

**TEKST NR 223**

**1992**

**THE FUNCTIONAL DETERMINANT**

THOMAS P. BRANSON

**TEKSTER fra**

**IMFUFA**

**ROSKILDE UNIVERSITETSCENTER**

INSTITUT FOR STUDIET AF MATEMATIK OG FYSIK SAMT DERES  
FUNKTIONER I UNDERVISNING, FORSKNING OG ANVENDELSER

IMFUFA, Roskilde Universitetscenter, Postboks 260, 4000 Roskilde  
THE FUNCTIONAL DETERMINANT

by: Thomas P. Branson

IMFUFA tekst nr. 223/92

101 pages

ISSN 0106-6242

---

**ABSTRACT.** Results in the spectral theory of differential operators, and recent results on conformally covariant differential operators and on sharp inequalities, are combined in a study of functional determinants of natural differential operators. The setting is that of compact Riemannian manifolds. We concentrate especially on the conformally flat case, and obtain formulas in dimensions two, four, and six for the functional determinants of operators which are well behaved under conformal change of metric. The two dimensional formulas are due to Polyakov, and the four dimensional formulas to Branson and Ørsted; the method is sufficiently streamlined here that we are able to present the six dimensional case for the first time. In particular, we solve the extremal problems for the functional determinants of the conformal Laplacian and of the square of the Dirac operator on  $S^2$ , and in the standard conformal classes on  $S^4$  and  $S^6$ . The  $S^2$  results are due to Onofri, and the  $S^4$  results to Branson, Chang, and Yang; the  $S^6$  results are presented for the first time here. Recent results of Graham, Jenne, Mason, and Sparling on conformally covariant differential operators, and of Beckner on sharp Sobolev and Moser-Trudinger type inequalities, are used in an essential way, as are a computation of the spectra of intertwining operators for the complementary series of  $SO_0(m+1, 1)$ , and the precise dependence of all computations on the dimension. In the process of solving the extremal problem on  $S^6$ , we are forced to derive a new and delicate conformally covariant sharp inequality, essentially a covariant form of the Sobolev imbedding  $L_1^2(S^6) \hookrightarrow L^3(S^6)$  for section spaces of trace free symmetric two-tensors. Finally, we present results of Branson, Chang, and Yang on using the functional determinant to bound metrics in a given conformal class. The setting here is that of compact four-manifolds which admit locally symmetric (but not necessarily conformally flat) Riemannian metrics.

# THE FUNCTIONAL DETERMINANT

THOMAS P. BRANSON

**ABSTRACT.** Results in the spectral theory of differential operators, and recent results on conformally covariant differential operators and on sharp inequalities, are combined in a study of functional determinants of natural differential operators. The setting is that of compact Riemannian manifolds. We concentrate especially on the conformally flat case, and obtain formulas in dimensions two, four, and six for the functional determinants of operators which are well behaved under conformal change of metric. The two dimensional formulas are due to Polyakov, and the four dimensional formulas to Branson and Ørsted; the method is sufficiently streamlined here that we are able to present the six dimensional case for the first time. In particular, we solve the extremal problems for the functional determinants of the conformal Laplacian and of the square of the Dirac operator on  $S^2$ , and in the standard conformal classes on  $S^4$  and  $S^6$ . The  $S^2$  results are due to Onofri, and the  $S^4$  results to Branson, Chang, and Yang; the  $S^6$  results are presented for the first time here. Recent results of Graham, Jenne, Mason, and Sparling on conformally covariant differential operators, and of Beckner on sharp Sobolev and Moser-Trudinger type inequalities, are used in an essential way, as are a computation of the spectra of intertwining operators for the complementary series of  $SO_0(m+1, 1)$ , and the precise dependence of all computations on the dimension. In the process of solving the extremal problem on  $S^6$ , we are forced to derive a new and delicate conformally covariant sharp inequality, essentially a covariant form of the Sobolev imbedding  $L_1^2(S^6) \hookrightarrow L^3(S^6)$  for section spaces of trace free symmetric two-tensors. Finally, we present results of Branson, Chang, and Yang on using the functional determinant to bound metrics in a given conformal class. The setting here is that of compact four-manifolds which admit locally symmetric (but not necessarily conformally flat) Riemannian metrics.

## 0. INTRODUCTION

Some very recent work in Analysis and Geometry has revealed strong new connections among fields which, while never completely separate, have at least been studied in very different ways. Part of the stimulus for this has been physical String Theory, which led in the last decade to a fresh look at Riemann surfaces, always a meeting ground for different disciplines in Analysis. In these notes, we would like to clarify some of these connections as they have manifested themselves in the study of string theoretic principles in higher ( $> 2$ ) dimensions. Broadly speaking, the fields in question are:

- I the spectral theory of differential operators;
- II conformal geometry; and
- III sharp inequalities.

---

Lecture Notes, First Global Analysis Research Symposium on Pure and Applied Mathematics, Seoul National University. Partially supported by the Danish Research Council.

In this discussion, we work in the category of compact Riemannian manifolds. Under the heading (I) are such tools as the heat kernel expansion, index theory, and functional determinants. Two of the major goals involve relating geometry to spectral data. In the *isospectral problem*, one tries to show that the spectrum of some natural differential operator (for example, the Laplacian  $\Delta$ ) determines the geometry (Riemannian metric), or at least that there is a very small set of metrics with the same spectrum. In the *uniformization problem*, one tries to use some spectral invariant  $S$  to "drive" the metric to a uniform state (usually one of constant curvature in some sense), either by solving an extremal problem for  $S$  as a functional on the space of metrics, or by setting up a "heat flow" (parabolic equation) which will produce the uniform state at time infinity. Under the heading (II), the main tools are conformally invariant differential operators. (III) is a hard analytic topic; among the major tools relevant here is *symmetrization* and the use of symmetric decreasing rearrangement to "improve" the value of functionals like those mentioned in the discussion of (I) above. "Sharp" inequalities are those with best constants and extremals given. Geometrically, a sharp inequality can usually be viewed as an invariant quantity, i.e., the quantity asserted to be nonnegative. Sharpness, not to mention the applicability of symmetrization in the proof, are intimately connected to the geometric invariance exhibited by the eventual inequality. More functional analytically, a sharp inequality can often be viewed as a norm computation for an imbedding of Banach spaces, the prototypical example being the Sobolev Imbedding Theorem. Both of these viewpoints will be useful here.

The more or less straightforward connections are (I) $\leftrightarrow$ (II) and (II) $\leftrightarrow$ (III); the link (I) $\leftrightarrow$ (III) has been somewhat mysterious. For example, one would like a reason for the fact that Onofri's analysis of the extremal problem for the functional determinant  $\det \Delta$  on the sphere  $S^2$  leads directly to the Moser-Trudinger inequality, other than that both problems are extremely natural. A main goal of this treatment, aside from showing that similar phenomena occur in higher dimensions, is to show that these phenomena should be expected, i.e. are to some extent predictable from the geometric formulation of the problems. In other words, we would like to make the link (I) $\leftrightarrow$ (III) explicit.

A curious additional connection is that between (III) and the theory of the *complementary series* of the Lie group  $SO_0(m+1, 1)$ ; we make this completely explicit in Sec. 3 of these notes. It has been remarked that, with respect to the problem of determining the unitary dual of a semisimple Lie group, the complementary series is an anomalous sort of object, not really fitting into any framework that does much good in the study of unitary representations in general. For this reason, complementary series representations have even acquired a reputation as being somewhat "useless". Furthermore, according to [Vo, p. 17], "One hopes not to need them for most harmonic analysis problems." It is, therefore, ironic that they are so important in the present treatment, and more so because they are useful for the same reason that they have been thought useless: the invariant inner product is a "strange" one, obtained from the  $L^2$  inner product  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  by insertion of a pseudo-differential *intertwining operator*  $A$  to form  $(\cdot, A\cdot)$ . These  $A$  are actually elliptic operators defining invariant versions of the inner products in the Sobolev spaces  $L^2_\nu$  (meaning  $L^2$ , with  $\nu$  derivatives in  $L^2$ ,  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ ). Otherwise said, they are invariant Banach isomorphisms from  $L^2_\nu$  to its dual  $L^2_{-\nu}$ ; for a discrete set of  $\nu$ , they are actually differential operators, and

in fact the realizations on the standard sphere  $S^m$  of conformally covariant differential operators that exist for general Riemannian metrics. Furthermore, the spectra of these intertwining operators are explicitly computable from the intertwining relation. We return to this theme in Sec. 7 to derive an essentially new estimate crucial to the extremal problem for the functional determinant on  $S^6$ ; here we need not only the complementary series representations from the *spherical principal series* (principal series representations carried by spaces of scalar valued functions), but also a tensor valued complementary series. In a way, the complementary series is the central object in this investigation; indeed, we just have touched upon links to all the other ideas in this circle (including (I-III)) in discussing it.

In describing the results of this work, we shall stay on a not-too-technical level for the remainder of the introduction (just referring ahead for definitions and clarification). We continue the study of the functional determinant in higher ( $> 2$ ) dimensions begun in [BØ3, BCY], and derive new formulas for functional determinants of operators with certain nice conformal properties, in particular for the conformal Laplacian (or Yamabe operator)  $Y$  and the square  $\nabla^2$  of the Dirac operator, on conformally flat manifolds of dimension six. One motivation for going to dimension six is the search for a pattern in the extremal problem for the functional determinant. In a fundamental paper [On], Onofri showed that as a functional on the space of volume  $4\pi$  Riemannian metrics on the Riemann sphere  $S^2$ , the functional determinant  $\det \Delta$  of the Laplacian is maximized exactly at the standard metric  $g_0$  and its transforms under the Möbius group of  $S^2$ . His method was as follows: (1) prove the statement replacing "Riemannian metrics" by "metrics in the standard conformal class  $[g_0] := \{g_\omega = e^{2\omega}g \mid \omega \in C^\infty(S^2)\}$ ." This is done by computing a quotient  $(\det \Delta_\omega)/(\det \Delta_0)$ , where  $\Delta_\omega$  is the Laplacian in the metric  $g_\omega$ , and then noticing that the resulting quantity is exactly that asserted to be nonpositive by the celebrated Moser-Trudinger inequality. This inequality may be viewed as the norm computation for the imbedding of the Sobolev class  $L_1^2$  into the Orlicz class  $e^L$ . (2) Then note that any Riemannian metric on  $S^2$  is the pullback of some  $g_\omega$  under a diffeomorphism  $\varphi \in \text{Diffeo}(S^2)$ . Since spectral invariants of  $\Delta$  or of any other natural differential operator are also diffeomorphism invariants, the result follows; the spectral invariants involved here are, of course,  $\det \Delta$  and the volume (which appears in the spectral asymptotics of  $\Delta$ ). Similar results hold for the Laplacians of higher spin bundles; in particular the spin Laplacian, i.e. the square  $\nabla^2$  of the Dirac operator  $\nabla$ , though one important dissimilarity is that  $\det \nabla^2$  is *minimized* in the standard geometry.

The first thing to go radically wrong with Onofri's argument when we go up in dimension is this second step: generalizing the Möbius group to the conformal group  $\text{ctran}(S^m, g_0)$ , up to covering a copy of  $\text{SO}_0(m+1, 1)$ , we get an extremely large space of metrics, even after deflation by the infinite dimensional groups of diffeomorphisms and of conformal changes of metric. To be somewhat more precise, the cone  $\mathcal{G}$  of Riemannian metrics is acted upon by the group  $\text{Diffeo}(S^m) \ltimes C_+^\infty(S^m)$ , where  $\ltimes$  is semidirect product, and the action of  $e^\omega \in C_+^\infty(S^m)$  is  $g \mapsto e^{2\omega}g$ . The product is semidirect because diffeomorphisms pull back conformal factors  $e^\omega$ . If  $m = 2$ , the orbit space  $\mathcal{G}/\text{Diffeo}(S^m) \ltimes C_+^\infty(S^m)$  is a single point, but if  $m > 2$ , it is infinite dimensional and quite complicated structurally. The upshot is that, in higher dimensions, we must stay within a given conformal class, at least at

first, in looking for analogues of Onofri's Theorem and other fundamental string theoretic principles. Almost no work has been done on the question of cutting across conformal classes, either for the extremal problem or the closely related isospectral problem.

There are still more unpleasant facts to be faced in higher dimension: much as we like the ordinary Laplacian  $\Delta$  (for example, for its topological significance), it simply does not have the good conformal behavior necessary to get a *Polyakov formula* for the conformal variation of its determinant. Nature strongly prefers that we compute the determinant of a *conformally covariant* differential operator, or at least a positive integral power of such. The Dirac operator  $\nabla$  is conformally covariant, so we can always consider  $\nabla^2$ . There is also a Laplacian on functions, the *conformal Laplacian*

$$Y := \Delta + \frac{m-2}{4(m-1)}\tau,$$

where  $\tau$  is the scalar curvature, which has nice conformal properties, and which specializes to  $\Delta$  in dimension two.

At this point one would like to examine the situation in dimension  $m = 3$ . However, the functional determinant is quite rigid conformally in odd dimensions, and so at least for the problem we are looking at, the next dimension is  $m = 4$ . Here Branson and Ørsted [BØ3] computed quotients of the form

$$(0.1) \quad (\det A_\omega)/(\det A_0)$$

for reasonably general operators  $A$  and background metrics  $g_0$ . (In particular, conformal flatness was not assumed.) As above, the subscript  $\omega$  indicates that we evaluate in the metric  $g_\omega = e^{2\omega}g_0$ . Later, Branson, Chang, and Yang [BCY] attacked the isospectral and extremal problems related to these formulas. One result of this latter work is that something survives of the Onofri reasoning: consider the extremal problems for  $\det Y_\omega$  and  $\det \nabla_\omega^2$  in the standard conformal class  $[g_0]$  on  $S^4$ . What emerges from the quantities (0.1) is now a linear combination of two norm computations: one for the exponential class imbedding  $L_2^2 \hookrightarrow e^L$ , and another for the "ordinary" borderline Sobolev imbedding  $L_1^2 \hookrightarrow L^4$ . The latter inequality is that involved in the Yamabe problem, and in fact it is quite fruitful to think of it in this way. The former inequality is the four dimensional version of a generalized Moser-Trudinger inequality due to Beckner [Bec]. The "miracle" that occurs is that in this linear combination, the signs of the two coefficients agree, both for  $A = Y$  and  $A = \nabla^2$ , so we get extremal results. But just as in dimension 2, the  $Y$  signs disagree with the  $\nabla^2$  signs, so we have opposite kinds of extrema. This is summarized in the first two lines of Table 0.1 below. As is clear from the third line of the table, the sign miracles continue in dimension six (where in fact they seem more improbable, in that more coefficients have to fall into place with the correct sign). Note that the difference between the behavior of  $Y$  and  $\nabla^2$  is essential and is not due to conventions; we use the same convention in each case (i.e., that the leading symbol is multiplication by  $|\xi|^2$ ). The third line of the table is the main new "factual" result of the present work; it is written out precisely as Theorem 0.1.

THE FUNCTIONAL DETERMINANT AT THE STANDARD  
METRIC AND ITS CONFORMAL TRANSFORMS

	$\det Y_\omega$	$\det \mathcal{V}_\omega^2$
$S^2$	max	min
$S^4$	min	max
$S^6$	max	min

TABLE 0.1

**Theorem 0.1.** On  $S^6$ , for  $g = g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0$  in the conformal class of the standard metric  $g_0$  and having the standard volume  $16\pi^3/15$ , the quantity  $\det Y_\omega$  (resp.  $\det \mathcal{V}_\omega^2$ ) is maximized (resp. minimized) exactly when  $g_\omega = h^* g_0$  for some conformal diffeomorphism  $h$  on  $(S^6, g_0)$ .

The use of a generalized Polyakov formula to compute quotients of the form (0.1) requires a fairly explicit knowledge of one of the heat kernel invariants of the operator  $A$  in question, that at the “index level”; i.e. that with a homogeneity degree (under uniform dilation of the metric) which compensates that of the Riemannian measure. We call this invariant  $U_m[A]$ . It is often said that the combinatorial complexity of the heat invariants explodes as one goes up in level; since level equals dimension in our problem, our difficulties explode as the dimension goes up. It has been possible, and hopefully not completely tasteless, to compute in dimension 6 by paying close attention to the dependence of all quantities on dimension; that is, by performing what physicists might call *dimensional regularization*. Specifically, we deal with universal polynomial formulas whose coefficients are rational functions of the dimension  $m$ , and use computations valid for large even  $m$  to make conclusions about a specific  $m$ . In other words, we meromorphically continue rational functions of  $m$ , using  $m = \infty$  as the limit point. This point of view excuses us from considering *pure divergence terms* in the heat invariant  $U_m[A]$  in some subcomputations. The advantage gained from this is nonexistent in dimension 2, minor in dimension 4, and considerable in dimension 6. To make things even more tractable, we work in the conformally flat category; this is of course stable under the changes of metric we want to consider, and does not discard the case of the sphere.

Extrapolating from dimensions 2, 4, and 6, the philosophy would seem to be as follows: the term corresponding to the exponential class Beckner-Moser-Trudinger inequality [Bec], i.e. that related to the norm computation for the imbedding  $L_{m/2}^2 \hookrightarrow e^L$ , is, in a sense to be made precise, the *leading term* in the functional determinant. Its coefficient originates in the leading term (really an equivalence class in the space of metric invariants) of  $U_m[A]$ ; such leading terms were studied in [G5, BGØ1]. Looking at these formulas, one finds that if the leading term alone were decisive, the result would be the obvious continuation of Table 0.1 to arbitrary even  $m$ . The sign miracles, then, consist in coefficients of “trailing terms” having the correct sign. The estimation of the trailing terms, by the time we get to dimension 6, entails some relatively delicate conformal geometry. To oversimplify quite a bit, what ends up being used, in addition to the imbedding  $L_3^2 \hookrightarrow e^L$ , is the borderline imbedding  $L_1^2 \hookrightarrow L^3$ , both in the trivial scalar bundle, and in the bundle  $\text{TFS}^2$  of trace

free symmetric two-tensors. More specifically, we have to study the effect of the scalar imbedding on the scalar curvature function, and of the TFS<sup>2</sup> imbedding on the Einstein tensor.

Our treatment depends heavily on two pieces of technology that have only recently come clearly into view. The first is the construction by Graham, Jenne, Mason, and Sparling [GJMS] of conformally covariant operators on scalar functions with leading term  $\Delta^{n/2}$ ,  $n$  a positive even integer, as long as it is not the case that the dimension  $m$  is even and less than  $n$ . In particular, this allows us to find a representative of the leading term equivalence class described above which behaves relatively simply under conformal variation. The other is Beckner's recent work on sharp Sobolev and Moser-Trudinger inequalities, based on fundamental work of Lieb [Lie] on best constants and extremals for Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequalities in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . In Sec. 3 below, we give versions of some of Beckner's proofs that use group invariance (and indeed, the complementary series) in an essential way.

The sequence of events in these notes will be as follows. Sec. 1 is about conformal covariance in general, and the Graham-Jenne-Mason-Sparling operators  $P_n$  in particular. Something of extreme importance to us is the zeroth order term  $Q_n$  of such a  $P_n$ , defined here by applying  $P_n$  to the constant function:  $P_n 1 = (m - n)Q_n/2$ , where  $m$  is the dimension. Sec. 2 is about the principal series of  $SO_0(m+1, 1)$ , and especially its subseries, the complementary series. Here we show how to compute the spectrum of an intertwining operator, and relate such operators to the operators  $P_n$  of the previous section. Sec. 3 presents Beckner's theory of sharp inequalities on the sphere (i.e. that part of the theory that we shall need, from a point of view that suits our needs), with heavy emphasis on connections to the complementary series. Sec. 4 presents joint work of Branson and Ørsted on conformal index theory and the generalized Polyakov formula. Sec. 5 presents the 2 and 4 dimensional theory from the dimensional regularization point of view; the end results are somewhat different derivations of known results of Onofri and of Branson and Ørsted. In Sec. 6, we do the computations necessary to get formulas for  $\det Y$  and  $\det \nabla^2$  in 6 dimensions. In Sec. 7, these are applied to prove Theorem 0.1. A large part of Sec. 7 is devoted to some delicate conformal geometry and a new sharp inequality that seems to be necessary to the proof. Sec. 7 concludes with a discussion of the sign pattern of Table 0.1 and its continuation, based on the *leading term* analysis of Gilkey [G5], and of prospects for future work. In Sec. 8, we compute the denominators  $\det A_0$  of (0.1) on low dimensional spheres for  $A = Y$  and  $A = \nabla^2$ ; in particular, this gives the extremal values of  $\det Y$  and  $\det \nabla^2$  on these spheres. Here the method, arithmetic with explicitly given zeta functions, is mostly disjoint from that used to compute (0.1). In Sec. 9, we work in the four dimensional, not necessarily conformally flat case, and present results of Branson, Chang, and Yang [BCY] on the question of bounding Riemannian metrics  $g_\omega$  within a conformal class by their spectral invariants  $\det A$  (for appropriate  $A$ ) and  $\text{vol}(g_\omega)$ .

It is a pleasure to thank Bill Beckner, Alice Chang, Peter Gilkey, Bent Ørsted, and Paul Yang for their help in clarifying the thinking of these notes; the remaining unclarity is, of course, the fault of the author. This material was part of a series of talks given by the author at the First Global Analysis Research Center Symposium on Pure and Applied Mathematics at Seoul National University; thanks are due to the organizers, especially Hyeong In Choi, Dong Pyo Chi, and Jongsik Kim, for their efforts. Finally, the author



thanks Roskilde University, Seoul National University, and Sonderforschungsbereich 170 at the University of Göttingen for their hospitality, and the Danish Research Council for financial support, during the writing of these notes.

## 1. CONFORMALLY COVARIANT DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS ON SCALAR FUNCTIONS

Let  $(M, g)$  be a smooth, compact Riemannian manifold without boundary.  $m$  will always denote the dimension of  $M$ . Let  $\nabla$  be the Levi-Civita connection and  $R$  be the Riemann curvature tensor of  $g$ . We shall say that a differential operator  $D$  on smooth scalar functions on  $M$  is *natural* if it can be given by a universal polynomial expression in  $g$ , its inverse  $g^i$ ,  $\nabla$ , and  $R$ , using tensor product and contraction. Such an object, of course, is not really an operator, but a rule that canonically assigns an operator to each Riemannian manifold of a given dimension. For example,  $D$  could be the ordinary Laplacian  $\Delta = \delta d$ , where  $d$  is the exterior derivative and  $\delta$  its formal adjoint, since in the usual invariant index notation,  $\Delta = -g^{ij}\nabla_i\nabla_j$ . A *local scalar invariant* can be described as a natural differential operator of order zero, or alternatively, as a linear combination of monomials

$$(1.1) \quad C((\nabla_{a_1} \dots \nabla_{a_p} R_{ijkl}) \dots (\nabla_{b_1} \dots \nabla_{b_q} R_{stuv})),$$

where  $C$  is some operator which groups indices into pairs, raises one index in each pair, and contracts to a scalar.

We shall also have some use for natural operators between bundles of tensor-spinors. Recall that the structure group of Riemannian geometry is  $O(m)$ ; of oriented Riemannian geometry,  $SO(m)$ , and of oriented Riemannian spin geometry,  $\text{Spin}(m)$ . (By Weyl's invariant theory, (1.1) is a basis of the local scalar  $O(m)$  invariants; see, e.g., [BFG, Sec. 5.8].) If  $H$  is one of these structure groups, a tensor-spinor bundle is just a vector bundle of the form  $\mathcal{F}_H \times_\lambda V$ , where  $(V, \lambda)$  is a finite-dimensional representation of  $H$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_H$  is the bundle of  $H$ -frames. To define a natural operator between two such bundles, we just impose the polynomial restriction above, noting the following: (a) if  $H = SO(m)$ , the volume form  $E$  is allowed to enter our polynomial constructions; (b) if  $H = \text{Spin}(m)$ , the Levi-Civita connection is extended to the Levi-Civita spin connection (which we also call  $\nabla$ ), and  $E$  and the Clifford section  $\gamma$  can enter our polynomial constructions. ( $\gamma$  is a section of  $TM \otimes \text{End}(\Sigma M)$ , where  $\Sigma M$  is the spinor bundle.) For example, if  $\star$  is the Hodge star operator on differential forms,  $\star d$  is a natural operator  $SO(m)$ -operator. Here  $E$  makes its appearance via its image  $\star$  under the natural bundle injection  $\Lambda^m M \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^p M, \Lambda^{m-p} M)$ . The *Dirac operator*  $\nabla = \gamma^i \nabla_i$  is a natural  $\text{Spin}(m)$ -operator on sections of  $\Sigma M$ .

A natural differential operator  $D$  is *conformally covariant* of bidegree  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  in dimension  $m$  if for any  $m$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold  $(M, g_0)$ ,

$$(1.2) \quad g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0, \quad \omega \in C^\infty(M) \Rightarrow D_\omega = e^{-b\omega} D_0 \mu(e^{a\omega}),$$

where for any  $f \in C^\infty(M)$ ,  $\mu(f)$  is multiplication by  $f$ . Here the subscripts indicate the metric in which we are evaluating; for example,  $D_0$  is computed in  $g_0$ , and  $D_\omega$  in  $g_\omega$ . We fix this subscript notation for use whenever we vary the metric within a conformal class

$$[g_0] := \{g_{e\omega} = e^{2e\omega} g_0 \mid \omega \in C^\infty(M)\};$$

to avoid confusion, we call the base metric  $g_0$  instead of  $g$  in this case. We shall also apply the subscript notation to other quantities, for example, local invariants and the

Riemannian measure  $dv$ . If  $SO(m)$  or  $Spin(m)$  bundles are involved in the construction of the operator  $D$ , we impose the compatible scalings  $E_\omega = e^{m\omega}E_0$  and  $\gamma_\omega = e^{-\omega}\gamma_0$  in (1.2); the latter scaling is forced by the Clifford relations.

We shall sometimes have use for the infinitesimal form of the conformal covariance relation (1.2). Suppose  $\omega \in C^\infty(M)$ , and consider the curve  $g_{\epsilon\omega}$  of conformal metrics; then (1.2) implies that

$$(1.3) \quad (d/d\epsilon)|_{\epsilon=0}D_{\epsilon\omega} = -(b-a)\omega D_0 + a[D_0, \mu(\omega)].$$

where  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  is the commutator. (Unless otherwise stated, all such variational formulas are meant in the elementary sense; for example, if  $\varphi$  is a smooth section and  $x \in M$ ,  $((d/d\epsilon)|_{\epsilon=0}D_{\epsilon\omega}\varphi)(x)$  means  $(d/d\epsilon)|_{\epsilon=0}((D_{\epsilon\omega}\varphi)(x))$ .) The finite and infinitesimal forms of the conformal covariance relation are, in fact, equivalent: an application of (1.3) with  $g_{\epsilon_0\omega}$  in place of  $g_0$  gives

$$(d/d\epsilon)|_{\epsilon=\epsilon_0}\{e^{b\epsilon\omega}D_{\epsilon\omega}\mu(e^{-a\epsilon\omega})\} = 0$$

for any  $\epsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The best-known example of a conformal covariant is the *conformal Laplacian*, or *Yamabe operator*

$$Y = \Delta + \frac{m-2}{4(m-1)}\tau, \quad m \neq 1,$$

where  $\tau$  is the scalar curvature  $R^{ij}_{ij}$  of  $g$ . (Our convention on placement of indices will be the one that makes  $R^{1212}$  positive on standard spheres.) The Yamabe operator has conformal bidegree  $((m-2)/2, (m+2)/2)$ . Somewhat less well-known is the fourth-order *Paneitz operator*  $P_4$ , which was introduced in [P] (see also [Bra1, Theorem 1.21], and [ES]). To describe  $P$ , let  $\rho$  be the Ricci tensor of  $\nabla$ ;  $\rho_{ij} = R^k_{ikj}$ , and let

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} J &= \tau/(2(m-1)), & m \neq 1, \\ V &= (\rho - Jg)/(m-2), & m \neq 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$P = \Delta^2 + \delta Td + (m-4)Q/2, \quad m \neq 1, 2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T &= (m-2)J - 4V \cdot, \\ Q &= \frac{m}{2}J^2 - 2|V|^2 + \Delta J. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $V \cdot$  is the natural action of a two-tensor on one-forms,  $(V \cdot \varphi)_j = V^i_j \varphi_i$ , and  $|V|^2 = V^{ij}V_{ij}$ . The conformal bidegree of  $P$  is  $((m-4)2, (m+4)/2)$ .

The examples of  $Y$  and  $P$  make it clear that the dependence of a conformal covariant on the dimension  $m$  is potentially important. Indeed, this dependence can be used to derive the Gauss curvature prescription equation in dimension 2 from the Yamabe equation in

higher dimension. Applying the conformal covariance relation for  $Y = \Delta + (m-2)J/2$  to the constant function 1, we get

$$(1.5) \quad \left( \Delta + \frac{m-2}{2} J \right)_0 e^{\frac{m-2}{2}\omega} = \frac{m-2}{2} J_0 e^{\frac{m-2}{2}\omega}, \quad \omega \in C^\infty(M).$$

Since  $\Delta$  annihilates constants,

$$\Delta_0(e^{\frac{m-2}{2}\omega} - 1) + \frac{m-2}{2} J_0 e^{\frac{m-2}{2}\omega} = \frac{m-2}{2} J_0 e^{\frac{m-2}{2}\omega}.$$

Because the coefficients appearing in the expressions of  $Y$  and  $J$  as formal polynomials are rational in  $m$ , as are all terms in the conformal covariance relation for  $Y$  (after multiplication by appropriate exponential factors), we may apply analytic continuation; specifically, we can divide by  $(m-2)/2$  and then evaluate at  $m=2$  to get

$$\Delta_0\omega + J_0 = J_0 e^{2\omega}, \quad m=2.$$

Thus the Yamabe equation, with its power function nonlinearity (viewed as an equation on  $e^{(m-2)\omega/2}$ ), goes over to an equation with an exponential nonlinearity in  $\omega$ . On the level of identities, this reflects the transition on the level of inequalities from the borderline Sobolev imbedding  $L^2_1 \rightarrow L^{2m/(m-2)}$  to the Moser-Trudinger inequality as  $m \downarrow 2$  (see Sec. 3 below). Clearly the same argument describes the behavior of the Paneitz operator  $P$  and Paneitz quantity  $Q$  as we approach the critical dimension, in this case  $m=4$ : starting with the identity

$$\left( P^0 + \frac{m-4}{2} Q \right)_0 e^{\frac{m-4}{2}\omega} = \frac{m-4}{2} Q_0 e^{\frac{m-4}{2}\omega},$$

where  $P^0 = P - (m-4)Q/2$ , we get

$$P_0\omega + Q_0 = Q_0 e^{4\omega}, \quad m=4,$$

since  $P^0$  annihilates constants, and  $P = P^0$  in dimension 4. The corresponding event on the level of inequalities is the transition from the borderline Sobolev imbedding  $L^2_2 \rightarrow L^{2m/(m-4)}$  to an exponential class inequality as  $m \downarrow 4$ ; such inequalities have been studied in different settings by Lieb [Lie], Adams [Ad], and Beckner [Bec].

Onofri [On] and Osgood, Phillips, and Sarnak [OPS1-2] showed that the Moser-Trudinger inequality is decisive in the study of the functional determinant of the Laplacian as a functional on the space of metrics in dimension 2. Branson, Chang, and Yang [BCY] showed that the exponential class inequality mentioned just above, together with the "conventional" borderline inequality  $L^2_1 \rightarrow L^4$ , play a similar role in dimension 4. Here the Paneitz operator, which arises naturally in 4-dimensional determinant computations of Branson and Ørsted [BØ3], plays a central role. This is one of several motivations for a study of higher-order generalizations of  $Y$  and  $P$ . Graham, Jenne, Mason, and Sparling [GJMS] have recently made such a study; we collect some of their results here in a form that will be useful to us.

**Theorem 1.1 [GJMS].** Let  $n$  be a positive even integer. Suppose that

$$(1.6) \quad m \text{ is odd,} \quad \text{or} \quad n \leq m.$$

There is a conformally covariant differential operator  $P_n$  on scalar functions, of conformal bidegree  $((m - n)/2, (m + n)/2)$ , such that:

- (a) The leading symbol of  $P_n$  is that of  $\Delta^{n/2}$ . On  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with its standard metric,  $P_n = \Delta^{n/2}$ .
- (b)  $P_n = P_n^0 + \frac{m-n}{2} Q_n$ , where  $Q_n$  is a local scalar invariant and  $P_n^0$  has the form  $\delta S_{n-2} d$  for some natural differential operator  $S_{n-2}$  on one-forms; in particular,  $P_n^0$  annihilates constants.
- (c) There are universal expressions for  $S_{n-2}$  and  $Q_n$  (and thus for  $P_n$ ) as polynomials in  $(g, g^{\sharp}, R, \nabla)$  with coefficients that are real rational functions of  $m$ , regular at all positive integral  $m$  satisfying (1.6).
- (d)  $P_n$  is formally self-adjoint.

The theorem does not assert uniqueness of the  $P_n$ . In fact, it is easy to show nonuniqueness if  $n$  is a multiple of 4: if  $C$  is the Weyl conformal curvature tensor,

$$(1.7) \quad C^i{}_{jkl} = R^i{}_{jkl} + V_{jk}\delta^i{}_l - V_{jl}\delta^i{}_k + V^i{}_lg_{jk} - V^i{}_kg_{jl},$$

scalar multiples of  $|C|^{n/2} = (C^{ijkl}C_{ijkl})^{n/4}$  can be added to  $P_n$  without disturbing conformal covariance. Less trivial instances of nonuniqueness are also known. In the next section, however, we shall show that the evaluation of  $P_n$  on the sphere  $S^m$  with its standard metric  $g_0$ , or with any conformal multiple of  $g_0$ , is unique.

Note that rationality in  $m$  is preserved upon changes of basis resulting when the generators  $R, \rho, \tau$  are replaced by  $C, V, J$ , and *vice versa*; we shall often use this fact implicitly.

The operators  $Y$  and  $P$  fill the requirements set by the theorem for  $P_2$  and  $P_4$ , with  $J$  and  $Q$  as the corresponding  $Q_2$  and  $Q_4$ . In fact, some elementary invariant theory shows that  $P_2$  is uniquely determined to be  $Y$ , and  $P_4$  must have the form  $P + \alpha(m)|C|^2$  for some rational function  $\alpha(m)$ .

**Remark 1.2.** There is no formal difference in the above discussion between Riemannian and pseudo-Riemannian conformal geometry: the formation of monomials (1.1) is the same, and the finite dimensional representation theory of the structure group  $\text{Spin}_0(p, q)$ ,  $p + q = m$ , is the same as that of  $\text{Spin}_0(m)$  by the Weyl unitary trick. In particular, the operators of Theorem 1.1 exist in the pseudo-Riemannian regime, and are given by the same formal polynomials as in the Riemannian case.

Although it is not our intention to try to write an explicit formula for  $Q_n$  except in low dimension, its conformal behavior can be described in arbitrary dimension:

**Corollary 1.3.** If  $\omega \in C^\infty(M)$ ,

$$(1.8) \quad \int (Q_m dv)_\omega = \int (Q_m dv)_0, \quad m \text{ even.}$$

If  $(m, n)$  is as in (1.6), then

$$(1.9) \quad (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int (Q_n dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = (m - n) \int \omega(Q_n dv)_0.$$

*Proof.* The conformal covariance relation for  $P_n$ , applied to the constant function 1, reads

$$(1.10) \quad \left( P_n^0 + \frac{m-n}{2} Q_n \right)_0 e^{\frac{m-n}{2}\omega} = \frac{m-n}{2} (Q_n)_\omega e^{\frac{m+n}{2}\omega}.$$

Just as for the cases  $n = 2, 4$ , we can analytically continue to compute the conformal behavior of  $Q_m$ , which is not explicitly given by (1.10). Since  $P_n^0 = \delta S_{n-2}d$  annihilates constants,

$$(1.11) \quad (P_n^0)_0(e^{\beta\omega} - 1) + \beta(Q_n)_0 e^{\beta\omega} = \beta(Q_n)_\omega e^{(m-\beta)\omega}, \quad \beta = (m-n)/2.$$

By Theorem 1.1(c), we can divide by  $\beta$  and evaluate at  $\beta = 0$ :

$$(P_m)_0\omega + (Q_m)_0 = (Q_m)_\omega e^{m\omega}, \quad m \text{ even.}$$

Since  $(dv)_\omega = e^{m\omega}(dv)_0$ ,

$$(1.12) \quad ((P_m)_0\omega + (Q_m)_0)(dv)_0 = (Q_m dv)_\omega, \quad m \text{ even.}$$

But  $P_m = \delta S_{m-2}d$ , so Stokes' Theorem gives (1.8). The infinitesimal form of (1.10) is

$$(1.13) \quad (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0}(Q_n)_{\varepsilon\omega} + n\omega(Q_n)_0 = (P_n^0)_0\omega,$$

in all dimensions  $m$  described by (1.6), except  $m = n$ . But we can use analytic continuation, or take the infinitesimal form of (1.12), to extend (1.13) to dimension  $m = n$ . Since  $(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0}(dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = m\omega(dv)_0$ , the result is (1.9).  $\square$

It is also possible to say something about the terms in  $Q_n$  with the most and least derivatives. To make this precise, fix  $m$  and consider the space  $\mathcal{I}_n$  of local scalar  $O(m)$  invariants  $A$  which have *homogeneity*  $n$  in the sense that a uniform scaling  $\bar{g} = \alpha^2 g$ ,  $0 < \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , results in  $\bar{A} = \alpha^{-n} A$ . It is easy to see that the monomial (1.1) is in  $\mathcal{I}_n$  with

$$(1.14) \quad n = (2+p) + \dots + (2+q).$$

There is a natural vector space filtration

$$\mathcal{I}_{n,0} \subset \mathcal{I}_{n,2} \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{I}_{n,n-2} = \mathcal{I}_n$$

of  $\mathcal{I}_n$  defined by declaring (1.1) to be in  $\mathcal{I}_{n,N}$  if (1.14) holds and  $p + \dots + q \leq N$ . (Of course, applications of the curvature identities to a quantity which appears only to be in  $\mathcal{I}_{n,N}$  may show that that quantity is actually in more elite space  $\mathcal{I}_{n,N'}$ ,  $N' < N$ .) For example, the  $m$ -dimensional Pfaffian  $\text{Pff}_m$  is an element of  $\mathcal{I}_{m,0}$ . The terms in  $Q_n$  with the most derivatives are described by the following.

**Corollary 1.4.** *If  $Q_n$  is as in Theorem 1.1, then  $Q_n \simeq \Delta^{(n-2)/2} J$  modulo  $\mathcal{I}_{n,n-4}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $m$  and consider the following conformal variation operator  $\text{Var}_n$  on  $\mathcal{I}_n$ :

$$\text{Var}_n(\omega, A) = (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} A_{\varepsilon\omega} + n\omega A_0, \quad \omega \in C^\infty(M).$$

An inductive argument [Bra1, Sec. 1.b] shows that the target space for  $\text{Var}_n$  is a space  $\mathcal{J}_n$  of  $d\omega$ -augmented local invariants generated by formal monomials

$$C((\nabla_{a_1} \dots \nabla_{a_p} R_{ijkl}) \dots (\nabla_{b_1} \dots \nabla_{b_q} R_{stuv})(\nabla_{c_1} \dots \nabla_{c_r} \omega)),$$

where  $C$  is as described after (1.1),  $r > 0$ , and  $(2+p) + \dots + (2+q) + r = n$ . Here  $\omega$  is to be viewed as an indeterminate element of  $C^\infty(M)$ . Just as for the unaugmented invariants above, the number  $p+q+r$  of explicit derivatives defines a filtration

$$\mathcal{J}_{n,2} \subset \mathcal{J}_{n,4} \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{J}_{n,n} = \mathcal{J}_n,$$

and it is easily shown that

$$(1.15) \quad \text{Var}_n(\cdot, \mathcal{I}_{n,N}) \subset \mathcal{J}_{n,N+2}.$$

(Again, see [Bra1, Sec. 1.b].) Elementary invariant theory [BGØ2, Sec. 1] shows that  $\mathcal{I}_n/\mathcal{I}_{n,n-4}$  and  $\mathcal{J}_n/\mathcal{J}_{n,n-2}$  are one dimensional, with generators given by the equivalence classes of  $\Delta^{(n-2)/2} J$  and  $\Delta^{n/2} \omega$  respectively. In particular, there is a constant  $a$  (which may *a priori* depend on  $m$  and  $n$ ) for which

$$(1.16) \quad Q_n - a\Delta^{(n-2)/2} J \in \mathcal{J}_{n,n-4}.$$

The conformal covariance relation for  $Y$  and its consequence (1.5) show that

$$(1.17) \quad \text{Var}_n(\omega, \Delta^{(n-2)/2} J) \simeq \Delta^{n/2} \omega \text{ modulo } \mathcal{J}_{n,n-2}.$$

By (1.13),

$$\text{Var}_n(\omega, Q_n) = P_n^0 \omega \simeq \Delta^{n/2} \omega \text{ modulo } \mathcal{J}_{n,n-2}$$

in all dimensions  $m$  satisfying (1.6). This and (1.17) identify the constant  $a$  in (1.16) as 1, completing the proof.  $\square$

We can also write down the term in  $\int Q_n dv$  with the most derivatives. Note that *exact divergences*, i.e. local scalar invariants in the range of the formal adjoint  $\delta$  of the exterior derivative  $d$ , integrate to zero, and that it is precisely the exact divergences that integrate to zero universally.

**Corollary 1.5.** *If  $Q_n$  is as in Theorem 1.1, then  $Q_n \simeq \Delta^{(n-2)/2} J + \frac{m-n}{2} |\nabla^{(n-4)/2} J|^2$  modulo  $\mathcal{I}_{n,n-6} + \mathcal{R}(\delta)$ .*

*Proof.* Invariant theory and Corollary 1.4 show that  $Q_n \simeq \Delta^{(n-2)/2} J + b |\nabla^{(n-4)/2} J|^2$ , where  $b$  is a constant depending on  $m$  and  $n$ . But integrating by parts,

$$(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int (|\nabla^{(n-4)/2} J|^2 dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = 2 \int \omega((\Delta^{(n-2)/2} J + B)dv)_0,$$

where  $B \in \mathcal{I}_{n,n-4}$ . That  $b = (m-n)/2$  now follows from (1.15) and Corollary 1.3.  $\square$

Still more information about  $Q_n$  can be gleaned from (1.10), and this information is crucial to an understanding of how a study of the functional determinant leads to the operators  $P_m$ . The problem that arises is to compute a conformal primitive, or integral, of a level  $m$  local invariant  $U$ ; this is a functional quantity  $\mathcal{P}$  on the conformal class  $[g_0]$  for which

$$(1.18) \quad (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \mathcal{P}_{\omega+\varepsilon\eta} = \int \eta(U dv)_{\omega}, \quad \text{all } \omega, \eta \in C^\infty(M).$$

As usual, the convention is that a quantity subscripted with  $\omega$  is evaluated in the metric  $g_\omega$ . Conformal primitives, when they exist, are unique up to constant functionals on  $[g_0]$ , since they solve first-order initial value problems in  $\varepsilon$  when restricted to the curves  $g_{\varepsilon\omega}$  for a fixed  $\omega$ .  $Q_m$  enters because by Corollary 1.4, it is the "leading term" of any such  $U$  up to a constant factor. (Of course,  $\Delta^{(m-2)/2} J$  could also be used as the leading term, but the conformal behavior of  $Q_m$  is much nicer.) In practice, the leading term is more difficult to estimate than "trailing terms"; an instance is the problem from [BCY] in dimension 4 mentioned above: the leading term corresponds to an exponential class imbedding  $L_2^2 \rightarrow e^L$ , while the (sole) trailing term is estimated by the ordinary borderline imbedding  $L_1^2 \rightarrow L^4$ . When we try to solve (1.18) with  $U = Q_n$ , all is straightforward for  $m$  odd or  $m > n$ : by (1.9), we may take  $\mathcal{P}$  to be  $(\int Q_n dv)/(m-n)$ . When  $m = n$ , we get a solution  $\mathcal{P}$  by analytic continuation: after division by  $\beta$  in (1.11), we have

$$(1.19) \quad \left\{ (P_n^0)_0 \left( \frac{e^{\beta\omega} - 1}{\beta} \right) + (Q_n)_0 e^{\beta\omega} \right\} (dv)_0 = (Q_n)_\omega e^{-\beta\omega} (dv)_\omega.$$

In the proof of Corollary 1.3, we just evaluated this at  $m = n$ ; to get higher-order (in  $\beta$ ) information, we rewrite (1.19) as

$$(1.20) \quad (Q_n dv)_\omega - (Q_n dv)_0 = \left\{ (P_n^0)_0 \left( \frac{e^{\beta\omega} - 1}{\beta} \right) + (e^{\beta\omega} - 1)(P_n^0)_0 \left( \frac{e^{\beta\omega} - 1}{\beta} \right) + (e^{2\beta\omega} - 1)(Q_n)_0 \right\} (dv)_0.$$

Upon integration, we lose the first term on the right by Stokes' Theorem. Dividing (1.20) by  $2\beta = m - n$ , we have

$$\int \frac{(Q_n dv)_\omega - (Q_n dv)_0}{m-n} = \int \left\{ \left( \frac{e^{\beta\omega} - 1}{2\beta} \right) (P_n^0)_0 \left( \frac{e^{\beta\omega} - 1}{2\beta} \right) + \left( \frac{e^{2\beta\omega} - 1}{2\beta} \right) (Q_n)_0 \right\} (dv)_0.$$



Evaluating at  $m = n$ , we get

$$\int \frac{(Q_n dv)_\omega - (Q_n dv)_0}{m - n} \Big|_{m=n} = \frac{1}{2} \int \omega(P_n)_0 \omega(dv)_0 + \int \omega(Q_n)_0 (dv)_0.$$

We have not defined the class of meromorphic-in- $m$  local invariants appropriate to making this precise, but this will not be necessary. What we shall need is the following, the proof of which is immediate from (1.12) and the discussion above:

**Corollary 1.6.** *If  $m$  is odd or  $n < m$ , the functional*

$$\mathcal{P}_{(m,n)} : \omega \mapsto (\mathcal{P}_{(m,n)})_\omega := (m - n)^{-1} \int \{(Q_n dv)_\omega - (Q_n dv)_0\}$$

is a conformal primitive for  $Q_n$  in the sense of (1.18), and vanishes at  $\omega = 0$ . If  $m$  is even, the functional

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{P}_{(m,m)})_\omega &= \frac{1}{2} \int \omega((P_m)_0 \omega)(dv)_0 + \int \omega(Q_m dv)_0 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \omega \{(Q_m dv)_\omega + (Q_m dv)_0\} \end{aligned}$$

is a conformal primitive for  $Q_m$  which vanishes at  $\omega = 0$ .  $\square$

2. CONFORMAL COVARIANCE ON THE SPHERE, AND  
THE SPHERICAL PRINCIPAL SERIES OF  $SO_0(m+1, 1)$

Beckner [Bec] has pointed out that the meaning of Lieb's best constant for the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  [Lie] is more apparent when this inequality is transferred to the setting of the sphere  $S^m$  via stereographic projection. The present author pointed out that these constants, together with other constants which arise when the inequalities are written in terms of spherical harmonics, are actually data from the theory of *spherical principal series* representations of the semisimple Lie group  $G = SO_0(m+1, 1)$  (see [Bec, Secs. 2,4]). Here the word "spherical" just refers to the fact that these representations live in spaces of ordinary functions, as opposed to vector bundle sections. (Properly understood, they live in spaces of line bundle sections, but it is not necessary to view them in this light, and we intend to offer a totally elementary workout of the theory.)

