

ISOPARAMETRIC FOLIATION AND A PROBLEM OF BESSE ON GENERALIZATIONS OF EINSTEIN CONDITION

ZIZHOU TANG AND WENJIAO YAN[†]

ABSTRACT. The focal sets of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres with $g = 4$ are all Willmore submanifolds, being minimal but mostly non-Einstein ([TY1], [QTY]). Inspired by A.Gray's view, the present paper shows that, these focal sets are all \mathcal{A} -manifolds but rarely Ricci parallel, except possibly for the only unclassified case. As a byproduct, it gives infinitely many simply-connected examples to the problem 16.56 (i) of Besse concerning generalizations of the Einstein condition.

1. Introduction

The Riemannian manifolds with constant Ricci curvatures (the Einstein condition) and those with constant scalar curvatures are two important classes of Riemannian manifolds. We denote them by \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{S} , respectively. Then there comes apparently a class of manifolds with parallel Ricci tensor, denoted by \mathcal{P} , lies between \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{S} . As further generalizations of the Einstein condition, A. Gray ([Gra]) introduced two significant classes \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} defined as follows, in which the Ricci tensor ρ is cyclic parallel and a Codazzi tensor, respectively:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} & : \nabla_i \rho_{jk} + \nabla_j \rho_{ki} + \nabla_k \rho_{ij} = 0 \\ \mathcal{B} & : \nabla_i \rho_{jk} - \nabla_j \rho_{ik} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

These two classes \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are investigated extensively since then. In view of the second Bianchi identity, the class \mathcal{B} coincides with those having harmonic curvatures. Gray also showed that the following inclusions exist between the various classes:

$$\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \begin{matrix} \subset \mathcal{A} \\ \subset \mathcal{B} \end{matrix} \quad \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{S}$$

and proved that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are the only classes between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S} from the view of group representations.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C25, 53C40, 57R20.

Key words and phrases. Isoparametric hypersurfaces, focal submanifolds, Ricci parallel, \mathcal{A} -manifold, a problem of Besse.

[†] the corresponding author.

[TY1] and [QTY] provide many new examples of Willmore submanifolds in spheres via isoparametric foliation. More precisely, the focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres with four distinct principal curvatures (the most complicated and abundant case) are all Willmore submanifolds in spheres. Since the focal submanifolds are minimal in spheres, in contrast with the well-known fact that the Einstein manifolds minimally immersed in spheres are Willmore, [QTY] also determined which of these focal submanifolds are Einstein. A further and natural question arises: *are they Ricci parallel, \mathcal{A} -manifolds, or \mathcal{B} -manifolds?* The present paper aims at an answer to this question.

To state clearly the results, we first need a short review of the isoparametric foliation.

Researches on classifications and applications of isoparametric foliation in spheres have been quite active recently (for classifications, see [CCJ], [Miy], [Chi]; for applications, see for example, [GR], [GX], [QTY], [TXY], [TY1], [TY2]). As is well known, an isoparametric hypersurface M^n in $S^{n+1}(1)$ is a hypersurface with constant principal curvatures. Let g be the number of distinct principal curvatures with multiplicity m_i ($i = 1, \dots, g$). According to [Mün], g can be only 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6, and $m_i = m_{i+2}$ (subscripts mod g). When $g = 1, 2, 3$ and 6, the classification for isoparametric hypersurfaces are accomplished; when $g = 4$, all isoparametric hypersurfaces are of OT-FKM type (defined later), or of homogeneous type with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2), (4, 5)$ except possibly for the case with $(m_1, m_2) = (7, 8)$ (cf. [Chi]).

In fact, an isoparametric hypersurfaces in $S^{n+1}(1)$ always comes as a family of parallel hypersurfaces, which are level hypersurfaces (isoparametric foliation) of an isoparametric function f , that is, a function on $S^{n+1}(1)$ satisfying

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} |\nabla f|^2 = b(f), \\ \Delta f = a(f), \end{cases}$$

where ∇f and Δf are the gradient and Laplacian of f on $S^{n+1}(1)$, b and a smooth and continuous functions on \mathbb{R} , respectively. The two singular sets of f are called the focal sets (submanifolds), denoted respectively by M_1 and M_2 , being actually minimal submanifolds of $S^{n+1}(1)$ with codimensions $m_1 + 1$ and $m_2 + 1$ (cf. [CR]).

Now we recall the construction of isoparametric functions of OT-FKM type, constructed by Ferus, Karcher and Münzner ([FKM]), following [OT]. For a symmetric Clifford system $\{P_0, \dots, P_m\}$ on \mathbb{R}^{2l} , *i.e.* P_α 's are symmetric matrices satisfying $P_\alpha P_\beta + P_\beta P_\alpha = 2\delta_{\alpha\beta} I_{2l}$, a homogeneous polynomial F of degree 4 on \mathbb{R}^{2l} is defined as:

$$(1.3) \quad F(x) = |x|^4 - 2 \sum_{\alpha=0}^m \langle P_\alpha x, x \rangle^2.$$

It is easy to verify that $f = F|_{S^{2l-1}}$ is an isoparametric function on S^{2l-1} . The focal submanifolds $M_1 = f^{-1}(1)$, $M_2 = f^{-1}(-1)$, and the multiplicity pair is $(m_1, m_2) = (m, l - m - 1)$, provided $m > 0$ and $l - m - 1 > 0$, where $l = k\delta(m)$ ($k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$), $\delta(m)$ is the dimension of an irreducible module of the Clifford algebra \mathcal{C}_{m-1} .

It was observed by [KN] that the isoparametric hypersurfaces are \mathcal{A} -manifolds only when $g \leq 3$, and Ricci parallel only when $g \leq 2$. The present paper will study in-depth the focal submanifolds. As one of the main results, we prove

Theorem 1.1. All the focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres with $g = 4$ are \mathcal{A} -manifolds, except possibly for the only unclassified case with $(m_1, m_2) = (7, 8)$.

From now on, we shall concentrate on the focal submanifolds M_i ($i = 1, 2$) not in the unclassified case $(m_1, m_2) = (7, 8)$. From Theorem 1.1 and the relation $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$ it follows that

$$M_i \in \mathcal{P} \iff M_i \in \mathcal{B}, (i = 1, 2).$$

Thus we are left to investigate which M_i is Ricci parallel.

The following theorem achieves a complete answer to this question.

Theorem 1.2. For the focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres with $g = 4$, we have

- (i) The M_1 of OT-FKM type is Ricci parallel if and only if $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 1), (6, 1)$, or it is diffeomorphic to $Sp(2)$ in the homogeneous case with $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 3)$; while the M_2 of OT-FKM type is Ricci parallel if and only if $(m_1, m_2) = (1, k)$.
- (ii) For $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$, the one diffeomorphic to $\tilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$ is Ricci parallel, while the other diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$ is not.
- (iii) For $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 5)$, both are not Ricci parallel.

Remark 1.1. As we mentioned in [QTY], the only Einstein ones among the known focal submanifolds are actually the focal submanifold M_1 of OT-FKM type diffeomorphic to $Sp(2)$ in the homogeneous case with $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 3)$ and the focal submanifold diffeomorphic to $\tilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$ with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$.

It is well known that the D'Atri spaces (Riemannian manifolds with volume preserving geodesic symmetries) belong to the class \mathcal{A} (cf. [Bes], pp.450). So the examples of \mathcal{A} -manifolds are not rare in the literature, but mostly are (locally) homogeneous.

In this regard, Besse ([Bes], 16.56(i), pp.451) posed the following problem as one of "some open problems" : *Find examples of \mathcal{A} -manifolds, which are neither locally homogeneous, nor locally isometric to Riemannian products and have non-parallel Ricci tensor.*

To find examples for this problem, [Jel] and [PT] constructed \mathcal{A} -manifolds on S^1 -bundles over locally non-homogeneous Kähler-Einstein manifolds, and on S^1 -bundles over a $K3$ surface, from defining Riemannian submersion metric on the S^1 -bundles. But in some sense, their examples are not so satisfying, as they are not simply-connected, and the metrics are not natural enough.

On the ground of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2, in virtue of the following two propositions, we find a series of natural, simply-connected examples for this open problem of Besse.

Proposition 1.1. The focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres with $g = 4$ and $m_1, m_2 > 1$ are not Riemannian products.

Proposition 1.2. The focal submanifolds M_1 of OT-FKM type with $(m_1, m_2) = (3, 4k)$ are not intrinsically homogeneous.

Remark 1.2. By Morse theory, one sees that if $m_1 > 1$ (resp. $m_2 > 1$), the focal submanifold M_2 (resp. M_1) is simply-connected (cf. [Tan]). Combining the two propositions above with Theorem 1.1 and 1.2, we conclude that the focal submanifolds M_1 of OT-FKM type with $(m_1, m_2) = (3, 4k)$ are simply-connected \mathcal{A} -manifolds with non-parallel Ricci tensor, which are minimal submanifolds in spheres, but neither locally homogeneous, nor locally isometric to Riemannian products. Much more examples to the problem of Besse can be obtained in this way, however we shall not go into the details in this paper.

2. \mathcal{A} -manifolds

We begin this section with displaying an equivalent condition of the definition (1.1) for \mathcal{A} -manifold, that is

$$(2.1) \quad (\nabla_X \rho)(X, X) = 0, \text{ for any tangent vector } X.$$

Based on the known classification results of the isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres with four distinct principal curvatures, we will divide the proof of Theorem 1.1 into three parts: the OT-FKM type, the homogeneous cases with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$ and $(4, 5)$.

2.1. OT-FKM type.

2.1.1. M_1 of OT-FKM type. According to the definition (1.3), the focal submanifold M_1 of OT-FKM type can be written as:

$$M_1 = \{x \in S^{2l-1} \mid \langle P_0 x, x \rangle = \langle P_1 x, x \rangle = \cdots = \langle P_m x, x \rangle = 0\}.$$

Note that $\dim M_1 = 2l - m - 2$. As pointed out by [FKM], the normal space in S^{2l-1} at $x \in M_1$ is

$$T_x^\perp M_1 = \{ Px \mid P \in \mathbb{R}\Sigma(P_0, \dots, P_m) \},$$

where $\Sigma(P_0, \dots, P_m)$ is the unit sphere in $\text{Span}\{P_0, \dots, P_m\}$, which is called *the Clifford sphere* determined by the system $\{P_0, \dots, P_m\}$.

