

# Scalar-flat Kähler surfaces whose Weyl tensor annihilates the Ricci form

Andrzej Derdzinski<sup>1</sup>, Sinhwi Kim<sup>2</sup>, and JeongHyeong Park<sup>2</sup>

ABSTRACT. We conjecture that any scalar-flat Kähler surface in which the Weyl tensor acting on 2-forms annihilates the Ricci form must be either Ricci-flat or locally isometric to a Riemannian product of two real surfaces with mutually opposite nonzero constant Gaussian curvatures. This amounts to the nonexistence of proper weakly Einstein anti-self-dual Kähler surfaces. We prove the above conjecture in three special cases: when the manifold is compact, when one of the Ricci eigendistributions is integrable, and when the norms of the Ricci and Weyl tensors are functionally dependent.

## 1. Introduction

Following Euh *et al.* [9, p. 112] we call a Riemannian four-manifold *weakly Einstein* if the triple contraction of its curvature tensor against itself is a functional multiple of the metric, and then refer to it as *proper* [6] if it is neither Einstein, nor conformally flat and scalar-flat. As shown by Euh *et al.* [9, Cor. 2.2] and García-Río *et al.* [11, Thm. 2(i)], the weakly Einstein property follows in both cases excluded by the word *proper*. See also [5, formula (4.7)].

Proper weakly Einstein metrics that are also locally homogeneous were constructed by Euh *et al.* [10, Expl. 3.7], and classified by Arias-Marco and Kowalski [1, p. 23]. Other related results can be found, for instance, in [3, 14, 16].

There exist proper weakly Einstein Kähler surfaces [5, Sect. 12], and it is known [5, Theorem 1.2] that they are never self-dual relative to the standard orientation.

It remains an open question, however, whether a proper weakly Einstein Kähler surface can be *anti-self-dual*. We conjecture that this is *not* the case, which – see Remark 2.1 below – is nothing else than the following claim:

(1.1) any scalar-flat Kähler surface in which the Weyl tensor acting on 2-forms annihilates the Ricci form must have parallel Ricci tensor; this, equivalently, means that it is either Ricci-flat, or locally isometric to a Riemannian product of two real surfaces with mutually opposite, nonzero constant Gaussian curvatures.

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53B35, 53C55.

*Key words and phrases.* Weakly Einstein metric, Kähler surface, anti-self-dual metric.

The above phrasing of our conjecture shows that it is of independent interest, aside from questions pertaining to weakly Einstein manifolds. With the symbols

$$(1.2) \quad M, J, g, \nabla, R, r, W, s, \omega, \rho$$

always standing for the underlying complex surface, the complex-structure tensor, the Kähler metric in question, its Levi-Civita connection, curvature, Ricci and Weyl tensors, scalar curvature, Kähler form and Ricci form, Conjecture (1.1) states – according to formula (2.3) below – that, in a Kähler surface,

$$(1.3) \quad \text{if } s \text{ and } W\rho \text{ vanish identically, then so does } W \text{ or } \rho.$$

Another version of (1.1) uses the conditions

$$(1.4) \quad \text{i) } g(e_j, e_k) = \delta_{jk}, \quad \text{ii) } (Je_1, Je_2, Je_3, Je_4) = (e_2, -e_1, e_4, -e_3)$$

imposed on a smooth local frame  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$ , along with the requirement that

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{the only nonzero curvature components} \\ &R_{ijkl} \text{ be the ones algebraically related to} \\ &R_{1212} = -\lambda, \quad R_{1313} = R_{2424} = R_{1423} = \sigma, \\ &R_{1414} = R_{2323} = R_{1342} = -\sigma, \quad R_{3434} = \lambda \end{aligned}$$

for some functions  $\lambda, \sigma$ , where  $R_{ijkl} = R(e_i, e_j, e_k, e_l)$ . At the end of Sect. 2 we have this equivalent phrasing of Conjecture (1.1): in an almost-complex four-manifold,

$$(1.6) \quad \text{if (1.4) – (1.5) hold and } \nabla J = 0, \text{ then } \lambda = 0 \text{ or } \sigma = 0 \text{ identically.}$$

Our argument for plausibility of Conjecture (1.1) is twofold. First, we establish (1.1) in the following three special cases. For proofs, see Sect. 2, 7 and 8.

**THEOREM A.** *Conjecture (1.1) is true if one also assumes that*

- (i) *M is compact, or*
- (ii) *one of the Ricci eigendistributions is integrable, or*
- (iii) *the norms of the Ricci and Weyl tensors are functionally dependent.*

*The conclusion about (i) remains valid beyond the Kähler category. Namely, any compact oriented Riemannian four-manifold which is scalar-flat, anti-self-dual and weakly Einstein, must be Ricci-flat or conformally flat.*

Both (ii), (iii) hold if the norm of the Ricci tensor is constant (Remark 2.2).

Secondly, we provide evidence supporting Conjecture (1.1) in the form of calculations related to the system of exterior equations on a four-manifold, involving two functions  $\lambda, \sigma$  and eight 1-forms  $A, B, C, D, F, G, L, S$ , which reads

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{at each point } A, B, C, D \text{ are linearly independent,} \\ &\text{while, for } E = (S + L)/2 \text{ and } H = (S - L)/2, \\ &dA = B \wedge E + C \wedge F + D \wedge G, \\ & dB = -A \wedge E + D \wedge F - C \wedge G, \\ &dC = -A \wedge F + B \wedge G + D \wedge H, \\ &dD = -B \wedge F - A \wedge G - C \wedge H, \\ &dF = L \wedge G + \sigma(A \wedge C - D \wedge B), \\ &dG = -L \wedge F - \sigma(A \wedge D - B \wedge C), \\ &dL = -4F \wedge G - \lambda(A \wedge B + C \wedge D), \\ &dS = -\lambda(A \wedge B - C \wedge D). \end{aligned}$$

As we point out in Sect. 4, Conjecture (1.1) is equivalent to the following statement: *the system (1.7) implies that one of the functions  $\lambda, \sigma$  vanishes identically.*

We emphasize here the *constructive aspect of the system* (1.7): if Conjecture (1.1) turns out to be false, (1.7), with  $\lambda\sigma \neq 0$ , will serve as a local characterization, at generic points, of all the counterexamples, that is, according to (1.3), of those Kähler surfaces with  $s = 0$  and  $W\rho = 0$  in which  $W \neq 0$  and  $\rho \neq 0$  everywhere.

Geometrically,  $A, B, C, D$  represent  $J$  and  $g$  by being  $g$ -orthonormal and having  $(J^*A, J^*C) = (-B, -D)$ , while  $E, F, G, H$  are the connection 1-forms in the frame  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  dual to  $A, B, C, D$ , there being just four of them, as they together constitute a 1-form valued in the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{u}(2)$ . In terms of  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$ , we have (1.4), and the first four exterior equations of (1.7) state that  $\nabla$  is torsion-free, while the last four amount precisely to (1.5). See Lemma 4.4.

Remark 4.1 provides another interpretation of (1.5): in (1.2),

$$(1.8) \quad \omega = A \wedge B + C \wedge D, \quad \rho = -\lambda(A \wedge B - C \wedge D),$$

the length  $\sqrt{2}$  mutually orthogonal anti-self-dual 2-forms

$$(1.9) \quad \zeta = -A \wedge B + C \wedge D, \quad \eta = -A \wedge C + D \wedge B, \quad \theta = -A \wedge D + B \wedge C$$

are eigenforms of  $W$  for the eigenvalue functions  $0, 2\sigma, -2\sigma$ , while  $2G, 2F, L$  are – due to formula (4.8) – the connection 1-forms, relative to the local trivialization (1.9), of the Levi-Civita connection in the bundle of anti-self-dual 2-forms.

If  $\lambda\sigma \neq 0$ , (1.7) has further consequences. Applying  $d$  to it, in Sect. 4, we derive explicit rational expressions (4.6) for the component functions of  $L, F, G$  in terms of  $\lambda, \sigma, d\lambda$  and  $d\sigma$ . These expressions turn (1.7) into a system of thirty-six equations imposed on  $\lambda, \sigma$ , the component functions  $S_i, \lambda_i, \sigma_i$  of  $S, d\lambda, d\sigma$ , and their first-order directional derivatives  $S_{ij}, \lambda_{ij}, \sigma_{ij}$ . For now, let us choose to ignore the six equations involving  $S_{ij}$ . The remaining thirty equations imply that

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad & (12\sigma^2 - \lambda^2)(\lambda_2\lambda_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_4) = 2\lambda[\mu_-(\lambda_2\sigma_3 - \lambda_1\sigma_4) + \mu_+(\lambda_3\sigma_2 - \lambda_4\sigma_1)], \\ (b) \quad & (12\sigma^2 - \lambda^2)(\lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_4) = 2\lambda[\mu_+(\lambda_1\sigma_3 + \lambda_2\sigma_4) + \mu_-(\lambda_3\sigma_1 + \lambda_4\sigma_2)], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu_{\pm} = 2\sigma \pm \lambda$ . See Remark 5.1, where we also describe the reason why the number of equations may be further reduced by six, to twenty-four: the equations satisfy four linear-dependence relations, and two of their functional combinations result in the constraints (a) – (b), thus allowing us to eliminate two more equations, and replace them with (a) – (b). However, taking the directional derivatives of (a) and (b), we can in turn augment our system with eight more equations, raising their total number to thirty-two. They are linear in the thirty-six quantities  $S_i, \lambda_i, \sigma_i, S_{ij}, \lambda_{ij}, \sigma_{ij}$ . This last number can be reduced to thirty-two since – as explained in the lines following (6.3) – we are free to assume that  $\lambda_4 = 0$  by suppressing a rotational symmetry inherent in the system (1.4) – (1.5). Consequently, there are now as many linear equations as there are unknowns. What makes it plausible to expect that no nontrivial solutions exist is the presence of six more equations, involving  $S_{ij}$ , which we earlier chose to ignore.

