

INDEX ESTIMATE BY FIRST BETTI NUMBER OF MINIMAL HYPERSURFACES IN COMPACT SYMMETRIC SPACES

TORU KAJIGAYA AND KEITA KUNIKAWA

ABSTRACT. We show that the Morse index of unstable closed minimal hypersurface Σ in a compact semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space $M = G/K$ is bounded from below by constant times the first Betti number of Σ .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Σ be a closed hypersurface in a closed Riemannian manifold (M, g) . Σ is called *minimal* if it is a critical point of the volume functional under any infinitesimal deformation of Σ . The study of minimal hypersurfaces is still actively researched in connection with various areas of mathematics. One of the main concern is related to the Morse index and the topology of minimal hypersurface. The notion of *index* is defined by the maximal dimension of the subspace of the space of normal vector fields such that the Hessian of the volume functional is negative-definite on the subspace, and this measures how many directions exist to decrease the volume of Σ . There are many interesting study on the estimate of index and the relation to geometry of minimal hypersurface in a given Riemannian manifold. We refer the reader to [1, 7, 9, 12, 17] and references therein for a detailed background and related results.

As stated in [1] (see also [5, 7, 8, 9, 17]), there is a conjecture by Schoen, Marques and Neves that, if M has positive Ricci curvature, then there exists a positive constant C depending only on M such that the inequality

$$(1) \quad \text{index}(\Sigma) \geq C b_1(\Sigma)$$

holds for any closed embedded minimal hypersurface Σ in M , where $b_1(\Sigma)$ is the first Betti number of Σ . This conjecture was confirmed by Savo [14] in the case when M is the standard sphere S^n , and by generalizing his method, Ambrozio-Carlotto-Sharp [1] proved the conjecture affirmatively when M is a compact rank-one symmetric space (i.e. M is either S^n , $\mathbb{R}P^n$, $\mathbb{C}P^n$, $\mathbb{H}P^n$ or the Cayley plane $\mathbb{O}P^2$). It is a natural attempt to extend these results to a general compact Riemannian symmetric space (RSS for short) of positive Ricci curvature, in particular, to a compact *semi-simple* RSS. Here, a compact symmetric space is called semi-simple if the identity component of the isometry group $I_0(M)$ becomes a compact semi-simple Lie group, and it provides a very typical example of Riemannian manifold of positive Ricci curvature.

In this direction, by using the same method of [1], Ambrozio-Carlotto-Sharp [1] and Gorodski-Mendes-Radeschi [5] verified the conjecture for the following compact semi-simple symmetric spaces; The product of sphere $S^p \times S^q$ of $p, q \geq 2$ and $(p, q) \neq (2, 2)$, the quaternionic Grassmannian manifolds, $Sp(n)$ (for any n) and $SU(n)$ of $n \leq 17$. We remark that, besides these symmetric examples, the conjecture has been also confirmed under some situations (see [1, 5] for other results). However, as considered in [5], it seems difficult to prove the conjecture by using the method in [1] for a general compact symmetric space.

In [8], Mendes-Radeschi generalized the method by introducing the notion of *virtual immersion* of a Riemannian manifold M . Moreover, they proved that the inequality (1) holds when M is a product of two compact rank-one symmetric spaces, or for an oriented minimal hypersurface Σ in an oriented compact semi-simple symmetric space with an additional assumption that there exists a point $p \in \Sigma$ such that the principal curvatures at p are distinct ([8, Corollary D]). Note that as mentioned in [8], the last result of [8] can be slightly extended, namely, the same conclusion holds if Σ is unstable (i.e. $\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq 1$) and satisfies the assumption of principal curvatures. See also Appendix A.2 for the method using the virtual immersion.

The aim of the present paper is to provide another approach to extend the method used by Savo and Ambrozio-Carlotto-Sharp. Furthermore, we confirm that for a compact semi-simple RSS M , the

Date: October 16, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 53C42, 53C35.

inequality (1) holds if the minimal hypersurface Σ in M is unstable. More precisely, we show the following result.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 5.1). *Let M be a compact semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space and Σ be a closed minimal hypersurface embedded in M . If Σ is unstable, then it holds that*

$$(2) \quad \text{index}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{2}{d(d-1) + 2(2n-3)} b_1(\Sigma),$$

where d is the dimension of the isometry group of M and $n = \dim M$.

An embedded hypersurface Σ is called *two-sided* if the normal bundle is trivial in M (otherwise, Σ is called *one-sided*). It follows from the second variational formula (cf. [15]) that any two-sided minimal hypersurface Σ is unstable if M has positive Ricci curvature. Therefore, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2. *The inequality (2) holds for every two-sided closed minimal hypersurface Σ embedded in a compact semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space.*

If M is simply-connected, then any embedded hypersurface in M is two-sided. Thus, we obtain

Corollary 1.3. *The conjecture by Marques-Neves-Schoen holds for any simply-connected compact semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space.*

We shall make some remarks on our results. Firstly, in Theorem 1.1, we proved an index bound under the assumption that Σ is unstable (Note that Theorem 1.1 holds even if Σ is one-sided). Therefore in a compact semi-simple RSS, the problem is still remaining for stable minimal hypersurfaces. Notice that a stable minimal hypersurface in a compact semi-simple RSS M can exist only when M is not simply-connected and Σ is one-sided in M . Moreover, the inequality (1) suggests that $b_1(\Sigma)$ must be 0 if Σ is stable. For example, the totally geodesic $\mathbb{R}P^{n-1}$ is stable in $\mathbb{R}P^n$, and when $M = \mathbb{R}P^n$, the inequality (1) has been proved for any embedded closed minimal hypersurfaces ([1]). Secondly, we remark that in (2), the constant depending on M is not necessarily better than the previous results given in [1, 5, 8, 14]. For example, the result by Ambrozio-Carlotto-Sharp [1] provides a much better constant when M is a rank-one symmetric space, and Mendes-Radeschi [8] proved more precise result when Σ has a point p such that the principal curvatures at p are distinct.

The method by Ambrozio-Carlotto-Sharp [1] is based on a kind of ‘‘averaging method’’, which goes back to the method used in [6, 15]. More precisely, we first generate a test normal variation $\Phi_\omega(v)$ of a minimal hypersurface Σ in M by combining a harmonic 1-form ω and a vector $v \in \mathcal{G}$ of a finite dimensional metric vector space \mathcal{G} , namely, we take a bilinear map

$$\Phi : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \Gamma(\nu\Sigma),$$

where \mathcal{H} is the space of harmonic 1-forms on Σ and $\Gamma(\nu\Sigma)$ denotes the space of normal vector fields along Σ in M . Next, we consider a quadratic form $q_\omega(v, w) := Q(\Phi_\omega(v), \Phi_\omega(w))$ on \mathcal{G} , where Q is the index form of the minimal hypersurface Σ in M . Then it turns out that a sufficient condition for the inequality (1) is given by $\text{Tr}q_\omega < 0$ for any $\omega \in \mathcal{H}$ (see Section 2 for details). A problem here is how to define a preferred test variation Φ in order to estimate the trace of q_ω . In [1], two reasonable choice of test variations are presented by using an isometric immersion of the ambient Riemannian manifold M^n into the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{n+k} . The first method is inspired by the idea of Ros [12] and Urbano [19], and this is applicable to a minimal surface in a 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold (see [1, Proposition 4]). Another choice is a generalization of the method by Savo [14], and this can be applied to a minimal hypersurface of any dimension ([1, Theorem A]). In any case, an advantage of these methods is that the trace formula for q_ω is derived in a better form so that $\text{Tr}q_\omega$ can be estimated by using geometry of the isometric immersion $M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$. See [1, 5] or Appendix for details.

In the present paper, we show that the methods in [1] are naturally extended by considering an isometric immersion of a Riemannian manifold M into a compact semi-simple RSS N . Indeed, we can define the test variation Φ and a quadratic form q_ω by a similar way via the isometric immersion $M \rightarrow N$ (See Section 3 and 4). Moreover, we obtain generalized trace formulas (Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 4.3) as extensions of formulas given in [1, Proposition 1 and 2]. We remark that if $M = N$, it turns out that the test variation given in Section 4 coincides with the one defined in [8] by using the virtual immersion (See Appendix A.2 for the correspondence). However, our approach and the description of the trace formula are different from [8].

Similar to [1], the trace can be estimated using the geometry of $M \rightarrow N$. As a simple application of our formula, we prove that the inequality (1) holds for any closed minimal surface in a family of

Berger spheres by using an isometric immersion of the Berger sphere to the complex projective space $\mathbb{C}P^2$ (Theorem 3.4).

Moreover, when M is also a compact semi-simple RSS, by taking the identity map $id : M \rightarrow M$ as an isometric immersion, we show that the trace of q_ω with respect to a certain test variation Φ is always equal to 0 for any harmonic 1-form ω (Proposition 4.4). Note that the same conclusion was also obtained in [8] by using the virtual immersion. If $\text{Tr}q_\omega = 0$ for any $\omega \in \mathcal{H}$, then we obtain an affine bound $\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq C(b_1(\Sigma) - D)$ for some constant C, D depending only on M (see Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 5.5), and if furthermore Σ is unstable (i.e. $\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq 1$), the affine bound implies the required linear bound $\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq C'b_1(\Sigma)$ for some constant C' determined by C and D . We remark that this argument has been used in [2] in the case when N is a flat torus and in [8] by using the virtual immersion, however, in both papers, they supposed an additional assumption that there exists a point $p \in \Sigma$ such that the principal curvatures at p are distinct. In this paper, we shall improve their argument, and prove the inequality (2) without the assumption of principal curvatures. Actually, our argument can be applied to the case when N is a flat torus as well, and the result given in [2, Theorem 1] is generalized to any closed minimal hypersurface in the flat torus.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we summarize our method of index estimate in a general setting based on the argument given in [1, 8]. In Section 3, by considering an isometric immersion of M into a compact semi-simple RSS N , we derive the first trace formula as an extension of the formula given in [1, Proposition 1]. By using this, we prove that the inequality (1) holds for any closed minimal surface embedded in a family of Berger spheres. In Section 4, extending the another method given in [1], we prove the second trace formula via the isometric immersion $M \rightarrow N$. Finally, we prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 5 by improving the argument in [2, 8].

2. INDEX AND THE METHOD OF ESTIMATE

2.1. Second variation of minimal hypersurfaces. Let M^n be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold and Σ a closed $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifold. We consider an isometric immersion $f : \Sigma \rightarrow M$. We identify the tangent space $T_p\Sigma$ with a subspace of $T_{f(p)}M$ via the differential map $df_p : T_p\Sigma \rightarrow T_{f(p)}M$. We denote the orthogonal complement of $T_p\Sigma$ in $T_{f(p)}M$ by $\nu_p\Sigma$, and we call $\nu_p\Sigma$ a normal space of f at p . In our setting, $\nu_p\Sigma$ is a 1-dimensional subspace. We denote the normal bundle of f by $\nu\Sigma$.

We denote the Levi-Civita connection of M by ∇^M . The *second fundamental form* A of f is defined by $A(X, Y) := (\nabla_X^M Y)^\perp$ for $X, Y \in \Gamma(T\Sigma)$, where \perp means the orthogonal projection to the normal space. The second fundamental form is a symmetric tensor field on Σ . The mean curvature vector H of f is defined by $H := \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} A(e_\mu, e_\mu)$, where $\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^{n-1}$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_p\Sigma$. We say f is *minimal* if f is a critical point of the volume functional, or equivalently, the mean curvature vector H is vanishing along f . In the following, we always assume f is a minimal immersion of $(n-1)$ -dimensional closed manifold Σ . When f is an embedding, we call Σ a *minimal hypersurface* in M .

The second variation of the volume functional for a normal variation $\{f_s\}_{s \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)}$ of a minimal immersion $f = f_0$ is given by (cf. [15])

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2} \text{Vol}(f_s) \Big|_{s=0} = \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla^\perp V|^2 - \text{Ric}^M(V, V) - |A|^2 |V|^2 d\mu_\Sigma,$$

where $V := \frac{df_s}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \in \Gamma(\nu\Sigma)$, ∇^\perp denotes the normal connection and Ric^M is the Ricci tensor of M . We define a quadratic form on $\Gamma(\nu\Sigma)$ by

$$Q(V, W) = \int_{\Sigma} \langle \nabla^\perp V, \nabla^\perp W \rangle - \text{Ric}^M(V, W) - |A|^2 \langle V, W \rangle d\mu_\Sigma \quad \text{for } V, W \in \Gamma(\nu\Sigma),$$

and Q is called the *index form* of f . A minimal immersion f is said to be *stable* if $Q(V, V) \geq 0$ for any normal vector field V , otherwise we say *unstable*.

Remark 2.1. As mentioned in [1], we can deal with a non-orientable hypersurface. If this is the case, the symbol $d\mu_\Sigma$ denotes the *Riemannian density* of Σ (See [10] for details). Since the divergence theorem holds even for Riemannian densities, the computation presented in this paper works just as well as in the orientable case.

By using the divergence theorem, we may write

$$Q(V, W) = - \int_{\Sigma} \langle \Delta^\perp V + R^M(V)^\perp + |A|^2 V, W \rangle d\mu_\Sigma,$$

where Δ^\perp is the Laplacian of ∇^\perp and $R^M(V) := \text{Tr}R^M(V, \cdot)$, where R^M is the curvature tensor of M defined by $R^M(X, Y)Z = \nabla_X^M \nabla_Y^M Z - \nabla_Y^M \nabla_X^M Z - \nabla_{[X, Y]}^M Z$. We put

$$\mathcal{J}(V) := \Delta^\perp V + R^M(V)^\perp + |A|^2 V.$$

It is known that \mathcal{J} is a self-adjoint elliptic linear operator acting on $\Gamma(\nu\Sigma)$ and it has discrete eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty$ (Note that the eigenvalue is defined by $\mathcal{J}(V) = -\lambda V$). Then, the *index* of f is given by the dimension of the eigenspaces of negative eigenvalues. Also, the *nullity* is defined by the dimension of 0-eigenspaces. We denote the index (resp. nullity) of $f : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ by $\text{index}(\Sigma)$ (resp. $\text{nullity}(\Sigma)$).

An embedded hypersurface Σ is called *two-sided* if the normal bundle $\nu\Sigma$ is trivial, i.e. there exists a smooth unit normal vector field ν along Σ . Otherwise, we say Σ *one-sided*. If the ambient space M is oriented, then Σ is two-sided if and only if Σ is oriented. In general, if the normal bundle $\nu\Sigma$ of a minimal immersion $f : \Sigma^{n-1} \rightarrow M^n$ is trivial, then a normal vector field V is written as $V = \varphi \cdot \nu$ for some $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$. Thus, the second variation becomes

$$Q(\varphi, \psi) = - \int_\Sigma \langle \mathcal{J}(\varphi), \psi \rangle d\mu_\Sigma, \quad \varphi, \psi \in C^\infty(M),$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{J}(\varphi) := \Delta\varphi + \text{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu)\varphi + |A|^2\varphi.$$

If this is the case, the index (resp. nullity) of f coincides with the dimension of eigenspaces of negative eigenvalues (resp. 0-eigenvalue) of \mathcal{J} acting on $C^\infty(\Sigma)$.