For the normal vector $\xi_\alpha = P_\alpha x$, $\alpha = 0, \dots, m$, denote $A_\alpha =: A_{\xi_\alpha}$ the shape operator corresponding to ξ_α . Then for any $X, Y \in T_x M_1$, the Ricci tensor $\rho(X, Y)$ is given by (cf. [TY1])

$$\rho(X, Y) = 2(l - m - 2)\langle X, Y \rangle + \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha \neq \beta}^m \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle \langle Y, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle.$$

As the metric tensor is parallel, we need only to focus on the tensor

$$\sigma(X, Y) =: \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha \neq \beta}^m \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle \langle Y, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle.$$

A direct calculation implies

$$\begin{aligned} & (\nabla_Z \sigma)(X, Y) \\ &= Z\sigma(X, Y) - \sigma(\nabla_Z X, Y) - \sigma(X, \nabla_Z Y) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha \neq \beta}^m \langle X, \nabla_Z(P_\alpha P_\beta x) \rangle \langle Y, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle + \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle \langle Y, \nabla_Z(P_\alpha P_\beta x) \rangle \\ (2.2) \quad &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha \neq \beta}^m \langle X, D_Z(P_\alpha P_\beta x) \rangle \langle Y, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle + \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle \langle Y, D_Z(P_\alpha P_\beta x) \rangle \\ &= - \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha \neq \beta}^m \langle Z, \langle Y, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta X + \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta Y \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where ∇ and D are the Levi-Civita connections on M_1 and \mathbb{R}^{2l} , respectively.

Apparently, taking $X = Y = Z$, (2.2) leads directly to $(\nabla_X \sigma)(X, X) = 0$, equivalently, M_1 of OT-FKM type is an \mathcal{A} -manifold, as we desired.

2.1.2. M_2 of OT-FKM type. Following [FKM], we see that the focal submanifold

$$\begin{aligned} M_2 &= F^{-1}(-1) \cap S^{2l-1} \\ &= \{x \in S^{2l-1} \mid \text{there exists } P \in \Sigma(P_0, \dots, P_m) \text{ with } Px = x\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for any $P \in \Sigma(P_0, \dots, P_m)$, its eigenvalues must be ± 1 , with equal multiplicity. Thus \mathbb{R}^{2l} can be decomposed as a direct sum of the corresponding eigenspaces $E_+(P)$ and $E_-(P)$.

Given $x \in M_2$ and $P \in \Sigma(P_0, \dots, P_m)$ with $Px = x$. Define

$$\Sigma_P := \{Q \in \Sigma(P_0, \dots, P_m) \mid \langle P, Q \rangle := \frac{1}{2l} \text{Trace}(PQ) = 0\},$$

which is the equatorial sphere of $\Sigma(P_0, \dots, P_m)$ orthogonal to P . In this way, there exists a decomposition of the tangent space $T_x M_2$ with respect to the eigenspaces of the shape operator.

Lemma ([FKM]) *The principal curvatures of the shape operator A_η with respect to any unit normal vector $\eta \in T_x^\perp M_2$ are 0, 1, and -1 , with the corresponding eigenspaces $\text{Ker}(A_\eta)$, $E_+(A_\eta)$, $E_-(A_\eta)$ as follows:*

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Ker}(A_\eta) &= \{v \in E_+(P) \mid v \perp x, v \perp \Sigma_P \eta\}, \\ E_+(A_\eta) &= \mathbb{R}\Sigma_P(x + \eta), \\ E_-(A_\eta) &= \mathbb{R}\Sigma_P(x - \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\dim \text{Ker}(A_\eta) = l - m - 1, \quad \dim E_+(A_\eta) = \dim E_-(A_\eta) = m.$$

Let's now choose $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_{l-m}$ as an orthonormal basis of $T_x^\perp M_2$ in S^{2l-1} . Denote $A_\alpha =: A_{\eta_\alpha}$. Then the minimality of M_2 in S^{2l-1} leads us to the following expression of the Ricci tensor with respect to $X, Y \in T_x M_2$:

$$(2.4) \quad \rho(X, Y) = (l + m - 2)\langle X, Y \rangle - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{l-m} \langle A_\alpha X, A_\alpha Y \rangle.$$

Again, we just need to deal with the tensor $\tau(X, Y) =: \sum_{\alpha=1}^{l-m} \langle A_\alpha X, A_\alpha Y \rangle$.

For this purpose, we make some preparation. In order to facilitate the expression, we denote $Q_0 =: P$. Then we can extend it to such a symmetric Clifford system $\{Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_m\}$ with $Q_i \in \Sigma_P$ ($i \geq 1$) that $\Sigma(Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_m) = \Sigma(P, P_1, \dots, P_m)$. Using the previous lemma, it is not difficult to find the following:

Lemma 2.1. Given i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, the unit vectors

$$(2.5) \quad \{Q_i \eta_1, \dots, Q_i \eta_{l-m}, Q_i x, \dots, Q_i m x, Q_i Q_1 x, \dots, \widehat{Q_i Q_i x}, \dots, Q_i Q_m x\}.$$

constitute an orthonormal basis of $T_x M_2$.

Observe that by (2.3), we can decompose $A_\alpha X$ as

$$A_\alpha X = \sum_{i=1}^m \langle X, Q_i x \rangle Q_i \eta_\alpha + \langle X, Q_i \eta_\alpha \rangle Q_i x.$$

Then a direct verification by using (2.5) shows that

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau(X, Y) &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{l-m} \sum_{i=1}^m \langle X, Q_i x \rangle \langle Y, Q_i x \rangle + \langle X, Q_i \eta_\alpha \rangle \langle Y, Q_i \eta_\alpha \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{l-m} \sum_{k=0}^m \langle X, P_k x \rangle \langle Y, P_k x \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{i=1}^m \left\{ \langle X, Y \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^m \langle X, Q_j x \rangle \langle Y, Q_j x \rangle - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^m \langle X, Q_i Q_j x \rangle \langle Y, Q_i Q_j x \rangle \right\} \\
& = m \langle X, Y \rangle + (l - 2m) \sum_{k=0}^m \langle X, P_k x \rangle \langle Y, P_k x \rangle - \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^m \langle X, Q_i Q_j x \rangle \langle Y, Q_i Q_j x \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$(2.7) \quad V(X, Y) =: \sum_{k=0}^m \langle X, P_k x \rangle \langle Y, P_k x \rangle, \quad W(X, Y) =: \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^m \langle X, Q_i Q_j x \rangle \langle Y, Q_i Q_j x \rangle.$$

Then decomposing X with respect to the orthonormal basis (2.5), we see that the tensor V is cyclic parallel, since

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.8) \quad (\nabla_X V)(X, X) & = 2 \sum_{k=0}^m \langle X, P_k x \rangle \langle X, P_k X \rangle \\
& = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \langle X, Q_i x \rangle \langle X, Q_i X \rangle \\
& = 4 \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^m \langle X, Q_i x \rangle \langle X, Q_j x \rangle \langle X, Q_i Q_j x \rangle \\
& = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

As for the tensor W , we can rewrite it as

$$(2.9) \quad W(X, Y) = \sum_{k,s=0, k \neq s}^m \langle X, P_k P_s x \rangle \langle Y, P_k P_s x \rangle - 2V(X, Y)$$

Thus it is easy to see that

$$(2.10) \quad (\nabla_X W)(X, X) = 2 \sum_{k,s=0, k \neq s}^m \langle X, P_k P_s x \rangle \langle X, P_k P_s X \rangle - 2(\nabla_X V)(X, X) = 0.$$

At last, combining (2.4), (2.6), (2.8) with (2.10), we arrive at the conclusion that the focal submanifold M_2 of OT-FKM type is an \mathcal{A} -manifold, as desired.

2.2. the homogeneous case. It is well known that a homogeneous (isoparametric) hypersurface in $S^{n+1}(1)$ can be characterized as a principal orbit of the isotropy representation of some rank two symmetric space G/K , while focal submanifolds correspond to the singular orbits (cf. [HL]). Denote by \mathcal{G} and \mathfrak{k} the Lie algebras of G and K , respectively. Then one has the following Cartan decomposition

$$\mathcal{G} \cong \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}.$$

Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the usual $Ad(K)$ -invariant inner product on \mathcal{G} that is induced from the Killing form and the Cartan involution of \mathcal{G} . Following [BCO], let $z_0 \in \mathfrak{p}$ be a unit

vector and $M = Ad(K) \cdot z_0$ the corresponding adjoint orbit included in the unit sphere. This leads to a reductive decomposition of \mathfrak{k} at z_0 :

$$\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{k}_{z_0} \oplus \mathfrak{m},$$

where $\mathfrak{k}_{z_0} = \{Y \in \mathfrak{k} \mid [Y, z_0] = 0\}$ is the isotropy subalgebra at z_0 , and \mathfrak{m} is the orthogonal complement with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ of \mathfrak{k}_{z_0} in \mathfrak{k} . The tangent space and normal space of M in \mathfrak{p} at z_0 are given by

$$T_{z_0}M = [\mathfrak{m}, z_0], \quad T_{z_0}^\perp M = \{ \xi \in \mathfrak{p} \mid [\xi, z_0] = 0 \},$$

while the shape operator with respect to ξ is

$$A_\xi[m, z_0] = -[m, \xi]^\top, \quad \text{for } m \in \mathfrak{m},$$

where $(\cdot)^\top$ denotes the orthogonal projection to $T_{z_0}M$. We prepare the following lemma whose proof is omitted.

