

# LINEAR STABILITY OF COMPACT SHRINKING RICCI SOLITONS

HUAI-DONG CAO AND MENG ZHU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we continue to investigate the second variation of Perelman's  $\nu$ -entropy for compact shrinking Ricci solitons. In particular, we improve some of our previous work in [10] and the more recent work in [31] and obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for a compact shrinking Ricci soliton to be linearly stable. Our work also extends similar results of Hamilton, Ilmanen and the first author in [7] (see also [8]) for positive Einstein manifolds to the compact shrinking Ricci soliton case.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This is a sequel to our previous paper [10], in which we derived the second variation formula of Perelman's  $\nu$ -entropy for compact shrinking Ricci solitons and obtained certain necessary condition for the linear stability of compact Ricci shrinkers.

Recall that a complete Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, g)$  is called a *shrinking Ricci soliton* if there exists a smooth vector field  $V$  on  $M^n$  such that the Ricci tensor  $Rc$  of the metric  $g$  satisfies the equation

$$Rc + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_V g = \frac{1}{2\tau}g,$$

where  $\tau > 0$  is a constant and  $\mathcal{L}_V g$  denotes the Lie derivative of  $g$  in the direction of  $V$ . If  $V$  is the gradient vector field  $\nabla f$  of a smooth function  $f$ , then we have a *gradient shrinking Ricci soliton* given by

$$(1.1) \quad Rc + \nabla^2 f = \frac{1}{2\tau}g,$$

for some constant  $\tau > 0$ . Here,  $\nabla^2 f$  denotes the Hessian of  $f$ , and  $f$  is called a *potential function* of the Ricci soliton. Clearly, when  $f$  is a constant we have an Einstein metric of positive scalar curvature. Thus, gradient shrinking Ricci solitons include positive Einstein manifolds as a special case. In the following, we use  $(M^n, g, f)$  to denote a gradient shrinking Ricci soliton.

Gradient shrinking Ricci solitons are self-similar solutions to Hamilton's Ricci flow and often arise as Type I singularity models in the Ricci flow as shown by Naber [34], Enders-Müller-Topping [19] and Cao-Zhang [11]. As such, they play a significant role in the study of the formation of singularities in the Ricci flow and its applications. Therefore, it is very important to either classify, if possible, or understand the geometry of gradient shrinking Ricci solitons.

---

The first author was partially supported by a Simons Foundation Collaboration Grant. The second author was partially supported by NSFC Grant No. 11971168, Shanghai Science and Technology Innovation Program Basic Research Project STCSM 20JC1412900, and the Science and Technology Commission of Shanghai Municipality No. 22DZ2229014.

Hamilton [25] showed that any 2-dimensional complete gradient shrinking Ricci soliton is isometric to either  $\mathbb{S}^2$ , or  $\mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^2$ , or the Gaussian shrinking soliton on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . In dimension 3, by using the Hamilton-Ivey curvature pinching, Ivey [26] proved that a compact shrinking soliton must be a spherical space form  $\mathbb{S}^3/\Gamma$ . Furthermore, a complete classification in dimension three follows from the works of Perelman [38], Naber [34], Ni-Wallach [35], and Cao-Chen-Zhu [6] that any three-dimensional complete gradient shrinking Ricci soliton is either isometric to the Gaussian soliton  $\mathbb{R}^3$  or a finite quotient of either  $\mathbb{S}^3$  or  $\mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ . However, in dimension  $n \geq 4$ , there do exist non-Einstein and non-product gradient shrinking Ricci solitons. Specifically, in dimension  $n = 4$ , Koiso [28] and the first author [3] independently constructed a gradient Kähler-Ricci shrinking soliton on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \# (-\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2)$ , and Wang-Zhu [39] found another one on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \# (-2\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2)$ . In the noncompact case, Feldman-Ilmanen-Knopf [20] constructed a  $U(2)$ -invariant gradient shrinking Kähler-Ricci soliton on the tautological line bundle  $\mathcal{O}(-1)$  of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$ , i.e., the blow-up of  $\mathbb{C}^2$  at the origin. Very recently, a noncompact toric gradient shrinking Kähler-Ricci soliton on the blowup of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}$  at one point was found by Bamler-Cifarelli-Conlon-Deruelle [1]. These are the only known examples of nontrivial (i.e., non-Einstein) and non-product complete shrinking Ricci solitons in dimension 4 so far. We remark that the constructions in [3, 20, 28, 39] all extend to higher dimensions. For additional examples in higher dimensions, see, e.g., Dancer-Wang [18], Futaki-Wang [21], and Yang [40].

Ricci solitons can also be viewed as fixed points of the Ricci flow, as a dynamical system on the space of Riemannian metrics modulo diffeomorphisms and scalings. In [37], Perelman introduced the  $\mathcal{W}$ -functional

$$\mathcal{W}(\hat{g}, \hat{f}, \hat{\tau}) = \int_M [\hat{\tau}(\hat{R} + |\nabla \hat{f}|^2) + \hat{f} - n](4\pi\hat{\tau})^{-\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\hat{f}} d\hat{V},$$

on any compact manifold  $M^n$ , where  $\hat{g}$  is a Riemannian metric on  $M$ ,  $\hat{R}$  its scalar curvature,  $\hat{f}$  any smooth function on  $M^n$ , and  $\hat{\tau} > 0$  a positive parameter. The associated  $\nu$ -entropy is defined by

$$\nu(\hat{g}) = \inf \{ \mathcal{W}(\hat{g}, \hat{f}, \hat{\tau}) : \hat{f} \in C^\infty(M), \hat{\tau} > 0, (4\pi\hat{\tau})^{-\frac{n}{2}} \int e^{-\hat{f}} d\hat{V} = 1 \},$$

which is always attained by some  $\hat{f}$  and  $\hat{\tau}$ . Furthermore, Perelman showed that the  $\nu$ -entropy is monotone increasing under the Ricci flow, and its critical points are precisely given by gradient shrinking Ricci solitons  $(M^n, g, f)$  satisfying (1.1). In particular, it follows that all compact shrinking Ricci solitons are necessarily gradient ones.