The starting point is the realization of  $G$  as (the identity component of) the conformal transformation group of the sphere with its standard metric  $g$ . In general, a *conformal transformation* on a Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  is a diffeomorphism  $h$  on  $M$  with  $h \cdot g = \Omega_h^2 g$ , where  $0 < \Omega_h \in C^\infty(M)$ . Here  $h \cdot$  is the natural pushout of tensors by a diffeomorphism; in particular,  $h \cdot = (h^{-1})^*$  on purely covariant tensors like  $g$ . The group of conformal transformations will be called  $\text{ctran}(M, g)$ . The map  $h \mapsto \Omega_h$  carrying  $\text{ctran}(M, g)$  to  $C^\infty(M)_+$  is a *multiplier*, or *cocycle*:

$$(2.1) \quad \Omega_{h_1 \circ h_2} = \Omega_{h_1}(h_1 \cdot \Omega_{h_2}).$$

The corresponding infinitesimal notion is that of *conformal vector field*. Let  $\mathcal{D}^1(M)$  be the  $C^\infty(M)$ -module of smooth vector fields, and let  $\mathcal{L}$  denote the Lie derivative.  $X \in \mathcal{D}^1(M)$  is conformal if  $\mathcal{L}_X g = 2\omega_X g$  for some  $\omega_X \in C^\infty(M)$ ; we denote the Lie algebra of conformal vector fields by  $\text{cvf}(M, g)$ . The map  $X \mapsto \omega_X$  carrying  $\text{cvf}(M, g)$  to  $C^\infty(M)$  is an infinitesimal cocycle:

$$(2.2) \quad \omega_{[X_1, X_2]} = X_1 \omega_{X_2} - X_2 \omega_{X_1}.$$

The connection between the finite and infinitesimal notion is made by integrating conformal vector fields to local one-parameter groups of local conformal transformations. The relation to conformal change of metric as treated in the last section is as follows: a conformal transformation  $h$  can be thought of as a composition

$$(2.3) \quad h : (M, g) \xrightarrow{h} (M, \Omega_h^2 g) \xrightarrow{\text{id}} (M, g)$$

of an isometry and a conformal change of metric. Thus a general conformal covariant  $D$  of bidegree  $(a, b)$  will have the behavior

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} D(\Omega_h^a h \cdot \varphi) &= \Omega_h^b h \cdot (D\varphi), \\ D(L_X + a\omega_X)\varphi &= (L_X + b\omega_X)D\varphi \end{aligned}$$

under the transformations above.

On the sphere, all conformal vector fields integrate globally. Indeed, the conformal action of  $G$  on  $S^m$  resolves the singularities in the action of the conformal group on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ : under stereographic projection, the action is transferred to  $S^m$ , where the singular generator, inversion in the unit sphere, becomes reflection across an equator. To see the action concretely, we realize  $S^m$  as the unit sphere  $S_1^m$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ , with homogeneous coordinate  $y = (y_0 \dots, y_m)$ , and also as  $S_1^m \times \{1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+2}$ ; the "extra" component will be called  $y_{m+1}$ . If  $A \in G$ , we can take the linear action of  $A$  on  $(y, 1)$  and then divide by  $(A(y, 1))_{m+1} > 0$  to get a new element  $A \cdot y$  of  $S_1^m \times \{1\}$ . This action defines an isomorphism

$$\iota : G \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{ctran}(S^m, g).$$

From the Lie-theoretic viewpoint,  $G$  is the fundamental object, and the space  $S^m$  arises as  $G/P_{\min}$ , where  $P_{\min}$  is a *minimal parabolic* subgroup. As one does generally in semisimple theory, take a Cartan decomposition  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} + \mathfrak{s}$  on the Lie algebra level, choose a maximal abelian Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{a}$  in  $\mathfrak{s}$ , and fix a positive open Weyl chamber  $\mathfrak{a}_+^*$  in  $\mathfrak{a}^*$ . Let  $G = KAN$  be the corresponding Iwasawa decomposition, and let  $M$  be the centralizer  $\{m \in K \mid (\text{Ad } m)H = H, \text{ all } H \in \mathfrak{a}\}$ . The minimal parabolic subgroup corresponding to our choices is  $P = MAN$ . The Iwasawa decomposition gives an identification of the homogeneous spaces  $G/MAN$  and  $K/M$ .

In our case, and in the notation above,  $K$  is the copy of  $\text{SO}(m+1)$  that acts in the  $(y_0 \dots, y_m)$  variables, and  $M$  is the copy of  $\text{SO}(m)$  that acts in the  $(y_1 \dots, y_m)$  variables. Here and in the rest of this section, we assume that  $m \geq 2$ . The smooth action of  $G$  infinitesimalizes to a Lie algebra isomorphism

$$\iota : \mathfrak{g} \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{cvf}(S^m, g).$$

In homogeneous coordinates on  $\mathbb{R}^{m+2}$ , if  $\varepsilon_i = 1$  for  $i = 0, \dots, m$  and  $\varepsilon_{m+1} = -1$ ,  $\iota(\mathfrak{g})$  is spanned by the  $L_{ij} = \varepsilon_i y_i \partial_j - \varepsilon_j y_j \partial_i$  for  $0 \leq i, j \leq m+1$ , and the commutation relations are

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} [L_{ij}, L_{jk}] &= \varepsilon_j L_{ik}, \\ [L_{ij}, L_{kl}] &= 0 \text{ if } i, j, k, l \text{ are distinct.} \end{aligned}$$

$\iota(\mathfrak{k})$  is spanned by the  $L_{ij}$  with  $0 \leq i, j \leq m$ . By (2.5),  $\mathfrak{a}$  is one-dimensional; we make the choice  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathbb{R}H_0$ , where  $\iota(H_0) = L_{0, m+1}$ . As a result of this choice,  $\iota(\mathfrak{m}) = \text{span}\{L_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}$ . We also need to pick a positive Weyl chamber  $\mathfrak{a}_+^*$ ; we do this by declaring the dual element  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ , i.e. the one with  $\alpha(H_0) = 1$ , to be positive. To see the  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a})$  root structure, note that  $L_{i, m+1} + L_{0i}$  (resp.  $L_{i, m+1} - L_{0i}$ ) is a  $+1$  (resp.  $-1$ ) eigenvector of  $[L_{0, m+1}, \cdot]$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Thus there are two roots,  $\pm\alpha$ , with root spaces

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha} = \iota^{-1}(\text{span}\{L_{i, m+1} \pm L_{0i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}).$$

The Iwasawa  $\mathfrak{n}$  is the sum of the positive root spaces, here  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ ; its image  $\theta\mathfrak{n} = \bar{\mathfrak{n}}$  under the Cartan involution  $\theta$  is just  $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ . The multiplicity of  $\alpha$  is  $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha = m$ , so the important quantity  $\rho$ , half the sum of the positive  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a})$  roots, is  $m\alpha/2$ .

A remark on normalizations is in order. From the Lie-theoretic point of view, natural Riemannian metrics on homogeneous spaces of  $G$ , when they exist, are determined by the Killing form  $B_{\mathfrak{g}}(X, Y) = -\text{tr}(\text{ad } X \text{ ad } Y)$ . The normalization

$$b = b_{\mathfrak{so}(p,q)} = B_{\mathfrak{so}(p,q)}/2(p+q-2)$$

of Killing forms in the  $\mathfrak{so}(p, q)$  series has several convenient effects: (a)  $b(X, Y) = -\text{tr } \ell(X)\ell(Y)$  for  $\ell$  the defining representation of  $\mathfrak{so}(p, q)$ ; (b) for any standard (block stabilization) inclusion  $\mathfrak{so}(p', q') \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{so}(p, q)$ , the restricted and intrinsic forms  $b$  agree on the smaller algebra. If  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(m+1, 1)$  as above, we also get: (c)  $|\alpha| = 1$  in the corresponding inner product on  $\mathfrak{g}^*$ ; (d) the manifold  $K/M$  with the normalized Killing form metric is the *standard*  $m$ -sphere, which is distinguished by its scalar curvature  $m(m-1)$ . Indeed, by [Bes, 7.39], the scalar curvature of  $K/M$  in the  $B_{\mathfrak{k}}$  metric is  $m/2$ . Our normalization divides the metric by  $2(m-1)$ , and thus multiplies the scalar curvature by  $2(m-1)$ , giving  $m(m-1)$  as desired.

At this point, we are ready to set up the spherical principal series representations, at first in elementary differential geometric terms. It will be convenient to have at our disposal, in addition to  $C^\infty(S^m)$ , the smaller space  $\mathcal{E}(S^m)$  of functions which are finite sums of spherical harmonics on  $S^m$ . Like  $C^\infty(S^m)$  functions,  $\mathcal{E}(S^m)$  is dense in any Sobolev space, and so its use will not cause problems later, when we close in Sobolev norms determined by the representation theory. In representation theoretic terms,  $\mathcal{E}(S^m)$  is the space of  $K$ -finite vectors.

By the cocycle conditions (2.1, 2.2), the maps

$$u_\nu(h) = \Omega_h^{\nu + \frac{m}{2}} h, \quad U_\nu(X) = X + (\nu + \frac{m}{2})\omega_X$$

for  $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$ , are homomorphisms

$$(2.6) \quad \text{ctran}(S^m, \mathfrak{g}) \xrightarrow{u_\nu} \text{Aut } C^\infty(S^m), \quad \text{cvf}(S^m, \mathfrak{g}) \xrightarrow{U_\nu} \text{End } C^\infty(M),$$

in the group and Lie algebra senses respectively.

**Remark 2.1.** The extra summand of  $m/2$  above is the customary " $\rho$ -shift": it follows from the last paragraph that an isometric and positivity preserving identification of  $\mathfrak{a}^*$  with  $\mathbb{R}$  identifies  $\rho$  with  $m/2$ . We put in the  $\rho$ -shift for ease of contact with the Lie theoretic literature, but its use is just a convention.

Note that since  $\iota(K)$  and  $\iota(\mathfrak{k})$  consist of isometric transformations and vector fields respectively,

$$(2.7) \quad \Omega_h = 1, \quad h \in \iota(K); \quad \omega_X = 0, \quad X \in \iota(\mathfrak{k});$$

thus  $u_\nu|_K$  and  $U_\nu|_{\mathfrak{k}}$  are independent of  $\nu$ . We shall now show that the infinitesimal maps  $U_\nu(X)$  stabilize  $\mathcal{E}(S^m)$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $E_j$  be the space of  $j^{\text{th}}$ -order spherical harmonics on  $S^m$ .  $\iota(K)$  and  $\iota(\mathfrak{k})$  stabilize each  $E_j$ , and*

$$\omega_X E_j, X E_j \subset E_{j-1} \oplus E_{j+1}, \quad X \in \iota(\mathfrak{s}),$$

where by convention,  $E_{-1} = 0$ . In particular,  $U_\nu$  is a Lie algebra homomorphism from  $\text{cvf}(S^m, g)$  to  $\text{End } \mathcal{E}(S^m)$ .

*Proof.*  $\iota(K)$  is the rotation group of  $S^m$ , and thus stabilizes each  $E_j$ . The assertions about  $\mathfrak{s}$  are immediate once we note that in homogeneous coordinates  $(y_0 \dots, y_m)$  on  $S^m \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ ,  $L_{i,m+1} = \partial_{y_i}$ ; and that  $\omega_{L_{i,m+1}}$  is the homogeneous coordinate function  $y_i$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq m$ .  $\square$

Of course, the treatment just above is a very special case of a standard setup in semisimple Lie theory. In the general semisimple setting, and in the notation above, we can view  $C^\infty(K/M)$  as the space of right- $M$ -fixed vectors in  $C^\infty(K)$ ,

$$C^\infty(K/M) \simeq_K \{ \varphi \in C^\infty(K) \mid \varphi(km) = \varphi(k), \text{ all } k \in K, m \in M \}.$$

Let  $P = P_{\min} = MAN$ . When we switch to the  $G/P$  realization of  $K/M$ , we can choose the effect of  $A$  in the corresponding right equivariance rule:

$$\begin{aligned} C^\infty(G/P) &\simeq_K C^\infty(\text{Ind}_P^G 1 \otimes \lambda \otimes 1) \\ &= \{ \psi \in C^\infty(G) \mid \psi(xman) = a^{-\lambda-\rho} \psi(x), \text{ all } x \in G, m \in M, a \in A, n \in N \}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, for  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ , we define  $a^\lambda$  as  $e^{\lambda(\log a)}$ , using the fact that the exponential map is a diffeomorphism from  $\mathfrak{a}$  to  $A$ . The notation  $\text{Ind}_P^G 1 \otimes \lambda \otimes 1$  indicates that we induce, from  $P$  to  $G$ , the representation that acts trivially on  $M$  and  $N$ , and by  $a \mapsto a^{-\lambda-\rho}$  on  $A$ .  $G$  and  $g$  act on these spaces of equivariant functions via left multiplication to give homomorphisms

$$\pi_\lambda : G \rightarrow \text{Aut } C^\infty(G/P), \quad \Pi_\lambda : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \text{End } C^\infty(G/P),$$

the second of which is the infinitesimal form of the first. The point is that when everything is unraveled, the homomorphisms  $u_\nu$  of (2.6) are exactly the  $\pi_{\nu\alpha}$ , and similarly with  $U, \Pi$  in place of  $u, \pi$ . To be more precise, if we use the letter  $j$  for the identification  $G/P \rightarrow S^m$ , then

$$\pi_{\nu\alpha}(x)(f \circ j) = j \circ u_\nu(\iota(x))f, \quad x \in G, f \in C^\infty(S^m).$$

We shall now do our work entirely in the elementary differential geometric setting, and suppress the identifications  $\iota$  and  $j$  in the notation.

We shall need some results that imply the uniqueness of intertwining operators; these are closely related to results on irreducibility, which we shall also state and prove. The driving result is the following. Let  $u$  be the  $\nu$ -independent  $K$ -representation  $u_\nu$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** (Cocycle irreducibility.) For all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(2.7) \quad \text{Proj}_{E_{j \pm 1}} \omega(\mathfrak{s})E_j = E_{j \pm 1},$$

where  $\omega(\mathfrak{s}) := \{\omega_X \mid X \in \mathfrak{s}\}$ . As a result, the orbit  $\mathcal{O}(f)$  of any nonzero  $f \in E_j$ , for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , under the joint action of  $u(K)$  and  $\omega(\mathfrak{s})$ , is  $\mathcal{E}(S^m)$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{E}(S^m)$  has no nontrivial invariant subspace under this joint action.

*Proof.* By the proof of Lemma 2.2, if  $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^m$  is any orthonormal basis of  $\mathfrak{s}$ ,

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{i=0}^m \omega_{X_i}^2 = 1.$$

(This sum is independent of the choice of orthonormal basis, and is the sum of squares of the homogeneous coordinate functions for the choice made above.) For each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , put

$$t_j^\pm = \sum_{i=0}^m \text{Proj}_{E_j} \omega_{X_i} \text{Proj}_{E_{j \pm 1}} \omega_{X_i} |_{E_j}.$$

The sum on the right is a  $K$ -endomorphism of  $E_j$ , and so is a scalar by Schur's Lemma. By (2.8),  $t_j^+ + t_j^- = 1$ . By the trace identity  $\text{tr } ab = \text{tr } ba$ ,

$$(\dim E_j)t_j^+ = (\dim E_{j+1})t_{j+1}^-, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This allows us to compute the  $t_j^\pm$  inductively: since  $t_0^+ = 1$  and

$$\frac{\dim E_{j+1}}{\dim E_j} = \frac{(m+j-1)(m+2j+1)}{(j+1)(m+2j-1)},$$

we get

$$t_j^+ = \frac{m+j-1}{m+2j-1}, \quad t_j^- = \frac{j}{m+2j-1}.$$

In particular, all of these numbers except  $t_0^-$  are nonzero. Thus  $\text{Proj}_{E_{j \pm 1}} \omega(\mathfrak{s})E_j$  is nonzero unless  $j = 0$  and the minus sign is chosen. But  $X \otimes \varphi \mapsto \text{Proj}_{E_{j \pm 1}} \omega_X \varphi$  is an  $\text{SO}(m)$  map  $\mathfrak{s} \otimes E_j \rightarrow E_{j \pm 1}$ , so Schur's Lemma gives (2.7).

For the statements about  $\mathcal{O}(f)$ , first note that since  $\text{SO}(m)$  is transitive on  $E_j$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(f) \supset E_j$ . By (2.7),  $\mathcal{O}(f) \supset E_{j-1} \oplus E_j \oplus E_{j+1}$ ; by induction  $\mathcal{O}(f) = \mathcal{E}(S^m)$ . The  $E_j$  are  $\text{SO}(m)$ -invariant, so any invariant subspace is of the form  $V = \oplus_{j \in B} E_j$  for some subset  $B$  of the natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}$ . If  $V \neq 0$ , it has a nonzero  $f$  in some  $E_j$  as above, forcing it to be  $\mathcal{E}(S^m)$ .  $\square$

The results we need really amount to irreducibility under some of the  $(u(K), U_\nu(\mathfrak{s}))$ . The above lemma replaces a *generic irreducibility* theorem of Bruhat [Bru], which implies irreducibility off a set of measure 0 in the  $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$  parameter. In our setting, all reducibility questions are settled by the cocycle  $\omega$ , since in a certain sense all the representations  $U_\nu$  can be written in terms of  $\omega$ . We make this precise in the following.

**Lemma 2.4.** *If  $\Delta$  is the Laplacian on  $S^m$ , then*

$$[\Delta, \mu(\omega_X)] = 2U_0(X), \quad X \in \mathfrak{s}.$$

*Proof.* We need only prove this for the basis elements  $X = L_{i,m+1}$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq m$ . By symmetry ( $K$ -invariance and irreducibility of  $\mathfrak{s}$  under  $K$ ), we need only treat  $Z = L_{0,m+1}$ . For this, introduce the azimuthal angular coordinate  $p$ , i.e. that with

$$\cos p = y_0 = \omega_Z.$$

Since  $Z = (\sin p)\partial_p$ , we have

$$dy_0 = -Z_b,$$

where  $b$  is the metric identification  $TS^m \rightarrow T^*S^m$ . But

$$(2.9) \quad [\Delta, \mu(y_0)] = \Delta y_0 - 2\iota(dy_0)d = \Delta y_0 + 2\iota(Z)d = \Delta y_0 + 2Z,$$

where  $\iota$  is interior multiplication. Since  $y_0 \in E_1$  and

$$(2.10) \quad \Delta|_{E_j} = \kappa_j = j(m-1+j),$$

$\Delta y_0 = m y_0$ , so  $[\Delta, \mu(y_0)] = 2Z + m y_0 = 2U_0(Z)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.5.** *If  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ ,*

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Proj}_{E_{j+1}} U_\nu(X)|_{E_j} &= \frac{m+2j+2\nu}{2} \text{Proj}_{E_{j+1}} \omega_X|_{E_j}, \\ \text{Proj}_{E_{j-1}} U_\nu(X)|_{E_j} &= \frac{-m-2j+2+2\nu}{2} \text{Proj}_{E_{j-1}} \omega_X|_{E_j}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $m+2j+2\nu \neq 0$ , then  $\text{Proj}_{E_{j+1}} U_\nu(\mathfrak{s})E_j = E_{j+1}$ . If  $m+2j-2-2\nu \neq 0$ , then  $\text{Proj}_{E_{j-1}} U_\nu(\mathfrak{s})E_j = E_{j-1}$ .

*Proof.* If  $X \in \mathfrak{k}$ , all terms in (2.11) vanish, so we may assume  $X \in \mathfrak{s}$ . Then (2.11) follows from Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, together with the fact that  $\kappa_{j+1} - \kappa_j = m+2j$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.6.** (Irreducibility) *If  $\pm\nu \notin m/2 + \mathbb{N}$ , the assertions of Lemma 2.3 hold with  $(u(K), U_\nu(\mathfrak{s}))$  in place of  $(u(K), \omega(\mathfrak{s}))$ .*

*Proof.* The first statement is immediate from Corollary 2.5, once we note that the 0 coefficient there when  $\nu = (m-2)/2$  describes a map from  $E_0$  to  $E_{-1}$ .  $\square$

The  $u_{\sqrt{-1}\lambda}$  for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  are called the *unitary principal series*, and the  $u_\nu$  for  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $|\nu| < m/2$  are the *complementary series*. In the course of computing the *intertwining operators* for the principal series, we shall be able to explain how this terminology came about (Remark 2.9 below). More importantly, we shall make contact with the  $S^m$  realizations of the conformally covariant operators  $P_n$ , and with Lieb's best constant for the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality.

**Definition 2.7.** A linear operator  $T$  on  $\mathcal{E}(S^m)$  is intertwining of bidegree  $(\nu, \sigma) \in \mathbb{C}^2$  if  $T$  commutes with  $u(K)$ , and  $TU_\nu(X) = U_\sigma(X)T$  for all  $X \in \mathfrak{s}$ .

Intertwining in this  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module sense is equivalent to intertwining in an appropriately formulated group sense; for us, this will be easiest to see from the concrete form of the intertwinors. Note that a conformally covariant differential operator in the sense of (1.2, 1.3), when evaluated in the standard  $S^m$ , is intertwining of bidegree  $(a - \frac{m}{2}, b - \frac{m}{2})$ . Schur's Lemma, together with the fact that the  $E_j$  are inequivalent irreducible  $K$ -modules, shows that each intertwinor  $T$  is diagonalized by the decomposition  $\mathcal{E}(S^m) = \bigoplus E_j$ . That is, we can identify  $T$  with a list of eigenvalues  $\mu_j \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $T|_{E_j} = \mu_j$ . Corollary 2.5 shows that we can construct a  $T$  of bidegree  $(\sigma, \nu)$  by finding a list  $\{\mu_j\}$  satisfying

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} (m + 2j + 2\nu)\mu_{j+1} &= (m + 2j + 2\sigma)\mu_j, \\ (-m - 2j + 2 + 2\nu)\mu_{j-1} &= (-m - 2j + 2 + 2\sigma)\mu_j. \end{aligned}$$

Apart from trivialities, there is no such list unless the consistency constraint  $\sigma = -\nu$  is satisfied. When  $-\nu \notin \frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N}$ , however, there is a unique such list (up to a constant factor) giving an intertwinor of bidegree  $(-\nu, \nu)$ , that being

$$(2.13) \quad \mu_j^\nu = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{m}{2} + j + \nu)}{\Gamma(\frac{m}{2} + j - \nu)}.$$

If  $\nu \in \frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N}$ , this formula is to be interpreted in the sense of analytic continuation; that is,  $\mu_j^\nu = 0$  if  $\nu \in \frac{m}{2} + j + \mathbb{N}$ . By (2.10),

$$\mu_j^\nu = \frac{\Gamma(B + \nu + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(B - \nu + \frac{1}{2})} \Big|_{E_j},$$

where

$$(2.14) \quad B = \sqrt{\Delta + \left(\frac{m-1}{2}\right)^2}.$$

Note that

$$(2.15) \quad B|_{E_j} = j + \frac{m-1}{2}.$$

We can now state:

**Theorem 2.8.**

(a) Aside from multiples of the identity, all intertwinors have bidegree  $(-\nu, \nu)$  for some  $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$ . If  $-\nu \notin \frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N}$ , the operator

$$A_{2\nu} := \Gamma(B + \nu + \frac{1}{2}) / \Gamma(B - \nu + \frac{1}{2})$$



is the unique intertwinor of bidegree  $(-\nu, \nu)$ , up to a constant factor. If  $\nu \notin \frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N}$ , the operator

$$\tilde{A}_{2\nu} := \frac{\Gamma(\frac{m}{2} - \nu)\Gamma(B + \nu + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{m}{2} + \nu)\Gamma(B - \nu + \frac{1}{2})}$$

is the unique such intertwinor, up to a constant factor.

(b) If  $-\nu \in \frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\tilde{A}_{2\nu}$  is a finite rank operator on  $\mathcal{E}(S^m)$ . For  $-\nu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (\frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N})$ ,  $A_{2\nu}$  extends to a bounded operator of loss  $2\nu$  between Sobolev classes; that is  $A_{2\nu} : L_k^2(S^m) \rightarrow L_{k-2\nu}^2(S^m)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ . Denoting the space of operators with loss  $l$  by  $\Psi_l(S^m)$ , we have that  $A_{2\nu}$  lies in the coset  $\Delta^\nu + \Psi_{2\nu-1}(S^m) \in \Psi_{2\nu}(S^m)/\Psi_{2\nu-1}(S^m)$ .

(c) For  $-\nu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (\frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N})$ ,  $A_{2\nu}$  is  $G$  intertwinning:

$$(2.16) \quad A_{2\nu}u_{-\nu}(h) = u_\nu(h)A_{2\nu} \quad \text{on } C^\infty(S^m) \text{ for all } h \in G.$$

The same statement holds for  $\tilde{A}_{2\nu}$  if  $\nu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (\frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N})$ .

(d) For  $-\nu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (\frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N})$ ,  $A_{2\nu}$  is symmetric: if  $\varphi_i$  is in the Sobolev class  $L_{k_i}^2(S^m)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , with  $k_1 + k_2 = 2\nu$ , then  $(\varphi_1, A_{2\nu}\varphi_2) = (A_{2\nu}\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ , where  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the extension of the (sesquilinear)  $L^2$  inner product to a pairing of  $C^\infty$  functions with distributions. The same is true of  $\tilde{A}_{2\nu}$  if  $\nu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (\frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N})$ .

(e) If  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $|\nu| < m/2$ , then  $A_{2\nu}$  is a positive operator: if  $\varphi \in L_\nu^2(S^m)$ , then  $(A_{2\nu}\varphi, \varphi) \geq 0$ , with equality if and only if  $\varphi = 0$ .

(f) If  $(m, n)$  and  $P_n$  are as in Theorem 1.1, then on  $S^m$  with its standard metric  $g_0$ ,

$$(P_n)_0 = A_n = \prod_{\alpha=1}^{n/2} \{(B + \alpha - \frac{1}{2})(B - \alpha + \frac{1}{2})\}, \quad (Q_n)_0 = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{m+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{m-n+2}{2})}.$$

In particular,  $(Q_m)_0 = \Gamma(m)$ . As a result, if  $\omega \in C^\infty(S^m)$ , then in the metric  $g_\omega = e^{2\omega}g_0$ ,

$$(P_n)_\omega = e^{-\frac{m+n}{2}\omega} A_n \mu(e^{\frac{m-n}{2}\omega}).$$

If  $n \neq m$ ,

$$(Q_n dv)_\omega = e^{\beta\omega} \left\{ \frac{\Gamma(\frac{m+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{m-n+2}{2})} + A_n \frac{e^{\beta\omega} - 1}{\beta} \right\} (dv)_0,$$

where  $\beta = (m - n)/2$ ; and

$$(Q_m dv)_\omega = (A_m \omega + (Q_m)_0)(dv)_0.$$

*Proof.* (a) is immediate from (2.15) and the discussion above. Note that  $A_{2\nu}$  and  $\tilde{A}_{2\nu}$  agree (are nonzero constant multiples of one another) where both are defined. If  $-\nu \in \frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N}$ , the factor  $\Gamma(B + \nu + \frac{1}{2})/\Gamma(\frac{m}{2} + \nu)$  in  $\tilde{A}_{2\nu}$  annihilates  $E_j$  for  $j \geq -\nu - \frac{m}{2} + 1$ ; this proves the finite rank assertion. By (2.10), any operator  $T$  with  $T|_{E_j} = \lambda_j \sim \text{const} \cdot j^\delta$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  extends to a bounded operator  $L_k^2 \rightarrow L_{k-\delta}^2$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ . But by Stirling's formula,

$\mu_j^\nu \sim j^{2\nu} + cj^{2\nu-1}$  for some constant  $c$ ; this proves the rest of (b). (c) is proved formally, on a dense set of  $h \in G$ , by computing that

$$(d/d\varepsilon)\{u_\nu(h_{-\varepsilon})A_{2\nu}u_{-\nu}(h_\varepsilon)\} = 0$$

as a consequence of the  $\mathfrak{g}$  intertwining relation, where  $h_\varepsilon$  is a local one-parameter group in  $G$ . By part (b), this calculation makes sense in a space of bounded operators between appropriate Sobolev spaces and gives (2.16) as an operator identity; by the Sobolev Lemma, (2.16) is true in the elementary sense. The same argument works for the finite rank operators in part (b). (d) is true formally because the eigenvalues of  $A_{2\nu}$  and  $\tilde{A}_{2\nu}$  are real; the orders of the Sobolev spaces involved are computed from (b). (e) is immediate from the eigenvalue list (2.13).

For (f), first note that by (2.4) and Remark 2.1,  $(P_n)_0$  must be intertwining of bidegree  $(-n/2, n/2)$  on  $(S^m, g_0)$ . Indeed, by universality,  $P_n$  is  $K$  intertwining; by the infinitesimal conformal covariance relation applied to the functions  $\omega_X$ ,  $X \in \text{cvf}(S^m, g_0)$ ,  $P_n$  must be  $\mathfrak{g}$  intertwining. Since  $A_n$  is the only intertwinor of bidegree  $(-n/2, n/2)$  with the correct leading symbol (that of  $\Delta^{n/2}$ ), it follows that  $(P_n)_0 = A_n$ . The formula for  $(P_n)_0 = A_n$  now follows from part (a), and the formula for  $(P_n)_\omega$  follows from conformal covariance. The formulas for  $Q_n$  are derived by applying those for  $P_n$  to the constant function 1, except when  $n = m$ . The formula for  $Q_m$  follows from (1.12).  $\square$

**Remark 2.9.** It is easily seen that the  $u_{\sqrt{-1}\lambda}$  for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  are unitary in the  $L^2$  inner product; these representations make up the unitary principal series mentioned before, but will not be of direct interest to us. The inner product  $(\cdot, A_{2\nu}\cdot)$  is invariant for  $u_{-\nu}$  whenever  $-\nu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (\frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N})$ , and is positive definite if and only if  $|\nu| < m/2$ . In fact, Theorem 2.8 shows that if  $\nu \in (-m/2, m/2)$ , the norm corresponding to the inner product  $(\cdot, A_{2\nu}\cdot)$  defines the Sobolev class  $L_\nu^2$ . The  $(L_\nu^2(S^m), u_{-\nu})$  for  $\nu \in (-m/2, m/2)$  are the complementary series mentioned above; they are directly involved in what follows.

### 3. CONFORMAL COVARIANCE ON $\mathbb{R}^m$ , AND THE INEQUALITIES OF LIEB AND BECKNER

In the last section, we established an intertwining property, equivalent to covariance under multiplication of the metric by some special conformal factors, for the operators

$$A_{2\nu} \in \Delta_{S^m}^\nu + \Psi_{2\nu-1}(S^m), \quad -\nu \notin \frac{m}{2} + \mathbb{N},$$

where  $\Psi_d(S^m)$  is the space of operators of loss  $d$  described in Theorem 2.8(b). The operators  $P_n$  of Theorem 1.1, when evaluated on  $S^m$ , are special cases. In this section, we shall use stereographic projection to view the intertwinors  $A_{2\nu}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with its standard metric. Not surprisingly, they turn out to be exactly the operators  $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^m}^\nu$ . For the complementary series range of  $\nu$ , viz.  $|\nu| < m/2$ , these operators are given by integral kernels; in fact exactly those integral kernels estimated by the Lieb inequalities. This circumstance allowed Beckner to give a simple expression for these inequalities on  $S^m$ , using facts about spherical harmonics and Gegenbauer polynomials. Here we shall give an explanation that does not depend on these technical devices, but only on group invariance.

For ease of comparison, we follow Beckner's notation for the time being. Accordingly, let  $d\xi$  be the normalized measure on the standard sphere, so that  $\int_{S^m} d\xi = 1$ . We view  $S^m$  as the unit sphere in a copy of  $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$  with coordinate function  $\xi = (u, s) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}$ . Our convention for the stereographic projection will be as follows: we identify  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , whose coordinate will be called  $x$ , with the complement  $S^m \setminus (0, -1)$  of the *south pole* via

$$x = \frac{u}{1+s}, \quad u = \frac{2x}{1+r^2}, \quad s = \frac{1-r^2}{1+r^2} := \cos p, \quad \alpha := |u| = \sin p.$$

Here  $r = |x|$ , and  $p$  is the azimuthal angle mentioned in the proof of Lemma 2.4. The standard metrics are related by

$$(3.1) \quad g_{\mathbb{R}^m} = \Phi^2 g_{S^m}, \quad \Phi = \frac{1}{2}(1+r^2) = \frac{1}{1+s}.$$

If  $d\xi'$  is the usual, unnormalized Riemannian measure on  $S^m$ , (3.1) implies that

$$dx = \left(\frac{1+r^2}{2}\right)^m d\xi' = \left(\frac{1+r^2}{2}\right)^m v_m d\xi,$$

where

$$v_m = \frac{2\pi^{\frac{m+1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{m+1}{2})} = \frac{(4\pi)^{\frac{m}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{m}{2})}{\Gamma(m)}$$

is the volume of  $(S^m, d\xi')$ .

The stereographic projection, like the intertwining principle of the last section, is a special case of a general setup in semisimple theory. Let  $\bar{N} = \exp \bar{n}$ , and let  $o$  be the identity coset in  $G/MAN$ . There is a natural diffeomorphic injection  $\bar{N} \rightarrow G/MAN$ , given by  $\bar{n} \mapsto \bar{n} \cdot o$ . In our situation,  $\bar{N}$  is naturally identified with  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , and as shown in the last section,  $G/MAN$  is naturally  $S^m$ . We omit the details of this approach, noting

only its potential usefulness in future applications to, for example, CR geometry (replacing  $SO_0(m+1, 1)$  by  $SU(m+1, 1)$ ).

One of the convenient aspects of having both the  $S^m$  and  $\mathbb{R}^m$  pictures is that conformal covariance of a pseudo-differential operator  $T$  is easy to check, given some explicit formula for  $T$ . The full conformal group  $O(m+1, 1)$  of the sphere, when realized in the  $\mathbb{R}^m$  picture, is generated by the group  $O(m)$  of origin-fixing isometries, the translation group  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , the dilations  $\delta_c : x \mapsto cx$  for  $0 < c \in \mathbb{R}$ , and the inversion in the unit sphere,  $Q : x \rightarrow x/r^2$ . The inversion is singular at  $x = 0$ ; this is the reason why one must compactify to get an "honest" group action. In the  $S^m$  picture,  $Q : (u, s) \mapsto (u, -s)$  is an isometry. This gives rise to the following useful principle:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Suppose  $S$  (resp.  $T$ ) is a linear transformation on  $C^\infty(S^m)$  (resp.  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ ), with*

$$(3.2) \quad T = \Phi^{-b} S \mu(\Phi^a)$$

for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ , where  $\Phi$  is as in (3.1). If  $S$  is isometry invariant on  $S^m$ ,  $T$  is isometry invariant on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , and the dilational behavior of  $T$  is

$$(3.3) \quad T(\delta_c \cdot f) = c^{a-b} \delta_c \cdot (Tf)$$

for all  $c > 0$  and  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , then  $S$  is intertwining of bidegree  $(a - m/2, b - m/2)$  on  $S^m$ , and

$$(3.4) \quad T(r^{-2a} Q \cdot f) = r^{-2b} Q \cdot (Tf)$$

for all  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ .

The proof is based on the following observation:

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $g$  and  $\bar{g} = \Phi^2 g$  be conformally related metrics on a manifold  $M$ ,  $0 < \Phi \in C^\infty(M)$ . If  $h \in \text{ctran}(M, g)$ ,  $h \cdot g = \Omega_h^2 g$ , then  $h \in \text{ctran}(M, \bar{g})$  and  $h \cdot \bar{g} = \Xi_h^2 \bar{g}$  with  $\Phi \Xi_h = (h \cdot \Phi) \Omega_h$ . Fix  $h \in \text{ctran}(M, g) = \text{ctran}(M, \bar{g})$ ; suppose that  $S$  is a linear transformation on  $C^\infty(M)$  with the intertwining property*

$$S(\Omega_h^a h \cdot \varphi) = \Omega_h^b h \cdot (S\varphi), \quad \text{all } \varphi \in C^\infty(M)$$

for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ ; and let  $T = \Phi^{-b} S \mu(\Phi^a)$ . Then  $T$  has the intertwining property

$$T(\Xi_h^a h \cdot f) = \Xi_h^b h \cdot (Tf), \quad \text{all } f \in C^\infty(M).$$

*Proof.* This is immediate from the identities  $h \cdot (\varphi\psi) = (h \cdot \varphi)(h \cdot \psi)$  for all  $\varphi, \psi \in C^\infty(M)$ , and  $h \cdot \Phi^a = (h \cdot \Phi)^a$  for all  $0 < \Phi \in C^\infty(M)$  and  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* We apply the lemma in the case where  $g = g_{S^m}$  and  $\bar{g} = g_{\mathbb{R}^m}$ . Because of the singularity of the inversion  $Q$  on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , the manifold  $M$  can be taken to be  $S^m$  minus at most two points, or conformally equivalently,  $\mathbb{R}^m$  minus at most one point,

the puncture sets depending on the conformal transformation considered. The proposition follows from the fact that the conformal transformations are generated by the isometries on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and  $S^m$ , together with the dilations on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , once we note that (3.3) is the conformal covariance relation for dilations ( $\Xi_{\delta_c} = c$ ), and (3.4) is the conformal covariance relation for  $Q$  ( $\Xi_Q = r^{-2}$ ).  $\square$

Consider now the convolution operators  $r^{-(m-2\nu)} *$  on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  for  $\nu \in (0, m/2]$ ; in detail,

$$(r^{-(m-2\nu)} * f)(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x) |x - y|^{-(m-2\nu)} dx.$$

$r^{-(m-2\nu)} *$  can be naturally viewed as a bounded operator from  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^m)$  to its dual  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , where  $p = 2m/(m + 2\nu)$  and  $q = 2m/(m - 2\nu)$ . We would also like to view  $r^{-(m-2\nu)} *$  as an operator between  $L^2$  Sobolev spaces, and make contact with the theory of the principal series. The philosophy is that up to a constant factor,  $r^{-(m-2\nu)} *$  is an inverse for  $\Delta^\nu$ ; we shall not develop this thinking precisely, but rather move to the compact setting of the sphere, where all is straightforward. The numbers  $p, q, \nu$  are related by the commutative diagram (3.5), in which the maps  $\iota$  are borderline Sobolev imbeddings, and the map on the right is bounded as a consequence of the boundedness of the other three maps. The norms on all spaces are conformally invariant; on the top line, in the representation  $u_{-\nu}$ , and on the bottom line, in the representation  $u_\nu$ . For the  $L^2$  Sobolev spaces, this is a consequence of Remark 2.9; for  $L^p$  and  $L^q$ , it follows upon a change of variable once we notice that  $h \cdot d\xi = \Omega_h^m d\xi$  for  $h \in \text{ctran}(S^m, g)$ .

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} L^2_\nu(S^m) & \xrightarrow{\iota} & L^q(S^m) \\ \uparrow A_{-2\nu} & & \uparrow A_{-2\nu} \\ L^2_{-\nu}(S^m) & \xleftarrow{\iota} & L^p(S^m) \end{array}$$

Using hard analytic symmetrization arguments, Lieb showed that:

**Theorem 3.3 [Lie].** *If  $\nu \in (0, m/2]$ ,*

$$\max_{\mathbb{P}L^p(\mathbb{R}^m)} \frac{|\langle r^{-(m-2\nu)} * f, g \rangle|}{\|f\|_p \|g\|_p}$$

is attained exactly at

$$(3.6) \quad [f] = [g] = [\Xi_h^{m/2+\nu} h \cdot \Phi^{-(m/2+\nu)}],$$

where  $h$  is a conformal transformation on  $(\mathbb{R}^m, \bar{g})$  as above (i.e,  $h$  may have a point singularity), and  $h \cdot \bar{g} = \Xi_h^2 g$ . Here  $\mathbb{P}L^p(\mathbb{R}^m)$  is the projective space on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^m)$ ,  $[\cdot]$  is the projective equivalence class, and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the pairing of  $L^q(\mathbb{R}^m, dx)$  and  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^m, dx)$ .  $\square$

In particular, the maximum is attained at

$$f = g = (1 + r^2)^{-(m/2+\nu)}.$$

In the  $\Omega, \Xi$  notation of Lemma 3.2, again taking  $g = g_{S^m}$ ,  $\bar{g} = g_{\mathbb{R}^m}$ , we can rewrite (3.6) as

$$(3.7) \quad [f] = [g] = [(\Omega_h/\Phi)^{m/2+\nu}].$$

Consider the correspondences

$$f \xleftrightarrow{(p)} \varphi = \Phi^{m/2+\nu} f, \quad k \xleftrightarrow{(q)} \kappa = \Phi^{m/2-\nu} k$$

between measurable functions  $f, k$  on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\varphi, \kappa$  on  $S^m$ . Since  $dx = \Phi^m d\xi' = v_m \Phi^m d\xi$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^m, dx)} &= v_m^{1/p} \|\varphi\|_{L^p(S^m, d\xi)}, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} k(x) f(x) dx &= v_m \int_{S^m} \kappa(\xi) \varphi(\xi) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

To transfer Lieb's inequality, we need to write the operator  $r^{-(m-2\nu)*}$  in the spherical setting. Now the distance between  $\xi, \eta \in S^m$  in the ambient  $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$  is

$$|\xi - \eta|^2 = \{\Phi(x)\Phi(y)\}^{-1} |x - y|^2,$$

where  $\xi$  corresponds to  $x$  and  $\eta$  to  $y$  under the stereographic projection. To make contact with Lemma 3.2, let  $T = r^{-(m-2\nu)*}$ ; then

$$\begin{aligned} (Tf)(\eta) &= (T(\Phi^{\nu-m/2}\varphi))(\eta) \\ &= v_m \int_{S^m} \Phi(\xi)^{\nu-m/2} \varphi(\xi) (\Phi(\xi)\Phi(\eta))^{-(m/2-\nu)} |\xi - \eta|^{-(m-2\nu)} \Phi(\xi)^m d\xi \\ &= v_m \Phi(\eta)^{-(m/2-\nu)} \int_{S^m} \varphi(\xi) |\xi - \eta|^{-(m-2\nu)} d\xi \\ &:= \Phi(\eta)^{-(m/2-\nu)} (S\varphi)(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

$T$  and  $S$  are manifestly isometry invariant on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and  $S^m$  respectively. By translation invariance, the dilational behavior of  $T$  can be detected at a single point:

$$(T(\delta_c \cdot f))(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(c^{-1}x) |x|^{-(m-2\nu)} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(y) (c|y|)^{-(m-2\nu)} c^m dy = c^{2\nu} (Tf)(0),$$

so  $T(\delta_c \cdot f) = c^{2\nu} \delta_c \cdot (Tf)$ . Thus by Proposition 3.1,  $S$  is intertwining of bidegree  $(\nu, -\nu)$ . By the uniqueness result Theorem 2.8(a), we must have

$$S = b\tilde{A}_{-2\nu} = b \frac{\Gamma(\frac{m}{2} + \nu)\Gamma(B - \nu + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{m}{2} - \nu)\Gamma(B + \nu + \frac{1}{2})}$$

for some nonzero constant  $b$ . In fact, since  $S$  and  $\tilde{A}_{-2\nu}$  are both nonnegative,  $b > 0$ . Putting all this together, we get

$$\frac{|\langle \tilde{A}_{-2\nu}\varphi, \psi \rangle_{(S^m, d\xi)}|}{\|\varphi\|_{L^p(S^m)} \|\psi\|_{L^p(S^m)}} = b^{-1} v_m^{2\nu/m} \frac{|(r^{-(m-2\nu)*} f, g)_{(\mathbb{R}^m, dx)}|}{\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^m, dx)} \|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^m, dx)}},$$

where  $f \xleftrightarrow{(p)} \varphi$  and  $g \xleftrightarrow{(p)} \psi$  as above. Thus we can conclude:

**Theorem 3.4 [Bec].** *If  $\nu \in (0, m/2]$ ,*

$$\max_{\text{PLP}(S^m, d\xi)} \frac{|\langle \tilde{A}_{-2\nu} \varphi, \psi \rangle_{(S^m, d\xi)}|}{\|\varphi\|_{L^p(S^m, d\xi)} \|\psi\|_{L^p(S^m, d\xi)}}$$

*is attained exactly for*

$$[\varphi] = [\psi] = [\Omega_h^{m/2+\nu}], \quad h \in \text{ctran}(S^m, g). \quad \square$$

In particular, one of the extremal functions is 1, so the maximum value is 1. The endpoint  $\nu = 0$ , missing in Lieb's theorem, can be restored here: for  $\nu = 0$ ,  $p = 2$  and  $\tilde{A}_{2\nu}$  is the identity, so the functional is maximized whenever  $[\varphi] = [\psi]$ . This is a qualitative difference from the situation for  $\nu \in (0, m/2]$ , where there is a finite-parameter set of minimizers.