2.2. Method of index estimate. The following lemma is a generalization of argument used in [1, 8].

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose $f : \Sigma^{n-1} \rightarrow M^n$ is a minimal immersion. Let \mathcal{G} be a finite dimensional vector space equipped with a positive-definite inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}$ and suppose that there is a bilinear map*

$$\Phi : \Gamma(T\Sigma) \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \Gamma(\nu\Sigma)$$

so that Φ defines a quadratic form q_T on \mathcal{G} for each $T \in \Gamma(T\Sigma)$;

$$q_T(v, w) := Q(\Phi_{T,v}, \Phi_{T,w}) = - \int_\Sigma \langle \mathcal{J}(\Phi_{T,v}), \Phi_{T,w} \rangle d\mu_\Sigma,$$

where $\Phi_{T,v} = \Phi(T, v)$. We also define another quadratic form L_T on \mathcal{G} by

$$L_T(v, w) := \langle \Phi_{T,v}, \Phi_{T,w} \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)} = \int_\Sigma \langle \Phi_{T,v}, \Phi_{T,w} \rangle d\mu_\Sigma.$$

Then we have

- (i) *If there exists a finite dimensional linear subspace $S \subset \Gamma(T\Sigma)$ and a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q_T < c \cdot \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} L_T$ for any non-trivial element $T \in S$, then*

$$\#\{\text{eigenvalues of } \mathcal{J} \text{ less than } c\} \geq \frac{\dim S}{\dim \mathcal{G}}.$$

- (ii) *If there exists a finite dimensional linear subspace $S \subset \Gamma(T\Sigma)$ such that $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q_T \leq 0$ for any non-trivial element $T \in S$, then*

$$\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{G}} (\dim S - \dim S_0),$$

where

$$S_0 := \{T \in S \mid \mathcal{J}(\Phi_{T,v}) \equiv 0 \ \forall v \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

Proof. We denote the eigenvalue of \mathcal{J} by $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_r \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty$. Fix a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the set of eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^l$ satisfying that $\lambda_k < c$. Then, $l = \#\{\text{eigenvalues of } \mathcal{J} \text{ less than } c\}$. We take an L^2 -basis $\{V_k\}_{k=1}^l$ of the eigenspaces of $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^l$, and we fix an orthonormal basis $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^\delta$ of \mathcal{G} , where $\delta = \dim \mathcal{G}$.

- (i) We define a linear map $\chi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\delta \times l}$ by

$$\chi(T) := \left[\int_\Sigma \langle \Phi_{T, \theta_i}, V_k \rangle d\mu_\Sigma \right]_{i=1, \dots, \delta, k=1, \dots, l},$$

where the right hand side is regarded as a (column) vector in $\mathbb{R}^{\delta \times l}$.

Assume that $\dim S > \delta \times l$. Then there exists a non-trivial element $T_0 \in S$ such that $\chi(T_0) = 0$. Namely, Φ_{T_0, θ_i} is L^2 -orthogonal to V_k for any $i = 1, \dots, \delta$ and $k = 1, \dots, l$, and hence, we obtain

$$Q(\Phi_{T_0, \theta_i}, \Phi_{T_0, \theta_i}) \geq \lambda_{l+1} \int_{\Sigma} |\Phi_{T_0, \theta_i}|^2 d\mu_{\Sigma}.$$

Summing up for all $i = 1, \dots, \delta$, we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q_{T_0} \geq \lambda_{l+1} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} L_{T_0}.$$

Note that we used the assumption that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}$ is positive-definite, i.e. the trace of a quadratic form q is defined by $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q = \sum_{i=1}^{\delta} q(\theta_i, \theta_i)$.

However, since we assume $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q_{T_0} < c \cdot \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} L_{T_0} \leq \lambda_{l+1} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} L_{T_0}$, this is a contradiction. Therefore, we obtain $\dim S \leq \delta \times l$ and this proves (i).

(ii) We slightly modify the proof of (i). Let S_0^{\perp} be the orthogonal complement of S_0 in $S \subset \Gamma(T\Sigma)$. Take an L^2 -basis $\{V_k\}_{k=1}^l$ of *negative* eigenfunctions of \mathcal{J} (namely we set $c = 0$ in the proof of (i)) and let $\chi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\delta \times l}$ be the same map given in the proof of (i). We consider the restricted map $\chi' = \chi|_{S_0^{\perp}} : S_0^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\delta \times l}$. Assume that $\dim S_0^{\perp} > \delta \times l$. Then there exists a non-trivial element $T_0 \in S_0^{\perp}$ so that $\chi'(T_0) = 0$. Then Φ_{T_0, θ_i} is L^2 -orthogonal to any negative eigenvector, and hence, we obtain

$$(3) \quad Q(\Phi_{T_0, \theta_i}, \Phi_{T_0, \theta_i}) \geq 0$$

for any i . In particular, we have $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q_{T_0} \geq 0$ (as $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{G}}$ is positive-definite). Since we assume $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q_{T_0} \leq 0$, we obtain $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q_{T_0} = 0$. By (3), this implies

$$(4) \quad Q(\Phi_{T_0, \theta_i}, \Phi_{T_0, \theta_i}) = - \int_{\Sigma} \langle \mathcal{J}(\Phi_{T_0, \theta_i}), \Phi_{T_0, \theta_i} \rangle = 0$$

for any i . Because Φ_{T_0, θ_i} is L^2 -orthogonal to any negative eigenvector, (4) implies $\mathcal{J}(\Phi_{T_0, \theta_i}) = 0$ for any i , i.e. $T_0 \in S_0$. This contradicts the facts that $T_0 \in S_0^{\perp}$ and $T_0 \neq 0$. Therefore, $\dim S_0^{\perp} \leq \delta \times l$. This proves (ii). \square

As a special situation, we consider the set of harmonic 1-forms \mathcal{H} on Σ and denote its metric dual by $\mathcal{H}^* \subset \Gamma(T\Sigma)$. Note that, by Hodge theory, we have $\dim \mathcal{H}^* = b_1(\Sigma)$, where $b_1(\Sigma)$ is the first Betti number of Σ . By letting $S = \mathcal{H}^*$ in the previous lemma, we obtain the following result as an extension of [1, Theorem A] and [8, Proposition 10]:

Proposition 2.3. *Let $f : \Sigma^{n-1} \rightarrow M^n$ be a minimal immersion. Suppose the same assumption given in Lemma 2.2.*

(i) *If $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q_{\omega^{\sharp}} < 0$ (strictly negative) for any non-trivial $\omega \in \mathcal{H}$, then it holds that*

$$\mathrm{index}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{G}} b_1(\Sigma).$$

(ii) *If $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{G}} q_{\omega^{\sharp}} \leq 0$ (non-positive) for any non-trivial $\omega \in \mathcal{H}$, then it holds that*

$$\mathrm{index}(\Sigma) + \mathrm{nullity}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{G}} b_1(\Sigma) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathrm{index}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{G}} (b_1(\Sigma) - \dim \mathcal{H}_0),$$

where $\mathcal{H}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ is a linear subspace defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_0 := \{\omega \in \mathcal{H} \mid \mathcal{J}(\Phi_{\omega^{\sharp}, v}) \equiv 0 \ \forall v \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

The proof of our main result (Theorem 5.1) will be done by taking an appropriate map $\Phi : \Gamma(T\Sigma) \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \Gamma(\nu\Sigma)$ and applying Proposition 2.3 to the map Φ . In order to construct Φ , we consider an isometric immersion M^n into an $(n+k)$ -dimensional Riemannian symmetric space N^{n+k} . When $N = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$, the method has been considered by Ambrozio-Carlotto-Sharp [1, 2] which is inspired by the idea of Ros [12], Urbano [19] and Savo [14]. In the present paper, we extend their method to the case when N is a compact semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space (see also Appendix for the correspondence of our argument in the case when $N = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$). We shall give the details of our method in Section 3 and 4.

2.3. Preliminaries on symmetric spaces. A Riemannian manifold (N, g) is called a *Riemannian symmetric space* (RSS for short) if, for each $p \in N$, there is an isometry s_p on N satisfying that (i) $s_p^2 = id_N$ and (ii) p is an isolated fixed point of s_p . Note that (N, g) is a complete Riemannian manifold. Moreover, it is known that the identity component of the isometry group $I_0(N)$ acts on N transitively and thus, N is diffeomorphic to the homogeneous space G/K_p , where $G = I_0(N)$ and K_p is the isotropy subgroup at some point $p \in N$. In the following, we identify N with G/K_p . We refer to [13] for basic facts for RSS.

We denote the Lie algebra of G (resp. K_p) by \mathfrak{g} (resp. \mathfrak{k}_p). The geodesic symmetry s_p at p defines an involutive automorphism $\tilde{\sigma}_p$ on $G = I_0(N)$ by $\tilde{\sigma}_p(g) := s_p g s_p$. Then, the differential $\sigma_p := (d\tilde{\sigma}_p)_e$ at the identity element $e \in G$ induces an involutive automorphism $\sigma_p : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$, and the eigen-decomposition of σ_p yields a reductive decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}_p \oplus \mathfrak{n}_p,$$

where \mathfrak{k}_p coincides with the $+1$ -eigenspace of σ_p and \mathfrak{n}_p denotes the -1 -eigenspace of σ_p . The decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}_p \oplus \mathfrak{n}_p$ satisfies the following bracket relations

$$(5) \quad [\mathfrak{k}_p, \mathfrak{k}_p] \subset \mathfrak{k}_p, \quad [\mathfrak{k}_p, \mathfrak{n}_p] \subset \mathfrak{n}_p, \quad [\mathfrak{n}_p, \mathfrak{n}_p] \subset \mathfrak{k}_p.$$

For an element $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, we define the *fundamental vector field* X^\dagger on $N = G/K_p$ by

$$X^\dagger(q) := \left. \frac{d}{dt} \exp(tX)q \right|_{t=0}, \quad q \in N.$$

Then, X^\dagger defines a Killing vector field on N since $\exp(tX) \in G = I_0(N)$ is a 1-parameter subgroup of isometries. It is a general fact for Riemannian homogeneous spaces that the map $X \mapsto X^\dagger$ is a linear map satisfying that

$$(6) \quad [X^\dagger, Y^\dagger] = -[X, Y]^\dagger.$$

Moreover, for each $p \in N$, the linear map

$$\mathfrak{n}_p \rightarrow T_p N, \quad X \mapsto X^\dagger(p)$$

yields an isomorphism. We denote the converse correspondence by $T_p N \ni V \mapsto \tilde{V} \in \mathfrak{n}_p$.

The following lemma is a fundamental fact on symmetric space, but will be a key in our argument.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose N is a Riemannian symmetric space and fix arbitrary point $p \in N$. We denote the Levi-Civita connection of N by $\bar{\nabla}$.*

- (i) *If $X \in \mathfrak{k}_p$ then $X^\dagger(p) = 0$, and $\bar{\nabla}_V X^\dagger(p)$ corresponds to $[X, \tilde{V}] \in \mathfrak{n}_p$ for any $V \in T_p N$.*
- (ii) *If $X \in \mathfrak{n}_p$ then $\bar{\nabla} X^\dagger(p) = 0$.*

Proof. We give a proof for the sake of convenience of the reader.

(i) If $X \in \mathfrak{k}_p$, then we have $\exp(tX) \in K_p$. Thus, $X^\dagger(p) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \exp(tX)p \right|_{t=0} = \left. \frac{d}{dt} p \right|_{t=0} = 0$ since K_p is the isotropy subgroup at p . Moreover, since $V_p = \tilde{V}_p^\dagger$, we have

$$\bar{\nabla}_V X^\dagger(p) = \bar{\nabla}_{\tilde{V}^\dagger} X^\dagger(p) = [\tilde{V}^\dagger, X^\dagger](p) = [X, \tilde{V}]^\dagger(p)$$

where we used $X^\dagger(p) = 0$ and (6). Since $[X, \tilde{V}] \in \mathfrak{n}_p$ by (5), this shows that $\bar{\nabla}_V X^\dagger(p)$ corresponds to $[X, \tilde{V}]$ via the canonical identification $T_p N \simeq \mathfrak{n}_p$.

(ii) By (i) and the bracket relation (5), we have

$$(7) \quad [Y, Z]^\dagger(p) = 0 \quad \text{for any } Y, Z \in \mathfrak{n}_p$$

since $[Y, Z] \in \mathfrak{k}_p$. On the other hand, since X^\dagger is a Killing vector field on N , we have

$$X^\dagger \langle y, z \rangle = \langle [X^\dagger, y], z \rangle + \langle y, [X^\dagger, z] \rangle$$

for any vector fields y, z on N . Thus, the Koszul formula and (6) show that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle \bar{\nabla}_{X^\dagger} Y^\dagger, Z^\dagger \rangle &= X^\dagger \langle Y^\dagger, Z^\dagger \rangle + Y^\dagger \langle X^\dagger, Z^\dagger \rangle - Z^\dagger \langle X^\dagger, Y^\dagger \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle [X^\dagger, Y^\dagger], Z^\dagger \rangle - \langle [X^\dagger, Z^\dagger], Y^\dagger \rangle - \langle [Y^\dagger, Z^\dagger], X^\dagger \rangle \\ &= \langle [X^\dagger, Y^\dagger], Z^\dagger \rangle + \langle [X^\dagger, Z^\dagger], Y^\dagger \rangle + \langle [Y^\dagger, Z^\dagger], X^\dagger \rangle \\ &= -\langle [X, Y]^\dagger, Z^\dagger \rangle - \langle [X, Z]^\dagger, Y^\dagger \rangle - \langle [Y, Z]^\dagger, X^\dagger \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for any $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{g}$. In particular, by (7), we obtain $\langle \overline{\nabla}_{X^\dagger} Y^\dagger, Z^\dagger \rangle(p) = 0$ for any $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{n}_p$. Since \mathfrak{n}_p is isomorphic to $T_p N$ via the map $X \mapsto X^\dagger(p)$, this shows that $\overline{\nabla} Y^\dagger(p) = 0$. Because $Y \in \mathfrak{n}_p$ is arbitrary, this proves the second assertion. \square

A Riemannian symmetric space N is said to be *semi-simple* if the identity component of the isometry group $G = I_0(N)$ is a semi-simple Lie group. In the following, we assume $N = G/K_p$ is a semi-simple RSS. Note that this assumption is not restrictive. In fact, it is known that any simply-connected RSS is decomposed into a product of Euclidean space and a semi-simple RSS. Moreover, any semi-simple RSS is an Einstein manifold, and if furthermore G is compact, then N has positive Ricci curvature. We remark that the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{n+k} is not a semi-simple RSS and somehow a special case. We will discuss the case when $N = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ in Appendix.