Lemma 2.2. Given $m, \tilde{m} \in \mathfrak{m}$, the Levi-Civita connection on M is stated as

$$\nabla_{[m, z]}[\tilde{m}, z] = [\tilde{m}, [m, z]]^\top, \quad z \in M.$$

Now let $M^n = Ad(K) \cdot z_0$ be a singular orbit, so that it is a minimal submanifold in the unit sphere S^{n+p} . Choose ξ_1, \dots, ξ_p as a unit normal basis. Similar as (2.4), to verify the condition (2.1), we need only deal with the tensor $\tau(X, Y) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^p \langle A_\alpha X, A_\alpha Y \rangle$, for which we have

$$\frac{1}{2}(\nabla_X \tau)(X, X) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^p \langle \nabla_X(A_\alpha X) - A_\alpha(\nabla_X X), A_\alpha X \rangle.$$

Given a tangent vector at z_0 , say $[m, z_0]$ for some $m \in \mathfrak{m}$, we extend it to a tangent vector field X by $X(z) = [m, z]$ for $z \in M$. We have the following two equations and define m' uniquely by the first one:

$$\nabla_X X|_{z_0} = [m, [m, z_0]]^\top = [m', z_0], \quad A_\alpha X = -[m, \xi_\alpha]^\top.$$

Let $\gamma(t) = \exp(tm) \cdot z_0 \in M$ be a curve so that $\gamma(0) = z_0$, $\gamma'(0) = X(z_0)$. Clearly, for any $\alpha = 1, \dots, p$, the unit normal vector ξ_α at z_0 can be extended along the curve $\gamma(t)$ to $\xi_\alpha(t) = \exp(tm) \cdot \xi_\alpha$. Then it is easy to see that $A_{\xi_\alpha(t)} X|_{\gamma(t)} = -[m, \xi_\alpha(t)]^\top$. It follows from the equality $\exp(tm) \cdot [m, \xi_\alpha] = [m, \exp(tm) \cdot \xi_\alpha]$ that $A_{\xi_\alpha(t)} X|_{\gamma(t)} = -\exp(tm) \cdot [m, \xi_\alpha]^\top$. Thus we obtain immediately

$$\nabla_X(A_\alpha X)|_{z_0} = -\left(\frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0}[m, \xi_\alpha(t)]^\top\right)^\top = -[m, [m, \xi_\alpha]^\top]^\top, \quad A_\alpha(\nabla_X X) = -[m', \xi_\alpha]^\top.$$

In this way, an equivalent condition of (2.1) for the orbit M to be an \mathcal{A} -manifold can be stated as

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_X \tau)(X, X) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^p \langle [m, \xi_\alpha]^\top, [m, [m, \xi_\alpha]^\top]^\top \rangle - \langle [m, \xi_\alpha]^\top, [m', \xi_\alpha]^\top \rangle = 0.$$

2.2.1. $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$.

In this case, $G = SO(5) \times SO(5)$, $K = SO(5)$. Notice that

$$\mathfrak{k} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & X \end{pmatrix} : X \in \mathfrak{so}(5) \right\} \cong \mathfrak{so}(5), \quad \mathfrak{p} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & -X \end{pmatrix} : X \in \mathfrak{so}(5) \right\} \cong \mathfrak{so}(5),$$

for simplicity, we will just write the upper triangular part of a matrix in this subsection.

The group K acts on \mathfrak{p} by the adjoint action:

$$\begin{aligned} K \times \mathfrak{p} &\rightarrow \mathfrak{p} \\ A, Z &\mapsto A \cdot Z \cdot A^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of [QTY], the singular orbit (focal submanifold) diffeomorphic to $\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$ is Einstein, thus automatically Ricci parallel, and an \mathcal{A} -manifold. Therefore, we will concentrate on the other singular orbit (focal submanifold) in this subsection.

Choose a point $z_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} J & & \\ & J & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, with $J =: \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. It is easy to see

that the orbit $\{A \cdot z_0 \cdot A^{-1} \mid A \in SO(5)\}$ denoted by M_1 is a singular orbit, which is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$, as pointed out in [QTY].

A direct calculation shows that

$$\mathfrak{k}_{z_0} = \mathfrak{u}(1) \times \mathfrak{u}(1), \quad \mathfrak{m} \cong \left\{ m = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A & \mathbf{b} \\ * & 0 & \mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ a_2 & -a_1 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in M_{2,1}(\mathbb{R}) \right\}.$$

Noticing that $JA = -AJ$ and $A^t = A$, a tangent vector of M_1 at z_0 can be expressed as:

$$[m, z_0] = mz_0 - z_0m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2AJ & -J\mathbf{b} \\ * & 0 & -J\mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus any normal vector $\xi \in T_{z_0}^\perp M_1 \subset T_{z_0} \mathfrak{p}$ with $\langle \xi, z_0 \rangle = 0$ can be written as

$$\xi = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda J & X & 0 \\ * & -\lambda J & 0 \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, JX = XJ.$$

Meanwhile, the equality

$$[m, [m, z_0]]^\top = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 3JA\mathbf{c} \\ * & 0 & -3JA\mathbf{b} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix} =: [m', z_0]$$

implies that

$$m' = 3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -A\mathbf{c} \\ * & 0 & A\mathbf{b} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, from

$$[m, \xi] = \begin{pmatrix} XA - AX^t & 0 & -(\lambda J\mathbf{b} + X\mathbf{c}) \\ * & X^t A - AX & \lambda J\mathbf{c} + X^t \mathbf{b} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, [m', \xi] = 3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \lambda J A \mathbf{c} - X A \mathbf{b} \\ * & 0 & \lambda J A \mathbf{b} - X^t A \mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$[m, \xi]^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -(\lambda J\mathbf{b} + X\mathbf{c}) \\ * & 0 & \lambda J\mathbf{c} + X^t \mathbf{b} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, [m', \xi]^\top = [m', \xi],$$

it follows the equality as below:

$$(2.12) \quad \langle [m, \xi]^\top, [m', \xi]^\top \rangle = 0.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$[m, [m, \xi]^\top]^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & \lambda A J \mathbf{c} + A X^t \mathbf{b} \\ * & 0 & \lambda A J \mathbf{b} + A X \mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then a simple calculation leads to

$$(2.13) \quad \langle [m, \xi]^\top, [m, [m, \xi]^\top]^\top \rangle = 0.$$

Consequently, combining (2.12) with (2.13), the proof of (2.11) is accomplished. Namely, the focal submanifold diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$ is an \mathcal{A} -manifold.

2.2.2. $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 5)$.

In this case, $G = SO(10)$, $K = U(5)$, $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{so}(5, \mathbb{C})$. K acts on \mathfrak{p} by the adjoint action:

$$\begin{aligned} K \times \mathfrak{p} &\rightarrow \mathfrak{p} \\ g, Z &\mapsto \bar{g} \cdot Z \cdot g^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

(1). Choose a point $z_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} J & & \\ & J & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, with $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. It is easily seen that the corresponding orbit

$$M_1^{14} = \{\bar{g} \cdot z_0 \cdot g^{-1} \mid g \in U(5)\}$$

is a singular orbit (focal submanifold), which is diffeomorphic to $U(5)/Sp(2) \times U(1)$ (cf. [QTY]).

Since the action of $U(5)$ on $\mathfrak{so}(5, \mathbb{C})$ is given by $\bar{g} \cdot Z \cdot g^{-1}$, we emphasize that the expressions before Subsection 2.2.1 for tangent space, normal space, shape operator, and connection are still valid, only to replace the expression of $[\cdot, \cdot]$ with $[m, z_0] = \bar{m}z_0 - z_0m$. In this way, the equality $\exp(tm) \cdot [m, \xi_\alpha] = [m, \exp(tm) \cdot \xi_\alpha]$ still holds.

With no difficulty, we obtain that

$$\mathfrak{m} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda I & A & \mathbf{b} \\ * & \mu I & \mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \lambda, \mu \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbb{R}, A \in gl(2, \mathbb{C}), \bar{A}J = -JA, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in M_{2,1}(\mathbb{C}) \right\}.$$

Notice that a tangent vector at z_0 can be given by

$$[m, z_0] = \bar{m}z_0 - z_0m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -2\lambda J & 2\bar{A}J & -J\mathbf{b} \\ * & -2\mu J & -J\mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Any normal vector $\xi \in T_{z_0}^\perp M_1 \subset T_{z_0} \mathfrak{p}$ with $\langle \xi, z_0 \rangle = 0$ can be written as

$$\xi = \begin{pmatrix} tJ & X & 0 \\ * & -tJ & 0 \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } t \in \mathbb{R}, \bar{X}J = JX.$$

Additionally, the following equation

$$[m, [m, z_0]]^\top = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 3(\lambda J\mathbf{b} + JA\mathbf{c}) \\ * & 0 & 3(\mu J\mathbf{c} - J\bar{A}^t\mathbf{b}) \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix} =: [m', z_0],$$

implies that

$$m' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -3(\lambda\mathbf{b} + A\mathbf{c}) \\ * & 0 & -3(\mu\mathbf{c} - \bar{A}^t\mathbf{b}) \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Based on the condition of $\bar{A}J = -JA$ and $\bar{X}J = JX$, we obtain:

$$[m, \xi]^\top = \begin{pmatrix} -2t\lambda J + X\bar{A}^t - \bar{A}X^t & -(\lambda + \mu)X & -(tJ\mathbf{b} + X\mathbf{c}) \\ * & 2t\mu J + X^tA - A^tX & tJ\mathbf{c} + X^t\mathbf{b} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$[m', \xi]^\top = 3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & t\lambda J\mathbf{b} + tJA\mathbf{c} + \mu X\mathbf{c} - X\bar{A}^t\mathbf{b} \\ * & 0 & -t\mu J\mathbf{c} + tJ\bar{A}^t\mathbf{b} - \lambda X^t\mathbf{b} - X^tA\mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, a direct calculation leads to

$$(2.14) \quad \langle [m, \xi]^\top, [m', \xi]^\top \rangle = 0.$$

Next, to simplify the calculation of $\langle [m, \xi]^\top, [m, [m, \xi]^\top]^\top \rangle$, we will choose a normal basis such that it satisfies either (i) or (ii) as follows:

