

Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric via an Einstein-Dirac parabolic flow

Yannick Sire Tian Xu

Abstract

We introduce a new parabolic flow deforming any Riemannian metric on a spin manifold by following a constrained gradient flow of the total scalar curvature. This flow is built out of the well-known Dirac-Einstein functional. We prove local well-posedness of smooth solutions. The present contribution is the first installment of more general program on the Einstein-Dirac problem.

Keywords. Dirac operator; Einstein-Dirac problem; Parabolic flow.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Basic notations	6
3	Perturbation for a spinorial eigenvalue problem	7
3.1	A quick review on the multiplicity of eigenvalues	8
3.2	The perturbation	10
4	A nonlocal linear parabolic equation	12
5	An initial-value problem for the Einstein-Dirac equation	18
5.1	Set up of the problem	18
5.2	The local well-posedness	19

Y. Sire: Department of Mathematics, Johns Hopkins University, 3400 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21218; e-mail: ysire1@jhu.edu

T. Xu: Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, Zhejiang, 321004, China; e-mail: xutian@amss.ac.cn

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): Primary 53C27; Secondary 35R01

A Appendix	27
A.1 Parabolic Sobolev embeddings	27
A.2 Regularity theory for the linear problem (4.7)	27
A.3 Technical results	31

1 Introduction

The conformally invariant variational problems that arise in geometry and theoretical physics often exhibit rich and subtle mathematical structures. Uncovering and utilizing these structures to explore new phenomena can lead to some of the most challenging and interesting problems in geometric analysis. One of the most famous examples in this context is the Yamabe problem on a closed Riemannian manifold (M, g) , $\dim M \geq 3$, which aims at finding a metric \tilde{g} in the given conformal class $[g] := \{e^{2f}g : f \in C^\infty(M)\}$ such that the scalar curvature $\text{Scal}_{\tilde{g}}$ is constant (this problem has been settled by a series of works of H. Yamabe, N. Trudinger, T. Aubin and R. Schoen, see for instance [2, 33, 37, 40] and [31] for a good overview). The major steps in the resolution of the Yamabe problem have deep links with variational methods, elliptic partial differential equations, and general relativity.

Let us mention here that there exists a parabolic proof of the Yamabe problem, which is somehow more desirable, as it focuses on an evolution equation that deforms any Riemannian metric conformally to a constant scalar curvature one. In his seminal paper [24], R.S. Hamilton has introduced the so-called Yamabe flow which is given by the following equation

$$\partial_t g(t) = -(\text{Scal}_{g(t)} - \overline{\text{Scal}}_{g(t)})g(t), \quad g(0) = g_0,$$

where g_0 stands for the initial metric and $\overline{\text{Scal}}_{g(t)} = \int_M \text{Scal}_{g(t)} d\text{vol}_{g(t)} / \int_M d\text{vol}_{g(t)}$ is the average scalar curvature of the evolved metric $g(t)$. And this gave rise to an extensive literature, see for instance [9, 10, 14, 34, 41].

In the context of spin geometry, spinor bundles are an important tool in differential geometry as well as in mathematical physics, where they model fermionic particles. A nonlinear coupling of the gravitational field with an eigenspinor of the Dirac operator via the energy-momentum tensor gives rise to an interesting problem, which is to find a Riemannian structure admitting an eigenspinor such that its energy-momentum tensor satisfies the Einstein equation. More precisely, let M be a closed manifold of dimension $m \geq 3$ and equipped with a *topological spin structure* on M (the term “topological” refers to the fact that the definition does not depend on a metric; however, we remark here that it does need a differentiable structure on M , not only a topological one, see [4] for more details on this). For a fixed real constant $\lambda \neq 0$, the starting point is the action functional

$$W(g, \psi) := \int_M \left[\text{Scal}_g + (D_g \psi, \psi)_g - \lambda |\psi|_g^2 \right] d\text{vol}_g \quad (1.1)$$

describing the interaction of a spinor field ψ and a gravitational metric g , whose volume element is denoted by $d\text{vol}_g$. We use D_g for the Dirac operator derived from the metric g and $(\cdot, \cdot)_g$ for the hermitian scalar product on the spinor bundle $\mathbb{S}(M, g)$. The Euler-Lagrange equations are the Einstein and the Dirac equation

$$\text{Ric}_g - \frac{1}{2} \text{Scal}_g g = \frac{1}{4} T_{(g, \psi)}, \quad D_g \psi = \lambda \psi, \quad (1.2)$$

where the energy-momentum tensor $T_{(g,\psi)}$ is given by the formula

$$T_{(g,\psi)}(X, Y) = \operatorname{Re}(X \cdot \nabla_Y^g \psi + Y \cdot \nabla_X^g \psi, \psi)_g \quad \forall X, Y \in TM$$

with “ \cdot ” being the Clifford multiplication and ∇^g being the metric connection on $\mathbb{S}(M, g)$. The coupled system (1.2), henceforth called the *Einstein-Dirac equation*, has been considered in physics for a long time in dimension 4 and Lorentzian signature, as it describes the interaction for a particle of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ with the gravitation field (cf. [11, 17]). See also [6, 20, 27] for some studies on the Riemannian spin 3-manifolds.

By restricting the functional (1.1) on a given conformal class $[g]$ and using the conformal covariance of the Dirac operator (cf. [22, 25])

$$D_g \psi = e^{\frac{m+1}{2}f} D_{e^{2f}g} (e^{-\frac{m-1}{2}f} \psi), \quad (1.3)$$

we obtain a functional Φ given by

$$\Phi(u, \psi) := W(u^{\frac{4}{m-2}} g, u^{-\frac{m-1}{m-2}} \psi) = \int_M \left[u L_g u + (D_g \psi, \psi)_g - \lambda u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} |\psi|_g^2 \right] d \operatorname{vol}_g$$

for a positive function u and a spinor field ψ , where $L_g = -\frac{4(m-1)}{m-2} \Delta_g + \operatorname{Scal}_g$ is the conformal Yamabe operator. The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equations are

$$\begin{cases} L_g u = \frac{\lambda}{m-2} |\psi|_g^2 u^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}}, \\ D_g \psi = \lambda u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \psi, \end{cases} \quad u > 0 \quad (1.4)$$

which is conformally invariant. Such a coupled system has drawn much attention in recent years, see for instance [8, 29] and references therein, where the regularity theorems, Fredholm theorems and bubbling phenomenon have been investigated in dimension 3.

Let us point out here that one can use the simple scaling $v = \mu u$ and $\varphi = \tau \psi$, with $\mu, \tau > 0$, to transform (1.4) equivalently to

$$\begin{cases} L_g v = \frac{\lambda}{m-2} \tau^{-2} \mu^{\frac{2m-6}{m-2}} |\varphi|_g^2 v^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}}, \\ D_g \varphi = \lambda \mu^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} v^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \varphi, \end{cases} \quad v > 0.$$

And hence, by suitably choosing μ and τ , we can see that the specific value of λ in Eq. (1.4) is rather irrelevant. On the other hand, since the Yamabe operator is involved, one can expect that the sign of λ would play a role in the analysis of Eq. (1.4), say for instance $\lambda > 0$ (or $\lambda < 0$) represents the case of positive (or negative) scalar curvature. The existence problem for the Einstein-Dirac equation in the form of (1.4) remains largely unexplored. One of the goals of the present work is specifically to design a parabolic approach to the existence issue for (1.4). Additionally, we want to propose and develop a parabolic approach to the conformal deformation of Riemannian metrics based on the previous Einstein-Dirac equation. Since the first equation in (1.4) is elliptic, the naive approach to make it parabolic by flowing both equations does not provide a suitable parabolic PDE. Indeed, some standard computations to evolve geometric quantities under the flow do not lead to anything useful. On the other hand, the second

equation in (1.4) can be viewed as a generalized eigenvalue problem for the Dirac operator D_g . Using the link with the Yamabe flow which is the gradient flow of the total scalar curvature, we couple the evolution of scalar curvature via Yamabe flow, *under the generalized eigenvalue equation for the spinor interpreted as a constraint for the flow*. It is then natural to relate the flow with a conformal evolution of the Riemannian metric since the Yamabe operator and the scalar curvature are involved, just as in the Yamabe problem. And thus, we introduce the following flow for the Einstein-Dirac equation (which will be formally introduced in Subsection 5.1):

$$\frac{\partial u^{\frac{m+2}{m-2}}}{\partial t} = -\frac{m+2}{m-2} \left[L_g u - \left(\frac{\int_M u L_g u d \text{vol}_g}{\int_M u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} |\psi_u|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g} \right) |\psi_u|_g^2 u^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}} \right]. \quad (1.5)$$

where ψ_u stands for the generalized Dirac-eigenspinor along the flow (the corresponding eigenvalue, which is not directly appearing in (1.5), will be denoted by λ_u). The initial data consist of a positive function $u(0) = u_0$ on M and an eigenpair $(\lambda_u(0), \psi_u(0)) = (\lambda_0, \psi_0)$. We shall consider this problem as a model for a parabolic approach to other problems in geometric analysis that involve a nonlocal term.

In what follows, let (M, g, σ) be an m -dimensional closed spin manifold, $m \geq 3$, with a fixed spin structure $\sigma : P_{\text{Spin}}(M) \rightarrow P_{\text{SO}}(M)$ and a fixed smooth Riemannian metric g . Endow the space \mathcal{M} of Riemannian metrics over M with the C^∞ -topology. In order to provide a precise description of our result, we recall a ‘‘rigidity’’ condition introduced in [12] for the Dirac operator.

Definition 1.1. An eigenspace of the Dirac operator D_g is said to be a rigid eigenspace if it has dimension greater or equal than two, and for any two eigenspinors ψ, φ with $\int_M |\psi|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g = \int_M |\varphi|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g = 1$ then

$$|\psi(x)|_g = |\varphi(x)|_g \quad \forall x \in M.$$

Denote \mathcal{C}_+^∞ the set of all positive smooth functions on M and equip it with C^∞ -topology. For each $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}_+^\infty$, let (λ_0, ψ_0) with $\lambda_0 \neq 0$ be a nontrivial eigenpair of the generalized eigenvalue problem

$$D_g \psi = \lambda u_0^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \psi \quad \text{for } (\lambda, \psi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Gamma(\mathbb{S}(M, g)). \quad (1.6)$$

Our main result is the following

Theorem 1.2. *Assume D_g has no rigid eigenspaces. For a generic choice of $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}_+^\infty$, the problem (1.5) with initial data (u_0, λ_0, ψ_0) admits a unique smooth solution in the time interval $[0, T)$ for some $T > 0$.*

Here, by ‘‘generic’’ we mean the set of functions $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}_+^\infty$ for which Theorem 1.2 holds is a residual set of \mathcal{C}_+^∞ .

The previous theorem provides only the local well-posedness for (1.5). We would like to emphasize that global well-posedness does not follow from standard techniques due to the special structure of our PDE. It is important to notice that the problem we consider is of parabolic-elliptic nature. Of course, our Theorem 1.2 implies, by standard parabolic arguments, global well-posedness for *small* data. More importantly, the *convergence* of the flow is a difficult problem. We will address it in a forthcoming work but we would like to point out that if convergence

holds at infinity we expect that the limit would solve

$$\begin{cases} L_g u = \frac{\int_M u L_g u d \text{vol}_g}{\int_M u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} |\psi|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g} |\psi|_g^2 u^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}}, \\ D_g \psi = \frac{\int_M (D_g \psi, \psi)_g d \text{vol}_g}{\int_M u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} |\psi|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g} u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \psi, \end{cases} \quad u > 0. \quad (1.7)$$

and a direct computation shows that there is a one-to-one correspondence between solutions of (1.4) and (1.7).

Of course, one would like to get rid of the ‘‘rigidity’’ assumption in Theorem 1.2. This will be the case in dimension three since the quaternionic rank of the spinor bundle is simple, that is $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{H}} \mathbb{S}(M) = 1$ when $\dim M = 3$. Hence, as a specific case, we have

Theorem 1.3. *For a generic smooth positive function u_0 on a closed spin 3-manifold (M, g, σ) , and an arbitrary choice of (λ_0, ψ_0) satisfying*

$$D_g \psi_0 = \lambda_0 u_0^2 \psi_0 \quad (1.8)$$

with $\lambda_0 \neq 0$ and $\psi_0 \neq 0$. There exist $T > 0$ and a unique smooth triple $(u, \lambda_u, \psi_u) : [0, T) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_+^\infty \times \mathbb{R} \times \Gamma(\mathbb{S}(M, g))$ so that $u(0) = u_0$, $\lambda_u(0) = \lambda_0$, $\psi_u(0) = \psi_0$ and

$$D_g \psi_u(t) = \lambda_u(t) u(t)^2 \psi_u(t) \quad \text{for all time } t \in [0, T).$$

Furthermore, (u, ψ_u) evolves through the following flow equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = - \left[L_g u - \left(\frac{\int_M u L_g u d \text{vol}_g}{\int_M u^2 |\psi_u|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g} \right) |\psi_u|_g^2 u \right] u^{-4}.$$

Here we would like to provide an explanation for the generic selection of the initial value $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}_+^\infty$. In fact, our results need to be established upon the basis that $\lambda_u(t) \neq 0$ always remains a simple eigenvalue of the eigen-problem (1.6) or (1.8). This is because, if at some time t , $\lambda_u(t)$ is a multiple eigenvalue, it is unclear whether the corresponding eigenspinor can smoothly evolve along the Einstein-Dirac flow. Even in the simplest case of matrix operators, we can easily find examples where the initial matrix, under a smooth perturbation, has a multiple eigenvalue and its corresponding eigenvector that do not continuously depend on the perturbation. Therefore, this limitation currently restricts us to only obtaining short-time existence of the Einstein-Dirac flow.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will briefly introduce some notations and the Sobolev spaces that will be used later. In Section 3, we will describe the continuous dependence properties of the solutions to the eigenvalue problem of the Dirac operator under continuous changes in the Riemannian metric. In Section 4, we will establish existence and uniqueness for solutions of a linear parabolic equation with non-local term, which will serve as a fundamental tool for studying the flow problem mentioned earlier. In Section 5, we will prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, which provide the short time existence for the Einstein-Dirac parabolic flow (1.5).

2 Basic notations

In this section, we shall briefly recall some notations and properties of conformal differential operators involved, and provide the definitions of the Sobolev spaces that we will be using.

Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian m -manifold, $m \geq 3$, we denote the conformal Laplacian (also known as the Yamabe operator) acting on scalar functions by

$$L_g u := -\frac{4(m-1)}{m-2} \Delta_g u + \text{Scal}_g u$$

where Δ_g is the Laplace-Beltrami operator and Scal_g is the scalar curvature. The conformal covariance of L_g reads as

$$L_g u = e^{\frac{m+2}{2}f} L_{e^{2f}g} (e^{-\frac{m-2}{2}f} u).$$

For an integer k , and $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth enough, we denote by $\nabla_g^k u$ the k th covariant derivative of u and $|\nabla_g^k u|$ the norm of $\nabla_g^k u$ defined in a local chart by

$$|\nabla_g^k u| = g^{i_1 j_1} \dots g^{i_k j_k} (\nabla_g^k u)_{i_1 \dots i_k} (\nabla_g^k u)_{j_1 \dots j_k}$$

Recall that $(\nabla_g u)_i = \partial_i u$ while $(\nabla_g^2)_{ij} = \partial_i \partial_j u - \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_k u$, where Γ_{ij}^k is the Christoffel symbols. In the sequel, we will denote $C^k(M) = \{u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \nabla_g^j u \text{ is continuous for } j = 0, 1, \dots, k\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_+^k := \{u \in C^k(M) \mid u > 0\}$. The notation $u \in C^\infty(M)$ (respectively $u \in \mathcal{C}_+^\infty$) will be understood as $u \in C^k(M)$ (respectively $u \in \mathcal{C}_+^k$) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We also denote $H^k(M)$ the Sobolev spaces on M equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H^k(M)} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^k \int_M |\nabla_g^j u|^2 d \text{vol}_g}.$$

The inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^k(M)}$ associated to $\|\cdot\|_{H^k(M)}$ is given by

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{H^k(M)} = \sum_{j=0}^k \int_M \langle \nabla_g^j u, \nabla_g^j v \rangle d \text{vol}_g$$

where, in the above expression, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product on covariant tensor fields associated to g . Note here that, by the Sobolev embedding theorems, one can look at $H^k(M)$ as subspaces of $L^p(M)$ for $1 \leq p \leq \frac{2m}{m-2k}$. And the standard L^p -norm will be simply denoted by $|\cdot|_p$.