By definition, a compact shrinking Ricci soliton  $(M^n, g, f)$  is *linearly stable* (or  $\nu$ -stable) if the second variation of the  $\nu$ -entropy is nonpositive at  $g$ . In [7], Hamilton, Ilmanen and the first author initiated the study of linear stability of compact shrinking Ricci solitons. They obtained the second variation formula of Perelman's  $\nu$ -entropy for positive Einstein manifolds and investigated their linear stability. Among other results, they showed that, while the round sphere  $\mathbb{S}^n$  is linearly stable and the complex projective space  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$  is neutrally linearly stable<sup>1</sup>, many known

---

<sup>1</sup>Recently, Knopf and Sesum [27] showed that  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$  is not a local maximum of the  $\nu$ -entropy, hence is dynamically unstable as first shown by Kröncke [30].

positive Einstein manifolds are unstable. In particular, all product Einstein manifolds and Fano Kähler-Einstein manifolds with Hodge number  $h^{1,1} > 1$  are unstable. More recently, a complete description of the linear stability (or instability) of irreducible symmetric spaces of compact type was provided by C. He and the first author [8]. Meanwhile, in [10], we derived the second variation formula of Perelman's  $\nu$ -entropy for compact shrinking Ricci solitons which we now recall.

Let  $(M^n, g, f)$  be a compact shrinking Ricci soliton satisfying (1.1) and  $\text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$  denote the space of symmetric (covariant) 2-tensors on  $M$ . For any  $h = h_{ij} \in \text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$ , consider the variation  $g(s) = g + sh$  and let

$$(1.2) \quad \text{div}_f h = e^f \text{div}(e^{-f}h) = \text{div} h - h(\nabla f, \cdot),$$

$\text{div}_f^\dagger$  be the adjoint of  $\text{div}_f$  with respect to the weighted  $L^2$ -inner product

$$(1.3) \quad (\cdot, \cdot)_f = \int_M \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle e^{-f} dV,$$

$$(1.4) \quad \Delta_f h := \Delta h - \nabla f \cdot \nabla h,$$

and

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{L}_f h = \frac{1}{2} \Delta_f h + \text{Rm}(h, \cdot) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta_f h_{ik} + R_{ijkl} h_{jl}.$$

Then the second variation  $\delta_g^2 \nu(h, h)$  of the  $\nu$ -entropy is given in [10] by

$$\delta_g^2 \nu(h, h) = \left. \frac{d^2}{ds^2} \right|_{s=0} \nu(g(s)) = \frac{1}{(4\pi\tau)^{n/2}} \int_M \langle N_f h, h \rangle e^{-f} dV,$$

where the *Jacobi operator* (also known as the *stability operator*)  $N_f$  is defined by

$$(1.6) \quad N_f h := \mathcal{L}_f h + \text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f h + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \hat{v}_h - \text{Rc} \frac{\int_M \langle \text{Rc}, h \rangle e^{-f} dV}{\int_M R e^{-f} dV},$$

and  $\hat{v}_h$  is the unique solution of

$$\Delta_f \hat{v}_h + \frac{\hat{v}_h}{2\tau} = \text{div}_f \text{div}_f h, \quad \int_M \hat{v}_h e^{-f} dV = 0.$$

For more details, we refer the reader to our previous paper [10] or Section 2 below. Note that  $\text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$  admits the following standard direct sum decomposition:

$$(1.7) \quad \text{Sym}^2(T^*M) = \text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger) \oplus \text{Ker}(\text{div}_f).$$

The first factor

$$\text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger) = \{\text{div}_f^\dagger(\omega) \mid \omega \in \Omega^1(M)\} = \{\mathcal{L}_X g \mid X = \omega^\sharp \in \mathcal{X}(M)\}$$

represents deformations  $g(s)$  of  $g$  by diffeomorphisms. Since the  $\nu$ -entropy is invariant under diffeomorphisms, the second variation vanishes on this factor.

In [10], we observed that  $\text{div}_f(\text{Rc}) = 0$  and showed that  $\text{Rc}$  is an eigen-tensor of  $\mathcal{L}_f$  with eigenvalue<sup>2</sup>  $1/2\tau$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}_f \text{Rc} = \frac{1}{2\tau} \text{Rc}$ . Moreover, for any linearly stable compact shrinking Ricci soliton, we proved that  $1/2\tau$  is the only positive eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_f$  on  $\text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)$  with multiplicity one. Very recently, Mehrmohamadi and Razavi [31] made some new progress. In particular, they showed that  $N_f$  vanishes on

<sup>2</sup>Note the different sign convention we used in [10] for eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}_f$ : In [10],  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_f$  if  $-\mathcal{L}_f h = \lambda h$  for some symmetric 2-tensor  $h \neq 0$ .

$\text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger)$ , extending a similar result in [7, 8] for positive Einstein manifolds to the compact shrinking Ricci soliton case. In addition, in terms of the operator  $\mathcal{L}_f$ , they showed that (i) if a compact shrinking Ricci soliton  $(M^n, g, f)$  is linearly stable, then the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}_f$  on  $\text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$ , other than  $\frac{1}{2\tau}$  with multiplicity one, must be less than or equal to  $\frac{1}{4\tau}$ ; (ii) if a compact shrinking soliton  $(M^n, g, f)$  has  $\mathcal{L}_f \leq 0$  on  $\text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$ , except on scalar multiples of  $Rc$ , then  $(M^n, g, f)$  is linearly stable (see Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 in [31], respectively).

