

# The Dirichlet problem for the prescribed Ricci curvature equation on cohomogeneity one manifolds

Artem Pulemotov<sup>\*†‡</sup>

a.pulemotov@uq.edu.au

September 25, 2018

## Abstract

Let  $M$  be a domain enclosed between two principal orbits on a cohomogeneity one manifold  $M_1$ . Suppose  $T$  and  $R$  are symmetric invariant  $(0,2)$ -tensor fields on  $M$  and  $\partial M$ , respectively. The paper studies the prescribed Ricci curvature equation  $\text{Ric}(G) = T$  for a Riemannian metric  $G$  on  $M$  subject to the boundary condition  $G_{\partial M} = R$  (the notation  $G_{\partial M}$  here stands for the metric induced by  $G$  on  $\partial M$ ). Imposing a standard assumption on  $M_1$ , we describe a set of requirements on  $T$  and  $R$  that guarantee global and local solvability.

**Keywords:** Ricci curvature, Dirichlet problem, cohomogeneity one.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 53B20, 53C20, 58J32.

## 1 Introduction

Suppose  $M$  is a smooth manifold of dimension 3 or higher (possibly with boundary) and  $T$  is a symmetric  $(0,2)$ -tensor field on  $M$ . The present paper investigates the prescribed Ricci curvature equation

$$\text{Ric}(G) = T, \tag{1.1}$$

where the unknown  $G$  is a Riemannian metric on  $M$ . Mathematicians have been studying (1.1) since at least the early 1980's. We invite the reader to see [7, 4] for the history of the subject. The list of recent references not mentioned in [7, 4] includes but is not limited to [16, 15, 27, 28, 22, 26].

The solvability of boundary-value problems for equation (1.1) is, by and large, an unexplored topic. The author of the present paper made progress on this topic in [24]. The main theorems of [24] concern the local solvability of Dirichlet- and Neumann-type problems for (1.1) (i.e., solvability in a neighbourhood of a boundary point on  $M$ ).

It is worth noting that D. DeTurck's study of (1.1) underlay his discovery of the DeTurck trick. In a similar fashion, new knowledge about boundary-value problems for (1.1) may help answer questions about the existence and uniqueness of solutions to boundary-value problems for the Ricci flow and the Einstein equation. Such questions were investigated in [29, 1, 10, 5, 2, 17, 23, 25] and other works. A large number still remain open.

Let  $M_1$  be a smooth connected manifold of dimension 3 or higher with  $\partial M_1 = \emptyset$ . Consider a compact Lie group  $\mathcal{G}$  acting on  $M_1$ . Suppose the orbit space  $M_1/\mathcal{G}$  is one-dimensional. It is then customary to call  $M_1$  a cohomogeneity one manifold. Such manifolds enjoy numerous applications in geometry and mathematical physics; see, e.g., [6, 8, 11, 13] and the references of [21]. In what follows, we suppose  $M$  is the closure of a domain on  $M_1$  contained between two principal  $\mathcal{G}$ -orbits. The boundary of  $M$  is then equal to the union of these orbits. It will be convenient for us to assume that the tensor field  $T$  introduced above is defined on all

<sup>\*</sup>School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, The University of Chicago, 5734 South University Ave, Chicago, IL 60637-1514, USA

<sup>‡</sup>The author is the recipient of an Australian Research Council Discovery Early-Career Researcher Award DE150101548.

of  $M_1$ , not just  $M$ . The purpose of the present paper is to study the global and local existence of solutions to a Dirichlet-type problem for equation (1.1) on  $M$ . Our main results are stated as Theorems 2.2, 2.5 and 2.6.

## 2 Main results

Because the space  $M_1/\mathcal{G}$  is one-dimensional, it must be homeomorphic to the real line, the closed interval, the half-line, or the circle. In the first and the fourth case, there are no singular orbits on  $M_1$ . For the sake of convenience, we will assume that  $M_1/\mathcal{G}$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}$ . It is easy to state analogues of our theorems in the situations where this assumption does not hold. Pick a point in  $M_1$  and denote by  $\mathcal{H}$  the isotropy group of this point. We will use the symbol  $\mathfrak{g}$  for the Lie algebra of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Choose an  $\text{Ad}(\mathcal{G})$ -invariant scalar product  $Q$  on  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Suppose  $\mathfrak{p}$  is the orthogonal complement of the Lie algebra of  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$  with respect to  $Q$ . We standardly identify  $\mathfrak{p}$  with the tangent space of  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  at  $\mathcal{H}$ . The isotropy representation of  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  then yields the structure of an  $\mathcal{H}$ -module on  $\mathfrak{p}$ . The following requirement will be imposed throughout the rest of the paper.

**Hypothesis 2.1.** *The  $\mathcal{H}$ -module  $\mathfrak{p}$  appears as an orthogonal sum*

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{p}_n \quad (2.1)$$

*of pairwise non-isomorphic irreducible  $\mathcal{H}$ -modules  $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_n$ .*

Roughly speaking, Hypothesis 2.1 ensures that  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant  $(0,2)$ -tensor fields on  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  are diagonal; cf. (2.4) and (2.6) below. This hypothesis is rather standard. It has come up in several papers including [12, 13].

Let the tensor field  $T$  be  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant. Assume that it is possible to construct a diffeomorphism

$$\Psi : \mathbb{R} \times (\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow M_1 \quad (2.2)$$

such that the map  $\Psi(r, \cdot)$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant for every  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and the equality

$$\Psi^*T = dr \otimes dr + T_r, \quad r \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.3)$$

holds true. Here,  $T_r$  is a  $(0,2)$ -tensor field on  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  defined for each  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . It is fully determined by how it acts on  $\mathfrak{p}$ . In view of Hypothesis 2.1, there exist smooth functions  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that

$$T_r(X, Y) = \phi_1(r) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} Y) + \cdots + \phi_n(r) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} Y), \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}. \quad (2.4)$$

The notation  $\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_k} X$  and  $\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_k} Y$  refers to the projections of  $X$  and  $Y$  onto  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, n$ .

If the tensor field  $T$  is positive-definite, it is always possible to construct the diffeomorphism  $\Psi$ . Indeed, in this case, we can interpret  $T$  as a Riemannian metric on  $M_1$  and consider a unit speed geodesic  $\eta$  with respect to this metric. Assuming  $\eta$  is orthogonal to all the principal orbits, we define  $\Psi(r, g\mathcal{H}) = g\eta(r)$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ . This construction is quite standard. For example, it was used in [18, 21, 13].

In what follows, we suppose that  $\Psi$  is the identity map and

$$M = [0, \sigma] \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H} \quad (2.5)$$

for some  $\sigma > 0$ . This does not cause any loss of generality. Let  $R$  be a symmetric positive-definite  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant  $(0,2)$ -tensor field on  $\partial M$ . We will use  $R$  to impose a boundary condition on (1.1). Denote by  $R^0$  and  $R^\sigma$  the restrictions of  $R$  to  $\{0\} \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  and  $\{\sigma\} \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ , respectively. Given  $\tau \in [0, \sigma]$ , it will be convenient for us to identify the tangent spaces to  $\{\tau\} \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  at the point  $\{\tau\} \times \mathcal{H}$  with  $\mathfrak{p}$  in the natural way. We observe that  $R$  is fully determined by how  $R^0$  and  $R^\sigma$  act on  $\mathfrak{p}$ . Thanks to Hypothesis 2.1, there exist positive numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  satisfying the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} R^0(X, Y) &= a_1^2 Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} Y) + \cdots + a_n^2 Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} Y), \\ R^\sigma(X, Y) &= b_1^2 Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} Y) + \cdots + b_n^2 Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} Y), \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Fix a number  $\alpha > 0$  such that

$$|\phi_i(r)| \leq \alpha, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad r \in [0, \sigma], \quad (2.7)$$

along with a pair of numbers  $\omega_1, \omega_2 > 0$  such that

$$\omega_1 \leq a_i, b_i \leq \omega_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.8)$$

Denote by  $d_i$  the dimension of  $\mathfrak{p}_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Given a Riemannian metric  $G$  defined on a neighbourhood of  $\partial M$ , we write  $G_{\partial M}$  for the metric induced by  $G$  on  $\partial M$ . Our first result is a sufficient condition for the global solvability of a Dirichlet-type problem for (1.1).