In the case of *compact* four-manifolds, [2, Prop. 4.70], reproduced below as formula (2.6), seems to hint at some variational aspect of the weakly Einstein condition. Closer inspection shows that this is not the case, in any interesting way: *no proper weakly Einstein metric is a critical point of  $\|R\|^2$ , the squared  $L^2$  norm of the curvature tensor*. See (2.7). On the other hand, if the manifold is also oriented, *scalar-flat anti-self-dual Riemannian metrics, when they exist, are well known – cf. (2.5) – to be precisely the absolute minima of the functional  $\|R\|^2$* . The last class includes scalar-flat Kähler-surface metrics, numerous nontrivial examples

of which are exhibited in [13] and [12], while the two italicized statements are used, in Sect. 2, to prove the final clause of Theorem A.

The authors wish to thank Claude LeBrun for helpful comments and clarifications concerning the subject matter of the preceding paragraph and the way in which the final clause of Theorem A arises from variational considerations.

## 2. Preliminaries

All manifolds are assumed connected, all mappings and tensor fields smooth.

We will use the fact that, given a local frame  $e_i$  in a manifold and its dual  $e^i$ ,

$$(2.1) \quad 2de^k = -C_{ij}^k e^i \wedge e^j \text{ for the functions } C_{ij}^k \text{ with } [e_i, e_j] = C_{ij}^k e_k.$$

For the curvature, Weyl, and Ricci tensors of a Riemannian metric  $g$  in any dimension  $n \geq 3$  we use the sign convention such that  $r_{ij} = g^{pq} R_{ipjq}$ . Thus,

$$W_{ijpq} = R_{ijpq} - \frac{1}{n-2} (g_{ip}r_{jq} + g_{jq}r_{ip} - g_{jp}r_{iq} - g_{iq}r_{jp}) \\ + \frac{s}{(n-1)(n-2)} (g_{ip}g_{jq} - g_{jp}g_{iq}),$$

$s$  being the scalar curvature. Consequently, if  $n = 4$  and  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  is a local  $g$ -orthonormal frame, one has (1.5) if and only if

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{the only nonzero components of the Weyl and} \\ &\text{Ricci tensors are those algebraically related to} \\ &W_{1313} = W_{2424} = W_{1423} = \sigma, \quad r_{11} = r_{22} = -\lambda, \\ &W_{1414} = W_{2323} = W_{1342} = -\sigma, \quad r_{33} = r_{44} = \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

As shown by Tanno [15], a conformally flat Kähler surface is

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{either flat, or locally isometric to a Riemannian product of two real} \\ &\text{surfaces with mutually opposite, nonzero constant Gaussian curvatures.} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it is well known – see, for instance, [4, p. 459] – that

$$(2.4) \quad \text{anti-self-duality of a Kähler surface amounts to its scalar-flatness.}$$

REMARK 2.1. According to parts (a) and (d) in [5, Theorem 5.1], a scalar-flat Kähler surface is weakly Einstein if and only if  $W\rho = 0$ . Thus, (1.1) is, due to (2.4) and (2.3), equivalent to the conjecture stated immediately before (1.1).

PROOF OF THEOREM A, case (i). The equivalence between parts (d) and (e) in [5, Theorem 5.1] shows that a Kähler surface with  $s = 0$  and  $W\rho = 0$  necessarily has  $\Delta\rho = 0$  or, in local coordinates,  $\rho_{ij,k}^k = 0$ . In the compact case, integrating the inner product  $\langle \rho, \Delta\rho \rangle$  by parts, we get  $\nabla\rho = 0$ , as required.  $\square$

In the following argument  $d^*$  is the formal adjoint of the *Codazzi operator*  $d$ , cf. [2, Sect. 16.5], sending a twice-covariant symmetric tensor field  $b$  on a Riemannian manifold to  $db$  given, in coordinates, by  $[db]_{ijk} = b_{kj,i} - b_{ki,j}$ .

PROOF OF THE FINAL CLAUSE OF THEOREM A. From the Chern-Weil integral formulae for characteristic numbers one obtains

$$12\|R\|^2 = \|s\|^2 + 48\|W^+\|^2 - 96\pi^2[\chi(M) + 3\tau(M)],$$

where  $\chi(M)$  and  $\tau(M)$  are the Euler characteristic and signature of a compact oriented Riemannian four-manifold  $(M, g)$ , and  $\| \cdot \|$  denotes the  $L^2$  norm. One

verifies this, for instance, by subtracting 12 times [4, formula (25.1)] from [4, formula (25.8)]. Thus, given a compact oriented four-manifold  $M$ ,

(2.5) if  $M$  admits a scalar-flat anti-self-dual Riemannian metric  $g$ , any such  $g$  realizes the absolute minimum value of the functional  $\|R\|^2$  in the space of all metrics on  $M$ ,

the minimum being  $-8\pi^2[\chi(M) + 3\tau(M)]$ . On the other hand, according to [2, Prop. 4.70], on a compact manifold of dimension four, with  $d, d^*$  defined above,

(2.6) at any metric  $g$ , one-half of the gradient of the functional  $\|R\|^2$  equals  $d^*dr$  minus the traceless part of the triple contraction of  $R$  against itself.

Thus, if  $g$  satisfies the assumptions in the final clause of Theorem A, the resulting equality  $d^*dr = 0$  implies, via integration by parts, that  $dr = 0$ , and so  $g$  has harmonic curvature [2, Sect. 16.33]. Our assertion now follows from [7, Thm. 22.3]. In the Kähler case, instead of invoking [7], one can also use [2, Prop. 16.30].  $\square$

The third and second lines above show that, on a compact four-manifold,

(2.7) no proper weakly Einstein metric is a critical point of the functional  $\|R\|^2$ .

REMARK 2.2. The line following Theorem A is obvious: by (2.2), the Ricci tensor  $r$  has the spectrum  $-\lambda, -\lambda, \lambda, \lambda$  and the norm  $2|\lambda|$ , the constancy of which trivially implies (iii), as well as integrability of both Ricci eigendistributions when  $\lambda \neq 0$ , since they are the kernels of the closed 2-forms  $\rho \pm \lambda\omega$ , cf. (1.2).

LEMMA 2.3. *At points of an anti-self-dual Kähler surface  $(M, g)$  where the Ricci and Weyl tensors are both nonzero, the weakly Einstein property is equivalent, locally, to the existence of a smooth frame  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  such that (1.4) – (1.5) hold with some nowhere-zero functions  $\lambda$  and  $\sigma$ .*

PROOF. We assume that  $(M, g)$  is anti-self-dual, and so  $s = 0$  due to (2.4).

First, let  $(M, g)$  be weakly Einstein with  $W$  and  $r$  both nonzero at  $x \in M$ . As  $s = 0$ , the final clause of [6, Corollary 1.6] allows us to choose scalars  $\lambda, \sigma$  and a positive orthonormal basis  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  of  $T_x M$  with (2.2), where [6] uses the symbol  $\xi$  for our  $\sigma$ . Thus, (1.5) follows. Switching  $e_1, e_2$  with  $e_2, e_1$  and  $e_3, e_4$  with  $e_4, e_3$ , if needed, we also get (1.4-ii). Since  $\lambda\sigma \neq 0$ , we may choose such  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  which depend smoothly on the point  $x$ , as the resulting local frames are well known [8, Sect. 6] to be precisely the smooth local sections of a  $G$ -principal bundle over  $M$ , for some matrix group  $G \subseteq \text{SO}(4)$ .

Conversely, as (1.4) – (1.5) lead to (2.2), the first part of [6, Corollary 1.6] for  $\xi = \sigma$ , combined with its final clause, implies the weakly Einstein property of  $g$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

We can now show that (1.6) is equivalent to Conjecture (1.1) or, in other words (see Remark 2.1) to the claim immediately preceding (1.1). Namely, *the negation of (1.6) yields a Kähler-surface metric  $g$  realizing (1.4) – (1.5), with  $\lambda\sigma \neq 0$ , so that, according to Lemma 2.3,  $g$  is weakly Einstein and, by (2.2), also proper. On the other hand, any  $g$  having this latter property, satisfies, again due to Lemma 2.3 and (2.2), the negation of (1.6).*

### 3. Pointwise symmetries of the system (1.4) – (1.5)

REMARK 3.1. For a smooth local frame  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  in a Kähler surface and functions  $\lambda, \sigma$ , the conditions (1.4) – (1.5) are equivalent to having (1.4) along with the following version of (1.5):

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} R_{1313} = R_{1441} = \sigma, \quad R_{1221} = R_{3434} = \lambda, \quad R_{1234} = 0, \\ R_{ijkl} = 0 \quad \text{whenever the set } \{i, j, k, l\} \text{ has 3 elements,} \end{aligned}$$

as the remaining parts of (1.5) then are immediate from the general Riemannian and Kähler symmetries of the curvature tensor.