When (M, g) is equipped additionally with a spin structure, we shall consider $\mathbb{S}(M)$ the canonical spinor bundle over M (see [19]), whose sections are called spinors on M . This bundle is endowed with a natural Clifford multiplication \mathfrak{M} , a hermitian metric $(\cdot, \cdot)_g$ and a natural metric connection $\nabla^{\mathbb{S}(M)}$. The Dirac operator D_g acts on spinors

$$D_g : \Gamma(\mathbb{S}(M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathbb{S}(M))$$

is defined as the composition $\mathfrak{M} \circ \nabla^{\mathbb{S}(M)}$ in the sense that

$$\nabla^{\mathbb{S}(M)} : \Gamma(\mathbb{S}(M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(T^*M \otimes \mathbb{S}(M)),$$

$$\mathfrak{M} : \Gamma(TM \otimes \mathbb{S}(M)) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathbb{S}(M)),$$

where $T^*M \simeq TM$ have been identified by means of the metric g . We also have a conformal covariance here:

$$D_g \psi = e^{\frac{m+1}{2}f} D_{e^{2f}g} (e^{-\frac{m-1}{2}f} \psi),$$

see for instance [22,25]. Let us remind here that the Dirac operator D_g on a closed spin manifold is essentially self-adjoint in $L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$, has compact resolvent and there exists a complete L^2 -orthonormal basis of eigenspinors $\{\psi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$:

$$D_g \psi_i = \lambda_i \psi_i,$$

and the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are of finite multiplicities and are unbounded on both sides of the real line (i.e. $|\lambda_i| \rightarrow +\infty$ as $|i| \rightarrow +\infty$). For a spinor $\psi \in L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$, it has a representation

$$\psi = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \alpha_i \psi_i$$

with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$ so that $\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 < +\infty$. And for $s > 0$, we can define the unbounded operator $|D_g|^s : L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) \rightarrow L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ by

$$|D_g|^s \psi = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \alpha_i |\lambda_i|^s \psi_i.$$

Let us denote $H^s(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ the domain of $|D_g|^s$, namely $\psi = \sum_i \alpha_i \psi_i \in H^s(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ if and only if

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |\alpha_i|^2 |\lambda_i|^{2s} < +\infty.$$

Then $H^s(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ coincides with the standard Sobolev space $W^{s,2}(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ (see [1]) and can be endowed with the inner product

$$\langle \psi, \varphi \rangle_s = \operatorname{Re} \int_M (|D_g|^s \psi, |D_g|^s \varphi)_g d \operatorname{vol}_g + \int_M (\psi, \varphi)_g d \operatorname{vol}_g.$$

3 Perturbation for a spinorial eigenvalue problem

In this section, we are mainly interested in a generalized eigenvalue perturbation problem for the Dirac operator. More precisely, we intend to find the eigenvalues and eigenspinors of the equation

$$D_g \psi = \lambda u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \psi, \tag{3.1}$$

that is perturbed from $D_g \psi_0 = \lambda_0 u_0^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \psi_0$ with known eigenvalue and eigenspinor. Here some basic conventions are in order, such as we will always assume that u_0 and u are positive functions, i.e., $u_0, u \in C_+^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.

In what follows, let us collect all possible eigenvalues of (3.1) as

$$\Sigma_{g,u} := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \ker \left(D_g - \lambda u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \right) \neq \{0\} \right\},$$

and we call $\ker \left(D_g - \lambda u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \right)$ the eigenspace of $\lambda \in \Sigma_{g,u}$. The main results of this section are built upon the following observation.

Proposition 3.1. *For each $u \in \mathcal{C}_+^k$, the following holds:*

- (1) *The set $\Sigma_{g,u}$ is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ consisting of an unbounded discrete sequence of eigenvalues, in particular, $\Sigma_{g,u}$ is unbounded on both sides of \mathbb{R} .*
- (2) *The eigenspace of $\lambda \in \Sigma_{g,u}$ is finite-dimensional and consists of eigenspinors in the class \mathcal{C}^{k+1} .*
- (3) *If the new inner product*

$$(\psi, \varphi)_2^u = \operatorname{Re} \int_M u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} (\psi, \varphi)_g d \operatorname{vol}_g$$

is introduced on $L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$, then the eigenspaces of all $\lambda \in \Sigma_{g,u}$ form a complete orthonormal decomposition of $L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$, i.e.,

$$L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) = \overline{\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Sigma_{g,u}} \ker (D_g - \lambda u^{\frac{2}{m-2}})}.$$

where the close is taken over with respect to the $(\cdot, \cdot)_2^u$ -norm.

Remark 3.2. There are several ways of dealing with the set $\Sigma_{g,u}$, and here we point out that the eigenvalue problem $D_g \psi = \lambda u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \psi$ can be conformally transformed into

$$D_{g^u} \varphi = \lambda \varphi \tag{3.2}$$

where $g^u = u^{\frac{4}{m-2}} g$ and $\varphi = u^{-\frac{m-1}{m-2}} \psi$. The new inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_2^u$ is actually the standard L^2 -inner product induced by the metric g^u . And hence $\Sigma_{g,u}$ is nothing but the spectrum of D_{g^u} . With all these in hand, we find Proposition 3.1 is a direct consequence of the classical spectral theory of elliptic self-adjoint operators. And for later use, we shall write $\Sigma_{g,u} = \{\lambda_i(u) : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with the ordering

$$-\infty \leftarrow \cdots \leq \lambda_{-1}(u) \leq \lambda_0(u) \leq 0 < \lambda_1(u) \leq \lambda_2(u) \leq \cdots \rightarrow +\infty$$

where the eigenvalues are repeated with respect to their multiplicities. We also remark that these eigenvalues are not necessarily symmetric about the origin, see [23].

3.1 A quick review on the multiplicity of eigenvalues

When it comes to perturbing the function u in order to describe the behavior of the eigenvalue problem (3.1), it will be beneficial and simplifying to assume that the eigenvalues and eigenspinors vary smoothly with respect to the external factors. But things are often more complicated, and here we refer the readers to Kato's book [26] for a technical report of general perturbed eigenvalue problems. In what follows, we give an elementary example of 2×2 -matrices to illustrate that perturbation of eigenvectors may have nasty behavior.

Example 3.3. Let I be the 2×2 identity matrix. Then any vector is an eigenvector, and we may simply set $v_0 = (\sqrt{2}/2, \sqrt{2}/2)$ as one possible candidate with unit length. And if we consider a small perturbation

$$I(\varepsilon) = I + \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

then the unit eigenvectors will be $v_1 = (1, 0)$ and $v_2 = (0, 1)$ which are independent of ε . Clearly, $|v_0 - v_1|$ and $|v_0 - v_2|$ will never go to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

From the above example, we can observe that a small perturbation can cause a repeated eigenvalue to split into distinct new eigenvalues. And additionally, an arbitrary choice of the unperturbed eigenvector may lead to discontinuity in relation to the perturbation parameter.

Regarding the conformally covariant operators, we are lucky that, in many cases, it has been shown that the eigenvalues of these operators are generically simple. The main example is the Laplace operator on smooth functions on a compact manifold, see for instance [5, 7, 36, 38], and it is generally believed that eigenvalues of these formally self-adjoint operators with positive leading symbol on $SO(m)$ or $Spin(m)$ irreducible bundles are generically simple.

Now, let us turn back to the equation (3.2), which is conformally equivalent to our target problem (3.1). We remark here that, when M has dimension $m = 3, 4, 5 \pmod{8}$, the spinor bundle has a quaternionic structure which commutes with Clifford multiplication [19, Section 1.7] or [28, Page 33, Table III]. Hence, in these cases the eigenspaces of the Dirac operator are quaternionic vector spaces. So in the sequel when we are talking about the dimension of an eigenspace, we mean the quaternionic dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}$ for $m = 3, 4, 5 \pmod{8}$ and the complex dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}$ for other cases.

For a closed spin m -manifold M and $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, denote by \mathcal{M}^k the space of Riemannian metrics on M equipped with the C^k -topology. In what follows, for a given $g \in \mathcal{M}^k$, let us consider the conformal change $g^u = u^{\frac{4}{m-2}}g$ with $u \in C_+^k$ and the possible splitting of the eigenvalues of D_{g^u} when u is a perturbation from some u_0 . We introduce the following

Definition 3.4. An eigenvalue λ of $D_{g^{u_0}}$ (i.e., $\lambda \in \Sigma_{g, u_0}$) is said to have the conformal splitting property in the direction of $v \in C^\infty(M)$ if $\dim \ker(D_{g^{u_0}} - \lambda) > 1$ and there exists at least one pair of eigenvalues $\lambda_{0,1}(\varepsilon)$ and $\lambda_{0,2}(\varepsilon)$ of $D_{g^{u_0+\varepsilon v}}$, which are continuous functions defined for small $\varepsilon \geq 0$ satisfying

- (1) $\lambda_{0,1}(0) = \lambda_{0,2}(0) = \lambda$;
- (2) $\lambda_{0,1}(\varepsilon) \neq \lambda_{0,2}(\varepsilon)$ for $\varepsilon > 0$.

The eigenvalues $\lambda_{0,1}(\varepsilon)$ and $\lambda_{0,2}(\varepsilon)$ are said to depart from the unperturbed eigenvalue λ by splitting at $\varepsilon = 0$.

Remark 3.5. Here we emphasize that, since the mapping $\varepsilon \mapsto g^{u_0+\varepsilon v}$ provides a real analytic parameterization of metrics in \mathcal{M}^k , the perturbation theory developed in [26, Chapter VII] can be employed. In particular, each $\lambda \in \Sigma_{g, u_0}$ provides a batch of real analytic functions $\lambda_{0,1}(\varepsilon), \dots, \lambda_{0,l}(\varepsilon) \in \Sigma_{g, u_0+\varepsilon v}$ such that $\lambda_{0,j}(0) = \lambda$, $j = 1, \dots, l$, and the sum of all multiplicities of $\lambda_{0,j}(\varepsilon)$'s equals to the multiplicity of λ . And therefore, if $\lambda \in \Sigma_{g, u_0}$ has the conformal splitting property in a direction v then the multiplicity of each eigenvalue, which depart from λ , will be strictly less than that of λ . Meanwhile, those eigenvalue that has simple multiplicity will stay simple as ε varies.

In this setting, we have the following lemma which is due to M. Dahl [15, Lemma 3.1].

Lemma 3.6. *On a closed spin 3-manifold, given $g \in \mathcal{M}^k$ and let λ be a non-zero eigenvalue of D_g with $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \ker(D_g - \lambda) > 1$. Then there exists $v \in C^\infty(M)$ such that λ has the conformal splitting property in the direction of v .*

Remark 3.7. (1) Let us point out here that, with an additional rigid assumption on the operator D_g , a similar result holds for higher dimensions (see [12] for detailed statements). And it is unclear whether or not such a rigid assumption can be dropped in general cases. The reason that one does not need further assumptions in dimension 3 is because the quaternionic rank of the spinor bundle is simple, that is $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{H}} \mathbb{S}(M) = 1$.

(2) Due to the conformal covariance of the Dirac operator (see (1.3)), $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \ker D_g$ is invariant under the conformal change of the background metric g . This is the reason why we only focus on non-zero eigenvalues and the associated eigenspaces.

By recalling the conformal equivalence of (3.1) and (3.2), for given $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $g \in \mathcal{M}^k$, let us consider the set

$$\mathcal{U}_{g,n}^k := \{u \in \mathcal{C}_+^k : \lambda \text{ is simple for all } \lambda \in \Sigma_{g,u} \cap ([-n, n] \setminus \{0\})\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Then, in a view of Remark 3.5, we have the following characterization for $\mathcal{U}_{g,n}^k$.

Lemma 3.8. *On a closed spin m -manifold with $m \geq 3$ and, if $m > 3$, suppose additionally that every non-zero eigenvalue of $D_{\tilde{g}}$ has either simple multiplicity or the conformal splitting property in certain directions, for any $\tilde{g} \in [g] := \{e^{2f}g : f \in \mathcal{C}_+^k\}$. Then $\mathcal{U}_{g,n}^k$ is an open dense subset of \mathcal{C}_+^k .*

Proof. We only need to show that $\mathcal{U}_{g,n}^k$ is dense in \mathcal{C}_+^k , since the openness follows from the fact that the eigenvalues of D_g depend continuously on g (see [3, Proposition 7.1]). To this end, let us fix $u_* \in \mathcal{C}_+^k \setminus \mathcal{U}_{g,n}^k$ and let U be an open neighborhood of u_* . Since there exists $\lambda_* \in \Sigma_{g,u_*} \cap ([-n, n] \setminus \{0\})$ such that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \ker(D_{g^{u_*}} - \lambda_*) > 1,$$

we can use our assumption to obtain $v_1 \in C^\infty(M)$ and a conformal deformation $g^{u_* + \varepsilon_1 v_1}$ which decreases the multiplicity of λ_* , for $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ suitably small. Clearly, those eigenvalues in $[-n, n] \setminus \{0\}$ that were simple would remain being simple for such ε_1 due to the analytic perturbation theory (see [26]). Let ε_1 be small such that $u_* + \varepsilon_1 v_1 \in U$. If $u_* + \varepsilon_1 v_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{g,n}^k$, then we are done. And if not, we can repeat the above procedure finitely many times to get a function $u_* + \varepsilon_1 v_1 + \dots + \varepsilon_l v_l \in U \cap \mathcal{U}_{g,n}^k$. Therefore, due to the arbitrariness of u_* and U , we have $\mathcal{U}_{g,n}^k$ is dense in \mathcal{C}_+^k as desired. \square

3.2 The perturbation

For a given $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}_+^k$, we will now stick to the case that $\lambda_0 \in \Sigma_{g,u_0} \setminus \{0\}$ is a simple eigenvalue and ψ_0 is a normalized eigenspinor, that is we have

$$\ker(D_g - \lambda_0 u_0^{\frac{2}{m-2}}) = \text{span}\{\psi_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_M u_0^{\frac{2}{m-2}} |\psi_0|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g = 1. \quad (3.4)$$

Actually, there is no loss of generality if we assume that $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_{g,n_0}^k$ for some fixed $n_0 \geq 1$ and $|\lambda_0| \leq n_0$, and we shall work under the assumptions of Lemma 3.8. It is clear that $L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ possesses the $(\cdot, \cdot)_2^{u_0}$ -orthogonal decomposition $L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) = \text{span}\{\psi_0\} \oplus \text{span}\{\psi_0\}^\perp$.

To proceed, let us introduce the spinor subspaces $\tilde{L}^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\psi_0\} \oplus \text{span}\{\psi_0\}^\perp$ and $\tilde{H}^1(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) = H^1(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) \cap \tilde{L}^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$. That is, we consider the subspaces in which the ψ_0 -direction is always real. Furthermore, we will consider the mapping $\Phi : \mathcal{C}_+^k \times \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{H}^1(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{L}^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ with

$$\Phi(u, \lambda, \psi) = \left(\int_M u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} |\psi|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g - 1, u^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g \psi - \lambda \psi \right). \quad (3.5)$$

Then, by taking derivatives with respect to λ and ψ , we find

$$\nabla_{(\lambda, \psi)} \Phi(u, \lambda, \psi)[\mu, \varphi] = \left(2 \text{Re} \int_M u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} (\psi, \varphi)_g d \text{vol}_g, u^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g \varphi - \lambda \varphi - \mu \psi \right).$$

for $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi \in H^1(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$. And in what follows, we are going to use the Implicit function theorem to characterize the relation between the external factor u and the perturbed couple (λ, ψ) in the eigenvalue problem (3.1).