**Theorem 2.2.** *There exist functions  $\rho_0 : (0, \infty)^2 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  and  $\sigma_0 : (0, \infty)^5 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ , both independent of the tensor fields  $T$  and  $R$ , such that the following statement is satisfied: if the formulas*

$$\left| \frac{d}{dr} \phi_i(r) \right| \leq c_1 \sigma, \quad |a_i - b_i| \leq c_2 \sigma^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad r \in [0, \sigma], \quad (2.9)$$

and the formulas

$$\sum_{i=1}^n d_i \left( \max\{\phi_i(r), 0\} + \frac{\omega_2^2}{\omega_1^2} \min\{\phi_i(r), 0\} \right) > \rho_0(\omega_1, \omega_2), \quad (2.10)$$

$$\sigma < \sigma_0(\alpha, \omega_1, \omega_2, c_1, c_2), \quad r \in [0, \sigma],$$

hold for some  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ , then the manifold  $M$  supports a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric  $G$  solving the equation  $\text{Ric}(G) = T$  on  $M$  under the boundary condition  $G_{\partial M} = R$ .

*Remark 2.3.* When proving Theorem 2.2, we will obtain explicit expressions for  $\rho_0$  and  $\sigma_0$ . These expressions (at least the one for  $\sigma_0$ ) will be rather unsightly.

*Remark 2.4.* The first formula in (2.9) essentially forbids the part of  $T$  tangent to the  $\mathcal{G}$ -orbits to change dramatically from one orbit to another. The second one says that  $R^0$  should not be very different from  $R^\sigma$ . Note that formulas (2.9) are automatically satisfied when  $R^0$  coincides with  $R^\sigma$  on  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$  are constant. The meaning of (2.10) is that the tensor field  $T$  has to be large in the directions tangent to the  $\mathcal{G}$ -orbits and small in the direction transverse to the  $\mathcal{G}$ -orbits.

Our second result establishes the local solvability of (1.1) in the interior of  $M$ . Given  $\tau \in [0, \sigma]$ , we denote by  $\Gamma^\tau$  the  $\mathcal{G}$ -orbit  $\{\tau\} \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  on  $M$ .

**Theorem 2.5.** *For each  $\tau \in (0, \sigma)$ , there exists a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric  $G^\tau$  on  $M$  such that the equality  $\text{Ric}(G^\tau) = T$  holds on some neighbourhood of  $\Gamma^\tau$ .*

Next, we establish the local solvability of (1.1) near  $\partial M$ .

**Theorem 2.6.** *There exists a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric  $G^{bdy}$  on  $M$  such that  $\text{Ric}(G^{bdy}) = T$  on some neighbourhood of  $\partial M$  and  $G_{\partial M}^{bdy} = R$ .*

The proofs of Theorems 2.5 and 2.6 will rely on Proposition 3.9 appearing below. This proposition will also demonstrate that a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant metric solving the prescribed Ricci curvature equation near a  $\mathcal{G}$ -orbit on  $M$  is uniquely determined by the metric it induces on this  $\mathcal{G}$ -orbit and by the orbit's second fundamental form.

*Remark 2.7.* Assume  $\mathcal{G}$  is the special orthogonal group  $\text{SO}(d)$  and  $M_1$  coincides with  $\mathbb{R}^d$  less a closed ball around the origin. One may then be able to study boundary-value problems for (1.1) with the methods of [9]; see also [19]. These methods consist in reducing the prescribed Ricci curvature equation to a first-order ordinary differential equation for a single real-value function. The authors of [9] were able to achieve such a reduction by exploiting the fact that  $\text{SO}(d)$ -invariant metrics on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are globally conformally flat. In essence, their arguments relied on a clever change of variable in the prescribed Ricci curvature equation.

*Remark 2.8.* Instead of requiring that Hypothesis 2.1 hold for  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ , we may assume  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  is an abelian Lie group. The  $\mathcal{H}$ -module  $\mathfrak{p}$  can then be written in the form (2.1) with the  $\mathcal{H}$ -modules  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  being one-dimensional for all  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . As before, we suppose there exists a diffeomorphism  $\Psi$  satisfying formula (2.3). In our current situation, however, it is not necessarily the case that there are smooth functions  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$  from  $[0, \sigma]$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  obeying equality (2.4). Assume that such functions do exist. Suppose also that one can find positive numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  such that (2.6) holds. Thus, we demand that  $T$  and  $R$  be diagonal with respect to (2.1). It is then possible to prove the assertions of Theorems 2.5, 2.6, and 2.2 using the reasoning of Section 3.

*Remark 2.9.* Instead of assuming the existence of  $\Psi$  above, one may assume there is a diffeomorphism such that (2.3) holds with this diffeomorphism substituted for  $\Psi$  and a minus sign in front of  $dr \otimes dr$ . The techniques in the present paper seem to be effective for treating this case. We will not dwell on any further details.

*Example 2.10.* Given an interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  and a number  $\epsilon \geq 0$ , denote

$$\mathcal{D}_I = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \in I\}, \quad \mathcal{S}_\epsilon = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x^2 + y^2 = \epsilon^2\}.$$

Assume  $\mathcal{G}$  is the product  $\text{SO}(2) \times \text{SO}(2)$ . Define  $M_1$  to equal  $\mathcal{D}_{(\frac{\chi}{2}, 2)} \times \mathcal{S}_1$  with  $\chi > 0$ . The standard action of  $\text{SO}(2)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  gives rise to an action of  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $M_1$ . The orbits of this action are the tori  $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon \times \mathcal{S}_1$  with  $\epsilon \in (\frac{\chi}{2}, 2)$ . The isotropy group of an arbitrarily chosen point in  $M_1$  consists of nothing but the identity element in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Consider a  $(0, 2)$ -tensor field  $T$  on  $M_1$ . It is convenient for us to assume that  $T$  is positive-definite, although this assumption can be relaxed. Suppose  $T$  is rotationally symmetric in the sense of [14, 24]. This means  $T$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant and diagonal with respect to the cylindrical coordinates on  $\mathcal{D}_{[0, 2]} \times \mathcal{S}_1$ . We define  $M$  to equal  $\mathcal{D}_{[\chi, 1]} \times \mathcal{S}_1$ . Thus,  $M$  is a solid torus less a neighbourhood of the core circle. Consider a symmetric positive-definite  $(0, 2)$ -tensor field  $R$  on  $\partial M$ . We suppose  $R$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant and diagonal in the coordinates induced on  $\partial M$  by the cylindrical coordinates on  $\mathcal{D}_{[0, 2]} \times \mathcal{S}_1$ . In the current setting, Theorem 2.2 (along with Remark 2.8) yields a sufficient condition for the solvability of the equation  $\text{Ric}(G) = T$  on all of  $M$ , subject to  $G_{\partial M} = R$ . No such condition previously appeared in the literature. Theorems 2.5 and 2.6 imply local solvability; cf. [24].

### 3 The proofs

In what follows, we assume  $T$  is positive-definite and  $c_1 = c_2 = 1$ . Thus, the function  $\sigma_0$ , whose existence Theorem 2.2 asserts, becomes a function of three variables, not five. These assumptions will make our arguments easier to follow. Removing them is straightforward.

#### 3.1 Preparatory material

We begin by stating a formula for the Ricci curvature of a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant metric on  $M$ . This formula will involve two arrays of numbers,  $(\beta_k)_{k=1}^n$  and  $(\gamma_{k,l}^m)_{k,l,m=1}^n$ . In order to introduce them, denote by  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  and  $P$  the Lie bracket and the Killing form of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The irreducibility of the summands in decomposition (2.1) implies the existence of nonnegative numbers  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$  such that

$$P(X, Y) = -\beta_k Q(X, Y), \quad k = 1, \dots, n, \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}_k.$$

Because the group  $\mathcal{G}$  is compact and Hypothesis 2.1 holds, at least one of these numbers must be strictly positive. Suppose  $d$  is the dimension of  $M$ . We choose a  $Q$ -orthonormal basis  $(\tilde{e}_i)_{i=1}^{d-1}$  of the space  $\mathfrak{p}$  adapted to (2.1). In addition to  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ , let us define

$$\gamma_{k,l}^m = \frac{1}{d_k} \sum Q([\tilde{e}_{\iota_k}, \tilde{e}_{\iota_l}], \tilde{e}_{\iota_m})^2$$

for  $m, k, l = 1, \dots, n$ . The sum here is taken over all  $\iota_k, \iota_l$ , and  $\iota_m$  such that  $\tilde{e}_{\iota_k} \in \mathfrak{p}_k$ ,  $\tilde{e}_{\iota_l} \in \mathfrak{p}_l$ , and  $\tilde{e}_{\iota_m} \in \mathfrak{p}_m$ . Note that  $\gamma_{k,l}^m$  is independent of the choice of  $(\tilde{e}_i)_{i=1}^{d-1}$ .