Clearly, the nonpositivity of the second variation of  $\nu$ , i.e.,  $\delta_g^2\nu(h, h) \leq 0$ , is implied by the nonpositivity of the stability operator  $N_f$  on the space  $\text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$  of symmetric 2-tensors. Thus, studying linear stability of compact shrinking Ricci solitons requires a closer look into the eigenvalues and eigenspaces of  $N_f$ , especially its leading term  $\mathcal{L}_f$  defined by (1.5), acting on  $\text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$ . Since  $\text{div}_f(Rc) = 0$ , we can further decompose  $\text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$  in (1.7) by

$$(1.8) \quad \text{Sym}^2(T^*M) = \text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger) \oplus \mathbb{R} \cdot Rc \oplus \text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp,$$

where  $\mathbb{R} \cdot Rc = \{\rho Rc \mid \rho \in \mathbb{R}\}$  is the one dimensional subspace generated by the Ricci tensor  $Rc$ , and

$$(1.9) \quad \text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp = \{h \in \text{Ker}(\text{div}_f) \mid \int_M \langle h, Rc \rangle e^{-f} dV = 0\}$$

denotes the orthogonal complement of  $\mathbb{R} \cdot Rc$  in  $\text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)$  with respect to the weighted inner product (1.3).

In this paper, by exploring decomposition (1.8), we are able to further improve our previous work in [10] and the work of Mehrmohamadi and Razavi [31]. Our main results are as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $(M^n, g, f)$  be a compact shrinking Ricci soliton satisfying equation (1.1). Then,*

- (i) *the decomposition of  $\text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$  in (1.8) is both invariant under  $\mathcal{L}_f$  and orthogonal with respect to the second variation  $\delta_g^2\nu$  of the  $\nu$ -entropy.*
- (ii) *the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}_f$  on  $\text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger)$  are strictly less than  $\frac{1}{4\tau}$ .*

**Theorem 1.2.** *A compact shrinking Ricci soliton  $(M^n, g, f)$  is linearly stable if and only if  $\mathcal{L}_f \leq 0$  on  $\text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp$ .*

*Remark 1.1.* Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 above are extensions of similar results by Hamilton, Ilmanen and the first author in [7] (see also Theorem 1.1 in [8]) for positive Einstein manifolds.

While there have been a lot of progress in recent years in understanding geometry of general higher dimensional ( $n \geq 4$ ) complete noncompact gradient shrinking Ricci solitons, especially in dimension four, e.g., [9, 12, 13, 15, 29, 32, 33] and [17, 1], very little is known about the geometry of general compact shrinking Ricci solitons in dimension  $n = 4$  or higher. On the other hand, for possible applications of the Ricci flow to topology, one is mostly interested in the classification of stable shrinking solitons, since unstable ones could be perturbed away hence may not represent generic singularities of the Ricci flow. Thus, exploring the variational structure of compact Ricci shrinkers becomes rather significant. We point out that Hall and Murphy [22] have proven that compact shrinking Kähler-Ricci solitons with Hodge number  $h^{1,1} > 1$  are unstable, thus extending the result of Cao-Hamilton-Ilmanen

[7] for Fano Kähler-Einstein manifolds to the shrinking Kähler-Ricci soliton case, by showing that  $\mathcal{L}_f$  admits at least one eigen-tensor in  $\text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp$  with eigenvalue  $1/2\tau$ . In particular, the Cao-Koiso soliton on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \# (-\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2)$  and Wang-Zhu soliton on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \# (-2\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2)$  are unstable. Moreover, Hall and Murphy [23] showed that the Page metric [36] on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \# (-\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2)$  is unstable. We hope our new results in this paper will play a significant role in the future study of linearly stable shrinking Ricci solitons.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we fix our notation and recall some useful facts that will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. First of all, by scaling the metric  $g$ , we may assume that  $\tau = 1$  in equation (1.1) so that

$$(2.1) \quad Rc + \nabla^2 f = \frac{1}{2}g.$$

We also normalize  $f$  so that

$$(4\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \int_M e^{-f} dV = 1.$$

From now on, we shall assume that  $(M^n, g, f)$  is a compact shrinking Ricci soliton satisfying (2.1).

As in [10], for any symmetric 2-tensor  $h = h_{ij}$  and 1-form  $\omega = \omega_i$ , we denote

$$\text{div } \omega := \nabla_i \omega_i, \quad (\text{div } h)_i := \nabla_j h_{ji}.$$

Moreover, as done in [5, 10], we define  $\text{div}_f(\cdot) := e^f \text{div}(e^{-f}(\cdot))$ , or more specifically,

$$(2.2) \quad \text{div}_f \omega = \text{div } \omega - \omega(\nabla f) = \nabla_i \omega_i - \omega_i \nabla_i f,$$

and

$$(2.3) \quad \text{div}_f h = \text{div } h - h(\nabla f, \cdot) = \nabla_j h_{ij} - h_{ij} \nabla_j f.$$

We also define the operator  $\text{div}_f^\dagger$  on functions by

$$(2.4) \quad \text{div}_f^\dagger u = -\nabla u, \quad u \in C^\infty(M)$$

and on 1-forms by

$$(2.5) \quad (\text{div}_f^\dagger \omega)_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2}(\nabla_i \omega_j + \nabla_j \omega_i) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g_{ij},$$

where  $\omega^\#$  is the vector field dual to  $\omega$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  denotes the Lie derivative, so that

$$(2.6) \quad \int_M e^{-f} \langle \text{div}_f^\dagger \omega, h \rangle dV = \int_M e^{-f} \langle \omega, \text{div}_f h \rangle dV.$$

Clearly,  $\text{div}_f^\dagger$  is just the adjoint of  $\text{div}_f$  with respect to the weighted  $L^2$ -inner product

$$(2.7) \quad (\cdot, \cdot)_f = \int_M \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle e^{-f} dV.$$

*Remark 2.1.* If we denote by  $\text{div}^*$  the adjoint of  $\text{div}$  with respect to the usual  $L^2$ -inner product

$$(2.8) \quad (\cdot, \cdot) = \int_M \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle dV,$$

then, as pointed out in [5], one can easily verify that

$$(2.9) \quad \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger = \operatorname{div}^*.$$

Finally, we denote

$$(2.10) \quad \Delta_f := e^f \operatorname{div}(e^{-f} \nabla) = \Delta - \nabla f \cdot \nabla,$$

which is self-adjoint with respect to the weighted  $L^2$ -inner product (2.7),

$$Rm(h, \cdot)_{ik} := R_{ijkl} h_{jl},$$

and define the operator

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{L}_f h = \frac{1}{2} \Delta_f h + Rm(h, \cdot)$$

on the space of symmetric 2-tensors. It is easy to see that, like  $\Delta_f$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_f$  is a self-adjoint operator with respect to the weighted  $L^2$ -inner product (2.7).