(i). $X = 0, t = 1$. On this condition, we have

$$[m, z_0] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -2\lambda J & 2\bar{A}J & -J\mathbf{b} \\ * & -2\mu J & -J\mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad [m, \xi]^\top = [m, \xi] = \begin{pmatrix} -2\lambda J & 0 & -J\mathbf{b} \\ * & 2\mu J & J\mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which imply

$$[m, [m, \xi]^\top]^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & 3\lambda J\mathbf{b} + \bar{A}J\mathbf{c} \\ * & 0 & -3\mu J\mathbf{c} + \bar{A}^t J\mathbf{b} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By a simple calculation, we obtain

$$(2.15) \quad \langle [m, \xi]^\top, [m, [m, \xi]^\top]^\top \rangle = 0.$$

(ii). $t = 0$. On this condition, we have

$$[m, z_0] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -2\lambda J & 2\bar{A}J & -J\mathbf{b} \\ * & -2\mu J & -J\mathbf{c} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad [m, \xi]^\top = \begin{pmatrix} X\bar{A}^t - \bar{A}X^t & -(\lambda + \mu)X & -X\mathbf{c} \\ * & X^t A - A^t X & X^t \mathbf{b} \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For clarity, defining

$$\sigma := X\bar{A}^t - \bar{A}X^t, \quad \theta := X^t A - A^t X,$$

we have

$$[m, [m, \xi]^\top]^\top = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -(3\lambda + \mu)\sigma \\ +\bar{\mathbf{b}}\mathbf{c}^t X^t - X\mathbf{c}\bar{\mathbf{b}}^t \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda + \mu)^2 X + \bar{A}\theta - \sigma A \\ -\bar{\mathbf{b}}\mathbf{b}^t X - X\mathbf{c}\bar{\mathbf{c}}^t \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} (2\lambda + \mu)X\mathbf{c} \\ +(2\bar{A}X^t - X\bar{A}^t)\mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix} \\ * & \begin{pmatrix} -(\lambda + 3\mu)\theta \\ +X^t \bar{\mathbf{b}}\bar{\mathbf{c}}^t - \bar{\mathbf{c}}\mathbf{b}^t X \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} -(\lambda + 2\mu)X^t \mathbf{b} \\ +(2A^t X - X^t A)\mathbf{c} \end{pmatrix} \\ * & * & 2\mathbf{b}^t X\mathbf{c} - 2\mathbf{c}^t X^t \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then a complicated but not difficult calculation shows that

$$(2.16) \quad \langle [m, \xi]^\top, [m, [m, \xi]^\top]^\top \rangle = 0.$$

Finally, combining (2.14) (2.15) with (2.16), we achieve the equality in (2.11). Namely, the focal submanifold M_1^{14} with $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 5)$ is an \mathcal{A} -manifold.

(2). Choose a point $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} J \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, with $J =: \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. It is easily seen that the

corresponding orbit

$$M_2^{13} = \{\bar{g} \cdot z_0 \cdot g^{-1} \mid g \in U(5)\}$$

is a focal submanifold, which is diffeomorphic to $U(5)/SU(2) \times U(3)$ (cf. [QTY]).

Without much difficulty, we observe

$$\mathfrak{m} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda I & \mathbf{A} \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \lambda \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{A} \in M_{2,3}(\mathbb{C}) \right\}.$$

Then a tangent vector at z_0 is given by:

$$[m, z_0] = \bar{m}z_0 - z_0m = - \begin{pmatrix} 2\lambda J & J\mathbf{A} \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and any normal vector $\xi \in T_{z_0}^\perp M_2^{13} \subset T_{z_0}\mathfrak{p}$ with $\langle \xi, z_0 \rangle = 0$ can be expressed as

$$\xi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & X \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } X + X^t = 0, X \in gl(3, \mathbb{C}).$$

Additionally, the equality

$$[m, [m, z_0]]^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 3\lambda J\mathbf{A} \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix} =: [m', z_0],$$

implies that

$$m' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -3\lambda\mathbf{A} \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, we get

$$[m, \xi]^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \bar{\mathbf{A}}X \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } [m', \xi]^\top = 3\lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \bar{\mathbf{A}}X \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which leads directly to

$$(2.17) \quad \langle [m, \xi]^\top, [m', \xi]^\top \rangle = 0.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$[m, [m, \xi]^\top] = \begin{pmatrix} * & -\lambda\bar{\mathbf{A}}X \\ * & * \end{pmatrix},$$

which implies immediately

$$(2.18) \quad \langle [m, \xi]^\top, [m, [m, \xi]^\top] \rangle = 0.$$

Finally, combining (2.17) with (2.18), we achieve the proof of (2.11), which means that, the focal submanifold M_2^{13} with $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 5)$ is an \mathcal{A} -manifold.

3. Ricci parallelism of the homogeneous cases

At the beginning of this section, we recall some facts for a Riemannian manifold M^n with $\pi_1 M = 0$.

Given $p \in M^n$, define the Ricci operator $S_p : T_p M \rightarrow T_p M$ by $\langle S_p(X), Y \rangle = \rho(X, Y)$, $\forall Y \in T_p M$. Clearly, the Ricci operator S_p is a self-adjoint operator with eigenvalues at p :

$$\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \cdots < \lambda_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

In this regard, we can decompose $T_p M$ into the eigenspaces E_i for S_p as

$$T_p M^n = E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus E_k.$$

Now suppose M^n is Ricci parallel, which means that the Ricci tensor is invariant under parallel translation. Then the Ricci operator has eigenvalues $\lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_k$ at each point. As a result, we can parallel translate these eigenspaces to get a global decomposition

$$TM^n = \zeta_1 \oplus \zeta_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \zeta_k,$$

into parallel distributions, with the property that

$$S|_{\zeta_i} = \lambda_i \cdot Id.$$

By the assumption $\pi_1 M^n = 0$, and de Rham decomposition theorem, we can derive a global isometric splitting of M^n as

$$M^n \cong N_1 \times N_2 \times \cdots \times N_k, \quad \text{with } N_i \text{ Einstein and } TN_i = \zeta_i \text{ (} i = 1, 2, \dots, k \text{)}.$$

As we mentioned in Remark 1.2, the focal submanifold M_1 (resp. M_2) with $m_2 > 1$ (resp. $m_1 > 1$) is simply-connected.

Lemma 3.1. Suppose the focal submanifold $M_1^{m_1+2m_2}$ (resp. $M_2^{2m_1+m_2}$) with $g = 4$ and $m_2 > 1$ (resp. $m_1 > 1$) is Ricci parallel, and the Ricci operator has eigenvalues $\lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_k$ with $k \geq 2$. Then $k = 2$.

Proof. We are mainly concerned with the proof for $M_1^{m_1+2m_2}$; the other case is verbatim with obvious changes on index ranges.

Suppose $k \geq 3$. Then a splitting for M_1 can be decomposed as a product of closed manifolds: $M_1 \cong N_1^{n_1} \times N_2^{n_2} \times \overline{N}_3^{n_3}$ with $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n_3$, where $\overline{N}_3 = N_3 \times \cdots \times N_k$. Then from the assumption $0 = \pi_1 M_1 \cong \pi_1 N_2 \oplus \pi_1 \overline{N}_3$, we observe that N_1 , N_2 and \overline{N}_3 are simply-connected as well. Thus $n_i \geq 2$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$).

As a matter of fact, for the focal submanifold $M_1^{m_1+2m_2}$ with $m_2 > 1$, the Betti numbers satisfy (cf. [Mün]):

- (1) $\beta_i(M_1) = 0$, for $i \neq 0, m_2, m_1 + m_2$, or $m_1 + 2m_2$;
- (2) $\beta_j(M_1) = 1$, for $j = 0, m_2, m_1 + m_2$, and $m_1 + 2m_2$.

In fact, the homology groups of M_1 have no torsion. On the condition of this fact, for $2 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n_3 \leq m_1 + 2m_2 - 4$, from the Künneth formula for homology group with \mathbb{Z} -coefficients:

$$H_k(P \times Q) \cong \sum_{p+q=k} H_p(P) \otimes H_q(Q) \oplus \sum_{r+s=k-1} \text{Tor}(H_r(P), H_s(Q)),$$

it follows that

$$\beta_{n_1}(M_1), \beta_{n_2}(M_1), \beta_{n_3}(M_1) \geq 1, \beta_{n_1+n_2}(M_1), \beta_{n_1+n_3}(M_1), \beta_{n_2+n_3}(M_1) \geq 1.$$

Consequently, we obtain that $n_1 = m_2$, and thus $n_1 + n_2 = m_1 + m_2$. Thus $M_1^{m_1+2m_2} = N_1^{m_2} \times N_2^{m_1} \times \overline{N}_3^{m_2}$, and further $m_1 = m_2$. Moreover, it follows that $\beta_{2m_1}(M_1) \geq 3$, a contradiction. \square

Now suppose $k = 2$. From the argument above, it follows that $M_1^{m_1+2m_2} \cong N_1^{m_2} \times N_2^{m_1+m_2}$ with $\pi_1 N_1 = \pi_1 N_2 = 0$. By Künneth formula, we get $H_i N_1 = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m_2 - 1$. Similarly $H_i N_2 = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m_1 - 1$. In other words, N_1, N_2 are all simply connected homology spheres. Therefore, we obtain the following proposition:

Proposition 3.1. Suppose the focal submanifold $M_1^{m_1+2m_2}$ with $g = 4$ and $m_2 > 1$ is Ricci parallel, but not Einstein. Then

- (i) The Ricci operator S has exactly two eigenvalues, with multiplicities m_2 and $m_1 + m_2$, respectively;
- (ii) $M_1^{m_1+2m_2}$ is diffeomorphic to a product $N_1^{m_2} \times N_2^{m_1+m_2}$, where each factor is a simply connected homology sphere.

In the following, we will verify the Ricci parallelism for the focal submanifolds with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$ and $(4, 5)$ case by case. As mentioned before, the focal submanifold diffeomorphic to $\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$ with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$ is Einstein, while the other one diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$ is not.

Case 1: The focal submanifold M_1^6 (diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$) with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$.

Suppose $M_1^6 \stackrel{\text{diffeo.}}{\cong} \mathbb{C}P^3$ is Ricci parallel. Then from Proposition 3.1(ii), it follows that $\mathbb{C}P^3$ is diffeomorphic to $N_1^2 \times N_2^4$. Observe that N_1 is a simply connected surface, it must be homeomorphic to a 2-sphere, and thus the third homotopy group $\pi_3(N_1) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. This implies that $\pi_3(N_1^2 \times N_2^4) \not\cong 0$, while $\pi_3 \mathbb{C}P^3 \cong 0$. There comes a contradiction.

Consequently, the focal submanifold M_1^6 in this case is not Ricci parallel.

Case 2: The focal submanifold M_1^{14} (diffeomorphic to $U(5)/Sp(2) \times U(1)$) with $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 5)$.

Suppose that M_1^{14} is Ricci parallel. It follows from Proposition 3.1 (ii) that M_1 is diffeomorphic to $N_1^5 \times N_2^9$. We are going to show this impossible.