Consider a Riemannian metric  $G$  on  $M$ . Suppose  $h, f_1, \dots, f_n$  are smooth functions from  $[0, \sigma]$  to  $(0, \infty)$ . Let  $G$  be defined by the equality

$$G = h^2(r) dr \otimes dr + G_r, \quad r \in [0, \sigma]. \quad (3.1)$$

The tensor field  $G_r$  in the right-hand side is the  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric on  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  such that

$$G_r(X, Y) = f_1^2(r) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} Y) + \dots + f_n^2(r) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} Y), \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}. \quad (3.2)$$

In the sequel, the prime next to a real-valued function on  $[0, \sigma]$  will denote the derivative of this function.

**Lemma 3.1.** *The Ricci curvature of the Riemannian metric  $G$  given by (3.1) and (3.2) obeys the equality*

$$\text{Ric}(G) = \text{Ric}^{\text{lin}} + \text{Ric}_r^{\text{orb}}, \quad r \in [0, \sigma],$$

where  $\text{Ric}^{\text{lin}}$  is the  $(0,2)$ -tensor field on  $[0, \sigma]$  satisfying

$$\text{Ric}^{\text{lin}} = - \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{f_k''}{f_k} - \frac{h' f_k'}{h f_k} \right) dr \otimes dr$$

and  $\text{Ric}_r^{\text{orb}}$  is the  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant  $(0,2)$ -tensor field on  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ric}_r^{\text{orb}}(X, Y) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{\beta_i}{2} + \sum_{k,l=1}^n \gamma_{i,k}^l \frac{f_i^4 - 2f_k^4}{4f_k^2 f_l^2} - \frac{f_i f_i'}{h} \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \frac{f_k'}{h f_k} + \frac{f_i'^2}{h^2} - \frac{f_i f_i''}{h^2} + \frac{f_i h' f_i'}{h^3} \right) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} Y) \end{aligned}$$

for  $X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}$ .

*Proof.* The terms involving  $dr$  are computed and listed under Proposition 1.14 in [18]. Let us find  $\text{Ric}_r^{\text{orb}}$ . Hypothesis 2.1 implies

$$\text{Ric}_r^{\text{orb}}(X, Y) = 0$$

when  $X \in \mathfrak{p}_i$  and  $Y \in \mathfrak{p}_j$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Remark 1.16 in [18] states that

$$\text{Ric}_r^{\text{orb}}(X, X) = \left( \frac{\beta_i}{2} + \sum_{k,l=1}^n \gamma_{i,k}^l \frac{f_i^4 - 2f_k^4}{4f_k^2 f_l^2} - \frac{f_i f_i'}{h} \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \frac{f_k'}{h f_k} + \frac{f_i'^2}{h^2} - \frac{f_i f_i''}{h^2} + \frac{f_i h' f_i'}{h^3} \right) Q(X, X)$$

when  $X \in \mathfrak{p}_i$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . In view of Hypothesis 2.1, the desired expression for  $\text{Ric}_r^{\text{orb}}$  immediately follows.  $\square$

If the Ricci curvature of  $G$  coincides with  $T$ , then Lemma 3.1 yields the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} - \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{f_k''}{f_k} - \frac{h' f_k'}{h f_k} \right) &= 1, \\ \frac{\beta_i}{2} + \sum_{k,l=1}^n \gamma_{i,k}^l \frac{f_i^4 - 2f_k^4}{4f_k^2 f_l^2} - \frac{f_i f_i'}{h} \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \frac{f_k'}{h f_k} + \frac{f_i'^2}{h^2} - \frac{f_i f_i''}{h^2} + \frac{f_i h' f_i'}{h^3} &= \phi_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

The following result is essentially a restatement of the contracted second Bianchi identity.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Assume the Ricci curvature of the metric  $G$  given by (3.1) and (3.2) obeys the equality*

$$\text{Ric}(G) = \bar{\sigma}(r) dr \otimes dr + T_r, \quad r \in [0, \sigma],$$

with  $\bar{\sigma}$  being a smooth function on  $[0, \sigma]$  and  $T_r$  satisfying (2.4). Then

$$\frac{\bar{\sigma}'}{2h^2} - \frac{\bar{\sigma} h'}{h^3} = \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{\phi_k'}{2f_k^2} - \frac{\bar{\sigma} f_k'}{h^2 f_k} \right). \quad (3.4)$$

*Proof.* Fix a  $Q$ -orthonormal basis  $(\tilde{e}_i)_{i=1}^{d-1}$  of the space  $\mathfrak{p}$  adapted to the decomposition (2.1). Recall that we identify  $\mathfrak{p}$  with the tangent space of  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  at  $\mathcal{H}$ . Given  $r_0 \in [0, \sigma]$ , let us construct a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant  $G$ -orthonormal frame field  $(e_i)_{i=1}^d$  on a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $(r_0, \mathcal{H})$  in  $M$  so that the following requirements are met:

1. The equality  $e_i = (0, \frac{1}{f_i(r)}\tilde{e}_i)$  holds at  $(r, \mathcal{H})$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, d-1$  as long as  $(r, \mathcal{H}) \in U$ .
2. The vector field  $e_d$  coincides with  $(\frac{1}{h(r)}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}, 0)$  on  $U$ .

The contracted second Bianchi identity then implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \nabla_{e_i} \text{Ric}(G)(e_i, e_d) = \frac{1}{2} e_d \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \text{Ric}(G)(e_i, e_i) \right).$$

The symbol  $\nabla$  in the left-hand side denotes the covariant derivative in the tensor bundle over  $M$  given by the Levi-Civita connection of  $G$ . We calculate and see that the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d \nabla_{e_i} \text{Ric}(G)(e_i, e_d) &= \sum_{i=1}^d e_i(\text{Ric}(G)(e_i, e_d)) - \sum_{i=1}^d \text{Ric}(G)(\nabla_{e_i} e_i, e_d) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^d \text{Ric}(G)(e_i, \nabla_{e_i} e_d) \\ &= e_d(\text{Ric}(G)(e_d, e_d)) - \sum_{i=1}^d G(\nabla_{e_i} e_i, e_d) \text{Ric}(G)(e_d, e_d) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^d G(\nabla_{e_i} e_d, e_i) \text{Ric}(G)(e_i, e_i) \\ &= \frac{\bar{\sigma}'}{h^3} - \frac{2\bar{\sigma}h'}{h^4} + \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \frac{\bar{\sigma}f'_k}{h^3 f_k} - \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \frac{f'_k}{h f_k^3} \phi_k, \end{aligned}$$

as well as the equality

$$\frac{1}{2} e_d \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \text{Ric}(G)(e_i, e_i) \right) = \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{\phi'_k}{2h f_k^2} - \frac{f'_k}{h f_k^3} \phi_k \right) + \frac{\bar{\sigma}'}{2h^3} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}h'}{h^4},$$

hold at  $(r_0, \mathcal{H})$ . The assertion of the lemma follows immediately.  $\square$

Denote by  $f$  and  $\phi$  the functions  $(f_1, \dots, f_n)$  and  $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$  acting from  $[0, \sigma]$  to  $(0, \infty)^n$ . We can rewrite the second equality in (3.3) as

$$f''(r) = F(h(r), h'(r), f(r), f'(r), \phi(r)), \quad r \in [0, \sigma], \quad (3.5)$$

with  $F : (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty)^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  given by the formulas

$$\begin{aligned} F(p, q, x, y, z) &= (F_1(p, q, x, y, z), \dots, F_n(p, q, x, y, z)), \\ F_i(p, q, x, y, z) &= \frac{\beta_i p^2}{2x_i} + p^2 \sum_{k,l=1}^n \gamma_{i,k}^l \frac{x_i^4 - 2x_k^4}{4x_i x_k^2 x_l^2} - \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \frac{y_i y_k}{x_k} + \frac{y_i^2}{x_i} + \frac{q y_i}{p} - \frac{p^2}{x_i} z_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ p &\in (0, \infty), \quad q \in \mathbb{R}, \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (0, \infty)^n, \quad y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

The prime next to a vector-valued function means component-wise differentiation. Combining the two equalities in (3.3), we find

$$H_1(f(r), f'(r)) = h^2(r) H_2(f(r), \phi(r)), \quad r \in [0, \sigma], \quad (3.6)$$

with the mappings  $H_1 : (0, \infty)^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $H_2 : (0, \infty)^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by the formulas

$$H_1(x, y) = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \sum_{l=1}^n d_l \frac{y_k y_l}{x_k x_l} - \frac{y_k^2}{x_k^2} \right), \quad H_2(x, z) = \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{z_k}{x_k^2} - \frac{\beta_k}{2x_k^2} - \sum_{l,m=1}^n \gamma_{k,l}^m \frac{x_k^4 - 2x_l^4}{4x_k^2 x_l^2 x_m^2} \right),$$

$$x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (0, \infty)^n, \quad y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It will be convenient for us to denote

$$H(x, y, z) = \sqrt{H_1(x, y)H_2^{-1}(x, z)}$$

for  $x \in (0, \infty)^n$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $H_2(x, z) \neq 0$  and  $H_1(x, y)H_2^{-1}(x, z) \geq 0$ .