LEMMA 3.2. *The conditions (1.4) – (1.5) imposed on  $g, J, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \lambda$  and  $\sigma$  remain satisfied when the sextuple  $(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \lambda, \sigma)$  is replaced by one of*

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{(i)} & (e_2, -e_1, e_3, e_4, \lambda, -\sigma), \\ \text{(ii)} & (e_1, e_2, e_4, -e_3, \lambda, -\sigma), \\ \text{(iii)} & (e_2, -e_1, e_4, -e_3, \lambda, \sigma), \\ \text{(iv)} & (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2, -\lambda, \sigma). \end{array}$$

In fact, with (1.5) replaced by (3.1): the claims about (i) and (iv) are obvious,

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{(ii) equals the result of conjugating (i) by (iv),} \\ \text{and (iii) is the composition: (i) followed by (ii).} \end{aligned}$$

More generally, (i) and (iv) are easily seen to generate a thirty-two-element group acting on the sextuples  $(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \lambda, \sigma)$ . In addition, (iii) is a special case of a *continuous symmetry* of the system (1.4) – (1.5):

LEMMA 3.3. *With  $\lambda$  and  $\sigma$  fixed, (1.4) – (1.5) are invariant under simultaneous rotations, involving any angle function, of the pairs  $(e_1, e_2)$  and  $(e_3, e_4)$ .*

PROOF. Replacing (1.5) with (3.1), we clearly get our claim for the equalities in (3.1) having  $\lambda$  or 0 on the right-hand side. For the rotational invariance of  $R_{1313}$  and  $R_{1414}$ , it suffices to verify that, whenever  $c^2 + s^2 = 1$ ,

$$(3.4) \quad R(ce_1 + se_2, ce_3 + se_4, ce_1 + se_2, ce_3 + se_4) = R_{1313},$$

as the analogous equality for  $R_{1414}$  arises when one replaces  $(e_3, e_4)$  by  $(e_4, -e_3)$  and invokes (3.2-ii). The left-hand side of (3.4), easily evaluated from (3.1), equals  $(c^2 + s^2)^2\sigma$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

REMARK 3.4. At any given point, the conditions (1.4) – (1.5) with  $\lambda\sigma \neq 0$  uniquely determine the frame  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  up to simultaneous rotations of the pairs  $(e_1, e_2)$  and  $(e_3, e_4)$ , as in Lemma 3.3, and the action of the thirty-two-element group, mentioned in the line following (3.3). See the proof of (c) in [6, the lines following formula (7.7)], applied to  $\theta = 0$ , which could also be used as another proof of our Lemma 3.3.

### 4. The associated exterior differential equations

In a Riemannian four-manifold  $(M, g)$  carrying an almost complex structure  $J$  compatible with the metric  $g$ , consider a smooth local frame  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  satisfying (1.4), and a connection  $\nabla$  in the tangent bundle  $TM$  with  $\nabla g = 0$  and  $\nabla J = 0$ , having the component functions  $\Gamma_{ij}^k$  and connection 1-forms  $\Gamma_j^k$  given by

$$(4.1) \quad \nabla e_j = \Gamma_j^k \otimes e_k \quad (\text{summed over } k), \quad \text{so that } \Gamma_j^k(e_i) = \Gamma_{ij}^k \quad \text{and } \nabla_{e_i} e_j = \Gamma_{ij}^k e_k.$$

Then  $\Gamma_j^k$  may be arranged in a matrix of the form

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_1^1 & \Gamma_2^1 & \Gamma_3^1 & \Gamma_4^1 \\ \Gamma_1^2 & \Gamma_2^2 & \Gamma_3^2 & \Gamma_4^2 \\ \Gamma_1^3 & \Gamma_2^3 & \Gamma_3^3 & \Gamma_4^3 \\ \Gamma_1^4 & \Gamma_2^4 & \Gamma_3^4 & \Gamma_4^4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & E & F & G \\ -E & 0 & -G & F \\ -F & G & 0 & H \\ -G & -F & -H & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In fact, for arbitrary functions  $\Gamma_{ij}^k$  in (4.1), it is clear that  $\nabla g = 0$  if and only if  $\Gamma_{ij}^k$  is skew-symmetric in  $j, k$ , while  $\nabla J = 0$  if and only if  $\Gamma_{ij}^k = (-1)^{j+k} \Gamma_{ip}^q$  whenever  $\{\{j, p\}, \{k, q\}\} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}\}$ . Note that  $\nabla$  need not be torsion-free.

In other words,  $\nabla$  is a connection in  $TM$  viewed as a complex vector bundle, in which  $g$  is the real part of a  $\nabla$ -parallel Hermitian fibre metric, and the right-hand side of (4.2) represents, in real terms, a 1-form valued in the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{u}(2)$ .

Let  $A, B, C, D$  be the local trivialization of  $T^*M$  dual to the frame  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$ :

$$(4.3) \quad (A, B, C, D) = (e^1, e^2, e^3, e^4).$$

REMARK 4.1. With (4.3), the relations (1.4) and (2.2) easily give  $g = A \otimes A + B \otimes B + C \otimes C + D \otimes D$  and  $r = -\lambda(A \otimes A + B \otimes B) + \lambda(C \otimes C + D \otimes D)$  in (1.2), while  $(W\zeta, W\eta, W\theta) = (0, 2\sigma\eta, -2\sigma\theta)$ , proving (1.8) and the claim following (1.9).

LEMMA 4.2. *Under the above assumptions, with  $S = E + H$ , the replacements*

(i) – (iv) in Lemma 3.2 cause  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \lambda, \sigma, E, H, S$  to be replaced by

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{array}{lll} \text{i)} & e_2, -e_1, e_3, e_4, & \text{and } \lambda, -\sigma, \text{ and } E, H, S, \\ \text{ii)} & e_1, e_2, e_4, -e_3, & \text{and } \lambda, -\sigma, \text{ and } E, H, S, \\ \text{iii)} & e_2, -e_1, e_4, -e_3, & \text{and } \lambda, \sigma, \text{ and } E, H, S, \\ \text{iv)} & e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2, & \text{and } -\lambda, \sigma, \text{ and } H, E, S, \\ \text{v)} & e_3, e_4, e_2, -e_1, & \text{and } -\lambda, -\sigma, \text{ and } H, E, S. \end{array}$$

PROOF. The cases of (i) and (iv) are obvious from Lemma 3.2 and (4.2), while (ii) – (iii) then arise via (3.3), and (v) is nothing else than (i) followed by (iv).  $\square$

REMARK 4.3. Also,  $A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, L = E - H, S, \lambda, \sigma$  may be replaced

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{array}{lll} \text{i)} & B, -A, C, D, & \text{and } E, -G, F, H, L, S, \text{ and } \lambda, -\sigma, \\ \text{ii)} & A, B, D, -C, & \text{and } E, G, -F, H, L, S, \text{ and } \lambda, -\sigma, \\ \text{iii)} & D, -C, A, B, & \text{and } H, -G, -F, E, -L, S, \text{ and } -\lambda, -\sigma, \\ \text{iv)} & C, D, A, B, & \text{and } H, -F, G, E, -L, S, \text{ and } -\lambda, \sigma. \end{array}$$

In fact, (iii) arises as (ii) followed by (iv), while the other claims are immediate from Lemma 4.2 and (4.2) – (4.3).

LEMMA 4.4. *Let  $M, g, J, \nabla, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  be as above.*

- (a)  $\nabla$  is torsion-free if and only if  $A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H$  satisfy the first four exterior equations of (1.7).
- (b) If  $\nabla$  is torsion-free, (1.5) is equivalent to the last four equations in (1.7) with  $L = E - H$  and  $S = E + H$ .

PROOF. By (2.1),  $\nabla$  is torsion-free if and only if  $2de^k = [\Gamma_{ji}^k - \Gamma_{ij}^k]e^i \wedge e^j$  which, due to skew-symmetry of  $e^i \wedge e^j$  in  $i, j$ , is the same as  $de^k = \Gamma_{ji}^k e^i \wedge e^j$ , that is,  $de^k = e^i \wedge \Gamma_i^k$ , since (4.1) gives  $\Gamma_{ji}^k e^j = \Gamma_i^k$ . Now (4.2) and (4.3) yield (a).

