

SELF-DUAL AND EVEN POINCARÉ-EINSTEIN METRICS IN DIMENSION FOUR

MATTHEW J. GURSKY, STEPHEN E. MCKEOWN, AND AARON J. TYRRELL

ABSTRACT. We prove rigidity and gap theorems for self-dual and even Poincaré-Einstein metrics in dimension four. As a corollary, we give an obstruction to the existence of self-dual Poincaré-Einstein metrics in terms of conformal invariants of the boundary and the topology of the bulk. As a by-product of our proof we identify a new scalar conformal invariant of three-dimensional Riemannian manifolds.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X^{n+1} be the interior of a compact $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold \overline{X} with non-empty boundary $M = \partial X$. A Riemannian metric g_+ defined in X is called *conformally compact* if there is a defining function ρ for the boundary (i.e., $\rho > 0$ in X , $M = \{\rho = 0\}$, and $d\rho \neq 0$ on M) such that $\bar{g} = \rho^2 g_+$ defines a Riemannian metric (of some degree of regularity) on \overline{X} . Since defining functions are obviously not unique, a conformally compact metric g_+ determines a conformal class of metrics on the boundary called the *conformal infinity* of (X, g_+) .

If g_+ satisfies the Einstein condition

$$(1.1) \quad Ric(g_+) = -ng_+,$$

then g_+ is called a *Poincaré-Einstein* metric. The model of Poincaré-Einstein metrics is the Poincaré model of hyperbolic space on the unit ball $B^{n+1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : |x| < 1\}$, where

$$(1.2) \quad g_H = \frac{4}{(1 - |x|^2)^2} ds^2$$

and ds^2 is the Euclidean metric.

In this article we restrict our attention to $n = 3$ and consider two special, but important, classes of Poincaré-Einstein manifolds. In each case, we establish gap and rigidity theorems.

We will extensively use the expansions of Poincaré-Einstein metrics at the boundary, the so-called Fefferman-Graham expansions. These expansions are guaranteed to exist to infinite order so long as \bar{g} has at least C^2 regularity up to the boundary; see [9, 1]. Although it is known that Einstein metrics exist not satisfying either the hypothesis or the conclusion of this result ([3]), we will assume as a matter of definition that all Poincaré-Einstein metrics have at least a C^2 compactification.

1.1. Self-Dual Poincaré-Einstein metrics. Suppose $X = X^4$ is four-dimensional and oriented. If g is any Riemannian metric on X , then under the action of the

Hodge-* operator the bundle of self-dual two-forms splits into two rank-three sub-bundles of *self-dual* and *anti-self dual* two-forms

$$(1.3) \quad \Lambda^2(X) = \Lambda_+^2(X) \oplus \Lambda_-^2(X),$$

corresponding to the +1 and -1 eigenspaces of *. The Weyl curvature tensor of g , viewed as a linear map $W_g : \Lambda^2(X) \rightarrow \Lambda^2(X)$, preserves the splitting (1.3). As a consequence, there are well defined bundle maps $W_g^\pm : \Lambda_\pm^2(X) \rightarrow \Lambda_\pm^2(X)$. We say that g is *self-dual* if $W^- \equiv 0$.

Examples of self-dual Poincaré-Einstein metrics (henceforth SDPE metrics) include, of course, the hyperbolic metric on the unit ball. Pedersen [20] gave an explicit family of $SU(2)$ -invariant self-dual Poincaré-Einstein metrics on B^4 which we will discuss in more detail below (see also [21]). More generally, given any $SU(2)$ -invariant conformal class $[g]$ on S^3 , Hitchin [18] proved the existence of a SDPE metric g_+ in B^4 whose conformal infinity is $[g]$.

LeBrun [19] showed that *locally*, the existence of self-dual Poincaré-Einstein metrics is unobstructed when the boundary metric is real analytic. More precisely, if M^3 is real analytic and g is a real analytic metric on M^3 , then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ and a SDPE metric g_+ defined on $X = M^3 \times (0, \epsilon)$ whose conformal infinity is given by $(M^3, [g])$. Subsequently, Fefferman-Graham ([12], Chapter 5) gave a different proof of this fact.

There is, however, a *global* obstruction to the existence of SDPE metrics with given conformal boundary, which follows from the Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem:

$$(1.4) \quad \int_X (|W_{g_+}^+|^2 - |W_{g_+}^-|^2) dv_{g_+} = 12\pi^2 (\tau(X) - \eta(M, [g])),$$

where $\tau(X)$ is the signature of X and $\eta(M, [g])$ is the eta-invariant of the boundary. (Here and throughout the paper, the operator norm of the Weyl tensor is used; i.e., $|W^\pm|^2 = \frac{1}{4} W_{ijkl}^\pm (W^\pm)^{ijkl}$). If g_+ is SDPE, then (1.4) implies

$$(1.5) \quad \int_X |W_{g_+}^+|^2 dv_{g_+} = 12\pi^2 (\tau(X) - \eta(M, [g])).$$

In particular,

$$(1.6) \quad \tau(X) \geq \eta(M, [g]),$$

with equality if and only if (X, g_+) is hyperbolic. We will refer to this inequality as the *signature obstruction*.

One of our main results gives a new obstruction to the existence of self-dual Poincaré-Einstein metrics in terms of topological invariants of the bulk and conformal invariants of the boundary (see Theorem 1.2 below). One such invariant is the well known Yamabe invariant; the other invariant is “local” (i.e., can be expressed in terms of the curvature and its derivatives). To describe this invariant we need to introduce some additional notation.

Let (M^3, g) be a closed, three-dimensional Riemannian manifold. Let P denote the Schouten tensor of g , and

$$C_{ijk} = \nabla_k P_{ij} - \nabla_j P_{ik}$$

the Cotton tensor. We can equivalently view C as a symmetric two-tensor by defining

$$\mathcal{C}_{ij} = \mu_i^{k\ell} C_{jk\ell},$$

where μ is the volume form. It is well known that C is a conformal invariant; hence \mathcal{C} is:

$$\tilde{g} = e^{2w}g \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{g}} = e^{-4w}\mathcal{C}_g.$$

It is also well known that in dimension three, vanishing of the Cotton tensor is the obstruction to a metric being locally conformally flat.

One can construct other (non-obvious) conformal invariants from the Cotton tensor, and two such invariants will play a key role in our work on SDPE metrics:

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M, g) be a three-dimensional Riemannian manifold. Let $C = C_g$ denote the Cotton tensor, and $\mu = \mu_g$ the volume form with respect to g . Also, define the symmetric two-tensors*

$$\begin{aligned} V_{ij} &= \nabla^k C_{ijk}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{ij} &= \mu_i^{k\ell} C_{jk\ell}, \end{aligned}$$

where μ is the volume form of (M, g) . Then $\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle_g$ and $|\mathcal{C}|_g^2$ are pointwise conformal invariants: if $\tilde{g} = e^{2w_0}g$,

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{V}, \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rangle_{\tilde{g}} &= e^{-7w_0} \langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle_g, \\ |\tilde{\mathcal{C}}|_{\tilde{g}}^2 &= e^{-6w_0} |\mathcal{C}|_g^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, when it converges

$$(1.8) \quad I(M^3, [g]) = \int_M \frac{\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle}{|\mathcal{C}|^{4/3}} dv_g$$

is an integral conformal invariant.

The conformal invariance of $\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle$ does not seem to be known to experts, and its construction may be of independent interest.

Since the integral in (1.8) may not converge, in general we define

$$(1.9) \quad I_0(M^3, [g]) := \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \frac{\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle}{(\epsilon + |\mathcal{C}|^2)^{2/3}} dv_g \in [-\infty, \infty].$$

For example, when (M^3, g) is locally conformally flat (hence $\mathcal{C} = 0$), $I_0(M^3, [g]) = 0$.

Our next result shows that when the invariant I_0 and the Yamabe invariant of the conformal infinity of a SDPE metric are both positive, then the signature obstruction can be sharpened:

Theorem 1.2. *Let (X^4, g_+) be an oriented, self-dual, four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold. Let $M^3 = \partial X^4$, and $(M^3, [g])$ denote the conformal infinity of (X^4, g_+) . Assume*

- (i) $I_0(M^3, [g]) \geq 0$,
- (ii) $Y(M^3, [g]) > 0$.

Then either g_+ is hyperbolic, or

$$(1.10) \quad \tau(X^4) \geq \eta(M^3, [g]) + \frac{1}{3}\chi(X^4).$$

Specializing to the ball, we have

Corollary 1.3. *Let g_+ be a self-dual, four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein metric on B^4 with conformal infinity $(S^3, [g])$. Assume*

$$(i) \ I_0(S^3, [g]) \geq 0,$$

$$(ii) \ Y(S^3, [g]) > 0.$$

Then either g_+ is hyperbolic, or

$$(1.11) \quad \eta(S^3, [g]) \leq -\frac{1}{3}.$$

Interestingly, Theorem 1.2 also gives obstructions to the existence of self-dual Poincaré-Einstein fillings:

Corollary 1.4. *Let $(M^3, [g])$ be a conformal three-manifold satisfying*

$$(i) \ I_0(M^3, [g]) \geq 0,$$

$$(ii) \ Y(M^3, [g]) > 0.$$

Then there are infinitely many smooth, non-diffeomorphic manifolds Y^4 with the following properties:

- $\partial Y^4 = M^3$,
- Y^4 and $(M^3, [g])$ satisfy the signature obstruction (1.6),
- Y^4 does not admit a self-dual Poincaré-Einstein metric g_+ whose conformal infinity is given by $(M^3, [g])$.

For all $k \geq 1$, the connected sum of k copies of $S^2 \times S^1$ admit locally conformally flat metrics with positive scalar, and therefore satisfy the assumptions of Corollary 1.4:

Corollary 1.5. *Let g be a locally conformally flat metric of positive scalar curvature on $M^3 = k(S^2 \times S^1)$. Then there are infinitely many smooth, non-diffeomorphic manifolds Y^4 satisfying the conclusions of Corollary 1.4.*

In Pedersen's construction of $SU(2)$ -invariant SDPE metrics on B^4 , the conformal infinities are given by the Berger spheres, whose construction we briefly recall. Let $\{E_1, E_2, E_3\}$ be the basis of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ given by

$$E_1 = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}, E_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, E_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and let $\{E^1, E^2, E^3\}$ be the dual basis of one-forms. The 1-parameter family of left-invariant metrics

$$g_\epsilon = \epsilon E^1 \otimes E^1 + E^2 \otimes E^2 + E^3 \otimes E^3$$

on $SU(2) \simeq S^3$ are called the *Berger metrics*. When $\epsilon = 1$, then $g_1 = g_0$, the round metric on S^3 . In particular, Pedersen's examples give a 1-parameter family

$(g_+)_\epsilon$ of SDPE metrics on B^4 with $(g_+)_1 = g_H$, the hyperbolic metric. A tedious calculation gives

$$(1.12) \quad I(S^3, [g_\epsilon]) = -12\sqrt[3]{6}\pi^2\epsilon^4|\epsilon - 1|^{2/3} \leq 0,$$

with equality holding only for $\epsilon = 1$; i.e., $g_1 = g_0$. In particular, Theorem 1.2 does not apply to these metrics.