Solving (3.4) for  $h'(r)$  and substituting 1 for  $\bar{\sigma}(r)$ , we arrive at the following conclusion: if  $\text{Ric}(G)$  coincides with  $T$ , then

$$h'(r) = K(h(r), f(r), f'(r), \phi'(r)), \quad r \in [0, \sigma]. \quad (3.7)$$

Here,  $K : (0, \infty)^{1+n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$K(p, x, y, w) = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i \left( \frac{p y_i}{x_i} - \frac{p^3 w_i}{2x_i^2} \right),$$

$$p \in (0, \infty), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (0, \infty)^n, \quad y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad w = (w_1, \dots, w_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let  $a$  and  $b$  denote the vectors  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  and  $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$  with the numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  coming from (2.6). If the metric  $G_{\partial M}$  induced by  $G$  on  $\partial M$  equals  $R$ , then

$$f(0) = a, \quad f(\sigma) = b. \quad (3.8)$$

We also point out that, whenever (3.6) holds, we must have

$$H_1(f(0), f'(0)) = h^2(0)H_2(f(0), \phi(0)). \quad (3.9)$$

### 3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2 (less the key lemma)

Intuitively, our plan for proving Theorem 2.2 is to find a metric  $G$  satisfying two requirements. The first one is that  $\text{Ric}(G)$  equal  $T$  in the directions tangent to the  $\mathcal{G}$ -orbits. The other is that  $G$  and  $T$  obey the contracted second Bianchi identity. When both of these requirements are met, it must be the case that  $\text{Ric}(G) = T$ . We define  $\rho_0$  by the formula

$$\rho_0(p, q) = 2 \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{\beta_k q^2}{2p^2} + \sum_{l,m=1}^n \gamma_{k,l}^m \frac{q^6}{4p^6} \right), \quad p, q \in (0, \infty).$$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Assume that inequalities (2.9) and the first inequality in (2.10) are satisfied. There exists a function  $\sigma_0 : (0, \infty)^3 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  such that the following statement holds: if  $\sigma$  is less than  $\sigma_0(\alpha, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ , then we can find smooth  $f : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow (0, \infty)^n$  and  $h : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  solving equations (3.5) and (3.7) under the boundary conditions (3.8) and (3.9).*

We will present the proof of Lemma 3.3 in Section 3.3. Meanwhile, fix a function  $\sigma_0$  satisfying the assertion of this lemma. Suppose  $\sigma$  is less than  $\sigma_0(\alpha, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ . Let  $f : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow (0, \infty)^n$  and  $h : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  be smooth functions obeying (3.5), (3.7), (3.8) and (3.9). We define the metric  $G$  on  $M$  through (3.1)–(3.2). It is easy to see that the Ricci curvature of  $G$  must equal

$$\bar{\sigma}(r) dr \otimes dr + T_r, \quad r \in [0, \sigma],$$

for some  $\bar{\sigma} : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The induced metric  $G_{\partial M}$  coincides with  $R$ . The proof of Theorem 2.2 will be complete if we demonstrate that  $\bar{\sigma}(r) = 1$  for all  $r \in [0, \sigma]$ .

Lemma 3.2 implies

$$\bar{\sigma}' = \frac{2\bar{\sigma}h'}{h} + \sum_{i=1}^n d_i \left( \frac{h^2\phi_i'}{f_i^2} - \frac{2\bar{\sigma}f_i'}{f_i} \right). \quad (3.10)$$

Thanks to (3.7), this formula will still hold if we replace  $\bar{\sigma}$  in it by the function identically equal to 1 on  $[0, \sigma]$ . Furthermore, invoking Lemma 3.1 and the boundary conditions (3.8)–(3.9), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\sigma}(0) &= - \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{f_k''(0)}{a_k} - \frac{h'(0)f_k'(0)}{h(0)a_k} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{\beta_k h^2(0)}{2a_k^2} + h^2(0) \sum_{l,m=1}^n \gamma_{k,l}^m \frac{a_k^4 - 2a_l^4}{4a_k^2 a_l^2 a_m^2} - \sum_{l=1}^n d_l \frac{f_k'(0)f_l'(0)}{a_k a_l} + \frac{f_k'^2(0)}{a_k^2} - \frac{h^2(0)}{a_k^2} \phi_k(0) \right) \\ &= h^2(0)H_2(a, \phi(0)) + (1 - H_1(a, f'(0))) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

The standard theorems on the uniqueness of solutions to ordinary differential equations now yield  $\bar{\sigma}(r) = 1$  for  $r \in [0, \sigma]$ .

### 3.3 Proof of Lemma 3.3

From now on and until the end of Section 3.3, we assume that inequalities (2.9) and the first inequality in (2.10) are satisfied. Let  $\bar{f} : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be defined by

$$\bar{f}(r) = a \frac{\sigma - r}{\sigma} + b \frac{r}{\sigma}, \quad r \in [0, \sigma].$$

We seek the function  $f$ , whose existence Lemma 3.3 asserts, in a neighbourhood of  $\bar{f}$ . This, in particular, will help us ensure the positivity of the components of  $f$ . Similarly, we look for the function  $h$  in a neighbourhood of the function  $\bar{h}$  to be introduced in Lemma 3.4. Our arguments will involve the constants

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= H(\bar{f}(0), \bar{f}'(0), \phi(0)), \\ K_0 &= \sup_{p \in [\frac{H_0}{2}, \frac{3H_0}{2}]} \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |K(p, \bar{f}(r), \bar{f}'(r), \phi'(r))|. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality in (2.9) and the first inequality in (2.10) imply that  $H_0$  is well-defined under the assumptions of Lemma 3.4. Recall that the letter  $d$  stands for the dimension of  $M$ . It is evident that  $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i = d - 1$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\rho_1, \sigma_1 > 0$  be given by the formulas*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &= \max \left\{ 4 \left( \sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{\alpha}{\omega_1^2} + \sum_{l,m=1}^n \gamma_{k,l}^m \frac{\omega_2^4}{2\omega_1^6} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{9}{4} \left( \frac{\rho_0(\omega_1, \omega_2)}{2\omega_2^2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\}, \\ \sigma_1 &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\omega_1}{4d}, \frac{2\omega_1^2}{(2\rho_1^2\omega_1 + \rho_1^4)(d-1)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\sigma \leq \sigma_1$ , then the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{h}'(r) &= K(\bar{h}(r), \bar{f}(r), \bar{f}'(r), \phi'(r)), \quad r \in [0, \sigma], \\ \bar{h}(0) &= H_0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

has a unique smooth solution  $\bar{h} : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow (\frac{1}{\rho_1}, \rho_1)$ .



*Proof.* Assume  $\sigma < \sigma_1$ . Employing the standard theory of ordinary differential equations, it is easy to show that the problem (3.11) has a unique smooth solution on the interval  $[0, \min\{\sigma, \frac{H_0}{2\kappa}\}]$  as long as  $K_0 \leq \kappa$ . The values of this solution must lie in  $[\frac{H_0}{2}, \frac{3H_0}{2}]$ .