Since we have assumed the validity of (3.4) for (u_0, λ_0, ψ_0) , we can write $\varphi = \tau \psi_0 + \varphi^\perp$ with $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi^\perp \in \text{span}\{\psi_0\}^\perp$ for any $\varphi \in \tilde{H}^1(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) \subset \tilde{L}^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ with respect to the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_2^{u_0}$. Then we have

$$\nabla_{(\lambda, \psi)} \Phi(u_0, \lambda_0, \psi_0)[\mu, \varphi] = (2\tau, u_0^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g \varphi^\perp - \lambda_0 \varphi^\perp - \mu \psi_0).$$

At this moment, by collecting $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ the $(\cdot, \cdot)_2^{u_0}$ -normalized eigenspinors associated to Σ_{g, u_0} (see Proposition 3.1 and Remark 3.2), we can represent for an element $\phi \in \tilde{L}^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ with the Fourier series $\phi = \sum \alpha_i \varphi_i$, where $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$. Clearly, we have $\lambda_{i_0}(u_0) = \lambda_0$ and $\varphi_{i_0} = \psi_0$ for some i_0 , and hence $\alpha_{i_0} = (\phi, \psi_0)_2^{u_0} \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, by looking at the equation

$$\nabla_{(\lambda, \psi)} \Phi(u_0, \lambda_0, \psi_0)[\mu, \varphi] = (\kappa, \phi)$$

with $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi \in \tilde{L}^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ being arbitrarily given, we can solve it uniquely with

$$\mu = -\alpha_{i_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi = \frac{\kappa}{2} \psi_0 + \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{\alpha_i}{\lambda_i(u_0) - \lambda_0} \varphi_i.$$

Therefore $\nabla_{(\lambda, \psi)} \Phi(u_0, \lambda_0, \psi_0) : \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{H}^1(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{L}^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ is invertible. And now, a direct application of the Implicit function theorem gives us the following perturbation result.

Lemma 3.9. *Given $k, n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, let $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_{g, n_0}^k$ and (λ_0, ψ_0) satisfies (3.4) with $\lambda_0 \in [-n_0, n_0] \setminus \{0\}$. If $u \in C^k(M \times [0, T])$ with $u(\cdot, 0) = u_0$, then (by narrowing the time interval if necessary) there exist a C^k mapping $[0, T] \rightarrow (\lambda(t), \psi(t))$ such that $\lambda(0) = \lambda_0$, $\psi(0) = \psi_0$ and*

$$\Phi(u(\cdot, t), \lambda(t), \psi(t)) \equiv 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.6)$$

Furthermore, apart from the function u and its time-derivatives, the j -th derivatives of λ and ψ only depend on the first $j - 1$ derivatives of λ and ψ , where $1 \leq j \leq k$. In particular, the first order derivatives of λ and ψ can be formulated as

$$\lambda'(t) = -\frac{2\lambda(t)}{m-2} \int_M u(\cdot, t)^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}} \partial_t u(\cdot, t) |\psi(t)|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g$$

and

$$\psi'(t) = \frac{\lambda'(t)}{2\lambda(t)} \psi(t) - \frac{2\lambda(t)}{m-2} (u(t)^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g - \lambda(t))^{-1} \circ (I - P_{\lambda(t)}) (u(t)^{-1} \partial_t u(\cdot, t) \psi(t))$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, where $P_{\lambda(t)}$ is the L^2 -eigenprojection associated to $\lambda(t)$.

4 A nonlocal linear parabolic equation

In this section, we discuss the existence of solutions to a linear equation of the form

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \mathcal{A}(x, t) \Delta_g u + \mathcal{L}[u] = f(x, t) \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where $\mathcal{A} : M \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth and uniformly bounded with all their derivatives, and \mathcal{L} is a continuous linear operator between some suitable function spaces containing lower order differential operations (a specific characterization of \mathcal{L} will be given later). Moreover, let us assume that the function \mathcal{A} is uniformly positive, i.e., there exists a positive constant $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathcal{A}(x, t) \geq \delta$ for all x and t . Hence Eq. (4.1) is of parabolic type. This developments in this section serve as the PDE foundations for the flow we investigate.

In order to give a precise description of the linear operator \mathcal{L} and to obtain solutions of Eq. (4.1), let us introduce some basic function spaces that are useful in our argument. Let $u, v : M \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be smooth functions, we set

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{LH_a^k} = \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \langle u(\cdot, t), v(\cdot, t) \rangle_{H^k(M)} dt \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

and

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{HH_a} = \langle u, v \rangle_{LH_a^1} + \langle \partial_t u, \partial_t v \rangle_{LH_a^0},$$

where $a > 0$ is understood to be a positive parameter. We denote LH_a^k and HH_a to be the Hilbert spaces formed by completion of $C^\infty(M \times [0, +\infty))$ in the corresponding norms. We also consider $C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$ as the space of smooth functions which vanish for very large and very small times, and denote $HH_{a,0}$ the completion of $C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$ in HH_a . Furthermore, when we come to consider the higher regularity of solutions of Eq. (4.1), we shall make use of the following Hilbert space

$$P_a^l := \{u : M \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \|\partial_t^j u\|_{LH_a^{2(l-j)}} < +\infty, j = 0, \dots, l\}$$

and equip it with the inner product

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{P_a^l} = \sum_{j=0}^l \langle \partial_t^j u, \partial_t^j v \rangle_{LH_a^{2(l-j)}} = \sum_{2j+k \leq 2l} \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \langle \partial_t^j u, \partial_t^k v \rangle_{H^k(M)} dt.$$

We note that $P_a^0 = LH_a^0$ and the embedding $P_a^l \hookrightarrow LH_a^{2l}$ holds for $l \geq 1$. And we also have the embedding $P_a^l(M) \hookrightarrow HH_a$ for $l \geq 1$.

Now we turn to characterize the linear operator \mathcal{L} in Eq. (4.1), and we shall make the following three standing assumptions under consideration. For ease of notation, the space of bounded linear operators from a Banach space X to another Banach space Y is denoted by $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$.

(A1) $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{L}(LH_a^1, LH_a^0)$, moreover, there exists a time-independent constant $C > 0$ such that $|\mathcal{L}[u](\cdot, t)|_2 \leq C\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{H^1(M)}$ for all $u \in LH_a^1$.

(A2) $\mathcal{L}[\alpha u](\cdot, t) = \alpha(t)\mathcal{L}[u](\cdot, t)$ for any smooth function $\alpha : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

(A3) $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{L}(P_a^l, P_a^l)$ for $l \in \mathbb{N}$

Using the specific form of the operator $-\mathcal{A}(x, t)\Delta_g + \mathcal{L}$ and integration by parts, we introduce the following bilinear form, which we denote by \mathcal{A}_t , defined on $H^1(M) \times H^1(M)$ (this product space is understood as a t -fiber of the total space $LH_a^1 \times LH_a^1$):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_t(u, v) &= \int_M -\mathcal{A}v\Delta_g u + v\mathcal{L}[u]d\text{vol}_g \\ &= \int_M \mathcal{A}\nabla_g u \cdot \nabla_g v + v\nabla_g \mathcal{A} \cdot \nabla_g u + v\mathcal{L}[u]d\text{vol}_g. \end{aligned}$$

Then a weak solution of Eq. (4.1) is defined by a function $u \in HH_a$ such that $u(x, 0) = u_0(x)$ and

$$\langle \partial_t u, \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0} + \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \mathcal{A}_t(u, \phi) dt = \langle f, \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0} \quad (4.2)$$

for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$.

Our first existence result is stated as follows.

Proposition 4.1. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{L} be as above. There exists $a_0 > 0$ depending only on \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{L} and the background manifold (M, g) such that, if $a > a_0$, then for every $f \in LH_a^0$ the equation*

$$\partial_t u - \mathcal{A}(x, t)\Delta_g u + \mathcal{L}[u] = f, \quad u(\cdot, 0) = 0 \quad (4.3)$$

has a unique weak solution in $HH_{a,0}$.

Before establishing the proof of Proposition 4.1, let us recall a variant of the Lax-Milgram Theorem, which relaxes the continuity assumption on the bilinear form.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $(H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a Hilbert space and $(V, \|\cdot\|_V)$ be an inner-product space continuously embedded in H . Let $\Phi : H \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bilinear form with the properties that*

- (1) *the mapping $h \mapsto \Phi(h, v)$ is continuous on H for each fixed $v \in V$,*
- (2) *Φ is coercive on V , i.e., $\Phi(v, v) \geq \beta\|v\|_V^2$ for some $\beta > 0$.*

If $F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous linear functional, then there exists $h_F \in H$ such that $F(v) = \Phi(h_F, v)$ for all $v \in V$. If, in addition V is dense in H , then $h_F \in H$ is uniquely determined.

Remark 4.3. In Lemma 4.2, we do not assume that $(V, \|\cdot\|_V)$ is complete. And we also do not need the bi-continuity of the bilinear form Φ , which is a critical hypothesis of the Lax-Milgram Theorem. We refer the readers to [18, Chapter 10, Theorem 16] and [35, Lemma 3.2] for a detailed proof of Lemma 4.2.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. First of all, let us remark that the assumptions on \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{L} imply that a Gårding type inequality holds for the operator $-\mathcal{A}(x, t)\Delta_g + \mathcal{L}$, that is

$$\mathcal{A}_t(\phi, \phi) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \|\phi\|_{H^1(M)}^2 - \kappa |\phi|_2^2 \quad (4.4)$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is a constant depending continuously on the C^1 -norm of \mathcal{A} and on the curvature tensor of (M, g) and its covariant derivatives. And, by virtue of the assumption (A2), we find that u is a solution to (4.3) if and only if $w(x, t) = e^{-\gamma t}u(x, t)$ solves the equation

$$\partial_t w - \mathcal{A}(x, t)\Delta_g w + \gamma w + \mathcal{L}[w] = f_\gamma(x, t) := e^{-\gamma t}f(x, t), \quad w(\cdot, 0) = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

By choosing $\gamma = \kappa$, we see that

$$(\mathcal{A}_t + \gamma)(\phi, \phi) = \mathcal{A}_t(\phi, \phi) + \gamma |\phi|_2^2 \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \|\phi\|_{H^1(M)}^2. \quad (4.6)$$

In the sequel, we will focus on the equivalent problem (4.5).

To proceed, let us consider a bilinear form on $HH_{a,0} \times C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$:

$$\mathcal{P}(w, \phi) = \langle \partial_t w, \partial_t \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0} + \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} (\mathcal{A}_t + \gamma)(w, \partial_t \phi) dt,$$

and a linear functional on $C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$:

$$F(\phi) = \langle f_\gamma, \partial_t \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0}.$$

We mention here that the parameter $a > 0$ will be given later. Clearly, for a fixed $\phi \in C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$, the bilinear form \mathcal{P} is continuous in w with respect to the HH_a -norm. And it is evident that F is continuous with respect to the HH_a -norm, given that $f_\gamma \in LH_a^0$.

To see the coerciveness of \mathcal{P} on $C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$, for an arbitrary $\phi \in C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$, let us look at

$$\mathcal{P}(\phi, \phi) = \|\partial_t \phi\|_{LH_a^0}^2 + \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} (\mathcal{A}_t + \gamma)(\phi, \partial_t \phi) dt.$$

Let I denote the second term on the right hand side, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} (\mathcal{A}_t + \gamma)(\phi, \partial_t \phi) dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M (\mathcal{A} \nabla_g \phi \cdot \nabla_g \partial_t \phi + \partial_t \phi \nabla_g \mathcal{A} \cdot \nabla_g \phi + \gamma \phi \partial_t \phi + \partial_t \phi \mathcal{L}[\phi]) d \text{vol}_g dt. \end{aligned}$$

By setting

$$I_1 = \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M (\mathcal{A} \nabla_g \phi \cdot \nabla_g \partial_t \phi + \gamma \phi \partial_t \phi) d \text{vol}_g dt$$

and

$$I_2 = \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M (\partial_t \phi \nabla_g \mathcal{A} \cdot \nabla_g \phi + \partial_t \phi \mathcal{L}[\phi]) d \text{vol}_g dt,$$

we soon have $I = I_1 + I_2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\geq -(|\nabla_g \mathcal{A}|_\infty + C) \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} |\partial_t \phi(\cdot, t)|_2 \|\phi(\cdot, t)\|_{H^1(M)} dt \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{2} \|\partial_t \phi\|_{LH_a^0}^2 - \frac{(|\nabla_g \mathcal{A}|_\infty + C)^2}{2} \|\phi\|_{LH_a^1}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is the constant from the assumption (A1) for the linear operator \mathcal{L} and the last inequality comes from the Young's inequality. On the other hand, it follows from partial integration in time that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M \left(a\mathcal{A} |\nabla_g \phi|^2 + a\gamma |\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_t \mathcal{A} |\nabla_g \phi|^2 \right) d \text{vol}_g dt \\ &\geq \left(a \min\{\delta, \gamma\} - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_t \mathcal{A}|_\infty \right) \|\phi\|_{LH_a^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by combining the above two estimates, we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}(\phi, \phi) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\partial_t \phi\|_{LH_a^0}^2 + \left(a \min\{\delta, \gamma\} - \frac{1}{2} |\partial_t \mathcal{A}|_\infty - \frac{(|\nabla_g \mathcal{A}|_\infty + C)^2}{2} \right) \|\phi\|_{LH_a^1}.$$

And, when a is chosen so large that

$$a > \frac{|\partial_t \mathcal{A}|_\infty + (|\nabla_g \mathcal{A}|_\infty + C)^2}{2 \min\{\delta, \gamma\}},$$

we can guarantee that \mathcal{P} is coercive on $C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$ with respect to the HH_a -norm. Therefore we may conclude from Lemma 4.2 that there is a unique $w_F \in HH_{a,0}$ for which $\mathcal{P}(w_F, \phi) = F(\phi)$ for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$.

We are almost at the stage to deliver the unique weak solution of (4.3). The problem that remains is we have only tested (4.5) against functions with zero average over time, that is, the bilinear form \mathcal{P} is defined by simply testing (4.5) with the function $\partial_t \phi$. This would normally mean that the w_F obtained above differs from a solution of (4.5) by a time constant function. However, one does not need to worry about this problem. In fact, for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$, we can consider a modified function

$$\varphi_\tau(x, t) = \varphi(x, t) - \varphi(x, t - \tau)$$

where $\tau > 0$ is large enough such that the support of the second term does not intersect with that of the first term. Then φ_τ can be represented as $\partial_t \phi_\tau$ for some $\phi_\tau \in C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$, and hence

$$\langle \partial_t w_F, \varphi_\tau \rangle_{LH_a^0} + \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} (\mathcal{A}_t + \gamma)(w_F, \varphi_\tau) dt = \langle f_\gamma, \varphi_\tau \rangle_{LH_a^0}$$

holds for sufficiently large τ . By taking to the limit $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, it follows that

$$\langle \partial_t w_F, \varphi \rangle_{LH_a^0} + \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} (\mathcal{A}_t + \gamma)(w_F, \varphi) dt = \langle f_\gamma, \varphi \rangle_{LH_a^0}.$$

Hence w_F is indeed the unique weak solution of (4.5), and this is to say, there exists a unique solution $u \in HH_{a+\gamma,0}$ of Eq. (4.3) provided that $f \in LH_{a+\gamma}^0$. \square

As an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.1, we have an existence and uniqueness result for more general initial data.

Corollary 4.4. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition 4.1. For every $f \in LH_a^0$ and $u_0 \in H^2(M)$, the equation*

$$\partial_t u - \mathcal{A}(x, t)\Delta_g u + \mathcal{L}[u] = f, \quad u(\cdot, 0) = u_0 \quad (4.7)$$

has a unique weak solution in HH_a , provided $a > a_0$ as in Proposition 4.1.