By Lemma 1.1 in [Tan], the Stiefel-Whitney class $w_4(M_2)$ of M_2^{13} is nonzero (based on the elegant work of U. Abresch). It follows that the normal bundle $\nu(M_2)$ of M_2^{13} in S^{19} has $w_4(\nu(M_2)) \neq 0$. By Thom isomorphism, we see clearly that the Steenrod square

$$Sq^4 : H^5(M_1; \mathbb{Z}_2) \longrightarrow H^9(M_1; \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

is nonzero (compare with page 262 in [Fan]), from which we claim that M_1^{14} is not diffeomorphic to $N_1^5 \times N_2^9$. To show the claim above, we choose generators

$$e_i \in H^0(N_i; \mathbb{Z}_2), \quad a_i \in H^{d_i}(N_i; \mathbb{Z}_2), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $d_i := \dim(N_i)$. Denote by p_i the projection from $N_1 \times N_2$ to N_i . Then by Künneth formula, $p_1^*(a_1) \cup p_2^*(e_2)$ generates $H^5(M_1; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. By Cartan formula (cf. [MS]), we see

$$Sq^4(p_1^*(a_1) \cup p_2^*(e_2)) = p_1^*Sq^4(a_1) \cup p_2^*(e_2) = 0 \cup p_2^*(e_2) = 0,$$

a contradiction.

Case 3: The focal submanifold M_2^{13} (diffeomorphic to $U(5)/SU(2) \times U(3)$) with $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 5)$.

As in Subsection 2.2.2 (2), we choose the point $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} J & \\ & 0 \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, with $J =: \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Recall that M_2^{13} is the orbit of the isotropy representation at z_0 . Take a tangent vector $X = [m, z_0] = - \begin{pmatrix} 2\lambda J & J\mathbf{A} \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, with $m = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda I & \mathbf{A} \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{u}(5)$, $\lambda \in \sqrt{-1}\mathbb{R}$; and normal vectors ξ_α with $\langle \xi_\alpha, z_0 \rangle = 0$ as $\xi_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & X_\alpha \end{pmatrix}$ with $X_\alpha + X_\alpha^t = 0$, $X_\alpha \in \mathfrak{gl}(3, \mathbb{C})$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, 6$.

Since the Ricci tensor with respect to $X, Y \in T_{z_0}M_2$ is $\rho(X, Y) = \langle 12X - \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 A_\alpha^2 X, Y \rangle$, the Ricci operator can be written as

$$S(X) = 12X - \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 A_\alpha^2 X.$$

We are now left to complete the verification by virtue of Proposition 3.1 (i).

From the formula $A_\alpha X = -[m, \xi_\alpha]^\top =: [\bar{m}_\alpha, z_0]$, it follows that

$$\bar{m}_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -J\bar{\mathbf{A}}X_\alpha \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{u}(5).$$

Thus choosing $X_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $X_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $X_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $X_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $X_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and $X_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \\ 0 & -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, we derive that

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^6 A_\alpha^2 X = - \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 [\bar{m}_\alpha, \xi_\alpha]^\top = \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -J\mathbf{A}\bar{X}_\alpha X_\alpha \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 4J\mathbf{A} \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this way, we obtain the Ricci operator

$$S(X) = 12X - \sum_{\alpha=1}^6 A_\alpha^2 X = \begin{pmatrix} -24\lambda J & -8J\mathbf{A} \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A direct calculation shows that the Ricci operator S has two eigenvalues 12 and 8, with multiplicities 1 and 12, respectively, which contradicts Proposition 3.1 (i).

The proof of Theorem 1.2 (ii), (iii) is now complete.

4. Ricci parallelism of OT-FKM type

For convenience, we will firstly deal with the focal submanifold M_2 of OT-FKM type.

4.1. M_2 of OT-FKM type. The proof of Theorem 1.2 will be finished by establishing the following two propositions.

Proposition 4.1. The focal submanifold M_2 of OT-FKM type with $m = 1$ is Ricci parallel.

Proof. When $m = 1$, the equalities (2.6) turn to be

$$(4.1) \quad \tau(X, Y) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{l-1} \langle A_\alpha X, A_\alpha Y \rangle = \langle X, Y \rangle + (l-2)V(X, Y),$$

where $V(X, Y)$ is defined in (2.7). At $x \in M_2$ with $Px = x$, we can always choose $Q_0 =: P = \langle P_0x, x \rangle P_0 + \langle P_1x, x \rangle P_1$ by the definition of FKM-polynomial F in (1.3), and then Q_1 can be stated as $Q_1 = \langle P_1x, x \rangle P_0 - \langle P_0x, x \rangle P_1$. In this way, it is easily seen that

$$V(X, Y) = \sum_{k=0}^1 \langle X, P_kx \rangle \langle Y, P_kx \rangle = \langle X, Q_1x \rangle \langle Y, Q_1x \rangle,$$

and then

$$(4.2) \quad \nabla V = 0 \iff \langle X, \nabla_Z(Q_1x) \rangle \langle X, Q_1x \rangle = 0, \quad \forall X, Z \in T_x M_2.$$

For the first factor on the righthand side, it follows from a simple calculation that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X, \nabla_Z(Q_1x) \rangle &= \langle X, D_Z(\langle P_1x, x \rangle P_0x - \langle P_0x, x \rangle P_1x) \rangle \\ &= \langle X, Q_1Z + 2(\langle P_1x, Z \rangle P_0x - \langle P_0x, Z \rangle P_1x) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$= 0.$$

We need to explain the reason for the last equality. In this case $\{Q_1N_1, Q_1N_2, \dots, Q_1N_{l-1}, Q_1x\}$ constitutes an orthonormal basis of T_xM_2 by (2.5), and we can show that

$$\langle Q_1Z, Q_1x \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \langle P_1x, Z \rangle P_0x - \langle P_0x, Z \rangle P_1x, Q_1x \rangle = \langle Z, Q_0x \rangle = 0,$$

and for any $\alpha = 1, \dots, l-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Q_1Z, Q_1N_\alpha \rangle &= 0, \\ \langle \langle P_1x, Z \rangle P_0x - \langle P_0x, Z \rangle P_1x, Q_1N_\alpha \rangle &= -\langle N_\alpha, Q_1x \rangle \langle Z, Q_1x \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Proposition 4.1 is now complete.

Remark 4.1. In fact, as asserted by [TY2], up to a two-fold covering, M_2 with $m = 1$ is isometric to $S^1 \times S^{l-1}$.

Proposition 4.2. The focal submanifold M_2 of OT-FKM type with $m \geq 2$ is not Ricci parallel.

Proof. Recall the equalities (2.6)

$$\tau(X, Y) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{l-m} \langle A_\alpha X, A_\alpha Y \rangle = m \langle X, Y \rangle + (l - 2m)V(X, Y) - W(X, Y).$$

For covariant derivative of the items on the righthand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_Z V)(X, Y) &= \sum_{i=0}^m \langle X, P_i Z \rangle \langle Y, P_i x \rangle + \langle X, P_i x \rangle \langle Y, P_i Z \rangle \\ (4.3) \quad &= \sum_{i=1}^m \langle X, Q_i Z \rangle \langle Y, Q_i x \rangle + \langle X, Q_i x \rangle \langle Y, Q_i Z \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

and by (2.9), it is not difficult to see

$$\begin{aligned} (4.4) \quad &(\nabla_Z W)(X, Y) \\ &= \sum_{k,s=0, k \neq s}^m \left(\langle X, P_k P_s Z \rangle \langle Y, P_k P_s x \rangle + \langle X, P_k P_s x \rangle \langle Y, P_k P_s Z \rangle \right) - 2(\nabla_Z V)(X, Y) \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^m \left(\langle X, Q_i Q_j Z \rangle \langle Y, Q_i Q_j x \rangle + \langle X, Q_i Q_j x \rangle \langle Y, Q_i Q_j Z \rangle \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\langle X, Q_i x \rangle \langle Y, Q_i Q_0 Z \rangle + \langle Y, Q_i x \rangle \langle X, Q_i Q_0 Z \rangle \right) - 2(\nabla_Z V)(X, Y) \end{aligned}$$

Taking $X = Q_1 Q_2 x, Y = Q_1 x$ and $Z = Q_2 x$ in (4.3), (4.4), we obtain

$$(4.5) \quad (\nabla_Z \tau)(X, Y) = l - 2m + 2 + \sum_{\substack{i,j=1, \dots, m, i \neq j, \\ \{i,j\} \neq \{1,2\}}} \langle Q_1 Q_2 x, Q_i Q_j x \rangle^2 \geq l - 2m + 2.$$

Suppose M_2 is Ricci parallel. Then we get $l - 2m + 2 \leq 0$, which holds only in the cases $(m_1, m_2) = (6, 1)$, $(5, 2)$ and $(9, 6)$ in OT-FKM type.

While in view of [FKM], the families with multiplicities $(6, 1)$ and $(5, 2)$ are congruent to that with multiplicities $(1, 6)$ and $(2, 5)$ respectively, and the focal submanifolds interchange. Thus the focal submanifold M_2 with $(m_1, m_2) = (6, 1)$ and $(m_1, m_2) = (5, 2)$ are congruent to M_1 with $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 6)$ and $(2, 5)$ respectively, which are not Ricci parallel as a direct result of (4.9) in Subsection 4.2.

As for the $(9, 6)$ case, we have

Lemma 4.1. The focal submanifold M_2 of OT-FKM type with $(m_1, m_2) = (9, 6)$ is not Ricci parallel.

Up to now, the proof of Proposition 4.2 is complete provided we give a proof of the lemma above.

Proof. Suppose that M_2^{24} is Ricci parallel. It follows from Proposition 3.1(ii) that M_2 is diffeomorphic to $N_1^9 \times N_2^{15}$, where N_1 and N_2 are simply connected homology spheres. By the well-known Hurewicz theorem and Whitehead theorem, one sees that any simply connected homology sphere is in fact homotopy equivalent to a unit sphere. Thus M_2^{24} has the same homotopy type with $S^9 \times S^{15}$.