When G is semi-simple, then there is a canonical bilinear form \mathbf{B} on the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G , called the *Killing form*. It is known that \mathbf{B} is non-degenerate and invariant under any Lie algebra automorphism on \mathfrak{g} . Moreover, if G is compact, then \mathbf{B} is negative-definite. Thus, if this is the case, we can define a positive-definite inner product on \mathfrak{g} by

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} := -\mathbf{B}(X, Y).$$

Actually, this inner product induces the canonical G -invariant Riemannian metric on a compact semi-simple symmetric space $N = G/K_p$. More precisely, the restriction of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ to the subspace \mathfrak{n}_p defines an $\text{Ad}(K_p)$ -invariant inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{n}_p}$ on \mathfrak{n}_p . Then, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{n}_p}$ extends to the G -invariant Riemannian metric on $N = G/K_p$ by the left G -action. In particular, $(\mathfrak{n}_p, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{n}_p})$ and $(T_p N, g_p)$ are isometric by the canonical isomorphism $\mathfrak{n}_p \simeq T_p N$.

We use the following simple fact for the canonical inner product:

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose G is compact and semi-simple. Then, the canonical decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}_p \oplus \mathfrak{n}_p$ is an orthogonal decomposition w.r.t. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ for every $p \in N$.*

Proof. Take arbitrary $X \in \mathfrak{k}_p$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{n}_p$. Since the Killing form is invariant for any automorphism on the Lie algebra, we have

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = -\mathbf{B}(X, Y) = -\mathbf{B}(d\sigma_p X, d\sigma_p Y) = \mathbf{B}(X, Y) = -\langle X, Y \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$$

and hence, $\langle X, Y \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = 0$. \square

Remark 2.6. When G is non-compact, one can define a positive-definite inner product on \mathfrak{g} by $\langle X, Y \rangle'_{\mathfrak{g}} := -\mathbf{B}(X, \sigma_o Y)$, where $\sigma_o : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ is the Cartan involution at a fixed point $o \in N$. Actually, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle'_{\mathfrak{g}}$ induces the canonical G -invariant Riemannian metric on N . However, we remark that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle'_{\mathfrak{g}}$ depends on the fixed point $o \in N$ and because of this, the canonical decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}_p \oplus \mathfrak{n}_p$ at $p \in N$ may not be orthogonal w.r.t. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle'_{\mathfrak{g}}$, although the decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}_o \oplus \mathfrak{n}_o$ at o is orthogonal. Lemma 2.5 is crucial in our argument, and our computations given in Section 3 and 4 does not work if we choose $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle'_{\mathfrak{g}}$ as the inner product on \mathfrak{g} when G is non-compact.

3. TRACE FORMULA I

Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian manifold and $f : \Sigma^{n-1} \rightarrow M^n$ an isometric immersion of closed manifold Σ^{n-1} . Throughout this section, we suppose that f has *trivial normal bundle* (i.e Σ is *two-sided* if f is an embedding) so that there is a smooth unit normal vector field ν along Σ . In this section, we provide a trace formula for a quadratic form by extending the method considered in [1, Proposition 1], and give a simple application.

Suppose that M^n is isometrically immersed into a compact semi-simple symmetric space $N^{n+k} = G/K$ via the map $F : M \rightarrow N$. Then, Σ is isometrically immersed into N by the map $F \circ f : \Sigma \rightarrow N$. We consider the following map:

$$\Psi : \Gamma(T\Sigma) \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \Gamma(\nu\Sigma), \quad \Psi(T, X) = \psi_{T, X} \nu,$$

where

$$\psi_{T, X}(p) := \langle T, X^\dagger \rangle_{F \circ f(p)}.$$

Also, we consider a quadratic form on \mathfrak{g} defined by

$$r_T(X, Y) := Q(\psi_{T, X}, \psi_{T, Y}).$$

We shall compute the trace of r_T over \mathfrak{g} with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ defined by the negative Killing form. We put

$$r_{T,p}(X, Y) := \langle \mathcal{J}(\psi_{T,X}), \psi_{T,Y} \rangle(p)$$

for $p \in \Sigma$ so that

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} r_T = - \int_{\Sigma} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} r_{T,p} d\mu_{\Sigma}.$$

In the following, we abbreviate the fixed subscript T .

We use the following notations:

- $\bar{\nabla}, \nabla^M, \nabla$: the Levi-Civita connections of N, M and Σ , respectively.
- \bar{R}, R^M, R , the curvature tensors of $\bar{\nabla}, \nabla^M$ and ∇ , respectively. Note that we use the following definition of the curvature tensor (the sign is different from [1]):

$$\bar{R}(X, Y)Z := \bar{\nabla}_X \bar{\nabla}_Y Z - \bar{\nabla}_Y \bar{\nabla}_X Z - \bar{\nabla}_{[X, Y]} Z.$$

- $\bar{\mathrm{Ric}}, \mathrm{Ric}^M$: the Ricci tensor of $\bar{\nabla}$ and ∇^M , respectively.
- A, B : the second fundamental forms of $\Sigma \rightarrow M$ and $M \rightarrow N$, respectively.
- For a fixed point $p \in \Sigma$, we take a geodesic normal coordinate around p in Σ , and we denote the coordinate basis by $\{\partial_{\mu}\}_{\mu=1}^{n-1}$.

In this notation, we have the following fundamental formulas.

- (Gauss equation) For any $X, Y, Z, W \in T_p \Sigma$, we have

$$\langle R^M(X, Y)Z, W \rangle = \langle R(X, Y)Z, W \rangle + \langle A(X, Z), A(Y, W) \rangle - \langle A(X, W), A(Y, Z) \rangle.$$

Gauss equation for the isometric immersion $M \rightarrow N$ is given as well.

- (Codazzi equation) For any $X, Y, Z \in T_p \Sigma$, we have

$$(R^M(X, Y)Z)^{\perp} = (\nabla_X^{\perp} A)(Y, Z) - (\nabla_Y^{\perp} A)(X, Z),$$

where ∇^{\perp} is the normal connection defined by $\nabla_X^{\perp} \xi := (\nabla_X^M \xi)^{\perp}$ for a normal vector field ξ along Σ in M and $(\nabla_X^{\perp} A)(Y, Z) = \nabla_X^{\perp}(A(Y, Z)) - A(\nabla_X Y, Z) - A(Y, \nabla_X Z)$.

3.1. Trace formula. We first prove the following general formula.

Lemma 3.1. *Let M^n be a Riemannian manifold and $\Sigma^{n-1} \rightarrow M^n$ a minimal immersion of a closed manifold Σ^{n-1} . For any tangent vector field T on Σ , we have*

$$(8) \quad \frac{1}{2} \Delta |T|^2 - |\nabla T|^2 = -(\Delta_1 T^b)(T) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R^M(T, \partial_{\mu}) \partial_{\mu}, T \rangle - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_{\mu}, T)|^2,$$

where $T^b = \langle T, \cdot \rangle|_{\Sigma}$ and Δ_1 is the Hodge Laplacian action on $\Omega^1(\Sigma)$ the space of 1-forms on Σ .

Proof. Fix arbitrary point $p \in \Sigma$ and we take a geodesic normal coordinate in Σ . By the Bochner-Weitzenböck formula and the Gauss equation for minimal immersion $\Sigma \rightarrow M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \Delta |T|^2 - |\nabla T|^2 &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nabla_{\partial_{\mu}} \nabla_{\partial_{\mu}} T, T \rangle(p) \\ &= -(\Delta_1 T^b)(T) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R(T, \partial_{\mu}) \partial_{\mu}, T \rangle \\ &= -(\Delta_1 T^b)(T) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R^M(T, \partial_{\mu}) \partial_{\mu}, T \rangle - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_{\mu}, T)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the formula. □

Next, we compute the trace of r_p for a fixed point $p \in \Sigma$.

Lemma 3.2.

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} r_p &= -(\Delta_1 T^b)(T) - 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_{\mu}, T)|^2 + |A|^2 |T|^2 + \mathrm{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) |T|^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |B(\partial_{\mu}, T)|^2 + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R^M(T, \partial_{\mu}) \partial_{\mu}, T \rangle - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{R}(T, \partial_{\mu}) \partial_{\mu}, T \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since the trace is independent of the choice of orthonormal basis, we shall take a preferred orthonormal basis of \mathfrak{g} . We put $d = \dim \mathfrak{g}$. By Lemma 2.5, the canonical decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}_p \oplus \mathfrak{n}_p$ is orthogonal, and hence, we can take an orthonormal basis $\{X_1, \dots, X_{d-(n+k)}, Y_1, \dots, Y_{n+k}\}$ of \mathfrak{g} so that $\{X_1, \dots, X_{d-(n+k)}\}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathfrak{k}_p and $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_{n+k}\}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathfrak{n}_p . Since $X^\dagger(p) = 0$ by Lemma 2.4, we see $r_p(X_i, X_i) = 0$ for any $i = 1, \dots, d - (n+k)$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} r_p = \sum_{i=1}^{n+k} r_p(Y_i, Y_i)(p) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+k} \left(\Delta \psi_{Y_i} \cdot \psi_{Y_i}(p) + (\mathrm{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2) \psi_{Y_i}^2(p) \right).$$

Since the linear isomorphism $\mathfrak{n}_p \simeq T_p N$ is isometric, $\{Y_i^\dagger(p)\}_{i=1}^{n+k}$ becomes an orthonormal basis of $T_p N$. Therefore, we see

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+k} \psi_{Y_i}^2(p) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+k} \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle^2(p) = |T|^2.$$

In the following computations, we take a geodesic normal coordinate of the hypersurface Σ around p . By Lemma 2.4, we have $\bar{\nabla} Y_i^\dagger(p) = 0$, and hence, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \psi_{Y_i} \cdot \psi_{Y_i}(p) &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \partial_\mu \partial_\mu \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) \cdot \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) \\ (10) \quad &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) \cdot \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle T, \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) \cdot \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) \end{aligned}$$

Because $\{Y_i^\dagger(p)\}_{i=1}^{n+k}$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_p N$, the first term in (10) is computed by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n+k} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) \cdot \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T, T \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \Delta |T|^2 - |\nabla T|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |B(\partial_\mu, T)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the relation $\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T = \nabla_{\partial_\mu} T + A(\partial_\mu, T) + B(\partial_\mu, T)$. Thus, by using (8), the last equation becomes

$$-(\Delta_1 T^b)(T) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R^M(T, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle - 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |B(\partial_\mu, T)|^2.$$

Next, we consider the second term of (10). Since Y^\dagger is a Killing vector field on N , we have $(\bar{\nabla}^2 Y^\dagger)(Z, W) = -\bar{R}(Y^\dagger, Z)W$ for any $Z, W \in T_p N$. Combining this with $\bar{\nabla} Y_i^\dagger(p) = 0$, we have

$$(11) \quad (\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} Y_i^\dagger)(p) = (\bar{\nabla}^2 Y_i^\dagger)(\partial_\mu, \partial_\mu)(p) = -\bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu.$$

Therefore, the second term of (10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n+k} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle T, \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) \cdot \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+k} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} -\langle T, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \rangle(p) \cdot \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle(p) \\ &= - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{R}(T, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these to (10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \psi_{Y_i} \cdot \psi_{Y_i}(p) &= -(\Delta_1 T^b)(T) - 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |B(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R^M(T, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{R}(T, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the desired formula. \square

If we choose $T = \omega^\sharp$ the metric dual of a harmonic 1-form ω on Σ , then we have $\Delta_1 T^\flat = \Delta_1 \omega = 0$ and hence, by (9), we obtain

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} r_{\omega^\sharp} &= \int_{\Sigma} 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp)|^2 - |A|^2 |\omega|^2 - \mathrm{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) |\omega|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(|B(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp)|^2 - \langle R^M(\omega^\sharp, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle + \langle \bar{R}(\omega^\sharp, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle \right) d\mu_{\Sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

If furthermore, Σ is a surface, we obtain the following which extends the formula given in [1, Proposition 1].

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose M^3 is a 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold isometrically immersed into a compact semi-simple symmetric space $N = G/K$. Let Σ be a closed two-sided minimal surface in M^3 . Then, for any harmonic 1-form ω on Σ , we have*

$$(13) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} r_{\omega^\sharp} = \int_{\Sigma} -\mathrm{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) |\omega|^2 + \sum_{\mu=1}^2 \left(2|B(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp)|^2 - \langle B(\partial_\mu, \partial_\mu), B(\omega^\sharp, \omega^\sharp) \rangle \right) d\mu_{\Sigma}.$$

$$(14) \quad = \int_{\Sigma} \sum_{\mu=1}^2 |B(e_\mu, \omega^\sharp)|^2 - \frac{\mathrm{scl}(M)}{2} |\omega|^2 + \sum_{\mu=1}^2 \langle \bar{R}(\omega^\sharp, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle d\mu_{\Sigma},$$

where $\mathrm{scl}(M)$ is the scalar curvature of M .

Proof. We may assume $\{\partial_1, \partial_2\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_p \Sigma$ satisfying that $A(\partial_i, \partial_j) = \lambda_i \delta_{ij}$, where λ_1 and λ_2 are eigenvalues of A . Since Σ is a minimal surface, we have $\lambda = \lambda_1 = -\lambda_2$, and hence, we see

$$2 \sum_{\mu=1}^2 |A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp)|^2 - |A|^2 |\omega|^2 = 0.$$

Substituting this to (12) and by using the Gauss equation for $M \rightarrow N$, we obtain (13). Moreover, the Gauss equation for the minimal surface $\Sigma \rightarrow M^3$ shows that (see also [1])

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R^M(\omega^\sharp, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle + \mathrm{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) |\omega|^2 = \frac{\mathrm{scl}(M)}{2} |\omega|^2.$$

Substituting this to (12), we obtain (14). \square

3.2. An application. We give a simple application of the trace formula (13). We take the complex projective space $\mathbb{C}P^2$ as a symmetric space N , and consider a real hypersurface M^3 in $\mathbb{C}P^2$. Note that, as a symmetric space, $\mathbb{C}P^2$ is isometric to $G/K = SU(3)/S(U(1) \times U(2))$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the holomorphic sectional curvature of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ is equal to 4.

Let S_r^3 be the geodesic hypersphere of geodesic radius r in $\mathbb{C}P^2(4)$. Note that $r \in (0, \pi/2)$ (where $\pi/2$ is equal to the injectivity radius of $\mathbb{C}P^m(4)$) and S_r coincides with an orbit of the isotropy subgroup $S(U(1) \times U(2))$. Moreover, S_r is diffeomorphic to the 3-dimensional sphere S^3 , and S_r equipped with the induced metric from $\mathbb{C}P^2(4)$ is isometric to a *Berger sphere*.

It is known that S_r is an η -umbilical hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}P^2(4)$. Namely, for a unit normal vector field ν_S of S_r in $\mathbb{C}P^2(4)$, we define a 1-form η on S_r by $\eta(X) := -\langle J\nu_S, X \rangle$, where J is the complex structure on $\mathbb{C}P^2$, and then the second fundamental form of S_r is given by

$$(15) \quad B(X, Y) = a\langle X, Y \rangle + b\eta(X)\eta(Y),$$

with $a = \cot r$ and $b = -\tan r$. We refer to [4] for details of the above facts.