Next, let  $\nabla$  be torsion-free. The components  $R_{ijk}{}^l$  of the (1,3) curvature tensor  $R$  of  $\nabla$ , with  $R(e_i, e_j)e_k = R_{ijk}{}^l e_l$ , are given by  $R_{ijk}{}^l = d_j \Gamma_{ik}^l - d_i \Gamma_{jk}^l +$

$\Gamma_{jp}^l \Gamma_{ik}^p - \Gamma_{ip}^l \Gamma_{jk}^p + [\Gamma_{ij}^p - \Gamma_{ji}^p] \Gamma_{pk}^l$ , where  $d_i$  denotes the  $e_i$ -directional derivative. This amounts to  $R_k^l = -d\Gamma_k^l + \Gamma_k^p \wedge \Gamma_p^l$  for the 2-forms  $R_k^l$ , skew-symmetric in  $k, l$ , characterized by  $R_k^l(e_i, e_j) = R_{ijk}^l$ . As (1.5) reads

$$\begin{aligned} R_1^2 &= -\lambda A \wedge B, & R_1^3 &= R_2^4 = \sigma(A \wedge C - D \wedge B), \\ R_3^4 &= \lambda C \wedge D, & R_2^3 &= -R_1^4 = \sigma(A \wedge D - B \wedge C), \end{aligned}$$

the assertion (b) follows from (4.2).  $\square$

LEMMA 4.5. *Given functions  $\lambda, \sigma$  and 1-forms  $A, B, C, D, F, G, L, S$ , on a four-manifold satisfying (1.7), let us express  $L, F, G, d\lambda, d\sigma$  as functional combinations of (4.3), with some coefficients  $L_i, F_i, G_i, \lambda_i, \sigma_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . Then*

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{a)} \quad & 16\lambda\sigma^2(L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4) = 8\lambda\sigma(-\sigma_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_4, -\sigma_3) \\ & \quad \quad \quad + \mu_*(\lambda_2, -\lambda_1, -\lambda_4, \lambda_3), \\ \text{b)} \quad & 8\lambda\sigma(F_1, F_2, G_3, G_4) = -\mu_-(\lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_2, -\lambda_1), \\ \text{c)} \quad & 8\lambda\sigma(F_3, F_4, G_1, G_2) = \mu_+(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_4, \lambda_3), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu_{\pm} = 2\sigma \pm \lambda$  and  $\mu_* = \mu_+ \mu_- = 4\sigma^2 - \lambda^2$ .

PROOF. For the coefficient functions  $L_i, F_i, G_i, \lambda_i, \sigma_i$ , one has

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{i)} \quad & 2\sigma L_1 + \mu_+ G_3 = -\sigma_2, & \text{ii)} \quad & 2\sigma L_2 + \mu_+ G_4 = \sigma_1, \\ \text{iii)} \quad & 2\sigma L_3 - \mu_- G_1 = \sigma_4, & \text{iv)} \quad & 2\sigma L_4 - \mu_- G_2 = -\sigma_3, \\ \text{v)} \quad & \mu_+ F_1 + \mu_- G_2 = 0, & \text{vi)} \quad & \mu_+ F_2 - \mu_- G_1 = 0, \\ \text{vii)} \quad & \mu_+ F_3 - \mu_- G_4 = \lambda_1, & \text{viii)} \quad & \mu_+ F_4 + \mu_- G_3 = \lambda_2, \\ \text{ix)} \quad & \mu_- F_1 + \mu_+ G_2 = \lambda_3, & \text{x)} \quad & \mu_- F_2 - \mu_+ G_1 = \lambda_4, \\ \text{xi)} \quad & \mu_- F_3 - \mu_+ G_4 = 0, & \text{xii)} \quad & \mu_- F_4 + \mu_+ G_3 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, applying  $d$  to the formula for  $dF$  in (1.7), as well as to  $d(S - L) = 4F \wedge G + 2\lambda C \wedge D$  and  $d(S + L) = -4F \wedge G - 2\lambda A \wedge B$ , the difference and sum of the last two equations in (1.7), we obtain, respectively, from (1.7),

$$\begin{aligned} d\sigma \wedge (A \wedge C - D \wedge B) &= \mu_+ G \wedge A \wedge B - \mu_- G \wedge C \wedge D - 2\sigma L \wedge (A \wedge D - B \wedge C), \\ d\lambda \wedge C \wedge D &= -\mu_- G \wedge (A \wedge C - D \wedge B) - \mu_+ F \wedge (A \wedge D - B \wedge C), \\ d\lambda \wedge A \wedge B &= -\mu_- F \wedge (A \wedge D - B \wedge C) - \mu_+ G \wedge (A \wedge C - D \wedge B). \end{aligned}$$

These equalities amount to (4.7). As equations (4.7-v) – (4.7-xii) read

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \mu_+ & \mu_- \\ \mu_- & \mu_+ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} F_3 & F_4 & G_2 & -G_1 \\ -G_4 & G_3 & F_1 & F_2 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 & \lambda_4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \text{while } \begin{bmatrix} \mu_+ & -\mu_- \\ -\mu_- & \mu_+ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mu_+ & \mu_- \\ \mu_- & \mu_+ \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} 8\lambda\sigma & 0 \\ 0 & 8\lambda\sigma \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

(4.6-b) and (4.6-c) follow. Now (4.7-i) – (4.7-iv) yield (4.6-a).  $\square$

Due to (4.1) we have  $\nabla \xi^k = -\Gamma_j^k \otimes \xi^j$ , that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla A &= -E \otimes B - F \otimes C - G \otimes D, & \nabla B &= E \otimes A + G \otimes C - F \otimes D, \\ \nabla C &= F \otimes A - G \otimes B - H \otimes D, & \nabla D &= G \otimes A + F \otimes B + H \otimes C, \end{aligned}$$

where only the first equality needs to be verified, using (4.2) – (4.3), as (4.5) then yields the other three. Consequently, for  $\zeta, \eta, \theta$  in (1.9),

$$(4.8) \quad \nabla \zeta = 2G \otimes \eta - 2F \otimes \theta, \quad \nabla \eta = -2G \otimes \zeta + L \otimes \theta, \quad \nabla \theta = 2F \otimes \zeta - L \otimes \eta.$$

REMARK 4.6. Conjecture (1.1) is true under the additional assumption that  $\lambda$  is constant. Namely, one then easily verifies the italicized statement following (1.7): having (1.7) with  $d\lambda = 0$  at points where  $\lambda\sigma \neq 0$  would, by (4.6-b) – (4.6-c), give  $F = G = 0$ , and hence  $\sigma = 0$ , due to the equations involving  $dF$  and  $dG$  in (1.7).

