (M_u, J_u) via σ_a^{-1} . We consider the following diffeomorphism

$$\Psi_a = (\psi_u^{-1} \circ \sigma_a^{-1} \circ \psi_{u(a)})^{-1} : M_0 \rightarrow M_0. \quad (27)$$

Then it's straightforward to deduce from Lemma 2.1 and (27) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} |\Psi_{a,\star} \circ \tilde{J}_u \circ \Psi_{a,\star}^{-1} - J_0|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \\
&= \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} |\psi_{u(a),\star}^{-1} \circ J_{u(a)} \circ \psi_{u(a),\star} - J_0|_{C^k, g_0, M_0} \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

which means \tilde{J}_u degenerates to J_0 . Finally, by Theorem 1.5 in [3] on uniqueness of Kähler-Einstein degeneration and the uniqueness of Kähler-Einstein metric due to Bando and Mabuchi [1], we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\omega}_{KE}(\text{limit of the Kähler-Ricci flow}) \\
&= \omega_{KE}(\text{the original Kähler-Einstein metric in the central fiber}),
\end{aligned}$$

up to a biholomorphism. \square

3 Appendix: Mukai 3-fold and proof of Theorem 1.1.

It suffices to check the Mukai 3-folds form a special degeneration in the sense of Definition 1.2. This is already done by the work of Tian [10] and Donaldson [4]. Actually the Mukai 3-folds form a holomorphic degeneration, which is much more special than the differential family in Definition 1.2. To give a self-contained proof, we very briefly introduce the necessary aspects of Mukai-Umemura 3-folds for our application, where we use the convention employed by Tian in [10]. Let $G(4, 7)$ be the Grassmannian manifold consisting of the 4-planes in \mathbb{C}^7 . For any 3-plane F in $\wedge^2 \mathbb{C}^7$, we consider the subvariety M_F as

$$M_F = \{p \in G(4, 7) \mid F|_p = 0\}. \tag{29}$$

Consider the 3-plane $F_0 = \{f_1, f_2, f_3\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1 &= 3e_1 \wedge e_6 - 5e_2 \wedge e_5 + 6e_3 \wedge e_4; \\
f_2 &= 3e_1 \wedge e_7 - 2e_2 \wedge e_6 + e_3 \wedge e_5; \\
f_3 &= e_2 \wedge e_7 - e_3 \wedge e_6 + e_4 \wedge e_5.
\end{aligned}$$

The Lie algebra of holomorphic vector fields over M_{F_0} , denoted as $\eta(M_{F_0})$, is isomorphic to $sl(2, \mathbb{C})$. As a subalgebra of $sl(7, \mathbb{C})$ ($sl(7, \mathbb{C})$ naturally acts on 3-planes in $\wedge^2 \mathbb{C}^7$ via its fundamental action), $\eta(M_{F_0})$ is given by

$$\bullet \quad H_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 \end{pmatrix};$$

$$H_2 = \begin{vmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{vmatrix};$$

$$H_3 = \begin{vmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 \end{vmatrix}.$$

Now we consider the deformation F_v of F_0 as $F_v = \{f_1^v, f_2^v, f_3^v\}$, such that

$$f_i^v = f_i + \sum_{j+k \geq 7+i} v_{ijk} e_j \wedge e_k, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

In [10], Tian showed that when $v \neq 0$ and $|v|$ is small, the deformed Fano 3-fold M_{F_v} does not admit any Kähler-Einstein metric. On the other hand, Donaldson showed M_{F_0} admits a Kähler-Einstein metric. Moreover, Donaldson showed there is at least a 2-parameter family of small deformations $M_{\alpha, C}$ of M_{F_0} such that $M_{\alpha, C}$ also admit Kähler-Einstein metric for all α, C small. Thus M_{F_0} is not isolated Kähler-Einstein. Nevertheless, M_{F_0} is a Kähler-Einstein degeneration of M_{F_v} . To be precise, we consider the one real-parameter group generated by H_1 .

$$\psi(s) = \begin{vmatrix} s^{-3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s^{-2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & s & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & s^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & s^3 \end{vmatrix}.$$

It's easy to check that

$$|s\psi(s)f_1^v - f_1| + |\psi(s)f_2^v - f_2| + |s^{-1}\psi(s)f_3^v - f_3| \leq C|s|. \quad (30)$$

Hence

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \psi(s)M_{F_v} = M_{F_0}. \quad (31)$$

Thus $\cup_{s \in [-1, 1]} \psi(s)M_{F_v}$ is a smooth submanifold of $G(4, 7) \times \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, since $C_1(M_{F_v}) = C_1(Q)|_{M_{F_v}}$ (Q is the universal quotient bundle of $G(4, 7)$), we can take a closed positive $(1, 1)$ -form $\Omega \in C_1(Q)$ over $G(4, 7)$. Then the restricted form $\Omega|_{\mathbb{M}}$ plays the role of the G in item 2 of Definition 1.2.

References

- [1] S, Bando; T, Mabuchi. *Uniqueness of Einstein Kähler metrics modulo connected group actions*. Algebraic geometry, Sendai, 1985, 1140, Adv. Stud. Pure Math, 10, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.
- [2] H,D, Cao. *Deformation of Kähler metrics to Kähler-Einstein metrics on compact Kähler manifolds*. Invent.Math.81(1985), no.2, 359-372.
- [3] X,X, Chen, S, Sun. *Calabi flow, geodesic rays, and uniqueness of constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics*. Preprint.
- [4] S,K, Donaldson. *Kähler geometry on toric manifolds, and some other manifolds with large symmetry*. arXiv:0803.0985.
- [5] R, Hamilton. *Three-Manifolds with Positive Ricci Curvature*. J. Diff. Geom. 1982.
- [6] K, Kodaira. *Complex manifolds and deformation of complex structures*. Springer.
- [7] S, Mukai. *Fano 3-folds*. In "Complex projective geometry", 255-263 London math. Soc. Lecture Notes 179 Cambridge UP (1992).
- [8] S, Mukai; H, Umemura. *Minimal rational threefolds*. In: Algebraic Geometry (Tokyo/Kyoto 1982) 490-518 Lecture Notes in Math. 1016 Springer 1983.
- [9] Y, Wang; S, Sun. *On the Kähler-Ricci flow near a Kähler-Einstein metric*. To appear in Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik.
- [10] G,Tian. *Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature*. Invent. Math.137. 1-37 (1997).
- [11] G,Tian, X,H Zhu. *Convergence of Kähler-Ricci flow*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 20 (2007), no. 3, 675–699.
- [12] G,Tian, X,H, Zhu. *Perelman's W-functional and stability of Kähler-Ricci flow*, arxiv: math/0801.3504.
- [13] S,T, Yau. *On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the Complex Monge Ampère equation I*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 31 (1978).

Yuanqi Wang, Department of Mathematics, University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA; wangyuanqi@math.ucsb.edu.