On the other hand, it is impossible that M_2^{24} has the same homotopy type with $S^9 \times S^{15}$ by the Clifford construction. To show this claim, we follow Wang ([Wan]). For a symmetric Clifford system $\{P_0, \dots, P_m\}$ on \mathbb{R}^{2l} with $l = k\delta(m)$, where k is a positive integer and $\delta(m)$ is the dimension of irreducible C_{m-1} -modules, by using the theory of Atiyah-Bott-Shapiro, Wang constructed a vector bundle ξ of rank l over S^m . Moreover, Wang showed (Prop.1 in [Wan]) that the focal manifold M_2 is diffeomorphic to $S(\xi)$, the unit sphere bundle of ξ . Suppose that $l \geq m + 2$. Thus the vector ξ is trivial if and only if it is stable trivial. If m is not divisible by 4, observe (ref. the proof of Corollary 1 in [Wan]) that $\xi - l \in \widetilde{KO}(S^m)$ is equal to k times a generator of $\widetilde{KO}(S^m)$.

In our case, $l = 16, m = 9$. The assumption $l \geq m + 2$ is satisfied. Furthermore, since $\delta(9) = 16, k = 1$, it follows from the arguments above that

$$\xi - 16 \in \widetilde{KO}(S^9) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \text{ is a generator.}$$

Thus the characteristic map $\chi(\xi)$ of the bundle ξ over S^9 is not trivial in $\pi_8 SO(16)$. Consider the J -homomorphism of Whitehead

$$J : \pi_8 SO(16) \cong \pi_8 SO \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \longrightarrow \pi_{24} S^{16} \cong \pi_8^S.$$

By Adams[Adm], the homomorphism J is a monomorphism. Hence $J(\chi(\xi))$ does not vanish in the stable homotopy group π_8^S . Applying Theorem (1.11) in [JW], we conclude that M_2^{24} has not the same homotopy type with $S^9 \times S^{15}$.

4.2. M_1 of **OT-FKM type**. From (2.2), it follows that the focal submanifold M_1 of OT-FKM type is Ricci parallel, if and only if at any point $x \in M_1$,

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha \neq \beta}^m \langle Y, \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta Z + \langle Z, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta X \rangle = 0, \quad \forall X, Y, Z \in T_x M_1.$$

It is easily seen that an equivalent condition of (4.6) can be stated as:

$$\begin{aligned} A(X, Y) &=: \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha < \beta}^m \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta Y + \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta Y \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta x \\ &\in \mathbb{R}x \oplus \text{Span}\{P_0 x, P_1 x, \dots, P_m x\} =: \mathcal{L}, \quad \forall X, Y \in T_x M_1, \forall x \in M_1. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\mathcal{V}_x =: \text{Span}\{P_\alpha P_\beta x, 0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq m\} \subset T_x M_1, \quad \mathcal{W}_x =: \mathcal{V}_x^\perp \subset T_x M_1,$$

so that $T_x M_1 = \mathcal{V}_x \oplus \mathcal{W}_x$.

Suppose now that M_1 is Ricci parallel. Firstly, for any $X = w \in \mathcal{W}_x$, we have

$$(4.7) \quad A(w, Y) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha < \beta}^m \langle w, P_\alpha P_\beta Y \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta x \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{V}_x = \{0\}, \quad \forall Y \in T_x M_1.$$

Next, choosing $Y = P_0 w \in T_x M_1$, (4.7) changes to

$$(4.8) \quad A(w, P_0 w) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha < \beta}^m \langle w, P_\alpha P_\beta P_0 w \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta x = \sum_{\beta=1}^m \langle w, P_\beta w \rangle P_0 P_\beta x = 0.$$

Since $P_0 P_1 x, P_0 P_2 x, \dots, P_0 P_m x$ are linearly independent, (4.8) implies that

$$\langle w, P_\beta w \rangle = 0, \quad \beta = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Analogously, replacing $Y = P_0 w$ with $Y = P_1 w, P_2 w, \dots, P_m w$ leads to

$$\langle w, P_\alpha w \rangle = 0, \quad \alpha = 0, 1, \dots, m.$$

Using a polarization, it is easy to find that $\langle w_1, P_\alpha w_2 \rangle = 0$, for any $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_x$. In other words,

$$P_\alpha w \in \mathcal{V}_x, \quad \text{for any } w \in \mathcal{W}_x.$$

Denote the shape operator with respect to $P_0 x$ by $A_0 =: A_{P_0 x}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 : T_x M_1 &\rightarrow T_x M_1 = T_0 \oplus T_1 \oplus T_{-1} \\ X &\mapsto -(P_0 X)^\top \end{aligned}$$

where T_0, T_1, T_{-1} are eigenspaces of A_0 corresponding to eigenvalues $0, 1, -1$, respectively, and in this case, $T_0 = \text{Span}\{P_0 P_1 x, P_0 P_2 x, \dots, P_0 P_m x\} \subset \mathcal{V}_x$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} A_0|_{\mathcal{W}_x} : \mathcal{W}_x &\rightarrow T_0^\perp \subset \mathcal{V}_x \\ w &\mapsto A_0 w = -P_0 w \in \mathcal{V}_x \end{aligned}$$

is injective. Then it is clear that $\dim \mathcal{W}_x \leq \dim T_0^\perp$, which implies immediately the following necessary condition for M_1 to be Ricci parallel:

$$(4.9) \quad \dim \mathcal{V}_x \geq l - 1 = k\delta(m) - 1.$$

On the other hand, $\dim \mathcal{V}_x \leq \frac{1}{2}m(m+1)$. Comparing with the following inequalities

$$l - 1 > \frac{1}{2}m(m + 1), \quad l - m - 1 > 0,$$

we are left to deal with the following cases, while the others are not Ricci parallel:

m	2	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
k	2	2	1,2	1,2	2,3	2,3,4	1,2	1	1	1

(1) the case $m = 2, k = 2$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 1)$.

In view of [FKM], the family with multiplicities $(2, 1)$ is congruent to that with multiplicities $(1, 2)$, and the focal submanifolds interchange. Thus the focal submanifold M_1 with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 1)$ is congruent to M_2 with $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 2)$, which is Ricci parallel according to Proposition 4.1.

(2) the case $m = 4, k = 2$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 3)$.

According to [FKM], there are two examples of OT-FKM type isoparametric polynomials with multiplicities $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 3)$, which are distinguished by an invariant

$$\text{Trace}(P_0P_1P_2P_3P_4) = 2q\delta(4), \quad \text{with } q \equiv 2 \pmod{2}.$$

When $q = 2$, [QTY] asserts that the M_1 is Einstein. Thus we are left to the other case $q = 0$, in which $P_0P_1P_2P_3P_4 \neq \pm Id$.

Setting $P = P_0P_1P_2P_3$, it is easy to see that P is symmetric and $P^2 = Id$. Then following from Theorem 5.1 and 5.2 in [FKM], we can find a point $x \in M_1$ as the +1-eigenvector of P , i.e. $P_0P_1P_2P_3x = x$. On this condition, we can show

$$\mathcal{V}_x = \text{Span}\{P_0P_1x, P_0P_2x, P_0P_3x, P_0P_4x, P_1P_4x, P_2P_4x, P_3P_4x\}.$$

Then from the decomposition $T_xM_1 = \mathcal{V}_x \oplus \mathcal{W}_x$, it follows that

$$\mathcal{W}_x = \text{Span}\{P_0P_1P_4x, P_0P_2P_4x, P_0P_3P_4x\}.$$

On the other hand, using polarization, another equivalent condition of (4.6) can be stated as well:

$$(4.10) \quad B(X) =: \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha < \beta}^m \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta X \in \mathcal{L}, \quad \text{for any } X \in T_xM_1, x \in M_1.$$

Choosing now $X = P_0P_1x + w \in \mathcal{V}_x \oplus \mathcal{W}_x$, we get

$$B(X) = -2x + (P_0P_1 - P_2P_3)w.$$

Suppose that M_1 is Ricci parallel. Noticing $\langle (P_0P_1 - P_2P_3)w, x \rangle = \langle (P_0P_1 - P_2P_3)w, P_i x \rangle = 0$ ($i = 0, 1, 2, 3$), the arguments above imply

$$(P_0P_1 - P_2P_3)w \parallel P_4x.$$

However, setting $w = P_0P_2P_4x$, we have $\langle (P_0P_1 - P_2P_3)w, P_4x \rangle = -2\langle P_1P_2P_4x, P_4x \rangle = 0$. Then it must be true that $P_1P_2P_4x = 0$, a contradiction.

Therefore, M_1 with $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 3)$ and $P_0P_1P_2P_3P_4 \neq \pm Id$ is not Ricci parallel.

(3) the cases $m = 5, k = 1, 2$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (5, 2), (5, 10)$.

Choose $x \in S^{2l-1}$ as a common eigenvector of the commuting 4-products $P_0P_1P_2P_3$ and $P_0P_1P_4P_5$. It is easy to see that $x \in M_1$ and $\dim \mathcal{V}_x = 7$.

In the case $(m_1, m_2) = (5, 2)$, $\dim \mathcal{W}_x = 2$, and $\mathcal{W}_x = \text{Span}\{P_0P_2P_4x, P_0P_2P_5x\}$. Suppose M_1 is Ricci parallel. Then for $w = P_0P_2P_4x$, $X = P_0P_2P_5x$, we have

$$A(w, X) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha < \beta}^5 \langle w, P_\alpha P_\beta X \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta x = 3P_4P_5x \neq 0,$$

which contradicts (4.7).

In the case $(m_1, m_2) = (5, 10)$, $\dim \mathcal{V}_x = 7 < l - 1 = 15$, which means that M_1 is not Ricci parallel by (4.9).

(4) the cases $m = 6, k = 1, 2$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (6, 1), (6, 9)$.

In the case $(m_1, m_2) = (6, 1)$, according to [FKM], M_1 is congruent to M_2 with $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 6)$, which is Ricci parallel by Proposition 4.1.

In the case $(m_1, m_2) = (6, 9)$, choose $x \in S^{2l-1}$ as a common eigenvector of the commuting 4-products $P_0P_1P_2P_3$, $P_0P_1P_4P_5$ and $P_0P_2P_4P_6$. Then it is easy to see that $x \in M_1$ and $\dim \mathcal{V}_x \leq 7 < l - 1 = 15$. It follows from (4.9) that M_1 is not Ricci parallel.

(5) the cases $m = 7, k = 2, 3$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (7, 8), (7, 16)$.

Choose $x \in S^{2l-1}$ as a common eigenvector of the commuting 4-products $P_0P_1P_2P_3$, $P_0P_1P_4P_5$, $P_0P_1P_6P_7$ and $P_0P_2P_4P_6$. Then it is easily seen that $x \in M_1$ and $\dim \mathcal{V}_x = 7$.