### 5. The thirty-six directional-derivative equations

Assuming (1.4) – (1.5) with  $\nabla J = 0$ , denoting by  $S_i, \lambda_i, \sigma_i$  the component functions of  $S, d\lambda, d\sigma$  relative to the local frame  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$ , and by  $S_{ij}, \lambda_{ij}, \sigma_{ij}$  their  $e_j$ -directional derivatives, at points where  $\lambda\sigma \neq 0$  one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& (a) \quad 2[2(\lambda_{12} - \lambda_{21}) + \lambda_1 S_1 + \lambda_2 S_2] \sigma = \lambda_1 \sigma_2 - \lambda_2 \sigma_1, \\
& (a_4) \quad 2[2(\lambda_{34} - \lambda_{43}) + \lambda_3 S_3 + \lambda_4 S_4] \sigma = \lambda_3 \sigma_4 - \lambda_4 \sigma_3, \\
& (b) \quad 2[2(\lambda_{13} - \lambda_{31}) + \lambda_2 S_3 - \lambda_4 S_1] \sigma = -\lambda_1 \lambda_3 - \lambda_2 \sigma_4 + (\sigma_2 - \lambda_2) \lambda_4, \\
& (b_1) \quad 2[2(\lambda_{23} - \lambda_{32}) - \lambda_1 S_3 - \lambda_4 S_2] \sigma = \lambda_2 \lambda_3 - (\sigma_1 + \lambda_1) \lambda_4 + \lambda_1 \sigma_4, \\
& (b_2) \quad 2[2(\lambda_{14} - \lambda_{41}) + \lambda_2 S_4 + \lambda_3 S_1] \sigma = -\lambda_2 \lambda_3 + \lambda_2 \sigma_3 - \lambda_3 \sigma_2 + \lambda_1 \lambda_4, \\
& (b_3) \quad 2[2(\lambda_{24} - \lambda_{42}) + \lambda_3 S_2 - \lambda_1 S_4] \sigma = -\lambda_1 \lambda_3 - \lambda_2 \lambda_4 - \lambda_1 \sigma_3 + \lambda_3 \sigma_1, \\
& (c) \quad 16[2(\lambda_{32} - \lambda_{41}) + \lambda_3 S_1 + \lambda_4 S_2] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_- = 8\lambda\sigma(2\sigma + 7\lambda)(\lambda_4 \sigma_1 - \lambda_3 \sigma_2) \\
& \quad + (3\lambda^3 + 2\lambda^2\sigma - 28\lambda\sigma^2 - 104\sigma^3)(\lambda_1 \lambda_4 - \lambda_2 \lambda_3), \\
& (c_1) \quad 16[2(\lambda_{31} + \lambda_{42}) + \lambda_4 S_1 - \lambda_3 S_2] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_+ = 8\lambda\sigma(7\lambda - 2\sigma)(\lambda_3 \sigma_1 + \lambda_4 \sigma_2) \\
& \quad + (3\lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2\sigma - 28\lambda\sigma^2 + 104\sigma^3)(\lambda_1 \lambda_3 + \lambda_2 \lambda_4), \\
& (c_4) \quad 16[2(\lambda_{23} - \lambda_{14}) - \lambda_1 S_3 - \lambda_2 S_4] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_+ = 8\lambda\sigma(2\sigma - 7\lambda)(\lambda_1 \sigma_4 - \lambda_2 \sigma_3) \\
& \quad + (3\lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2\sigma - 28\lambda\sigma^2 + 104\sigma^3)(\lambda_2 \lambda_3 - \lambda_1 \lambda_4), \\
& (c_5) \quad 16[2(\lambda_{13} + \lambda_{24}) + \lambda_2 S_3 - \lambda_1 S_4] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_- = -8\lambda\sigma(2\sigma + 7\lambda)(\lambda_1 \sigma_3 + \lambda_2 \sigma_4) \\
& \quad - (3\lambda^3 + 2\lambda^2\sigma - 28\lambda\sigma^2 - 104\sigma^3)(\lambda_1 \lambda_3 + \lambda_2 \lambda_4), \\
& (d) \quad 16[2(\mu_+ \lambda_{11} + \mu_- \lambda_{33}) + \mu_+ \lambda_2 S_1 + \mu_- \lambda_4 S_3] \lambda \sigma^2 = -3\mu_* (\mu_- \lambda_2^2 + \mu_+ \lambda_4^2) \\
& \quad + 8\lambda\sigma[(2\sigma - 3\lambda)\lambda_2 \sigma_2 + (2\sigma + 3\lambda)\lambda_4 \sigma_4 + 4\lambda(\lambda_1 \sigma_1 - \lambda_3 \sigma_3) + 32\lambda\sigma^3] \\
& \quad + 4\sigma[(\lambda^2 + 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_1^2 + (\lambda^2 - 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_3^2], \\
& (d_1) \quad 16[2(\mu_- \lambda_{22} + \mu_+ \lambda_{33}) - \mu_- \lambda_1 S_2 + \mu_+ \lambda_4 S_3] \lambda \sigma^2 = -3\mu_* (\mu_+ \lambda_1^2 + \mu_- \lambda_4^2) \\
& \quad + 8\lambda\sigma[(2\sigma + 3\lambda)\lambda_1 \sigma_1 + (2\sigma - 3\lambda)\lambda_4 \sigma_4 + 4\lambda(\lambda_3 \sigma_3 - \lambda_2 \sigma_2) - 32\lambda\sigma^3] \\
& \quad + 4\sigma[(\lambda^2 - 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_2^2 + (\lambda^2 + 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_3^2], \\
& (d_2) \quad 16[2(\mu_- \lambda_{11} + \mu_+ \lambda_{44}) + \mu_- \lambda_2 S_1 - \mu_+ \lambda_3 S_4] \lambda \sigma^2 = -3\mu_* (\mu_+ \lambda_2^2 + \mu_- \lambda_3^2) \\
& \quad + 8\lambda\sigma[(2\sigma + 3\lambda)\lambda_2 \sigma_2 + (2\sigma - 3\lambda)\lambda_3 \sigma_3 - 4\lambda(\lambda_1 \sigma_1 + \lambda_4 \sigma_4) - 32\lambda\sigma^3] \\
& \quad + 4\sigma[(\lambda^2 - 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_1^2 + (\lambda^2 + 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_4^2], \\
& (d_3) \quad 16[2(\mu_+ \lambda_{22} + \mu_- \lambda_{44}) - \mu_+ \lambda_1 S_2 - \mu_- \lambda_3 S_4] \lambda \sigma^2 = -3\mu_* (\mu_- \lambda_1^2 + \mu_+ \lambda_3^2) \\
& \quad + 8\lambda\sigma[(2\sigma - 3\lambda)\lambda_1 \sigma_1 + (2\sigma + 3\lambda)\lambda_3 \sigma_3 + 4\lambda(\lambda_2 \sigma_2 - \lambda_4 \sigma_4) + 32\lambda\sigma^3] \\
& \quad + 4\sigma[(\lambda^2 + 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_2^2 + (\lambda^2 - 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_4^2], \\
& (e) \quad 16[2(\mu_+ \lambda_{21} + \mu_- \lambda_{34}) - \mu_+ \lambda_1 S_1 + \mu_- \lambda_4 S_4] \lambda \sigma^2 = 32\lambda^2\sigma(\lambda_2 \sigma_1 - \lambda_3 \sigma_4) \\
& \quad + (3\lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2\sigma + 4\lambda\sigma^2 + 104\sigma^3)\lambda_1 \lambda_2 - (3\lambda^3 + 2\lambda^2\sigma + 4\lambda\sigma^2 - 104\sigma^3)\lambda_3 \lambda_4 \\
& \quad + 8\lambda\sigma[(3\lambda - 2\sigma)\lambda_1 \sigma_2 - (3\lambda + 2\sigma)\lambda_4 \sigma_3], \\
& (e_1) \quad 16[2(\mu_- \lambda_{12} - \mu_+ \lambda_{34}) + \mu_- \lambda_2 S_2 - \mu_+ \lambda_4 S_4] \lambda \sigma^2 = -32\lambda^2\sigma(\lambda_1 \sigma_2 + \lambda_3 \sigma_4) \\
& \quad - (3\lambda^3 + 2\lambda^2\sigma + 4\lambda\sigma^2 - 104\sigma^3)\lambda_1 \lambda_2 - (3\lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2\sigma + 4\lambda\sigma^2 + 104\sigma^3)\lambda_3 \lambda_4 \\
& \quad + 8\lambda\sigma[(2\sigma - 3\lambda)\lambda_4 \sigma_3 - (2\sigma + 3\lambda)\lambda_2 \sigma_1], \\
& (e_2) \quad 16[2(\mu_- \lambda_{21} - \mu_+ \lambda_{43}) - \mu_- \lambda_1 S_1 + \mu_+ \lambda_3 S_3] \lambda \sigma^2 = -32\lambda^2\sigma(\lambda_2 \sigma_1 + \lambda_4 \sigma_3) \\
& \quad - (3\lambda^3 + 2\lambda^2\sigma + 4\lambda\sigma^2 - 104\sigma^3)\lambda_1 \lambda_2 - (3\lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2\sigma + 4\lambda\sigma^2 + 104\sigma^3)\lambda_3 \lambda_4 \\
& \quad + 8\lambda\sigma[(2\sigma - 3\lambda)\lambda_3 \sigma_4 - (2\sigma + 3\lambda)\lambda_1 \sigma_2], \\
& (e_3) \quad 16[2(\mu_+ \lambda_{12} + \mu_- \lambda_{43}) + \mu_+ \lambda_2 S_2 - \mu_- \lambda_3 S_3] \lambda \sigma^2 = 32\lambda^2\sigma(\lambda_1 \sigma_2 - \lambda_4 \sigma_3) \\
& \quad + (3\lambda^3 - 2\lambda^2\sigma + 4\lambda\sigma^2 + 104\sigma^3)\lambda_1 \lambda_2 - (3\lambda^3 + 2\lambda^2\sigma + 4\lambda\sigma^2 - 104\sigma^3)\lambda_3 \lambda_4 \\