By the Gauss equation and (15), it turns out that the Ricci tensor of $M = S_r^3$ is given by (see also [4, p.359])

$$(16) \quad \mathrm{Ric}^M(X, Y) = (2a^2 + 4)\langle X, Y \rangle - 4\eta(X)\eta(Y)$$

for any $X, Y \in T_p S_r$. If X is a unit tangent vector, then we see

$$\mathrm{Ric}^M(X, X) = (2a^2 + 4) - 4(1 - |X_h|^2) = 2a^2 + 4|X_h|^2 > 0,$$

where we set $X = X_h - \eta(X)J\nu_S$. Therefore, any geodesic hypersphere S_r has positive Ricci curvature. Moreover, if $r \neq r'$, then S_r and $S_{r'}$ are neither isometric nor homothetic.

Now, let us consider a closed minimal surface Σ in S_r^3 . We remark that Torralbo [18] proved that there exists an embedded closed minimal surface of arbitrary genus in the Berger sphere. Moreover, any embedded surface in S_r^3 is two-sided and any closed minimal surface embedded in S_r^3 is unstable since S_r^3 is simply-connected and has positive Ricci curvature. Applying Proposition 3.3, we obtain the following result:

Theorem 3.4. *Let S_r^3 be the geodesic hypersphere of radius $r \in (0, \pi/2)$ in $\mathbb{C}P^2(4)$. If the geodesic radius r satisfies*

$$0 < \tan r < \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{3}} = 1.652 \dots,$$

then, it holds that

$$\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{1}{8}b_1(\Sigma)$$

for any closed minimal surface Σ embedded in S_r^3 .

Proof. We take $M = S_r^3$ and compute the trace formula (13) given in Proposition 3.3.

For a unit tangent vector $T \in T_p\Sigma$, we consider the following quantity:

$$\beta(T) := -\text{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) + \sum_{\mu=1}^2 \left(2|B(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 - \langle B(\partial_\mu, \partial_\mu), B(T, T) \rangle \right)$$

By (13), if $\beta(T) < 0$ for any unit vector T and $p \in \Sigma$, then we have $\text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp} < 0$. Thus, the result follows from Proposition 2.3-(i) since $\dim_{\mathfrak{g}} = \dim SU(3) = 8$.

By using (15), we have

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^2 \left(2|B(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 - \langle B(\partial_\mu, \partial_\mu), B(T, T) \rangle \right) = 1 - \eta(\nu)^2 - b^2\eta(T)^2\eta(\nu)^2 + (b^2 - 2)\eta(T)^2.$$

where we used the relation $\sum_{\mu=1}^2 \eta(\partial_\mu)^2 = 1 - \eta(\nu)^2$, $ab = -1$ and $|T|^2 = 1$. Moreover, by (16), we have

$$\text{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) = (2a^2 + 4) - 4\eta(\nu)^2.$$

Therefore, we see

$$\beta(T) = -2a^2 - 3(1 - \eta(\nu)^2) - b^2\eta(T)^2\eta(\nu)^2 + (b^2 - 2)\eta(T)^2.$$

Since $\eta(T)^2 = \langle J\nu_S, T \rangle^2 \leq |J\nu_S|^2|T|^2 \leq 1$ for any unit vector T , we see

$$\beta(T) \leq -2a^2 + b^2 - 2 = -2\cot^2 r + \tan^2 r - 2.$$

Moreover, the inequality $-2\cot^2 r + \tan^2 r - 2 < 0$ satisfies if $0 < \tan^2 r < 1 + \sqrt{3}$. Thus, if this is the case, we have $\beta(T) < 0$ for any $T \in T_p\Sigma$ and $p \in \Sigma$, and the desired conclusion holds. \square

Remark 3.5. By using the another trace formula (33) given in the next section, we obtain a similar result for a geodesic hypersphere S_r^{2m-1} in $\mathbb{C}P^m(4)$ of $m \geq 3$. More precisely, one can find some positive constant c_m depending only on m such that if the geodesic radius r satisfies $0 < \tan r < c_m$, then the inequality

$$\text{index}(\Sigma) > \frac{1}{d(d-1)}b_1(\Sigma)$$

holds for any closed minimal hypersurface in S_r^{2m-1} , where $d = \dim SU(m) = m^2 - 1$.

4. TRACE FORMULA II

Continued from the previous section, let $N^{n+k} = G/K$ be a compact semi-simple RSS and suppose that a Riemannian manifold M^n is isometrically immersed into N^{n+k} via the map $F : M \rightarrow N$. Note that we can assume that $M = N$ and F is the identity map. Let $f : \Sigma^{n-1} \rightarrow M^n$ be a minimal immersion, and throughout this section, we suppose that f has a trivial normal bundle. In this section, we extend the trace formula [1, Proposition 2] to compact semi-simple symmetric spaces.

We denote the \mathbb{R} -linear space of exterior algebra of second degree on the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} by $\wedge^2\mathfrak{g}$, namely, $\wedge^2\mathfrak{g}$ is a vector space spanned by elements of the form $X \wedge Y$ for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. For an element $v \in \wedge^2\mathfrak{g}$, we define a smooth function on Σ as follows: By using the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on \mathfrak{g} , we define a positive-definite inner product on $\wedge^2\mathfrak{g}$ by

$$\langle X \wedge Y, Z \wedge W \rangle_{\wedge^2\mathfrak{g}} := \langle X, Z \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} \langle Y, W \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} - \langle X, W \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} \langle Y, Z \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$$

for elements $X \wedge Y, Z \wedge W \in \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$ and we linearly extend it to whole $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$.

Let $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a basis of \mathfrak{g} . Then the associated basis of $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$ is given by $\{\theta_i \wedge \theta_j\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq d}$. For each $p \in \Sigma$, we define a linear map $\Pi : \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \Gamma(\wedge^2 TN)$ by

$$\Pi(\theta_i \wedge \theta_j)(p) = \theta_i^\dagger(p) \wedge \theta_j^\dagger(p)$$

and we linearly extend the map to whole $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$. Note that the definition of Π does not depend on the choice of basis of \mathfrak{g} .

Now, we consider a minimal immersion $f : \Sigma^{n-1} \rightarrow M^n$ with trivial normal bundle. We fix a unit normal vector field ν along f . Then, we consider a map

$$\Phi : \Gamma(T\Sigma) \times \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \Gamma(\nu\Sigma), \quad \Phi(T, v) := \varphi_{T, v} \cdot \nu,$$

where $\varphi_{T, v} \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ is defined by

$$(17) \quad \varphi_{T, v} = \langle \nu \wedge T, \Pi(v) \rangle.$$

Also, we consider the quadratic form on $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$ by

$$q_T(v, w) := Q(\varphi_{T, v}, \varphi_{T, w})$$

for $T \in \Gamma(T\Sigma)$. The aim of this section is to compute the trace of q_T over $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$.

Remark 4.1. If $M = N$ (i.e. $F = id_M$), it turns out that the test function (17) coincides with the one considered in [8]. See Appendix A.2 for the detail.

For each $p \in \Sigma$, we define a quadratic form $q_{T, p}$ on $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$ by

$$q_{T, p}(v, w) := \langle \mathcal{J}(\varphi_{T, v}), \varphi_{T, w} \rangle(p)$$

so that

$$(18) \quad \text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_T = - \int_{\Sigma} \text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{T, p} d\mu_{\Sigma}.$$

In the following, we abbreviate the fixed index T , e.g. $q_{\theta_i} = q_{T, \theta_i}$ etc.

Proposition 4.2. *For any smooth tangent vector field T of Σ , we have*

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{T, p} &= -(\Delta_1 T^\flat)(T) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(|B(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 + |B(\partial_\mu, \nu)|^2 |T|^2 \right) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R^M(T, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle + \text{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) |T|^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(\langle \bar{R}(T, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle + \langle \bar{R}(\nu, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \nu \rangle |T|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $T^\flat := \langle T, \cdot \rangle|_{\Sigma}$, Δ_1 is the Hodge Laplacian acting on $\Omega^1(\Sigma)$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.5, the decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}_p \oplus \mathfrak{n}_p$ is orthogonal w.r.t. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$, and hence, we can take an orthonormal basis $\{X_1, \dots, X_{d-(n+k)}, Y_1, \dots, Y_{n+k}\}$ of \mathfrak{g} so that $\{X_1, \dots, X_{d-(n+k)}\}$ is a basis of \mathfrak{k}_p and $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_{n+k}\}$ is a basis of \mathfrak{n}_p . Then, the orthonormal basis of $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$ is given by $X_l \wedge X_m, X_l \wedge Y_i, Y_i \wedge Y_j$ for $1 \leq l < m \leq d - (n+k)$ and $1 \leq i < j \leq n+k$. Since $X_l^\dagger(p) = 0$ for any $l = 1, \dots, d - (n+k)$ by Lemma 2.4, we see

$$\varphi_{X_l \wedge X_m}(p) = \varphi_{X_l \wedge Y_i}(p) = 0$$

for any $l, m = 1, \dots, d - (n+k)$ and $i = 1, \dots, n+k$. In particular, we have

$$(20) \quad \text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_p = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+k} q_p(Y_i \wedge Y_j, Y_i \wedge Y_j)$$

Recall that, under the identification $\mathfrak{n}_p \simeq T_p N$, $\{Y_1^\dagger(p), \dots, Y_{n+k}^\dagger(p)\}$ becomes an orthonormal basis of $T_p N$. We also take a geodesic normal coordinate of the hypersurface Σ around p , and denote the coordinate basis by $\{\partial_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^{n-1}$.

By (20), we have

$$(21) \quad \text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_p = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+k} \Delta \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j} \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) + (\text{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2) \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}^2(p).$$

Note that we have

$$(22) \quad \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+k} \langle Z \wedge W, Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) = \langle Z, \nu \rangle \langle W, T \rangle - \langle Z, T \rangle \langle W, \nu \rangle$$

for any $Z, W \in T_p N$. Indeed, we see

$$(23) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle Z \wedge W, Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j} \\ &= \left(\langle Z, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle W, Y_j^\dagger \rangle - \langle Z, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle W, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \right) \left(\langle \nu, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_j^\dagger \rangle - \langle \nu, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \right) \\ &= \langle Z, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle W, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle \nu, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_j^\dagger \rangle - \langle Z, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle W, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle \nu, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \\ &\quad - \langle Z, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle W, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle \nu, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_j^\dagger \rangle + \langle Z, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle W, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle \nu, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$(24) \quad \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+k} \langle Z \wedge W, Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n+k} \sum_{j=1}^{n+k} \langle Z \wedge W, Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p)$$

since $\langle Z \wedge W, Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j} = \langle Z \wedge W, Y_j^\dagger \wedge Y_i^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_j \wedge Y_i}$ and $Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_i^\dagger = 0$. Substituting (23) to (24) and by using the fact that $\{Y_i^\dagger(p)\}_i$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_p N$, we obtain (22).

In particular, in the last term of (21), we have

$$(25) \quad \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+k} \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}^2 = |\nu|^2 |T|^2 - \langle \nu, T \rangle^2 = |T|^2$$

since $|\nu|^2 = 1$ and $\langle \nu, T \rangle = 0$.

We shall consider the first term of the RHS of (21). Since $\bar{\nabla} Y_i^\dagger(p) = 0$ for any i by Lemma 2.4, we have $\bar{\nabla}(Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger)(p) = \bar{\nabla} Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger(p) + Y_i^\dagger \wedge \bar{\nabla} Y_j^\dagger(p) = 0$. Therefore, we see

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} & \Delta \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) \\ &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \partial_\mu \partial_\mu \langle \nu \wedge T, Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle(p) \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) \\ &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (\nu \wedge T), Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle(p) \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nu \wedge T, \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger) \rangle(p) \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p), \end{aligned}$$

We consider the first term of (26). We have

$$(27) \quad \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (\nu \wedge T) = (\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu) \wedge T + 2 \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu \wedge \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T + \nu \wedge (\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T),$$

and hence, by (22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+k} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (\nu \wedge T), Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) \\ &= \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \nu \rangle |T|^2 + 2 \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, T \rangle^2 + \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T, T \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

where we used the facts $\langle \nu, T \rangle = 0$ and $|\nu|^2 = 1$ along Σ which also imply $\langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, T \rangle = -\langle \nu, \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \nu \rangle = 0$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \nu \rangle |T|^2 &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} -|\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu|^2 |T|^2 \quad (\text{since } \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \nu \rangle = 0 \text{ along } \Sigma) \\
&= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} (-|\nabla_{\partial_\mu}^M \nu|^2 - |B(\partial_\mu, \nu)|^2) |T|^2 = -|A|^2 |T|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |B(\partial_\mu, \nu)|^2 |T|^2. \\
2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, T \rangle^2 &= 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nabla_{\partial_\mu}^M \nu, T \rangle^2 = 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_\mu, T)|^2. \\
\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T, T \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \Delta |T|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} T|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \Delta |T|^2 - |\nabla T|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |B(\partial_\mu, T)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up these, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(28) \quad & \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (\nu \wedge T), Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \Delta |T|^2 - |\nabla T|^2 + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 - |A|^2 |T|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} (|B(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 + |B(\partial_\mu, \nu)|^2 |T|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider the second term of (26). Since $\bar{\nabla} Y_i^\dagger(p) = 0$, we have

$$\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger)(p) = \{(\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} Y_i^\dagger) \wedge Y_j^\dagger + Y_i^\dagger \wedge (\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} Y_j^\dagger)\}(p).$$

Moreover, by (11), we obtain

$$(29) \quad \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger)(p) = -(\bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu) \wedge Y_j^\dagger(p) + (\bar{R}(Y_j^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu) \wedge Y_i^\dagger(p).$$

Since $\varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j} = -\varphi_{Y_j \wedge Y_i}$, the second term of (26) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
(30) \quad & \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+k} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nu \wedge T, \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger) \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) \\
&= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+k} \sum_{j=1}^{n+k} -\langle \nu \wedge T, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \nu \wedge T, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle &= \langle \nu, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \rangle \langle T, Y_j^\dagger \rangle - \langle T, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \rangle \langle \nu, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \\
\varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j} &= \langle \nu, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_j^\dagger \rangle - \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle \nu, Y_j^\dagger \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\langle \nu \wedge T, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \wedge Y_j^\dagger \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j} \\
&= -\langle \nu, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \rangle \langle \nu, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_j^\dagger \rangle^2 + \langle \nu, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \rangle \langle \nu, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \\
& \quad + \langle T, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \rangle \langle \nu, Y_i^\dagger \rangle \langle \nu, Y_j^\dagger \rangle \langle T, Y_j^\dagger \rangle - \langle T, \bar{R}(Y_i^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu \rangle \langle \nu, Y_j^\dagger \rangle^2 \langle T, Y_i^\dagger \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up for $i, j = 1, \dots, n+k$, (30) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(31) \quad & \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n+k} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nu \wedge T, \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (Y_i^\dagger \wedge Y_j^\dagger) \rangle \cdot \varphi_{Y_i \wedge Y_j}(p) \\
&= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(-\langle \bar{R}(\nu, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \nu \rangle |T|^2 - \langle \bar{R}(T, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle \right).
\end{aligned}$$

since $\langle T, \nu \rangle = 0$ and $|\nu|^2 = 1$.