Our assumptions imply

$$\frac{1}{\rho_1} \leq \frac{H_0}{2} < \frac{3H_0}{2} \leq \rho_1.$$

In view of (2.9), the estimate

$$K_0 \leq \frac{(2\rho_1\omega_1\sigma + \rho_1^3\sigma)(d-1)}{2\omega_1^2}$$

holds true. Keeping these facts in mind, we conclude that problem (3.11) has a unique smooth solution

$$\bar{h} : \left[0, \min\left\{\sigma, \frac{2\omega_1^2}{(2\rho_1^2\omega_1\sigma + \rho_1^4\sigma)(d-1)}\right\}\right] \rightarrow \left(\frac{1}{\rho_1}, \rho_1\right).$$

At the same time, whenever  $\sigma \leq \sigma_1$ , the equality

$$\sigma = \min\left\{\sigma, \frac{2\omega_1^2}{(2\rho_1^2\omega_1\sigma + \rho_1^4\sigma)(d-1)}\right\}$$

is satisfied. This means  $\bar{h}$  is actually defined on  $[0, \sigma]$ .  $\square$

From this moment on and until the end of Section 3.3, let us assume that  $\sigma \leq \sigma_1$ . It then makes sense to talk about  $\bar{h}$ . Our plan is to prove, for small  $\sigma$ , the existence of smooth  $u : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $v : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  solving the equations

$$\begin{aligned} u''(r) &= F(\bar{h}(r) + v(r), \bar{h}'(r) + v'(r), \bar{f}(r) + u(r), \bar{f}'(r) + u'(r), \phi(r)), \\ v'(r) &= -\bar{h}'(r) + K(\bar{h}(r) + v(r), \bar{f}(r) + u(r), \bar{f}'(r) + u'(r), \phi'(r)), \quad r \in [0, \sigma], \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

under the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} u(0) &= u(\sigma) = 0, \\ v(0) &= -\bar{h}(0) + H(\bar{f}(0) + u(0), \bar{f}'(0) + u'(0), \phi(0)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

We will then set  $f = \bar{f} + u$  and  $h = \bar{h} + v$ . It is obvious that these functions will obey (3.5), (3.7), (3.8) and (3.9).

Our proof of the existence of  $u$  and  $v$  will rely on the Schauder fixed point theorem. Let us introduce the space  $\mathcal{B}$  of all the pairs  $(v_1, v_2)$  such that  $v_1 : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $C^1$ -differentiable and  $v_2 : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous. We endow  $\mathcal{B}$  with the norm

$$|(v_1, v_2)|_{\mathcal{B}} = \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |v_1(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} + \sigma \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |v_1'(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} + \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |v_2(r)|,$$

where  $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$  is the Euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Denote by  $B(L)$  the closed ball in  $\mathcal{B}$  of radius  $L > 0$  centered at 0. We will now define a map  $\mathcal{C} : B(L) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  and show that  $\mathcal{C}$  has a fixed point  $(u, v)$  under appropriate conditions. The functions  $u$  and  $v$  will satisfy (3.12) and (3.13).

Assume the radius  $L$  is less than or equal to  $\frac{\sigma}{2} \min\{\omega_1, \frac{1}{\rho_1}\}$ . Given  $(\mu, \nu) \in B(L)$ , let  $u_{\mu, \nu}$  be the unique solution of the problem

$$\begin{aligned} u''_{\mu, \nu}(r) &= \bar{F}(\bar{h}(r) + \nu(r), \bar{f}(r) + \mu(r), \bar{f}'(r) + \mu'(r), \phi(r), \phi'(r)), \quad r \in [0, \sigma], \\ u_{\mu, \nu}(0) &= u_{\mu, \nu}(\sigma) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$\bar{F}(p, x, y, z, w) = F(p, K(p, x, y, w), x, y, z), \quad p \in (0, \infty), \quad x \in (0, \infty)^n, \quad y, z, w \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It is obvious that such a solution exists. Moreover, it is easy to write down an explicit formula for it (the formula is quite lengthy, and we will not present it here; the reader may find it in, e.g., [20, Section XII.4]). We will set  $\mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu) = (u_{\mu, \nu}, v_{\mu, \nu})$  for a properly chosen  $v_{\mu, \nu} : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Before we can describe  $v_{\mu, \nu}$ , however, we need to state the following auxiliary result.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\Theta$  be given by the formula*

$$\Theta = \sqrt{d} \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \left| \frac{4\beta_i \rho_1^2}{\omega_1} + 1, 536\rho_1^2 \sum_{k, l=1}^n \gamma_{i, k}^l \frac{\omega_2^4}{\omega_1^5} + 2\omega_1 + (2\omega_1 + 2\omega_1^2 + 8\rho_1^2)(d-1) + \frac{8\alpha\rho_1^2}{\omega_1} \right|.$$

If  $(\mu, \nu)$  lie in  $B(L)$ , then the estimate

$$\sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} \left| \bar{F}(\bar{h}(r) + \nu(r), \bar{f}(r) + \mu(r), \bar{f}'(r) + \mu'(r), \phi(r), \phi'(r)) \right|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \Theta \quad (3.15)$$

holds true. Moreover, in this case, we have

$$|u_{\mu, \nu}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{8} \Theta, \quad |u'_{\mu, \nu}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \frac{\sigma}{2} \Theta, \quad r \in [0, \sigma]. \quad (3.16)$$

*Proof.* Inequality (3.15) is a straightforward consequence of the definition of  $\bar{F}$ . To obtain (3.16), it suffices to write down an explicit formula for  $u_{\mu, \nu}$  and perform elementary estimation of its terms (for the second part of (3.16), one needs to differentiate before estimating). We refer to [20, Section XII.4] for the details of this argument.  $\square$

From now on and until the end of Section 3.3, we assume

$$\sigma \leq \min \left\{ \sigma_1, \sqrt{\frac{\omega_1}{\Theta}}, \frac{\omega_1}{2d\Theta} \right\}. \quad (3.17)$$

Given  $(\mu, \nu) \in B(L)$ , let us introduce  $v_{\mu, \nu} : [0, \sigma] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  through the formula

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\mu, \nu}(r) = & -\bar{h}(0) + H(\bar{f}(0) + u_{\mu, \nu}(0), \bar{f}'(0) + u'_{\mu, \nu}(0), \phi(0)) \\ & + \int_0^r (-\bar{h}'(s) + K(\bar{h}(s) + \nu(s), \bar{f}(s) + u_{\mu, \nu}(s), \bar{f}'(s) + u'_{\mu, \nu}(s), \phi'(s))) ds, \quad r \in [0, \sigma]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Lemma 3.5 and inequality (3.17) imply the estimates

$$\sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |u_{\mu, \nu}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \frac{\omega_1}{2}, \quad \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |u'_{\mu, \nu}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \frac{\omega_1}{4d},$$

which ensure that the right-hand side of (3.18) is well-defined (indeed, the expression  $H(\bar{f}(0), y, \phi(0))$  is well-defined and positive whenever  $|y|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \frac{\omega_1}{2d}$ ). We now set  $\mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu) = (u_{\mu, \nu}, v_{\mu, \nu})$ . Our next goal is to show that, when  $\sigma$  is sufficiently small and the radius  $L$  is appropriately chosen, the map  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfies the conditions of the Schauder theorem.

Suppose  $\theta > 0$  is a constant obeying the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} |H(x, y, z) - H(x, \hat{y}, z)| & \leq \theta |y - \hat{y}|_{\mathbb{R}^n}, \\ |H(x, y, z) - H(x, \hat{y}, z)| & \leq \theta \sum_{k, l=1}^n |y_k y_l - \hat{y}_k \hat{y}_l|, \\ x & \in [\omega_1, \omega_2]^n, \\ y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) & \in \left[ -\frac{\omega_1}{2d}, \frac{\omega_1}{2d} \right]^n, \quad \hat{y} = (\hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_n) \in \left[ -\frac{\omega_1}{2d}, \frac{\omega_1}{2d} \right]^n, \\ z & \in \left\{ (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in [0, \alpha]^n \mid \sum_{k=1}^n d_k z_k \geq \rho_0(\omega_1, \omega_2) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

and the inequality

$$|K(p, x, y, w) - K(\hat{p}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, w)| \leq \theta(|p - \hat{p}| + |x - \hat{x}|_{\mathbb{R}^n} + |y - \hat{y}|_{\mathbb{R}^n}),$$

$$p, \hat{p} \in \left[ \frac{1}{2\rho_1}, 2\rho_1 \right], \quad x, \hat{x} \in \left[ \frac{\omega_1}{2}, 2\omega_2 \right]^n, \quad y, \hat{y} \in \left[ -\frac{\omega_1}{2d}, \frac{\omega_1}{2d} \right]^n, \quad w \in [-1, 1]^n. \quad (3.20)$$

It is obvious that such a  $\theta$  exists. We define

$$\Sigma = \Theta + \theta n^2(2\Theta + \Theta^2 + \omega_1),$$

$$\sigma_0(\alpha, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \min \left\{ \sigma_1, \sqrt{\frac{\omega_1}{\Theta}}, \frac{\omega_1}{2d\Theta}, \frac{\omega_1}{2\Sigma}, \frac{1}{2\rho_1\Sigma} \right\}.$$

Note that  $\sigma_0$  is the function whose existence (along with  $\rho_0$ ) Lemma 3.3 asserts. Let us also set  $L_0 = \sigma^2\Sigma$ . From now on, we will assume the second inequality in (2.10) holds, i.e.,  $\sigma < \sigma_0(\alpha, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ . This implies, in particular, that  $L_0$  cannot exceed  $\frac{\sigma}{2} \min \left\{ \omega_1, \frac{1}{\rho_1} \right\}$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *The image  $\mathcal{CB}(L_0)$  is contained in  $B(L_0)$ .*