& \quad + 8\lambda\sigma[(3\lambda - 2\sigma)\lambda_2 \sigma_1 - (3\lambda + 2\sigma)\lambda_3 \sigma_4],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(f) \quad & 16[2(\sigma_{12} - \sigma_{21}) + \sigma_1 S_1 + \sigma_2 S_2] \lambda \sigma^2 = \mu_* (\lambda_1 \sigma_2 - \lambda_2 \sigma_1) + 16\sigma^2 (\lambda_4 \sigma_3 - \lambda_3 \sigma_4), \\
(f_4) \quad & 16[2(\sigma_{43} - \sigma_{34}) - \sigma_3 S_3 - \sigma_4 S_4] \lambda \sigma^2 = 16\sigma^2 (\lambda_1 \sigma_2 - \lambda_2 \sigma_1) + \mu_* (\lambda_4 \sigma_3 - \lambda_3 \sigma_4), \\
(g) \quad & 16[2(\sigma_{13} - \sigma_{31}) + \sigma_2 S_3 - \sigma_4 S_1] \lambda \sigma^2 \\
& = 4\sigma (\mu_- \lambda_3 \sigma_1 - \mu_+ \lambda_1 \sigma_3) + \mu_-^2 \lambda_2 \sigma_4 - \mu_+^2 \lambda_4 \sigma_2, \\
(g_1) \quad & 16[2(\sigma_{32} - \sigma_{23}) + \sigma_1 S_3 + \sigma_4 S_2] \lambda \sigma^2 \\
& = \mu_+^2 \lambda_1 \sigma_4 - \mu_-^2 \lambda_4 \sigma_1 + 4\sigma (\mu_- \lambda_2 \sigma_3 - \mu_+ \lambda_3 \sigma_2), \\
(g_2) \quad & 16[2(\sigma_{41} - \sigma_{14}) - \sigma_2 S_4 - \sigma_3 S_1] \lambda \sigma^2 \\
& = \mu_+^2 \lambda_2 \sigma_3 - \mu_-^2 \lambda_3 \sigma_2 + 4\sigma (\mu_- \lambda_1 \sigma_4 - \mu_+ \lambda_4 \sigma_1), \\
(g_3) \quad & 16[2(\sigma_{42} - \sigma_{24}) + \sigma_1 S_4 - \sigma_3 S_2] \lambda \sigma^2 \\
& = \mu_+^2 \lambda_3 \sigma_1 - \mu_-^2 \lambda_1 \sigma_3 + 4\sigma (\mu_+ \lambda_2 \sigma_4 - \mu_- \lambda_4 \sigma_2), \\
(h) \quad & 16[2(\lambda_{11} + \lambda_{22}) + \lambda_2 S_1 - \lambda_1 S_2] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_* \\
& - 128[2(\sigma_{11} + \sigma_{22}) + \sigma_2 S_1 - \sigma_1 S_2] \lambda^2 \sigma^3 + 320\lambda^2 \sigma^2 (\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2) \\
& = (112\sigma^4 + 40\lambda^2 \sigma^2 - \lambda^4) (\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2) - 48\sigma^2 \mu_* (\lambda_3^2 + \lambda_4^2) \\
& + 16\lambda\sigma [(4\sigma^2 - 5\lambda^2) (\lambda_1 \sigma_1 + \lambda_2 \sigma_2) + 8\sigma^2 (\lambda_3 \sigma_3 + \lambda_4 \sigma_4) + 32\lambda^2 \sigma^3], \\
(h_4) \quad & 16[2(\lambda_{33} + \lambda_{44}) + \lambda_4 S_3 - \lambda_3 S_4] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_* \\
& - 128[2(\sigma_{33} + \sigma_{44}) + \sigma_4 S_3 - \sigma_3 S_4] \lambda^2 \sigma^3 + 320\lambda^2 \sigma^2 (\sigma_3^2 + \sigma_4^2) \\
& = (112\sigma^4 + 40\lambda^2 \sigma^2 - \lambda^4) (\lambda_3^2 + \lambda_4^2) - 48\sigma^2 \mu_* (\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2) \\
& + 16\lambda\sigma [(4\sigma^2 - 5\lambda^2) (\lambda_3 \sigma_3 + \lambda_4 \sigma_4) + 8\sigma^2 (\lambda_1 \sigma_1 + \lambda_2 \sigma_2) - 32\lambda^2 \sigma^3], \\
(i) \quad & 16[2(\lambda_{41} + \lambda_{23}) - \lambda_1 S_3 - \lambda_3 S_1] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_* \\
& - 128[2(\sigma_{41} + \sigma_{23}) - \sigma_1 S_3 - \sigma_3 S_1] \lambda^2 \sigma^3 \\
& = (304\sigma^4 - 160\lambda\sigma^3 + 56\lambda^2 \sigma^2 + 8\lambda^3 \sigma - \lambda^4) \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \\
& + (304\sigma^4 + 160\lambda\sigma^3 + 56\lambda^2 \sigma^2 - 8\lambda^3 \sigma - \lambda^4) \lambda_1 \lambda_4 \\
& - 8\lambda\sigma [\mu_-^2 \lambda_3 \sigma_2 + \mu_+^2 \lambda_1 \sigma_4 + 40\lambda\sigma (\sigma_1 \sigma_4 + \sigma_2 \sigma_3)] \\
& - 8\lambda\sigma [(4\sigma^2 - 4\lambda\sigma + 9\lambda^2) \lambda_2 \sigma_3 + (4\sigma^2 + 4\lambda\sigma + 9\lambda^2) \lambda_4 \sigma_1], \\
(i_1) \quad & 16[2(\lambda_{42} - \lambda_{13}) - \lambda_2 S_3 - \lambda_3 S_2] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_* \\
& - 128[2(\sigma_{42} - \sigma_{13}) - \sigma_2 S_3 - \sigma_3 S_2] \lambda^2 \sigma^3 \\
& = (304\sigma^4 - 160\lambda\sigma^3 + 56\lambda^2 \sigma^2 + 8\lambda^3 \sigma - \lambda^4) \lambda_2 \lambda_4 \\
& - (304\sigma^4 + 160\lambda\sigma^3 + 56\lambda^2 \sigma^2 - 8\lambda^3 \sigma - \lambda^4) \lambda_1 \lambda_3 \\
& + 8\lambda\sigma [\mu_+^2 \lambda_3 \sigma_1 - \mu_-^2 \lambda_2 \sigma_4 + 40\lambda\sigma (\sigma_1 \sigma_3 - \sigma_2 \sigma_4)] \\
& + 8\lambda\sigma [(4\sigma^2 + 4\lambda\sigma + 9\lambda^2) \lambda_1 \sigma_3 - (4\sigma^2 - 4\lambda\sigma + 9\lambda^2) \lambda_4 \sigma_2], \\
(i_2) \quad & 16[2(\lambda_{24} - \lambda_{31}) - \lambda_1 S_4 - \lambda_4 S_1] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_* \\
& - 128[2(\sigma_{24} - \sigma_{31}) - \sigma_1 S_4 - \sigma_4 S_1] \lambda^2 \sigma^3 \\
& = (304\sigma^4 + 160\lambda\sigma^3 + 56\lambda^2 \sigma^2 - 8\lambda^3 \sigma - \lambda^4) \lambda_2 \lambda_4 \\
& - (304\sigma^4 - 160\lambda\sigma^3 + 56\lambda^2 \sigma^2 + 8\lambda^3 \sigma - \lambda^4) \lambda_1 \lambda_3 \\
& + 8\lambda\sigma [\mu_-^2 \lambda_1 \sigma_3 - \mu_+^2 \lambda_4 \sigma_2 + 40\lambda\sigma (\sigma_1 \sigma_3 - \sigma_2 \sigma_4)] \\
& + 8\lambda\sigma [(4\sigma^2 - 4\lambda\sigma + 9\lambda^2) \lambda_3 \sigma_1 - (4\sigma^2 + 4\lambda\sigma + 9\lambda^2) \lambda_2 \sigma_4], \\
(i_3) \quad & 16[2(\lambda_{14} + \lambda_{32}) + \lambda_2 S_4 + \lambda_4 S_2] \lambda \sigma^2 \mu_* \\
& - 128[2(\sigma_{14} + \sigma_{32}) + \sigma_2 S_4 + \sigma_4 S_2] \lambda^2 \sigma^3 \\
& = (304\sigma^4 - 160\lambda\sigma^3 + 56\lambda^2 \sigma^2 + 8\lambda^3 \sigma - \lambda^4) \lambda_1 \lambda_4 \\
& + (304\sigma^4 + 160\lambda\sigma^3 + 56\lambda^2 \sigma^2 - 8\lambda^3 \sigma - \lambda^4) \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \\
& - 8\lambda\sigma [\mu_-^2 \lambda_4 \sigma_1 + \mu_+^2 \lambda_2 \sigma_3 + 40\lambda\sigma (\sigma_2 \sigma_3 + \sigma_1 \sigma_4)] \\
& - 8\lambda\sigma [(4\sigma^2 - 4\lambda\sigma + 9\lambda^2) \lambda_1 \sigma_4 + (4\sigma^2 + 4\lambda\sigma + 9\lambda^2) \lambda_3 \sigma_2], \\
(j) \quad & 16[2(S_{21} - S_{12}) - S_1^2 - S_2^2] \lambda \sigma^2 + 8\lambda\sigma (\sigma_2 S_1 - \sigma_1 S_2) \\
& = \mu_* (\lambda_2 S_1 - \lambda_1 S_2) + 16\sigma^2 (\lambda_3 S_4 - \lambda_4 S_3) - 32\lambda^2 \sigma^2, \\
(j_4) \quad & 16[2(S_{43} - S_{34}) - S_3^2 - S_4^2] \lambda \sigma^2 + 8\lambda\sigma (\sigma_4 S_3 - \sigma_3 S_4) \\
& = \mu_* (\lambda_4 S_3 - \lambda_3 S_4) + 16\sigma^2 (\lambda_1 S_2 - \lambda_2 S_1) + 32\lambda^2 \sigma^2, \\
(k) \quad & 16[2(S_{31} - S_{13}) + S_1 S_4 - S_2 S_3] \lambda \sigma^2 + 8\lambda\sigma (\sigma_2 S_4 - \sigma_4 S_2) \\
& = \mu_+^2 \lambda_4 S_2 - \mu_-^2 \lambda_2 S_4 + 4\sigma (\mu_+ \lambda_1 S_3 - \mu_- \lambda_3 S_1),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(k_1) \quad & 16[2(S_{32} - S_{23}) + S_2S_4 + S_1S_3]\lambda\sigma^2 + 8\lambda\sigma(\sigma_4S_1 - \sigma_1S_4) \\
& = \mu_+^2\lambda_1S_4 - \mu_-^2\lambda_4S_1 + 4\sigma(\mu_- \lambda_2S_3 - \mu_+ \lambda_3S_2), \\
(k_2) \quad & 16[2(S_{41} - S_{14}) - S_1S_3 - S_2S_4]\lambda\sigma^2 + 8\lambda\sigma(\sigma_3S_2 - \sigma_2S_3) \\
& = \mu_+^2\lambda_2S_3 - \mu_-^2\lambda_3S_2 + 4\sigma(\mu_- \lambda_1S_4 - \mu_+ \lambda_4S_1), \\
(k_3) \quad & 16[2(S_{42} - S_{24}) - S_2S_3 + S_1S_4]\lambda\sigma^2 + 8\lambda\sigma(\sigma_1S_3 - \sigma_3S_1) \\
& = \mu_+^2\lambda_3S_1 - \mu_-^2\lambda_1S_3 + 4\sigma(\mu_+ \lambda_2S_4 - \mu_- \lambda_4S_2).
\end{aligned}$$