1.2. Even Poincaré-Einstein metrics. Let (X^4, g_+) be a four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold with conformal infinity $(M^3, [g])$. By the work of Graham-Lee (see [14, 13]), given $\hat{g} \in [g]$ there is a unique defining function $r > 0$ in a neighborhood of M such that g_+ can be expressed as

$$(1.13) \quad g_+ = r^{-2} (dr^2 + h_r),$$

where h_r is a family of metrics on M with an expansion of the form

$$(1.14) \quad h_r = \hat{g} + g^{(2)}r^2 + g^{(3)}r^3 + \dots,$$

with $g^{(i)}$ tensors on M . The tensor $g^{(3)}$ is formally undetermined, and can be viewed as the Neumann data corresponding to the Dirichlet data \hat{g} .

Definition 1.6. We say that g_+ is *even* if $g^{(3)} = 0$.

It follows from [13, p. 34 and Lemma 2.2] that the property of evenness does not depend on the choice of conformal representative of $[g]$, and hence is conformally invariant. Also, as the name suggests, evenness implies that $g^{(2k+1)} = 0$ for all $k \geq 0$ in the expansion (1.14); see the same source. Hyperbolic metrics and their quotients are examples of even metrics.

Anderson [2] showed that even metrics arise in the first variation of the renormalized volume. More precisely, suppose h is an infinitesimal Einstein deformation (i.e., h is in the kernel of the linearized Einstein operator with respect to g_+ ; see Section 2 of [2] for details). If $h_0 = h|_{TM}$ denotes the induced variation of the boundary metric \hat{g} , then

$$(1.15) \quad V'(h) = \frac{d}{dt} V(g_+ + th) \Big|_{t=0} = -\frac{1}{4} \int_M \langle h_0, g^{(3)} \rangle_{\hat{g}} dA_{\hat{g}}$$

(see Theorem 2.2 of [2]). In particular, we see that if g_+ is even, then it is a critical point of the renormalized volume functional.

The formula (1.15) follows from Anderson's formula for the renormalized volume:

$$(1.16) \quad V = \frac{4}{3}\pi^2\chi(X) - \frac{1}{6} \int_X |W_{g_+}|^2 dv_{g_+}.$$

Notice this gives the topological bound

$$(1.17) \quad V \leq \frac{4}{3}\pi^2\chi(X),$$

with equality if and only if g_+ is hyperbolic. In particular, for any Poincaré-Einstein metric on the ball B^4 we have

$$V \leq \frac{4}{3}\pi^2,$$

and equality is only attained for the hyperbolic metric.

Our next result gives a “gap” result for the renormalized volume for even metrics:

Theorem 1.7. *Let (X^4, g_+) be an even Poincaré-Einstein manifold with conformal infinity $(M^3, [g])$. If $Y(M^3, [g]) > 0$, then either g_+ is hyperbolic, or*

$$(1.18) \quad V \leq \min \left\{ \frac{2}{3}\pi^2\chi(X^4), -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}Y(M^3, [g])^{3/2} + \frac{4}{3}\pi^2\chi(X^4) \right\}.$$

In particular, if g_+ is an even Poincaré-Einstein metric on B^4 then

$$(1.19) \quad V \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}V_0, V_0 - \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}Y(M^3, [g])^{3/2} \right\},$$

where $V_0 = \frac{4}{3}\pi^2$ is the renormalized volume of the hyperbolic metric.

By a result of Chang-Qing-Yang [6], if X^4 is not diffeomorphic to B^4 and M^3 is not diffeomorphic to S^3 , then

$$V \leq \frac{2}{3}\pi^2\chi(X^4).$$

Therefore, (1.18) is an improvement on their inequality only when $X = B^4$ and $M = S^3$, or if the Yamabe invariant of the conformal infinity is sufficiently large. The dependence of the upper bound on the Yamabe invariant of the conformal infinity relies on a result of Chang-Ge [5], which gives a comparison between the Yamabe invariant of the conformal infinity and the “type-I” Yamabe invariant of the interior (see Section 2).

An interesting example is given by $X^4 = B^4/\mathbb{Z}$ and $M^3 = S^2 \times S^1$. In this case X^4 admits a hyperbolic metric obtained as the quotient of the standard hyperbolic metric on B^4 along an isometry. These metrics are obviously even, and the renormalized volume $V = 0$. For any other (non-hyperbolic) even metric on B^4/\mathbb{Z} , (1.20) implies

$$(1.20) \quad V \leq -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}Y(M^3, [g])^{3/2} < 0.$$

There is an obvious parallel between the question of the existence of non-hyperbolic even Poincaré-Einstein metrics on B^4 , and the existence of non-round Einstein metrics on S^4 . In both cases, the metrics are critical points of a natural geometric variational problem. Furthermore, the associated canonical metrics (the hyperbolic metric in the former case, and the round metric in the latter) are isolated; i.e., in a sufficiently small neighborhood there are no other examples. For both cases there is also a notion of “positivity”: for even metrics the sign of the Yamabe invariant of the conformal infinity, and for Einstein metrics the sign of the Einstein constant. We end with the following natural question:

Question 1.8. *Suppose g_+ is an even Poincaré-Einstein metric on B^4 whose conformal infinity is of positive Yamabe type. Is g_+ hyperbolic?*

1.3. Organization of the paper. In Section 2 we prove an elementary inequality for the Yamabe invariant that follows from the Chern-Gauss-Bonnet formula. We also record an estimate for the Yamabe invariant of Poincaré-Einstein manifolds due to Chang and Ge which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.7. In Section 3 we prove a key Weitzenböck formula for the (weighted) Weyl tensor.

In Sections 4 and 5 we present the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.7, assuming certain expansions for the Weyl tensor of a Poincaré-Einstein metric. These expansions, which build on the formulas in Chapter 5 of [12], are worked out in Sections 6 and 7.

Finally, in Section 8 we give a proof of Theorem 1.1.

1.4. Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Alice Chang for informing us of her work with Yuxin Ge, which we quote in Lemma 2.2, and for numerous enlightening conversations. The first author acknowledges the support of NSF grant DMS-2105460. The second author acknowledges the support of Simons Foundation grant 966614.

2. ESTIMATES OF THE YAMABE INVARIANT

In this section prove two estimates for the Yamabe invariant in our setting that will be needed in the proofs of the main results.

Let (X, M, h) be a compact Riemannian four-manifold with non-empty boundary $M = \partial X$. Let R_h denote the scalar curvature of h and $H = H_h$ the mean curvature of M with respect to h . Define $\mathcal{E}_h : W^{1,2}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{E}_h[\phi] = \int_X \left(|\nabla_h \phi|^2 + \frac{1}{6} R_h \phi^2 \right) dv_h + \frac{1}{3} \oint_M H \phi^2 dA_h.$$

The quantity \mathcal{E} is conformally invariant in the sense that if $\tilde{h} = e^{2w}h$, then

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{h}}[\phi] = \mathcal{E}_h[e^w \phi].$$

We also define the Yamabe functional

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{Y}_h[\phi] = \frac{\mathcal{E}_h[\phi]}{\left(\int_X |\phi|^4 dV_h \right)^{1/2}}.$$

The (type I-) Yamabe invariant is defined by

$$(2.4) \quad Y_1(X, M, [h]) = \inf_{\phi \in W^{1,2}(X) \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{Y}_h[\phi].$$

By standard conformal transformation laws, an equivalent definition is given by

$$(2.5) \quad Y_1(X, M, [h]) = \inf_{\tilde{h} \in [h]} \frac{\frac{1}{6} \int_X R_{\tilde{h}} dv_{\tilde{h}} + \frac{1}{3} \oint_M H_{\tilde{h}} dA_{\tilde{h}}}{\left(\text{vol}(X, \tilde{h}) \right)^{1/2}}.$$

A function $v \in W^{1,2}$ attaining $Y_1(X, M, [h])$ defines a (smooth) conformal metric $h_1 = v^2 h$ satisfying

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} R_{h_1} &= \frac{1}{6} Y_1(X, M, [h]) \quad \text{in } X, \\ H_{h_1} &= 0 \quad \text{on } M \end{aligned}$$

(see [11]).

Using the Chern-Gauss-Bonnet formula, we obtain the following elementary inequality for the Yamabe invariant:

Lemma 2.1. *Let (X, M, h) be a compact Riemannian four-manifold with non-empty boundary $M = \partial X$. Assume*

(i) *M is umbilic with respect to h .*

(ii) $Y_1(X, M, [h]) \geq 0$.

Then

$$(2.7) \quad 8\pi^2\chi(X) \leq \int_X |W_h|^2 dv_h + \frac{3}{2}Y_1(X, M, [h])^2.$$

Proof. By conformal invariance we may assume that M is minimal with respect to h (see Lemma 1.1 of [11]). As in the proof of Theorem 6.1 of [11], let $\{v_i\}$ be a minimizing sequence for $Y_1(X, M, [h])$ obtained by the standard sub-critical regularization procedure. More precisely, each v_i is a solution of the PDE

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} -\Delta_h v_i + \frac{1}{6}R_h v_i &= Y_1(X, M, [h])v_i^{3-\delta_i} \quad \text{in } X, \\ \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial \nu} &= 0 \quad \text{on } M, \end{aligned}$$

where ν is the outward unit normal with respect to h and $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we may assume that v_i is normalized so that $\int_X v_i^4 dv_h = 1$. Here and throughout, $\Delta_h = \div_h \text{grad}_h$.

By standard regularity properties (see [8], Theorem 1), we may assume $v_i \in C^\infty(\bar{X})$ and $v_i > 0$. By (2.8), the scalar curvature and mean curvature of $h_i = v_i^2 h$ are given by

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} R_{h_i} &= 6Y_1(X, M, [h])v_i^{-\delta_i} \quad \text{in } X, \\ H_{h_i} &= 0 \quad \text{on } M. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, since the boundary is minimal with respect to h_i , it is totally geodesic. Therefore, by the Chern-Gauss-Bonnet formula

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} 8\pi^2\chi(X) &= \int_X |W_{h_i}|^2 dv_{h_i} - \frac{1}{2} \int_X |E_{h_i}|^2 dv_{h_i} + \frac{1}{24} \int_X R_{h_i}^2 dv_{h_i} \\ &\leq \int_X |W_{h_i}|^2 dv_{h_i} + \frac{1}{24} \int_X R_{h_i}^2 dv_{h_i}. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.9) and the volume normalization,

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_X R_{h_i}^2 dv_{h_i} &= 36Y_1(X, M, [h])^2 \int_X v_i^{4-2\delta_i} dv_h \\ &\leq 36Y_1(X, M, [h])^2 \left(\int_X v_i^4 dv_h \right)^{1-\delta_i/2} \left(\int_X dv_h \right)^{\delta_i/2} \\ &= 36Y_1(X, M, [h])^2 \text{Vol}(h)^{\delta_i/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.10) and using the conformal invariance of the L^2 -norm of the Weyl tensor, we find

$$(2.12) \quad 8\pi^2\chi(X) \leq \int_X |W_h|^2 dv_h + \frac{3}{2}Y_1(X, M, [h])^2 \text{Vol}(h)^{\delta_i/2}.$$

Letting $i \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive at (2.7). \square

Now let (X, g_+) be a four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold with conformal infinity $(M^3, [g])$. Various estimates for the Yamabe invariant of the boundary relative to the Yamabe invariant of a compactification appear in [16], [7], [23], [24], [5]. The following estimate of Chang-Ge will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.7:

Lemma 2.2. (See [5]) *Let (X, g_+) be a four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold with conformal infinity $(M^3, [g])$. Assume $Y(M^3, [g]) \geq 0$. Then*

$$(2.13) \quad Y_1(X, M, [\bar{g}])^2 \geq 2\sqrt{6}Y(M^3, [g])^{3/2},$$

where $\bar{g} = r^2 g_+$ is any (smooth) compactification of (X, g_+) .