It has turned out that an inequality dual to Theorem 3.4, as well as a generalized Moser-Trudinger inequality obtained by taking the dual of an endpoint derivative of Theorem 3.4, are crucial to the estimation of functional determinants of natural differential operators on  $S^2$  and  $S^4$  [On, OPS1-2, BØ3, BCY]. The above inequalities were derived in detail to show the power of the present group-invariance machinery, which replaces Beckner's use of technical devices like Gegenbauer polynomials and the Funk-Hecke formula. For the following inequalities, we refer to Beckner's arguments deriving them from Theorem 3.4. The geometric interpretations included in our statements of Corollaries 3.6 and 3.8 below are partially indicated in [Bec].

**Theorem 3.5.** (The Sobolev imbedding  $L^2_\nu \hookrightarrow L^{2m/(m-2\nu)}$  [Bec].) *If  $\nu \in [0, m/2)$ , with notation as above,*

$$\min_{\text{PL}^q(S^m, d\xi)} \frac{|\langle \tilde{A}_{2\nu} \kappa, \lambda \rangle_{(S^m, d\xi)}|}{\|\kappa\|_{L^q(S^m, d\xi)} \|\lambda\|_{L^q(S^m, d\xi)}}$$

*is attained exactly for*

$$[\kappa] = [\lambda] = [\Omega_h^{m/2-\nu}], \quad h \in \text{ctran}(S^m, g). \quad \square$$

**Corollary 3.6.**

(a) *If  $\nu < m/2$  is a positive integer and  $n = 2\nu$ ,*

$$\|\kappa\|_{L^{2m/(m-n)}(S^m, d\xi)}^2 \leq \frac{\Gamma(\frac{m-n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{m+n}{2})} (A_n \kappa, \kappa)_{L^2(S^m, d\xi)} = (\beta(Q_n)_0)^{-1} ((P_n)_0 \kappa, \kappa)_{L^2(S^m, d\xi)},$$

*with equality if and only if  $[\kappa] = [\Omega_h^\beta]$ ,  $h \in \text{ctran}(S^m, g)$ , where  $\beta = (m - n)/2$ .*

(b) *If  $(m, n)$  is as in part (a),*

$$\|(Q_n)_\omega\|_{L^{m/n}(S^m, (d\xi)_\omega)}$$

is minimized exactly when  $[e^\omega] = [\Omega_h]$ ,  $h \in \text{ctran}(S^m, g)$ . Here  $(d\xi)_\omega = (dv)_\omega/v_m$ , where  $(dv)_\omega$  is the Riemannian measure of the metric  $e^{2\omega}g$ .

*Proof of Corollary 3.6.* The transition from Theorem 3.5 to part (a) is made via Theorem 2.8. Part (b) can then be proved by an argument of Paul Yang. Let  $c = \beta(Q_n)_0$ ,  $q = m/\beta = 2m/(m-n)$ ,  $f = e^{\beta\omega}$ , and  $T = (P_n^0)_0$ ; then

$$c\|f\|_q^2 \leq \int_{S^m} f(T+c)f d\xi \leq \|f^2\|_{q/2} \left\| \frac{Tf}{f} + c \right\|_{q/(q-2)}$$

by Hölder's inequality. Here  $\|\cdot\|_p$  is the norm in  $L^p(S^m, d\xi)$ . Since  $\|f\|_q^2 = \|f^2\|_{q/2}$ , this is the desired result.  $\square$

Corollary 3.6 gives an interpretation of the Sobolev imbedding  $L^2_{n/2} \hookrightarrow L^{2m/(m-n)}$  in terms of local invariants which is similar to the interpretation of the Yamabe functional in terms of the total scalar curvature.

**Theorem 3.7.** (The imbedding  $L^2_{m/2} \hookrightarrow e^L$  [Bec].) Let  $\bar{\omega} = \int_{S^m} \omega d\xi$  be the mean value of  $\omega \in C^\infty(S^m)$ . Then

$$(3.8) \quad \log \int_{S^m} e^{m(\omega-\bar{\omega})} d\xi \leq \frac{m}{2\Gamma(m)} (P_m \omega, \omega)_{L^2(S^m, d\xi)},$$

with equality if and only if

$$(3.9) \quad [e^\omega] = [\Omega_h], \quad h \in \text{ctran}(S^m, g). \quad \square$$

**Corollary 3.8.**

$$(3.10) \quad (Q_m)_0 \log \int_{S^m} e^{m\omega} d\xi \leq \frac{m}{2} \int_{S^m} \omega \{ (Q_m d\xi)_\omega + (Q_m d\xi)_0 \},$$

with equality if and only if (3.9) holds. Under the volume-preservation restriction  $\int_{S^m} (d\xi)_\omega = 1$ ,

$$(3.11) \quad 0 \leq \frac{m}{2} \int_{S^m} \omega \{ (Q_m d\xi)_\omega + (Q_m d\xi)_0 \},$$

with equality if and only if  $e^\omega = \Omega_h$  for some  $h \in \text{ctran}(S^m, g)$ .

Note that the invariance of the right side of (3.8) under scaling ( $\omega \mapsto \omega + \text{const}$ ) follows from the fact that  $P_m$  is formally self adjoint and annihilates constants.

*Proof of Corollary 3.8.* We use (1.12) to write (3.8) in the form

$$(Q_m)_0 \left( \log \int_{S^m} e^{m\omega} d\xi - m\bar{\omega} \right) \leq \frac{m}{2} \left\{ \int_{S^m} \omega (Q_m dv)_\omega d\xi - (Q_m)_0 \bar{\omega} \right\},$$



with equality if and only if (3.9) holds. This is equivalent to

$$(Q_m)_0 \log \int_{S^m} e^{m\omega} d\xi \leq \frac{m}{2} \int_{S^m} \omega \{ (Q_m d\xi)_\omega + (Q_m d\xi)_0 \},$$

with equality if and only if (3.9) holds. Since  $\int_{S^m} (d\xi)_\omega = \int_{S^m} e^{m\omega} d\xi$ , we get (3.11) for volume 1 conformal metrics. To see when equality holds in (3.11), we just have to note that metrics corresponding to  $e^\omega = \Omega_h$  have volume 1:

$$\int_{S^m} \Omega_h^m d\xi = \int_{S^m} h \cdot d\xi = \int_{S^m} d\xi = 1. \quad \square$$

## 4. THE CONFORMAL INDEX AND THE GENERALIZED POLYAKOV FORMULA

Return now to the setting of Sec. 1, where  $(M, g)$  is a Riemannian manifold of dimension  $m$ , possibly with orientation (and thus a volume form  $E$ ), and possibly with spin structure (and thus a Clifford section  $\gamma$ ). We would like to study the functional determinant of some natural differential operators  $A$ . For convenience, we separate the different kinds of assumptions needed for different parts of the theory.

**Analytic assumptions 4.1.** Let  $A$  be a differential operator of positive order on sections of a tensor-spinor bundle  $\mathbf{V}$  over  $M$ . Suppose that  $A$  is formally self-adjoint and has positive definite leading symbol  $\sigma_{\text{lead}}(A)$ ; that is,  $\sigma_{\text{lead}}(A)(x, \xi)$  is positive definite in  $\text{End } \mathbf{V}_x$  for all  $x \in M$  and  $0 \neq \xi \in T_x^*M$ .

**Remark 4.2.** The assumptions on the leading symbol make sense because tensor-spinor bundles over a Riemannian manifold come equipped with Riemannian vector bundle structures.  $A$  is, in particular, elliptic. Since  $\sigma_{\text{lead}}(A)(x, -\xi) = (-1)^{\text{ord } A} \sigma_{\text{lead}}(A)(x, \xi)$ , the assumption of positive definite leading symbol forces the order of  $A$  to be even. We shall fix the notation  $2\ell = 2\ell[A] > 0$  for  $\text{ord } A$ .

Under the analytic assumptions 4.1, we can write down the heat kernel trace expansion, and define the zeta function and functional determinant. Let  $f$  denote an indeterminate element of  $C^\infty(M)$ ; the *heat expansion* is

$$(4.1) \quad \text{Tr}_{L^2} f \exp(-tA) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(f, A) t^{(n-m)/2\ell}, \quad t \downarrow 0.$$

(See, e.g., [G4].) Here

$$a_n(f, A) = \int_M f U_n[A] dv,$$

where  $U_n[A]$  is locally computable from the symbol of  $A$  in local coordinates;  $U_n[A]$  is polynomial in the *total* symbol, with coefficients that are smooth in the *leading* symbol. The invariants  $U_n$  vanish for  $n$  odd. The auxiliary function  $f$  is a useful device for holding onto *divergence terms* in the heat coefficients; these disappear from view (by Stokes' Theorem) if we only consider  $a_n[A] := a_n(1, A) = \int U_n[A]$ . We could also keep track of the endomorphism-valued invariants in the heat kernel expansion by allowing  $f$  to be valued in  $\text{End } \mathbf{V}$ , but this will not be useful for our purposes.

The heat operator trace can also be written in terms of the spectrum of  $A$ . Under the analytic assumptions 4.1,  $A$  has real eigenvalue spectrum  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \dots \uparrow \infty$ .  $A$  may have finitely many negative and zero eigenvalues. The *zeta function* associated to  $A$  is

$$\zeta_A(s) = \sum_{\lambda_j \neq 0} |\lambda_j|^{-s}.$$

$\zeta_A(s)$  is well-defined and holomorphic for large  $\text{Re } s$ . Let  $q[A]$  denote the multiplicity of 0

as an eigenvalue of  $A$ . Then by the heat expansion (4.1),

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{\lambda_j \neq 0} e^{-t|\lambda_j|} = -q[A] + 2 \sum_{\lambda_j < 0} \sinh(t\lambda_j) + \sum_{n=0}^N a_n[A] t^{(n-m)/2\ell} + O(t^{(N-m+2)/2\ell})$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^N \tilde{a}_n[A] t^{(n-m)/2\ell} + O(t^{(N-m+1)/2\ell}),$$

where

$$\tilde{a}_n[A] = \begin{cases} a_n[A] - q[A], & n = m, \\ a_n[A] + 2 \sum_{\lambda_j < 0} \lambda_j^k / k!, & n \in m + 2\ell(1 + 2\mathbb{N}), \\ a_n[A] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

( $\tilde{a}_n[A]$  might not vanish for some odd  $n$ , but this can only happen if  $m$  is odd.) Applying the Mellin transform, we get a meromorphic continuation of  $\zeta_A(s)$  to  $\mathbb{C}$ :

$$\zeta_A(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \left( \sum_{n=0}^N \left( s - \frac{m-n}{2\ell} \right)^{-1} \tilde{a}_n[A] + \int_0^1 t^{s-1} O(t^{(N-m+1)/2\ell}) dt + \int_1^\infty t^{s-1} \sum_{\lambda_j > 0} e^{-t\lambda_j} dt \right),$$

where  $O(t^{(N-m+1)/2\ell})$  is the error term from (4.2). In particular,  $\zeta_A(s)$  is regular at  $s = 0$ , and we can define the *functional determinant* of  $A$  by

$$\det A := (-1)^{\#\{\lambda_j < 0\}} \exp(-\zeta'_A(0)).$$

Before going further, we need to restrict to natural operators.

**Naturality assumptions 4.3.**  $A$  is natural in the sense of Sec. 1, with coefficients that depend rationally on the dimension  $m$ . (In particular,  $A$  might not exist for a finite set  $\mathcal{C}_A \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$  of dimensions.) With respect to uniform dilations of the metric,  $A$  has homogeneity degree  $-\text{ord } A$ , in the sense that if  $0 < \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\bar{g} = \alpha^2 g$ , and (if orientation and/or spin structure is involved)  $\bar{E} = \alpha^m E$ ,  $\bar{\gamma} = \alpha^{-1} \gamma$ , then  $\bar{A} = \alpha^{-2\ell} A$ . Furthermore,  $A$  satisfies the analytic assumptions 4.1 categorically: the realization of  $A$  on any Riemannian manifold  $M$  for  $m \notin \mathcal{C}_A$  satisfies 4.1.

**Remark 4.4.** By Weyl's invariant theory, the heat invariants  $U_n$  of any  $A$  satisfying the naturality assumptions 4.1 must be local scalar invariants in the sense of Sec. 1. Furthermore, under the above scaling, they must satisfy

$$(4.3) \quad \bar{U}_n = \alpha^{-n} U_n,$$

by the heat expansion and the formula

$$\exp(-t(\alpha^{-2\ell} A)) = \exp(-(\alpha^{-2\ell} t)A).$$

We shall say that any local scalar invariant satisfying (4.3), or any natural differential operator scaling as in (4.3), has *level*  $n$ . It is straightforward to show that we may also measure the level via a “derivative count” as follows: If  $U$  is a level  $n$  monomial local invariant or monomial natural differential operator, of degree  $(k_R, k_\nabla)$  in  $(R, \nabla)$ , then

$$2k_R + k_\nabla = n.$$

(Occurrences of  $g, g^\sharp, E, \gamma$  do not affect the level.) Our homogeneity assumption on  $A$  just says that  $A$  has a consistent level, equal to its order  $2\ell$ . Thus  $\sigma_{\text{lead}}(A)$  is polynomial in  $g, g^\sharp, \gamma, E$ ; that is, no higher jets of these objects are involved in the leading symbol. We also get that the section  $\tilde{\sigma}_{\text{lead}}$  of  $(\text{Symm}(T^*M)^{\otimes 2\ell}) \otimes \text{End } V$  representing the leading symbol is parallel (annihilated by  $\nabla$ ), since  $g, g^\sharp, \gamma, E$  are.

**Remark 4.5.** It is important to note that the functional determinant is not invariant under uniform dilation (scaling) of the metric. Suppose, as above, that  $\bar{g} = \alpha^2 g$  for  $0 < \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , and if applicable,  $\bar{E} = \alpha^m E, \bar{\gamma} = \alpha^{-1} \gamma$ . Then

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \zeta_{\bar{A}}(0) &= \zeta_A(0), \\ \det \bar{A} &= \alpha^{-2\ell \zeta_A(0)} \det A. \end{aligned}$$

That is, the quantity  $\zeta_A(0)$  is scale-invariant, and the functional determinant has a scale homogeneity that depends on  $\zeta_A(0)$ . Thus the functional

$$\mathcal{D}(A, g) = (\text{vol } g)^{2\ell \zeta_A(0)/m} \det A$$

is a scale-invariant “version” of the determinant. An added advantage of  $\mathcal{D}(A, g)$  is that, like  $\zeta_A(0)$  and the determinant, it is a *spectral invariant*, since  $\ell[A]$  and  $\text{vol } g$  are. ( $\text{vol } g = ca_0[A]$ , where  $c$  is a nonzero constant depending only on  $\sigma_{\text{lead}}[A]$ .) We emphasize, however, that there is no reason to expect  $\det A$  or  $\mathcal{D}(A, g)$  to be the integral of a local expression, as is  $a_n[A]$ .

We shall now impose some additional *conformal* assumptions.

**Conformal assumptions 4.6.**  $A$  is a positive integral power of a natural differential operator  $D$ ,  $A = D^h$ , with  $h$  independent of  $m$ , and  $D$  conformally covariant in the sense of 1.2, with a conformal bidegree  $(a, b) = (a(m), b(m))$  that is rational in  $m$ .

**Remark 4.7.** We do not assume that  $A$  itself is conformally covariant, or that  $D$  has positive definite leading symbol. Working in this generality allows to handle, for example, the square  $\nabla^2$  of the Dirac operator. Under 4.6 and the scale homogeneity assumptions of 4.3, the conformal bidegree of  $D$  is forced to take the form  $(a, a + 2\ell/h)$ .

An extremely important property from our point of view is a generalization of the scale-invariance property (4.4) to *pointwise*, or conformal scaling. This property is heavily dependent on the conformal assumptions 4.6. Following [BØ1], we call this a *conformal index property*.

**Conformal Index Theorem 4.8 [BØ1].** Let  $M$  be an  $m$ -dimensional compact manifold, and suppose that  $A$  satisfies 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6, with  $m \notin \mathcal{C}_A$ . Then the quantities  $q[A]$ ,  $\#\{\lambda_j < 0\}$ ,  $a_m[A]$ , and  $\zeta_A(0)$  are constant on each conformal class  $[g_0] = \{e^{2\omega}g_0 \mid \omega \in C^\infty(M)\}$  of Riemannian metrics on  $M$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\sigma_{\text{lead}}(A) = \sigma_{\text{lead}}(D)^h$ ,  $D$  is elliptic, and thus has pure eigenvalue spectrum; as a result,  $\mathcal{N}(A) = \mathcal{N}(D)$ .  $q[A] = \dim \mathcal{N}(D)$  is conformally invariant because  $\varphi \mapsto e^{a\omega}\varphi$  is a bijection of  $\mathcal{N}(D_0)$  onto  $\mathcal{N}(D_\omega)$ . The conformal invariance of  $\#\{\lambda_j < 0\}$  follows from, e.g., [Bl, Proposition 1], using the just mentioned explicit knowledge of the motion of the 0 eigenspace under variation of  $\omega$ . Since  $\zeta_A(0) = a_m[A] - q[A]$ , we just need to show that  $a_m[A]$  is conformally invariant.

For this, choose  $\omega \in C^\infty(M)$ , and consider the conformal curve of metrics  $g_{\varepsilon\omega} = e^{2\varepsilon\omega}g_0$ . If we can show that the operator  $(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0}$  annihilates the functional  $a_m[A_{\varepsilon\omega}]$ , we are done, since the result may then be applied with  $g_{\varepsilon\omega}$  in place of  $g_0$ , and  $\omega$  is arbitrary. The estimates of [BØ1] justify the following formal computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} a_n[A] t^{(n-m)/2\ell} &\sim (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \text{Tr} \exp(-tA_{\varepsilon\omega}) \\ &= -t \text{Tr}\{((d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} A_{\varepsilon\omega}) \exp(-tA_0)\} \\ &= -t \text{Tr}\{hD_0^h{}^{-1}((d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} D_{\varepsilon\omega}) \exp(-tA_0)\} \\ &= -t \text{Tr}\{hD_0^h{}^{-1}(-(2\ell/h)\omega D_0 + a[D_0, \mu(\omega)]) \exp(-tA_0)\} \\ &= 2t\ell \text{Tr} \omega \{D_0^h \exp(-tA_0)\} \\ &= 2t\ell \text{Tr} \omega \{A_0 \exp(-tA_0)\} \\ &= -2t\ell (d/dt) \text{Tr} \omega \exp(-tA_0) \\ &\sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (m-n) a_n(\omega, A_0) \\ &\sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (m-n) \int_M \omega(U_n[A] dv)_0, \end{aligned}$$

where, of course, the asymptotics are for  $t \downarrow 0$ . Here we have used the fact that functions of  $D$  and  $A$  commute, and that  $e^{-tA_0}$  is a smoothing operator for  $t > 0$ . Comparing coefficients for  $n = m$ , we get the desired result.  $\square$

As a corollary to the proof, we get a formula that will be useful below:

**Corollary 4.9 [BØ2].** Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.8,

$$(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} a_n[A_{\varepsilon\omega}] = (m-n) \int_M \omega(U_n[A] dv)_0.$$

Thus the functional  $(m-n)^{-1} a_n[A_\omega]$  is a conformal primitive for  $U_n[A]$  if  $n \neq m$ .  $\square$

If we wish, we can use the corollary to “reconstruct” the divergence terms in  $U_n[A]$  from the integrated invariant  $a_n[A]$ , as long as  $n \neq m$ . In fact, the rational dependence on

dimension assumed in 4.3 allows us to analytically continue in  $m$  (with some additional assumptions on  $\sigma_{\text{lead}}(A)$ ; see 5.1(a) below), so the restriction  $n \neq m$  will not really be a problem.

We shall now show that the functional determinant is the "missing" conformal primitive in the above, i.e., that of  $U_m[A]$ . This will complete a very strong analogy between the local invariants  $Q_n$  and the quadratic form  $(P_m\omega, \omega)_{L^2}$  studied in Sec. 1 on one hand; and the local invariants  $U_n[A]$  and the functional determinant on the other. This analogy will have more than esthetic value to us; it will actually lead to an efficient procedure for computing quotients of the form  $(\det A_\omega)/(\det A_0)$ .

**Theorem 4.10** (Generalized Polyakov formula [BØ2]). *Suppose  $A$  satisfies 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6. Let  $(M, g_0)$  be a particular  $m$ -dimensional manifold,  $m \notin \mathcal{C}_A$ , on which  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$ . Then*

$$(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \zeta'_{A_\varepsilon\omega}(0) = 2la_m(\omega, A_0).$$

*Proof.* First assume that  $\#\{\lambda_j < 0\} = 0$ , so that each  $A_\omega$  is a positive operator. The estimates in [BØ1, BØ2] allow us to conclude that  $(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \zeta_{A_\varepsilon\omega}(s)$  is meromorphic in  $s$ , and that we can interchange the order of conformal variation and analytic continuation, of conformal variation and  $s$ -differentiation. (Besides uniform estimates, this depends on the conformal invariance of  $q[A]$  and of  $\#\{\lambda_j < 0\}$ , because of the way the nonpositive spectrum was handled in the definition of the functional determinant.) For  $\text{Re } s$  large,

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \zeta'_{A_\varepsilon\omega}(s) &= (d/ds)(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \zeta_{A_\varepsilon\omega}(s) \\ &= (d/ds) \left\{ \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty t^{s-1} \{(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \text{Tr} \exp(-tA_\varepsilon\omega)\} dt \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} &= -(d/ds) \left\{ \frac{2\ell}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty t^s (d/dt) \text{Tr}(\omega \exp(-tA_0)) dt \right\} \\ &= (d/ds) \left\{ \frac{2\ell s}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty t^{s-1} \text{Tr}(\omega \exp(-tA_0)) dt \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Analytically continuing this formula, the value at  $s = 0$  is the same as that of

$$\frac{2\ell}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty t^{s-1} \text{Tr}(\omega \exp(-tA_0)) dt,$$

viz.  $2la_m(\omega, A_0)$ .

To dispense with the positivity assumption on  $A$ , note that we have proved the result for the positive operator  $A^2$ . But  $\zeta_{A^2}(s) = \zeta_A(2s)$ , so  $\zeta'_{A^2}(0) = 2\zeta'_A(0)$ ; and by [FG],  $U_m[A^2] = U_m[A]$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.11.** The effect of zero eigensections on the above formula and argument is as follows. Since  $q[A]$  is conformally invariant, formula (4.5) is still correct. Formula (4.6) is also correct, and can be rewritten as

$$-(d/ds) \left\{ \frac{2\ell}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty t^s (d/dt) \text{Tr}(\omega(\exp(-tA_0) - \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{N}(A_0)}) dt \right\}$$

It is now clear that the integral converges, and that the  $\int_1^\infty$  part does not affect the value of the expression at  $s = 0$ . The kernel function of  $\omega\{\exp(-tA_0) - \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{N}(A_0)}\}$  is

$$\omega(x) \left\{ H(t, x, y) - \sum_{\lambda_j=0} \varphi_j(x) \otimes \varphi_j^*(y) \right\},$$

where  $H(t, x, y)$  is the kernel function of  $\exp(-tA_0)$ , and  $\{\varphi_j\}$  is an  $L^2$  orthonormal basis of the zero eigensections. The conclusion is that

$$\begin{aligned} (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \zeta'_{A_\varepsilon\omega}(0) &= 2\ell \left( a_m(\omega, A_0) - \int_M \omega \sum_{\lambda_j=0} |\varphi_j(x)|^2 (dv)_0 \right) \\ &= 2\ell \int_M \omega \left( U_m[A] - \sum_{\lambda_j=0} |\varphi_j(x)|^2 \right) (dv)_0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can compute with the generalized Polyakov formula if  $\mathcal{N}(A_0) = 0$ , or if we have explicit knowledge of  $\mathcal{N}(A_0)$ . For example, if  $(M, g_0)$  is a flat torus, any parallel section is annihilated by any natural differential operator, so zero eigenvalues are unavoidable. On the other hand,  $\mathcal{N}(A_0)$  consists *exactly* of the parallel sections in this case, i.e. of the sections that have constant components in the standard trivialization; thus we know these sections explicitly. The conformal covariance relation then gives us knowledge of the null space in conformally related metrics, i.e., of  $\mathcal{N}(A_\omega)$ .

**Remark 4.12.** Because  $U_m[A]$  vanishes for  $m$  odd, the functional determinant of an operator satisfying our conformal assumptions is conformally rigid in odd dimensions in the absence of a null space. If there is a null space, the conformal variation of the determinant depends only on the conformal variation of this null space. For boundary value problems, however, we do get an interesting functional in odd dimensions, since there is a nonvanishing boundary contribution to  $a_{\text{odd}}(\omega, A)$  [BG1, BG2].

We would now like to compute the quotients  $(\det A_\omega)/(\det A_0)$ ; what we shall actually write down is the equivalent information

$$(4.7) \quad -\log((\det A_\omega)/(\det A_0)) = -\log |\det A_\omega| + \log |\det A_0|,$$

or the equivalent scale-invariant information

$$-\log(\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)/(\mathcal{D}(A, g_0))) = -\frac{2\ell\zeta_A(0)}{m} \log \frac{\int_M e^{m\omega} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} - \log \frac{\det A_\omega}{\det A_0}.$$

(Note that  $\text{sgn det } A_\omega = \text{sgn det } A_0$  since  $\#\{\lambda_j < 0\}$  is conformally invariant, and that the scale-invariant quantity makes sense as a functional on the conformal class  $[g_0]$  because  $\zeta_A(0)$  is conformally invariant.) According to the generalized Polyakov formula, say for  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$ , we just need to compute a conformal primitive for  $U_m[A]$  that vanishes at  $\omega = 0$  in order to compute (4.7).

## 5. THE FUNCTIONAL DETERMINANT IN DIMENSIONS 2 AND 4

To avoid having to compute the divergence terms in  $U_m[A]$ , replacing this information by the knowledge of  $a_m[A]$  for each even dimension  $m \notin C_A$ , we need the following technical assumption on  $(m, U_m[A])$ . The assumption is satisfied in all situations where we are able to compute  $U_m[A]$ , so it is no impediment to our calculations. One might conjecture that it true quite generally.

**Technical assumptions 5.1.** Fix  $n \in 2\mathbb{Z}^+$ , and make the following assumptions on  $(n, A)$ :

(a) There exists a universal function  $u(m)$ , meromorphic on  $\mathbb{C}$  and depending only on the formal polynomial expression of  $\sigma_{\text{lead}}(A)$ , such that the coefficients in the formal polynomial expression for  $u_A(m)U_n[A]$  are rational in  $m$  for  $m \in 2\mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $m \notin C_A$ .

(b) There is a rational function  $\alpha_n(m)$  and a local scalar  $O(m)$  invariant  $B_n(m)$  depending rationally on  $m \in 2\mathbb{Z}^+$ , both regular at  $m = n$ , such that

$$u_A(m)U_n[A] \simeq \alpha_n(m)Q_n + (m - n)B_n(m) \quad \text{modulo } \mathcal{R}(\delta),$$

for all conformally flat compact Riemannian manifolds of even dimension  $m \notin C_A$ . Here  $\delta$  is the formal adjoint of the exterior derivative  $d$  on functions, and  $\mathcal{R}(\delta)$  is its range.

**Remark 5.2.** Local scalar  $O(m)$  invariants with dimension-dependent coefficients should be viewed in the light of Gilkey's Theorem [G1, BFG, G4]: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , let  $L_n^m$  be the space of level  $n$  local scalar  $O(m)$  invariants in Riemannian manifolds of dimension  $m$ . Then  $L_n^m = 0$  if  $n$  is odd. For  $n$  even, there are natural surjections  $s_m : L_n^m \rightarrow L_n^{m-1}$  defined by *stabilization*, i.e. evaluation on product Riemannian manifolds  $N \times S^1$ ,  $\dim N = m - 1$ , followed by restriction to the submanifold  $N \times \{1\} \simeq N$ .  $s_m$  is bijective if  $m$  is odd, and

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{Pff}_m \rightarrow L_n^m \rightarrow L_n^{m-1} \rightarrow 0$$

is exact if  $m$  is even. Here  $\text{Pff}_m$  is the  $m$ -dimensional Pfaffian. Since we would like to exploit dependence on dimension, we consider direct limit  $L_n$  of the  $L_n^m$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and let

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \text{Rat}(m) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} L_n,$$

where  $\text{Rat}(m)$  is the field of rational functions in  $m$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the  $\otimes$ -algebra  $\bigoplus_n \mathcal{L}_n$ . We can also consider  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ , the  $\otimes$ -algebra of local  $O(m)$  scalar invariants in the conformally flat category, obtained by taking the quotient of  $\mathcal{L}$  by the ideal  $\mathcal{I}_C$  generated by the Weyl tensor  $C$ . This cannot be done in  $\bigoplus_n L_n$  (i.e. with constant coefficients), since the formula (1.7, 1.4) for  $C$  depends (rationally) on the dimension  $m$ . Another way of seeing this problem is to note that stabilization does not respect conformal flatness:  $N \times S^1$  is generically conformally curved, even for conformally flat  $N$ , and *vice versa*. After taking the quotient, we can reintroduce the grading by level,  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \bigoplus_n \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$ , and restrict to a given dimension  $m$  to get  $\tilde{L}_n^m$ .



**Remark 5.3.** Suppose  $A$  satisfies the naturality assumptions 4.3, acting on sections of a tensor-spinor bundle  $\mathbf{V}$ , that  $\text{ord } A = 2$  and  $\sigma_2(A)$  is *scalar*, i.e.  $\sigma_2(A)(x, \xi) = |\xi|^2 \text{Id}_{\mathbf{V}_x}$ . Then examination of the algorithm that produces the heat invariants [G4] shows that the coefficients appearing in the formal polynomial expression for  $(4\pi)^{m/2}(\dim \mathbf{V})^{-1}U_n[A]$  are rational in  $m$ , so we have no rationality problems so long as  $(4\pi)^{m/2}(\dim \mathbf{V})^{-1}$  is meromorphic. This is one reason for restricting to *even*  $m$  in 5.1: the fiber dimension of the spinor bundle is  $2^{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}$ ; this is the holomorphic function  $2^{m/2}$  when applied to even  $m$ , but a different holomorphic function,  $2^{(m-1)/2}$ , when applied to odd  $m$ . The point is that we have to keep track of the dependence of the fiber dimension  $\dim \mathbf{V}$  on  $m$ , and that for the operators  $Y$  and  $\nabla^2$ , this dependence causes no problem. If  $\text{ord } A = 4$  and  $\sigma_4(A)$  is scalar in the sense that  $\sigma_4(A)(x, \xi) = |\xi|^4 \text{Id}_{\mathbf{V}_x}$ , the same can be said with a certain meromorphic function in place of  $(4\pi)^{m/2}$ ; unlike the second order case, this function now depends on  $n$  [G3, FG]. Eventually, we need to apply meromorphic continuation to coefficients in formal polynomials defining local invariants; the limit point involved is  $m = \infty$ , so we need meromorphicity there. This is the reason for extracting the universal meromorphic factor in 5.1: so that we shall really only need to apply meromorphic continuation to rational functions (whose singularities at infinity, if any, are poles). The assumptions are certainly not the weakest under which meromorphic continuation can be performed, but suffice for the present purposes.

**Remark 5.4.** Note that there are "new" identities in  $\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{I}_C$  that do not appear, at first glance, to involve  $C$  directly; the most basic example follows from the Bianchi identity: in an orthonormal frame, summing over repeated indices,

$$C_{ijk|l} = (m-3)(V_{j|lk} - V_{jk|l}),$$

so  $V_{j|lk}$  is symmetric in all three indices for  $m \neq 3$ ; this is not true in dimension  $m \geq 4$  in the conformally curved case.

**Remark 5.5.** Some subclasses of  $L_n^m$ ,  $\tilde{L}_n^m$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_n$ , and of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$  will be important to us. First, let  $F_{n-1}^m$  be the space of level  $n-1$  local  $O(m)$  invariant one forms in dimension  $m$ , and define the space  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$  of such forms with  $\text{Rat}(m)$  coefficients. Let  $\tilde{F}_{n-1}^m$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{n-1}$  be the corresponding spaces of invariants in the conformally flat category. Then  $\delta$  carries  $F_{n-1}^m \rightarrow L_n^m$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_n$ ,  $\tilde{F}_{n-1}^m \rightarrow \tilde{L}_n^m$ , and  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{n-1} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$ . This gives rise to the spaces  $\delta F_{n-1}^m$ ,  $\delta \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ ,  $\delta \tilde{F}_{n-1}^m$ , and  $\delta \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n$  of *exact divergences*. Another class of interest to us is that of level  $n$  local invariants  $U$  satisfying

$$(5.1) \quad (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_M (U dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = (m-n) \int_M \omega(U dv)_0$$

under variation along the conformal curve  $g_{\varepsilon\omega} = e^{2\varepsilon\omega} g_0$ ; this condition makes sense within  $L_n^m$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_n$ ,  $\tilde{L}_n^m$ , or  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$ , giving rise to classes  $CL_n^m$ ,  $C\mathcal{L}_n$ ,  $C\tilde{L}_n^m$ , and  $C\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$  of *relative conformal invariants*.  $Q_n$  satisfies (5.1) by Corollary 1.3; by Corollary 4.9, so does  $U_n[A]$  for  $A$  satisfying 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6.  $CL_m^m$  and  $C\tilde{L}_m^m$  consist of local invariants whose integrals are conformal invariants, and  $\delta F_{m-1}^m \subset CL_m^m$ ,  $\delta \tilde{F}_{m-1}^m \subset C\tilde{L}_m^m$ . Given 5.1(a), we could conclude 5.1(b) if we just knew that the coset  $[U_n] = U_n + \delta \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{n-1}$  in  $C\tilde{L}_n^m/\delta \tilde{F}_{n-1}^m$  is a real

multiple of the coset  $[Q_n]$ . (By Theorem 2.8(f),  $[Q_n] \neq 0$ .) It may in fact be the case that  $C\tilde{L}_n^n/\delta\tilde{F}_{n-1}^n$  is one dimensional for each even  $n$ ; this is a kind of "conformal Singer conjecture." In that case, 5.1(b) would be superfluous. For  $n = 2, 4, 6$ , the cases in which we shall do explicit calculations, the conjecture is true, as we shall see below. Beyond levels 2, 4, and 6, it can at least be said that by the time one sets up a computational scheme powerful enough to compute  $U_n[A]$ , one has in particular explicit knowledge of the space  $C\tilde{L}_n^n/\delta\tilde{F}_{n-1}^n$ .

We are now ready to write a very general formula for the functional determinant in the conformally flat case.

**Theorem 5.6.** *Under the assumptions 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6 on  $A$ , and 5.1 on  $(m, A)$ , with  $m \in 2\mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $m \notin \mathcal{C}_A$ , the quantity  $\mathcal{A}$  defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} u_A(m)\mathcal{A} &:= \frac{1}{2}\alpha_m(m) \int \omega\{(Q_m dv)_\omega + (Q_m dv)_0\} + \int \{(B_m(m)dv)_\omega - (B_m(m)dv)_0\} \\ &= \alpha_m(m) \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int \omega((P_m)_0\omega)(dv)_0 + \int \omega(Q_m dv)_0 \right\} + \int \{(B_m(m)dv)_\omega - (B_m(m)dv)_0\} \end{aligned}$$

is a conformal primitive for  $U_m[A]$  on conformally flat conformal classes  $[g_0]$ , and vanishes at  $\omega = 0$ . As a result, given a particular  $m$ -dimensional conformally flat compact Riemannian manifold  $(M, g_0)$  on which  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$  (and which has orientation and/or spin structure if required to define  $A$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} (5.2) \quad 2\ell\mathcal{A} &= -\log \frac{\det A_\omega}{\det A_0} \\ &= -\log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega}g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} + \frac{2\ell\zeta_A(0)}{m} \log \frac{\int_M e^{m\omega}(dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let

$$V_n[A] := U_n[A] - \alpha_n(m)Q_n;$$

then

$$\int V_n dv = (m - n) \int B_n(m)dv$$

for  $m \notin \mathcal{C}_A$ . Since  $V_n[A] \in C\tilde{L}_n^m$ ,

$$(m - n)(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int (B_n(m)dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int (V_n dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = (m - n) \int \omega(V_n dv)_0.$$

Thus  $\int B_m(m)dv$  is a conformal primitive for  $V_m$  in dimension  $m$ , and  $\int \{(B_m(m)dv)_\omega - (B_m(m)dv)_0\}$  is a conformal primitive that vanishes at  $\omega = 0$ . By Corollary 1.6,  $\frac{1}{2} \int \omega\{(Q_m dv)_\omega + (Q_m dv)_0\}$  is a conformal primitive for  $Q_m$  vanishing at  $\omega = 0$ . The determinant formulas now follow from Theorem 4.10.  $\square$

The functional

$$\int \{(B_m(m)dv)_\omega - (B_m(m)dv)_0\}$$

is invariant under change of scale ( $\omega \mapsto \omega + \text{const}$ ), so the "correction" term in (5.2) is a correction to the functional involving  $Q_m$  (or  $Q_m$  and  $P_m$ ). Indeed, the coefficients of the correction term and the  $Q_m$  term are related by

$$\zeta_A(0) + q[A] = a_m[A] = u_A(m)^{-1} \alpha_m(m) \int (Q_m dv)_0.$$

This allows us to write the scale invariant determinant functional in a way which is well adapted to estimation techniques:

**Corollary 5.7.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.6 (including  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$ ), if  $Q_m$  is constant on  $(M, g_0)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} -(2\ell)^{-1} u_A(m) \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} &= \alpha_m(m) \left\{ -\frac{(Q_m)_0}{m} \log \frac{\int_M e^{m(\omega - \bar{\omega})} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_M \omega((P_m)_0 \omega) (dv)_0 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int \{(B_m(m)dv)_\omega - (B_m(m)dv)_0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\omega}$  is the  $(dv)_0$ -average of  $\omega$ .  $\square$

Note that the term involving  $P_m$  is scale invariant because  $P_m$  annihilates constants in dimension  $m$ .

We shall illustrate the theory by computing the functional determinants of the conformal Laplacian  $Y$ , and of the square  $\mathcal{V}^2$  of the Dirac operator on conformally flat manifolds in dimensions 2, 4, and 6. Since both operators have second order scalar leading symbol, we may take  $u_A(m) = (4\pi)^{m/2}$  in both cases (Remark 5.3). The two dimensional theory has been much studied; see, e.g. [On, OPS1-2]. The four dimensional theory was developed in [BØ3, BCY], and the six dimensional theory is presented for the first time here. The Dirac operator is conformally covariant,

$$g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0, \quad \gamma_\omega = e^{-\omega} \gamma_0, \quad \omega \in C^\infty(M) \Rightarrow \mathcal{V}_\omega = e^{-(m+1)\omega/2} \mathcal{V}_0 \mu(e^{(m-1)\omega/2}),$$

so the conformal assumption 4.6 is satisfied in both cases. Our formulas for the heat invariants come from [G2]. These formulas can be applied in particular to natural operators of the form  $\nabla^* \nabla - \mathcal{E}$  on tensor-spinor bundles  $\mathbf{V}$ , where  $\mathcal{E}$  is a smooth section of  $\text{End } \mathbf{V}$ . For  $Y$ , this is  $\mathcal{E}_Y = -(m-2)J/2$ , while for  $\mathcal{V}^2$ , this is  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{V}^2} = -\tau \text{Id}_\Sigma / 4 = -(m-1)J \text{Id}_\Sigma / 2$  by the Lichnerowicz formula [Lic]. To evaluate  $a_4[\mathcal{V}^2]$  and  $a_6[\mathcal{V}^2]$ , we shall need the *spin curvature* [Ko],

$$W_{ij} = -\frac{1}{4} R_{klij} \gamma_k \gamma_l$$

in an orthonormal frame.

In studying 2-dimensional manifolds, we are especially interested in local scalar invariants of level 2. The space  $\mathcal{L}_2$  of such is one-dimensional, and is generated by the scalar curvature  $\tau$ . We could (and shall) also use our normalized scalar curvature  $J$  as the generator of  $\mathcal{L}_2$ . All 2-dimensional manifolds are conformally flat, so our theory is completely general thus far. By, e.g., [G2],

$$6(4\pi)^{m/2} N^{-1} a_2 [\nabla^* \nabla - \mathcal{E}] = \int \{\tau + 6\mathcal{E}\} dv,$$

where  $N$  is the fiber dimension of the bundle  $\mathbf{V}$  on whose sections  $A$  acts. Thus

$$(5.3) \quad 6(4\pi)^{m/2} a_2 [Y] = (-m + 4) \int J dv,$$

$$(5.4) \quad 6(4\pi)^{m/2} 2^{-[m/2]} a_2 [\nabla^2] = (-m + 1) \int J dv.$$

(Though we have written the spinor formula for arbitrary  $m$ , our rationality assumptions are satisfied only when we restrict to even  $m$ , and it is only this part of the formula that we actually use.) Since  $J = Q_2$ ,  $Y = P_2$ , and  $Y$  is just  $\Delta$  in dimension  $m = 2$ ,  $J$  has the conformal primitive

$$\frac{1}{2} \int \{(Jdv)_\omega + (Jdv)_0\} = \frac{1}{2} \int \omega(\Delta_0 \omega)(dv)_0 + \int \omega(Jdv)_0$$

in dimension 2.  $\Delta$  always has a one-dimensional null space generated by the constant function; in the metric  $g$ , the constant  $\text{vol}(g)^{-1/2}$  is an  $L^2$  orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{N}(\Delta)$ . By Remark 4.11, the quotient of functional determinants has an extra term coming from the conformal primitive of

$$\frac{\int \omega(dv)_\omega}{\int (dv)_\omega},$$

that primitive being  $(\log \int (dv)_\omega)/2$ . Note that  $\text{Pff}_2 = \tau/4\pi = J/2\pi$ , so the conformal index of  $\Delta$  is

$$\zeta_\Delta(0) = a_2[\Delta] - 1 = \frac{1}{6} \chi(M) - 1$$

by (5.3), where  $\chi(M)$  is the Euler characteristic. The upshot is:

**Theorem 5.8.** *On a compact manifold  $M$  of dimension  $m = 2$ , in any Riemannian conformal class  $[g_0]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \frac{\det \Delta_\omega}{\det \Delta_0} &= -\log \frac{\int_M e^{2\omega}(dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} + \frac{1}{12\pi} \int_M \omega \{(Jdv)_\omega + (Jdv)_0\} \\ &= -\log \frac{\int_M e^{2\omega}(dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} + \frac{1}{12\pi} \int_M \omega(\Delta_0 \omega)(dv)_0 + \frac{1}{6\pi} \int_M \omega(Jdv)_0. \end{aligned}$$

The scale invariant determinant functional is

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \frac{\mathcal{D}(\Delta, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(\Delta, g_0)} &= -\frac{1}{6} \chi(M) \log \frac{\int_M e^{2\omega}(dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} + \frac{1}{12\pi} \int_M \omega \{(Jdv)_\omega + (Jdv)_0\} \\ &= -\frac{1}{6} \chi(M) \log \frac{\int_M e^{2\omega}(dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} + \frac{1}{12\pi} \int_M \omega(\Delta_0 \omega)(dv)_0 + \frac{1}{6\pi} \int_M \omega(Jdv)_0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if  $J_0$  is constant,

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = -\frac{1}{6} \chi(M) \log \frac{\int_M e^{2(\omega - \bar{\omega})} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} + \frac{1}{12\pi} \int_M \omega(\Delta_0 \omega) (dv)_0,$$

where  $\bar{\omega}$  is the  $(dv)_0$ -average of  $\omega$ . If  $(M, g_0)$  is  $S^2$  with its standard metric  $g_0$ , and  $d\xi = (dv)_0/4\pi$ ,  $(d\xi)_\omega = (dv)_\omega/4\pi$  are the normalized measures of Sec. 3, then

$$(5.5) \quad -\log \frac{\mathcal{D}(\Delta, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(\Delta, g_0)} = \frac{1}{3} \left( -\log \int_{S^2} e^{2(\omega - \bar{\omega})} d\xi + \int_{S^2} \omega(\Delta_0 \omega) d\xi \right). \quad \square$$

Note that by the Uniformization Theorem, we are entitled to assume that  $J_0$ , the Gauss curvature of the background metric  $g_0$ , is constant. Remarkably, the quantity in (5.5) is exactly that estimated by the Moser-Trudinger inequality, i.e. the  $m = 2$  case of Theorem 3.7. This leads directly to Onofri's result on the maximum value of the functional determinant.

**Corollary 5.9 [On].** Among all volume  $4\pi$  metrics  $g$  on  $S^2$ ,  $\det \Delta_g$  is maximized exactly at those diffeomorphic to the standard metric  $g_0$ ; i.e. for which  $g = \varphi^* g_0$ ,  $\varphi \in \text{Diffeo}(S^2)$ .