By (21), (25), (26), (28) and (31), we obtain

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_p &= \frac{1}{2} \Delta |T|^2 - |\nabla T|^2 + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(|B(\partial_\mu, T)|^2 + |B(\partial_\mu, \nu)|^2 |T|^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(\langle \bar{R}(T, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle + \langle \bar{R}(\nu, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \nu \rangle |T|^2 \right) + \mathrm{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) |T|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, substituting the identity (8) to (32), the term $\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |A(\partial_\mu, T)|^2$ in (32) is cancelled out, and we obtain the desired formula (19). \square

Now, we consider a special situation. Let ω be a harmonic 1-form on Σ . We take $T = \omega^\sharp$ the metric dual of ω . Then, we have $\Delta_1 T^b = \Delta_1 \omega = 0$, and hence, by (18)–(19), we obtain the following trace formula.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose a Riemannian manifold M^n is isometrically immersed into a compact semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space N^{n+k} , and $f : \Sigma^{n-1} \rightarrow M^n$ is a minimal immersion with trivial normal bundle. Then, we have*

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp} &= \int_{\Sigma} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(|B(e_\mu, \omega^\sharp)|^2 + |B(e_\mu, \nu)|^2 |\omega|^2 \right) - \left(\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R^M(\omega^\sharp, e_\mu) e_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle + \mathrm{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) |\omega|^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(\langle \bar{R}(\omega^\sharp, e_\mu) e_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle + \langle \bar{R}(\nu, e_\mu) e_\mu, \nu \rangle |\omega|^2 \right) d\mu_{\Sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

for any harmonic 1-form ω on Σ , where $\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^{n-1}$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_p \Sigma$.

By the Gauss equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(-\langle R^M(\omega^\sharp, e_\mu) e_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle + \langle \bar{R}(\omega^\sharp, e_\mu) e_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle \right) &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(|B(\omega^\sharp, e_\mu)|^2 - \langle B(\omega^\sharp, \omega^\sharp), B(e_\mu, e_\mu) \rangle \right), \\ -\mathrm{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{R}(\nu, e_\mu) e_\mu, \nu \rangle &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(|B(\nu, e_\mu)|^2 - \langle B(\nu, \nu), B(e_\mu, e_\mu) \rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the trace formula (33) is written by

$$(34) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp} &= \int_{\Sigma} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} 2 \left(|B(\omega^\sharp, e_\mu)|^2 + |B(\nu, e_\mu)|^2 |\omega|^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(\langle B(\omega^\sharp, \omega^\sharp), B(e_\mu, e_\mu) \rangle + \langle B(\nu, \nu), B(e_\mu, e_\mu) \rangle |\omega|^2 \right) d\mu_{\Sigma} \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we obtain the following consequence.

Proposition 4.4. *Let M be a totally geodesic submanifold (possibly $M = N$) in a compact semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space N , and $f : \Sigma^{n-1} \rightarrow M^n$ be a minimal immersion with trivial normal bundle. Then we have $\mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp} = 0$ for any harmonic 1-form ω on Σ .*

We remark that any complete totally geodesic submanifold in a symmetric space is also a symmetric space (but not necessarily semi-simple).

Combining this result with Proposition 2.3-(ii), we obtain the following theorem which has been proved in [8, Theorem A] (However, our approach is different from [8]).

Theorem 4.5 (Mendes-Radeschi [8]). *Let Σ be a closed, two-sided minimal hypersurface in a compact semi-simple symmetric space $N = G/K$ of $\dim G = d$. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{index}(\Sigma) + \mathrm{nullity}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{2}{d(d-1)} b_1(\Sigma).$$

Remark 4.6 (Comparison with the trace formula in \mathbb{R}^m). Under the same assumption given in Theorem 4.3, we further assume that the semi-simple compact RSS N is isometrically immersed into the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m via the map $G : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$. Namely, we suppose that we have the following isometric immersions:

$$\Sigma^{n-1} \xrightarrow{f} M^n \xrightarrow{F} N^{n+k} \xrightarrow{G} \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Note that, for a symmetric space N , there are some well-studied isometric immersions from N into \mathbb{R}^m (e.g. see [1, 5]). We denote the second fundamental form of three isometric immersions $F : M \rightarrow N$, $G \circ F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $G : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ by B , B' and B_N , respectively.

Since M^n is isometrically immersed into \mathbb{R}^m by the map $G \circ F$, we can apply the tracing method used in [1] to the map $G \circ F$, and then, we have the following trace formula (see (51) in Appendix):

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^m} \widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp} &= \int_{\Sigma} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} 2 \left(|B'(\omega^\sharp, e_\mu)|^2 + |B'(\nu, e_\mu)|^2 |\omega|^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(\langle B'(\omega^\sharp, \omega^\sharp), B'(e_\mu, e_\mu) \rangle + \langle B'(\nu, \nu), B'(e_\mu, e_\mu) \rangle |\omega|^2 \right) d\mu_{\Sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp}$ is a quadratic form on $\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^m$ considered in [1] (see Appendix for details). Notice that the right hand side is nothing but the replacing B with B' in (34). Since $B'(X, Y) = B(X, Y) + B_N(X, Y)$ for any $X, Y \in T_p M$, and $B(X, Y)$ is orthogonal to $B_N(X, Y)$, the formulas (34) and (35) show the following relation:

$$(36) \quad \mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^m} \widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp} + \int_{\Sigma} \beta_N \left(\frac{\omega^\sharp}{|\omega|}, \nu \right) \cdot |\omega|^2 d\mu_{\Sigma},$$

where we put

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_N(X, \nu) &:= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} 2 \left(|B_N(X, e_\mu)|^2 + |B_N(\nu, e_\mu)|^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(\langle B_N(X, X), B_N(e_\mu, e_\mu) \rangle + \langle B_N(\nu, \nu), B_N(e_\mu, e_\mu) \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

for a unit tangent vector $X \in T_p \Sigma$, and $\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^{n-1}$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_p \Sigma$.

We remark that, by the relation (36), if $\beta_N(X, \nu) < 0$ for any unit vector $X \in T_p \Sigma$ and $p \in \Sigma$, then it holds that $\mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^m} \widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp} < \mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp}$ for any non-trivial harmonic 1-form ω . Therefore, in this case, it is more reasonable to use $\mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^m} \widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp}$ rather than $\mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp}$ to show that the trace is negative (or non-positive) in order to apply Proposition 2.3. For example, if $G : S^{n+k}(r) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+k+1}$ is the canonical isometric embedding of the sphere of radius r , then it is easy to see that $\beta_N(X, \nu) = -\frac{2}{r^2}(n-2)$ and $\beta_N(X, \nu) < 0$ if $n \geq 3$. This means that if M^n is isometrically immersed into $N = S^{n+k}$, it seems better to consider $G \circ F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+k+1}$ and apply the method used in [1] instead of using our trace formula (33) for $F : M^n \rightarrow S^{n+k}$.

However, we may not expect such a situation for a general symmetric space N . Namely, there is a possibility that the opposite inequality holds; $\mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^m} \widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp} > \mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp}$. For example, by Proposition 4.4, when $M = N$ and F is the identity map, we always have $\mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp} = 0$ even if $\mathrm{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathbb{R}^m} \widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp} > 0$.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The aim of this section is to show the following result (Theorem 1.1).

Theorem 5.1. *Let Σ be a closed minimal hypersurface (not necessarily two-sided) in a compact semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space $M = G/K$. If Σ is unstable (i.e. $\mathrm{ind}(\Sigma) \geq 1$), then we have*

$$(37) \quad \mathrm{index}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{2}{d(d-1) + 2(2n-3)} b_1(\Sigma),$$

where $d = \dim G$ and $n = \dim M$.

The following proof is a refinement of the argument given by Ambrozio-Carlotto-Sharp [2] and Mendes-Radeschi [8]. We first prove Theorem 5.1 in the case when Σ is two-sided, and then, we shall deal with the one-sided case. Throughout this section, we suppose that M is a semi-simple compact Riemannian symmetric space, and by assuming $M = N$, we use the same notation given in the previous sections (e.g. $\nabla^M = \overline{\nabla}$, $R^M = \overline{R}$, etc). We begin with the following formula.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $M = N$ be a compact semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space and Σ be a two-sided minimal hypersurface in M . Fix arbitrary point $p \in \Sigma$. Then for any harmonic 1-form ω on Σ and any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{n}_p$, we have*

$$\mathcal{J}(\varphi_{\omega^\sharp, X \wedge Y})(p) = -2\langle A(\nabla_{(Y^\dagger)^\top} \omega^\sharp, (X^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle + 2\langle A(\nabla_{(X^\dagger)^\top} \omega^\sharp, (Y^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle,$$

where \top means the orthogonal projection to $T_p \Sigma$.

Remark 5.3. A similar formula was proved in [2, Proposition 3] when M is the flat torus.

To prove this, we shall compute $\mathcal{J}(\varphi_{\omega^\sharp, X \wedge Y}) = \Delta \varphi_{\omega^\sharp, X \wedge Y} + (\overline{\text{Ric}}(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2) \varphi_{\omega^\sharp, X \wedge Y}$ at the fixed point p . We denote $\varphi_{\omega^\sharp, X \wedge Y}$ by $\varphi_{X \wedge Y}$ for simplicity. We take the geodesic normal coordinate $\{\partial_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^{n-1}$ of Σ around $p \in \Sigma$. Then, for any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{n}_p$, we have $\overline{\nabla} X^\dagger(p) = \overline{\nabla} Y^\dagger(p) = 0$ by Lemma 2.4 and hence, we see

$$(38) \quad \Delta \varphi_{X \wedge Y}(p) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (\nu \wedge \omega^\sharp), X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger \rangle(p) + \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nu \wedge \omega^\sharp, \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger) \rangle(p).$$

Here, we note that

$$(39) \quad \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (\nu \wedge \omega^\sharp) = (\overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu) \wedge \omega^\sharp + 2 \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu \wedge \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp + \nu \wedge (\overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp).$$

Recall that any compact semi-simple RSS M is an Einstein manifold with positive Ricci curvature.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose $M = N$ is a compact semi-simple RSS with $\overline{\text{Ric}} = cg$ and ω is a harmonic 1-form on Σ . Then, we have*

$$(40) \quad \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle (\overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu) \wedge \omega^\sharp, X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger \rangle(p) = -|A|^2 \varphi_{X \wedge Y}.$$

$$(41) \quad \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} 2 \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu \wedge \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger \rangle(p) = -2 \langle A(\nabla_{(Y^\dagger)^\top} \omega^\sharp, (X^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle - 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle A(\partial_\mu, (X^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), Y^\dagger \rangle \\ + 2 \langle A(\nabla_{(X^\dagger)^\top} \omega^\sharp, (Y^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle + 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle A(\partial_\mu, (Y^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), X^\dagger \rangle.$$

$$(42) \quad \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nu \wedge (\overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp), X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger \rangle(p) = -\langle \overline{R}(Y^\dagger, \nu) \nu, \omega^\sharp \rangle \langle X^\dagger, \nu \rangle - 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle A(\partial_\mu, (Y^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), X^\dagger \rangle \\ + \langle \overline{R}(X^\dagger, \nu) \nu, \omega^\sharp \rangle \langle Y^\dagger, \nu \rangle + 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle A(\partial_\mu, (X^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), Y^\dagger \rangle \\ + c \cdot \varphi_{X \wedge Y}.$$

$$(43) \quad \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nu \wedge \omega^\sharp, \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger) \rangle(p) = -\langle \overline{R}(X^\dagger, \nu) \nu, \omega^\sharp \rangle \langle Y^\dagger, \nu \rangle \\ + \langle \overline{R}(Y^\dagger, \nu) \nu, \omega^\sharp \rangle \langle X^\dagger, \nu \rangle - 2c \cdot \varphi_{X \wedge Y}.$$

Proof. First, we shall show (40). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \partial_\xi \rangle &= \partial_\mu \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \partial_\xi \rangle - \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \partial_\xi \rangle \\ &= -\partial_\mu \langle A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi), \nu \rangle - \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \partial_\xi \rangle \\ &= -\langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi)), \nu \rangle - \langle A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi), \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu \rangle - \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \partial_\xi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi)$ is parallel to ν and $\langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \nu \rangle = 0$ along Σ , we have $\langle A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi), \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu \rangle = 0$. Moreover, we have $\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \partial_\xi(p) = A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi)(p)$ at the fixed point $p \in \Sigma$, and hence, $\langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \partial_\xi \rangle(p) = 0$. Thus, we see

$$\begin{aligned}
(44) \quad \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \partial_\xi \rangle(p) &= -\langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi)), \nu \rangle \\
&= -\langle (\nabla_{\partial_\mu}^\perp A)(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi), \nu \rangle \\
&= -\langle (\nabla_{\partial_\mu}^\perp A)(\partial_\xi, \partial_\mu), \nu \rangle \\
&= -\langle (\nabla_{\partial_\xi}^\perp A)(\partial_\mu, \partial_\mu), \nu \rangle - \langle (\bar{R}(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi) \partial_\mu)^\perp, \nu \rangle \\
&= -\langle (\nabla_{\partial_\xi}^\perp A)(\partial_\mu, \partial_\mu), \nu \rangle + \langle \bar{R}(\partial_\xi, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \nu \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where ∇^\perp is the normal connection and $(\nabla_X^\perp A)(Y, Z) = \nabla_X^\perp (A(Y, Z)) - A(\nabla_X Y, Z) - A(Y, \nabla_X Z)$, and we used the Codazzi equation in the fourth equality. Since Σ is a minimal hypersurface, we have

$$\sum_{\mu, \lambda=1}^{n-1} g^{\mu\lambda} \langle A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\lambda), \nu \rangle = 0$$

around the point p . Differentiating this equation in the direction of ∂_ξ , we see

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \partial_\xi \left(\sum_{\mu, \lambda=1}^{n-1} g^{\mu\lambda} \langle A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\lambda), \nu \rangle \right)(p) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \partial_\xi \langle A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\mu), \nu \rangle(p) \\
&= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nabla_{\partial_\xi}^\perp (A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\mu)), \nu \rangle(p) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle (\nabla_{\partial_\xi}^\perp A)(\partial_\mu, \partial_\mu), \nu \rangle(p)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\xi = 1, \dots, n-1$. Moreover, since M is Einstein, we have

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{R}(\partial_\xi, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \nu \rangle = \bar{\text{Ric}}(\partial_\xi, \nu) = c \langle \partial_\xi, \nu \rangle = 0$$

for any $\xi = 1, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, by (44), we obtain

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \partial_\xi \rangle(p) = 0 \quad \text{for any } \xi = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

In particular, $\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu(p)$ is proportional to ν . Since $\langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \nu \rangle = 0$ along Σ , we see

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, \nu \rangle(p) = -\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} |\bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu|^2 = -|A|^2$$

and this implies (40).