Now we restate the second variation of the  $\nu$ -entropy derived in [10] with  $\tau = 1$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** ([10]) *Let  $(M^n, g, f)$  be a compact shrinking Ricci soliton satisfying (2.1). For any symmetric 2-tensor  $h = h_{ij}$ , consider the variation  $g(s) = g_{ij} + s h_{ij}$ . Then the second variation  $\delta_g^2 \nu(h, h)$  is given by*

$$(2.12) \quad \delta_g^2 \nu(h, h) = \left. \frac{d^2}{ds^2} \right|_{s=0} \nu(g(s)) = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{n/2}} \int_M \langle N_f h, h \rangle e^{-f} dV,$$

where the stability operator  $N_f$  is given by

$$(2.13) \quad N_f h := \mathcal{L}_f h + \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \operatorname{div}_f h + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \hat{v}_h - Rc \frac{\int_M \langle Rc, h \rangle e^{-f} dV}{\int_M R e^{-f} dV},$$

and the function  $\hat{v}_h$  is the unique solution of

$$(2.14) \quad \Delta_f \hat{v}_h + \frac{\hat{v}_h}{2} = \operatorname{div}_f \operatorname{div}_f h, \quad \int_M \hat{v}_h e^{-f} dV = 0.$$

Next, we recall the following facts (see, e.g., Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 in [10]).

**Lemma 2.1.** ([10]) *Let  $(M^n, g, f)$  be a compact shrinking Ricci soliton satisfying (2.1). Then,*

- (i)  $Rc \in \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{div}_f)$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathcal{L}_f(Rc) = \frac{1}{2} Rc$ .

We shall also need the following useful identities found by Mehrmohamadi-Razavi [31]; see also Colding and Minicozzi [16], in which they derived more general versions of identities (2.15)-(2.20) that are valid for smooth metric measure spaces.

**Lemma 2.2.** ([31, 16]) *Let  $(M^n, g, f)$  be a compact shrinking Ricci soliton satisfying (2.1). Then, for any function  $u$ , 1-form  $\omega$  and symmetric 2-tensor  $h$ , the following identities hold*

$$(2.15) \quad \nabla \Delta_f u = \Delta_f \nabla u - \frac{1}{2} \nabla u,$$

$$(2.16) \quad \operatorname{div}_f \Delta_f \omega = \Delta_f \operatorname{div}_f \omega + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_f \omega,$$

$$(2.17) \quad \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \Delta_f \omega = 2 \mathcal{L}_f \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega,$$

$$(2.18) \quad 2\mathcal{L}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g) = \mathcal{L}_{(\Delta_f\omega)^\sharp}g + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g,$$

$$(2.19) \quad 2 \operatorname{div}_f \mathcal{L}_f h = \Delta_f \operatorname{div}_f h + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_f h,$$

and

$$(2.20) \quad \operatorname{div}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g) = -2 \operatorname{div}_f \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega = \Delta_f \omega + \nabla(\operatorname{div}_f \omega) + \frac{1}{2}\omega.$$

For the reader's convenience and the sake of completeness, we provide a quick proof here.

*Proof.* The above identities follow from direct computations given below.

- For (2.15):

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_i \Delta_f u &= \nabla_i \nabla_j \nabla_j u - \nabla_i \nabla_j f \nabla_j u - \nabla_j f \nabla_i \nabla_j u \\ &= \Delta \nabla_i u + R_{ijjk} \nabla_k u - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_i u + R_{ij} \nabla_j u - \nabla_j f \nabla_j \nabla_i u \\ &= \Delta_f \nabla_i u - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_i u. \end{aligned}$$

- For (2.16): It follows from (2.15) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M u \operatorname{div}_f(\Delta_f \omega) e^{-f} dV &= \int_M - \langle \Delta_f \nabla u, \omega \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &= \int_M - \langle \nabla(\Delta_f u) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla u, \omega \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &= \int_M u (\Delta_f \operatorname{div}_f \omega + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_f \omega) e^{-f} dV. \end{aligned}$$

- For (2.17):

$$2\mathcal{L}_f \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta_f (\nabla_i \omega_j + \nabla_j \omega_i) - R_{ikjl} (\nabla_k \omega_l + \nabla_l \omega_k).$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_f \nabla_i \omega_j &= \nabla_k \nabla_k \nabla_i \omega_j - \nabla_k f \nabla_k \nabla_i \omega_j \\ &= \nabla_k (\nabla_i \nabla_k \omega_j + R_{kijl} \omega_l) - \nabla_k f (\nabla_i \nabla_k \omega_j + R_{kijl} \omega_l) \\ &= \nabla_i \Delta \omega_j + R_{il} \nabla_l \omega_j + R_{kijl} \nabla_k \omega_l + \nabla_k R_{kijl} \omega_l + R_{kijl} \nabla_k \omega_l \\ &\quad - \nabla_i (\nabla_k f \nabla_k \omega_j) + \nabla_i \nabla_k f \nabla_k \omega_j + R_{kijl} \nabla_k f \omega_l \\ &= \nabla_i \Delta_f \omega_j - 2R_{kijl} \nabla_k \omega_l + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_i \omega_j. \end{aligned}$$

- For (2.18): According to (2.5), (2.18) is equivalent to (2.17).
- For (2.19): Similar to the proof of (2.16), (2.19) is the adjoint of (2.17) with respect to the inner product (2.7).

- For (2.20):

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g)_j &= \nabla_i (\nabla_i \omega_j + \nabla_j \omega_i) - \nabla_i f (\nabla_i \omega_j + \nabla_j \omega_i) \\ &= \Delta_f \omega_j + \nabla_j \nabla_i \omega_i + R_{jk} \omega_k - \nabla_j (\nabla_i f \omega_i) + \nabla_j \nabla_i f \omega_i \\ &= \Delta_f \omega_j + \nabla_j \operatorname{div}_f \omega + \frac{1}{2} \omega_j. \end{aligned}$$

□

*Remark 2.2.* Some of the identities in Lemma 2.2 were first obtained in [8] for positive Einstein manifolds.