Here we have used the fact that  $\Delta$  has no negative eigenvalues to reduce to the extremal problem for the quantity (5.5). The fact that one can maximize over the space of *all* metrics is special to dimension 2: given any Riemannian metric  $g$  on  $S^2$ , there is a  $\varphi \in \text{Diffeo}(S^2)$  with  $\varphi^* g \in [g_0]$  [OPS1]. Since the determinant and the scale-invariant determinant functional are spectral invariants, they are diffeomorphism invariants, and this reduces us to the conformal problem of the Moser inequality. For general compact 2-manifolds  $M$ , roughly speaking, there are only "finitely many degrees of freedom" remaining once conformal change and diffeomorphism are "drained out" [OPS1]. In its precise form, this is a statement about the reduced space of metrics  $\mathcal{G}/\text{Diffeo}(M) \times C_+^\infty(M)$ , where  $\mathcal{G}$  is the space of Riemannian metrics and  $C_+^\infty(M)$  acts by conformal change of metric.

If  $\mathcal{N}(\nabla) = 0$ , the conformal index of  $\nabla^2$  is

$$\zeta_{\nabla^2}(0) = -\chi(M)/12,$$

by (5.4), so we have:

**Theorem 5.10.** On a compact spin manifold of dimension  $m = 2$ , in any Riemannian conformal class  $[g_0]$  where the conformally invariant condition  $\mathcal{N}(\nabla) = 0$  holds,

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \frac{\det \nabla_\omega^2}{\det \nabla_0^2} &= -\frac{1}{12\pi} \int_M \omega \{ (Jdv)_\omega + (Jdv)_0 \} \\ &= -\frac{1}{12\pi} \int_M \omega(\Delta_0 \omega) (dv)_0 - \frac{1}{6\pi} \int_M \omega (Jdv)_0. \end{aligned}$$

The scale invariant determinant functional is

$$-\log \frac{\mathcal{D}(\nabla^2, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(\nabla^2, g_0)} = \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(\Delta, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(\Delta, g_0)}.$$

As a result, on  $S^2$ ,  $\det \mathcal{V}_\omega^2$  is minimized for  $g = g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0 \in [g_0]$  of volume  $4\pi$  exactly when  $g_\omega = h \cdot g_0$  for some  $h \in \text{ctran}(S^2, g_0)$ .

Again, the absence of negative eigenvalues allows us to reduce to the extremal problem for the scale invariant determinant functional. Note that though the construction of the spinor bundle depends on the metric, spinor bundles constructed from conformally related metrics can be identified.

For  $m \geq 4$ , the space  $L_4^m$  of level 4 local scalar  $O(m)$  invariants is four dimensional. A basis which is especially adapted to dimension independent calculations is  $|R|^2, |\rho|^2, \tau^2, \Delta\tau$ . A convenient basis for calculations involving conformal change of metric is  $|C|^2, |V|^2, J^2, \Delta J$ ; this new basis can be written in terms of the old one using coefficients that are rational in  $m$ ; thus we have two different bases of  $\mathcal{L}_4$  over  $\text{Rat}(m)$ . In the conformally flat category,  $|V|^2, J^2$  is a basis of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4/\delta\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_3$  over  $\text{Rat}(m)$ . By, e.g., [Bra1],

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0}(J^2)_{\varepsilon\omega} &= -4\omega(J^2)_0 + 2J\Delta\omega, \\ (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0}(|V|^2)_{\varepsilon\omega} &= -4\omega(|V|^2)_0 - 2\langle V, \text{Hess}_{g_0}\omega \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where for two-tensors  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ ,  $\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle = \varphi_{ij}\psi_{ij}$  in an orthonormal basis. By the Bianchi identity  $V_{ij|i} = J_{|j}$  and integration by parts, the space  $C\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4/\delta\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_3^4$  in dimension 4 has the single generator  $[J^2 - |V|^2] = J^2 - |V|^2 + \delta\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_3^4$ , of which  $[Q]$  and  $[\text{Pff}_4]$  must be scalar multiples. (As in Sec. 1, we write  $Q = Q_4$ .) On  $S^4$  with its standard metric,  $J^2 - |V|^2 = 3$ ,  $\text{Pff}_4 = 2/v_4 = 3/4\pi^2$ , and by Theorem 2.8(f),  $Q = 6$ ; thus

$$(5.7) \quad 2[J^2 - |V|^2] = [Q] = 8\pi^2[\text{Pff}_4] \quad \text{in } C\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4/\delta\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_3^4.$$

By Remark 5.5, the technical assumption 5.1(b) will automatically be satisfied for the pair  $(4, A)$  provided  $A$  satisfies 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6, and  $(4, A)$  satisfies 5.1(a). In this case we can write

$$u_A(m)a_4[A] = \int \{ \alpha_4(m)Q + (m-4)(k_V(m)|V|^2 + k_J(m)J^2) \} dv$$

for some rational functions  $k_V(m)$  and  $k_J(m)$  which are regular at  $m = 4$ . Here, as in Sec. 1,  $Q = Q_4$ . Now take a particular 4-manifold  $(M, g_0)$ , and assume for simplicity that  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$  there. The conformal index is

$$\zeta_A(0) = a_4[A] = u_A(4)^{-1} \alpha_4(4) \int_M Q dv = 8\pi^2 u_A(4)^{-1} \alpha_4(4) \chi(M);$$

specializing Theorem 5.6, we get:

**Theorem 5.11 [BØ3].** Suppose  $A = A(m)$  satisfies 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6, and is regular at  $m = 4$ . Suppose that the pair  $(4, A)$  satisfies 5.1(a). Let  $(M, g_0)$  be a particular conformally flat compact Riemannian four-manifold (with orientation and/or spin structure if required to define  $A$ ), and suppose that  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$  on  $(M, g_0)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} - (2\ell)^{-1} u_A(4) \log \frac{\det A_\omega}{\det A_0} &= \frac{1}{2} \alpha_4(4) \int_M \omega \{ (Qdv)_\omega + (Qdv)_0 \} \\ &\quad + k_V(4) \int_M \{ (|V|^2 dv)_\omega - (|V|^2 dv)_0 \} + k_J(4) \int_M \{ (J^2 dv)_\omega - (J^2 dv)_0 \} \\ &= \alpha_4(4) \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_M \omega(P_0\omega)(dv)_0 + \int_M \omega(Qdv)_0 \right\} + (k_V(4) + k_J(4)) \int_M \{ (J^2 dv)_\omega - (J^2 dv)_0 \}. \end{aligned}$$

The scale invariant determinant functional is

$$-(2\ell)^{-1} u_A(4) \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = -2\pi^2 \alpha_4(4) \chi(M) \log \frac{\int_M e^{4\omega} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} - (2\ell)^{-1} u_A(4) \log \frac{\det A_\omega}{\det A_0}.$$

If  $Q$  is constant on  $(M, g_0)$ ,  $Q_0 = 8\pi^2 \chi(M) / \text{vol}(g_0)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} -(2\ell)^{-1} u_A(4) \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} &= \alpha_4(4) \left\{ -\frac{Q_0 \text{vol}(g_0)}{4} \log \frac{\int_M e^{4(\omega - \bar{\omega})} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_M \omega(P_0 \omega) (dv)_0 \right\} + (k_V(4) + k_J(4)) \int_M \{(J^2 dv)_\omega - (J^2 dv)_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

If in addition  $J$  is constant on  $(M, g_0)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (5.8) \quad &-(2\ell)^{-1} u_A(4) \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = \\ &\alpha_4(4) \left\{ -\frac{Q_0 \text{vol}(g_0)}{4} \log \frac{\int_M e^{4(\omega - \bar{\omega})} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} + \frac{1}{2} \int_M \omega(P_0 \omega) (dv)_0 \right\} \\ &+ (k_V(4) + k_J(4)) \int_M \left\{ \left( \frac{(\Delta + J)_0 e^\omega}{e^\omega} \right)^2 - J_0^2 \right\} (dv)_0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if  $g_0$  is the standard  $S^4$  metric,

$$\begin{aligned} (5.9) \quad &-(2\ell)^{-1} u_A(4) \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = \\ &4\pi^2 \alpha_4(4) \left\{ -\log \int_{S^4} e^{4(\omega - \bar{\omega})} d\xi + \frac{1}{3} \int_{S^4} \omega(\Delta_0(\Delta_0 + 2)\omega) d\xi \right\} \\ &+ \frac{8\pi^2 (k_V(4) + k_J(4))}{3} \int_{S^4} \left\{ \left( \frac{(\Delta_0 + 2)e^\omega}{e^\omega} \right)^2 - 4 \right\} d\xi. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the conformal index property in the form (5.7) to eliminate the more complicated invariant  $|V|^2$  from the formulas in favor of  $J^2$ . For (5.8), we have used the covariance relation for the conformal Laplacian  $Y$ , together with the fact that  $Y = \Delta + J$  in dimension four. For (5.9), we have substituted the standard four-sphere values  $Q = 6$ ,  $J = 2$ , and  $P = \Delta(\Delta + 2)$ .

**Remark 5.12.** In [BØ3], where a somewhat different computational approach was taken, the numbers  $u_A(4)^{-1} \alpha_4(4)$  and  $u_A(4)^{-1} (k_V(4) + k_J(4))$  were called  $\frac{1}{2} \beta_2$  and  $\frac{1}{2} \beta_3$  respectively; this notation is also used in [BCY]. In [BØ3],  $\beta_3$  arose as the coefficient of  $\Delta J$  in  $U_4[A]$ .  $\beta_3$  ends up attached to the  $J^2$  term in the determinant formula because  $\frac{1}{2} J^2$  is a conformal primitive for  $\Delta J$ . In the current approach, we do not need to compute such divergence terms, but need instead knowledge of all the non-divergence terms as functions

of the dimension  $m$ , not just in dimension four. In essence, instead of computing divergence terms via the "reconstruction principle" of Corollary 4.9, analytically continuing to dimension 4, and then finding a conformal primitive, we just find a conformal primitive for  $m \neq 4$  and analytically continue to  $m = 4$ .

Just as in dimension two, we now have everything written in terms of functionals which are sharply estimated by Lieb-Beckner inequalities, at least on the sphere. The novelty is that now we have a linear combination of *two* such functionals, that associated to the imbedding  $L_2^2 \hookrightarrow e^L$ , and that associated to the "ordinary" borderline Sobolev inequality  $L_1^2 \hookrightarrow L^4$ . The best constants and extremals are given by Corollary 3.6 and Theorem 3.7. However, we are not finished estimating unless the coefficients involved,  $\alpha_4(4)$  and  $k_V(4) + k_J(4)$ , have the same sign, or else one vanishes and the other does not. Fortunately, the signs do agree in the cases  $A = Y$  and  $A = \mathcal{V}^2$ . (They also agree for  $A = P$ , but we shall not work this out in detail here.)

To find these coefficients, recall from [G2, Theorem 4.3] that

$$(5.10) \quad (4\pi)^{m/2} 360 a_4 [\nabla^* \nabla - \mathcal{E}] = \int_M \text{tr}_V \{ 5\tau^2 - 2|\rho|^2 + 2|R|^2 + 60\tau\mathcal{E} + 180\mathcal{E}^2 + 30W_{ij}W_{ij} \} dv,$$

where  $W$  is the curvature of the bundle  $V$  in which  $\nabla^* \nabla - \mathcal{E}$  acts. (Recall that our convention on index placement in the Riemann tensor differs from that of the reference; on standard  $S^2$ , our  $R_{1212}$  is positive.) An expression like  $W_{ij}W_{ij}$  does not, of course, refer to any particular orthonormal frame, but is an abbreviation for that quantity that equals  $W_{ij}W_{ij}$  in *any* local orthonormal frame; that is, it is invariant index notation. We apply (5.10) to the Yamabe operator in the conformally flat category via Table 5.1, which expresses all relevant invariants in terms of  $J^2$  and  $|V|^2$ .

TERMS IN  $(4\pi)^{m/2} 360 a_4 [Y]$  ( $\mathcal{E} = -\frac{1}{2}(m-2)J$ ,  $W = 0$ )

	$J^2$	$ V ^2$		coef.
$\tau^2$	$4(m-1)^2$	0		5
$ \rho ^2$	$3m-4$	$(m-2)^2$		-2
$ R ^2$	4	$4(m-2)$		2
$\tau\mathcal{E}$	$-(m-1)(m-2)$	0		60
$\mathcal{E}^2$	$\frac{1}{4}(m-2)^2$	0		180

TABLE 5.1

The meaning of, for example, the second row of the table, is that

$$|\rho|^2 = (3m-4)J^2 + (m-2)^2|V|^2,$$



and that the coefficient of  $|\rho|^2$  on the right in (5.10) is  $-2$ . Thus, since

$$\int Q dv = \int \left\{ \frac{1}{2} m J^2 - 2|V|^2 \right\} dv,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4\pi)^{m/2} 360 a_4[Y] &= (m-6) \int \left\{ (5m-16)J^2 - 2(m-2)|V|^2 \right\} dv \\ &= 2(m-6) \int Q dv + (m-4)(m-6) \int \left\{ 4J^2 - 2|V|^2 \right\} dv. \end{aligned}$$

We collect this information in:

**Lemma 5.13.** For  $(n, A) = (4, Y)$  and the choice  $u_Y(m) = (4\pi)^{m/2}$ , the function in 5.1(b) is

$$\alpha_4(m) = (m-6)/180,$$

and the local invariant can be taken to be

$$B_4(m) = (m-6)\{4J^2 - 2|V|^2\}/360.$$

As a result,  $\alpha_4(4) = k_V(4) + k_J(4) = -1/90$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.14.** The factor  $m-6$  in the formula for  $a_4[Y]$  is expected. By a result that appears to have originated in [Schi] (see also [BØ1, BG1]),  $U_{m-2}[Y]$  is a local conformal invariant in the sense that

$$\bar{g} = \Omega^2 g, \quad 0 < \Omega \in C^\infty(M) \Rightarrow \bar{U}_{m-2}[Y] = \Omega^{2-m} U_{m-2}[Y].$$

(A similar result holds for any conformal covariant  $A$  of order  $2\ell$  satisfying 4.1 and 4.3, replacing each  $m-2$  above with  $m-2\ell$ . This is most clearly seen from [BG1, Lemma 3.1(c)].) But we are now working in the conformally flat category, where all such local conformal invariants vanish. The same principle can be seen in the factor of  $m-4$  in (5.3) above, and in the factor of  $m-8$  in Lemma 6.9 below.

To treat  $A = \nabla^2$ , we need to adjust the above calculation for the change from  $\mathcal{E} = -(m-2)J/2$  to  $\mathcal{E} = -\tau/4 = -(m-1)J/2$  (the Lichnerowicz formula), for the change in fiber dimension, and for the spin curvature; these adjustments are detailed in Table 5.2.

(VALUE AT  $\mathcal{E} = -\frac{1}{2}(m-1)J$ ) MINUS (VALUE AT  $\mathcal{E} = -\frac{1}{2}(m-2)J$ )

	$J^2$	$ V ^2$		coef.
$\tau\mathcal{E}$	$-(m-1)$	0		60
$\mathcal{E}^2$	$\frac{1}{4}(2m-3)$	0		180

NEW TERM IN  $(4\pi)^{m/2} 360 \cdot 2^{-[m/2]} \alpha_4[\nabla^2]$  RESULTING FROM  
SPINOR ( $\Sigma$ ) BUNDLE CURVATURE  $W_{ij} = -\frac{1}{4}R_{kl ij}\gamma^k\gamma^l$

	$J^2$	$ V ^2$		coef.
$\text{tr}_\Sigma W_{ij}W_{ij}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$m-2$		30

TABLE 5.2

Collecting the information, we get:

**Lemma 5.15.** For  $(n, A) = (4, \nabla^2)$ , with the choice  $u_{\nabla^2}(m) = (4\pi)^{m/2} 2^{-m/2}$  ( $m$  even), the function in (5.1) can be taken to be

$$\alpha_4(m) = 11/360,$$

and the local invariant can be taken to be

$$B_4(m) = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(10m-3)J^2 - (2m+7)|V|^2}{360}.$$

As a result,  $\alpha_4(4) = 11/360$  and  $k_V(4) + k_J(4) = 7/720$ . In particular, these numbers have the same sign.

Neither  $Y$  nor  $\nabla^2$  has negative eigenvalues on  $(S^4, g_0)$ ; thus by Theorem 4.8, the same is true with  $g_\omega$  in place of  $g_0$  for any  $\omega \in C^\infty(S^4)$ . As a result, the extremal problem for  $\det Y_\omega$  is the same as that for  $\log(\mathcal{D}(Y, e^{2\omega}g_0))/(\mathcal{D}(Y, g_0))$ , and similarly for  $\det \nabla^2$ . (If there were an odd number of negative eigenvalues, the extremal problem would be the same, but the roles of maxima and minima would be reversed.) In view of Theorem 5.11, Corollary 3.6, and Theorem 3.7, we have proved:

**Theorem 5.16.** On  $S^4$ ,  $\det Y_\omega$  is minimized for  $g = g_\omega = e^{2\omega}g_0 \in [g_0]$  of volume  $8\pi^2/3$  exactly when  $g_\omega = h \cdot g_0$  for some  $h \in \text{ctran}(S^4, g_0)$ .  $\det \nabla^2_\omega$  is maximized at exactly the same metrics.

6. THE FUNCTIONAL DETERMINANT IN DIMENSION 6

One of the requirements for an application of our method to dimension six is a formula for  $\int Q_6 dv$  in the conformally flat case. Actual computation of the operator  $P_6$  via the algorithm implicit in [GJMS], or in [Wü], is a formidable undertaking. Instead of taking this tack, we shall write down a trial formula, with undetermined coefficients, for  $Q_6$ , then evaluate the coefficients using some special computations.

**Lemma 6.1.** *The four invariants  $|dJ|^2$ ,  $J^3$ ,  $J|V|^2$ , and  $\text{tr } V^3 := V_{ij}V_{jk}V_{ki}$  give a basis of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_6$ .*

*Proof.* A basis of such metric invariants in the not necessarily conformally flat category (i.e., of  $\mathcal{L}_6$ ) is given in [G2]. To get the above result, one just needs to show that each of these invariant is a linear combination of the four given above in the conformally flat case; this follows from the formula (1.7) for  $R$  in terms of  $C$  and  $V$ . (Exact formulas are given in Table 6.1 below.)  $\square$

Note that the "trace" in  $\text{tr } V^3$  is that of  $\text{End } TM$  (or  $\text{End } T^*M$ ). We already know that the  $|dJ|^2$  coefficient in  $Q_6$  is  $(m - 6)/2$  by Corollary 1.5. We can more information by evaluating on the standard sphere, and (recalling Remark 1.2) on the conformally flat pseudo-Riemannian manifolds  $(S^{(q,p)}, g_0) := (S^q \times S^p, g_{S^q} - g_{S^p})$ , with  $p + q = n$ . Up to covering, these are the conformal compactifications of the standard signature  $(q, p)$  flat spaces; that is, they bear the same relation to these flat spaces as the sphere does to Euclidean space. The group  $SO_0(q + 1, p + 1)$  acts on  $(S^{(q,p)}, g_0)$  by conformal transformations [K1, Bra2], and one can study the representation theoretic problem analogous to that of Sec. 2 above. We shall not need a full treatment of this theory, but just the analogue of Theorem 2.8(f). Using (2.10) on  $S^q$  and  $S^p$  to interpret and rewrite results of Molčanov [M], we get:

**Theorem 6.2 [M].** *Let  $B$  be the operator of (2.14) on standard  $S^q$  (with  $q$  in place of  $m$ ), and let  $C$  be the similar operator on standard  $S^p$  (with  $p$  in place of  $m$ ). Then the unique differential intertwinor of order  $n \in 2\mathbb{Z}^+$  for the conformal action of  $SO_0(q + 1, p + 1)$  on functions over  $S^{(q,p)}$  is*

$$P_n = P_2 \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\frac{n-2}{4}} \{(B + C + 2\alpha)(B - C - 2\alpha)(B + C - 2\alpha)(B - C + 2\alpha)\}$$

if  $n/2$  is odd, where  $P_2 = (B + C)(B - C)$ , and

$$P_n = \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\frac{n}{4}} \{(B + C + (2\alpha - 1))(B - C - (2\alpha - 1))(B + C - (2\alpha - 1))(B - C + (2\alpha - 1))\}$$

if  $n/2$  is even.  $\square$

Note that if  $p = 0$ , we are (up to covering) in the situation of Theorem 2.8(f), and we recover that result by noting that the operator  $C$  is just the number  $1/2$ .

**Corollary 6.3.** *In the setting of Theorem 6.2,*

$$32Q_6 = (m+2)(m-2)(q-p)(q-p+4)(q-p-4),$$

*Proof.* We compute using  $(m-6)Q_6/2 = P_61$ .  $\square$

On  $(S^{(q,p)}, g_0)$ ,

$$dJ = 0, \quad 8J^3 = (q-p)^3, \quad 8J|V|^2 = m(q-p), \quad 8 \operatorname{tr} V^3 = q-p.$$

As a result, if

$$(6.1) \quad \int Q_6 dv = \int \left\{ \frac{m-6}{2} |dJ|^2 + a(m)J^3 + b(m)J|V|^2 + c(m) \operatorname{tr} V^3 \right\} dv$$

(using the  $|dJ|^2$  coefficient determined above), then equating coefficients of  $(q-p)^3$  and of  $q-p$  gives

$$(6.2) \quad 4a(m) = (m+2)(m-2),$$

$$(6.3) \quad mb(m) + c(m) = -4(m+2)(m-2).$$

Thus our consideration of mixed signature conformally flat spaces has given us two of the three remaining ( $m$  dependent) undetermined coefficients; the sphere alone provides just one. To find the remaining undetermined coefficient, we do a partial computation of the integrals of  $Q_6$ ,  $|dJ|^2$ ,  $J^3$ ,  $J|V|^2$ , and  $\operatorname{tr} V^3$  on the Riemannian manifolds  $(T^m, e^{2\omega}g_0)$ , where  $(T^m, g_0)$  is the flat torus and  $\omega \in C^\infty(T^m)$ . Direct computation gives

$$J_\omega = -e^{-2\omega} \operatorname{tr} \lambda,$$

$$V_\omega = -\lambda,$$

$$dJ_\omega = e^{-2\omega} \left\{ d\Delta\omega - 2(\Delta\omega)d\omega + \frac{m-2}{2} d|d\omega|^2 + (m-2)|d\omega|^2 d\omega \right\}$$

where all natural differential operators are computed in the background metric  $g_0$ , and

$$\lambda = \operatorname{Hess} \omega - d\omega \otimes d\omega + \frac{1}{2}|d\omega|^2 g_0.$$

Now introduce “...” as an abbreviation for “differential monomials of fourth or higher degree in  $\omega$ .” We have:

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} J_\omega^3 &= e^{-6\omega}((\Delta\omega)^3 + \dots), \\ (J|V|^2)_\omega &= e^{-6\omega}((\Delta\omega)|\operatorname{Hess} \omega|^2 + \dots), \\ (\operatorname{tr} V^3)_\omega &= -e^{-6\omega}(\operatorname{tr}(\operatorname{Hess} \omega)^3 + \dots), \\ (|dJ|^2)_\omega &= e^{-6\omega}(|d\Delta\omega|^2 + 2\langle d\Delta\omega, -2(\Delta\omega)d\omega + \frac{m-2}{2}d|d\omega|^2 \rangle + \dots). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $(dv)_\omega = e^{m\omega}(dv)_0$ , the integrated form of this is

$$\int (J^3 dv)_\omega = \int e^{2\beta\omega}((\Delta\omega)^3 + \dots)(dv)_0,$$

where  $\beta = (m - 6)/2$ , and similarly for the other invariants. Integration by parts gives several relations among the integrals of invariants appearing in (6.4):

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \int e^{2\beta\omega}(\Delta\omega)(d\Delta\omega, d\omega)(dv)_0 &= \int e^{2\beta\omega}\left\{\frac{1}{2}(\Delta\omega)^3 + \dots\right\}(dv)_0, \\ \int e^{2\beta\omega}\langle d\Delta\omega, d|d\omega|^2 \rangle (dv)_0 &= \int e^{2\beta\omega}\{2(\Delta\omega)|\text{Hess}\omega|^2 - (\Delta\omega)^3 + \dots\}(dv)_0, \\ \int e^{2\beta\omega}(\text{tr}(\text{Hess}\omega)^3)(dv)_0 &= \int e^{2\beta\omega}\left\{\frac{1}{2}(\Delta\omega)^3 - \frac{3}{2}(\Delta\omega)|\text{Hess}\omega|^2 + \dots\right\}(dv)_0. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \int e^{2\beta\omega}(J^3 dv)_\omega &= \int e^{2\beta\omega}\{(\Delta\omega)^3 + \dots\}(dv)_0, \\ \int e^{2\beta\omega}(J|V|^2 dv)_\omega &= \int e^{2\beta\omega}\{(\Delta\omega)|\text{Hess}\omega|^2 + \dots\}(dv)_0, \\ \int e^{2\beta\omega}(\text{tr} V^3 dv)_\omega &= \int e^{2\beta\omega}\left\{-\frac{1}{2}(\Delta\omega)^3 + \frac{3}{2}(\Delta\omega)|\text{Hess}\omega|^2 + \dots\right\}(dv)_0, \\ \int e^{2\beta\omega}(|dJ|^2 dv)_\omega &= \int e^{2\beta\omega}\{|d\Delta\omega|^2 - m(\Delta\omega)^3 \\ &\quad + 2(m-2)(\Delta\omega)|\text{Hess}\omega|^2 + \dots\}(dv)_0. \end{aligned}$$

By (1.10), the fact that  $P_6 = \Delta^3$  on  $(T^m, g_0)$ , and integration by parts,

$$\beta \int (Q_6 dv)_\omega = \int e^{\beta\omega}(\Delta^3 e^{\beta\omega})(dv)_0 = \int |d\Delta e^{\beta\omega}|^2 (dv)_0.$$

But

$$d\Delta e^{\beta\omega} = e^{\beta\omega}(\beta d\Delta\omega - \beta^2 d|d\omega|^2) + \beta^2(\Delta\omega)d\omega - \beta^3|d\omega|^2 d\omega.$$

Integrating by parts and using (6.5), we get

$$\beta \int (Q_6 dv)_\omega = \int e^{2\beta\omega}\{\beta^2|d\Delta\omega|^2 - \beta^3(\Delta\omega)^3 + 4\beta^3(\Delta\omega)|\text{Hess}\omega|^2 + \dots\}(dv)_0.$$

Moreover, it is easily seen that the invariant integrals  $\int e^{2\beta\omega} S_k(\omega)(dv)_0$ , where  $S_1(\omega) = |d\Delta\omega|^2$ ,  $S_2(\omega) = (\Delta\omega)^3$ , and  $S_3(\omega) = (\Delta\omega)|\text{Hess}\omega|^2$ , are linearly independent. In the notation of (6.1), the result is that

$$b(m) = -4m, \quad c(m) = 16.$$

Here we have used (6.2), but not our knowledge of the  $|dJ|^2$  coefficient  $\beta$ , nor (6.3); these can be considered as checks on our calculations. We pause to collect the information:

**Theorem 6.4.** *In the conformally flat category,*

$$\int Q_6 dv = \int \left\{ \frac{m-6}{2} |dJ|^2 + \frac{(m+2)(m-2)}{4} J^3 - 4mJ|V|^2 + 16 \operatorname{tr} V^3 \right\} dv. \quad \square$$

Another check on this result is the case  $m = 6$ , where it implies that  $Q_6 \simeq 8(J^3 - 3J|V|^2 + 2 \operatorname{tr} V^3)$  modulo exact divergences for conformally flat metrics. The following lemma shows that up to a constant factor, this is the only possibility.

**Lemma 6.5.** *The class  $C\tilde{L}_6^6/\delta\tilde{F}_6^6$  of Remark 5.5 is generated by the coset  $[J^3 - 3J|V|^2 + 2 \operatorname{tr} V^3]$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $m = 6$  and  $(M, g)$  is conformally flat. By [Bra1, (2:9)],

$$(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_M (|dJ|^2 dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_M J\Delta J dv = \int_M \omega(\{2\Delta^2 J - 4J\Delta J + 4|dJ|^2\} dv)_0$$

under the usual conformal variation. By (5.6), integration by parts, the Ricci identities, and Remark 5.4,

$$(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_M (J^3 dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = 6 \int_M \omega(\{J\Delta J - |dJ|^2\} dv)_0,$$

$$(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_M (J|V|^2 dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = \int_M \omega(\{2J\Delta J - 4|dJ|^2 - 2\langle \operatorname{Hess} J, V \rangle + 2\langle \nabla^* \nabla V, V \rangle - 2|\nabla V|^2\} dv)_0,$$

$$(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_M (\operatorname{tr} V^3 dv)_{\varepsilon\omega} = -3 \int_M \omega\{\langle \operatorname{Hess} J, V \rangle + |dJ|^2 + |\nabla V|^2 - \langle \nabla^* \nabla V, V \rangle\} dv)_0.$$

It is easily verified that the local invariants

$$\Delta^2 J, J\Delta J, |dJ|^2, \langle \operatorname{Hess} J, V \rangle, \langle \nabla^* \nabla V, V \rangle, |\nabla V|^2$$

are linearly independent in the conformally flat category, and the result follows.  $\square$

In particular, the Pfaffian must have the form  $c(J^3 - 3J|V|^2 + 2 \operatorname{tr} V^3)$  on conformally flat six-manifolds, where  $c$  is a universal constant. Since  $\chi(S^6) = 2$  and  $J = 3$ ,  $V = \frac{1}{2}g$  on  $S^6$ , we have  $15cv_6 = 2$ . Since  $v_6 = 16\pi^3/15$ ,

$$\operatorname{Pff}_6 = (J^3 - 3J|V|^2 + 2 \operatorname{tr} V^3)/8\pi^3,$$

$$\int Q_6 dv = 64\pi^3 \chi(M)$$

in the conformally flat case.

By Remark 5.5, the technical assumption 5.1(b) will be satisfied for the pair  $(6, A)$  provided  $A$  satisfies 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6, and  $(6, A)$  satisfies 5.1(a). In this case we can write

$$u_A(m)a_6[A] = \int \{\alpha_6(m)Q_6 + (m-6)(k_0(m)|dJ|^2 + k_1(m)J^3 + k_2(m)J|V|^2 + k_4(m)\operatorname{tr} V^3)\} dv$$

for rational functions  $k_i(m)$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, 3$  which are regular at  $m = 6$ . Taking a particular conformally flat 6-manifold  $(M, g_0)$  on which  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$ , the conformal index is

$$\zeta_A(0) = a_6[A] = u_A(6)^{-1} \alpha_6(6) \int_M Q_6 dv = 64\pi^3 u_A(6)^{-1} \alpha_6(6) \chi(M).$$

Specializing Theorem 5.6, we get:

**Theorem 6.6.** Suppose  $A = A(m)$  satisfies 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6, and is regular at  $m = 6$ . Suppose the pair  $(6, A)$  satisfies 5.1(a). Let  $(M, g_0)$  be a particular conformally flat compact Riemannian six-manifold (with orientation and/or spin structure if required to define  $A$ ), and suppose that  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$  on  $(M, g_0)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - (2\ell)^{-1} u_A(6) \log \frac{\det A_\omega}{\det A_0} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_6(6) \int_M \omega \{ (Q_6 dv)_\omega + (Q_6 dv)_0 \} \\
 & + k_0(6) \int_M \{ (|dJ|^2 dv)_\omega - (|dJ|^2 dv)_0 \} + k_1(6) \int_M \{ (J^3 dv)_\omega - (J^3 dv)_0 \} \\
 & + k_2(6) \int_M \{ (J|V|^2 dv)_\omega - (J|V|^2 dv)_0 \} + k_3(6) \int_M \{ (\text{tr } V^3 dv)_\omega - (\text{tr } V^3 dv)_0 \} \\
 & = \alpha_6(6) \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_M \omega((P_6)_0 \omega)(dv)_0 + \int_M \omega(Q_6 dv)_0 \right\} + k_0(6) \int_M \{ (|dJ|^2 dv)_\omega - (|dJ|^2 dv)_0 \} \\
 & + (k_1(6) - \frac{1}{2} k_3(6)) \int_M \{ (J^3 dv)_\omega - (J^3 dv)_0 \} \\
 & + (k_2(6) + \frac{3}{2} k_3(6)) \int_M \{ (J|V|^2 dv)_\omega - (J|V|^2 dv)_0 \}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The scale invariant determinant functional is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - (2\ell)^{-1} u_A(6) \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = \\
 & - \frac{32\pi^3}{3} \alpha_6(6) \chi(M) \log \frac{\int_M e^{6\omega} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} - (2\ell)^{-1} u_A(6) \log \frac{\det A_\omega}{\det A_0}.
 \end{aligned}$$

If  $Q_6$  is constant on  $(M, g_0)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - (2\ell)^{-1} u_A(6) \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = \alpha_6(6) \left\{ - \frac{(Q_6)_0 \text{vol}(g_0)}{6} \log \frac{\int_M e^{6(\omega - \bar{\omega})} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} \right. \\
 & + \frac{1}{2} \int_M \omega((P_6)_0 \omega)(dv)_0 \left. \right\} + k_0(6) \int_M \{ (|dJ|^2 dv)_\omega - (|dJ|^2 dv)_0 \} \\
 & + (k_1(6) - \frac{1}{2} k_3(6)) \int_M \{ (J^3 dv)_\omega - (J^3 dv)_0 \} \\
 & + (k_2(6) + \frac{3}{2} k_3(6)) \int_M \{ (J|V|^2 dv)_\omega - (J|V|^2 dv)_0 \}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if  $g_0$  is the standard metric on  $S^6$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& -(2\ell)^{-1} u_A(6) \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = \\
& \frac{64\pi^3}{3} \alpha_6(6) \left\{ -\log \int_{S^6} e^{6(\omega - \bar{\omega})} d\xi + \frac{1}{40} \int_{S^6} \omega (\Delta_0(\Delta_0 + 4)(\Delta_0 + 6)\omega) d\xi \right\} \\
& + \frac{16\pi^3}{15} \left\{ k_0(6) \int_{S^6} \{(|dJ|^2 d\xi)_\omega - (|dJ|^2 d\xi)_0\} \right. \\
& + (k_1(6) - \frac{1}{2} k_3(6)) \int_M \{(J^3 d\xi)_\omega - (J^3 d\xi)_0\} \\
& \left. + (k_2(6) + \frac{3}{2} k_3(6)) \int_M \{(J|V|^2 d\xi)_\omega - (J|V|^2 d\xi)_0\} \right\}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

The remaining step in making the determinant functionals for  $Y$  and  $\mathcal{V}^2$  explicit in dimension 6 is the determination of the constants  $\alpha_6(6)$  and  $k_1(6) - \frac{1}{2} k_3(6)$ ,  $k_2(6) + \frac{3}{2} k_3(6)$  in each case. As in the two and four dimensional cases, these constants are implicit in an integrated heat invariant, in this case  $a_6$ . By [G2], in the notation of (5.10),

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.6) \quad (4\pi)^{m/2} 7! a_6 [\nabla^* \nabla - \mathcal{E}] &= \int \text{tr}_V \{ -11 |\nabla \tau|^2 + 6 |\nabla \rho|^2 - 28 \rho_{jk|l} \rho_{jl|k} \\
& - 3 |\nabla R|^2 - 420 |\nabla \mathcal{E}|^2 - 168 \langle \nabla \tau, \nabla \mathcal{E} \rangle - 84 W_{ij|j} W_{ik|k} \\
& + \frac{35}{9} \tau^3 - \frac{14}{3} \tau |\rho|^2 + \frac{14}{3} \tau |R|^2 - \frac{208}{9} \text{tr} \rho^3 + \frac{64}{3} \rho_{ij} \rho_{kl} R_{ikjl} \\
& - \frac{16}{3} \rho_{ij} R_{iklp} R_{jklp} + \frac{44}{9} R_{ijkl} R_{ijpq} R_{klpq} + \frac{80}{9} R_{ijkl} R_{ipkq} R_{jplq} \\
& + 840 \mathcal{E}^3 + 420 \tau \mathcal{E}^2 + 70 \tau^2 \mathcal{E} - 28 |\rho|^2 \mathcal{E} + 28 |R|^2 \mathcal{E} \\
& + 56 W_{ij} W_{jk} W_{ki} + 70 \tau W_{ij} W_{ij} + 56 \rho_{ij} W_{ki} W_{kj} \\
& + 28 R_{ijkl} W_{ij} W_{kl} + 420 \mathcal{E} W_{ij} W_{ij} \} dv
\end{aligned}$$

Conformal flatness is not assumed.

**Remark 6.7.** For arbitrary  $(V, \nabla)$ , the Bianchi identity and integration by parts give:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \text{tr}_V W_{ij|k} W_{ij|k} dv &= \int \{ 2 \text{tr}_V W_{ij|j} W_{ik|k} - 2 \rho_{ij} \text{tr}_V W_{ki} W_{kj} \\
& + R_{ijkl} \text{tr}_V W_{ij} W_{kl} - 4 \text{tr}_V W_{ij} W_{jk} W_{ki} \} dv.
\end{aligned}$$

Conformal flatness is not assumed here either. Because of this identity, the expression  $W_{ij|k} W_{ij|k}$  does not occur in (6.6).

Moving to the conformally flat case, we first write the purely metric terms (i.e., those not involving  $\mathcal{E}$  or  $W$ ) in terms of  $J$  and  $V$ . The results are in tables 6.2 and 6.3 below; the intermediate calculations are contained in the following lemma:



**Lemma 6.8.** *Suppose  $g$  is conformally flat. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\rho|^2 &= (m-2)^2|V|^2 + (3m-4)J^2, \\
 |R|^2 &= 4(m-2)|V|^2 + 4J^2, \\
 V_{ij}\rho_{jk} &= (m-2)V_{ij}V_{jk} + JV_{ik}, \\
 V_{ij}\rho_{jk}\rho_{ki} &= (m-2)^2 \operatorname{tr} V^3 + 2(m-2)J|V|^2 + J^3, \\
 V_{ij}R_{iklp} &= -V_{jp}V_{kl} + V_{jl}V_{kp} - V_{ij}V_{ip}g_{kl} + V_{ij}V_{il}g_{kp}, \\
 V_{ij}R_{iklp}R_{jklp} &= 2(m-4) \operatorname{tr} V^3 + 6J|V|^2, \\
 R_{kljp}R_{ilkp} &= \frac{1}{2}R_{iklp}R_{jklp}, \\
 V_{ij}V_{kl}R_{jkil} &= -2 \operatorname{tr} V^3 + 2J|V|^2, \\
 V_{ij}\rho_{kl}R_{jkil} &= -2(m-2) \operatorname{tr} V^3 + 3(m-2)J|V|^2 + J^3. \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

QUADRATIC METRIC TERMS

	$\int  dJ ^2$	$\int J^3$	$\int J V ^2$	$\int \operatorname{tr} V^3$		coef.
$\int  \nabla\tau ^2$	$4(m-1)^2$	0	0	0		-11
$\int  \nabla\rho ^2$	$m(m-1)$	0	$(m-2)^2$	$-m(m-2)^2$		6
$\int \rho_{jk} l\rho_{jl} k$	$(m-1)^2$	0	$(m-2)^2$	$-m(m-2)^2$		-28
$\int  \nabla R ^2$	$4(m-1)$	0	$4(m-2)$	$-4m(m-2)$		-3

TABLE 6.2

CUBIC METRIC TERMS

	$J^3$	$J V ^2$	$\operatorname{tr} V^3$	coef.
$\tau^3$	$8(m-1)^3$	0	0	$\frac{35}{9}$
$\tau \rho ^2$	$2(m-1)(3m-4)$	$2(m-1)(m-2)^2$	0	$-\frac{14}{3}$
$\tau R ^2$	$8(m-1)$	$8(m-1)(m-2)$	0	$\frac{14}{3}$
$\operatorname{tr} \rho^3$	$2(2m-3)$	$3(m-2)^2$	$(m-2)^3$	$-\frac{208}{9}$
$\rho_{ij}\rho_{kl}R_{ikjl}$	$2(2m-3)$	$4(m-2)^2$	$-2(m-2)^2$	$\frac{64}{3}$
$\rho_{ij}R_{iklp}R_{jklp}$	4	$10(m-2)$	$2(m-2)(m-4)$	$-\frac{16}{3}$
$R_{ijkl}R_{ijpq}R_{klpq}$	0	24	$8(m-4)$	$\frac{44}{9}$
$R_{ijkl}R_{ipkq}R_{jplq}$	2	$6(m-3)$	$-2(3m-8)$	$\frac{80}{9}$

TABLE 6.3

Concentrating for the moment on the conformal Laplacian  $Y$ , we compute the  $\mathcal{E}$  terms:

$$A = Y: \mathcal{E} = -\frac{m-2}{2}J, W = 0$$

	$J^3$	$J V ^2$	$\text{tr } V^3$		coef.
$\mathcal{E}^3$	$-\frac{1}{8}(m-2)^3$	0	0		840
$\tau\mathcal{E}^2$	$\frac{1}{2}(m-1)(m-2)^2$	0	0		420
$\tau^2\mathcal{E}$	$-2(m-1)^2(m-2)$	0	0		70
$ \rho ^2\mathcal{E}$	$-\frac{1}{2}(m-2)(3m-4)$	$-\frac{1}{2}(m-2)^3$	0		-28
$ R ^2\mathcal{E}$	$-2(m-2)$	$-2(m-2)^2$	0		28

	$\int  dJ ^2$	$\int J^3$	$\int J V ^2$	$\int \text{tr } V^3$		coef.
$\int  \nabla\mathcal{E} ^2$	$\frac{1}{4}(m-2)^2$	0	0	0		-420
$\int \langle \nabla\tau, \nabla\mathcal{E} \rangle$	$-(m-1)(m-2)$	0	0	0		-168

TABLE 6.4

We now add everything up to get:

**Lemma 6.9.**

$$\begin{aligned} (4\pi)^{m/2} 7! \alpha_6[Y] &= (m-8) \int \left\{ -3(m-6)|dJ|^2 - \frac{1}{9}(35m^2 - 266m + 456)J^3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2}{3}(m-1)(7m-30)J|V|^2 - \frac{2}{9}(5m^2 - 2m - 48)\text{tr } V^3 \right\} dv \\ &= -\frac{5}{3}(m-8) \int Q_6 dv + (m-8)(m-6) \int \left\{ -\frac{13}{6}|dJ|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{36}(125m-314)J^3 + \frac{2}{3}(7m-5)J|V|^2 - \frac{2}{9}(5m+28)\text{tr } V^3 \right\} dv. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, for  $(n, A) = (6, Y)$  and the choice  $u_Y(m) = (4\pi)^{m/2}$ , the function in 5.1(b) can be taken to be

$$\alpha_6(m) = -\frac{5(m-8)}{3 \cdot 7!},$$

and the local invariant can be taken to be

$$B_6(m) = \frac{m-8}{7!} \left\{ -\frac{13}{6}|dJ|^2 - \frac{1}{36}(125m-314)J^3 + \frac{2}{3}(7m-5)J|V|^2 - \frac{2}{9}(5m+28)\text{tr } V^3 \right\}.$$

In particular,

$$3 \cdot 7!(\alpha_6(6), k_0(6), k_1(6) - \frac{1}{2}k_3(6), k_2(6) + \frac{3}{2}k_3(6)) = (10, 13, 34, -32). \quad \square$$

To handle  $A = \nabla^2$ , we need to adjust the calculation for the change from  $\mathcal{E} = -(m-2)J/2$  to  $\mathcal{E} = -(m-1)J/2$ , and take account of the spin curvature terms.