Next, we shall prove (41). Note that

$$(45) \quad 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu \wedge \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger \rangle = 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(\langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, X^\dagger \rangle \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, Y^\dagger \rangle - \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, Y^\dagger \rangle \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, X^\dagger \rangle \right).$$

Since ω is a closed 1-form, we have $\langle \nabla_T \omega^\sharp, U \rangle = \langle \nabla_U \omega^\sharp, T \rangle$ for any $T, U \in T_p \Sigma$. Thus, for any $X \in T_p M$, we see

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, X \rangle &= \langle \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, X^\top \rangle + \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, \nu \rangle \langle \nu, X \rangle \\
&= \langle \nabla_{X^\top} \omega^\sharp, \partial_\mu \rangle + \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), X \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu, X^\dagger \rangle \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, Y^\dagger \rangle(p) &= -\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle A(\partial_\mu, (X^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle \{ \langle \nabla_{(Y^\dagger)^\top} \omega^\sharp, \partial_\mu \rangle + \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), Y^\dagger \rangle \}(p) \\
&= -\langle A(\nabla_{(Y^\dagger)^\top} \omega^\sharp, (X^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle A(\partial_\mu, (X^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), Y^\dagger \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this to (45), we obtain (41).

We shall consider (42). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, \partial_\xi \rangle(p) &= \partial_\mu \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, \partial_\xi \rangle - \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \partial_\xi \rangle \\ &= \partial_\mu \langle \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, \partial_\xi \rangle - \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi) \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, \partial_\xi \rangle - \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), A(\partial_\mu, \partial_\xi) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (46) \quad \langle \nu \wedge \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger \rangle(p) &= \sum_{\xi=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, \partial_\xi \rangle \langle \nu \wedge \partial_\xi, X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\xi=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, \partial_\xi \rangle \left(\langle \nu, X^\dagger \rangle \langle \partial_\xi, Y^\dagger \rangle - \langle \nu, Y^\dagger \rangle \langle \partial_\xi, X^\dagger \rangle \right) \\ &= \left(\langle \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, (Y^\dagger)^\top \rangle - \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), A(\partial_\mu, (Y^\dagger)^\top) \rangle \right) \langle X^\dagger, \nu \rangle \\ &\quad - \left(\langle \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, (X^\dagger)^\top \rangle - \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), A(\partial_\mu, (X^\dagger)^\top) \rangle \right) \langle Y^\dagger, \nu \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have

$$(47) \quad \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), A(\partial_\mu, (Y^\dagger)^\top) \rangle \langle X^\dagger, \nu \rangle = \langle A(\partial_\mu, (Y^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), X^\dagger \rangle.$$

Since ω is a harmonic 1-form, the Bochner-Weitzenböck formula and the Gauss equation for minimal hypersurface $\Sigma \rightarrow N$ shows that, for any $T \in T_p \Sigma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \nabla_{\partial_\mu} \omega^\sharp, T \rangle(p) &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R(\omega^\sharp, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \bar{R}(\omega^\sharp, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, T \rangle - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), A(\partial_\mu, T) \rangle \\ &= \bar{\text{Ric}}(\omega^\sharp, T) - \langle \bar{R}(\omega^\sharp, \nu) \nu, T \rangle - \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle A(\partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp), A(\partial_\mu, T) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this formula to (46) and using (47), we obtain (42).

Finally, we shall show (43). The equation (29) shows that

$$\langle \nu \wedge \omega^\sharp, \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger) \rangle(p) = \langle \nu \wedge \omega^\sharp, -(\bar{R}(X^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu) \wedge Y^\dagger + (\bar{R}(Y^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu) \wedge X^\dagger \rangle(p),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle \nu \wedge \omega^\sharp, (\bar{R}(X^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu) \wedge Y^\dagger \rangle &= \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(\langle \bar{R}(X^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \nu \rangle \langle Y^\dagger, \omega^\sharp \rangle - \langle \bar{R}(X^\dagger, \partial_\mu) \partial_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle \langle Y^\dagger, \nu \rangle \right) \\ &= \bar{\text{Ric}}(X^\dagger, \nu) \langle Y^\dagger, \omega^\sharp \rangle - \bar{\text{Ric}}(X^\dagger, \omega^\sharp) \langle Y^\dagger, \nu \rangle + \langle \bar{R}(X^\dagger, \nu) \nu, \omega^\sharp \rangle \langle Y^\dagger, \nu \rangle \\ &= c\varphi_{X \wedge Y} + \langle \bar{R}(X^\dagger, \nu) \nu, \omega^\sharp \rangle \langle Y^\dagger, \nu \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (43). □

By (38)–(43), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(\varphi_{X \wedge Y})(p) &= \Delta \varphi_{X \wedge Y} + (c + |A|^2) \varphi_{X \wedge Y} \\ &= -2 \langle A(\nabla_{(Y^\dagger)^\top} \omega^\sharp, (X^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle + 2 \langle A(\nabla_{(X^\dagger)^\top} \omega^\sharp, (Y^\dagger)^\top), \nu \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{n}_p$, and this proves Proposition 5.2.

As a consequence, if a harmonic 1-form ω satisfies $\mathcal{J}(\varphi_{\omega^\sharp, \alpha}) = 0$ along Σ for any $\alpha \in \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$, then we obtain

$$A(\nabla_X \omega^\sharp, Y) = A(\nabla_Y \omega^\sharp, X)$$

for any $X, Y \in T_p \Sigma$ and any $p \in \Sigma$ since \mathfrak{n}_p is isomorphic to $T_p M$ by the correspondence $X \mapsto X^\dagger(p)$. Thus, we define a linear subspace of \mathcal{H} by

$$\mathcal{H}_1 := \{ \omega \in \mathcal{H} \mid A(\nabla_X \omega^\sharp, Y) = A(\nabla_Y \omega^\sharp, X), \forall X, Y \in T_p \Sigma, \forall p \in \Sigma \}.$$

Then, $\mathcal{H}_0 = \{ \omega \in \mathcal{H} \mid \mathcal{J}(\varphi_{\omega^\sharp, \alpha}) = 0, \forall \alpha \in \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g} \}$ is a linear subspace of \mathcal{H}_1 .

We shall estimate the dimension of \mathcal{H}_1 . The following proposition is a generalization of [2, Proposition 5], and the proof is inspired by the argument of Li [11].

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose Σ^{n-1} is a closed two-sided minimal hypersurface in a compact semi-simple symmetric space M^n . Then we have*

$$\dim \mathcal{H}_1 \leq 2n - 3.$$

Remark 5.6. This proposition was proved in [2] when M is a flat torus and under an additional assumption that “there is a point $p \in \Sigma$ so that the eigenvalues of shape operator $S_\nu(p)$ at p are distinct”. Our proof below is a refinement of the argument in [2, 11] combining with a technical result given in Appendix B, and it turns out that we can remove the additional assumption even when M is a flat torus.

We also remark that in [8], Mendes-Radeschi provide more precise estimate of $\dim \mathcal{H}_0 (\leq \dim \mathcal{H}_1)$ when there is a point p such that $S_\nu(p)$ has distinct eigenvalues.

To prove this, we use the following fact.

Lemma 5.7. *Let τ be a closed 1-form on Σ , and we set $T = \tau^\sharp$. Then, $A(\nabla_X T, Y) = A(\nabla_Y T, X)$ for any $X, Y \in T_p \Sigma$ if and only if $[S_\nu, \nabla T] = 0$, where $S_\nu : T_p \Sigma \rightarrow T_p \Sigma$ is the shape operator at p defined by $S_\nu(X) := -(\overline{\nabla}_X \nu)^\top$.*

Proof. Recall that, if τ is a closed 1-form, then $\langle \nabla_X T, Y \rangle = \langle \nabla_Y T, X \rangle$ for any $X, Y \in T_p \Sigma$. A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [S_\nu, \nabla T] \partial_\mu, \partial_\xi \rangle &= \langle S_\nu(\nabla_{\partial_\mu} T), \partial_\xi \rangle - \langle \nabla_{S_\nu(\partial_\mu)} T, \partial_\xi \rangle \\ &= \langle A(\partial_\xi, \nabla_{\partial_\mu} T), \nu \rangle - \langle \nabla_{\partial_\xi} T, S_\nu(\partial_\mu) \rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\xi} \nabla_{\partial_\mu} T, \nu \rangle + \langle \nabla_{\partial_\xi} T, \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nu \rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\xi} \nabla_{\partial_\mu} T, \nu \rangle - \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} \nabla_{\partial_\xi} T, \nu \rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{R}(\partial_\xi, \partial_\mu) T, \nu \rangle - \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\xi} (A(\partial_\mu, T)) - \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (A(\partial_\xi, T)), \nu \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, at the point p , the Codazzi equation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\xi} (A(\partial_\mu, T)) - \overline{\nabla}_{\partial_\mu} (A(\partial_\xi, T)), \nu \rangle(p) &= \langle (\nabla_{\partial_\xi}^\perp A)(\partial_\mu, T) - (\nabla_{\partial_\mu}^\perp A)(\partial_\xi, T), \nu \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle A(\partial_\mu, \nabla_{\partial_\xi} T) - A(\partial_\xi, \nabla_{\partial_\mu} T), \nu \rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{R}(\partial_\xi, \partial_\mu) T, \nu \rangle + \langle A(\partial_\mu, \nabla_{\partial_\xi} T) - A(\partial_\xi, \nabla_{\partial_\mu} T), \nu \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this to the previous equation, we obtain

$$\langle [S_\nu, \nabla T] \partial_\mu, \partial_\xi \rangle = - \langle A(\partial_\mu, \nabla_{\partial_\xi} T) - A(\partial_\xi, \nabla_{\partial_\mu} T), \nu \rangle$$

for any $\mu, \xi = 1, \dots, n-1$. This implies the conclusion. \square

Now, we give a proof of Proposition 5.5.

Proof of Proposition 5.5. By Lemma 5.7, \mathcal{H}_1 can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = \{\omega \in \mathcal{H} \mid [S_\nu, \nabla \omega^\sharp] = 0\}.$$

Notice that, for any harmonic 1-form ω , $\nabla \omega^\sharp(X, Y) = \langle \nabla_X \omega^\sharp, Y \rangle$ is symmetric and hence $\nabla \omega^\sharp : T_p \Sigma \rightarrow T_p \Sigma$ is diagonalizable and has real eigenvalues. Therefore, if $\omega \in \mathcal{H}_1$, by using Proposition B.1, there exists a geodesic ball $B_\rho(p) \subset \Sigma$ around some point $p \in \Sigma$ and a smooth orthonormal frame $\{E_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^{n-1}$ on $B_\rho(p)$ which simultaneously diagonalizes S_ν and $\nabla \omega^\sharp$. In particular, we have

$$(48) \quad \nabla \omega^\sharp(E_\mu, E_\xi) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu \neq \xi.$$

Note that the proof of [2, Proposition 5] essentially use the relation (48) and smoothness of principal vectors, both of them are derived by assuming that there is a point $p \in \Sigma$ where all the principal curvatures are distinct. Thanks to Lemma 5.7 and Proposition B.1, we can remove the assumption of principal curvatures considered in [2]. The rest of our proof completely follows the argument in [2].

For a harmonic 1-form ω , $\nabla \omega^\sharp$ is trace-free, i.e.,

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \nabla \omega^\sharp(E_\mu, E_\mu) = 0.$$

Combining this fact and (48), $\nabla\omega^\sharp$ on $B_\rho(p)$ is completely determined by the functions

$$\nabla\omega^\sharp(E_1, E_1), \dots, \nabla\omega^\sharp(E_{n-2}, E_{n-2}).$$

Now, we consider $2n - 3$ functions on $B_\rho(p)$ by

$$\phi_{\omega,i}(q) := \begin{cases} \omega(E_i)(q) & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \\ \nabla\omega^\sharp(E_{i-n+1}, E_{i-n+1})(q) & \text{for } n \leq i \leq 2n-3. \end{cases}$$

Given any $q \in B_\rho(p)$, let $\gamma(t) : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \Sigma^{n-1}$ be the unique geodesic connecting p to q . Restricting the functions $\phi_{\omega,1}, \dots, \phi_{\omega,2n-3}$ to the geodesic $\gamma(t)$, we obtain the functions

$$f_i(t) := \phi_{\omega,i}(\gamma(t)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq 2n-3.$$

Owing to the local smoothness of $\{E_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^{n-1}$, the same computation given in the proof of [2, Proposition 5] holds, and moreover, we see that $\{f_i\}$ solves a linear ODE system of normal form. In particular, the value along γ is determined by the initial value $(f_1(0), \dots, f_{2n-3}(0)) = (\phi_{\omega,1}(p), \dots, \phi_{\omega,2n-3}(p))$, namely, the values $(\phi_{\omega,1}(q), \dots, \phi_{\omega,2n-3}(q))$ ($q \in B_\rho(p)$) are uniquely determined by $(\phi_{\omega,1}(p), \dots, \phi_{\omega,2n-3}(p))$.

Let ω and ω' be two harmonic forms belonging to the subspace $\mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}$. If $\phi_{\omega,i}(p) = \phi_{\omega',i}(p)$ for any $i = 1, \dots, 2n-3$, then the above argument shows that $\omega(q) = \omega'(q)$ for any $q \in B_\rho(p)$, and by using the unique continuation theorem for harmonic forms [3], we obtain $\omega = \omega'$ on Σ . Therefore an element $\omega \in \mathcal{H}_1$ is determined by $(\phi_{\omega,1}(p), \dots, \phi_{\omega,2n-3}(p))$, and this implies that the dimension of \mathcal{H}_1 is at most $2n-3$ as required. \square

Finally, we give a proof of our main result (Theorem 5.1).

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We first assume that Σ^{n-1} is two-sided. By proposition 4.4, we have $\text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp} = 0$ for any harmonic 1-form ω on Σ . Since $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}}$ is positive-definite on $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$, Proposition 2.3-(ii) shows an affine bound $\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq C(b_1(\Sigma) - \dim \mathcal{H}_0)$, where we put $C = 2/(d(d-1))$, $d = \dim \mathfrak{g}$. Moreover, by Proposition 5.5, we have $\dim \mathcal{H}_0 \leq \dim \mathcal{H}_1 \leq 2n-3$ since \mathcal{H}_0 is a linear subspace of \mathcal{H}_1 . Combining this, we obtain

$$(49) \quad \text{index}(\Sigma) \geq C(b_1(\Sigma) - D),$$

where we set $D = 2n-3$. If a real number a satisfies $a \geq 1$, then we have $a \geq (a+c)/(1+c)$ for any $c \geq 0$. Therefore, if Σ is unstable (i.e. $\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq 1$), then (49) implies

$$(50) \quad \text{index}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{\text{index}(\Sigma) + CD}{1 + CD} \geq \frac{Cb_1(\Sigma)}{1 + CD} = \frac{2}{d(d-1) + 2(2n-3)} b_1(\Sigma).$$

This proves the required inequality.