3. A WEITZENBÖCK FORMULA

The main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 3.1. *Let (X^4, g_+) be an oriented four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold. Let $\rho > 0$ be a defining function, and $\bar{g} = \rho^2 g_+$. Define*

$$Z_{\bar{g}}^+ = \rho W_{g_+}^+.$$

Then $Z^+ = Z_{\bar{g}}^+$ satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{1}{2}\Delta|Z^+|^2 = |\nabla Z^+|^2 - 6 \operatorname{tr} \left(W^+ \circ (Z^+)^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2}R|Z^+|^2,$$

where the covariant derivatives and curvature are with respect to the metric \bar{g} . Also, away from the zero locus of $|Z^+|$,

$$(3.2) \quad |\nabla Z^+|^2 \geq \frac{5}{3}|\nabla|Z^+|^2.$$

Theorem 3.1 will follow from a more general result. Let (X, g_0) be an oriented, four-dimensional manifold such that the self-dual Weyl tensor is harmonic:

$$(3.3) \quad (\delta_{g_0} W_{g_0}^+)_{jkl} = \nabla_{g_0}^m (W_{g_0}^+)_{mjkl} = 0.$$

Given a conformal metric $g = e^{2w} g_0$, the conformal transformation formula for the Riemannian connection implies

$$(3.4) \quad (\delta_g W_g^\pm)_{jkl} = e^{-2w} \left\{ (\delta_{g_0} W_{g_0}^\pm)_{jkl} - \nabla_{g_0}^m w (W_{g_0}^\pm)_{mjkl} \right\}.$$

In particular, the condition (3.3) is not conformally invariant. However, the formula (3.4) easily implies the following:

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose (X, g_0) is an oriented, four-dimensional manifold whose self-dual Weyl tensor is harmonic. Given a conformal metric $g = e^{2w} g_0$, let*

$$(3.5) \quad Z_g^+ = e^w W_{g_0}^+ \in \Gamma(W^+),$$

where $W^+ \subset W$ is the sub-bundle of self-dual algebraic Weyl tensors. Then $Z^+ = Z_g^+$ is harmonic with respect to g :

$$(3.6) \quad \delta_g Z^+ = 0.$$

In [10], Derdzinski showed that the condition $\delta_{g_0} W_{g_0}^+ = 0$ implies that $W_{g_0}^+$ satisfies the following Weitzenböck formula:

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{g_0} |W_{g_0}^+|^2 &= |\nabla_{g_0} W_{g_0}^+|^2 - 18 \det W_{g_0}^+ + \frac{1}{2} R_0 |W_{g_0}^+|^2 \\ &= |\nabla_{g_0} W_{g_0}^+|^2 - 6 \operatorname{tr}_{g_0} \left(W_{g_0}^+ \circ (W_{g_0}^+)^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} R_0 |W_{g_0}^+|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the norms are with respect to g_0 . If $g = e^{2w} g_0$, since Z^+ is harmonic with respect to g , it satisfies a similar Weitzenböck formula:

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose (X, g_0) is an oriented, four-dimensional manifold whose self-dual Weyl tensor is harmonic. Given a conformal metric $g = e^{2w} g_0$, let $Z^+ = Z_g^+$ be defined as in (3.5). Then Z^+ satisfies*

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{1}{2} \Delta_g |Z^+|^2 = |\nabla Z^+|^2 - 6 \operatorname{tr} \left(W^+ \circ (Z^+)^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} R |Z^+|^2.$$

Proof. It is possible to give a proof by the same methods of the proof (3.7) in [10]. However, it is much more straightforward to simply use the fact that $Z^+ = e^w W_{g_0}^+$, and use the standard conformal transformation formulas for the Riemannian connection and scalar curvature to observe

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla Z^+|_g^2 &= e^{-8w} \left\{ |\nabla_{g_0} W_{g_0}^+|_{g_0}^2 - 5 \langle \nabla_{g_0} w, \nabla_{g_0} |W_{g_0}^+ \rangle_{g_0} + 15 |\nabla_{g_0} w|_{g_0}^2 |W_{g_0}^+|_{g_0}^2 \right\}, \\ \Delta_g |Z^+|_g^2 &= e^{-8w} \left\{ \Delta_{g_0} |W_{g_0}^+|_{g_0}^2 - 6 (\Delta_{g_0} w) |W_{g_0}^+|_{g_0}^2 - 10 \langle \nabla_{g_0} w, \nabla_{g_0} |W_{g_0}^+ \rangle_{g_0} + 24 |\nabla_{g_0} w|_{g_0}^2 |W_{g_0}^+|_{g_0}^2 \right\}, \\ R_g |Z^+|_g^2 &= e^{-8w} \left\{ R_{g_0} |W_{g_0}^+|_{g_0}^2 - 6 (\Delta_{g_0} w) |W_{g_0}^+|_{g_0}^2 - 6 |\nabla_{g_0} w|_{g_0}^2 |W_{g_0}^+|_{g_0}^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these with (3.7) we obtain (3.8). \square

Corollary 3.4. *Suppose (X, g_0) is an oriented, four-dimensional manifold whose self-dual Weyl tensor is harmonic. Given a conformal metric $g = e^{2w} g_0$, let $Z^+ = Z_g^+$ be defined as in (3.5). Then away from the zero locus of $|Z^+|$,*

$$(3.9) \quad |\nabla Z^+|^2 \geq \frac{5}{3} |\nabla |Z^+||^2.$$

Proof. The Kato inequality (3.2) was proved for the self-dual Weyl tensor in [17] (see also [4]), but the proof for Z^+ is obviously the same. \square

The proof of Theorem 3.1. Suppose (X^4, g_+) is an oriented, four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold. The Einstein condition implies that the self-dual Weyl tensor $W_{g_+}^+$ is harmonic. Therefore, given a defining function $\rho > 0$, we can apply Corollaries 3.3 and 3.4 with $g_0 = g_+$ and $e^w = \rho$, and Theorem 3.1 follows. \square

4. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2 AND ITS COROLLARIES

The proof of Theorem 1.2. Suppose (X^4, g_+) is an oriented, self-dual, four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold with conformal infinity $(M^3, [g])$. We assume

- (i) $I_0(M^3, [g]) \geq 0$,
- (ii) $Y(M^3, [g]) > 0$.

Choose a representative in the conformal infinity (which we again denote g) and let $r > 0$ be the special defining function associated to g . Let $\bar{g} = r^2 g_+$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on the following proposition:

Proposition 4.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2,*

$$(4.1) \quad Y_1(X, M, [\bar{g}])^2 \leq \frac{2}{3} \int_X |W_{g_+}^+|^2 dv_{g_+}.$$

Before giving a proof of this proposition, let us show how Theorem 1.2 follows. Again, as observed by J. Qing in [22], since $Y(M^3, [g]) > 0$ it follows that $Y_1(X, M, [\bar{g}]) > 0$. Also, the Fefferman-Graham expansion implies that M is totally umbilic with respect to \bar{g} . Therefore, by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$(4.2) \quad 8\pi^2 \chi(X) \leq \int_X |W_{\bar{g}}|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{3}{2} Y_1(X, M, [\bar{g}])^2 = \int_X |W_{g_+}^+|^2 dv_{g_+} + \frac{3}{2} Y_1(X, M, [\bar{g}])^2.$$

Combining with (4.1), we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad 8\pi^2 \chi(X) \leq 2 \int_X |W_{g_+}^+|^2 dv_{g_+}.$$

By the Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index formula,

$$\int_X |W_{\bar{g}}^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} = 12\pi^2 (\tau(X) - \eta(M, [g])),$$

hence

$$8\pi^2 \chi(X) \leq 24\pi^2 (\tau(X) - \eta(M, [g])),$$

which gives (1.10). □

The proof Proposition 4.1. Let $Z^+ = rW_{g_+}^+$. By Theorem 3.1, Z^\pm satisfy

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\bar{g}} |Z^\pm|^2 = |\nabla_{\bar{g}} Z^\pm|^2 - 6 \operatorname{tr} (W_{\bar{g}}^\pm \circ (Z^\pm)^2) + \frac{1}{2} R_{\bar{g}} |Z^\pm|^2.$$

Since Z^\pm and W^\pm are trace-free,

$$\left| \operatorname{tr} (W_{\bar{g}}^\pm \circ (Z^\pm)^2) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} |W_{\bar{g}}^\pm| |Z^\pm|^2.$$

Substituting this into (4.4), we have

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\bar{g}} |Z^\pm|^2 \geq |\nabla_{\bar{g}} Z^\pm|^2 - \sqrt{6} |W_{\bar{g}}^\pm| |Z^\pm|^2 + \frac{1}{2} R_{\bar{g}} |Z^\pm|^2.$$

For $\epsilon > 0$ let

$$(4.6) \quad f_\epsilon = (\epsilon + |Z^+|^2)^{1/6}.$$

Multiply (4.5) by f_ϵ^{-4} , and integrate over X :

$$(4.7) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} \Delta_{\bar{g}} |Z^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \geq \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} Z^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_X \left(R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+| \right) f_\epsilon^{-4} |Z^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}}.$$

For the term on the left, we integrate by parts:

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} \Delta_{\bar{g}} |Z^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_X \langle \nabla_{\bar{g}} (f_\epsilon^{-4}), \nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^+|^2 \rangle_{\bar{g}} dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z^+|^2 dA_{\bar{g}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_X \langle \nabla_{\bar{g}} (f_\epsilon^{-4}), \nabla_{\bar{g}} (f_\epsilon^6) \rangle_{\bar{g}} dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z^+|^2 dA_{\bar{g}} \\ &= 12 \int_X |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z^+|^2 dA_{\bar{g}}, \end{aligned}$$

where ν is the outward normal to M with respect to $g = \bar{g}|_M$. For the first term on the right-hand side of (4.7), we use the refined Kato inequality $|\nabla_{\bar{g}} Z^+|^2 \geq \frac{5}{3} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^+||^2$. Let $X_Z = \{p \in X : Z^+(p) \neq 0\}$. Then

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} Z^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} &= \int_{X_Z} f_\epsilon^{-4} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} Z^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \int_{X \setminus X_Z} f_\epsilon^{-4} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} Z^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \\ &\geq \frac{5}{3} \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^+||^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \\ &= \left(\frac{5}{3} \right) \left(\frac{1}{4} \right) \int_{X_Z} f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{1}{|Z^+|^2} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} (|Z^+|^2)|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \\ &= \frac{5}{12} \int_{X_Z} f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{1}{|Z^+|^2} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} (f_\epsilon^6)|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \\ &= 15 \int_{X_Z} f_\epsilon^6 \frac{1}{|Z^+|^2} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \\ &\geq 15 \int_{X_Z} f_\epsilon^6 \frac{1}{(\epsilon + |Z^+|^2)} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \\ &= 15 \int_{X_Z} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \\ &= 15 \int_X |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.7), (4.8), and (4.9), we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z^+|^2 dA_{\bar{g}} \geq 3 \int_X |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_X \left(R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+| \right) f_\epsilon^{-4} |Z^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}}.$$