(VALUE AT  $\mathcal{E} = -\frac{m-1}{2}J$ ) MINUS (VALUE AT  $\mathcal{E} = -\frac{m-2}{2}J$ ), UNTRACED

	$\int  dJ ^2$	$\int J^3$	$\int J V ^2$	$\int \text{tr } V^3$		coef.
$\int  \nabla \mathcal{E} ^2$	$\frac{1}{4}(2m-3)$	0	0	0		-420
$\int \langle \nabla \tau, \nabla \mathcal{E} \rangle$	$-(m-1)$	0	0	0		-168

	$J^3$	$J V ^2$	$\text{tr } V^3$		coef.
$\mathcal{E}^3$	$-\frac{1}{8}(3m^2 - 9m + 7)$	0	0		840
$\tau \mathcal{E}^2$	$\frac{1}{2}(m-1)(2m-3)$	0	0		420
$\tau^2 \mathcal{E}$	$-2(m-1)^2$	0	0		70
$ \rho ^2 \mathcal{E}$	$-\frac{1}{2}(3m-4)$	$-\frac{1}{2}(m-2)^2$	0		-28
$ R ^2 \mathcal{E}$	-2	$-2(m-2)$	0		28

NEW TERMS IN  $(4\pi)^{m/2} 7! 2^{-[m/2]} a_6 [\nabla^2]$  RESULTING FROM SPINOR  
 ( $\Sigma$ ) BUNDLE CURVATURE  $W_{ij} = -\frac{1}{4} R_{klij} \gamma_k \gamma_l$ .  
 $\mathcal{E} = -\frac{m-1}{2} J$

	$\int  dJ ^2$	$\int J^3$	$\int J V ^2$	$\int \text{tr } V^3$		coef.
$\int \text{tr}_\Sigma W_{ij j} W_{ik k}$	$-\frac{1}{4}(m-1)$	0	0	0		-84

	$J^3$	$J V ^2$	$\text{tr } V^3$		coef.
$\text{tr}_\Sigma W_{ij} W_{jk} W_{ki}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{3}{4}(m-3)$	$-\frac{1}{4}(3m-8)$		56
$\tau \text{tr}_\Sigma W_{ij} W_{ij}$	$-(m-1)$	$-(m-1)(m-2)$	0		70
$\rho_{ij} \text{tr}_\Sigma W_{ki} W_{kj}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{5}{4}(m-2)$	$-\frac{1}{4}(m-2)(m-4)$		56
$R_{ijkl} \text{tr}_\Sigma W_{ij} W_{kl}$	0	-3	$-(m-4)$		28
$\text{tr}_\Sigma \mathcal{E} W_{ij} W_{ij}$	$\frac{1}{4}(m-1)$	$\frac{1}{4}(m-1)(m-2)$	0		420

TABLE 6.5

Summing up, we get

**Lemma 6.10.**

$$\begin{aligned}
(4\pi)^{m/2} 7! 2^{-[m/2]} \alpha_6[\mathcal{V}^2] &= \int \left\{ -3(m-1)(m-6)|\nabla J|^2 \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{9}(35m^3 - 231m^2 + 316m + 6)J^3 + \frac{1}{3}(14m^3 - 39m^2 - 83m + 24)J|V|^2 \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{2}{9}(5m^3 + 21m^2 - 95m - 120)\operatorname{tr} V^3 \right\} dv \\
&= -\frac{191}{12} \int Q_6 dv + (m-6) \int \left\{ -\frac{1}{24}(72m-263)|\nabla J|^2 \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{144}(560m^2 - 909m - 398)J^3 + \frac{1}{3}(14m^2 + 45m - 4)J|V|^2 \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{2}{9}(5m^2 + 51m + 211)\operatorname{tr} V^3 \right\} dv.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, for  $(n, A) = (6, \mathcal{V}^2)$  and the choice  $u_{\mathcal{V}^2}(m) = (4\pi)^{m/2} 2^{m/2}$  ( $m$  even), the function in 5.1(b) can be taken to be

$$\alpha_6(m) = -\frac{191}{12 \cdot 7!},$$

and the local invariant can be taken so that

$$\begin{aligned}
7! B_6(m) &= -\frac{1}{24}(72m-263)|\nabla J|^2 - \frac{1}{144}(560m^2 - 909m - 398)J^3 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3}(14m^2 + 45m - 4)J|V|^2 - \frac{2}{9}(5m^2 + 51m + 211)\operatorname{tr} V^3.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$72 \cdot 7!(\alpha_6(6), k_0(6), k_1(6) - \frac{1}{2}k_3(6), k_2(6) + \frac{3}{2}k_3(6)) = (-1146, -507, -1578, 1752). \quad \square$$

In the next section we shall show that on  $S^6$ , the quantity  $\det Y_\omega$  is maximized at those  $g = g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0 \in [g_0]$  of volume  $16\pi^3/15$  for which  $g_\omega = h \cdot g_0$  for some  $h \in \operatorname{ctran}(S^6, g_0)$ , and the quantity  $\det \mathcal{V}_\omega^2$  is minimized at exactly the same metrics. The proof will make essential use of (1) Theorem 3.7 (the exponential class inequality describing the imbedding  $L_3^2 \hookrightarrow e^L$ ); (2) Corollary 3.6(b) (controlling the imbedding  $L_1^2 \hookrightarrow L^3$ ); (3) Obata's Theorem; (4) a geometric inequality describing the imbedding  $L_1^2(S^6, \operatorname{TFS}^2) \hookrightarrow L^3(S^6, \operatorname{TFS}^2)$ , where  $\operatorname{TFS}^2$  is the bundle of trace-free symmetric tensors; and (5) the numerical data of Lemmas 6.9 and 6.10.

## 7. GEOMETRIC INEQUALITIES IN DIMENSION 6

Recall from Theorem 6.6 and Lemma 6.9 that if  $g_0$  is the standard  $S^6$  metric, then the scale invariant determinant functional for the conformal Laplacian in the standard conformal class on  $S^6$  is

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & -3 \cdot 7! \cdot \frac{1}{2} (4\pi)^3 \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(Y, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(Y, g_0)} = \frac{64\pi^3}{3} \cdot 10\mathcal{B}_6 \\ & + \frac{16\pi^3}{15} \left\{ 13 \int_{S^6} \{(|dJ|^2 d\xi)_\omega - (|dJ|^2 d\xi)_0\} + 34 \int_{S^6} \{(J^3 d\xi)_\omega - (J^3 d\xi)_0\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 32 \int_{S^6} \{(J|V|^2 d\xi)_\omega - (J|V|^2 d\xi)_0\} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_6$  is the nonnegative quantity estimate by the Beckner-Moser-Trudinger inequality (Theorem 3.7):

$$\mathcal{B}_6 := -\log \int_{S^6} e^{6(\omega - \bar{\omega})} (d\xi)_0 + \frac{1}{40} \int_{S^6} \omega (\Delta_0 (\Delta_0 + 4) (\Delta_0 + 6) \omega) (d\xi)_0.$$

By Lemma 6.10, the corresponding functional for the square of the Dirac operator is

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & -72 \cdot 7! \cdot \frac{1}{2} (4\pi)^3 2^{-3} \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(\nabla^2, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(\nabla^2, g_0)} = \frac{64\pi^3}{3} \cdot (-1146)\mathcal{B}_6 \\ & + \frac{16\pi^3}{15} \left\{ -507 \int_{S^6} \{(|dJ|^2 d\xi)_\omega - (|dJ|^2 d\xi)_0\} - 1578 \int_{S^6} \{(J^3 d\xi)_\omega - (J^3 d\xi)_0\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 1752 \int_{S^6} \{(J|V|^2 d\xi)_\omega - (J|V|^2 d\xi)_0\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In each case, we would like to know that the second group of terms on the right, i.e. that with coefficient  $16\pi^3/15$ , is sharply estimated in the same way (and with the same sign) as the first ( $\mathcal{B}_6$ ) term. Remarkably, the coefficients that we have extracted from the heat invariants are such that this is the case:

**Theorem 7.1.** *On  $S^6$ , for  $g = g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0 \in [g_0]$  in the conformal class of the standard metric  $g_0$  and having the standard volume  $v_6 = 16\pi^3/15$ , the quantity  $\det Y_\omega$  is maximized exactly when*

$$(7.3) \quad g_\omega = h \cdot g_0, \quad \text{some } h \in \text{ctran}(S^6, g_0).$$

*The quantity  $\det \nabla_\omega^2$  is minimized exactly at the same metrics.*

Besides Theorem 3.7, the proof will require a clever use of Corollary 3.6, and some further estimates based on Obata's Theorem and the conformal geometry of the bundle TFS<sup>2</sup> of trace-free symmetric two tensors; these are given in Lemmas 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4.

**Lemma 7.2.** On  $S^m$  with  $m \geq 3$ , for  $g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0$ ,  $\omega \in C^\infty(S^m)$ ,

$$\int_{S^m} (|dJ|^2 d\xi)_\omega \geq 0,$$

with equality if and only if

$$(7.4) \quad g_\omega = \alpha^2 h \cdot g_0, \quad \text{some } h \in \text{ctran}(S^m, g_0), \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

*Proof.* The inequality is obvious. Equality holds if and only if  $J$  is constant; by Obata's Theorem [Ob] this holds if and only if (7.4).  $\square$

**Lemma 7.3.** On  $S^6$ , for  $g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0$ ,  $\omega \in C^\infty(S^6)$ ,

$$\int_{S^6} (\{|dJ|^2 + 2J^3\} d\xi)_\omega \geq 6 \left( \int_{S^6} (|J|^3 d\xi)_\omega \right)^{2/3} \geq 54,$$

with  $\int_{S^6} (\{|dJ|^2 + 2J^3\} d\xi)_\omega = 54$  if and only if (7.4) (with  $m = 6$ ).

*Proof.* The Yamabe functional in the metric  $g_\omega$ , at a function  $u \in C^\infty(S^6)$ , is

$$(7.5) \quad \mathcal{Y}(\omega, u) = \frac{((\Delta + 2J)_\omega u, u)_{L^2((d\xi)_\omega)}}{\|u\|_{L^2((d\xi)_\omega)}^2},$$

where  $u \in C^\infty(M)$  is not identically zero. By the solution of the Yamabe problem on the sphere and the conformal covariance relation

$$\mathcal{Y}(\omega + \eta, u) = \mathcal{Y}(\omega, e^{2\eta} u)$$

for the Yamabe functional (valid for general  $m$ ,  $(M, g_0)$ , and  $\omega, \eta \in C^\infty(M)$ ), we have

$$\mathcal{Y}(\omega, u) \geq \mathcal{Y}(0, 1) = 2J_0 = 6.$$

Applying this to  $u = J_\omega$ , we get the first  $\geq$  in (7.5). Corollary 3.6(b) with  $m = 6$ ,  $n = 2$  gives the second  $\geq$ , and shows that equality holds there if and only if (7.4). But any  $g_\omega$  satisfying (7.4) has  $J \equiv 3\alpha^{-2}$  and  $\int_{S^6} (d\xi)_\omega = \alpha^6$ ; showing that  $\int_{S^6} (\{|dJ|^2 + 2J^3\} d\xi)_\omega = 54$  whenever (7.4) holds.  $\square$

The third inequality is derived using a second order conformally covariant differential operator  $D_{(2)}$  on sections of  $\text{TFS}^2$  first constructed by V. Wunsch [Wü, Proposition 3.2]. We shall give a construction of  $D_{(2)}$  which is easier to generalize, and is based on the group theoretic machinery we have already put into place. The idea of the corresponding estimate is similar to that of the proof of Lemma 7.3: we look at the quantity  $((D_{(2)} b, b)_{L^2(S^6, \text{TFS}^2)})_\omega$ , where  $b$  is the Einstein tensor. (As usual, the subscript  $\omega$  indicates that the quantity is computed in the metric  $g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0$ .) Fortunately, a deep analysis of the analogue of the Yamabe functional is not required.

To explain the Wunsch operator, we widen the discussion for the moment to oriented Riemannian manifolds  $(M, g)$  of dimension  $m \geq 3$ . (Orientation is just a convenience, and is not really necessary.) Each irreducible representation  $(V, \sigma)$  of the structure group  $SO(m)$  defines an associated vector bundle  $V_\sigma = \mathcal{F}_{SO(m)} \times_\sigma V$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_{SO(m)}$  is the bundle of oriented orthonormal frames. Because the defining representation  $\delta$  of  $SO(m)$  is faithful and gives rise to the cotangent (or tangent) bundle, each  $V_\sigma$  can be realized as a tensor bundle, though this realization is not unique. The Levi-Civita covariant derivative  $\nabla$  carries sections of  $V_\sigma$  to sections of  $T^*M \otimes V_\sigma$ :

$$\nabla : C^\infty(M, V_\sigma) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, T^*M \otimes V_\sigma).$$

The bundle  $T^*M \otimes V_\sigma$  is generally not irreducible under the structure group  $SO(m)$  (i.e.,  $\delta \otimes \sigma$  is not an irreducible representation); in fact, it is irreducible if and only if  $\sigma$  is the trivial one dimensional representation. We decompose into irreducibles:

$$(7.6) \quad \delta \otimes \sigma \simeq_{SO(m)} \bigoplus_{u=1}^{N_\sigma} \mu_u;$$

on the level of bundles,

$$T^*M \otimes V_\sigma \simeq_{SO(m)} \bigoplus_{u=1}^{N_\sigma} N_\sigma V_{\mu_u}.$$

By, e.g., [SW], the summands occur with multiplicity one, so it is legitimate to form the *gradients*

$$(7.7) \quad G_{\sigma\mu_u} = G_u := \text{Proj}_{V_{\mu_u}} \nabla : C^\infty(M, V_\sigma) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, V_{\mu_u}).$$

It is immediate that on  $C^\infty(V_\sigma)$ , with consistent choices of bundle inner product normalizations,

$$(7.8) \quad \nabla = \sum_{u=1}^{N_\sigma} G_u, \quad \nabla^* \nabla = \sum_{u=1}^{N_\sigma} G_u^* G_u.$$

Equivalence classes of irreducible representations  $\sigma \in \text{Irr}(SO(m))$  are parameterized by *dominant weights*, vectors  $\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ ,  $\ell = [m/2]$ , with

$$(7.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_\ell, & \quad m \text{ odd,} \\ \sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\ell-1} \geq |\sigma_\ell|, & \quad m \text{ even.} \end{aligned}$$

The dominant weight parameter is the highest weight in the representation; note the customary abuse of notation in using  $\sigma$  to denote both the representation and its highest weight. When writing dominant weights, we shall sometimes omit terminal strings of zeroes. Examples are  $\sigma = (0)$ , the trivial representation;  $\sigma = (1)$ , the defining representation, and  $\sigma = (2)$ , the trace free symmetric two tensor representation.

To determine the target bundles for the gradients in (7.7), we just need to perform the decomposition (7.6). By, e.g., [F, Theorem 3.4],  $\mu \in \{\mu_u\}$  if and only if  $\mu$  is dominant ((7.9) holds) and either

$$(7.10) \quad \mu = \sigma \pm e_a,$$

for some  $a \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ , where  $e_a$  is the  $a^{\text{th}}$  unit vector in  $\mathbf{Z}^\ell$ , or

$$(7.11) \quad m \text{ is odd, } \sigma_\ell \neq 0, \mu = \sigma.$$

In particular,

$$(1) \otimes (2) \simeq_{\text{SO}(m)} (1) \oplus (3) \oplus (2, 1), \quad m \geq 5.$$

Now fix  $\sigma = (2)$ , so that  $V_\sigma = \text{TFS}^2$ , suppose that  $m \geq 5$ , and that  $(M, g)$  is conformally flat. We are especially interested in computing the effect of the gradients  $G_{(1)}$ ,  $G_{(3)}$ , and  $G_{(2,1)}$  on the (normalized) Einstein tensor  $b = V - (J/m)g$ . Because of the identity in Remark 5.4,  $V_{ij|k} = V_{ik|j}$ , so

$$(7.12) \quad b_{ij|k} - b_{ik|j} = -\frac{1}{m}(J_{|k}g_{ij} - J_{|j}g_{ik}).$$

Note also that

$$b_{ij|j} = \frac{m-1}{m}J_{|i}.$$

Some elementary tensor calculus shows that the (3) part of any three tensor  $(\varphi_{ijk})$  which is trace free and symmetric in the  $j$  and  $k$  arguments is

$$(\text{Proj}_{(3)}\varphi)_{ijk} = \frac{1}{3}(\varphi_{ijk} + \varphi_{jki} + \varphi_{kij}) - \frac{2}{3(m+2)}(g_{ij}\varphi_{llk} + g_{ki}\varphi_{llj} + g_{jk}\varphi_{lli}),$$

and that the (1) part is

$$-\frac{2}{(m+2)(m-1)}g_{jk}\varphi_{lli} + \frac{m}{(m+2)(m-1)}(g_{ij}\varphi_{llk} + g_{ik}\varphi_{llj}).$$

As a result of these formulas and the identity (7.12),

$$(7.13) \quad (\text{Proj}_{(3)}\nabla b)_{ijk} = \nabla_i b_{jk} + \frac{2}{m(m+2)}J_{|i}g_{jk} - \frac{1}{m+2}(J_{|j}g_{ik} + J_{|k}g_{ij}),$$

$$(\text{Proj}_{(1)}\nabla b)_{ijk} = -\frac{2}{m(m+2)}J_{|i}g_{jk} + \frac{1}{m+2}(J_{|j}g_{ik} + J_{|k}g_{ij}).$$

Adding up, we get

$$(7.14) \quad \nabla b = G_{(3)}b + G_{(1)}b; \quad \text{so } G_{(2,1)}b = 0$$



by (7.8). The interpretation of what has just happened is as follows: if  $\mathcal{R}$  is the (reducible)  $SO(m)$  representation carried by tensors of Riemann type, then the multiplicity of  $(2, 1)$  in  $\delta \otimes \mathcal{R}$  is 2. (See, e.g., [St].) One copy comes from the  $\nabla C$  part, and the other from the  $\nabla \rho$  part of  $\nabla R$ . The second Bianchi identity implies that these two are linearly dependent; i.e., that actual Riemann tensors  $R$  have their  $\nabla R$  living in a bundle with only one  $V_{(2,1)}$  summand. But conformal flatness implies that the expression in  $\nabla C$  associated to the first copy vanishes; hence all  $(2, 1)$  information vanishes.

For the time being, we once again drop the conformal flatness assumption. In [F], Fegan shows that each gradient is conformally covariant, and computes the corresponding conformal bidegrees. Since there may be many different tensor realizations of a  $V_\sigma$ , each with its own *internal conformal weight*, it is important to set all internal conformal weights to zero (or some other chosen value) in order to state the result cleanly. The structure group of  $m$  dimensional oriented Riemannian conformal geometry is  $CO(m) := \mathbb{R}^+ \times SO(m)$ ; the irreducible representations of  $CO(m)$  are the

$$\sigma^p(a, h) = a^p \sigma(h), \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^+, h \in SO(m),$$

where  $p \in \mathbb{C}$ ;  $p$  is the internal conformal weight. We let  $V_\sigma^p$  be the corresponding  $CO(m)$  bundle. The tangent bundle naturally carries the defining representation of  $SO(m)$  with internal conformal weight  $-1$ ; while the cotangent bundle has internal conformal weight  $+1$ . When we realize  $TFS^2$  as a bundle of covariant tensors (i.e., in the tensor square of  $T^*M$ ), we give it internal conformal weight  $+2$ ; similarly, we have been computing with a realization of  $V_{(3)}$  that has conformal weight  $+3$ . Because  $\nabla g = 0$ , the construction of  $\nabla$ , of the  $\text{Proj}_{\mu_\nu}$ , and of natural differential operators is insensitive to the internal conformal weight. The conformal bidegree of a conformally covariant operator, however, is definitely affected by the choice of internal conformal weights. In fact, a chase through the formalism shows that if

$$D : C^\infty(M, V_\sigma^p) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, V_\mu^q),$$

is conformally covariant of bidegree  $(a, b)$ , then

$$D : C^\infty(M, V_\sigma^{p'}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, V_\mu^{q'})$$

is conformally covariant of bidegree  $(a - p' + p, b - q' + q)$ ; in particular,

$$D : C^\infty(M, V_\sigma^{p+a}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, V_\mu^{q+b})$$

is conformally invariant.

**Theorem 7.5 [F].** *If the gradient  $G_{\sigma\mu}$  exists, i.e. if (7.10) or (7.11) holds, then*

$$G_{\sigma\mu} : C^\infty(M, V_\sigma^p) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, V_\mu^{p+1})$$

*is conformally invariant for*

$$p = p_{\sigma\mu} := \frac{1}{2}(m - 1 + \langle 2\rho_{so(m)} + \sigma + \mu, \sigma - \mu \rangle),$$

where  $2\rho_{so(m)} = (m-2, m-4, \dots, m-2\ell)$ . All first order conformally covariant operators between  $SO(m)$  irreducible tensor bundles arise in this way.  $\square$

For many values of  $\sigma$ , Fegan's Theorem leads to a natural construction of a second order conformally invariant operator from  $V_\sigma^{(m-2)/2} \rightarrow V_\sigma^{(m+2)/2}$ ; we shall present this construction here. Note that the formal adjoint of a gradient, being conformally covariant, is, up to normalization, another gradient by Theorem 7.5. In the notation of (7.7), consider the compositions

$$C^\infty(M, V_\sigma^{(m-2)/2}) \xrightarrow{G_u} C^\infty(M, V_{\mu_u}^{m/2}) \xrightarrow{G_u^*} C^\infty(M, V_\sigma^{(m+2)/2}).$$

(To normalize the formal adjoint construction, take the product metric on the bundle  $T^*M \otimes V_\sigma$ .) Fegan's Theorem shows that, with these choices of internal conformal weights,  $G_u$  is conformally covariant of bidegree  $(c_u, c_u)$ , and  $G_u^*$  is conformally covariant of bidegree  $(-c_u, -c_u)$ , where

$$c_u := \frac{1}{2}(1 + \langle 2\rho_{so(m)} + \sigma + \mu_u, \sigma - \mu_u \rangle).$$

Thus we have the conformal variational formula

$$\begin{aligned} (d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0}(G_u^*G_u)_{\varepsilon\omega} &= c_u(G_u^*[G_u, \mu(\omega)] - [G_u^*, \mu(\omega)]G_u) \\ &= c_u(G_u^*[G_u, \mu(\omega)] + [G_u, \mu(\omega)]^*G_u). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_u [G_u, \mu(\omega)]\varphi = [\nabla, \mu(\omega)]\varphi = d\omega \otimes \varphi =: t(\omega)\varphi$$

for any smooth section  $\varphi$ , we find that

$$(d/d\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \sum_{u=1}^{N_\sigma} c_u^{-1}(G_u^*G_u)_{\varepsilon\omega} = \nabla^*t(d\omega) + t(d\omega)^*\nabla,$$

where the right side is evaluated in the background metric  $g = g_0$ , provided no  $c_u$  vanishes. But computing in a local orthonormal frame,

$$(\nabla^*t(d\omega) + t(d\omega)^*\nabla)\varphi = -\nabla_i((\nabla_i\omega)\varphi) + (\nabla_i\omega)\nabla_i\varphi = -(\nabla_i\nabla_i\omega)\varphi = (\Delta\omega)\varphi.$$

On the other hand, multiplication by  $J$ , viewed as an operator from  $V_\sigma^{(m-2)/2}$  to  $V_\sigma^{(m+2)/2}$ , has the conformal variation  $\mu(\Delta\omega)$ . We have proved:

**Theorem 7.6.** *In the notation above, if no  $c_u$  vanishes, then*

$$D_\sigma := J - \sum_{u=1}^{N_\sigma} c_u^{-1}G_u^*G_u$$

is conformally invariant as an operator from  $V_\sigma^{(m-2)/2}$  to  $V_\sigma^{(m+2)/2}$ .  $\square$

Of course, there is no guarantee that  $D_\sigma$  is not zero, or zeroth order. Our immediate interest is the behavior of  $D_{(2)}$  in the conformally flat case, and especially on  $S^6$ . What we shall use is the following weak consequence of conformal covariance:

**Lemma 7.7.** *The condition*

$$(7.15) \quad (D_\sigma \varphi, \varphi)_{L^2(M, \mathbf{V}_\sigma)} \geq 0, \quad \text{all } \varphi \in C^\infty(M, \mathbf{V}_\sigma)$$

is conformally invariant: if satisfied in the metric  $g_0$ , it is satisfied at all metrics  $e^{2\omega} g_0$ ,  $\omega \in C^\infty(M)$ .

Note that the  $L^2(M, \mathbf{V}_\sigma)$  inner product is naturally associated to the  $SO(m)$  bundle  $\mathbf{V}_\sigma$ ; that is, it is independent of the internal conformal weight.

*Proof of Lemma 7.7.* Computing with internal conformal weight 0, i.e. in  $\mathbf{V}_\sigma^0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((D_\sigma)_\omega \varphi, \varphi)_{L^2(M, g, \mathbf{V}_\sigma^0)} &= \int_M \langle (D_\sigma)_\omega \varphi, \varphi \rangle (dv)_\omega \\ &= \int_M e^{-(m+2)\omega/2} \langle (D_\sigma)_0(e^{(m-2)\omega/2} \varphi), \varphi \rangle e^{m\omega} (dv)_0 \\ &= \int_M \langle (D_\sigma)_0(e^{(m-2)\omega/2} \varphi), e^{(m-2)\omega/2} \varphi \rangle (dv)_0. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that the bundle inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is conformally invariant is a consequence of having set the internal conformal weight to 0; if we set it to another value, all terms in the calculation change, but of course the result is the same. Since  $\mu(e^{(m-2)\omega/2})$  is bijective on  $C^\infty(M, \mathbf{V}_\sigma)$ , we have the Lemma.  $\square$

We would now like to establish that  $(S^6, g_0)$  has property (7.15) with  $\sigma = (2)$ . For this, we return to the thinking of Sec. 2, and set up the principal series  $\text{Ind}_P^G \sigma \otimes \lambda \otimes 1$ . That is, we replace the trivial representation of  $(0)$  of  $SO(m)$ , which we called 1 in Sec. 2, by the representation  $\sigma$ . Vectors in this representation can be viewed as sections of the bundle  $\mathbf{V}_\sigma$  over  $S^m$ , or as functions  $\psi$  on  $G$  which are equivariant in the sense that, in the notation of Section 2,

$$\psi(xman) = a^{-\lambda - \rho} \sigma(m)^{-1} \psi(x)$$

for all  $x \in G$ ,  $m \in M$ ,  $a \in A$ ,  $n \in N$ . (In particular,  $\rho$  is half the sum of the positive  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a})$  roots as in Sec. 2, as opposed to  $\rho_{\mathfrak{so}(m)}$  above, which is half the sum of the  $\mathfrak{m}$  roots.) The  $K$  decomposition of the space  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_\sigma)$  of  $K$ -finite sections is given by *Frobenius reciprocity*, which gives a natural identification of  $\text{Hom}_M(\lambda, \beta)$  and  $\text{Hom}_K(\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_\sigma), \beta)$  for any  $\beta \in \text{Irr}(K) \simeq \text{Irr}(SO(m+1))$ . In particular, the multiplicity of a  $K$ -type  $\beta$  in  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_\sigma)$  is the same as the multiplicity of the  $M$ -type  $\sigma$  in  $\beta|_M$ . This latter multiplicity  $m(\beta, \sigma)$  is given by the following *branching rule*. First note that the  $\beta \in \text{Irr}(K)$  are parameterized by dominant weights as in (7.9), with  $m+1$  in place of  $m$ . By [Bo, p. 143],  $m(\beta, \sigma)$  is either 0 or 1, and is 1 if and only if

$$(7.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_1 \geq \sigma_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_\ell \geq |\beta_{\ell+1}|, & \quad m \text{ odd,} \\ \beta_1 \geq \sigma_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\ell-1} \geq \beta_\ell \geq |\sigma_\ell|, & \quad m \text{ even.} \end{aligned}$$

We say that  $\beta \downarrow \sigma$  (or  $\sigma \uparrow \beta$ ) if (7.16) holds. By the multiplicity one property, the splitting

$$\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_\sigma) \simeq_K \bigoplus_{\beta \downarrow \sigma} \beta.$$

diagonalizes every  $K$  invariant differential operator, including  $D_\lambda$  and the Bochner Laplacian  $\nabla^*\nabla$ . ( $K$  acts by isometries, and all operators which are natural in the sense of Sec. 1 are isometry invariant.) By [Bra3, Theorem 1.1], the eigenvalue of  $\nabla^*\nabla$  on the  $\beta$  summand is

$$\beta(\text{Cas}_t) - \sigma(\text{Cas}_m),$$

where  $\text{Cas}$  is the Casimir operator;

$$\beta(\text{Cas}_t) = \langle 2\rho_t + \beta, \beta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}L} \quad \sigma(\text{Cas}_m) = \langle 2\rho_m + \sigma, \sigma \rangle_{\mathbb{R}t},$$

where  $L = [(m+1)/2]$  and  $\rho_t = (m-1, m-3, \dots, m+1-2L)$ . Note that  $\sigma(\text{Cas}_m)$  is just multiplication by a constant on  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_\sigma)$ .

Looking just at  $\sigma = (2)$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_{(2)}) = \bigoplus_{q=0}^2 \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\infty} F_{(2+j,q)}, \quad m \geq 4,$$

where

$$F_{(2+j,q)} \simeq_K (2+j, q),$$

and  $\nabla^*\nabla$  acts by

$$(7.17) \quad 2(1+j) + j(m+1+j) + (m-3+q)q$$

on  $F_{(2+j,q)}$ . This allows us to run a "spectrum generating" argument as in Sec. 2 to determine the eigenvalues of  $D_{(2)}$ .

The action of  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$  on  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_{(2)})$  is by  $(U_\nu^{(2)}, u^{(2)}) =: (U_\nu, u)$ , where  $u(h) = h \cdot$  for  $h$  an isometry of  $(S^m, g_0)$ , and  $U_\nu(X) = \mathcal{L}_X + (\nu + \frac{m}{2})\omega_X$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_X$  is the Lie derivative,  $\omega_X$  is as in Sec. 2, and  $\lambda = \nu\alpha$  for  $\alpha$  the positive  $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a})$  root as in Sec. 2. (In particular,  $\omega_{L_{i,m+1}}$  is the homogeneous coordinate function  $y_i$ .) The effect of the Lie derivative (unlike the covariant derivative) depends on the internal conformal weight  $p$ ; in the expression for  $U_\nu$  in terms of  $\mathcal{L}$  immediately above, we have chosen  $p = 0$ .

**Lemma 7.8.** *If  $X \in \mathfrak{s}$  and  $\beta = (2+j, q) \in \mathbb{N} \times \{0, 1, 2\}$ , then*

$$(7.18) \quad \omega_X F_\beta, \mathcal{L}_X F_\beta \subset F_{\beta-(1,0)} \oplus F_{\beta+(1,0)} \oplus F_{\beta-(0,1)} \oplus F_{\beta+(0,1)},$$

where by convention,  $F_{(-1,q)} = F_{(j,-1)} = F_{(j,3)} = 0$ .

*Proof.* The maps

$$X \otimes \varphi \mapsto \omega_X \varphi, \quad X \otimes \varphi \mapsto U_\nu(X)\varphi$$

are  $K$  equivariant from  $\mathfrak{s} \otimes F_{(2+j,q)}$  to  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_{(2)})$ , the  $K$  module structure on  $\mathfrak{s}$  being given by the adjoint representation. Since  $(\mathfrak{s}, \text{ad})$  is a copy of the defining representation of  $\text{SO}(m+1)$ ,  $\mathfrak{s} \otimes F_{(2+j,q)}$  is  $K$  isomorphic to the space on the right in (7.18), by the selection rule (7.10, 7.11) with  $m+1$  in place of  $m$ , and the result follows.  $\square$

The analogue of Lemma 2.4 is:

**Lemma 7.9.** For  $X \in \mathfrak{s}$ ,  $[\nabla^* \nabla, \mu(\omega_X)] = 2U_0(X)$ .

*Proof.* The proof is the same as that of Lemma 2.4 until we reach (2.9), which is replaced by

$$[\nabla^* \nabla, \mu(y_0)] = \mu(\Delta y_0) + 2\nabla_Z.$$

But if  $X$  is a conformal vector field, an easy calculation (based on the relations  $\nabla_X g = 0$  and  $\mathcal{L}_X g = 2\omega_X g$ ) shows that for a conformal vector field  $X$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_X = \nabla_X + p\omega_X \quad \text{on } C^\infty(M, \mathbf{V}_\sigma^p)$$

in general. This and the fact that  $\Delta y_0 = m y_0$  give

$$[\nabla^* \nabla, \mu(y_0)] = 2\mathcal{L}_Z + m\mu(y_0) \quad \text{on } \mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_{(2)}^0),$$

as desired.  $\square$

Let us say that  $\beta \leftrightarrow \gamma$  if and only if  $\gamma$  is a summand in the  $K$  decomposition of  $\mathfrak{s} \otimes \beta$ ; Lemma 7.8 describes the  $\gamma$  satisfying  $\beta \leftrightarrow \gamma$  for fixed  $\beta \downarrow (2)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{s}$  is self-contragredient as a  $K$  module, the relation  $\beta \leftrightarrow \gamma$  is symmetric. (The symmetry of  $\leftrightarrow$  can also be read off from (7.10,7.11) with  $m+1$  in place of  $m$ .) The analogue of Lemma 2.3 is:

**Lemma 7.10.** (Cocycle irreducibility.) If  $\beta \leftrightarrow \gamma$  and  $\beta, \gamma \downarrow (2)$ , then

$$\text{Proj}_\gamma \omega(\mathfrak{s})F_\beta = F_\gamma.$$

As a result, the orbit  $\mathcal{O}(\varphi)$  of any nonzero  $\varphi \in F_\beta$ , for any  $\beta \downarrow (2)$ , under the joint action of  $u(K)$  and  $\omega(\mathfrak{s})$ , is  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_{(2)})$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_{(2)})$  has no nontrivial invariant subspace under this action.

*Proof.* In analogy with the proof of Lemma 2.3, let

$$(7.19) \quad t_\beta^\gamma = \sum_{i=0}^m \text{Proj}_\beta \omega_{X_i} \text{Proj}_\gamma \omega_{X_i} |_\beta$$

for all  $\beta, \gamma \downarrow (2)$ , where  $\{X_i\}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\mathfrak{s}$ . Here we abuse notation by writing  $|_\beta$  and  $\text{Proj}_\beta$  instead of  $|_{F_\beta}$  and  $\text{Proj}_{F_\beta}$ . The sum on the right in (7.19) is a  $K$ -endomorphism of  $F_{(2+j,q)}$ , and thus  $t_\beta^\gamma$  is a scalar by Schur's Lemma. By (2.8),

$$(7.20) \quad \sum_{\{\gamma | \gamma \leftrightarrow \beta\}} t_\beta^\gamma = 1.$$

By the trace identity  $\text{tr } ab = \text{tr } ba$ ,

$$(7.21) \quad (\dim \beta) t_\beta^\gamma = (\dim \gamma) t_\gamma^\beta$$

whenever  $\gamma \downarrow (2)$ . Unlike their analogues in the scalar case, (7.20) and (7.21) are not strong enough to compute the  $t_\beta^\gamma$ . But we can get the rest of the information we need by

"squaring" Lemma 7.9. Specifically, let  $\kappa_\beta = \langle 2\rho_\mathfrak{t} + \beta, \beta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^L}$  be the eigenvalue of  $\beta(\text{Cas}_\mathfrak{t})$  on the  $\beta$  summand of  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_{(2)})$ . If  $\beta, \gamma \downarrow \sigma$ , Lemma 7.9 shows that if  $X \in \mathfrak{s}$ , then

$$(7.22) \quad (\kappa_\gamma - \kappa_\beta) \text{Proj}_\gamma \omega_X|_\beta = 2 \text{Proj}_\gamma U_0(X)|_\beta.$$

Switching the roles of  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  in (7.22), composing with the original form of (7.22), summing over  $X$  in an orthonormal basis  $\{X_i\}$  for  $\mathfrak{s}$ , and summing over all  $\gamma \leftrightarrow \beta$  for fixed  $\beta$ , we get

$$- \sum_{\{\gamma|\gamma \leftrightarrow \beta\}} (\kappa_\gamma - \kappa_\beta)^2 t_\beta^\gamma = 4 \sum_i U_0(X_i)^2|_\beta = 4(U_0(\text{Cas}_\mathfrak{g}) - \beta(\text{Cas}_\mathfrak{t})).$$

By, e.g., [Kn, 8.22 and 12.28], taking account of our normalizations,  $U_0(\text{Cas}_\mathfrak{g})$  is multiplication by the constant  $\sigma(\text{Cas}_\mathfrak{m}) - m^2/4$ , where here  $\sigma = (2)$ , so  $\sigma(\text{Cas}_\mathfrak{m}) = 2m$ . Thus

$$(7.23) \quad \sum_{\{\gamma|\gamma \leftrightarrow \beta\}} (\kappa_\gamma - \kappa_\beta)^2 t_\beta^\gamma = m^2 - 8m + 4\kappa_\beta.$$

If  $\beta = (2 + j, q)$ ,

$$(7.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \kappa_\beta &= (m + j + 1)(j + 2) + q(m + q - 3), \\ \kappa_{\beta+(1,0)} - \kappa_\beta &= m + 2j + 4, \\ \kappa_{\beta+(0,1)} - \kappa_\beta &= m + 2q - 2, \end{aligned}$$

and by Weyl's dimension formula (see, e.g. [War, Theorem 2.4.1.6]),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dim(\beta + (1,0))}{\dim \beta} &= \frac{(m + j + q + 1)(j - q + 4)(m + j)(m + 2j + 5)}{(m + j + q)(j - q + 3)(j + 4)(m + 2j + 3)}, \\ \frac{\dim(\beta + (0,1))}{\dim \beta} &= \frac{(m + j + q + 1)(j - q + 2)(m + q - 3)(m + 2q - 1)}{(m + j + q)(j - q + 3)(q + 1)(m + 2q - 3)}. \end{aligned}$$

This data and (7.20,7.21,7.23) allows us to compute the  $t_\beta^\gamma$  inductively. The result is:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} t_\beta^{\beta+(1,0)} &= \frac{(j+1)(m+j+3)}{(j+3)(m+2j+3)} \\ t_\beta^{\beta-(1,0)} &= \frac{j(m+j+2)}{(m+j)(m+2j+3)} \\ t_\beta^{\beta+(0,1)} &= \frac{2m}{(j+3)(m+j)} \end{aligned} \right\} \beta = (2+j, 0),$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} t_\beta^{\beta+(1,0)} &= \frac{(j+1)(m+j)(m+j+3)}{(j+2)(m+j+1)(m+2j+3)} \\ t_\beta^{\beta-(1,0)} &= \frac{j(j+3)(m+j+2)}{(j+2)(m+j+1)(m+2j+3)} \\ t_\beta^{\beta+(0,1)} &= \frac{(m-2)(m+1)}{(m+j+1)(j+2)(m-1)} \\ t_\beta^{\beta-(0,1)} &= \frac{2m}{(m+j+1)(j+2)(m-1)} \end{aligned} \right\} \beta = (2+j, 1),$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} t_\beta^{\beta+(1,0)} &= \frac{(m+j)(m+j+3)}{(m+j+2)(m+2j+3)} \\ t_\beta^{\beta-(1,0)} &= \frac{j(j+3)}{(j+1)(m+2j+3)} \\ t_\beta^{\beta-(0,1)} &= \frac{2}{(j+1)(m+j+2)} \end{aligned} \right\} \beta = (2+j, 2).$$

(Recall that we assumed  $m \geq 5$ .) In particular, none of these numbers vanishes, except those giving  $t_\beta^\gamma$  when it is not the case that  $\gamma \downarrow \sigma$ . This establishes the lemma.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.11.** *If  $\beta = (2+j, q)$  as above,  $\beta \leftrightarrow \gamma \downarrow (2)$ , and  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ ,*

$$(7.25) \quad \text{Proj}_\gamma U_\nu(X)|_\beta = c(\beta, \gamma, \nu) \text{Proj}_\gamma \omega_X|_\beta,$$

where  $c(\beta, \gamma, \nu) = \frac{1}{2}(\kappa_\gamma - \kappa_\beta + 2\nu)$ . If  $|\nu| < (m-2)/2$ , then  $\text{Proj}_\gamma U_\nu(X)|_\beta = F_\gamma$ , and the assertions of Lemma 7.10 hold with  $(u(K), U_\nu(\mathfrak{s}))$  in place of  $(u(K), \omega(\mathfrak{s}))$ .

*Proof.* For  $X \in \mathfrak{k}$ , both sides of (7.25) vanish, so we are reduced to  $X \in \mathfrak{s}$ , for which (7.25) follows from (7.22) and the fact that  $U_\nu = U_0 + \nu\omega$ . For the rest of the statement, we just have to know that  $c(\beta, \gamma, \nu) \neq 0$  for  $|\nu| < (m-2)/2$ ; this follows from (7.24).  $\square$

With this irreducibility result in place, we can follow the arguments of Sec. 2 to generate the spectrum of an intertwining operator  $A$  of bidegree  $(-1, 1)$ ; this operator will be unique up to a constant factor. Since the Wunsch operator  $D_{(2)}$ , being conformally covariant of bidegree  $((m-2)/2, (m+2)/2)$ , must in particular be intertwining with bidegree  $((m-2)/2, (m+2)/2) - (m/2, m/2) = (-1, 1)$ , it will have to coincide with  $A$  up to a constant factor  $C$ . Since we are interested in positivity properties of  $D_{(2)}$ , we shall need to determine (at least the sign of)  $C$ .

**Lemma 7.12.** For  $m \geq 5$ , the eigenvalue of  $D_{(2)}$  on  $F_{(2+j,q)}$  is

$$(7.26) \quad \mu_{(2+j,q)} = \frac{(m+4+2j)(m+2+2j)(m+2q-2)(m+2q-4)}{2(m+2)^2(m-4)}.$$

In particular,  $D_{(2)}$  satisfies condition (7.15) on  $(S^m, g_0)$ , and thus on  $(S^m, e^{2\omega}g_0)$  for each  $\omega \in C^\infty(S^m)$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 7.10 and Corollary 7.11, an intertwinor of bidegree  $(-1, 1)$  has

$$(\kappa_\gamma - \kappa_\beta - 2)\mu_\gamma = (\kappa_\gamma - \kappa_\beta + 2)\mu_\beta$$

whenever  $\beta \leftrightarrow \gamma$  and  $\beta, \gamma \downarrow (2)$ . By the proof of Corollary 7.11, all coefficients in this relation are nonzero, so the list  $\{\mu_\beta\}$  is uniquely determined up to a constant factor. Computing inductively, we get

$$\mu_{(2+j,q)} = C \frac{(m+4+2j)(m+2+2j)(m+2q-2)(m+2q-4)}{(m+4)(m+2)(m-2)(m-4)},$$

where  $C = \mu_{(2,0)}$  is a constant which may depend on  $m$ . By Theorem 7.6,

$$(7.27) \quad D_{(2)} = J + \frac{2}{m+2} G_{(3)}^* G_{(3)} - \frac{2}{m+2} G_{(1)}^* G_{(1)} + \frac{2}{m-4} G_{(2,1)}^* G_{(2,1)}.$$

(Note that (7.27) and the conformal covariance relation for  $D_{(2)}$  are completely general, and in particular do not depend on conformal flatness of the metric.) By the branching rule (7.16) and Frobenius reciprocity, the multiplicity of  $(2, 0)$  in the  $K$  decomposition of  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_{(3)})$  is 0, and similarly for  $\mathcal{E}(S^m, \mathbf{V}_{(2,1)})$ . Since gradients are  $K$  equivariant operators, Schur's Lemma implies that  $G_{(3)}\varphi = 0$  and  $G_{(2,1)}\varphi = 0$ , so computing in the standard sphere metric  $g_0$ , we get

$$D_{(2)}\varphi = \left( J - \frac{2}{m+2} G_{(1)}^* G_{(1)} \right) \varphi = \left( J - \frac{2}{m+2} \nabla^* \nabla \right) \varphi, \quad \varphi \in F_{(2,0)}.$$

But with  $g_0$  as the metric,  $J = m/2$ , and  $\nabla^* \nabla \varphi = 2\varphi$  by (7.17). Thus

$$C = \mu_{(2,0)} = \frac{(m+4)(m-2)}{2(m+2)},$$

as desired for (7.26). The statement about condition (7.15) follows from Lemma 7.7.  $\square$

**Theorem 7.13.** Suppose  $m \geq 5$ , and let  $g_0$  be the standard metric on  $S^m$ . Then on  $(S^m, g_\omega)$  with  $g_\omega = e^{2\omega}g_0$ ,  $\omega \in C^\infty(S^m)$ ,

$$\int_{S^m} \left( \left\{ \frac{2(m-1)(m-2)}{m(m+2)^2} |dJ|^2 - \frac{1}{m} J^3 + \frac{m+4}{m+2} J|V|^2 - \frac{2m}{m+2} \text{tr } V^3 \right\} d\xi \right)_\omega \geq 0,$$



with equality if and only if (7.4) holds. If  $m = 6$ ,

$$\int_{S^6} \left( \left\{ |dJ|^2 + \frac{28}{5} J^3 - \frac{48}{5} J|V|^2 \right\} d\xi \right)_{\omega} \geq 108,$$

with equality if and only if (7.4) holds (with  $m = 6$ ).

*Proof.* By (7.14) and (7.27), on any Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(2)}b &= \left( J + \frac{2}{m+2} G_{(3)}^* G_{(3)} - \frac{2}{m+2} G_{(1)}^* G_{(1)} \right) b \\ &= \left( J + \frac{2}{m+2} \nabla^* \nabla - \frac{4}{m+2} G_{(1)}^* G_{(1)} \right) b. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(7.28) \quad (D_{(2)}b, b)_{L^2(M, g, TFS^2)} = \int_M J|b|^2 dv + \frac{2}{m+2} \|\nabla b\|^2 - \frac{4}{m+2} \|G_{(1)}b\|^2,$$

where the norms are those of the  $L^2$  section spaces of the appropriate bundles. But

$$(7.29) \quad \|\nabla b\|^2 = \|\nabla V - \frac{1}{m} dJ \otimes g\|^2 = \|\nabla V\|^2 - \frac{1}{m} \|dJ\|^2.$$

At this point we restrict to the conformally flat case. Using Remark 5.4 and integrating by parts, we get

$$\|\nabla V\|^2 = \int V_{ij|k} V_{ij|k} dv = \int V_{ij|k} V_{ik|j} dv = - \int V_{ij|kj} V_{ik} dv.$$

By the Ricci and Bianchi identities,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{ij|kj} &= V_{ij|jk} + R_{pikj} V_{pj} - R_{jpkj} V_{ip} \\ &= J_{|ik} - R_{ijkl} V_{jl} + \rho_{pk} V_{ip}. \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\rho_{pk} V_{ip} = (m-2) V_{pk} V_{ip} + J V_{ik},$$

and (using conformal flatness again),

$$-R_{ijkl} V_{jl} = V_{il} V_{kl} - J V_{ik} + V_{jk} V_{ji} - |V|^2 g_{ik}.$$

Furthermore, integrating by parts again and using the Bianchi identity,

$$\int J_{|ik} V_{ik} dv = - \int J_{|i} V_{ik|k} dv = - \int |dJ|^2 dv.$$

Collecting calculations, we get that

$$\|\nabla V\|^2 = \int |dJ|^2 dv + \int J|V|^2 dv - m \int \text{tr } V^3 dv$$

in the conformally flat case. By (7.29),

$$(7.30) \quad \|\nabla b\|^2 = \frac{m-1}{m} \int |dJ|^2 dv + \int J|V|^2 dv - m \int \text{tr } V^3 dv.$$

By (7.13),

$$(7.31) \quad \|G_{(1)}b\|^2 = \frac{2(m-1)}{m(m+2)} \int |dJ|^2 dv.$$

Finally,

$$(7.32) \quad J|b|^2 = J|V|^2 - \frac{1}{m}J^3.$$

Collecting the information from (7.28), (7.30), (7.31), and (7.32), we get that

$$(D_{(2)}b, b)_{L^2(M, g, \text{TFS}^2)} = \int \left\{ \frac{2(m-1)(m-2)}{m(m+2)^2} |dJ|^2 - \frac{1}{m}J^3 + \frac{m+4}{m+2}J|V|^2 - \frac{2m}{m+2} \text{tr } V^3 \right\} dv$$

in the conformally flat case. This and Lemma 7.12 imply the first (general  $m$ ) inequality in the theorem. Furthermore, by Lemma 7.12 and the conformal covariance relation for  $D_{(2)}$ , equality holds in this inequality if and only if  $e^{(m-2)\omega/2}b_\omega$  vanishes, if and only if  $b_\omega$  vanishes, if and only if  $g_\omega$  is Einstein. Since Einstein metrics have constant scalar curvature for  $m > 2$ , Obata's Theorem finishes the general  $m$  part of the theorem.