Next, we consider the case when Σ is one-sided. We set $\tilde{\Sigma} := \{(p, \nu_p) \mid p \in \Sigma, \nu_p \in \nu_p \Sigma, |\nu_p| = 1\}$. We endow $\tilde{\Sigma}$ a manifold structure so that a natural projection $\pi : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ becomes a two-fold covering map. Then we obtain an immersion $\tilde{f} := f \circ \pi : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow M$, where $f : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ is the isometric immersion of Σ . We induce a Riemannian metric on $\tilde{\Sigma}$ via the map \tilde{f} so that $\tilde{f} : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow M$ becomes an isometric immersion.

We put $\tilde{\nu}_{(p, \nu_p)} := \nu_p$. Then, $\tilde{\nu}$ defines a smooth normal vector field along \tilde{f} , and in particular, the normal bundle $\nu \tilde{\Sigma}$ of \tilde{f} is trivial. Note that, for the non-trivial deck transformation $\tau : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}$, we have $\tilde{\nu} \circ \tau = -\tilde{\nu}$ under natural identifications $(\tilde{f}^* TM)_{\tau(\tilde{p})} \simeq (\tilde{f}^* TM)_{\tilde{p}} \simeq (\tilde{f}^* TM)_p$ for $\tilde{p} \in \tilde{\Sigma}$ and $p = \pi(\tilde{p}) \in \Sigma$.

For any $V \in \Gamma(\tilde{f}^* TM)$, we define a natural lift $\tilde{V} \in \Gamma(\tilde{f}^* TM)$ by $\tilde{V}(\tilde{p}) := V(\pi(\tilde{p})) = V(p)$. If V is a normal vector field, we can associate a function $\varphi_V \in C^\infty(\tilde{\Sigma})$ satisfying that $\tilde{V} = \varphi_V \cdot \tilde{\nu}$. Then, since $\tilde{\nu} \circ \tau = -\tilde{\nu}$ and $\tilde{V} \circ \tau = \tilde{V}$, it holds that $\varphi_V \circ \tau = -\varphi_V$, i.e. φ_V is an odd function with respect to the deck transformation. Conversely, for any odd function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\tilde{\Sigma})$, we obtain a well-defined smooth normal vector field V along f by $V(p) = \varphi(\tilde{p}) \cdot \tilde{\nu}(\tilde{p})$, where $\tilde{p} \in \pi^{-1}(p)$.

Let T be any tangent vector field along f and \tilde{T} its natural lift. Since \tilde{T} is invariant under the deck transformation, the function $\varphi_{\tilde{T}, w} = \langle \tilde{\nu} \wedge \tilde{T}, \Pi(w) \rangle$ is an odd function for any $w \in \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$, and it yields a normal vector field $V_{\tilde{T}, w}$ along f . Thus, we obtain a map

$$\Phi : \Gamma(T\Sigma) \times \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \Gamma(\nu\Sigma), \quad \Phi(T, w) = V_{\tilde{T}, w}$$

and a quadratic form

$$q_T(v, w) := Q(V_{\tilde{T}, v}, V_{\tilde{T}, w}).$$

Note that, since $\pi : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a two-fold covering (and π is a Riemannian submersion), we have $Q_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\tilde{V}, \tilde{V}) = 2Q(V, V)$, where $Q_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ is the index form of $\tilde{\Sigma}$.

Now, we take a harmonic 1-form ω on Σ . Then, $\tilde{\omega} = \pi^*\omega$ is a harmonic 1-form on $\tilde{\Sigma}$. Moreover, $\tilde{\omega}^\sharp$ coincides with the natural lift of ω^\sharp . Therefore, by Proposition 4.4, we obtain $\text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\omega^\sharp} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} q_{\tilde{\omega}^\sharp} = 0$ for any harmonic 1-form ω on Σ . Thus, by Proposition 2.3, we obtain an affine bound $\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq C(b_1(\Sigma) - \dim \mathcal{H}_0)$, where $\mathcal{H}_0 = \{\omega \in \mathcal{H} \mid \mathcal{J}_\Sigma(\Phi_{\omega^\sharp, v}) = 0 \ \forall v \in \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}\}$. Since $\mathcal{J}_\Sigma(\Phi_{\omega^\sharp, v}) = \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\varphi_{\tilde{\omega}^\sharp, v})$, we see $\tilde{\omega} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0 := \{\omega \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\Sigma}} \mid \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\varphi_{\omega^\sharp, v}) = 0 \ \forall v \in \wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}\}$ if $\omega \in \mathcal{H}_0$, namely, the pull-back induces a linear map $\pi^* : \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0$. Since $\text{Ker} \pi^* = \{0\}$, we obtain $\dim \mathcal{H}_0 \leq \dim \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0 \leq \dim \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1 \leq 2n - 3$ by Proposition 5.5, and hence, we obtain an affine bound (49). Therefore if Σ is unstable, we obtain (50) as well as the case of two-sided hypersurface. This completes the proof. \square

APPENDIX A. RELATION TO PREVIOUS METHODS

A.1. The case of \mathbb{R}^{n+k} . In Theorem 4.3, we derive a trace formula for a Riemannian manifold M isometrically immersed into a semi-simple Riemannian symmetric space N . A corresponding trace formula in the case when $N = \mathbb{R}^m$ has been derived by Ambrozio-Carlotto-Sharp [1, Proposition 2]. In this appendix, we remark that our argument given in Section 4 can be adapted to the case when $N = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$, and their formula is recovered by a slight modification.

The identity component of the isometry group of \mathbb{R}^{n+k} is given by a semi-direct product $G = SO(n+k) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$. Notice that G is not a semi-simple Lie group (and hence, we cannot use the results given in the previous subsection directly). More precisely, G is expressed by

$$G = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mid A \in SO(n+k), b \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \right\} \subset GL(n+k+1, \mathbb{R}),$$

and G acts on \mathbb{R}^{n+k} by

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Ax + b \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k}.$$

The Lie algebra of \mathfrak{g} is given by

$$\mathfrak{g} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} X & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid X \in \mathfrak{o}(n+k), y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \right\} \subset \mathfrak{gl}(n+k+1, \mathbb{R}).$$

Fix arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$. Then the geodesic symmetry s_x at x is given by $s_x = \begin{pmatrix} -I_{n+k} & 2x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in G$.

Thus the differential at $e \in G$ of the involution σ_x is expressed by

$$d\sigma_x \left(\begin{pmatrix} X & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = s_x \begin{pmatrix} X & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} s_x = \begin{pmatrix} X & -y - X(2x) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, the eigendecomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}_x \oplus \mathfrak{n}_x$ is given by

$$\mathfrak{k}_x = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} X & -Xx \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid X \in \mathfrak{o}(n+k) \right\}, \quad \mathfrak{n}_x = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} O & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \right\}.$$

Notice that \mathfrak{n}_x does not depend on the choice of $x \in N = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ and thus, we denote $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{n}_x$. We define the standard inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathfrak{n} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$, and extend it to $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}$.

Suppose M is isometrically immersed into $N = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ and let Σ be a closed two-sided minimal hypersurface in M . Similar to Section 4, we fix a tangent vector field $T \in \Gamma(T\Sigma)$, and for each $v \in \wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}$ we consider a smooth function

$$\hat{\varphi}_{T,v} := \langle \nu \wedge T, \Pi(v) \rangle,$$

where ν is a unit normal vector field of Σ in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} and $\Pi(X \wedge Y) = X^\dagger \wedge Y^\dagger$ for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{n}$, and we linearly extend the map to whole $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}$. It should be noted that, for $Y = \begin{pmatrix} O & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{n}$, the Killing vector field generated by Y is given by $Y^\dagger = y$, i.e. Y^\dagger is regarded as a parallel vector field on \mathbb{R}^{n+k} . Therefore, for an orthonormal basis $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^{n+k}$ of $\mathfrak{n} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$, we may write

$$\hat{\varphi}_{T, \theta_i \wedge \theta_j} = \langle \nu \wedge T, \theta_i \wedge \theta_j \rangle.$$

This recovers the test function considered in [1, Subsection 3.2].

Now, we define a quadratic form \hat{q}_T on $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}$ by

$$\hat{q}_T(v, w) := Q(\hat{\varphi}_{T,v}, \hat{\varphi}_{T,w})$$

and we consider the trace of \widehat{q}_T over $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}$. We remark that we take the trace over $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}$ (not over $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$. Compare with the semi-simple case (18)). When $N = G/K_p$ is a semi-simple RSS, \mathfrak{n}_p depends on p in general, and hence, $\text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}_p} q_T$ is as well. This is a reason why we take the trace over $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}$ when N is semi-simple.

If Σ is a (two-sided) closed minimal hypersurface in M^n , the computation given in Proposition 4.2 is worked without any modification, and if T is the dual vector of a harmonic 1-form ω , then we obtain

$$(51) \quad \text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}} \widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp} = \int_{\Sigma} \sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \left(|B(e_\mu, \omega^\sharp)|^2 + |B(e_\mu, \nu)|^2 |\omega|^2 \right) - \left(\sum_{\mu=1}^{n-1} \langle R^M(\omega^\sharp, e_\mu) e_\mu, \omega^\sharp \rangle + \text{Ric}^M(\nu, \nu) |\omega|^2 \right)$$

as $\overline{R} = 0$ in (33). This recovers the trace formula given in [1, Proposition 2]. Note that the another trace formula given in [1, Proposition 1] is also recovered by a similar way. Moreover, by using Proposition 2.3-(i), we obtain the following.

Theorem A.1 ([1]). *Suppose M^n is isometrically immersed into \mathbb{R}^{n+k} and let Σ be a closed minimal hypersurface in M . If $\text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}} \widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp} < 0$ for any non-trivial harmonic 1-form ω on Σ , then we have*

$$\text{index}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{2}{(n+k)(n+k-1)} b_1(\Sigma).$$

See [1, 5] for several examples of M satisfying that $\text{Tr}_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{n}} \widehat{q}_{\omega^\sharp} < 0$ for any harmonic 1-form ω on any closed minimal hypersurface in M .

A.2. The method of Mendes-Radeschi. In [8], Mendes-Radeschi generalizes the previous method by using the notion of virtual immersion. According to [8], we briefly summarize their method, and as a consequence, we show that they use the same test function given in the present paper.

Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold, and V be a finite-dimensional real vector space equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V$. The *virtual immersion* of M is a V -valued 1-form $\Omega : TM \rightarrow V$ satisfying the following two-conditions:

- (i) $\langle \Omega_p(X), \Omega_p(Y) \rangle_V = g_p(X, Y)$ for any $p \in M$ and $X, Y \in T_p M$.
- (ii) $\langle (d\Omega)_p(X, Y), \Omega_p(Z) \rangle_V = 0$ for any $p \in M$ and $X, Y, Z \in T_p M$.

If M admits a virtual immersion Ω , we obtain an immersion of the tangent bundle TM to the trivial bundle $M \times V$ by the map $(p, X) \mapsto (p, \Omega_p(X))$ where $X \in T_p M$. This immersion is isometric in the sense of (i), and moreover the above two conditions imply that the natural flat connection D on $M \times V$ induces the Levi-Civita connection ∇^M on $TM \subset M \times V$ (See [8] for details). This notion generalizes the situation of isometric immersion of M into the Euclidean space $V = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$. Namely, if $F : M \rightarrow V = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ is an isometric immersion, then F^*TV is a trivial bundle over M and we have a natural immersion $TM \rightarrow F^*TV \simeq M \times V$, and in this case, the virtual immersion is given by $dF : TM \rightarrow V = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$. For a virtual immersion $\Omega : TM \rightarrow V$, we can define the second fundamental form Π of Ω by using the flat connection D similar to the usual second fundamental form. Moreover, the formulas of Weingarten, Gauss, Ricci and Codazzi (relative to Π and D) also hold for the virtual immersion Ω analogous to the isometric immersion into the Euclidean space [8, Proposition 7]. However, the second fundamental form Π is not symmetric in general.

Let Σ be a two-sided closed minimal hypersurface in M , and we suppose M admits a virtual immersion $\Omega : TM \rightarrow V$. Then, Mendes-Radeschi considered the following test variation along Σ (See [8, eq.(6)]. Note that we change the sign);

$$(52) \quad \Phi : \mathcal{H} \times \wedge^2 V \rightarrow \Gamma(\nu\Sigma), \quad \Phi_{\omega, \alpha} := \langle \Omega(\nu) \wedge \Omega(\omega^\sharp), \alpha \rangle_{\wedge^2 V} \cdot \nu,$$

where ν is a unit normal vector field along Σ , ω is a harmonic 1-form on Σ and $\alpha \in \wedge^2 V$. Note that if $F : M \rightarrow V = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ is an isometric immersion and $\Omega = dF$, then the test variation coincides with the one considered in [1] (see also Appendix A.1). Then, by applying the tracing method for Φ , they derived a trace formula in terms of the second fundamental form Π of Ω_0 and the curvature tensor of M ([8, eq.(5) and (7)]).

Now, let us assume that M is a compact Riemannian symmetric space. In [8], Mendes-Radeschi showed that any compact RSS admits a natural virtual immersion described as follows. Let $M = G/K$ be a compact RSS, and denote the associated canonical decomposition by $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$. We define an $\text{Ad}(G)$ -invariant inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on \mathfrak{g} . Since the isotropy subgroup K acts on \mathfrak{m} via the restriction of adjoint representation, we have a homogeneous fiber bundle $G \times_K \mathfrak{m}$ on $M = G/K$ associated to the principal bundle $G \rightarrow G/K$. More precisely, $G \times_K \mathfrak{m} := G \times \mathfrak{m} / \sim$, where the equivalent relation is

defined by the K -action $k \cdot (g, X) := (gk^{-1}, \text{Ad}(k)X)$. $G \times_K \mathfrak{m}$ is identified with the tangent bundle TM by the map

$$G \times_K \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow TM, \quad [g, X] \mapsto dg_o(X),$$

where $o = [e] \in G/K$ is the origin of G/K . Under this identification, we define a \mathfrak{g} -valued 1-form on M by

$$\Omega_0 : G \times_K \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}, \quad [g, X] \mapsto \text{Ad}(g)X.$$

Then, it turns out that Ω_0 is a virtual immersion of M ([8, Lemma 11]). Moreover, the second fundamental form II of Ω_0 is skew-symmetric, and this property actually characterizes the symmetric space ([8, Theorem B]).

Our claim here is the following.

Lemma A.2. *Suppose M is semi-simple, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is defined by the negative-Killing form. By taking the specific virtual immersion Ω_0 , the test function given in (52) is written as*

$$\langle \Omega_0(\nu) \wedge \Omega_0(\omega^\sharp), \theta \wedge \xi \rangle_{\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}} = \langle \nu \wedge \omega^\sharp, \theta^\dagger \wedge \xi^\dagger \rangle$$

for any $\theta, \xi \in \mathfrak{g}$.