We can rewrite the last term above as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_X \left(R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+| \right) f_\epsilon^{-4} |Z^+|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_X \left(R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+| \right) f_\epsilon^{-4} (f_\epsilon^6 - \epsilon) dv_{\bar{g}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_X \left(R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+| \right) f_\epsilon^2 dv_{\bar{g}} - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \int_X \left(R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+| \right) f_\epsilon^{-2} dv_{\bar{g}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f_\epsilon \geq \epsilon^{1/6}$,

$$-\frac{1}{2} \epsilon \int_X \left(R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+| \right) f_\epsilon^{-2} dv_{\bar{g}} = O(\epsilon^{2/3}).$$

Consequently, (4.10) implies

$$(4.11) \quad 3 \int_X |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_X R_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \leq \sqrt{6} \int_X |W_{\bar{g}}^+|^2 f_\epsilon^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z^+|^2 dA_{\bar{g}} + O(\epsilon^{2/3}).$$

It follows from the Fefferman-Graham expansions that the mean curvature of M with respect to $g = \bar{g}|_M$ vanishes. Therefore, dividing (4.10) by 3 we get

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\bar{g}}[f_\epsilon] &\leq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \int_X |W_{\bar{g}}^+|^2 f_\epsilon^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{6} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z^+|^2 dA_g + O(\epsilon^{2/3}) \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \left(\int_X |W_{g_+}^+|^2 dv_{g_+} \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_X f_\epsilon^4 dv_{\bar{g}} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{6} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z^+|^2 dA_g + O(\epsilon^{2/3}). \end{aligned}$$

Claim 4.2.

$$(4.13) \quad \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z^+|^2 dA_g = -4I_0(M^3, [g]).$$

Assuming the claim for now, by (4.12) and the assumption that $I_0(M^3, [g]) \geq 0$, we have

$$(4.14) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\bar{g}}[f_\epsilon] \leq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \left(\int_X |W_{g_+}^+|^2 dv_{g_+} \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_X f_\epsilon^4 dv_{\bar{g}} \right)^{1/2} + O(\epsilon^{2/3}).$$

If g_+ is not hyperbolic, then there is a $c_0 > 0$ (independent of ϵ) such that

$$\int_X f_\epsilon^4 dv_{\bar{g}} \geq c_0 > 0.$$

Therefore,

$$(4.15) \quad \mathcal{Y}_{\bar{g}}[f_\epsilon] \leq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \left(\int_X |W_{g_+}^+|^2 dv_{g_+} \right)^{1/2} + O(\epsilon^{2/3}),$$

and (4.1) follows. \square

The proof of Claim 4.2. By the definition of Z^+ and the conformal transformation law for the Weyl tensor,

$$\begin{aligned} |Z^+|^2 &= |Z^+|_{\bar{g}}^2 \\ &= |rW_{g^+}|_{\bar{g}}^2 \\ &= r^2|W_{g^+}|_{\bar{g}}^2 \\ &= r^2|r^{-2}W_{\bar{g}^+}|_{\bar{g}}^2 \\ &= r^{-2}|W_{\bar{g}^+}|_{\bar{g}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 7.3,

$$\begin{aligned} |Z^+|^2 &= r^{-2}\{r^2|\mathcal{C}|^2 + 4r^3\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle + O(r^4)\} \\ &= |\mathcal{C}|^2 + 4r\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle + O(r^2), \end{aligned}$$

where V and \mathcal{C} are with respect to $g = \bar{g}|_{TM}$. It follows that

$$(4.16) \quad f_\epsilon|_M = (\epsilon + |\mathcal{C}|^2)^{1/6}.$$

Also, since r is a special defining function, $\nu = -\frac{\partial}{\partial r}|_M$, hence

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}|Z^+|^2 &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\{|\mathcal{C}|^2 + 4r\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle + O(r^2)\}|_{r=0} \\ &= -4\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining (4.16) and (4.17), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z^+|^2 dA_g &= \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \oint_M \frac{-4\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle}{(\epsilon + |\mathcal{C}|^2)^{2/3}} dA_g \\ &= -4 \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \oint_M \frac{\langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle}{(\epsilon + |\mathcal{C}|^2)^{2/3}} dA_g \\ &= -4I_0(M^3, [g]). \end{aligned}$$

□

The proof of Corollary 1.4. Suppose $(M^3, [g])$ is a conformal three-manifold satisfying

- (i) $I_0(M^3, [g]) \geq 0$,
- (ii) $Y(M^3, [g]) > 0$.

Let X_0 be any smooth four-manifold such that $\partial X_0 = M$. For $k \geq 0$, let X_k be the manifold with boundary obtained by deleting a ball in the interior of X_0 and taking a connected sum with k copies of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$: $X_k = X_0 \# k\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$. Then $\partial X_k = M$, and by properties of the signature, $\tau(X_k) = \tau(X_0) + k$. Therefore, if we take k_0 large enough,

$$(4.18) \quad \tau(X_{k_0}) > \eta(M^3, [g]).$$

Next, Let Y_ℓ be the manifold obtained by deleting a ball in the interior of X_{k_0} and taking a connected sum with ℓ copies of $S^2 \times S^2$. Then $\partial Y_\ell = M$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(Y_\ell) &= \chi(X_{k_0}) + 2\ell, \\ \tau(Y_\ell) &= \tau(X_{k_0}).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that for all ℓ sufficiently large, say $\ell > \ell_0$,

$$(4.19) \quad \tau(Y_\ell) = \tau(X_{k_0}) < \eta(M^3, [g]) + \frac{1}{3}\chi(Y_\ell),$$

while

$$(4.20) \quad \tau(Y_\ell) = \tau(X_{k_0}) > \eta(M^3, [g]).$$

In particular, Y_ℓ satisfies the signature obstruction.

If $\ell > \ell_0$ and Y_ℓ admits a self-dual Poincaré-Einstein metric g_+ whose conformal infinity is given by $(M^3, [g])$, then by Theorem 1.2 either g_+ is hyperbolic, or we have

$$\tau(Y_\ell) \geq \eta(M^3, [g]) + \frac{1}{3}\chi(Y_\ell).$$

Since this contradicts (4.19), g_+ must be hyperbolic. However, in this case the Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index formula implies $\tau(Y_\ell) = \eta(M^3, [g])$, but this contradicts (4.20). □

5. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7

The proof of Theorem 1.7. Let (X^4, g_+) be an even Poincaré-Einstein manifold. Let $(M^3, [g])$ denote the conformal infinity, and assume $Y(M^3, [g]) > 0$.

Choose a representative (which we also denote g) in the conformal infinity $[g]$, and let $r > 0$ be the special defining function associated to g . Let $\bar{g} = r^2 g_+$. The proof of Theorem 1.7 is based on the following proposition, whose proof parallels the proof of Proposition 4.1:

Proposition 5.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.7,*

$$(5.1) \quad Y_1(X, M, [\bar{g}])^2 \leq \frac{2}{3} \int_X |W_{g_+}|^2 dv_{g_+}.$$

Before giving a proof of this proposition, let us show how Theorem 1.7 follows. First, as observed by J. Qing in [22], since $Y(M^3, [g]) > 0$ it follows that $Y_1(X, M, [\bar{g}]) > 0$. Also, the Fefferman-Graham expansion implies that M is totally umbilic with respect to \bar{g} . Therefore, by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$(5.2) \quad 8\pi^2 \chi(X) \leq \int_X |W_{\bar{g}}|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{3}{2} Y_1(X, M, [\bar{g}])^2 = \int_X |W_{g_+}|^2 dv_{g_+} + \frac{3}{2} Y_1(X, M, [\bar{g}])^2.$$

Combining with (5.1), we obtain

$$(5.3) \quad 8\pi^2 \chi(X) \leq 2 \int_X |W_{g_+}|^2 dv_{g_+}.$$

By Anderson's formula for the renormalized volume (5.4),

$$(5.4) \quad V = \frac{4}{3}\pi^2\chi(X) - \frac{1}{6}\int_X |W_{g_+}|^2 dv_{g_+},$$

which by (5.3) implies

$$(5.5) \quad V \leq \frac{2}{3}\pi^2\chi(X).$$

Also, by Lemma 2.2 we have

$$2\sqrt{6}Y(M^3, [g])^{3/2} \leq Y_1(X, M[\bar{g}])^2,$$

hence by (5.1)

$$2\sqrt{6}Y(M^3, [g])^{3/2} \leq \frac{2}{3}\int_X |W_{g_+}|^2 dv_{g_+}.$$

Again appealing to Anderson's formula (5.4) we get

$$(5.6) \quad V \leq \frac{4}{3}\pi^2\chi(X) - \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}Y(M^3, [g])^{3/2}.$$

Combining (5.5) and (5.6),

$$V \leq \min \left\{ \frac{2}{3}\pi^2\chi(X), \frac{4}{3}\pi^2\chi(X) - \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}Y(M^3, [g])^{3/2} \right\}.$$

□

The proof of Proposition 5.1. Let $Z^\pm = rW_{g_+}^\pm$. By (4.5),

$$(5.7) \quad \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{\bar{g}}|Z^+|^2 \geq |\nabla_{\bar{g}}Z^+|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+|\right)|Z^+|^2.$$

Let

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} Z &= Z^+ + Z^- \\ &= rW_{g_+}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |Z|^2 &= |Z^+|^2 + |Z^-|^2, \\ |\nabla_{\bar{g}}Z|^2 &= |\nabla_{\bar{g}}Z^+|^2 + |\nabla_{\bar{g}}Z^-|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second follows since the connection preserves the splitting (1.3). Consequently, by (5.7) we have

$$(5.9) \quad \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{\bar{g}}|Z|^2 = |\nabla_{\bar{g}}Z|^2 - \sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+||Z^+|^2 - \sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^-||Z^-|^2 + \frac{1}{2}R_{\bar{g}}|Z|^2.$$

An elementary Lagrange-multiplier argument gives

$$\max_{\substack{x^2+y^2=1, \\ a^2+b^2=1}} (ax^2 + by^2) = 1,$$

hence

$$(5.10) \quad -\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^+||Z^+|^2 - \sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}^-||Z^-|^2 \geq -\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}||Z|^2.$$

Substituting this into (5.9) gives

$$(5.11) \quad \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{\bar{g}}|Z|^2 \geq |\nabla_{\bar{g}}Z|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}|\right)|Z|^2.$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$, and define

$$(5.12) \quad f_\epsilon = (\epsilon + |Z|^2)^{1/6}.$$

Multiply (5.11) by f_ϵ^{-4} , and integrate over X :

$$(5.13) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} \Delta_{\bar{g}} |Z|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \geq \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} Z|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_X (R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}|) f_\epsilon^{-4} |Z|^2 dv_{\bar{g}}.$$

For the term on the left, we integrate by parts:

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} \Delta_{\bar{g}} |Z|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_X \langle \nabla_{\bar{g}} (f_\epsilon^{-4}), \nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z|^2 \rangle_{\bar{g}} dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z|^2 dA_g \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_X \langle \nabla_{\bar{g}} (f_\epsilon^{-4}), \nabla_{\bar{g}} (f_\epsilon^6) \rangle_{\bar{g}} dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z|^2 dA_g \\ &= 12 \int_X |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z|^2 dA_g, \end{aligned}$$

where ν is the outward normal to M with respect to $g = \bar{g}|_M$.