Specializing to  $m = 6$  and multiplying both sides of the inequality by  $48/5$ , we get that

$$\int_{S^6} \left( \left\{ |dJ|^2 - \frac{8}{5}J^3 + 12J|V|^2 - \frac{72}{5} \text{tr } V^3 \right\} d\xi \right)_\omega \geq 0,$$

with equality if and only if (7.4) holds. We now use the conformal invariance of  $\int Q_6 dv$  to eliminate the  $\text{tr } V^3$  term from this inequality: by Theorem 6.4,

$$\int Q_6 dv = 8 \int \{J^3 - 3J|V|^2 + 2 \text{tr } V^3\} dv, \quad m = 6.$$

Adding 0 to both sides of our inequality in the form  $\frac{9}{10} \int_{S^6} \{(Q_6 dv)_\omega - (Q_6 dv)_0\}$ , we get the second ( $m = 6$ ) part of the theorem.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

*Proof of Theorem 7.1.* Neither  $Y_0$  nor  $\nabla_0^2$  has negative eigenvalues, so the same holds for  $Y_\omega$  and  $\nabla_\omega^2$  by Theorem 4.8. (Alternatively, the fact that  $\nabla$  is formally self-adjoint implies that  $\nabla^2$  will never have negative eigenvalues.) Thus maximizing  $\det Y_\omega$  is the same as maximizing  $\log(\mathcal{D}(Y, e^{2\omega} g_0))/(\mathcal{D}(Y, g_0))$ , and similarly for minimizing  $\det \nabla_\omega^2$ . Collecting the information from (7.1), (7.2), Lemmas 7.2 and 7.3, and Theorem 7.13, and representing the quantity

$$\int_{S^6} \{(|dJ|^2 d\xi)_\omega - (|dJ|^2 d\xi)_0\} + b \int_{S^6} \{(J^3 d\xi)_\omega - (J^3 d\xi)_0\} + c \int_{S^6} \{(J|V|^2 d\xi)_\omega - (J|V|^2 d\xi)_0\}$$

by the triple  $(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , we just have to show that the vectors

$$w_Y := (13, 34, -32), \quad -w_{\nabla^2} := (507, 1578, -1752)$$

have positive coefficients when expressed as linear combinations of

$$u_1 := (1, 0, 0), \quad u_2 := (1, 2, 0), \quad u_3 := (1, \frac{28}{5}, -\frac{48}{5}).$$

But

$$(7.33) \quad 3w_Y = 6u_1 + 23u_2 + 10u_3,$$

and

$$(7.34) \quad -2w_{\nabla^2} = 93u_1 + 556u_2 + 365u_3. \quad \square$$

**Remark 7.14.** It is remarkable, and somewhat mysterious, that the vectors (7.33) and (7.34) representing the “trailing terms” of the functional determinants of  $Y$  and  $\nabla^2$  fall into the rather narrow positive cone  $\mathcal{K}$  generated by  $u_1$ ,  $u_2$ , and  $u_3$ . The coefficients involved are simply buried somewhere in the heat invariants, and thus are determined “purely algebraically.” There would seem to be no *a priori* reason that these coefficients should satisfy inequality constraints, but they do. Such “luck” was also present in the four dimensional case; for each operator, the sign of one constant had to be correct to get an extremal result. Specifically, the quantity asserted to be positive by the norm computation for the Sobolev imbedding  $L_1^2 \hookrightarrow L^4$  had to have a coefficient sign “matching” that of the  $L_2^2 \hookrightarrow e^L$  quantity. In six dimensions, our proof demanded that three signs fall into place. (The true maximal positive cone is actually larger than the one we have constructed; see the next remark.) The inequalities we have used can be thought of as (at least consequences of) two imbeddings  $L_1^2 \hookrightarrow L^3$ , that for scalar functions and that for trace free symmetric two-tensors, and of course  $L_3^2 \hookrightarrow e^L$ . One of the challenges for future work is to explain why these sign miracles occur.

**Remark 7.15.** It would save quite a bit of delicate conformal geometry, as well as the introduction of the principal series  $\text{Ind}_{MAN}^G(2) \otimes \nu \otimes 1$ , if we could replace the positive quantity  $(D_{(2)}b, b)_{L^2(S^6, g_\omega, \text{TFS}^2)}$  of Theorem 7.13 with the simpler quantity  $\|G_{(3)}b\|^2$ , which we have not yet used. By (7.8), (7.14), (7.30), and (7.31),

$$\|G_{(3)}b\|^2 = \int \left\{ \frac{m-1}{m+2} |dJ|^2 + J|V|^2 - m \text{tr} V^3 \right\} dv, \quad m \geq 5.$$

Thus

$$\int \left\{ |dJ|^2 + \frac{8}{5} J|V|^2 - \frac{48}{5} \text{tr} V^3 \right\} dv \geq 0, \quad m = 6.$$

Adding 0 in the form  $\frac{3}{5} \int_{S^6} \{(Q_6 dv)_\omega - (Q_6 dv)_0\}$ , we eliminate the  $\text{tr} V^3$  term as usual; the result is

$$\int \left\{ |dJ|^2 + \frac{24}{5} J^3 - \frac{64}{5} J|V|^2 \right\} dv \geq 0, \quad m = 6.$$

Even on  $S^6$ , this is new information, since the vector

$$u_4 := \left(1, \frac{24}{5}, -\frac{64}{5}\right)$$

representing this quantity is not in the positive cone  $\mathcal{K}$  described in the last remark:

$$3u_4 = 3u_1 - 4u_2 + 4u_3,$$

and of course  $u_1$ ,  $u_2$ , and  $u_3$  are linearly independent. However, we cannot prove positivity of  $w_Y$  or of  $w_{\mathcal{Y}^2}$  using only  $u_1$ ,  $u_2$ , and  $u_4$ , since

$$2w_Y = -u_1 + 22u_2 + 5u_4, \quad -8w_{\mathcal{Y}^2} = -723u_1 + 3684u_2 + 1095u_4,$$

and  $u_1$ ,  $u_2$ , and  $u_4$  are linearly independent.

While signs of trailing terms must miraculously fall into place in order to produce the extremal behavior summarized in Table 0.1, the sign of the leading term's coefficient is predictable in arbitrary even dimension  $m$ . Indeed, by [BGØ1, Theorem 1.5], any natural operator of the form  $A = \nabla^* \nabla - c_A J$ ,  $c_A$  constant, has

$$(7.35) \quad (4\pi)^{m/2} (\text{leading term})(U_m[A]) = \frac{(-1)^{m/2} (m/2)!}{2(m+1)!} (-2m(m-1) + 4(m+1)c_A) \Delta^{(m-2)/2} J.$$

To be precise about what is meant by "leading term", recall the notation of Corollary 1.4: the right side of (7.35) agrees with  $(4\pi)^{m/2} U_m[A]$  modulo  $\mathcal{I}_{m, m-4}$ . By Corollary 1.4, it also agrees with  $Q_m$  modulo  $\mathcal{I}_{m, m-4}$ . This explains the sign pattern in Table 0.1:  $Y$  and  $\mathcal{Y}^2$  both have the form  $\nabla^* \nabla - cJ$ , with  $c_Y = (m-2)/2$ ,  $c_{\mathcal{Y}^2} = (m-1)/2$ . But the sign of the quantity  $-2m(m-1) + 4(m+1)c_A$  changes as  $c_A$  moves between these two values:

$$-2m(m-1) + 4(m+1)c_Y = -4, \quad -2m(m-1) + 4(m+1)c_{\mathcal{Y}^2} = 2(m-1).$$

Thus

$$(\text{leading term})(U_m[Y]) = -(-1)^{m/2} k_Y Q_m, \quad (\text{leading term})(U_m[\nabla^2]) = (-1)^{m/2} k_{\nabla^2} Q_m,$$

where  $k_Y$  and  $k_{\nabla^2}$  are positive constants. If  $U_m[A]$  consisted only of its leading term, the consequence would be the obvious extension of Table 0.1. Guessing that the signs of the trailing terms' coefficients will continue to fall into place as we go up in dimension, we offer:

**Conjecture 7.16.** On  $S^m$  for  $m$  even, for  $g = g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g_0 \in [g_0]$  in the conformal class of the standard metric  $g_0$  and having the standard volume  $v_m = (4\pi)^{m/2} \Gamma(m/2)/\Gamma(m)$ , the quantities  $-(-1)^{m/2} \det Y_\omega$  and  $(-1)^{m/2} \det \nabla_\omega^2$  are maximized exactly when

$$g_\omega = h \cdot g_0, \quad \text{some } h \in \text{ctran}(S^m, g_0).$$

It remains to treat other operators  $A$  satisfying our assumptions 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6. For example, limiting ourselves just to operators that we have discussed here, we could treat the  $P_n$  when (1.6) is satisfied, or the Wunsch operator  $D_{(2)}$  of Section 7 when  $m \geq 5$ . Certainly computations with  $P = P_4$  in dimension  $m = 4$  are feasible; the relevant information about the heat invariants is contained in [G3]. Perhaps some analogue of Conjecture 7.16 is more tractable for the operator  $P_m$ , which is in some ways more like the two dimensional Laplacian than is the conformal Laplacian in dimension  $m$ .

Another exciting challenge is that of determinants of elliptic boundary value problems. There has been much recent progress in developing computation schemes for boundary contributions to the heat invariants [BG1], and in deriving sharp boundary value Sobolev inequalities [E1-2]. A rich supply of conformally covariant boundary value problems certainly exists; for example, if the basic operator (acting in the interior of our manifold with boundary) is the conformal Laplacian  $Y$ , one can choose either a pure Dirichlet condition, or a generalized Neumann condition known to physicists as the *Robin* condition, and have conformal covariance as well as ellipticity. See [E1, Sec. 1] for a description of the Robin condition, and [BG2] for determinant computations in dimension four based on these conditions, as well as for a discussion of the "correct" boundary conditions for a higher order conformal covariant like  $P_n$ .

In another direction, it should be possible to attack all of these problems (covariant operators, sharp inequalities, functional determinants) in geometries other than Riemannian conformal geometry; specifically, a target of interest and opportunity is CR (tangential Cauchy-Riemann) geometry. Indeed, just as our considerations here are intimately related to the complementary series of representations of  $SO_0(m+1, 1)$ , so are those for CR geometry to the complementary series of  $SU(m+1, 1)$ . The necessary programs in these other geometries are certainly at a much more primitive state of development than their Riemannian conformal analogues, but the requisite hard analysis and heat operator theory are in progress.

We have concentrated here on finding a (one sided) bound for the functional determinant. The other side of the coin is the prospect of using the functional determinant to bound other quantities, notably the metric. This brings us into the realm of *isospectral*

problems; specifically, problems of determining the "size" of a set of metrics which are isospectral for some given operator, for example  $\Delta$  or  $Y$ . In this context, "compact in the  $C^\infty$  topology modulo diffeomorphisms" is the usually conjectured size; if it is possible to show that isospectral classes are singletons (modulo diffeomorphisms), one is "hearing the shape of a drum." The point is that the functional determinant has been crucial in some such investigations, in particular [OPS2] in dimension two, and [BCY] in dimension four. The exponential class inequality needed, again the description of the norm of the imbedding  $L^2_{m/2} \hookrightarrow e^L$ , is provided by a transplantation to "bumpy" manifolds of an exponential class inequality of Adams [Ad], originally proved for domains in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ ; see [BCY, Proposition 2.2] for such a transplantation.

Finally, because of our interest in extremal problems on the sphere, we have up to now on the conformally flat case, obtaining general formulas for the functional determinant that involve the Euler characteristic  $\chi(M)$ . Beyond conformal flatness,  $\chi(M)$  tends to get replaced by linear combinations of  $\chi(M)$  and various invariants of conformal, but not of topological, structure [BØ3, BCY]; see Sec. 9 below. Since many manifolds with conformally curved background metrics exhibit a high degree of symmetry (see, e.g. [BCY, Sec. 3]), there are new frontiers for the present techniques even within Riemannian conformal geometry.

8. THE VALUE OF THE FUNCTIONAL DETERMINANT AT THE EXTREMALS

Now that we know the metrics on  $S^2$ , and in the standard conformal classes  $[g_0]$  on  $S^4$  and  $S^6$ , on which  $\det Y$  and  $\det \nabla^2$  is extremal, it is possible to actually calculate the extreme values. So far we have formulas for quotients like  $(\det Y_\omega)/(\det Y_0)$ ; knowing the extremal value (which is taken on at  $g_0$ ), we will then know  $\det Y_\omega$ . It is not at all clear whether there are any real applications of this further knowledge. We shall show:

**Theorem 8.1.** *The extreme values of  $\det Y$  and  $\det \nabla^2$  referred to in Table 0.1 are given in terms of the Riemann zeta function  $\zeta_R(s)$  by the following table.*

	$-\log \det Y_\omega$	$-\log \det \nabla^2_\omega$
$S^2$	$-\frac{1}{2} + 4\zeta'_R(-1)$	$8\zeta'_R(-1)$
$S^4$	$\frac{1}{3}\{\frac{1}{48} + 2\zeta'_R(-3) + \zeta'_R(-1)\}$	$\frac{8}{3}\{\zeta'_R(-3) - \zeta'_R(-1)\}$
$S^6$	$\frac{1}{30}\{-\frac{1}{45} + \zeta'_R(-5) - \zeta'_R(-1)\}$	$\frac{4}{15}\{\zeta'_R(-5) - 5\zeta'_R(-3) + 4\zeta'_R(-1)\}$

TABLE 8.1

In this section, the index  $j$  will always run over the natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}$ . The *Hurwitz zeta functions* are

$$\zeta_a(s) = \sum_j (j+a)^{-s}, \quad a > 0,$$

and the Riemann zeta function is  $\zeta_R(s) = \zeta_1(s)$ . Note that

$$(8.1) \quad \begin{aligned} (d/da)\zeta_a(s) &= -s\zeta_a(s+1), \\ \zeta_a(s) - \zeta_{a+1}(s) &= a^{-s}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the *double zeta functions*

$$\begin{aligned} h_a(s) &= \sum_j [(j+a)(j+a+1)]^{-s}, \\ f_a(s) &= \sum_j (2j+2a+1)[(j+a)(j+a+1)]^{-s}. \end{aligned}$$

In analogy with (8.1), we have

$$(8.2) \quad (d/da)h_a(s) = -sf_a(s+1),$$

$$(8.3) \quad (d/da)f_a(s) = (2-4s)h_a(s) - sh_a(s+1),$$

$$(8.4) \quad h_a(s) - h_{a+1}(s) = [a(a+1)]^{-s},$$

$$(8.5) \quad f_a(s) - f_{a+1}(s) = (2a+1)[a(a+1)]^{-s}.$$

All these zeta functions have isolated simple poles. All identities are valid in their elementary form for large  $\operatorname{Re} s$ , and for all  $s$  in the sense of analytic continuation. In particular, a quantity expressed as a sum or product of terms, some of which are singular at a given value of  $s$ , might still be regular at that  $s$ .

The Riemann zeta function satisfies

$$(8.6) \quad \zeta_R(-2m) = 0, \quad \zeta_R(1-2m) = (-1)^m B_m / 2m \quad (m \in \mathbb{Z}^+); \quad \zeta_R(0) = -\frac{1}{2},$$

where the  $B_m$  are the Bernoulli numbers:  $B_1 = 1/6$ ,  $B_2 = 1/30$ ,  $B_3 = 1/42$ ,  $B_4 = 1/30$ ,  $B_5 = 5/66, \dots$  [WW, 13.15]. Further [WW, 13.21],

$$\zeta_a(0) = \frac{1}{2} - a.$$

A straightforward generalization of a calculation in [We] gives, for the double zeta functions,

$$(8.7) \quad h_a(-m) = \frac{(-1)^m (m!)^2}{2(2m+1)^2} + \sum_{k=0}^m (-1)^k \binom{m}{k} \zeta_{a+1}(-2m+k), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Differentiating using (8.2), we get

$$(8.8) \quad f_a(1-m) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^m (-1)^k \binom{m}{k} (2m-k) \zeta_{a+1}(-2m+k+1), \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

(It is tedious, but possible, to check the derivative of this formula against (8.3); the values given in (8.6) are necessary for this.) In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} h_a(0) &= -a, & h_a(-1) &= -\frac{1}{12} + \zeta_{a+1}(-2) - \zeta_{a+1}(-1), \\ f_a(0) &= \frac{1}{3} - a^2, & f_a(-1) &= 2\zeta_{a+1}(-3) - 3\zeta_{a+1}(-2) + \zeta_{a+1}(-1). \end{aligned}$$

If  $a$  is a natural number in the above formulas,

$$h_a(-1) = -\frac{1}{3}a(a^2 - 1), \quad f_a(-1) = -\frac{1}{15} - \frac{1}{2}a^2(a^2 - 1).$$

Now consider  $s$ -derivatives, denoted by a prime. In analogy with

$$\zeta'_R(0) = -\frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi,$$

and again generalizing computations in [We], we have:

$$(8.9) \quad \begin{aligned} h'_a(0) &= 2\zeta'_{a+1}(0) - \log a, \\ h'_a(-1) &= 2\zeta'_{a+1}(-2) - (a^2 + a) \log a, \\ f'_a(0) &= 4\zeta'_{a+1}(-1) - \frac{1}{2} - (2a + 1) \log a, \\ f'_a(-1) &= 4\zeta'_{a+1}(-3) + 2\zeta'_{a+1}(-1) - a(a + 1)(2a + 1) \log a + \frac{1}{24}. \end{aligned}$$



Vardi [Va, Proposition 3.1] has made related calculations with the functions

$$H_d^n(s) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^d}{k^s(k+n)^s}, \quad d, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Extending the domain of the  $d$  parameter to run through  $\mathbb{N}$ , these can clearly be related to our double zeta functions; for example,

$$(8.10) \quad \begin{aligned} h_1 &= H_0^1, \quad f_1 = 2H_1^1 + H_0^1, \quad h_{1/2}(s) = 4^s H_0^2(s) - H_0^1(s), \\ f_{1/2}(s) &= 4^s (H_1^2(s) + H_0^2(s)) - 2H_1^1(s) - H_0^1(s). \end{aligned}$$

In fact, we shall only really be interested in  $h_a$  and  $f_a$  for  $a \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^+$ , so by (8.4) and (8.5), the  $H_d^n$  are sufficient for our purposes. Furthermore, since

$$(8.11) \quad H_d^n(s-1) = H_{d+2}^n(s) + nH_{d+1}^n(s),$$

knowledge of the behavior of the  $H_d^n$  at  $s = 0$  will give us knowledge of the behavior the  $H_d^n$ , and thus the  $h_a$  and  $f_a$  for  $a \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$ , at all nonpositive integers. More specifically, let  $d$  range through  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $n$  through  $\{1, 2\}$ , and  $a$  through  $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$ . If we know  $H_d^n(0)$  and  $(H_d^n)'(0)$ , then we also know  $h_a(-m)$ ,  $h'_a(-m)$ ,  $f_a(-m)$ ,  $f'_a(-m)$ . Vardi shows:

**Theorem 8.2 [Va].** *If  $d, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,*

$$(H_d^n)'(0) = \sum_{k=1}^n (k-n)^d \log k - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(-n)^{d+1}}{d+1} \sum_{j=1}^d j^{-1} + \zeta'_R(-d) + (-n)^d \sum_{r=0}^d \binom{d}{r} \frac{\zeta'_R(-r)}{(-n)^r}.$$

*In particular,*

$$(H_d^1)'(0) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{(-1)^{d+1}}{d+1} \sum_{j=1}^d j^{-1} + \zeta'_R(-d) + (-1)^d \sum_{r=0}^d \binom{d}{r} (-1)^r \zeta'_R(-r).$$

The results of our computations, based on Weisberger's method via (8.7), (8.8), and (8.9), check with Vardi's where applicable. A slight gap remains in our knowledge, in that we have no formula for  $(H_0^n)'(0)$ , but this does not keep us from getting the data needed for Theorem 8.1.

Consider first the conformal Laplacian  $Y$ , which is the constant shift

$$Y = \Delta + \frac{1}{4}m(m-2)$$

of the Laplacian on  $(S^m, g_0)$ . By (2.10),  $Y$  takes the value

$$\lambda_{m,j} := \left( j + \frac{m-2}{2} \right) \left( j + \frac{m}{2} \right)$$

on the space  $E_{m,j}$  of  $j^{\text{th}}$  order spherical harmonics. But

$$N_{m,j} := \dim E_{m,j} = \frac{m+2j-1}{(m-1)!} (m+j-2) \dots (j+1),$$

so the zeta function is

$$\zeta_{(S^m, g_0, Y)}(s) = \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (m+2j-1) \{(m+j-2) \dots (j+1)\} \left\{ \left( j + \frac{m-2}{2} \right) \left( j + \frac{m}{2} \right) \right\}^{-s},$$

$m \geq 3$ .

Now note that the factors of both  $\lambda_{m,j}$  and  $N_{m,j}$  exhibit a certain symmetry about the value  $j + \frac{m-1}{2}$ ; this allows us to perform the following trick. If  $m$  is even, define a polynomial  $\Phi_m(x)$  and integers  $b_{\alpha,m}$  by

$$\Phi_m(x) = \prod_{p=0}^{\frac{m-4}{2}} (x - p(p+1)) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} b_{\alpha,m} x^{\alpha}.$$

Then

$$(8.12) \quad \zeta_{(S^m, g_0, Y)}(s) = \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} b_{\alpha,m} f_{\frac{m-2}{2}}(s - \alpha), \quad m \text{ even.}$$

But recall that this really expresses  $\zeta_{(S^m, g_0, Y)}$  in terms of  $f_1$ , since

$$f_{\frac{m-2}{2}}(s) = f_1(s) - \sum_{q=1}^{\frac{m-4}{2}} (2q+1) \{q(q+1)\}^{-s}.$$

In fact, the situation is even simpler than this: we can actually replace  $f_{(m-2)/2}$  by  $f_1$  in (8.12), since

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} b_{\alpha,m} \{q(q+1)\}^{\alpha} = \Phi_m(q(q+1)) = 0$$

for  $q = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{m-4}{2}$ . The result is:

$$(8.13) \quad \zeta_{(S^m, g_0, Y)}(s) = \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} b_{\alpha,m} f_1(s - \alpha), \quad m \text{ even.}$$

The case  $m = 2$  is exceptional in that the zero eigenvalue must be thrown out before the construction of the zeta function; the result is

$$(8.14) \quad \zeta_{(S^2, g_0, \Delta)}(s) = f_1(s).$$

Special cases of (8.13) are

$$(8.15) \quad \zeta_{(S^4, g_0, Y)}(s) = \frac{1}{6} f_1(s-1),$$

$$(8.16) \quad \zeta_{(S^6, g_0, Y)}(s) = \frac{1}{120} \{f_1(s-2) - 2f_1(s-1)\}.$$

If  $m$  is odd, define a polynomial  $\Psi_m(x)$  and rational numbers  $c_{\alpha, m}$  by

$$\Psi_m(x) = \prod_{p=0}^{\frac{m-3}{2}} (x - (p + \frac{1}{2})(p - \frac{1}{2})) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} c_{\alpha, m} x^\alpha.$$

Then

$$\zeta_{(S^m, g_0, Y)}(s) = \frac{2}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} c_{\alpha, m} h_{\frac{m-2}{2}}(s-\alpha), \quad m \text{ odd}.$$

This is a formula in terms of  $h_{1/2}$ , since

$$h_{\frac{m-2}{2}}(s) = h_{\frac{1}{2}}(s) - \sum_{q=1}^{\frac{m-3}{2}} \{(q + \frac{1}{2})(q - \frac{1}{2})\}^{-s}.$$

In fact, since

$$\sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} c_{\alpha, m} \{(q + \frac{1}{2})(q - \frac{1}{2})\}^\alpha = \Psi_m((q + \frac{1}{2})(q - \frac{1}{2})) = 0$$

for  $q = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{m-3}{2}$ , we may simply replace  $h_{\frac{m-2}{2}}$  by  $h_{1/2}$ :

$$\zeta_{(S^m, g_0, Y)}(s) = \frac{2}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} c_{\alpha, m} h_{\frac{1}{2}}(s-\alpha), \quad m \text{ odd}.$$

As special cases, we get

$$\zeta_{(S^3, g_0, Y)}(s) = h_{\frac{1}{2}}(s-1) + \frac{1}{4} h_{\frac{1}{2}}(s),$$

$$\zeta_{(S^5, g_0, Y)}(s) = \frac{1}{12} \{h_{\frac{1}{2}}(s-2) - \frac{1}{2} h_{\frac{1}{2}}(s-1) - \frac{3}{16} h_{\frac{1}{2}}(s)\}.$$

The square of the Dirac operator is easier in a sense, because only the *single* (Hurwitz) zeta functions enter. (In general,  $n$ -fold zeta functions, i.e. those involving expressions of the form  $[(j+a)(j+a+1)\dots(j+a+n)]^{-s}$ , seem to be needed to treat  $n^{\text{th}}$  order operators.) By [Bra3, Sec. 4],  $\nabla^2$  on  $(S^m, g_0)$  has eigenvalue

$$(8.17) \quad \mu_{m, j} := \left(j + \frac{m}{2}\right)^2$$

on a space of dimension

$$T_{m,j} := \frac{2^{\ell+1}}{(m-1)!} (m+j-1) \dots (j+1), \quad j \in \mathbb{N},$$

where  $\ell = [m/2]$  as in the last section. First assume that  $m$  is even; then

$$\zeta_{(S^m, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) = \frac{2^{(m+2)/2}}{(m-1)!} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \prod_{p=1}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} \left[ \left( j + \frac{m}{2} + p \right) \left( j + \frac{m}{2} - p \right) \right] \right\} \left( j + \frac{m}{2} \right)^{-(2s-1)}.$$

We write

$$\Xi_m(x) := \prod_{p=1}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} (x - p^2) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} d_{\alpha,m} x^{\alpha}.$$

Proceeding for the most part as in the case of the conformal Laplacian, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{(S^m, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) &= \frac{2^{(m+2)/2}}{(m-1)!} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} d_{\alpha,m} \left( j + \frac{m}{2} \right)^{-(2s-1-2\alpha)} \\ &= \frac{2^{(m+2)/2}}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} d_{\alpha,m} \zeta_{m/2}(2s-1-2\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

But by (8.1),

$$\zeta_{m/2}(s) = \zeta_R(s) - \sum_{q=1}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} q^{-s},$$

and so

$$\zeta_{(S^m, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) = \frac{2^{(m+2)/2}}{(m-1)!} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} d_{\alpha,m} \zeta_R(2s-1-2\alpha) - \sum_{q=1}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} q^{-(2s-1)} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} d_{\alpha,m} q^{2\alpha} \right\}.$$

But

$$\sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} d_{\alpha,m} q^{2\alpha} = \Xi(q^2) = 0$$

for  $q = 1, \dots, \frac{m-2}{2}$ . As a result,

$$\zeta_{(S^m, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) = \frac{2^{(m+2)/2}}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-2}{2}} d_{\alpha,m} \zeta_R(2s-1-2\alpha), \quad m \text{ even.}$$

In particular,

$$(8.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \zeta_{(S^2, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) &= 4\zeta_R(2s - 1), \\ \zeta_{(S^4, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) &= \frac{4}{3} \{ \zeta_R(2s - 3) - \zeta_R(2s - 1) \}, \\ \zeta_{(S^6, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) &= \frac{2}{15} \{ \zeta_R(2s - 5) - 5\zeta_R(2s - 3) + 4\zeta_R(2s - 1) \}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $m$  is odd,

$$(m + j - 1) \dots (j + 1) = \prod_{p=1}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} \left[ \left( j + \frac{m}{2} \right)^2 - \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right],$$

so we write

$$\Theta_m(x) := \prod_{p=1}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} \left( x - \left( p - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} e_{\alpha, m} x^\alpha,$$

and compute that

$$\zeta_{(S^m, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) = \frac{2^{(m+1)/2}}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} e_{\alpha, m} \zeta_{m/2}(2s - 2\alpha).$$

However, by (8.1),

$$\zeta_{m/2}(s) = \zeta_{1/2}(s) - \sum_{q=1}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} q^{-s}.$$

As above, the sum over  $q$  makes no contribution, and

$$\zeta_{(S^m, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) = \frac{2^{(m+1)/2}}{(m-1)!} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\frac{m-1}{2}} e_{\alpha, m} \zeta_{1/2}(2s - 2\alpha), \quad m \text{ odd}.$$

For example,

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{(S^3, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) &= 2 \{ \zeta_{1/2}(2s - 2) - \frac{1}{4} \zeta_{1/2}(2s) \}, \\ \zeta_{(S^5, g_0, \mathcal{P}^2)}(s) &= \frac{1}{3} \{ \zeta_{1/2}(2s - 4) - \frac{5}{2} \zeta_{1/2}(2s - 2) + \frac{9}{16} \zeta_{1/2}(2s) \}. \end{aligned}$$

The information we have collected is sufficient for computation of the determinants of a wide variety of elliptic operators and boundary value problems on the sphere; however, we shall content ourselves just with the computations needed for Theorem 8.1.

*Proof of Theorem 8.1.* By (8.1),  $\zeta'_2 = \zeta'_1 = \zeta'_R$ , so by (8.9), (8.14), and (8.15),

$$\zeta'_{(S^2, g_0, \Delta)}(0) = f'_1(0) = 4\zeta'_R(-1) - \frac{1}{2},$$

and

$$\zeta'_{(S^4, g_0, \gamma)}(0) = \frac{1}{6} f_1'(-1) = \frac{1}{3} \left\{ \frac{1}{48} + 2\zeta'_R(-3) + \zeta'_R(-1) \right\}.$$

By (8.16), we need to know  $f_1'(-2)$ . By (8.10) and (8.11),

$$f_1'(-2) = (2H_1^1 + H_0^1)'(-2) = (2H_3^1 + 3H_2^1 + H_1^1)'(-1) = (2H_5^1 + 5H_4^1 + 4H_3^1 + H_2^1)'(0).$$

By Theorem 8.2,

$$(H_2^1)'(0) = \frac{1}{4} + 2\zeta'_R(-2) - 2\zeta'_R(-1) + \zeta'_R(0),$$

$$(H_3^1)'(0) = -\frac{11}{48} + 2\zeta'_R(-3) - 3\zeta'_R(-2) + 3\zeta'_R(-1) - \zeta'_R(0),$$

$$(H_4^1)'(0) = \frac{5}{24} + 2\zeta'_R(-4) - 4\zeta'_R(-3) + 6\zeta'_R(-2) - 4\zeta'_R(-1) + \zeta'_R(0),$$

$$(H_5^1)'(0) = -\frac{137}{720} + 2\zeta'_R(-5) - 5\zeta'_R(-4) + 10\zeta'_R(-3) - 10\zeta'_R(-2) + 5\zeta'_R(-1) - \zeta'_R(0).$$

Thus

$$f_1'(-2) = -\frac{1}{180} + 4\zeta'_R(-5) + 8\zeta'_R(-3).$$

Finally,

$$\zeta'_{(S^6, g_0, \gamma)}(0) = \frac{1}{120} \{ f_1'(-2) - 2f_1'(-1) \} = \frac{1}{30} \left\{ -\frac{1}{45} + \zeta'_R(-5) - \zeta'_R(-1) \right\}.$$

For the values of  $-\log \det \nabla^2$ , it is immediate from (8.18) that

$$\zeta'_{(S^2, g_0, \nabla^2)}(0) = 8\zeta'_R(-1),$$

$$\zeta'_{(S^4, g_0, \nabla^2)}(0) = \frac{8}{3} \{ \zeta'_R(-3) - \zeta'_R(-1) \},$$

$$\zeta'_{(S^6, g_0, \nabla^2)}(0) = \frac{4}{15} \{ \zeta'_R(-5) - 5\zeta'_R(-3) + 4\zeta'_R(-1) \}. \quad \square$$

Though it is not at all clear whether the relative size of the numbers in Theorem 8.1 has any significance, we include here a computation of their numerical values to three decimal places; Table 8.2 gives  $e^{-a}$  for  $a$  the corresponding entry in Table 8.1. The numbers are based on a table of values for  $(\zeta'_R/\zeta_R)(s)$  given in [Wal].

EXTREMAL VALUES

	$\det Y_\omega$	$\det \nabla_\omega^2$
$S^2$	3.195...	3.756...
$S^4$	1.046...	0.634...
$S^6$	0.995...	1.202...

TABLE 8.2

9. BEYOND CONFORMAL FLATNESS IN THE FOUR DIMENSIONAL CASE

In this section we recount results of Branson, Chang, and Yang [BCY] on the question of using the functional determinant to bound the metric. The idea is to show that a set of isospectral conformal metrics is compact (modulo the effect of diffeomorphisms) in the  $C^\infty$  topology; this problem is still unsolved in dimension four, but our results give boundedness in the Sobolev  $L^2_2$  topology. If it were possible to improve this to  $L^{2+\epsilon}_2$  or  $L^{2+\epsilon}_2$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , one could use the heat invariants to carry out an inductive estimation scheme that would replace  $L^2_2$  by  $L^2_n$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ; this would give compactness in the  $C^\infty$  topology. So far the requisite improvement has remained elusive.

As in [BØ3, BCY], we wish to work without the assumption of conformal flatness. Accordingly, we work in the category of compact Riemannian manifolds  $(M, g)$  (without specifying the dimension  $m$  just yet), and suppose that we have an operator  $A$  satisfying 4.1, 4.3, 4.6. We shall be concerned about the heat invariant  $U_4[A]$ , so we assume that the pair  $(4, A)$  satisfies part (a) of the technical assumptions 5.1. Recall the discussion preceding (5.6), where it was established that the four invariants

$$|C|^2, |V|^2, J^2, \Delta J$$

form a basis of the space  $\mathcal{L}_4$  of  $O(m)$  scalar invariants over  $\text{Rat}(m)$ . If we wish to deal with orientation sensitive operators  $A$  in dimension four, we need to consider instead the space of level four  $SO(4)$  invariants, of which a basis is  $|C_+|^2, |C_-|^2, |V|^2, J^2, \Delta J$ , where  $C_\pm$  are the self- and anti-self-dual parts of the Weyl tensor  $C$ . (The bundle of which  $C$  is a section is a subbundle of the symmetric tensor square of the middle exterior bundle  $\Lambda^2$ ; thus the Hodge  $\star$  acts.) Though it is not much of a problem to make the modifications to deal with orientation sensitive  $A$  (especially with the approach of [BØ3]), we shall not do so here. Recall that part (b) of 5.1 was automatic in the conformally flat category for  $n = 4$ ; by the same reasoning, the following is true without the conformal flatness assumption: there is a rational function  $\beta(m)$ , regular at  $m = 4$ , with

$$u_A(m)U_n[A] \simeq \alpha_4(m)Q + \beta(m)|C|^2 + (m - 4)B_4(m) \quad \text{modulo } \mathcal{R}(\delta),$$

where all other quantities are as in Sec. 5. In dimension four,  $(|C|^2 dv)_\omega$  is independent of  $\omega$ , so  $\omega \mapsto \int \omega(|C|^2 dv)_\omega$  is a conformal primitive for  $|C|^2$  which vanishes at  $\omega = 0$ . In our notation, the Pfaffian is

$$\text{Pff}_4 = (32\pi^2)^{-1} \int (|C|^2 - 8|V|^2 + 8J^2) dv$$

by [BCY, (2.14)], so the analogue of (5.7) is

$$(9.1) \quad 8\pi^2[\text{Pff}_4] = \left[\frac{1}{4}|C|^2 + 2J^2 - 2|V|^2\right] = \frac{1}{4}[|C|^2] + [Q] \quad \text{in } CL^4_4/\delta F^4_3.$$

These considerations lead in a straightforward way to the following generalization of Theorem 5.11:

**Theorem 9.1 [BØ3].** Suppose  $A = A(m)$  satisfies 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6, and is regular and orientation insensitive at  $m = 4$ . Suppose that the pair  $(4, A)$  satisfies 5.1. Let  $(M, g_0)$  be a particular compact Riemannian four-manifold (with spin structure if required to define  $A$ ), and suppose that  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$  on  $(M, g_0)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & - (2\ell)^{-1} u_A(4) \log \frac{\det A_\omega}{\det A_0} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_4(4) \int_M \omega \{ (Qdv)_\omega + (Qdv)_0 \} + \beta(4) \int_M \omega (|C|^2 dv)_0 \\ & \quad + k_V(4) \int_M \{ (|V|^2 dv)_\omega - (|V|^2 dv)_0 \} + k_J(4) \int_M \{ (J^2 dv)_\omega - (J^2 dv)_0 \} \\ & = \alpha_4(4) \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_M \omega (P_0 \omega)(dv)_0 + \int_M \omega (Qdv)_0 \right\} + \beta(4) \int_M \omega (|C|^2 dv)_0 \\ & \quad + (k_V(4) + k_J(4)) \int_M \{ (J^2 dv)_\omega - (J^2 dv)_0 \}. \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_4$ ,  $k_V$ , and  $k_J$  are as in Theorem 5.11. The scale invariant determinant functional is

$$\begin{aligned} & - (2\ell)^{-1} u_A(4) \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = \\ & \quad - \left\{ 2\pi^2 \alpha_4(4) \chi(M) + \frac{1}{4} (\beta(4) - \frac{1}{4} \alpha_4(4)) \int_M (|C|^2 dv)_0 \right\} \log \frac{\int_M e^{4\omega} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} \\ & \quad - (2\ell)^{-1} u_A(4) \log \frac{\det A_\omega}{\det A_0}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Recalling Remark 5.12, we adopt the following notation to harmonize with [BØ3, BCY]:

$$u_A(4)^{-1} \alpha_4(4) =: \frac{1}{2} \beta_2[A], \quad u_A(4)^{-1} (k_V(4) + k_J(4)) =: \frac{1}{2} \beta_3[A], \quad u_A(4)^{-1} \beta(4) =: \beta_1[A].$$

Furthermore, we shall usually denote  $\beta_i[A]$  simply by  $\beta_i$ . If  $Q_0$ ,  $(|C|^2)_0$ , and  $J_0$  are constants, say  $(|C|^2)_0 \equiv c^2$ , Theorem 9.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & - (2\ell)^{-1} \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = \\ & \quad - \left\{ \pi^2 \beta_2 \chi(M) + \frac{1}{4} (\beta_1 - \frac{1}{8} \beta_2) \text{vol}(g_0) c^2 \right\} \log \frac{\int_M e^{4\omega} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \beta_2 \left\{ Q_0 \int_M \omega (dv)_0 + \frac{1}{2} \int_M \omega (P_0 \omega)(dv)_0 \right\} + \beta_1 c^2 \int_M \omega (dv)_0 \\ (9.2) \quad & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \beta_3 \left\{ -J_0^2 \text{vol}(g_0) + \int_M \{ (J^2 dv)_\omega \} \right\} \\ & = \left\{ 4\pi^2 \beta_2 \chi(M) + (\beta_1 - \frac{1}{8} \beta_2) \text{vol}(g_0) c^2 \right\} \left\{ \frac{\int_M \omega (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} - \frac{1}{4} \log \frac{\int_M e^{4\omega} (dv)_0}{\text{vol}(g_0)} \right\} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4} \beta_2 \int_M \omega (P_0 \omega)(dv)_0 + \frac{1}{2} \beta_3 \left\{ -J_0^2 \text{vol}(g_0) + \int_M \{ (J^2 dv)_\omega \} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

in view of (9.1).



**Remark 9.2.** By Schoen's solution of the Yamabe conjecture [Scho], the  $J_0 \equiv \text{const}$  assumption is "gratis"; we can always take such a background metric  $g_0$  if  $M$  is connected. This and the other constancy assumptions are certainly satisfied for a locally symmetric ( $\nabla R = 0$ ) background. [BØ3] assumed that  $g_0$  was Einstein in addition; here we have removed that assumption, which really only serves to guarantee that  $P_0$  is a polynomial in  $\Delta_0$  with real coefficients:

$$g_0 \text{ Einstein} \Rightarrow P_0 = (\Delta^2 + J\Delta)_0, \quad Q_0 = \frac{3}{2}J_0^2.$$

A normal coordinate argument shows that if  $g_0$  is locally symmetric and  $M$  is connected, then the eigenvalues of  $V_0$  are constant over  $M$ , and thus there are constants  $h_0$  and  $h_1$ , depending on  $(M, g_0)$ , such that

$$(9.3) \quad \int_M \omega(\Delta_0^2 \omega)(dv)_0 + h_0 \int_M |d\omega|_0^2 (dv)_0 \leq \int_M \omega(P_0 \omega)(dv)_0 \\ \leq \int_M \omega(\Delta_0^2 \omega)(dv)_0 + h_1 \int_M |d\omega|_0^2 (dv)_0.$$

We shall use (9.3) to eliminate the need for the Einstein assumption in Theorem 9.10 below. If we freeze out scale changes by demanding that  $\text{vol}(g_\omega)$  agree with  $\text{vol}(g_0)$ , we can simply drop the log term in (9.2), and replace the  $\mathcal{D}$  functional by the "det" functional.

**Remark 9.3.** As remarked in [BØ3, Sec. 4], we can use (5.10) to compute that

$$(4\pi)^2 \cdot 180(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)[Y] = (1, -4, -4), \\ (4\pi)^2 \cdot 360(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)[\mathcal{V}^2] = (-7, 88, 28).$$

(In fact, except for the  $\beta_1$  values, we have already computed this in Lemmas 5.13 and 5.15.)

In the following, we use the notation  $f_M$  for normalized integration; that is,

$$f_M \cdot dv_g = \left( \int_M \cdot dv_g \right) / \text{vol}(g).$$

In this notation,  $\bar{f} = f_M f dv_g$  for  $f \in C^\infty(M)$ , and (9.2) reads

$$(9.4) \quad - (2\ell)^{-1} \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)} = \\ - \frac{1}{4} \left\{ 4\pi^2 \beta_2 \chi(M) + (\beta_1 - \frac{1}{8}\beta_2) \text{vol}(g_0) c^2 \right\} \log \int_M e^{4(\omega - \bar{\omega})} (dv)_0 \\ + \frac{1}{4} \beta_2 \int_M \omega(P_0 \omega)(dv)_0 + \frac{1}{2} \beta_3 \left\{ -J_0^2 \text{vol}(g_0) + \int_M \{(J^2 dv)_\omega\} \right\}.$$

To get an estimate of this, our first pressing need is a generalization of the Beckner-Moser-Trudinger inequality Theorem 3.7 to handle the part not involving  $\beta_3$ ; this is gotten by transplanting to manifolds a Moser type inequality of D. Adams, originally proved for domains in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ .

**Theorem 9.4.** [Ad, Theorem 1] Let  $n < m$  be positive integers, and let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . There are constants  $c_0 = c_0(n, m)$  and  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, m)$  such that for all  $u \in C^n(\mathbb{R}^m)$  with support contained in  $\Omega$  and  $\|\nabla^n u\|_p \leq 1$ ,  $p = m/n$ ,

$$(9.5) \quad \int_{\Omega} \exp(\beta|u(x)|^{p'}) dx \leq c_0 |\Omega|$$

for all  $\beta \leq \beta_0$ , where  $p' = p/(p-1)$  and  $|\Omega|$  is the measure of  $\Omega$ . Furthermore, if  $\beta > \beta_0$ , then there exists a smooth function  $u$  supported in  $\Omega$  with  $\|\nabla^n u\|_p \leq 1$  for which the integral in (9.5) can be made as large as we please. If  $m = 4$  and  $n = p = p' = 2$ , then  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(2, 4) = 32\pi^2$ .  $\square$

Note that for  $n$  even,  $\|\nabla^n u\|^2 = \|\Delta^{n/2} u\|^2$ , while for  $n$  odd,  $\|\nabla^n u\|^2 = \|\nabla \Delta^{(n-1)/2} u\|^2$ . The elliptic operators  $\Delta^q$  could be replaced here by others with suitably uniform coefficients without changing the general form of the statement of the theorem; the constants, of course, would change. For the special case  $m = 4$ ,  $n = p = p' = 2$ , the transplanted theorem takes the following form.

**Theorem 9.5.** Let  $(M, g)$  be a 4-dimensional compact Riemannian manifold without boundary. There is a constant  $c_0$  such that for all  $u \in C^2(M)$  with  $\|\Delta u\|_2 \leq 1$ ,

$$\int_M \exp(32\pi^2 |u - \bar{u}|^2) dv_g \leq c_0 \text{vol}(g).$$

Furthermore, the exponent  $32\pi^2$  is the best possible in the sense that if  $\beta > 32\pi^2$ , there exists a smooth function  $u$  on  $M$  with  $\|\Delta u\|_2 \leq 1$  and  $\int_M \exp(\beta |u - \bar{u}|^2) dv_g$  arbitrarily large.

This theorem implies that if  $u$  is not constant,

$$(9.6) \quad \int_M \exp\left(\frac{32\pi^2 |u - \bar{u}|^2}{\|\Delta u\|_2^2}\right) dv_g \leq c_0.$$

Before giving the proof, we indicate the connection to Beckner's Moser type inequality.