For positive Einstein manifolds, C. He and the first author also showed in [8] that the restriction of  $N_f$  to the subspace  $\text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger)$  is zero, i.e.,  $N_f|_{\text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger)} = 0$ , a fact first noted in Cao-Hamilton-Ilmanen [7]. By using identities (2.16), (2.18) and (2.20) in Lemma 2.2, Mehrmohamadi and Razavi [31] were able to generalize this to the case of compact shrinking Ricci solitons.

**Lemma 2.3.** ([31]) *Let  $(M^n, g, f)$  be a compact shrinking Ricci soliton satisfying (2.1). Then, we have*

$$N_f|_{\text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger)} = 0.$$

*Proof.* Notice that, according to (2.20) and (2.16),

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{div}_f \text{div}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp} g) &= \text{div}_f(\Delta_f \omega + \nabla \text{div}_f \omega + \frac{1}{2}\omega) \\ &= 2\Delta_f(\text{div}_f \omega) + \text{div}_f \omega. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we denote by  $\xi = \mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp} g$ , then according to (2.14)

$$(2.22) \quad \hat{v}_\xi = 2 \text{div}_f \omega.$$

Now, by (2.5), (2.18), (2.20) and (2.22), we obtain

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{aligned} -2N_f(\text{div}_f^\dagger \omega) &= N_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp} g) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp} g) + \text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp} g) + \nabla^2(\text{div}_f \omega) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta_f \omega)^\sharp} g + \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp} g + \text{div}_f^\dagger(\Delta_f \omega) + \text{div}_f^\dagger(d(\text{div}_f \omega)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\text{div}_f^\dagger \omega + \nabla^2(\text{div}_f \omega) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

### 3. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 stated in the introduction. Once again, by scaling the metric  $g$ , we normalize  $\tau = 1$  and assume that  $(M^n, g, f)$  is a compact shrinking Ricci soliton satisfying

$$(3.1) \quad Rc + \nabla^2 f = \frac{1}{2}g.$$

First of all, recall that we have the following direct sum decomposition

$$(3.2) \quad \text{Sym}^2(T^*M) = \text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger) \oplus \mathbb{R} \cdot Rc \oplus \text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp,$$

where  $\mathbb{R} \cdot Rc$  is the one dimensional subspace generated by the Ricci tensor  $Rc$  and  $\text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp$ , as defined in (1.9), denotes the orthogonal complement of  $\mathbb{R} \cdot Rc$  in  $\text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)$  with respect to the weighted inner product  $\int_M \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle e^{-f} dV$ .

We divide the proof of Theorem 1.1 into two propositions.

**Proposition 3.1.** *The subspaces  $\text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger)$ ,  $\mathbb{R} \cdot Rc$ ,  $\text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp$  are invariant subspaces of the linear operator  $\mathcal{L}_f$ . Moreover, (3.2) is an orthogonal decomposition with respect to the quadratic form  $\delta_g^2 \nu(h, h)$  of the second variation in Theorem 2.1.*



*Proof.* Firstly, by (2.17),

$$\mathcal{L}_f(\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger(\Delta_f \omega + \frac{1}{2} \omega) \in \operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger).$$

This shows that  $\operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger)$  is invariant under  $\mathcal{L}_f$ .

Next, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have

$$\mathcal{L}_f Rc = \frac{1}{2} Rc.$$

Hence,  $\mathbb{R} \cdot Rc$  is an invariant subspace of  $\mathcal{L}_f$ .

Finally, for any  $h \in \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{div}_f)^\perp$ , it follows from (2.19) that

$$\operatorname{div}_f(\mathcal{L}_f h) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \Delta_f \operatorname{div}_f h + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_f h \right) = 0.$$

Moreover, since  $\mathcal{L}_f Rc = \frac{1}{2} Rc$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \langle \mathcal{L}_f h, Rc \rangle e^{-f} dV &= \int_M \langle h, \mathcal{L}_f Rc \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_M \langle h, Rc \rangle e^{-f} dV = 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}_f h \in \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{div}_f)^\perp$ . Therefore,  $\operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{div}_f)^\perp$  is also invariant under  $\mathcal{L}_f$ .

Moreover, the invariant subspace property just demonstrated together with the fact that  $\operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger)$ ,  $\mathbb{R} \cdot Rc$ , and  $\operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{div}_f)^\perp$  are mutually orthogonal to each other (with respect to the weighted inner product) immediately imply that the decomposition (1.8) of  $\operatorname{Sym}^2(T^*M)$  is also orthogonal with respect to the second variation  $\delta_\nu^2 \nu(h, h)$  of the  $\nu$ -entropy.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $(M^n, g, f)$  be a compact shrinking Ricci soliton satisfying (3.1). Then the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}_f$  on  $\operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger)$  are strictly less than  $\frac{1}{4}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_f$  on  $\operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger)$  and

$$\mathcal{L}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g) = \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g$$

for some  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g \equiv -2 \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega \in \operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger)$  with  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g \neq 0$ . Since  $N_f = 0$  on  $\operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger)$  by Lemma 2.3, from (2.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.3) \quad 0 &= N_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g) + \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \operatorname{div}_f \mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g + \nabla^2 \operatorname{div}_f \omega \\ &= \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g + \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \operatorname{div}_f \mathcal{L}_{\omega^\#} g + \nabla^2 \operatorname{div}_f \omega \\ &= -2\lambda \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega - 2 \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \operatorname{div}_f \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega - \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \nabla \operatorname{div}_f \omega \\ &= -\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger(2\lambda \omega + 2 \operatorname{div}_f \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega + \nabla \operatorname{div}_f \omega). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\eta = -(2\lambda \omega + 2 \operatorname{div}_f \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \omega + \nabla \operatorname{div}_f \omega).$$