For the first term on the right-hand side of (5.13), we use the refined Kato inequality in (3.2):

$$(5.15) \quad \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} |\nabla_{\bar{g}} Z|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \geq \frac{5}{3} \int_X f_\epsilon^{-4} (|\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^+|^2 + |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^-|^2) dv_{\bar{g}}.$$

We claim that (away from the zero loci of $|Z^\pm|$)

$$(5.16) \quad \frac{5}{3} f_\epsilon^{-4} (|\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^+|^2 + |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^-|^2) \geq 15 |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f|^2.$$

To see this, compute

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\bar{g}} f &= \frac{1}{6} (\epsilon + |Z|^2)^{-5/6} (2|Z^+| |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^+| + 2|Z^-| |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^-|) \\ &= \frac{1}{3} f^{-5} (|Z^+| |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^+| + |Z^-| |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^-|); \end{aligned}$$

hence,

$$|\nabla_{\bar{g}} f|^2 = \frac{1}{9} f^{-10} (|Z^+|^2 |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^+|^2 + 2|Z^+| |Z^-| \langle \nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^+|, \nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^-| \rangle + |Z^-|^2 |\nabla_{\bar{g}} |Z^-|^2).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{5}{3} f_\epsilon^{-4} (|\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^+|^2 + |\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^-|^2) - 15|\nabla_{\bar{g}}f|^2 \\
&= \frac{5}{3} f_\epsilon^{-10} \left\{ f_\epsilon^6 (|\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^+|^2 + |\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^-|^2) - (|Z^+|^2 |\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^+|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2|Z^+||Z^-| \langle \nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^+, \nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^- \rangle + |Z^-|^2 |\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^-|^2) \right\} \\
&\geq \frac{5}{3} f_\epsilon^{-10} \left\{ (|Z^+|^2 + |Z^-|^2) (|\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^+|^2 + |\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^-|^2) - (|Z^+|^2 |\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^+|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2|Z^+||Z^-| \langle \nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^+, \nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^- \rangle + |Z^-|^2 |\nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^-|^2) \right\} \\
&= \frac{5}{3} f_\epsilon^{-10} \left| |Z^+ \nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^-| - |Z^- \nabla_{\bar{g}}|Z^+| \right|^2 \\
&\geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

Substituting (5.16) into (5.15) and combining with (5.13) and (5.14) we obtain

$$(5.17) \quad \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z|^2 dA_{\bar{g}} \geq 3 \int_X |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_X (R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}|) f_\epsilon^{-4} |Z|^2 dv_{\bar{g}}.$$

We can rewrite the last term above as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \int_X (R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}|) f_\epsilon^{-4} |Z|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_X (R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}|) f_\epsilon^{-4} (f_\epsilon^6 - \epsilon) dv_{\bar{g}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_X (R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}|) f_\epsilon^2 dv_{\bar{g}} - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \int_X (R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}|) f_\epsilon^{-2} dv_{\bar{g}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $f_\epsilon \geq \epsilon^{1/6}$,

$$-\frac{1}{2} \epsilon \int_X (R_{\bar{g}} - 2\sqrt{6}|W_{\bar{g}}|) f_\epsilon^{-2} dv_{\bar{g}} = O(\epsilon^{2/3}).$$

Consequently, (5.17) implies

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{aligned}
& 3 \int_X |\nabla_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_X R_{\bar{g}} f_\epsilon^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{6} \int_X |W_{\bar{g}}| f_\epsilon^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z|^2 dA_{\bar{g}} + O(\epsilon^{2/3}).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Fefferman-Graham expansions that the mean curvature of M with respect to $g = \bar{g}|_M$ vanishes. Therefore, dividing (5.18) by 3 we get

$$(5.19) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\bar{g}}[f_\epsilon] \leq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \int_X |W_{\bar{g}}| f_\epsilon^2 dv_{\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{6} \oint_M f_\epsilon^{-4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z|^2 dA_{\bar{g}} + O(\epsilon^{2/3}),$$

where \mathcal{E} is defined in (2.1).

To estimate the right-hand side of (5.19), we first observe that

$$(5.20) \quad \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \int_X |W_{\bar{g}}| f_\epsilon^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \left(\int_X |W_{\bar{g}}|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_X f_\epsilon^4 dv_{\bar{g}} \right)^{1/2}$$

Claim 5.2. *The boundary integrand in (5.19) vanishes:*

$$(5.21) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z|^2 = 0.$$

Assuming the claim for now, it follows from (5.19) and (5.20) that

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\bar{g}}[f_\epsilon] &\leq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \left(\int_X |W_{\bar{g}}|^2 dv_{\bar{g}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_X f_\epsilon^4 dv_{\bar{g}} \right)^{1/2} + O(\epsilon^{2/3}) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \left(\int_X |W_{g_+}|^2 dv_{g_+} \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_X f_\epsilon^4 dv_{\bar{g}} \right)^{1/2} + O(\epsilon^{2/3}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows by the conformal invariance of the L^2 -norm of the Weyl tensor. By the definition of Z ,

$$\int_X f_\epsilon^4 dv_{\bar{g}} \geq \int_X |Z|^{4/3} dv_{\bar{g}} = \int r^4 |W_{\bar{g}}|_{\bar{g}}^{4/3} dv_{\bar{g}}.$$

It follows that if (X, g_+) is not hyperbolic, then there is a $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\left(\int_X f_\epsilon^4 dv_{\bar{g}} \right)^{1/2} \geq c_0 > 0,$$

independent of ϵ . Dividing (5.22) by $\left(\int_X f_\epsilon^4 dv_{\bar{g}} \right)^{1/2}$, we get

$$(5.23) \quad \mathcal{Y}_{\bar{g}}[f_\epsilon] \leq \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \left(\int_X |W_{g_+}|^2 dv_{g_+} \right)^{1/2} + O(\epsilon^{2/3}),$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_{\bar{g}}$ is the Yamabe functional associated to \bar{g} (see (2.3)). Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, (5.1) follows. \square

The proof of Claim 5.2. By (5.8) and the conformal transformation law for the Weyl tensor,

$$\begin{aligned} |Z|^2 &= |Z|_{\bar{g}}^2 \\ &= |rW_{g_+}|_{\bar{g}}^2 \\ &= r^2 |W_{g_+}|_{\bar{g}}^2 \\ &= r^2 |r^{-2}W_{\bar{g}}|_{\bar{g}}^2 \\ &= r^{-2} |W_{\bar{g}}|_{\bar{g}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By (7.2) of Corollary 7.1,

$$\begin{aligned} |Z|^2 &= r^{-2} \{r^2 |\mathcal{C}|^2 + O(r^4)\} \\ &= |\mathcal{C}|^2 + O(r^2), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{C} is with respect to $g = \bar{g}|_M$. Since r is a special defining function, $\nu = -\frac{\partial}{\partial r}|_M$, hence

$$(5.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} |Z|^2 &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \{|\mathcal{C}|^2 + O(r^2)\}|_{r=0} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

6. EXPANSIONS FOR FOUR-DIMENSIONAL POINCARÉ-EINSTEIN METRICS

In this section we calculate the expansion of the Weyl tensor that was needed in the proofs of the main results. Let (X^4, g_+) be an oriented four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold with conformal infinity $(M, [\hat{g}])$, where $M = \partial X$. We fix a representative of the conformal infinity which we also denote by \hat{g} , and let $r > 0$ denote a special defining function associated to \hat{g} . Let $\bar{g} = r^2 g_+$.

In this section we closely follow the conventions and notation of Chapter 5 of [12]. If $\{\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3\}$ is an oriented local basis of coordinate vector fields on M , then $\{\partial_0, \partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3\}$ is an oriented local basis for a neighborhood in X . We use lower case Greek indices when labeling components of tensor fields on X (e.g., $0 \leq \alpha \leq 3$), and lower case Latin indices for tensor fields on M (e.g., $1 \leq i \leq 3$). The 0-index always corresponds to ∂_r .

By the Fefferman-Graham expansions,

$$(6.1) \quad g_{ij} = \hat{g}_{ij} - r^2 \hat{P}_{ij} + r^3 g_{ij}^{(3)} + r^4 g_{ij}^{(4)} + O(r^5),$$

where \hat{P} is the Schouten tensor with respect to \hat{g} . This implies the following expansions for the Christoffel symbols:

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{\Gamma}_{ij}^k &= \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^k - \frac{1}{2} r^2 [\hat{\nabla}_i \hat{P}_j^k + \hat{\nabla}_j \hat{P}_i^k - \hat{\nabla}^k \hat{P}_{ij}] + O(r^3), \\ \bar{\Gamma}_{ij}^0 &= r \hat{P}_{ij} - \frac{3}{2} r^2 g_{ij}^{(3)} - 2r^3 g_{ij}^{(4)} + O(r^4), \\ \bar{\Gamma}_{i0}^k &= -r \hat{P}_i^k + \frac{3}{2} r^2 (g^{(3)})_i^k + r^3 [2(g^{(4)})_i^k - (\hat{P}^2)_i^k] + O(r^4), \\ \bar{\Gamma}_{0j}^k &= \bar{\Gamma}_{00}^k = \bar{\Gamma}_{00}^0 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\nabla}$ is the connection with respect to \hat{g} . Using these formulas, and the formulas from page 48 of [12], we conclude

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{R}_{ijkl} &= \hat{R}_{ijkl} + \frac{1}{2} r^2 [\hat{\nabla}_j C_{ikl} - \hat{\nabla}_i C_{jkl} - \hat{g}_{ik} (\hat{P}^2)_{jl} + \hat{g}_{il} (\hat{P}^2)_{jk} \\ &\quad + \hat{g}_{jk} (\hat{P}^2)_{il} - \hat{g}_{j\ell} (\hat{P}^2)_{ik} - 4\hat{P}_{ik} \hat{P}_{j\ell} + 4\hat{P}_{jk} \hat{P}_{i\ell}] + O(r^3), \\ \bar{R}_{i0j0} &= \hat{P}_{ij} - 3r g_{ij}^{(3)} + r^2 [(\hat{P}^2)_{ij} - 6g_{ij}^{(4)}] + O(r^3), \\ \bar{R}_{0ijk} &= -r C_{ijk} + \frac{3}{2} r^2 [\hat{\nabla}_k g_{ij}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_j g_{ik}^{(3)}] + O(r^3), \end{aligned}$$

where C is the Cotton tensor with respect \hat{g} :

$$C_{ijk} = \hat{\nabla}_k \hat{P}_{ij} - \hat{\nabla}_j \hat{P}_{ik}.$$

6.1. Expansion of the Weyl tensor. To obtain expansions for the Weyl tensor, we first need expansions of the Schouten tensor \bar{P} with respect to \bar{g} . Since $g_+ = r^{-2} \bar{g}$, the conformal transformation law for the Schouten tensor implies

$$(6.4) \quad P_{g_+} = \bar{P} + \frac{\bar{\nabla}^2 r}{r} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\bar{\nabla} r|^2}{r^2} \bar{g}.$$

By the Einstein condition and the fact that r is a special defining function, this gives

$$(6.5) \quad \bar{P} = -\frac{\bar{\nabla}^2 r}{r}.$$

Using the formulas for the Christoffel symbols in (6.2), we get

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{P}_{ij} &= \hat{P}_{ij} - \frac{3}{2}r g_{ij}^{(3)} - 2r^2 g_{ij}^{(4)} + O(r^3), \\ \bar{P}_{i0} &= 0, \\ \bar{P}_{00} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the standard decomposition of the curvature tensor,

$$\bar{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = \bar{R}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} - \bar{g}_{\alpha\gamma}\bar{P}_{\beta\delta} + \bar{g}_{\alpha\delta}\bar{P}_{\beta\gamma} + \bar{g}_{\beta\gamma}\bar{P}_{\alpha\delta} - \bar{g}_{\beta\delta}\bar{P}_{\alpha\gamma}.$$

Using the formulas in (6.3) and (6.6), this implies

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{W}_{ijkl} &= \frac{3}{2}r[\hat{g}_{ik}g_{j\ell}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{i\ell}g_{jk}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{jk}g_{i\ell}^{(3)} + \hat{g}_{j\ell}g_{ik}^{(3)}] + r^2V_{ijkl} + O(r^3), \\ \bar{W}_{i0j0} &= -\frac{3}{2}r g_{ij}^{(3)} + r^2[(\hat{P})_{ij}^2 - 4g_{ij}^{(4)}] + O(r^3), \\ \bar{W}_{0ijk} &= -rC_{ijk} + \frac{3}{2}r^2[\hat{\nabla}_k g_{ij}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_j g_{ik}^{(3)}] + O(r^3), \end{aligned}$$

where for notational convenience we define

$$(6.8) \quad \begin{aligned} V_{ijkl} &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\nabla}_j C_{ik\ell} - \hat{\nabla}_i C_{jk\ell}) - \frac{1}{2}\hat{g}_{ik}(\hat{P}^2)_{j\ell} + \frac{1}{2}\hat{g}_{i\ell}(\hat{P}^2)_{jk} + \frac{1}{2}\hat{g}_{jk}(\hat{P}^2)_{i\ell} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{g}_{j\ell}(\hat{P}^2)_{ik} \\ &\quad + 2[\hat{g}_{ik}g_{j\ell}^{(4)} - \hat{g}_{i\ell}g_{jk}^{(4)} - \hat{g}_{jk}g_{i\ell}^{(4)} + \hat{g}_{j\ell}g_{ik}^{(4)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the formula for \bar{W}_{ijkl} implies that V is a curvature-type tensor on M .