**Lemma 9.6.** Given  $m \in 2\mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $\beta > 0$  and an inequality

$$\int_M \exp\left(\frac{\beta |u - \bar{u}|^2}{\|\nabla^{m/2} u\|_2^2}\right) dv_g \leq c_0$$

on an  $m$  dimensional compact Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$ , valid for all nonconstant  $u \in C^\infty(M)$ , we may conclude an inequality

$$(9.7) \quad \log \int_M e^{m(u-\bar{u})} dv_g \leq \log c_0 + \tilde{\beta} \|\nabla^{m/2} u\|_2^2, \quad \tilde{\beta} = \frac{m^2}{4\beta},$$

for all  $u \in C^\infty(M)$ . (The quantity  $\|\nabla^{m/2} u\|_2^2$  is computed using  $\int$ , as opposed to  $f$ .) In particular, if  $m = 4$  and  $\beta = 32\pi^2$ , then  $\tilde{\beta} = 1/8\pi^2$ .

*Proof.* If  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  are constants, the inequality

$$(\alpha(u - \bar{u}) + \gamma \|\nabla^{m/2} u\|_2^2)^2 \geq 0$$

implies that

$$2\alpha\gamma(u - \bar{u})\|\nabla^{m/2}u\|_2^2 \leq \alpha^2(u - \bar{u})^2 + \gamma^2\|\nabla^{m/2}u\|_2^4,$$

so

$$2\alpha\gamma(u - \bar{u}) \leq \alpha^2 \frac{(u - \bar{u})^2}{\|\nabla^{m/2}u\|_2^2} + \gamma^2\|\nabla^{m/2}u\|_2^2,$$

and, if we choose  $\alpha^2 = \beta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int_M e^{2\alpha\gamma(u - \bar{u})} dv_g &\leq \log \int_M \exp\left(\alpha^2 \frac{(u - \bar{u})^2}{\|\nabla^{m/2}u\|_2^2} + \gamma^2\|\nabla^{m/2}u\|_2^2\right) dv_g \\ &\leq \log c_0 + \gamma^2\|\nabla^{m/2}u\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $\gamma$  so that  $2\alpha\gamma = m$ , we have the result for nonconstant  $u$ . Since neither side of (9.7) depends on the constant component in the expansion of  $u$  into eigenfunctions of the Laplacian, (9.7) is valid for all  $u$ .  $\square$

Since the proof of Theorem 9.5 is a modified version of Adams' proof of Theorem 9.4, we shall only sketch it, with special attention to the necessary modifications. The following lemma of Aubin replaces the fractional integral representation of compactly supported functions on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with a Green's function representation formula valid for functions on compact manifolds.

**Lemma 9.7.** [Au, Theorem 4.13] *Let  $(M, g)$  be a compact,  $m$  dimensional Riemannian manifold. There exists a Green's function  $G(x, y)$  of the Laplacian  $\Delta$  with the following properties:*

(a) For all  $C^2$  functions  $u$  on  $M$ ,

$$(9.8) \quad u(x) - \bar{u} = \int_M (\Delta u(y))G(x, y)dv_g(y);$$

(b)  $G(x, y) = G(y, x)$  is  $C^\infty$  on the complement of the diagonal in  $M \times M$ ;

(c) If  $2k > m > 2$ ,

$$G(x, y) = H(x, y) + \sum_{i=1}^k \int_M \Gamma_i(x, z)H(z, y)dv_g(y) + F(x, y),$$

where  $H(x, y) = ((m - 2)v_{m-1})^{-1}r^{2-m}f(r)$  for  $m > 2$ ;  $r = d(x, y)$  is the distance from  $x$  to  $y$ ;  $v_{m-1}$  is the volume of the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ ;  $f(r)$  is a positive decreasing function;  $f(r) = 1$  in a neighborhood of  $r = 0$ ; and  $f(r) = 0$  for  $r \geq \delta$ ,  $\delta = \delta(M, g)$  being the injectivity radius of  $(M, g)$ ;  $\Gamma(x, y) := \Gamma_1(x, y) = -\Delta_y H(x, y)$ ;

$$\Gamma_{i+1}(x, y) = \int_M \Gamma_i(x, z)\Gamma(z, y)dv_g(y), \quad i = 1, \dots, k - 1;$$

and  $F(x, y)$  is continuous on  $M \times M$ .  $\square$

In the case of a compact Riemannian 4-manifold  $(M, g)$ , in the expression for the Green's function, we have a uniform estimate  $|\Gamma(x, y)| \leq \alpha r^{-2}$ , valid when  $r$  is less than the

injectivity radius  $\delta$  [Au, 4.10]. Here the constant  $\alpha = \alpha(M, g)$  depends on uniform bounds for the sectional curvature of  $g$  [Au, 4.9 and Theorem 1.53]; like the injectivity radius, such uniform bounds always exist for compact  $M$ . Thus if  $Z_i(x, y) := \int_M \Gamma_i(x, z)H(z, y)dv_g(y)$ ,

$$|Z_1(x, y)| \leq \text{const}(1 + |\log d(x, y)|),$$

and  $Z_2(x, y)$  is continuous on  $M \times M$ . This implies that in the 4-dimensional case, we have

$$(9.9) \quad G(x, y) = H(x, y) + Z(x, y) + R(x, y),$$

where  $|H(x, y)| \leq (4\pi^2)^{-1}r^{-2}$ ,  $|Z(x, y)| \leq \text{const}(1 + |\log d(x, y)|)$ , and  $R(x, y)$  is continuous on  $M \times M$ .

Another basic lemma used in the proof of Theorem 9.5 is the following result of O'Neil. Suppose  $f$  is a locally integrable function on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , and denote by  $f^*$  the symmetric decreasing rearrangement of  $f$ ; that is, for each  $s \geq 0$ , define  $\lambda(s) = |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid |f(x)| > s\}|$ , and define  $f^*$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  by  $f^*(t) = \inf\{s > 0 \mid \lambda(s) \leq t\}$ . Let  $f^{**}(t) = t^{-1} \int_0^t f^*(s)ds$ .

**Lemma 9.8.** [O'N, Lemma 1.5] *Let  $h = T(f, g) = f * g$ . Then*

$$h^{**}(t) \leq t f^{**}(t) g^{**}(t) + \int_t^\infty f^*(s) g^*(s) ds. \quad \square$$

To apply Lemma 9.8 in our setting, we just need to note that the proof of [O'N, Lemma 1.5] goes through if we replace the Euclidean convolution  $f * g$  by

$$h(x) = \int_M f(y)g(x, y)dv_g(y), \quad x \in M,$$

for a one-point function  $f$  and a two-point function  $g$  which is actually a function of  $r$ , i.e.  $g(x, y) = g(r) = g(d(x, y))$ . Here the functions  $f^*$  and  $\lambda$  are defined exactly as for  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , just replacing  $\mathbb{R}^m$  by  $M$  in the definition of  $\lambda$ .

*Proof of Theorem 9.5.* Given  $u \in C^2(M)$ , apply (9.8) and (9.9) to write

$$u(x) - \bar{u} = h(x) + z(x) + r(x),$$

where  $h(x) = \int_M (\Delta u)(y)H(x, y)dv_g(y)$ ,  $z(x) = \int_M (\Delta u)(y)Z(x, y)dv_g(y)$ , and  $r(x) = \int_M (\Delta u)(y)R(x, y)dv_g(y)$ . Applying Hölder's inequality, we have

$$|z(x)| \leq \|\Delta u\|_2 \left( \int_M |Z(x, y)|^2 dv_g(y) \right)^{1/2} \leq \alpha(M, g)$$

for all  $x \in M$ . Hence  $\|z\|_\infty \leq \alpha(M, g)$ . One can also make a pointwise estimate of  $r(x)$  to obtain  $\|r\|_\infty \leq \alpha(M, g)$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - \bar{u}| &\leq \int_M |(\Delta u)(y)| |H(x, y)| dv_g(y) + \alpha(M, g) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_M |(\Delta u)(y)| d(x, y)^{-2} dv_g(y) + \alpha(M, g). \end{aligned}$$

We now apply our adaptation of Lemma 9.8 with  $f = |\Delta u|$  and  $g(x, y) = d(x, y)^{-2}/4\pi^2$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |u - \bar{u}|^{**}(t) &\leq \alpha(M, g) + h^{**}(t) \\ &\leq \alpha(M, g) + t f^{**} g^{**}(t) + \int_t^\infty f^*(s) g^*(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where again  $h(x) = \int_M f(y)g(x, y)dv_g(y)$ . From this point on, the argument of [Ad, Sec. 2] carries through to establish that

$$\int_M \exp(32\pi^2 |u - \bar{u}|^2) dv_g(x) \leq \text{const} \cdot \text{vol}(g). \quad \square$$

**Remark 9.9.** The analysis below is sensitive to the constants  $\beta_i[A]$ , to the Euler characteristic, and (assuming a locally symmetric background metric) the constant value  $c^2$  of  $|C|^2$ . Specifically, it requires that  $\beta_2\beta_3 > 0$ ; recall from Remark 9.3 that we have this for  $A = Y$  and  $A = \mathbb{V}^2$ . The value of  $\beta_1/\beta_2$  also matters when  $(M, g_0)$  is not conformally flat. With notation and assumptions as above, let

$$k(M, g_0, A) = \left( 4 \frac{\beta_1[A]}{\beta_2[A]} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \text{vol}(g_0)c^2 + 16\pi^2 \chi(M).$$

If  $g_0$  is conformally flat,  $k(M, g_0, A) = k(M) = 16\pi^2 \chi(M)$  is independent of  $g_0$  and  $A$ ; in the conformally curved case,

$$k(M, g_0, Y) = -\frac{3}{2} \text{vol}(g_0)c^2 + 16\pi^2 \chi(M), \quad k(M, g_0, \mathbb{V}^2) = -\frac{9}{11} \text{vol}(g_0)c^2 + 16\pi^2 \chi(M).$$

For simplicity, when it is clear which background data  $(M, g_0, A)$  are intended, we write  $k$  for  $k(M, g_0, A)$ , and  $F_A(\omega)$  for

$$-(2\ell)^{-1} \log \frac{\mathcal{D}(A, e^{2\omega} g_0)}{\mathcal{D}(A, g_0)}.$$

**Theorem 9.10.** Suppose  $(M, g_0)$  is a compact connected Riemannian 4-manifold with  $g_0$  locally symmetric, and that  $A$  is as in Theorem 9.1. Suppose  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$  on  $(M, g_0)$ , that  $k(M, g_0, A) < 32\pi^2$ , and that  $\beta_2[A]\beta_3[A] > 0$ . If  $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $c_2 > 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{X}_{c_1, c_2}[A] := \{ \omega \in C^\infty(M) \mid (\text{sgn } \beta_2[A])F_A(\omega) \leq c_1, \text{vol}(e^{2\omega} g_0)/\text{vol}(g_0) = c_2 \}$$

is uniformly bounded in the  $L^2_2$  norm, with

$$\|\omega\|_{L^2_2} \leq \text{const}(c_1, c_2, M, g_0, A), \quad \text{all } \omega \in \mathcal{X}_{c_1, c_2}[A].$$

*Proof.* Throughout the proof, all integrals are with respect to  $(dv)_0$ . First assume that  $\beta_2[A] < 0$ . By Theorem 9.5 and Lemma 9.6,

$$(9.10) \quad \log \int_M e^{4(\omega - \bar{\omega})} \leq \log c_0 + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2.$$

Thus (9.4), (9.3), the four dimensional Yamabe equation

$$(\Delta + J)_0 e^\omega = J_\omega e^{3\omega},$$

and the calculation

$$(\Delta e^\omega)/e^\omega = \Delta\omega - |d\omega|^2$$

give

$$\begin{aligned} F_A(\omega) &\leq -\frac{\beta_2 k}{16} \left\{ \log c_0 + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \beta_2 \left\{ \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2 + h_0 \int_M |d\omega|_0^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \beta_3 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_M \left( \frac{\Delta_0 e^\omega}{e^\omega} \right)^2 - J_0 \int_M |d\omega|_0^2 \right\} \\ &= -\frac{\beta_2}{16} \left\{ \log c_0 + \left( \frac{k}{8\pi^2} - 4 \right) \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{1}{4} \beta_2 h_0 - \beta_3 J_0 \right) \int_M |d\omega|_0^2 + \frac{1}{2} \beta_3 \int_M \left( \frac{\Delta_0 e^\omega}{e^\omega} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $a := k/32\pi^2$ , and recall that  $a < 1$  is one of our assumptions. Then rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{4} \beta_2 (1-a) \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \beta_3 \int_M \left( \frac{\Delta_0 e^\omega}{e^\omega} \right)^2 \leq \\ (9.11) \quad &\left( \frac{1}{4} \beta_2 h_0 - \beta_3 J_0 \right) \int_M |d\omega|_0^2 - \frac{1}{16} \beta_2 k \log c_0 - F_A(\omega) \leq \\ &\left( \frac{1}{4} \beta_2 h_0 - \beta_3 J_0 \right) \int_M |d\omega|_0^2 + c_1 + \text{const}(M, g_0, A). \end{aligned}$$

We expand the exponential term as

$$\int_M \left( \frac{\Delta_0 e^\omega}{e^\omega} \right)^2 = \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega - |d\omega|_0^2)^2 = \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2 - 2 \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega) |d\omega|_0^2 + \int_M |d\omega|_0^4,$$

and estimate the cross term in this by

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \left| \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega) |d\omega|_0^2 \right| &\leq 2 \left( \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_M |d\omega|_0^4 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \lambda \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2 + \lambda^{-1} \int_M |d\omega|_0^4 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\lambda > 0$ . By the sign assumptions on  $\beta_2, \beta_3$ , we may choose  $\lambda > 1$  so that

$$b := -\frac{1}{4} \beta_2 (1-a) - \frac{1}{2} \beta_3 (1-\lambda) > 0;$$

this leaves us with

$$b \int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \beta_3 (1 - \lambda^{-1}) \int_M |d\omega|_0^4 \leq (\frac{1}{4} \beta_2 h_0 - \beta_3 J_0) \int_M |d\omega|_0^2 + c_1 + \text{const}(M, g_0, A).$$

The first term on the right of this can be estimated via

$$2 \int_M |d\omega|_0^2 \leq 2 \left( \int_M |d\omega|_0^4 \right)^{1/2} \text{vol}(g_0)^{1/2} \leq \epsilon \int_M |d\omega|_0^4 + \epsilon^{-1} \text{vol}(g_0).$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . We can now choose  $\epsilon = \epsilon(M, g_0, A)$  so that

$$\int_M (\Delta_0 \omega)^2 + \int_M |d\omega|_0^4 \leq \text{const}(c_1, M, g_0, A).$$

To achieve an  $L_2^2$  bound, we still need an estimate on  $\omega$  itself to combine with our bounds on  $\|\Delta_0 \omega\|_2$  and  $\|d\omega\|_4$ . This comes from the fact that the normalized volume  $\int_M e^{4\omega}$  is fixed at  $c_2$ . Indeed, by (9.10),  $-\bar{\omega} + c_2 \leq \text{const}(c_1, M, g_0, A)$ ; this is a bound below on  $\bar{\omega}$ . On the other hand,  $e^{4\bar{\omega}} \leq \int_M e^{4\omega} = c_2$  is a bound above. The upshot is that  $|\bar{\omega}|$  is bounded by a constant depending on  $c_1, c_2, M, g_0$ , and  $A$ .

The case  $\beta_2[A] > 0$  is entirely similar.  $\square$

**Corollary 9.11.** Suppose that  $(M, g_0)$  is as in Theorem 9.10. If  $16\pi^2 \chi(M) < 32\pi^2 + \frac{3}{2} \text{vol}(g_0)c^2$ , then

$$\mathcal{X}_{c_1, c_2}[Y] = \left\{ \omega \in C^\infty(M) \mid -F_Y(\omega) \leq c_1, \int_M e^{4\omega} (dv)_0 = c_2 \right\}$$

is uniformly bounded in the  $L_2^2$  norm by a constant depending on  $c_1, c_2$ , and  $(M, g_0)$ . If  $M$  has spin structure and  $16\pi^2 \chi(M) < 32\pi^2 + \frac{9}{11} \text{vol}(g_0)c^2$ , the same conclusion holds for

$$\mathcal{X}_{c_1, c_2}[\nabla^2] = \left\{ \omega \in C^\infty(M) \mid F_{\nabla^2}(\omega) \leq c_1, \int_M e^{4\omega} (dv)_0 = c_2 \right\}. \quad \square$$

Though our background metric  $g_0$  need not be Einstein, a convenient set of examples is provided by the compact connected homogeneous Einstein manifolds of dimension 4. These are classified in [J]; it turns out that homogeneous implies symmetric in this context, a situation that does not persist in higher dimensions. The list of possible universal covers for these spaces, grouped according to  $\text{sgn } J_0$ , is:

$$J_0 > 0: \quad (\text{a}) S^4, \quad (\text{b}) \mathbb{C}P^2, \quad (\text{c}) S^2 \times S^2;$$

$$J_0 = 0: \quad (\text{d}) \mathbb{R}^4;$$

$$J_0 < 0: \quad (\text{e}) H^4, \quad (\text{f}) \mathbb{C}H^2, \quad (\text{g}) H^2 \times H^2.$$

In each case there is an unambiguous choice of "standard" metric, up to normalization. Here  $H^m$  is the  $m$  dimensional hyperbolic space,  $\mathbb{C}H^2$  is the complex hyperbolic space

of complex dimension 2, and in cases (c) and (g), we use the same metric normalization on each factor. The compact, connected, locally symmetric Einstein 4-manifolds, being quotients of simply connected symmetric spaces by cocompact deck transformation groups of isometries, are compact quotients of spaces from the above list, inheriting the standard metrics. We shall treat each example, with a particular view toward identifying  $k(M, g_0, A)$ , and determining whether the null space  $\mathcal{N}(A)$  vanishes, as required for Theorem 9.10. In case (d), this null space never vanishes, but we show that our analysis applies nonetheless. Note that by (9.1), a compact Einstein 4-manifold  $(M, g)$  has

$$(9.12) \quad 32\pi^2\chi(M) = \int_M (|C|^2 + 6J^2) dv_g,$$

and thus has  $\chi(M) \geq 0$ , with equality if and only if  $g_0$  is flat (has vanishing Riemann tensor).

**Example 9.12.**  $S^4$  has Euler characteristic 2, and its standard metric  $g_0$  is conformally flat, so that  $k(S^4, g_0, A) = k(S^4) = 32\pi^2$ . Thus  $(S^4, g_0)$  is just outside the reach of Theorem 9.10. By making use of the large conformal transformation group, however, we shall be able to prove an analogous theorem (Theorem 9.19 below). The extremal problem for the functional determinant was treated in detail in Sec. 5. By Synge's Theorem, the only metric quotient of  $S^4$  is the real projective space  $\mathbb{R}P^4$ . This has Euler characteristic 1, so that  $k(\mathbb{R}P^4, g_0, A) = k(\mathbb{R}P^4) = 16\pi^2 < 32\pi^2$ . On  $(S^4, g_0)$ , the bottom eigenvalue of  $Y$  is  $J_0 = 2$ , and by the Lichnerowicz formula  $\nabla^2 - \nabla^*\nabla = \tau/4 = 3J/2$ , the bottom eigenvalue of  $\nabla^2$  is at least 3. (By (8.17), it is 4.) As a result,  $(\mathbb{R}P^4, g_0)$  with  $A = Y$  or  $\nabla^2$  satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 9.10.

**Example 9.13.** Consider  $\mathbb{C}P^2$ , and let  $g_0$  be the Fubini-Study metric, normalized so that the (constant) holomorphic sectional curvature is  $h = 4$ ; this is the usual normalization on any  $\mathbb{C}P^n$  [Bes, 2.59]. By [Bes, 11.5 and 11.12], the volume and scalar curvature of (any normalization of)  $g_0$  are related by

$$\text{vol}(g_0)\tau_0^2 = 288\pi^2.$$

Since  $\tau_0 = 6h$ ,  $J_0 = 4$ , and  $\text{vol}(g_0) = \pi^2/2$ . Since  $\chi(\mathbb{C}P^2) = 3$ , (9.12) gives  $c^2 = 96$ . Thus

$$k(\mathbb{C}P^2, g_0, A) = 48\pi^2 \left( 4 \frac{\beta_1[A]}{\beta_2[A]} - 1 \right),$$

so that the hypotheses of Theorem 9.10 are satisfied provided  $\beta_1[A]/\beta_2[A] < 5/12$  and  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$ . By Remark 9.3, the constraint on  $\beta_1/\beta_2$  is no problem for  $Y$ . Since  $\mathbb{C}P^2$  does not have spin structure [Bes, 6.72], there is no Dirac operator. (Being a complex manifold,  $\mathbb{C}P^2$  is orientable, so there is no  $\text{Pin}(4)$  structure either.) The bottom eigenvalue of  $Y_0$  is  $J_0 = 4$ , so that the null space constraint is no problem. By Synge's Theorem,  $\mathbb{C}P^2$  is a double cover of any metric quotient  $(M, g_0)$  it might have, but since  $\chi(\mathbb{C}P^2)$  is odd, there is no such quotient.



**Example 9.14.** Let  $M = S^2 \times S^2$ , and let  $g_0$  be the product of standard  $S^2$  metrics. Then  $\chi(M) = \chi(S^2)^2 = 4$ ,  $J_0 = 2/3$ , and  $\text{vol}(g_0) = 16\pi^2$ . As a consequence,  $c^2 = 16/3$  by (9.12). (That this space is conformally curved is perhaps contrary to naive expectation; we recall from Sec. 6 that the standard pseudo-Riemannian metric of signature  $(q, p)$  on  $S^q \times S^p$  is conformally flat.) As a consequence of the conformal curvature,  $\beta_1/\beta_2$  comes into play, and

$$k(S^2 \times S^2, g_0, A) = 32\pi^2 \left( \frac{2}{3} + \frac{32}{3} \frac{\beta_1[A]}{\beta_2[A]} \right).$$

Thus Theorem 9.10 applies as long as  $A_0$  has no zero eigenvalues and  $32\beta_1[A]/\beta_2[A] < 1$ . For  $A = Y$  and  $A = \nabla^2$ ,  $\beta_1/\beta_2 < 0$ ; the bottom eigenvalue of  $Y_0$  is  $J_0 = 2/3$ , and the bottom eigenvalue of  $\nabla^2$  is at least 1 by the Lichnerowicz formula. Thus the hypotheses of Theorem 9.10 are satisfied. If  $M$  is a compact quotient of  $S^2 \times S^2$ , then  $\chi(M) < 4$ . The bottom eigenvalue of a natural differential operator with positive definite leading symbol can only increase upon passage from the covering to the covered space (depending on whether or not some of the bottom eigenfunctions or eigensections descend to the quotient). Thus any  $A$  satisfying the the hypotheses of Theorem 9.10 on  $S^2 \times S^2$  satisfies them on  $M$  also; in particular, this is true for  $Y$  and  $\nabla^2$ .

**Example 9.15.** Suppose  $(M, g_0)$  is covered by  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , with the standard  $\mathbb{R}^4$  metric as the pullback of  $g_0$ . Here  $\chi(M) = c^2 = J_0 = 0$ , so  $k(M, g_0, A) = k(M) = 0 < 32\pi^2$ . A complication arises from the fact that all natural differential operators  $A$  on  $\mathbb{R}^4$  have 0 as an eigenvalue, so that one of the hypotheses of Theorem 9.10 may be violated if eigensections descend to  $M$ . The zero eigenfunctions or eigensections on  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , however, can be written down explicitly: each tensor-spinor bundle over  $\mathbb{R}^m$  has a standard trivialization. A tensor-spinor is annihilated by an elliptic natural differential operator  $A$  exactly when it has constant components in this trivialization. Let  $\mathcal{N}(A)_M$  be the space of such constant sections that descend to  $M$ , and let  $q = \dim \mathcal{N}(A)_M$ . By an argument in [BØ3, Sec. 3.b], the effect on the scale invariant log-determinant functional is to change  $F_A(\omega)$  to

$$\tilde{F}_A(\omega) = F_A(\omega) + \frac{q}{4} \log \frac{v_1^{1/4} v_r^{-1/r}}{v_0^{1/r-1/4}},$$

where  $v_\epsilon = \text{vol}(e^{2\epsilon\omega} g_0) \int_M e^{4\epsilon\omega} (dv)_0$ , and  $r$  is the order of the conformal covariant of which  $A$  is a power; in the notation of 4.6,  $r = 2\ell/h$ . (For example, if  $A = Y$ , then  $r = 2$ ; if  $A = \nabla^2$ , then  $r = 1$ .) If  $r = 4$ , then  $\tilde{F}_A(\omega) = F_A(\omega)$ , and all is well. If  $r < 4$ , the convexity of the exponential function gives

$$v_1^{r/4} \leq v_{r/4} \leq \max(v_0, v_1).$$

Thus the proof of Theorem 9.10 (without the assumption  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$ , and replacing  $F_A$  by  $\tilde{F}_A$ ) proceeds as before, until we get to (9.11), where we need only replace “const( $M, g_0, A$ )” on the right with “const( $M, g_0, A, c_2$ )”. The conclusion of the theorem is valid without modification.

**Example 9.16.** Let  $M$  be a compact quotient of  $H^4$ , inheriting the standard metric  $g_0$  of constant sectional curvature  $-1$ . Then  $(M, g_0)$  is a conformally flat Einstein manifold; by (9.12),  $\chi(M) = 3 \text{vol}(g_0)/4\pi^2 > 0$ . Thus  $k(M, g_0, A) = k(M) = 16\pi^2\chi(M)$ , and the constraint  $k(M) < 32\pi^2$  becomes  $\chi(M) < 2$ ; as a result, we need  $\chi(M) = 1$  (and thus  $\text{vol}(g_0) = 4\pi^2/3$ ). It is apparently very difficult to say anything elementary about the constraint  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$ , so in working with this example, we add it as a side condition.

**Example 9.17.** The usual Bergmann metric  $g_0$  on any  $\mathbb{C}H^n$  has constant holomorphic sectional curvature  $h = -4$  [Bes, 2.61]; this corresponds to  $J_0 = -4$ . By duality, the value of  $c^2$  on  $\mathbb{C}H^n$  is the same as that on  $\mathbb{C}P^n$ ; in the case  $n = 2$ , that value is  $c^2 = 96$  by the above. If  $M$  is a compact quotient with volume  $v_0$ , then  $\chi(M) = 6v_0/\pi^2 > 0$  by (9.12); in particular,  $v_0 \geq \pi^2/6$ . This yields

$$k(M, g_0, A) = 16\pi^2\chi(M) \left( 4 \frac{\beta_1[A]}{\beta_2[A]} + \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

Thus we need  $\chi(M)(1 + 8\beta_1[A]/\beta_2[A]) < 4$  to have  $k(M, g_0, A) < 32\pi^2$ . In particular, by Remark 9.3,  $k(M, g_0, Y) < 32\pi^2$  regardless of the value of  $\chi(M)$ , but to have  $k(M, g_0, \mathbb{V}^2) < 32\pi^2$ , we need  $\chi(M) < 11$ . Again, it is very difficult to treat the constraint  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$ , so we regard it as a side condition.

**Example 9.18.** A compact quotient  $M$  of  $H^2 \times H^2$ , endowed with the product  $g_0$  of Fubini-Study metrics of constant sectional curvature  $-1$ , has  $J_0 = -2/3$ . Duality with the  $\mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2$  situation gives  $c^2 = 16/3$ , and (9.12) gives  $\chi(M) = \text{vol}(g_0)/4\pi^2$ . Therefore

$$k(M, g_0, A) = 32\pi^2\chi(M) \left\{ \frac{1}{6} + \frac{8\beta_1[A]}{3\beta_2[A]} \right\}.$$

Thus the constraint  $k(M, g_0, A) < 32\pi^2$  reads  $\chi(M)(1 + 16\beta_1[A]/\beta_2[A]) < 6$ . In view of Remark 9.3, this always holds for  $L$  and, when  $M$  has spin structure,  $\mathbb{V}^2$  (regardless of the value of  $\chi(M)$ ). Again we view the constraint  $\mathcal{N}(A) = 0$  as a side condition.

Our final goal will be to show that an  $L_2^2$  boundedness result on the conformal factor  $\omega$  holds in the conformal class  $[g_0]$  of the standard metric on  $S^4$ , even though  $k(M, g_0, A)$  is exactly equal to the borderline value  $32\pi^2$  in this case. Since the statement as it stands would imply compactness in  $L_{2-\epsilon}^2$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and the conformal group  $\text{ctran}(S^4, g_0)$  is not compact, the conclusion has to be modified to "deflate" by the action of  $\text{ctran}(S^4, g_0)$ . We do this by specifying a "centeredness" property that is enjoyed by at least one conformal transform of any  $g_\omega \in [g_0]$ , and then showing that the set of centered metrics with the appropriate spectral invariants bounded as in Theorem 9.10 is bounded in the  $L_2^2$  norm.

If  $h \in \text{ctran}(S^4, g_0)$  and  $g_\omega = e^{2\omega}g_0$ , then

$$h \cdot g_\omega = e^{2h \cdot \omega} h \cdot g_0 = e^{2h \cdot \omega} \Omega_h^2 g_0,$$

in the notation of Sec. 2. If we set up an equivalence relation  $\sim$  in  $[g_0]$  by taking orbits under  $\text{ctran}(S^4, g_0)$ , then

$$g_\omega \sim g_{\omega'} \iff \omega' = h \cdot \omega + \log \Omega_h, \text{ some } h \in \text{ctran}(S^4, g_0).$$

We use this to set up an equivalence relation in  $L^2_2(S^4)$ : let  $T_h\omega := h \cdot \omega + \log \Omega_h$ ; then

$$\omega \sim \omega' \iff \omega' = T_h\omega, \text{ some } h \in \text{ctran}(S^4, g_0).$$

Our result is:

**Theorem 9.19.** *Let  $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $0 < c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ . On  $(S^4, g_0)$ , with  $A$  as in Theorem 9.10, let*

$$W = W_{c_1, c_2} := \left\{ \omega \in C^\infty(S^4) \mid F_A(\omega) = c_1, \int_{S^4} e^{4\omega} (dv)_0 = c_2 \right\}.$$

Then  $W$  is bounded in  $L^2_2 / \sim$ , in the sense that for each  $\omega \in W$ , there is a  $\tilde{\omega} \sim \omega$  such that  $\{\tilde{\omega} \mid \omega \in W\}$  is uniformly bounded in the  $L^2_2$  norm, with

$$\|\tilde{\omega}\|_{L^2_2} \leq \text{const}(c_1, c_2, A).$$

The proof is based on the strategy used in [On, CY, OPS1-2] to prove the corresponding result for  $S^2$ . Let

$$S_0 = \left\{ \omega \in C^\infty(S^4) \mid \int_{S^4} x_j e^{4\omega} (dv)_0 = 0, j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \right\},$$

where the  $x_j$  are homogeneous coordinates on  $S^4$ . A basic fact we shall use is:

**Lemma 9.20.** *Given  $\omega \in C^\infty(S^4)$ , there is an  $h \in \text{ctran}(S^4, g_0)$  with  $T_h\omega \in S_0$ .*

*Proof.* Recall from Sec. 2 that the identity component of  $\text{ctran}(S^4, g_0)$  is a copy of  $G = \text{SO}_0(5, 1)$ , of which the maximal compact subgroup is  $K = \text{SO}(5)$ . The symmetric space  $G/K$  can be naturally identified with the ball  $B^5$ ; in fact, this is a standard realization of  $H^5$ . The lemma is a simple consequence of the fixed point theorem (applied to the obvious map on  $B^5$ ); a complete proof can be found in [CY].  $\square$

The following is an analogue of the Adams inequality (which involves  $\|\Delta^{m/2}\omega\|$  in dimension  $m$ ) with a proof analogous to that of a result of Aubin [Au] involving  $\|\nabla\omega\|_m$  on  $S^m$ .

**Lemma 9.21.** *If  $\omega \in S_0$ , then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist constants  $C_1(\varepsilon)$  and  $C_2(\varepsilon)$  with*

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int_{S^4} e^{4(\omega - \tilde{\omega})} &\leq C_1(\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{8\pi^2} + \varepsilon \right) \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)^2 + C_2(\varepsilon) \int_{S^4} |d\omega|^2 \\ (9.13) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= C_1(\varepsilon) + \left( \frac{1}{6} + \frac{4\pi^2}{3} \varepsilon \right) \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)^2 + C_2(\varepsilon) \int_{S^4} |d\omega|^2. \end{aligned}$$

(Here all integrals are with respect to  $(dv)_0$ .)

**Remark 9.22.** (9.13) should be compared to (9.10) and (3.8). By Theorem 3.7, the coefficient  $1/8\pi^2$  in (9.10) cannot be improved.

*Proof of Lemma 9.21.* We may assume that  $\text{vol}(g_\omega) = v_0 := 8\pi^2/3$ , since each term in (9.13) is insensitive to constant shifts of  $\omega$ , and these constant shifts keep us within  $\mathcal{S}_0$ . With this assumption, (9.13) is now equivalent to

$$(9.14) \quad 0 \leq 4\bar{\omega} + C_1(\varepsilon) + \left( \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + \varepsilon \right) \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)^2 + C_2(\varepsilon) \int_{S^4} |d\omega|_0^2.$$

Here and below, all integrals are with respect to  $(dv)_0$ . To establish (9.14), cover  $S^4$  by ten cap shaped congruent domains, each centered at one of the *poles* (points at which  $|x_i| = 1$  for some  $i$ , and  $x_j = 0$  for  $j \neq i$ ). Rotating axes if necessary, we may assume that

$$\int_{\Omega_{\delta_1}} e^{4\omega} \geq \frac{v_0}{10}, \quad \Omega_{\delta_1} = \{x \in S^4 \mid \delta_1 \leq x_5 \leq 1\},$$

for some  $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$  which is independent of  $\omega$ . (In fact, we are guaranteed this for any  $\delta_1 > 1/\sqrt{5}$ .) Since  $\int_{S^4} e^{4\omega} x_5 = 0$ , an elementary computation shows that if we choose  $\delta_2 \leq \delta_1/19$ , then

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_{\delta_2}} e^{4\omega} \geq \delta_2 v_0, \quad \tilde{\Omega}_{\delta_2} = \{x \in S^4 \mid -1 \leq x_5 \leq -\delta_2\}.$$

We now choose a cutoff function  $\varphi_1$ , where  $\varphi_1 \equiv 1$  on  $\Omega_{\delta_1}$ ,  $0 \leq \varphi_1 \leq 1$ , and  $\varphi_1 \equiv 0$  off  $\Omega_{\delta_1/2}$ . Let  $\varphi_2$  be the similarly defined cutoff function for  $(\tilde{\Omega}_{\delta_2}, \tilde{\Omega}_{\delta_2/2})$ . Note that the  $\varphi_k$  can be taken to be independent of  $\omega$ , since the  $\delta_k$  are. Applying (9.10) to the functions  $(\omega - \bar{\omega})\varphi_k$ , we obtain

$$(9.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{v_0}{10} &\leq \int_{\Omega_{\delta_1}} e^{4\omega} \leq e^{4\bar{\omega}} \int_{S^4} e^{4(\omega - \bar{\omega})\varphi_1} \\ &\leq e^{4\bar{\omega}} v_0 c_0 \exp \left\{ 4 \int_{S^4} (\omega - \bar{\omega})\varphi_1 + (8\pi^2)^{-1} \int_{S^4} (\Delta[(\omega - \bar{\omega})\varphi_1])^2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$(9.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta_2 v_0 &\leq \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_{\delta_2}} e^{4\omega} \\ &\leq e^{4\bar{\omega}} v_0 c_0 \exp \left\{ 4 \int_{S^4} (\omega - \bar{\omega})\varphi_2 + (8\pi^2)^{-1} \int_{S^4} (\Delta[(\omega - \bar{\omega})\varphi_2])^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now observe that

$$(9.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{S^4} (\Delta[(\omega - \bar{\omega})\varphi_1])^2 &= \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)^2 \varphi_1^2 + 4 \int_{S^4} \langle d\omega, d\varphi_1 \rangle^2 + \int_{S^4} (\Delta\varphi_1)^2 (\omega - \bar{\omega})^2 \\ &\quad - 4 \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)\varphi_1 \langle d\omega, d\varphi_1 \rangle + 2 \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)\varphi_1 (\omega - \bar{\omega}) \Delta\varphi_1 \\ &\quad - 4 \int_{S^4} \langle d\omega, d\varphi_1 \rangle (\omega - \bar{\omega}) \Delta\varphi_1 \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega_{\delta_1/2}} (\Delta\omega)^2 + \varepsilon \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)^2 + C(\varepsilon, \delta_1) \int_{S^4} |d\omega|^2, \end{aligned}$$

for some suitable constant  $C(\varepsilon, \delta_1)$ . Similarly,

$$(9.18) \quad \int_{S^4} (\Delta[(\omega - \bar{\omega})\varphi_2])^2 \leq \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_{\delta_2/2}} (\Delta\omega)^2 + \varepsilon \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)^2 + C(\delta_2, \varepsilon) \int_{S^4} |d\omega|^2.$$

Because the bottom nonzero eigenvalue of the Laplacian on  $S^4$  is 4, we also have

$$(9.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{S^4} (\omega - \bar{\omega})\varphi_k &\leq \int_{S^4} |\omega - \bar{\omega}| \leq \left( \int_{S^4} (\omega - \bar{\omega})^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \int_{S^4} |d\omega|_0^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{16} + \int_{S^4} |d\omega|_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting estimates (9.17) and (9.19) into (9.15), we obtain

$$(9.20) \quad \frac{1}{10} \leq e^{4\bar{\omega}} c_0 \exp \left\{ 1 + (8\pi^2)^{-1} \int_{\Omega_{\delta_1/2}} (\Delta\omega)^2 + \varepsilon \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)^2 + C(\varepsilon, \delta_1) \int_{S^4} |d\omega|_0^2 \right\}.$$

Similarly, from (9.18) and 9.19),

$$(9.21) \quad \delta_2 \leq e^{4\bar{\omega}} c_0 \exp \left\{ 1 + (8\pi^2)^{-1} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_{\delta_2/2}} (\Delta\omega)^2 + \varepsilon \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)^2 + C(\varepsilon, \delta_2) \int_{S^4} |d\omega|_0^2 \right\}.$$

We now multiply (9.20) and (9.21) and take the square root on both sides, noting that  $\Omega_{\delta_1/2}$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}_{\delta_2/2}$  are disjoint regions in  $S^4$ , to obtain:

$$\sqrt{\delta_2/10} \leq e^{4\bar{\omega}} c_0 \exp \left\{ 1 + \left( \frac{1}{16\pi^2} + \varepsilon \right) \int_{S^4} (\Delta\omega)^2 + C(\varepsilon, \delta_1, \delta_2) \int_{S^4} |d\omega|_0^2 \right\}.$$

Since we can make concrete choices of the  $\delta_k$  (any  $\delta_1 > 1/\sqrt{5}$ , and then any  $\delta_2 \leq \delta_1/19$ ), (9.14) follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 9.19.* Given  $\omega \in C^\infty(S^4)$ , we may apply Lemma 9.20 to transform to  $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_0$  with  $\bar{\omega} \sim \omega$ . Assuming without loss of generality that  $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_0$ , the strategy used in the proof of Theorem 9.10 works if we use Lemma 9.21 in place of (9.10).  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [Ad] D. Adams, *A sharp inequality of J. Moser for higher order derivatives*, Annals of Math. **128** (1988), 385–398.
- [Au] T. Aubin, *Fonction de Green et valeurs propres du Laplacien*, J. Math. Pures App. **53** (1974), 347–371.
- [BFG] M. Beals, C. Fefferman, and R. Grossman, *Strictly pseudoconvex domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **8** (1983), 125–322.
- [Bec] W. Beckner, *Sharp Sobolev inequalities on the sphere and the Moser-Trudinger inequality*, preprint.
- [Bes] A. Besse, *Einstein Manifolds*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 3. Folge, Band 10, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [Bl] D. Bleecker, *Determination of a Riemannian metric from the first variation of its spectrum*, Amer. J. Math. **107** (1985), 815–831.
- [Bo] H. Boerner, *Darstellungen von Gruppen*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1955.
- [Bra1] T. Branson, *Differential operators canonically associated to a conformal structure*, Math. Scand. **57** (1985), 293–345.
- [Bra2] T. Branson, *Group representations arising from Lorentz conformal geometry*, J. Funct. Anal. **74** (1987), 199–291.
- [Bra3] T. Branson, *Harmonic analysis in vector bundles associated to the rotation and spin groups*, J. Funct. Anal. **106** (1992), 314–328.
- [BCY] T. Branson, A. S.-Y. Chang, and P. Yang, *Estimates and extremals for zeta function determinants on four-manifolds*, to appear, Commun. Math. Phys. (1992).
- [BG1] T. Branson and P. Gilkey, *The asymptotics of the Laplacian on a manifold with boundary*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **15** (1990), 245–272.
- [BG2] T. Branson and P. Gilkey, *The functional determinant of a four-dimensional boundary value problem*, in preparation.
- [BGØ1] T. Branson, P. Gilkey, and B. Ørsted, *Leading terms in the heat invariants*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **109** (1990), 437–450.
- [BGØ2] T. Branson, P. Gilkey, and B. Ørsted, *Leading terms in the heat invariants for the Laplacians of the de Rham, signature, and spin complexes*, Math. Scand. **66** (1990), 307–319.
- [BØ1] T. Branson and B. Ørsted, *Conformal indices of Riemannian manifolds*, Compositio Math. **60** (1986), 261–293.
- [BØ2] T. Branson and B. Ørsted, *Conformal geometry and global invariants*, Diff. Geom. Appl. **1** (1991), 279–308.
- [BØ3] T. Branson and B. Ørsted, *Explicit functional determinants in four dimensions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **113** (1991), 669–682.
- [Bru] F. Bruhat, *Sur les représentations induites des groupes de Lie*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **84** (1956), 97–205.
- [CY] S.-Y. A. Chang and P. Yang, *Compactness of isospectral conformal metrics on  $S^3$* , Comment. Math. Helvetici **64** (1989), 363–374.
- [ES] M. Eastwood and M. Singer, *A conformally invariant Maxwell gauge*, Phys. Lett. **107A** (1985), 73–74.
- [E1] J. Escobar, *Sharp constant in a Sobolev trace inequality*, Indiana U. Math. J. **37** (1988), 687–698.
- [E2] J. Escobar, *The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary*, J. Differential Geom. **35** (1992), 21–84.
- [F] H. D. Fegan, *Conformally invariant first order differential operators*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford **27** (1976), 371–378.
- [FG] H. D. Fegan and P. Gilkey, *Invariants of the heat equation*, Pacific J. Math. **117** (1985), 233–254.
- [G1] P. Gilkey, *Smooth invariants of a Riemannian manifold*, Adv. in Math. **28** (1978), 1–10.
- [G2] P. Gilkey, *Recursion relations and the asymptotic behavior of the eigenvalues of the Laplacian*, Compositio Math. **38** (1979), 201–240.
- [G3] P. Gilkey, *The spectral geometry of the higher order Laplacian*, Duke Math. J. **47** (1980), 511–528.
- [G4] P. Gilkey, *Invariance Theory, the Heat Equation, and the Atiyah-Singer Index Theorem*, Publish or Perish, Wilmington, Delaware, 1984.
- [G5] P. Gilkey, *Leading terms in asymptotics of the heat equation*, Contemp. Math. **73** (1988), 79–85.