Then (3.3) says that

$$(3.4) \quad \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \eta = 0.$$

On the other hand, it follows from (2.20) that

$$\eta = -2\lambda\omega + \Delta_f\omega + \frac{1}{2}\omega = \Delta_f\omega + \left(\frac{1}{2} - 2\lambda\right)\omega.$$

**Claim 1.** The following identity holds,

$$(3.5) \quad \Delta_f \operatorname{div}_f \omega = (2\lambda - 1) \operatorname{div}_f \omega.$$

Indeed, it follows from (2.18) that

$$2\mathcal{L}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g) = \mathcal{L}_{(\Delta_f\omega + \frac{1}{2}\omega)^\sharp}g.$$

From (2.21), we know that

$$\hat{v}_{\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g} = 2 \operatorname{div}_f \omega.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\hat{v}_{\mathcal{L}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g)} &= \hat{v}_{\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta_f\omega + \frac{1}{2}\omega)^\sharp}g} \\ &= 2 \operatorname{div}_f \left( \Delta_f\omega + \frac{1}{2}\omega \right) \\ &= 2(\Delta_f \operatorname{div}_f \omega + \operatorname{div}_f \omega), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step above, we have used (2.16).

Since  $\mathcal{L}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g) = \lambda\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_f \operatorname{div}_f \omega + \operatorname{div}_f \omega &= \hat{v}_{\mathcal{L}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g)} \\ &= \hat{v}_{\lambda\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g} \\ &= \lambda\hat{v}_{\mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp}g} = 2\lambda \operatorname{div}_f \omega, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\Delta_f \operatorname{div}_f \omega = (2\lambda - 1) \operatorname{div}_f \omega.$$

This proves Claim 1.

Thus, by using (2.16) and (3.5), we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_f \eta &= \operatorname{div}_f \Delta_f\omega + \left(\frac{1}{2} - 2\lambda\right) \operatorname{div}_f \omega \\ &= \Delta_f \operatorname{div}_f \omega + (1 - 2\lambda) \operatorname{div}_f \omega = 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Claim 2.**  $\eta = 0$ .

Indeed, since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \langle \eta, \Delta_f \eta \rangle e^{-f} dV &= \int_M \langle \eta, \operatorname{div}_f \nabla \eta \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &= \int_M \langle \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \eta, \nabla \eta \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &= \int_M \frac{1}{2} (\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \eta)_{ij} (\nabla_i \eta_j + \nabla_j \eta_i) e^{-f} dV \\ &= - \int_M |\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \eta|^2 e^{-f} dV, \end{aligned}$$

by (2.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M |\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \eta|^2 e^{-f} dV &= \int_M \langle \eta, \operatorname{div}_f \operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \eta \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_M \langle \eta, \Delta_f \eta + \nabla \operatorname{div}_f \eta + \frac{1}{2} \eta \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &= \int_M \left[ \frac{1}{2} |\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \eta|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\operatorname{div}_f \eta|^2 - \frac{1}{4} |\eta|^2 \right] e^{-f} dV, \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$(3.7) \quad \int_M |\eta|^2 e^{-f} dV = 2 \int_M (|\operatorname{div}_f \eta|^2 - |\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \eta|^2) e^{-f} dV.$$

Hence, it follows from (3.4) and (3.6) that  $\eta = 0$ , proving Claim 2.

Notice that  $\eta = 0$  means

$$\Delta_f \omega = (2\lambda - \frac{1}{2})\omega.$$

Therefore, to prove  $\lambda < \frac{1}{4}$ , it suffices to show that the eigenvalues of  $\Delta_f$  on the space of 1-forms are negative.

We argue by contradiction. Suppose that  $\sigma$  is a nonzero 1-form, and  $\Delta_f \sigma = \mu \sigma$  for some  $\mu \geq 0$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta_f |\sigma|^2 = \langle \Delta_f \sigma, \sigma \rangle + |\nabla \sigma|^2 = \mu |\sigma|^2 + |\nabla \sigma|^2.$$

Integrating both sides with respect to the measure  $e^{-f} dV$  implies

$$\int_M (\mu |\sigma|^2 + |\nabla \sigma|^2) e^{-f} dV = 0.$$

Hence  $\mu = 0$  and  $\nabla \sigma = 0$ , which imply that  $\Delta_f \sigma = 0$  and  $\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger \sigma = 0$ .

On the other hand, from (2.16),

$$\Delta_f (\operatorname{div}_f \sigma) = \operatorname{div}_f (\Delta_f \sigma) - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_f \sigma = -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_f \sigma.$$

But the first eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$  of  $\Delta_f$  on functions is greater than  $\frac{1}{2}$  (see page 759 in [10] for a proof). Thus, we conclude that  $\operatorname{div}_f \sigma = 0$ . Therefore, it follows from (3.7) that  $\sigma = 0$ , a contradiction.

This shows that  $\lambda < 1/4$  and concludes the proof of Proposition 3.2, as well as Theorem 1.1.  $\square$

Finally, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.2.

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.1, a compact shrinking Ricci soliton  $(M^n, g, f)$  is linearly stable if and only if

$$\delta_g^2 \nu(h, h) := \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{n/2}} \int_M \langle N_f h, h \rangle e^{-f} dV \leq 0$$

for every  $h \in \operatorname{Sym}^2(T^*M) = \operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{div}_f^\dagger) \oplus \mathbb{R} \cdot \operatorname{Rc} \oplus \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{div}_f)^\perp$ .

However, by Theorem 1.1(i) (i.e., Proposition 3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \langle N_f h, h \rangle e^{-f} dV &= \int_M \langle N_f h_1, h_1 \rangle e^{-f} dV + \int_M \langle N_f h_2, h_2 \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &\quad + \int_M \langle N_f h^\perp, h^\perp \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &= \int_M \langle N_f h_2, h_2 \rangle e^{-f} dV + \int_M \langle N_f h^\perp, h^\perp \rangle e^{-f} dV, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$h = h_1 + h_2 + h^\perp, \quad \text{with } h_1 \in \text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger), \quad h_2 \in \mathbb{R} \cdot \text{Rc}, \quad h^\perp \in \text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp,$$

and, in the last equality, we have used the fact that  $\delta_g^2 \nu(h_1, h_1) = 0$  for  $h_1 \in \text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger)$  due to the diffeomorphism invariance of the  $\nu$ -entropy.