We can use the above expansions to explicitly compute $g^{(4)}$:

Proposition 6.1. *Let (X, g_+) be a four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold, and \hat{g} a representative in the conformal infinity with associated special defining function r . Then*

$$(6.9) \quad g_{ij}^{(4)} = \frac{1}{4}(\hat{\nabla}^k C_{ijk} + (\hat{P}^2)_{ij}).$$

Proof. On M , we define the tensor

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} V_{ij} &= \hat{g}^{k\ell}V_{ikj\ell} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\hat{\nabla}^k C_{ijk} - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{P}^2)_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}|\hat{P}|^2\hat{g}_{ij} + 2(g_{ij}^{(4)} + \text{tr}_{\hat{g}}g^{(4)}\hat{g}_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Since \bar{W} and $g^{(3)}$ are trace-free,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \bar{g}^{\alpha\beta}\bar{W}_{i\alpha j\beta} \\ &= \bar{g}^{00}\bar{W}_{i0j0} + \bar{g}^{k\ell}\bar{W}_{ikj\ell} \\ &= \left\{ -\frac{3}{2}r g_{ij}^{(3)} + r^2[(\hat{P})_{ij}^2 - 4g_{ij}^{(4)}] + O(r^3) \right\} \\ &\quad + \left\{ \hat{g}^{k\ell} + O(r^2) \right\} \left\{ \frac{3}{2}r[\hat{g}_{ij}g_{k\ell}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{i\ell}g_{jk}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{jk}g_{i\ell}^{(3)} + \hat{g}_{k\ell}g_{ij}^{(3)}] + r^2V_{ikj\ell} + O(r^3) \right\} \\ &= r^2[\hat{P}_{ij}^2 - 4g_{ij}^{(4)} + V_{ij}] + O(r^3), \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$(6.11) \quad 4g_{ij}^{(4)} = \hat{P}_{ij}^2 + V_{ij}.$$

Taking the trace gives

$$\begin{aligned} 4\mathrm{tr}_{\hat{g}} g^{(4)} &= |\hat{P}|^2 + \mathrm{tr}_{\hat{g}} V \\ &= |\hat{P}|^2 + (-2|\hat{P}|^2 + 8\mathrm{tr}_{\hat{g}} g^{(4)}) \\ &= -|\hat{P}|^2 + 8\mathrm{tr}_{\hat{g}} g^{(4)}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(6.12) \quad \mathrm{tr}_{\hat{g}} g^{(4)} = \frac{1}{4}|\hat{P}|^2.$$

Returning to (6.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 4g_{ij}^{(4)} &= \hat{P}_{ij}^2 + V_{ij} \\ &= \hat{P}_{ij}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\nabla}^k C_{ijk} - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{P}^2)_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}|\hat{P}|^2\hat{g}_{ij} + 2(g_{ij}^{(4)} + \mathrm{tr}_{\hat{g}} g^{(4)}\hat{g}_{ij}) \\ (6.13) \quad &= \hat{P}_{ij}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\nabla}^k C_{ijk} - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{P}^2)_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}|\hat{P}|^2\hat{g}_{ij} + 2g_{ij}^{(4)} + 2\left(\frac{1}{4}|\hat{P}|^2\right)\hat{g}_{ij} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\hat{\nabla}^k C_{ijk} + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{P}^2)_{ij} + 2g_{ij}^{(4)}, \end{aligned}$$

and (6.9) follows. \square

Lemma 6.2. *We have*

$$(6.14) \quad V_{ijkl} = \hat{g}_{ik}\hat{\nabla}^m C_{jlm} - \hat{g}_{il}\hat{\nabla}^m C_{jkm} - \hat{g}_{jk}\hat{\nabla}^m C_{ilm} + \hat{g}_{jl}\hat{\nabla}^m C_{ikm},$$

and

$$(6.15) \quad V_{ij} = \hat{\nabla}^k C_{ijk}.$$

Proof. Note that (6.15) is immediate from (6.11) and Proposition 6.1.

Since V_{ijkl} is a curvature-type tensor defined on a three-dimensional vector space, its fully trace-free part must vanish:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{ijkl} &:= V_{ijkl} - (\hat{g}_{ik}V_{jl} - \hat{g}_{il}V_{jk} - \hat{g}_{jk}V_{il} + \hat{g}_{jl}V_{ik}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_{\hat{g}} V (\hat{g}_{ik}\hat{g}_{jl} - \hat{g}_{il}\hat{g}_{jk}) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then (6.14) follows from this fact and (6.15). \square

We thus obtain the following.

Proposition 6.3. *Let (X, g_+) be a four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold, and \hat{g} a representative in the conformal infinity with associated special defining function r . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{W}_{ijkl} &= \frac{3}{2}r[\hat{g}_{ik}g_{jl}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{il}g_{jk}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{jk}g_{il}^{(3)} + \hat{g}_{jl}g_{ik}^{(3)}] + r^2V_{ijkl} + O(r^3), \\ (6.16) \quad \bar{W}_{i0j0} &= -\frac{3}{2}rg_{ij}^{(3)} - r^2V_{ij} + O(r^3), \\ \bar{W}_{0ijk} &= -rC_{ijk} + \frac{3}{2}r^2[\hat{\nabla}_k g_{ij}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_j g_{ik}^{(3)}] + O(r^3), \end{aligned}$$

where V_{ijkl} and V_{ij} are given by (6.14) and (6.15).

6.2. **Expansions of \overline{W}^\pm .** As in [12], we denote the volume form of g_r by μ , and the volume form of \overline{g} by $\overline{\mu}$. Obviously

$$\overline{\mu}_{ijkl} = 0,$$

since the boundary is three-dimensional. As pointed out in [12],

$$(6.17) \quad \overline{\mu}_{0ijk} = \sqrt{\det g_r} \epsilon_{ijk}.$$

We begin with the expansion of \overline{W}_{ijkl}^+ (i.e., all tangential components). To do this, we first compute the expansion of $(\star \overline{W})_{ijkl}$:

$$(6.18) \quad \begin{aligned} (\star \overline{W})_{ijkl} &= \frac{1}{2} \overline{\mu}_{ij}^{\rho\sigma} \overline{W}_{\rho\sigma kl} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \overline{\mu}_{ij\nu\theta} \overline{g}^{\nu\rho} \overline{g}^{\theta\sigma} \overline{W}_{\rho\sigma kl} \\ &= \overline{\mu}_{ijm0} \overline{g}^{mp} \overline{W}_{p0kl} \\ &= \sqrt{\det g_r} \overline{g}^{mp} \epsilon_{ijm} \overline{W}_{0pkl}. \end{aligned}$$

From the expansions of g_r above we know

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\det g_r} \overline{g}^{mp} \epsilon_{ijm} &= (1 + O(r^2)) (\widehat{g}^{mp} + O(r^2)) \sqrt{\det \widehat{g}} \epsilon_{ijm} \\ &= \widehat{g}^{mp} \sqrt{\det \widehat{g}} \epsilon_{ijm} + O(r^2) \\ &= \widehat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p + O(r^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\mu}$ is the volume form of \widehat{g} . Then using the expansion of \overline{W} in (6.7), we get

$$(6.19) \quad (\star \overline{W})_{ijkl} = -r \widehat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p C_{pkl} + \frac{3}{2} r^2 (\widehat{\nabla}_\ell g_{pk}^{(3)} - \widehat{\nabla}_k g_{pl}^{(3)}) \widehat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p + O(r^3).$$

Combining with the first formula in (6.7) gives

$$(6.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{W}_{ijkl}^+ &= \frac{1}{2} (\overline{W}_{ijkl} + (\star \overline{W})_{ijkl}) \\ &= r \left\{ \frac{3}{4} [\widehat{g}_{ik} g_{j\ell}^{(3)} - \widehat{g}_{il} g_{jk}^{(3)} - \widehat{g}_{jk} g_{i\ell}^{(3)} + \widehat{g}_{j\ell} g_{ik}^{(3)}] - \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p C_{pkl} \right\} \\ &\quad + r^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} V_{ijkl} + \frac{3}{4} (\widehat{\nabla}_\ell g_{pk}^{(3)} - \widehat{\nabla}_k g_{pl}^{(3)}) \widehat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p \right\} + O(r^3). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(6.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{W}_{ijkl}^- &= \frac{1}{2} (\overline{W}_{ijkl} - (\star \overline{W})_{ijkl}) \\ &= r \left\{ \frac{3}{4} [\widehat{g}_{ik} g_{j\ell}^{(3)} - \widehat{g}_{il} g_{jk}^{(3)} - \widehat{g}_{jk} g_{i\ell}^{(3)} + \widehat{g}_{j\ell} g_{ik}^{(3)}] + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p C_{pkl} \right\} \\ &\quad + r^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} V_{ijkl} - \frac{3}{4} (\widehat{\nabla}_\ell g_{pk}^{(3)} - \widehat{\nabla}_k g_{pl}^{(3)}) \widehat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p \right\} + O(r^3). \end{aligned}$$