*Proof.* Take a pair  $(\mu, \nu)$  from  $B(L_0)$ . Our goal is to show that  $\mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)$  lies in  $B(L_0)$ . Lemma 3.5 yields the estimate

$$|(u_{\mu, \nu}, v_{\mu, \nu})|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \sigma^2\Theta + \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |v_{\mu, \nu}(r)|.$$

Remembering the second formula in (2.9), we also find

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{\mu, \nu}(r)| &\leq \left| -\bar{h}(0) + H(\bar{f}(0) + u_{\mu, \nu}(0), \bar{f}'(0) + u'_{\mu, \nu}(0), \phi(0)) \right| \\ &\quad + \sigma \sup_{s \in [0, r]} \left| -\bar{h}'(s) + K(\bar{h}(s) + \nu(s), \bar{f}(s) + u_{\mu, \nu}(s), \bar{f}'(s) + u'_{\mu, \nu}(s), \phi'(s)) \right| \\ &= \left| H(\bar{f}(0), \bar{f}'(0) + u'_{\mu, \nu}(0), \phi(0)) - H(\bar{f}(0), \bar{f}'(0), \phi(0)) \right| \\ &\quad + \sigma \sup_{s \in [0, r]} \left| K(\bar{h}(s) + \nu(s), \bar{f}(s) + u_{\mu, \nu}(s), \bar{f}'(s) + u'_{\mu, \nu}(s), \phi'(s)) - K(\bar{h}(s), \bar{f}(s), \bar{f}'(s), \phi'(s)) \right| \\ &\leq \theta \sum_{k, l=1}^n (\sigma |(u_{\mu, \nu})'_k(0)| + \sigma |(u_{\mu, \nu})'_l(0)| + |(u_{\mu, \nu})'_k(0)(u_{\mu, \nu})'_l(0)|) \\ &\quad + \sigma\theta \sup_{s \in [0, r]} (|\nu(s)| + |u_{\mu, \nu}(s)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} + |u'_{\mu, \nu}(s)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \\ &\leq \sigma^2\theta n^2(2\Theta + \Theta^2 + \omega_1), \quad r \in [0, \sigma], \end{aligned}$$

where  $(u_{\mu, \nu})_k$  and  $(u_{\mu, \nu})_l$  are the  $k$ th and the  $l$ th components of  $u_{\mu, \nu}$ . Consequently, it must be the case that

$$|(u_{\mu, \nu}, v_{\mu, \nu})|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \sigma^2(\Theta + \theta n^2(2\Theta + \Theta^2 + \omega_1)) = \sigma^2\Sigma = L_0. \quad \square$$

**Lemma 3.7.** *The map  $\mathcal{C} : B(L_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is continuous.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume the constant  $\theta$  fixed above satisfies

$$\left| \bar{F}(p, x, y, z, w) - \bar{F}(\hat{p}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, z, w) \right|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \theta(|p - \hat{p}| + |x - \hat{x}|_{\mathbb{R}^n} + |y - \hat{y}|_{\mathbb{R}^n}),$$

$$p, \hat{p} \in \left[ \frac{1}{2\rho_1}, 2\rho_1 \right], \quad x, \hat{x} \in \left[ \frac{\omega_1}{2}, 2\omega_2 \right]^n, \quad y, \hat{y} \in \left[ -\frac{\omega_1}{2}, \frac{\omega_1}{2} \right]^n, \quad z \in [0, \alpha]^n, \quad w \in [-1, 1]^n. \quad (3.21)$$

Suppose the pairs  $(\mu_1, \nu_1)$  and  $(\mu_2, \nu_2)$  lie in  $B(L_0)$ . The first formula in (3.14), along with inequalities (3.16) and (3.21), imply

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |u_{\mu_1, \nu_1}(r) - u_{\mu_2, \nu_2}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} &\leq \frac{\sigma\theta}{8} |(\mu_1, \nu_1) - (\mu_2, \nu_2)|_{\mathcal{B}}, \\ \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |u'_{\mu_1, \nu_1}(r) - u'_{\mu_2, \nu_2}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} &\leq \frac{\theta}{2} |(\mu_1, \nu_1) - (\mu_2, \nu_2)|_{\mathcal{B}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.18), (3.19), and (3.20), we also find

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |v_{\mu_1, \nu_1}(r) - v_{\mu_2, \nu_2}(r)| &\leq \theta |u'_{\mu_1, \nu_1}(0) - u'_{\mu_2, \nu_2}(0)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} + \theta \int_0^\sigma |\nu_1(s) - \nu_2(s)| ds \\ &\quad + \theta \int_0^\sigma (|u_{\mu_1, \nu_1}(s) - u_{\mu_2, \nu_2}(s)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} + |u'_{\mu_1, \nu_1}(s) - u'_{\mu_2, \nu_2}(s)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}) ds \\ &\leq \left( \frac{3\theta^2}{2} + \theta \right) |(\mu_1, \nu_1) - (\mu_2, \nu_2)|_{\mathcal{B}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it must be the case that

$$|\mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \nu_1) - \mathcal{C}(\mu_2, \nu_2)|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \left( \frac{3\theta^2}{2} + 2\theta \right) |(\mu_1, \nu_1) - (\mu_2, \nu_2)|_{\mathcal{B}},$$

which tells us  $\mathcal{C}$  is continuous.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** *The closure of the set  $CB(L_0)$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  is a compact subset of  $\mathcal{B}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $((\mu_j, \nu_j))_{j=1}^\infty$  are pairs from  $B(L_0)$ . It suffices to prove that the sequence  $((u_{\mu_j, \nu_j}, v_{\mu_j, \nu_j}))_{j=1}^\infty$  has a convergent subsequence. The mean value theorem and Lemma 3.5 yield the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r_1) - u_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r_2)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} &\leq \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |u'_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} |r_1 - r_2| \leq \frac{\sigma}{2} \Theta |r_1 - r_2|, \\ |u'_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r_1) - u'_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r_2)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} &\leq \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |u''_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} |r_1 - r_2| \leq \Theta |r_1 - r_2|, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

for  $r_1, r_2 \in [0, \sigma]$ . Recalling formulas (3.11) and (3.20), we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r_1) - v_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r_2)| &\leq \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |v'_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r)| |r_1 - r_2| \\ &\leq \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} |-\bar{h}'(r) + K(\bar{h}(r) + \nu_j(r), \bar{f}(r) + u_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r), \bar{f}'(r) + u'_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r), \phi'(r))| |r_1 - r_2| \\ &\leq \theta \sup_{r \in [0, \sigma]} (|\nu_j(r)| + |u_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} + |u'_{\mu_j, \nu_j}(r)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}) |r_1 - r_2| \\ &\leq \theta(\sigma^2 \Sigma + \sigma \Theta) |r_1 - r_2|, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, \quad r_1, r_2 \in [0, \sigma]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the sequences  $(u_{\mu_j, \nu_j})_{j=1}^\infty$ ,  $(u'_{\mu_j, \nu_j})_{j=1}^\infty$ , and  $(v_{\mu_j, \nu_j})_{j=1}^\infty$  are equicontinuous. Furthermore, because  $CB(L_0)$  is a subset of  $B(L_0)$ , they are uniformly bounded. These facts, along with the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, imply that  $((u_{\mu_j, \nu_j}, v_{\mu_j, \nu_j}))_{j=1}^\infty$  must have a convergent subsequence.  $\square$

According to the lemmas above, the map  $\mathcal{C} : B(L_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is continuous, and its image is a precompact subset of  $B(L_0)$ . Consequently, the Schauder theorem (see, e.g., [20, Chapter XII, Corollary 0.1]) allows us to conclude that there exists a pair  $(u, v) \in B(L_0)$  satisfying the equality  $\mathcal{C}(u, v) = (u, v)$ . It is easy to understand that  $u$  and  $v$  obey (3.12) and (3.13). A simple bootstrapping argument demonstrates that  $u$  and  $v$  are smooth. We define  $f = \bar{f} + u$  and  $h = \bar{h} + v$ . Clearly, these functions take values in  $(0, \infty)^n$  and  $(0, \infty)$ , respectively, and solve (3.5) and (3.7) under the conditions (3.8) and (3.9). Thus, Lemma 3.3 is established.