On the other hand, since  $\text{div}_f \text{Rc} = 0$  and  $\mathcal{L}_f \text{Rc} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Rc}$  by Lemma 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} N_f(\text{Rc}) &= \mathcal{L}_f \text{Rc} - \frac{\int_M |\text{Rc}|^2 e^{-f} dV}{\int_M R e^{-f} dV} \text{Rc} \\ &= \mathcal{L}_f \text{Rc} - \frac{1}{2} \text{Rc} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that

$$\int_M |\text{Rc}|^2 e^{-f} dV = \frac{1}{2} \int_M R e^{-f} dV,$$

because the scalar curvature  $R$  satisfies the well-known equation  $\Delta_f R = R - 2|\text{Rc}|^2$ . Hence,  $N_f = 0$  on  $\mathbb{R} \cdot \text{Rc}$ , and it follows that

$$\int_M \langle N_f h_2, h_2 \rangle e^{-f} dV = 0.$$

Also, as  $N_f = \mathcal{L}_f$  on  $\text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp$ , we immediately conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \langle N_f h, h \rangle e^{-f} dV &= \int_M \langle N_f h^\perp, h^\perp \rangle e^{-f} dV \\ &= \int_M \langle \mathcal{L}_f h^\perp, h^\perp \rangle e^{-f} dV. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\delta_g^2 \nu(h, h) \leq 0$  if and only if

$$\int_M \langle \mathcal{L}_f h^\perp, h^\perp \rangle e^{-f} dV \leq 0.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.2.  $\square$

*Remark 3.1.* In the proof of Theorem 1.2, if we use Lemma 2.3 instead of Theorem 1.1 (i) then we would get the following more explicit information about the Jacobi operator  $N_f$ .

**Proposition 3.3.**

$$(3.8) \quad N_f = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{on } \text{Im}(\text{div}_f^\dagger); \\ 0, & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \cdot \text{Rc}; \\ \mathcal{L}_f & \text{on } \text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp. \end{cases}$$

In particular,  $N_f \leq 0$  on  $\text{Sym}^2(T^*M)$  if and only if  $\mathcal{L}_f \leq 0$  on  $\text{Ker}(\text{div}_f)^\perp$ .

*Remark 3.2.* Suppose  $\xi = \mathcal{L}_{\omega^\sharp} g$  is an eigen-tensor of  $\mathcal{L}_f$  for some 1-form  $\omega$ , with

$$\mathcal{L}_f \xi = \lambda \xi.$$

Then one can show that  $\text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f \xi$  and  $\nabla^2 \text{div}_f \omega$  are also eigen-tensors of  $\mathcal{L}_f$  with the same eigenvalue, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_f(\text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f \xi) = \lambda(\text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f \xi),$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_f(\nabla^2 \text{div}_f \omega) = \lambda(\nabla^2 \text{div}_f \omega).$$

Indeed, if  $\mathcal{L}_f(\xi) = \lambda \xi$  then, by using the identity

$$(3.9) \quad \text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f(\mathcal{L}_f h) = \mathcal{L}_f(\text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f h)$$

shown in [31], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_f(\text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f \xi) &= \text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f(\mathcal{L}_f \xi) \\ &= \lambda(\text{div}_f^\dagger \text{div}_f \xi). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by setting  $u = \text{div}_f \omega$  and combining (3.5) with (2.18) and (2.15), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{L}_f(\nabla^2 u) &= \mathcal{L}_f(\mathcal{L}_{\nabla u} g) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{(\Delta_f(du))^\sharp} g + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\frac{1}{2} \nabla u} g \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\nabla(\Delta_f u + u)} g \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{2\lambda \nabla u} g \\ &= 2\lambda \nabla^2 u. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude our paper, we mention two open problems.

**Conjecture 1 (Hamilton; 2004 [4, 5])**  $\mathbb{S}^4$  and  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$  are the only  $\nu$ -stable four dimensional positive Einstein manifolds.