Proof. Let us set $\tilde{u}_0(x, t) = e^{-t}u_0(x)$ and $v = u - \tilde{u}_0$. Then we shall consider the equation

$$\partial_t v - \mathcal{A}(x, t)\Delta_g v + \mathcal{L}[v] = f + \tilde{u}_0 + \mathcal{A}(x, t)\Delta_g \tilde{u}_0 - \mathcal{L}[\tilde{u}_0], \quad v(\cdot, 0) = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

Since $u_0 \in H^2(M)$, we soon have $\tilde{u}_0 + \mathcal{A}\Delta_g \tilde{u}_0 \in LH_a^0$. Note also that $\tilde{u}_0 \in P_a^1$, by virtue of the assumption (A3) for \mathcal{L} , we have $\mathcal{L}[\tilde{u}_0] \in P_a^1(M) \hookrightarrow P_a^0(M) = LH_a^0$. Hence, Proposition 4.1 implies that for all $a > 0$ large enough, there is a unique $v \in HH_{a,0}$ solving Eq. (4.8), which is equivalent to say that there is a unique $u \in HH_a$ solving (4.7). \square

Let us mention here that the above existence result is less than optimal as the natural class of the initial data is $H^1(M)$. However, these limitations will be addressed and improved by the estimates proven in our upcoming work. Specifically, our next focus is on the regularity of the weak solution that has been obtained above. In essence, we aim to establish two main results: firstly, the weak solution exhibits a level of smoothness determined by the homogeneous term f and the initial value u_0 ; and secondly, the relationship between the solution u and the homogeneous term can be understood as an isomorphism within suitably defined Banach spaces.

Lemma 4.5. *For $a \geq \kappa + \frac{1}{2}$, if $u \in HH_a$ is a weak solution of (4.7) with $f \in LH_a^0$ and $u_0 \in L^2(M)$, then the following estimate holds*

$$\|u\|_{LH_a^1}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\delta} (\|u_0\|_2^2 + \|f\|_{LH_a^0}^2).$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is given in (4.4) and $\delta > 0$ is the lower bound of the function \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Since $u \in HH_a$ is a weak solution of (4.7), by using u itself as a test function, we find that

$$\langle \partial_t u, u \rangle_{LH_a^0} + \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \mathcal{A}_t(u, u) dt = \langle f, u \rangle_{LH_a^0}. \quad (4.9)$$

Although one should use a compactly supported smooth function to test (4.7), the above identity is still possible since the density of $C_c^\infty(M \times (0, +\infty))$ in $HH_{a,0}$ suggests us to use $\chi_\varepsilon \cdot u \in HH_{a,0}$ as a test function, where χ_ε is a smooth cut-off multiplier given by $\chi_\varepsilon(t) = \chi(t/\varepsilon)$ with

$$\chi(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \leq 1, \\ 1, & t \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Then, by taking to the limit $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, one easily obtain (4.9).

Notice that, for any $v \in HH_a$ with initial value $v(\cdot, 0) \in L^2(M)$, we have the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_t v, v \rangle_{LH_a^0} &= \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M v \partial_t v d \text{vol}_g dt \\ &= a \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M v^2 d \text{vol}_g dt - \frac{1}{2} \int_M v(\cdot, 0)^2 d \text{vol}_g \\ &= a \|v\|_{LH_a^0}^2 - \frac{1}{2} |v(\cdot, 0)|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Hence, by (4.9), (4.4) and Young's inequality, we soon deduce that

$$\frac{\delta}{2} \|u\|_{LH_a^1}^2 + \left(a - \kappa - \frac{1}{2}\right) \|u\|_{LH_a^0}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} |u_0|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{LH_a^0}^2.$$

Therefore, by choosing $a \geq \kappa + \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain the conclusion. \square

The above estimate can be further improved to get higher regularity. In fact, we have the following P_a^l -version of the usual a priori energy estimate for parabolic equations, whose proof is postponed to the Appendix A.2

Lemma 4.6. *For $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, if $u \in P_a^l$ is a weak solution of (4.7) with $f \in P_a^l$ and $u_0 \in H^{2l+1}(M)$, then $u \in P_a^{l+1}$ and*

$$\|u\|_{P_a^{l+1}}^2 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^{2l+1}(M)}^2 + \|f\|_{P_a^l}^2)$$

provided $a > 0$ is large enough in the sense of Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.5, where $C > 0$ depends only on $l, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L}, \nabla_g \mathcal{A}, \partial_t \mathcal{A}, \dots, \partial_t^l \mathcal{A}$ and the manifold M .

The estimates we have just derived can now be utilized to yield the following global existence result, which is an analogue of [32, Theorem 2.3.5].

Theorem 4.7. *If $a > 0$ is large enough, then for every $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ the linear map*

$$\mathfrak{F}[u] = (u_0, \partial_t u - \mathcal{A} \Delta_g u + \mathcal{L}[u]) \quad (4.11)$$

where $u_0 = u(\cdot, 0)$, is an isomorphism of P_a^{l+1} onto $H^{2l+1}(M) \times P_a^l$.

Proof. Since \mathfrak{F} is linear, the continuity follows immediately from the boundedness of \mathfrak{F} . The bound for the second component is much clearer since we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t u - \mathcal{A} \Delta_g u + \mathcal{L}[u]\|_{P_a^l} &\leq \|\partial_t u\|_{P_a^l} + \|\mathcal{A} \Delta_g u\|_{P_a^l} + \|\mathcal{L}[u]\|_{P_a^l} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{P_a^{l+1}} + \|\mathcal{L}[u]\|_{P_a^{l+1}} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{P_a^{l+1}} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the assumption (A3) for \mathcal{L} in the last inequality. Meanwhile, the continuity of the first component of \mathfrak{F} follows directly from the argument in [32].

We next need to show that \mathfrak{F} has an inverse. This suffices to show that the equation $\mathfrak{F}[u] = (u_0, f)$, for arbitrarily given u_0 and f , is uniquely solvable in the appropriate class. However,

this was exactly the conclusion of the existence results Proposition 4.1, Corollary 4.4 and the regularity theory culminating in Lemma 4.6.

The only remaining loophole is that, when $l = 0$, the initial data in Corollary 4.4 was assumed to be in $H^2(M)$. In order to close this, for an arbitrary $f \in P_a^0$, let $u_0 \in H^1(M)$ and let $\{u_0^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of smooth functions on M converging to u_0 with respect to the H^1 -norm. For each j , Corollary 4.4 returns a function $u^{(j)}$ in P_a^1 which solves the equation $\mathfrak{F}[u^{(j)}] = (u_0^{(j)}, f)$. Then, by virtue of Lemma 4.6 with $l = 0$, we have $\{u^{(j)}\}$ converge in P_a^1 to a limit function u . And, by the continuity of \mathfrak{F} , we have $\mathfrak{F}[u] = (u_0, f)$, i.e. the inverse of \mathfrak{F} exists.

Note that the estimate in Lemma 4.6 also implies the inverse of \mathfrak{F} is continuous, we therefore conclude that $\mathfrak{F} : P_a^{l+1} \rightarrow H^{2l+1}(M) \times P_a^l$ is an isomorphism. \square

5 An initial-value problem for the Einstein-Dirac equation

5.1 Set up of the problem

Recall that we denote $L_g = -c_m \Delta_g + \text{Scal}_g$ the conformal Laplace operator on (M, g) with $c_m = \frac{4(m-1)}{m-2}$. For a conformal metric $g^u = u^{\frac{4}{m-2}} g$, we note that the scalar curvature of g^u is related to the scalar curvature of g by

$$\text{Scal}_{g^u} = u^{-\frac{m+2}{m-2}} L_g u.$$

Hence for $g^{uv} = v^{\frac{4}{m-2}} g^u = (uv)^{\frac{4}{m-2}} g$, by letting $w = uv$, we obtain

$$\text{Scal}_{g^{uv}} = v^{-\frac{m+2}{m-2}} L_g u v = w^{-\frac{m+2}{m-2}} L_g w.$$

and this recovers the conformal covariance

$$L_g u v = u^{-\frac{m+2}{m-2}} L_g (uv). \quad (5.1)$$

Given a metric $g(0) = g^{u_0} \in [g]$, where $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}_+^k$ is such that the Dirac operator $D_{g(0)}$ has a simple eigenvalue $\lambda(u_0) \neq 0$. By virtue of Section 3, we can assume there is an open neighborhood \mathcal{U}_0 of u_0 in \mathcal{C}_+^k such that the simple Dirac eigenvalue $\lambda : \mathcal{U}_0 \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$, $u \mapsto \lambda_u := \lambda(u)$ is well-defined. Then

$$\mathcal{E} := \left\{ (u, \psi) \in \mathcal{U}_0 \times L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M)) : \psi \in \ker \left(D_g - \lambda_u u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \right) \right\}$$

gives rise to a smooth line bundle over \mathcal{U}_0 equipped with the $(\cdot, \cdot)_2^u$ -metric at each u . Building upon this, we can evolve $g(0)$ through a family of conformal metrics $g(t) = g^{u(\cdot, t)}$, $t \geq 0$, constrained on \mathcal{E} by considering the flow equation

$$\frac{\partial u^{\frac{m+2}{m-2}}}{\partial t} = -\frac{m+2}{m-2} \left[L_g u - \left(\frac{\int_M u L_g u d \text{vol}_g}{\int_M u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} |\psi|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g} \right) |\psi|_g^2 u^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}} \right] \quad (5.2)$$

with $(u(\cdot, t), \psi(\cdot, t)) \in \mathcal{E}$. We shall refer this equation as the *Einstein-Dirac flow*.

Evidently, by setting

$$\psi_u = \frac{\psi}{\sqrt{\int_M u^{\frac{2}{m-2}} |\psi|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g}}$$

for $(u, \psi) \in \mathcal{E}$, we have ψ_u is $(\cdot, \cdot)_2^u$ -normalized in the sense that $(\psi_u, \psi_u)_2^u \equiv 1$ and (5.2) can be simplified to the following parabolic type equation

$$\frac{\partial u^{\frac{m+2}{m-2}}}{\partial t} = -\frac{m+2}{m-2} \left[L_g u - \left(\int_M u L_g u d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_u|_g^2 u^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}} \right]. \quad (5.3)$$

Notice that the map $t \mapsto g(t)$ preserves the conformal structure, by denoting

$$\eta_u(\cdot, t) = -\frac{4}{m-2} \left[\text{Scal}_{g(t)} - \left(\int_M u(\cdot, t) L_g u(\cdot, t) d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_u(t)|_g^2 u(\cdot, t)^{-\frac{2(m-1)}{m-2}} \right],$$

we can equivalently transform (5.3) into

$$\partial_t u = \frac{m-2}{4} \eta_u u$$

or the evolution of g as

$$\partial_t g(t) = \eta_u g(t).$$

Clearly, the flow problem (5.3) leads us to consider a quasilinear parabolic scalar equation, but with an unconventional term involving a concomitant eigenspinor. It will surprise nobody that such an equation still admit short-time (or even long-time) solutions. Nevertheless, this does not belong to the standard theory and requires proof.

5.2 The local well-posedness

We construct now the short-time solution to the Einstein-Dirac flow (5.3) with initial data $(u_0, \psi_0) \in \mathcal{E}$. Our main result in this subsection is as follows.

Proposition 5.1. *There exists $T > 0$ such that the Einstein-Dirac flow with above initial data $(u_0, \psi_0) \in \mathcal{E}$ has a unique smooth solution in the time interval $[0, T]$.*

For $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T > 0$, let us introduce the following Hilbert space

$$P^l(T) := \left\{ u : M \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \sum_{2j+k \leq 2l} \int_0^T \|\partial_t^j u\|_{H^k(M)}^2 dt < +\infty \right\}$$

and equip it with the norm

$$\|u\|_{P^l(T)}^2 = \sum_{2j+k \leq 2l} \int_0^T \|\partial_t^j u\|_{H^k(M)}^2 dt.$$

Clearly, for every $T > 0$, there is a natural continuous embedding $P_a^l \hookrightarrow P^l(T)$ by restricting all functions on the time interval $[0, T]$. And, in the study of short time existence result, it will be easier to use the space $P^l(T)$ instead of the weighted spaces P_a^l , $a > 0$.

Before we consider our flow problem (5.3), we revisit the equation (4.1) since it will serve as a linearization of (5.3). For later use, for a function $w \in P_a^l$, the current state of w at time $t \in [0, +\infty)$ will be referred to $(t, w(\cdot, t))$ with $w(\cdot, t) \in P_{a,t}^l$, where $P_{a,t}^l$ stands for the function space at time t (and we will simply call it t -fiber of P_a^l). Then, a crucial requirement for the operator \mathcal{L} to ensure the short-term existence result is that the current state of $\mathcal{L}[u]$ should never be affected by the future state of u . In view of this, let us present the following lemma in the setting of $P^l(T)$ spaces.

Lemma 5.2. *Under the assumptions (A2) and (A3), for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T > 0$, \mathcal{L} is a continuous linear operator on $P^l(T)$, i.e., $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{L}(P^l(T), P^l(T))$.*

Proof. We first claim that

Claim. *\mathcal{L} is t -fiber preserving on the P_a^l spaces in the sense that $\mathcal{L}[u](\cdot, t) \in P_{a,t}^l$ depends only on the current state of u at time t for all $u \in P_a^l$.*

And then, we only need to check the boundedness of \mathcal{L} on $P^l(T)$. Let us assume to the contrary that there exists a $P^l(T)$ -bounded sequence of functions $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that $\|\mathcal{L}[u_j]\|_{P^l(T)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

For each $j \geq 1$, let us consider an bounded extension $\tilde{u}_j \in P_a^l$ of the function u_j in the sense that

$$\tilde{u}_j|_{M \times [0, T]} = u_j \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{u}_j\|_{P_a^l} \leq C \|u_j\|_{P^l(T)}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of j . Then, by the assumption (A3) and the above claim, we have that $\{\mathcal{L}[\tilde{u}_j]\}$ is a P_a^l -bounded sequence satisfying $\mathcal{L}[\tilde{u}_j]|_{M \times [0, T]} = \mathcal{L}[u_j]$. On the other hand, it follows easily that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}[\tilde{u}_j]\|_{P_a^l}^2 &= \sum_{2j+k \leq 2l} \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \|\partial_t^j \mathcal{L}[\tilde{u}_j]\|_{H^k(M)}^2 dt \\ &\geq C_{a,T} \sum_{2j+k \leq 2l} \int_0^T \|\partial_t^j \mathcal{L}[\tilde{u}_j]\|_{H^k(M)}^2 dt = C_{a,T} \|\mathcal{L}[u_j]\|_{P^l(T)}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where $C_{a,T} > 0$ depends only on a and T . And since we have assumed that $\|\mathcal{L}[u_j]\|_{P^l(T)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, we can conclude from (5.4) that $\|\mathcal{L}[\tilde{u}_j]\|_{P_a^l} \rightarrow \infty$, which is absurd. And therefore, \mathcal{L} must be a bounded linear operator on $P^l(T)$.

It remains to check the above claim. And let us point out here that the claim is actually equivalent to the assumption (A2) imposed before. In fact, due to the linearity of \mathcal{L} , it is evident that the t -fiber preserving property of \mathcal{L} implies (A2). And to see the reverse, let us take an arbitrary function $\alpha \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ so that $\alpha(0) = 1$ and $\alpha \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus (-1, 1)$, and define $\alpha_{\tau,\varepsilon}(t) = \alpha((t - \tau)/\varepsilon)$ for $t \geq 0$ with $\tau \in [0, +\infty)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then we can infer from (A2) that

$$\mathcal{L}[u](\cdot, \tau) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \alpha_{\tau,\varepsilon}(\tau) \mathcal{L}[u](\cdot, \tau) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}[\alpha_{\tau,\varepsilon} u](\cdot, \tau).$$

This, together with the arbitrariness of α , suggests that $\mathcal{L}[u](\cdot, \tau)$ depends only on the current state $(\tau, u(\cdot, \tau))$. \square

Analogous to Theorem 4.7, we have the following time-localized result in the setting of $P^l(T)$ spaces.