In these two cases, we have $l = k\delta(7) = 16$ or 24 . It follows immediately that $\dim \mathcal{V}_x < l - 1$, thus M_1 in both cases are not Ricci parallel.

(6) the cases $m = 8, k = 2, 3, 4$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (8, 7), (8, 15), (8, 23)$.

When $k = 2$ (resp. $3, 4$), the FKM-polynomial is defined on \mathbb{R}^{32} (resp. $\mathbb{R}^{48}, \mathbb{R}^{64}$). Since $P_2P_4P_6P_8$ anti-commutes with P_2 , $E_+(P_2P_4P_6P_8)$ has dimension 16 (resp. 24, 32). It is an invariant subspace of the anti-commuting operators $P_3P_4P_7P_8$ and P_3 . Thus $E_+(P_2P_4P_6P_8) \cap E_+(P_3P_4P_7P_8)$ is of dimension 8 (resp. 12, 16) and further it is an invariant subspace of the anti-commuting operators $P_5P_6P_7P_8$ and P_5 . Thus the space

$E' =: E_+(P_2P_4P_6P_8) \cap E_+(P_3P_4P_7P_8) \cap E_+(P_5P_6P_7P_8)$ is of dimension 4 (resp. 6, 8) and on this space, we have

$$F(x) = |x|^4 - 2 \sum_{\alpha=0}^1 \langle P_\alpha x, x \rangle^2.$$

This function is not constant and a maximum point lies in M_1 . We choose such an $x \in M_1$. Then at this point, it is not difficult to see that $\dim \mathcal{V}_x \leq 22$.

In the case $k = 2$ (resp. 3), $l - 1 = 23$ (resp. 31), we have $\dim \mathcal{V}_x < l - 1$. A similar argument as above shows that M_1 with $(m_1, m_2) = (8, 15)$ or $(8, 23)$ is not Ricci parallel.

In the case $k = 1$, we divide the proof into two cases: the definite family $P_0P_1 \cdots P_8 = \pm Id$ and the indefinite family $P_0P_1 \cdots P_8 \neq \pm Id$.

Case 1: For the definite family, we observe that

$$\{P_0P_1x, \dots, P_0P_8x, P_1P_2x, \dots, P_1P_8x, P_2P_3x, \dots, P_2P_8x, P_3P_4x\}$$

constitutes an orthonormal basis of T_xM_1 . Taking $X = P_0P_3x$, $Y = P_0P_2x$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} A(X, Y) &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha < \beta}^m \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta Y + \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta Y \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta x \\ &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0, \alpha < \beta}^m \langle P_0P_3x, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta P_0P_2x + \langle P_0P_3x, P_\alpha P_\beta P_0P_2x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta x \\ &= 2P_2P_3x \\ &\notin \mathcal{L} \end{aligned}$$

Thus M_1 in this case is not Ricci parallel.

Case 2: For the indefinite family, extend $\{P_0, P_1, \dots, P_8\}$ to $\{P_0, P_1, \dots, P_9\}$. Choose x to be a common eigenvector of $P_{2\alpha}P_{2\alpha+1}P_{2\beta}P_{2\beta+1}$, $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 4$. Then $x \in M_1$ and $\dim \mathcal{V}_x = 21$. On the other hand, since M_1 is of dimension 22, the Ricci operator $S(X) = 2(l - m - 2)X + 2 \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 9} \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle P_\alpha P_\beta x$, must have an eigenvalue 0 with multiplicity 1.

Suppose that M_1 is Ricci parallel, which is indeed not Einstein (cf. [QTY]). Then Proposition 3.1 (i) shows that the Ricci operator must have two eigenvalues with multiplicities 7 and 15, respectively. There comes a contradiction.

Therefore, M_1 in this case is not Ricci parallel.

(7) the cases $m = 9$, $k = 1, 2$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (9, 6), (9, 22)$.

In the case $(m_1, m_2) = (9, 6)$, the Ricci curvature with respect to $X, Y \in T_x M_1$ can be stated as (cf. [QTY]):

$$(4.11) \quad \rho(X, Y) = 10\langle X, Y \rangle + 4\left\{\frac{5}{2}\langle X, P_0 P_1 x \rangle \langle Y, P_0 P_1 x \rangle + \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \Lambda} \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle \langle Y, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle\right\}$$

where $\Lambda = \{(0, 2), (0, 3), \dots, (0, 9), (2, 4), (2, 5), \dots, (2, 9), (4, 6), (4, 7), \dots, (4, 9), (6, 8), (6, 9)\}$.

By a direct calculation, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4}(\nabla_Z \rho)(X, Y) &= \frac{5}{2}\langle X, P_0 P_1 Z \rangle \langle Y, P_0 P_1 x \rangle + \frac{5}{2}\langle X, P_0 P_1 x \rangle \langle Y, P_0 P_1 Z \rangle \\ &+ \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \Lambda} (\langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta Z \rangle \langle Y, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle + \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x \rangle \langle Y, P_\alpha P_\beta Z \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Taking now tangent vectors $X = P_0 P_1 x$, $Y = P_0 P_2 x$ and $Z = P_1 P_2 x$, we get

$$\frac{1}{4}(\nabla_Z \rho)(X, Y) = \frac{3}{2} + \sum_{\alpha=6}^9 \langle P_0 P_2 x, P_\alpha P_\alpha x \rangle^2 + \sum_{\beta=8}^9 \langle P_0 P_2 x, P_\beta P_\beta x \rangle^2 \geq \frac{3}{2}.$$

Thus the M_1 with $(m_1, m_2) = (9, 6)$ is not Ricci parallel.

In the case $(m_1, m_2) = (9, 22)$, choose $x \in S^{2l-1}$ as a common eigenvector of the commuting 4-products $P_{2\alpha} P_{2\alpha+1} P_{2\beta} P_{2\beta+1}$, $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 4$. Then it is easy to see that $x \in M_1$ and $\dim \mathcal{V}_x \leq 21$. Evidently, $\dim \mathcal{V}_x < l - 1 = 31$, thus M_1 is not Ricci parallel.

(8) the case $m = 10, k = 1$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (10, 21)$.

With a similar discussion as in the case (6), it follows that the space $E_+(P_0 P_1 P_2 P_3) \cap E_+(P_0 P_1 P_4 P_5) \cap E_+(P_4 P_5 P_6 P_7) \cap E_+(P_2 P_3 P_8 P_9)$ is of dimension 4. On this space, the FKM-polynomial is

$$F(x) = |x|^4 - 2\langle P_{10} x, x \rangle^2.$$

This function is not constant and a maximum point lies in M_1 . We choose $x \in S^{63}$ to be the maximum point of the restricted F . It is easily seen that $x \in M_1$, and $\dim \mathcal{V}_x \leq 31 = l - 1$.

If $\dim \mathcal{V}_x < 31$, then M_1 is not Ricci parallel.

If $\dim \mathcal{V}_x = 31 = l - 1$, since M_1 is of dimension 52, 0 must be an eigenvalue of the Ricci operator S with multiplicity 21. Suppose that M_1 is Ricci parallel, which is indeed not Einstein by [QTY]. Then the Ricci operator S has two eigenvalues with multiplicities 21 and 31, respectively. Thus for any tangent vector $X \in \mathcal{V}_x$, $S(X) = c \cdot X$, where c is a constant. However, taking $X_1 = P_0 P_1 x$, we have $S(X_1) = 5P_0 P_1 x$; while taking $X_2 = P_0 P_{10} x$, we have $S(X_2) = P_0 P_{10} x$, which is an obvious contradiction.

Therefore, M_1 is not Ricci parallel.

(9) the case $m = 11, k = 1$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (11, 52)$.

Choose $x \in S^{127}$ as a common eigenvector of the commuting 4- products $P_{2\alpha}P_{2\alpha+1}P_{2\beta}P_{2\beta+1}$, $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 5$. Then it is easy to see that $x \in M_1$ and further $\dim \mathcal{V}_x \leq 31 < l-1 = 63$. Thus M_1 is not Ricci parallel.

(10) the case $m = 12$, $k = 1$, i.e. $(m_1, m_2) = (12, 51)$.

Choose $x \in S^{127}$ as a common eigenvector of the commuting 4- products $P_0P_1P_2P_3$, $P_4P_5P_6P_7$, $P_0P_1P_8P_9$, $P_2P_3P_8P_9$, $P_6P_7P_{10}P_{11}$, and $P_0P_2P_8P_{12}$. Then it is easy to see that $x \in M_1$ and further $\dim \mathcal{V}_x \leq 56 < l-1 = 63$. Thus M_1 is not Ricci parallel.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 (i) is now complete.

5. Examples to the problem of Besse

We begin this section with a proof of Proposition 1.1.

Proposition 1.1. The focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres with $g = 4$ and $m_1, m_2 > 1$ are not Riemannian products.

Proof. For convenience, we are only concerned with the proof for M_1 , while the other case is verbatim.

Observe that the sectional curvature is given by

$$Sec(X \wedge Y) = 1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, X \rangle \langle A_\alpha Y, Y \rangle - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, Y \rangle^2,$$

where X and Y are unit tangent vectors at the same point perpendicular to each other. For simplicity, we denote

$$\tilde{A}(X, Y) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, X \rangle \langle A_\alpha Y, Y \rangle, \quad \tilde{B}(X, Y) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, Y \rangle^2.$$

Lemma 5.1. The inequality $\tilde{A} \leq 1$ holds, and the equality holds if and only if the following two conditions are both satisfied:

- (1) $\langle A_\alpha X, X \rangle = \langle A_\alpha Y, Y \rangle$, for any $\alpha = 1, \dots, m_1 + 1$
- (2) X is an +1-eigenvector for a certain unit normal vector N .