Next we compute $(\star \overline{W})_{i0j0}$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\star \overline{W})_{i0j0} &= \frac{1}{2} \overline{g}^{km} \overline{g}^{\ell p} \overline{\mu}_{0ik\ell} \overline{W}_{0jmp} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \overline{g}^{km} \overline{g}^{\ell p} \sqrt{\det g_r} \epsilon_{ik\ell} \overline{W}_{0jmp}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(6.22) \quad (\star \overline{W})_{i0j0} = -\frac{1}{2}r \hat{\mu}_i^{mp} C_{jmp} + \frac{3}{4}r^2 (\hat{\nabla}_p g_{jm}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_m g_{jp}^{(3)}) \hat{\mu}_i^{mp} + O(r^3),$$

and

$$(6.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{W}_{i0j0}^+ &= \frac{1}{2}(\overline{W}_{i0j0} + (\star \overline{W})_{i0j0}) \\ &= r \left\{ -\frac{3}{4}g_{ij}^{(3)} - \frac{1}{4}\hat{\mu}_i^{mp} C_{jmp} \right\} \\ &\quad + r^2 \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}V_{ij} + \frac{3}{8}(\hat{\nabla}_p g_{jm}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_m g_{jp}^{(3)}) \hat{\mu}_i^{mp} \right\} + O(r^3). \end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$(6.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{W}_{i0j0}^- &= r \left\{ -\frac{3}{4}g_{ij}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{4}\hat{\mu}_i^{mp} C_{jmp} \right\} \\ &\quad + r^2 \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}V_{ij} - \frac{3}{8}(\hat{\nabla}_p g_{jm}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_m g_{jp}^{(3)}) \hat{\mu}_i^{mp} \right\} + O(r^3). \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} (\star \overline{W})_{0ijk} &= \frac{1}{2} \hat{g}^{\ell p} \hat{g}^{qm} \overline{\mu}_{0i\ell m} \overline{W}_{pqjk} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \hat{g}^{\ell p} \hat{g}^{qm} \sqrt{\det g_r} \epsilon_{i\ell m} \overline{W}_{pqjk}; \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$(\star \overline{W})_{0ijk} = \frac{3}{4}r \left\{ \hat{g}_{jp} g_{kq}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{kp} g_{jq}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{jq} g_{kp}^{(3)} + \hat{g}_{kq} g_{jp}^{(3)} \right\} \hat{\mu}_i^{pq} + \frac{1}{2}r^2 \hat{\mu}_i^{pq} V_{pqjk} + O(r^3).$$

It follows that

$$(6.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{W}_{0ijk}^+ &= r \left\{ \frac{3}{8} [\hat{g}_{jp} g_{kq}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{kp} g_{jq}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{jq} g_{kp}^{(3)} + \hat{g}_{kq} g_{jp}^{(3)}] \hat{\mu}_i^{pq} - \frac{1}{2} C_{ijk} \right\} \\ &\quad + r^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \hat{\mu}_i^{pq} V_{pqjk} + \frac{3}{4} [\hat{\nabla}_k g_{ij}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_j g_{ik}^{(3)}] \right\} + O(r^3), \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{W}_{0ijk}^- &= r \left\{ -\frac{3}{8} [\hat{g}_{jp} g_{kq}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{kp} g_{jq}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{jq} g_{kp}^{(3)} + \hat{g}_{kq} g_{jp}^{(3)}] \hat{\mu}_i^{pq} - \frac{1}{2} C_{ijk} \right\} \\ &\quad + r^2 \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \hat{\mu}_i^{pq} V_{pqjk} + \frac{3}{4} [\hat{\nabla}_k g_{ij}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_j g_{ik}^{(3)}] \right\} + O(r^3), \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing, we have

Proposition 6.4. *Let (X, g_+) be an oriented, four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold. Let \hat{g} be a representative of the conformal infinity, and r the associated*

special defining function, and $\bar{g} = r^2 g_+$. Then

(6.27)

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{W}_{ijkl}^\pm &= r \left\{ \frac{3}{4} [\hat{g}_{ik} g_{jl}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{il} g_{jk}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{jk} g_{il}^{(3)} + \hat{g}_{jl} g_{ik}^{(3)}] \mp \frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p C_{pkl} \right\} \\ &\quad + r^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} V_{ijkl} \pm \frac{3}{4} (\hat{\nabla}_\ell g_{pk}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_k g_{p\ell}^{(3)}) \hat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p \right\} + O(r^3), \\ \overline{W}_{i0j0}^\pm &= r \left\{ -\frac{3}{4} g_{ij}^{(3)} \mp \frac{1}{4} \hat{\mu}_i{}^{mp} C_{jmp} \right\} + r^2 \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} V_{ij} \pm \frac{3}{8} (\hat{\nabla}_p g_{jm}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_m g_{jp}^{(3)}) \hat{\mu}_i{}^{mp} \right\} + O(r^3), \\ \overline{W}_{0ijk}^\pm &= r \left\{ \pm \frac{3}{8} [\hat{g}_{jp} g_{kq}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{kp} g_{jq}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{jq} g_{kp}^{(3)} + \hat{g}_{kq} g_{jp}^{(3)}] \hat{\mu}_i{}^{pq} - \frac{1}{2} C_{ijk} \right\} \\ &\quad + r^2 \left\{ \pm \frac{1}{4} \hat{\mu}_i{}^{pq} V_{pqjk} + \frac{3}{4} [\hat{\nabla}_k g_{ij}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_j g_{ik}^{(3)}] \right\} + O(r^3),\end{aligned}$$

where the tensors V_{ijkl} and V_{ij} are given by (6.8) and (6.10).

7. EXPANSIONS FOR EVEN AND SELF-DUAL METRICS

In this section we state two key corollaries of the preceding calculations.

Corollary 7.1. *Let (X, g_+) be an even, four-dimensional Poincaré-Einstein manifold, and \hat{g} a representative in the conformal infinity with associated special defining function r . Then*

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{aligned}\overline{W}_{ijkl} &= r^2 V_{ijkl} + O(r^3), \\ \overline{W}_{i0j0} &= -r^2 V_{ij} + O(r^3), \\ \overline{W}_{0ijk} &= -r C_{ijk} + O(r^3),\end{aligned}$$

where V_{ijkl} and V_{ij} are given by (6.14) and (6.15). In particular,

$$(7.2) \quad |\overline{W}|_g^2 = r^2 |C|^2 + O(r^4).$$

Also, we have

$$(7.3) \quad \begin{aligned}\overline{W}_{ijkl}^\pm &= \mp \frac{1}{2} r \hat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p C_{pkl} + \frac{1}{2} r^2 V_{ijkl} + O(r^3), \\ \overline{W}_{i0j0}^\pm &= \mp \frac{1}{4} r \hat{\mu}_i{}^{mp} C_{jmp} - \frac{1}{2} r^2 V_{ij} + O(r^3), \\ \overline{W}_{0ijk}^+ &= -\frac{1}{2} r C_{ijk} \pm \frac{1}{4} r^2 \hat{\mu}_i{}^{pq} V_{pqjk} + O(r^3).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. These formulas follow from Propositions 6.3 and 6.4 and the fact that $g^{(3)} = 0$. \square

Corollary 7.2. *If (X, g_+) is an oriented, self-dual Poincaré-Einstein manifold, then*

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{aligned}\overline{W}_{ijkl}^+ &= -r \hat{\mu}_{ij}{}^p C_{pkl} + r^2 V_{ijkl} + O(r^3), \\ \overline{W}_{i0j0}^+ &= -\frac{1}{2} r C_{ij} - r^2 V_{ij} + O(r^3), \\ \overline{W}_{0ijk}^+ &= -r C_{ijk} + \frac{1}{2} r^2 V_{pqjk} \hat{\mu}_i{}^{pq} + O(r^3),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$(7.5) \quad \mathcal{C}_{ij} = \hat{\mu}_i^{kl} C_{jkl}.$$

Proof. Since g_+ is self-dual, it follows from (6.21) that

$$(7.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{3}{4} [\hat{g}_{ik} g_{jl}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{il} g_{jk}^{(3)} - \hat{g}_{jk} g_{il}^{(3)} + \hat{g}_{jl} g_{ik}^{(3)}] &= -\frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu}_{ij}^p C_{pkl}, \\ \frac{3}{4} (\hat{\nabla}_\ell g_{pk}^{(3)} - \hat{\nabla}_k g_{pl}^{(3)}) \hat{\mu}_{ij}^p &= \frac{1}{2} V_{ijkl}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the first formula above is equivalent to (5.5) of Theorem 5.3 in [12].

Substituting these into (6.20) we get the first formula in (7.4). The proof of the other two formulas is similar. \square

Determining the expansion of the norm of the Weyl tensor is much more involved in the self-dual case, so we state it as a separate result:

Proposition 7.3. *If (X, g_+) is an oriented self-dual Poincaré-Einstein manifold, then*

$$(7.7) \quad |\overline{W}^+|_{\hat{g}}^2 = r^2 |\mathcal{C}|_{\hat{g}}^2 + 4r^3 \langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle + O(r^4).$$

Proof. First, we note that

$$(7.8) \quad \begin{aligned} |\overline{W}^+|_{\hat{g}}^2 &= \frac{1}{4} \hat{g}^{\alpha\mu} \hat{g}^{\beta\nu} \hat{g}^{\gamma\delta} \hat{g}^{\sigma\tau} \overline{W}^+_{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma} \overline{W}^+_{\mu\nu\delta\tau} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \hat{g}^{ip} \hat{g}^{jq} \hat{g}^{kr} \hat{g}^{\ell s} \overline{W}^+_{ijkl} \overline{W}^+_{pqrs} + \hat{g}^{ip} \hat{g}^{jq} \hat{g}^{kr} \overline{W}^+_{0ijk} \overline{W}^+_{0pqr} \\ &\quad + \hat{g}^{ip} \hat{g}^{jq} \overline{W}^+_{i0j0} \overline{W}^+_{p0q0} \\ &:= I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

By the first formula in (7.4),

$$(7.9) \quad \begin{aligned} I_1 &= \frac{1}{4} \hat{g}^{ip} \hat{g}^{jq} \hat{g}^{kr} \hat{g}^{\ell s} \overline{W}^+_{ijkl} \overline{W}^+_{pqrs} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} (\hat{g}^{ip} + O(r^2)) (\hat{g}^{jq} + O(r^2)) (\hat{g}^{kr} + O(r^2)) (\hat{g}^{\ell s} + O(r^2)) \left\{ -r \hat{\mu}_{ij}^m C_{mkl} + r^2 V_{ijkl} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + O(r^3) \right\} \left\{ -r \hat{\mu}_{pq}^n C_{nrs} + r^2 V_{pqrs} + O(r^3) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} r^2 \hat{g}^{ip} \hat{g}^{jq} \hat{g}^{kr} \hat{g}^{\ell s} \hat{\mu}_{ij}^m \hat{\mu}_{pq}^n C_{mkl} C_{nrs} - \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{g}^{ip} \hat{g}^{jq} \hat{g}^{kr} \hat{g}^{\ell s} \hat{\mu}_{ij}^m \hat{\mu}_{pq}^n C_{mkl} V_{pqrs} + O(r^4) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} r^2 \hat{\mu}^{pqm} \hat{\mu}_{pq}^n C_{mkl} C_n{}^{kl} - \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\mu}^{pqm} C_{mkl} V_{pq}{}^{kl} + O(r^4). \end{aligned}$$

It will be convenient to rewrite the second term on the right. First, by skew-symmetry of the volume form,

$$(7.10) \quad -\frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu}^{pqm} C_{mkl} V_{pq}{}^{kl} = -\frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu}^{mpq} V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_{mkl}.$$

Claim 7.4.

$$(7.11) \quad -\frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu}^{mpq} V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_{mkl} = \langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle = V_i^j \mathcal{C}_j^i.$$

Proof. In the following, we will repeatedly use the identity

$$(7.12) \quad \widehat{\mu}^{p ij} \widehat{\mu}_{pkl} = \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} - \delta_{jk} \delta_{il}.$$

From this, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}_{jk}^m C_{mi} &= \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}_{jk}^m \widehat{\mu}_m^{pq} C_{ipq} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}_{mjk} \widehat{\mu}^{mpq} C_{ipq} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{jp} \delta_{kq} - \delta_{jq} \delta_{kp}) C_{ipq} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (C_{ijk} - C_{ikj}) \\ &= C_{ijk}, \end{aligned}$$

which can also be expressed as

$$(7.13) \quad C_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}_{mjk} C_i^m.$$