Lemma 5.3. *For every $T > 0$ and $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, the map \mathfrak{F} given by formula (4.11) is an isomorphism of $P^{l+1}(T)$ onto $H^{2l+1}(M) \times P^l(T)$.*

Proof. With Lemma 5.2 readily available, we can establish the continuity of \mathfrak{F} by employing the same reasoning as in Theorem 4.7. Hence, our sole objective is to prove that \mathfrak{F} is an isomorphism.

Given any $u_0 \in H^{2l+1}(M)$ and $f \in P^l(T)$, let us consider an extension $\tilde{f} \in P_a^l$ of the function f and we set $\tilde{u} \in P_a^{l+1}$ be the solution of the linear problem (4.7) in $M \times [0, +\infty)$. Clearly, $u := \tilde{u}|_{M \times [0, T]}$ belongs to $P^{l+1}(T)$ and satisfies $\mathfrak{F}[u] = (u_0, f)$ in $M \times [0, T]$. Suppose that $v \in P^{l+1}(T)$ is another function such that $\mathfrak{F}[v] = (u_0, f)$ in $M \times [0, T]$, then we set $w = u - v$. Now, it is easy to see that w satisfies the equation

$$\partial_t w - \mathcal{A}\Delta_g w + \mathcal{L}[w] = 0, \quad w(\cdot, 0) = 0.$$

Notice that, by (4.4), we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M w^2(x, t) d \text{vol}_g &= 2 \int_0^t \int_M w(x, s) \partial_t w(x, s) d \text{vol}_g ds \\ &= 2 \int_0^t \int_M w(x, s) [\mathcal{A}\Delta_g w - \mathcal{L}[w]](x, s) d \text{vol}_g ds \\ &\leq -\delta \int_0^t \|w(\cdot, s)\|_{H^1(M)}^2 ds + 2\kappa \int_0^t |w(\cdot, s)|_2^2 ds \\ &\leq 2\kappa \int_0^t \int_M w^2(x, s) d \text{vol}_g ds \end{aligned}$$

as $w(\cdot, t) \in W^{2,2}(M)$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$. Then, by Gronwall's inequality, we have that $\int_M w^2(x, t) d \text{vol}_g$ is zero for every $t \in [0, T]$. It follows that w is identically zero, and hence u and v must coincide.

Since $\mathfrak{F} : P^{l+1}(T) \rightarrow H^{2l+1}(M) \times P^l(T)$ is a continuous bijection, we can conclude from the open mapping theorem that \mathfrak{F} is an isomorphism. \square

Remark 5.4. If both u_0 and f are smooth functions, then the unique solution u of Eq. (4.7) is guaranteed to be in the space $\cap_{l \geq 1} P^l(T)$. By the Parabolic Sobolev embeddings (see for instance Proposition A.1 in the Appendix), for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we can always find a large l so that $P^l(T)$ continuously embeds into $C^k(M \times [0, T])$. And hence we can conclude that the solution u actually belongs to $C^\infty(M \times [0, T])$ provided that u_0 and f are smooth.

Now we are nearing the point where we can provide the short time existence result for the Einstein-Dirac flow (5.3). Before we start the proof, let us denote $P_+^l(T)$ as the positive cone in $P^l(T)$, consisting of all $u \in P^l(T)$ such that $u > 0$. We also introduce a subset of $P_+^l(T)$ as

$$P_{+,1}^l(T) := \{u \in P_+^l(T) : u(\cdot, 0) \in \mathcal{U}_{g,n_0}^1\}$$

where \mathcal{U}_{g,n_0}^1 is given by (3.3) with $n_0 > 1$ being initially fixed. We will now consider the a quasilinear elliptic operator given by

$$\mathcal{Q}[u] = c_m u^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \Delta_g u - \text{Scal}_g u^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} + \left(\int_M u L_g u d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_u|_g^2 u^{-\frac{m}{m-2}},$$

where $c_m = \frac{4(m-1)}{m-2}$ and $\psi_u(t) \in L^2(M, \mathbb{S}(M))$ is the normalized eigenspinor associated to the simple Dirac eigenvalue $\lambda_u(t) \neq 0$ with $\lambda_u(0) \in [-n_0, 0) \cup (0, n_0]$, which exists at least for a small time interval $[0, T_u]$. Let us mention that, due to the parabolic Sobolev embeddings (see for instance [30, Proposition 4.1]), we have $P^l(T) \hookrightarrow C^1(M \times [0, T])$ for $l > \frac{m+6}{4}$. Then, under the hypothesis of Lemma 3.8, we can see that $P_{+,1}^l(T)$ is an open dense subset of $P_+^l(T)$. We also emphasize that the set $P_{+,1}^l(T)$ can be regarded as a collection of curves of functions with their starting point in \mathcal{U}_{g,n_0}^1 . It is possible that for certain curves in this collection, the Dirac operator associated with the conformal metric $g^{u(\cdot, t_*)}$ at a particular time $t_* > 0$ may not possess a simple eigenvalue. However, thanks to Lemma 3.9, we can always find a $P^l(T)$ -neighborhood U of a given function $u \in P_{+,1}^l(T)$ (by setting T smaller if necessary) so that \mathcal{Q} is well-defined in the sense that $t \mapsto (\lambda_v(t), \psi_v(t))$ exists (at least continuously) for all $v \in U$ on $[0, T]$. And we shall call U the \mathcal{Q} -admissible neighborhood of u . In order to study the short time existence result of Eq. (5.3), for a given $u \in P_{+,1}^l(T)$ and its \mathcal{Q} -admissible neighborhood $U \subset P_{+,1}^l(T)$, let us consider

$$\mathcal{F}[v] = (v_0, \partial_t v - \mathcal{Q}_*[v]), \quad \forall v \in U \quad (5.5)$$

where $v_0 := v(\cdot, 0)$ and

$$\mathcal{Q}_*[v] := c_m v^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \Delta_g v - \text{Scal}_g v^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} + \vartheta(t) \left(\int_M v L_g v d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_v|_g^2 v^{-\frac{m}{m-2}},$$

with $\vartheta \in C^\infty([0, +\infty))$ satisfying

$$\vartheta(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t \leq T/2 \\ 0, & t \geq 3T/4 \end{cases}.$$

Once a \mathcal{Q} -admissible neighborhood U is fixed, one of our key ingredient here is the observation that $\mathcal{F} : U \rightarrow H^{2l-1}(M) \times P^{l-1}(T)$ is of class C^1 provided that l is suitably large (say $l > (m+8)/2$). In particular, the Fréchet derivative of \mathcal{F} at $v \in U$ can be written in the form

$$D\mathcal{F}[v](w) = \frac{d}{d\tau} \mathcal{F}[v + \tau w] \Big|_{\tau=0} = (w_0, \partial_t w - c_m v^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \Delta_g w + \mathcal{L}_v[w])$$

for $w \in P^l(T)$, where $\mathcal{L}_v \in \mathcal{L}(P^l(T), P^l(T))$ depends continuously on v (the explicit formulation of \mathcal{L}_v will be given later). Notice that we have inserted a cut-off function ϑ in the formulation of \mathcal{Q}_* , we can actually extend \mathcal{Q}_* to act on any positive function $\tilde{v} \in P_a^l$, $a > 0$, such that $\tilde{v}|_{M \times [0, T]} = v \in U$. And hence the induced operator $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{v}}$ exists as well for such \tilde{v} . By taking a cut-off function $\rho \in C^\infty([0, +\infty))$ so that $\rho(t) = 1$ for $t \leq T$ and $\rho(t) = 0$ for $t \geq 2T$, we can introduce an extension of $D\mathcal{F}[v]$ as

$$\mathfrak{F}_{\tilde{v}}[w] = (w_0, \partial_t w - (c_m \rho \tilde{v}^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} + 1 - \rho) \Delta_g w + \rho \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{v}}[w]) \quad \text{for } w \in P_a^l. \quad (5.6)$$

And then we have $\mathfrak{F}_{\tilde{v}}|_{P^l(T)} = D\mathcal{F}[v]$. In case \tilde{v} is a smooth function, the above expression will make it legitimate to apply Theorem 4.7 and Lemma 5.3 to $\mathfrak{F}_{\tilde{v}}$ and $D\mathcal{F}[v]$ respectively. All these will be verified in Appendix A.3.

The proof of Proposition 5.1 will be divided into two classical steps: the local existence and the energy inequality.

Proof of Proposition 5.1: local existence. Given $u_0 \in \cap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{U}_{g, n_0}^k$, let us consider an auxiliary function

$$w_*(x, t) = \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \frac{a_i(x) t^i}{i!} \quad (5.7)$$

with $l \in \mathbb{N}$ being necessarily large, $a_0 = u_0$ and $a_1, \dots, a_{l-1} \in C^\infty(M)$ to be determined later. Notice that $a_0 > 0$, by virtue of Lemma 3.9, we can always find $T > 0$ small such that $w_* \in P_{+,1}^l(T)$ and the eigenpair $(\lambda_{w_*}(t), \psi_{w_*}(t))$ exists on $[0, T]$. Furthermore, we can take $u_* \in P^l(T)$ to be the unique solution of the linear problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = c_m w_*^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \Delta_g u - \text{Scal}_g w_*^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} + \vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M w_* L_g w_* d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_{w_*}|_g^2 w_*^{-\frac{m}{m-2}} \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x). \end{cases}$$

Such solution exists by Lemma 5.3 and it is smooth by Remark 5.4, as u_0 and w_* are smooth (thus the eigenspinor ψ_{w_*} is also smooth).

By narrowing the time interval $[0, T]$ (if necessary), we have $u_* \in P_{+,1}^l(T)$ and

$$\mathcal{F}[u_*] = (u_0, \partial_t u_* - \mathcal{Q}_*[u_*]) =: (u_0, f_*)$$

where f_* has the explicit expression

$$\begin{aligned} f_* &= c_m \left(w_*^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} - u_*^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \right) \Delta_g u_* - \text{Scal}_g \left(w_*^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} - u_*^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} \right) \\ &\quad + \vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M w_* L_g w_* d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_{w_*}|_g^2 w_*^{-\frac{m}{m-2}} \\ &\quad - \vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M u_* L_g u_* d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_{u_*}|_g^2 u_*^{-\frac{m}{m-2}}. \end{aligned}$$

If we compute the Fréchet derivative of the map \mathcal{F} at $u_* \in C^\infty(M \times [0, T])$, in the ‘‘direction’’ $w \in P^l(T)$, we obtain

$$D\mathcal{F}[u_*](w) = (w_0, \partial_t w - c_m u_*^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \Delta_g w + \mathcal{L}_{u_*}[w])$$

where $w_0 := w(\cdot, 0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{u_*}[w] &= \frac{4c_m}{m-2} u_*^{-\frac{m+2}{m-2}} w \Delta_g u_* - \frac{m-6}{m-2} \text{Scal}_g u_*^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} w \\ &\quad + 2\vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M w L_g u_* d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_{u_*}|_g^2 u_*^{-\frac{m}{m-2}} \\ &\quad + 2\vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M u_* L_g u_* d \text{vol}_g \right) \text{Re}(\psi_{u_*}, \phi_{u_*, w})_g u_*^{-\frac{m}{m-2}} \\ &\quad - \frac{m}{m-2} \vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M u_* L_g u_* d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_{u_*}|_g^2 u_*^{-\frac{2m-2}{m-2}} w \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{u_*, w}(t) &= \frac{\kappa_{u_*, w}(t)}{2} \psi_{u_*}(t) \\ &\quad - \frac{2\lambda_{u_*}(t)}{m-2} \left(u_*(\cdot, t)^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g - \lambda_{u_*}(t) \right)^{-1} \circ (I - P_{\lambda_{u_*}(t)}) \left(u_*(\cdot, t)^{-1} w(\cdot, t) \psi_{u_*}(t) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\kappa_{u_*, w}(t) = -\frac{2}{m-2} \int_M u_*(\cdot, t)^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}} w(\cdot, t) |\psi_{u_*}(t)|_g^2 d\text{vol}_g.$$

And we can find that $D\mathcal{F}[u_*](w) = (z, f) \in H^{2l-1}(M) \times P^{l-1}(T)$ is equivalent to the linear problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w - c_m u_*^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \Delta_g w + \mathcal{L}_{u_*}[w] = f \\ w(x, 0) = z(x) \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

which coincides with our model problem (4.1) on $M \times [0, T]$.

By applying Lemma 5.3, we can see that $D\mathcal{F}[u_*] : P^l(T) \rightarrow H^{2l-1}(M) \times P^{l-1}(T)$ is an isomorphism. And, in other words, there exists a unique solution $w_{z, f}$ of Eq. (5.8) for every pair $(z, f) \in H^{2l-1}(M) \times P^{l-1}(T)$. Now, by virtue of the inverse function theorem, we find the map \mathcal{F} is a diffeomorphism from a neighborhood $U \subset P_{+,1}^l(T)$ of u_* onto a neighborhood $V \subset H^{2l-1}(M) \times P^{l-1}(T)$ of (u_0, f_*) . Particularly, U can be chosen as a \mathcal{Q} -admissible neighborhood of u_* .

Next, we can consider a sequence of time-shifted functions $f_{*,k} : M \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f_{*,k}(x, t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq t < 1/k, \\ f_*(x, t - 1/k) & \text{if } 1/k \leq t \leq T. \end{cases}$$

Assuming for the moment that

$$\partial_t^j f_*|_{t=0} = 0 \text{ and } \nabla_g^p \partial_t^j f_*|_{t=0} = 0 \text{ for any } j = 0, 1, \dots, l-1 \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.9)$$

We can then directly deduce $\nabla_g^p \partial_t^j f_{*,k} \in C(M \times [0, T])$ for every $j = 0, 1, \dots, l-1$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, it follows easily that

$$\nabla_g^p \partial_t^j f_{*,k} \rightarrow \nabla_g^p \partial_t^j f_* \text{ in } L^2(M \times [0, T]) \text{ for } j = 0, 1, \dots, l-1 \text{ and } 2j + p \leq 2(l-1),$$

and hence $f_{*,k} \rightarrow f_*$ in $P^{l-1}(T)$. From this point of view, there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (u_0, f_{*,k_0}) lies in the neighborhood V of $\mathcal{F}[u_*] = (u_0, f_*)$ and $f_{*,k_0} = 0$ on $M \times [0, 1/k_0]$. Since \mathcal{F} is a diffeomorphism between U and V , we can find a function $u_{*,k_0} \in U$ such that $\mathcal{F}[u_{*,k_0}] = (u_0, f_{*,k_0})$. Clearly, such $u_{*,k_0} \in P_{+,1}^l(1/k_0)$ will be a solution of the Einstein-Dirac flow (5.3) on $M \times [0, 1/k_0]$. By taking $T_0 < 1/k_0$, the parabolic regularity implies that $u_{*,k_0} \in C^\infty(M \times [0, T_0])$.