Proof. As mentioned in [8, Remark 13], under the identification $TM \simeq G \times_K \mathfrak{m}$, the Killing vector field $\theta^\dagger_{[g]}$ corresponds to $[g, (\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{m}}]$ for any $g \in G$ and $\theta \in \mathfrak{g}$, where $(\cdot)_{\mathfrak{m}}$ means the orthogonal projection to \mathfrak{m} . Indeed, we see

$$dg_{[g]}^{-1}(\theta^\dagger) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} g^{-1} \exp(t\theta) g \cdot o \right|_{t=0} = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \exp(t \text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta) \cdot o \right|_{t=0} = (\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{m}},$$

where we used the identification $\mathfrak{m} \simeq T_o M$. This shows $\theta^\dagger_{[g]} = [g, (\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{m}}]$ under the identification $TM \simeq G \times_K \mathfrak{m}$. Thus, by definition of Ω_0 , we have

$$(53) \quad \Omega_0(\theta^\dagger_{[g]}) = \text{Ad}(g)(\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{m}} = \theta - \text{Ad}(g)(\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{k}}.$$

We take arbitrary vector field $Z \in \Gamma(TM)$. Then, by using (53), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega_0(Z), \theta \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} &= \langle \Omega_0(Z), \Omega_0(\theta^\dagger) \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} - \langle \Omega_0(Z), \text{Ad}(g)(\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{k}} \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ &= \langle Z, \theta^\dagger \rangle - \langle \Omega_0(Z), \text{Ad}(g)(\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{k}} \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the condition (i) in the definition of virtual immersion. For each point $[g] \in M$, there exists a vector $X_Z \in \mathfrak{g}$ satisfying that $Z_{[g]} = (X_Z^\dagger)_{[g]}$. Then, by (53), we see

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega_0(Z), \text{Ad}(g)(\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{k}} \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} &= \langle \text{Ad}(g)(\text{Ad}(g^{-1})X_Z)_{\mathfrak{m}}, \text{Ad}(g)(\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{k}} \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} \\ &= \langle (\text{Ad}(g)^{-1}X_Z)_{\mathfrak{m}}, (\text{Ad}(g^{-1})\theta)_{\mathfrak{k}} \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is $\text{Ad}(G)$ -invariant and the canonical decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$ is orthogonal with respect to the (negative) Killing form (see Lemma 2.5). Therefore, we obtain $\langle \Omega_0(Z), \theta \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = \langle Z, \theta^\dagger \rangle$ for any $Z \in \Gamma(TM)$, and this implies the desired conclusion. \square

Hence, the test function considered in [8] coincides with our test function given in Section 4 in the case when M is itself a compact semi-simple RSS. Note that, however, our setting considered in Section 4 is more general, and the expression of the trace formula is different from [8].

APPENDIX B. LOCAL SMOOTHNESS OF SIMULTANEOUS EIGENVECTORS

In this Appendix, we prove the following technical result used in the proof of Proposition 5.5.

Proposition B.1. *Let (Σ^m, g) be a smooth Riemannian manifold, and α, β be smooth symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor fields on Σ . Suppose furthermore the $(1, 1)$ -tensor fields $A := g^{-1}\alpha$ and $B := g^{-1}\beta$ are commutes with each other, i.e. $[A, B] = 0$ on Σ . Then, there exists an open subset $U \subset \Sigma$ and a smooth orthonormal frame $\{E_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$ on U such that A and B are simultaneously diagonalized by $\{E_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$ at every point $p \in U$.*

The proof relies on the result by Singley [16]. We briefly summarize his result before the proof.

Let G and G' be smooth symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor fields on a smooth m -dimensional manifold Σ . For each $p \in \Sigma$, G defines a linear map $T_p \Sigma \rightarrow T_p^* \Sigma$, $v \mapsto G(v, \cdot)$ which is also denoted by G . We define the linear map $G' : T_p \Sigma \rightarrow T_p^* \Sigma$ as well. If G is positive definite, then G is invertible, and we obtain a linear map $(G^{-1}G')(p) : T_p \Sigma \rightarrow T_p \Sigma$. For example, if Σ^m is a hypersurface in a Riemannian manifold (M^{m+1}, g) , we may choose the symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensors as the induced metric g and $\tilde{A}(X, Y) := \langle A(X, Y), \nu \rangle$, where

A is the second fundamental form of Σ^m . In this case, $G^{-1}G' = g^{-1}\tilde{A}$ coincides with the shape operator S_ν of Σ . Since both G and G' are symmetric and G is invertible, we see that $G^{-1}G'$ is diagonalizable with real eigenvalues $\{\kappa_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$ and a corresponding orthonormal eigenbasis $\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$ of $T_p\Sigma$. Note that, in general, there is no guarantee that the eigenvalues and eigenvectors are smooth on whole of Σ . However, it turns out to be true on an open dense subset on Σ :

Lemma B.2 (Theorem 1, 2 and 3 in [16]). *After the re-ordering of $\{\kappa_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$ by $\kappa_1(p) \leq \dots \leq \kappa_m(p)$, we have the following:*

- (1) κ_μ is continuous on whole of Σ for any $\mu = 1, \dots, m$.
- (2) There is an open dense subset $U \subset \Sigma$ on which κ_μ is C^∞ for any $\mu = 1, \dots, m$.
- (3) For any point $p \in U$, there is a neighborhood U_p of p and a C^∞ orthonormal frame $\{E_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$ on U_p which diagonalizes $G^{-1}G'(q)$ for each $q \in U_p$. Moreover, the multiplicities of eigenvalues are constant on U_p .

Remark B.3. In [16], the open dense subset $U \subset \Sigma$ is explicitly given by considering the multiplicity of the eigenvalues of $G^{-1}G'$. However we do not need the explicit form of U in this paper.

By using this lemma, we shall give a proof of Proposition B.1.

Proof of Proposition B.1. By Lemma B.2, there exists a point $p_0 \in \Sigma$ and an open neighborhood U_{p_0} of p_0 such that $A = g^{-1}\alpha$ is diagonalized by a smooth orthonormal frame $\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$ on U_{p_0} . Moreover, we may assume the multiplicities of eigenvalues of A are constant on U_{p_0} and A is expressed by the diagonal matrix $A = \text{diag}(\lambda_1 I_{m_1}, \dots, \lambda_r I_{m_r})$ on U_{p_0} with respect to the local frame $\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$, where $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_r$ are the distinct eigenvalues of A , m_i is the multiplicity of λ_i and I_{m_i} is the identity matrix of order m_i .

Since $[A, B] = 0$, each eigenspace of A is invariant by the left multiplication of B , and this implies that B is expressed by the block matrix $B = \text{diag}(B_1, \dots, B_r)$ on U_{p_0} with respect to the local frame $\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$, where B_i is some square matrix of order m_i . Note that each B_i is a symmetric matrix since so is B . We consider a symmetric matrix defined by $\tilde{B}_1 := \text{diag}(B_1, I_{m_2}, \dots, I_{m_r})$ which represents some $(1, 1)$ -tensor field $g^{-1}\tilde{\beta}'_1$ on U_{p_0} , where we regard U_{p_0} as a Riemannian manifold by the induced metric. By Lemma B.2, there exists a point $p_1 \in U_{p_0}$ such that there is an open neighborhood $U_{p_1} \subset U_{p_0}$ of p_1 and a smooth orthonormal frame $\{e_\mu^{(1)}\}_{\mu=1}^m$ which diagonalizes \tilde{B}_1 and the multiplicities of eigenvalues of \tilde{B}_1 are constant on U_{p_1} . Since \tilde{B}_1 has eigenvalue 1, we denote the 1-eigenspace of \tilde{B}_1 by $V^{(1)}$ and set $k_1 := \dim V^{(1)}$ which is constant on U_{p_1} . Note that $k_1 \geq m_2 + \dots + m_r = m - m_1$.

By taking a re-ordering if necessary, we may assume that $V^{(1)}$ is spanned by $\{e_i^{(1)}\}_{i=m-k_1+1}^m$. Since $e_l \in V^{(1)}$ for any $l > m_1$, we see that $W^{(1)} := \text{span}\{e_{m_1+1}, \dots, e_m\}$ is a $(m - m_1)$ -dimensional linear subspace of $V^{(1)}$. If $V^{(1)} \neq W^{(1)}$, we can find $k_1 - (m - m_1)$ vectors $e_{i_1}^{(1)}, \dots, e_{i_{k_1-(m-m_1)}}^{(1)}$ in $\{e_i^{(1)}\}_{i=m-k_1+1}^m$ so that $\{e_{i_1}^{(1)}, \dots, e_{i_{k_1-(m-m_1)}}^{(1)}, e_{m_1+1}, \dots, e_m\}$ becomes a basis of $V^{(1)}$. By the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization, we obtain an orthonormal basis of $V^{(1)}$ of the form $\{e'_{i_1}, \dots, e'_{i_{k_1-(m-m_1)}}, e_{m_1+1}, \dots, e_m\}$. Now, we put

$$Q_1 := (e_1^{(1)}, \dots, e_{m-k_1}^{(1)}, e'_{i_1}, \dots, e'_{i_{k_1-(m-m_1)}}, e_{m_1+1}, \dots, e_m).$$

By construction, Q_1 consists of eigenvectors of \tilde{B}_1 , and each component of Q_1 is a smooth function on U_{p_1} . Moreover, Q_1 is expressed by $\text{diag}(Q'_1, I_{m_2}, \dots, I_{m_r})$ for some square matrix Q'_1 of order m_1 (since the matrix is expressed by using $\{e_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$), and we have $Q_1^{-1}\tilde{B}_1Q_1 = \text{diag}(B'_1, I_{m_2}, \dots, I_{m_r})$, where B'_1 is the diagonalized matrix of B_1 .

Next, we consider a symmetric matrix $\tilde{B}_2 = \text{diag}(I_{m_1}, B_2, I_{m_3}, \dots, I_{m_r})$ and by a similar argument, we see that there is a point $p_2 \in U_{p_1}$, an open neighborhood $U_{p_2} \subset U_{p_1}$ and a matrix Q_2 whose components are smooth function on U_{p_2} satisfying that $Q_2 = \text{diag}(I_{m_1}, Q'_2, I_{m_3}, \dots, I_{m_r})$ and $Q_2^{-1}\tilde{B}_2Q_2 = \text{diag}(I_{m_1}, B'_2, I_{m_3}, \dots, I_{m_r})$, where B'_2 is the diagonalized matrix of B_2 .

By repeating the argument, we obtain a decreasing sequence of open subsets $U_{p_0} \supset U_{p_1} \supset \dots \supset U_{p_r}$ and matrices Q_1, \dots, Q_r defined on U_{p_r} . We set $R := Q_1Q_2 \dots Q_r$. Then, we see that $R^{-1}AR$ and $R^{-1}BR$ are diagonal matrices by construction of Q_i . Thus we put $E_\mu := R(e_\mu)$ for each $\mu = 1, \dots, m$ and then, since each Q_i is an orthogonal matrix and has smooth components, $\{E_\mu\}_{\mu=1}^m$ is a smooth orthonormal frame defined on U_{p_r} which simultaneously diagonalizes A and B . This completes the proof. \square

Acknowledgements. T.K. is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K03122. K.K. is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K03105.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. AMBROZIO, A.CARLOTTO AND B. SHARP, *Comparing the Morse index and the first Betti number of minimal hypersurfaces*. J. Differ. Geom. **108**(3), 379–410 (2018).
- [2] L. AMBROZIO, A.CARLOTTO AND B. SHARP, *A note on the index of closed minimal hypersurfaces of flat tori*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **146** (2018), no. 1, 335–344.
- [3] N. ARONSZAJN, A. KRZYWICKI, J. SZARSKI, *A unique continuation theorem for exterior differential forms on Riemannian manifolds*, Ark. Mat. **4** (1962), 417–453.
- [4] J. BERNDT AND L. VANHECKE, *Naturally reductive Riemannian homogeneous spaces and real hypersurfaces in complex and quaternionic space forms*, In: Differential Geometry and Its Applications, Opava, 1992, Math. Publ., 1, Silesian Univ. Opava, Opava, 1993, 353–364.
- [5] C. GORODSKI, R.A.E.MENDES AND M.RADESCHI. *Robust index bounds for minimal hypersurfaces of isoparametric submanifolds and symmetric spaces*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **58** (2019), no. 4, Paper No. 118, 25 pp.
- [6] H.B.LAWSON JR. AND J. SIMONS, *On stable currents and their application to global problems in real and complex geometry*, Ann. of Math. (1973), 427–450.
- [7] F. MARQUES, *Minimal surfaces - variational theory and applications*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Seoul (2014).
- [8] R.A.E.MENDES AND M.RADESCHI. *Virtual immersions and minimal hypersurfaces in compact symmetric spaces*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **59** (2020), Paper No. 192, 18 pp.
- [9] A. NEVES. *New applications of min-max theory*, In: Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Seoul (2014).
- [10] J. L. LEE, *Introduction to smooth manifolds*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 218. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003. xviii+628 pp.
- [11] C. LI, *Index and topology of minimal hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^n* , preprint (arXiv:1605.09693).
- [12] A. ROS, *One-sided complete stable minimal surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. **74** (2006), no. 1, 69–92.
- [13] T. SAKAI, *Riemannian geometry*, Transl. Math. Monogr., 149, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996, xiv+358 pp.
- [14] A.SAVO, *Index bounds for minimal hypersurfaces of the sphere*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **59** (2010), no. 3, 823–837.
- [15] J. SIMONS, *Minimal varieties in Riemannian manifolds*, Ann. of Math. **88**, 62–105 (1968).
- [16] D.H. SINGLEY, *Smoothness theorems for the principal curvatures and principal vectors of a hypersurface*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **5** (1975), no.1, 135–144.
- [17] A. SONG, *Morse index, Betti numbers, and singular set of bounded area minimal hypersurfaces*, Duke Math. J. **172** (2023), no. 11, 2073–2147.
- [18] F. TORRALBO, *Compact minimal surfaces in the Berger spheres*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **41** (2012), no. 4, 391–405.
- [19] F. URBANO, *Minimal surfaces with low index in the three-dimensional sphere*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **108** (1990), no. 4, 989–992,

(T. Kajigaya) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE 1-3 KAGURAZAKA SHINJUKU-KU, TOKYO 162-8601 JAPAN

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (AIST), MATHAM-OIL, SENDAI 980-8577 JAPAN

Email address: kajigaya@rs.tus.ac.jp

(K. Kunikawa) GRADUATE SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY, INDUSTRIAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, TOKUSHIMA UNIVERSITY, 2-1 MINAMIJOSANJIMA-CHO, TOKUSHIMA, 770-8506, JAPAN

Email address: kunikawa@tokushima-u.ac.jp