In fact, as  $(2E, 2H) = (S + L, S - L)$ , (4.2) yields the Lie-bracket relations

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.1) \quad & 2[e_1, e_2] = (S_1 + L_1)e_1 + (S_2 + L_2)e_2 + 2(G_1 + F_2)e_3 + 2(G_2 - F_1)e_4, \\
& 2[e_1, e_3] = 2F_1e_1 + (S_3 + L_3 - 2G_1)e_2 + 2F_3e_3 + (2G_3 + L_1 - S_1)e_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the directional derivatives of  $\lambda$  and  $\sigma$  along the vector fields (5.1) multiplied by  $16\lambda\sigma^2$ , and using (4.6), which, in particular, gives

$$(5.2) \quad 8\lambda\sigma(G_1 + F_2) = -4\sigma\lambda_4, \quad 8\lambda\sigma(G_2 - F_1) = 4\sigma\lambda_3,$$

we obtain (a), (b), (f) and (g). Next, given a 1-form  $Z = Z_i e^i$ , let  $Z_{ij} = d_j Z_i$ . By (4.3) and (1.7),  $dZ$  is the combination of  $A \wedge B$ ,  $A \wedge C$ ,  $A \wedge D$ ,  $B \wedge C$ ,  $B \wedge D$ ,  $C \wedge D$  with the first three respective coefficient functions

$$\begin{aligned}
& Z_{21} - Z_{12} - Z_1E_1 - Z_2E_2 - Z_3(F_2 + G_1) + Z_4(F_1 - G_2), \\
& Z_{31} - Z_{13} - Z_1F_1 + Z_2(G_1 - E_3) - Z_3F_3 + Z_4(H_1 - G_3), \\
& Z_{41} - Z_{14} - Z_1G_1 - Z_2(F_1 + E_4) - Z_3(F_4 + H_1) - Z_4G_4.
\end{aligned}$$

In view of (1.7), the above three lines equal

$$\begin{aligned}
& L_1G_2 - L_2G_1, \quad L_1G_3 - L_3G_1, \quad L_1G_4 - L_4G_1 \quad \text{when } Z = F, \\
& 4(F_2G_1 - F_1G_2) - \lambda, \quad 4(F_3G_1 - F_1G_3), \quad 4(F_4G_1 - F_1G_4) \quad \text{if } Z = L.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $Z = S$  the first two of them are  $-\lambda$  and 0. Of the eight equalities just described, multiplying the first three by  $256\lambda^2\sigma^3$ , the next two by  $512\lambda^2\sigma^4$ , the last two by  $32\lambda\sigma^2$ , then using (4.6), while replacing  $E$  by  $(S + L)/2$  and  $H$  by  $(S - L)/2$ , we get (c), (d), (e), (h), (i), (j), (k). The equalities labeled by plain letters  $a, b, \dots, j, k$  have now been established. They imply the remaining ones, with subscripts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 in their labels, each subscript referring to one of the five cases of (4.4). Thus,  $(e_2)$  arises from (e) via (4.4-ii), and  $(h_4)$  from (h) via (4.4-iv).

REMARK 5.1. One easily verifies that equation  $(e_3)$ , or  $(e_1)$ , or  $(i_1)$ , or  $(i_3)$ , is the linear combination of (a),  $(a_4)$ , (e), or (a),  $(a_4)$ ,  $(e_2)$ , or  $(c_1)$ ,  $(c_5)$ , (g),  $(g_3)$ ,  $(i_2)$ , or (c),  $(c_4)$ ,  $(g_2)$ ,  $(g_1)$ , (i), with the respective coefficient functions  $8\lambda\sigma\mu_+$ ,  $-8\lambda\sigma\mu_-$ , 1, or  $8\lambda\sigma\mu_-$ ,  $-8\lambda\sigma\mu_+$ , 1, or  $\mu_-$ ,  $-\mu_+$ ,  $8\lambda\sigma$ ,  $-8\lambda\sigma$ , 1 or, finally,  $\mu_+$ ,  $-\mu_-$ ,  $8\lambda\sigma$ ,  $-8\lambda\sigma$ , 1. On the other hand, the linear combination of  $(b_2)$ ,  $(b_1)$ , (c),  $(c_4)$  with the coefficients  $8\lambda\sigma\mu_*$ ,  $-8\lambda\sigma\mu_*$ ,  $-\mu_+$ ,  $\mu_-$  yields  $32\lambda\sigma$  times equation (a) in the Introduction, while (b) then follows from (a) via (3.2-ii). Equivalently, (b) multiplied by  $32\lambda\sigma$  also arises as the combination of (b),  $(b_3)$ ,  $(c_1)$ ,  $(c_5)$  with the coefficients  $8\lambda\sigma\mu_*$ ,  $8\lambda\sigma\mu_*$ ,  $\mu_-$ ,  $-\mu_+$ .

REMARK 5.2. Under the assumptions (1.4) – (1.5), at points where  $\lambda\sigma \neq 0$ , due to (2.2), the Ricci eigendistributions are  $\text{span}(e_1, e_2)$  and  $\text{span}(e_3, e_4)$ . The former (or, the latter) is integrable if and only if  $\lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0$  (or, respectively,  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$ ). In fact, the first claim is obvious from the first line of (5.1) and (5.2), and it implies the second one as a consequence of (3.2-iv).

## 6. Generic points

To prove an equality-type conclusion (\*) on a manifold  $M$ , one can obviously fix a tensor field  $\Theta$ , with the zero set  $Y$ , and establish (\*) just on the open dense set  $Y^\circ \cup [M \setminus Y]$  of  $\Theta$ -generic points, arising as the union of the interior  $Y^\circ$  of  $Y$  and the complement  $M \setminus Y$  of  $Y$ .

Our proofs of Conjecture (1.1) in the special cases (ii) – (iii) of Theorem A will consist in showing that, under either of the assumptions (ii) – (iii),

$$(6.1) \quad \lambda\sigma = 0 \text{ identically whenever (1.4) – (1.5) hold and } \nabla J = 0,$$

which is a slightly modified version of (1.6).

In fact, suppose that we have established the equality  $\lambda\sigma = 0$  in (6.1). At  $\sigma$ -generic points, with  $Y$  as above for  $\Theta = \sigma$ , the metric restricted to  $Y^\circ$ , or  $M \setminus Y$ , is, due to (2.2), conformally flat or, respectively, Ricci-flat, and so – see (2.3) – on both sets the Ricci tensor is parallel. This is the assertion of (1.1). It also shows that either  $\lambda = 0$  identically, or  $\lambda \neq 0 = \sigma$  everywhere, as required in (1.6).

In both cases (ii), (iii), we will derive a contradiction from the assumption that

$$(6.2) \quad (1.4) - (1.5) \text{ with } \nabla J = 0 \text{ and } \lambda\sigma \neq 0 \text{ everywhere.}$$

In other words, we will consider the zero set  $Y$  of  $\lambda\sigma$  and the  $\lambda\sigma$ -generic set  $Y^\circ \cup [M \setminus Y]$ . On  $Y^\circ$  our claim,  $\lambda\sigma = 0$  in (6.1), holds trivially, and the contradiction resulting from (6.2), where we have replaced  $M$  by  $M \setminus Y$ , amounts to showing that  $M \setminus Y$  is empty.

In addition to (6.2), we may – and will – assume that

$$(6.3) \quad \lambda_4 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_3 > 0 \quad \text{everywhere,}$$

which results in no loss of generality: with  $Y$  being this time the zero set of  $d\lambda$ , Remark 4.6 yields our assertion,  $\lambda\sigma = 0$ , on  $Y^\circ$ , while in  $M \setminus Y$ , locally, (3.2-iv) and Lemma 3.3 allow us, respectively, to require that  $\nabla\lambda$  have a nonzero projection onto  $\text{span}(e_3, e_4)$ , and that this projection be equal to  $\lambda_3 e_3$  with  $\lambda_3 > 0$ .

REMARK 6.1. To summarize: in the next two sections we will prove assertion of Theorem A, in the form  $\lambda\sigma = 0$  – cf. (6.1) – assuming, in addition, (ii) or (iii). In the latter case, we will consider the  $d\lambda$ -generic set  $Y^\circ \cup [M \setminus Y]$ , and observe that  $\lambda\sigma = 0$  on  $Y^\circ$ , so that we are free to replace  $M$  by  $M \setminus Y$ . In both cases, we will then show that the conditions (6.2) – (6.3) lead to a contradiction.

## 7. Proof of case (ii) in Theorem A

Following Remark 6.1, we now assume (6.2) – (6.3), along with (ii) in Theorem A, in order to derive a contradiction.

In view of Remark 5.2 and (6.3),  $\text{span}(e_1, e_2)$  cannot be integrable. Since we are assuming (ii), this leads to integrability of  $\text{span}(e_3, e_4)$ , with  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$ .

As we now have  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_4 = 0$ , (b), (b<sub>1</sub>), (b<sub>2</sub>) and (b<sub>3</sub>) give, successively,

$$(7.1) \quad \lambda_{31} = 0, \quad \lambda_{32} = 0, \quad 2\sigma S_1 = -\sigma_2, \quad 2\sigma S_2 = \sigma_1,$$

turning (c) and (c<sub>1</sub>), with  $\lambda\sigma\lambda_3 \neq 0$ , into  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 0$ , and so, by (7.1),  $S_1 = S_2 = 0$ . From (j) and (h) we thus get  $\lambda_3 S_4 = 2\lambda^2$  and  $3\mu_* \lambda_3^2 = 8\lambda\sigma(\lambda_3\sigma_3 + 4\lambda^2\sigma)$ . Combined with (d<sub>2</sub>), or with (d<sub>3</sub>), this yields

$$(7.2) \quad \lambda_3\sigma_3 = -4\sigma\mu_*, \text{ so that } 3\mu_* \lambda_3^2 = 64\lambda\sigma^2(\lambda^2 - 2\sigma^2).$$

Next, (d) and  $(d_1)$ , divided by  $4\sigma$ , amount to

$$(7.3) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{i)} \quad 8\lambda\sigma\mu_- \lambda_{33} = 8\lambda^2(8\sigma^3 - \lambda_3\sigma_3) + (\lambda^2 - 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_3^2, \\ \text{ii)} \quad 8\lambda\sigma\mu_+ \lambda_{33} = 8\lambda^2(\lambda_3\sigma_3 - 8\sigma^3) + (\lambda^2 + 4\lambda\sigma + 20\sigma^2)\lambda_3^2. \end{array}$$

The combination of (7.3-i) and (7.3-ii) with the coefficients  $3\mu_*\mu_+$  and  $-3\mu_*\mu_-$ , evaluated via (7.2), then divided by  $512\lambda^2\sigma^2$ , reads  $0 = \lambda^4 - 5\lambda^2\sigma^2 + 12\sigma^4$ . This is a contradiction, the right-hand side being clearly positive unless  $\lambda = \sigma = 0$ .