It remains to verify (5.9), which is strongly depending on the choice of those functions a_1, \dots, a_{l-1} in (5.7). Notice that we have set $a_0 = u_0 \in \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{U}_{g, n_0}^k$, let us defined a_i via the recurrence formula

$$a_i = \partial_t^{i-1} \left[c_m w_*^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \Delta_g u_* - \text{Scal}_g w_*^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} + \vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M w_* L_g w_* d\text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_{w_*}|_g^2 w_*^{-\frac{m}{m-2}} \right] \Big|_{t=0}$$

for $i \geq 1$. Observe that the right-hand side above contains time-derivatives at $t = 0$ of w_* , $\nabla_g w_*$, $L_g w_*$ and $\Delta_g u_*$ only up to order $i - 1$, hence it depends only on the functions a_0, \dots, a_{i-1} . In this way, we get the precise details of the functions $a_1, \dots, a_{l-1} \in C^\infty(M)$. Following on this clue, we point out that $a_i = \partial_t^i w_*|_{t=0} = \partial_t^i u_*|_{t=0}$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, l-1$. And hence $f_* \in C^\infty(M \times [0, T])$ satisfies (5.9) as was required. \square

Having disposed of the local existence result, we will now turn to consider the uniqueness of a solution and the continuous dependence on its initial data. Actually, we shall mention here that the proof above gives us more. In fact, once the uniqueness is settled, the solution of the Einstein-Dirac flow (5.3) with initial data $(u_0, \lambda_0, \psi_0) \in \cap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{U}_{g, n_0}^k \times (-n_0, n_0) \times \ker(D_g - \lambda_0 u_0^{2/(m-2)})$ can be characterized by $u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(u_0, 0)$ restricted on $M \times [0, T_0]$. Assuming $u_{j,0} \rightarrow u_0$ in $C^\infty(M)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, we also have $u_{j,0} \rightarrow u_0$ in $H^{2l-1}(M)$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence for j large enough we have $u_j = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(u_{j,0}, 0) \in P_{+,1}^l(T_0)$ is the unique solution with initial data $(u_{j,0}, \lambda_{j,0}, \psi_{j,0})$. By recalling the continuity of perturbed Dirac eigenvalue problem mentioned in Section 3, the eigenpair $(\lambda_{j,0}, \psi_{j,0})$ can be chosen so that $\lambda_{j,0} \rightarrow \lambda_0$ and $\psi_{j,0} \rightarrow \psi_0$. Therefore, we have $u_j \rightarrow u$ in $P^l(T_0)$ -topology, which is nothing but the continuous dependence on the initial data. In what follows, let us verify the uniqueness result of the Einstein-Dirac flow.

Proof of Proposition 5.1: energy inequality. Suppose that we have two $P_{+,1}^l(T_0)$ -solutions u and v of (5.3) on $M \times [0, T_0]$ with $u(\cdot, 0) = v(\cdot, 0) = u_0$, $\lambda_u(0) = \lambda_v(0)$ and $\psi_u(0) = \psi_v(0)$, where l is suitably large. By setting $w = u - v$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{dt} \int_M |\nabla_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g &= 2 \int_M \nabla_g w \cdot \nabla_g \partial_t w d \text{vol}_g \\
 &= 2 \int_M \nabla_g w \cdot \nabla_g (\mathcal{Q}[u] - \mathcal{Q}[v]) d \text{vol}_g \\
 &= -2 \int_M \Delta_g w \cdot (\mathcal{Q}[u] - \mathcal{Q}[v]) d \text{vol}_g \\
 &= -2c_m \int_M u^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g \\
 &\quad - 2c_m \int_M \Delta_g w \cdot \left((u^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} - v^{-\frac{4}{m-2}}) \Delta_g v \right) d \text{vol}_g \\
 &\quad + 2 \int_M \Delta_g w \cdot \text{Scal}_g \cdot \left(u^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} - v^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} \right) d \text{vol}_g \\
 &\quad - 2 \int_M \Delta_g w \cdot (\mathcal{S}[u] - \mathcal{S}[v]) d \text{vol}_g,
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}[z] = \left(\int_M z L_g z d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_z|_g^2 z^{-\frac{m}{m-2}}$$

for $z = u$ or v .

Here we need to be careful because the well-definedness of $\mathcal{S}[u]$ and $\mathcal{S}[v]$ do not imply the existence of $\mathcal{S}[su + (1-s)v]$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$ on $M \times [0, T_0]$. However, since we have assumed $u(\cdot, 0) = v(\cdot, 0) = u_0$, it is possible to find $\tau \in (0, T_0]$ and a \mathcal{Q} -admissible neighborhood $U \subset P_{+,1}^l(\tau)$ of $u|_{M \times [0, \tau]}$ such that $(su + (1-s)v)|_{M \times [0, \tau]} \in U$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. Indeed, we can first find a C^1 -neighborhood \mathcal{O} of u_0 so that $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{U}_{g, n_0}^1$ and $u(\cdot, t), v(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{O}$ for all $t \in [0, \tau]$. Then, by Lemma 3.9 and the parabolic Sobolev embedding Proposition A.1, we have \mathcal{S} can be defined on any t -parameterized trajectory of functions in \mathcal{O} . Notice that we have $(su + (1-s)v)(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{O}$ for all $t \in [0, \tau]$ and $s \in [0, 1]$, we can thus ensure $(su + (1-s)v)|_{M \times [0, \tau]}$ lies in a \mathcal{Q} -admissible neighborhood of $u|_{M \times [0, \tau]}$. And therefore, we can consider the map $s \mapsto \mathcal{S}[su + (1-s)v]$ on $M \times [0, \tau]$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$.

Let's go back to the previous computation. By setting l large enough (so that Lemma A.4 applies), the positiveness and boundedness of u and v imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M u^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g &\geq \delta \int_M |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g, \\ \int_M \Delta_g w \cdot \left((u^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} - v^{-\frac{4}{m-2}}) \Delta_g v \right) d \text{vol}_g &\leq C \int_M |\Delta_g w| |u - v| d \text{vol}_g \\ &= C \int_M |\Delta_g w| |w| d \text{vol}_g \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_M |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g + C_\varepsilon \int_M |w|^2 d \text{vol}_g, \\ \int_M \Delta_g w \cdot \text{Scal}_g \cdot \left(u^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} - v^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} \right) d \text{vol}_g &\leq \varepsilon \int_M |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g + C_\varepsilon \int_M |w|^2 d \text{vol}_g, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \Delta_g w \cdot (\mathcal{S}[u] - \mathcal{S}[v]) d \text{vol}_g &\leq \varepsilon \int_M |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g + C_\varepsilon \int_M |\mathcal{S}[u] - \mathcal{S}[v]|^2 d \text{vol}_g \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_M |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g + C_\varepsilon \int_M |D\mathcal{S}[v + \theta w](w)|^2 d \text{vol}_g \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_M |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g + C_\varepsilon \int_M (|\nabla_g w|^2 + |w|^2) d \text{vol}_g, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last estimate we have designated $D\mathcal{S}$ as the Fréchet derivative of $\mathcal{S} : P_{+,1}^l(\tau) \supset U \rightarrow P^l(\tau)$ (which exists due to Lemma A.4 and satisfies assumption (A1) as is indicated by Corollary A.5). By fixing ε small, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_M |\nabla_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g \leq -\frac{\delta}{2} \int_M |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g + C \int_M (|\nabla_g w|^2 + |w|^2) d \text{vol}_g. \quad (5.10)$$

Next, using similar idea as above, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_M |w|^2 d \text{vol}_g &= 2 \int_M w \cdot (\mathcal{Q}[u] - \mathcal{Q}[v]) d \text{vol}_g \\ &= 2c_m \int_M u^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} w \Delta_g w d \text{vol}_g \\ &\quad + 2c_m \int_M w \cdot \left((u^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} - v^{-\frac{4}{m-2}}) \Delta_g v \right) d \text{vol}_g \\ &\quad - 2 \int_M w \cdot \text{Scal}_g \cdot \left(u^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} - v^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}} \right) d \text{vol}_g \\ &\quad + 2 \int_M w \cdot (\mathcal{S}[u] - \mathcal{S}[v]) d \text{vol}_g \\ &\leq \varepsilon \int_M |\Delta_g w|^2 d \text{vol}_g + C_\varepsilon \int_M (|\nabla_g w|^2 + |w|^2) d \text{vol}_g. \end{aligned}$$

By fixing ε small and putting the above estimate together with (5.10), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_M (|\nabla_g w|^2 + |w|^2) d \text{vol}_g \leq C \int_M (|\nabla_g w|^2 + |w|^2) d \text{vol}_g \quad (5.11)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ on the time interval $[0, \tau]$.

Finally, from (5.11), we can conclude that the quantity $\int_M (|\nabla_g w|^2 + |w|^2) d \text{vol}_g$ is identically zero on $[0, \tau]$ since we have $w(\cdot, 0) = 0$. Moreover, by repeating the above argument, it follows that if $\int_M (|\nabla_g w|^2 + |w|^2) d \text{vol}_g$ is zero at some time t_0 , then it must be zero for every time $t \in [t_0, T_0]$. The proof is hereby completed. \square

A Appendix

A.1 Parabolic Sobolev embeddings

We present here some embedding results that were used in the context. For a proof of the following proposition, we refer the readers to [30, Proposition 4.1].

Proposition A.1. *Let $u \in P^l(T)$. Then, for $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2j + k \leq 2l$, we have*

$$\|\partial_t^j \nabla^k u\|_{L^q(M \times [0, T])} \leq C \|u\|_{P^l(T)} \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2l - k - 2j}{m + 2} > 0;$$

$$\|\partial_t^j \nabla^k u\|_{L^q(M \times [0, T])} \leq C \|u\|_{P^l(T)} \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2l - k - 2j}{m + 2} = 0 \text{ and } 1 \leq q < +\infty;$$

the function $\partial_t^j \nabla^k u$ is continuous and

$$\|\partial_t^j \nabla^k u\|_{C(M \times [0, T])} \leq C \|u\|_{P^l(T)} \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2l - k - 2j}{m + 2} < 0,$$

where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of u .

A.2 Regularity theory for the linear problem (4.7)

In the following discussion, we will demonstrate that a weak solution u of equation (4.7) possesses higher-order derivatives by obtaining estimates for its difference quotients.

Lemma A.2. *If $u \in HH_a$ is a weak solution of (4.7) with $f \in LH_a^0$ and $u_0 \in H^1(M)$ and $a > 0$ is suitably large, then $u \in LH_a^2$ and the following estimate holds*

$$\|u\|_{LH_a^2}^2 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^1(M)}^2 + \|f\|_{LH_a^0}^2),$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L}, \nabla_g \mathcal{A}$ and the manifold M .

Proof. For $r > 0$, let us denote $B_r(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ the open ball of radius r centered at the origin. Since M is compact, we can choose $r < \text{inj}(M)/3$ (where $\text{inj}(M) > 0$ represents the injectivity radius of M) and $\{(U_i, \Psi_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ as a family of smooth local coordinate system on M such

that $\Psi_i : B_r(0) \rightarrow U_i \subset M$ is a diffeomorphism and $\cup_{i=1}^N U_i = M$. Let η be a smooth cut-off function on \mathbb{R}^m satisfying

$$\eta(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in B_r(0), \\ 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus B_{2r}(0). \end{cases}$$

We also denote $U_i^* = \Psi_i(B_{3r}(0))$.

Given some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let us assume that we already have the estimate for u in LH_a^{l+1} , for each $l = 0, \dots, k-1$, i.e.,

$$\|u\|_{LH_a^{l+1}}^2 \leq C(\|u\|_{H^1(M)}^2 + \|f\|_{LH_a^0}^2).$$

Evidently, Lemma 4.5 suggests the above estimate holds for $k = 1$. To proceed, for $h \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, let us set $\phi = \Delta_{-h}^k(\eta^4 \Delta_h^k u)$ in U_i^* , where η and the finite difference operator

$$\Delta_h w = \frac{w(x + he_s) - w(x)}{h}$$

are lifted to M using the coordinate map Ψ_i and Δ_h^k means acting Δ_h for k times. In the above formulation, e_s is an arbitrarily fixed element of the local frame $\{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$. Outside U_i^* we simply extend ϕ to be zero. At this moment, although we don't have uniform estimate in h for the norms of ϕ , the function is at least as regular as u .

Testing (4.7) with ϕ , we obtain

$$\langle \partial_t u, \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0} + \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \mathcal{A}(u, \phi) dt = \langle f, \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Shifting difference operators with the discrete analogue of partial integration in space, we soon deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \partial_t(\eta^2 \Delta_h^k u), \eta^2 \Delta_h^k u \rangle_{LH_a^0} - \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M \mathcal{A}_k^* \Delta_g(\Delta_h^k u) \eta^4 \Delta_h^k u \, d \text{vol}_g \, dt \\ & + (-1)^k \langle \mathcal{L}[u], \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0} = (-1)^k \langle f, \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0} + E \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where we have set

$$E = \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M \Delta_h^j \mathcal{A}_{k-j}^* \Delta_g(\Delta_h^{k-j} u) \eta^4 \Delta_h^k u \, d \text{vol}_g \, dt.$$

Additional explanation may be necessary: the function $\mathcal{A}_j^*(\cdot, \cdot)$, $j = 0, \dots, k$, which is given by $\mathcal{A}_j^*(x, t) = \mathcal{A}(x + jhe_s, t)$, arises through an application of the discretised product rule

$$\Delta_h(wz)(x) = w(x + he_s) \Delta_h z(x) + z(x) \Delta_h w(x).$$

Since we have assumed that \mathcal{A} is smooth, the functions $\mathcal{A}_0^*, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k^*$ share all pointwise properties.

Focusing on E , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |E| & \leq C \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M \sum_{j=1}^k |\nabla_g(\Delta_h^{k-j} u)| (|\nabla_g(\eta^4 \Delta_h^k u)| + |\eta^4 \Delta_h^k u|) \, d \text{vol}_g \, dt \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon \|u\|_{LH_a^k}^2 + \varepsilon \|\eta^4 \nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where we have used [21, Lemma 7.23] in the last inequality, $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small constant whose value will be given later and $C_\varepsilon > 0$ depends on ε and the L^∞ -norm of derivatives of the coefficients $\mathcal{A}_1^*, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k^*$ (they are also controlled by the corresponding norms of \mathcal{A}). Regarding the remaining terms in (A.2), we can address the first term on the left using (4.10), that is

$$\langle \partial_t(\eta^2 \Delta_h^k u), \eta^2 \Delta_h^k u \rangle_{LH_a^0} = a \|\eta^2 \Delta_h^k u\|_{LH_a^0}^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\eta^2 \Delta_h^k u_0|_2^2. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

And for the elliptic part, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E^* &:= - \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M \mathcal{A}_k^* \Delta_g(\Delta_h^k u) \eta^4 \Delta_h^k u \, d \text{vol}_g \, dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M (\eta^4 \mathcal{A}_k^* \nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u) \cdot \nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u) + \nabla_g(\eta^4 \mathcal{A}_k^*) \cdot \nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u) \Delta_h^k u) \, d \text{vol}_g \, dt \\ &\geq \int_0^\infty e^{-2at} \int_M (\eta^4 \mathcal{A}_k^* \nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u) \cdot \nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u) - C \eta^2 |\nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u)| |\Delta_h^k u|) \, d \text{vol}_g \, dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on the gradient of $\eta \mathcal{A}_k^*$. And so, using the ellipticity of \mathcal{A}_k^* and Young's inequality, we find

$$\begin{aligned} E^* &\geq \delta \|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 - \frac{\delta}{4} \|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 - C_\delta \|\Delta_h^k u\|_{LH_a^0}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{3\delta}{4} \|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h^k u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 - C_\delta \|u\|_{LH_a^k}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where we have used [21, Lemma 7.23] again in the last inequality. Now, let us consider the two remaining terms in (A.2). Actually, the estimates can be easily obtained if we now explicitly take $k = 1$:

$$|\langle \mathcal{L}[u], \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0}| \leq C_{\mathcal{L}} \|u\|_{LH_a^1} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h u\|_{LH_a^1} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $C_{\mathcal{L}} > 0$ comes from the assumption (A1) for \mathcal{L} , and meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0}| &\leq \|f\|_{LH_a^0} \|\Delta_{-h}(\eta^4 \Delta_h u)\|_{LH_a^0} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{LH_a^0} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h u\|_{LH_a^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Combining (A.3)-(A.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{3\delta}{4} \|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 - C_\delta \|u\|_{LH_a^1}^2 &\leq C_\varepsilon \|u\|_{LH_a^1}^2 + \varepsilon \|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\eta^2 \Delta_h u_0|_2^2 \\ &\quad + C_{\mathcal{L}} \|u\|_{LH_a^1} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h u\|_{LH_a^1} + \|f\|_{LH_a^0} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h u\|_{LH_a^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by choosing $\varepsilon \leq \delta/4$, invoking Lemma 4.5 and recalling the hypothesis that $u_0 \in H^1(M)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 &\leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^1(M)}^2 + \|u\|_{LH_a^1}^2 + \|f\|_{LH_a^0}^2) \\ &\leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^1(M)}^2 + \|f\|_{LH_a^0}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{L} and $\nabla_g \mathcal{A}$. And hence, we have an uniform LH_a^1 -bound in h for all the difference quotients of first order in the open set U_i , which therefore converge weakly to the weak derivatives satisfying the estimate

$$\|\nabla_g^2 u\|_{LH_a^0(U_i)}^2 \leq C (\|u_0\|_{H^1(M)}^2 + \|f\|_{LH_a^0}^2).$$

Here we use $LH_a^0(U_i)$ to symbolize the corresponding function space on U_i . Finally, by summing over all coordinate charts, we obtain the desired result. \square

As a direct consequence of Lemma A.2, u is smooth enough that we pointwisely have $\partial_t u = f + \mathcal{A}\Delta_g u - \mathcal{L}[u] \in LH_a^0$. This, together with the fact $LH_a^0 = P_a^0$, gives us an estimate for the time derivative of u :

Corollary A.3. *If $u \in HH_a$ is a weak solution of (4.7) with $f \in P_a^0$ and $u_0 \in H^1(M)$, then $u \in P_a^1$ and*

$$\|u\|_{P_a^1}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^1(M)}^2 + \|f\|_{P_a^0}^2)$$

provided $a > 0$ is large enough in the sense of Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.5, where $C > 0$ depends only on $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L}, \nabla_g \mathcal{A}$ and the manifold M .