Since $C_{[mkl]} = 0$, we can rewrite the term in (7.11) as

$$(7.14) \quad -\frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}^{mpq} V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_{mkl} = \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}^{mpq} V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_{klm} + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}^{mpq} V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_{lmk}.$$

Hence, by (7.13),

$$\begin{aligned} (7.15) \quad -\frac{1}{2} \widehat{\mu}^{mpq} V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_{mkl} &= \frac{1}{4} \widehat{\mu}^{mpq} V_{pq}{}^{kl} \widehat{\mu}_{s\ell m} C_k^s + \frac{1}{4} \widehat{\mu}^{mpq} V_{pq}{}^{kl} \widehat{\mu}_{smk} C_\ell^s \\ &= -\frac{1}{4} \widehat{\mu}^{mpq} \widehat{\mu}_{m\ell s} V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_k^s - \frac{1}{4} \widehat{\mu}^{mpq} \widehat{\mu}_{msk} V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_\ell^s \\ &= -\frac{1}{4} (\delta_{p\ell} \delta_{qs} - \delta_{\ell q} \delta_{ps}) V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_k^s - \frac{1}{4} (\delta_{ps} \delta_{qk} - \delta_{sq} \delta_{pk}) V_{pq}{}^{kl} C_\ell^s \\ &= V_s^k C_k^s. \end{aligned}$$

□

For the first term in the last line of (7.9), we use the identity (7.12) to show

$$\frac{1}{4} r^2 \widehat{\mu}^{pqm} \widehat{\mu}_{pq}{}^n C_{mkl} C_n{}^{kl} = \frac{1}{4} |\mathcal{C}|^2.$$

Combining with Claim 7.4, we get

$$(7.16) \quad I_1 = \frac{1}{4} r^2 |\mathcal{C}|^2 + r^3 \langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle + O(r^4).$$

Using the second formula in (7.4) we find

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.17) \quad I_2 &= \bar{g}^{ip} \bar{g}^{jq} \bar{g}^{kr} \overline{W}_{0ijk}^+ \overline{W}_{0pqr}^+ \\
&= (\hat{g}^{ip} + O(r^2)) (\hat{g}^{jq} + O(r^2)) (\hat{g}^{kr} + O(r^2)) \left\{ -rC_{ijk} + \frac{1}{2}r^2 V_{pqjk} \hat{\mu}_i^{pq} + O(r^3) \right\} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ -rC_{pqr} + \frac{1}{2}r^2 V_{abqr} \hat{\mu}_p^{ab} + O(r^3) \right\} \\
&= r^2 \hat{g}^{ip} \hat{g}^{jq} \hat{g}^{kr} C_{ijk} C_{pqr} - r^3 \hat{g}^{ip} \hat{g}^{jq} \hat{g}^{kr} C_{ijk} V_{abqr} \hat{\mu}_p^{ab} + O(r^4) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}r^2 |\mathcal{C}|^2 - r^3 \hat{\mu}^{iab} V_{ab}{}^{jk} C_{ijk} + O(r^4).
\end{aligned}$$

By Claim 7.4, this can be expressed as

$$(7.18) \quad I_2 = \frac{1}{2}r^2 |\mathcal{C}|^2 + 2r^3 \langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle + O(r^4).$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.19) \quad I_3 &= \bar{g}^{ip} \bar{g}^{jq} \overline{W}_{i0j0}^+ \overline{W}_{p0q0}^+ \\
&= (\hat{g}^{ip} + O(r^2)) (\hat{g}^{jq} + O(r^2)) \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}r C_{ij} - r^2 V_{ij} + O(r^3) \right\} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}r C_{pq} - r^2 V_{pq} + O(r^3) \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{4}r^2 |\mathcal{C}|_{\bar{g}}^2 + r^3 \hat{g}^{ip} \hat{g}^{kq} C_{ij} V_{pq} + O(r^4) \\
&= \frac{1}{4}r^2 |\mathcal{C}|_{\bar{g}}^2 + r^3 \langle V, \mathcal{C} \rangle + O(r^4).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (7.16), (7.18), and (7.19), we get (7.7). \square

8. A CONFORMAL INVARIANT IN DIMENSION THREE

The proof of Theorem 1.1. Although it is possible to verify (1.7) directly, we will give a ‘‘holographic’’ construction of the invariants.

Let (M, g) be a three-dimensional Riemannian manifold. By Theorem 5.3 of [12], there is an $\epsilon > 0$ and a (formal) self-dual Poincaré-Einstein metric g_+ defined on $X = M \times [0, \epsilon)$ whose conformal infinity is $(M, [g])$. By ‘‘formal’’, we mean that g_+ can be expressed as

$$g_+ = r^{-2} (dr^2 + g_r),$$

where g_r is a one-parameter family of metrics on M that is determined to infinite order. In particular, if we write

$$g_r = g + g^{(2)}r^2 + g^{(3)}r^3 + g^{(4)}r^4 + \dots,$$

then the Einstein condition determines $g^{(2)}$ and $g^{(4)}$, while the self-duality condition determines $g^{(3)}$ (see (7.6)). Then, by the proof of Proposition 7.3,

$$(8.1) \quad |\overline{W}^+|_{\bar{g}}^2 = r^2 |\mathcal{C}_g|_g^2 + 4r^3 \langle V_g, \mathcal{C}_g \rangle_g + O(r^4),$$

where $\bar{g} = r^2 g_+ = dr^2 + g_r$. Since

$$|W_{g_+}^+|_{g_+}^2 = r^4 |\overline{W}^+|_{\bar{g}}^2,$$

(8.1) implies

$$(8.2) \quad |W_{g_+}^+|_{g_+}^2 = r^6 |\mathcal{C}_g|_g^2 + 4r^7 \langle V_g, \mathcal{C}_g \rangle_g + O(r^8).$$

Now, let $\tilde{g} \in [g]$, and write

$$(8.3) \quad \tilde{g} = e^{2w_0} g$$

for some $w_0 \in C^\infty(M)$. If we write g_+ in normal form with

$$g_+ = \tilde{r}^{-2} (d\tilde{r}^2 + \tilde{g}_{\tilde{r}}),$$

where $\tilde{g}_{\tilde{r}}|_{\tilde{r}=0} = \tilde{g}$, then (8.2) becomes

$$(8.4) \quad |W_{g_+}^+|_{g_+}^2 = \tilde{r}^6 |\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{g}}|_{\tilde{g}}^2 + 4\tilde{r}^7 \langle V_{\tilde{g}}, \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{g}} \rangle_{\tilde{g}} + O(\tilde{r}^8).$$

By Lemma 2.2 of [13],

$$\tilde{r} = re^w,$$

where w has an expansion that consists of only even powers of r :

$$w = w_0 + O(r^2),$$

where w_0 is given in (8.3). In particular,

$$(8.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{r}^6 &= r^6 e^{6w_0} + O(r^8), \\ \tilde{r}^7 &= r^7 e^{7w_0} + O(r^9). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these into (8.4) and comparing with (8.2), we get (1.7). □

REFERENCES

- [1] M. T. Anderson, Boundary regularity, uniqueness, and non-uniqueness for AH Einstein metrics on four-manifolds, *Adv. Math.* **179** (2003) 205-249.
- [2] M. T. Anderson, L^2 -curvature and volume renormalization of AHE metrics on 4-manifolds, *Math. Res. Lett.* **8** (2001), no. 1-2, 171–188.
- [3] E. Bahuaud and J. M. Lee, Low-regularity Poincaré-Einstein metrics, *Proc. AMS* **146**(5) 2239-2252.
- [4] D. M. Calderbank, P. Gauduchon, M. Herzlich, Refined Kato inequalities and conformal weights in Riemannian geometry, *J. Funct. Anal.* **173** (2000), no.1, 214–255.
- [5] S.Y.-A. Chang and Y. Ge, On a problem of conformal fill in by Poincaré-Einstein manifolds in dimension 4, preprint.
- [6] S.Y.-A. Chang, J. Qing, and P. Yang, On the topology of conformally compact Einstein 4-manifolds. *Noncompact problems at the intersection of geometry, analysis, and topology*, 49–61. Contemp. Math., 350. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004
- [7] X. Chen, M. Lai, and F. Wang, Escobar-Yamabe compactifications for Poincaré-Einstein manifolds and rigidity theorems, *Adv. Math.* **343** (2019), 16–35.
- [8] P. Cherrier, Problemes de Neumann non lineaires sur les varietes riemanniennes, *J. Funct. Anal.* **7** (1984), no.2, 154–206.
- [9] P. T. Chruściel, E. Delay, J. M. Lee, and D. N. Skinner, Boundary regularity of conformally compact Einstein manifolds, *J. Diff. Geo.* **69** (2005), 111-136
- [10] A. Derdzinski, Self-dual Kähler manifolds and Einstein manifolds of dimension four, *Compositio Math.* **49** (1983), no. 3, 405–433.
- [11] J. F. Escobar, The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary, *J. Diff. Geom.* **35** (1992), no.1, 21–84.
- [12] C. Fefferman and C. R. Graham, The ambient metric, Ann. of Math. Stud., **178** Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012, x+113 pp.
- [13] C. R. Graham, Volume and area renormalizations for conformally compact Einstein metrics, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* (2) Suppl. (2000), no. 63, 31–42.

- [14] C. R. Graham and J. M. Lee, Einstein metrics with prescribed conformal infinity on the ball, *Adv. Math.* **87**(2) (1991)
- [15] M. J. Gursky, Four-manifolds with $\delta W^+ = 0$ and Einstein constants of the sphere, *Math. Ann.* **318** (2000), no. 3, 417–431.
- [16] M. J. Gursky and Q. Han, Non-existence of Poincaré-Einstein manifolds with prescribed conformal infinity, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **27** (2017), no.4, 863–879.
- [17] M. J. Gursky and C. LeBrun, On Einstein manifolds of positive sectional curvature. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **17** (1999), no.4, 315–328.
- [18] N. J. Hitchin, Twistor spaces, Einstein metrics and isomonodromic deformations, *J. Differential Geom.* **42** (1995), no. 1, 30–112.
- [19] C. LeBrun, Thickenings and conformal gravity, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **139** (1991), no. 1, 1–43.
- [20] H. Pedersen, Einstein metrics, spinning top motions and monopoles, *Math. Ann.* **274** (1986), no.1, 35–59.
- [21] Y. Matsumoto, A construction of Poincaré-Einstein metrics of cohomogeneity one on the ball, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **147** (2019), no.9, 3983–3993.
- [22] J. Qing, *On the rigidity for conformally compact Einstein manifolds*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2003, no. 21, 1141–1153.
- [23] S. Raulot, Simon, A remark on the rigidity of Poincaré-Einstein manifolds, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **109** (2019), no.5, 1247–1256.
- [24] X. Wang and Z. Wang, On a sharp inequality relating Yamabe invariants on a Poincaré-Einstein manifold, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **150** (2022), no.11, 4923–4929.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, NOTRE DAME, IN 46556
Email address: mgursky@nd.edu

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT DALLAS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FO 35, 800
 W. CAMPBELL ROAD, RICHARDSON, TX 75080-3021
Email address: mgursky@nd.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY, LUBBOCK, TX
 79409
Email address: mgursky@nd.edu