### 8. Case (iii)

As stated in Remark 6.1, we first consider the  $d\lambda$ -generic set  $Y^o \cup [M \setminus Y]$ , and note that, due to Remark 4.6, our assertion,  $\lambda\sigma = 0$ , holds on  $Y^o$ . We may thus replace  $M$  with  $M \setminus Y$ , and assume (6.2) – (6.3), along with (iii) in Theorem A, in order to derive a contradiction. In view of (6.2) – (6.3),

$$(8.1) \quad \lambda\sigma(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2) \neq 0 \text{ everywhere.}$$

By (iii) and (2.2),  $\sigma$  is, locally, a function of  $\lambda$ , with the derivative  $\sigma' = d\sigma/d\lambda$ .

Next, according to case (ii) of Theorem A, already established in Sect. 7, combined with Remark 5.2, on any nonempty open set, one cannot simultaneously have  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$  and the condition  $\lambda\sigma \neq 0$  in (6.2). Thus, if  $Y^o \cup [M \setminus Y]$  now denotes the  $(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2)$ -generic set, then  $Y^o$  must be empty. As  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  cannot both vanish on  $M \setminus Y$  (now replacing  $M$ ), (a) – (b) in the Introduction yield

$$(8.2) \quad \text{i)} \quad 8\lambda\sigma\sigma' = 12\sigma^2 - \lambda^2, \quad \text{ii)} \quad 64\lambda^2\sigma^3\sigma'' = (4\sigma^2 - \lambda^2)(12\sigma^2 + \lambda^2),$$

while  $\sigma_i = \sigma'\lambda_i$  and  $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma'\lambda_{ij} + \sigma''\lambda_i\lambda_j$ . Hence, replacing

$$\begin{array}{l} 8\lambda\sigma\sigma_i \text{ with } (12\sigma^2 - \lambda^2)\lambda_i, \quad 8\lambda\sigma\sigma_i - \mu_*\lambda_i \text{ with } 8\sigma^2\lambda_i, \\ 8\lambda\sigma^2(8\lambda\sigma\sigma_{ij} - \mu_*\lambda_{ij}) \text{ with } 64\lambda\sigma^4\lambda_{ij} + (4\sigma^2 - \lambda^2)(12\sigma^2 + \lambda^2)\lambda_i\lambda_j, \end{array}$$

as allowed by (8.2), we rewrite (d),  $(d_1)$ ,  $(d_2)$ ,  $(d_3)$ , (h),  $(h_4)$  in Sect. 5 as

$$\begin{aligned} & 4[2(\mu_+\lambda_{11} + \mu_-\lambda_{33}) + \mu_+\lambda_2S_1]\lambda\sigma^2 = (\lambda - 6\sigma)\lambda\sigma\lambda_2^2 + 64\lambda^2\sigma^4 \\ & \quad + (20\sigma^3 + 16\lambda\sigma^2 + \lambda^2\sigma - \lambda^3)\lambda_1^2 + (20\sigma^3 - 16\lambda\sigma^2 + \lambda^2\sigma + \lambda^3)\lambda_3^2, \\ & 4[2(\mu_-\lambda_{22} + \mu_+\lambda_{33}) - \mu_-\lambda_1S_2]\lambda\sigma^2 = (\lambda + 6\sigma)\lambda\sigma\lambda_1^2 - 64\lambda^2\sigma^4 \\ & \quad + (20\sigma^3 - 16\lambda\sigma^2 + \lambda^2\sigma + \lambda^3)\lambda_2^2 + (20\sigma^3 + 16\lambda\sigma^2 + \lambda^2\sigma - \lambda^3)\lambda_3^2, \\ & 4(2\mu_-\lambda_{11} + \mu_-\lambda_2S_1 - \mu_+\lambda_3S_4)\lambda\sigma^2 = \lambda\sigma[(\lambda + 6\sigma)\lambda_2^2 + (\lambda - 6\sigma)\lambda_3^2] \\ & \quad + (20\sigma^3 - 16\lambda\sigma^2 + \lambda^2\sigma + \lambda^3)\lambda_1^2 - 64\lambda^2\sigma^4, \\ & 4(2\mu_+\lambda_{22} - \mu_+\lambda_1S_2 - \mu_-\lambda_3S_4)\lambda\sigma^2 = \lambda\sigma[(\lambda - 6\sigma)\lambda_1^2 + (\lambda + 6\sigma)\lambda_3^2] \\ & \quad + (20\sigma^3 + 16\lambda\sigma^2 + \lambda^2\sigma - \lambda^3)\lambda_2^2 + 64\lambda^2\sigma^4, \\ & 4[2(\lambda_{11} + \lambda_{22}) + \lambda_2S_1 - \lambda_1S_2]\lambda\sigma^2 = 10\sigma^2(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2) - \lambda^2\lambda_3^2 - 16\lambda^3\sigma^2, \\ & 4(2\lambda_{33} - \lambda_3S_4)\lambda\sigma^2 = 10\sigma^2\lambda_3^2 - \lambda^2(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2) + 16\lambda^3\sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting the sum of the last two equations above, multiplied by  $4\sigma$ , from the sum of the first four, we get  $8\lambda^2\sigma(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2) = 0$ , which contradicts (8.1).

### References

- [1] T. Arias-Marco and O. Kowalski, *Classification of 4-dimensional homogeneous weakly Einstein manifolds*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **65**(140) (2015), no. 1, 21–59.
- [2] A. L. Besse, *Einstein Manifolds*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [3] S. Caeiro-Oliveira and R. Mariño-Villar, *An algebraic characterization of weakly-Einstein hypersurfaces in space forms*, J. Geom. Phys. **214** (2025), art. 105530, 10 pp.
- [4] A. Derdzinski, *Einstein metrics in dimension four*, Handbook of Differential Geometry, vol. I, pp. 419–707. North-Holland, Amsterdam (2000).

- [5] A. Derdzinski, Y. Euh, S. Kim and J. H. Park, *On weakly Einstein Kähler surfaces*, Internat. J. Math. **36** (2025), no. 14, art. 2550057, 23 pp.
- [6] A. Derdzinski, J. H. Park, and W. Shin, *Weakly Einstein curvature tensors*, preprint, available from <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2504.18752>.
- [7] A. Derdzinski, J. H. Park and W. Shin, *Weakly Einstein conformal products*, preprint, available from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.05173>.
- [8] A. Derdzinski, P. Piccione and I. Terek, *Nijenhuis geometry of parallel tensors*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **204** (2025), no. 4, 1381–1401.
- [9] Y. Euh, J. H. Park and K. Sekigawa, *A curvature identity on a 4-dimensional Riemannian manifold*, Results Math. **63** (2013), no. 1-2, 107–114.
- [10] Y. Euh, J. H. Park and K. Sekigawa, *A generalization of a 4-dimensional Einstein manifold*, Math. Slovaca **63** (2013), 595–610.
- [11] E. García-Río, A. Haji-Badali, R. Mariño-Villar and M. E. Vázquez-Abal, *Locally conformally flat weakly-Einstein manifolds*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **111** (2018), no. 5, 549–559.
- [12] J. Kim, C. LeBrun and M. Pontecorvo, *Scalar-flat Kähler surfaces of all genera*, J. reine angew. Math. **486** (1997), 69–95.
- [13] C. LeBrun, *Scalar-flat Kähler metrics on blown-Up ruled surfaces*, J. reine angew. Math. **420** (1991), 161–177.
- [14] R. Mariño-Villar, *Structure of locally conformally flat manifolds satisfying some weakly-Einstein conditions*, J. Geom Phys. **186** (2023), art. 104754, 8 pp.
- [15] S. Tanno, *4-dimensional conformally flat Kahler manifolds*, Tôhoku Math. J. **24** (1972), no. 3, 501–504.
- [16] Y. Wang and Y. Zhang, *Weakly Einstein real hypersurfaces in  $\mathbb{C}P^2$  and  $\mathbb{C}H^2$* , J. Geom. Phys. **181** (2022), art. 104648, 11 pp.

<sup>1</sup> DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OH 43210, USA  
*Email address:* [andrzej@math.ohio-state.edu](mailto:andrzej@math.ohio-state.edu)

<sup>2</sup> DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUNGKYUNKWAN UNIVERSITY, SUWON, 16419, KOREA  
*Email address:* [kimsinhwi@skku.edu](mailto:kimsinhwi@skku.edu), [parkj@skku.edu](mailto:parkj@skku.edu)