Now we are ready to give the P_a^l -version of the a priori energy estimate for parabolic equation (4.7).

Proof of Lemma 4.6. In this case, let us take a smooth cut-off function η as in the proof of Lemma A.2 and choose $\phi = \Delta_{-h}^{2l+k}(\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u)$ for $h \neq 0$ as the test function in (A.1). Then we can proceed almost the same as before. The difference here lies in the bounds for the integrals, which come from the homogeneous term f and the linear term $\mathcal{L}[u]$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0}| &= |\langle \Delta_h^{2l} f, \Delta_{-h}^k(\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u) \rangle_{LH_a^0}| \leq \|f\|_{LH_a^{2l}} \|\Delta_{-h}^k(\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u)\|_{LH_a^0} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{LH_a^{2l}} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u\|_{LH_a^k} \end{aligned}$$

and, by recalling the hypothesis that $u \in P_a^l$ and the embedding $P_a^l \hookrightarrow LH_a^{2l}$, we have $\mathcal{L}[u] \in LH_a^{2l}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathcal{L}[u], \phi \rangle_{LH_a^0}| &= |\langle \Delta_h^{2l} \mathcal{L}[u], \Delta_{-h}^k(\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u) \rangle_{LH_a^0}| \leq \|\mathcal{L}[u]\|_{LH_a^{2l}} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u\|_{LH_a^k} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{L}[u]\|_{P_a^l} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u\|_{LH_a^k} \leq C_{\mathcal{L},l} \|u\|_{P_a^l} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u\|_{LH_a^k}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, very similar to what have done in the proof of Lemma A.2, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{3\delta}{4} \|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h^{2l+k} u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 &\leq C_\varepsilon \|u\|_{LH_a^{2l+k}}^2 + \varepsilon \|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h^{2l+k} u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\eta^2 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u_0\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + C_{\mathcal{L},l} \|u\|_{P_a^l} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u\|_{LH_a^k} + \|f\|_{LH_a^{2l}} \|\eta^4 \Delta_h^{2l+k} u\|_{LH_a^k}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

And, by taking $\varepsilon \leq \delta/4$, $k = 0$ and invoking the embedding $P_a^l \hookrightarrow LH_a^{2l}$, we first find that

$$\|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h^{2l} u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2l}(M)}^2 + \|u\|_{P_a^l}^2 + \|f\|_{P_a^l}^2)$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of h . Hence, by taking to the limit $h \rightarrow 0$ and summing over all coordinate charts, we obtain

$$\|u\|_{LH_a^{2l+1}}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2l+1}(M)}^2 + \|u\|_{P_a^l}^2 + \|f\|_{P_a^l}^2) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

with $C > 0$ depends only on $l, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L}, \nabla_g \mathcal{A}$ and the manifold M . Next, let us take $k = 1$ in (A.8) and use Young's inequality to obtain

$$\|\eta^2 \nabla_g(\Delta_h^{2l+1} u)\|_{LH_a^0}^2 \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2l+1}(M)}^2 + \|u\|_{LH_a^{2l+1}}^2 + \|u\|_{P_a^l}^2 + \|f\|_{LH_a^{2l}}^2).$$

Once again, by taking to the limit $h \rightarrow 0$ and summing over all coordinate charts, we soon get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{LH_a^{2l+2}} &\leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2l+1}(M)}^2 + \|u\|_{LH_a^{2l+1}}^2 + \|u\|_{P_a^l}^2 + \|f\|_{LH_a^{2l}}^2) \\ &\leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^{2l+1}(M)}^2 + \|u\|_{P_a^l}^2 + \|f\|_{LH_a^{2l}}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where the last inequality follows from (A.9).

So much for the spatial regularity, and we shall turn to consider the time derivatives. Notice that we have assumed $u \in P_a^l$ is a solution to $\partial_t u = f + \mathcal{A}\Delta_g u - \mathcal{L}[u]$, thus we have $\partial_t^s u$ exists almost everywhere in $LH_a^{2(l-s)}$ for $s = 0, \dots, l$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^{s+1} u\|_{LH_a^{2(l-s)}}^2 &\leq C_s \left(\|\partial_t^s f\|_{LH_a^{2(l-s)}}^2 + \|\partial_t^s \mathcal{L}[u]\|_{LH_a^{2(l-s)}}^2 + \sum_{j \leq s} \|\partial_t^j u\|_{LH_a^{2(l+1-j)}}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C_s \left(\|f\|_{P_a^l}^2 + \|u\|_{P_a^l}^2 + \sum_{j \leq s} \|\partial_t^j u\|_{LH_a^{2(l+1-j)}}^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

with $C_s > 0$ depends on the L^∞ -norms of \mathcal{A} , $\partial_t \mathcal{A}$, \dots , $\partial_t^s \mathcal{A}$. Now, starting from Corollary A.3, (A.10), $s = 0$ and iterating up to $s = l$, we obtain the desired conclusion. \square

A.3 Technical results

In this section, let us collect some basic properties of the map \mathcal{F} defined in (5.5), which are crucial in the proof of our short time existence result.

Lemma A.4. *For $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $l > (m+6)/2$ and $T > 0$ small, let $u \in P_{+,s}^{l+1}(T)$ be such that \mathcal{F} is well-defined. It holds that $\mathcal{F}[u] \in H^{2l+1}(M) \times P^l(T)$. Moreover, for a \mathcal{Q} -admissible neighborhood U of u , the map \mathcal{F} is of class C^1 on U .*

Proof. Note that the first component of \mathcal{F} , i.e., the map $v \mapsto v(\cdot, 0)$ is linear and bounded from $P^{l+1}(T)$ to $H^{2l+1}(M)$. As a result, it falls within the class C^1 . Additionally, the map $v \mapsto \partial_t v$ is also linear and bounded, by taking functions from $P^{l+1}(T)$ to $P^l(T)$. Therefore, it is likewise of class C^1 . Now, it remains to show that the following two maps

$$\mathcal{Q}_1[v] := c_m v^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \Delta_g v - \text{Scal}_g v^{\frac{m-6}{m-2}}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Q}_2[v] := \left(\int_M v L_g v d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_v|_g^2 v^{-\frac{m}{m-2}}$$

belong to $C^1(U, P^l(T))$ for some neighborhood $U \subset P_{+,s}^{l+1}(T)$ of u .

The analysis for the C^1 -property of the operator \mathcal{Q}_1 can be found in [30, Lemma 2.5], where we only need to assume that $l > m/4$ to obtain $\mathcal{Q}_1 \in C^1(P_{+,s}^{l+1}(T), P^l(T))$. Hence, in what follows, we will focus on the operator \mathcal{Q}_2 , for which we have to pay more attention on the Dirac eigenspinor. To proceed, let $U \subset P_{+,s}^{l+1}(T)$ be an open and bounded neighborhood of the given function u so that the simple eigenvalue $t \mapsto \lambda_v(t)$ is well-defined for all $v \in U$, then our first step is to prove that $\mathcal{Q}_2 \in C(U, P^{l+1}(T))$.

Let us fix $v \in U$. In order to show that $\mathcal{Q}_2[v] \in P^{l+1}(T)$, we need to establish some basic estimates for derivatives of the eigenspinor ψ_v . For this purpose, let us go back to Lemma 3.9,

where the derivation of the eigenpair $(\lambda_v(t), \psi_v(t))$ is presented, and we shall firstly consider the growth of $\lambda_v(t)$ with respect to t .

In general cases, let $\psi(t)$ be an eigenspinor of $v(\cdot, t)^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g$ with eigenvalue $\lambda(t)$ so that $\lambda(0) \in [-n_0, n_0] \setminus \{0\}$. Using the expression of λ' in Lemma 3.9, it follows from the P^{l+1} -boundedness of v and the parabolic Sobolev embedding $P^{l+1}(T) \hookrightarrow C^1(M \times [0, T])$ for $l > (m+2)/4$ that there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ (independent of $v \in U$) such that

$$|\lambda'(t)| \leq C|\lambda(t)| \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T].$$

The solution of this differential inequality leads to the following bound for the growth of the perturbed eigenvalues:

$$|\lambda(t) - \lambda(0)| \leq n_0(e^{Ct} - 1), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Let us write $\lambda_{0,1} < \lambda_{0,2} < \dots < \lambda_{0,j_0}$ for all the simple eigenvalues of $v(\cdot, 0)^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g$ that belong to $[-n_0, n_0] \setminus \{0\}$. Let $d_1, \dots, d_{j_0} > 0$ be such that the intervals $I_j = [\lambda_{0,j} - d_j, \lambda_{0,j} + d_j]$ for $j = 1, \dots, j_0$ are disjoint. Set $\lambda_{0,-}$ for the biggest eigenvalue in $(-\infty, -n_0)$ and $\lambda_{0,+}$ for the smallest eigenvalue in $(n_0, +\infty)$. By taking d_1 and d_{j_0} smaller if necessary, we can assume that $\lambda_{0,-} \notin I_1$ and $\lambda_{0,+} \notin I_{j_0}$ (see Fig. 1).




Figure 1: Simple eigenvalues of $v(\cdot, t)^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g$ that belong to $(\lambda_{0,-}, \lambda_{0,+}) \setminus \{0\}$

To ensure that, for each $j = 1, \dots, j_0$, the perturbed eigenvalue $\lambda_{0,j}(t)$ belongs I_j , we only need to narrow the time interval $[0, T]$ so that

$$|\lambda_{0,j}(t) - \lambda_{0,j}| \leq n_0(e^{CT} - 1) \leq d_j \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, j_0.$$

And, by [3, Proposition 7.1], we can also ensure that none of the perturbations of the eigenvalues that initially belonged to $\mathbb{R} \setminus [-n_0, n_0]$ coincide with $\lambda_{0,1}(t), \dots, \lambda_{0,j_0}(t)$. Therefore, once the initial datum $\lambda_v(0) \in \{\lambda_{0,1}, \dots, \lambda_{0,j_0}\} \cap [-n_0, n_0] \setminus \{0\}$ is given for a function $v \in U$, we can find a constant $C_* > 0$ (independent of v and t) such that

$$\|(v(\cdot, t)^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g - \lambda_v(t))^{-1} \circ (I - P_{\lambda_v(t)})\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_*. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Hence, from Lemma 3.9, we find $\psi'_v(\cdot)$ exists and is L^2 -uniformly bounded with respect to all $v \in U$. Actually the above proof gives us more, namely we can conclude from the elliptic regularity of Dirac operator that the map $t \mapsto \psi_v(t)$ induces a C^1 -curve in the space of spinors.

Taking into account a function $v \in U \subset P^{l+1}(T)$ has weak time-derivatives up to order $l+1$, in order to prove that $\mathcal{Q}_2 \in C(U, P^{l+1}(T))$, we need to show that the map

$$v \mapsto \partial_t^j \mathcal{Q}_2[v]$$

belongs to $C(U, L^2([0, T], H^k(M)))$ whenever $j = 0, 1, \dots, l+1$ and $2j + k \leq 2(l+1)$.

We can assume from now on that $k_l \geq 1$ is the biggest integer so that $P^{l+1}(T) \hookrightarrow C^{k_l}(M \times [0, T])$. By the parabolic Sobolev embeddings (see Proposition A.1), it follows easily that

$$l = \left\lceil \frac{m+2}{4} \right\rceil + k_l$$

where $\lceil r \rceil$ stands for the largest integer that doesn't exceed $r \in (0, +\infty)$. To estimate the time-derivatives of $\mathcal{Q}_2[v]$, we have to show that the corresponding derivatives of ψ_v exist and possess some necessary regularity. In this direction, we can first apply Lemma 3.9 to obtain the time-derivatives of ψ_v up to order k_l which are all continuous in t . To go further, it can be seen from an induction argument that, up to certain constants, $\partial_t^j \mathcal{Q}_2[v]$ is a summation of functions in the form of

$$\left(\int_M (\partial_t^{\alpha_1} v) L_g (\partial_t^{\alpha_2} v) d \text{vol}_g \right) \cdot \text{Re} \left(\partial_t^{\beta_1} \psi_v, \partial_t^{\beta_2} \psi_v \right)_g \cdot (v^{-\gamma_0}) (\partial_t v)^{\gamma_1} \dots (\partial_t^{n_j} v)^{\gamma_{n_j}} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n_j}$ are non-negative integers with $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} i \gamma_i = j$ and $\gamma_0 \geq 0$. And it is easy to see that, for each $j \in \{k_l + 1, \dots, l+1\}$, there exists at most one element in $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, n_j\}$ that is greater than $\frac{l+1}{2}$. And we remark here that, when l is suitably large (say at least $l \geq (m+4)/2$), there holds $\frac{l+1}{2} \leq k_l$.

If $\max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\} > k_l$, then we can assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_1 > k_l$ (since the conformal Laplace operator L_g is self-adjoint, we can always interchange the places of α_1 and α_2). And in this case, by using Hölder's inequality, we find that the function in (A.12) has the same integrability as $\partial_t^{\alpha_1} v$ since the remaining factors are all L^∞ -bounded. In particular, we have

$$\int_0^T \left| \int_M (\partial_t^{\alpha_1} v) L_g (\partial_t^{\alpha_2} v) d \text{vol}_g \right|^{q_{\alpha_1}} dt \leq C(q_{\alpha_1}, \|v\|_{C^{\alpha_2+2}(M \times [0, T])}) \|\partial_t^{\alpha_1} v\|_{L^{q_{\alpha_1}}(M \times [0, T])}^{q_{\alpha_1}}$$

where

$$q_{\alpha_1} = \begin{cases} \frac{m+2}{2} \left(\frac{m-2}{4} - l + \alpha_1 \right)^{-1} & \text{if } \frac{m-2}{4} - l + \alpha_1 > 0, \\ \text{any finite number} & \text{if } \frac{m-2}{4} - l + \alpha_1 = 0, \end{cases}$$

and the coefficient $C(q_{\alpha_1}, \|v\|_{C^{\alpha_2+2}(M \times [0, T])}) > 0$ depends only on q_{α_1} and $\|v\|_{C^{\alpha_2+2}(M \times [0, T])}$. Notice that $\alpha_1 \geq k_l + 1$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq j \leq l+1$, we can deduce $\alpha_2 \leq \lfloor \frac{m+2}{4} \rfloor$. Since we have assumed $l \geq (m+6)/2$, we find that $k_l \geq \lfloor \frac{m+2}{4} \rfloor + 2$. This implies $\alpha_2 + 2 \leq k_l$ and, therefore, $\|v\|_{C^{\alpha_2+2}(M \times [0, T])} < +\infty$.