**Conjecture 2 (Cao; 2006 [4, 5])** A  $\nu$ -stable compact shrinking Ricci soliton is necessarily Einstein.

*Remark 3.3.* Besides  $\mathbb{S}^4$  and  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$ , the other known positive Einstein 4-manifolds are the Kähler-Einstein manifolds  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$ ,  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \# (-k\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2)$  ( $3 \leq k \leq 8$ ), and the (non-Kähler Einstein but conformally Kähler) Page metric [36] on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \# (-\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2)$  and Chen-LeBrun-Weber metric [14] on  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2 \# (-2\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2)$ . Note that, for  $n > 4$ , C. He and the first author [8] have found a strictly stable positive Einstein manifold, other than the round sphere  $\mathbb{S}^n$ , in dimension 8.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bamler, Richard H.; Cifarelli, Charles; Conlon, Ronan J.; Deruelle, Alix: *A new complete two-dimensional shrinking gradient Kähler-Ricci soliton*, preprint (2022), arXiv:2206.10785.
- [2] Besse, A. L.: *Einstein manifolds*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], **10**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987. xii+510 pp.
- [3] Cao, Huai-Dong: *Existence of gradient Kähler-Ricci solitons, Elliptic and Parabolic Methods in Geometry* (Minneapolis, MN, 1994), (A K Peters, Wellesley, MA 1996) 1–16.
- [4] Cao, Huai-Dong: *Geometry of Ricci solitons*. Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B **27** (2006), no. 2, 121–142.
- [5] Cao, Huai-Dong: *Recent progress on Ricci solitons*, Recent advances in geometric analysis, Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM), **11** (International Press, 2010) 1–38.
- [6] Cao, Huai-Dong; Chen, Bing-Long; Zhu, Xi-Ping: *Recent developments on Hamilton's Ricci flow*, Surveys in differential geometry. Vol. XII. Geometric flows, 47–112, Surv. Differ. Geom., 12, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2008.
- [7] Cao, Huai-Dong; Hamilton, Richard S.; Ilmanen, Tom: *Gaussian densities and stability for some Ricci solitons*, arXiv:math.DG/0404165.
- [8] Cao, Huai-Dong and He, Chenxu: *Linear stability of Perelman's  $\nu$ -entropy on symmetric spaces of compact type*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 2015 (2015), no. 709, 229–246.
- [9] Cao, Huai-Dong and Zhou, Detang: *On complete gradient shrinking solitons*, J. Differential Geom. **85**, (2010) 175–185.
- [10] Cao, Huai-Dong and Zhu, Meng: *On second variation of Perelman's Ricci shrinker entropy*, Math. Ann. 353 (2012), No. 3, 747–763.
- [11] Cao, Xiaodong and Zhang, Qi S.: *The conjugate heat equation and ancient solutions of the Ricci flow*, Adv. Math. 228 no. 5 (2011), 2891–2919.
- [12] Carrillo, J. A. and Ni, L.: *Sharp logarithmic Sobolev inequalities on gradient solitons and applications*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **17** (2009), no. 4, 721–753.
- [13] Chen, Bing-Long: *Strong uniqueness of the Ricci flow*, J. Differential Geom. **82** (2009), no. 2, 363–382.
- [14] Chen, X.; LeBrun, C.; and Weber, B.: *On conformally Kähler, Einstein manifolds*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 21 (2008), 1137–1168.
- [15] Chow, B.; Lu, P.; Yang, B.: *Lower bounds for the scalar curvatures of noncompact gradient Ricci solitons*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **349** (2011), no. 23–24, 1265–1267.
- [16] Colding, Tobias H. and Minicozzi, William P.: *Singularities of Ricci flow and diffeomorphisms*, arXiv:2109.06240
- [17] Conlon, R. J.; Deruelle, A.; Sun, S.: *Classification results for expanding and shrinking gradient Kähler-Ricci solitons*, preprint, arXiv:1904.00147.
- [18] Dancer, Andrew S. and Wang, McKenzie Y.: *On Ricci solitons of cohomogeneity one*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. 39 (2011), no. 3, 259–292.
- [19] Enders, Joerg; Müller, Reto; Topping, Peter M.: *On type-I singularities in Ricci flow*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 19 (2011), no. 5, 905–922.
- [20] Feldman, M.; Ilmanen, T.; Knopf, D.: *Rotationally symmetric shrinking and expanding gradient Kähler-Ricci solitons*, J. Differential Geom., **65**, (2003) 169–209.
- [21] Futaki, Akito and Wang, Mu-Tao: *Constructing Kähler-Ricci solitons from Sasaki-Einstein manifolds*, Asian J. Math. 15 (2011), no. 1, 33–52.
- [22] Hall, Stuart J. and Murphy, Thomas: *On the linear stability of Kähler-Ricci solitons*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **139** (2011), 3327–3337.
- [23] Hall, Stuart J. and Murphy, Thomas: *On the spectrum of the Page and the Chen-LeBrun-Weber metrics*. Ann. Global Anal. Geom. 46 (2014), no. 1, 87–101.
- [24] Hamilton, R. S.: *The Ricci flow on surfaces*, Contemporary Mathematics **71**, (1988) 237–261.
- [25] Hamilton, R. S.: *The formation of singularities in the Ricci flow*, Surveys in Differential Geometry (Cambridge, MA, 1993), **2**, 7–136, International Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995.
- [26] Ivey, T.: *Ricci solitons on compact three-manifolds*, Diff. Geom. Appl. **3**, (1993) 301–307.
- [27] Knopf, Dan and Sesum, Natasa: *Dynamic instability of  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^N$  under Ricci flow*, J. Geom. Anal., 29 (2019), 902–916.

- [28] Koiso, N.: *On rotationally symmetric Hamilton's equation for Kähler-Einstein metrics*, Recent Topics in Diff. Anal. Geom., Adv. Studies Pure Math., **18-I**, (Academic Press, Boston, MA 1990) 327–337.
- [29] Kotschwar, Brett and Wang, Lu: *Rigidity of asymptotically conical shrinking gradient Ricci solitons*, J. Differential Geom. **100** (2015), 55–108.
- [30] Kröncke, Klaus: *Stability of Einstein metrics under Ricci flow*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **28** (2020), no. 2, 351–394.
- [31] Mehrmohamadi, Mansour and Razavi, Asadollah: *Commutator formulas for gradient Ricci shrinkers and their applications to linear stability*, arXiv:2104.08343.
- [32] Munteanu, Ovidiu and Wang, Jiaping: *Geometry of shrinking Ricci solitons*, Compos. Math. **151** (2015), no. 12, 2273–2300.
- [33] Munteanu, Ovidiu and Wang, Jiaping: *Conical structure for shrinking Ricci solitons*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **19** (2017), no. 11, 3377–3390.
- [34] Naber, Aaron: *Noncompact shrinking four solitons with nonnegative curvature*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **645** (2010), 125–153.
- [35] Ni, Lei and Wallach, Noah: *On a classification of gradient shrinking solitons*, Math. Res. Lett. **15**:5 (2008), 941–955.
- [36] Page, D.: *A compact rotating gravitational instanton*. Phys. Lett. **79B** (1979), 235–238.
- [37] Perelman, G.: *The entropy formula for the Ricci flow and its geometric applications*, arXiv:math.DG/0211159.
- [38] Perelman, G.: *Ricci flow with surgery on three manifolds*, arXiv:math.DG/0303109.
- [39] Wang, X.- J. and Zhu, X.- H.: *Kähler-Ricci solitons on toric manifolds with positive first Chern class*, Adv. Math. **188**, (2004) no. 1, 87–103.
- [40] Yang, Bo: *A characterization of noncompact Koiso-type solitons*, Internat. J. Math. **23** (2012), no. 5, 1250054, 13 pp.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, BETHLEHEM, PA 18015, USA

*Email address:* huc2@lehigh.edu

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND SHANGHAI KEY LABORATORY OF PMMP, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200241, CHINA

*Email address:* mzhu@math.ecnu.edu.cn