### 3.4 Proof of Theorems 2.5 and 2.6

Given  $\tau \in [0, \sigma]$  and  $\kappa > 0$ , set

$$J_\kappa^\tau = (\tau - \kappa, \tau + \kappa) \cap [0, \sigma], \quad \mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau = J_\kappa^\tau \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}.$$

Obviously,  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$  is a neighbourhood of  $\Gamma^\tau$  in  $M$ . Assume  $G^\tau$  is a Riemannian metric on  $M$  and  $G_{\Gamma^\tau}^\tau$  is the metric on  $\Gamma^\tau$  induced by  $G^\tau$ . Let  $\text{II}(G^\tau)$  be the second fundamental form of  $\Gamma^\tau$  in  $M$  with respect to  $G^\tau$  and to the unit normal whose scalar product with  $(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}, 0)$  is less than 0.

For each  $\tau \in [0, \sigma]$ , consider a symmetric positive-definite  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant  $(0, 2)$ -tensor field  $R^\tau$  on  $\Gamma^\tau$ . In order to keep our notation consistent, we assume  $R^0$  and  $R^\sigma$  are the restrictions of  $R$  to  $\{0\} \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  and  $\{\sigma\} \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ . It is evident that  $R^\tau$  is fully determined by how it acts on  $\mathfrak{p}$ . There exist numbers  $a_{\tau,1}, \dots, a_{\tau,n} > 0$  satisfying

$$R^\tau(X, Y) = a_{\tau,1}^2 Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} Y) + \dots + a_{\tau,n}^2 Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} Y), \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}.$$

Let us also fix, for every  $\tau \in [0, \sigma]$ , a symmetric  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant tensor field  $S^\tau$  on  $\Gamma^\tau$ . There are  $\delta_{\tau,1}, \dots, \delta_{\tau,n} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$S^\tau(X, Y) = \delta_{\tau,1} Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} Y) + \dots + \delta_{\tau,n} Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} Y), \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}.$$

Proposition 3.9, which we are about to state, underlies Theorems 2.5 and 2.6. The author's paper [24] contains similar results, though established in a different setting. Another closely related theorem was obtained in [3]. The methods we use in the present paper are different from those of [24], as we explain in Remark 3.10 below.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Suppose  $\tau \in [0, \sigma]$ . The following two statements are equivalent:*

1. *For some  $\kappa > 0$ , there exists a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric  $G^\tau$  on  $M$  such that  $\text{Ric}(G^\tau) = T$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$ ,  $G_{\Gamma^\tau}^\tau = R^\tau$ , and  $\text{II}(G^\tau) = S^\tau$ .*
2. *The inequality*

$$\sum_{k=1}^n d_k \left( \frac{\beta_k}{2a_{\tau,k}^2} + \sum_{l,m=1}^n \gamma_{k,l}^m \frac{a_{\tau,k}^4 - 2a_{\tau,l}^4}{4a_{\tau,k}^2 a_{\tau,l}^2 a_{\tau,m}^2} - \sum_{l=1}^n d_l \frac{\delta_{\tau,k} \delta_{\tau,l}}{a_{\tau,k}^2 a_{\tau,l}^2} + \frac{\delta_{\tau,k}^2}{a_{\tau,k}^4} - \frac{1}{a_{\tau,k}^2} \phi_k(\tau) \right) < 0 \quad (3.22)$$

*is satisfied.*

*If these statements hold and  $\check{G}^\tau$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant metric on  $M$  such that  $\text{Ric}(\check{G}^\tau) = T$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$ ,  $\check{G}_{\Gamma^\tau}^\tau = R^\tau$ , and  $\text{II}(\check{G}^\tau) = S^\tau$ , then  $\check{G}^\tau$  must coincide with  $G^\tau$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose there exist  $\kappa > 0$  and a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric  $G^\tau$  on  $M$  such that  $\text{Ric}(G^\tau) = T$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$ ,  $G_{\Gamma^\tau}^\tau = R^\tau$ , and  $\text{II}(G^\tau) = S^\tau$ . Employing Lemma 3.1 and the fact that  $T$  is positive-definite, one can show that  $G^\tau$  satisfies the formula

$$G^\tau = h_\tau^2(r) dr \otimes dr + G_\tau^\tau, \quad r \in J_\kappa^\tau. \quad (3.23)$$

Here,  $h_\tau$  is a smooth function acting from  $J_\kappa^\tau$  to  $(0, \infty)$ . The tensor field  $G_\tau^\tau$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric on  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ . It is clear that

$$G_\tau^\tau(X, Y) = f_{\tau,1}^2(r) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} Y) + \dots + f_{\tau,n}^2(r) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} Y), \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}, \quad (3.24)$$

for some smooth functions  $f_{\tau,1}, \dots, f_{\tau,n}$  from  $J_\kappa^\tau$  to  $(0, \infty)$ . The equality  $\text{Ric}(G^\tau) = T$  and Lemma 3.1 imply

$$H_1(f_\tau(r), f'_\tau(r)) = h_\tau^2(r) H_2(f_\tau(r), \phi(r)), \quad r \in J_\kappa^\tau. \quad (3.25)$$

The notation  $f_\tau$  here stands for  $(f_{\tau,1}, \dots, f_{\tau,n})$ . Because  $G_{\Gamma^\tau}^\tau = R^\tau$  and  $\text{II}(G^\tau) = S^\tau$ , we also have

$$f_\tau(\tau) = a_\tau, \quad f'_\tau(\tau) = -h_\tau(\tau) \delta_\tau^a,$$

where  $a_\tau = (a_{\tau,1}, \dots, a_{\tau,n})$  and  $\delta_\tau^a = (\frac{\delta_{\tau,1}}{a_{\tau,1}}, \dots, \frac{\delta_{\tau,n}}{a_{\tau,n}})$ . Keeping these two formulas in mind and using (3.25), we easily calculate that the quantity in the left-hand side of (3.22) is equal to  $-\frac{1}{h_\tau^2(\tau)}$ . This quantity must, therefore, be negative.

Assume now that (3.22) holds. Let us prove the existence of  $\kappa > 0$  and a metric  $G^\tau$  on  $M$  such that  $\text{Ric}(G^\tau) = T$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$ ,  $G_{\Gamma^\tau}^\tau = R^\tau$ , and  $\text{II}(G^\tau) = S^\tau$ . Consider the system of ordinary differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} f_\tau''(r) &= \bar{F}(h_\tau(r), f_\tau(r), f_\tau'(r), \phi(r), \phi'(r)), \\ h_\tau'(r) &= K(h_\tau(r), f_\tau(r), f_\tau'(r), \phi'(r)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

for the unknown functions  $f_\tau$  and  $h_\tau$ . We supplement this system with the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} f_\tau(\tau) &= a_\tau, \\ f_\tau'(\tau) &= -(H_2(a_\tau, \phi(\tau)) + (1 - H_1(a_\tau, \delta_\tau^a)))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta_\tau^a, \\ h_\tau(\tau) &= (H_2(a_\tau, \phi(\tau)) + (1 - H_1(a_\tau, \delta_\tau^a)))^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

Note that, thanks to (3.22), the right-hand sides of the last two formulas are well-defined. The standard theory of ordinary differential equations tells us that problem (3.26)–(3.27) has a solution. To be more precise, for some number  $\kappa > 0$ , there exist smooth functions  $f_\tau : J_\kappa^\tau \rightarrow (0, \infty)^n$  and  $h_\tau : J_\kappa^\tau \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  solving (3.26) on  $J_\kappa^\tau$  and satisfying (3.27). With these functions at hand, we define a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric  $G^\tau$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$  by formulas (3.23) and (3.24). We extend it to all of  $M$  arbitrarily. It follows from (3.26) that

$$\text{Ric}(G^\tau) = \hat{\sigma}(r) dr \otimes dr + T_r, \quad r \in J_\kappa^\tau,$$

for some  $\hat{\sigma} : J_\kappa^\tau \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Employing Lemma 3.2 and arguing as in Section 3.2, one demonstrates that  $\hat{\sigma}$  must be identically equal to 1 on  $J_\kappa^\tau$ . This means  $\text{Ric}(G^\tau) = T$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$ . Conditions (3.27) imply that  $G_{\Gamma^\tau}^\tau = R^\tau$  and  $\text{II}(G^\tau) = S^\tau$ .