If $n_j > k_l$, then we get the corresponding exponent $\gamma_{n_j} = 1$. And similar to the previous case, we once again conclude that the function in (A.12) has the same integrability as $\partial_t^{n_j} v$ since the remaining factors are all L^∞ -bounded. It remains to consider the case $\max\{\beta_1, \beta_2\} > k_l$, and we can also assume without loss of generality that $\beta_1 > k_l$. In order to study the integrability of $\partial_t^{\beta_1} \psi_v$, let us go back to (3.5) and consider the identity (3.6) because this is where ψ_v and its derivatives originate. Clearly, the derivatives of λ_v will be also involved as was pointed out in Lemma 3.9.

Suppose that the time-derivatives of λ_v and ψ_v exist up to order $s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and, in particular, there holds

$$\lambda_v^{(s)} \in L^2([0, T]) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_t^s \psi_v \in L^2([0, T], H^{2(l+1)-2s+1}(M, \mathbb{S}(M))) \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where $\lambda_v^{(s)}$ stands for the s -th derivative of λ_v , and $\lambda_v^{(0)} = \lambda_v$. To consider the $(s+1)$ -th derivatives, we need to look at the mapping

$$t \mapsto \left(\nabla_{(\lambda, \psi)} \Phi(v(\cdot, t), \lambda_v(t), \psi_v(t)) \right)^{-1} [\kappa_{s+1}(t), \phi_{s+1}(t)],$$

where κ_{s+1} is a summation of functions in the form of

$$\operatorname{Re} \int_M (v^{\mu_0}) (\partial_t v)^{\mu_1} \dots (\partial_t^{r_{s+1}})^{\mu_{r_{s+1}}} (\partial_t^{\nu_1} \psi_v, \partial_t^{\nu_2} \psi_v)_g d \operatorname{vol}_g$$

with $\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{r_{s+1}} i \mu_i = s+1$, $\max\{\nu_1, \nu_2\} \leq s$ and $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and ϕ_{s+1} is a summation of spinors in the form of

$$\lambda_v^{(\sigma)} \cdot (v^{\rho_0}) (\partial_t v)^{\rho_1} \dots (\partial_t^{d_{s+1}})^{\rho_{d_{s+1}}} \partial_t^\omega \psi_v$$

and

$$(v^{\chi_0}) (\partial_t v)^{\chi_1} \dots (\partial_t^{b_{s+1}} v)^{\chi_{b_{s+1}}} D_g \partial_t^\theta \psi_v$$

with $\sigma + \omega + \sum_{i=1}^{d_{s+1}} i \rho_i = s+1$, $\max\{\sigma, \omega\} \leq s$, $\theta + \sum_{i=1}^{b_{s+1}} i \chi_i = s+1$, $\theta \leq s$ and $\rho_0, \chi_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, once (A.13) is satisfied, we can deduce that $\lambda_v^{(s+1)}$ and $\partial_t^{s+1} \psi_v$ exist and satisfy

$$\lambda_v^{(s+1)} = -(\phi_{s+1}, \psi_v)_2^v \in L^2([0, T])$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t^{s+1} \psi_v &= \frac{\kappa_{s+1}}{2} \psi_v + \left(v^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g - \lambda_v \right)^{-1} \circ (I - P_{\lambda_v}) \phi_{s+1} \\ &\in L^2([0, T], H^{2(l+1)-2(s+1)+1}(M, \mathbb{S}(M))). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, by using the elliptic regularity of the Dirac operator, (A.13) is valid for $s = 0$. Therefore, by an induction argument, the above analysis indicates that (A.13) is valid for all $s = 0, 1, \dots, l+1$.

Now, let us turn back to (A.12). By using Hölder's inequality, an immediate consequence of the above arguments is that $\partial_t^j \mathcal{Q}_2[v] \in L^2([0, T], L^2(M)) \simeq L^2(M \times [0, T])$ and the map $v \mapsto \partial_t^j \mathcal{Q}_2[v]$ belongs to $C(U, L^2(M \times [0, T]))$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, l+1$. We also notice that, the space or mixed space-time derivatives $\partial_t^j \nabla^k \mathcal{Q}_2[v]$ with $2j+k \leq 2(l+1)$ can be treated similarly, by observing that the function $\partial_t^r \nabla^p v$ has the same integrability of $\partial_t^{r+p/2} v$ from the view point of the embeddings in Proposition A.1. This will suggest that $\mathcal{Q}_2 \in C(U, P^{l+1}(T))$ as was desired.

To see that the Fréchet derivative $D\mathcal{Q}_2$ exists and belongs to $C(U, \mathcal{L}(P^{l+1}(T), P^{l+1}(T)))$, we shall first look at the Gateaux derivative

$$(v, w) \mapsto d\mathcal{Q}_2(v, w) := \left. \frac{d}{d\tau} \mathcal{Q}_2[v + \tau w] \right|_{\tau=0}$$

for $v \in U$ and $w \in P^{l+1}(T)$. A direct computation, together with Lemma 3.9, shows that

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathcal{Q}_2(v, w) &= 2 \left(\int_M v L_g w d \operatorname{vol}_g \right) |\psi_v|_g^2 v^{-\frac{m}{m-2}} + 2 \left(\int_M v L_g v d \operatorname{vol}_g \right) \operatorname{Re}(\psi_v, \phi_{v,w})_g v^{-\frac{m}{m-2}} \\ &\quad - \frac{m}{m-2} \left(\int_M v L_g v d \operatorname{vol}_g \right) |\psi_v|_g^2 v^{-\frac{2m-2}{m-2}} w \end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

where

$$\phi_{v,w}(t) = \frac{\kappa_{v,w}(t)}{2} \psi_v(t) - \frac{2\lambda_v(t)}{m-2} (v(\cdot, t)^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g - \lambda_v(t))^{-1} \circ (I - P_{\lambda_v(t)}) (v(\cdot, t)^{-1} w(\cdot, t) \psi_v(t))$$

with

$$\kappa_{v,w}(t) = -\frac{2}{m-2} \int_M v(\cdot, t)^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}} w(\cdot, t) |\psi_v(t)|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g.$$

Then it is easy to see that $d\mathcal{Q}_2(v, w)$ is linear in w . And it is clear, since $w \in P^{l+1}(T)$, that the same estimates used to show the continuity of \mathcal{Q}_2 can be repeated here to prove $d\mathcal{Q}_2(v, \cdot) \in \mathcal{L}(P^{l+1}(T), P^{l+1}(T))$. Moreover, an analogous reasoning also applies to the continuity of $v \mapsto d\mathcal{Q}_2(v, \cdot)$. Therefore, the Fréchet derivative of \mathcal{Q}_2 exists with $D\mathcal{Q}_2[v] = d\mathcal{Q}_2(v, \cdot)$, for all $v \in U$, which completes the proof. \square

By computing the Fréchet derivative of \mathcal{F} at $v \in U \subset P_{+,s}^{l+1}(T)$, we find that

$$D\mathcal{F}[v](w) = \frac{d}{d\tau} \mathcal{F}[v + \tau w] \Big|_{\tau=0} = (w_0, \partial_t w - c_m v^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} \Delta_g w + \mathcal{L}_v[w])$$

for $w \in P^{l+1}(T)$, where $\mathcal{L}_v \in \mathcal{L}(P^{l+1}(T), P^{l+1}(T))$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_v[w] &= \frac{4c_m}{m-2} v^{-\frac{m+2}{m-2}} w \Delta_g v - \frac{m-6}{m-2} \text{Scal}_g v^{-\frac{4}{m-2}} w \\ &\quad + 2\vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M w L_g v d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_v|_g^2 v^{-\frac{m}{m-2}} \\ &\quad + 2\vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M v L_g v d \text{vol}_g \right) \text{Re}(\psi_v, \phi_{v,w})_g v^{-\frac{m}{m-2}} \\ &\quad - \frac{m}{m-2} \vartheta \cdot \left(\int_M v L_g v d \text{vol}_g \right) |\psi_v|_g^2 v^{-\frac{2m-2}{m-2}} w \end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{v,w}(t) &= \frac{\kappa_{v,w}(t)}{2} \psi_v(t) \\ &\quad - \frac{2\lambda_v(t)}{m-2} (v(\cdot, t)^{-\frac{2}{m-2}} D_g - \lambda_v(t))^{-1} \circ (I - P_{\lambda_v(t)}) (v(\cdot, t)^{-1} w(\cdot, t) \psi_v(t)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\kappa_{v,w}(t) = -\frac{2}{m-2} \int_M v(\cdot, t)^{\frac{4-m}{m-2}} w(\cdot, t) |\psi_v(t)|_g^2 d \text{vol}_g.$$

The following result is a direct consequence of Lemma A.4.

Corollary A.5. *If \mathcal{F} is C^1 on $U \subset P_{+,s}^{l+1}(T)$, for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and $v \in U \cap C^\infty(M \times [0, T])$, then \mathcal{L}_v satisfies*

- (1) $|\mathcal{L}_v[w](\cdot, t)|_2 \leq C \|w(\cdot, t)\|_{H^1(M)}$ for some constant $C > 0$;
- (2) $\mathcal{L}_v[\alpha w](\cdot, t) = \alpha(t) \mathcal{L}_v[w](\cdot, t)$ for any smooth function $\alpha : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;
- (3) $\mathcal{L}_v \in \mathcal{L}(P^j(T), P^j(T))$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Clearly, the validity of (2) follows directly from the linearity of \mathcal{L}_v . And, by repeating the arguments of Lemma A.4, we can easily check (3) is satisfied as v is smooth. So we only need to confirm that \mathcal{L}_v satisfies (1).

In fact, using the smoothness and positiveness of v on $M \times [0, T]$, the L^2 -norm of $\mathcal{L}_v[w](\cdot, t)$ can be estimated via (A.15) as

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_v[w](\cdot, t)|_2 &\leq C \left(|w(\cdot, t)|_2 + \left| \int_M w L_g v d \text{vol}_g \right| + |\phi_{v,w}(t)|_2 \right) \\ &\leq C (|w(\cdot, t)|_2 + \|w(\cdot, t)\|_{H^1(M)} + |\phi_{v,w}(t)|_2) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used

$$\left| \int_M w L_g v d \text{vol}_g \right| = \left| \int_M (c_m \nabla_g w \cdot \nabla_g v + \text{Scal}_g v w) d \text{vol}_g \right| \leq C \|w(\cdot, t)\|_{H^1(M)}$$

with $C > 0$ independent of w and t . Notice that, by (A.11), we have $|\phi_{v,w}(t)|_2 \leq C |w(\cdot, t)|_2$. Therefore, we obtain (1) as was asserted. \square

References

- [1] B. Ammann, A variational problem in conformal spin geometry, Habilitationsschrift, Universität Hamburg 2003.
- [2] T. Aubin, Équations différentielles non linéaires et problème de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire, J. Math. Pures Appl. 55 (1976), 269-296.
- [3] C. Bär, Metrics with harmonic spinors, Geom. Func. Anal. 6:6 (1996), 899-942.
- [4] C. Bär, P. Gauduchon, A. Moroianu, Generalized cylinders in semi-Riemannian and spin geometry, Math. Z. 249:3 (2005), 545-580.
- [5] S. Bando, H. Urakawa, Generic properties of the eigenvalue of the Laplacian for compact Riemannian manifolds, Tohoku Math. J. 35:2 (1983), 155-172.
- [6] F.A. Belgun, The Einstein-Dirac equation on Sasakian 3-manifolds, J. Geom. Phys. 37 (2001), 229-236.
- [7] D. Blecker, L. Wilson, Splitting the spectrum of a Riemannian manifold, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 11:5 (1980), 813-818.
- [8] W. Borrelli, A. Maalaoui, Some properties of Dirac-Einstein bubbles, J. Geom. Anal. 31:6 (2021), 5766-5782.
- [9] S. Brendle, Convergence of the Yamabe flow for arbitrary initial energy, J. Differential Geom. 69:2 (2005) 217-278.

- [10] S. Brendle, Convergence of the Yamabe flow in dimension 6 and higher, *Invent. Math.* 170:3 (2007) 541-576.
- [11] D.R. Brill, J.A. Wheeler, Interaction of Neutrinos and Gravitational Fields, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 29 (1957), 465-479.
- [12] Y. Canzani, On the multiplicity of eigenvalues of conformally covariant operators, *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble* 64:3 (2014), 947-970.
- [13] I. Chavel, *Eigenvalues in Riemannian Geometry*, Academic Press 1984.
- [14] B. Chow, The Yamabe flow on locally conformally flat manifolds with positive Ricci curvature, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 45:8 (1992) 1003-1014.
- [15] M. Dahl, Dirac eigenvalues for generic metrics on three-manifolds, *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* 24:1 (2003), 95-100.
- [16] P. Drábek and J. Milota, *Methods of Nonlinear Analysis. Applications to Differential Equations*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2007.
- [17] F. Finster, J. Smoller, S.T. Yau, Particlelike solutions of the Einstein-Dirac equations, *Phys. Rev. D* 59:10, 104020 (1999).
- [18] A. Friedman, *Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1964.
- [19] T. Friedrich, *Dirac Operators in Riemannian Geometry*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics 25 (2000).
- [20] T. Friedrich, Solutions of the Einstein-Dirac equation on Riemannian 3-manifolds with constant scalar curvature, *J. Geom. Phys.* 36 (2000), 199-210.
- [21] D. Gilbarg, N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer, Berlin, 1977.
- [22] O. Hijazi, A conformal lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the Dirac operator and Killing spinors, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 104 (1986), 151-162.
- [23] N. Ginoux, *The Dirac Spectrum*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1976. Springer, Berlin 2009.
- [24] R.S. Hamilton, The Ricci flow on surfaces, in: *Mathematics and general relativity* (Santa Cruz, CA, 1986), vol. 71 of *Contemp. Math.*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1988, pp. 237-262.
- [25] N. Hitchin, Harmonic spinors, *Adv. Math.* 14 (1974), 1-55.

- [26] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995, Reprint of the 1980 edition.
- [27] E.C. Kim, T. Friedrich, The Einstein-Dirac equation on Riemannian spin manifolds, *J. Geom. Phys.* 33 (2000), 128-172.
- [28] H. B. Lawson, M. L. Michelson, *Spin Geometry*, Princeton University Press (1989).
- [29] A. Maalaoui, V. Martino, Characterization of the Palais-Smale sequences for the conformal Dirac-Einstein problem and applications, *J. Diff. Equ.* 266 (2019), 2493-2541.
- [30] C. Mantegazza, L. Martinazzi, A note on quasilinear parabolic equations on manifolds, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) Vol. XI* (2012), 857-874.
- [31] J.M. Lee, T. Parker, The Yamabe problem, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 17 (1987), 37-91.
- [32] A. Polden, *Curves and surfaces of least total curvature and fourth-order flows*, Ph.D. Thesis, Mathematisches Institut, Universität Tübingen, 1996. See: www.mathematik.uni-tuebingen.de/ab/analysis/pub/alex/alex.html.
- [33] R. Schoen, Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature, *J. Differ. Geom.* 20 (1984), 479-495.
- [34] H. Schwetlick, M. Struwe, Convergence of the Yamabe flow for “large” energies, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 562 (2003) 59-100.
- [35] J.J. Sharples, Linear and quasilinear parabolic equations in Sobolev space, *J. Differ. Equ.* 202 (2004), 111-142.
- [36] M. Teytel, How rare are multiple eigenvalues? *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 98:4 (1999), 1059-1078.
- [37] N. Trudinger, Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* 22:4 (1968), 265-274.
- [38] K. Uhlenbeck, Generic properties of eigenfunctions, *Amer. J. Math.* 98:4 (1976), 1059-1078.
- [39] M. Willem, *Minimax Theorems*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1996.
- [40] H. Yamabe, On a deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds, *Osaka Math. J.* 12 (1960), 21-37.
- [41] R. Ye, Global existence and convergence of Yamabe flow, *J. Differential Geom.* 39:1 (1994) 35-50.