- [GJMS] C. R. Graham, R. Jenne, L. Mason, and G. Sparling, *Conformally invariant powers of the Laplacian, I: existence*, to appear, J. London Math. Soc.
- [Kl] F. Klein, *Vorlesungen über Höhere Geometrie*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1926.
- [Kn] A. Knapp, *Representation Theory of Semisimple Groups*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1986.
- [Ko] Y. Kosmann, *Dérivées de Lie des spineurs*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) XCI (1972), 317–395.
- [Lic] A. Lichnerowicz, *Spineurs harmoniques*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 257 (1963), 7–9.
- [Lie] E. Lieb, *Sharp constants in the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev and related inequalities*, Annals of Math. 118 (1983), 349–374.
- [M] V. Molčanov, *Representations of pseudo-orthogonal groups associated with a cone*, Math. USSR Sb. 10 (1970), 333–347.
- [Ob] Obata, *The conjectures on conformal transformations of Riemannian manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. 6 (1971), 247–258.
- [O’N] R. O’Neil, *Convolution operators and  $L(p, q)$  spaces*, Duke Math. J. 30 (1963), 129–142.
- [On] E. Onofri, *On the positivity of the effective action in a theory of random surfaces*, Commun. Math. Phys. 86 (1982), 321–326.
- [OPS1] B. Osgood, R. Phillips, and P. Sarnak, *Extremals of determinants of Laplacians*, J. Funct. Anal. 80 (1988), 148–211.
- [OPS2] B. Osgood, R. Phillips, and P. Sarnak, *Compact isospectral sets of surfaces*, J. Funct. Anal. 80 (1988), 212–234.
- [P] S. Paneitz, *A quartic conformally covariant differential operator for arbitrary pseudo-Riemannian manifolds*, preprint, 1983.
- [Sch] R. Schimming, *Lineare Differentialoperatoren zweiter Ordnung mit metrischem Hauptteil und die Methode der Koinzidenzwerte in der Riemannschen Geometrie*, Beiträge Anal. 15 (1981), 77–91.
- [Scho] R. Schoen, *Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature*, J. Differential Geom. 20 (1984), 479–495.
- [SW] E. Stein and G. Weiss, *Generalization of the Cauchy-Riemann equations and representations of the rotation group*, Amer. J. Math. 90 (1968), 163–196.
- [St] R. Strichartz, *Linear algebra of curvature tensors and their covariant derivatives*, Canad. J. Math. 40 (1988), 1105–1143.
- [Va] I. Vardi, *Determinants of Laplacians and multiple gamma functions*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 19 (1988), 493–507.
- [Vo] D. Vogan, *Unitary Representations of Reductive Lie Groups*, Annals of Mathematics Studies 118, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1987.
- [Wal] A. Walther, *Anschauliches zur Riemannschen Zetafunktion*, Acta Math. 48 (1926), 393–400.
- [War] G. Warner, *Harmonic Analysis on Semi-Simple Lie Groups I*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.
- [We] W. Weisberger, *Normalization of the path integral measure and the coupling constants for bosonic strings*, Nuclear Physics B 284 (1987), 171–200.
- [WW] E. T. Whittaker and G. N. Watson, *A Course of Modern Analysis*, fourth edition, Cambridge University Press, 1946.
- [Wü] V. Wunsch, *On conformally invariant differential operators*, Math. Nachr. 129 (1986), 269–281.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY IA 52242 USA; MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, ROSKILDE UNIVERSITY, DK-4000 ROSKILDE, DENMARK, and SONDERFORSCHUNGSBEREICH 170, BUNSENSTRASSE 3-5, D-3400 GÖTTINGEN, GERMANY

E-mail: branson@math.uiowa.edu

- 1/78 "TANKER OM EN PRAKSIS" - et matematikprojekt.  
Projektrapport af: Anne Jensen, Lena Lindenskov, Marianne Kesselhahn og Nicolai Lomholt.  
Vejleder: Anders Madsen
- 2/78 "OPTIMERING" - Menneskets forøgede beherskelsermuligheder af natur og samfund.  
Projektrapport af: Tom J. Andersen, Tommy R. Andersen, Gert Krenøe og Peter H. Lassen  
Vejleder: Bernhelm Boss.
- 3/78 "OPCAVESAMLING", breddekursus i fysik.  
Af: Lasse Rasmussen, Aage Bonde Kræmmer og Jens Højgaard Jensen.
- 4/78 "TRE ESSAYS" - om matematikundervisning, matematiklæreruddannelsen og videnskabsrindalismen.  
Af: Mogens Niss  
Nr. 4 er p.t. udgået.
- 5/78 "BIBLIOGRAFISK VEJLEDNING til studiet af DEN MODERNE FYSIKS HISTORIE".  
Af: Helge Kragh.  
Nr. 5 er p.t. udgået.
- 6/78 "NOGLE ARTIKLER OG DEBATINDLÆG OM - læreruddannelse og undervisning i fysik, og - de naturvidenskabelige fags situation efter studenteroprøret".  
Af: Karin Beyer, Jens Højgaard Jensen og Bent C. Jørgensen.
- 7/78 "MATEMATIKKENS FORHOLD TIL SAMFUNDSØKONOMIEN".  
Af: B.V. Gnedenko.  
Nr. 7 er udgået.
- 8/78 "DYNAMIK OG DIAGRAMMER". Introduktion til energy-bond-graph formalismen.  
Af: Peder Voetmann Christiansen.
- 9/78 "OM PRAKSIS' INDFLYDELSE PÅ MATEMATIKKENS UDVIKLING". - Motiver til Kepler's: "Nova Stereometria Doliorum Vinariorum".  
Projektrapport af: Lasse Rasmussen.  
Vejleder: Anders Madsen.
- 
- 10/79 "TERMODYNAMIK I GYMNASIET".  
Projektrapport af: Jan Christensen og Jeanne Mortensen.  
Vejledere: Karin Beyer og Peder Voetmann Christiansen.
- 11/79 "STATISTISKE MATERIALER".  
Af: Jørgen Larsen.
- 12/79 "LINEÆRE DIFFERENTIALLIGNINGER OG DIFFERENTIALLIGNINGSSYSTEMER".  
Af: Mogens Brun Heefelt.  
Nr. 12 er udgået.
- 13/79 "CAVENDISH'S FORSØG I GYMNASIET".  
Projektrapport af: Gert Kreinøe.  
Vejleder: Albert Chr. Paulsen.
- 14/79 "BOOKS ABOUT MATHEMATICS: History, Philosophy, Education, Models, System Theory, and Works of".  
Af: Else Høyrup.  
Nr. 14 er p.t. udgået.
- 15/79 "STRUKTUREL STABILITET OG KATASTROFER i systemer i og udenfor termodynamisk ligevægt".  
Specialeopgave af: Leif S. Striegler.  
Vejleder: Peder Voetmann Christiansen.
- 16/79 "STATISTIK I KRÆFTFORSKNINGEN".  
Projektrapport af: Michael Olsen og Jørn Jensen.  
Vejleder: Jørgen Larsen.
- 17/79 "AT SPØRGE OG AT SVARE i fysikundervisningen".  
Af: Albert Christian Paulsen.
- 18/79 "MATHEMATICS AND THE REAL WORLD", Proceedings af an International Workshop, Roskilde University Centre, Denmark, 1978.  
Preprint.  
Af: Bernhelm Booss og Mogens Niss (eds.)
- 19/79 "GEOMETRI, SKOLE OG VIRKELIGHED".  
Projektrapport af: Tom J. Andersen, Tommy R. Andersen og Per H.H. Larsen.  
Vejleder: Mogens Niss.
- 20/79 "STATISTISKE MODELLER TIL BESTEMMELSE AF SIKRE DOSER FOR CARCINOGENE STOFFER".  
Projektrapport af: Michael Olsen og Jørn Jensen.  
Vejleder: Jørgen Larsen
- 21/79 "KONTROL I GYMNASIET-FORMÅL OG KONSEKVENSER".  
Projektrapport af: Crilles Bacher, Per S.Jensen, Preben Jensen og Torben Nysteen.
- 22/79 "SEMIOTIK OG SYSTEMEGENSKABER (1)".  
1-port lineært response og støj i fysikken.  
Af: Peder Voetmann Christiansen.
- 23/79 "ON THE HISTORY OF EARLY WAVE MECHANICS - with special emphasis on the role of reality".  
Af: Helge Kragh.
- 
- 24/80 "MATEMATIKOPFATTELSE hos 2.C'ERE".  
a+b 1. En analyse. 2. Interviewmateriale.  
Projektrapport af: Jan Christensen og Knud Lindhardt Rasmussen.  
Vejleder: Mogens Niss.
- 25/80 "EKSAMENSOPGAVER", Dybdemodul/fysik 1974-79.
- 26/80 "OM MATEMATISKE MODELLER".  
En projektrapport og to artikler.  
Af: Jens Højgaard Jensen m.fl.
- 27/80 "METHODOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE IN PAUL DIRAC'S PHYSICS".  
Af: Helge Kragh.
- 28/80 "DILEMTRISK RELAXATION" - et forslag til en ny model bygget på væskernes viscoelastiske egenskaber".  
Projektrapport af: Gert Kreinøe.  
Vejleder: Niels Boye Olsen.
- 29/80 "ODIN - undervisningsmateriale til et kursus i differentiaalligningsmodeller".  
Projektrapport af: Tommy R. Andersen, Per H.H. Larsen og Peter H. Lassen.  
Vejleder: Mogens Brun Heefelt.
- 30/80 "FUSIONSENERGIEN - - - ATOMSAMFUNDETS ENDESTATION".  
Af: Oluf Danielsen.  
Nr. 30 er udgået.
- 31/80 "VIDENSKABSTEORETISKE PROBLEMER VED UNDERVISNINGSSYSTEMER BASERET PÅ MØNGELÆRE".  
Projektrapport af: Troels Lange og Jørgen Karrebæk.  
Vejleder: Stig Andur Pedersen.  
Nr. 31 er p.t. udgået.
- 32/80 "POLYMERE STOFFERS VISCOELASTISKE EGENSKABER - BELYST VED HJÆLP AF MEKANISKE IMPEDANSMÅLINGER - GER MOSSBAUEREFFEKTMÅLINGER".  
Projektrapport af: Crilles Bacher og Preben Jensen.  
Vejledere: Niels Boye Olsen og Peder Voetmann Christiansen.
- 33/80 "KONSTITUERING AF FAG INDEN FOR TEKNISK - NATURVIDENSKABELIGE UDDANNELSER. I-II".  
Af: Arne Jakobsen.
- 34/80 "ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF WIND ENERGY UTILIZATION".  
ENERGY SERIES NO. I.  
Af: Bent Sørensen  
Nr. 34 er udgået.



- 35/80 "HISTORISKE STUDIER I DEN NYERE ATOMFYSIKS UDVIKLING".  
Af: Helge Kragh.
- 36/80 "HVAD ER MENINGEN MED MATEMATIKUNDERVISNINGEN?".  
Fire artikler.  
Af: Mogens Niss.
- 37/80 "RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY STORAGE".  
ENERGY SERIES NO. 2.  
Af: Bent Sørensen.
- 
- 38/81 "TIL EN HISTORIETEORI OM NATURERKENDELSE, TEKNOLOGI OG SAMFUND".  
Projekt rapport af: Erik Gade, Hans Hedal, Henrik Lau og Finn Physant.  
Vejledere: Stig Andur Pedersen, Helge Kragh og Ib Thiersen.  
Nr. 38 er p.t. udgivet.
- 39/81 "TIL KRITIKKEN AF VERSTØKONOMIEN".  
Af: Jens Højgaard Jensen.
- 40/81 "TELEKOMMUNIKATION I DANMARK - oplæg til en teknologivurdering".  
Projekt rapport af: Arne Jørgensen, Bruno Petersen og Jan Vedde.  
Vejleder: Per Nørgaard.
- 41/81 "PLANNING AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO THE INTRODUCTION OF RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES INTO ENERGY SUPPLY SYSTEMS".  
ENERGY SERIES NO. 3.  
Af: Bent Sørensen.
- 42/81 "VIDENSAB TEORI SAMFUND - En introduktion til materialistiske videnskabsopfattelser".  
Af: Helge Kragh og Stig Andur Pedersen.
- 43/81 1. "COMPARATIVE RISK ASSESSMENT OF TOTAL ENERGY SYSTEMS".  
2. "ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF DECENTRALIZATION".  
ENERGY SERIES NO. 4.  
Af: Bent Sørensen.
- 44/81 "HISTORISKE UNDERSØGELSER AF DE EKSPERIMENTELLE FORUDSÆTNINGER FOR RUTHERFORDS ATOMMODEL".  
Projekt rapport af: Niels Thor Nielsen.  
Vejleder: Bent C. Jørgensen.
- 
- 45/82 Er aldrig udkommet.
- 46/82 "EKSEMPLARISK UNDERVISNING OG FYSISK ERKENDELSE-1+11 ILLUSTRERET VED TO EKSEMPLER".  
Projekt rapport af: Torben O. Olsen, Lasse Rasmussen og Niels Dreyer Sørensen.  
Vejleder: Bent C. Jørgensen.
- 47/82 "BARSEBÄCK OG DET VÆRST OFFICIELT-TÆNKELIGE UHELD".  
ENERGY SERIES NO. 5.  
Af: Bent Sørensen.
- 48/82 "EN UNDERSØGELSE AF MATEMATIKUNDERVISNINGEN PÅ ADGANGSKURSUS TIL KØBENHAVNS TEKNIKUM".  
Projekt rapport af: Lis Eilertzen, Jørgen Karrebæk, Troels Lange, Preben Nørregaard, Lissi Pedersen, Laust Rishøj, Lill Røn og Isaac Showiki.  
Vejleder: Mogens Niss.
- 49/82 "ANALYSE AF MULTISPEKTRALE SATELLITBILLEDER".  
Projekt rapport af: Preben Nørregaard.  
Vejledere: Jørgen Larsen og Rasmus Ole Rasmussen.
- 50/82 "HERSLEV - MULIGHEDER FOR VEDVARENDE ENERGI I EN LANDSBY".  
ENERGY SERIES NO. 6.  
Rapport af: Bent Christensen, Bent Hove Jensen, Dennis B. Møller, Bjarne Laursen, Bjarne Lillethorup og Jacob Mørch Pedersen.  
Vejleder: Bent Sørensen.
- 51/82 "HVAD KAN DER GØRES FOR AT AFHJÆLPE PIGERS BLOKERING OVERFOR MATEMATIK?".  
Projekt rapport af: Lis Eilertzen, Lissi Pedersen, Lill Røn og Susanne Stender.
- 52/82 "DESUSPENSION OF SPLITTING ELLIPTIC SYMBOLS".  
Af: Bernhelm Booss og Krzysztof Wojciechowski.
- 53/82 "THE CONSTITUTION OF SUBJECTS IN ENGINEERING EDUCATION".  
Af: Arne Jacobsen og Stig Andur Pedersen.
- 54/82 "FUTURES RESEARCH" - A Philosophical Analysis of Its Subject-Matter and Methods.  
Af: Stig Andur Pedersen og Johannes Witt-Hansen.
- 55/82 "MATEMATISKE MODELLER" - Litteratur på Roskilde Universitetsbibliotek.  
En biografi.  
Af: Else Højrup.  
Vedr. tekst nr. 55/82 se også tekst nr. 62/83.
- 56/82 "EN - TO - MANGE" -  
En undersøgelse af matematisk økologi.  
Projekt rapport af: Troels Lange.  
Vejleder: Anders Madsen.
- 
- 57/83 "ASPECT EKSPERIMENTET"-  
Skulte variable i kvantemekanikken?  
Projekt rapport af: Tom Juul Andersen.  
Vejleder: Peder Voetmann Christiansen.  
Nr. 57 er udgivet.
- 58/83 "MATEMATISKE VANDRINGER" - Modelbetragtninger over spredning af dyr mellem småbiotoper i agerlandet.  
Projekt rapport af: Per Hammershøj Jensen og Lene Vagn Rasmussen.  
Vejleder: Jørgen Larsen.
- 59/83 "THE METHODOLOGY OF ENERGY PLANNING".  
ENERGY SERIES NO. 7.  
Af: Bent Sørensen.
- 60/83 "MATEMATISK MODEKSPERTISE"- et eksempel.  
Projekt rapport af: Erik O. Gade, Jørgen Karrebæk og Preben Nørregaard.  
Vejleder: Anders Madsen.
- 61/83 "FYSIKS IDEOLOGISKE FUNKTION, SOM ET EKSEMPEL PÅ EN NATURVIDENSAB - HISTORISK SET".  
Projekt rapport af: Annette Post Nielsen.  
Vejledere: Jens Højrup, Jens Højgaard Jensen og Jørgen Vogelius.
- 62/83 "MATEMATISKE MODELLER" - Litteratur på Roskilde Universitetsbibliotek.  
En biografi 2. rev. udgave.  
Af: Else Højrup.
- 63/83 "GREATING ENERGY FUTURES: A SHORT GUIDE TO ENERGY PLANNING".  
ENERGY SERIES No. 8.  
Af: David Crossley og Bent Sørensen.
- 64/83 "VON MATEMATIK UND KRIEG".  
Af: Bernhelm Booss og Jens Højrup.
- 65/83 "ANVENDT MATEMATIK - TEORI ELLER PRAKSIS".  
Projekt rapport af: Per Hedegård Andersen, Kirsten Habekost, Carsten Holst-Jensen, Annelise von Moos, Else Marie Pedersen og Erling Møller Pedersen.  
Vejledere: Bernhelm Booss og Klaus Grünbaum.
- 66/83 "MATEMATISKE MODELLER FOR PERIODISK SELEKTION I ESCHERICHIA COLI".  
Projekt rapport af: Hanne Lisbet Andersen, Ole Richard Jensen og Klavs Frisdahl.  
Vejledere: Jørgen Larsen og Anders Hede Madsen.
- 67/83 "ELEPSOIDE METODEN - EN NY METODE TIL LINEÆR PROGRAMMERING?".  
Projekt rapport af: Lone Billmann og Lars Boye.  
Vejleder: Mogens Brun Heefelt.
- 68/83 "STOKASTISKE MODELLER I POPULATIONSGENETIK" - til kritikken af teoriladede modeller.  
Projekt rapport af: Lise Odgård Gade, Susanne Hansén, Michael Hviid og Frank Mølgård Olsen.  
Vejleder: Jørgen Larsen.

- 69/83 "ELEVFORUDSÆTNINGER I FYSIK"  
- en test i l.g med kommentarer.  
Af: Albert C. Paulsen.
- 70/83 "INDLÆRINGS - OG FORMIDLINGSPROBLEMER I MATEMATIK PÅ VOKSENUNDERVISNINGSNIVEAU".  
Projektrapport af: Hanne Lisbet Andersen, Torben J. Andreasen, Svend Åge Houmann, Helle Glerup Jensen, Keld Fl. Nielsen, Lene Vagn Rasmussen.  
Vejleder: Klaus Grünbaum og Anders Hede Madsen.
- 71/83 "PIGER OG FYSIK"  
- et problem og en udfordring for skolen?  
Af: Karin Beyer, Sussanne Blegaa, Birthe Olsen, Jette Reich og Mette Vedelsby.
- 72/83 "VERDEN IFVLGE PEIRCE" - to metafysiske essays, om og af C.S Peirce.  
Af: Peder Voetmann Christiansen.
- 73/83 "'EN ENERGIANALYSE AF LANDBRUG"  
- økologisk contra traditionelt.  
ENERGY SERIES NO. 9  
Specialeopgave i fysik af: Bent Hove Jensen.  
Vejleder: Bent Sørensen.
- 
- 74/84 "MINIATURISERING AF MIKROELEKTRONIK" - om videnskabeliggjort teknologi og nytten af at lære fysik.  
Projektrapport af: Bodil Harder og Linda Szko-tak Jensen.  
Vejledere: Jens Højgaard Jensen og Bent C. Jørgensen.
- 75/84 "MATEMATIKUNDERVISNINGEN I FREMTIDENS GYMNASIUM"  
- Case: Lineær programmering.  
Projektrapport af: Morten Blomhøj, Klavs Frisdahl og Frank Mølgaard Olsen.  
Vejledere: Mogens Brun Heefelt og Jens Bjørneboe.
- 76/84 "KERNEKRAFT I DANMARK?" - Et høringssvar indkaldt af miljøministeriet, med kritik af miljøstyrelsens rapporter af 15. marts 1984.  
ENERGY SERIES No. 10  
Af: Niels Boye Olsen og Bent Sørensen.
- 77/84 "POLITISKE INDEKS - FUP ELLER FAKTA?"  
Opinionsundersøgelser belyst ved statistiske modeller.  
Projektrapport af: Svend Åge Houmann, Keld Nielsen og Susanne Stender.  
Vejledere: Jørgen Larsen og Jens Bjørneboe.
- 78/84 "JÆVNSTRØMSLEDNINGSEVNE OG GITTERSTRUKTUR I AMORFT GERMANIUM".  
Specialrapport af: Hans Hedal, Frank C. Ludvigsen og Finn C. Physant.  
Vejleder: Niels Boye Olsen.
- 79/84 "MATEMATIK OG ALMENDANNELSE".  
Projektrapport af: Henrik Ooster, Mikael Wennerberg Johansen, Povl Kattler, Birgitte Lydholm og Morten Overgaard Nielsen.  
Vejleder: Bernhelm Booss.
- 80/84 "KURSUSMATERIALE TIL MATEMATIK B".  
Af: Mogens Brun Heefelt.
- 81/84 "FREKVENSAFHÆNGIG LEDNINGSEVNE I AMORFT GERMANIUM".  
Specialrapport af: Jørgen Wind Petersen og Jan Christensen.  
Vejleder: Niels Boye Olsen.
- 82/84 "MATEMATIK - OG FYSIKUNDERVISNINGEN I DET AUTOMATISEREDE SAMFUND".  
Rapport fra et seminar afholdt i Hvidovre 25-27 april 1983.  
Red.: Jens Højgaard Jensen, Bent C. Jørgensen og Mogens Niss.
- 83/84 "ON THE QUANTIFICATION OF SECURITY":  
PEACE RESEARCH SERIES NO. 1.  
Af: Bent Sørensen  
nr. 83 er p.t. udgået
- 84/84 "NOGLE ARTIKLER OM MATEMATIK, FYSIK OG ALMENDANNELSE".  
Af: Jens Højgaard Jensen, Mogens Niss m. fl.
- 85/84 "CENTRIFUGALREGULATORER OG MATEMATIK".  
Specialrapport af: Per Hedegård Andersen, Carsten Holst-Jensen, Else Marie Pedersen og Erling Møller Pedersen.  
Vejleder: Stig Andur Pedersen.
- 86/84 "SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF ALTERNATIVE DEFENSE OPTIONS FOR WESTERN EUROPE".  
PEACE RESEARCH SERIES NO. 2  
Af: Bent Sørensen.
- 87/84 "A SIMPLE MODEL OF AC HOPPING CONDUCTIVITY IN DISORDERED SOLIDS".  
Af: Jeppe C. Dyre.
- 88/84 "RISE, FALL AND RESURRECTION OF INFINITESIMALS".  
Af: Detlef Laugwitz.
- 89/84 "FJERNVARMEOPTIMERING".  
Af: Bjarne Lillethorup og Jacob Mørch Pedersen.
- 90/84 "ENERGI I L.G - EN TEORI FOR TILFREMELÆGGELSE".  
Af: Albert Chr. Paulsen.
- 
- 91/85 "KVANTETEORI FOR GYMNASIET".  
1. Lærervejledning  
Projektrapport af: Biger Lundgren, Henning Sten Hansen og John Johansson.  
Vejleder: Torsten Meyer.
- 92/85 "KVANTETEORI FOR GYMNASIET".  
2. Materiale  
Projektrapport af: Biger Lundgren, Henning Sten Hansen og John Johansson.  
Vejleder: Torsten Meyer.
- 93/85 "THE SEMIOTICS OF QUANTUM - NON - LOCALITY".  
Af: Peder Voetmann Christiansen.
- 94/85 "TREENIGHEDEN BOURBAKI - generalen, matematikeren og ånden".  
Projektrapport af: Morten Blomhøj, Klavs Frisdahl og Frank M. Olsen.  
Vejleder: Mogens Niss.
- 95/85 "AN ALTERNATIV DEFENSE PLAN FOR WESTERN EUROPE".  
PEACE RESEARCH SERIES NO. 3  
Af: Bent Sørensen
- 96/85 "ASPEKTER VED KRAFTVARMEFORSYNING".  
Af: Bjarne Lillethorup.  
Vejleder: Bent Sørensen.
- 97/85 "ON THE PHYSICS OF A.C. HOPPING CONDUCTIVITY".  
Af: Jeppe C. Dyre.
- 98/85 "VALGMULIGHEDER I INFORMATIONSAlderEN".  
Af: Bent Sørensen.
- 99/85 "Der er langt fra Q til R".  
Projektrapport af: Niels Jørgensen og Mikael Klintonp.  
Vejleder: Stig Andur Pedersen.
- 100/85 "TALSYSTEMETS OPBYGNING".  
Af: Mogens Niss.
- 101/85 "EXTENDED MOMENTUM THEORY FOR WINDMILLS IN PERTURBATIVE FORM".  
Af: Ganesh Sengupta.
- 102/85 OPSTILLING OG ANALYSE AF MATEMATISKE MODELLER, BELYST VED MODELLER OVER KØERS FODEROPTAGELSE OG - OMSÆTNING".  
Projektrapport af: Lis Eilertzen, Kirsten Habekost, Lill Røn og Susanne Stender.  
Vejleder: Klaus Grünbaum.

- 103/85 "ØDSLE KOLDKRIGERE OG VIDENSKABENS LYSE IDEER".  
 Projekt rapport af: Niels Ole Dam og Kurt Jensen.  
 Vejleder: Bent Sørensen.
- 104/85 "ANALOGREGNEMASKINEN OG LORENZLIGNINGER".  
 Af: Jens Jøger.
- 105/85 "THE FREQUENCY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPECIFIC HEAT OF THE GLASS REANSTITIOT".  
 Af: Tage Christensen.
- "A SIMPLE MODEL AF AC HOPPING CONDUCTIVITY".  
 Af: Jeppe C. Dyre.  
 Contributions to the Third International Conference on the Structure of Non - Crystalline Materials held in Grenoble July 1985.
- 106/85 "QUANTUM THEORY OF EXTENDED PARTICLES".  
 Af: Bent Sørensen.
- 107/85 "EN MYG GØR INGEN EPIDEMI".  
 - flodblindhed som eksempel på matematisk modellering af et epidemiologisk problem.  
 Projekt rapport af: Per Hedegård Andersen, Lars Boye, Carsten Holst Jensen, Else Marie Pedersen og Erling Møller Pedersen.  
 Vejleder: Jesper Larsen.
- 108/85 "APPLICATIONS AND MODELLING IN THE MATHEMATICS CURRICULUM" - state and trends -  
 Af: Mogens Niss.
- 109/85 "COX I STUDIETILLEN" - Cox's regressionsmodel anvendt på studenteroplysninger fra RUC.  
 Projekt rapport af: Mikael Wemmerberg Johansen, Poul Kattler og Torben J. Andreasen.  
 Vejleder: Jørgen Larsen.
- 110/85 "PLANNING FOR SECURITY".  
 Af: Bent Sørensen
- 111/85 "JORDEN RUNDT PÅ FLADE KORT".  
 Projekt rapport af: Birgit Andresen, Beatriz Quinones og Jimmy Staal.  
 Vejleder: Mogens Niss.
- 112/85 "VIDENSKABELIGGØRELSE AF DANSK TEKNOLOGISK INNOVATION FREM TIL 1950 - BELYST VED EKSEMPLER".  
 Projekt rapport af: Erik Odgaard Gade, Hans Hedal, Frank C. Ludvigsen, Annette Post Nielsen og Finn Physant.  
 Vejleder: Claus Bryld og Bent C. Jørgensen.
- 113/85 "DESUSPENSION OF SPLITTING ELLIPTIC SYMBOLS 11".  
 Af: Bernhelm Booss og Krzysztof Wojciechowski.
- 114/85 "ANVENDELSE AF GRAFISKE METODER TIL ANALYSE AF KONTIGENSTABELLER".  
 Projekt rapport af: Lone Billmann, Ole R. Jensen og Anne-Lise von Moos.  
 Vejleder: Jørgen Larsen.
- 115/85 "MATEMATIKKENS UDVIKLING OP TIL RENESSANCEN".  
 Af: Mogens Niss.
- 116/85 "A PHENOMENOLOGICAL MODEL FOR THE MEYER-NELDEL RULE".  
 Af: Jeppe C. Dyre.
- 117/85 "KRAFT & FJERNVARMEOPTIMERING".  
 Af: Jacob Mørch Pedersen.  
 Vejleder: Bent Sørensen
- 118/85 "TILFÆLDIGHEDEN OG NØVENDIGHEDEN IFØLGE PEIRCE OG FYSIKKEN".  
 Af: Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 119/86 "DET ER GANSKE VIST - - EUKLIDS FEMTE POSTULAT KUNNE NOK SKABE RØRE I ANDEDÅNEN".  
 Af: Iben Maj Christiansen  
 Vejleder: Mogens Niss.
- 120/86 "ET ANTAL STATISTISKE STANDARDMODELLER".  
 Af: Jørgen Larsen
- 121/86 "SIMULATION I KONTINUERT TID".  
 Af: Peder Voetmann Christiansen.
- 122/86 "ON THE MECHANISM OF GLASS IONIC CONDUCTIVITY".  
 Af: Jeppe C. Dyre.
- 123/86 "GYMNASIEFYSIKKEN OG DEN STORE VERDEN".  
 Fysiklærerforeningen, IMFUFA, RUC.
- 124/86 "OPGAVESAMLING I MATEMATIK".  
 Samtlige opgaver stillet i tiden 1974-jan. 1986.
- 125/86 "UVBY, 6 - systemet - en effektiv fotometrisk spektral-klassifikation af B-, A- og F-stjerner".  
 Projekt rapport af: Birger Lundgren.
- 126/86 "OM UDVIKLINGEN AF DEN SPECIELLE RELATIVITETSTEORI".  
 Projekt rapport af: Lise Odgaard & Linda Szkotak Jensen  
 Vejledere: Karin Beyer & Stig Andur Pedersen.
- 127/86 "GALOIS' BIDRAG TIL UDVIKLINGEN AF DEN ABSTRAKTE ALGEBRA".  
 Projekt rapport af: Pernille Sand, Heine Larsen & Lars Frandsen.  
 Vejleder: Mogens Niss.
- 128/86 "SMÅKRYB" - om ikke-standard analyse.  
 Projekt rapport af: Niels Jørgensen & Mikael Klintonp.  
 Vejleder: Jeppe Dyre.
- 129/86 "PHYSICS IN SOCIETY"  
 Lecture Notes 1983 (1986)  
 Af: Bent Sørensen
- 130/86 "Studies in Wind Power"  
 Af: Bent Sørensen
- 131/86 "FYSIK OG SAMFUND" - Et integreret fysik/historie-projekt om naturanskuelsens historiske udvikling og dens samfundsmæssige betingethed.  
 Projekt rapport af: Jakob Heckscher, Søren Brønd, Andy Wierød.  
 Vejledere: Jens Høyrup, Jørgen Vogelius, Jens Højgaard Jensen.
- 132/86 "FYSIK OG DANNEELSE"  
 Projekt rapport af: Søren Brønd, Andy Wierød.  
 Vejledere: Karin Beyer, Jørgen Vogelius.
- 133/86 "CHERNOBYL ACCIDENT: ASSESSING THE DATA. ENERGY SERIES NO. 15.  
 Af: Bent Sørensen.
- 
- 134/87 "THE D.C. AND THE A.C. ELECTRICAL TRANSPORT IN AsSeTe SYSTEM"  
 Authors: M.B.El-Den, N.B.Olsen, Ib Høst Pedersen, Petr Visčor
- 135/87 "INTUITIONISTISK MATEMATIKS METODER OG ERKENDELSESTEORETISKE FORUDSETNINGER"  
 MATEMATIKSPECIALE: Claus Larsen  
 Vejledere: Anton Jensen og Stig Andur Pedersen
- 136/87 "Mystisk og naturlig filosofi: En skitse af kristendommens første og andet møde med græsk filosofi"  
 Projekt rapport af Frank Colding Ludvigsen  
 Vejledere: Historie: Ib Thiersen  
 Fysik: Jens Højgaard Jensen
- 137/87 "HOPMODELLER FOR ELEKTRISK LEDNING I UORDNEDE FASTE STOFFER" - Resume af licentiatafhandling  
 Af: Jeppe Dyre  
 Vejledere: Niels Boye Olsen og Peder Voetmann Christiansen.

- 138/87 "JOSEPHSON EFFECT AND CIRCLE MAP."  
Paper presented at The International Workshop on Teaching Nonlinear Phenomena at Universities and Schools, "Chaos in Education". Balaton, Hungary, 26 April-2 May 1987.  
By: Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 139/87 "Machbarkeit nichtbeherrschbarer Technik durch Fortschritte in der Erkennbarkeit der Natur"  
Af: Bernhelm Booss-Bavnbek  
Martin Bohle-Carbonell
- 140/87 "ON THE TOPOLOGY OF SPACES OF HOLOMORPHIC MAPS"  
By: Jens Gravesen
- 141/87 "RADIOMETERS UDVIKLING AF BLODGASAPPARATUR - ET TEKNOLOGIHISTORISK PROJEKT"  
Projektrapport af Finn C. Physant  
Vejleder: Ib Thiersen
- 142/87 "The Calderón Projektor for Operators With Splitting Elliptic Symbols"  
by: Bernhelm Booss-Bavnbek og  
Krzysztof P. Wojciechowski
- 143/87 "Kursusmateriale til Matematik på NAT-BAS"  
af: Mogens Brun Heefelt
- 144/87 "Context and Non-Locality - A Peircean Approach"  
Paper presented at the Symposium on the Foundations of Modern Physics The Copenhagen Interpretation 60 Years after the Como Lecture. Joensuu, Finland, 6 - 8 august 1987.  
By: Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 145/87 "AIMS AND SCOPE OF APPLICATIONS AND MODELLING IN MATHEMATICS CURRICULA"  
Manuscript of a plenary lecture delivered at ICMTA 3, Kassel, FRG 8.-11.9.1987  
By: Mogens Niss
- 146/87 "BESTEMMELSE AF BULKRESISTIVITETEN I SILICIUM"  
- en ny frekvensbaseret målemetode.  
Fysikspeciale af Jan Vedde  
Vejledere: Niels Boye Olsen & Petr Višćor
- 147/87 "Rapport om BIS på NAT-BAS"  
redigeret af: Mogens Brun Heefelt
- 148/87 "Naturvidenskabsundervisning med Samfundsperspektiv"  
af: Peter Colding-Jørgensen DLH  
Albert Chr. Paulsen
- 149/87 "In-Situ Measurements of the density of amorphous germanium prepared in ultra high vacuum"  
by: Petr Višćor
- 150/87 "Structure and the Existence of the first sharp diffraction peak in amorphous germanium prepared in UHV and measured in-situ"  
by: Petr Višćor
- 151/87 "DYNAMISK PROGRAMMERING"  
Matematikprojekt af:  
Birgit Andresen, Keld Nielsen og Jimmy Staal  
Vejleder: Mogens Niss
- 152/87 "PSEUDO-DIFFERENTIAL PROJECTIONS AND THE TOPOLOGY OF CERTAIN SPACES OF ELLIPTIC BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS"  
by: Bernhelm Booss-Bavnbek  
Krzysztof P. Wojciechowski
- 153/87 "HALVLEDERTEKNOLOGIENS UDVIKLING MELLEM MILITÆRE OG CIVILE KREFTER"  
Et eksempel på humanistisk teknologihistorie  
Historiespeciale  
Af: Hans Hedal  
Vejleder: Ib Thiersen
- 154/87 "MASTER EQUATION APPROACH TO VISCOUS LIQUIDS AND THE GLASS TRANSITION"  
By: Jeppe Dyre
- 155/87 "A NOTE ON THE ACTION OF THE POISSON SOLUTION OPERATOR TO THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM FOR A FORMALLY SELFADJOINT DIFFERENTIAL OPERATOR"  
by: Michael Pedersen
- 156/87 "THE RANDOM FREE ENERGY BARRIER MODEL FOR AC CONDUCTION IN DISORDERED SOLIDS"  
by: Jeppe C. Dyre
- 157/87 "STABILIZATION OF PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS BY FINITE DIMENSIONAL BOUNDARY FEEDBACK CONTROL: A pseudo-differential approach."  
by: Michael Pedersen
- 158/87 "UNIFIED FORMALISM FOR EXCESS CURRENT NOISE IN RANDOM WALK MODELS"  
by: Jeppe Dyre
- 159/87 "STUDIES IN SOLAR ENERGY"  
by: Bent Sørensen
- 160/87 "LOOP GROUPS AND INSTANTONS IN DIMENSION TWO"  
by: Jens Gravesen
- 161/87 "PSEUDO-DIFFERENTIAL PERTURBATIONS AND STABILIZATION OF DISTRIBUTED PARAMETER SYSTEMS: Dirichlet feedback control problems"  
by: Michael Pedersen
- 162/87 "PIGER & FYSIK - OG MEGET MERE"  
AF: Karin Beyer, Sussanne Blegaa, Birthe Olsen, Jette Reich, Mette Vedelsby
- 163/87 "EN MATEMATISK MODEL TIL BESTEMMELSE AF PERMEABILITETEN FOR BLOD-NETHINDE-BARRIEREN"  
Af: Finn Langberg, Michael Jarden, Lars Frellesen  
Vejleder: Jesper Larsen
- 164/87 "Vurdering af matematisk teknologi  
Technology Assessment  
Technikfolgenabschätzung"  
Af: Bernhelm Booss-Bavnbek, Glen Pate med  
Martin Bohle-Carbonell og Jens Højgaard Jensen
- 165/87 "COMPLEX STRUCTURES IN THE NASH-MOSER CATEGORY"  
by: Jens Gravesen

- 166/88 "Grundbegreber i Sandsynlighedsregningen"  
Af: Jørgen Larsen
- 167a/88 "BASISSTATISTIK 1. Diskrete modeller"  
Af: Jørgen Larsen
- 167b/88 "BASISSTATISTIK 2. Kontinuerte modeller"  
Af: Jørgen Larsen
- 168/88 "OVERFLADEN AF PLANETEN MARS"  
Laboratorie-simulering og MARS-analoger undersøgt ved Mössbauerspektroskopi.  
Fysikspeciale af:  
Birger Lundgren  
Vejleder: Jens Martin Knudsen  
Fys.Lab./HCØ
- 169/88 "CHARLES S. PEIRCE: MURSTEN OG MØRTEL TIL EN METAFYSIK."  
Fem artikler fra tidsskriftet "The Monist" 1891-93.  
Introduktion og oversættelse:  
Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 170/88 "OPGAVESAMLING I MATEMATIK"  
Samtlige opgaver stillet i tiden 1974 - juni 1988
- 171/88 "The Dirac Equation with Light-Cone Data"  
af: Johnny Tom Ottesen
- 172/88 "FYSIK OG VIRKELIGHED"  
Kvantemekanikkens grundlagsproblem i gymnasiet.  
Fysikprojekt af:  
Erik Lund og Kurt Jensen  
Vejledere: Albert Chr. Paulsen og Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 
- 173/89 "NUMERISKE ALGORITMER"  
af: Mogens Brun Heefelt
- 174/89 "GRAFISK FREMSTILLING AF FRAKTALER OG KAOS"  
af: Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 175/89 "AN ELEMENTARY ANALYSIS OF THE TIME DEPENDENT SPECTRUM OF THE NON-STATONARY SOLUTION TO THE OPERATOR RICCATI EQUATION"  
af: Michael Pedersen
- 176/89 "A MAXIMUM ENTROPY ANSATZ FOR NONLINEAR RESPONSE THEORY"  
af: Jeppe Dyre
- 177/89 "HVAD SKAL ADAM STÅ MODEL TIL"  
af: Morten Andersen, Ulla Engström, Thomas Gravesen, Nanna Lund, Pia Madsen, Dina Rawat, Peter Torstensen  
Vejleder: Mogens Brun Heefelt
- 178/89 "BIOSYNTESEN AF PENICILLIN - en matematisk model"  
af: Ulla Eghave Rasmussen, Hans Oxvang Mortensen, Michael Jarden  
vejleder i matematik: Jesper Larsen  
biologi: Erling Lauridsen
- 179a/89 "LÆRERVEJLEDNING M.M. til et eksperimentelt forløb om kaos"  
af: Andy Wierød, Søren Brønd og Jimmy Staal  
Vejledere: Peder Voetmann Christiansen  
Karin Beyer
- 179b/89 "ELEVHEFTE: Noter til et eksperimentelt kursus om kaos"  
af: Andy Wierød, Søren Brønd og Jimmy Staal  
Vejledere: Peder Voetmann Christiansen  
Karin Beyer
- 180/89 "KAOS I FYSISKE SYSTEMER eksemplificeret ved torsions- og dobbeltpendul".  
af: Andy Wierød, Søren Brønd og Jimmy Staal  
Vejleder: Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 181/89 "A ZERO-PARAMETER CONSTITUTIVE RELATION FOR PURE SHEAR VISCOELASTICITY"  
by: Jeppe Dyre
- 183/89 "MATHEMATICAL PROBLEM SOLVING, MODELLING. APPLICATIONS AND LINKS TO OTHER SUBJECTS - State. trends and issues in mathematics instruction  
by: WERNER BLUM, Kassel (FRG) og  
MOGENS NISS, Roskilde (Denmark)
- 184/89 "En metode til bestemmelse af den frekvensafhængige varmfylde af en underafkølet væske ved glasovergangen"  
af: Tage Emil Christensen
- 
- 185/90 "EN NÆSTEN PERIODISK HISTORIE"  
Et matematisk projekt  
af: Steen Grode og Thomas Jessen  
Vejleder: Jacob Jacobsen
- 186/90 "RITUAL OG RATIONALITET i videnskabers udvikling"  
redigeret af Arne Jakobsen og Stig Andur Pedersen
- 187/90 "RSA - et kryptografisk system"  
af: Annemette Sofie Olufsen, Lars Frellesen og Ole Møller Nielsen  
Vejledere: Michael Pedersen og Finn Munk
- 188/90 "FERMICONDENSATION - AN ALMOST IDEAL GLASS TRANSITION"  
by: Jeppe Dyre
- 189/90 "DATAMATER I MATEMATIKUNDERVISNINGEN PÅ GYMNASIET OG HØJERE LÆREANSTALTER  
af: Finn Langberg

- 190/90 "FIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR AN APPROXIMATE NONLINEAR RESPONSE THEORY"  
by: Jeppe Dyre
- 191/90 "MOORE COHOMOLOGY, PRINCIPAL BUNDLES AND ACTIONS OF GROUPS ON  $C^*$ -ALGEBRAS"  
by: Iain Raeburn and Dana P. Williams
- 192/90 "Age-dependent host mortality in the dynamics of endemic infectious diseases and SIR-models of the epidemiology and natural selection of co-circulating influenza virus with partial cross-immunity"  
by: Viggo Andreasen
- 193/90 "Causal and Diagnostic Reasoning"  
by: Stig Andur Pedersen
- 194a/90 "DETERMINISTISK KAOS"  
Projektrapport af : Frank Olsen
- 194b/90 "DETERMINISTISK KAOS"  
Kørselsrapport  
Projektrapport af: Frank Olsen
- 195/90 "STADIER PÅ PARADIGMETS VEJ"  
Et projekt om den videnskabelige udvikling der førte til dannelse af kvantemekanikken.  
Projektrapport for 1. modul på fysikuddannelsen, skrevet af:  
Anja Boisen, Thomas Hougård, Anders Gorm Larsen, Nicolai Ryge.  
Vejleder: Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 196/90 "ER KAOS NØDVENDIGT?"  
- en projektrapport om kaos' paradigmatiske status i fysikken.  
af: Johannes K. Nielsen, Jimmy Staal og Peter Bøggild  
Vejleder: Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 197/90 "Kontrafaktiske konditionaler i HOL"  
af: Jesper Voetmann, Hans Oxvang Mortensen og Aleksander Høst-Madsen  
Vejleder: Stig Andur Pedersen
- 198/90 "Metal-Isolator-Metal systemer"  
Speciale  
af: Frank Olsen
- 199/90 "SPREDT FÆGTNING" Artikelsamling  
af: Jens Højgaard Jensen
- 200/90 "LINEÆR ALGEBRA OG ANALYSE"  
Noter til den naturvidenskabelige basisuddannelse.  
af: Mogens Niss
- 201/90 "Undersøgelse af atomare korrelationer i amorfe stoffer ved røntgendiffraction"  
af: Karen Birkelund og Klaus Dahl Jensen  
Vejledere: Petr Višćor, Ole Bakander
- 202/90 "TEGN OG KVANTER"  
Foredrag og artikler, 1971-90.  
af: Peder Voetmann Christiansen
- 203/90 "OPGAVESAMLING I MATEMATIK" 1974-1990  
afleser tekst 170/88
- 
- 204/91 "ERKENDELSE OG KVANTEMEKANIK"  
et Breddemodul Fysik Projekt  
af: Thomas Jessen  
Vejleder: Petr Višćor
- 205/91 "PEIRCE'S LOGIC OF VAGUENESS"  
by: Claudine Engel-Tiercelin  
Department of Philosophy  
Université de Paris-1  
(Panthéon-Sorbonne)
- 206a+b/91 "GERMANIUMBEAMANALYSE SAMT A - GE TYNDFILMS ELEKTRISKE EGENSKABER"  
Eksperimentelt Fysikspeciale  
af: Jeanne Linda Mortensen og Annette Post Nielsen  
Vejleder: Petr Višćor
- 207/91 "SOME REMARKS ON AC CONDUCTION IN DISORDERED SOLIDS"  
by: Jeppe C. Dyre
- 208/91 "LANGEVIN MODELS FOR SHEAR STRESS FLUCTUATIONS IN FLOWS OF VISCO-ELASTIC LIQUIDS"  
by: Jeppe C. Dyre
- 209/91 "LORENZ GUIDE" Kompendium til den danske fysiker Ludvig Lorenz, 1829-91.  
af: Helge Kragh
- 210/91 "Global Dimension, Tower of Algebras, and Jones Index of Split Seperable Subalgebras with Unitality Condition.  
by: Lars Kadison
- 211/91 "I SANDHEDENS TJENESTE"  
- historien bag teorien for de komplekse tal.  
af: Lise Arleth, Charlotte Gjerrild, Jane Hansen, Linda Kyndlev, Anne Charlotte Nilsson, Kamma Tulinius.  
Vejledere: Jesper Larsen og Bernhelm Booss-Bavnbek
- 212/91 "Cyclic Homology of Triangular Matrix Algebras"  
by: Lars Kadison
- 213/91 "Disease-induced natural selection in a diploid host  
by: Viggo Andreasen and Freddy B. Christiansen

- 214|91 "Hallej i eteren" - om  
elektromagnetisme. Oplæg  
til undervisningsmateriale  
i gymnasiet.  
Af: Nils Kruse, Peter Gastrup,  
Kristian Hoppe, Jeppe Guldager  
Vejledere: Petr Viscor, Hans Hedal
- 215|91 "Physics and Technology of Metal-  
Insulator-Metal thin film structures  
used as planar electron emitters  
by: A.Delong, M.Drsticka, K.Hladil,  
V.Kolarik, F.Olsen, P.Pavelka and  
Petr Viscor.
- 216|91 "Kvantemekanik på PC'eren"  
af: Thomas Jessen
- 
- 217/92 "Two papers on APPLICATIONS AND MODELLING  
IN THE MATHEMATICS CURRICULUM"  
by: Mogens Nias
- 218/92 "A Three-Square Theorem"  
by: Lars Kadison
- 219/92 "RUPNOK - stationær strømning i elastiske rør"  
af: Anja Boisen, Karen Birkelund, Mette Olufsen  
Vejleder: Jesper Larsen
- 220/92 "Automatisk diagnosticering i digitale kredsløb"  
af: Bjørn Christensen, Ole Møller Nielsen  
Vejleder: Stig Andur Pedersen
- 221/92 "A BUNDLE VALUED RADON TRANSFORM, WITH  
APPLICATIONS TO INVARIANT WAVE EQUATIONS"  
by: Thomas P. Branson, Gestur Olafsson and  
Henrik Schlichtkrull
- 222/92 On the Representations of some Infinite Dimensional  
Groups and Algebras Related to Quantum Physics  
by: Johnny T. Ottesen
- 223/92 THE FUNCTIONAL DETERMINANT  
by: Thomas P. Branson
- 224/92 UNIVERSAL AC CONDUCTIVITY OF NON-METALLIC SOLIDS AT  
LOW TEMPERATURES  
by: Jeppe C. Dyre