Suppose now that statements 1 and 2 in Proposition 3.9 hold true. We may assume the metric  $G^\tau$  satisfies (3.23) and (3.24). Then the functions  $f_\tau$  and  $h_\tau$  solve (3.26)–(3.27) on  $J_\kappa^\tau$ . Consider a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric  $\check{G}^\tau$  on  $M$  such that  $\text{Ric}(\check{G}^\tau) = T$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$ ,  $\check{G}_{\Gamma^\tau}^\tau = R^\tau$ , and  $\text{II}(\check{G}^\tau) = S^\tau$ . Our objective is to show that  $\check{G}^\tau$  coincides with  $G^\tau$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$ . By analogy with (3.23), we write

$$\check{G}^\tau = \check{h}_\tau^2(r) dr \otimes dr + \check{G}_\tau^\tau, \quad r \in J_\kappa^\tau.$$

In the right-hand side,  $\check{h}_\tau : J_\kappa^\tau \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  is a smooth function. The tensor field  $\check{G}_\tau^\tau$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant Riemannian metric on  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ . There are smooth functions  $\check{f}_{\tau,1}, \dots, \check{f}_{\tau,n}$  from  $J_\kappa^\tau$  to  $(0, \infty)$  such that

$$\check{G}_\tau^\tau(X, Y) = \check{f}_{\tau,1}^2(r) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} Y) + \dots + \check{f}_{\tau,n}^2(r) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} Y), \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}.$$

It will be convenient for us to denote  $\check{f}_\tau = (\check{f}_{\tau,1}, \dots, \check{f}_{\tau,n})$ . Because  $\text{Ric}(\check{G}^\tau) = T$ ,  $\check{G}_{\Gamma^\tau}^\tau = R^\tau$ , and  $\text{II}(\check{G}^\tau) = S^\tau$ , formulas (3.26)–(3.27) would still hold on  $J_\kappa^\tau$  if we substituted  $\check{f}_\tau$ ,  $\check{f}_\tau'$ ,  $\check{f}_\tau''$ ,  $\check{h}_\tau$ , and  $\check{h}_\tau'$  in them for  $f_\tau$ ,  $f_\tau'$ ,  $f_\tau''$ ,  $h_\tau$ , and  $h_\tau'$ . The standard theory of ordinary differential equations then implies that  $\check{f}_\tau = f_\tau$  and  $\check{h}_\tau = h_\tau$  on  $J_\kappa^\tau$ . Consequently,  $\check{G}^\tau$  coincides with  $G^\tau$  on  $\mathcal{X}_\kappa^\tau$ . Thus, the proof is complete.  $\square$

*Remark 3.10.* One may establish Proposition 3.9 by adapting the methods employed in the paper [24]. The main idea behind those methods is to modify the right-hand side of (1.1) by a  $G$ -dependent diffeomorphism making the equation more easily solvable. Such an approach relies on the work of DeTurck (see [7, Chapter 5] for an overview) and is similar in spirit to the DeTurck trick for the Ricci flow. Conversely, it seems possible to prove the existence and uniqueness results in [24] with the techniques employed above.

*Remark 3.11.* Suppose we are in the situation described in Remark 2.8. Thus,  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  is an abelian Lie group, and Hypothesis 2.1 fails to hold. In this case, statement 2 of Proposition 3.9 implies statement 1, but establishing the converse implication may be problematic. Roughly speaking, this is because, when Hypothesis 2.1 does not hold, the metric  $G^\tau$  need not be diagonal with respect to (2.1). For the same reason, proving the assertion about  $\check{G}^\tau$  may be troublesome with our methods.

*Remark 3.12.* Statement 1 of Proposition 3.9 is equivalent to statement 2 even if  $T$  is not positive-definite. Yet our methods do not yield the assertion about  $\tilde{G}^\tau$  in this case. Recall that, if  $T$  is not positive-definite, we need to assume the existence of a diffeomorphism  $\Psi$  satisfying (2.2), (2.3) and (2.4).

Theorems 2.5 and 2.6 follow from Proposition 3.9 by choosing  $R^\tau$  and  $S^\tau$  in such a way that

$$\begin{aligned} R^\tau(X, Y) &= \left( \frac{\sigma - \tau}{\sigma} a_1 + \frac{\tau}{\sigma} b_1 \right) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_1} Y) \\ &\quad + \cdots + \left( \frac{1 - \tau}{\sigma} a_n + \frac{\tau}{\sigma} b_n \right) Q(\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} X, \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{p}_n} Y), \\ S^\tau(X, Y) &= \beta Q(X, Y), \quad X, Y \in \mathfrak{p}, \end{aligned}$$

for a sufficiently large  $\beta > 0$ .

## References

- [1] M.T. Anderson, On boundary value problems for Einstein metrics, *Geom. Topol.* 12 (2008) 2009–2045.
- [2] M.T. Anderson, Boundary value problems for metrics on 3-manifolds, in: X. Dai and X. Rong (Eds.), *Metric and differential geometry, in honor of J. Cheeger*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2012, pp. 3–17.
- [3] M.T. Anderson, M. Herzlich, Unique continuation results for Ricci curvature and applications, *J. Geom. Phys.* 58 (2008) 179–207; erratum in *J. Geom. Phys.* 60 (2010) 1062–1067.
- [4] T. Aubin, *Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [5] M. Bailesteanu, X. Cao, A. Pulemotov, Gradient estimates for the heat equation under the Ricci flow, *J. Funct. Anal.* 258 (2010) 3517–3542.
- [6] L. Bérard Bergery, Sur de nouvelles varietes riemanniennes d'Einstein, *Institut Élie Cartan* 6 (1982) 1–60.
- [7] A. Besse, *Einstein manifolds*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [8] C. Böhm, Inhomogeneous Einstein metrics on low-dimensional spheres and other low-dimensional spaces, *Invent. Math.* 134 (1998) 145–176.
- [9] J. Cao, D.M. DeTurck, The Ricci curvature equation with rotational symmetry, *Amer. J. Math.* 116 (1994) 219–241.
- [10] J.C. Cortissoz, Three-manifolds of positive curvature and convex weakly umbilic boundary, *Geom. Dedicata* 138 (2009) 83–98.
- [11] A.S. Dancer, M.Y. Wang, Integrable cases of the Einstein equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 208 (1999) 225–243.
- [12] A.S. Dancer, M.Y. Wang, The cohomogeneity one Einstein equations from the Hamiltonian viewpoint, *J. reine angew. Math.* 524 (2000) 97–128.
- [13] A.S. Dancer, M.Y. Wang, On Ricci solitons of cohomogeneity one, *Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom.* 39 (2011) 259–292.
- [14] J. DeBlois, D. Knopf, A. Young, Cross curvature flow on a negatively curved solid torus, *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 10 (2010) 343–372.
- [15] Ph. Delanoë, Local solvability of elliptic, and curvature, equations on compact manifolds, *J. reine angew. Math.* 558 (2003) 23–45.
- [16] E. Delay, Studies of some curvature operators in a neighborhood of an asymptotically hyperbolic Einstein manifold, *Adv. Math.* 168 (2002) 213–224.

- [17] P. Gianniotis, The Ricci flow on manifolds with boundary, arXiv:1210.0813 [math.DG].
- [18] K. Grove, W. Ziller, Cohomogeneity one manifolds with positive Ricci curvature, *Invent. Math.* 149 (2002) 619–646.
- [19] R.S. Hamilton, The Ricci curvature equation, in: S.-S. Chern (Ed.), *Seminar on nonlinear partial differential equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984, pp. 47–72.
- [20] P. Hartman, *Ordinary differential equations*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1964.
- [21] C.A. Hoelscher, Classification of cohomogeneity one manifolds in low dimensions, *Pacific J. Math.* 246 (2010) 129–185.
- [22] R. Pina, K. Tenenblat, On solutions of the Ricci curvature equation and the Einstein equation, *Israel J. Math.* 171 (2009) 61–76.
- [23] A. Pulemotov, Quasilinear parabolic equations and the Ricci flow on manifolds with boundary, *J. reine angew. Math.* 683 (2013) 97–118.
- [24] A. Pulemotov, Metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature near the boundary of a manifold, *Math. Ann.* 357 (2013) 969–986.
- [25] A. Pulemotov, The Ricci flow on domains in cohomogeneity one manifolds, submitted, arXiv:1410.7505 [math.AP].
- [26] A. Pulemotov, Metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature on homogeneous spaces, submitted, arXiv:1504.01498 [math.DG].
- [27] Y.A. Rubinstein, Some discretizations of geometric evolution equations and the Ricci iteration on the space of Kähler metrics, *Adv. Math.* 218 (2008) 1526–1565.
- [28] Y.A. Rubinstein, Some discretizations of geometric evolution equations and the Ricci iteration on the space of Kähler metrics, Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2008.
- [29] Y. Shen, On Ricci deformation of a Riemannian metric on manifold with boundary, *Pacific J. Math.* 173 (1996) 203–221.