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Denote

$$\mathbf{a} =: (\langle A_1 X, X \rangle, \langle A_2 X, X \rangle, \dots, \langle A_{m_1+1} X, X \rangle) =: (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{m_1+1}),$$

$$\mathbf{b} =: (\langle A_1 Y, Y \rangle, \langle A_2 Y, Y \rangle, \dots, \langle A_{m_1+1} Y, Y \rangle).$$

Notice that $\tilde{A} = \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq |\mathbf{a}| \cdot |\mathbf{b}| \leq \frac{1}{2}(|\mathbf{a}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2)$, and

$$\tilde{A} = \frac{1}{2}(|\mathbf{a}|^2 + |\mathbf{b}|^2) \iff \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$$

Define a function on the unit tangent bundle by

$$\phi : S(TM_1) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$X \longmapsto \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, X \rangle^2$$

For any curve $X(t)$ in $S(TM_1)$ with $X(0) = X$ a maximum point, we have

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \phi(X(t)) = 4 \left\langle \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, X \rangle A_\alpha X, X'(0) \right\rangle,$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, X \rangle A_\alpha X = c \cdot X,$$

for some number c . Hence

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, X \rangle^2 = c \langle X, X \rangle = c \geq 0.$$

If $c = 0$, then $\tilde{A} = 0$. Thus we are left to consider $c > 0$. For any orthonormal normal vectors $\{N_1, N_2, \dots, N_{m_1+1}\}$ of M_1 in the unit sphere, we denote a unit normal vector by $N =: \frac{1}{|\mathbf{a}|} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} a_\alpha N_\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} a_\alpha N_\alpha$. Then it is clear that $A_N X = \sqrt{c} \cdot X$.

On the other hand, recall that for any unit tangent vector on a focal submanifold with $g = 4$, the corresponding principal curvatures are ± 1 and 0 (cf. [CR]). Thus $c = 1$, which leads directly that $\tilde{A} \leq 1$. \square

Now we continue proving Proposition 1.1. Combining Lemma 5.1 with the fact $\tilde{B} \geq 0$, we can conclude that

$$(5.1) \quad \text{Sec} \leq 2.$$

Recall that for an orthonormal basis $\{X =: e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{m_1+2m_2}\}$ of $T_x M_1$, the Gauss equation leads the Ricci curvature $\rho(X)$ to be

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(X) &= \sum_{i=2}^{m_1+2m_2} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, X \rangle \langle A_\alpha e_i, e_i \rangle - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} \langle A_\alpha X, e_i \rangle^2 \right\} \\ &= m_1 + 2m_2 - 1 - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1+1} |A_\alpha X|^2 \\ &\geq 2(m_2 - 1), \end{aligned}$$

since A_α ($\alpha = 1, \dots, m_1 + 1$) is trace free with eigenvalues ± 1 and 0 .

Suppose M_1 is a Riemannian product. Using the Künneth formula and the Betti numbers of the focal submanifolds given in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we can assert that $M_1 \cong N_1^{m_2} \times N_2^{m_1+m_2}$. Thus for $X = e_1, \dots, e_{m_2} \in T_x N_1$, (5.1) and (5.2) lead to

$$2(m_2 - 1) \leq \rho(X) = \text{Sec}(X \wedge e_2) + \dots + \text{Sec}(X \wedge e_{m_2}) \leq 2(m_2 - 1)$$

which implies that $\rho(X) = 2(m_2 - 1)$, and further $Sec(X \wedge e_i) = 2$ ($i = 2, \dots, m_2$), $Sec(e_j, e_i) = 0$ ($i = 1, \dots, m_2, j = m_2 + 1, \dots, m_1 + m_2$).

However, let $\{\tilde{\eta}_1 =: \eta, \tilde{\eta}_2, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_{m_1+1}\}$ be orthonormal normal vectors at $x \in M_1$ in the unit sphere $S^{2m_1+2m_2+1}$, with respect to which, we have $A_{\tilde{\eta}_1}X = X$, and thus $A_{\tilde{\eta}_\alpha}X = 0$ for $\alpha = 2, \dots, m_1 + 1$. We choose a unit $Y \in T_x N_2$ with $A_\eta Y \neq -Y$. Thus $\langle Y, A_{\tilde{\eta}_\alpha}X \rangle = 0$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, m_1 + 1$). On these conditions, it is easy to see that $\tilde{A}(X, Y) \neq -1$ and $\tilde{B}(X, Y) = 0$, thus $Sec(X \wedge Y) \neq 0$, a contradiction to the product splitting.

The proof of Proposition 1.1 is now complete. \square

To illustrate our examples to the open problem of Besse, it suffices to prove Proposition 1.2.

Proposition 1.2. The focal submanifolds M_1 of OT-FKM type with $(m_1, m_2) = (3, 4k)$ are not intrinsically homogeneous.

Proof. According to Theorem 5.1 in [FKM], the space Ω defined by

$$\{x \in M_1 \mid \text{there exists an orthonormal } Q_0, \dots, Q_3 \in \Sigma(P_0, \dots, P_3) \text{ with } Q_0 \cdots Q_3 x = x\}$$

can be expressed as

$$\{x \in M_1 \mid \text{there exists orthonormal } N_0, \dots, N_3 \in T_x^\perp M_1 \text{ with } \dim\left(\bigcap_{i=0}^3 Ker A_{N_i}\right) \geq 3\}.$$

By Theorem 5.2 in [FKM], when $m_1 = 3$, Ω is non-empty and $\Omega \neq M_1$. Comparing with Theorem 5.8 in [FKM], which states that $\dim(\bigcap_{i=0}^3 Ker A_{N_i}) \leq 3$ when $m_1 = 3$, we can conclude that $\dim(\bigcap_{i=0}^3 Ker A_{N_i}) = 3$. Thus for any $x \in \Omega$, and a unit $X \in T_x M_1$, the Ricci curvature $\rho(X)$ takes the maximum $2l - 6$ at the 3-dimensional subspace $\bigcap_{i=0}^3 Ker A_{N_i}$ of $T_x M_1$.

On the other hand, at any $y \in M_1 \setminus \Omega$, the Ricci curvature is less than the maximum $2l - 6$.

The proof of Proposition 1.2 is now complete.

Acknowledgements . The authors would like to thank the referees for very helpful comments. The project was partially supported by the NSFC (No. 11331002, and No. 11301027), the SRFDP (No. 20130003120008), the BJNSF (No. 1144013), the FRFCU (No. 2012CXQT09) and the Program for Changjiang Scholars and Innovative Research Team in University.

REFERENCES

[Adm] J. F. Adams, *On the groups $J(X)$ -III*, Topology, **3** (1965), 193-222.

- [BCO] J. Berndt, S. Console and C. Olmos, *Submanifolds and holonomy*, Research Notes in Mathematics Series, Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2003.
- [Bes] A.L. Besse, *Einstein Manifolds*, Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1987.
- [CCJ] T. E. Cecil, Q. S. Chi, and G. R. Jensen, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four principal curvatures*, Ann. Math. **166** (2007), no. 1, 1–76.
- [Chi] Q. S. Chi, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four principal curvatures, III*, J. Diff. Geom. **94** (2013), 487–522.
- [CR] T. E. Cecil and P. T. Ryan, *Tight and taut immersions of manifolds*, Research Notes in Math. **107**, Pitman, London, 1985.
- [Fan] F. Q. Fang, *On the topology of isoparametric hypersurfaces with four distinct principal curvatures*, Proc. AMS, **127** (1999), 259–264.
- [FKM] D. Ferus, H. Karcher, and H. F. Münzner, *Cliffordalgebren und neue isoparametrische Hyperflächen*, Math. Z. **177** (1981), 479–502.
- [GR] J. Q. Ge and M. Radeschi, *Differentiable classification of 4-manifolds with singular Riemannian foliations*, Math. Ann., **363** (2015), 525–548.
- [Gra] A. Gray, *Einstein like manifolds which are not Einstein*, Geom. Ded. **7** (1978), 259–280.
- [GX] J. Q. Ge and Y. Q. Xie, *Gradient map of isoparametric polynomial and its application to Ginzburg-Landau system*, J. Funct. Anal., **258** (2010) 1682–1691.
- [HL] W. Y. Hsiang and H. B. Lawson, *Minimal submanifolds of low cohomogeneity*, J. Diff. Geom. **5** (1971), 1–38.
- [Jel] W. Jelonek. *On A -Tensors in Riemannian geometry*, Preprint 551, Polish Acad. Sci., 1995.
- [JW] I. M. James and J. H. C. Whitehead, *On the homotopy theory of sphere bundles over spheres, I*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **4** (1954), 196–218.
- [KN] U. Ki and H. Nakagawa, *A characterization of the Cartan hypersurface in a sphere*, Tôhoku Math. J., **39** (1987), 27–40.
- [Miy] R. Miyaoka, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with $(g, m) = (6, 2)$* , Ann. Math., **177** (2013), 53–110.
- [MS] S. Milnor and J. Stasheff, *Characteristic Classes*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1974.
- [Mün] H. F. Münzner, *Isoparametrische Hyperflächen in Sphären, I and II*, Math. Ann., **251** (1980), 57–71 and **256** (1981), 215–232.
- [OT] H. Ozeki and M. Takeuchi, *On some types of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres, I and II*, Tôhoku Math. J. **27** (1975), 515–559 and **28** (1976), 7–55.
- [PT] H. Pedersen and P. Tod, *The Ledger curvature conditions and D'Atri geometry*, Diff. Geom. Appl., **11** (1999), 155–162.
- [QTY] C. Qian, Z. Z. Tang and W. J. Yan, *New examples of Willmore submanifolds in the unit sphere via isoparametric functions, II*, Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom. **43** (2013), 47–62.
- [Tan] Z. Z. Tang, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four distinct principal curvatures*, Chinese Sci. Bull, **36** (1991), 1237–1240.
- [TXY] Z. Z. Tang, Y. Q. Xie and W. J. Yan, *Schoen-Yau-Gromov-Lawson theory and isoparametric foliation*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **20** (2012), 989–1018.
- [TY1] Z. Z. Tang and W. J. Yan, *New examples of Willmore submanifolds in the unit sphere via isoparametric functions*, Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom. **42** (2012), 403–410.
- [TY2] Z. Z. Tang and W. J. Yan, *Isoparametric foliation and Yau conjecture on the first eigenvalue*, J. Diff. Geom. **94** (2013), 539–558.
- [Wan] Q. M. Wang, *On the topology of Clifford Isoparametric hypersurfaces*, J. Diff. Geom. **27** (1988), 55–66.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPLEX SYSTEMS,
BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100875, CHINA

E-mail address: `zztang@bnu.edu.cn`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPLEX SYSTEMS,
BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100875, CHINA

E-mail address: `wjyan@bnu.edu.cn`